

Sabet, Navid; Winter, Christoph

**Working Paper**

## Immigrant Legalization and the Redistribution of State Funds: Evidence from the 1986 IRCA

CESifo Working Paper, No. 10787

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

*Suggested Citation:* Sabet, Navid; Winter, Christoph (2023) : Immigrant Legalization and the Redistribution of State Funds: Evidence from the 1986 IRCA, CESifo Working Paper, No. 10787, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/282475>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

**Immigrant Legalization and  
the Redistribution of State  
Funds: Evidence from the  
1986 IRCA**

*Navid Sabet, Christoph Winter*

## **Impressum:**

CESifo Working Papers

ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)

Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH

The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute

Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany

Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email [office@cesifo.de](mailto:office@cesifo.de)

Editor: Clemens Fuest

<https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: [www.SSRN.com](http://www.SSRN.com)
- from the RePEc website: [www.RePEc.org](http://www.RePEc.org)
- from the CESifo website: <https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

# Immigrant Legalization and the Redistribution of State Funds: Evidence from the 1986 IRCA

## Abstract

We study the impact of immigrant legalization on fiscal transfers from state to local governments in the United States, exploiting variation in legal status from the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). State governments allocate more resources to IRCA counties, an allocation that is responsive to the electoral incentives of the governor. Importantly, the effect emerges prior to the enfranchisement of the IRCA migrants and we argue it is driven by the IRCA's capacity to politically empower already legal Hispanic migrants in mixed legal status communities. The IRCA increases turnout in large Hispanic communities as well as Hispanic political engagement, without triggering anti-migrant sentiment.

JEL-Codes: J150, H720, P160.

Keywords: distributive politics, state and local government, immigrant legalization.

*Navid Sabet\**  
*Faculty of Economics and Business*  
*Goethe University Frankfurt*  
*Theodor-W.-Adorno-Platz 4*  
*Germany – 60629 Frankfurt*  
*sabet@econ.uni-frankfurt.de*

*Christoph Winter*  
*christophwinter@me.com*

\*corresponding author

This Version: November 14, 2023

## 1. Introduction

Legal status has first order economic consequences on the lives of individual migrants and on the communities in which they reside. Immigrant legalization has been shown, for example, to have significant consequences on labor market outcomes (Kossoudji and Cobb-Clark 2002; Pan 2012; Rivera-Batiz 1999), educational outcomes (Cortes 2013; Sabet 2023), crime (Pinotti 2017), safety net transfers (Cascio and Lewis 2019) and congressional redistricting and Hispanic political representation (Sabet and Yuchtman 2023). Less attention, however, has been paid to understanding the impact of legal status on fiscal transfers. This is particularly surprising given the rich literature that establishes the politically motivated fiscal responses to changes in political rights brought about by enfranchisement (Cascio and Washington 2014; Miller 2008).

In this paper, we aim at filling this gap by analyzing the impact of immigrant legalization on fiscal transfers from state to local governments in the United States. To do so, we exploit variation in legal status arising out of the historic 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) which legalized millions of mostly Hispanic migrants across US counties. To identify our model, we rely on the fact undocumented migrants are already included in US census counts (Sabet and Yuchtman 2023; Sabet 2023). The IRCA thus shocked the legal status of millions of Hispanic migrants without triggering wider socio-economic change, enabling us to isolate the impact of immigrant legalization on fiscal transfers.<sup>1</sup>

Using a differences-in-differences regression framework, we compare the distribution of intergovernmental revenue (IGR) from state to local governments across US counties with differential exposure to the IRCA before and after 1989, the first year when IRCA applicants acquired legal status. Our baseline estimate suggests that a one standard deviation increase in the share of IRCA applicants in a county increases per capita IGR by 6 percent relative to the pre-legalization IGR mean. The result is robust to a wide range of alternative specifications and samples and is not reflective of differential pre-trends.

An important question is the extent to which the fiscal response reflects discretionary political choices as opposed to mechanical forces. To distinguish these explanations, we test for heterogeneous effects according to the political circumstances of the state governor and find a clear pattern: IRCA counties attract differentially more resources from the state when the governor is eligible for reelection. The effect vanishes when the governor is ineligible to run for office because of term limits. By contrast, partisan affiliation, of either the state governor or the state legislature, has no differential effect on state transfers. These results suggest that the electoral incentives of state governors, rather than partisan considerations, drive our results.

Importantly, the IRCA provided legal status — that is, lawful permanent residency but without the full rights of citizenship — to nearly all those who applied for it. Five years after permanent residency, those legalized by the IRCA could acquire voting rights through

---

1. Both Sabet and Yuchtman (2023) and Sabet (2023) demonstrate that the IRCA is not associated with significant changes, in levels or trends, in a wide range of county socio-economic covariates.

naturalization. This unique feature of the IRCA allows us to decouple the effect of legal status from enfranchisement in our analysis and we find that legalization positively predicts transfers *prior to enfranchisement*.<sup>2</sup> We argue that legal status attracts more resources from the state even in the absence of enfranchisement because of its capacity to politically empower already legal Hispanic citizens in communities of mixed legal status. We support this claim with a number of pieces of evidence.

First, we find that the IRCA increases turnout significantly in communities with larger, *pre-existing* shares of legal Hispanic migrants. What is more, we split the sample according to the size of the pre-existing legal Hispanic population and find that the IRCA has a significant effect on fiscal transfers only in the sample of counties with above median populations of already legal Hispanic migrants. Second, relying on individual survey data, we find that the IRCA leads Hispanics to report significantly higher levels of political engagement and participation post-legalization, including a higher likelihood of volunteering for, donating to, and participating in political campaigns. Both whites and Hispanics residing in high-IRCA counties are significantly more likely to receive contact by a political party in the lead up to an election, suggesting that the legalization is a relevant factor in the outreach efforts of political parties. We find no evidence of increased anti-migrant sentiment as a result of the IRCA. Together, these results suggest that the IRCA increased political mobilization without triggering nativist backlash.

Our work offers two main contributions. First, we add to the literature on the economics of legal status. This scholarship has documented the effect of legalization on a range of social and economic outcomes including education, earnings, employment, language skills, safety net transfers, and crime (Kossoudji and Cobb-Clark 2002; Rivera-Batiz 1999; Pan 2012; Cascio and Lewis 2019; Cortes 2013; Sabet 2023; Freedman, Owens, and Bohn 2018; Pinotti 2017). Other papers have examined the political consequences of immigrant legalization on such outcomes as congressional redistricting (Sabet and Yuchtman 2023) and Hispanic representation on school boards (Sabet 2023). We add to this literature by examining the impact of legalization on fiscal transfers. Additionally, by examining how political participation is affected by the IRCA, we are able to shed light on some of the important ways in which legalization spills over to affect the political participation of communities of mixed legal status.

Second, our paper contributes to the literature that examines the economic consequences of the expansion of voter franchise. This scholarship has examined the extension, or the de-facto extension, of voting rights to such groups as women (Miller 2008), African Americans (Cascio and Washington 2014), young people (Bertocchi et al. 2020) and lesser educated citizens (Fujiwara 2015). While similar in spirit to these papers, our point of departure is to separate the effect of immigrant legalization from immigrant enfranchisement in explaining the distribution of resources. We argue that the effects of the former are more far-reaching than the latter

---

2. One consideration is whether elected politicians *anticipated* the eventual enfranchisement of the newly legalized in their allocation decisions. By 2000, however, just one third of the legalized had naturalized (Rytina 2002), making actual or potential enfranchisement an unlikely explanation for our results.

because legal status lifts barriers of social exclusion not just for the undocumented but for their communities and family networks.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 briefly discusses the historical background of the IRCA. Section 3 describes our data and their sources while our results are presented in Sections 4 to 6. Section 7 concludes.

## **2. The Immigration Reform and Control Act**

The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) was signed into law in 1986 by the Reagan Administration. Its purpose was to restrict the flow of undocumented migrants into the United States and was built on three main pillars: an employer sanctions provision that made it unlawful to knowingly hire undocumented migrants; greater funding for border security; and an amnesty program aimed at documented undocumented migrants (Chishti and Kamasaki 2014).

Some 3 million migrants applied for legal status under the IRCA and over 85 percent of them were of Hispanic origin (Sabet 2023). The path to citizenship (and voting rights) occurred in stages. Once the initial application was accepted, migrants received temporary legal status which could last for up to 18 months. After this period migrants would, if they successfully completed a language and civics examination, receive permanent legal status. Five years after permanent residency, IRCA migrants were eligible to receive citizenship via naturalization.

As Rytina (2002) notes, “the impact of IRCA was much more concentrated with respect to legal immigration than naturalization.” This is borne out in the figures. In total, some 90 percent of all migrants received legal status under the IRCA (Sabet 2023; Rytina 2002). Of these, nearly 90 percent received permanent legal status by 1991 and the majority of the remaining migrants received it by 1994 (Sabet 2023). By contrast, just over a third of IRCA migrants naturalized as US citizens by 2000 and the majority did so in the mid to late 1990s (Sabet 2023). The institutional feature of the IRCA that mandated a five year window between legal status and application for citizenship is what enables us to disentangle the effect of immigrant legalization from immigrant enfranchisement in our analysis.

Because undocumented migrants are already included in US census counts, the IRCA shocked the legal status of a population without triggering wider socio-economic change. As demonstrated in both Sabet (2023) and Sabet and Yuchtman (2023), the IRCA is not associated with differential changes, neither in levels nor in trends, with a wide range of county level socio-economic characteristics.<sup>3</sup> This feature of the IRCA enables our regression framework to identify the effect of variation in legal status on intergovernmental revenues independently of other socio-demographic changes.

---

3. Of course, this does not imply that IRCA migrants are randomly allocated across US counties. Instead, the findings in Sabet (2023) and Sabet and Yuchtman (2023) suggest that, conditional on exploiting variation within counties and within a state-year, the share of IRCA migrants does not lead to differential changes in county characteristics.

### 3. Data

In this section, we provide an overview the main variables used in the study.

*IRCA Migrants:* The key explanatory variable in our study is the cumulative number of IRCA applicants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990.<sup>4</sup> We obtain this information from Sabet (2023) and Sabet and Yuchtman (2023) who, in turn, take it from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Legalization Summary Public Use Tape data. As explained in those papers, important limitation of this data is that there are no county identifiers for migrants who applied from counties with populations less than 100,000 or with fewer than 25 applicants. The number of IRCA immigrants in counties with missing IRCA information is thus imputed by allocating a state's unassigned IRCA immigrants (all migrants have state identifiers) to counties with missing IRCA information according to the share of the total Hispanic population residing in such counties in 1990.<sup>5</sup> We also undertake three empirical exercises that demonstrate that the imputation method does not adversely affect the results or drive them. These include dropping all counties with imputed IRCA information, controlling for the time-varying effect of these counties; and an alternative imputation method that predicts the share of IRCA applicants in counties whose IRCA share is not known using the estimated coefficients from a model that uses a rich set of county characteristics to predict the migrant shares for the large counties for which the IRCA share is known (this method is described in more detail in (Sabet 2023)). Across all approaches, we find very similar results suggesting that this data limitation is not an overwhelming concern.

*County finances:* We use intergovernmental revenues (IGR) per 1980 county population from state governments to local governments (counties, cities, municipalities aggregated to the county) as our primary dependent variable.<sup>6</sup> The Census Government Finance and Employment Classification Manual defines this variable as “state grants-in-aid” to local governments. Although it does include Federal pass through money, correspondence with staff at the Census Bureau confirms that “each state determines what specific funding sources (if any) are used for grants to local governments” and that “each state determines the nature, amount and distribution of state grants internally.”<sup>7</sup>

Our data on county revenues and expenditures are all taken from the US Census Bureau's internal database on individual local government finances (“IndFin”). This database spans fiscal

---

4. We use applications per capita as opposed to legalized per capita so as to rule out any potential selection issues that might arise for those whose applications were actually accepted.

5. This imputation method is explained in more detail in Sabet and Yuchtman (2023).

6. On average, counties in the sample receive USD 16 million in intergovernmental revenue per year, an amount which comprises approximately 30 percent of all local government revenue (figures derived from authors own calculations using our own data).

7. Personal correspondence with Michael Fredericks of the Local Government Finance Statistics Branch of the Census Bureau on 26 November 2018.



years 1957, 1962, 1967, and 1970 to 2006. The annual series begins as of 1973.

*County covariates:* We collect data on county characteristics from the US Census Bureau in order to control for the time-varying effect of various socio-economic characteristics, measured in 1980, in our regression analyses.

*Governor characteristics:* We utilize a host of governor related data including party affiliation and indicators for whether (s)he is a lame duck or in an election year in order to better understand the responsiveness of our results to the political circumstances of the governor. These data are obtained from Klarner (2013). We add to these data information on the partisan make up of state legislatures which we digitized, respectively, from the National Conference of State Legislatures.

*Governor elections:* We obtain county-level election returns for gubernatorial elections from two sources. For pre-1990 values, we obtain information from ICPSR study 13 (“*General Election Data for the United States, 1950 – 1990*”). For 1990 and beyond, we purchased data from Dave Leip’s Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections (<http://uselectionatlas.org>).

*Political participation and engagement:* We test whether the IRCA leads to increases in political participation at the individual level for people with differential exposure to the IRCA. To conduct this exercise, we use restricted-use survey data from the American National Election Studies (ANES) with county identifiers which enable us to link IRCA information and other county covariates to this dataset.

## 4. Immigrant Legalization and Intergovernmental Revenue

### 4.1 Event Study Estimates

We begin our analysis by examining trends in intergovernmental revenue from state to local governments. For each county  $c$  in time period  $t$ , we estimate the parameters of the following econometric model:

$$y_{c,t} = \sum_{j=1985, j \neq 1988}^{2000} \beta_j (IRCA_{c,1990} \times D_j^t) + \delta_c + \zeta_{st} + \theta(X_{c,1980} \times P_{89}) + \gamma(R_{c,1980} \times P_{89}) + \epsilon_{c,t} \quad (1)$$

Where  $y$  denotes total IGR from state to local governments per 1980 county population.  $IRCA_{c,1990}$  is a standardized measure of a county’s 1990 share of IRCA migrants and this term

is interacted with time dummies, denoted by  $D_j^t$ . The model includes county fixed effects,  $\delta_c$  as well as state-by-year fixed effects,  $\zeta_{st}$ .  $X_{c,1980}$  is a vector of 1980 county level covariates which include log of county population, log of county income, the size of the population in poverty, and the size of the school age population (i.e., between 5 and 19), each interacted with  $P_{89}$ , an indicator that is 1 for time periods on or after 1989 and zero otherwise.  $R_{c,1980}$  is a vector of 1980 race controls that includes the size of the county population that is white, black and Hispanic, each interacted with  $P_{89}$ . Standard errors are clustered at the county level, shown as  $\epsilon_{c,t}$ , and we weight all our regressions by the 1980 county population. Our sample begins in 1985, one year prior to the passage of the IRCA and extends until 2000.

The results are shown in Figure 1 and demonstrate a positive post-1988 effect on transfers in counties with differential exposure to the IRCA. The pre-treatment coefficients display no trend and are both individually and jointly indistinguishable from zero (the  $p$ -value for a chi-squared test of joint significance of the three pre-period coefficients is 0.993). This increases confidence that the patterns are driven by legalization and not pre-existing linear trends in high-IRCA counties.

#### 4.2 Baseline Estimates

We test the strength of the relationship between legalization and fiscal transfers by estimating the parameters of the following specification:

$$y_{c,t} = \alpha_0 + \beta(IRCA_{c,1990} \times P_{89}) + \delta_c + \zeta_{st} + \theta(X_{c,1980} \times P_{89}) + \gamma(R_{c,1980} \times P_{89}) + \epsilon_{c,t} \quad (2)$$

In this model, we interact our standardized measure of IRCA migrants,  $IRCA_{c,1990}$ , with an indicator,  $P_{89}$ , that is 1 for time periods on or after 1989 and zero otherwise. All other terms are as previously defined. We report our estimates for  $\beta$  in Table 1.

Column 1 reports the baseline estimate. It suggests that a one standard deviation increase in the share of IRCA migrants in a county increases per capita IGR from state to local governments by around nine dollars. Relative to the pre-legalization sample mean, this represents a six percent increase in per capita IGR. In column 2, we present the results from a more parsimonious model that includes no controls (but does include county and state-by-year fixed effects) and in column 3 we add additional county level controls. These include the time-varying effect of: 1980 measures of population with tertiary education, 1982 measures of crime rates, and the 1999 share of public schools in the county covered by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.<sup>8</sup> The results are not affected by the inclusion, or omission, of these controls.

In column 4, we do not weight the regression to demonstrate that our results are not

8. We obtain the number of schools eligible for Title I funding from the Common Core of Data Public Schools data. Although this information is only available as of 1999, we assume that Title I eligibility is correlated over time.

sensitive to the choice of weights. In column 5, we control for the time-varying effect of being a border state. In columns 6 to 8, we undertake three approaches to ensure that our baseline method of imputing missing IRCA information does not adversely drive our results. First, in column 6, we control for the time-varying effect of counties with imputed IRCA shares; second, in column 7, we employ an alternative method of imputing the missing IRCA information; and third, in column 8, we drop counties with missing IRCA information altogether. In column 9, we drop counties covered by the pre-clearance requirement of Section 5 of the VRA and in column 10, we restrict the sample to those counties whose IGR information is observed every year in our sample.<sup>9</sup> In column 11, we drop counties with 1980 populations in the top 10 percentile to ensure the result is not driven by large urban centers which may serve as sanctuary cities. Across all 11 empirical specifications and sample restrictions, the coefficient of interest is estimated with precision and its magnitude is stable.

Finally, in column 12, we test the extent to which immigrant legalization, as opposed to immigrant enfranchisement, drives our results. To this purpose, we include in our estimation the interaction of  $IRCA_{c,1990}$  with  $P_{94}$ , which is one for time periods on or after 1994, the year when the bulk of IRCA migrants naturalized, and zero otherwise. As shown, there is a significant post-1994 effect of the IRCA on the distribution of resources, highlighting the potential role of immigrant naturalization as a channel to explain our results. Importantly, however, the coefficient on  $IRCA_{c,1990} \times P_{89}$  remains positive and precisely estimated, suggesting that the legalization of immigrants, as distinct from their naturalization and enfranchisement, is a significant factor in the distribution of public resources.

In Online Appendix A, we investigate different categories of IGR revenue as well as different categories of county *expenditure* in order to discern for what purposes state IGR was targeted. We find that state IGR for education increases differentially in IRCA counties and that local spending follows similar patterns: counties with differential exposure to the IRCA spend more on education, a result driven by greater elementary and secondary spending. There are also some welfare effects. Both state IGR for welfare and local spending on welfare increase in IRCA counties but these effects are much shorter lived (appear in 1992/1993 and vanish by 1997) and display more pre-trends than the education results.

## 5. Political Heterogeneities

An important question concerns the extent to which our results reflect mechanical forces. Although each state determines “the nature, amount and distribution of state grants internally”, state IGR does include federal pass through money. Moreover, one may be concerned that the fiscal response reflects a rules-based transfer formula based on the number of newly legalized migrants in a county. In this section, we distinguish the extent to which our results are driven

9. As mentioned in Section 3, the data on county revenues comes from the US Census Bureau’s internal data base on individual local government finances. Although it is a yearly series (as of 1973), not every county is surveyed in every year.

by mechanical forces as opposed to discretionary choices of state governors. To do so, we leverage information on the political circumstances of state governors. The intuition is simple: if our results are due to a rules-based formula, there little reason to expect heterogeneous effects according to factors such as term limits.

We investigate this intuition in Figure 2. In panel (a), we find that when the governor is eligible for reelection, the IRCA has a positive and significant effect on fiscal transfers, both during the election year and outside it. In panel (b), we see that this pattern vanishes in the sample of governors who are no longer eligible for re-election because of term limits. There is no longer any effect of the IRCA on fiscal transfers, neither in the election year or prior to it. In panel (c) and (d), we test for differences according to the partisan characteristics of state governors (panel (c)) and state legislatures (panel (d)). As shown, the effect of the IRCA on fiscal transfers remains positive and precisely estimated regardless of the partisan affiliation of the state’s executive and legislative branches. These results suggest that the electoral incentives of the state governor, rather than their political affiliation, drives the fiscal response of the IRCA.

## 6. IRCA and Political Mobilization

We argue that the differential allocation of transfers to counties affected by the IRCA was motivated not so much to win the political support of the newly legalized migrants — many of whom earned the right to vote in the mid to late 1990s — but rather that of entire Hispanic communities that were politically mobilized as a result of the IRCA. In this respect, both Sabet (2023) and Sabet and Yuchtman (2023) document significant political effects of the IRCA on such outcomes as congressional redistricting and Hispanic representation in congress as well as on local school boards. Sabet and Yuchtman (2023), in particular, demonstrate that the IRCA legalized a politically cohesive group (i.e., Democratic leaning) which increased the political relevance of the IRCA for state lawmakers.

In this section, we measure the impact of the IRCA on political mobilization at the local level using two additional measures: voter turnout in gubernatorial elections and political participation and engagement using individual survey data.

### 6.1 Voter turnout

To test the electoral relevance of the IRCA at the state level, we estimate our baseline econometric specification using county level votes per 1980 capita in gubernatorial elections as the outcome. However, we test for two important heterogeneous effects: first, we test whether the relationship between the IRCA and turnout is non-linear, by including the term  $IRCA_{c,1990}^2 \times P_{89}$  in our estimation. Second, we examine whether the IRCA has a differentially stronger effect in Hispanic communities of mixed legal status. To this end, we include in our model the triple interaction  $IRCA_{c,1990} \times P_{89} \times \text{Already Legal}$  (all lower order terms included) where “Already Legal” is the standardized measure of the 1980 share of the Hispanic migrant population that is

already legal.<sup>10</sup>

We report the coefficients on  $IRCA_{c,1990}^2 \times P_{89}$  and  $IRCA_{c,1990} \times P_{89} \times \text{Already Legal}$  in Figure 3. In panel (a) we study votes per 1980 capita in all governor elections from 1980 to 2000. In panel (b) we examine the vote share for the Democratic candidate in these same elections.

As shown in panel (a), the effect of the IRCA on turnout is non-linear. Communities with thick networks of newly documented migrants experience differentially greater levels of voter turnout. Moreover, the effect of the IRCA on turnout increases differentially as a function of the size of the pre-existing legal Hispanic population.<sup>11</sup>

In panel (b), we repeat the analysis but examine the Democratic vote share in gubernatorial elections. The IRCA does display a non-linear relationship: it is not the case that larger and larger undocumented communities vote increasingly Democratic. By contrast, however, the Democratic vote share of the gubernatorial candidate does not significantly differ according to the size of the pre-existing Hispanic legal population. This pattern suggests that the political impact of the IRCA on large, Hispanic communities of mixed legal status is to increase participation without affecting the partisan nature of that participation.

## 6.2 Political participation and engagement

In this section, we analyze survey data from the American National Election Studies (ANES). For each person residing in a given county in the ANES, we link the 1990 number of per capita IRCA migrants in that county in order to test for the effect of the IRCA on various measures of political participation and engagement. We report our results in Figure 4, where we plot the coefficient on  $IRCA_{c,1990} \times P_{89} \times \text{White}$ , on  $IRCA_{c,1990} \times P_{89} \times \text{Hispanic}$  (all lower order terms included) when they are regressed against a range of individual survey responses.<sup>12</sup>

In models 1 to 3, we test whether the IRCA increases the likelihood of receiving contact by a political party. As shown, both whites and Hispanics are more likely to receive contact by political parties post-legalization, highlighting the importance of the IRCA for political outreach. What is more, this outreach appears to have a partisan dimension: whereas both whites and Hispanics in high-IRCA counties are increasingly likely to receive contact from the Democratic party (model 2), the IRCA increases the likelihood of contact from the Republican party only for whites (model 3).

In model 4, we find that the IRCA increases the probability of Hispanics working for

10. We calculate this measure by deducting the total number of IRCA applicants in a county from its 1980 Hispanic population, arguing that this difference represents a measure of the size of the “already legal” Hispanic population.

11. In Online Appendix B, we replicate our baseline results in a sample of counties with above and below median levels of already-legal Hispanic migrants. As shown, we find a positive and significant effect of the IRCA on fiscal transfers only in the sample of counties with above median populations of already-legal Hispanic migrants.

12. The estimating model is the same as that presented in equation 2 but with two modifications: first, the outcome is measured at the level of people, living across US counties over time, and second, it includes an individual’s age, income and education.

a political campaign. In model 5 and 6, we test for two additional measures of political participation: participation in campaign activities and political donations. In both cases, the IRCA increases Hispanic likelihood of participation. Finally, in model 7, we test for anti-migrant sentiment using the “illegal alien” thermometer of the ANES.<sup>13</sup> As shown, there is no evidence that the IRCA increased anti-migrant sentiment. Together, these results suggest that the IRCA increased Hispanic political mobilization without triggering nativist backlash.

## 7. Conclusion

Undocumented migration is a hotly contested issue in the United States where the number of such migrants has nearly quadrupled in the past thirty years. In this paper, we shed light on the impact of legal status on fiscal transfers. Counties with differential exposure to the IRCA receive significantly more per capita resources from state governments. This effect responds to the electoral incentives of the state governor, suggesting that it is politically motivated.

A key institutional feature of the IRCA was that it mandated a five year window between legal status and citizenship. This enables us to disentangle the effect of immigrant legalization from immigrant enfranchisement in our analysis. Importantly, we found that immigrant legalization under the IRCA positively predicts transfers *prior to enfranchisement*. To understand why this might be the case, we studied the impact of the IRCA on the political participation. We found that the IRCA increases turnout in state level elections in counties with large pre-existing Hispanic populations. It also increases various measures of Hispanic political engagement at the individual level without triggering anti-migrant backlash. These results point to important spillover effects that immigrant legalization has on the political participation and mobilization of communities of mixed legal status.

## References

- Bertocchi, Graziella, Arcangelo Dimico, Francesco Lancia, and Alessia Russo. 2020. “Youth enfranchisement, political responsiveness, and education expenditure: Evidence from the US.” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 12 (3): 76–106.
- Cascio, Elizabeth U., and Ethan Lewis. 2019. “Distributing the Green (Cards): Permanent Residency and Personal Income Taxes after the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.” *Journal of Public Economics* (April).
- Cascio, Elizabeth U., and Ebonya Washington. 2014. “Valuing the Vote: The Redistribution of Voting Rights and State Funds Following the Voting Rights Act of 1965.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (1): 379–433.
- Chishti, Muzaffar, and Charles Kamasaki. 2014. “IRCA in Retrospect: Guideposts for Immigration Reform.” *Migration Policy Institute: Issue Brief No. 9*.

---

13. The thermometer is on a scale from 0 (cold feelings) to 100 (warm feelings). The variable is 1 if a person reports a score between 0 and 40 and zero if they report feelings of 41 and higher. Changing this to a 50-50 split does not change the results.

- Cortes, Kalena E. 2013. “Achieving the DREAM: The Effect of IRCA on Immigrant Youth Post-secondary Educational Access.” *The American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 103 (3): 428–432.
- Freedman, Matthew, Emily Owens, and Sarah Bohn. 2018. “Immigration, employment opportunities, and criminal behavior.” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 10 (2): 117–51.
- Fujiwara, Thomas. 2015. “Voting Technology, Political Responsiveness, and Infant Health: Evidence From Brazil.” *Econometrica* 83 (2): 423–464.
- Klarner, Carl. 2013. “Governors dataset.” *Harvard Dataverse*.
- Kossoudji, Sherrie A., and Deborah A. Cobb-Clark. 2002. “Coming out of the shadows: Learning about Legal Status and Wages from the Legalized Population.” *Journal of Labor Economics* 20 (3): 598–628.
- Miller, Grant. 2008. “Women’s Suffrage, Political Responsiveness, and Child Survival in American History.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123 (3): 1287–1327.
- Pan, Ying. 2012. “The Impact of Legal Status on Immigrants’ Earnings and Human Capital: Evidence from the IRCA 1986.” *Journal of Labor Research* 33 (2): 119–142.
- Pinotti, Paolo. 2017. “Clicking on heaven’s door: The effect of immigrant legalization on crime.” *American Economic Review* 107 (1): 138–68.
- Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L. 1999. “Undocumented Workers in the Labor Market: An Analysis of the Earnings of Legal and Illegal Mexican Immigrants in the United States.” *Journal of Population Economics* 12 (1): 91–116.
- Rytina, Nancy. 2002. *IRCA Legalization Effects: Lawful Permanent Residence and Naturalization through 2001*. Technical report. Office of Policy and Planning, INS.
- Sabet, Navid. 2023. “Out of the Shadows and into the Classroom: Immigrant Legalization, Hispanic Schooling and Hispanic Representation on School Boards.”
- Sabet, Navid, and Noam Yuchtman. 2023. “Identifying Partisan Gerrymandering and Its Consequences: Evidence from the 1990 US Census Redistricting.” *CESifo Working Paper No. 10554*.

## 8. Figures





Figure 1  
IRCA and Trends in Total Per Capita State Intergovernmental Revenue

**Notes:** This figure plots the coefficient on  $IRCA_{90}$ , the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990, interacted with time dummies. The outcome variable is total per 1980 capita intergovernmental revenue from state to local governments. The regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects. They also include 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with  $P_{89}$  which is one for time periods on or after 1989 and zero before. Standard errors are clustered at the county level and confidence intervals are drawn at 90 percent. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population. The  $p$ -value for a chi-squared test of joint significance of the three pre-period coefficients is 0.993.





**Figure 2**  
IRCA, Per Capita IGR and Political Heterogeneity

**Notes:** This figure plots the coefficient on  $IRCA_{90}$ , the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990, interacted with  $P_{89}$ , an indicator that is one for time periods on or after 1989 and zero otherwise. The outcome is total per 1980 capita intergovernmental revenue from state to local governments. The analysis in panel (a) is restricted to governors who are not lame-ducks while the analysis in panel (b) is restricted to state's with a lame-duck governor (i.e., ineligible for reelection due to term limits). “Leg R” is one if the state legislature is Republican or split. The regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects. They also include 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with  $P_{89}$ . Standard errors are clustered at the county level and confidence intervals are drawn at 90 percent. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population.




Figure 3  
IRCA and Individual Political Participation and Engagement

**Notes:** This figure plots the coefficient on  $IRCA_{90}$ , the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990, interacted with  $P_{89}$ , an indicator that is zero for time periods prior to 1989 and 1 for periods on or after 1989. The outcome variable in panel (a) is the standardized number of votes for governor per 1980 county population over the age of 18. In panel (b) it is the standardized vote share for the Democratic gubernatorial candidate. *Already Legal* is a standardized measure of the size of the 1980 Hispanic population that is already legal. All regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects. They also include 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with  $P_{89}$ . Standard errors are clustered at the county level and confidence intervals are drawn at 90 percent. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population. The sample includes all gubernatorial elections between 1980 and 2000.




Figure 4  
IRCA and Individual Political Participation and Engagement

**Notes:** This figure plots the coefficient on IRCA<sub>90</sub>, the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990, interacted with interacted with P<sub>89</sub>, an indicator that is zero for time periods prior to 1989 and 1 for periods on or after 1989. All the outcomes (except for model 5) are indicator variables that are one (and zero otherwise) if a person reports: receiving contact by a political party (model 1, or contact from the Democratic or Republican party, models 2 and 3, respectively); working for a political campaign (model 4); donating money to a political campaign (model 6); or holding negative views towards undocumented migrants (model 7). In model 5, the outcome is a count of the number of campaign activities a person reports participating in. The regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects as well as individual measures of income, age and education. They also include 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with P<sub>89</sub>. Standard errors are clustered at the county level and confidence intervals are drawn at 90 percent. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population.

## 9. Tables

Table 1  
IRCA and Per Capita Intergovernmental Revenue from State to Local Governments

	Empirical Specifications							Sample Restrictions				Post-94
	(1) Baseline Covariates	(2) No Covariates	(3) Additional Covariates	(4) Unweighted	(5) Border State × Post	(6) Control Imputed	(7) Alternative Imputation	(8) Drop Imputed	(9) Drop VRA 5	(10) Always In Sample	(11) Population < 90 <sup>th</sup> Pctl.	(12) IRCA × P <sub>94</sub>
IRCA <sub>90</sub> × P <sub>89</sub>	8.743*** (2.933)	8.912** (3.764)	6.056*** (1.648)	7.925*** (2.674)	8.743*** (2.933)	9.084*** (3.001)	5.352** (2.563)	10.20* (5.492)	9.960*** (3.069)	13.22** (5.184)	4.411** (1.794)	4.939** (2.021)
IRCA <sub>90</sub> × P <sub>94</sub>												8.373** (3.648)
<i>N</i>	35,349	35,365	31,152	35,349	35,349	35,349	35,349	7,944	12,858	18,720	30,523	35,349
Clusters	3,024	3,025	3,020	3,024	3,024	3,024	3,024	505	2,176	1,170	2,721	3,024
$\bar{Y}_{Pre}$	147	147	146	147	147	147	147	154	143	174	145	147
[ <i>S.D.</i> ]	283	283	212	283	283	283	283	310	163	391	269	283

*Notes:* The outcome variable is per 1980 capita intergovernmental revenue (IGR) from state to local governments measured at the county level. IRCA<sub>90</sub> is the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990. P<sub>89</sub> is an indicator that is one for periods on or after 1989 and zero otherwise. All regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects. They also include, except for column 2, 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with P<sub>89</sub>. Additional covariates in column 3 include the crime rate (1982 values), share of schools in the county covered under Title I (1999 values), and the share of the population with a bachelors degree (1980 values), each interacted with P<sub>89</sub>. The specification in column 5 includes an interaction between P<sub>89</sub> and an indicator for whether a county is located in a border state. Column 6 includes the time-varying effect of counties whose IRCA shares had to be imputed, column 7 employs an alternative imputation to calculate missing IRCA shares and column 8 drops counties whose IRCA shares had to be imputed. In column 9, counties covered by the pre-clearance requirement of Section 5 of the VRA are dropped. Column 10 restricts the sample to those counties whose IGR information is observed in each year of the sample. In column 11, counties with 1980 populations in the top 10 percentile are dropped. Column 12 includes an additional interaction of IRCA<sub>90</sub> with P<sub>94</sub>, an indicator that is 1 for periods on or after 1994 and zero otherwise. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the county. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population, except for column 4 which has no weights. \*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

**Online Appendix for Paper:**  
***Immigrant Legalization and the Redistribution of State Funds:  
Evidence from the 1986 IRCA***

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>A</b>	<b>IGR Targets</b>	<b>A- 1</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>IRCA and IGR in Counties with High Already Legal Populations</b>	<b>B- 1</b>

---

## A. IGR Targets

In this Online Appendix, I present event study estimates using different categories of state IGR as the outcome as well as different categories of county level expenditure. The results are reported in Figure A.1. As shown, there is a positive effect on the IRCA for state IGR for education and, to a lesser extent, for welfare. At the county level, the IRCA increases per capita expenditure on different categories of education. Although the coefficients are not estimated with a great deal of precision, the patterns are clearer: post-1989, there is a gradual increase in education expenditure. The patterns for welfare are less clear. In the mid 90s, there is a short-lived differential increase in welfare spending, but appears only between 1994 and 1996.




Figure A.1  
IRCA and Trends in Per Capita IGR and County Spending

**Notes:** This figure plots the coefficient on IRCA<sub>90</sub>, the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990, interacted with time dummies. The outcome variable is total per capita intergovernmental revenue from state to local governments for education (panel (a1)) and for welfare (panel (b1)). In panels (a2), (a3) as well as (b2) and (b3) the outcome is per capita county spending on different categories, as labelled. The regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects. They also include 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with  $P_{89}$  which is one for time periods on or after 1989 and zero before. Standard errors are clustered at the county level and confidence intervals are drawn at 90 percent. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population.

## B. IRCA and IGR in Counties with High Already Legal Populations

We demonstrate that the differential effect of the IRCA on political participation is stronger in counties with larger pre-existing Hispanic populations that are already legal. As explained in the main manuscript, we construct this measure by deducting the total number of IRCA applicants in a county from its 1980 Hispanic population, arguing that this difference represents a measure of the size of the “already legal” Hispanic population. In this Appendix, we demonstrate that our baseline results are observable only in the sample of counties with already-legal Hispanic population sizes above the sample-median. These results are reported in Table B.1. Column 1 reproduces the baseline estimate. In column 2, we restrict the sample to those counties with already-legal Hispanic population sizes above median. As shown, almost the entire effect is explained in this sample of counties. In column 3, we analyze the relationship of the IRCA with IGR in counties with smaller pre-existing Hispanic populations. As shown, there is a positive coefficient but it is not distinguishable from zero. These results are in line with the fact that political participation is also strongest in counties larger, pre-existing Hispanic populations.

Table B.1  
IRCA and IGR in Counties with High and Low  
Already Legal Hispanic Migrants

	(1) Baseline Sample	(2) High Legal	(3) Not High Legal
$IRCA_{90} \times P_{89}$	8.743*** (2.933)	10.76*** (3.547)	11.77 (7.450)
$N$	35,349	19,813	15,502
Clusters	3,024	1,524	1,500
$\bar{Y}_{Pre}$	147	134	161
[ $S.D$ ]	[283]	[263]	[302]

*Notes:* The outcome variable is per capita intergovernmental revenue (IGR) from state to local governments measured at the county level.  $IRCA_{90}$  is the standardized number of IRCA immigrants per 1,000 county inhabitants measured in 1990.  $P_{89}$  is an indicator that is one for periods on or after 1989 and zero otherwise. All regressions include county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects. They also include 1980 measures of county population, income, school-aged population (i.e., between 5 and 19), population that is poor as well as the white, black and Hispanic population size, each interacted with  $P_{89}$ . Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the county. All regressions are weighted by the size of the 1980 county population. \*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .