

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 11109

**The Education and Employment Effects of
DACA, In-State Tuition and Financial Aid
for Undocumented Immigrants**

Lisa Dickson
T. H. Gindling
James Kitchin

OCTOBER 2017

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 11109

The Education and Employment Effects of DACA, In-State Tuition and Financial Aid for Undocumented Immigrants

Lisa Dickson

UMBC

T. H. Gindling

UMBC and IZA

James Kitchin

UMBC

OCTOBER 2017

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

The Education and Employment Effects of DACA, In-State Tuition and Financial Aid for Undocumented Immigrants*

Many undocumented immigrants come to the U.S. as children. Undocumented immigrant children have a legal right to attend free public primary and secondary schools. However, in most states undocumented immigrants are treated as out-of-state students in public colleges and universities, and are therefore required to pay substantially higher tuition than other state residents. Since 2001, 21 of 50 U.S. states have implemented policies that allow undocumented immigrants to qualify for in-state resident tuition (ISRT) at public colleges and universities. In 12 of these states undocumented immigrants are also eligible for financial aid. In this study we present strong evidence that both ISRT policies and access to financial aid significantly increase the college enrollment and graduation rates of undocumented immigrants but have no impact on the college enrollment or graduation rates of U.S.-born youth. Another important change in immigration policy that affects many undocumented immigrant children is the 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). DACA allows undocumented individuals who came to the U.S. as children to obtain legal employment. The potential of being able to work legally in the United States could represent a significant increase in earnings as well as a substantial increase in the perceived benefits of higher education. Our findings present evidence that DACA led to an increase in youth employment and a decrease in college enrollment rates. Further, we find no evidence that the introduction of DACA reduced or increased the positive impact of ISRT and financial aid policies.

JEL Classification: I23, J61

Keywords: higher education, undocumented immigrants, tuition policies at public universities

Corresponding author:

T. H. Gindling
Department of Economics and School of Public Policy
University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC)
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 21250
USA

E-mail: gindling@umbc.edu

* This research is supported by the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (MIPAR) at UMBC and a Spencer Foundation Small Research Grant (#201700107).

I. Introduction

Recent estimates by Passel and Cohn (2011) suggest there are over 11 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. and this represents approximately 4% of the population. Undocumented immigrants have a legal right to attend free public primary and secondary schools in the United States. No federal policy is in place governing access to higher education for undocumented immigrants. In more than half of the states, undocumented immigrants are charged either out-of-state or international tuition rates at public higher education institutions due to the lack of legal documentation proving eligibility for in-state resident tuition (ISRT) rates. Since 2001, 21 of 50 U.S. states have implemented policies that allow undocumented immigrants to qualify for ISRT at public colleges and universities within their respective state. In 7 of these states, undocumented immigrants are also eligible for state-funded financial aid. The reduction in costs associated with paying the national average for in-state tuition rather than out-of-state tuition at a four-year university is more than \$15,000 a year (College Board, 2016).

When deciding whether to invest in higher education, Becker's theory of human capital suggests individuals consider the expected benefits and expected costs of this investment. The reduction in costs due to ISRT laws and financial aid should increase the probability that beneficiaries of these policies pursue higher education. In addition, these policies could also increase the probability of high school graduation as students may see a future in pursuing more education. In this study, we use monthly individual-level data from the Current Population Surveys (CPS) from July 1999 to December 2015 to implement a difference-in-differences estimate that uses cross-state and over-time variation to identify the impact of these policies on high school graduation, college enrollment and college graduation.

In 2012, President Obama changed federal policy for undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children with his executive order Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). This program allows individuals who meet certain qualifications to obtain temporary legal status in the United States. This could affect the magnitude of the impact of in-state tuition policies on college enrollment for undocumented youth. The executive order could have increased the effects of ISRT laws as students could more easily obtain legal employment after

graduation from college. The executive order could also have made it easier to obtain legal employment to help pay for a college education. At the same time, it raised the opportunity cost of obtaining more education as individuals could enter the legal labor market with DACA and could earn more. We analyze the effects of DACA as well as ISRT laws and state financial aid on student outcomes. Given that DACA could have changed an individual's probability of employment, we analyze the effects of ISRT laws, state financial aid and DACA on employment outcomes in addition to educational outcomes. Since increased employment and increased enrollment in education could be seen as beneficial effects, we analyze the effects of these policies on the fraction of youth who are neither employed nor enrolled in education or training (NEET).

Recently, the Department of Homeland Security stated that they will no longer be accepting initial applications for the DACA program.¹ Individuals can also only apply for renewals through March 5, 2018, unless Congress acts or President Trump issues another executive order. The effects of the rescission of DACA are unknown given how recently the policy changed. Individuals who were brought to the United States as children are often labelled as “dreamers” as they would have been the beneficiaries of the DREAM Act (Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act) that was considered by Congress but never passed. While the effects of the change in policy are unknown, the change in policy highlights the uncertainty that “dreamers” who are the beneficiaries of the in-state tuition laws and state financial aid policies face. According to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, over 1.2 million applications were approved for the DACA program between 2012 and 2016.² Yet, this is likely an underestimate of those who could potentially have benefitted from the program as many who are eligible may have feared to apply or were unable to pay the application fee.

¹ The Department of Homeland Security describes the rescission of DACA on the following website: <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2017/09/05/memorandum-rescission-daca> The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services also describes the changes to DACA here:

<https://www.uscis.gov/archive/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>

² The following chart shows the number of applications for DACA.

https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca_performance_data_fy2016_qtr3.pdf

The method we employ to analyze the effects of the policies is similar to the method used in earlier studies to analyze the effects of ISRT laws. Kaushal (2008), Flores (2010), Chin and Juhn (2011), Dickson and Pender (2013a), Potochnick (2014) and Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) all use difference-in-differences. Kaushal (2008) finds that, for Mexican youth, in-state tuition laws lead to a 2.5 percentage point increase in college enrollment, a 3.4 percentage point increase in the proportion with a high school degree and a 1.3 percentage point increase in the proportion with at least an associate college degree. Potochnick (2014) estimates that in-state tuition laws reduced the high school dropout rates of Mexican foreign-born non-citizens by 7 percentage points. Flores (2010), analyzes outcomes for all Latino non-citizens and demonstrates that the policy positively affects enrollment in college. Dickson and Pender (2013b) show that the in-state tuition law in Texas increased college enrollment rates. On the other hand, Chin and Juhn (2011) reports no statistically significant effects of in-state tuition policy on college enrollment. The differences in the results across the studies could be due to the data sources as well as the timing of the policy changes.

Our work follows most closely the methodology in the most recent of these articles, Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014), who estimate the impact of in-state tuition laws on college enrollment, tuition costs, student financial aid and indebtedness using data from the CPS for July 1999 to December 2012. The analysis in our study extends the analysis in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) and other previous studies in several ways. First, we update these data to include data from January 2013 to December 2015. During this time period 9 additional states implemented in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants, so that we can examine the impact in the 21 states that have had such legislation (Table 1), rather than the 12 used in the econometric analysis in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014).³ We find that the enrollment results presented in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) hold up when these additional three years of data and 9 states are included in the analysis. Second, we extend Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) by

³ In their empirical analysis Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) identify 15 states with in-state tuition for undocumented immigrant policies. However, because their data extends only to December 2012 and because they lag the policy variable one year, three states drop out of the policy group in the regressions: Colorado, Oregon and Maryland. We also lag the policy variable one year. This implies that in the current draft of our paper, where we use data up to December 2015, we are only able to include 5 states where undocumented immigrants are eligible for financial aid.

estimating the impact of in-state tuition laws on high school and college graduation rates, youth employment rates, and the likelihood that youth are neither in school nor employed (NEET). In 7 states with in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants, these students are also eligible for state-funded financial aid. The third way in which we extend Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) is to estimate whether eligibility for financial aid has an impact on college enrollment and graduation that goes beyond that of in-state tuition laws. The fourth way in which we extend the results is to include an analysis of the effects of DACA.

Researchers have shown that DACA has produced benefits for those who have applied and been admitted to the program (Gonzales and Terriquez, 2013; Gonzales and Bautista-Chavez, 2014; Gonzales, Terriquez and Rusczyk, 2014). These benefits include: obtaining a new job, increased job earnings, getting an internship, opening their first bank account, getting their first credit card, getting a driver's license, and gaining access to healthcare (Gonzales and Terriquez, 2013; Gonzales and Bautista-Chavez, 2014; Gonzales, Terriquez and Rusczyk, 2014). Importantly, Gonzales, Terriquez and Rusczyk (2014) as well as Gonzales and Bautista-Chavez (2014) show that the benefits of DACA are not equally dispersed and that the DACA recipients that were already enrolled in college or had a college degree were significantly more likely to have obtained a new job and have experienced increased earnings. This suggests that DACA-recipients likely have a greater motivation than their undocumented peers who are not DACA-recipients to obtain a degree as they can more fully reap the benefits of that degree in the job market.

Besides increasing the motivation for obtaining a four-year degree, DACA can also help undocumented students access and fund a college education. Abrego and Gonzales (2010) show that for many undocumented youth one obstacle to staying in school is lack of access to reliable and efficient transportation. This makes it difficult for these students to commute to both their jobs and to school, which in turn makes it harder for them to both fund their education and be successful in school (Abrego and Gonzales, 2010). Knowing that this situation awaits them might discourage some undocumented students from enrolling in college in the first place. DACA is likely to help mitigate this barrier. 61% of DACA recipients ages 18-31 that were surveyed obtained a driver's license for the first time, which might very well increase both their

educational and employment opportunities (Gonzales and Terriquez, 2013). Another institutional barrier facing undocumented students who are enrolled in school is lack of access to on-campus jobs and work-study programs (Gonzales, 2010). DACA-recipients would not face this barrier as DACA allows them access to on-campus jobs and internships (Gonzales and Bautista-Chavez, 2014). While this does not make the cost of college any less expensive it does provide DACA-recipients new ways to help pay for the costs of attending college.

The literature on the impacts of DACA provides two reasons to be skeptical that ISRT policies will have a larger effect on DACA-eligible students than on their non-eligible counterparts. First, DACA-recipients from a lower socio-economic background were much less likely to have experienced the benefits that DACA produced for the group as a whole (Gonzales, Terriquez and Rusczyk, 2014). It is likely that DACA-recipients from lower socio-economic backgrounds will struggle to take advantage of in-state tuition policies as well. The costs of college may still be formidable for these individuals and DACA raised the opportunity cost of a college education as well as they could now be legally employed. Furthermore, it is possible that DACA will not change the enrollment behavior of the recipients that come from families that are relatively better off. Gonzalez, Terriquez and Rusczyk (2014) tell us that DACA-recipients who already had a four-year degree benefited the most from the program. These students were able to access a college education before DACA went into effect and so younger students from similar backgrounds would likely still have enrolled in school if DACA had not been implemented. This line of reasoning is supported by Baum and Flores (2011) who find that most of the variation in college attendance is not due to immigration status but rather is accounted for by the individual characteristics of the immigrants and the different cultural groups that they are a part of. Both Gonzales, Terriquez and Rusczyk (2014) and Baum and Flores (2011) find that Mexicans are among the most disadvantaged groups of undocumented immigrants. This means that it might be difficult for any impacts of DACA to show up in our results as, following the literature, we use Mexican non-citizens as our proxy for undocumented immigrants. The second reason to be skeptical that in-state tuition policies will have a larger effect on DACA-eligible students is that DACA doesn't actually make attending college any cheaper. DACA does not supersede the state and federal exclusions to accessing financial aid that are already in place (Gonzales and Bautista-Chavez, 2014). 42% of the surveyed respondents who were eligible for DACA but did not apply

for it cited not being able to afford the \$465-dollar application fee (Gonzales and Bautista-Chavez, 2014). If these students cannot afford to apply for DACA then they are not likely to be able to afford college tuition. The ways that DACA does help students to access and fund a college education, through eliminating part of the transportation barrier and granting access to on-campus jobs and internships, are indirect and therefore might not be large enough to show up in the quantitative data.

II. Data and Methodology

We use individual-level data from the monthly basic Current Population Survey (CPS) for July 1999 to December 2015. The CPS does not identify undocumented immigrants directly. We follow Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) and other recent literature and use Mexican-born non-citizens as a proxy for likely undocumented immigrants.

We begin our analysis by examining the impact of ISRT policies only. Following the methodology in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014), our basic difference-in-differences model is shown in equation (1)

$$Y_{ist} = B_0 + B_1 \text{Policy}_{st} + B_2 X_{ist} + B_3 Z_{st} + \alpha_t + \delta_s + E_{ist} \quad (\text{EQ 1})$$

Y_{ist} is a dummy variable that indicates the outcome of interest for individual i in state s at time t . We estimate five sets of regressions with five different dichotomous dependent variables: (1) Y equals one if the individual is attending college and zero otherwise, (2) Y equals one if the individual has an associates or four-year college degree and zero otherwise, (3) Y equals one if the individual has at least a high school degree and zero otherwise (4) Y equals one if the individual is neither employed, nor in training nor enrolled in school (NEET). In the regressions examining the impact of in-state tuition policies on college enrollment and NEET rates we limit the analysis to individuals between 17-24 years who have a high school degree or GED and who have not yet attained a bachelor's degree. In the regressions examining the impact on college graduation we limit the sample to 23-28 year olds who have graduated from high school or have

a GED. In the regressions examining the impact on high school graduation we limit the sample to individuals between 17-22 years who are not currently in high school.

The explanatory variable of interest in equation (1) is $Policy_{st}$, which is a dummy variable equal to one for individuals residing in states offering in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.⁴ Table 1 lists the states that have implemented in-state tuition policies for undocumented immigrants, and the month and year these policies were implemented. Following the standard practice in the literature, we lag the policy variable for one year to take into account that the full effects of the policies are likely to take some time. We estimate equation (1) separately for foreign-born Mexican non-citizens (our proxy for undocumented immigrants) and for seven other demographic groups.

In addition to the policy, equation (1) controls for a set of individual characteristics (X_{ist}): gender, age, race, marital status and the number of years an immigrant has been in the United States. Z_{st} is a vector of state characteristics at time t and includes unemployment rate, the proportion of white individuals who have obtained a bachelor's degree, and the proportion of Mexican-born individuals who have obtained a bachelor's degree. These are the same explanatory variables as in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014). Also following Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014) we also explore the sensitivity of our results to a range of state (δ_s) and time (α_t) fixed effects.

While 21 states have implemented in-state tuition policies for undocumented immigrants, 7 of these states have gone further and allow undocumented immigrants to be eligible for state-funded financial aid (see Table 1). In order to examine whether providing access to financial aid has an additional effect (beyond simply the impact of in-state tuition) on college enrollment and graduation, we estimate the following equation.

⁴ We also tested for the robustness of this variable to different specifications. We did allow for the policy variable to be broader to include the two other states where they allowed DACA recipients to pay in-state resident tuition. Our results were robust to that variation and the results that follow focus on our main results where the policy variable is defined by whether the state allows for undocumented individuals who meet certain criteria to pay in-state resident tuition.

$$Y_{ist} = B_0 + B_1 \text{Policy}_{st} + a \text{Aid}_{st} + B_2 X_{ist} + B_3 Z_{st} + \alpha_t + \delta_s + E_{ist} \quad (\text{EQ 2})$$

In equation (2) all variables are defined in the same way as in equation (1) except for Aid_{st} , which is equal to one if state s in time t has an in-state tuition law and allows undocumented immigrants to be eligible for financial aid. The coefficient on this variable, a , measures the additional impact of aid eligibility (beyond in-state tuition) on college enrollment and college graduation rates.

In our final set of estimates we examine the impact of DACA, and whether the impact of ISRT policies changed with the introduction of DACA. Specifically, we estimate the following equation:

$$Y_{ist} = B_0 + B_1 \text{Policy}_{st} + B_2 X_{ist} + B_3 Z_{st} + B_4 \text{DACA}_t + B_5 \text{Eligible}_i + B_6 \text{DACA} * \text{ELIGIBLE}_{it} + \alpha_t + \delta_s + E_{ist} \quad (\text{EQ 3})$$

Where Policy , X , Z , α_t and δ_s are the same as in equations (1) and (2). DACA_t is a dummy variable which is one after June 2012, and zero before. B_1 is an estimate of the impact of ISRT policies on Y , controlling for the presence or absence of DACA. Eligible_i is an indicator variable for whether individual i is part of the groups eligible for DACA. Individuals are eligible for DACA if they are a non-citizen, entered the country prior to 2008, are 15 years of age or older, were younger than 31 years-old on June 15, 2012, entered the country before their sixteenth birthday, and are either enrolled in school or have a high school diploma or its equivalent. The estimated impact of DACA is measured by B_6 .

Equations (1), (2) and (3) are estimated using individual-level data from the Current Population Surveys (CPS) and linear probability models with robust standard errors clustered by state.

III. Results

Table 2 presents summary statistics for the data used in the enrollment and DACA regressions. Table 2a shows that college enrollment rates are lowest for the groups that we expect to be

affected by ISRT, Hispanic and Mexican non-citizens, while the highest enrollment rates are for non-Hispanic non-citizens. Enrollment rates for Hispanic non-citizens, at 22% are also lower than enrollment rates for our control group, foreign-born Hispanic citizens (36%). Hispanics are also more likely to live in states with ISRT policies compared to non-Hispanic natives.

DACA eligible individuals, on average, were younger when they immigrated but have been in the U.S. for longer than the non-eligible group (Table 2b). DACA eligible individuals are less likely to be male than non-eligible individuals.

A. Impacts of in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants (ISRT)

Our estimates of impact of in-state tuition policies on college enrollment rates (B_1 in equation 1) are presented in Table 3. Despite including three more years of data and 9 additional states with in-state tuition policies, our estimates of the impact of in-state tuition policies on college enrollment (Table 3) are very similar to those in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014). Across most specifications the impact of in-state tuition laws on Mexican non-citizens (our proxy for undocumented immigrants) is positive and significant. Even the magnitude of our estimates—that in-state tuition policies increase college enrollment of Mexican-born non-citizen by approximately 4 percentage points is similar to Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014). Our estimate of the magnitude of the impact on college enrollment of undocumented immigrants is larger than that of Kaushal (2008), who analyzed data from 1997 to 2005.⁵

The evidence presented in Table 3 suggests that children born in the U.S. (Hispanic or non-Hispanic) are not crowded out of college because of ISRT policies. On the other hand, as in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014), our results also suggest that Hispanic foreign-born citizens and other Hispanic non-citizens may pay an unintended price because college enrollment rates for this group fall with the introduction of in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants.

⁵ Bozick, Miller and Kaneshiro (2015) present evidence that this result is stronger when comparing states without ISRT policies to states which explicitly forbid ISRT. They find no significant impact on enrollment rates when comparing ISRT states with states with no policy (controlling for states with policies that explicitly forbid ISRT).

Our estimates of the impact of ISRT policies on college graduation rates are presented in Table 4. ISRT policies for undocumented immigrants also led to statistically significant increases in college graduation rates for Mexican non-citizens (Table 4) although the magnitude of the effect is smaller than the impact on college enrollments. This is reasonable as not all of the new students who enroll in college are likely to graduate and in some states the ISRT policy hasn't been in-place long enough for new enrollees to graduate. Our estimates suggest that ISRT policies increased college graduates by approximately 2 percentage points. This is consistent with the results found in Kaushal (2008) that ISRT policies led to a 1.3 percentage point increase in college graduation rates.

In-state resident tuition policies in theory may increase the likelihood of high school graduation as students may now consider the possibility of a college education as more feasible. Yet, the results from our regressions show no evidence of an impact of ISRT policies on high school graduation rates; the impact of in-state tuition policies for Mexican non-citizens on high school graduation rates is positive but not statistically significant (Table 5).

Table 6 presents the estimates of ISRT policies on the likelihood that individuals are neither in school nor employed nor in training programs (NEET). The impact of ISRT laws on NEET for Mexican non-citizens are statistically significant and suggest ISRT policies lowered the proportion of NEETs by approximately 2 percentage points. Consistent with the impact of ISRT policies on NEET rates, Tables 9 and 10 presents estimates of the impact of ISRT policies and DACA on college enrollment rates and the probability that an individual is employed. These results confirm the positive impact of ISRT policies on enrollment rates, but also show that ISRT policies had no statistically significant impact on employment rates.

B. Additional impacts of eligibility for aid

Table 7 presents estimates of the additional impact of state financial aid eligibility (beyond in-state tuition) on college enrollment rates (the coefficient a in equation 2). The estimates suggest a statistically significant positive impact of eligibility for state financial aid on college enrollment rates that goes beyond the impact of ISRT policies. It should be noted that

undocumented students are still ineligible for federal financial aid and the effects we are measuring are the effects of being eligible for state financial aid. The additional impact of adding eligibility for state financial aid has a positive impact on college enrollment for Hispanic non-citizens and Mexican non-citizens. The impact is statistically significant for the two most complete specifications, and suggests that adding eligibility for state financial aid to ISRT policies increases college enrollment of Mexican non-citizens by approximately 4 percentage points. This is as large as the impact of the ISRT policies themselves, and suggests that the combined impact of in-state tuition policies is to increase college enrollment of Mexican non-citizens by 8 percentage points.⁶

Table 8 suggests that adding eligibility for state-funded financial aid to ISRT policies also increases college graduation rates for Mexican non-citizens; the impact is positive and statistically significant for 3 of 4 specifications. The estimated additional impact of adding eligibility for state-funded financial aid is approximately 2 percentage points which is as large as the impact of the ISRT policies themselves.

C. DACA and ISRT policies

Table 9 presents estimates of the impact of DACA on college enrollment in addition to ISRT policies. These results reconfirm that ISRT policies had a positive impact on college enrollment rates for Mexican non-citizens. However, the impact of DACA on college enrollment rates is negative and generally statistically significant. DACA reduced enrollment rates of Mexican non-citizens by 3 to 5 percentage points. This last result is lower than the estimate presented in Amuedo-Dorantes and Antman (2017), who estimated that DACA lowered college enrollment rates by 11 percentage points. Our estimates suggest that DACA reduced college enrollment rates for non-Hispanic non-citizens by 3 to 5 percentage points.

⁶ The estimate of the total impact of ISRT and state financial aid is calculated by adding the coefficient on ISRT policies from table 3 to the coefficient on aid from table 7. Note that the coefficient on ISRT policies estimated using equation (2) is similar to the same coefficient from equation (1), which is reported in table 3.

Amuedo-Dorantes and Antman (2017) also present evidence that DACA led to a 9 to 10 percentage point increase in employment rates for DACA-eligible individuals. Table 10 presents estimates of the impact of ISRT policies and DACA on the probability that an individual is employed. We find that ISRT policies had no statistically significant impact on employment rates. On the other hand, consistent with Amuedo-Dorantes and Antman (2017), we find that DACA led to an increase in employment rates of Hispanic and Mexican non-citizens by 3 to 4 percentage points. DACA also led to an increase in employment rates for non-Hispanic non-citizens. To estimate the combined impact of DACA on college enrollment and employment, we examine the impact of DACA on NEET rates. Table 11 presents our estimates of the impact of the interaction of DACA and ISRT policies on NEET rates. We find that the enrollment and employment effects of DACA cancel each other, and the impact of DACA on NEET rates is not statistically different from zero for Hispanic and Mexican non-citizens in most specifications.

We find that DACA had no statistically significant impact on the positive college enrollment impact of ISRT policies (Tables 12). Table 13 also shows that DACA had no influence on the negative impact of ISRT policies on NEET rates. Table 14 further shows that DACA had no influence on the insignificant impact of ISRT policies on youth employment rates.

IV. Conclusions

We update previous research on the impact of in-state tuition policies by including additional years of data, which also allows us to consider additional states with in-state tuition laws.

Kaushal (2008) used data from 1997 to 2005, Chin and Juhn (2011) used data from 2000-2005, and Potochnick (2014) used data from 1998 to 2008. Even the data in the most recent study, Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014), ended in December 2012. We update these data to include data from January 2013 to December 2015. During this time period, 9 additional states implemented in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants, so that we can examine the impact in the 21 states that have had such legislation, rather than the 12 used in the econometric analysis in Amuedo-Dorantes and Sparber (2014).

We also extend the previous analysis by analyzing the impact of in-state tuition policies on college enrollment rates, college graduation rates, high school graduation rates, youth

employment rates and NEET (neither in school not employed) rates. Next, we add to the previous literature by estimating the additional impact of adding eligibility for financial aid to in-state tuition policies. Finally, we explore how DACA might affect the magnitude of the impact of in-state tuition policies on DACA-eligible youth and on those not eligible for the program.

We find that the results presented in the previous literature regarding enrollment and graduation effects hold up well to the addition of more data and more states with in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants. Our estimates suggest that in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants increased college enrollment rates of undocumented immigrants by 3 to 4 percentage points and increased college graduation rates by 1 to 2 percentage points. The magnitude of these results is within the range of the estimates reported by other studies. Our study thus adds to the consistent evidence that in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants significantly increases educational attainment for undocumented immigrant students. We also add to the literature by finding that ISRT policies reduced the likelihood that youth are neither in school nor employed (NEET), while they had no significant impact on employment rates.

Another way in which we add to the literature is to examine the impact of adding eligibility for state-funded financial aid to ISRT for undocumented immigrants. Our results suggest that adding eligibility for financial aid to in-state tuition policies increases college enrollment of Mexican non-citizens by approximately an additional 4 percentage points. This is as large as the impact of the ISRT policies themselves. Our results also suggest that adding eligibility for state-funded financial aid to in-state tuition policies also increases college graduation rates for Mexican non-citizens by 2 to 3 percentage points. This also is as large as the impact of the ISRT policies themselves.

A final way that we add to the literature is to investigate if DACA affected youth outcomes, and whether it increases the magnitude of the impact of in-state tuition policies for DACA-eligible individuals. We find no evidence that DACA had any influence on the enrollment, graduation or employment impacts of ISRT policies. However, we find that, by itself, DACA led to declines in college enrollment rates of 3 to 5 percentage points. On the other hand, we find that DACA increased youth employment rates by 3 to 4 percentage points.

Bibliography

- Abrego, L. J., and R. G. Gonzales. "Blocked Paths, Uncertain Futures: The Postsecondary Education and Labor Market Prospects of Undocumented Latino Youth." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 15(1-2), 2010, 144-157.
- Amuedo-Dorantes, C., and F. Antman. "Schooling and Labor Market Effects of Temporary Authorization: Evidence from DACA." *Journal of Population Economics*, 30(1), 2017, 339-373.
- Amuedo-Dorantes, C., and C. Sparber. "In-State Tuition for Undocumented Immigrants and its Impact on College Enrollment, Tuition Costs, Student Financial Aid, and Indebtedness," *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 49, 2014, 11-24.
- Baum, S., and S. M. Flores. "Higher Education and Children in Immigrant Families." *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 2011, 171-193.
- Bozick, R., T. Miller, and M. Kaneshiro. "Non-citizen Mexican Youth in US Higher Education: A Closer Look at the Relationship between State Tuition Policies and College Enrollment." *International Migration Review*, 50(4), 2015, 864-889.
- Chin, A., and C. Juhn. "Does Reducing College Costs Improve Educational Outcomes for Undocumented Immigrants? Evidence from State Laws Permitting Un-Documented Immigrants to Pay In-state Tuition at State Colleges and Universities," in *Latinos and the Economy, Integration and Impact in Schools, Labor Markets and Beyond*, edited by D. Leal and S. Trejo. New York: Springer, 2011, 63-94.
- College Board. "Trends in College Pricing 2016." Trends in Higher Education Series, 2016. Accessed July 18, 2017. https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/2016-trends-college-pricing-web_1.pdf.
- Department of Homeland Security. "Memorandum on Rescission of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)." 2017. Accessed September 30, 2017 <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2017/09/05/memorandum-rescission-daca>
- Dickson, L., and M. Pender. "Do In-State Tuition Benefits Affect the Enrollment of Non-Citizens? Evidence from Universities in Texas." *Economics of Education Review*, 37, 2013a, 126-137.
- Dickson, L., and M. Pender. "College Enrollment and Retention Effects of In-State Tuition Benefits to Non-Citizens." 2013b. Accessed September 15, 2017 <http://economics.umbc.edu/files/2017/07/Texas-Research-Brief.pdf>
- Flores, S. M. "State Dream Acts: The Effect of In-State Resident Tuition Policies and Undocumented Latino Students." *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(2), 2010, 239-283.

- Flores, S. M., and J. Chapa. "Latino Immigrant Access to Higher Education in a Bipolar Context of Reception." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 8(1), 2009, 90-109.
- Fry, R., and P. Taylor. "High School Drop-Out Rate at Record Low: Hispanic High School Graduates Pass Whites in Rate of college Enrollment." PEW Hispanic Center, 2013. Accessed August 17, 2016. http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2013/05/PHC_college_enrollment_2013-05.pdf.
- Gonzales, R. G. "More than Just Access: Undocumented Students Navigating the Postsecondary Terrain." *Journal of College Admission*, 206, 2010, 48-52.
- Gonzales, R. G., and A. M. Bautista-Chavez. "Two years and counting: Assessing the growing power of DACA." American Immigration Council Special Report, 2014. Accessed August 16, 2016. https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/two_years_and_counting_assessing_the_growing_power_of_daca_final.pdf.
- Gonzales, R. G., and V. Terriquez. "How DACA is Impacting the Lives of Those Who are Now DACAmented: Preliminary Findings from the National UnDACAmented Research Project." Immigration Policy Center Special Report, 2013. Accessed August 16, 2016. https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/daca_final_ipc_csii_1.pdf.
- Gonzales, R. G., V. Terriquez, and S. P. Ruszczyk. "Becoming DACAmented: Assessing the Short-Term Benefits of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)." *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(14), 2014, 1852-1872.
- Kaushal, N. "In-state Tuition for the Undocumented: Education Effects on Mexican Young Adults." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(4), 2008, 771-792.
- Passel, J. S. "Estimates of the Size and Characteristics of the Undocumented Population." Pew Hispanic Center Report, 2005. Accessed August 17, 2016. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/44.pdf>
- Passel, J. and D. Cohn. "Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010." Pew Hispanic Center Report, 2011. Accessed August 17, 2016. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/133.pdf>.
- Potochnick, S. "How States Can Reduce the Dropout Rate for Undocumented Immigrant Youth: The Effects of In-State Resident Tuition Policies," *Social Science Research*, 45, 2014, 18-32.
- Terriquez, V. "Trapped in the Working Class? Prospects for the Intergenerational (im)Mobility of Latino Youth." *Sociological Inquiry*, 84(3), 2014, 382-411.
- United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. "Consideration of Deferred Action for

Childhood Arrivals (DACA).” Accessed September 30, 2017
<https://www.uscis.gov/archive/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. “Number of I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals by Fiscal Year, Intake, Biometrics and Case Status: 2012-2016 (June 30).” Accessed September 30, 2017
https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca_performancedata_fy2016_qtr3.pdf

Table 1: In-state Tuition and Financial Aid for Undocumented Immigrants

IN-STATE TUITION FOR UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS LEGISLATION		
STATE	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMMENTS
Texas	July 2001	
California	January, 2002;	
Utah	July, 2002	
New York	Sept. 2002	
Illinois	June 2003	
Oklahoma	June 2003	Law amended in 2007 to allow the state university Board of Regents to set the policy, who continued the policy.
Washington	July, 2003	
Kansas	July 2004	
New Mexico	April 2005	
Nebraska	Sept. 2006	
Wisconsin	July 2009	Revoked June 26, 2011*
Connecticut	July, 2011	
Rhode Island	Sept. 2012	Board of Governors decision
Maryland	Dec. 2012	
Hawaii	March 2013	Board of Regents Decision
Colorado	May 2013	
Oregon	July, 2013	
Michigan	Aug. 2013	Board of Regents Decision
Minnesota	July 2013	
New Jersey	Jan. 2014	
Florida	July 2014	

FINANCIAL AID AVAILABLE FOR UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS		
STATE	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMMENTS
California	January, 2012	
Colorado	May, 2013	
Hawaii	March, 2013	
Texas	July, 2001	
New Mexico	April, 2005	
Oregon	September, 2015**	
Utah	June, 2015**	

*In the regressions, the introduction of the law was lagged one year while the revocation was not lagged.

** Not yet included in regression analysis. We are currently updating our data

Table 2A: Weighted means of observations used in preferred enrollment regressions, by demographic group
individuals 17 to 24 years of age (through 2015)

	(1)	(1a)	(1b)	(2)	(3)	(3a)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Hispanic non-citizens	Mexican non-citizens	Other (non- Mexican) Hispanic non-citizens	Non- Hispanic non-citizens	Hispanic natives	Mexican natives	Non- Hispanic natives	Hispanic foreign born citizens	Non-Hispanic foreign born citizens
College enrollment rate	0.223	0.186	0.301	0.531	0.390	0.373	0.424	0.357	0.598
	(0.416)	(0.389)	(0.459)	(0.499)	(0.488)	(0.484)	(0.494)	(0.479)	(0.490)
Share living in treatment state (lagged)	0.460	0.534	0.315	0.397	0.606	0.694	0.263	0.465	0.469
	(0.498)	(0.499)	(0.465)	(0.489)	(0.489)	(0.461)	(0.440)	(0.499)	(0.499)
Observations	52,576	35,384	17,103	46,586	171,321	112,571	1,333,379	11,657	23,584

Note: Standard deviations in parenthesis

Table 2B: Descriptive statistics by DACA-eligibility status for the entire period, pre-DACA and post-DACA
sample: all non-citizens 17-24 years of age with a high school diploma or GED

	Entire Period				Pre-DACA Period				Post-DACA Period			
	Eligible group		Non-eligible group		Eligible group		Non-eligible group		Eligible group		Non-eligible group	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
DACA-Eligible	1.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	1.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	1.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Age at arrival	8.156	(22.389)	18.020	(4.703)	8.480	(25.786)	17.755	(4.994)	7.200	(4.143)	19.219	(2.764)
Time in the U.S.	12.356	(4.802)	3.895	(4.637)	11.789	(4.919)	4.220	(4.973)	14.028	(3.997)	2.424	(2.062)
Male	0.509	(0.500)	0.524	(0.499)	0.506	(0.500)	0.523	(0.499)	0.515	(0.500)	0.524	(0.499)
White	0.723	(0.447)	0.590	(0.492)	0.719	(0.450)	0.620	(0.485)	0.737	(0.440)	0.454	(0.498)
Black	0.103	(0.304)	0.117	(0.321)	0.101	(0.302)	0.113	(0.317)	0.107	(0.309)	0.135	(0.342)
Asian	0.124	(0.329)	0.196	(0.397)	0.127	(0.333)	0.156	(0.363)	0.114	(0.318)	0.379	(0.485)
Age	20.753	(1.951)	21.915	(1.765)	20.592	(1.928)	21.975	(1.729)	21.228	(1.942)	21.642	(1.894)
Married	0.145	(0.352)	0.238	(0.426)	0.150	(0.357)	0.253	(0.434)	0.129	(0.336)	0.175	(0.380)
High school but no bachelors	0.951	(0.217)	0.844	(0.363)	0.958	(0.202)	0.854	(0.353)	0.930	(0.255)	0.797	(0.402)
Associates or higher	0.100	(0.300)	0.208	(0.406)	0.091	(0.288)	0.199	(0.399)	0.125	(0.331)	0.248	(0.432)
Bachelors or higher	0.049	(0.217)	0.156	(0.363)	0.042	(0.202)	0.146	(0.353)	0.070	(0.255)	0.203	(0.402)
State unemployment rate	6.789	(2.271)	6.007	(1.945)	6.822	(2.474)	6.269	(2.264)	6.693	(1.519)	6.469	(1.452)
Resides in a policy state	0.547	(0.498)	0.355	(0.478)	0.522	(0.500)	0.302	(0.459)	0.619	(0.486)	0.582	(0.493)
Observations	42,941		72,123		32,916		60,205		10,025		11,918	

Table 3: Impact of In-State Tuition Policies for Undocumented Immigrant College Enrollment from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 17-24

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is attending college

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens	0.008 (0.017)	0.010 (0.015)	0.013 (0.014)	0.016 (0.015)	52,576
[1a] Mexican non-citizens	0.039** (0.018)	0.038** (0.016)	0.037** (0.014)	0.020 (0.021)	35,384
[1b] Other Hispanic noncitizens	-0.054** (0.024)	-0.044* (0.023)	-0.033 (0.020)	0.010 (0.023)	17,103
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens	-0.040* (0.023)	-0.035* (0.020)	-0.032* (0.019)	-0.006 (0.019)	46,586
[3] Hispanic natives	0.004 (0.006)	0.008 (0.007)	0.010 (0.006)	0.006 (0.009)	171,321
[3a] Mexican natives	-0.009 (0.013)	-0.011 (0.013)	-0.011 (0.012)	-0.014 (0.015)	112,571
[4] Non-Hispanic natives	-0.001 (0.009)	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.001 (0.006)	-0.004 (0.008)	1,333,377
[5] Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.097*** (0.024)	-0.097*** (0.025)	-0.092*** (0.026)	-0.047* (0.025)	11,657
[6] Non-Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.004 (0.022)	-0.004 (0.023)	-0.005 (0.023)	-0.001 (0.028)	23,584
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 4: Impact of In-State Tuition Policies for Undocumented Immigrant College Graduation from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 23-28

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual graduated with an associates or four-year degree or higher

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens	0.021 (0.013)	0.015 (0.012)	0.015 (0.011)	0.022 (0.013)	54,110
[1a] Mexican non-citizens	0.028* (0.014)	0.021* (0.013)	0.022* (0.012)	0.031** (0.013)	36,932
[1b] Other Hispanic noncitizens	-0.001 (0.020)	0.009 (0.023)	0.012 (0.027)	0.015 (0.036)	17,040
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens	0.014 (0.017)	0.011 (0.016)	0.014 (0.016)	-0.029 (0.025)	56,197
[3] Hispanic natives	-0.003 (0.018)	0.001 (0.018)	0.002 (0.018)	0.008 (0.022)	91,377
[3a] Mexican natives	-0.016 (0.011)	-0.008 (0.010)	-0.011 (0.010)	-0.005 (0.011)	57,972
[4] Non-Hispanic natives	0.013** (0.005)	0.008* (0.005)	0.006 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.006)	925,366
[5] Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.005 (0.032)	-0.015 (0.024)	-0.014 (0.023)	0.018 (0.039)	10,868
[6] Non-Hispanic foreign-born citizens	0.009 (0.026)	-0.008 (0.024)	-0.010 (0.023)	0.009 (0.026)	26,207
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 5: Impact of In-State Tuition Policies for Undocumented Immigrant High School Graduation from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 17-22
Dichotomous dependent variable: individual graduated with a high school degree or higher

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.007 (0.016)	-0.004 (0.014)	0.015 (0.018)	69,533
[1a] Mexican non-citizens	0.014 (0.023)	0.016 (0.022)	0.015 (0.021)	0.030 (0.023)	50,090
[1b] Other Hispanic noncitizens	-0.098** (0.046)	-0.095** (0.043)	-0.075* (0.038)	-0.043* (0.026)	19,160
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens	-0.026 (0.016)	-0.027 (0.017)	-0.024 (0.014)	-0.028* (0.015)	42,334
[3] Hispanic natives	-0.006 (0.011)	-0.007 (0.010)	-0.006 (0.010)	0.007 (0.010)	168,108
[3a] Mexican natives	0.015** (0.007)	0.015** (0.006)	0.013** (0.006)	0.033*** (0.007)	110,847
[4] Non-Hispanic natives	-0.006* (0.004)	-0.007* (0.004)	-0.007* (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)	1,226,818
[5] Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.089** (0.039)	-0.083** (0.038)	-0.079** (0.034)	-0.053* (0.028)	10,227
[6] Non-Hispanic foreign-born citizens	0.004 (0.015)	0.011 (0.013)	0.010 (0.013)	0.025** (0.012)	20,637
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 6: Impact of In-State Tuition Policies for rate of Undocumented Immigrant that are Not Working and Not in School from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 17-24

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is not working nor enrolled in school

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens	-0.012 (0.009)	-0.012 (0.010)	-0.012 (0.008)	-0.012 (0.009)	120,875
[1a] Mexican non-citizens	-0.029*** (0.009)	-0.022** (0.009)	-0.021*** (0.007)	-0.021** (0.008)	85,751
[1b] Other Hispanic noncitizens	0.017 (0.013)	0.012 (0.013)	0.010 (0.011)	0.000 (0.015)	34,579
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens	0.002 (0.010)	0.004 (0.009)	0.004 (0.009)	0.007 (0.010)	76,350
[3] Hispanic natives	0.008 (0.008)	0.006 (0.008)	0.006 (0.007)	0.001 (0.007)	279,242
[3a] Mexican natives	0.002 (0.005)	0.001 (0.005)	0.002 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.006)	183,945
[4] Non-Hispanic natives	-0.004* (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)	0.002 (0.002)	2,070,067
[5] Hispanic foreign-born citizens	0.051* (0.027)	0.053** (0.026)	0.057** (0.024)	0.051** (0.022)	18,146
[6] Non-Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.013 (0.012)	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.015 (0.012)	-0.016 (0.015)	36,081
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 7: Additional Impact of State Financial Aid for Undocumented Immigrant College Enrollment from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 17-24

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is attending college

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens	0.011 (0.016)	0.021 (0.017)	0.032** (0.015)	0.038** (0.014)	52,576
[1a] Mexican non-citizens	0.018 (0.017)	0.026 (0.018)	0.042** (0.016)	0.039** (0.016)	35,384
[1b] Other Hispanic noncitizens	-0.036 (0.031)	-0.025 (0.033)	-0.012 (0.034)	0.027 (0.056)	17,103
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens	-0.067*** (0.020)	-0.059*** (0.018)	-0.048** (0.022)	-0.011 (0.029)	46,586
[3] Hispanic natives	0.001 (0.010)	0.000 (0.011)	0.013* (0.007)	0.013** (0.005)	171,321
[3a] Mexican natives	-0.001 (0.006)	0.000 (0.006)	0.014** (0.006)	0.014** (0.007)	112,571
[4] Non-Hispanic natives	0.019* (0.010)	0.013 (0.010)	0.022*** (0.007)	0.023*** (0.005)	1,333,377
[5] Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.066 (0.047)	-0.080 (0.050)	-0.073 (0.051)	-0.059*** (0.022)	11,657
[6] Non-Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.047* (0.025)	-0.052** (0.024)	-0.052* (0.028)	-0.003 (0.031)	23,584
Controls for					
ISRT Policy	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 8: Additional Impact of State Financial Aid for Undocumented Immigrant College Graduation from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 23-28

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual graduated with an associates or four-year degree or higher

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens	0.000 (0.010)	-0.006 (0.008)	0.002 (0.009)	0.002 (0.009)	54,110
[1a] Mexican non-citizens	0.010 (0.009)	0.018* (0.009)	0.023** (0.009)	0.027*** (0.010)	36,932
[1b] Other Hispanic noncitizens	-0.029 (0.035)	-0.045** (0.020)	-0.033 (0.023)	-0.076*** (0.016)	17,040
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens	0.030 (0.042)	0.037 (0.044)	0.052 (0.040)	0.050*** (0.015)	56,197
[3] Hispanic natives	-0.013 (0.011)	-0.022** (0.010)	-0.016** (0.007)	-0.018* (0.010)	91,377
[3a] Mexican natives	-0.020** (0.008)	-0.025*** (0.007)	-0.016** (0.008)	-0.018** (0.009)	57,972
[4] Non-Hispanic natives	-0.009 (0.006)	-0.002 (0.006)	0.005 (0.006)	0.004 (0.006)	925,366
[5] Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.075** (0.036)	-0.093** (0.036)	-0.097** (0.037)	-0.068*** (0.015)	10,868
[6] Non-Hispanic foreign-born citizens	-0.027 (0.022)	-0.036 (0.022)	-0.047** (0.021)	-0.040* (0.021)	26,207
Controls for					
ISRT Policy	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 9: Impact of ISRT Policy and DACA-Eligibility for Undocumented Immigrant College Enrollment from July 1999 through December 2015, Ages 17-24

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is attending college

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens					52,576
ISRT Policy	0.002 (0.018)	0.007 (0.016)	0.011 (0.014)	0.014 (0.015)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.051** (0.022)	-0.008 (0.019)	-0.020 (0.020)	-0.020 (0.021)	
Eligibility	0.160*** (0.014)	0.093*** (0.010)	0.042*** (0.010)	0.042*** (0.010)	
[1a] Mexican non-citizens					35,384
ISRT Policy	0.033* (0.019)	0.035** (0.017)	0.036** (0.014)	0.018 (0.021)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.051** (0.020)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.032* (0.017)	-0.035** (0.016)	
Eligibility	0.160*** (0.019)	0.098*** (0.013)	0.033*** (0.009)	0.032*** (0.009)	
[1b] Other Hispanic non-citizens					17,103
ISRT Policy	-0.051* (0.027)	-0.042* (0.025)	-0.034 (0.021)	0.011 (0.023)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.007 (0.030)	0.049* (0.025)	0.042 (0.025)	0.046* (0.026)	
Eligibility	0.156*** (0.022)	0.079*** (0.016)	0.051** (0.020)	0.051** (0.021)	
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens					46,586
ISRT Policy	-0.041* (0.023)	-0.035* (0.020)	-0.034* (0.019)	-0.009 (0.019)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.116*** (0.024)	-0.046** (0.019)	-0.038* (0.021)	-0.033 (0.022)	
Eligibility	0.086*** (0.019)	0.010 (0.019)	0.040*** (0.013)	0.040*** (0.013)	
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 10: Impact of In-State Tuition and DACA-Eligibility for Rate of Undocumented Immigrants that are Employed from July 1999 – Dec. 2015, Ages 17-24
Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is employed

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens					52,576
ISRT Policy	0.006 (0.018)	0.006 (0.019)	0.003 (0.018)	0.005 (0.022)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.100*** (0.019)	0.033* (0.019)	0.033* (0.020)	0.038* (0.020)	
Eligibility	-0.078*** (0.011)	-0.007 (0.011)	-0.002 (0.015)	-0.001 (0.015)	
[1a] Mexican non-citizens					35,384
ISRT Policy	0.025 (0.018)	0.015 (0.016)	0.013 (0.016)	0.022 (0.016)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.108*** (0.019)	0.040** (0.018)	0.042** (0.019)	0.041** (0.018)	
Eligibility	-0.078*** (0.012)	-0.004 (0.011)	0.001 (0.021)	0.002 (0.021)	
[1b] Other Hispanic non-citizens					17,103
ISRT Policy	-0.012 (0.025)	-0.008 (0.026)	-0.007 (0.024)	-0.014 (0.026)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.076* (0.038)	0.005 (0.034)	0.000 (0.034)	-0.005 (0.035)	
Eligibility	-0.071*** (0.026)	0.004 (0.020)	-0.000 (0.020)	0.003 (0.020)	
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens					46,586
ISRT Policy	0.004 (0.017)	0.005 (0.017)	0.008 (0.016)	-0.002 (0.015)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.113*** (0.021)	0.051** (0.020)	0.033 (0.020)	0.033* (0.020)	
Eligibility	-0.012 (0.013)	0.050*** (0.014)	-0.014 (0.016)	-0.014 (0.016)	
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

Armed Services personnel are not included in these regressions

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 11: Impact of ISRT Policy and DACA-Eligibility for Rate of Undocumented Immigrants that are Not Working and are Not Enrolled in School from July 1999 – Dec. 2015, Ages 17-24
Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is not working nor enrolled in school

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens					52,576
ISRT Policy	-0.011 (0.018)	-0.015 (0.019)	-0.015 (0.017)	-0.014 (0.018)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.024 (0.020)	-0.003 (0.019)	0.001 (0.019)	0.001 (0.019)	
Eligibility	-0.032*** (0.009)	-0.038*** (0.010)	-0.022* (0.013)	-0.023* (0.013)	
[1a] Mexican non-citizens					35,384
ISRT Policy	-0.047*** (0.015)	-0.039*** (0.014)	-0.038*** (0.013)	-0.033** (0.015)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.045** (0.022)	-0.014 (0.017)	-0.009 (0.018)	-0.004 (0.016)	
Eligibility	-0.030** (0.013)	-0.046*** (0.013)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.016)	
[1b] Other Hispanic non-citizens					17,103
ISRT Policy	0.036 (0.025)	0.026 (0.025)	0.024 (0.021)	0.004 (0.025)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.014 (0.035)	-0.009 (0.031)	-0.006 (0.031)	-0.004 (0.032)	
Eligibility	-0.038*** (0.010)	-0.030*** (0.011)	-0.029** (0.012)	-0.032** (0.012)	
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens					46,586
ISRT Policy	0.016 (0.011)	0.013 (0.010)	0.012 (0.010)	0.006 (0.013)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.022 (0.017)	0.004 (0.016)	0.008 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	
Eligibility	-0.027*** (0.008)	-0.007 (0.008)	0.005 (0.011)	0.005 (0.011)	
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis

* Significant at 10%

** Significant at 5%

*** Significant at 1%

Table 12: Impact of ISRT Policy, DACA-Eligibility, & Interactions for Undocumented Immigrant College Enrollment from July 1999 – Dec. 2015, Ages 17-24
Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is attending college

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens					52,576
ISRT Policy	-0.014 (0.020)	-0.015 (0.019)	-0.006 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.018)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.052** (0.023)	-0.002 (0.018)	-0.015 (0.020)	-0.017 (0.021)	
Eligibility	0.146*** (0.015)	0.071*** (0.009)	0.027*** (0.010)	0.027** (0.010)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	-0.006 (0.024)	-0.018 (0.021)	-0.014 (0.022)	-0.011 (0.026)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.031* (0.016)	0.044*** (0.014)	0.035** (0.015)	0.034** (0.015)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	0.011 -0.025	0.011 -0.022	0.014 (0.021)	0.022 (0.028)	
[1a] Mexican non-citizens					35,384
ISRT Policy	0.012 (0.023)	0.006 (0.021)	0.015 (0.020)	0.004 (0.024)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.071** (0.031)	-0.032 (0.026)	-0.050* (0.028)	-0.041 (0.029)	
Eligibility	0.143*** (0.025)	0.072*** (0.015)	0.017 (0.015)	0.015 (0.015)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	0.019 (0.032)	0.009 (0.029)	0.018 (0.030)	0.001 (0.032)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.031* (0.019)	0.046*** (0.015)	0.032* (0.017)	0.033* (0.017)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	0.062** -0.026	0.061** -0.025	0.065** (0.024)	0.038 (0.033)	
[1b] Other Hispanic non-citizens					17,103
ISRT Policy	-0.069** (0.026)	-0.065** (0.026)	-0.054** (0.025)	-0.016 (0.022)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.014 (0.032)	0.075** (0.028)	0.072** (0.029)	0.054* (0.029)	
Eligibility	0.138*** (0.014)	0.056*** (0.012)	0.031* (0.017)	0.032* (0.018)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	-0.063 (0.043)	-0.077** (0.034)	-0.084** (0.034)	-0.033 (0.048)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.054 (0.037)	0.068** (0.028)	0.069*** (0.026)	0.064*** (0.023)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	-0.077 -0.056	-0.073 (0.047)	-0.069 (0.042)	0.016 (0.066)	
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens					46,586
ISRT Policy	-0.033 (0.026)	-0.038* (0.022)	-0.038* (0.021)	-0.008 (0.019)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.130*** (0.039)	-0.053 (0.036)	-0.041 (0.038)	-0.062* (0.034)	
Eligibility	0.098*** (0.025)	0.007 (0.026)	0.036 (0.022)	0.041* (0.021)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	0.033 (0.051)	0.011 (0.048)	0.003 (0.048)	0.051 (0.046)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	-0.029 (0.028)	0.005 (0.025)	0.011 (0.025)	-0.003 (0.024)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	-0.029 -0.043	-0.021 (0.043)	-0.024 (0.041)	0.041 (0.041)	
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis; * Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5%, *** Significant at 1%

Table 13: Impact of ISRT Policy, DACA-Eligibility, and Interactions for Rate of Undocumented Immigrants that are Not Working and are Not Enrolled in School from July 1999 – Dec. 2015, Ages 17-24. Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is not working nor enrolled in school

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens					52,576
ISRT Policy	-0.003 (0.021)	-0.010 (0.024)	-0.012 (0.023)	-0.010 (0.023)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.016 (0.025)	-0.006 (0.021)	-0.004 (0.022)	-0.003 (0.024)	
Eligibility	-0.027*** (0.010)	-0.033*** (0.010)	-0.019 (0.011)	-0.019* (0.011)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	-0.009 (0.015)	0.007 (0.014)	0.009 (0.014)	0.008 (0.020)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	-0.012 (0.018)	-0.011 (0.017)	-0.007 (0.020)	-0.008 (0.020)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	-0.024 (0.018)	-0.014 (0.018)	-0.010 (0.015)	-0.011 (0.023)	
[1a] Mexican non-citizens					35,384
ISRT Policy	-0.026 (0.024)	-0.026 (0.023)	-0.028 (0.024)	-0.025 (0.023)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.030 (0.033)	-0.013 (0.026)	-0.007 (0.028)	-0.008 (0.031)	
Eligibility	-0.013 (0.015)	-0.033** (0.013)	-0.009 (0.013)	-0.009 (0.013)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	-0.012 (0.024)	0.004 (0.022)	0.002 (0.023)	0.010 (0.029)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	-0.032 (0.024)	-0.023 (0.023)	-0.017 (0.025)	-0.017 (0.025)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	-0.071*** (0.020)	-0.046*** (0.017)	-0.043** (0.017)	-0.033 (0.029)	
[1b] Other Hispanic non-citizens					17,103
ISRT Policy	0.020 (0.021)	0.011 (0.023)	0.009 (0.019)	-0.004 (0.026)	
Eligibility*DACA	-0.019 (0.034)	-0.018 (0.028)	-0.018 (0.028)	-0.005 (0.026)	
Eligibility	-0.047*** (0.011)	-0.038*** (0.013)	-0.036** (0.015)	-0.037** (0.016)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	0.004 (0.036)	0.015 (0.031)	0.021 (0.032)	-0.001 (0.033)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.030* (0.016)	0.026 (0.017)	0.023 (0.014)	0.018 (0.014)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	0.055 (0.046)	0.051 (0.038)	0.053 (0.037)	0.013 (0.044)	
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens					46,586
ISRT Policy	0.016 (0.013)	0.013 (0.011)	0.011 (0.011)	0.009 (0.014)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.002 (0.024)	-0.020 (0.022)	-0.017 (0.021)	-0.022 (0.023)	
Eligibility	-0.024** (0.009)	-0.002 (0.010)	0.009 (0.012)	0.009 (0.012)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	0.036 (0.033)	0.043 (0.032)	0.045 (0.032)	0.048 (0.035)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	-0.008 (0.014)	-0.010 (0.014)	-0.009 (0.014)	-0.009 (0.014)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	0.045 (0.028)	0.047* (0.027)	0.047* (0.027)	0.047 (0.034)	
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis; * Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5%, *** Significant at 1%

Table 14: Impact of In-State Tuition, DACA-Eligibility, and Interactions for Rate of Undocumented Immigrants that are Employed from July 1999 – Dec. 2015, Ages 17-24

Dichotomous dependent variable: individual is employed

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Obs.
Citizenship groups					
[1] Hispanic non-citizens					52,576
ISRT Policy	0.000 (0.027)	0.010 (0.028)	0.007 (0.027)	0.009 (0.028)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.093*** (0.029)	0.030 (0.027)	0.033 (0.028)	0.031 (0.032)	
Eligibility	-0.082*** (0.014)	-0.002 (0.011)	0.002 (0.013)	0.003 (0.013)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	0.008 (0.030)	0.006 (0.027)	0.001 (0.028)	0.012 (0.033)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.008 (0.027)	-0.009 (0.022)	-0.009 (0.026)	-0.008 (0.025)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	0.016 (0.021)	0.007 (0.022)	-0.000 (0.018)	0.013 (0.030)	
[1a] Mexican non-citizens					35,384
ISRT Policy	0.009 (0.029)	0.015 (0.025)	0.013 (0.027)	0.021 (0.025)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.105*** (0.036)	0.046 (0.031)	0.050 (0.034)	0.040 (0.036)	
Eligibility	-0.094*** (0.020)	-0.005 (0.014)	-0.001 (0.014)	-0.000 (0.014)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	-0.002 (0.036)	-0.008 (0.032)	-0.011 (0.034)	-0.000 (0.037)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.028 (0.032)	0.002 (0.027)	0.003 (0.031)	0.004 (0.031)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	0.035 (0.031)	0.009 (0.028)	0.005 (0.028)	0.024 (0.037)	
[1b] Other Hispanic non-citizens					17,103
ISRT Policy	0.008 (0.039)	0.018 (0.037)	0.019 (0.035)	0.010 (0.036)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.071* (0.039)	-0.005 (0.034)	-0.008 (0.033)	-0.016 (0.037)	
Eligibility	-0.056*** (0.016)	0.025* (0.013)	0.018 (0.019)	0.020 (0.020)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	0.026 (0.042)	0.039 (0.041)	0.033 (0.042)	0.037 (0.040)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	-0.048 (0.038)	-0.063* (0.033)	-0.061** (0.029)	-0.056* (0.030)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	-0.014 (0.030)	-0.006 (0.029)	-0.010 (0.028)	-0.010 (0.034)	
[2] Non-Hispanic non-citizens					46,586
ISRT Policy	-0.005 (0.021)	0.008 (0.020)	0.015 (0.018)	-0.000 (0.017)	
Eligibility*DACA	0.133*** (0.038)	0.064* (0.036)	0.046 (0.035)	0.065* (0.033)	
Eligibility	-0.027 (0.018)	0.051*** (0.015)	-0.009 (0.018)	-0.013 (0.018)	
Eligibility*DACA*ISRT Policy	-0.044 (0.049)	-0.021 (0.042)	-0.020 (0.042)	-0.054 (0.039)	
Eligibility*ISRT Policy	0.036 (0.033)	-0.003 (0.027)	-0.012 (0.027)	-0.002 (0.025)	
Total ISRT Policy Effect	-0.014 (0.053)	-0.017 (0.049)	-0.017 (0.049)	-0.057 (0.049)	
Controls for					
Gender indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Age indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Marital status indicator	N	Y	Y	Y	
Race indicators	N	Y	Y	Y	
Unemployment rate	N	N	Y	Y	
% of whites with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
% of Mexicans with a bachelor's degree	N	N	Y	Y	
Years in US	N	N	Y	Y	
State	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Date (year*month)	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Month	N	N	N	N	
State time trends	N	N	N	Y	

Notes: cluster-robust standard errors in parenthesis; * Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5%, *** Significant at 1%; Armed Services Personnel are Not Included in these Regressions