Replication Report: The Effect of DACA Eligibility on Full-Time Employment Among Mexican-Born Immigrants

Independent Replication Study

January 2026

Abstract

This study examines the causal effect of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) eligibility on full-time employment among Mexican-born Hispanic immigrants in the United States. Using a difference-in-differences design that exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff, I compare individuals aged 26–30 at the time of DACA implementation (June 15, 2012) with those aged 31–35 who would have been eligible but for exceeding the age limit. Using American Community Survey data from 2006–2016, I find a positive but statistically insignificant effect of approximately 1.7 percentage points on full-time employment in the preferred specification with survey weights and controls. However, the basic difference-in-differences estimate of 5.5 percentage points is statistically significant, and the event study analysis shows significant effects emerging by 2016. The findings suggest that DACA may have had modest positive effects on full-time employment, though precision is limited and results are sensitive to specification.

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Background on DACA

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program was established by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012. The program provides temporary protection from deportation and work authorization to undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children. DACA represented a significant policy intervention that potentially affected the labor market outcomes of nearly one million young adults.

To be eligible for DACA, individuals must have:

1. Arrived in the US before their 16th birthday
2. Not yet reached their 31st birthday as of June 15, 2012
3. Lived continuously in the US since June 15, 2007
4. Been present in the US on June 15, 2012 without lawful immigration status

The program offered two years of work authorization and relief from deportation, with the possibility of renewal. By providing legal work authorization, DACA removed a significant barrier to formal employment for eligible individuals. Recipients could also apply for driver's licenses and other identification in many states, further facilitating their labor market participation.

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 on the probability of full-time employment, defined as usually working 35 hours or more per week?

1.3 Theoretical Framework

DACA eligibility could affect full-time employment through several channels:

1. **Legal work authorization**: DACA provides recipients with the legal right to work, enabling access to formal sector jobs that often offer full-time positions with benefits.
2. **Reduced deportation risk**: Protection from deportation may increase willingness to take stable, full-time positions rather than informal or temporary work.

3. **Access to identification**: The ability to obtain driver's licenses and Social Security numbers expands job opportunities and reduces commuting constraints.

4. **Human capital investments**: Reduced uncertainty about future immigration status may encourage investments in education and training that lead to better job outcomes.

2 Data

2.1 Data Source

The analysis uses data from the American Community Survey (ACS) obtained through IPUMS USA. The ACS is a large-scale, nationally representative household survey conducted annually by the U.S. Census Bureau. I use the one-year ACS files from 2006 through 2016, which provide detailed information on demographics, immigration history, and labor market outcomes.

The ACS is a repeated cross-section, not a panel dataset. This means that different individuals are surveyed each year, and we cannot track the same individuals over time. This is an important limitation for our analysis, as the difference-in-differences design relies on comparing population averages rather than individual trajectories.

2.2 Sample Selection

The analytical sample is constructed by applying the following filters to approximate DACA eligibility:

1. **Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity**: HISPAN = 1 (Mexican)

2. **Born in Mexico**: BPL = 200 (Mexico)

3. **Non-citizen**: CITIZEN = 3 (Not a citizen)

4. **Arrived before age 16**: (YRIMMIG - BIRTHYR) < 16

5. **Continuous residence since 2007**: YRIMMIG ≤ 2007

Table 1 shows the sample size at each stage of the filtering process.

Table 1: Sample Construction

Filter Applied	Observations	Reduction
Raw data (2006–2016 ACS)	33,851,424	–
Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity	2,945,521	30,905,903
Born in Mexico	991,261	1,954,260
Non-citizen	701,347	289,914
Arrived before age 16	205,327	496,020
Continuous residence since 2007	195,023	10,304
Age 26–35 in 2012	49,019	145,004
Excluding 2012	44,725	4,294

Notes: This table shows the progressive sample restrictions applied to construct the analytical sample. The final sample of 44,725 observations includes treatment group (ages 26–30 in 2012) and control group (ages 31–35 in 2012) across survey years 2006–2011 and 2013–2016.

2.3 Variable Definitions

2.3.1 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:

$$\text{fulltime}_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if UHRSWORK}_i \geq 35 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

2.3.2 Treatment and Control Groups

The treatment assignment is based on age as of June 15, 2012:

- **Treatment group**: Individuals aged 26–30 in 2012 (birth years 1982–1986). These individuals were eligible for DACA.
- **Control group**: Individuals aged 31–35 in 2012 (birth years 1977–1981). These individuals would have been eligible for DACA but for exceeding the age limit of 31.

Age in 2012 is calculated as:

$$\text{age\_2012}_i = 2012 - \text{BIRTHYR}_i \tag{2}$$

2.3.3 Time Periods

- **Pre-treatment period**: 2006–2011
- **Post-treatment period**: 2013–2016

The year 2012 is excluded because DACA was implemented in mid-year (June 15, 2012), and the ACS does not record the month of interview. This means observations from 2012 could be from either before or after DACA implementation.

2.3.4 Control Variables

The following control variables are included in the regression analysis:

- **Female**: Indicator for SEX = 2
- **Married**: Indicator for MARST = 1 (married, spouse present)
- **High school or more**: Indicator for EDUC $\geq$ 6
- **College**: Indicator for EDUC $\geq$ 10
- **Age**: Current age in survey year
- **Age squared**: Quadratic term for age
- **Year fixed effects**: Indicators for each survey year
- **State fixed effects**: Indicators for state of residence (STATEFIP)

3 Methodology

3.1 Identification Strategy

The identification strategy exploits the arbitrary age cutoff in DACA eligibility. Individuals who were 31 or older on June 15, 2012, were ineligible for DACA regardless of meeting all other criteria. This creates a natural experiment where individuals just above and below the age threshold provide treatment and control groups.

The key identifying assumption is that, in the absence of DACA, the treatment and control groups would have experienced parallel trends in full-time employment. Both groups are similar in that they:

- Were born in Mexico

- Identify as Hispanic-Mexican
- Are non-citizens (likely undocumented)
- Arrived in the US before age 16
- Have been in the US since at least 2007

The main difference is their age, which creates the treatment assignment.

3.2 Difference-in-Differences Specification

The basic difference-in-differences regression is:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Treat}_i + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \beta_3 (\text{Treat}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + \epsilon_{it} \tag{3}$$

where:

- Y_{it} is the full-time employment indicator for individual i in year t
- Treat_i is an indicator for being in the treatment group (ages 26–30 in 2012)
- Post_t is an indicator for the post-treatment period (2013–2016)
- β_3 is the difference-in-differences estimate of the DACA effect

The extended specification includes year fixed effects, demographic controls, and state fixed effects:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Treat}_i + \gamma_t + \beta_3 (\text{Treat}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + X_i' \delta + \mu_s + \epsilon_{it} \tag{4}$$

where γ_t are year fixed effects, X_i is a vector of demographic controls, and μ_s are state fixed effects.

3.3 Weighted Estimation

The ACS provides person weights (PERWT) that account for the complex survey design and make the sample representative of the US population. The preferred specification uses weighted least squares (WLS) with these survey weights:

$$\min_{\beta} \sum_{i} w_i (Y_i - X_i' \beta)^2 \tag{5}$$

where w_i is the survey weight for observation i.

3.4 Event Study Analysis

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

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Treat}_i + \sum_{k \neq 2011} \gamma_k \text{Year}_k + \sum_{k \neq 2011} \delta_k (\text{Treat}_i \times \text{Year}_k) + \epsilon_{it} \tag{6}$$

The coefficients δ_k for $k < 2012$ test the parallel trends assumption—they should be close to zero and statistically insignificant if the treatment and control groups were on similar trajectories before DACA. The coefficients δ_k for $k \geq 2013$ capture the dynamic treatment effects.

4 Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents summary statistics for the treatment and control groups.

Table 2: Summary Statistics by Treatment Group

	Treatment (Ages 26–30)	Control (Ages 31–35)
N	26,591	18,134
Female (%)	44.0	43.9
Married (%)	37.2	49.8
Mean age in survey	26.3	31.4
Mean years in US	17.0	21.5
Full-time employed (%)	61.9	63.2

Notes: Treatment group consists of individuals who were ages 26–30 on June 15, 2012. Control group consists of individuals who were ages 31–35 on June 15, 2012. Statistics are calculated over all survey years (2006–2011, 2013–2016).

The groups are similar in gender composition (about 44% female) but differ in marital status, with the older control group having higher marriage rates (49.8% vs. 37.2%). The control group also has longer tenure in the US (21.5 years vs. 17.0 years on average), which is mechanically related to their older age.

4.2 Raw Difference-in-Differences

Table 3 presents the 2×2 table of full-time employment rates that forms the basis of the difference-in-differences calculation.

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

	Pre (2006–2011)	Post (2013–2016)	Difference
Treatment (26–30)	0.6111	0.6339	+0.0228
Control (31–35)	0.6431	0.6108	−0.0323
Difference	−0.0320	+0.0231	**+0.0551**

Notes: Cells show the proportion of individuals working 35+ hours per week. The difference-in-differences estimate is $0.0551 = (0.6339 - 0.6111) - (0.6108 - 0.6431)$.

The raw difference-in-differences estimate is 5.51 percentage points. The treatment group saw an increase in full-time employment from 61.1% to 63.4% (+2.28 pp), while the control group experienced a decline from 64.3% to 61.1% (−3.23 pp). The differential change of 5.51 percentage points represents the simple difference-in-differences estimate.

4.3 Trends in Full-Time Employment

Table 4 shows the year-by-year full-time employment rates for both groups.

Table 4: Full-Time Employment Rates by Year and Group

Year	Control (31–35)	Treatment (26–30)
Pre-DACA Period		
2006	0.6823	0.6280
2007	0.6891	0.6468
2008	0.6638	0.6410
2009	0.6134	0.5924
2010	0.6111	0.5803
2011	0.5909	0.5713
Post-DACA Period		
2013	0.5975	0.6078
2014	0.5999	0.6201
2015	0.6216	0.6410
2016	0.6275	0.6722

Notes: Year 2012 is excluded due to mid-year DACA implementation. The vertical line indicates DACA implementation.

Several patterns emerge:

1. Both groups experienced declining employment during the Great Recession (2008–2011).

2. The treatment group consistently had lower full-time employment rates than the control group in the pre-period.

3. After DACA, the treatment group's employment rate exceeded the control group's by 2013 and continued to grow faster through 2016.

4. By 2016, the treatment group had a 4.5 percentage point advantage over the control group.

4.4 Regression Results

Table 5 presents the main regression results across different specifications.

Table 5: Difference-in-Differences Regression Results

	(1) Basic DiD	(2) Year FE	(3) Controls	(4) Full Model
Treat × Post (DiD)	0.0551***	0.0554***	0.0160	0.0143
	(0.0098)	(0.0098)	(0.0132)	(0.0132)
Treat	−0.0320***	−0.0324***	0.0100	0.0101
	(0.0057)	(0.0057)	(0.0098)	(0.0098)
Post	−0.0323***	–	–	–
	(0.0076)			
Female			−0.3568***	−0.3560***
			(0.0044)	(0.0044)
Married			0.0155***	0.0133***
			(0.0043)	(0.0043)
Year FE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	No	No	No	Yes
R-squared	0.001	0.004	0.140	0.144
N	44,725	44,725	44,725	44,725

Notes: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Controls in columns (3) and (4) include age, age squared, high school indicator, and college indicator in addition to variables shown.

The basic difference-in-differences estimate (Column 1) is 5.51 percentage points and is highly statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Adding year fixed effects (Column 2) has minimal impact on the estimate.

However, once demographic controls are added (Column 3), the coefficient drops substantially to 1.6 percentage points and becomes statistically insignificant (p = 0.226). The full model with state fixed effects (Column 4) yields a similar estimate of 1.43 percentage points.

This attenuation suggests that observable demographic differences between the treatment and control groups, particularly age-related characteristics, explain much of the raw difference-in-differences effect.

4.5 Weighted Results

Table 6 presents results using ACS survey weights.

Table 6: Weighted Regression Results (Preferred Specification)

	Weighted WLS
Treat × Post (DiD)	0.0171
	(0.0157)
95% Confidence Interval	[−0.0136, 0.0479]
p-value	0.275
Treat	0.0095
	(0.0113)
Female	−0.3707***
	(0.0052)
Married	−0.0083*
	(0.0050)
Year FE	Yes
State FE	Yes
Controls	Yes
R-squared	0.160
N	44,725

Notes: Weighted least squares using ACS person weights (PERWT). Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

The preferred weighted estimate is 1.71 percentage points with a standard error of 1.57 percentage points. The 95% confidence interval ranges from −1.36 to +4.79 percentage

points, spanning zero. This estimate is not statistically significant at conventional levels (p = 0.275).

4.6 Event Study Results

Table 7 presents the event study coefficients, which show year-specific treatment effects relative to 2011 (the reference year).

Table 7: Event Study Coefficients (Relative to 2011)

Year	Coefficient	Std. Error	p-value
Pre-DACA Period (Parallel Trends Test)			
2006	−0.0347	(0.0196)	0.078*
2007	−0.0226	(0.0198)	0.252
2008	−0.0032	(0.0202)	0.876
2009	−0.0013	(0.0207)	0.948
2010	−0.0112	(0.0205)	0.586
Post-DACA Period (Treatment Effects)			
2013	0.0299	(0.0213)	0.160
2014	0.0398	(0.0214)	0.063*
2015	0.0390	(0.0218)	0.074*
2016	0.0642	(0.0219)	0.003***

Notes: Coefficients from event study regression with 2011 as the omitted reference year. Standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

The event study reveals several important patterns:

Pre-trends: The pre-DACA coefficients are generally small and statistically insignificant, though 2006 shows marginally significant negative difference (−3.47 pp, p = 0.078). The coefficients trend toward zero as we approach 2011, consistent with the parallel trends assumption being approximately satisfied in the years immediately before DACA.

Post-DACA effects: The treatment effects grow over time:

- 2013: +2.99 pp (not significant)
- 2014: +3.98 pp (marginally significant)
- 2015: +3.90 pp (marginally significant)
- 2016: +6.42 pp (highly significant, p = 0.003)

This pattern suggests that the effects of DACA may have accumulated over time as more individuals obtained DACA status and transitioned to formal employment.

4.7 Robustness Checks

4.7.1 Placebo Test

Using only pre-treatment data (2006–2011), I conduct a placebo test using 2009 as a "fake" treatment year:

Table 8: Placebo Test Results

	Coefficient	p-value
Fake DiD (2009 as treatment)	0.0164	0.152
	(0.0115)	

The placebo coefficient is not statistically significant ($p = 0.152$), providing some support for the parallel trends assumption. However, the positive point estimate (1.64 pp) suggests some divergence in trends even in the pre-period.

4.7.2 Alternative Outcome: Any Employment

As a robustness check, I examine the effect on any employment (EMPSTAT = 1) rather than full-time employment:

Table 9: Alternative Outcome: Any Employment

	Coefficient	p-value
DiD (Any Employment)	0.0433***	<0.001
	(0.0094)	

The effect on any employment (4.33 pp) is larger and statistically significant, suggesting DACA may have affected the extensive margin of employment more strongly than the intensive margin.

4.7.3 Heterogeneity by Gender

Table 10: Heterogeneity by Gender

	Coefficient	Std. Error	N
Male	0.0598***	(0.0112)	25,058
Female	0.0365**	(0.0150)	19,667

The effect is larger and more precisely estimated for males (5.98 pp, $p < 0.001$) than females (3.65 pp, $p = 0.015$). This could reflect differential labor force participation patterns or different baseline employment rates by gender.

4.7.4 Alternative Control Group

Using individuals aged 32–36 in 2012 as an alternative control group:

Table 11: Alternative Control Group (Ages 32–36)

	Coefficient	Std. Error	N
DiD (Control: 32–36)	0.0579***	(0.0106)	40,767

The estimate using the alternative control group (5.79 pp) is similar to the baseline estimate and remains highly significant.

5 Discussion

5.1 Summary of Findings

This study finds mixed evidence for the effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment. The key findings are:

1. The simple difference-in-differences estimate suggests a large positive effect of 5.51 percentage points on full-time employment.

2. After controlling for demographic characteristics and using survey weights, the effect attenuates to 1.71 percentage points and becomes statistically insignificant.

3. The event study analysis shows that effects grew over time, with a statistically significant 6.42 percentage point effect by 2016.

4. Effects are larger for males than females and for any employment compared to full-time employment specifically.

5.2 Interpretation

The attenuation of the effect when adding controls warrants careful interpretation. Several factors may explain this pattern:

1. **Age-related confounding**: The treatment and control groups differ systematically in age, which affects employment independently of DACA. The control variables (age, age squared) may absorb variation that is partly attributable to DACA.

2. **Parallel trends violations**: The pre-trend in 2006 suggests the groups may not have been on perfectly parallel trajectories, though trends converge closer to 2012.

3. **Power limitations**: With a standard error of 1.57 percentage points in the preferred specification, we lack power to detect effects smaller than about 3 percentage points.

The growing effect over time (from 3.0 pp in 2013 to 6.4 pp in 2016) is consistent with the gradual rollout of DACA. Applications began in August 2012, and it took time for recipients to obtain work authorization and transition to formal employment.

5.3 Comparison with Prior Literature

My findings are broadly consistent with prior research on DACA's labor market effects. Studies using similar difference-in-differences approaches have found positive effects on employment and earnings, though effect sizes vary. The attenuation of effects with controls is also consistent with the challenges of disentangling DACA effects from age-related trends.

5.4 Limitations

Several limitations should be considered:

1. **Undocumented status proxy**: The ACS does not directly identify undocumented immigrants. Using non-citizenship as a proxy includes some legal non-citizens while potentially missing undocumented individuals who misreport their status.

2. **Cross-sectional data**: The ACS is a repeated cross-section, not a panel. We cannot track individuals over time or observe the same person before and after DACA.

3. **Selection into DACA**: Not all eligible individuals applied for DACA. The analysis estimates the intent-to-treat effect of eligibility, not the treatment effect of receiving DACA.

4. **Age discontinuity**: The treatment and control groups differ in age by construction. While this is the source of identifying variation, it also means the groups differ on age-correlated characteristics.

5. **General equilibrium effects**: DACA may have affected the control group through labor market competition, potentially biasing the difference-in-differences estimate toward zero.

6 Conclusion

This study estimates the effect of DACA eligibility on full-time employment using a difference-in-differences design that exploits the age-based eligibility cutoff. The preferred estimate suggests a modest positive effect of approximately 1.7 percentage points, though this estimate is not statistically significant at conventional levels.

The basic difference-in-differences estimate of 5.5 percentage points is statistically significant, and the event study shows effects growing to 6.4 percentage points by 2016. The attenuation with controls suggests that compositional differences between the treatment and control groups explain some of the raw difference.

Overall, the evidence is consistent with DACA having positive effects on full-time employment, though the magnitude and statistical significance depend on specification. The growing effects over time and significant results for males suggest that DACA's impact on formal employment accumulated gradually as recipients obtained work authorization and transitioned to full-time positions.

Future research using administrative data or longer post-treatment periods could provide more precise estimates of DACA's labor market effects.

Appendix: Technical Details

A.1 IPUMS Variable Codes

Table 12: IPUMS Variable Definitions

Variable	Values Used	Description
HISPAN	$= 1$	Hispanic-Mexican ethnicity
BPL	$= 200$	Birthplace Mexico
CITIZEN	$= 3$	Not a citizen
YRIMMIG	$> 0, \leq 2007$	Year of immigration
BIRTHYR	–	Year of birth
UHRSWORK	≥ 35	Usual hours worked per week
EMPSTAT	$= 1$	Employed
SEX	$= 2$ for female	Sex
MARST	$= 1$	Married, spouse present
EDUC	≥ 6 for HS+, ≥ 10 for college	Education
STATEFIP	–	State FIPS code
PERWT	–	Person weight

A.2 Sample Sizes by Year

Table 13: Sample Sizes by Year and Treatment Group

Year	Treatment	Control	Total
2006	2,539	1,844	4,383
2007	2,658	1,776	4,434
2008	2,808	2,003	4,811
2009	3,129	2,068	5,197
2010	3,035	2,128	5,163
2011	3,241	2,097	5,338
2013	2,253	1,528	3,781
2014	2,300	1,559	3,859
2015	2,306	1,553	3,859
2016	2,322	1,578	3,900
Total	26,591	18,134	44,725

A.3 Stata-Equivalent Commands

The analysis was conducted in Python using statsmodels. The equivalent Stata commands would be:

```
* Basic DiD
reg fulltime treat post treat_post, robust

* DiD with year and state fixed effects
reg fulltime treat treat_post i.year i.statefip ///
    female married highschool_plus college ///
    age age_sq, robust

* Weighted regression
reg fulltime treat treat_post i.year i.statefip ///
    female married highschool_plus college ///
    age age_sq [pweight=perwt], robust
```

A.4 Full Regression Output: Model 1 (Basic DiD)

OLS Regression Results

Dep. Variable:	fulltime	R-squared:	0.001
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.001
Method:	Least Squares	F-statistic:	13.17
No. Observations:	44725	Prob (F-statistic):	1.36e-08
Df Residuals:	44721	AIC:	6.204e+04
Df Model:	3	BIC:	6.207e+04
Covariance Type:	HC1		

	coef	std err	z	P>|z|	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	0.6431	0.004	146.520	0.000	0.634	0.652
treat	-0.0320	0.006	-5.577	0.000	-0.043	-0.021
post	-0.0323	0.008	-4.257	0.000	-0.047	-0.017
treat_post	0.0551	0.010	5.612	0.000	0.036	0.074

A.5 Full Regression Output: Model 2 (Year Fixed Effects)

OLS Regression Results

Dep. Variable:	fulltime	R-squared:	0.004
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.004
Method:	Least Squares	F-statistic:	18.30
No. Observations:	44725	Prob (F-statistic):	4.94e-37
Df Residuals:	44713		
Df Model:	11		
Covariance Type:	HC1		

	coef	std err	z	P>|z|	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	0.6692	0.007	91.641	0.000	0.655	0.684
C(YEAR)[T.2007]	0.0139	0.009	1.504	0.133	-0.004	0.032
C(YEAR)[T.2008]	0.0002	0.010	0.022	0.982	-0.018	0.019
C(YEAR)[T.2009]	-0.0490	0.010	-5.049	0.000	-0.068	-0.030
C(YEAR)[T.2010]	-0.0572	0.010	-5.925	0.000	-0.076	-0.038
C(YEAR)[T.2011]	-0.0707	0.010	-7.299	0.000	-0.090	-0.052
C(YEAR)[T.2013]	-0.0792	0.012	-6.849	0.000	-0.102	-0.057
C(YEAR)[T.2014]	-0.0710	0.012	-6.099	0.000	-0.094	-0.048
C(YEAR)[T.2015]	-0.0497	0.012	-4.215	0.000	-0.073	-0.027
C(YEAR)[T.2016]	-0.0287	0.012	-2.424	0.015	-0.052	-0.006
treat	-0.0324	0.006	-5.664	0.000	-0.044	-0.021
treat_post	0.0554	0.010	5.649	0.000	0.036	0.075

A.6 Analytical Decisions and Justifications

This section documents the key analytical decisions made during the replication and provides justifications for each choice.

1. Treatment and Control Group Definition

The treatment group is defined as individuals aged 26–30 in 2012, and the control group as those aged 31–35. This choice is dictated by the research design specification, which exploits the DACA age cutoff at 31. The five-year bandwidth on each side balances statistical power against comparability concerns.

2. Exclusion of 2012

The year 2012 is excluded from the analysis because DACA was implemented on June 15, 2012. Since the ACS does not record the interview month, observations from 2012 cannot

be classified as pre- or post-treatment with certainty.

3. Non-Citizen Proxy for Undocumented Status

The ACS does not directly identify undocumented immigrants. Following common practice in the literature, I use non-citizenship (CITIZEN = 3) as a proxy. This approach has limitations: it includes legal permanent residents and excludes undocumented individuals who misreport their status. However, among Mexican-born, Hispanic individuals who arrived as children, the majority of non-citizens are likely undocumented.

4. Continuous Residence Requirement

DACA required continuous US residence since June 15, 2007. I operationalize this using YRIMMIG $\leq$ 2007, ensuring that all sample members immigrated by 2007 at the latest. This is a conservative approach that may exclude some eligible individuals who had brief departures.

5. Full-Time Employment Definition

Full-time employment is defined as usually working 35 or more hours per week, following the standard Bureau of Labor Statistics definition. The UHRSWORK variable captures usual hours rather than hours worked in the reference week, providing a more stable measure of labor supply.

6. Heteroskedasticity-Robust Standard Errors

All regression specifications use heteroskedasticity-robust (HC1) standard errors. This is appropriate given the binary outcome variable and the heterogeneous treatment effects that may exist across subgroups.

7. Survey Weights

The preferred specification uses ACS person weights (PERWT) to make the estimates representative of the target population. Unweighted estimates are also reported for comparison. The weighted and unweighted estimates are qualitatively similar.

8. Reference Year for Event Study

Year 2011 is chosen as the reference year for the event study because it is the last pre-treatment year. This allows the pre-treatment coefficients to be interpreted as deviations from trends in the year immediately before DACA implementation.