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

Replication Report (Task 84)

Independent Replication Study

January 2026

Abstract

This report presents an independent replication analysis examining the causal effect of eligibility for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program on full-time employment among ethnically Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals in the United States. Using a difference-in-differences identification strategy that compares individuals aged 26–30 (treatment group) to those aged 31–35 (control group) at the time of DACA implementation, I find that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 6.5 percentage points. This effect is statistically significant across multiple specifications and robust to various sensitivity analyses, including tests for pre-trends and placebo effects. The findings suggest that DACA had a meaningful positive impact on labor market outcomes for eligible individuals.

Keywords: DACA, immigration policy, employment, difference-in-differences, causal inference

Contents

1 Introduction

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, enacted on June 15, 2012, represented a significant shift in U.S. immigration policy by providing temporary relief from deportation and work authorization to eligible undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children. The program potentially affected hundreds of thousands of individuals, predominantly from Mexico, and may have had substantial effects on their labor market outcomes.

This report presents an independent replication study examining the causal impact of DACA eligibility on full-time employment. The central research question is: *Among ethnically Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born people living in the United States, what was the causal impact of eligibility for DACA on the probability that the eligible person is employed full-time (defined as usually working 35 hours per week or more)?*

To address this question, I employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) identification strategy that exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff for DACA. Specifically, individuals who were aged 26–30 at the time of DACA implementation (June 15, 2012) comprise the treatment group, while those aged 31–35—who would have been eligible except for their age—serve as the comparison group. By comparing changes in full-time employment from the pre-DACA period (2008–2011) to the post-DACA period (2013–2016) between these two groups, I can estimate the causal effect of DACA eligibility under the parallel trends assumption.

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS) provided through IPUMS USA. The prepared dataset includes 17,382 observations of individuals meeting the eligibility criteria (aside from age), with key variables for treatment status, time period, and full-time employment already constructed.

The main finding is that DACA eligibility is associated with a statistically significant increase in full-time employment of approximately 6.5 percentage points. This estimate is robust across multiple specifications, including models with demographic controls and state fixed effects. Robustness checks confirm that there are no significant differential pre-trends between treatment and control groups, and a placebo test using only pre-period data does not detect a spurious effect.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the research design and identification strategy. Section 3 presents the data and sample characteristics. Section 4 details the empirical methodology. Section 5 presents the main results. Section 6 discusses robustness checks. Section 7 explores heterogeneity in the treatment effect. Section 8 concludes with a discussion of the findings and their implications.

2 Research Design

2.1 Background on DACA

DACA was announced by the Department of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012, and began accepting applications on August 15, 2012. The program provided two primary benefits to eligible individuals: (1) deferred action from deportation for two years (renewable), and (2) authorization to work legally in the United States. Additionally, DACA recipients could apply for Social Security numbers and, in some states, driver's licenses.

To be eligible for DACA, individuals had to meet several criteria:

- Were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012
- Arrived in the United States before their 16th birthday
- Had lived continuously in the U.S. since June 15, 2007
- Were present in the U.S. on June 15, 2012
- Did not have lawful status (citizenship or legal residency) on that date
- Met certain educational or military service requirements

In the first four years of the program, nearly 900,000 initial applications were received, with approximately 90% approved. While the program was not specific to any nationality, the structure of undocumented immigration to the United States meant that the majority of eligible individuals were from Mexico.

2.2 Identification Strategy

The identification strategy exploits the age cutoff in DACA eligibility. Individuals who were aged 30 or younger on June 15, 2012, were potentially eligible for DACA, while those who had already turned 31 were ineligible regardless of meeting all other criteria. This creates a natural comparison group of individuals who are similar in many respects to the treated group but were excluded from the program solely due to their age.

The difference-in-differences estimator compares:

1. The change in full-time employment for the treatment group (ages 26–30 at policy implementation) from the pre-period to the post-period
2. The change in full-time employment for the control group (ages 31–35 at policy implementation) over the same time frame

The difference between these two changes provides the DiD estimate:

$$\hat{\delta}_{DiD} = (\bar{Y}_{T,post} - \bar{Y}_{T,pre}) - (\bar{Y}_{C,post} - \bar{Y}_{C,pre}) \tag{1}$$

where T denotes the treatment group and C the control group.

2.3 Identifying Assumptions

The key identifying assumption for the DiD estimator is the **parallel trends assumption**: in the absence of DACA, full-time employment trends would have been the same for the treatment and control groups. This assumption cannot be directly tested, but we can examine whether pre-treatment trends were similar between the groups, which provides supportive evidence if they were parallel.

Additional assumptions include:

- **No anticipation**: Individuals did not change their employment behavior in anticipation of DACA before it was announced
- **No spillovers**: The treatment did not affect employment outcomes for the control group
- **Stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA)**: The treatment effect for one individual does not depend on the treatment status of others

3 Data

3.1 Data Source

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS), accessed through IPUMS USA. The ACS is an annual household survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau that collects detailed demographic, social, economic, and housing information from a nationally representative sample of U.S. residents.

The prepared dataset includes ACS data from 2008 through 2016, excluding 2012. The year 2012 is omitted because it cannot be determined whether respondents from that year were surveyed before or after DACA was announced (June 15, 2012). This creates a clear pre-period (2008–2011) and post-period (2013–2016) for the analysis.

3.2 Sample Construction

The analytic sample consists of ethnically Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals who meet the non-age-related eligibility criteria for DACA. The dataset includes:

- **Treatment group (ELIGIBLE = 1)**: Individuals who were aged 26–30 on June 15, 2012

- **Control group (ELIGIBLE = 0)**: Individuals who were aged 31–35 on June 15, 2012

The age groups were chosen to ensure comparability while maintaining sufficient sample sizes. Individuals who were neither in the treatment nor control group have been excluded from the data. Per the instructions, no further sample restrictions were applied.

3.3 Variables

3.3.1 Outcome Variable

- **FT**: Full-time employment indicator, equal to 1 if the individual usually works 35 or more hours per week, and 0 otherwise. This includes individuals not in the labor force as 0 values.

3.3.2 Key Treatment Variables

- **ELIGIBLE**: Treatment indicator, equal to 1 for the treatment group (ages 26–30) and 0 for the control group (ages 31–35)
- **AFTER**: Post-treatment period indicator, equal to 1 for years 2013–2016 and 0 for years 2008–2011
- **ELIGIBLE** $\times$ **AFTER**: The interaction term, which captures the DiD effect

3.3.3 Control Variables

- **SEX**: Sex of the respondent (1 = Male, 2 = Female)
- **AGE**: Age of the respondent at the time of the survey
- **MARST**: Marital status (1 = Married, spouse present)
- **YRSUSA1**: Years lived in the United States
- **HS_DEGREE**: Indicator for having at least a high school degree
- **STATEFIP**: State FIPS code for state fixed effects

3.3.4 Survey Weight

- **PERWT**: Person weight provided by IPUMS for obtaining nationally representative estimates

3.4 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the sample sizes by treatment group and time period.

Table 1: Sample Sizes by Treatment Group and Period

	Pre-DACA (2008–2011)	Post-DACA (2013–2016)	Total
Control (31–35)	3,294	2,706	6,000
Treatment (26–30)	6,233	5,149	11,382
Total	9,527	7,855	17,382

Table 2 presents the baseline characteristics of the treatment and control groups.

Table 2: Sample Characteristics by Treatment Group

Characteristic	Control (31–35)	Treatment (26–30)
Mean Age	32.75	27.97
Female (%)	47.1	48.2
Mean Years in USA	23.66	19.40
Education Distribution (%)		
Less than High School	0.1	0.1
High School Degree	73.8	70.4
Some College	15.3	17.2
Two-Year Degree	5.1	6.0
BA or Higher	5.8	6.3

The two groups are reasonably comparable, though the treatment group is younger by construction and has spent fewer years in the United States on average. Educational attainment is similar across groups, with the vast majority having at least a high school degree. Gender composition is nearly identical.

Table 3 presents full-time employment rates by group and period.

Table 3: Full-Time Employment Rates by Group and Period (Weighted)

	Pre-DACA	Post-DACA	Change	
Control (31–35)	0.689	0.663	−0.026	
Treatment (26–30)	0.637	0.686	+0.049	
Difference-in-Differences				**0.075**

The simple difference-in-differences calculation shows that while full-time employment decreased slightly for the control group between periods, it increased substantially for the treatment group. The raw DiD estimate of 7.5 percentage points suggests a positive effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment.

4 Methodology

4.1 Econometric Framework

The primary estimation approach is a linear probability model (LPM) estimated via ordinary least squares (OLS) or weighted least squares (WLS). The basic DiD regression specification is:

$$FT_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 \cdot AFTER_t + \beta_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + \epsilon_i \quad (2)$$

where:

- FT_i is the full-time employment indicator for individual i
- $ELIGIBLE_i$ indicates whether individual i is in the treatment group
- $AFTER_t$ indicates whether the observation is from the post-DACA period
- β_3 is the coefficient of interest—the DiD estimator

The coefficient β_3 captures the causal effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment under the parallel trends assumption.

4.2 Extended Specifications

To improve the precision of estimates and control for potential confounders, I estimate several extended specifications:

Model with Demographic Controls:

$$FT_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 \cdot AFTER_t + \beta_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + X_i'\gamma + \epsilon_i \quad (3)$$

where X_i is a vector of individual-level controls including:

- Female indicator (SEX = 2)
- Married indicator (MARST = 1)
- Age (continuous)
- Years in USA (YRSUSA1)
- High school degree indicator (HS_DEGREE)

Model with State Fixed Effects:

$$FT_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 \cdot AFTER_t + \beta_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + X_i'\gamma + \sum_s \alpha_s \cdot State_{is} + \epsilon_i \quad (4)$$

State fixed effects control for time-invariant state-level factors that may affect employment, such as regional labor market conditions, state policies toward immigrants, and industry composition.

Model with Year Fixed Effects:

$$FT_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + X_i'\gamma + \sum_s \alpha_s \cdot State_{is} + \sum_t \tau_t \cdot Year_t + \epsilon_i \tag{5}$$

Year fixed effects absorb year-specific shocks common to all individuals, such as macroeconomic conditions during the Great Recession recovery.

4.3 Survey Weights

To obtain nationally representative estimates, I use the person weights (PERWT) provided by IPUMS. The main specifications are estimated using weighted least squares (WLS), which weights each observation by PERWT. This accounts for the complex sampling design of the ACS and ensures that estimates reflect the population of interest rather than just the sample.

4.4 Standard Errors

All standard errors are computed using the Huber-White heteroskedasticity-robust (HC1) variance estimator. This is particularly important given the binary nature of the outcome variable, which leads to heteroskedasticity by construction in the linear probability model.

4.5 Alternative Estimators

As robustness checks, I also estimate the treatment effect using:

- **Probit model**: Maximum likelihood estimation with marginal effects computed at the mean
- **Logit model**: Maximum likelihood estimation with marginal effects computed at the mean

These nonlinear models may be more appropriate for binary outcomes, and comparison of marginal effects with the LPM coefficients helps assess the robustness of findings across functional form assumptions.

5 Results

5.1 Main Results

Table 4 presents the DiD estimates across five specifications, ranging from the basic model without controls to the fully saturated model with demographic controls, state fixed effects, and year fixed effects.

Table 4: Difference-in-Differences Estimates of the Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment

	(1) Basic OLS	(2) WLS	(3) + Controls	(4) + State FE	(5) + Year FE
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.064***	0.075***	0.065***	0.065***	0.062***
	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
ELIGIBLE	−0.043***	−0.052***	−0.030**	−0.031**	−0.004
	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.018)
AFTER	−0.025**	−0.026*	−0.029	−0.031*	—
	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.018)	
Female			−0.332***	−0.331***	−0.330***
			(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Married			−0.027***	−0.029***	−0.028***
			(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Age			0.002	0.002	0.007**
			(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Years in USA			0.001	0.002*	0.002**
			(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
HS Degree			0.293*	0.307*	0.330*
			(0.170)	(0.177)	(0.180)
Survey Weights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	No	Yes
N	17,382	17,382	17,382	17,382	17,382
R^2	0.002	0.002	0.127	0.131	0.135

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

The results are remarkably consistent across specifications. The DiD estimate (ELIGIBLE $\times$ AFTER) ranges from 0.062 to 0.075, indicating that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by approximately 6.2 to 7.5 percentage points. All estimates are statistically significant at the 1% level.

5.2 Preferred Specification

My preferred specification is Model 4, which includes survey weights, demographic controls, and state fixed effects, but not year fixed effects. This specification:

- Uses survey weights to ensure nationally representative estimates
- Controls for observable demographic differences between treatment and control groups
- Includes state fixed effects to absorb time-invariant state-level confounders
- Retains the AFTER variable for interpretability of the time trend

Preferred Estimate:

- **Effect Size**: 0.065 (6.5 percentage points)
- **Standard Error**: 0.017
- **95% Confidence Interval**: [0.032, 0.097]
- **P-value**: < 0.001

This estimate implies that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 6.5 percentage points. Given the pre-treatment full-time employment rate of 63.7% for the treatment group, this represents a roughly 10% increase in full-time employment.

5.3 Interpretation of Control Variables

The control variable coefficients are consistent with labor economics literature:

- **Female**: Women are 33 percentage points less likely to work full-time than men, reflecting labor force participation differences and the prevalence of part-time work among women
- **Married**: Married individuals are about 3 percentage points less likely to work full-time, possibly due to household specialization
- **Age and Years in USA**: Both have small positive effects on full-time employment, reflecting human capital accumulation
- **HS Degree**: Having at least a high school degree increases full-time employment by about 30 percentage points, though this coefficient is imprecisely estimated due to limited variation

6 Robustness Checks

6.1 Pre-Trends Analysis

A critical assumption for the validity of the DiD estimator is parallel pre-trends between treatment and control groups. I test for differential pre-trends by estimating a model that interacts the ELIGIBLE indicator with a linear time trend in the pre-treatment period only:

$$FT_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \alpha_2 \cdot YEAR_t + \alpha_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times YEAR_t) + \epsilon_i \quad (6)$$

If the treatment and control groups had different employment trends before DACA, we would expect α_3 to be significantly different from zero.

Results:

- Coefficient on ELIGIBLE × YEAR: 0.017
- Standard Error: 0.011
- P-value: 0.113

The pre-trend interaction is not statistically significant, providing support for the parallel trends assumption. The two groups appear to have had similar employment trends prior to DACA implementation.

6.2 Placebo Test

To further validate the research design, I conduct a placebo test using only pre-treatment data. I artificially designate 2010–2011 as the "post" period and 2008–2009 as the "pre" period, then estimate the DiD model. If the original results were spurious, we might expect to find a significant effect in this placebo analysis.

Results:

- Placebo DiD Coefficient: 0.019
- Standard Error: 0.022
- P-value: 0.403

The placebo test shows no significant effect, suggesting that the observed treatment effect in the main analysis is not driven by pre-existing differences between groups.

6.3 Alternative Estimators

Table 5 compares estimates from the linear probability model with those from probit and logit models.

Table 5: Alternative Estimators: Treatment Effect Estimates

	Linear Probability Model (WLS)	Probit (Marginal Effects)	Logit (Marginal Effects)
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.065***	0.056***	0.055***
	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Demographic Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	17,382	17,382	17,382

Notes: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

The marginal effects from probit and logit models (5.6 and 5.5 percentage points, respectively) are slightly smaller than the LPM estimate but remain statistically significant and economically meaningful. The consistency across functional forms strengthens confidence in the findings.

7 Heterogeneity Analysis

To explore whether the treatment effect varies across subgroups, I estimate the DiD model separately by gender and education level.

7.1 By Gender

Table 6: Treatment Effect Heterogeneity by Gender

	Male	Female
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.064***	0.054*
	(0.020)	(0.028)
95% CI	[0.025, 0.102]	[−0.000, 0.109]
P-value	0.001	0.050
N	9,075	8,307

The point estimates are similar for men and women (6.4 vs. 5.4 percentage points), though the effect is more precisely estimated for men. The effect for women is marginally significant

at the 5% level, with the confidence interval just barely including zero. This suggests that DACA benefited both genders, with potentially slightly larger effects for men.

7.2 By Education

Due to the very small number of individuals without a high school degree in the sample (N = 12), meaningful heterogeneity analysis by education is limited. For individuals with at least a high school degree (N = 17,370), the estimated effect is 0.065 (SE = 0.017), essentially identical to the main estimate.

8 Discussion and Conclusion

8.1 Summary of Findings

This replication study provides evidence that DACA eligibility had a statistically significant and economically meaningful positive effect on full-time employment among eligible Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals. The preferred estimate indicates that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 6.5 percentage points (95% CI: 3.2 to 9.7 percentage points).

This finding is robust across multiple specifications:

- The effect persists when controlling for demographic characteristics
- The effect persists when including state and year fixed effects
- Alternative estimators (probit, logit) yield similar marginal effects
- Pre-trends analysis supports the parallel trends assumption
- A placebo test detects no spurious effects in pre-treatment data

8.2 Mechanisms

The positive effect of DACA on full-time employment likely operates through several mechanisms:

1. **Work Authorization**: DACA provided legal authorization to work, allowing recipients to access formal sector employment that was previously unavailable
2. **Reduced Fear of Deportation**: The temporary protection from deportation may have increased labor supply and willingness to pursue stable employment
3. **Access to Documentation**: DACA recipients could obtain Social Security numbers and, in many states, driver's licenses, facilitating employment verification and commuting to work

4. **Human Capital Investment**: Knowing they could work legally may have encouraged recipients to invest in skills and education that increased their employability

8.3 Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these results:

1. **Age-Based Comparison**: The treatment and control groups differ in age by construction. While I control for age, unobserved age-related factors could bias estimates.
2. **Repeated Cross-Section**: The ACS is not panel data, so the DiD compares different individuals before and after treatment, not the same individuals over time.
3. **Eligibility vs. Uptake**: The analysis estimates the effect of eligibility, not actual DACA receipt. Not all eligible individuals applied for or received DACA, so the effect on actual recipients may differ.
4. **Generalizability**: The sample is restricted to Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals. Effects may differ for eligible individuals from other countries.
5. **Parallel Trends**: While pre-trend tests are supportive, the parallel trends assumption cannot be directly verified.

8.4 Conclusion

This independent replication finds strong evidence that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by approximately 6.5 percentage points among eligible Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals. The effect is statistically significant, economically meaningful, and robust across a variety of specifications and robustness checks.

These findings contribute to our understanding of the labor market effects of immigration policy reforms that provide temporary status and work authorization to undocumented immigrants. The results suggest that programs like DACA can have substantial positive effects on employment outcomes for eligible individuals.

Appendix A: Full Regression Output

Model 4: Preferred Specification (Full Output)

Dependent Variable: FT (Full-Time Employment)
Method: Weighted Least Squares
Weights: PERWT (Person Weight)
Standard Errors: Heteroskedasticity-Robust (HC1)

	Coefficient	Std. Err.	P>|z|	[95% CI]
Intercept	0.408	0.205	0.046	[0.007, 0.810]
ELIGIBLE	-0.031	0.015	0.045	[-0.061,-0.001]
AFTER	-0.031	0.018	0.083	[-0.065, 0.004]
ELIGIBLE x AFTER	0.065	0.017	<0.001	[0.032, 0.097]
FEMALE	-0.331	0.008	<0.001	[-0.347,-0.315]
MARRIED	-0.029	0.008	<0.001	[-0.045,-0.013]
AGE	0.002	0.002	0.468	[-0.003, 0.007]
YRSUSA1	0.002	0.001	0.067	[-0.000, 0.003]
HS_DEGREE_BIN	0.307	0.177	0.082	[-0.039, 0.654]

State Fixed Effects: Yes (coefficients suppressed)

N = 17,382
R-squared = 0.131

Appendix B: Year-by-Year Employment Trends

Table 7 presents full-time employment rates by year for each group.

Table 7: Full-Time Employment Rates by Year (Unweighted)

Year	Control (31–35)	Treatment (26–30)	Difference
Pre-DACA Period			
2008	0.726	0.667	−0.059
2009	0.657	0.617	−0.040
2010	0.673	0.606	−0.067
2011	0.618	0.617	−0.001
Post-DACA Period			
2013	0.624	0.642	+0.018
2014	0.649	0.640	−0.009
2015	0.650	0.680	+0.030
2016	0.660	0.708	+0.048

The year-by-year data reveal several patterns:

1. Both groups experienced declining full-time employment during the Great Recession (2008–2011)
2. The treatment group consistently had lower employment than the control group in the pre-period
3. After DACA, the treatment group's employment increased and eventually surpassed the control group
4. The convergence and eventual reversal of the employment gap is consistent with a positive DACA effect

Appendix C: Analysis Code

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

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

The main analysis script (`analysis_script.py`) performs the following steps:

1. Load and prepare data
2. Generate descriptive statistics
3. Estimate five regression specifications
4. Conduct robustness checks (pre-trends, placebo, alternative estimators)
5. Perform heterogeneity analysis
6. Export results to JSON for report generation

Key estimation commands:

```
# Model 4: Preferred Specification
model4 = smf.wls(
    'FT ~ ELIGIBLE + AFTER + ELIGIBLE_AFTER + FEMALE + MARRIED
         + AGE + YRSUSA1 + HS_DEGREE_BIN + C(STATEFIP)',
    data=df,
    weights=df['PERWT']
).fit(cov_type='HC1')
```

Appendix D: Variable Definitions

Variable	Definition
FT	Full-time employment indicator (1 = usually works 35+ hours/week, 0 = otherwise)
ELIGIBLE	Treatment group indicator (1 = ages 26–30 on June 15, 2012, 0 = ages 31–35)
AFTER	Post-treatment period indicator (1 = 2013–2016, 0 = 2008–2011)
YEAR	Survey year
PERWT	Person weight from IPUMS
SEX	Sex (1 = Male, 2 = Female)
AGE	Age at time of survey
MARST	Marital status (1 = Married, spouse present; other values = other statuses)
YRSUSA1	Years lived in the United States
HS_DEGREE	Indicator for high school degree or higher
STATEFIP	State FIPS code
EDUC_RECODE	Recoded education categories
RACE_RECODE	Recoded race categories