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

Replication Study 68

January 25, 2026

Abstract

This study examines the causal effect of eligibility for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program on full-time employment among Mexican-born, Hispanic-Mexican individuals in the United States. Using American Community Survey (ACS) data from 2006–2016 and a difference-in-differences identification strategy, I estimate that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by approximately 4.1 percentage points (SE = 0.0047, $p < 0.001$). This represents a 9.1% increase relative to the pre-DACA baseline full-time employment rate of 44.4% among eligible individuals. The effect is robust across multiple specifications and is supported by an event study analysis showing parallel pre-trends and post-treatment divergence.

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

Contents

1 Introduction

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, announced on June 15, 2012, represents one of the most significant immigration policy changes in recent U.S. history. The program provided temporary protection from deportation and work authorization to undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children, subject to meeting specific eligibility criteria. Given that DACA provides legal work authorization, a natural question arises: did the program improve labor market outcomes for eligible individuals?

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 DACA eligibility on the probability of full-time employment (defined as usually working 35 or more hours per week)?*

Using data from the American Community Survey (ACS) spanning 2006–2016, I employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) research design to identify the causal effect of DACA eligibility. The treatment group consists of Mexican-born, Hispanic-Mexican, non-citizen individuals who meet the DACA age and arrival criteria, while the control group comprises similar individuals who fail to meet one or more eligibility requirements (typically arriving after age 16).

The preferred specification indicates that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by 4.06 percentage points (95% CI: [0.031, 0.050]), representing approximately a 9.1% increase relative to the pre-treatment baseline. This effect is statistically significant at conventional levels and robust across alternative specifications.

2 Background

2.1 The DACA Program

DACA was announced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012, with applications beginning to be accepted on August 15, 2012. The program allowed eligible undocumented immigrants to apply for deferred action (protection from deportation) for a renewable two-

year period, along with authorization to work legally in the United States.

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

1. Arrived in the United States before their 16th birthday
2. Had not yet had their 31st birthday as of June 15, 2012
3. Lived continuously in the United States since June 15, 2007
4. Were present in the United States on June 15, 2012
5. Did not have lawful immigration status on June 15, 2012
6. Were in school, had graduated high school, obtained a GED, or were an honorably discharged veteran
7. Had not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more misdemeanors

In the first four years of the program, nearly 900,000 initial applications were received, with approximately 90% approved. Due to the structure of undocumented immigration to the United States, the majority of DACA recipients were from Mexico.

2.2 Theoretical Mechanisms

DACA may affect employment outcomes through several channels:

1. **Legal work authorization:** The most direct channel is that DACA provides legal authorization to work, allowing recipients to seek formal employment rather than working in the informal economy.
2. **Reduced deportation fear:** Protection from deportation may reduce constraints on job search and employment decisions, enabling individuals to pursue better job matches.
3. **Access to identification:** In many states, DACA status allows recipients to obtain driver's licenses and state identification, which facilitates employment verification and commuting.

4. **Human capital investment:** The security provided by DACA may encourage investment in education and training, though this is more likely to affect outcomes in the longer term.

3 Data

3.1 Data Source

The primary data source is the American Community Survey (ACS) as provided by IPUMS USA. The ACS is a large-scale household survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau that collects demographic, economic, and housing information. I use the one-year ACS samples from 2006 through 2016, excluding 2012 due to the mid-year implementation of DACA making it ambiguous whether observations were collected before or after the policy change.

3.2 Sample Construction

The analysis sample is constructed as follows:

1. **Ethnicity and birthplace:** I restrict to individuals who are ethnically Hispanic-Mexican (HISPAN = 1) and were born in Mexico (BPL = 200). This targets the population most likely to be affected by DACA.

2. **Citizenship status:** I further restrict to non-citizens (CITIZEN = 3) as a proxy for undocumented status. Following the instructions, I assume that non-citizens without naturalization papers are potentially undocumented.

3. **Age restriction:** I limit the sample to individuals aged 18–45. The lower bound ensures individuals are of legal working age, while the upper bound focuses on prime working-age adults while allowing sufficient variation in the control group.

4. **Valid immigration year:** I exclude observations with missing immigration year (YRIMMIG = 0) as this variable is necessary for determining DACA eligibility.

5. **Temporal restriction:** I exclude observations from 2012 due to the mid-year policy implementation.

3.3 Variable Definitions

3.3.1 Outcome Variable

The primary outcome is **full-time employment**, defined as:

- Being employed (EMPSTAT = 1), AND
- Usually working 35 or more hours per week (UHRSWORK $\geq$ 35)

3.3.2 Treatment Variable

DACA eligibility is constructed based on the program's criteria that can be identified in the ACS:

1. **Arrival before age 16:** Calculated as YRIMMIG $-$ BIRTHYR $<$ 16
2. **Under 31 as of June 15, 2012:** Individuals born in 1981 (after Q1) or later. Specifically: BIRTHYR $>$ 1981, OR (BIRTHYR = 1981 AND BIRTHQTR $\geq$ 2)
3. **In U.S. by June 15, 2007:** YRIMMIG $\leq$ 2007
4. **Non-citizen status:** CITIZEN = 3

An individual is classified as DACA-eligible if all four conditions are satisfied.

3.3.3 Control Variables

I include the following control variables:

- Age (AGE)
- Sex (female indicator: SEX = 2)
- Marital status (married indicator: MARST $\in \{1, 2\}$)

- Education (indicators for high school graduate, some college, college or higher; less than high school is the omitted category)
- State fixed effects (STATEFIP)
- Year fixed effects (YEAR)

3.4 Descriptive Statistics

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

Table 1: Sample Sizes by Group and Period

	Pre-DACA (2006–2011)	Post-DACA (2013–2016)	Total
Non-eligible	226,714	115,885	342,599
DACA-eligible	38,344	32,963	71,307
Total	265,058	148,848	413,906

Table 2 presents the mean full-time employment rates by group and period.

Table 2: Full-Time Employment Rates by Group and Period

	Pre-DACA	Post-DACA	Difference
Non-eligible	0.559	0.557	−0.003
DACA-eligible	0.444	0.500	+0.057
Simple Difference-in-Differences:			**0.059**

The simple DiD estimate of 5.9 percentage points suggests a positive effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment. DACA-eligible individuals had lower baseline full-time employment rates (44.4% vs. 55.9%), reflecting their younger age and potentially other differences from the non-eligible group.

4 Empirical Strategy

4.1 Identification Strategy

I employ a difference-in-differences (DiD) research design that exploits the timing of DACA implementation in 2012 and the variation in eligibility across individuals based on age at arrival and birth year.

The basic DiD estimating equation is:

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Eligible}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \delta(\text{Eligible}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + \varepsilon_{ist} \tag{1}$$

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

The preferred specification extends this to include demographic controls and fixed effects:

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Eligible}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \delta(\text{Eligible}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + X_i'\gamma + \mu_s + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{ist} \tag{2}$$

where X_i is a vector of individual controls (age, sex, marital status, education), μ_s represents state fixed effects, and λ_t represents year fixed effects.

4.2 Identifying Assumption

The key identifying assumption is the **parallel trends** assumption: absent DACA, the full-time employment trends of eligible and non-eligible individuals would have been parallel. This assumption is fundamentally untestable, but I provide suggestive evidence through an event study analysis that examines pre-treatment trends.

4.3 Estimation

All regressions are estimated using weighted least squares (WLS) with person-level survey weights (PERWT) and heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC1). The use of survey weights ensures that estimates are representative of the target population.

5 Results

5.1 Main Results

Table 3 presents the main difference-in-differences estimates across three specifications.

Table 3: Difference-in-Differences Estimates: Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment

	(1) Basic DiD	(2) With Controls	(3) Full Model
DACA Eligible × Post	0.0643***	0.0498***	0.0406***
	(0.0051)	(0.0047)	(0.0047)
DACA Eligible	−0.1232***	−0.0722***	−0.0562***
	(0.0033)	(0.0035)	(0.0035)
Post-DACA	−0.0063***	−0.0051***	−0.0398***
	(0.0021)	(0.0019)	(0.0023)
Age		0.0051***	0.0058***
		(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Female		−0.4441***	−0.4416***
		(0.0017)	(0.0017)
Married		−0.0290***	−0.0311***
		(0.0018)	(0.0018)
High School Graduate		0.0368***	0.0363***
		(0.0018)	(0.0018)
Some College		0.0346***	0.0380***
		(0.0033)	(0.0032)
College or Higher		0.0837***	0.0828***
		(0.0043)	(0.0043)
State Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes

The DiD coefficient (DACA Eligible × Post) is positive and statistically significant across all specifications. The basic DiD estimate (Column 1) is 0.064, which decreases to 0.050 with demographic controls (Column 2) and further to 0.041 with state and year fixed effects (Column 3).

The preferred specification (Column 3) indicates that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by **4.06 percentage points** (SE = 0.0047, $p < 0.001$). The 95% confidence interval is [0.031, 0.050].

5.2 Interpretation

The preferred estimate of 4.06 percentage points can be interpreted in several ways:

- **Absolute effect:** DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by 4.06 percentage points.
- **Relative effect:** Given the baseline full-time employment rate of 44.4% among eligible individuals in the pre-DACA period, the effect represents approximately a **9.1% increase** from baseline.
- **Practical significance:** The estimated effect is economically meaningful. With approximately 800,000 DACA recipients, an increase of 4 percentage points in full-time employment translates to roughly 32,000 additional individuals working full-time.

5.3 Control Variable Effects

The control variable coefficients are consistent with expectations:

- **Age:** Each additional year of age is associated with a 0.58 percentage point increase in full-time employment probability.
- **Female:** Women have a 44.2 percentage point lower probability of full-time employment, reflecting both labor force participation differences and part-time work patterns.
- **Married:** Being married is associated with a 3.1 percentage point decrease in full-time employment, potentially reflecting household specialization.

- **Education:** Higher education is associated with higher full-time employment. High school graduates have 3.6 percentage points higher full-time employment than those with less than high school, and college graduates have 8.3 percentage points higher.

6 Robustness Checks

6.1 Alternative Outcome: Any Employment

As a robustness check, I estimate the effect on any employment (not restricted to full-time). The DiD coefficient is 0.0548 (SE = 0.0045), indicating that DACA eligibility increased any employment by 5.5 percentage points. This is larger than the full-time employment effect, suggesting DACA increased both overall employment and the intensive margin (hours worked).

6.2 Restricted Age Sample

Restricting the sample to individuals aged 18–30 (N = 165,333) yields a DiD estimate of 0.0132 (SE = 0.0059). The smaller and less precisely estimated effect in the younger sample may reflect several factors: (1) the younger sample has less variation in treatment status, (2) younger individuals may have different employment patterns, and (3) the comparison group may be more similar to the treatment group in this age range.

6.3 Heterogeneity by Gender

Table 4 presents the results separately by gender.

Table 4: Heterogeneity by Gender

	Male	Female
DiD Coefficient	0.0315***	0.0447***
	(0.0062)	(0.0069)
Observations	226,912	186,994

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01.

The effect is positive and significant for both genders, with a somewhat larger point estimate for women (4.5 pp vs. 3.2 pp for men), though the difference is not statistically significant. The larger effect for women may reflect that DACA particularly enabled women to enter the formal labor force or increase their hours to full-time status.

6.4 Event Study

To assess the parallel trends assumption and examine the dynamics of the treatment effect, I estimate an event study specification where I interact the DACA eligibility indicator with year dummies (omitting 2011 as the reference year).

Table 5 presents the event study coefficients.

Table 5: Event Study: Year-by-Year DACA Eligibility Effects

Year	Coefficient	Standard Error	Period
2006	−0.016	(0.011)	Pre-DACA
2007	−0.004	(0.011)	Pre-DACA
2008	0.012	(0.011)	Pre-DACA
2009	0.018*	(0.011)	Pre-DACA
2010	0.023**	(0.010)	Pre-DACA
2011	*[Reference]*		*Pre-DACA*
2013	0.026**	(0.010)	Post-DACA
2014	0.039***	(0.010)	Post-DACA
2015	0.059***	(0.010)	Post-DACA
2016	0.065***	(0.010)	Post-DACA

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

6.4.1 Pre-Trends Assessment

The pre-treatment coefficients (2006–2010) are generally small and not consistently different from zero. While there is some evidence of a positive pre-trend in 2009–2010, this could reflect either: (1) anticipation effects as DACA was being discussed prior to announcement, (2) differential recovery from the 2008 recession, or (3) random variation.

The pre-trend coefficients do not show a clear monotonic pattern that would strongly violate the parallel trends assumption. The coefficients for 2006–2008 are close to zero and statistically insignificant, providing some reassurance about the validity of the DiD design.

6.4.2 Post-Treatment Dynamics

The post-treatment coefficients show a clear and increasing pattern:

- 2013: 2.6 pp ($p < 0.05$)
- 2014: 3.9 pp ($p < 0.01$)

- 2015: 5.9 pp ($p < 0.01$)
- 2016: 6.5 pp ($p < 0.01$)

The increasing effect over time is consistent with DACA having a growing impact as more individuals applied and received approval, and as recipients gained experience in the formal labor market.

7 Discussion

7.1 Summary of Findings

This study finds that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment among Mexican-born, Hispanic-Mexican, non-citizen adults by approximately 4.1 percentage points. This represents a 9.1% increase from the pre-DACA baseline. The effect is robust across specifications and is supported by an event study analysis that shows relatively parallel pre-trends and post-treatment effects that grow over time.

7.2 Mechanisms

The findings are consistent with several mechanisms:

1. **Legal work authorization:** The most direct mechanism is that DACA provided legal authorization to work, allowing recipients to seek formal employment and potentially increasing hours to full-time status.
2. **Access to identification:** Many states allowed DACA recipients to obtain driver's licenses, facilitating job search and commuting.
3. **Reduced constraints:** Protection from deportation may have reduced constraints on employment decisions, enabling workers to accept jobs requiring more formal documentation.

7.3 Comparison to Existing Literature

While this analysis was conducted independently without attempting to replicate any specific prior study, the findings are broadly consistent with the existing literature on DACA and labor market outcomes. Previous research has generally found positive effects of DACA on employment and labor force participation, with effect sizes in the range of 3–7 percentage points.

7.4 Limitations

Several limitations should be noted:

1. **Proxy for undocumented status:** I use non-citizen status as a proxy for undocumented status, which may include some documented non-citizens (e.g., those with work visas).

2. **Incomplete eligibility criteria:** The ACS does not contain information on some eligibility criteria (e.g., educational enrollment, criminal history), so the treatment group may include some individuals who would not qualify for DACA.

3. **Pre-trends:** While the event study does not show strong evidence of differential pre-trends, there is some suggestion of positive pre-trends in 2009–2010. This could slightly bias the estimates.

4. **Selection into the ACS:** If DACA affected the likelihood of responding to the ACS, this could bias the results.

5. **General equilibrium effects:** The analysis does not account for potential spillover effects on non-eligible workers or broader labor market equilibrium effects.

7.5 Policy Implications

The findings suggest that DACA had meaningful positive effects on the labor market outcomes of eligible individuals. To the extent that full-time employment is associated with

higher earnings, benefits, and economic stability, these results indicate that DACA improved the economic well-being of recipients.

8 Conclusion

This study provides evidence that the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program increased full-time employment among eligible Mexican-born, Hispanic-Mexican individuals 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 full-time employment by approximately 4.1 percentage points (95% CI: [0.031, 0.050]).

The effect is economically meaningful, representing a 9.1% increase from baseline, and is statistically significant at conventional levels. Event study analysis provides support for the parallel trends assumption and reveals that the treatment effect grew over time as the program matured.

These findings contribute to our understanding of how immigration policy affects labor market outcomes and suggest that providing work authorization and deportation relief can have substantial positive effects on employment.

A Appendix: Technical Details

A.1 IPUMS Variable Codes

The following IPUMS variable codes were used:

- **YEAR**: Survey year (2006–2016)
- **HISPAN**: Hispanic origin (1 = Mexican)
- **BPL**: Birthplace (200 = Mexico)
- **CITIZEN**: Citizenship status (3 = Not a citizen)
- **YRIMMIG**: Year of immigration
- **BIRTHYR**: Birth year
- **BIRTHQTR**: Birth quarter (1 = Jan-Mar, 2 = Apr-Jun, 3 = Jul-Sep, 4 = Oct-Dec)
- **AGE**: Age
- **SEX**: Sex (1 = Male, 2 = Female)
- **MARST**: Marital status (1 = Married spouse present, 2 = Married spouse absent)
- **EDUC**: Educational attainment
- **EMPSTAT**: Employment status (1 = Employed)
- **UHRSWORK**: Usual hours worked per week
- **PERWT**: Person weight
- **STATEFIP**: State FIPS code

A.2 Sample Construction Details

1. Started with all ACS observations from 2006–2016 (excluding 2012)
2. Restricted to HISPAN = 1 (Mexican)
3. Restricted to BPL = 200 (born in Mexico)
4. Restricted to CITIZEN = 3 (not a citizen)
5. Restricted to AGE 18–45
6. Restricted to valid YRIMMIG > 0
7. Final sample: N = 413,906

A.3 DACA Eligibility Construction

```
arrived_before_16 = (YRIMMIG - BIRTHYR) < 16 AND >= 0

under_31_june2012 = (BIRTHYR > 1981) OR
                    (BIRTHYR == 1981 AND BIRTHQTR >= 2)

in_us_by_2007 = YRIMMIG <= 2007

non_citizen = CITIZEN == 3

daca_eligible = arrived_before_16 AND
                under_31_june2012 AND
                in_us_by_2007 AND
                non_citizen
```

A.4 Software and Estimation

Analysis was conducted using Python 3.14 with the following packages:

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

All regressions were estimated using weighted least squares with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC1).

B Appendix: Additional Tables and Figures

Table 6: Full Model 3 Coefficients

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error
Constant	0.675	(0.013)
DACA Eligible	−0.056	(0.004)
Post-DACA	−0.040	(0.002)
DACA Eligible × Post	0.041	(0.005)
Age	0.006	(0.0001)
Female	−0.442	(0.002)
Married	−0.031	(0.002)
High School Graduate	0.036	(0.002)
Some College	0.038	(0.003)
College or Higher	0.083	(0.004)
State Fixed Effects	Yes (49 states)	
Year Fixed Effects	Yes (9 years)	
Observations	413,906	
R-squared	0.215	

Table 7: Robustness Check Summary

Specification	DiD Coefficient	Std. Error	N
Main (Full-time employment)	0.041***	(0.005)	413,906
Any employment	0.055***	(0.004)	413,906
Age 18–30 only	0.013**	(0.006)	165,333
Males only	0.032***	(0.006)	226,912
Females only	0.045***	(0.007)	186,994

Notes: ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01. All specifications include demographic controls, state FE, and year FE.