

Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

Political Science Faculty Research and Publications

Political Science, Department of

11-1-2016

Immigrant Inclusion in the Safety Net: A Framework for Analysis and Effects on Educational Attainment

Meghan Condon
DePaul University

Alexandra Filindra
The University of Illinois at Chicago

Amber Wichowsky
Marquette University, amber.wichowsky@marquette.edu

Accepted version. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (November 2016): 424-448. DOI. © 2015
Policy Studies Organization. Used with permission.

Political Science Faculty Research and Publications/College of Arts and Sciences

This paper is NOT THE PUBLISHED VERSION; but the author’s final, peer-reviewed manuscript. The published version may be accessed by following the link in the citation below.

Policy Studies Journal, Vol. 44, No. 4 (2016): 424-448. [DOI](#). This article is © Wiley and permission has been granted for this version to appear in [e-Publications@Marquette](#). Wiley does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Wiley.

Contents

Abstract	2
The Impact of Policies Targeting Immigrants	4
Effects of Immigrant Inclusion: An Organizing Framework.....	5
Direct Effects	6
Application: Welfare Reform and Educational Attainment	7
Application: Welfare Reform and Educational Attainment	7
Immigrant Inclusion in State TANF Programs.....	8
Direct Effects on Educational Attainment	9
Spillover Effects on Educational Attainment.....	10
Empirical Strategy.....	11
Results	13
Discussion	22
Conclusion	23
Notes	25
References.....	26

Immigrant Inclusion in the Safety Net: A Framework for Analysis and Effects on Educational Attainment

Meghan Condon

School of Public Service, DePaul University, Chicago, IL

Alexandra Filindra

Political Science, University of Illinois, Chicago, Chicago, IL

Amber Wichowsky

Political Science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

Abstract

Across states, there is substantial variation in the degree to which immigrants and their children are offered public assistance. We present a theoretical framework for analyzing the effects of policy decisions about immigrant inclusion. We apply the framework to investigate the effect of the state safety net on educational attainment. We focus on the years following welfare reform in 1996, when states gained considerable autonomy over welfare policy, including decisions about the eligibility of immigrant residents. Leveraging state-level data from before and after reform, we estimate a difference-in-difference model to identify the effect of variation in immigrant inclusivity on educational attainment. We find that when states broaden the inclusivity of the social safety net to immigrants, young Latinos are more likely to graduate from high school. This effect is present beyond the group of Latino residents who receive additional benefits, suggesting that policy decisions about immigrants spill over to broader communities and communicate broader messages about social inclusion to racial and ethnic groups. We find similar patterns among Asian youth, but not among black and non-Hispanic white youth. We conclude that immigrant inclusion has consequences for the life prospects of the growing population of youth in high-immigrant ethnic groups.

KEY WORDS: immigrants, welfare policy, education, difference-in-difference estimation

The American states are experiencing a major demographic shift as the nation's population becomes increasingly non-white and foreign-born. Across states, there is substantial variation in the degree to which immigrants and their children are incorporated into society and offered public assistance. In this

article, we present a framework to organize theories from multiple disciplines about the effects of policies that target immigrant groups: The Policy Inclusion Effects (PIE) Framework. We draw attention to the *direct* effects of policy inclusion on the targeted groups as well as *spillover* effects across wider immigrant and minority communities, and note that eligibility restrictions structure the distribution of both *material* and *symbolic* resources across these groups. We then apply the framework to investigate how immigrant inclusion in the state social safety net affects youth from a high-immigrant ethnic group. Specifically, we ask whether young Latinos are more successful in their transition to adulthood in states that are inclusive rather than restrictive toward recent immigrants.

We investigate educational attainment, a critical indicator of economic and social mobility, and we focus our analysis on the historical moment when the variation in welfare state inclusivity saw the most dramatic increase: the years following the passage of the 1996 welfare reform. Many legal permanent residents (LPRs), eligible for federal benefits prior to reform, became ineligible. Subsequently, several states enacted policies to provide benefits to these LPRs under state-funded supplemental programs while others did not. This resulted in substantial state-level variation in social safety net access for immigrants and their children. We leverage this variation to ask what immigrant incorporation in the welfare state means for the educational attainment of youth from the racial and ethnic groups most affected. We expect that youth who are directly affected by eligibility restrictions, the children of low-income recent immigrants, will be more likely to drop out of high school in less inclusive states. However, our theoretical expectations extend beyond the youth who experience direct, material effects from these policy changes. We also test whether welfare inclusivity shapes the educational investment decisions of native-born Latino youth and immigrant youth whose own eligibility is unaffected by reform.

To identify these effects, we exploit the variation in welfare inclusivity across states and over time, estimating a series of difference-in-difference (DiD) models. We find that following welfare reform, low-income Latinos were more likely to graduate from high school in states that extended their own social safety nets to cover immigrants who became ineligible for federal benefits. We find direct effects among immigrant youth in the target population, who became ineligible in some states (see also Filindra, Blanding, & Garcia-Coll, 2011), and spillover effects among their co-ethnic peers who remained eligible following reform. We focus our analysis on Latinos, the largest high-immigrant ethnic group, but we also show that our main finding extends to Asians, who make up a growing share of the foreign-born. Although low-income Asian youth are more likely to graduate from high school than Latino youth across all states, they too saw more growth in the likelihood of graduating from high school in states with inclusive welfare policies. Finally, we consider whether the immigrant provisions of welfare reform are merely a proxy for the punitiveness or restrictiveness of the state welfare system overall. We find that our results are unique to high-immigrant groups. Members of low-immigrant groups—African American and white youth—are unaffected by immigrant eligibility changes. Our results suggest that policy decisions about immigrants communicate broader messages about social inclusion to racial and ethnic groups and have important effects on the life prospects of youth in high-immigrant ethnic groups.

We begin by presenting our theoretical framework. We then outline our test case: the changes to immigrant eligibility brought about by welfare reform and present the empirical expectations about educational attainment that flow from our framework. Next, we discuss potential threats to validity and the DiD empirical strategy we employ to address them. After presenting the results of our analysis, we conclude by discussing the implications for our understanding of immigration-related policy change.

The Impact of Policies Targeting Immigrants

Policies matter in the lives of immigrants. Sociologists have theorized that the political and policy environment within which immigrants and their children live, sometimes referred to as the context of reception, has a profound impact on social mobility (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes & Zhou, 1993). It can be either a marginalizing or integrating force. On one hand, policies such as segregation, literacy tests, and immigration quotas have hampered the integration of non-Anglo immigrants (Jones-Correa, 2000; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes & Zhou, 1993) and public health experts have identified deleterious effects of the policy environment on the mental and emotional health of immigrant populations and those who identify with them (Becerra, Androff, Cimino, Wagaman, & Blanchard, 2013). On the other hand, studies across disciplines have shown how inclusive policies have served to incorporate immigrants and their children into the mainstream, as is the case with civil rights laws and policies that encourage naturalization (Alba & Nee, 2003; Bloemraad, 2006; Van Hook, Brown, & Bean, 2006). More recently, several states have extended in-state tuition and other benefits to undocumented youth, and the federal Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) has allowed qualified undocumented young people to obtain temporary work permits; such policies have encouraged many young immigrants to finish high school, complete college, and gain employment (Bozick & Miller, 2014; Gonzales, Terriquez, & Ruszczyk, 2014; Kaushal, 2008). These policies have contributed to the social and economic integration of immigrants and their children.

Drawing on this rich but compartmentalized literature, we seek to develop a composite framework for understanding the effects of public policies that target immigrants. By public policies, we mean the laws, rules, and institutions developed by governing elites that explicitly or implicitly target specific social groups. We organize the effects of such policies along two dimensions. The first dimension, *order*, refers to the population affected. Policy can have first-order effects on the intended target population and second-order effects on individuals who are not in the intended target population but are affected indirectly. The *order* dimension is, therefore, divided between *direct* and *spillover* effects. The second dimension, *resource type*, refers to the nature of the resources provided or withheld by the policy decision. As Bloemraad (2013) and other scholars of policy inclusion have argued, policy provides both *material* resources, like money, and *symbolic* resources, like a sense of civic inclusion. Figure 1 displays The Policy Inclusion Effects (PIE) Framework detailing the four types of policy effects we identify. Attention to all four quadrants can assist scholars and policy analysts in identifying the total impact of policy targeting immigrants and developing hypotheses about policy effects across

outcomes. In this section, we present the framework. In the next, we apply it to develop and test hypotheses about the direct and spillover effects of immigrant eligibility changes in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA).

		Resource Type	
		Material	Symbolic
Order	Direct	Material benefits and burdens experienced by the target population	Social and political identities in the target population Feelings of membership and sense of inclusion in the target population The status and social construction of the target population in the minds of others
	Spillover	Material resources within families Material resources in school peer networks (youth only) Material resources held collectively within communities with high numbers of target population members Program participation among eligible individuals (chilling effects)	Identities, feelings of membership, and sense of inclusion among family members of targeted individuals Identities, feelings of membership, and sense of inclusion among youth in school peer networks of targeted individuals (youth only) Identities, feelings of membership, and sense of inclusion among others who identify with the target population (e.g. co-ethnic individuals) The status and social construction of the wider, co-ethnic group in the minds of others

Figure 1. Policy Inclusion Effects Framework (PIE).

Effects of Immigrant Inclusion: An Organizing Framework

As this expansive literature suggests, when policies target immigrants, it is especially important to examine effects both within and beyond the target population, which we refer to as *direct* and *spillover* effects. Policy provides benefits and burdens to a target population, which results in first-order, direct effects. But the effects of immigration policies can spill over onto the second generation as well as the ethnic community with which immigrants identify. And when a policy targets a narrow group of immigrants, like the undocumented or recently arriving LPRs, effects can spill over into the broader immigrant community. Attention to spillover policy effects is particularly important when immigrant groups are the target population because of deep ties with broader minority communities and mixed-status families.

Within all affected groups, policy provides *material* as well as *symbolic* benefits and burdens (Bloemraad, 2006; Filindra et al., 2011; Mettler & Soss, 2004). As Filindra et al. (2011) argue, inclusive immigrant policies “represent a positive signal from the state that immigrants are to be accommodated and their needs respected.... Conversely, punitive policies ... operate as a negative signal to immigrants that their presence and their cultural distinctiveness are not welcome” (p. 174). Bloemraad explains that for immigrants, whose membership in the polity is constantly contested and evolving, social mobility is affected in both material and symbolic ways:

“By providing support to some groups by not others, governments generate resource inequalities or help mitigate inequalities. Furthermore, by targeting some groups over others, governments generate symbolic resources and create normative boundaries around the type of people we help—the insiders—and those outside the community of care. Such differences produce variation in behavioral outcomes ... as well as attitudinal or affective outcomes. (2013, p. 196)”

Direct Effects

The upper-left quadrant of Figure 1 captures the material benefits and burdens distributed to the target population, the most straightforward category in our framework. Eligibility criteria are the primary policy design feature through which policy “creates the boundaries of target populations” (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, p. 335). The material resources that are provided to, or withheld from, members of the target population have important effects on several life outcomes as well as social mobility.

But restricting analysis to this quadrant leads to a serious underestimation of policy effects. First, in addition to determining the distribution of material resources, policies act as signals to targeted groups, communicating information about their position in the established social hierarchy and their prospects for inclusion as equal members in the polity. These symbolic effects on the target group are illustrated in the upper-right quadrant of Figure 1. Scholars have long argued that the policy environment sends signals about membership and inclusion (e.g., Marshall, 1992 [1950]; Soss, Fording, & Schram, 2011). For targeted immigrants, symbolic messages provided by policies influence a wide range of outcomes, including naturalization decisions (Bloemraad, 2006; Van Hook et al., 2006), and political behavior (Pantoja, Ramirez, & Segura, 2001; Pantoja & Segura, 2003). Eligibility is a particularly salient policy design feature in these cases. For example, those who live in inclusive policy environments are more likely to identify as Americans or as American ethnics (e.g., Mexican–American) and adopt the culture and the values of the American mainstream, while those who experience an exclusionary policy context are more likely to develop identities that differentiate them from the mainstream (Junn, 2007; Junn & Masuoka, 2008; Massey & Sanchez, 2010; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Furthermore, policy design features like eligibility restrictions can affect important outcomes by altering the social construction of the target group in the minds of policymakers and the public (Schneider & Ingram, 1993).

Application: Welfare Reform and Educational Attainment

The effects of public policies are not limited to the targeted individuals. A growing body of literature demonstrates that public policies have collateral effects on the broader networks with which the targeted individuals are affiliated. For example, the ripple effects of material deprivation, represented in the lower-left quadrant of Figure 1, can be felt through racial and ethnic networks, transmitted across families, peer groups, and communities. Material benefits spill over within families when public assistance to parents contributes to the well-being of their children or the collective material resources within a kin group. And policy scholars have shown that welfare reform and immigration enforcement policies can have community-wide “chilling effects” on minority participation in public services among those who remain eligible for them (e.g., Baczynski, 2012; Kaushal & Kaestner, 2005; Van Hook, 2003; Watson, 2014).

The symbolic effects of policies are also felt beyond the target population. Such spillover symbolic effects are represented in the lower-right quadrant of Figure 1 and have been observed across policy domains. For example, Burch (2014) finds that crime and incarceration policies can depress the political engagement of individuals who themselves are not under supervision, but live in neighborhoods that experience disproportionate rates of criminal justice interactions. Rocha, Hawes, Fryar, and Wrinkle (2014) show that high enforcement policies, intended to increase deportations of undocumented immigrants, actually have a greater effect on the migratory decisions of documented immigrants. Other research suggests that the policy context shapes identity formation, not just among immigrants, but among their kin (Junn, 2007; Junn & Masuoka, 2008; Massey & Sanchez, 2010). We posit that policy targeting one group of immigrants may also affect the prevailing social construction of ethnic groups or immigrants as a whole, as has been documented in some people's construction of Latinos overall as noncitizens (Conover, Searing, & Crewe, 2004).

In sum, through the effects specified in the first row of Figure 1, policies that target immigrants can induce intended and unintended behavioral change in the target population. And through the processes in the second row of Figure 1, they can do the same for individuals outside of the target population who either identify with or are linked to the target population in the minds of others. Scholars can apply this organizing framework to develop hypotheses about the total effects of policies that target immigrants and to think through the most important distinctions between effects. We turn now to an application of the PIE Framework, in which we focus on the distinction between the direct and spillover effects of Welfare Reform on educational attainment.

Application: Welfare Reform and Educational Attainment

The welfare domain offers an especially compelling case for applying this framework to generate hypotheses. As a result of a massive reorganization and reconceptualization of federal welfare policy, major decisions about program scope and inclusivity were devolved to the states. This led to 50 distinct, if related, welfare regimes with substantial implications for the civic standing and material

prospects of many low-income groups. While this variation has been studied to examine policy effects on racial groups (Soss et al., 2011), it has not been exploited to answer questions about immigrants.

As several scholars point out, immigrants have been given less attention in the literature on domestic welfare policy, even though incorporation and eligibility are particularly contentious in the case of immigrant recipients. Hochschild, Chattopadhyay, Gay, and Jones-Correa (2013) argue that scholars of immigrant incorporation need to give more attention to “perceptions of inclusion, including a sense of conditionality or marginality” (p. 10). And Sainsbury writes that “comparative scholarship on welfare states in the last decade has continued to ignore immigrants” (2012, p. 2). For example, some studies of welfare policy design have either grouped immigrant eligibility provisions with all welfare rules, examining them as additional, comparable indicators of the restrictiveness of the welfare state, or have dropped them entirely (De Jong, Graefe, Irving, & St. Pierre, 2006; cf. Soss, Condon, Holleque, & Wichowsky, 2006).

Immigrant Inclusion in State TANF Programs

In 1996, PRWORA was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. The Act made two dramatic changes to public assistance, both of which have drawn considerable scholarly attention. First, several measures were put in place to promote work, including time and family caps on benefits and work requirements. Second, the Act devolved responsibility for the administration of the new TANF public assistance program from the federal government to the states, spurring significant variation in the rules, benefits, and eligibility restrictions of welfare regimes across states.

In addition to these two well-studied changes, welfare reform also made eligibility conditional on political citizenship, a change that was one of the most controversial aspects of reform (Filindra, 2012; Fix & Haskins, 2002). Prior to reform, under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), LPRs were eligible for public assistance. PRWORA created a new categorization of immigrants based on the date of enactment of the law itself. Immigrants who had received LPR status prior to 1996 (pre-enactment LPRs) were eligible for federal TANF funds, and so were those immigrants who entered LPR status after 1996 but had completed more than 5 years on a green card (post-enactment LPRs). However, immigrants in their first 5 years of permanent residency were deemed ineligible for federal TANF funding.

The law empowered states to include or exclude any and all categories of LPRs from TANF. With the exception of Alabama, all states provided TANF funding to immigrants who became LPRs prior to 1996, and most states included those who had been in LPR status for more than 5 years. During the 5-year federal ban, states had the option to use state Maintenance of Effort (MOE) funds, which augment federal TANF funds, to provide assistance to immigrants who lost their benefits. Some states used state funds to provide benefits similar to TANF to LPRs, while other states chose not to do so.

Although the law restricted eligibility for some groups of LPRs, most noncitizens remained eligible because they were living in the country when the law was passed, or could receive benefits on behalf of their U.S.-born children (Van Hook, 2003). Nevertheless, welfare caseloads (Bell, 2001; Borjas, 2001; Fix & Passel, 1999, 2002) and Medicaid participation rates (Bitler, Gelbach, & Hoynes, 2005; DeLeire, Levine, & Levy, 2006) saw disproportionate drops among noncitizens in the years following reform, suggesting “that the anti-immigrant rhetoric in the law may have discouraged immigrant participation in public programs for which they remained eligible” (Watson, 2014, p. 3). And because immigrant eligibility grew more complex under welfare reform, many immigrants may have been confused as to whether they still qualified for benefits. Several studies point to a “chilling effect” of welfare reform, showing that participation in public assistance programs fell among immigrants who were not themselves affected by post-reform changes in eligibility (Kandula, Grogan, Rathouz, & Lauterdale, 2004; Kaushal & Kaestner, 2005).

Previous research on such chilling effects, however, has focused exclusively on immigrant participation rates in the very programs (TANF, Medicaid, SSI, Food Stamps) affected by welfare reform. No other study has considered how the exclusion of some immigrants has affected broader forms of well-being, particularly among the children from the racial and ethnic groups most targeted by these changes in immigrant eligibility.

We ask whether policy inclusion affects child development and the transition to adulthood. To investigate this question, we focus on one important developmental indicator: high school degree attainment among low-income individuals. High school graduation is an important indicator of social mobility and successful transition to adulthood (see e.g., Kearney & Levine, 2014b), and increasing the graduation rate among low-income youth is a national priority. Large inequalities in attainment between high- and low-income youth persist in the United States (Murnane, 2013). Whether decisions about immigrant inclusion in policy domains other than education have the potential to shrink this gap is not known.

In this way, by examining educational attainment, we focus on how decisions in one policy area affect broader developmental outcomes. A similar process has been documented in other policy domains, as with the broad-ranging impact of housing vouchers (e.g., Carlson, Haveman, Kaplan, & Wolfe, 2011). We argue that immigrant inclusion may have both material and symbolic importance for the children of excluded immigrants. But the PIE Framework suggests that there may also be spillover effects on immigrants who remained eligible or for native-born young people in high-immigrant racial and ethnic groups, explaining larger racial, ethnic, and income gaps.

Direct Effects on Educational Attainment

Welfare policy that restricts immigrant eligibility is, first and foremost, a form of exclusion, which can have material and symbolic effects on the developmental trajectories of youth in the target population. By limiting family resources and defining the social status of recent immigrants as inferior,

such policy can impede integration into American society and influence educational aspirations. Welfare policy may be important to the educational attainment of the children of targeted immigrants in several specific ways. Access to welfare benefits can affect the degree to which family resources can be devoted to education (Menjívar, 1997), increasing the pressure on youth to enter the labor market rather than continue schooling. And welfare policies can push excluded groups of immigrants into the margins of the economy, limiting opportunity to improve the economic standing and social integration of their children (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1997). The policy context can also affect the educational trajectories of immigrant children. Following Bronfenbrenner (1979), scholars have hypothesized that such effects may be the result of stress, depressed motivation (Filindra et al., 2011; Menjívar, 2008) and lowered aspirations and expectations (Becerra et al., 2013).

Policy can also affect developmental outcomes, like attainment, among targeted immigrants by distributing symbolic resources and sending signals about membership. For example, policy-driven feelings of stigmatization can affect individual self-esteem and self-regulation (Becerra et al., 2013; Inzlicht, McKay, & Aronson, 2006; Major & O'Brien, 2005), which in turn can influence various behaviors including educational attainment (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

Thus, although the causal link has not been tested directly, welfare ineligibility may affect the educational trajectories of the children within the target group of recent immigrants by introducing financial and social stress, encouraging early work entry over education for children, and dampening the educational aspirations of children who witness the difficulties they or their peers and co-ethnics may face in restrictive policy climates.

Spillover Effects on Educational Attainment

In addition to the direct effects on recent immigrant youth, we expect additional, spillover effects on immigrants who remain eligible for assistance and native members of high-immigrant ethnic groups. Welfare reform may have contributed to greater financial instability and psychological stress for families in noninclusive states who identify with the targeted immigrant group, depressing educational outcomes among their children. First, welfare ineligibility creates material disadvantage that transfers through families. For example, the material disabilities related to parental immigration status have implications for the educational outcomes of the next generation, decreasing the attainment of second-generation youth (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes & Zhou, 1993). Policy effects can also be transmitted beyond the targeted population through youth peer networks. Economists have identified several such “peer effects,” showing that students are affected by the educational performance of their classmates (e.g., Burke & Sass, 2013), and the impact is strongest for same-race peers (for a review see Hoxby, 2000; Sacerdote, 2011). There is also some evidence that the presence of immigrant children in a classroom can affect the educational outcomes of native-born peers more generally (Gould, Lavy, & Paserman, 2009) which may be due in part to the material disadvantage faced by many immigrant children. In the case of welfare reform, the depressed academic performance of immigrant youth ineligible for assistance may indirectly affect their eligible co-ethnic and co-immigrant peers.

Eligibility restrictions can also have spillover effects on educational outcomes when confusion about eligibility and fears about the immigration consequences of welfare receipt keep eligible legal permanent residents and their children off public assistance programs (Kaushal & Kaestner, 2005; Skinner, 2012; Van Hook, 2003), which may depress the educational outcomes of those who remain eligible. Scholars have documented the educational importance of “chilling effects” across other policies targeting immigrants. For example, intensified immigration enforcement is implicated in lower public assistance participation rates among the citizen children of immigrants (Watson, 2014) and in declines in the enrollment of Latino children in primary and secondary education (Baczynski, 2012).

Symbolic effects may also influence the educational attainment of children from high-immigrant communities. Immigrants from poor families may perceive greater prospects for success and social mobility in states that created a stronger safety net for immigrant families. Broadly speaking, greater socioeconomic stratification in the developmental context and the resulting feelings of exclusion can lead young people to make fewer investments in their development (Condon & Wichowsky, 2014; Kearney & Levine, 2014a, 2014b). Other research suggests that the symbolic benefits provided by policy can have important effects on educational outcomes of Latinos. For example, Shah (2009) demonstrates that when staffing diversity requirements create a higher representation of Latinos in school leadership, it raises parental involvement among Latinos, an important ingredient in a child's academic success. Messages of inclusion and exclusion sent through welfare policy may operate in a similar way.

Thus, the PIE Framework leads us to hypothesize that welfare inclusivity will affect the educational attainment of youth in the target population of recent LPRs, as well as the attainment of immigrants and co-ethnic youth in high-immigrant ethnic groups who remain eligible across all states. Specifically, we will exploit the variation in state immigrant welfare inclusivity across time and states to test the following hypotheses:

“Hypothesis 1 (H1): Post-reform, we expect a larger increase in the high school attainment of youth in high-immigrant ethnic groups in states that incorporated federally ineligible immigrants into their own social safety nets.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Immigrant inclusion in public assistance will have both direct effects on those who benefit during childhood, and spillover effects on those who identify with the target group of the policy, but whose own eligibility is unaffected by reform.”

Empirical Strategy

To test these hypotheses, this study uses individual-level data from the Annual Social and Economic Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CPS) conducted every March by the U.S. Census Bureau. We leverage data in the years before (1994–1995) and after (2003–2004) the 1996 welfare law. Because some states changed eligibility requirements for LPRs in the immediate years following

reform, we exclude data collected between 1996 and 2002. In doing so, we follow other welfare scholars (Nam & Kim, 2012). This lag (exclusion of years) is necessary for two reasons. First, although many states did modify their TANF requirements in the immediate years following reform, some states took longer to adjust their state policy regimes following reform. States' decisions to include or exclude LPRs were largely set by 2003. The lag is also necessary to ensure that the low-income individuals in the post-reform sample actually experienced their transition to adulthood after reform, and did not have a large portion of their adolescence prior to their states' moves toward inclusion.¹

Our dependent variable is high school attainment, defined as whether individuals (18–24) reported having a high school diploma or its equivalent. So that we can more precisely distinguish between the direct and spillover effects of welfare reform, we restrict our analysis to individuals who had a reported household income below the poverty line, which allows us to compare individuals who were materially affected by welfare reform (post-enactment immigrants) to those who would have remained eligible for welfare and health benefits. In so doing, we test whether states' decisions about whether to extend their social safety nets to newly arriving immigrants had any spillover effect on other youth most likely to live in the same communities and go to the same schools: young people who identify with high-immigrant ethnic groups but who are themselves from poor, nonimmigrant families, or immigrants not subject to the restriction, and thus still eligible for federal benefits. We focus on high school attainment among Latinos, the largest high-immigrant ethnic group in the country, but we also present results for Asians (a second high-immigrant group), and contrasting results from two low-immigrant groups: African Americans and non-Hispanic whites. We expect that welfare inclusivity for immigrants will have an effect on high school attainment among Latinos and Asians, but will have no bearing on the graduation rates of black and white students.

Our key independent variable is a dichotomous measure of immigrant inclusion, which we define as whether the state created a substitute program to cover newly arriving immigrants excluded from receiving federal benefits during their first 5 years in the United States (see also Rocha et al., 2014). As of 2003, 25 states had used their own funding to provide welfare benefits to some or all federally ineligible immigrants.²

We employ a DiD design to investigate the effects of state inclusivity on educational attainment. In this DiD study, we construct four comparison groups: two treated groups (residents of inclusive states pre- and post-reform) and two nontreated groups (residents of noninclusive states pre- and post-reform). This pre- and post-test with comparison group design captures any unobserved pre-reform differences between restrictive and inclusive states, and thus allows us to identify the effects of policy change (e.g., Blank, 2002). Specifically, our model takes the form:

$$Y_{ist} = a + b_1 * I_{is} + b_2 * T_{it} + b_3(I_{is} * T_{it}) + b_4 X_{ist} + b_5 S_{is} + e_{ist}$$

where I_{is} indicates whether individual i lives in an inclusive state, T_{it} distinguishes post-reform observations from pre-reform ones, X_{ist} is a vector of individual-level demographic and economic controls, S_{is} is a vector of state-level controls, and e_{ist} is a term for random error.

The coefficient on b_1 indicates the average differences in attainment rates between inclusive and noninclusive states. The coefficient on b_2 captures the time trend common to both inclusive and noninclusive states. The DiD estimate is the coefficient on b_3 , which shows whether and how changes in attainment rates differ by state inclusivity.

The quasi-experimental method controls for all observed and unobserved state differences prior to the reform period, but we include several additional state-level controls to account for any potential differences between inclusive and noninclusive states that could explain different trajectories in attainment. We control for the wealth and diversity of the state, including the percent Hispanic, percent African American, percent Asian, and percent below poverty in the state. We include the levels and changes in the foreign-born population to account for the possibility that more inclusive states saw greater increases in immigrant populations (Dodson, 2001). We also control for amount of income inequality in the state given prior research suggesting that contextual inequality depresses educational aspirations among disadvantaged youth (Kearney & Levine, 2014b). Finally, we control for policy liberalism and educational attainment in the state given prior research suggesting that liberal and cosmopolitan states were more likely to cover ineligible immigrants under a state TANF program (Hero & Preuhs, 2007). We use Berry, Ringquist, Fording, and Hanson's (1998) measure of state government ideology, where higher values indicate a more liberal ideology, and define educational attainment in the state as the share of those over the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree.

We also include several individual-level control variables to help reduce residual variance and increase the precision of our statistical tests. At the individual-level, we control for household income, mother's level of education, race, ethnicity, and citizenship status. We also include dichotomous measures for whether respondents are of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, or Salvadoran descent in models of Latino educational attainment. Finally, we cluster standard errors by state to account for the nonindependence of observations and weight the data using the CPS state weights to account for sampling design and nonresponse bias.

Results

Before turning to the regression results, we present descriptive detail on the measures of high school attainment that are used to obtain our DiD estimates in Table 1. Consistent with our expectations, we see that inclusive states saw greater increases in graduation rates than noninclusive states following welfare reform. Among young Latinos, we see little difference in average high school attainment rates in the CPS between inclusive and noninclusive states pre-reform.

Table 1. Average High School Attainment among Low-Income Latino Youth

	Pre-Reform	Post-Reform	Δ Post-Pre-Reform
Not inclusive	0.41	0.41	0.00
Inclusive	0.39	0.47	0.08
Δ Inclusive-Not inclusive	-0.02	0.06	0.08

Note: Cell entries are average high school attainment for low-income Latino youth. Pre-reform is defined as 1994–1995 and post-reform as 2003–2004. Data come from the March supplement of the Current Population Survey.

Table 2 shows that these results hold after conditioning on individual and state-level controls. Columns 1 and 2 report the results of interest for young Latinos and Asians, respectively. The first three coefficients in the table are our estimates of interest. We begin with the model of Latino educational attainment (column 1). The insignificant coefficient on *Post Reform* indicates that there was not a significantly different graduation rate among low-income Latinos in the post-reform period, as compared to the pre-reform period. This is consistent with the fact that the dramatic increase in high school graduation rates among Latinos began more recently, in the years after our analysis. The insignificant coefficient on *Inclusive State* indicates that there was not a statistically significant difference in the likelihood of high school graduation among Latinos between inclusive and noninclusive states in the pre-reform period.

Table 2. The Effect of Welfare Inclusivity of Educational Attainment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Latino	Asian	African American	Non-Hispanic White
Post reform	0.006	-0.962***	-0.038	0.463***
	(0.084)	(0.366)	(0.127)	(0.090)
Inclusive state	-0.215	-0.109	-0.154	-0.151
	(0.136)	(0.432)	(0.164)	(0.170)
Post reform x Inclusive state	0.348***	1.304***	0.051	-0.103
	(0.111)	(0.413)	(0.240)	(0.166)
Household income (logged)	0.024	0.004	0.028	0.018

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Latino	Asian	African American	Non-Hispanic White
	(0.021)	(0.032)	(0.020)	(0.018)
Naturalized citizen	-0.328	0.355		
	(0.406)	(0.718)		
First-generation	-0.556*	-0.576		
	(0.330)	(0.668)		
Second-generation	0.219	-0.631		
	(0.329)	(0.574)		
Education level of mother	0.020	0.322**	0.301***	0.446***
	(0.028)	(0.134)	(0.041)	(0.058)
% Hispanic in state	3.153***	-1.556	-0.871	1.232
	(1.098)	(3.745)	(1.190)	(0.886)
% Black in state	3.581**	1.803	-2.428*	1.171
	(1.386)	(3.443)	(1.253)	(0.868)
% Asian in state	1.850	-0.068	8.354***	0.695
	(1.457)	(3.140)	(3.103)	(2.158)
% College educated in state	2.612	8.624	12.322***	8.463***
	(3.541)	(14.752)	(4.058)	(2.479)
50/10 Income ratio	-0.023	-1.132	-0.375**	0.160
	(0.208)	(0.940)	(0.150)	(0.184)
% Families below poverty	-11.736	22.973	18.316***	-5.999
	(8.282)	(24.957)	(5.592)	(5.313)
Unemployment rate	4.830	19.541	3.338	-13.108**
	(8.723)	(21.170)	(4.706)	(5.512)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Latino	Asian	African American	Non-Hispanic White
% Foreign born in state	-3.218**	-1.745	-2.170	0.932
	(1.255)	(5.108)	(1.538)	(1.625)
Elite ideology	-0.003	-0.008	0.002	-0.001
	(0.002)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Change in % Foreign	-22.770**	-23.975	0.472	-26.097***
	(9.819)	(36.897)	(11.032)	(8.619)
Constant	0.262	1.877	-3.116***	-1.775*
	(1.107)	(3.639)	(1.076)	(1.040)
Observations	2935	439	2020	5072
Pseudo R ²	0.049	0.143	0.035	0.052

Note: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$. Logistic regression. Standard errors clustered by state. To save space, coefficients for Mexican, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Salvadoran, Guatemalan descent (column 1) and Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, Vietnamese, and Asian Indian descent (column 2) not shown.

Consistent with our theoretical expectations, however, the interaction term, *Inclusive State* \times *Post Reform*, is positive and statistically significant, showing that high school graduation rates among young Latinos increased at a significantly higher rate in inclusive states than noninclusive states. All else equal, the DiD estimate from the multivariate individual level models is 9 percentage points; the increase in the probability of a high school diploma was 9 points higher over the reform period than the gain in states that did not extend their safety nets to newly arriving immigrants. This is a large difference, just over a quarter of the size of the graduation gap between Latinos and non-Hispanic whites in our CPS sample of low-income young adults.

Among our individual-level controls, mother's level of education predicts high school attainment. We also consider citizenship status, including a set of dummy variables for first-, second-, and third-generation (or higher). First-generation includes the foreign-born. Second-generation refers to individuals who were born in the United States but whose parents are foreign-born. Third-generation or higher (i.e., parents were born in the United States) is the excluded category. All else equal, first-generation Latinos in the CPS sample were less likely to graduate from high school, as compared to both second-generation (foreign-born) and later-generation, native-born youth (see also Garcia-Coll &

Marks, 2011). Turnout among low-income Latinos also tends to be higher in more diverse states, but lower in states that have larger and growing foreign-born populations.

Columns 2–4 in Table 2 present the DiD results for three additional racial and ethnic groups, one high-immigrant group (Asian) and two low-immigrant groups (African American and non-Hispanic white). If the immigrant inclusion provision in state welfare policy is driving the result among Latino youth, we expect to see similar effects among Asians, but not among the low-immigrant groups.

We begin with the Asian subsample (column 2), a second high-immigrant population. We include this model as an additional test of the effect we find among Latinos, but we note that because of the smaller state sample sizes for the low-income Asian subsample in the CPS, the results should be interpreted cautiously. Consistent with the results in the first model of Latinos, more inclusive states also saw greater increases in high school graduation rates among young Asians, as shown in column (2).

In the last two columns of Table 2, we consider whether inclusivity is acting instead as a proxy for the overall restrictiveness of the state welfare system by estimating the DiD model for young African Americans (column 3) and non-Hispanic whites (column 4). States that chose to include recent immigrants may have made several other welfare policy decisions that could correlate with better child development outcomes among low-income residents (and thus higher educational attainment). If, in fact, other policy features aside from immigrant eligibility, like higher funding, more generous benefits, or less punitive eligibility rules, are driving the effect, then we would see effects on the educational attainment of young people in low-immigrant groups as well.

We find no such effects. The immigrant eligibility decision in a state has no detectable relationship with attainment among low-immigrant groups, but a strong, robust relationship with attainment for high-immigrant groups. Although the likelihood of holding a high school diploma was greater in the post-reform period among young non-Hispanic whites (but not young African Americans), the DiD estimate is statistically insignificant for both groups, suggesting that states' policy choices about whether to extend their social safety nets to recently arriving immigrants had no effect on high school attainment rates among low-immigrant groups: African Americans and non-Hispanic whites. We see this as strong evidence that the eligibility decision, and not other features of the welfare regime within the state, is responsible for our results.

In Table 3, we present three additional robustness checks of the main result for Latino youth. First, we show that these estimates are robust to including year and state fixed effects (column 1). Second, we present results using an alternative measure of policy inclusivity. Zimmerman, Tumlin, and Ost (1999) assess 12 separate categories of immigrant eligibility decisions to group states into four categories, from those that made their social safety nets most available to immigrants (1) to those that placed the most restrictions on immigrants (4). Under this definition, we categorize states as inclusive if their

safety nets were most available or somewhat available to immigrants. Column (2) shows that our main results hold using this alternative specification of policy inclusivity.

Table 3. Robustness Checks of Difference-in-Difference Estimates

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Fixed Effects	Alternative Measure	Placebo Test
Post reform	-0.072 (0.092)	0.021 (0.124)	1.127*** (0.336)
Inclusive state	0.040 (0.261)	-0.276* (0.153)	0.126 (0.365)
Post reform x Inclusive state	0.372*** (0.116)	0.218* (0.125)	-0.163 (0.399)
Household income (logged)	0.021 (0.021)	0.021 (0.022)	-0.007 (0.025)
Naturalized citizen	-0.342 (0.413)	-0.353 (0.408)	—a
First-generation	-0.576* (0.335)	-0.584* (0.334)	—a
Second-generation	0.209 (0.338)	0.205 (0.337)	—a
Education level of mother	0.021 (0.027)	0.021 (0.028)	-0.110*** (0.026)
Constant	0.075 (0.470)	0.079 (0.470)	-0.591* (0.335)
Observations	2923	2923	2012
Pseudo R ²	0.056	0.055	0.099

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Fixed Effects	Alternative Measure	Placebo Test
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: *** $p < 0.01$, $p < 0.10$. Logistic regression. Standard errors clustered by state. To save space coefficients for Mexican, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Salvadoran, Guatemalan descent not shown in columns (1) and (2).

a Variable not available in 1985 and 1986 CPS supplements.

Finally, in column (3) we check the robustness of the common time trend assumption in our DiD model. As previously discussed, our model assumes that absent welfare reform, the trend in educational attainment among Latinos would have been the same in inclusive states as in noninclusive states. The state-level controls in the models presented in Table 2, as well as the state and year fixed effects, account to some degree for differences that might explain different trajectories in educational attainment. Additionally, although there is no formal test of the time trend assumption, we gain leverage here by estimating a placebo DiD model in which we assume that welfare reform occurred in 1990 and compare attainment prior (1986–1987) and after (1994–1995) this point—that is, in the years in which there were no changes in immigrant welfare eligibility. If the assumptions of our DiD models are valid, then the DiD estimate in this placebo test should be zero. Conversely, a nonzero placebo treatment would suggest selection bias and thus call into question the assumption of a common time trend (Lechner, 2010). As shown in column (3), we find no evidence in our placebo test that state policy choices made after welfare reform had any effect in the pre-reform time period. Thus, we find support for H1: states that incorporated federally ineligible immigrants into their own social safety nets had larger increases in high school attainment of Latino youth.^{3,4}

We had also hypothesized that immigrant inclusion in public assistance would have spillover effects on young Latinos who themselves were not the target of immigrant restrictions under welfare reform. To test H2, we divide our sample of young Latinos into those who would have been directly affected by variability in state policy climate induced by PRWORA (recent immigrants who have been in the United States 5 years or less) and those who would not (citizens and those immigrants who have been in the country longer than 5 years). Because our sample of Latinos from immigrant families who have been in the country longer than 5 years includes native-born as well as foreign-born, we include a control for whether the individual was born in the United States. Table 4 reports the results by citizenship status and length of residency. The model in column (1) presents the test of the direct effect. Column (2) presents the estimate of the spillover effect on youth from immigrant families whose eligibility remains unchanged. Column (3) presents the estimate of the spillover effect on youth from nonimmigrant families.

Table 4. Effect of Welfare Inclusivity by Citizenship and Length of Residence

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Immigrant in United States Less than Five Years	Immigrant in United States More than Five Years	Nonimmigrant Family
Post reform	-0.226 (0.193)	0.008 (0.147)	0.183** (0.082)
Inclusive state	-0.166 (0.302)	-1.381*** (0.413)	0.099 (0.145)
Post reform X Inclusive state	0.846*** (0.252)	0.448** (0.178)	-0.021 (0.154)
Household income (logged)	-0.010 (0.042)	0.024 (0.042)	0.053** (0.025)
Education level of mother	-0.024 (0.056)	-0.128** (0.055)	0.153** (0.077)
U.S. born	—	0.020 (0.301)	—
% Hispanic in state	0.829 (2.230)	10.186** (4.621)	3.489*** (0.949)
% Black in state	1.482 (2.081)	10.119** (4.104)	6.473*** (1.517)
% Asian in state	-1.592 (3.203)	0.938 (7.591)	2.130 (1.962)
% College educated in state	17.562***	5.502	-1.288

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Immigrant in United States Less than Five Years	Immigrant in United States More than Five Years	Nonimmigrant Family
	(6.466)	(17.047)	(3.755)
50/10 Income ratio	-0.919**	0.725	0.069
	(0.447)	(0.994)	(0.258)
% Families below poverty	17.879	-62.742*	-14.723*
	(14.297)	(33.564)	(8.082)
% Foreign born in state	-0.487	-5.239	-4.509***
	(2.627)	(3.982)	(1.424)
Elite ideology	0.003	-0.022***	0.003
	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.002)
Change in % foreign	-9.468	-52.706	-40.339***
	(18.818)	(35.965)	(8.965)
Constant	-1.507	2.351	0.214
	(1.451)	(2.491)	(0.919)
Observations	867	590	1512
Pseudo R ²	0.036	0.078	0.031

Note: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$. Logistic regression. Standard errors clustered by state. To save space coefficients for Mexican, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Salvadoran, Guatemalan descent (column 1) not shown.

We find evidence of direct and spillover effects on Latino youth. Column (1) shows our DiD estimate for young Latinos who have been in the country for 5 years of less. These are the immigrants who would have been directly affected by the changes in welfare eligibility. As before, the DiD estimate is positive and statistically significant, suggesting that there was a larger increase in high school attainment in those states that used their own funds to cover immigrants ineligible for federal benefits. The DiD estimate from the multivariate individual-level model of attainment among newly arriving immigrants

is a 17 percentage point gain in the probability of a high school diploma, indicating a powerful direct effect of policy inclusion on attainment.

There is also a spillover effect. The DiD estimate is also positive and statistically significant in the model that estimates the effect of welfare reform on the subset of immigrants who would *not* have been affected by the immigrant provisions in PRWORA, as shown in column (2). The coefficient estimate on this spillover effect is roughly half the size of the estimated direct effect, 8 percentage points. The coefficient on *Inclusive State X Post Reform* in the model that estimates the effect of welfare reform on young Latinos from nonimmigrant families is not statistically distinguishable from zero. Thus, we find support for H2, but note that spillover effects are detectable only among other immigrants who were not directly affected by the policy change, and not among native-born co-ethnic youth.

Discussion

Drawing from the work of scholars of education, policy, and immigration across disciplines, our theoretical framework organizes the myriad ways in which policy exclusion can affect life outcomes among high-immigrant groups. We have applied this framework to investigate how immigrant inclusion in the state social safety net affects educational attainment among youth in high-immigrant groups, testing for both *direct* and *spillover* effects.

Our analysis results in two main findings. First, we find strong support for H1: when states take steps to broaden the inclusivity of the social safety net to immigrants, young Latinos and Asians are more likely to persist in schooling and graduate from high school. And we find no evidence that immigrant inclusivity predicts geographic variation in attainment for individuals from low-immigrant groups (African American and non-Hispanic white youth). We note that the large-scale demographic data from the CPS, while essential for identifying differences across states and time, do not allow us to investigate the personal experiences of those affected, but the PIE Framework points to several promising questions for future research in this respect. Notably, the relative role of the material and symbolic resources in connecting the immigrant provisions of PRWORA to educational outcomes remains an open question. Our framework suggests that both may be important, and we encourage other scholars to examine this question.

Second, consistent with H2, we show that the effects of policy inclusion are present beyond the group of Latino residents who receive additional benefits, suggesting that policy decisions about smaller groups of immigrants communicate broader messages about social inclusion and affect the symbolic and material status of high-immigrant ethnic groups more broadly. We find the strongest evidence that spillover effects occur through the immigrant community, rather than through the wider ethnic community.

We note that these data do not differentiate between undocumented and documented immigrants. Although there is no way to identify individual undocumented respondents in the CPS, it is likely that

some portion of our sample is undocumented. The presence of undocumented immigrants in the main analysis and the spillover analyses is unproblematic. Undocumented immigrant residents are not affected directly by the state eligibility decisions we study, because they are ineligible for welfare benefits in all states. They, like LPRs who have been in the country for longer than 5 years and the native born, are affected by these restrictions via spillover, because they live in the same communities, families, and social networks as directly affected immigrants. Excluding the undocumented from the main analysis and spillover analysis would lead us to underestimate the effects of eligibility provisions, and so it is preferable to include them. It would be useful to be able to include an indicator for undocumented status in the models to further increase the precision of the tests, but because the Census does not ask about legal status in the CPS, this is not possible.

The presence of undocumented immigrants in the direct effect analysis (Table 4, column 1) deserves more attention. There may be individuals in this subsample who have been in the country for fewer than 5 years, but are undocumented. As a result, the respondents in restrictive states are still all ineligible (either because they are undocumented or because there is no state program for recent LPRs), but some of the respondents in the inclusive states are also ineligible (because they are undocumented). The inclusion of the undocumented in this way would lead to an underestimation of the policy effect. If we could exclude the undocumented from the analytic sample used to estimate direct effects, the effects would likely be larger.⁵

Given the increases in the number of undocumented immigrants and salience to state immigration policymaking, this remains an important avenue for future research. For example, Rocha et al. (2014) find evidence that the policy context has a different relationship to the migration decisions of documented and undocumented immigrants. Scholars should continue to exploit different data sources to more closely examine variation across immigrant subpopulations, attending to both the direct effects on the targeted group as well as spillover effects across immigrant and ethnic communities.

Our goal has been to examine whether state welfare policy inclusivity affects the transition to adulthood, not only among targeted individuals, in this case recently arriving legal permanent residents, but also in the broader communities within which these immigrants are embedded. Indeed, our results suggest that welfare inclusivity has both direct and spillover effects on the educational attainment of children who are members of the broader ethnic, racial, and immigrant groups. Policy inclusivity toward immigrants affects the investments young people are able to make in themselves, and these effects extend beyond the target population of the policy.

Conclusion

Across the American states, there is growing variation in the degree to which immigrants are incorporated into society. A report by the National Immigration Law Center hailed 2013 as a year of unprecedented moves toward inclusivity in state immigration policy (Broder et al., 2013). Citing state

legislation to provide access to drivers' licenses, higher education, and protection for workers' rights, the report concludes, "as Congress continues to deliberate over federal immigration reform, state and local governments are moving forward with policies that integrate immigrants into communities and enhance their ability to contribute to the nation's economic and social health" (p. 16).

Drawing on literature from multiple social science disciplines, we present a unifying framework to guide scholars and policy analysts in assessing the effects of these policy eligibility decisions. This PIE Framework integrates this broad cross-disciplinary literature to underscore two important cleavages: most importantly, a full accounting of the consequences of immigrant eligibility provisions must address the *direct* effects on the targeted as well as *spillover* effects across wider immigrant and minority communities. We also note that eligibility restrictions have both *material* and *symbolic* importance for these groups. While all policy effects might be organized along these lines, we argue that these distinctions are especially important in the case of immigrant inclusion. Targeted immigrant groups are often deeply embedded within broader immigrant and minority networks, increasing the potential for large spillover effects across communities, kin, and schools. Furthermore, the membership of immigrants in the polity is contested and evolving in a way that is not always the case for the target groups of other policies, underscoring the relevance of policy's symbolic function for these groups.

We have applied the theoretical framework to more fully examine the era after welfare reform, when the variation in the inclusivity in the welfare state increased dramatically. We find evidence that exclusion from the social safety net has serious depressing effects on the life outcomes of youth within and beyond the target population. These spillover effects are present in two high-immigrant groups with very different educational profiles: Latinos and Asians, highlighting the robustness of the result. We point out that, had we restricted analysis to only those young people directly and materially affected by the eligibility restrictions, we would have seriously underestimated and misunderstood the effects of the policy. At the same time, a careful examination of spillover across different groups prevents us from over-claiming. Although the pooled models suggest broad spillover effects, when we look separately across segments of the sample, we find that restricting the eligibility of recent immigrants spills over across the wider immigrant community, but the effect on later-generation Latino youth is more uncertain.

Our study makes three additional contributions, advancing knowledge about welfare's immigrant eligibility restrictions. First, we focus attention on immigrant policy design at the national level. Exploiting variation across time and states, we show how states' decisions about whether to incorporate immigrants into their social safety nets explain state-level variation in educational attainment among low-income youth from high-immigrant ethnic groups. Second, we show that welfare policy decisions about immigrant eligibility have important, distinctive effects and that they are not just a proxy for the overall welfare or social climate in the state. Third and finally, by examining educational attainment, we show how signals of group inclusion or exclusion emanating from eligibility in one policy area can have an effect on broader developmental outcomes.

We have focused our analysis here on high school graduation, which is an important marker of successful transition to adulthood and a key factor in social mobility among low-income youth. Future research could employ our framework and method to investigate whether other developmental, social, and economic outcomes are similarly affected by policy inclusivity. In an effort to begin this line of inquiry, we have examined the effect of state welfare immigrant inclusion provisions on college enrollment among 19- to 24-year-olds. The results of these analyses are consistent with our main analysis; the DiD estimate is positive and statistically significant for low-income Latinos and Asians, but not for low-income African Americans and non-Hispanic whites. We present this result as exploratory. Educational transitions that take place earlier in the life course, like high school graduation, have been shown to have a stronger empirical connection to the characteristics of the developmental context (e.g., Lucas, 2001). And the further we extend the analysis into the adult years with repeated cross-sectional data from the CPS, the less certainty we have about factors like whether an adult respondent has moved from an inclusive state to a restrictive state during adulthood (or vice versa). However, that the results for postsecondary attainment mirror our main findings strongly suggests that immigrant eligibility decisions have far-reaching effects on the developmental trajectories and life prospects of young people in high-immigrant groups.

With an increasing number of immigrant and non-white youth in the nation, it is important to understand how and whether immigrant eligibility restrictions across policy areas matter in this way. Educational experiences will continue to shape immigrants' paths of adaptation and prospects for social mobility, particularly as the hollowing out of blue-collar and middle-class occupations has increased the economic returns to education. Our findings suggest that the growing variation in immigrant policy across states will have sizeable effects on the mobility of high-immigrant ethnic groups, and the PIE Framework presents a roadmap for researchers and policy analysts to organize and investigate these effects.

Notes

The authors' names are listed in alphabetical order. We would like to thank Mary Castro, Andreas Feldman, Amalia Pallares, and Paru Shah for their comments and assistance with this work. We also thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback. All errors remain ours. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA, September 3–6, 2015.

1. We checked the robustness of our results using different time periods and time lags between pre-reform and post-reform periods. Our results are robust to these alternative specifications (see Supporting Information).
2. These data come from the Urban Institute's Welfare Rules Database available at <http://anfdata.urban.org/wrd/databook.cfm> (last accessed February 2, 2015). Descriptive statistics for our variables are available in the Supporting Information.

3. Data availability prevents us from conducting a parallel placebo test with Asian respondents, because the CPS did not include an indicator for Asian race or ethnicity until 1988. However, we did estimate model of Asian attainment with fixed effects and with the alternative measure of inclusivity, and the results are robust.
4. In addition to these robustness checks, we have conducted a difference-in-differences-in-differences analysis with the Latino subpopulation, in which we do not restrict the sample to low-income individuals. This method allows us to compare the DiD estimates for high- and low-income individuals in the CPS. As expected, we find that policy inclusivity only affects the educational attainment of low-income respondents who are most likely to live in shared communities and families with directly affected individuals, and are thus most likely to experience spillover effects. The difference-in-difference estimate for high-income Latinos is 1 percentage point compared to 9 percentage points for low-income Latinos. These results are available in the Supporting Information.
5. As an additional check, we have also added The Pew Hispanic Center's annual estimate of the undocumented population in a state for the pre- and post-reform periods as an additional control. This state-level measure uses a "residual method" to estimate the size of the undocumented population (i.e., the difference between the population estimate of legal immigrants and the survey-based estimate of all foreign-born in the CPS). Our results remain robust to this alternative model specification. This model is available in the Supporting Information.

References

- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baczynski, Dan. 2012. "The Chilling Effects of Student Immigration Tracking Systems Violate Plyler." *Children's Legal Rights Journal* 33: 212–54.
- Becerra, David, David Androff, Andrea Cimino, M. Alex Wagaman, and Kelly N. Blanchard. 2013. "The Impact of Perceived Discrimination and Immigration Policies Upon Perceptions of Quality of Life Among Latinos in the United States." *Race and Social Problems* 5: 65–78.
- Bell, Stephen H. 2001. *Why Are Welfare Caseloads Falling?* Washington, DC: Urban Institute [Online]. <http://www.urban.org/publications/310302.html>
- Berry, William D., Evan J. Ringquist, Richard C. Fording, and Russell L. Hanson. 1998. "Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States, 1960-93." *American Journal of Political Science* 42: 327–48.
- Bitler, Marianne P., Jonah B. Gelbach, and Hilary W. Hoynes. 2005. "Welfare Reform and Health." *Journal of Human Resources* XL: 309–34.
- Blank, Rebecca M. 2002. "Evaluating Welfare Reform in the United States." NBER Working Paper No. w8983. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Bloemraad, Irene. 2013. "The Great Concern of Government: Public Policy as Material and Symbolic Resources." In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds. Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Jennifer Hochschild, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York: Oxford University Press, 195–208.
- Borjas, George J. 2001. "Welfare Reform and Immigration." In *New World of Welfare*, eds. Rebecca Blank and Ron Haskins. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 369–90.
- Bozick, Robert, and Trey Miller. 2014. "In-State College Tuition Policies for Undocumented Immigrants: Implications for High School Enrollment Among Non-citizen Mexican Youth." *Population Research and Policy Review* 33 (1): 13–30.
- Broder, Tanya, Maria Sofia Corona, Joan Friedland, Melissa Keaney, Jennifer Macias, and Josh Stehlik. 2013. *Inclusive Policies Advance Dramatically in the States: Immigrants' Access to Driver's Licenses, Higher Education, Workers' Rights, and Community Policing*. Los Angeles, CA: National Immigration Law Center.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1979. *The Ecology of Human Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burch, Traci R. 2014. "Effects of Imprisonment and Community Supervision on Neighborhood Political Participation in North Carolina." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 651: 184–201.
- Burke, Mary A., and Tim R. Sass. 2013. "Classroom Peer Effects and Student Achievement." *Journal of Labor Economics* 31: 51–82.
- Carlson, Deven, Robert Haveman, Thomas Kaplan, and Barbara Wolfe. 2011. "The Benefits and Costs of the Section 8 Housing Subsidy Program: A Framework and Estimates of First-Year Effects." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 30: 233–55.
- Condon, Meghan, and Amber Wichowsky. 2014. "The Political Implications of Educational Inequality." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, IL.
- Conover, Pamela Johnston, Donald D. Searing, and Ivor Crewe. 2004. "The Elusive Ideal of Equal Citizenship: Political Theory and Political Psychology in the United States and Great Britain." *Journal of Politics* 66: 1036–68.
- De Jong, Gordon F., Deborah Roempke Graefe, Shelley K. Irving, and Tanja St. Pierre. 2006. "Measuring State TANF Policy Variations and Change After Reform." *Social Science Quarterly* 87 (4): 755–81.
- DeLeire, Thomas, Judith A. Levine, and Helen Levy. 2006. "Is Welfare Reform Responsible for Low-Skilled Women's Declining Health Insurance Coverage in the 1990s?" *Journal of Human Resources* XLI: 495–528.
- Dodson, Marvin E. 2001. "Welfare Generosity and Location Choices among New United States Immigrants." *International Review of Law and Economics* 21: 47–67.
- Filindra, Alexandra. 2012. "Immigrant Social Policy in the American States: Race Politics and State TANF and Medicaid Eligibility Rules for Legal Permanent Residents." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 13: 26–48.
- Filindra, Alexandra, David Blanding, and Cynthia Garcia-Coll. 2011. "The Power of Context: State-Level Policies, Politics and the Educational Performance of the Children of Immigrants in the United States." *Harvard Educational Review* 81: 163–93.
- Fix, Michael, and Ron Haskins. 2002. *Welfare Benefits for Non-Citizens*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Fix, Michael, and Jeffrey S. Passel. 1999. *Trends in Non-citizens' and Citizens' Use of Public Benefits Following Welfare Reform, 1994-1997*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- Fix, Michael, and Jeffrey S. Passel. 2002. *The Scope and Impact of Welfare Reform's Immigrant Provisions*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Garcia-Coll, Cynthia, and Amy K. Marks. 2011. *Is Becoming American a Developmental Risk?* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.
- Gonzales, Roberto G., Veronica Terriquez, and Stephen P. Ruzsczyk. 2014. "Becoming DACAmented: Assessing the Short-Term Benefits of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)." *American Behavioral Scientist* 58 (14): 1852–72.
- Gould, Eric D., Victor Lavy, and M. Daniele Paserman. 2009. "Does Immigration Affect the Long-Term Educational Outcomes of Natives? Quasi-Experimental Evidence." *The Economic Journal* 119: 1243–69.
- Hero, Rodney, and Robert Preuhs. 2007. "Immigration and the Evolving American Welfare State: Examining Policies in the U.S. States." *American Journal of Political Science* 51: 498–517.
- Hochschild, Jennifer, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. 2013. "Introduction." In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds. Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York: Oxford University Press, 1–23.
- Hoxby, Caroline. 2000. "Peer Effects in the Classroom: Learning from Gender and Race Variation." NBER Working Paper No. 7867. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Inzlicht, Michael, Linda McKay, and Joshua Aronson. 2006. "Stigma as Ego Depletion: How Being the Target of Prejudice Affects Self-Control." *Psychological Science* 17: 262–69.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 2000. "The Origins and Diffusion of Racial Restrictive Covenants." *Political Science Quarterly* 115: 541–68.
- Junn, Jane. 2007. "From Coolie to Model Minority: U.S. Immigration Policy and the Construction of Racial Identity." *The DuBois Review* 4: 355–73.
- Junn, Jane, and Natalie Masuoka. 2008. "Asian American Identity: Shared Racial Status and Political Context." *Perspectives on Politics* 6: 729–40.
- Kandula, Namartha R., Colleen M. Grogan, Paul J. Rathouz, and Diane Lauterdale. 2004. "The Unintended Impact of Welfare Reform on the Medicaid Enrollment of Eligible Immigrants." *Health Services Research* 39: 1509–26.
- Kaushal, Neeraj. 2008. "In-State Tuition for the Undocumented: Education Effects on Mexican Young Adults." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27 (4): 771–92.
- Kaushal, Neeraj, and Robert Kaestner. 2005. "Welfare Reform and Health Insurance of Immigrants." *Health Services Research* 40: 697–722.
- Kearney, Melissa S., and Phillip B. Levine. 2014a. "Income Inequality and Early Nonmarital Childbearing." *Journal of Human Resources* 49: 1–31.
- Kearney, Melissa S., and Phillip B. Levine. 2014b. "Income Inequality, Social Mobility and the Decision to Drop Out of High School." NBER Working Paper No. w20195. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Lechner, Michael. 2010. "The Estimation of Causal Effects by Difference-in-Difference Methods." *Foundations and Trends in Econometrics* 4: 165–224.
- Lucas, Samuel R. 2001. "Effectively Maintained Inequality: Education Transitions, Track Mobility, and Social Background Effects." *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (6): 1642–90.
- Major, Brenda, and Laurie T. O'Brien. 2005. "The Social Psychology of Stigma." *Annual Review of Psychology* 56: 393–421.
- Marshall, T. H. 1992 [1950]. *Citizenship and Social Class*. Concord, MA: Pluto Press.

- Massey, Douglass S., and Magaly Sanchez. 2010. *Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-Immigrant Times*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 1997. "Immigrant Kinship Networks: Vietnamese, Salvadorans and Mexicans in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 28: 1–20.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2008. "Educational Hopes, Documented Dreams: Guatemalan and Salvadoran Immigrants' Legality and Educational Prospects." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 620: 177–93.
- Mettler, Suzanne, and Joe Soss. 2004. "The Consequences of Public Policy for Democratic Citizenship: Bridging Policy Studies and Mass Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 2: 55–73.
- Murnane, Richard J. 2013. "U.S. High School Graduation Rates: Patterns and Explanations." *Journal of Economic Literature* 51 (2): 370–422.
- Nam, Yunju, and Wooksoo Kim. 2012. "Welfare Reform and Elderly Immigrants' Naturalization: Access to Public Benefits as an Incentive for Naturalization in the United States." *International Migration Review* 46: 656–79.
- Pantoja, A. D., and Gary Segura. 2003. "Fear and Loathing in California: Contextual Threat and Political Sophistication Among Latino Voters." *Political Behavior* 25: 265–86.
- Pantoja, A. D., R. Ramirez, and G. M. Segura. 2001. "Citizens by Choice, Voters by Necessity: Patterns of Political Mobilization by Naturalized Latinos." *Political Research Quarterly* 54: 729–50.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74–96.
- Rocha, Rene R., Daniel P. Hawes, Alisa Hicklin Fryar, and Robert D. Wrinkle. 2014. "Policy Climates, Enforcement Rates, and Migrant Behavior: Is Self-Deportation a Viable Immigration Policy?" *Policy Studies Journal* 42: 79–100.
- Sacerdote, Bruce. 2011. "Peer Effects in Education: How Might They Work, How Big Are They and How Much Do We Know Thus Far?" In *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, eds. Stephen Machin, Eric A. Hanushek, and Woessmann Ludger. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 249–77, Chapter 4.
- Sainsbury, Diane. 2012. *Welfare States and Immigrant Rights: The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87: 334–47.
- Shah, Paru. 2009. "Motivating Participation: The Symbolic Effects of Latino Representation on Parent School Involvement." *Social Science Quarterly* 90: 212–30.
- Skinner, Curtis. 2012. "State Immigration Legislation and SNAP Take-Up Among Immigrant Families with Children." *Journal of Economic Issues* 46: 661–81.
- Soss, Joe, Meghan Condon, Matthew Holleque, and Amber Wichowsky. 2006. "The Illusion of Technique: How Method-Driven Research Leads Welfare Scholarship Astray." *Social Science Quarterly* 87: 798–807.
- Soss, Joe, Richard C. Fording, and S. Schram. 2011. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Hook, Jennifer. 2003. "Welfare Reform's Chilling Effects on Noncitizens: Changes in Noncitizen Welfare Reciprocity or Shifts in Citizenship Status?" *Social Science Quarterly* 84: 613–31.
- Van Hook, J., S. K. Brown, and F. Bean. 2006. "For Love or Money? Welfare Reform and Immigrant Naturalization." *Social Forces* 85: 643–66.

- Watson, Tara. 2014. "Inside the Refrigerator: Immigration Enforcement and Chilling Effects in Medicaid Participation." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 6: 313–38.
- Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International Migration Review* 31: 975–1008.
- Zimmerman, Wendy, Karen C. Tumlin, and J. Ost. 1999. *Patchwork Policies: State Assistance for Immigrants Under Welfare Reform*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.