Executive Summary

Amid years of protracted congressional gridlock over immigration reform, the Obama administration in 2012 created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program to offer work authorization and a temporary reprieve from deportation to certain unauthorized immigrants brought to the United States as children. Implemented through executive action, DACA was viewed by critics as an unconstitutional overreach of presidential authority, and the Trump administration announced in September 2017 that it would wind down the program.

While approximately 793,000 unauthorized immigrants have ever received DACA status since the program was launched on August 15, 2012, nearly 690,000 were current recipients as of September 4, 2017, according to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), which stopped accepting new applications the following day. Program participants will continue to retain their protections until their two-year DACA grant expires—a date that will vary by individual based on when status was initially received or renewed.

Data released for the first time by USCIS in September 2017 have allowed researchers to update the methodology to better reflect the DACA-participating population.

Using a unique Migration Policy Institute (MPI) methodology that assigns legal status in U.S. Census Bureau data, thus permitting the modeling of the size and characteristics of certain foreign-born groups including unauthorized immigrants, this fact sheet provides new data on key characteristics of DACA holders. Among the indicators examined: recipients’ educational attainment, school enrollment, labor force participation, industries, and occupations. MPI previously released analysis of some of these characteristics for the DACA-eligible population, but data released for the first time by USCIS in September 2017 have allowed researchers to update the methodology to better reflect the DACA-participating population.

With DACA holders set to begin losing their protection in growing numbers starting early next year—MPI estimates about 915 people on average will fall out of DACA status each day beginning March 6, 2018—there is growing momentum in Congress to find a legislative solution for the population of young unauthorized immigrants referred to as DREAMers.

Among the fact sheet’s top findings:

- DACA recipients are almost as likely as U.S. adults in the same age group (15-32) to be enrolled in college (18 percent versus 20 percent), but less likely to have completed college (4 percent versus 18 percent). Forty-four percent of DACA holders...
have completed secondary education, but not enrolled in college. Another 20 percent remain in secondary school.

- Among DACA participants, women are more likely than men to be enrolled in college (20 percent versus 15 percent), but less likely to be working (48 percent versus 64 percent).
- Fifty-five percent of DACA holders are employed, amounting to 382,000 workers. They account for 0.25 percent of all U.S. workers. Most DACA participants (62 percent) who are not in the labor force are enrolled in school.
- One out of three DACA recipients who are enrolled in school also work—a rate roughly equivalent to that of the U.S. young adult population.
- DACA holders are much less likely than young unauthorized immigrants who are not eligible for deferred action to work in construction jobs and are more likely to work in office support jobs, showing that DACA can be a means to occupational mobility.
- There are about 9,000 DACA recipients employed as teachers or similar education professionals, and another 14,000 in health-care practitioner and support jobs.
- While MPI estimates an average 915 individuals will fall out of DACA status daily beginning in March, the peak period will be in January – March 2019, when around 50,000 individuals a month will lose their DACA protections. MPI projects that all recipients will have lost status by early March 2020.

The estimates of DACA holders’ characteristics offered here, as well as earlier MPI modeling of the populations that could be covered under several legalization scenarios introduced in Congress, could help inform the ongoing debate over the future of these unauthorized immigrants who came to the United States as children.

I. Introduction and Methodology

For more than a decade, Migration Policy Institute (MPI) researchers have offered estimates and described characteristics of the population of unauthorized immigrants referred to as DREAMers: those brought to the United States as children, and who have been largely educated in this country, with many now in the workforce. Following creation of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program in 2012, MPI has described the population potentially eligible to apply, via a number of publications and data tools.

In 2017, MPI researchers estimated that 1.3 million unauthorized immigrants met all the eligibility requirements to apply for DACA; 897,605 ultimately did apply as of June 30, 2017, for an application rate of 68 percent.

As with the earlier MPI research, the findings in this fact sheet draw upon a unique MPI methodology that permits estimation of the unauthorized population meeting the criteria to apply for the DACA program, as well as their demographic and other characteristics. The method combines data from two U.S. Census Bureau datasets: a pooled five-year file of the American Community Survey (ACS), which contains detailed characteristics of noncitizen populations at national and state levels, and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), which includes data identifying which noncitizens are legal permanent residents and which are not. MPI uses the legal status information in the SIPP to identify noncitizens who are likely to be unauthorized in the ACS—which does not collect legal status information—and in turn identifies unauthorized immigrants who are DACA-eligible based on their age, year of U.S. entry, and educational attainment.

This fact sheet first examines the rate at which current DACA recipients are expected to lose their status under the program termination outlines announced by the Trump administra-
tion on September 5, 2017. It then uses a revised dataset of DACA-eligible immigrants—reweighted to the participating population by age, gender, origin country, and state of residence in 2017—to provide national and state-level portraits of DACA holders on additional characteristics such as education, industry, and occupations, which are either not collected or not released by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). Understanding the characteristics of DACA recipients is important to assess the impact of the loss of work authorization—and potential deportation—of students and middle- and high-skilled workers in schools, universities, businesses, and immigrant communities.

II. Losing DACA Protections: A Timeline

A total of 793,026 unauthorized immigrants were approved for DACA status between the program’s launch on August 15, 2012 and June 30, 2017, according to the most recent data provided by USCIS. Of these, nearly 689,800 (or 87 percent) still participated in the program as of September 4, 2017—the day before the Trump administration announced a six-month wind-down of the program. On September 5, USCIS stopped accepting applications from new applicants and restricted renewal to participants whose DACA eligibility would expire by March 5, 2018—six months later. October 5 was the last day renewal applications were accepted. According to the latest media accounts, USCIS estimated that 21,000 to 22,000 of the 154,000 individuals eligible to renew their status had failed to do so as of October 19, while 132,000 to 133,000 did apply for renewal. Unless Congress, the administration, or federal courts take further action, DACA participants will begin to lose their status starting March 6, 2018.

MPI forecasts that on average approximately 915 DACA holders will lose their work authorization and protection from deportation each day between March 6, 2018 and March 5, 2020. When these immigrants fall back into unauthorized status and lose their work authorization, some employers may be forced to lay them off, and some may find themselves identified for deportation. Figure 1 shows the number of DACA holders expected to see their protections end by

![Figure 1. Predicted DACA Expirations from March 2018 through March 2020](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/content/dam/migrationpolicy/figures/0918-predicted_daca_expirations_2018_2020.png)

**Notes:** Expirations are based on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) reported data for March 2018 through August 2019 and Migration Policy Institute (MPI) estimates derived from USCIS data for September 2019 through March 2020. MPI’s estimates assume that the distribution of expirations from September 2019 through March 2020 matches the distribution of renewal applications from September 2017 through March 2018, and that everyone who applied for renewal would be approved for benefits for a two-year period starting in the month when their prior eligibility period expired.

**Sources:** MPI calculations based on USCIS administrative data; USCIS, “Approximate Active DACA Recipients as of September 4, 2017 by Month Validity Expires and Status of Associated Renewal as of September 7, 2017 (If Submitted),” accessed October 19, 2017, [www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca_renewal_data.pdf](http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca_renewal_data.pdf).
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month over this two-year period. The numbers are based on USCIS reporting that goes through August 2019 and MPI estimates of who is expected to lose protection from September 2019 onward through March 2020.

III. Education and Labor Force Profile of Current DACA Participants

This section discusses the education and labor force characteristics of unauthorized immigrants participating in the DACA program as of September 2017. To develop these estimates, the researchers employed USCIS administrative data released in September on DACA participants by age, gender, origin country, and state of residence, and used these data to reweight MPI’s database on the DACA-eligible population to provide a more refined view of those holding the status as of September 2017.14

A. The Educational Profile of Current Recipients

DACA has an educational requirement: to qualify for the program, participants must either be in school15 or hold a high school diploma or GED. Yet DACA holders are somewhat less educated than the overall U.S. population of similar ages (15 to 32). MPI estimates that 20 percent of DACA participants are still enrolled in secondary school (see Table 1). Forty-four percent have completed secondary education but have not pursued a college education at the time of the survey, compared to 19 percent among the broader U.S. population of similar age. Additionally, 18 percent of DACA recipients have enrolled in college, but have not yet graduated. Four percent have completed a bachelor’s degree versus 17 percent of the broader U.S. population. The overall U.S. population, however, includes 9 percent who had dropped out of high school, while the DACA program excludes high-school dropouts unless they were enrolled in an adult education program.16

Table 1. Educational Attainment and School Enrollment of U.S. Adults (ages 15-32) and Current DACA Recipients, by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and Enrollment Status</th>
<th>Total U.S. Population</th>
<th>Current DACA Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,108,000</td>
<td>689,800 362,700 326,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Female Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled and have not completed high school (%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in secondary school (%)</td>
<td>19 20 20 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school and not in higher education (%)</td>
<td>19 44 41 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in college (%)</td>
<td>20 18 20 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed some college, not enrolled (%)</td>
<td>16 15 15 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed at least a bachelor’s degree (%)</td>
<td>17 4 4 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “N/A” refers to the fact that virtually all current DACA participants have either completed high school or are currently enrolled—consistent with the program’s education requirement. Secondary school includes middle school and high school. The U.S. population and DACA-participant samples are limited to those ages 15 to 32 in 2010-14. The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of current DACA recipients reported by USCIS as of September 4, 2017.

Sources: MPI analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau pooled 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignments by Bachmeier and Van Hook.
For school enrollment rates for the 34 states with the most DACA holders, see Appendix 1.\(^17\)

Women participating in DACA are more likely to be enrolled in college than men (20 percent versus 15 percent) but have similar college completion rates (see Table 1.)

B. The Workforce Status of Current Recipients

Most DACA participants work, but they represent a very small share of the U.S. labor force. The majority of DACA participants (64 percent) are in the labor force: 55 percent are working, and 8 percent are unemployed and looking for work (see Table 2). The 442,000 DACA recipients in the labor force amounted to 0.27 percent of the total U.S. labor force of 161 million people in September 2017.\(^18\)

Many DACA participants are enrolled in school—either secondary school or college—and one out of three enrollees attends school and works at the same time, similar to the U.S. young adult population (see Table 2). Among those not enrolled in school, 69 percent are employed, and 22 percent are not in the labor force.

DACA-recipient men are more likely to be employed than women (64 percent versus 48 percent), reflecting a pattern similar to the overall unauthorized population.\(^19\) Most of this gender gap in employment occurs among those who are not enrolled in school: 81 percent of men holding DACA status work, compared to 58 percent of women. Some female DACA holders, like other young women, are likely to be out of school and out of the labor force due to child-care responsibilities. Lack of English skills could also be a barrier to their employment, as women with DACA status who are not in school

| Table 2. School Enrollment and Employment Rates of U.S. Adults (ages 15-32) and Current DACA Recipients, by Gender |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Total U.S. Population                           | Current DACA Recipients |
| Total Number                                    | Total            | Female           | Male             |
| Employed (%)                                    | 57               | 55               | 48               | 64               |
| Unemployed (%)                                  | 9                | 8                | 8                | 8                |
| Not in labor force (%)                          | 35               | 36               | 44               | 27               |
| Number Enrolled in School                       | 33,303,500       | 261,200          | 145,100          | 116,100          |
| Employed (%)                                    | 37               | 33               | 32               | 34               |
| Unemployed (%)                                  | 7                | 8                | 8                | 8                |
| Not in labor force (%)                          | 56               | 59               | 60               | 58               |
| Number Not Enrolled in School                   | 44,804,900       | 428,600          | 217,600          | 210,800          |
| Employed (%)                                    | 71               | 69               | 58               | 81               |
| Unemployed (%)                                  | 10               | 9                | 9                | 9                |
| Not in labor force (%)                          | 19               | 22               | 33               | 11               |

Notes: School enrollment includes those in middle school, high school, or college. The U.S. population and DACA-participant samples are limited to those ages 15 to 32 in 2010-14. The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of current DACA recipients as of September 4, 2017. Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Sources: MPI analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignment by Bachmeier and Van Hook.
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and not in the labor force are more likely to have limited English proficiency than DACA men out of the labor force: 44 percent versus 32 percent.

See Appendix 2 for employment rates for the DACA population, both in and out of education, for the 34 states with the greatest numbers of participants.

C. Major Industries and Occupations of Employment

DACA participants work in a wide variety of industries and occupations, including many in professional jobs. They are less likely than unauthorized workers who do not have DACA to work in outdoor, manual labor occupations such as construction.

1. Top Industries of Employment

The most common industries of employment for DACA recipients are hospitality, retail trade, construction, education, health and social services, and professional services (see Table 3). Twenty-three percent of the estimated 382,000 employed DACA recipients (89,000 workers) are employed in the hospitality industry, i.e., arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodations, and food services. Fourteen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total Current DACA Recipients | 689,800 | 100 |
| Employment | | |
| Unemployed or not in labor force | 307,400 | 45 |
| Employed | 382,400 | 55 |
| Employed Current DACA Recipients by Major Industry Group | 382,400 | 100 |
| Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodations, and Food Services | 88,900 | 23 |
| Retail Trade | 54,000 | 14 |
| Construction | 41,300 | 11 |
| Educational, Health, and Social Services | 40,700 | 11 |
| Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, and Waste Management Services | 39,000 | 10 |
| Manufacturing | 36,100 | 9 |
| Other Services (except public administration) | 23,900 | 6 |
| Agriculture | 14,400 | 4 |
| Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental and Leasing | 13,600 | 4 |
| Wholesale | 11,300 | 3 |
| Transportation and Warehousing | 9,600 | 3 |
| Information and Communications | 4,100 | 1 |
| Public Administration | 2,300 | <1 |
| Mining | <2,000 | <1 |
| Utilities | <1,000 | <1 |
| Armed Forces | <500 | <1 |

Note: Major industry groups are based on Census Bureau classifications. The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of active DACA recipients as of September 4, 2017. Sources: MPI analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignment by Bachmeier and Van Hook.
percent (about 54,000) are employed in retail trade, while 11 percent (41,000) are employed in construction and a similar number in the education, health, and social services industry. One-tenth (39,000) are employed in professional scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services. Thus, DACA recipients are employed in a broad range of sectors, including many in industries with substantial numbers of professional jobs. Industry-level

Table 4. Employed Current DACA Recipients, by Major Occupational Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Occupational Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Current DACA Recipients</td>
<td>689,800</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or not in labor force</td>
<td>307,400</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>382,400</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Current DACA Recipients by Major Occupational Group</td>
<td>382,400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation and Serving</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>53,500</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Administrative Support</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Material Moving</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care and Service</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishing, and Forestry</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, Maintenance, and Repair</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training, and Library</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-Care Support</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-Care Practitioners and Technical</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations Specialists</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Mathematical</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Specialists</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Engineering</td>
<td>&lt;2,000</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Social Services</td>
<td>&lt;2,000</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, Physical, and Social Science</td>
<td>&lt;1,500</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>&lt;1,000</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>&lt;1,000</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Specific</td>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Major occupational groups are based on Census Bureau classifications. The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of active DACA recipients as of September 4, 2017. Sources: MPI analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignment by Bachmeier and Van Hook.
data do not allow for analysis of the types of jobs that DACA recipients perform within each industry, however.

Appendix 3 provides data on the shares of employed DACA recipients working in the major industry groups for the 21 states with the most DACA workers.

2. Top Occupations

Analysis of occupations allows for more precision in identifying the types of jobs in which DACA recipients work, though here also sample sizes limit MPI's analysis to the major groups provided by the Census Bureau. The occupations most commonly employing DACA holders are food preparation and serving (16 percent, or 60,000 workers), sales (14 percent, or 54,000 workers), and office and administrative support (12 percent, or 47,000 workers) (see Table 4). Among unauthorized immigrants in the same age range who are not eligible for DACA, a similar share is employed in food preparation, but the share of ineligible unauthorized immigrants working in sales and office jobs is lower.

DACA recipients are half as likely to work in construction as compared to their unauthorized counterparts not eligible for DACA (10 percent versus 20 percent), and the share working in production jobs is slightly lower: 8 percent versus 9 percent. These occupational distributions suggest that DACA recipients are substantially less likely to work in outdoor, manual-labor jobs than similarly aged unauthorized immigrants not eligible for DACA.

Significant numbers of DACA recipients are also employed in professional occupations. Approximately 14,000 are managers, while 9,000 are employed as teachers or related workers (“education, training, and library” occupations).

About 5,000 work as health-care practitioners and another 9,000 in health-care support occupations. Almost 3,000 each work in business operations and in computer or mathematical occupations.

See Appendix 4 for the shares of employed DACA recipients working in the major occupational groups for the 21 states with the most DACA workers.

IV. Conclusions

Recent data from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, offering more specifics on the population currently holding status under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, have permitted the Migration Policy Institute to offer more detailed characteristics of those receiving DACA protections at the time the Trump administration placed the program on a six-month path to rescission in September 2017. These estimates should be useful for policymakers considering the potential impact at national and state levels of rescinding the program, as well as proposals to legalize DACA recipients and other DREAMers via legislation in Congress.

DACA has provided significant benefits to participants, which have been catalogued elsewhere. The analysis in this fact sheet supports the notion that DACA recipients obtain better jobs than other unauthorized immigrants, with many employed in professional occupations.

The analysis presented here shows that DACA recipients are a largely middle-skilled population, either enrolled in school or working or both. DACA recipients are widely dispersed across industries and occupations, and so are integrated into many different parts of the nation’s economy. While they represent a fraction of the U.S. millennial labor force, they have taken on prominence in the national immigration debate—by their own efforts as well as recognition in both parties that DREAMers here since childhood are a particularly sympathetic population.

As the DACA end date looms, with an average 915 young adults expected to begin losing their work authorization and protection from deportation daily beginning March 6, 2018 by MPI’s count, resolving their futures undoubtedly will take on new urgency.
# Appendix 1. School Enrollment Rates of Current DACA Recipients, Top States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current DACA Recipients</th>
<th>Enrolled in School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Secondary School</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>In Postsecondary Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>689,800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>197,900</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of current DACA recipients reported by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) as of September 4, 2017. Only states with sufficient sample sizes are shown. Secondary school includes both middle school and high school.

**Sources:** Migration Policy Institute (MPI) analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data from the pooled 2010-14 American Community Surveys (ACS) and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), with legal status assignments by James Bachmeier of Temple University and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.
## Appendix 2. Employment Rates of Current DACA Recipients In and Out of Education, Top States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>689,800</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>197,900</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of current DACA recipients reported by USCIS as of September 4, 2017. Refers to all current DACA recipients, whether in or out of education, and regardless of age. Those under age 16 are categorized as not in the labor force. Those enrolled in school include those enrolled in middle school, high school, or college/university. Only states with sufficient sample sizes are shown. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Sources: MPI analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data from the pooled 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignments by Bachmeier and Van Hook.
### Appendix 3. Employed Current DACA Recipients by Major Industry Group, Top States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current DACA Recipients</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>AZ</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>NV</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>UT</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (%)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or not in labor force (%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Current DACA Recipients</td>
<td>382,400</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>108,900</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>60,300</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share by Major Industry Group (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodations, and Food Services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, Health, and Social Services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Communications</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, and Waste Management Services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except public administration)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of current DACA recipients reported by USCIS as of September 4, 2017. Refers to all current DACA recipients regardless of age. Those under age 16 are categorized as not in the labor force. Only states with sufficient sample sizes are shown. Major industry groups are based on the U.S. Census Bureau’s classification. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Industry group percentages are of employed recipients.

Sources: MPI analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data from the pooled 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignments by Bachmeier and Van Hook.
### Appendix 4. Employed Current DACA Recipients by Major Occupational Group, Top States

| Major Occupational Group              | US   | AZ   | CA   | CO   | CT   | FL   | GA   | IL   | MD   | MA   | NV   | NJ   | NY   | NC   | OK   | OR   | PA   | TN   | TX   | UT   | VA   | WA   |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| **Current DACA Recipients**           | 689,800 | 25,500 | 197,900 | 15,500 | 3,800 | 27,000 | 21,600 | 35,600 | 8,100 | 5,900 | 12,400 | 17,400 | 32,900 | 25,100 | 6,100 | 10,200 | 4,900 | 7,900 | 113,000 | 8,900 | 10,100 | 16,300 |
| **Employment**                        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Employed (%)                          | 55%  | 47%  | 55%  | 60%  | 65%  | 59%  | 55%  | 60%  | 58%  | 58%  | 60%  | 55%  | 53%  | 56%  | 57%  | 51%  | 57%  | 53%  | 59%  | 62%  | 57%  |      |      |      |      |
| Unemployed or not in labor force (%) | 45%  | 53%  | 45%  | 40%  | 35%  | 41%  | 45%  | 40%  | 42%  | 42%  | 40%  | 45%  | 47%  | 44%  | 43%  | 49%  | 43%  | 47%  | 41%  | 38%  | 43%  |      |      |      |      |
| **Employed Current DACA Recipients**  | 382,400 | 12,100 | 108,900 | 9,200 | 2,500 | 15,900 | 11,900 | 21,400 | 4,700 | 3,400 | 7,200 | 10,400 | 18,000 | 13,200 | 3,400 | 5,900 | 2,500 | 4,500 | 60,300 | 5,200 | 6,300 | 9,300 |      |      |      |      |
| Share by Major Occupational Group (%) | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  | <1%  |      |      |      |      |      |      |

**Notes:** The 2010-14 DACA-eligible population is reweighted to match the age, gender, origin-country, and state-of-residence distribution of current DACA recipients reported by USCIS as of September 4, 2017. Refers to all current DACA recipients regardless of age. Those under age 16 are categorized as not in the labor force. Only states with sufficient sample sizes are shown. Major occupational groups are based on the U.S. Census Bureau’s classification. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Occupational group percentages are of employed recipients.

**Sources:** MPI analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data from the pooled 2010-14 ACS and 2008 SIPP, with legal status assignments by Bachmeier and Van Hook.


3 The specific eligibility requirements for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program were: (1) minimum age of 15 to apply; (2) arrival in the United States before age 16; (3) maximum age of 30 as of June 15, 2012 (when the program was announced); (4) physical presence and lack of lawful status in the United States on June 15, 2012; (5) continuous presence in the United States since June 15, 2007, five years before DACA was announced; (6) current school enrollment, completion of high school or its equivalent, or honorable discharge from the U.S. armed forces or Coast Guard; and (7) absence of a felony, significant misdemeanor, three or more misdemeanor convictions; and does not pose a threat to public safety or national security. See U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), “Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA),” updated October 6, 2017, [www.uscis.gov/archive/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca#guidelines](http://www.uscis.gov/archive/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca#guidelines).

4 For a complete listing of MPI’s work in this area, see MPI, “DREAM ACT/Deferred Action,” [www.migrationpolicy.org/topics/dream-act/deferred-action](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/topics/dream-act/deferred-action).

5 MPI estimated that as of 2017, there were 1.9 million unauthorized immigrants who met the age at entry and years of U.S. residence requirements constituting the minimum threshold to potentially be considered for DACA. Of that number, an estimated 1.3 million immediately met all eligibility requirements, another 408,000 could have met eligibility by enrolling in an adult education program leading to a high school degree or equivalent, while 120,000 would have aged into eligibility once they reached the program’s minimum application age of 15. Because USCIS stopped accepting applications in September 2017, these last two groups can no longer age into eligibility or enroll in adult education to qualify for the program. Eligibility due to adult education program enrollment and ineligibility due to criminal background or lack of continuous U.S. presence were not modeled due to lack of data. For methodological details, see the appendix section in Capps, Fix, and Zong, *The Education and Work Profiles of the DACA Population*.


7 MPI used data from the Census Bureau's 2010-14 American Community Survey (ACS) and the 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). While the ACS is issued annually, the SIPP is released only every several years. MPI is in the process of adapting the methodology to the 2014 SIPP, which was issued earlier in 2017. By using the SIPP’s numbers on legal permanent residents and naturalized citizens, MPI is able to look at the characteristics of the remaining foreign-born population, removing those likely to be on long-term nonimmigrant visas, Temporary Protected Status, or similar programs, leaving a residual population of those believed to be unauthorized. The characteristics of that population can then be assigned to the much larger and more recent ACS file. For more on MPI’s methodology, see Jeanne Batalova, Sarah Hooker, and Randy Capps, *DACA at the Two-Year Mark: A National and State Profile of Youth Eligible and Applying for Deferred Action* (Washington,
Table 1. Educational Attainment by Age, Gender, Origin-Country, and Residence-State Distribution of DACA Recipients

The SIPP and ACS data do not permit modeling enrollment in adult education programs that lead to a high school degree or equivalent, or to model criminal convictions or security-related disqualifications.

USCIS publication in September 2017 of new data on DACA recipients’ age, gender, origin-country, and residence-state distributions permits MPI to describe the educational and employment characteristics of the DACA-recipient population. Previously, MPI could only model characteristics for the DACA-eligible population, in particular those meeting all criteria to apply. The characteristics detailed here for DACA recipients vary somewhat from those previously offered for the DACA-eligible population (see Capps, Fix, and Zong, *The Education and Work Profiles of the DACA Population*) because the DACA-recipient profile looks somewhat different than that of the DACA-eligible cohort, as individuals did not apply in similar proportions. Younger immigrants, for instance, are more likely to be enrolled in school and less likely to be employed. Women are more likely than men to be enrolled in school, less likely to be employed overall and in construction, and more likely to be employed in service industries.

USCIS, “Number of Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.”


MPI used the 2010-14 American Community Survey (ACS) to develop the database of the population eligible for DACA: five years of data were used to improve the precision of the analysis, allowing for estimates for a broader range of industries, occupations, and states than would be possible using the single-year 2014 ACS. MPI has not yet finalized a dataset of the unauthorized population using more recent years of the ACS.

Three types of schools are considered according to USCIS guidelines: 1) a public, private, or charter elementary school, junior high or middle school, high school, secondary school, alternative program, or homeschool program that meets state requirements; 2) an education, literacy, or career training program (including vocational training) that has a purpose of improving literacy, mathematics, or English or is designed to lead to placement in postsecondary education, job training, or employment and where the enrollee is working to achieve such placement; or 3) an education program assisting students either in obtaining a regular high school diploma or its equivalent, or in passing a GED exam or other state-authorized exam. See USCIS, “Frequently Asked Questions,” updated October 6, 2017, www.uscis.gov/archive/frequently-asked-questions.
The ACS data employed here do not identify individuals enrolled in adult education or career training programs, so unauthorized immigrants who meet other eligibility requirements but who have not completed high school and are not enrolled in school are excluded from the DACA-participating group. USCIS has not released data on participants’ educational attainment or school enrollment.

This analysis was limited to 34 states because the other states did not have sufficiently large DACA populations to develop reliable estimates. In some cases, the data offered are limited to 21 states, for the same reason.

An estimated 382,000 DACA recipients are employed (see Table 2). This represents 0.25 percent of all U.S. workers (152 million) as of September. See U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, “The Employment Situation—September 2017” (news release USDL-17-1347, October 6, 2017), www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/empsit.pdf.


Capps, Fix, and Zong, The Education and Work Profiles of the DACA Population. The population not eligible for DACA includes those who met all DACA eligibility criteria except for the educational requirement, those who arrived in the United States after 2012, those who arrived when they were over age 15, and those who were ages 31 or older in 2012.

Prior to publication of the more complete USCIS data on current DACA recipients in September 2017, MPI estimated that 20,000 unauthorized immigrants who were DACA-eligible were in the teaching occupation. This estimate included those who were eligible for DACA but not participating in the program as of September 2017, as well as those who reported a teaching occupation but were not employed at the time of the ACS survey in 2010-14. The lower estimate presented here is limited to those participating in the program and employed as teachers and similar education professionals at the time of the ACS survey.

About the Authors

**Jie Zong** is an Associate Policy Analyst at the Migration Policy Institute, where she provides quantitative research support across MPI programs, particularly the National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy. Her research areas include structural and cultural integration of first- and second-generation immigrants, protective factors for children in refugee families, and workforce development in the United States.

Previously, Ms. Zong interned with the Center for Migration Studies of New York, where she provided research support on U.S. refugee and asylum issues, as well as the U.S. immigration detention system.

She holds a master’s degree of public administration from New York University’s Wagner Graduate School of Public Service with a specialization in policy analysis, and a bachelor of the arts degree in international finance from the Central University of Finance and Economics in China.

**Ariel G. Ruiz Soto** is an Associate Policy Analyst at MPI, where he provides quantitative research support across MPI programs. His research areas focus on the impact of U.S. immigration policies on immigrants’ experiences of socio-economic integration across varying geographical and political contexts. More recently, Mr. Ruiz Soto has analyzed methodological approaches to estimate sociodemographic trends of the unauthorized immigrant population in the United States.

Mr. Ruiz Soto holds a master’s degree from the University of Chicago’s School of Social Service Administration with an emphasis on immigration policy and service provision, and a bachelor’s degree in sociology from Whitman College.

**Jeanne Batalova** is a Senior Policy Analyst at MPI and Manager of the MPI Data Hub, a one-stop, online resource that provides instant access to the latest facts, stats, and maps covering U.S. and global data on immigration and immigrant integration. She is also a Nonresident Fellow with the Migration Policy Institute Europe.

Her areas of expertise include the impacts of immigrants on society and labor markets; social and economic mobility of first- and second-generation youth and young adults; and the policies and practices regulating immigration and integration of highly skilled workers and foreign students in the United States and other countries.

Dr. Batalova earned her PhD in sociology, with a specialization in demography, from the University of California-Irvine; an MBA from Roosevelt University; and bachelor of the arts in economics from the Academy of Economic Studies, Chisinau, Moldova.
Julia Gelatt is a Senior Policy Analyst at the MPI, working with the U.S. Immigration Policy Program. Her work focuses on the legal immigration system, demographic trends, and the implications of local, state, and federal U.S. immigration policy.

She previously worked as a Research Associate at the Urban Institute, where her mixed-methods research focused on state policies toward immigrants; barriers to and facilitators of immigrant families’ access to public benefits and public prekindergarten programs; and identifying youth victims of human trafficking. She was a Research Assistant at MPI before graduate school.

Dr. Gelatt earned her PhD in sociology, with a specialization in demography, from Princeton University, where her work focused on the relationship between immigration status and children’s health and well-being. She earned a bachelor of the arts in sociology/anthropology from Carleton College.

Randy Capps is Director of Research for U.S. Programs at MPI. His areas of expertise include immigration trends, the unauthorized population, immigrants in the U.S. labor force, the children of immigrants and their well-being, and immigrant health-care and public benefits access and use.

Dr. Capps, a demographer, has published widely on immigrant integration at the state and local level. He also has examined the impact of the detention and deportation of immigrant parents on children.

Prior to joining MPI, Dr. Capps was a researcher in the Immigration Studies Program at the Urban Institute (1993–96, and 2000–08).

He received his PhD in sociology from the University of Texas in 1999 and his Master of Public Affairs degree, also from the University of Texas, in 1992.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Unbound Philanthropy, and the Open Society Foundations.

© 2017 Migration Policy Institute.
All Rights Reserved.

Cover Design and Layout: Liz Heimann, MPI

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the Migration Policy Institute. A full-text PDF of this document is available for free download from www.migrationpolicy.org.

Information for reproducing excerpts from this publication can be found at www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy. Inquiries can also be directed to communications@migrationpolicy.org.

The Migration Policy Institute (MPI) is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank dedicated to the study of the movement of people worldwide. The Institute provides analysis, development, and evaluation of migration and refugee policies at the local, national, and international levels. It aims to meet the rising demand for pragmatic responses to the challenges and opportunities that migration presents in an ever more integrated world.

www.migrationpolicy.org