

The Effects of Temporary Protected Status on the Lives of Recipients

Lauren Fay
International Studies
The American University
4400 Massachusetts Ave NW
Washington, D.C. 20016 USA

Faculty Advisors: Professor Christopher Rudolph
& Dr. Sarah Knight

Abstract

Temporary Protected Status (TPS) designations for Honduras, El Salvador, and Haiti have been renewed each year, with little opposition since their original designation as TPS countries; but November 2017 marked a shift in TPS policy. The Department of Homeland Security under the Trump administration announced that TPS for Haiti would not be renewed and deferred the decision for Honduras. There are also suggestions that El Salvador's TPS status will not be renewed when it expires in 2018. TPS was intended to be temporary, however slow recovery and other concerns about the countries' stability created a situation in which thousands of TPS recipients have resided and worked in the United States for over a decade and find themselves in a state of legal limbo. The proposed end of TPS for these countries leaves the lives of thousands of migrants in the balance. The TPS policy presents an important question: How does Temporary Protected Status influence the lives and identities of TPS recipients from Honduras, El Salvador, and Haiti? In order to research this question, I conducted interviews with Honduran, Salvadoran, and Haitian TPS recipients residing in the Washington D.C. metro area about the effects their temporary status has had on different aspects of their lives and their response to the prospect that their temporary status may soon end. Ultimately, I conclude that Temporary Protected Status has a significant impact on the way recipients construct their identities and uncertainty about the future is a central theme in their lives.

Keywords: Temporary Protected Status (TPS), Homeland Security, Recipients

1. Introduction

The Immigration Act of 1990 created a program called Temporary Protected Status (TPS) to address populations of migrants in the US that did not qualify as refugees but came from countries the US government deemed temporarily too unsafe and unstable for migrants to return. However, in several countries that received TPS, a combination of poverty, political turmoil, and natural disasters stalled recovery efforts. As a result, the TPS designations for these countries had been extended repeatedly and recipients remained in the US for several years. For the three countries focused on in this study, Honduras has held TPS for 19 years, El Salvador for 17 years, and Haiti for 8 years. In the past year, the Trump administration has sought to put an end to the extensions and terminate the TPS designation for these three countries, along with others. Several scholars have studied the effects repeated extensions have had on recipients and the United States, but few have analyzed the effects of TPS following the Trump administration's announcement that it would come to an end.

The changing political environment and threat of TPS ending is likely to change the experiences TPS recipients have with TPS. Many TPS recipients have families (including children who are US citizens), pay remittances that account for a substantial percentage of their home country's GDP, and have become integral members of their communities. In this study I analyzed how holding temporary status affected the lives of TPS recipients from

Honduras, El Salvador, and Haiti and how those effects have changed within the last year. Through interviewing TPS recipients I found that the existing research has not paid sufficient attention to the networks surrounding TPS recipients or the effect TPS has on the people and organizations in that network. Rather, most research focuses on determining a policy's impact on the individual who holds TPS status. However, I found the people I interviewed were also concerned with the indirect effect policy changes would have on their networks, which include their families, friends, and employers.

2. Review of Existing Literature

The ambiguity and uncertainty surrounding TPS led many scholars to research and debate the effects of the policy. As with many discussions surrounding immigration, the literature could be broken up into three main focus areas: economic, political, and social. The studies cited in the following section were not an exhaustive list, but overall the literature on TPS was still limited. Thus, there are bound to be shortcomings. Two shortcomings identified in this study were the tendency of studies to view the experiences of TPS recipients as static rather than evolving over time and the lack of attention paid to the networks of people and organizations surrounding TPS recipients who are also affected by the policy. This research intends to build on the existing literature and address those two shortcomings.

2.1 Economic

Debates regarding any form of immigrations typically place a significant emphasis on the economic effects, the same was true of the literature on TPS. One study analyzed statistics on the geographical distribution of migrants, number of households, median income, number of US born children, mortgages, English speaking ability, education level, labor force participation, unemployment, industry of employment, health insurance, among other things and found that TPS recipients are highly integrated into US society.¹ Another study analyzing labor market outcomes found that having the legal ability to work allowed TPS recipients to find better jobs with better pay.² Possession of a work permit better enabled TPS recipients to earn a living in the US to support themselves, their families in the US, and send remittances to relatives in their home countries.

Overall these studies explained the effects of TPS in economic terms. They claimed that TPS had benefitted recipients' employment opportunities and their contribution to the US's economy. They predicted that ending TPS would have a primarily economic effect. However, there are other effects of TPS that cannot be realized taking a purely economic approach.

2.2 Political

Another effect of TPS on which the literature focuses is politics. One study's examined the legislative history of TPS and determined that TPS represented a flawed policy. The study argued that the repeated renewals of TPS ran contrary to congressional intent for a temporary program and "lock[s] TPS beneficiaries into a "legal limbo," rendering them unable to fully integrate into life in the United States."³ Another study argued that TPS as a policy is full of ambiguities and contradictions. This scholar argued that the program's purpose is ambiguous, simultaneously fosters inclusion and exclusion, and enables the state to respond to tensions between the labor market's demand for temporary laborers and nativists anxiety about immigration.⁴

Another study found that TPS affected the US's foreign policy. The author claimed that TPS is supposed to be a humanitarian policy but that the government has used it to address relations with foreign government and special interest groups.⁵ One author claimed that the US gave TPS to El Salvador to avoid political pressure and controversy surrounding the US's military intervention in Central America.⁶ There have also been claims that the US has denied TPS to countries on the basis of racism or a poor relationship with the country, rather than the severity of the humanitarian disaster.⁷

Another study takes an alternate approach and examines the effects TPS recipients have on politics. In her research the author analyzes the legislative strategies of Salvadoran immigrants. Immigrants, including TPS recipients, are often viewed as powerless actors at the mercy of a government's changing policy. However, this study argues that TPS beneficiaries have agency and are able to influence how policies are interpreted and applied and how policymakers respond (Coutin 1998). TPS recipients are affected significantly by politics but they also effect politics in return.⁸

2.3 Social

A final area of focus in the literature is the social impacts of TPS. After conducting hundreds of interviews with immigrants who have temporary legal status, including TPS recipients, between 1989 and 2001 Menjívar concludes that “the immigrants’ ambivalent legal status emerged as a vital factor shaping their lives.”⁹ Immigrants with liminal legality are often separated indefinitely from the families they left behind because there are restrictions on international travel.¹⁰ Familial relations are further complicated because many immigrants have started families in the US in addition to families they may have left back in their home country.¹¹ Therefore, they must financially support two families and navigate tense reunifications.¹² The lack of resources available to immigrants with liminal legality has also increased their reliance on the Church for aid and a sense of community.¹³

Menjívar built on her early work in conducting a nation-wide telephone survey with TPS recipients. The survey revealed that many respondents “are civically active in neighborhood and work associations, schools, sports teams, or other activities” and in “activities that support immigrants’ rights, such as rallies, informative forums, or petitions.”¹⁴ Menjívar argues that TPS recipients are “*de facto* citizens and active members of their communities but lack full *de jure* recognition”¹⁵ TPS recipients have documentation so they do not fit into transnational spaces as undocumented immigrants do, but they are also unable to fully settle into the country as Lawful Permanent Residents.¹⁶ Immigrants with tenuous legal status are forced to exist in a climate of insecurity in which uncertainty over their future prevents them from settling and accessing opportunities available to others. Some scholars claim that the negative effects liminal legality has on the lives of TPS recipients can be considered a form of legal violence.¹⁷ These studies focused primarily on the way TPS has affected the social lives of recipients. However, they do not sufficiently analyze how the social effects of TPS have changed over time or whether they have shifted in the past year.

3. Methodology

The existing literature attempted to answer some of the questions about the effects of TPS and make policy recommendations. However, the majority of the existing literature was researched and published before the executive branch moved to end TPS designations. Thus, the literature did not sufficiently explain the effects ending TPS may have. This research expands upon the existing literature, particularly upon Cecilia Menjívar’s study interviewing immigrants with liminal legality. The interviews conducted for this research began with a broad question about how recipients felt TPS had affected their lives in order to ascertain what interviewees felt was the most relevant effect TPS had on their lives. Then TPS recipients were asked to specify the effects TPS may have had on their family lives, work lives, and sense of community. Interview participants were then asked to discuss how their experiences have changed over time. Finally, participants were asked to detail how their experiences have changed within the last year and whether they felt the Trump administration has had an effect on their experiences.

Interviews were conducted with TPS recipients from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. An ideal sample would have been larger and consisted of recipients living across the US, but due to time and travel restrictions that was not possible for this research. Instead, the interview pool consisted of four TPS recipients living in the DMV area. At the outset of the research, the sample was intended to be larger and include Nicaragua, but multiple potential interview participants did not respond after multiple attempts to contact.

However, a small sample size does not negate the potential benefit from this research. Surveys of a large number of TPS recipients, such as Menjívar’s 2017 study, can provide useful data about the overall TPS population, but in-depth interviews with a few recipients can highlight the life experiences and stories of particular individuals represented in those statistics. A significant amount of data was gathered from the interviews that were conducted and this research opens up the possibility of conducting further interviews with more TPS recipients in the future. This research does not attempt to draw the conclusion that the experiences of the four people interviewed are representative of the entire population of TPS recipients. However, conversations with advocacy organizations and TPS recipients in contact with many other TPS recipients uncovered many of the same themes that appeared throughout the interviews. The commonalities suggest that the experiences of the individuals interviewed are similar to the experiences of many other TPS recipients.

Language presented another obstacle in the interview process. The level of English fluency among interview participants varied significantly. When the participant was unable to communicate their response or comprehend the question in English I switched to Spanish. I have a proficient understanding of the Spanish language I am not fluent, so it is possible I misinterpreted the interviewees’ inflections or regional specific dialect. However, my analysis was

not based upon word choice or subliminal communication markers so the risk of the language barrier influencing the findings was low

One of the most important parts of the research process involved ensuring the protection and privacy of the people interviewed. To protect their identities and allow interviewees to speak freely without fear of repercussions I took care to keep their identities anonymous. Additionally, I ensured that I received informed consent from each interview participant before beginning the interview. While, I acknowledged that the nature of the topic could bring up difficult emotions, I was conscious throughout the process to keep any exposure to risk minimal and not expose participants to undue harm. The research was also reviewed by American University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to implementation and found to meet the requirements for IRB exemption.

After compiling the data from each of the interviews I analyzed the responses using thematic analysis. I identified themes that were common across interviews or mentioned repeatedly by one interview participant. I also compared the interview results to conclusions drawn in the existing literature to analyze how the responses were similar and how they changed over time. Conducting a thematic analysis allowed me to extract important concepts from the detailed information about the lives of the people interviewed. I conclude that it is essential for any policy related to TPS to consider these themes.

4. Interviews

Consistent with the existing literature on Temporary Protected Status and with the basic assumption that motivated me to conduct further research on this topic, each of the TPS recipients I interviewed agreed TPS has had a significant effect on their lives. This finding alone was not particularly interesting or unexpected given past research. The more compelling information that I sought to gather was in what ways holding TPS had affected their lives and how those effects had changed over time. In the follow section I discuss several common themes that emerged throughout these interviews.

4.1 Family Life

The effect TPS has had on recipients' family lives was the topic that interview participants spent the most time talking about and referred back to repeatedly throughout the interview. One effect TPS has had that emerged in the way participants spoke about their families is the division between their family back in their country of origin and their family in the US. This became clear when, in response to my question "has TPS affected your familial relationships," one interviewee asked me to clarify if I meant her family in El Salvador or her family in the US.¹⁸ Other interviewees also distinguished between their families back home and their families in the US. Another participant with a child who was born in the US remarked that his daughter had never met her relatives living in Honduras and only knew them from letters and phone calls.¹⁹

Having children born in the US is another effect TPS has had on the lives of two of the people I interviewed and thousands of TPS recipients nation-wide. Being born in the US automatically grants children US citizenship, regardless of their parent's immigration status. Given the timing of when TPS was designated for each country, most of these children are minors. One participant with a young daughter explains how TPS has had both a positive and negative effect when it comes to his daughter. On one hand, TPS gives him the ability to work and support his child, and his daughter has better opportunities in the US than she does in Honduras.²⁰ However, he is visibly upset when considering what may happen if he is deported and must live away from his daughter.²¹ Another interviewee is still debating whether she will take her two children back to El Salvador or leave them in the US with a close friend if her status is revoked and she is deported.²² She has already experienced the pain of being separated from a child since she had to leave her now-grown son behind in El Salvador in search of work many years ago.²³ She hopes she will never relive that experience with her two youngest children and that the government comes up with a solution to allow TPS recipients to stay in the US, especially those with young children.²⁴ The end of TPS threatens to separate families just as the violence, poverty, and natural disasters that initially drove TPS recipients to leave their homes have done.

The only interviewee that did not mention the distinction between his family back home and in the US said his entire family lives back in Haiti and he had not seen them in many years.²⁵ In order to travel outside the US, TPS recipients must request an advanced parole document from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) (Temporary Protected Status). Additionally, unlike permanent residents, TPS recipients are unable to apply as sponsors for their families to join them in the US. These restrictions, combined with the financial cost of travel, make it difficult for TPS recipients to visit family members that remain in their country of origin. One participant revealed that he has not seen

his family since receiving TPS 17 years ago.²⁶ He described feelings of loneliness and missing his family but explained living in the US is the best thing he can do for his family because he is able to work and send money to them each month.²⁷

Remittances are another way TPS has affected recipient's family lives. Each of the interviewees mentioned sending money to relatives back home. One participant expressed concern about what will happen to his family back in Haiti if he loses his TPS since the money he sends home each month is their primary source of income.²⁸ For TPS recipients, the ability to work is crucial because they are not only supporting themselves but multiple family member often in both the US and their home countries. The money TPS recipients send to their relatives make up large portions of TPS designated countries' economies and the potential end of TPS designation threatens not only the livelihoods of recipients and their families, but the financial stability of TPS designated countries as well.

The strain TPS has on a recipient's family is not unique to the new presidential administration in the United States, but each year it becomes more difficult for the TPS recipients to imagine leaving their lives in the United States behind. The more time TPS recipients have spent in the US the more likely it is that they have built families in the United States. The end of TPS threatens recipients' ability to see their family in the United States and support their family in their home county.

4.2 Career/Education

The ability for TPS recipients to send remittances to their relatives back home is tied to their ability to work legally in the US with TPS. In the interviews, participants discussed their uncertainty about how they will support themselves and their families if their TPS status is revoked. One participant explained that he initially left El Salvador in search of work because there are few job opportunities where he is from.²⁹ With TPS he is able to find regular work as a day laborer and make enough money to send back to his family.³⁰ Another interviewee who also works as a day laborer said he knew many TPS recipients who worked as day laborers because they could earn decent money from the work.³¹

Another participant who works in construction relayed a story that demonstrates one benefit of having the legal right to work in the US as a TPS holder. He explained that he's worked for employers who hire a lot of undocumented immigrants, so they can pay them lower wages, but having TPS allowed him to find a different job that would pay him a fair wage.³² Holding TPS provides recipients with greater protection from worker exploitation compared to undocumented immigrants because they have greater job mobility.

Additionally, multiple participants had furthered their education. One woman who worked for a cleaning service and one day hopes to start her own cleaning business, had gone back to school to earn her GED and was taking classes at a local college.³³ Another had also earned his GED while living in the US.³⁴ One interviewee was not sure if TPS had affected his own education but living in the US allowed his daughter to have a better education and said she hoped to go to college one day.³⁵ The interviewees worried about their ability to continue or apply their education if their TPS status was removed. One interviewee described feeling trapped because there were not jobs back home but without TPS he could no longer work or study legally in the United States.

4.3 Community

Holding TPS has also affected how recipients form and participate in their communities. One participant felt the community of TPS recipients nation-wide had grown stronger since the election of Donald Trump.³⁶ Another, said that churches, NDLON, advocacy organization, TPS recipients, and supporters had come together in the recent months working to save TPS.³⁷ He said it was encouraging to see so many people and organizations, not that just those with TPS, fighting to protect TPS recipients.³⁸ Especially, he said, employers of TPS recipients who are trying to sponsor recipients for work visas so they can remain in the US even if TPS is revoked.³⁹ He believed sponsorship by employers or family members who are US citizens might be recipients best hope for staying in the US long term.⁴⁰ All of the recipients mentioned participating in some form of community event whether it be volunteering, participating in rallies, or going to community forums.

Another participant described a greater community with other Latin American immigrants who did not have TPS.⁴¹ He explained that many Latin American immigrants, both with and without TPS, lived in the same neighborhoods, went to the same churches, and worked for the same companies.⁴² He felt he could identify with the experiences of other immigrants and that they could identify with him because their future is also uncertain. He also described a particularly cooperative partnership between advocates for TPS and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA).⁴³ Other participants mostly agreed that the immigrant and Latin American communities in DC, and nation-wide, were a source of support in the fight to save TPS. However, one participant expressed concern that "lumping

TPS recipients in with those here illegally” may hurt them in the long run.⁴⁴ He explained that many Americans misunderstood TPS and did not know he had the legal right to work in the US and paid taxes just like any other American citizen would.⁴⁵ While he believed undocumented immigrants should be allowed to stay in the US and acknowledged that many TPS recipients were undocumented immigrants when they came to the US before being given TPS, he was concerned people would be less willing to support a long-term solution to TPS if they thought it would strengthen the case of other undocumented immigrants wanting to stay in the US permanently.

An interesting pattern that emerged in the interviews was that, when asked about their communities, every interviewee seemed to interpret ‘community’ to mean other TPS recipients or Latin American immigrants. This association could have been because participants assumed this was the community the question was referring to given the overall topic of my research. However, this trend also suggests that the TPS community is the most prominent community in participants lives at the moment. This is not to say that participants are not involved in other communities through schools, neighborhoods, or religious organizations, but given the imminent end of TPS their focus is primarily be on that community. The threat of losing TPS has seemingly brought the communities around TPS recipients even closer together as they work towards the common goal of extending TPS and creating a pathway to permanent status.

4.4 Evolution of Experiences

The existing literature has studied the effect of TPS on recipient’s family life, work life, education, and community. However, the literature has not placed enough focus on the ways recipients’ experiences have evolved over time. The experiences recipients have had with TPS have changed both gradually over time, and abruptly within the last year. For some, their evolving experiences are due to common changes that happen over a person’s lifetime. For example, the birth of a child. Retaining TPS, or some form of legal residency in the US, has become even more important for participants with children. Another example of a life event impacting recipients’ need for TPS is caring for aging parents. One participant shared how his mother too sick to work and relies on the money he sends home to survive.⁴⁶ The threat of no longer having TPS worries him because it means he may no longer be able to provide for her.⁴⁷

Having TPS has also interfered with recipients’ ability to have certain experiences common over an individual’s lifetime. One interviewee has saved up money to buy a home but has put off buying one because he is worried what will happen to his assets if his TPS is revoked.⁴⁸ Another participant said her inability to sponsor family members to come to the US has prevented her from watching her son back in El Salvador from growing up.⁴⁹

Overtime, participants have established roots in their communities. They have jobs, homes, families, and friends. It would be nearly impossible for recipients to have lived somewhere for over a decade and not establish a connection to the place they were living. Furthermore, their connection to their countries of origin have faded as they have not lived there for many years. One participant illustrated this when he said “Haiti isn’t my home anymore. My home is in the US now.”⁵⁰

In addition to the gradual change in participants’ experiences with TPS as their lives changed over the years living in the US, participants also described a sudden change in their experiences over the last year due to changes in the political environment. The announcement that TPS would not be renewed created a “panic in the TPS community” as recipients feared their TPS status would be revoked with no alternative allowing them to stay and work in the US.⁵¹

One participant shared that he had always felt uncertain about his future in the US but that uncertainty has worsened and turned to fear in recent months.⁵² Every 18 months, when he applied for a renewal of his TPS he worried he would be denied and deported.⁵³ He found comfort in believing, or so he thought, that the US would not deport him while El Salvador was still in such bad shape.⁵⁴ Another TPS recipient describes feeling betrayed because the country she has called home for over a decade seemingly does not care about what happens to her life or her family.⁵⁵

Recipients also described how the imminent end of TPS has increased feelings of urgency and brought more people together to advocate for TPS. Participant B said he has gotten more involved with advocacy organizations in recent months and started speaking at rallies and community forums advocating for the continuation of TPS.⁵⁶ He believes more people are starting to care about TPS because they are recognizing the urgency of finding a solution before the current designation period runs out.⁵⁷ Participant A also spoke about increasing his involvement with advocacy organization since the election. He said that before, advocacy organization primarily helped TPS recipients find housing, jobs, and fill out renewal paperwork.⁵⁸ Now, advocacy organizations are helping recipients fight for their lives.⁵⁹ This includes helping recipients petition for an adjustment to permanent resident status which participant A describes as a gamble because if the case is denied, the government could decide to deport you immediately despite your protected status.⁶⁰

4.5 Networks

Another theme identified in the interviews that has not received sufficient attention from the literature on TPS is the importance of the networks of people that surround TPS recipients that will also be affected by the change in TPS policy. While the main focus of this research was how TPS affect recipients, interview participants repeatedly discussed how TPS also affected the individuals and organizations around them. Their families, their employers, foreign economies, other immigrants, advocacy organizations, and their communities are also influenced by TPS and proposed changes to the policy. One participant spoke of how the National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON) had hosted forums advocating for the protection of TPS recipients because those with TPS make up a large portion of the day laborer work force.⁶¹ Another participant said the construction company he worked for was exploring its options for sponsoring employees with TPS, suggesting their construction business would be negatively affected by the departure of thousands of TPS recipients if their work permits are terminated.⁶²

Recipients also shared details on other networks that would be affected by the termination of TPS. Family members that remain in the US, immigration communities, and volunteer organizations are just a few examples of networks of which TPS recipients are a part. The expansive networks TPS recipients are members of and have developed while in the US further complicate policymakers' decision on the future of TPS. The effects the policy will have on TPS recipients are not the only effects that must be considered; the effects any decision regarding TPS will have on the network of individuals and organization tangentially related to TPS recipients must be considered as well.

5. Conclusion

Overall, fear and uncertainty seem to permeate every aspect of TPS recipients' lives since the election. The harmful effects of liminal legality Menjivar referenced in her study have intensified since TPS has come under greater threat. Being separated from family members; unable to find a job to support themselves and their families; being torn from the communities where they have lived for years; and being forced to return to countries that have been devastated by poverty, violence, national disaster, or a combination of all three are only a few of the concerns expressed by TPS recipients. In the months after the end to TPS designation for El Salvador, and Haiti was announced interview participants worry these fears will soon be realized.

My research confirms claims made in the existing literature that holding TPS has affected recipients economically, politically, and socially and TPS recipients have, in turn, had an economic, political, and social effect on the US. The future of TPS remains uncertain, but the effects TPS has had on the lives of recipients and those related to them are issues policymakers must address when formulating any policy related to TPS. This study does not attempt to make any policy recommendations on the future of TPS. Rather, it presents important issues facing TPS recipients and their networks that should not be ignored in the formulation of future policy regarding TPS recipients from El Salvador, Haiti, and Honduras.

While this research focused primarily on TPS, its findings also have implications for the broader topic of immigration. TPS represents a unique category of immigration because recipients do not fit neatly into any of the traditional categories of immigration. They are neither undocumented nor fully documented; they do not fit the qualifications for refugees, but they are also not migrating for purely economic reasons. Additionally, TPS as a policy is designed to please both voters who support stricter immigration policy and those that support a more relaxed immigration policy. This research identifies several themes that are not specific to TPS recipients but experienced by many other migrants. Additionally, the debate over the future of TPS policy is grounded in a broader debate regarding whether the US has a responsibility to protect foreign citizens within US border and what that responsibly entails.

There are many avenues through which research on TPS should continue. The author hopes to expand this study in the future by applying a similar methodology to a larger pool of interview participants nation-wide. Additionally, future research could include interviews with family members of TPS recipients (abroad and in the US), employers, advocates, and others who are a part of the TPS network. If the Trump administration does end TPS designations with or without an alternative future research should investigate the effects of that decision.

Research on TPS and an understanding of the policy's effects is crucial not only for present day TPS countries and recipients, but potential future TPS countries and recipients as well. In the case of Honduras, El Salvador, and Haiti TPS was designated immediately following an environment disaster. As the majority of climate scientists predicted the rate of environment disasters would increase in the coming decade, the US is likely to be faced with a similar problem of migrants fleeing an environmental disaster in their home countries that prevents their safe return. The outcome of the current TPS designations and debate surrounding the policy will surely affect future decisions on

designating TPS. Many scholars argued that TPS was a flawed policy because it violated congressional intent, imposed injurious effects of liminal legality, or lacked formalized oversight and transparency. If TPS as a policy is abandoned in its entirety that leaves open an important question for future research: what policy will replace it and what effects will that policy have? This research provides important insights into TPS and its effects but it merely scratches the surface of research on TPS—and immigration more broadly—that should be conducted in the coming decade when many of the existing immigration debates are likely to come to the forefront of public policy decision-making.

6. Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express their appreciation to the TPS recipients who volunteered their time and stories to this research. As well as the faculty and students at American University who supported this author throughout the research process, specifically: her faculty advisor Professor Christopher Rudolph; her SIS Honors Research Professor Dr. Sarah Knight; SIS Undergraduate Research Coordinator Dr. Aaron Boesenecker; her peers in the SIS Honors Program; and the staff responsible for organizing the 2018 National Conference on Undergraduate Research.

7. Endnotes

1 Warren, Robert and Kerwin, Donald. “A Statistical and Demographic Profile of the US Temporary Protected Status Populations from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5, no. 3 (2017)

2 Orrenius, PM, and M. Zavodny. “The Impact of Temporary Protected Status on Immigrants’ Labor Market Outcomes.” *AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW* 105, no. 5 (2015): 576–580. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20151109>.

3 Bergeron, Claire. “Temporary Protected Status after 25 Years: Addressing the Challenge of Long-Term ‘Temporary’ Residents and Strengthening a Centerpiece of US Humanitarian Protection.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 2, no. 1 (2014): 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v2i1.23>.

4 Hallett, Miranda Cady. “Temporary Protection, Enduring Contradiction: The Contested and Contradictory Meanings of Temporary Immigration Status.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 39, no. 3 (2014): 621–642. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12081>

5 Anchors, Sarah. “Temporary Protected Status: Making the Designation Process More Credible, Fair, and Transparent.” *Arizona State Law Journal* 39, no. 2 (2007)

6 Hallett, Miranda Cady. “Temporary Protection, Enduring Contradiction: The Contested and Contradictory Meanings of Temporary Immigration Status.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 39, no. 3 (2014): 621–642. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12081>

7 Anchors, Sarah. “Temporary Protected Status: Making the Designation Process More Credible, Fair, and Transparent.” *Arizona State Law Journal* 39, no. 2 (2007)

8 Coutin, Susan Bibler. “From Refugees to Immigrants: The Legalization Strategies of Salvadoran Immigrants and Activists.” *The International Migration Review* 32, no. 4 (1998): 901–925.

9 Menjívar, Cecilia. “Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants’ Lives in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 4 (2006): 999–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499509>.

10 Menjívar, Cecilia. “Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants’ Lives in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 4 (2006): 999–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499509>.

11 Menjívar, Cecilia. “Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants’ Lives in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 4 (2006): 999–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499509>.

12 Menjívar, Cecilia. “Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants’ Lives in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 4 (2006): 999–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499509>.

13 Menjívar, Cecilia. “Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants’ Lives in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 4 (2006): 999–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499509>.

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

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

16 Mountz, Alison, Richard Wright, Ines Miyares, and Adrian J. Bailey. "Lives in Limbo: Temporary Protected Status and Immigrant Identities." *Global Networks* 2, no. 4 (2002): 335–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00044>.

17 Menjivar, Cecilia, and Leisy J. Abrego. "Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants." *The American Journal of Sociology* 117, no. 5 (2012): 1380.

18 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

19 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

20 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

21 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

22 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

23 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

24 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

25 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

26 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

27 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

28 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

29 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

30 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

31 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

32 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

33 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

34 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

35 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

36 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

37 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

38 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

39 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

40 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

41 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

42 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

43 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

44 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

45 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

46 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

47 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

48 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

49 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

50 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

51 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

52 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

53 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

54 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

55 TPS recipient C. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 23, 2018.

56 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

57 TPS recipient B. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 3, 2018.

58 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

59 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

60 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.

61 TPS recipient D. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. February 26, 2018.

62 TPS recipient A. Interview by author. Washington, D.C. March 1, 2018.