The Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment: An Independent Replication Study

Independent Replication Report

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 research design that compares individuals aged 26–30 (DACA-eligible) to those aged 31–35 (ineligible due to age cutoff) before and after DACA implementation, I find that DACA eligibility is associated with a statistically significant 6.5 percentage point increase in the probability of full-time employment. This estimate is robust across multiple specifications including controls for demographics, education, year fixed effects, and state fixed effects. The analysis provides evidence supporting the hypothesis that work authorization through DACA increased labor market participation among 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. The program provided temporary relief from deportation and, critically, work authorization to undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children. Given that DACA explicitly granted legal work authorization to a population that previously faced substantial barriers to formal employment, understanding its impact on labor market outcomes is of considerable policy importance.

This report presents an independent replication study examining the effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment. The 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?*

The identification strategy exploits an age-based eligibility cutoff in DACA requirements. Individuals had to be under age 31 as of June 15, 2012 to be eligible. This creates a natural comparison between younger individuals (ages 26–30) who met the age criterion and older individuals (ages 31–35) who would have been eligible but for their age. Using a difference-in-differences framework, I compare changes in full-time employment between these groups before and after DACA implementation.

The main finding is that DACA eligibility is associated with a 6.5 percentage point increase in full-time employment probability, a substantively large and statistically significant effect. This estimate is robust across numerous specifications and sensitivity checks.

2 Background

2.1 The DACA Program

DACA was announced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012 and began accepting applications on August 15, 2012. The program offered qualifying individuals two-year renewable periods of deferred action (protection from deportation) and eligibility for work authorization. To qualify, applicants had to meet the following criteria:

- Arrived in the United States before age 16
- Under age 31 as of June 15, 2012
- Continuously resided in the U.S. since June 15, 2007
- Present in the U.S. on June 15, 2012 without lawful immigration status
- In school, graduated from high school, obtained a GED, or honorably discharged from military
- No significant criminal history

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 national origin, the majority of recipients were from Mexico due to the structure of undocumented immigration to the United States.

2.2 Theoretical Mechanisms

Several mechanisms suggest why DACA should increase employment among eligible individuals:

1. **Legal work authorization**: The most direct mechanism. Prior to DACA, eligible individuals could not legally work, limiting them to informal employment. Work authorization opened access to formal sector jobs.
2. **Reduced deportation risk**: By providing deferred action, DACA reduced the risk associated with employment and labor market participation more broadly.
3. **Driver's licenses**: Many states began allowing DACA recipients to obtain driver's licenses, improving labor market accessibility, particularly in areas with limited public transportation.
4. **Human capital investment**: Reduced uncertainty about future residence may have encouraged investments in education and job-specific skills.

3 Data

3.1 Data Source

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS) provided through IPUMS USA. The ACS is a nationally representative household survey conducted annually by the U.S. Census Bureau. The provided analytic file includes data from 2008 through 2016, with 2012 excluded because it cannot be determined whether observations in that year occurred before or after DACA implementation.

3.2 Sample Construction

The analytic sample consists of ethnically Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals who meet the broader DACA eligibility criteria (aside from the age cutoff). The sample is restricted to two age groups as of June 15, 2012:

- **Treatment group**: Ages 26–30 (DACA-eligible)
- **Control group**: Ages 31–35 (DACA-ineligible due to age cutoff)

The dataset contains pre-constructed variables for eligibility (`ELIGIBLE`), the post-treatment period (`AFTER`), and the full-time employment outcome (`FT`).

3.3 Key Variables

Table 1: Variable Definitions

Variable	Definition
FT	Binary indicator equal to 1 if usually working 35+ hours per week
ELIGIBLE	Binary indicator equal to 1 for treatment group (ages 26–30 in June 2012)
AFTER	Binary indicator equal to 1 for years 2013–2016
PERWT	Person-level sampling weight from ACS
SEX	Sex (1 = Male, 2 = Female)
AGE	Age at time of survey
MARST	Marital status
EDUC	Educational attainment
NCHILD	Number of own children in household
STATEFIP	State FIPS code

Note: FT, ELIGIBLE, and AFTER are coded 0/1. Original IPUMS binary variables use 1/2 coding.

3.4 Sample Statistics

Table 2 presents the sample composition. The full analytic sample contains 17,382 observations, with 11,382 in the treatment group and 6,000 in the control group. The pre-period (2008–2011) contains 9,527 observations and the post-period (2013–2016) contains 7,855 observations.

Table 2: Sample Composition

	Pre-DACA (2008–2011)		**Post-DACA (2013–2016)**	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Observations	6,233	3,294	5,149	2,706
Full-time employment rate	62.6%	67.0%	66.6%	64.5%

4 Empirical Strategy

4.1 Identification Strategy

The analysis employs a difference-in-differences (DiD) design that exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff for DACA. The key identifying assumption is that, absent DACA, the full-time employment rate would have evolved similarly for the treatment group (ages 26–30) and the control group (ages 31–35).

This assumption is plausible because:

1. Both groups share similar characteristics: Mexican-born, ethnically Hispanic, meeting other DACA eligibility criteria
2. The age cutoff is arbitrary with respect to employment determinants
3. The five-year age bandwidth limits lifecycle differences while maintaining adequate sample size

4.2 Regression Specification

The base DiD specification is:

$$FT_{ist} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 \cdot AFTER_t + \beta_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + \varepsilon_{ist} \quad (1)$$

where i indexes individuals, s indexes states, and t indexes time. The coefficient of interest is β_3, which captures the differential change in full-time employment for the treatment group relative to the control group after DACA implementation.

Extended specifications add demographic controls, education controls, year fixed effects, and state fixed effects:

$$FT_{ist} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 \cdot AFTER_t + \beta_3 \cdot (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + X_i'\gamma + \lambda_t + \mu_s + \varepsilon_{ist} \quad (2)$$

where X_i is a vector of individual-level controls, λ_t represents year fixed effects, and μ_s represents state fixed effects.

4.3 Estimation Details

- **Weights**: All regressions use ACS person weights (PERWT) to produce population-representative estimates.
- **Standard errors**: I report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (HC1) as the primary specification. Robustness checks include standard errors clustered at the state level.
- **Model**: Linear probability model (OLS/WLS) for interpretability. Logistic regression is examined as a robustness check.

5 Results

5.1 Descriptive Evidence

Figure ?? illustrates the raw difference-in-differences calculation using group means. Before DACA, the treatment group had a lower full-time employment rate (62.6%) compared to the control group (67.0%). After DACA, this pattern reversed: the treatment group's rate increased to 66.6% while the control group's rate declined to 64.5%.

Table 3: Raw Difference-in-Differences Calculation

	Pre-DACA	**Post-DACA**	**Change**
Treatment (Ages 26–30)	62.63%	66.58%	+3.95 pp
Control (Ages 31–35)	66.97%	64.49%	−2.48 pp
Difference-in-Differences			**+6.43 pp**

The raw DiD estimate is 6.43 percentage points: the treatment group experienced a 3.95 percentage point increase while the control group experienced a 2.48 percentage point decrease, yielding a differential of $3.95 - (-2.48) = 6.43$ percentage points.

5.2 Main Regression Results

Table 4 presents the main regression results across eight specifications. The DiD estimate (β_3) ranges from 0.062 to 0.075 across specifications, consistently positive and statistically significant at conventional levels.

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

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.064***	0.075***	0.075***	0.067***	0.065***	0.062***	0.06
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.
ELIGIBLE	−0.043***	−0.052***	−0.052***	−0.031**	−0.032**	−0.006	−0
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.
AFTER	−0.025**	−0.026**	−0.026*	−0.031*	−0.030*	–	
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.018)		
Weights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Y
Robust SE	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Y
Demographics	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Y
Education	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Y
Year FE	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Y
State FE	No	No	No	No	No	No	Y
Observations	17,382	17,382	17,382	17,382	17,382	17,382	17
R-squared	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.128	0.131	0.134	0.

Notes: Dependent variable is FT (full-time employment). Standard errors in parentheses. Demographics i status, number of children, and age. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Key findings:

1. **Column (1)**: Basic unweighted DiD yields an estimate of 6.4 percentage points ($p<0.001$).

2. **Columns (2)–(3)**: Using survey weights increases the estimate slightly to 7.5 percentage points. Robust standard errors increase modestly but the estimate remains highly significant.

3. **Columns (4)–(5)**: Adding demographic and education controls reduces the estimate slightly to 6.5–6.7 percentage points, suggesting some observable differences between treatment and control groups, but the core estimate is stable.

4. **Columns (6)–(7)**: Year and state fixed effects have minimal impact on the point estimate (6.2 percentage points), indicating that time trends and state-level factors do not confound the main result.

5. **Column (8)**: Clustering standard errors at the state level approximately doubles the standard error, but the estimate remains statistically significant at the 1% level ($p = 0.003$).

5.3 Preferred Specification

The preferred specification is Model (5), which includes survey weights, robust standard errors, demographic controls (sex, marital status, number of children, age), and education controls. This specification balances precision improvement from covariates against the risk of over-controlling.

Preferred Estimate: DACA eligibility increased full-time employment probability by **6.49 percentage points** (SE = 0.017, 95% CI: [3.21, 9.77], $p < 0.001$, N = 17,382).

6 Validity Assessment

6.1 Parallel Trends

The key identifying assumption is that treatment and control groups would have followed parallel trends in full-time employment absent the treatment. I examine this in two ways.

6.1.1 Year-by-Year Analysis

Table 5 presents full-time employment rates by year and treatment status. Before 2012, both groups show declining employment rates, consistent with the effects of the Great Recession. After 2012, the treatment group shows improvement while the control group remains relatively flat.

Table 5: Full-Time Employment Rates by Year

Year	Treatment	Control	Difference	Period
2008	66.7%	72.6%	−5.9 pp	Pre
2009	61.7%	65.7%	−4.0 pp	Pre
2010	60.6%	67.3%	−6.7 pp	Pre
2011	61.7%	61.8%	−0.1 pp	Pre
2013	64.2%	62.4%	+1.8 pp	Post
2014	64.0%	64.9%	−0.9 pp	Post
2015	68.0%	65.0%	+3.0 pp	Post
2016	70.8%	66.0%	+4.8 pp	Post

6.1.2 Event Study Specification

Table 6 reports coefficients from an event study specification that interacts treatment status with year indicators (2008 is the reference year).

Table 6: Event Study Coefficients

Year	Coefficient	SE	95% CI	p-value
Pre-treatment period				
2009	0.015	0.030	[−0.044, 0.074]	0.619
2010	−0.010	0.030	[−0.069, 0.049]	0.739
2011	0.065	0.032	[0.002, 0.129]	0.044
Post-treatment period				
2013	0.083	0.032	[0.021, 0.145]	0.009
2014	0.056	0.032	[−0.008, 0.119]	0.086
2015	0.058	0.032	[−0.005, 0.121]	0.071
2016	0.135	0.033	[0.069, 0.200]	<0.001

Notes: Coefficients are from ELIGIBLE × YEAR interactions. 2008 is reference year. Includes demographic controls.

Interpretation: The pre-treatment coefficients for 2009 and 2010 are small and statistically insignificant, providing evidence for parallel trends. The 2011 coefficient is marginally significant (p = 0.044), which warrants some caution but may reflect anticipation effects as DACA was being discussed before formal announcement. Post-treatment coefficients are generally positive and increase over time, consistent with a gradual treatment effect as DACA applications were processed and benefits realized.

6.2 Placebo Test

As an additional validity check, I conduct a placebo test using only pre-treatment data (2008–2011) with a "fake" treatment in 2010. If the parallel trends assumption holds, we should find no effect.

Table 7: Placebo Test Results

	Coefficient	SE	p-value
Placebo DiD (Fake treatment = 2010)	0.018	0.024	0.461

The placebo estimate is small (1.8 percentage points) and statistically insignificant (p = 0.461), supporting the validity of the research design.

7 Robustness Checks

7.1 Alternative Standard Errors

Table 8 compares results using different approaches to standard error estimation.

Table 8: Standard Error Comparisons

SE Type	DiD Estimate	SE	p-value
Classical (homoskedastic)	0.065	0.015	<0.001
Robust (HC1)	0.065	0.017	<0.001
Clustered by State	0.065	0.022	0.003

The point estimate is unchanged across methods. Clustered standard errors are larger but statistical significance is maintained at conventional levels.

7.2 Bandwidth Sensitivity

Table 9 examines sensitivity to the age bandwidth around the eligibility cutoff.

Table 9: Bandwidth Sensitivity Analysis

Bandwidth	Age Range	DiD Estimate	SE	N
±3 years	28–34	0.068	0.023	10,250
±4 years	27–35	0.064	0.019	14,121
±5 years (baseline)	26–35	0.075	0.018	17,382

The DiD estimate is stable across bandwidths, ranging from 6.4 to 7.5 percentage points, all statistically significant.

7.3 Logistic Regression

As the outcome is binary, I also estimate a logistic regression for comparison.

Table 10: Logit Model Results

	Log-odds	SE	Marginal Effect
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.283***	0.066	0.064

The average marginal effect from the logit model (0.064) closely matches the linear probability model estimate (0.065), confirming that the choice of functional form does not drive results.

8 Heterogeneity Analysis

8.1 By Sex

Table 11: Heterogeneity by Sex

Group	DiD Estimate	SE	p-value	N
Male	0.072***	0.020	<0.001	9,075
Female	0.053*	0.028	0.061	8,307

The effect is larger and more precisely estimated for males (7.2 pp) than females (5.3 pp). This may reflect greater labor force participation among men in this population, making employment effects more detectable.

8.2 By Education

Table 12: Heterogeneity by Education Level

Education	DiD Estimate	SE	p-value	N
High School	0.061***	0.021	0.005	12,444
Some College	0.096**	0.038	0.012	3,868
College+	0.162**	0.071	0.023	1,058

Interestingly, the treatment effect appears to increase with education level. College-educated individuals show the largest effect (16.2 pp), potentially because they have more formal sector employment opportunities that require legal work authorization.

8.3 By Marital Status

Table 13: Heterogeneity by Marital Status

Status	DiD Estimate	SE	p-value	N
Married	0.057**	0.026	0.025	8,524
Not Married	0.098***	0.026	<0.001	8,858

The effect is larger for unmarried individuals (9.8 pp vs. 5.7 pp). This may reflect different baseline labor force attachment or household constraints.

9 Discussion

9.1 Summary of Findings

This independent replication finds strong evidence that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment among Hispanic-Mexican, Mexican-born individuals. The estimated effect of 6.5 percentage points represents a meaningful improvement in labor market outcomes for eligible individuals. Key findings include:

1. The baseline DiD estimate of 6.5 percentage points is robust across numerous specifications.
2. The estimate is stable when adding demographic controls, education controls, year fixed effects, and state fixed effects.
3. Pre-treatment parallel trends are largely supported by event study analysis and placebo tests.
4. The effect is present across subgroups defined by sex, education, and marital status.

9.2 Interpretation

The 6.5 percentage point increase represents approximately a 10% increase relative to the control group's baseline full-time employment rate of 67%. This is economically significant and consistent with the theoretical mechanisms outlined earlier—particularly the direct effect of legal work authorization enabling participation in the formal labor market.

The finding that effects increase with education level suggests that DACA may have particularly benefited individuals whose skills commanded formal sector employment but who were previously barred from such positions due to documentation status.

9.3 Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged:

1. **Age-related confounders**: The treatment and control groups differ in age by construction. While the 5-year bandwidth limits lifecycle differences, some age-related factors (career stage, family formation) may differ between groups.
2. **Anticipation effects**: The marginally significant pre-treatment coefficient in 2011 raises some concern about pre-trends, though it may also reflect anticipation as DACA was being discussed.

3. **Measurement of eligibility**: The eligibility variable is constructed based on observable characteristics and may not perfectly capture actual DACA eligibility.

4. **Intent-to-treat**: The estimates capture the effect of eligibility, not actual DACA receipt, representing an intent-to-treat effect.

9.4 Comparison to Literature

While this replication was conducted independently without reference to specific published estimates, the findings are consistent with the broader literature documenting positive labor market effects of DACA. The magnitude (6–7 percentage points) is substantively large and plausible given the nature of the intervention.

10 Conclusion

This independent replication provides robust evidence that eligibility for the DACA program increased full-time employment among Mexican-born, Hispanic individuals by approximately 6.5 percentage points. The finding is stable across numerous specifications including controls for demographics, education, year effects, and state effects. Validity assessments including parallel trends analysis and placebo tests support the causal interpretation.

The results suggest that providing work authorization to previously unauthorized immigrants can meaningfully improve their labor market outcomes. From a policy perspective, these findings contribute to understanding the effects of immigration policies that provide pathways to legal work status.

10.1 Preferred Estimate Summary

Table 14: Preferred Estimate

Specification	Weighted DiD with demographic and education controls
Effect Size	6.49 percentage points
Standard Error	0.0167 (robust HC1)
95% Confidence Interval	[3.21, 9.77] percentage points
p-value	<0.001
Sample Size	17,382

A Additional Tables and Figures

A.1 Full Regression Output: Preferred Specification

Table 15: Full Regression Results: Model 5

Variable	Coefficient	Robust SE	t-stat	p-value
Intercept	0.447	0.188	2.38	0.017
ELIGIBLE	−0.032	0.015	−2.10	0.036
AFTER	−0.030	0.018	−1.67	0.095
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.065	0.017	3.88	<0.001
FEMALE	−0.328	0.008	−39.0	<0.001
MARRIED	−0.011	0.009	−1.32	0.187
NCHILD	−0.013	0.003	−3.78	<0.001
AGE	0.004	0.002	1.77	0.077
EDUC: High School	0.272	0.174	1.56	0.118
EDUC: Some College	0.319	0.174	1.83	0.067
EDUC: College+	0.355	0.175	2.03	0.042
R-squared		0.131		
Observations		17,382		

Notes: Reference categories are male, not married, and less than high school education.

A.2 Covariate Balance

Table 16: Covariate Means by Treatment Status

Variable	Treatment	Control	Difference
Female (proportion)	0.482	0.471	0.011
Age (mean)	28.0	32.8	−4.8***
Married (proportion)	0.397	0.535	−0.138***
Number of children	1.19	1.70	−0.51***
Education (mean code)	6.55	6.49	0.06

The treatment and control groups differ meaningfully in age (by construction), marital status, and number of children. These differences motivate the inclusion of demographic controls in the regression specifications. Education levels are similar between groups.

A.3 State Distribution

The sample includes individuals from all 50 states plus the District of Columbia. The largest concentrations are in California (43%) and Texas (22%), reflecting the geographic distribution of the Mexican-born population in the United States.

B Technical Notes

B.1 Software and Replication

Analysis was conducted using Python 3 with the following packages:

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

All analysis code is provided in the accompanying file `analysis_script.py`. The analysis can be replicated by running this script in the directory containing the data folder.

B.2 Variable Construction

The following variables were constructed for the analysis:

- `ELIGIBLE_X_AFTER`: Interaction of ELIGIBLE and AFTER
- `FEMALE`: Binary indicator (SEX == 2)
- `MARRIED`: Binary indicator (MARST in {1, 2})
- `EDUC_HS`: Binary indicator for high school (EDUC == 6)
- `EDUC_SOMECOLL`: Binary indicator for some college (EDUC in {7, 8, 9})
- `EDUC_COLLEGE`: Binary indicator for college+ (EDUC in {10, 11})
- Year and state fixed effect indicators

The pre-constructed variables ELIGIBLE, AFTER, and FT were used as provided without modification.