The Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment Among Mexican-Born Non-Citizens in the United States

Replication Study Report

Independent Replication

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 Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born non-citizens in the United States. Using data from the American Community Survey (2006–2016) and a difference-in-differences research design, I find that DACA eligibility is associated with a statistically significant 1.8 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment. This effect is robust to the inclusion of demographic controls, education, and state fixed effects. The findings suggest that DACA's provision of work authorization and protection from deportation had a modest positive effect on formal labor market participation among eligible individuals.

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

Contents

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 the United States in recent decades. The program offered temporary protection from deportation and work authorization to undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children and met specific eligibility criteria. By providing legal work authorization, DACA potentially enabled recipients to transition from informal to formal employment, access better job opportunities, and work without fear of workplace enforcement actions.

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

Understanding the labor market effects of DACA is important for several reasons. First, employment outcomes directly affect the economic well-being of immigrants and their families. Second, the labor market integration of immigrants has broader implications for economic productivity and fiscal contributions. Third, the DACA program remains politically contested, and rigorous evidence on its effects can inform policy debates.

I employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) research design that compares changes in full-time employment rates between DACA-eligible individuals and a comparison group of Mexican-born non-citizens who do not meet the eligibility criteria. This design leverages variation in eligibility based on age at arrival and age as of the program's implementation date.

The main finding is that DACA eligibility is associated with a 1.8 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment (95% CI: [0.9, 2.7], $p < 0.001$). This represents a 3.5% increase relative to the pre-DACA full-time employment rate of 51.7% among the eligible population. The effect is statistically significant and robust to various specifications and robustness checks.

2 Background on DACA

2.1 Program Description

DACA was announced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012, and began accepting applications on August 15, 2012. The program offered eligible individuals a two-year, renewable period of deferred action (protection from deportation) and eligibility for work

authorization. Recipients could also apply for driver's licenses in many states and access certain other benefits.

2.2 Eligibility Criteria

To be eligible for DACA, an individual must have:

1. Arrived in the United States before their 16th birthday
2. Not yet had their 31st birthday as of June 15, 2012 (i.e., born after June 15, 1981)
3. Lived continuously in the United States since June 15, 2007
4. Been present in the United States on June 15, 2012 without lawful status
5. Been enrolled in school, graduated from high school, obtained a GED, or been honorably discharged from the military
6. Not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more misdemeanors

2.3 Program Uptake

In the first four years of the program, nearly 900,000 initial applications were received, with approximately 90% approved. The vast majority of DACA recipients were from Mexico, reflecting patterns of undocumented immigration to the United States. The program has been subject to various legal challenges and policy changes over time, but remained in effect during the study period (2013–2016).

2.4 Expected Effects on Employment

DACA was expected to affect employment through several channels:

- **Work authorization**: DACA provides legal authorization to work, allowing recipients to access formal employment that requires documentation.
- **Reduced deportation risk**: Protection from deportation may increase willingness to engage with formal institutions and employers.
- **Driver's licenses**: Access to driver's licenses in many states expanded employment opportunities requiring driving.
- **Credential recognition**: Some DACA recipients could obtain professional licenses previously unavailable to undocumented immigrants.

3 Data

3.1 Data Source

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS) as provided by IPUMS USA. The ACS is an annual survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau that collects detailed demographic, economic, and housing information from approximately 3 million households each year.

I use the one-year ACS samples from 2006 through 2016, excluding 2012. The year 2012 is excluded because DACA was implemented mid-year (June 15, 2012), and the ACS does not identify the month of data collection, making it impossible to distinguish pre- and post-implementation observations within that year.

3.2 Sample Construction

The analytic sample is constructed through the following restrictions:

1. **Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity**: HISPAN = 1 (Mexican origin)
2. **Birthplace**: BPL = 200 (born in Mexico)
3. **Citizenship status**: CITIZEN = 3 (not a citizen)
4. **Working age**: AGE between 18 and 64
5. **Year**: Exclude 2012
6. **Housing status**: Exclude group quarters (GQ = 3 or 4)
7. **Valid immigration data**: Valid year of immigration (YRIMMIG $>$ 0)

Table 1 presents the sample construction.

Table 1: Sample Construction

Restriction	Observations	Change
Total ACS observations (2006–2016)	33,851,424	–
Hispanic-Mexican, Mexico-born, non-citizen	701,347	−33,150,077
Working age (18–64)	603,425	−97,922
Exclude 2012	547,614	−55,811
Exclude group quarters	529,973	−17,641
Valid age at arrival	528,360	−1,613
Final analytic sample	**528,360**	

3.3 Key Variables

3.3.1 Outcome Variable

The primary outcome is full-time employment, defined as usually working 35 or more hours per week. This is constructed from the UHRSWORK variable:

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

The mean full-time employment rate in the sample is 59.4%.

3.3.2 DACA Eligibility

DACA eligibility is determined using the following criteria that can be observed in the ACS:

1. **Arrived before age 16**: Calculated as YRIMMIG − BIRTHYR < 16
2. **Born after June 15, 1981**: BIRTHYR $\geq$ 1982 OR (BIRTHYR = 1981 AND BIRTHQTR ≥ 3)
3. **Present since 2007**: YRIMMIG $\leq$ 2007

An individual is coded as DACA-eligible if all three criteria are met. Note that some eligibility criteria (educational attainment, criminal history, physical presence on June 15, 2012) cannot be verified in the ACS data. The citizenship restriction (non-citizen) is already applied in the sample construction.

3.3.3 Control Variables

The analysis includes the following control variables:

- Age and age squared
- Sex (female indicator)
- Marital status (married indicator)
- Education categories: less than high school (reference), high school, some college, college or more
- Year fixed effects
- State fixed effects (in some specifications)

4 Empirical Strategy

4.1 Difference-in-Differences Design

The identification strategy relies on a difference-in-differences framework that compares changes in full-time employment between DACA-eligible individuals and a comparison group of Mexican-born non-citizens who do not meet the eligibility criteria.

The comparison group consists of Mexican-born non-citizens who fail to meet one or more DACA eligibility criteria:

- Arrived at age 16 or older, OR
- Born on or before June 15, 1981 (too old as of DACA implementation), OR
- Immigrated after 2007

4.2 Regression Specification

The main regression specification is:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{DACAEligible}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \beta_3 (\text{DACAEligible}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + X_{it}'\gamma + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where:

- Y_{it} is full-time employment status for individual i in year t
- DACAEligible_i indicates whether individual i meets DACA eligibility criteria
- Post_t indicates the post-DACA period (2013–2016)
- X_{it} is a vector of individual characteristics
- λ_t represents year fixed effects
- β_3 is the difference-in-differences estimator of interest

All regressions use person weights (PERWT) and robust (HC1) standard errors.

4.3 Identifying Assumptions

The key identifying assumption is the parallel trends assumption: in the absence of DACA, the change in full-time employment rates would have been the same for eligible and non-eligible individuals. This assumption is tested through:

1. Examination of pre-treatment trends using an event study specification
2. Comparison of pre-treatment characteristics between groups

4.4 Potential Threats to Identification

Several factors could threaten the validity of the estimates:

- **Differential trends**: If employment trends differed between eligible and non-eligible groups prior to DACA, the parallel trends assumption would be violated.
- **Selection into non-citizenship**: The comparison group of non-citizens may differ systematically from DACA-eligible individuals in unobserved ways.
- **Measurement error in eligibility**: Some eligibility criteria cannot be verified in the ACS, potentially leading to misclassification.
- **Spillover effects**: DACA could affect employment outcomes for non-eligible individuals through labor market competition or household effects.

5 Results

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics by DACA eligibility status and time period.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics by Group and Period

	Non-Eligible		DACA-Eligible	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Full-time employment rate	0.611	0.588	0.517	0.560
Employment rate	0.669	0.676	0.608	0.688
Mean age	38.3	42.0	22.2	25.2
Female (%)	46.6	48.6	45.5	46.8
Married (%)	66.5	66.6	27.4	34.5
N	289,478	171,381	36,276	31,225

The DACA-eligible group is substantially younger than the non-eligible group (mean age 22–25 vs. 38–42), reflecting the eligibility criteria based on age. The eligible group also has lower marriage rates, consistent with their younger age profile. Both groups show similar gender composition.

5.2 Simple Difference-in-Differences

Table 3 presents the simple (unadjusted) difference-in-differences calculation.

Table 3: Simple Difference-in-Differences

Group	Pre-DACA	Post-DACA	Difference
DACA-Eligible	0.517	0.560	+0.043
Non-Eligible	0.611	0.588	−0.023
Difference-in-Differences			**+0.066**

The simple DiD estimate suggests that DACA eligibility is associated with a 6.6 percentage point increase in full-time employment. However, this estimate does not account for differences in observable characteristics between groups.

5.3 Main Regression Results

Table 4 presents the main regression results across specifications with progressively more controls.

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

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
DACA × Post	0.0702***	0.0284***	0.0269***	0.0182***	0.0175***
	(0.0050)	(0.0046)	(0.0046)	(0.0046)	(0.0046)
DACA Eligible	−0.1021***	−0.0210***	−0.0251***	−0.0340***	−0.0340***
	(0.0033)	(0.0036)	(0.0036)	(0.0037)	(0.0037)
Post	−0.0243***	−0.0136***	−0.0150***	–	–
	(0.0018)	(0.0016)	(0.0016)		
Demographics	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Education	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
State FE	No	No	No	No	Yes
R-squared	0.008	0.209	0.210	0.232	0.234
N	528,360	528,360	528,360	528,360	528,360

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

All regressions weighted by person weights (PERWT).

Demographics include age, age squared, female, and married.

The coefficient of interest is the interaction term (DACA × Post), which represents the DiD estimate. Several patterns emerge:

1. The simple DiD estimate without controls (column 1) is 7.0 percentage points.
2. Adding demographic controls (column 2) reduces the estimate substantially to 2.8 percentage points, indicating that age differences between groups account for much of the raw difference.
3. Adding education controls (column 3) has minimal additional effect, yielding a 2.7 percentage point estimate.
4. The preferred specification with year fixed effects (column 4) produces an estimate of 1.8 percentage points.
5. Adding state fixed effects (column 5) yields a nearly identical estimate of 1.8 percentage points.

5.4 Preferred Estimate

The preferred specification is Model 4, which includes demographic controls, education, and year fixed effects. The main findings are:

Preferred Estimate: DACA eligibility is associated with a **1.82 percentage point** increase in the probability of full-time employment.

- Standard Error: 0.0046
- 95% Confidence Interval: [0.92, 2.73] percentage points
- P-value: < 0.0001
- Sample Size: 528,360

Relative to the pre-DACA full-time employment rate of 51.7% among eligible individuals, this represents a 3.5% increase.

6 Robustness Checks

6.1 Alternative Outcome Definitions

Table 5 presents results from robustness checks using alternative specifications.

Table 5: Robustness Checks

Specification	DiD Estimate	Std. Error	P-value
Main estimate (full-time $\geq$ 35 hrs)	**0.0182**	**0.0046**	**<0.001**
Alternative outcomes:			
Employment (any)	0.0266	0.0044	<0.001
Full-time ($\geq$ 40 hrs)	0.0152	0.0047	0.001
Subgroup analyses:			
Men only	0.0124	0.0059	0.037
Women only	0.0172	0.0070	0.014
Ages 18–35 only	0.0096	0.0051	0.061

Notes: All specifications include demographic controls, education, and year FE.

Key findings from robustness checks:

- **Employment (any)**: The effect on any employment (including part-time) is 2.7 percentage points, larger than the full-time effect, suggesting DACA increased overall labor market participation.
- **Full-time 40+ hours**: Using a stricter definition of full-time (40+ hours) yields a somewhat smaller but still significant effect of 1.5 percentage points.

- **Gender differences**: Effects are similar for men (1.2 pp) and women (1.7 pp), with the women's effect slightly larger but also noisier due to smaller sample size.
- **Younger sample**: Restricting to ages 18–35 reduces the effect to 1.0 percentage point and it becomes marginally insignificant ($p = 0.06$). This may reflect that the younger sample provides less variation in the comparison group.

6.2 Event Study Analysis

To assess the validity of the parallel trends assumption, I estimate an event study specification that allows the effect of DACA eligibility to vary by year:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \sum_{k \neq 2011} \beta_k (\text{DACAEligible}_i \times \mathbf{1}[t = k]) + X_{it}'\gamma + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{3}$$

The year 2011 serves as the reference period (the last pre-treatment year).

Table 6: Event Study Estimates (Reference Year: 2011)

Year	Coefficient	Std. Error	95% CI	P-value
Pre-treatment period:				
2006	0.0132	0.0111	[−0.009, 0.035]	0.233
2007	0.0086	0.0106	[−0.012, 0.029]	0.417
2008	0.0200	0.0106	[−0.001, 0.041]	0.059
2009	0.0205	0.0105	[−0.000, 0.041]	0.051
2010	0.0152	0.0102	[−0.005, 0.035]	0.137
Post-treatment period:				
2013	0.0135	0.0100	[−0.006, 0.033]	0.178
2014	0.0276	0.0101	[0.008, 0.047]	0.006
2015	0.0439	0.0099	[0.024, 0.063]	<0.001
2016	0.0447	0.0101	[0.025, 0.065]	<0.001

Notes: Reference year is 2011. Includes demographic controls and year FE.

The event study results support the parallel trends assumption:

- All pre-treatment coefficients (2006–2010) are not statistically different from zero at conventional levels, though 2008 and 2009 are marginally significant at the 10% level.
- Post-treatment effects emerge gradually: the 2013 effect is small and insignificant (0.014), while effects in 2014–2016 are larger and highly significant (0.028–0.045).
- The growing effect over time is consistent with gradual program uptake and the time needed for DACA recipients to translate work authorization into employment.

7 Discussion

7.1 Interpretation of Results

The main finding is that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 1.8 percentage points. This effect is statistically significant and robust to various specifications. Several considerations inform the interpretation of this result:

Magnitude: A 1.8 percentage point increase represents a 3.5% increase relative to the baseline full-time employment rate of 51.7% among DACA-eligible individuals. While modest in absolute terms, this effect is economically meaningful given that it reflects a policy change affecting hundreds of thousands of individuals.

Timing: The event study reveals that effects were small and insignificant in 2013 (the first full year after implementation) but grew substantially by 2015–2016. This pattern is consistent with:

- The time required to apply for and receive DACA status
- Gradual adjustment of job search behavior
- Employers' learning about DACA documentation

Mechanisms: The estimated effect likely reflects multiple channels through which DACA affects employment:

- Eligibility for jobs requiring work authorization
- Reduced fear of workplace immigration enforcement
- Access to driver's licenses expanding job opportunities
- Improved match quality through formal job search

7.2 Comparison with Existing Literature

The finding of a positive effect of DACA on employment is broadly consistent with previous research. Several studies using different data and methods have found positive effects of DACA on labor market outcomes, including employment, wages, and transitions from informal to formal employment.

The magnitude of my estimate (1.8 pp for full-time employment) falls within the range of estimates in the literature, which vary based on the specific outcome measure, comparison group definition, and time period examined.

7.3 Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these results:

1. **Eligibility measurement**: The ACS does not contain all information needed to determine DACA eligibility (e.g., educational attainment requirements, criminal history, physical presence on June 15, 2012). This likely introduces measurement error in the treatment indicator, which would typically bias estimates toward zero.

2. **Comparison group**: The comparison group of Mexican-born non-citizens who don't meet DACA criteria may differ from the treatment group in unobserved ways that affect employment trends.

3. **Selection into survey**: If DACA affected individuals' willingness to participate in government surveys, this could bias the sample composition over time.

4. **Spillover effects**: If DACA affected employment outcomes for non-eligible individuals (e.g., through labor market competition), the comparison group may not provide a valid counterfactual.

5. **Intent-to-treat**: The analysis estimates the effect of eligibility, not actual DACA receipt. Not all eligible individuals applied for or received DACA status.

8 Conclusion

This study provides evidence that DACA eligibility had a positive and statistically significant effect on full-time employment among Mexican-born non-citizens in the United States. Using a difference-in-differences research design and data from the American Community Survey (2006–2016), I estimate that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by 1.8 percentage points.

The effect is robust to the inclusion of demographic controls, education, and fixed effects for year and state. Event study analysis shows that effects were small in the first year after implementation but grew substantially over time, reaching approximately 4.5 percentage points by 2015–2016 relative to the reference year.

These findings suggest that policies providing work authorization and protection from deportation can improve labor market outcomes for undocumented immigrants. The results contribute to ongoing policy debates about immigration reform and the future of the DACA program.

Appendix A: Variable Definitions

Table 7: Variable Definitions

Variable	IPUMS Name	Definition
Year	YEAR	Survey year
Person weight	PERWT	Person-level sampling weight
Age	AGE	Age in years
Sex	SEX	1=Male, 2=Female
Birth year	BIRTHYR	Year of birth
Birth quarter	BIRTHQTR	Quarter of birth (1–4)
Marital status	MARST	Marital status code
Hispanic origin	HISPAN	Hispanic origin (1=Mexican)
Birthplace	BPL	Country/state of birth (200=Mexico)
Citizenship	CITIZEN	Citizenship status (3=Non-citizen)
Year of immigration	YRIMMIG	Year of immigration to US
Education	EDUC	Educational attainment code
Employment status	EMPSTAT	Employment status (1=Employed)
Hours worked	UHRSWORK	Usual hours worked per week
State	STATEFIP	State FIPS code
Group quarters	GQ	Group quarters status

Appendix B: DACA Eligibility Criteria Implementation

DACA eligibility is determined using the following logic:

```
# Age at arrival
age_at_arrival = YRIMMIG - BIRTHYR

# Criterion 1: Arrived before age 16
arrived_before_16 = (age_at_arrival < 16)

# Criterion 2: Born after June 15, 1981
# BIRTHQTR: 1=Jan-Mar, 2=Apr-Jun, 3=Jul-Sep, 4=Oct-Dec
born_after_june1981 = (BIRTHYR >= 1982) OR
                      (BIRTHYR == 1981 AND BIRTHQTR >= 3)

# Criterion 3: Present since June 2007
present_since_2007 = (YRIMMIG <= 2007)

# DACA Eligible: All criteria met
daca_eligible = arrived_before_16 AND
                born_after_june1981 AND
                present_since_2007
```

Note: Sample is already restricted to non-citizens (CITIZEN = 3), so the citizenship criterion is applied through sample selection.

Appendix C: Additional Tables

Table 8: Full Regression Results: Preferred Specification (Model 4)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error
DACA × Post	0.0182***	(0.0046)
DACA Eligible	−0.0340***	(0.0037)
Age	0.0348***	(0.0005)
Age squared	−0.0004***	(0.0000)
Female	−0.4490***	(0.0015)
Married	−0.0467***	(0.0016)
High school	0.0326***	(0.0016)
Some college	0.0289***	(0.0029)
College plus	0.0629***	(0.0037)
Year fixed effects	Yes	
R-squared	0.232	
N	528,360	

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

Table 9: Sample Characteristics by Year

Year	N	% DACA Eligible	FT Rate (Eligible)	FT Rate (Non-Eligible)
2006	50,512	13.6%	0.522	0.610
2007	50,970	13.0%	0.528	0.623
2008	54,219	12.3%	0.517	0.618
2009	53,808	11.7%	0.489	0.587
2010	55,024	11.2%	0.514	0.607
2011	61,221	12.7%	0.521	0.614
2013	56,652	12.8%	0.528	0.590
2014	55,419	12.8%	0.554	0.587
2015	45,746	12.2%	0.576	0.591
2016	44,789	12.2%	0.589	0.582

Appendix D: Sensitivity to Specification Choices

This appendix explores the sensitivity of the main results to various specification choices.

D.1 Alternative Age Restrictions

The main analysis restricts the sample to individuals aged 18–64. Table 10 shows how results vary with alternative age restrictions.

Table 10: Sensitivity to Age Restrictions

Age Range	DiD Estimate	Std. Error	N
18–64 (main)	0.0182	0.0046	528,360
18–50	0.0156	0.0048	476,891
18–40	0.0121	0.0049	358,224
18–35	0.0096	0.0051	242,226
21–64	0.0195	0.0048	492,651
25–64	0.0208	0.0051	436,187

The estimates are generally robust across age restrictions, though they become smaller and less precise when the sample is limited to younger individuals who have less variation in DACA eligibility status.

D.2 Inclusion of 2012

The main analysis excludes 2012 because DACA was implemented mid-year (June 15, 2012) and the ACS does not identify the month of survey response. As a sensitivity check, we can include 2012 observations, assigning them either to the pre-period or post-period.

When 2012 is included in the pre-period, the DiD estimate is 0.0168 (SE = 0.0044), slightly smaller than the main estimate of 0.0182. When 2012 is included in the post-period, the estimate is 0.0201 (SE = 0.0044), slightly larger. These results bracket the main estimate and suggest that the choice to exclude 2012 does not substantially affect conclusions.

D.3 Alternative Clustering

The main analysis uses heteroskedasticity-robust (HC1) standard errors. Alternative approaches to inference include:

- Clustering at the state level

- Clustering at the state-year level
- Bootstrap standard errors

In general, clustering at higher levels of aggregation tends to increase standard errors, but the main coefficient remains statistically significant at conventional levels under all approaches tested.

Appendix E: Data Quality Considerations

E.1 Non-Response and Survey Coverage

The American Community Survey achieves high response rates (approximately 95% for most years in the study period), but non-response may not be random. If DACA affected willingness to participate in government surveys, this could affect the sample composition over time.

There is limited evidence of systematic changes in survey participation among the target population. The sample size of Mexican-born non-citizens remains relatively stable over time, suggesting no dramatic shifts in survey participation following DACA implementation.

E.2 Immigration Status Measurement

A key limitation is that the ACS does not distinguish between documented and undocumented non-citizens. The analysis assumes that all non-naturalized, non-citizen Mexican-born individuals are potentially undocumented. This is a simplification, as some may have legal status (e.g., lawful permanent residents who have not naturalized, visa holders).

This measurement approach likely introduces noise in the identification of the DACA-eligible population, which would typically bias estimates toward zero. The estimated effects may therefore represent a lower bound of the true effect among the actually eligible population.

E.3 Variable Reliability

Key variables used in the analysis have varying degrees of reliability:

- **Year of immigration (YRIMMIG)**: This variable may be subject to recall error, particularly for individuals who immigrated at young ages or many years ago.
- **Birth year and quarter**: These are generally reliable demographic variables.
- **Hours worked (UHRSWORK)**: This captures "usual" hours worked per week, which may differ from actual hours in any given week.
- **Employment status**: Self-reported employment status may not perfectly capture formal vs. informal employment.

Appendix F: Comparison with Prior Literature

Several prior studies have examined the labor market effects of DACA using various data sources and methods. This section briefly compares the current findings with existing literature.

F.1 Summary of Prior Findings

Prior research has generally found positive effects of DACA on employment and labor market outcomes:

- Studies using administrative data have found evidence of increased formal employment and wages among DACA recipients.
- Research using survey data similar to this study has found positive effects on employment, with estimates ranging from 1 to 5 percentage points depending on the outcome measure and specification.
- Some studies have found larger effects for women than men, while others have found similar effects across genders.
- Research has documented effects on other outcomes including school enrollment, health insurance coverage, and geographic mobility.

F.2 Comparison with Current Findings

The current estimate of a 1.8 percentage point increase in full-time employment falls within the range of prior findings. Several factors may explain variation across studies:

1. **Outcome definition**: Full-time employment (35+ hours) is a more restrictive outcome than any employment, leading to smaller effects.
2. **Comparison group**: Different studies use different comparison groups (e.g., naturalized citizens, documented immigrants, non-Mexican immigrants), which can affect the magnitude of estimates.
3. **Time period**: Effects may vary over time as the program matures and more individuals obtain DACA status.
4. **Data source**: Administrative data may capture formal employment more accurately than survey data.

The consistency of findings across studies using different approaches strengthens confidence in the conclusion that DACA had positive effects on employment outcomes.