

May, 2017

Temporary Protected Status in The United States: The Experiences of Honduran and Salvadoran Immigrants

Cecilia Menjívar, PhD
Department of Sociology
University of Kansas

Contributing Organizations

Center for Migration Research, University of
Kansas (CMR at KU)

Central American Resource Center
(CARECEN) –Los Angeles

National Day Laborer Organizing Network
(NDLON)

About the Research Team

Byeongdon Oh, University of Kansas, Project Manager

Ana Garcia, CARECEN-Los Angeles, Survey Field Coordinator

Daniel Alvord, University of Kansas, Research Assistant

Andrea Gómez-Cervantes, University of Kansas, Research Assistant

Natalie Jansen, University of Kansas, Research Assistant

Acknowledgements

This project was made possible with funding from the Center for Migration Research at the University of Kansas, as well as from Foundation Distinguished Professorship research funds for Menjívar.

From its inception this project benefited from the assistance of various individuals at key points. Maria Enchautegui assisted with questionnaire construction as did Leisy Abrego and Walter Nicholls, and together with the entire research team they all read versions of this report and provided immensely helpful comments.

Preferred Citation

Menjívar, Cecilia. 2017. Temporary Protected Status in the United States: The Experiences of Honduran and Salvadoran Immigrants. Center for Migration Research, The University of Kansas.

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a nationwide survey of immigrants holding Temporary Protected Status (TPS). In collaboration with CARECEN-Los Angeles, NDLON and other organizations, the Center for Migration Research (CMR) at the University of Kansas designed and administered a randomized telephone survey and in-person survey of 2,098 respondents (Men 53.7%, Women 46.3%) from El Salvador (92.3%), Honduras (7.5%), and Nicaragua (0.2%). The survey was conducted in Spanish during the period April, 2016 to August, 2016 in the six cities with the largest populations of Central Americans: Los Angeles (34.1%), Houston (28.7%), Washington (21.0%), San Francisco (9.4%), New York (4.9%), and New Jersey (1.9%).

Survey results indicate that generally, TPS has contributed positively to the socioeconomic integration of these immigrants and therefore this legal status has benefitted these immigrants, their families and society in general. Key findings include:

- TPS holders have significantly high levels of labor force participation: 94.0% of men and 82.1% are working, with 83.2% of men and 54.9% of women working more than 40 hours per week, and 7.6% of men and 10.0% of women working more than one job. About one tenth of survey respondents were self-employed (men 13.4%, women 7.8%).
- Men work in construction/painting (18.9%), driving (9.3%), cleaning (6.3%), cooking (3.2%), gardening (2.8%), while women concentrate in cleaning buildings (16.5%) or houses (12.2%), childcare (7.6%), cooking (6.0%), or in clothing manufacture (5.8%).
- The average monthly income of the survey respondents is \$2,909.87 (men=\$3,597.64; women=\$2,054.31)
- 33.6% of men and 29.94% of women in the survey live in owner-occupied homes in the United States.
- The average educational level of the survey respondents at the time they arrived in the United States was 7.64 years; however, 49.2% of them have furthered their education in the United States, enrolling in at least one educational program, such as English language courses (36.4%), high school diploma or GED (9.6%), vocational certificate (4.9%), college courses (1.6%), and university (1.0%)
- 29.7% of the survey respondents volunteered in civic organizations, committees, or community groups in the 12 months prior to the survey, showing high levels of social integration. In addition, 20.2% engaged in activities to benefit to their community including donating blood, cleaning streets, etc.
- 80.3% of survey respondents pay income taxes, including 79.3% of those who are self-employed. They have contributed to social security for an avg. of 15.4 years and 90% file taxes every year.

Table of Contents

What is Temporary Protected Status?	1
Understanding Temporary Protected Status	1
Temporary Protected Status In the United States	2
Salvadorans and Hondurans on TPS: A Background	2
Data Collection	4
Data Collection	4
1. Demographic Profile	5
Demographic Profile.....	6
TPS holders families	7
2. Education	8
Educational Attainment	8
3. Economic Activities	9
Labor Force Participation	10
Remittances.....	10
Current Occupation.....	11
Work Violations.....	12
4. Taxes & Contributions	13
Taxes & Social Security.....	13
5. Health Insurance	14
Health Insurance	14
6. Community Settlement & Involvement	15
Homeownership	15
Community Involvement	16
7. Effects of TPS	17
Effects of TPS	17
Final Considerations and Recommendations	18
Social, Economic and Cultural Integration.....	18
Moving Beyond Temporariness.....	19
References	20
References.....	20

What is Temporary Protected Status?

According to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (2017) a country may be designated for Temporary Protected Status (TPS) when conditions in that country temporarily prevent the country's nationals from returning safely, or under certain circumstances, where the country is unable to handle the return of its nationals adequately. The Secretary of Homeland Security (DHS) may designate a country for TPS if there is ongoing armed conflict in that country, if an environmental disaster or an epidemic has occurred there, or for other extraordinary and temporary conditions. During the designated period, TPS beneficiaries are not removable from the United States, can obtain employment authorization (EAD), and in principle may be granted travel authorization, though this is very rarely used. Unlike undocumented immigrants, TPS beneficiaries cannot be detained by DHS on the basis of their legal status. However, unlike other forms of permanent legal residence, TPS is a temporary benefit that does not lead to lawful permanent residence status or any other immigration status (United States Citizenship and Immigration Services 2017). Importantly, TPS is only granted if it is consistent with U.S. national interests (Segerblom 2007; Seghetti, Ester, and Wasem 2015) and, contrary to refugee or asylum status, TPS is granted based on country conditions, not on individual situations (Bergeron 2014).

In practice, as Fitzpatrick (2000:280) observes, TPS “expands the protection of forced migrants who cannot satisfy the criteria [of refugee or asylum status]...it promises group-based protection when the determination of an individual’s status proves impossible... TP[S] serves as a short-term strategy to secure the immediate physical safety of refugees and a way station to more durable protection.” As such, TPS allows for the creation of international ties, solidarity, and political treaties between nations. And according to refugee law under the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHRC), temporary protection helps countries fulfill remedial obligations to other states that have provoked human rights violations and victims of flight (Fitzpatrick 2000; Golay 2001). Countries of Western Europe, Australia and others have created temporary protection statuses at different times for various groups as a result of: (1) armed conflicts, (2) internal strife, (3) systematic human rights violations, or (4) natural disaster (United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) 2014). However, the mechanisms that make TPS possible and its requirements make it difficult for beneficiaries to incorporate in the host countries, an aspect that highlights the temporariness of this designation.

Research has found that the in-between legality of immigrants in temporary statuses (e.g., not undocumented but not permanent legal residence either) and the embedded ambiguity inherent in these statuses is reflected in the experiences of immigrants who hold them (Abrego and Lakhani 2015; Gonzales 2016; Menjívar 2006). Although research has found that these immigrants share uncertainties and face barriers similar to those that undocumented immigrants also encounter, TPS holders’ experiences can differ from those of undocumented immigrants as well as from those of permanent residents (Bergeron 2014; Cebulko 2014; Menjívar 2006). A temporary status affects immigrants’ sense of belonging in society and process of socioeconomic integration. TPS holders are able to access economic opportunities they would otherwise be ineligible for, but the temporariness of the status can hinder other forms of more stable integration. That is, “TPS confers partial inclusion while simultaneously affirming that this status is temporary and partial” (Waters and Gernstein Pineau 2016:140).

Temporary Protected Status in the United States

Table 1. Temporary Protected Status Country Designations in the U.S.

Country	Designation Date	Expiration Date	Re-registration Period	Employment Authorization Document Expiration	Estimated Number 2015
El Salvador	Mar. 9, 2001	Mar. 9, 2018	Jul. 8, 2016 – Sep. 6, 2016	Mar. 9, 2017	204,000
Guinea	Nov. 21, 2014	May 21, 2017	N/A	May 20, 2017	2,000
Haiti	Jul. 23, 2011	Jul. 22, 2017	Aug. 25, 2015- Oct. 26, 2015	Jul. 22, 2016	50,000
Honduras	Jan. 5, 1999	Jan. 5, 2018	May 16, 2016 – Jul. 15, 2016	Jan. 5, 2017	61,000
Liberia	Nov. 21, 2014	May 21, 2017	N/A	May 20, 2017	4,000
Nepal	Jun. 24, 2015	Jun. 24, 2018	Oct. 26, 2016 – Dec. 27, 2016	Jun. 24, 2017	10,000 - 25,000
Nicaragua	Jan. 5, 1999	Jan. 5, 2018	May 16, 2016 – Jul. 15, 2016	Jan. 5, 2017	2,800
Sierra Leone	Nov. 21, 2014	May 21, 2017	N/A	May 20, 2017	2,000
Somalia	Sep. 18, 2012	Mar. 17, 2017	Jun. 1, 2015 – Jul. 31, 2015	NO Automatic Extension*.	270
Sudan	May 3, 2013	Nov. 2, 2017	Jan. 25, 2016 – Mar. 25, 2016	Nov. 2, 2016	300 – 500
South Sudan	May 3, 2016	Nov. 2, 2017	Jan. 25, 2016 – Mar. 25, 2016	Nov. 2, 2016	600
Syria	Aug. 1, 2016	Mar. 31, 2018	Aug. 1, 2016 – Sep. 30, 2016	Mar. 31, 2017	5,000
Yemen	Sep. 3, 2015	Mar. 3, 2017	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Sufficient time was deemed available to issue new EADs

Note: Data from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Offices, Temporary Protected Status

<https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status>

Estimates come from Congressional Research Service (see Argueta and Wasem 2016).

Salvadorans and Hondurans on TPS: A Background

The Immigration Act of 1990 authorized the creation of TPS. The U.S. Congress designated El Salvador as the first country whose nationals could apply for TPS (Chishti and Yale-Loehr 2016), a decision based on the civil war raging in that country at the time. This new status included important limitations: individuals applying for TPS had to already be in the United States; they could not apply for this benefit overseas. An applicant also had to meet the following requirements: continued residence in the United States, no felony convictions, not more than two misdemeanors committed in the United States, not pose a national security threat, and the person registered and reapplied for continuous status during a stipulated timeframe (Chishti and Yale-Loehr 2016). Since 1990, the requirements to apply, process, and maintain TPS have remained the same.

According to estimates by the Migration Policy Institute (2016) there are approximately 323,000 immigrants on TPS at the moment; they make up approximately 4% of the U.S. foreign-born population (Passel and Cohn 2016a). The overwhelming majority of those on TPS are

nationals of El Salvador (204,000) and Honduras (61,000). Other designated countries at the moment include Haiti (50,000), Syria (10,000), Liberia (4,000), and Nicaragua (2,800). Smaller numbers of recipients come from Nepal, Yemen, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan and Guinea are also included (Argueta and Wasem 2016; Chishti and Yale-Loehr 2016; Seghetti et al. 2015).

TPS is *temporary*, granted for a designated time period usually lasting between 6 to 18 months and can be extended if country conditions do not change (Bergeron 2014; Seghetti et al. 2015). And TPS does not lead to permanent residency or citizenship. Thus, unlike family reunification visas, TPS holders are unable to sponsor family members, and in contrast to refugees or those granted asylum, TPS beneficiaries do not receive settlement aid nor qualify for public assistance benefits (Kerwin 2014). However, they are eligible for emergency Medicaid, public health programs (e.g. immunizations), disaster relief, reduced lunch programs, and public K-12 education (Kerwin 2014). The only way that TPS holders can be adjusted to legal permanent residency is through an affirmative supermajority vote in the Senate (involving 3/5ths of all Senators), given an Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) provision for TPS (Kerwin 2014; Seghetti et al. 2015).

The first TPS designation for Salvadorans expired in 1992, but after the 12-year civil war ended country conditions did not change and a weakened economy did not recover. TPS holders, therefore, were granted another form of temporary relief, “deferred enforcement departure” (DED), which lasted until 1995. In January 2001 El Salvador suffered two deadly earthquakes, which prompted the U.S. government to once again designate El Salvador for TPS. An estimated 290,000 Salvadorans already present in the United States at the time were granted TPS, but according to estimates this number has declined to approximately 204,000 by 2015 (Orrenius and Zavodny 2015). Salvadoran TPS holders have had continuous presence in the country since March, 2001 and TPS has been expanded for them nine times.

Hondurans on TPS have been on this status consecutively longer than any other designated group. In October 1998, Hurricane Mitch left extensive devastation in Honduras, including an estimated 1.5 million homeless (out of approximately 6 million people at the time), entire villages destroyed, and billions of dollars in damages. The U.S. Congress designated Hondurans for TPS and according to estimates initially approximately 105,000 Hondurans benefited but the number has declined to approximately 61,000 today (Magaña-Salgado 2016). TPS has been renewed 10 times for Hondurans. As is the case for Salvadorans, Hondurans have had continuous presence in the United States, since January 1999.

Who are the TPS holders?

Even though Salvadorans and Hondurans have held TPS status for a decade and a half, little is known about their experiences. This is in part due to the lack of publically available data on this population. However, some extant research points to the benefits of this status, in particular protection from deportation. Research has shown that the threat of deportation has significant consequences to immigrants and their families, ranging from alterations in everyday routines, low wages and work exploitation, economic instability, mental and physical health downturns, decreases in educational attainment and cognitive development for children, and indefinite family separations (Aranda, Menjívar, and Donato 2014; Brabeck and Xu 2010; Dreby 2015; Gonzalez and Chaves 2012; Hagan, Castro, and Rodriguez 2010; Hasselberg 2016).

Furthermore, TPS gives immigrants access to a social security number and a work permit, which allows immigrants to obtain driver's licenses and other state-regulated licenses, leading to access to jobs with certain degree of mobility and to participate in society's institutions and civic organizations. Undoubtedly, TPS has provided immigrants with certain opportunities to expand their economic and social contributions to society that undocumented immigrants do not have.

Salvadoran and Honduran TPS holders comprise over 80% of the TPS population; they also make up 16 % of the Salvadoran population and 11.5% of the Honduran population in the United States today. These two groups are also the national-origin groups with the longest TPS tenure—17 years for Hondurans and 16 years for Salvadorans. Noteworthy, they have lived in the United States for much longer, for an average of 20 years, since TPS registration required that applicants already reside in the United States at the time of application. And the TPS program does not allow new entrants; thus, everyone on TPS today registered during a specified time period when the countries were designated. With a median age for TPS holders of 42 years, the average TPS holder has spent one third of their lives on TPS. This long-term settlement has allowed these TPS holders to become dynamic members of their communities and active contributors to the nation's coffers.

Based on a national-level telephone survey of 2,098 respondents in the five U.S. regions with the largest concentration of Salvadoran and Honduran immigrants, this report presents their demographic profile, educational background, economic activities and contributions, community involvement, and some of the effects and benefits of having TPS in the United States.

Data Collection

We determined the population of Central Americans to survey for this study using the U.S. Census. With data from the U.S. Census we identified the largest concentrations of Salvadorans and Hondurans in the country, assuming that TPS holders would live in the same geographic areas. Thus, we selected the top six metropolitan areas with the largest populations of Salvadorans and Hondurans: Los Angeles, San Francisco, Houston, Washington D.C., New York and New Jersey. We did not select the Miami area because although it has a high concentration of Hondurans it has far fewer Salvadorans and TPS holders are not as represented in Miami as they are in the other regions of the survey.

Without a sampling frame from which to select a sample of TPS holders to survey in those regions, we turned to community organizations that work with Central American communities to enlist their assistance in this effort. They were critical in two ways: They provided lists of TPS holders from which we selected survey participants. Equally important, they also enrolled volunteers to conduct the survey. These organizations include the Central American Resource Center (CARECEN), Red Nacional de Salvadoreños en el Exterior (RENASE), and Wind of the Spirit. We also obtained assistance from Salvadoran consulates.

Some of these organizations, like CARECEN, provide legal services and assist individuals with TPS renewals every 18 months, maintaining lists of the people they serve. However, we also obtained assistance from community organizations that do not provide direct legal services to TPS holders; in these cases, they worked in collaboration with local Salvadoran consulates to select potential survey participants from list of registrants that the consulates maintain. The table below shows what organization participated in each city, indicating whether

they are a direct service organization, the total number of volunteers in each city, and the total number of surveys collected there.

Table 2. Data Collection Regional Dispersion

Region	Organization(s)	Total Volunteers	Total Surveys Collected
Los Angeles	CARECEN-LA (legal services provider)	16	715
	RENACE-LA (non-legal service provider)		
San Francisco	RENACE-SF (non-legal service provider)	4	198
Houston	CRECEN- Houston (legal services provider)	6	600
Washington D.C.	CARECEN-DC (legal services provider)	6	441
	RENACE-DC (non-legal service provider)		
New York	REANCE-NY (non-legal services provider)	2	103
Ney Jersey	Wind of the Spirit (non-legal service provider)	5	39

Each list of TPS holders was randomized and the selection proceeded with an interval=5, that is, every fifth name was selected, determined as an optimal N to be secured based on the total number of names on each list¹, a compromise on the selection procedure that can still allow us to conduct statistical analysis. The selected names were then placed on a calling list for the telephone survey. Volunteers, TPS holders themselves, who were trained in administering the survey as well as in human subjects protocols and the ethics of conducting research,² then called each person on the selected list and recorded whether the person participated, declined to participate, if a voicemail was left, or if that person was unreachable.

Potential participants who were marked as unreachable were tried again up to total of 3 attempts. If by the 3rd attempt the potential participant was still unreachable, they were taken off the calling list. Some potential participants doubted the legitimacy of the survey and visited the organization in person to verify that the request for participation was not a scam. These few individuals completed the survey in person. Furthermore, some organizations came across some obstacles to complete the survey over the phone and thus opted for interviewing individuals as they came to the organization to obtain assistance to renew their TPS.

For those who agreed to participate, a letter of consent describing their rights and including contact information for Dr. Cecilia Menjívar was read to them before beginning with the survey. Once the surveys were completed, they were mailed to the coordinator at CARECEN-Los Angeles to review for completeness. Once reviewed, the surveys were mailed to the University of Kansas for data entering and management.

1. Demographic Profile

Given that the goal of the survey was to capture the largest TPS population, 92.3% of the survey participants originated in El Salvador and 7.5% in Honduras. As indicated earlier, the

¹ The total number of TPS holders on the lists provided by the organizations and the Salvadoran consulate varied by city. For instance, CARECEN-Los Angeles had a total list of TPS holders of 1,225, thus we obtained more than half of those on the list. The list in Houston had 4,000 names; the 600 names we obtained there made up a small proportion of the total. We adopted the interval of 5 to select from all lists to avoid confusion across organizations.

² This study was approved by the University of Kansas Institutional Review Board and Dr. Cecilia Menjívar, assisted by Ana Garcia, from CARECEN-Los Angeles, conducted the trainings for the survey takers.

survey was conducted in five regions with large concentrations of these immigrants: Houston, Los Angeles, New York/New Jersey region, San Francisco, and the Washington D.C. region. However, the majority of the survey participants lived either in Houston (28.7%) or Los Angeles (34.1%), which conforms with settlement patterns of Salvadorans in the United States (Lopez 2015), who make up the majority of TPS holders.

Of the 2,098 survey participants, the majority (53.7%) were men. The median age of TPS holders in the study was 43 years (42 for men, 43 for women), a group older than both the undocumented population and the immigrant population with permanent legal status (both have a median age of 36.1 years) (Taylor, Lopez, and Motel 2011), and older than the U.S. population in general, with a median age of 37 years (Lopez 2015).³

Table 3. Demographic Profile

	Men	Women	Total
N	1,126	972	2,098
Age (Median)	42	43	43
Country of Origin			
El Salvador	93.0%	91.5%	92.3%
Honduras	6.7%	8.3%	7.5%
Nicaragua	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%
Interview Missing	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Years in the U.S.	19.9	20.8	20.3
City of Residency			
Houston	31.7%	25.2%	28.7%
Los Angeles	29.4%	39.5%	34.1%
New Jersey	2.0%	1.7%	1.9%
New York	5.6%	4.1%	4.9%
San Francisco	9.8%	9.1%	9.4%
Washington D.C.	21.6%	20.4%	21.0%

The majority of TPS holders were married (40.7% total), a rate lower than among the general U.S. population (48.2%) (U.S. Census Bureau 2015a). Among TPS holders, more men (44.2%) than women (36.6%) were married; the marriage rate for women among TPS holders is lower than that of women in the general U.S. population (46.5%) (U.S. Census Bureau 2015a). Overall, 36% of TPS holders were single, but this rate was higher among women (42%) than among men (30%). This is comparable to the general U.S. population, among whom 30% live in single-person households, but higher than legal immigrants (17%) and undocumented immigrants (13%) who live in single-person households (Immigration Council 2014; Passel and Cohn 2009). Thus, TPS holders have lower rates of marriage than the U.S.-born population, and also have higher rates of singlehood than the U.S.-born population, authorized immigrants, and undocumented immigrants.⁴

³ It should be kept in mind that TPS survey respondents are older (just their time on TPS adds a decade and a half to their age as TPS was not extended to immigrants under 18 years of age).

⁴ Conventionally, 'married and cohabiting' is coded as 'married'. We separated 'married' and 'cohabiting'.

About 13% of TPS holders were cohabiting, a pattern that was more common among men (16%) than among women (10%). These cohabiting patterns mirror those in the countries of origin as well as among Latinos in the United States.

With respect to family composition, most TPS survey participants (86.3%) had at least one child, but on average they had between two and three children. This rate is higher than among unauthorized immigrants (46%), authorized adult immigrant (38%), or among the U.S.-born population (29%) (Taylor et al. 2011), which may be related to TPS holders being older than any of the other comparison groups.

TPS Holders' Families

Table 4. Family Composition

		Men	Women	Total
N		1,126	972	2,098
Marital Status				
	Single	30.8%	42.0%	36.0%
	Married	44.2%	36.6%	40.7%
	Cohabiting	16.3%	10.0%	13.3%
	Divorced	4.8%	6.4%	5.5%
	Separated	2.8%	2.0%	2.4%
	Widow	1.0%	2.9%	1.9%
	Married, but cohabiting now	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
	Interview Missing	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Children				
	Yes	82.3%	90.8%	86.3%
	No	17.3%	9.0%	13.4%
	Interview Missing	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%
	<i>Number of Children</i>	2.7	2.9	2.8
<i>Location of Children</i>	Everyone lives in the US	57.9%	65.1%	61.2%
	Everyone lives in another country	9.5%	6.9%	8.3%
	Some here and some in another country	14.9%	18.4%	16.5%
	Interview Missing	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
	Not Applicable	17.7%	9.2%	13.7%
<i>Children under 21 years of age</i>	Yes	64.9%	58.0%	61.7%
	No	17.2%	32.4%	24.3%
	Interview Missing	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%
	Not Applicable	17.7%	9.2%	13.7%
<i>Children under 21 years of age living in another country</i>	Yes	11.5%	7.2%	9.5%
	No	48.1%	46.3%	47.3%
	Interview Missing	5.2%	4.5%	4.9%
	Not Applicable	35.1%	42.0%	38.3%
<i>Children in the United States</i>	Yes	60.5%	61.5%	61.0%
	No	20.7%	28.3%	24.2%
	Interview Missing	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
	Not Applicable	17.7%	9.2%	13.7%

Sixty-one percent of TPS respondents had all of their children living in the United States; however, women were slightly more likely to have all of their children living in the United States than were men. On the other hand, 24% of TPS holders had either some or all of their children living outside of the United States. Specifically, 9.5% of men and 6.9% of women had all of their children abroad, while 14.9% of men and 18.4% of women had at least one child living in a different country. Although the majority of participants' children living abroad were older than 21 years of age, we must take into account that the TPS holders' average time spent living in the United States is over a decade and a half. Therefore, the majority of TPS holders who have children living abroad most likely left their children while they were young. These parents have been separated from their children for a significant part of the children's lives. The long-term separations in these families and the uncertainty of not knowing when they will see each other again, has created conditions for TPS holders to create new families in the United States (Menjívar 2006). Many TPS holders live in mixed-status families, with 61% having at least one child born in the U.S. (among those with children). The length of time spent living in the U.S. (16 years among Hondurans and 15 years for Salvadorans) and the formation of these new families, with almost two thirds having a U.S.-born child, means that TPS holders are rooted and settled in the United States and socially integrated in their communities across the country.

2. Education

Table 5. Education

		Men	Women	Total
N		1,126	972	2,098
Educational grade obtained in country of origin		7.8	7.4	7.6
Educational Experience in U.S.				
	Yes	47.4%	51.3%	49.2%
	No	51.9%	48.6%	50.3%
	Interview Missing	0.7%	0.1%	0.4%
<i>Finished high school or has a GED</i>	Yes	10.1%	9.0%	9.6%
	No	30.1%	36.7%	33.2%
	Interview Missing	7.2%	5.7%	6.5%
	Not Applicable	52.6%	48.7%	50.8%
<i>Some college courses without graduating</i>	Yes	1.3%	1.9%	1.6%
	No	38.3%	43.5%	40.7%
	Interview Missing	7.8%	6.0%	7.0%
	Not Applicable	52.6%	48.7%	50.8%
<i>Certificate</i>	Yes	4.0%	6.0%	4.9%
	No	35.8%	39.6%	37.6%
	Interview Missing	7.6%	5.8%	6.8%
	Not Applicable	52.6%	48.7%	50.8%
<i>University title</i>	Yes	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%
	No	38.7%	44.2%	41.3%
	Interview Missing	7.8%	6.0%	7.0%
	Not Applicable	52.6%	48.7%	50.8%
<i>English courses</i>	Yes	35.1%	37.9%	36.4%
	No	11.9%	12.8%	12.3%
	Interview Missing	0.4%	0.7%	0.6%
	Not Applicable	52.6%	48.7%	50.8%

The average level of education TPS holders obtained in their country of origin before migration is between 7th and 8th grade, a reflection of the constraints to accessing education that prevail in the origin countries. However, about half of TPS holders continued some form of education after arriving in the United States. For instance, about 36.4% enrolled in English courses, 9.6% finished high school or obtained a GED, 4.9% obtained a certificate, and about 2.6% enrolled in some college or obtained a college degree. Whereas there are small differences between women and men's educational attainment, this gender variation is important to note because it may impact the jobs that TPS holders can obtain. Thus, women showed higher involvement in higher education, English classes or certificates than men, while slightly more men finished high school or their GED. The lower educational levels of TPS holders are comparable to those of Salvadorans living in the U.S., who tend to have lower education levels than other Latinos and other groups in the United States (Lopez 2015). The general educational levels for TPS holders are also similar to those of undocumented immigrants; in 2009, 47% of undocumented immigrant adults ages 25-64 had less than a high school education, compared to 8% of U.S.-born residents of the same age (Passel and Cohn 2009).

3. Economic Activities

Table 6. Economic Activities

		Men	Women	Total
N		1,126	972	2,098
Number of Previous Jobs		4.8	4.0	4.4
Current Working Status				
		Yes	82.1%	88.5%
		No	17.6%	11.2%
		Interview Missing	0.3%	0.3%
<i>Self-employed</i>	Yes	13.4%	7.8%	10.8%
	No	78.2%	71.5%	75.1%
	Interview Missing	2.3%	2.8%	2.5%
	Not Applicable	6.0%	17.9%	11.5%
<i>Number of Current Jobs</i>		1.1	1.2	1.1
<i>Working Hours per Week</i>	20 hours or less	2.6%	8.3%	5.2%
	21 -39 hours	5.1%	16.4%	10.3%
	40 - 45 hours	52.8%	43.4%	48.4%
	46 hours or more	30.5%	11.5%	21.7%
	Interview Missing	3.1%	2.5%	2.8%
	Not Applicable	6.0%	17.9%	11.5%
<i>Monthly Income</i>		\$3,598	\$2,054	\$2,910
Remittance				
		Yes	73.3%	76.7%
		No	24.8%	21.4%
		Interview Missing	2.0%	1.9%
<i>Remittance per month</i>		\$303	\$227	\$269

The U.S. labor force is made up of 133 million U.S.-born workers (83% of the total), 19.5 million lawful immigrant workers (12%), and 8 million unauthorized immigrant workers (5%) (Passel and Cohn 2016). Through the work permit TPS holders obtain as part of TPS benefits, they have been active in the labor force and have made significant contributions to the U.S.

economy (see Orrenius and Zavodny 2015). The overall labor force participation rate of TPS holders is 88.5%, much higher than the 62.9 % in the U.S. population (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2017). With regard to labor force participation by gender, the overwhelming majority of men TPS holders, 93.9%, are currently working. This rate is higher than any of the other comparison groups. For instance, 91% of undocumented immigrant men, 79% of U.S.-born men, and 84% of lawful immigrants of similar age were in the labor force in 2014 (Passel and Cohn 2016). Women TPS holders have similarly high levels of labor force participation; 82.1% of them are currently working, a rate also higher than among other comparison groups. For instance, 61% of undocumented immigrant women, 72% of U.S.-born women, and 67% of lawful immigrant women were in the labor force in 2014 (Passel and Cohn 2016). Thus, overall, TPS holders' labor force participation rate is significantly higher than that of the general U.S. population and higher than among other immigrant groups, both authorized and undocumented.

93.9% men TPS holders and **82.1%** women are currently working, a higher rate than any other comparison group.

Reflecting their active labor force participation both women and men TPS holders have had between 4 and 5 jobs since they arrived to the United States. The majority of TPS holders only have one job at present; 85% of men and 71.1% of women had one job at the time of the survey. However, among those who had more than one job, there is a gender difference: More women (8.6% of women) than men (6.6%) had two jobs. This difference could be due to the fact that women have a higher rate of part-time work and thus they often stitch together various jobs in order to earn what full-time work would generate, a situation observed in other immigrant-receiving contexts (see Menjívar 2000).

Men TPS holders make approximately \$3,597.64 a month while women make \$2,054, a monthly income that is slightly higher than that of other Hispanics (Lopez 2015), but considerably less than median U.S. earnings. According to the ACS, the median annual household income is \$53,889, which works out to approximately \$4,500 a month (U.S. Census Bureau 2015c). And although TPS holders work in a variety of sectors and occupations, there are concentrations by gender. For instance, 23% men concentrate in construction; almost 14% work in driving and delivery, and approximately 8% work as dishwashers or cleaning offices or buildings. However, approximately 25.7% of men reported an “other” occupation, which comprises factory work. Among women, almost 17% work cleaning offices or buildings, approximately 18% work in childcare or cleaning houses, and close to 23% reported “other” occupations.

TPS holders are likely to put in long hours at work. While the majority work between 40-45 hours per week, women are more likely to work part-time; 24.7% of women worked 39 hours or less compared to only 8% of men. And men are more likely than women to work overtime (we define overtime as 46 hours of work per week). Thus, 52.75% of men reported working between 40 and 45 hours a week and 43.42% of women reported working those hours. In comparison, in the U.S. population in general, in 2015 the average

TPS holders have held between 4 to 5 jobs since arriving in the U.S.

number of hours men worked was 41 hours whereas women worked 36.2 hours per week (Pew Research Center 2016).

TPS holders remit regularly, contributing to their families and to maintain their countries' economies afloat. Approximately 77% of all TPS holders send remittances to their home country. Men send on average \$303 per month and women send on average \$226 per month. The lower remitted amount by women likely reflects their lower earnings. However, while men send approximately 8% of their monthly wages, women remit about 11% of their monthly earnings.

Table 7. Current Job/Occupation

	Men	Women	Total
N	1,126	972	2,098
Current Job			
Agriculture	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%
Cook	3.9%	5.2%	4.5%
Dishwasher	0.7%	0.9%	0.8%
Waiter	0.9%	1.6%	1.2%
Construction/ Painter	23.0%	0.8%	12.7%
Cleaning in offices/ buildings/school/hospital/restaurant/hotel	7.1%	16.7%	11.5%
Nurse	0.3%	1.9%	1.0%
Eldercare	0.2%	1.9%	1.0%
Receptionist	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%
Plumber	1.5%	0.1%	0.9%
Stylist/barber	0.4%	1.1%	0.7%
Car mechanic	2.7%	0.0%	1.4%
Electrician	2.3%	0.0%	1.2%
Gardener	3.4%	0.5%	2.0%
Childcare	0.3%	6.6%	3.2%
Cleaning houses	0.2%	11.2%	5.3%
Factory of clothes/ stockings/ accessories	1.5%	4.0%	2.7%
Worker at a store/supermarket	2.5%	3.8%	3.1%
Warehouse	2.7%	2.4%	2.5%
Driving/Delivery	13.7%	1.1%	7.9%
Other	25.7%	21.7%	23.8%
Currently not working	5.3%	14.5%	9.6%
Interview Missing	1.3%	3.1%	2.1%

One of the most significant benefits of having TPS is obtaining a work permit. As Orrenius and Zavodny (2015) found, having TPS had a significant impact on Salvadorans' labor force participation. Looking at pre- and post-TPS Salvadorans, the authors examined whether obtaining TPS aids Salvadorans in obtaining better wages or having better jobs compared to other Salvadorans who are not eligible for TPS and are undocumented. Orrenius and Zavodny's (2015) findings show that TPS leads to higher earnings for men and higher employment for women. Specifically, employed Salvadoran men with TPS are likely to earn about 13% more than those who do not have TPS. Furthermore, TPS holders are able to be more selective in the kinds of jobs they secure. Women who are employed and have TPS are also likely to work more than women who do not have TPS. Thus, as Orrenius and Zavodny found, even having a temporary permit increases the likelihood of better wages and employment. The findings we report here are consistent with this earlier conclusion.

Table 8. Workplace Violations

	Men	Women	Total
N	1,126	972	2,098
Your boss did not pay you on time in the last 12 months			
Yes	7.2%	6.9%	7.1%
No	88.5%	85.3%	87.0%
Interview Missing	4.3%	7.8%	5.9%
Your boss paid you less in the last 12 months			
Yes	10.6%	10.9%	10.7%
No	84.6%	81.1%	83.0%
Interview Missing	4.8%	8.0%	6.3%
Your boss owe you now for your work in the last 12 months			
Yes	3.7%	1.6%	2.8%
<i>How much?</i>	\$2,162	\$512	\$1,832
No	91.7%	90.0%	90.9%
Interview Missing	4.5%	8.3%	6.3%
You had injury in the last 12 months			
Yes	5.9%	7.1%	6.4%
No	90.9%	86.2%	88.7%
Interview Missing	3.3%	6.7%	4.9%
You had to leave your job due to an injury in the last 12 months			
Yes	2.2%	3.3%	2.7%
No	92.2%	88.4%	90.4%
Interview Missing	5.6%	8.3%	6.9%

Thus, although TPS has had positive effects, particularly on its beneficiaries' ability to secure employment and better paying jobs, it should be noted that TPS holders remain susceptible to worker exploitation. Temporary statuses are sometimes little understood, in government offices as well as in the workplace; often employers mistakenly understand TPS to be undocumented status because beneficiaries cannot show a green card. As such, some employers assume that it is a status incompatible with workers' rights even though all workers have rights. Thus, misunderstandings about a temporary legal status may leave TPS workers vulnerable to mistreatment in the workplace. In this survey, about 7% of TPS holders mentioned that their boss did not pay them on time in the 12 months prior to the survey, and almost 11% indicated that their boss paid them less than what they were supposed to be paid. About 6.4% described having an injury at work, and fewer than 3% described having to leave their job due to an injury in the 12 months prior to the survey. Finally about 2.8% of the respondents described that their boss owed them wages. Workplace violations that we identified among TPS respondents are similar those that undocumented immigrants have been found to experience (see

Hall and Greenman 2015). For instance, in a national study of workplace violations in several occupations and economic sectors, Bernhardt et al. (2009) found that foreign-born Latino workers had the highest minimum wage violation rates of any racial or ethnic group.

4. Taxes & Contributions

- **80.3%** of TPS holders pay income taxes, including **79.3%** of those who are self-employed.
- **90%** file taxes every year.

Table 9. Taxes and Contributions

		Men	Women	Total
N		1,126	972	2,098
Pay Social Security				
<i>Among the employed</i>	Yes	80.9%	79.4%	80.3%
	No	14.0%	16.2%	14.9%
	Interview Missing	5.1%	4.4%	4.8%
<i>Among the self-employed</i>	Yes	82.1%	73.7%	79.3%
	No	7.9%	6.6%	7.5%
	Interview Missing	9.9%	19.7%	13.2%
<i>Years of paying Social Security</i>		15.8	14.9	15.4
Pay Income Tax				
2015	Yes	95.1%	89.9%	92.7%
	No	3.6%	7.7%	5.5%
	Interview Missing	1.2%	2.4%	1.8%
2014	Yes	93.7%	87.7%	90.9%
	No	3.3%	6.8%	4.9%
	Interview Missing	3.0%	5.6%	4.2%
2013	Yes	94.4%	87.9%	91.4%
	No	2.6%	6.8%	4.5%
	Interview Missing	3.0%	5.3%	4.1%

TPS holders have contributed to social security for an avg. of 15.4 years.

The overwhelming majority of TPS holders, 80.3%, pay income taxes, including 79.3% of those who are self-employed. And TPS holders have contributed to social security for an average of 15.4 years, making contributions since they obtained TPS status. And 90% of TPS holders reported having filed income taxes every year in the three years prior to the survey. The ability to pay taxes and make more contributions to the nation’s coffers that a more stable legal status affords translates into contributions to the economy. It also represents a social investment that TPS holders are able to make as they become more socioeconomically integrated in society.

5. Health Insurance

76.5% of TPS holders have medical insurance through their job, a family member, the Affordable Care Act, or other sources.

TPS also allows access to medical health insurance. In our survey 76.5% of TPS holders had some form of medical insurance. The majority (38.3%) obtained insurance through their job, others acquired coverage through their partners (5%) or through their parents (.2%), the Affordable Care Act (7.7%), or other sources (24.7%). The percentage of uninsured TPS holders (22.3%) is more than double that of the uninsured in the general population ages 18-64 in the U.S. (12.8%) (Center for Disease Control and Prevention 2016). According to the ACS, 81.9% of adults between 18 and 64 are insured (85.7% men and 88.3% women) (U.S. Census Bureau 2015b). Importantly, the proportion of uninsured TPS holders (22.3%) in our survey is similar to the proportion of uninsured lawful permanent residents (23%) in 2014 (post-ACA), lower than among the undocumented (40%) (as the undocumented are ineligible to purchase coverage through the ACA or other forms of medical insurance), but higher than among U.S. citizens (10%) (Artiga et al. 2016). Therefore, reflecting their ‘in-between’ status, rates of insured TPS holders fall between those of the undocumented and the general U.S. population.

Access to health care is another area where TPS provides a benefit to the individuals and alleviates pressure on the health care system. By allowing TPS holders access to the opportunity to purchase health coverage they become insured. Thus, access to health insurance serves as a preventive measure. For instance, only 15% of TPS holders in this study had been in the emergency room in the 12 months prior to the survey interview. This rate varies by gender, as more women (20%) than men (10.7%) had been to the emergency room in the last 12 months prior to the interview.

Table 10. Health Insurance

		Men	Women	Total	
N		1,126	972	2,098	
Medical Insurance					
		Yes	75.0%	78.3%	76.5%
		No	23.5%	20.8%	22.3%
		Interview Missing	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%
<i>Source of Insurance</i>	My work	44.0%	31.7%	38.3%	
	My husband/wife	3.3%	6.9%	5.0%	
	Mother/father	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	
	Obama Care	6.8%	8.6%	7.7%	
	Other	20.0%	30.2%	24.7%	
	Interview Missing	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	
	Not Applicable	25.0%	21.7%	23.5%	
Emergency room visit in the last 12 months					
		Yes	10.7%	20.0%	15.0%
		No	86.7%	78.1%	82.7%
		Interview Missing	2.6%	2.0%	2.3%

6. Community Settlement and Involvement

An important indicator of immigrant settlement in the country is homeownership. Homeownership is a marker of economic mobility and incorporation; it also signals social embeddedness, membership, and a commitment to the neighborhood, city and country, as homeowners are considered to be connected members of their communities (Castillo 2014). Homeownership conveys the will to create a permanent group and stable social relations (Bourdieu 2005). And as Castillo (2014) observes, homeownership is deeply rooted in American culture, and for immigrants it may create better opportunities for themselves and their families. For TPS holders then homeownership is an economic indicator but also a sign of belonging and membership. Almost 32% of TPS holders in our survey own their home, which is half of the proportion of homeowners in the general U.S. population (64%) and slightly less than Hispanic homeowners (38%) (Lopez 2015). Furthermore, research has shown that undocumented immigrants are less likely to own a home (McConnell 2015) than documented immigrants (Hall and Greenman 2013). Given that TPS is a temporary status, therefore, the fact that one third of TPS holders own a home means that this group seeks to be part of U.S. society and to be active members of their communities.

31.9% of TPS holders own their home.

Table 11. Homeownership

	Men	Women	Total
N	1,126	972	2,098
Home Ownership			
Yes	33.6%	29.9%	31.9%
No	63.8%	68.4%	65.9%
Interview Missing	2.7%	1.6%	2.2%

They also pay property taxes and contribute in other ways that come with owning a home. Thus, it is not a coincidence that about 30% of TPS holders are actively involved in their communities, through neighborhood organizations (3.7%), their children's schools (9.8%), church (17.4%), work organizations or events (2.6%), sports teams (3.5%), or other activities (2.4%). Community involvement is more common among women (32.3%) than among men (27.4%), especially in children's schools or church. Indeed, the community involvement of TPS holders as a whole is slightly higher than that of the general U.S. population. According to a 2016 Bureau of Labor Statistics report, 24.9% of the U.S. population reported volunteering for an organization, and U.S. women volunteer at a higher rate than men, with 27.8% of women stating that they volunteer compared with 21.8% among men (U.S. Department of Labor 2016).

30% of TPS holders are civically active in neighborhood and work associations, schools, sports teams, or other activities.

About 20% of TPS holders participate in community service, such as volunteering in nonprofit organizations or in other service activities like children's hospitals. Their community involvement also includes activities that support immigrants' rights, such as rallies, informative forums, or petitions (26%). Yet, this form of participation is slightly more common among men (27.4%) than among women (24.2%).

Table 12. Community Settlement and Involvement

		Men	Women	Total
N		1,126	972	2,098
Participate in community organization				
	Yes	27.4%	32.3%	29.7%
	No	70.6%	65.8%	68.4%
	Interview Missing	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%
	<i>Years of participation</i>	9.4	9.1	9.3
<i>Community or neighborhood</i>	Yes	3.6%	3.9%	3.7%
	No	23.8%	28.4%	25.9%
	Interview Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	No Applicable	72.6%	67.7%	70.3%
<i>Children's school</i>	Yes	6.6%	13.5%	9.8%
	No	20.6%	18.8%	19.8%
	Interview Missing	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%
	No Applicable	72.6%	67.7%	70.3%
<i>Church</i>	Yes	14.8%	20.4%	17.4%
	No	12.5%	11.9%	12.2%
	Interview Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	No Applicable	72.6%	67.7%	70.3%
<i>Work</i>	Yes	2.4%	2.9%	2.6%
	No	24.6%	29.0%	26.6%
	Interview Missing	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
	No Applicable	72.6%	67.7%	70.3%
<i>Sports team</i>	Yes	4.7%	2.1%	3.5%
	No	22.6%	30.1%	26.1%
	Interview Missing	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
	No Applicable	72.6%	67.7%	70.3%
<i>Other</i>	Yes	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%
	No	24.9%	29.6%	27.1%
	Interview Missing	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
	No Applicable	72.6%	67.7%	70.3%
Community Service				
	Yes	20.9%	19.4%	20.2%
	No	75.2%	76.9%	76.0%
	Interview Missing	3.9%	3.7%	3.8%
Working for immigrants' right				
	Yes	27.4%	24.2%	25.9%
	No	69.2%	72.5%	70.7%
	Interview Missing	3.4%	3.3%	3.3%

7. Effects of TPS

In general, TPS has brought significant benefits to the TPS holders. Compared to the undocumented population, TPS has meant an increase in quality of life, higher incomes, better jobs, and higher rates of homeownership, among other indicators of integration and well-being. This has translated into benefits for families and communities and society as a whole; as it has allowed TPS holders to actively contribute to society economically, socially, and culturally. It also allows TPS holders to pay for their own medical insurance and to increase their tax contributions through homeownership, formal employment, and entrepreneurial activities. Thus, one of the most significant benefits of TPS is obtaining a work permit albeit for 18 months at a time. Therefore, benefits go beyond the economic gains of better employment and higher pay. TPS allows its beneficiaries to progress toward worker rights and protections, an important benefit that impacts all workers who labor alongside TPS holders, regardless of legal status or citizenship status. For instance, after obtaining TPS, 56.7% of survey participants were able to get a new job, and over half of those job changes involved getting a better job. And approximately 78% of TPS holders described better job opportunities as a direct benefit of TPS, with more men (81.6%) than women (73.8%) stating that their job opportunities improved after obtaining TPS. And about 12% of TPS holders were able to start their own business, with men reporting a higher rate of business ownership (14.2%) than women (9.6%).

Table 13. Effects of TPS

		Men	Women	Total
N		1,126	972	2,098
Years of TPS		15.4	15.3	15.3
Change a job after TPS				
Yes		60.7%	52.1%	56.7%
No		37.8%	44.8%	41.0%
Interview Missing		1.4%	3.2%	2.2%
<i>Got a better job</i>	Yes	58.5%	48.8%	54.0%
	No	2.2%	3.0%	2.6%
	Interview Missing	0.00%	0.3%	0.1%
	Not Applicable	39.2%	48.0%	43.3%
Benefit from TPS				
<i>Better job opportunities</i>		81.6%	73.8%	78.0%
<i>Better pay</i>		52.3%	41.6%	47.3%
<i>Opportunity to open my own business</i>		14.2%	9.6%	12.1%
<i>Less fear and worry for me</i>		47.0%	46.8%	46.9%
<i>Less fear and worry for my family</i>		34.0%	37.4%	35.6%
<i>More security for me</i>		67.5%	67.0%	67.3%
<i>More security for my family</i>		38.0%	37.0%	37.6%
<i>Easier to use medical services</i>		21.7%	21.7%	21.7%
<i>Being able to travel and visit my family</i>		27.3%	21.7%	24.7%
<i>Driver's license</i>		18.3%	15.6%	17.1%
<i>Other</i>		26.6%	27.0%	26.8%

Another critical benefit of TPS is relief from deportation, which translates into lower levels of anxiety and fear deportation. Research has shown that this fear can affect individuals and their families in multiple ways, including their physical and mental health (Aranda et al. 2014; Brabeck et al. 2015; Capps et al. 2015; De Genova 2002; Dreby 2015; Gonzales and

Chavez 2012; Menjívar and Abrego 2012; Yoshikawa, Suárez-Orozco, and Gonzales 2016). As such, our survey participants noted that TPS has helped decrease their fears and worries related to deportation for themselves (46.9%) and their family members (35.6%), which leads to a sense of certain stability in these families, in spite of the insecurity that comes from the renewals required to maintain this status. And approximately 67.5% of TPS holders stated that TPS has provided them with security for themselves or their families (37.6%).

Finally, survey participants noted that TPS has allowed them to obtain driver's licenses, which translates into a benefit for themselves, their families, and society in general. For instance, they are able to purchase car insurance, to drive without fear and safely, to have more freedom of movement to get to jobs that pay better or to attend their children's school or extracurricular activities, and to drive for a living as many TPS holders do on a daily basis.

Final Considerations and Recommendations

TPS has been critical and significantly beneficial for those who hold this status. As this report has shown, this legal status has elevated the quality of life of its recipients, and through these improvements, TPS also has had positive effects on these immigrants' family members, co-workers, neighbors, and coreligionists. In this report we have demonstrated, through contrasts with comparable groups such as undocumented immigrants, authorized residents, and the general U.S. population, the benefits that accrue to this legal status.

The comparisons we have made to immigrants in other legal statuses as well as to the U.S. population as a whole also highlight two fundamental aspects of his status: in-between and temporary. Thus, TPS holders' in-between legal status is reflected in their in-between conditions, as they generally do better than undocumented immigrants on the various indicators discussed in this report but not as well as those immigrants who are authorized or naturalized, or the U.S. population in general. As such, TPS represents a step in the right direction. It positions its beneficiaries in a favorable *starting* position in the process of integration, but this process is truncated as these immigrants quickly encounter a legal ceiling that precludes them from advancing further. For instance, in further analyses conducted based on data collected for this survey, a critical bifurcation was identified: TPS holders with higher levels of education do not earn commensurate earnings to their educational level; their earnings are similar to those of TPS holders with lower levels of education, other things being equal. In spite of this mismatch between education and earnings, TPS holders participate actively in civic society, which increases with time in the United States (Oh, Menjívar, Alvord and Agadjanian n.d.). Thus, TPS holders are *de facto* citizens and active members of their communities but lack full *de jure* recognition.

This legal ambiguity has repercussions for the individuals with TPS but also for their families and communities. Although TPS has allowed individual holders to acquire a measure of economic advancement and to gain partial formal integration, it does not allow for the integration of their families as TPS holders are prohibited from petitioning for family members. And although TPS has lessened the constant fear of deportation for its beneficiaries, this fear has not fully disappeared. Indeed, it has resurfaced with force in recent weeks with news reports of an expansion of detention and deportation of immigrants holding temporary statutes, such as DACA, and thus thought to have more secure statuses.

TPS also brings a measure of equity as individuals on this status are closer to feeling more equal to others—in owning a home or renting, when getting paid on time for a day of work, when seeking employment, when driving their kids to school—in general, when doing the routine activities of others who know their rights. Thus, the benefits go beyond the individual.

TPS holders have already fulfilled many of the requirements for legal permanent residence—the overwhelming majority holds at least one job; they pay taxes and purchase their own insurance; they have clean criminal records (these checks are required with every renewal); and have demonstrated that they have the will to belong and become full members of society through homeownership and raising children in the United States. Many also have continued to advance educationally. Thus, whereas TPS grants temporary relief, it is not ideal to live in uncertain legality for 15 years (but often longer), especially when those in this status are already *de facto* members of society. This report has demonstrated the benefits that can ensue from legality, even temporary; it also has shown that moving these immigrants to permanent legal residence would be even more beneficial for the immigrants, their families, and for U.S. society in general.

References

- Abrego, Leisy J. and Sarah M. Lakhani. 2015. "Incomplete Inclusion: Legal Violence and Immigrants in Liminal Legal Statuses." *Law & Policy* 37(4):265–93.
- Aranda, Elizabeth, Cecilia Menjívar, and Katharine M. Donato. 2014. "The Spillover Consequences of an Enforcement-First U.S. Immigration Regime." *American Behavioral Scientist* 58(13):1687–95.
- Argueta, Carla N. and Ruth Ellen Wasem. 2016. *Temporary Protected Status: Current Immigration Policy and Issues*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved March 10, 2017 (<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/RS20844.pdf>).
- Artiga, Samantha, Anthony Damico, Katherine Young, Elizabeth Cornachione, and Rachel Garfield. 2016. *Health Coverage and Care for Immigrants*. The Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured. Retrieved May 16, 2017 (<http://files.kff.org/attachment/issue-brief-health-coverage-and-care-for-immigrants>).
- Bergeron, Claire. 2014. "Temporary Protected Status after 25 Years: Addressing the Challenge of Long-Term 'Temporary' Residents and Strengthening a Centerpiece of US Humanitarian Protection." *Journal of Migration and Human Security* 2(1):22–43.
- Brabeck, Kalina, Erin Silbey, Patricia Taubin, and Angela Murcia. 2015. "The Influence of Immigrant Parent Legal Status on U.S.-Born Children's Academic Abilities: The Moderating Effects of Social Service Use." *Applied Developmental Science* 1–13.
- Brabeck, Kalina and Qingwen Xu. 2010. "The Impact of Detention and Deportation on Latino Immigrant Children and Families: A Quantitative Exploration." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 32(3):341–61.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2017. *Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey*. Washington, DC. Retrieved March 9, 2017 (<https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNS11300000>).
- Capps, Randy et al. 2015. *Implications of Immigrant Enforcement Activities for the Well-Being of Children in Immigrant Families*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved March 14, 2017 (<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/implications-immigration-enforcement-activities-well-being-children-immigrant-families>).
- Castillo, Esther. 2014. "Keys to Achieving the American Dream among Mexican Immigrants: The Roles of Homeownership, Naturalization, and Racial Identity." University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA. Retrieved March 9, 2017 (<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5t07506b>).
- Cebulko, Kara B. 2014. "Documented, Undocumented, and Liminal Legal: Legal Status During the Transition to Adulthood for 1.5- Generation Brazilian Immigrants." *The Sociological Quarterly* 55(1):143–67.

- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. 2016. *Health Insurance Coverage*. Washington, DC. Retrieved December 20, 2016 (<https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/health-insurance.htm>).
- Chishti, Muzaffar and Stephen Yale-Loehr. 2016. *The Immigration Act of 1990: Unfinished Business a Quarter-Century Later*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved March 9, 2017 (www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/1990-Act_2016_FINAL.pdf).
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2002. "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31(1):419–47.
- Dreby, Joanna. 2012. "The Burden of Deportation on Children in Mexican Immigrant Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74(4):829–45.
- Dreby, Joanna. 2015. *Everyday Illegal: When Policies Undermine Immigrant Families*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Joan. 2000. "Temporary Protection of Refugees: Elements of a Formalized Regime." *The American Journal of International Law* 94(2):279–306.
- Golay, Yann. 2001. "How Temporary Is Temporary Protection? La Protection Temporaire" Un Provisoire Appele a Durer?" *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 20(2):141–52.
- Gonzales, Roberto. 2016. *Lives in Limbo: Undocumented and Coming of Age in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gonzales, Roberto and Leo R. Chavez. 2012. "Awakening to a Nightmare:" Abjectivity and Illegality in the Lives of Undocumented 1.5-Generation Latino Immigrants in the United States." *Current Anthropology* 53(3):255–81.
- Hagan, Jacqueline, Brianna Castro, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2010. "The Effects of U.S. Deportation Policies on Immigrant Families and Communities: Cross-Border Perspectives." *North Carolina Law Review* 88:1800–1824.
- Hasselberg, Ines. 2016. *Enduring Uncertainty: Deportation, Punishment and Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Immigration Council. 2014. *Unauthorized Immigrants Today: A Demographic Profile*. Washington, DC. Retrieved January 23, 2017 (https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/profile_of_the_unauthorized_ii_final_1_0.pdf).
- Kerwin, Donald M. 2014. "Creating a More Responsive and Seamless Refugee Protection System: The Scope, Promise and Limitations of US Temporary Protection Programs." *Journal of Migration and Human Security* 2(1):44–72.
- Lopez, Gustavo. 2015. *Hispanics of Salvadoran Origin in the United States, 2013*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved March 9, 2017

- (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/15/hispanics-of-salvadoran-origin-in-the-united-states-2013/>).
- Magaña-Salgado, Jose. 2016. *Relief Not RAids: Temporary Protected Status for El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras*. Washington, DC: Immigrant Legal Resource Center. Retrieved May 16, 2017 (https://www.ilrc.org/sites/default/files/resources/01-13-2016_relief_not_raids_-_immigrant_legal_resource_center.pdf).
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2000. *Fragmented Ties: Salvadorian Immigrant Networks in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2006. “Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants’ Lives in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111(4):999–1037.
- Menjívar, Cecilia and Leisy J. Abrego. 2012. “Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants.” *American Journal of Sociology* 117(5):1380–1421.
- Orrenius, Pia M. and Madeline Zavodny. 2015. “The Impact of Temporary Protected Status on Immigrants’ Labor Market Outcomes.” *American Economic Review* 105(5):576–80.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and D’Vera Cohn. 2009. *A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved March 9, 2017 (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/107.pdf>).
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and D’Vera Cohn. 2016. *Size of U.S. Unauthorized Immigrant Workforce Stable After the Great Recession*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved March 14, 2017 (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/11/03/size-of-u-s-unauthorized-immigrant-workforce-stable-after-the-great-recession/>).
- Segerblom, Eva. 2007. “Temporary Protected Status: An Immigration Statute That Redefines Traditional Notions of Status and Temporariness.” *Nevada Law Journal* 7:664–85.
- Seghetti, Lisa, Karma Ester, and Ruth Ellen Wasem. 2015. *Temporary Protected Status: Current Immigration Policy and Issues*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved December 14, 2016 (http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/1461).
- Taylor, Paul, Mark Hugo Lopez, and Seth Motel. 2011. *Unauthorized Immigrants: Length of Residency, Patterns of Parenthood*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved March 14, 2017 (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/12/01/unauthorized-immigrants-length-of-residency-patterns-of-parenthood/>).
- United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). 2014. *Guidelines on Temporary Protection or Stay Arrangements*. Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved March 14, 2017 (<http://www.unhcr.org/5304b71c9.pdf>).

- United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. 2017. *Temporary Protected Status*. Washington, DC. Retrieved March 20, 2017 (<https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status>).
- Waters, Mary and Marisa Gernstein Pineau. 2016. *The Integration of Immigrants into American Society*. Washington, DC: National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu, Carola Suárez-Orozco, and Roberto Gonzales. 2016. “Unauthorized Status and Youth Development in the United States: Consensus Statement of the Society for Research on Adolescence.” *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 1–16.