

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

## Difference-in-Differences Analysis Using American Community Survey Data

Replication Study #62

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 individuals born in Mexico. Using American Community Survey data from 2008–2016 (excluding 2012) and a difference-in-differences research design, I compare individuals aged 26–30 at DACA implementation (treatment group) to those aged 31–35 (comparison group). The preferred specification, using survey weights and controlling for demographic characteristics, estimates that DACA eligibility increased the probability of full-time employment by 6.2 percentage points ( $SE = 0.017$ , 95% CI: [2.9, 9.5],  $p < 0.001$ ). This effect is robust across multiple specifications including state and year fixed effects. The findings provide evidence that DACA’s provision of work authorization had meaningful positive effects on labor market outcomes for eligible individuals.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Background on DACA . . . . .	4
1.2	Research Question . . . . .	5
1.3	Identification Strategy . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Data</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Data Source . . . . .	5
2.2	Sample Construction . . . . .	5
2.3	Key Variables . . . . .	6
2.3.1	Outcome Variable . . . . .	6
2.3.2	Treatment and Period Indicators . . . . .	6
2.3.3	Demographic Controls . . . . .	6
2.3.4	Survey Weights . . . . .	6
2.4	Descriptive Statistics . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Empirical Strategy</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Difference-in-Differences Framework . . . . .	8
3.2	Extended Specifications . . . . .	9
3.2.1	Demographic Controls . . . . .	9
3.2.2	State Fixed Effects . . . . .	9
3.2.3	Year Fixed Effects . . . . .	9
3.3	Event Study Specification . . . . .	9
3.4	Survey Weights . . . . .	10
3.5	Standard Errors . . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Main Results . . . . .	10
4.2	Robustness Checks . . . . .	12
4.3	Event Study Results . . . . .	12
4.4	Heterogeneity Analysis . . . . .	13
<b>5</b>	<b>Validity of Identification</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1	Parallel Trends Assumption . . . . .	14
5.1.1	Pre-Trend Differential Test . . . . .	15
5.1.2	Event Study Evidence . . . . .	15
5.2	Balance on Observables . . . . .	15

5.3 Threats to Identification . . . . .	16
<b>6 Discussion</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 Interpretation of Results . . . . .	17
6.2 Comparison with Prior Literature . . . . .	17
6.3 Policy Implications . . . . .	17
6.4 Limitations . . . . .	18
<b>7 Conclusion</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>A Appendix: Full Regression Output</b>	<b>20</b>
A.1 Model 1: Basic DiD (OLS, Unweighted) . . . . .	20
A.2 Model 4: DiD with Demographics (WLS, Weighted) . . . . .	20
<b>B Appendix: Variable Descriptions</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>C Appendix: Analytical Decisions</b>	<b>23</b>
C.1 Estimation Method . . . . .	23
C.2 Standard Errors . . . . .	23
C.3 Survey Weights . . . . .	23
C.4 Covariates . . . . .	23
C.5 Sample . . . . .	24

# 1 Introduction

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, enacted on June 15, 2012, represents one of the most significant immigration policy changes in recent U.S. history affecting undocumented immigrants. The program allows eligible undocumented individuals who arrived in the United States as children to obtain temporary protection from deportation and, critically, work authorization. This study examines the causal effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment outcomes among the target population.

## 1.1 Background on DACA

DACA was announced by the Department of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012. The program provides qualifying individuals with:

- Protection from deportation (deferred action) for a renewable two-year period
- Authorization to work legally in the United States
- Eligibility for a Social Security number
- Ability to obtain driver's licenses in most states

To be eligible for DACA, individuals must meet several criteria:

1. Arrived in the United States before their 16th birthday
2. Had not reached their 31st birthday as of June 15, 2012
3. Lived continuously in the U.S. since June 15, 2007
4. Were present in the U.S. on June 15, 2012
5. Did not have lawful immigration status at that time
6. Had no significant criminal history

Applications began being accepted on August 15, 2012. Within the first four years, nearly 900,000 initial applications were received, with approximately 90% approval rates. While the program was not limited to any national origin, the majority of eligible individuals were from Mexico due to patterns of undocumented immigration to the United States.

## 1.2 Research Question

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 (treatment) on the probability of being employed full-time (outcome), defined as usually working 35 hours per week or more?

## 1.3 Identification Strategy

The identification strategy exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff of DACA. Specifically, individuals who had reached their 31st birthday by June 15, 2012 were ineligible for the program regardless of meeting all other criteria. This creates a natural comparison group of individuals who would have been eligible but for their age.

The treatment group consists of individuals aged 26–30 as of June 15, 2012, while the comparison group consists of individuals aged 31–35. By comparing changes in full-time employment between these groups from the pre-DACA period (2008–2011) to the post-DACA period (2013–2016), we can estimate the causal effect of DACA eligibility under the parallel trends assumption.

# 2 Data

## 2.1 Data Source

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS) as provided by IPUMS USA. The ACS is a large-scale, nationally representative survey conducted annually by the U.S. Census Bureau, providing detailed demographic, social, economic, and housing information.

## 2.2 Sample Construction

The provided analytical sample includes ACS data from 2008 through 2016, with data from 2012 omitted because it cannot be determined whether individuals in that year were observed before or after DACA implementation. The sample is restricted to individuals who:

- Are ethnically Hispanic-Mexican
- Were born in Mexico

- Would be classified as either eligible (aged 26–30 in June 2012) or just-ineligible (aged 31–35 in June 2012) for DACA

The final analytical sample contains 17,382 person-observations across eight years.

## 2.3 Key Variables

### 2.3.1 Outcome Variable

The primary outcome is FT, a binary indicator equal to 1 if the individual usually works 35 or more hours per week (full-time employment) and 0 otherwise. Individuals not in the labor force are included with FT = 0.

### 2.3.2 Treatment and Period Indicators

- **ELIGIBLE:** Binary indicator equal to 1 for individuals aged 26–30 in June 2012 (treatment group) and 0 for individuals aged 31–35 (comparison group)
- **AFTER:** Binary indicator equal to 1 for years 2013–2016 (post-DACA) and 0 for years 2008–2011 (pre-DACA)

### 2.3.3 Demographic Controls

The analysis includes the following demographic covariates:

- **SEX:** Male or Female
- **AGE:** Age at survey time
- **MARST:** Marital status
- **EDUC\_RECODE:** Education level (Less than High School, High School, Some College, Two-Year Degree, BA+)
- **CensusRegion:** Geographic region (West, South, Midwest, Northeast)

### 2.3.4 Survey Weights

The variable PERWT contains person-level sampling weights from the ACS, which allow estimates to be representative of the target population.

## 2.4 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the distribution of observations by treatment status and time period.

Table 1: Sample Distribution by Treatment and Period

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

Note: Ages refer to age as of June 15, 2012. Control group consists of individuals ineligible for DACA due to age; treatment group consists of DACA-eligible individuals.

Table 2 presents summary statistics by treatment group.

Table 2: Summary Statistics by Treatment Group

Variable	Control (31–35)		Treatment (26–30)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Full-Time Employment	0.658	0.474	0.644	0.479
Age	32.75	2.98	27.97	3.08
Male	0.542	—	0.518	—
Married	0.520	—	0.419	—
N	6,000		11,382	

Note: Full-time employment defined as usually working 35+ hours per week.

Table 3 shows full-time employment rates by group and period, which form the basis of the difference-in-differences calculation.

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

	Pre-DACA (2008–2011)	Post-DACA (2013–2016)	Difference
<i>Unweighted Means</i>			
Control (Ages 31–35)	0.670	0.645	−0.025
Treatment (Ages 26–30)	0.626	0.666	+0.039
Difference-in-Differences			<b>0.064</b>
<i>Weighted Means</i>			
Control (Ages 31–35)	0.689	0.663	−0.026
Treatment (Ages 26–30)	0.637	0.686	+0.049
Difference-in-Differences			<b>0.075</b>

Note: Weighted means use ACS person weights (PERWT).

The raw data reveal a striking pattern: while the control group experienced a decline in full-time employment of approximately 2.5 percentage points from pre- to post-DACA, the treatment group experienced an increase of approximately 4 percentage points. This suggests a positive effect of DACA eligibility on employment.

### 3 Empirical Strategy

#### 3.1 Difference-in-Differences Framework

The primary empirical strategy is a difference-in-differences (DiD) design that exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff for DACA. The identifying assumption is that, in the absence of DACA, the treatment and control groups would have experienced parallel trends in full-time employment.

The basic DiD estimating equation is:

$$FT_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 AFTER_t + \beta_3 (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where:

- $FT_{it}$  is full-time employment status for individual  $i$  in year  $t$
- $ELIGIBLE_i$  equals 1 for the treatment group (ages 26–30)
- $AFTER_t$  equals 1 for years 2013–2016

- $ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t$  is the interaction term
- $\beta_3$  is the coefficient of interest, capturing the DiD estimate

## 3.2 Extended Specifications

To improve precision and address potential confounding, I estimate several extended specifications:

### 3.2.1 Demographic Controls

$$FT_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 AFTER_t + \beta_3 (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + \mathbf{X}'_{it} \gamma + \epsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{it}$  includes indicators for sex, marital status, education level, census region, and a continuous control for age.

### 3.2.2 State Fixed Effects

To control for time-invariant state-level factors that may affect employment:

$$FT_{ist} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 AFTER_t + \beta_3 (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + \mathbf{X}'_{it} \gamma + \delta_s + \epsilon_{ist} \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta_s$  represents state fixed effects.

### 3.2.3 Year Fixed Effects

To flexibly control for year-specific shocks:

$$FT_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_3 (ELIGIBLE_i \times AFTER_t) + \mathbf{X}'_{it} \gamma + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{it} \quad (4)$$

where  $\lambda_t$  represents year fixed effects (absorbing the main effect of  $AFTER$ ).

## 3.3 Event Study Specification

To examine the dynamics of the treatment effect and assess the parallel trends assumption, I estimate an event study specification:

$$FT_{it} = \alpha + \sum_{k \neq 2011} \beta_k (ELIGIBLE_i \times \mathbf{1}[Year_t = k]) + \sum_{k \neq 2011} \gamma_k \mathbf{1}[Year_t = k] + \delta ELIGIBLE_i + \epsilon_{it} \quad (5)$$

This specification allows the effect of DACA eligibility to vary by year, with 2011 (the last pre-treatment year) as the reference period.

### 3.4 Survey Weights

Given that the ACS uses a complex sampling design, I estimate both unweighted OLS and weighted least squares (WLS) specifications using the person-level sampling weights (PERWT). The weighted estimates are preferred as they provide population-representative effects.

### 3.5 Standard Errors

All standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust (HC1), also known as White standard errors. This accounts for potential heteroskedasticity in the error term, which is particularly important given the binary nature of the outcome variable in a linear probability model.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Main Results

Table 4 presents the difference-in-differences estimates across all specifications.

Table 4: Main Difference-in-Differences Results

	(1) Basic OLS	(2) Basic WLS	(3) Controls OLS	(4) Controls WLS
ELIGIBLE × AFTER	0.064*** (0.015) , 0.094 [0.039, 0.110]	0.075*** (0.018)	0.053*** (0.014)	0.062*** (0.017)
ELIGIBLE	-0.043*** (0.010)	-0.052*** (0.012)	-0.024* (0.013)	-0.032** (0.015)
AFTER	-0.025** (0.012)	-0.026* (0.015)	-0.029* (0.015)	-0.029 (0.018)
MALE			0.339*** (0.007)	0.334*** (0.008)
MARRIED			-0.023*** (0.007)	-0.024*** (0.008)
Demographics	No	No	Yes	Yes
Survey Weights	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	17,382	17,382	17,382	17,382
R-squared	0.002	0.002	0.131	0.131

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. 95% confidence intervals in brackets for ELIGIBLE × AFTER. Demographic controls include indicators for education (Some College, Two-Year Degree, BA+), census region (South, Midwest, Northeast), and centered age. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The key findings from Table 4 are:

1. The basic DiD estimate (Column 1) shows that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by 6.4 percentage points ( $p < 0.001$ ).
2. Using survey weights (Column 2) increases the estimate to 7.5 percentage points, suggesting the unweighted estimate may slightly understate the population effect.
3. Adding demographic controls (Column 3) reduces the estimate to 5.3 percentage points, indicating some of the raw difference was due to compositional differences.

4. The preferred specification (Column 4), which uses both survey weights and demographic controls, estimates the effect at 6.2 percentage points (95% CI: 2.9 to 9.5,  $p < 0.001$ ).

## 4.2 Robustness Checks

Table 5 presents robustness checks with state and year fixed effects.

Table 5: Robustness Checks: Fixed Effects Specifications

	(5) Controls + State FE	(6) Controls + Year FE	(7) Controls + Both
ELIGIBLE $\times$ AFTER	0.053*** (0.014)  [0.024, 0.079]	0.052*** (0.014)  , 0.081	—
Demographics	Yes	Yes	Yes
State Fixed Effects	Yes	No	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	17,382	17,382	17,382

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. 95% confidence intervals in brackets. All specifications are unweighted OLS with demographic controls. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The DiD estimate remains remarkably stable across specifications:

- Adding state fixed effects: 5.3 percentage points
- Adding year fixed effects: 5.2 percentage points

This stability suggests that the main results are not driven by state-specific trends or year-specific shocks.

## 4.3 Event Study Results

Table 6 presents the event study coefficients, which show the year-specific treatment effects relative to 2011.

Table 6: Event Study Coefficients (Reference: 2011)

Year	ELIGIBLE $\times$ Year	Standard Error
<i>Pre-Treatment Period</i>		
2008	−0.059**	(0.029)
2009	−0.039	(0.030)
2010	−0.066**	(0.029)
2011	[Reference]	—
<i>Post-Treatment Period</i>		
2013	0.019	(0.031)
2014	−0.009	(0.031)
2015	0.030	(0.032)
2016	0.049	(0.031)

Note: Coefficients from equation with year-specific treatment effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The event study reveals important patterns:

1. **Pre-trends:** The pre-treatment coefficients (2008–2010) are negative and some are statistically significant, suggesting the treatment group had lower relative full-time employment before DACA. However, a formal test of differential pre-trends (see Section 5.1) fails to reject the null hypothesis of parallel trends.
2. **Post-treatment dynamics:** The post-treatment coefficients show a pattern of increasing effects over time, from 0.02 in 2013 to 0.05 in 2016. While individually imprecise, this pattern suggests the effects of DACA may have strengthened as more eligible individuals obtained work authorization.

#### 4.4 Heterogeneity Analysis

Table 7 examines heterogeneity in the treatment effect across subgroups.

Table 7: Heterogeneity Analysis

Subgroup	DiD Estimate	Standard Error	N
<i>By Sex</i>			
Male	0.062***	(0.017)	9,075
Female	0.045*	(0.023)	8,307
<i>By Education</i>			
High School	0.048***	(0.018)	12,444
Some College	0.108***	(0.038)	2,877
BA+	0.086	(0.059)	1,058
<i>By Region</i>			
West	0.051**	(0.020)	10,290
South	0.103***	(0.029)	4,998
Midwest	0.013	(0.049)	1,578
Northeast	0.086	(0.090)	516

Note: Each row represents a separate regression of the basic DiD model estimated on the indicated subgroup. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Key findings from the heterogeneity analysis:

1. **By Sex:** The effect is larger and more precisely estimated for males (6.2 pp) than females (4.5 pp), though both are positive. This may reflect different labor force participation patterns.
2. **By Education:** The effect appears largest for those with some college education (10.8 pp), suggesting DACA may have particularly benefited individuals with moderate education who could access better job opportunities with work authorization.
3. **By Region:** The effect is strongest in the South (10.3 pp) and significant in the West (5.1 pp), where the majority of the sample resides. Effects in the Midwest and Northeast are imprecisely estimated due to smaller sample sizes.

## 5 Validity of Identification

### 5.1 Parallel Trends Assumption

The key identifying assumption for difference-in-differences is that the treatment and control groups would have followed parallel trends in the outcome in the absence of treatment. I

conduct two tests of this assumption.

### 5.1.1 Pre-Trend Differential Test

I estimate the following model on pre-DACA data only (2008–2011):

$$FT_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 ELIGIBLE_i + \beta_2 YEAR\_TREND_t + \beta_3 (ELIGIBLE_i \times YEAR\_TREND_t) + \epsilon_{it} \quad (6)$$

where  $YEAR\_TREND$  is a linear time trend (coded 0, 1, 2, 3 for years 2008–2011). The coefficient  $\beta_3$  tests whether trends differed between groups before DACA.

**Results:**

- $\hat{\beta}_3 = 0.015$  (SE = 0.009)
- $t$ -statistic = 1.66
- $p$ -value = 0.098

The coefficient is marginally significant at the 10% level but not at conventional 5% levels. This provides moderate support for the parallel trends assumption, though some caution is warranted.

### 5.1.2 Event Study Evidence

The event study results (Table 6) show that pre-treatment coefficients, while negative, do not exhibit a clear trend. The fluctuation between years (2008: -0.059, 2009: -0.039, 2010: -0.066) is inconsistent with systematic divergence before treatment.

## 5.2 Balance on Observables

Table 8 presents covariate balance between treatment and control groups in the pre-DACA period.

Table 8: Covariate Balance in Pre-Treatment Period

Variable	Treatment	Control	Difference	<i>p</i> -value
Male	0.519	0.544	-0.025	0.022
Married	0.411	0.529	-0.118	0.000
Age	25.74	30.52	-4.78	0.000
Some College	0.183	0.157	0.027	0.001
Two-Year Degree	0.052	0.052	0.000	0.965
BA+	0.055	0.056	-0.001	0.844

Note: Statistics calculated for pre-DACA period (2008–2011). *p*-values from two-sample *t*-tests.

The balance table reveals that the treatment and control groups differ on several dimensions:

- Age differs by construction (approximately 5 years)
- Marriage rates differ significantly (treatment group less likely to be married)
- Gender composition differs slightly

These imbalances motivate the inclusion of demographic controls in the preferred specification. The DiD design does not require perfect balance—only that any imbalances do not lead to differential trends. The stability of estimates when adding controls suggests composition differences are not driving the results.

### 5.3 Threats to Identification

Several potential threats to identification warrant discussion:

1. **Age-specific trends:** If employment trends differ by age in ways that would have occurred without DACA, the estimates would be biased. The comparison group (ages 31–35) helps address this by being close in age to the treatment group.
2. **Great Recession effects:** The pre-period (2008–2011) includes the Great Recession, which may have affected age groups differentially. The event study showing no clear pattern of pre-trends helps address this concern.
3. **Measurement of eligibility:** The ELIGIBLE variable is based on observable characteristics that approximate DACA eligibility. Some individuals in the treatment group may not have actually been eligible (e.g., if they arrived after age 16), which would attenuate estimates toward zero.

4. **Spillovers:** If DACA affected labor market conditions for the control group (e.g., through competition effects), this would bias estimates. Given the relatively small share of DACA-eligible workers in the labor market, such spillovers are likely minimal.

## 6 Discussion

### 6.1 Interpretation of Results

The preferred estimate indicates that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by 6.2 percentage points among eligible Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico. This represents a substantial improvement in labor market outcomes, equivalent to approximately a 10% increase from the baseline full-time employment rate of 63% in the pre-period.

The positive effect is consistent with the primary mechanism through which DACA was expected to affect employment: the provision of legal work authorization. Before DACA, eligible individuals could work only in informal employment or with fraudulent documents, facing risks of exploitation and limited job opportunities. With DACA, recipients gained access to the formal labor market, enabling them to seek better-paying, full-time positions.

### 6.2 Comparison with Prior Literature

These findings are broadly consistent with prior research on DACA's labor market effects. Studies have documented positive effects on employment, earnings, and occupational upgrading among DACA recipients. The magnitude of the estimated effect (6.2 percentage points) is within the range of estimates from other studies examining employment outcomes.

However, direct comparison is complicated by differences in:

- Sample definitions and populations studied
- Outcome measures (employment vs. full-time employment)
- Identification strategies and comparison groups
- Time periods examined

### 6.3 Policy Implications

The findings have several policy implications:

1. **Work authorization matters:** The results demonstrate that legal work authorization has meaningful effects on employment outcomes, supporting the economic rationale for programs like DACA.
2. **Integration benefits:** Improved employment among DACA-eligible individuals likely generates broader economic benefits through increased tax contributions, reduced reliance on public assistance, and greater consumer spending.
3. **Uncertainty costs:** The ongoing legal uncertainty surrounding DACA may impose costs by deterring full labor market integration, as employers and recipients face uncertain futures.

## 6.4 Limitations

Several limitations should be noted:

1. **Linear probability model:** Using OLS with a binary outcome can produce predicted probabilities outside [0,1] and may have heteroskedastic errors. However, for estimating average treatment effects, the linear probability model generally performs well.
2. **Repeated cross-sections:** The ACS is not a panel, so I cannot observe the same individuals before and after DACA. This prevents examining individual-level changes and may introduce additional noise.
3. **Parallel trends assumption:** While tests are supportive, the parallel trends assumption cannot be definitively verified. Any violation would bias the results.
4. **External validity:** Results apply specifically to Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico within the specified age range. Generalization to other DACA-eligible populations (e.g., from other countries) may not be warranted.

## 7 Conclusion

This study estimates the effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment using a difference-in-differences design that compares individuals just below the age cutoff (26–30 in June 2012) to those just above (31–35). Using data from the American Community Survey for 2008–2016, I find that DACA eligibility increased full-time employment by 6.2 percentage points (95% CI: 2.9 to 9.5 percentage points).

The estimate is robust across specifications including demographic controls, state fixed effects, and year fixed effects. Heterogeneity analysis suggests effects may be particularly strong for males, those with some college education, and those in the South. Tests of the parallel trends assumption provide moderate support for the identifying assumption, though some caution is warranted given marginally significant pre-trend differences.

These findings contribute to our understanding of how immigration policy affects labor market outcomes and provide evidence that DACA's work authorization provisions had meaningful positive effects on employment for eligible individuals.

## Preferred Estimate Summary

Specification	Model 4: DiD with demographics, weighted
<b>Effect Size</b>	0.062 (6.2 percentage points)
<b>Standard Error</b>	0.017
<b>95% Confidence Interval</b>	[0.029, 0.095]
<b>t-statistic</b>	3.70
<b>p-value</b>	< 0.001
<b>Sample Size</b>	17,382

## A Appendix: Full Regression Output

### A.1 Model 1: Basic DiD (OLS, Unweighted)

OLS Regression Results

Dep. Variable:	FT	R-squared:	0.002			
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.001			
No. Observations:	17382					
Covariance Type:	HC1					
<hr/>						
	coef	std err	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
<hr/>						
const	0.6697	0.008	81.715	0.000	0.654	0.686
ELIGIBLE	-0.0434	0.010	-4.237	0.000	-0.063	-0.023
AFTER	-0.0248	0.012	-2.016	0.044	-0.049	-0.001
ELIGIBLE_x_AFTER	0.0643	0.015	4.213	0.000	0.034	0.094
<hr/>						

### A.2 Model 4: DiD with Demographics (WLS, Weighted)

WLS Regression Results

Dep. Variable:	FT	R-squared:	0.131			
Model:	WLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.131			
No. Observations:	17382					
Covariance Type:	HC1					
<hr/>						
	coef	std err	z	P> z	[0.025	0.975]
<hr/>						
const	0.4783	0.012	39.966	0.000	0.455	0.502
ELIGIBLE	-0.0317	0.015	-2.062	0.039	-0.062	-0.002
AFTER	-0.0288	0.018	-1.633	0.102	-0.063	0.006
ELIGIBLE_x_AFTER	0.0619	0.017	3.703	0.000	0.029	0.095
MALE	0.3344	0.008	40.724	0.000	0.318	0.350
MARRIED	-0.0239	0.008	-2.980	0.003	-0.040	-0.008
SOME_COLLEGE	0.0485	0.011	4.356	0.000	0.027	0.070

TWO_YEAR	0.0631	0.018	3.438	0.001	0.027	0.099
BA_PLUS	0.0898	0.017	5.341	0.000	0.057	0.123
SOUTH	0.0351	0.009	3.893	0.000	0.017	0.053
MIDWEST	0.0460	0.014	3.288	0.001	0.019	0.073
NORTHEAST	0.0288	0.023	1.278	0.201	-0.015	0.073
AGE_CENTERED	0.0031	0.002	1.385	0.166	-0.001	0.007
=====						

## B Appendix: Variable Descriptions

Variable	Description
FT	Full-time employment indicator (1 = usually works 35+ hours/week)
ELIGIBLE	DACA eligibility indicator (1 = ages 26–30 in June 2012)
AFTER	Post-DACA period indicator (1 = years 2013–2016)
YEAR	Survey year (2008–2011, 2013–2016)
PERWT	ACS person-level sampling weight
SEX	Sex (Male, Female)
AGE	Age at time of survey
MARST	Marital status (Married spouse present, Married spouse absent, Separated, Divorced, Widowed, Never married)
EDUC_RECODE	Education level (Less than High School, High School, Some College, Two-Year Degree, BA+)
CensusRegion	Census region (West, South, Midwest, Northeast)
STATEFIP	State FIPS code
AGE_IN_JUNE_2012	Calculated age as of June 15, 2012

## C Appendix: Analytical Decisions

This appendix documents the key analytical decisions made in this study.

### C.1 Estimation Method

I use Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Weighted Least Squares (WLS) to estimate linear probability models. While probit or logit models would constrain predictions to [0,1], the linear probability model has several advantages:

- Coefficients directly interpretable as percentage point changes
- DiD coefficient directly captures the average treatment effect on the treated
- Robust to misspecification of the underlying probability model

### C.2 Standard Errors

Heteroskedasticity-robust (HC1) standard errors are used throughout. This is appropriate because:

- The binary outcome inherently produces heteroskedastic errors in a linear model
- Clustered standard errors by state were considered but not implemented as the primary specification to maintain comparability across models

### C.3 Survey Weights

The preferred specification uses ACS person weights (PERWT) to produce population-representative estimates. Unweighted estimates are also reported for comparison and are generally similar.

### C.4 Covariates

Covariates were selected based on:

- Theoretical relevance to employment outcomes (sex, education, marital status)
- Potential differences between treatment and control groups (age)
- Geographic heterogeneity (region)

## C.5 Sample

The entire provided analytical sample was used without additional restrictions, as instructed. The sample consists of Hispanic-Mexican individuals born in Mexico who were either DACA-eligible (ages 26–30 in June 2012) or just-ineligible (ages 31–35).