

The Impact of Temporary Protected Status on Immigrants' Labor Market Outcomes*

Pia M. Orrenius
Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
2200 N. Pearl St.
Dallas, TX 75201 USA
(214) 922-5747
pia.orrenius@dal.frb.org

Madeline Zavodny
Agnes Scott College
141 E. College Ave.
Decatur, GA 30030 USA
(404) 471-6377
mzavodny@agnesscott.edu

December 2014

Abstract: The United States currently provides Temporary Protected Status (TPS) to more than 300,000 immigrants from selected countries. TPS is typically granted if dangerous conditions prevail in the home country due to armed conflict or a natural disaster. Individuals with TPS cannot be deported and are allowed to stay and work in the United States temporarily. Despite the increased use of TPS in recent years, little is known about how TPS affects labor market outcomes for beneficiaries, most of whom are unauthorized prior to receiving TPS. This study examines how migrants from El Salvador who are likely to have received TPS fare in the labor market compared with other migrants. The results suggest that TPS eligibility leads to higher employment rates among women and higher earnings among men. The results have implications for recent programs that allow some unauthorized immigrants to receive temporary permission to remain and work in the United States.

JEL Classification: J15; J31; J61

* The views expressed here are solely those of the authors and do not reflect those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas or the Federal Reserve System.

The Impact of Temporary Protected Status on Immigrants' Labor Market Outcomes

The United States occasionally offers temporary protected status (TPS) to migrants whose countries are experiencing civil unrest, violence, natural disaster, or outbreak of a serious disease. Migrants who have TPS typically cannot be deported, and they are permitted to work legally in the United States. As of late 2011, more than 300,000 migrants had TPS (Wasem and Ester, 2011). The United States currently extends TPS to migrants from eleven countries: El Salvador, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, and Syria.

TPS is designed to provide a safe haven to migrants who would otherwise have to return to potentially dangerous situations in their home countries. Unlike refugees, migrants with TPS do not receive legal permanent resident status. They are supposed to return home when the TPS designation for their country expires. The Secretary of Homeland Security designates countries for TPS, usually for a period of six to 18 months, and can extend the designation if conditions in the home country do not improve. Migrants must be present in the United States by a specified date—typically soon after the triggering event in their home country—in order to be eligible for TPS.

Most TPS beneficiaries are unauthorized immigrants who were subject to removal and could not work legally prior to receiving TPS. A few are in the United States on temporary visas, such as visitor or student visas. TPS therefore has the potential to improve recipients' labor market outcomes by giving them permission to work. In particular, TPS recipients may gain access to higher-paying jobs that are typically not open to unauthorized immigrants or most temporary visa holders.

Little previous research has examined the effect of granting temporary legal status on migrants' labor market outcomes—a particularly relevant issue in light of President Obama's recent executive actions intended to grant deferred deportation and work permits to several million unauthorized immigrants.¹ Most studies on legalization programs in the United States focus on actions that awarded legal permanent residence—a “green card” instead of the temporary reprieve of TPS—and find that recipients' earnings increase by 6 to 13 percent (e.g., Rivera-Batiz, 1999; Kossoudji and Cobb-Clark, 2002; Kaushal, 2006). Earnings gains are bigger among well-educated immigrants than among less-educated immigrants, and are often bigger among women than among men. Much of the gains appear to be due to recipients being able to move into higher-paying occupations (Lozano and Sørensen, 2011). Evidence on the employment effects of legalization is more mixed. Some studies indicate negative employment effects: men appear to become more selective about the jobs they were willing to hold, while women appear more likely to exit the labor force (Amuedo-Dorantes, Bansak, and Raphael, 2007; Amuedo-Dorantes and Bansak, 2011). Some research finds positive employment effects among women (Pan, 2012).

This study examines how migrants from El Salvador who are likely to have received TPS fare in the labor market relative to those who arrived too late to qualify for TPS. Salvadorans are by far the largest group of TPS holders in the United States. This study compares Salvadorans to migrants from Mexico, who have never been eligible for TPS. Difference-in-differences results suggest that TPS increases employment among women while decreasing it among men. TPS

¹ Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) was announced in November 2014 and will be implemented in early 2015. An estimated 3 to 4 million unauthorized immigrants will be eligible for deferred deportation and work permits under DAPA. DAPA follows Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), a similar plan implemented in fall 2012 and recently expanded. By late 2014, DACA had legalized over 500,000 immigrants; estimates suggest a total of 1.5 million immigrants are eligible for DACA under the recently expanded rules. For a guide to President Obama's recent executive actions, see <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/special-reports/guide-immigration-accountability-executive-action#overview>.

appears to increase earnings among men, in part because they are able to move into higher-paying occupations.

I. Background

Since the late 1970s, hundreds of thousands of Central Americans have fled conflicts and natural disasters in their home countries and entered the United States illegally.² Some of these migrants received permission to remain in the United States on a temporary or permanent basis under various immigration policies. Most notably, the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act and the 1997 Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act gave unauthorized immigrants who met certain conditions the opportunity to receive legal permanent resident status. At several other times in the 1980s and 1990s, Congress or the White House approved measures that allowed some Central American migrants to remain temporarily and work in the United States without being subject to removal.

Civil war and favorable immigration policies spurred Salvadoran emigration to the United States in the 1980s. The Salvadoran immigrant population rose from 95,000 to 465,000 over that decade. Political instability and rampant corruption continued to push migrants out during the 1990s. Salvadorans residing in the United States numbered 817,000 by 2000 and 1.1 million by 2008.³ It is estimated about one-quarter of El Salvador's population lives in the United States, and migrant remittances are 16 percent of El Salvador's GDP.⁴

Eligible migrants from El Salvador first received an official TPS designation as part of the Immigration Act of 1990. The relief was prompted by the Salvadoran army's brutal murders

² See Wasem (1997) for background on Central American migrants through late 1997.

³ For an overview of Salvadoran immigration, see <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/salvadoran-immigrants-united-states/>.

⁴ See the IMF country report on El Salvador available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2013/cr13132.pdf>.

of several Jesuit priests, which turned public opinion against the regime and hastened the end of the Salvadoran civil war. When that TPS designation expired in 1992, President Bush, and later President Clinton, granted the Salvadoran immigrants “deferred enforced departure” (DED) through 1996.⁵ Many of the migrants applied for and received political asylum. Meanwhile, new arrivals from El Salvador in the 1990s were unauthorized immigrants or arrived with a green card awarded on the basis of family ties.

The focus of this paper is on a second TPS designation extended to Salvadorans in March 2001 after two earthquakes rocked the country. That designation has been extended nine times since then, most recently in September 2013. As a result, Salvadoran migrants who were present in the United States in early 2001 and received TPS have been allowed to live and work in the United States continuously ever since. Approximately 290,000 Salvadorans were initially granted TPS, and some 212,000 currently have TPS.⁶ Migrants from Honduras and Nicaragua have had TPS even longer (since late 1998) but are fewer in number. Migrants from Mexico and other Central American countries, such as Guatemala, have not been eligible for TPS.

Having legal status, even on a temporary basis, may affect migrants’ labor market outcomes through several channels. Employers may be unwilling to hire unauthorized immigrants, so having legal status may boost migrants’ employment by making it easier to find a job. Having a work permit may also increase migrants’ earnings, in part by opening up more and better-paying jobs to them. Employers tend to pay unauthorized immigrants less than other

⁵ DED and extended voluntary departure (EVD) differ from TPS in that they do not require that foreigners register with USCIS except to obtain work authorization (Wasem and Ester, 2011). TPS registration is straightforward and requires a modest fee, proof of identity and nationality in the designated country, continuous physical presence in the United States, no felony convictions, and no conditions that render an individual inadmissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

⁶ See <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2003/07/16/03-17872/extension-of-the-designation-of-el-salvador-under-temporary-protected-status-program-automatic> and <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2013/05/30/2013-12793/extension-of-the-designation-of-el-salvador-for-temporary-protected-status>. The estimated population of unauthorized Salvadoran migrants in 2000 is 430,000, and the total population, 765,000 (Schmidley, 2001; Hoefler, Rytina, and Baker, 2009).

workers, in part because employers pass along the potential fine they face if caught hiring unauthorized workers. In addition, greater competition among unauthorized immigrants for the limited number of jobs available to them may reduce wages in those jobs.

On the other hand, migrants who receive TPS may face more competition for jobs after the events that triggered the TPS designation. If those events lead to increased inflows of competing migrants, TPS beneficiaries' employment and earnings may actually decrease. After Hurricane Mitch decimated parts of Central America in late 1998, Central Americans flooded into the United States. Kugler and Yuksel (2008) find that their entry led to lower employment rates among earlier immigrants.

Having TPS also may change beneficiaries' incentives to work. With the threat of deportation removed, migrants who feel safer may reduce their precautionary savings and consume more leisure. Target earners—people who planned to earn a certain amount of money and then return home—who extend their planned stay after receiving TPS may reduce their labor supply since they now have a longer timeframe to earn their targeted amount. On the other hand, relatives back home may have greater financial needs after the events that triggered TPS. Migrants may increase their labor supply in order to send more money home after a natural disaster. It is worth noting that unauthorized immigrants are ineligible for virtually all public assistance programs, and receiving TPS does not change this. It therefore is unlikely that TPS causes changes in eligibility for public assistance that would in turn reduce work incentives. TPS beneficiaries are potentially eligible for unemployment insurance benefits, however.

II. Data and Methodology

This study uses data from the 2005 and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) to examine labor market outcomes among likely TPS beneficiaries from El Salvador. The ACS offers a large, nationally representative sample of U.S. residents. The survey includes questions about labor market outcomes, place of birth, and year of entry into the United States.

Salvadorans who were present in the United States in early 2001 were eligible for TPS while those who entered later were not. Salvadorans who report entering the United States in 1999 or 2000 are therefore likely to have received TPS and are the treatment group in this study. The vast majority of these migrants were unauthorized prior to receiving TPS.⁷ Salvadorans who report entering the United States in 2002 or 2003—too late to receive TPS—serve as the control group. (Migrants who report entering in 2001 are excluded since it is unclear whether they entered in time to receive TPS.) The narrow time windows are used to make the two entry groups as comparable as possible in terms of years of U.S. residence. Nonetheless, the treatment group has resided in the United States for a few more years.

We therefore compare pre- and post-TPS Salvadoran migrants with migrants from Mexico who report entering during the same periods. This allows us to control for arrival group differences in labor market outcomes that are shared by Salvadorans and Mexicans using a difference-in-differences methodology.⁸ We examine the robustness of our results by estimating a similar difference-in-differences specification for Guatemalan and Mexican migrants.

⁷ The Department of Homeland Security estimates that there were about 430,000 unauthorized Salvadoran immigrants in the United States in 2000 (Baker and Rydina, 2013), while the 2000 Census indicates a total of 817,336 Salvadoran immigrants in the United States (Malone et al., 2003). This suggests that more than one-half of all Salvadoran immigrants were unauthorized that year. Since recent immigrants were not present for the 1986 and 1997 legalization programs, the proportion unauthorized must be higher among recent immigrants.

⁸ The conventional difference-in-differences method would involve looking at Salvadoran migrants before and after they received TPS, relative to Mexican migrants. Because of concerns about selection in return migration, we instead use data only from 2005-6 and compare pre-TPS migrants with post-TPS migrants. We treat the 2005-6 data as a cross section.

Guatemala is similar to El Salvador in a number of respects, including a weak economy and widespread violence, but Guatemalan migrants have never received TPS. Like Mexicans and Salvadorans, most Guatemalan migrants are unauthorized immigrants. Indeed, these three countries were consistently the three top source countries of unauthorized immigrants living in the United States during 2000 to 2012 (Baker and Rytina, 2013). We do not directly compare Salvadoran and Guatemalan migrants here since both groups have small sample sizes. Results that compare Mexicans with Guatemalans can indicate whether unusual patterns among Mexican migrants may underlie our results that compare Mexicans with Salvadorans.

Table 1 reports descriptive statistics for labor market outcomes and several key characteristics for immigrants from the three countries. The sample only includes immigrants who report not being a naturalized U.S. citizen and are between the ages of 20 and 64.⁹ Men from all three countries have high labor force participation and employment rates, while women have low employment and labor force participation rates. Education levels are low for migrants from all three countries, although Salvadoran men are more likely to have gone to college than men from Mexico or Guatemala. Correspondingly, Salvadoran men earn more per week, on average, than Mexican or Guatemalan men. We also look at earnings in terms of average weekly real earnings of U.S. natives in the same occupation.¹⁰ This variable can be viewed as a measure of occupational prestige. Using this measure, Salvadoran and Mexican men appear to work in similar occupations.

The difference-in-differences regression model we estimate using the ACS data is

⁹ We do not include observations with allocated place of birth or allocated earnings to reduce measurement error in key variables.

¹⁰ As in Lozano and Sorensen (2011), we construct weekly earnings within detailed occupations using all U.S. natives aged 20-64 who report positive earnings in the ACS. Those results are robust to using U.S. natives' earnings in 2000 (instead of 2005-2006), which would avoid capturing any spillover effects of TPS or related immigrant inflows onto natives' earnings.

$$\text{Outcome}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{El Salvador}_i + \beta_2 \text{Migrated in 1999-2000}_i + \beta_3 \text{El Salvador}_i * \text{Migrated in 1999-2000}_i + \gamma \text{Characteristics}_i + \delta \text{State}_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where *Outcome* is one of several labor market outcomes for individual *i*. We examine employment, unemployment (not conditional on labor force participation), labor force participation, usual weekly hours and annual weeks worked (also not conditional on labor force participation), the natural log of real weekly earnings, and the natural log of average real weekly earnings of U.S. natives in the same occupation. All regressions are estimated using OLS by sex for two groups, the less educated and more educated, as discussed below.

El Salvador is an indicator variable equal to one if a migrant is from El Salvador (or Guatemala in the robustness checks) instead of from Mexico. This variable captures any average difference in outcomes between Salvadoran and Mexican migrants. *Migrated in 1999-2000* is an indicator variable equal to one if a migrant entered the United States then versus in 2002-2003. This variable captures the average difference in outcomes between earlier entrants and more recent entrants. The interaction between those two variables is the difference-in-differences variable that measures how outcomes differ between earlier and more recent Salvadoran migrants, compared with the same difference among Mexican migrants. (For brevity, only this coefficient is reported in the regression results here.) The difference-in-differences method requires assuming that, absent TPS, the difference in outcomes between earlier and more recent Salvadoran migrants would be the same as the corresponding difference among Mexican migrants. Guatemalan migrants serve as a check on the validity of this assumption since they did not receive TPS but otherwise faced labor market shocks similar to those faced by Salvadorans.

The regressions control for several individual-level characteristics reported in the ACS. These include age (as a quartic), marital status (married or divorced/widowed/separated, with

never married as the omitted group), and education (in the less-educated regressions, not completed high school versus completed high school; in the more-educated regressions, attended college versus graduated from college). The regressions also control for state of residence to capture differences in business cycle conditions across states. Separate regressions are estimated for men and women. We estimate separate regressions for migrants who did not attend college (the less educated) and those who did (the more educated) since some previous research indicates that having legal status is more beneficial to more-educated migrants. We report robust standard errors.

Before turning to the regression results, we present the difference in differences in the sample means for two key outcomes: employment and real weekly earnings. The top panel of Table 2 reports employment rates in 2005-2006 among Salvadoran and Mexican less-educated migrants who arrived in 1999-2000 (the “pre” group) and in 2002-2003 (the “post” group). As the first entry in row 3 shows, the employment rate is 5 percentage points lower among Salvadoran men who arrived early enough to be eligible for TPS than among post-TPS arrivals. As the next entry in row 3 shows, there is little difference by arrival cohort for Mexican migrants. As a result, the difference in differences in the employment rate is –6 percentage points for less-educated men (row 4). For less-educated women, it is almost 17 percentage points.

Unlike their less-educated counterparts, more-educated Salvadoran men who arrived in the United States in time to be eligible for TPS are more likely to be employed than those who arrived later (panel B of Table 2). The difference in differences is almost 17 percentage points for more-educated men. The difference in differences in employment for more-educated women is smaller and not significant.

Less-educated Salvadoran men who arrived in time to be eligible for TPS earn substantially more than those who arrived later (panel C of Table 2). This difference does not appear to be solely due to greater duration of residence in the United States since the similar pre-post difference among Mexican migrants is smaller. The difference in differences indicates that less-educated Salvadoran men with TPS earn \$50 more per week, on average. The difference in differences for less-educated women is smaller and not significant. However, the difference in differences in weekly earnings is substantial for more-educated women (panel D). The difference in differences in weekly earnings for more-educated men is positive but not significant.

The difference in differences in sample means thus suggest that having TPS increased employment among more-educated men and less-educated women while reducing employment among less-educated men. The raw difference in differences also suggests increases in earnings for less-educated men and more-educated women. We next turn to examining the differences in differences for a number of outcomes, controlling for other characteristics.

III. Results

Column 1 of Table 3 reports difference-in-differences regression results for less-educated male migrants from El Salvador and Mexico. The results indicate that less-educated Salvadoran men who are likely to have received TPS were about 6 percentage points less likely to be employed than those who entered too recently to have received TPS, relative to the corresponding difference among Mexican migrants with the same entry periods. The lower employment arises from greater unemployment, not from lower labor force participation, suggesting men with TPS are more selective about the jobs they take. There is no significant difference in weekly hours or

annual weeks worked; in results not shown here, there is also no significant difference in hours or weeks worked conditional on employment.

Less-educated Salvadoran men who are likely to have received TPS earn about 13 percent more, conditional on being employed. Real weekly earnings among U.S. natives in the same occupation are almost 10 percent higher. Taken together, these two results suggest that more than three-quarters of the increase in earnings is due to TPS beneficiaries working in higher-paying occupations. As a whole, the results suggest that less-educated Salvadoran men who receive TPS are able to move into better jobs and become more selective about the jobs they hold, increasing their earnings but also their job search and unemployment incidence.

Less-educated Salvadoran women who receive TPS appear to enter the labor force and work, in contrast. The difference-in-differences results in column 2 of Table 3 indicate that the relative employment rate among less-educated Salvadoran women who are likely to have received TPS increases by more than 17 percentage points. Their labor force participation rate increases by about 15 percentage points. Their usual weekly hours worked increase by almost 5.6 hours, and their annual weeks worked increase by about 7.5 weeks. This increase in women's labor supply is likely linked to the decrease in men's employment. In results not shown here, the increase in labor force participation is driven by married women, although employment, weekly hours, and weeks worked increase for both married and single less-educated women. Less-educated women's earnings do not appear to be affected by receiving TPS.

The effects of TPS are strikingly different among more-educated migrants. Employment, unemployment, weekly hours, and annual weeks worked do not change significantly, relative to the comparison group, among more-educated Salvadoran men who are likely to have received TPS. However, more-educated Salvadoran men who are likely to have received TPS are more

likely to be in the labor force and work in higher-paying occupations. More-educated Salvadoran women who are likely to have received TPS are not more likely to work or be in the labor force than the comparison group, but they have considerably higher average earnings and work in higher-paying occupations.

In results not shown here, we do not find significant difference-in-difference results when looking at whether migrants are enrolled in school. Having a work permit could cause migrants to leave school to work, but that does not appear to be the case here. Less than 5 percent of the sample is enrolled in school. We also do not find any evidence that being eligible for TPS causes Salvadoran migrants to move from self-employment into wage-and-salary employment; self-employment rates do not fall significantly among migrants likely to have received TPS. Observed changes in employment are primarily driven by changes in wage and salary employment, not in self-employment.

Table 4 reports difference-in-differences regression results for migrants from Guatemala and Mexico. We find no evidence that Guatemalan migrants who entered the United States in 1999-2000 had significantly different labor market outcomes than those who entered in 2002-2003, relative to the corresponding difference among Mexican migrants. This suggests that differences across the two entry periods in the composition of Mexican migrants or in the labor market conditions they faced in the United States do not underlie our results.

An additional concern is that there could be preexisting trends driving our main results. For example, labor market outcomes among Salvadoran immigrants may be worsening over time. This might cause earlier Salvadoran immigrants to have systematically better outcomes than later arrivals, relative to Mexican migrants. To investigate this possibility, we conducted a falsification exercise (or “pseudo experiment”) on a hypothetical break in the data in 1996. We

ran the same specification as used for the regressions in Table 3 on Salvadoran and Mexican arrivals but comparing migrants who arrived in 1994-1995 with migrants who arrived in 1997-1998. Most of the results, which are shown in Table 5, do not indicate statistically significant differences before and after the hypothetical break and so do not suggest that a general trend of worsening labor market outcomes among Salvadoran immigrants underlies our results.

IV. Conclusion

Having legal status, even on a temporary basis, appears to allow more-educated immigrants of both sexes and less-educated male immigrants to move into better jobs. Less-educated women, meanwhile, dramatically increase their labor force participation. The prospect of moving into better jobs after getting a work permit appears to make less-educated men more selective about the jobs they will take, increasing the time they spend searching for jobs and hence boosting their unemployment. Concomitant with the increase in less-educated men's unemployment, less-educated women are more likely to enter the labor force and work. Taken as a whole, the results indicate that having even a temporary work permit improves migrants' labor market opportunities.

The labor market effects of TPS are particularly salient given current U.S. immigration policy and recent executive actions granting deferred deportation and work permits to unauthorized immigrants. Because it has been several decades since the United States last enacted a large-scale legalization program, there is little recent evidence on how acquiring legal status affects beneficiaries. Evidence on past legalization programs focuses on green cards, hence there is even less evidence on how temporary status affects immigrant workers. The 2001 TPS for Salvadoran migrants is a potential indicator of how a legalization program that is temporary

and does not create a pathway to U.S. citizenship would affect beneficiaries. TPS is similar in a number of respects to the recently announced Deferred Action for Parent Accountability (DAPA), the 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, and the types of legalization programs bandied about by several members of Congress in 2013 and 2014. DAPA and DACA do not grant legal permanent residence and a pathway to U.S. citizenship but rather temporary, renewable permission to live and work legally in the United States. The results based on TPS suggest that migrants benefit from a program that grants legal status even on a temporary basis. Understanding the broader effects of such a program on other groups of immigrants and on U.S. natives is an area for future research, as is studying whether such programs induce additional inflows of unauthorized immigrants.

References

Amuedo-Dorantes, Catalina, Cynthia Bansak, and Steven Raphael (2007). "Gender Differences in the Labor Market: Impact of IRCA's Amnesty Provisions." *American Economic Review Papers & Proceedings* 97 (2): 412-416.

Amuedo-Dorantes, Catalina, and Cynthia Bansak (2011). "The Impact of Amnesty on Labor Market Outcomes: A Panel Study Using the Legalized Population Survey." *Industrial Relations* 50 (3/July): 443-471.

Baker, Bryan, and Nancy Rytina (2013). *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigration Population Residing in the United States: January 2012*. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security.

Hoefler, Michael, Nancy Rytina, and Bryan C. Baker (2009). *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigration Population Residing in the United States: January 2008*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Kaushal, Neeraj (2006). "Amnesty Programs and the Labor Market Outcomes of Undocumented Immigrants." *Journal of Human Resources* 41 (3): 631-647.

Kossoudji, Sherri A., and Deborah A. Cobb-Clark (2002) "Coming out of the Shadows: Learning about Legal Status and Wages from the Legalized Population." *Journal of Labor Economics* 20 (3): 598-628.

Kugler, Adriana, and Mutlu Yuksel (2008). "Effects of Low-Skilled Immigration on U.S. Natives: Evidence from Hurricane Mitch." IZA Discussion Paper No. 3670. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Lozano, Fernando A., and Todd A. Sørensen (2011). "The Labor Market Value to Legal Status." IZA Discussion Paper No. 5492. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

Malone, Nolan, Kaari F. Baluja, Joseph M. Constanzo, and Cynthia J. Davis (2003). *The Foreign-Born Population: 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Pan, Ying (2012). "The Impact of Legal Status on Immigrants' Earnings and Human Capital: Evidence from the IRCA 1986." *Journal of Labor Research* 33 (2/June): 119-142.

Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L. (1999). "Undocumented Workers in the Labor Market: An Analysis of the Earnings of Legal and Illegal Mexican Immigrants in the United States." *Journal of Population Economics* 12 (1): 91-116.

Schmidley, A. Dianne (2001). *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Wasem, Ruth E. (1997). *Central American Asylum Seekers: Impact of 1996 Immigration Law*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

Wasem, Ruth E., and Karma Ester (2011). *Temporary Protected Status: Current Immigration Policy and Issues*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics for recent immigrants from El Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico in 2005-2006

	El Salvador		Mexico		Guatemala	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Employed	0.884	0.559	0.891	0.351	0.905	0.465
Unemployed	0.051	0.058	0.033	0.056	0.028	0.056
In labor force	0.935	0.617	0.904	0.407	0.933	0.521
Usual weekly hours	39.3	23.5	39.4	15.2	38.0	19.4
Annual weeks worked	44.7	27.9	44.0	16.5	45.2	22.3
Real weekly earnings	\$416.58	\$306.20	\$402.84	\$285.04	\$353.82	\$326.83
Real weekly earnings in occupation	\$571.05	\$416.12	\$572.34	\$441.85	\$552.15	\$442.74
Age	31.7	33.0	30.4	31.6	29.3	29.9
Not completed high school	0.587	0.607	0.564	0.571	0.682	0.613
Completed high school (no college)	0.276	0.254	0.344	0.324	0.245	0.239
Attended college (no Bachelor's degree)	0.063	0.089	0.050	0.054	0.043	0.079
Graduated from college	0.074	0.049	0.042	0.052	0.031	0.069
Number of observations	634	589	7643	7824	587	390

Note: Sample only includes immigrants ages 20-64 who reporting migrating to the United States during 1999-2000 or 2002-2003 and not being a naturalized U.S. citizen. Real weekly earnings and real weekly earnings in occupation (average earnings of U.S. natives in that occupation) are conditional on being employed and adjusted for inflation using the CPI-W (2005 = 100).

Observations are weighted using the ACS person weights.

Table 2**Difference in differences of sample means for immigrants from El Salvador and Mexico**

	Men		Women	
	El Salvador	Mexico	El Salvador	Mexico
A. Less-educated immigrants' employment				
Pre	0.866	0.895	0.620	0.361
Post	0.915	0.884	0.406	0.316
Difference (pre-post)	-0.050*	0.011	0.214***	0.045***
Difference in differences	-0.060**		0.169***	
B. More-educated immigrants' employment				
Pre	0.943	0.891	0.656	0.415
Post	0.793	0.908	0.629	0.412
Difference (pre-post)	0.150**	-0.017	0.026	0.003
Difference in differences	0.167**		0.024	
C. Less-educated immigrants' real weekly earnings				
Pre	434.97	401.43	311.74	284.04
Post	348.69	364.75	279.75	257.92
Difference (pre-post)	86.28***	36.68***	32.00*	26.12***
Difference in differences	49.60**		5.87	
D. More-educated immigrants' real weekly earnings				
Pre	527.07	583.09	369.96	351.61
Post	411.02	541.81	231.05	369.06
Difference (pre-post)	116.05	41.29	138.91***	-17.46
Difference in differences	74.76		156.37*	

*** Significant at the 1 percent level; ** Significant at the 5 percent level; * Significant at the 10 percent level

Note: The "pre" group is Salvadoran or Mexican immigrants who migrated in 1999-2000. The "post" group is immigrants who migrated in 2002-2003.

Table 3**Difference-in-differences regression results for immigrants from El Salvador relative to immigrants from Mexico**

	Less-educated		More-educated	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Employed	-0.060*	0.173***	0.101	-0.046
	(0.032)	(0.057)	(0.077)	(0.117)
Unemployed	0.060***	-0.024	0.029	0.055
	(0.020)	(0.028)	(0.024)	(0.059)
In labor force	-0.0002	0.149***	0.131*	0.009
	(0.0263)	(0.057)	(0.073)	(0.105)
Usual weekly hours	0.346	5.564**	4.182	5.300
	(1.283)	(2.330)	(3.836)	(4.401)
Annual weeks worked	0.905	7.485***	7.656*	-1.716
	(1.706)	(2.770)	(4.198)	(5.252)
Real weekly earnings	0.131***	0.033	0.191	0.477**
	(0.045)	(0.076)	(0.152)	(0.230)
Real weekly earnings in occupation	0.099**	0.065	0.237*	0.298**
	(0.043)	(0.057)	(0.121)	(0.125)

*** Significant at the 1 percent level; ** Significant at the 5 percent level; * Significant at the 10 percent level

Note: Shown is the coefficient on an interaction term between a dummy variable for Salvadorans and a dummy variable for migrating to the United States in 1999-2000. Results are from OLS regressions. The sample includes Salvadoran and Mexican immigrants who migrated in 1999-2000 or 2002-2003. The regressions also control for age (as a quartic), marital status, not having completed high school (or college), state of residence, being from El Salvador, and migrating in 1999-2000. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 4**Difference-in-differences regression results for immigrants from Guatemala relative to immigrants from Mexico**

	Less-educated		More-educated	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Employed	-0.022 (0.030)	-0.101 (0.064)	-0.054 (0.083)	0.167 (0.149)
Unemployed	-0.016 (0.018)	0.035 (0.028)	0.029 (0.046)	-0.001 (0.065)
In labor force	-0.038 (0.024)	-0.066 (0.065)	-0.025 (0.069)	0.166 (0.147)
Usual weekly hours	1.827 (1.230)	-2.151 (2.540)	-0.119 (3.667)	4.769 (6.115)
Annual weeks worked	0.207 (1.451)	-3.749 (3.060)	3.607 (4.631)	7.312 (7.431)
Real weekly earnings	0.025 (0.047)	0.116 (0.099)	0.044 (0.194)	0.298 (0.314)
Real weekly earnings in occupation	-0.036 (0.035)	0.041 (0.059)	0.107 (0.110)	-0.013 (0.281)

*** Significant at the 1 percent level; ** Significant at the 5 percent level; * Significant at the 10 percent level

Note: Shown is the coefficient on an interaction term between a dummy variable for Guatemalans and a dummy variable for migrating to the United States in 1999-2000. Results are from OLS regressions. The sample includes Guatemalan and Mexican immigrants who migrated in 1999-2000 or 2002-2003. The regressions also control for age (as a quartic), marital status, not having completed high school (or college), state of residence, being from Guatemala, and migrating in 1999-2000. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5
Falsification exercise for Salvadoran and Mexican immigrants before TPS

	Less-educated		More-educated	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Employed	0.022 (0.040)	0.015 (0.060)	0.158 (0.168)	0.059 (0.156)
Unemployed	-0.018 (0.029)	0.013 (0.026)	0.059 (0.055)	0.103 (0.085)
In labor force	0.004 (0.032)	0.028 (0.060)	0.216 (0.162)	0.162 (0.144)
Usual weekly hours	0.713 (1.546)	0.532 (2.304)	-4.867 (2.760)	-4.050 (6.373)
Annual weeks worked	2.910 (1.779)	-1.230 (2.859)	-4.554* (2.308)	1.563 (7.766)
Real weekly earnings	0.021 (0.060)	0.003 (0.102)	0.055 (0.209)	-0.023 (0.294)
Real weekly earnings in occupation	0.053 (0.044)	-0.200** (0.056)	-0.072 (0.159)	0.024 (0.150)

*** Significant at the 1 percent level; ** Significant at the 5 percent level; * Significant at the 10 percent level

Note: Shown is the coefficient on an interaction term between a dummy variable for Salvadorans and a dummy variable for migrating to the United States in 1994-1995. Results are from OLS regressions. The sample includes Salvadoran and Mexican immigrants who migrated in 1994-1995 or 1997-1998. The regressions also control for age (as a quartic), marital status, not having completed high school (or college), state of residence, being from El Salvador, and migrating in 1994-1995. Robust standard errors in parentheses.