Methodology in Brief

The Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration (CSII) estimates of TPS were developed using a method similar to that offered by Warren and Kerwin (2017) of the Center for Migration Studies. First, we estimated and tagged the undocumented population in a version of the American Community Survey, 2012-2016 downloaded from IPUMS (Ruggles et al. 2017). The basics of that approach are reviewed in Le, Pastor, and Scoggins (2019) and differ from the CMS approach in that we apply fewer conditions and assign status to a larger number of observations based on a stratified probability model.

The probability estimates needed to do the latter exercise come from a logistic model applied to characteristics and status information in the 2014 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Other approaches, including some of our past work, have relied on the 2008 SIPP but it is likely that the characteristics of the unauthorized immigrant population have changed significantly since then. However, using the 2014 SIPP requires a bit of extra work to estimate who is likely to have changed status if they arrived without proper documentation (a task that was easier in the 2008 SIPP) and that is part of our approach.

Once we apply probability estimates (along with conditions) to fully assign status, we more or less follow CMS in tagging TPS holders with one difference. We first tag some of the undocumented as possible TPS holders based on country and year of arrival characteristics. While CMS then randomly selects from the pool till they hit country target totals, we select those with the highest likelihood of being authorized residents till we hit country target totals for adults (with the logic being TPS holders are more likely to resemble authorized immigrants). We then assign minor children to TPS status if they also meet the country and year of arrival bars and had at least one TPS parent.

The country targets for most countries are taken from Argueta (2017) with a few exceptions. First, immigrants from Guinea and Sierra Leone are now no longer eligible for TPS. Second, immigrants from Liberia are no longer eligible for TPS but a limited number who have been in the U.S. for a longer period are eligible for Deferred Enforced Departure (DED); we estimate that number by taking the previous TPS group and applying the new DED conditions to them.

Finally, our definition of a TPS household or family is not limited to the TPS status of the householder or head of family; rather, we consider whether there is any individual in the first family unit who has TPS status, including unmarried partners (but not including non-relatives such as roommates, boarders, employees, and foster children). We focus on the family because we believe this is where status concerns would be sharpest (versus another family unit sharing the same domicile). We consider the first family only because family relationships are not well specified for secondary family units in the same households. When we total up all members in the first family unit, we do not include the non-relatives (such as the aforementioned roommates) who were also not used in assigning TPS status to the family unit. This method likely underestimates the family members affected by TPS because it does not include secondary family units or foster children, and does not consider relationships with family members not in the same domicile.
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