**Latinx Families' Extended Household Structures and Child Behavioral Problems across
Mother's Immigrant Status in Los Angeles**

Jeehye Kang, Old Dominion University, jkang@odu.edu

Philip N. Cohen, University of Maryland

Feinian Chen, University of Maryland

June 2020

FORTHCOMING IN *CHILD INDICATORS RESEARCH*

Latinx Families' Extended Household Structures and Child Behavioral Problems across Mother's Immigrant Status in Los Angeles

Abstract

Using the panel samples from the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (L.A. FANS), this paper examined the associations of extended household structures—the entry, stay, and exit of grandparents (vertical kin) and other extended adults (horizontal kin)—with child behavioral problems across US-born, documented and undocumented Latinx families. Difference-score regression models showed differential associations of extended kin by different types of transitions. For children of US-born Latina mothers, gaining grandparents was associated with higher (worse) levels of internalizing (i.e. withdrawn) behaviors, whereas losing grandparents was associated with lower (better) levels of internalizing and externalizing (i.e. disobedient) behaviors. For children of documented Latina mothers, gaining grandparents had no effect, but losing grandparents and keeping horizontal kin were associated with lower levels of internalizing behaviors. For children of undocumented Latina mothers, gaining grandparents was associated with higher levels of externalizing behaviors, but keeping grandparents was associated with lower levels of internalizing behaviors, and keeping horizontal kin was associated with lower levels of both internalizing and externalizing behaviors. The association between the household transition of extended kin and children's behavior reflects selection rather than causation in the context of family life course and US immigration policy.

Keywords: child behavioral problems; extended household structures; undocumented.

More than 19 million US children are growing up in families with at least one foreign-born parent, and about 5 million children live with at least one undocumented parent (Child Trends, 2018; Passel et al., 2018). These children are likely to live in complex living arrangements with multiple adult family members, and continue living in extended households (with high member turnover) even after a long period of residence in the U.S. (Chavez, 1990; Hall et al., 2019; Menjívar, 2006; Yoshikawa, 2011). Such extended households usually consist of adult members in the same generation as parents – horizontal kin (i.e., aunts, uncles), rather than vertical kin (i.e. grandparents) – due to the selectivity of younger adults into migration and being ineligible for family reunification, if undocumented (Kang & Cohen 2017; Landale, Thomas, and Van Hook 2011; Van Hook and Glick 2007). Extended households are known to be crucial for immigrant families, especially undocumented families, to cope with poverty, social isolation, and potential family disruptions due to apprehension and deportation (Chavez, 1990, 2012). However, little is known about the children’s adjustment in extended immigrant households, not to mention the experience of children of undocumented immigrants. Although a caring adult member of the extended family may improve children’s withdrawn behaviors (internalizing behaviors) or disobedient behaviors (externalizing behaviors), how children of immigrants may organize their emotions and behaviors in response to extended kin is unknown (Jacobsen et al., 2012). Given the importance of children’s behavioral functioning for their future educational and health outcomes (Fanti & Henrich, 2010), as well as the growing demographic significance of children of immigrants (Child Trends, 2018), this lack of knowledge is problematic. This study aims to fill this knowledge gap.

Prior research provides some basis for understanding the development of children in extended households. Although most relevant studies have been correlational (DeLeire & Kalil,

2002; Mollborn, Fomby, & Dennis, 2011; Monserud & Elder Jr., 2011; Pittman & Boswell, 2008), there are some longitudinal studies showing that different types of transitions (e.g., entry, stay, exit) and different types of extended kin (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) have differential associations with child outcomes (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2007; Mollborn et al., 2012). Grandparents have greater impacts than do horizontal kin (aunts, uncles) on child development, but the direction of the associations depends on the type of transitions. The entry and stay of grandparents are negatively associated with child outcomes because the presence of grandparents in the household often relates to a family crisis situation, such as divorce, incarceration of a parent, or poor parental health, all of which may increase behavioral problems in children; by contrast, the exit of grandparents implies that family conditions may have improved, and may correlate with improvement in child behaviors (Burnette, 1997; Fuller-Thomson & Minkler, 2007). In other words, the association between the household transitions of extended kin and children's behaviors reflects selection rather than causation.

Prior research has focused exclusively on US-born families, which means findings may not hold for immigrant families. Immigrant families have different risks and resources; children of undocumented immigrants are at the greatest risk of behavioral problems (Brabeck & Sibley, 2016; Landale et al., 2015). The US immigration policy, immigrant families' migration processes, and parental legal status shape the organization of extended households, making the role of extended kin in immigrant families different from that in non-immigrant families (Enchautegui & Menjivar 2015; Gilbertson & Gurak 1992; Glick 1999; Gubernskaya & Tang 2017; Kang & Cohen, 2017). Given the greater availability of horizontal kin compared to grandparents, the former may play as important a role as do grandparents in immigrant families. The transitions of extended kin can also have different meanings. For documented immigrant

families, the entry of grandparents could occur through family reunification – in other words, as testament to a cohesive family network, not necessarily due to stressful and stigmatized events – and thus may not be associated with negative child outcomes. For undocumented immigrant families, the entry of grandparents could indicate a family crisis situation (e.g., parental deportation) that may hinder child behavioral development, but it could also indicate strong family ties and support (i.e., familism), which may benefit children (Chavez, 2012; Gubernskaya & Tang, 2017). It is unknown how two contrasting conditions would operate for children of undocumented immigrants. Thus, it stands to reason that extended household structures will have different associations with child behavioral outcomes across parental immigrant status.

Using the panel sample of children from the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Study (L.A. FANS), the current study will examine the associations between various extended household arrangements and child behavioral problems. The L.A. FANS is one of few longitudinal survey datasets that allow researchers to measure behavioral changes in children by the transitions of extended kin across two time points. The associations will be examined across different immigrant groups with Latin American origins: US-born, documented immigrant, and undocumented immigrant families. Given that Latinx immigrants account for more than 81 percent of the undocumented immigrants in the U.S. (Passel & Cohn, 2019), this research focuses on Latinx families; by doing so, the research controls racial and ethnic variance associated with different forms of extended household organization. Difference-score models will be employed to measure the differential associations of the entry, stay, and exit of extended kin. Our research aims to help provide adequate policy interventions to ameliorate the developmental disadvantages experienced by children of immigrants.

Review of Literature

Extended household organization and child behavioral problems

Forms of extended household organization examined from the life course perspective

Child behavioral problems reflect children's organization of emotions and behaviors in response to social stimuli (Jacobsen, Mather, & Dupuis, 2012). Families provide the most significant social stimuli in children's lives, along with family life stages and events (e.g., marriage, divorce, aging) in the social context (Elder, 1998). Although the literature has focused on the impacts of parental union status changes, recent studies recognize the significance of extended household organization for children (e.g. Mollborn et al., 2011, 2012). For example, changes in extended households reflect the shifting levels of dependence and needs of individuals, and the (re)distribution of resources and risks in extended households can influence child development (Blank & Torrecilha, 1998; Elder et al., 2003). Given that about 35 percent of children in the United States live with an adult other than their parents at some point (Cross 2018), it is crucial to examine how extended household structures are associated with children's well-being.

Researchers have assumed that the formation of extended family arrangements represents a parent's failure to achieve economic independence, or a system of social organization that compromises child development, such as divorce, unemployment, or parental incarceration (Burnette, 1997; Fuller-Thomson & Minkler, 2007). Older parents (that is, grandparents) often join the family in response to such family crises. The dissolution of extended family arrangements implies financial stability or other improvement in the nuclear family situation, which could have a positive implication for children's development (Blank, 1998; Blank & Torrecilha, 1998; Mollborn et al., 2012). For example, parents, especially those with younger children, often form extended households after divorce, when the need for additional caregivers for children is heightened; when the need for childcare decreases, such as when the single parent

remarries or begins cohabitation, the extended household likely dissolves (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Rodriguez, 1987). For these reasons, the entry and exit of extended members have differential influences on children. To examine the associations of changes in an extended household structure with child development, therefore, a longitudinal research design is imperative.

Entry, stay, and exit of different types of extended members

Longitudinal studies on children in extended household structures are few, compared to the volume of cross-sectional studies on co-residential kin (e.g., DeLeire & Kalil, 2002; Mollborn, Fomby, & Dennis, 2011; Monserud & Elder Jr., 2011; Pittman & Boswell, 2008), which support the positive effect of co-resident grandparents. Recent longitudinal studies suggest that not only the type of transitions (e.g., entry, stay, exit) but also the relationship of extended kin to the child (e.g., grandparents, other kin) have differential associations with child behavioral development (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2007; Mollborn et al., 2012). Consistent with the life course perspective, the entry and prolonged stay of an extended family member were negatively associated with children's development, whereas the exit of an extended member had positive associations (Mollborn et al., 2012). Grandparents played more roles in child development than did other kin, perhaps given the greater levels of the intergenerational resource exchanges between adult children and older parents compared to the lateral exchanges among individuals in the same generation (Hogan et al., 1993; Kana'iaupuni et al., 2005). However, the extent to which these patterns would apply to immigrant families is unknown because previous studies either focus only on non-immigrant families (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2007) or use parental immigrant status simply as a control variable (Mollborn et al., 2012).

Parental immigrant status, child behavioral problems, and extended households

Immigrant families pose different risks and resources for children. Studies that do not identify parental legal status show that Latinx children of immigrants (ages 12-17) have a lower risk of behavioral problems than those of US-born parents, due to the greater family support in immigrant families (Degboe et al., 2011). However, recent studies show that children of undocumented mothers are at greater risk of internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors than are those of US-born and documented mothers, due to poverty and fear of exposure (Brabeck & Sibley 2016; Landale et al. 2015). Although a few studies suggest that children of immigrants will likely experience improved socioemotional outcomes over time (Smokowski et al., 2010) and fare as well as those of US-born parents (Hao & Woo, 2012), it is unknown whether this pattern would apply to children of undocumented immigrants. Research on immigrant families supports the notion that the implications of extended household structures differ by parental legal status. Kang and Cohen (2017) showed that extended kin played a less positive role in documented families than in undocumented families, because the former tended to be in a position to help extended kin rather than the other way around. That analysis had a cross-sectional sample, and the relationship of extended kin to children was not measured. Thus, knowledge is still lacking on the effects of the entry, stay, and exit of vertical and horizontal kin.

Despite the lack of research, there are reasons to believe that some extended household structures may have different implications for children of immigrant families. First, US immigration policy determines the kin availability for immigrant families, changing the meaning of extended household structures (Enchautegui & Menjívar, 2015). For Latinx immigrants, grandparents are less available because working-age individuals select into migration to the U.S. (Van Hook & Glick, 2007). Moreover, under family reunification provisions, only citizens are allowed to reunite with older parents. Although a longer duration of residence in the U.S. (e.g.,

20 years or more) can lead to obtaining citizenship and eventually living with vertical kin, this will not happen in the case of undocumented immigrants, for whom it is extremely difficult to change their status (Gilbertson & Gurak, 1992; Glick, 1999; Gomborg-Muñoz, 2015). Indeed, compared with US-born individuals, Latinx immigrants are less likely to have vertical kin and more likely to have horizontal kin in their home (Blank & Torrecilha, 1998; Glick et al., 1997; Landale et al., 2011). Undocumented immigrants were the least likely to live with grandparents when compared with their documented and citizen counterparts in a nationally representative sample (Hall et al., 2019) as well as in New York, one of the gateway states (Yoshikawa, 2011). When grandparents are present in undocumented families, those older adults are also likely to be undocumented, having immigrated at younger ages and grown old in the U.S., rather than having joined the family as later-life migrants (Gubarnskaya & Tang, 2017).

Second, the migration processes of families and their kin shape the extended household organization for immigrant families (Gilbertson & Gurak, 1992; Glick, 1999; Van Hook & Glick, 2007). Latinx immigrants' migration patterns are characterized by "chain migration," whereby immigrant households in the United States serve as a "port in a storm" for the international migration of relatives or friends from the country of origin, and the new migrants rely on previous arrivals for assistance with housing, access to jobs, and other resources (Hagan et al., 2008; Massey & Gentsch, 2014; Pessar, 1982; Portes, 1995; Van Hook & Glick, 2007). Due to parental involvement in migration networks, children of immigrants are not only more likely to live in extended households at one point in time (Hernandez, 2004; Kang & Cohen, 2017; Landale et al., 2011; Van Hook & Glick, 2007), but they are also likely to experience changes in their household structure through the entry and exit of extended kin (Glick, 1999; Van Hook & Glick, 2007). The transitions of extended kin can be a normal part of family settlement

processes and a result of family reunification for immigrant families; however, these events might co-occur with traumatic events, such as the deportation of household members in the case of undocumented immigrant families (Hall et al., 2019).

Third, parental legal status can change family behaviors. Facing potential family disruption caused by apprehension and deportation, as well as persistent poverty, undocumented Mexicans and Central Americans rely on extended household members as an important resource to ensure the presence of caregivers for their children in case of parental absence (Chavez, 1990). Although immigrants tend to transition to simple (not extended) households with longer residence in the U.S. (Blank and Torres 1998; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994), undocumented immigrants tend to live in extended households even after many years in the U.S. (Chavez, 2012). The continuing need for physical and psychological security may make family relations in undocumented immigrant families different from those in documented or US-born families.

Expectations

Given the differential kin availability and family behaviors, the associations between extended household structures and children's behavioral outcomes are expected to vary across immigrant groups. Specifically, different types of extended kin can have differential associations. Although grandparents played a more important role than horizontal kin in non-immigrant families, horizontal kin may be as important as grandparents for immigrant families, given the greater availability of horizontal kin (Hogan et al., 1993; Kana'iaupuni et al., 2005). Extended kin transitions will also have different meanings across immigrant groups. Although the long-term residence of extended kin in the household has been understood as a parent's failure to achieve economic independence, the potential benefits of keeping extended kin (i.e., greater family security) may exceed the disadvantages of living in complex households (Chavez, 2012).

Glick (1999) documents that horizontal kin in extended households tend to provide more resources the longer they stay in the United States. A similar observation was reported in qualitative research on undocumented Central Americans in Houston (Rodriguez, 1987, p. 17) and ethnographic research based in San Diego (Chavez, 2012). Thus, we hypothesize that keeping extended kin (vertical and horizontal) will be associated with lower (better) levels of behavioral problems for children of undocumented immigrants.

Considering the limited availability of grandparents due to current immigration policy, the entry of grandparents may have distinct implications across immigrant groups. The entry of grandparents into the household has been understood as a system of family disorganization among US-born families (Burnette, 1997; Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2007; Fuller-Thomson & Minkler, 2007). However, for documented immigrant families (specifically, naturalized immigrants), such events may not imply a deterioration of family conditions but may rather be a result of family reunification (which might also reflect strong ties and commitment to family). For undocumented immigrant families, who are ineligible for legal avenues of family reunification, the entry of grandparents can have two contrasting meanings. One implies the family's longer duration of residence in the U.S. and a strong family support network (Gubernskaya & Tang, 2017); the other implies a family disruption (e.g. a parent's apprehension or deportation) that necessitates grandparents joining the family (Chavez, 1990, 2012). Due to lack of consistency in the existing literature (see Chen et al., 2015), we are unable to build a working hypothesis for undocumented immigrant families. Instead, potential mechanisms will be explored. Thus, we hypothesize only that gaining grandparents will be associated with higher (worse) levels of behavioral problems for children in US-born Latinx families, but this association will not hold for children in documented immigrant Latinx families.

Data and Method

Sample

The samples came from the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (L.A. FANS) panel data. The first wave was fielded between April 2000 and January 2002, throughout Los Angeles County. Fieldwork for the second wave took place between August 2006 and December 2008. In Wave 2, primary respondents from Wave 1 who were still residing in Los Angeles County were interviewed, regardless of whether they continued to live in their Wave 1 neighborhoods (Peterson et al. 2011). We excluded individuals who moved into the sampled neighborhoods between Waves 1 and 2 because we did not have information about their previous household composition. Similarly, children who were too young to have their behavioral problems assessed in the first wave were excluded (younger than three years). Only those children captured in both waves are included; this provides the longitudinal data allowing calculation of the difference scores in behavioral problems as well as changes in household composition.

The L.A. FANS obtained information from more than one respondent in sampled households. In households with children, one child was randomly chosen (RSC), and one of his or her siblings (SIB) was randomly selected as well, if the RSC had one or more siblings under age 17. For each household, an adult member (RSA) was randomly chosen to complete an adult questionnaire to garner information about immigrant status. This clustering within households was accounted for by using robust standard error estimators. The mother of the randomly selected child was designated as the primary caregiver and completed a parent questionnaire, a primary caregiver questionnaire and the adult questionnaire, if the mother was not the RSA. The

analytical sample was limited to randomly selected children and their siblings, whose primary caregiver completed all three questionnaires. Because families with children and families living in poor neighborhoods were oversampled, survey weights were used.

The current study's analytical sample was restricted to Latinx-origin children with US-born, documented, and undocumented mothers captured in *both waves*. First, 687 of 1,575 Latinx children were captured in both waves. Next, those missing on the outcome variables ($n=189$), and other control variables ($n=21$) were excluded, resulting in 477 children, and 954 child-years. The sampled children were aged 3-11 at Wave 1 and aged 8-17 at Wave 2. Given the non-trivial amount of attrition between two waves (56%), the child and family characteristics measured at Wave 1 in the panel sample were compared with the cross-sectional first wave sample, as well as the sample missing at Wave 2, to assess if there was any attrition bias (see Appendix). We found no significant difference in terms of the distributions of immigrant groups, levels of internalizing and externalizing behaviors, and family and household structures among those samples. To further test a sensitivity issue due to missing cases, we compared the results between the original and multiply imputed samples and found no significant difference (available upon request).

Measures

Dependent Variable We measured children's internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors with the Behavior Problems Index (BPI) developed by Peterson and Zill (1986), which has been used extensively in child development studies. Parents responded to the BPI questions using a three-point Likert scale that indicated how true each statement was of their child. Higher scores on both indices indicate a greater incidence of problem behaviors.

The internalizing scale assessed the presence of withdrawn and sad behaviors (Guttmanova et al., 2008, p. 2; Oldehinkel et al., 2004; Perle et al., 2013). The measure

consisted of eleven items, such as: felt or complained that no one loved him/her; too fearful or anxious, withdrawn; and/or has not gotten involved with others ($\alpha=.73$). The externalizing scale assessed the presence of aggressive and related behaviors (Guttmanova et al., 2008, p. 1). The measure consisted of seventeen items, such as: disobedient at school; difficulty concentrating; cruel or mean to others; and trouble getting along with other children ($\alpha=.87$). Most children had low behavior problem index scores, which meant the distribution of the measure was skewed. To reduce the heteroscedasticity and inflated standard errors of the estimates in regression analysis resulting from skewed variables, the behavior problem scores were log transformed (Hamilton, 2005). We logged them with the base of two so that a one-unit increase in the dependent variable indicated a doubling of the behavior problem index score. The difference score was obtained by deducting the behavioral scores at W1 from W2 scores.

Independent Variables

Following Mollborn and colleagues (2012), sets of dichotomous variables were created to capture transitions in household organization between Wave 1 and Wave 2. Although our primary focus was on different forms of extended household organization, parental union status changes were also measured due to the correlation between those events. Children were coded as keeping (i.e., co-resident at both waves), losing (co-resident at W1 but not W2), gaining (co-resident at W2 but not W1), or never including the following types of household members: (1) co-resident vertical kin (i.e., parents (in-law) or grandparents of the householder or the spouse of the householder), and (2) co-resident horizontal kin (i.e., siblings (in-law), cousins, nieces and nephews of the householder or the spouse of the householder), and (3) the primary caregiver's (= mother's, in 99% of cases) partner. To clarify, "losing" vertical kin means grandparents were present in the household at Wave 1, but absent in the household at Wave 2. Because only one

percent of children lost extended kin due to bereavement, this type of loss was not separately measured. The reference category for transitions in mother's union status was stably married mothers. In other words, compared with children of stably married mothers, those gaining a parental figure, those losing a parental figure, those with stably cohabiting mothers, and those with stably single-parent mothers (i.e., divorced, separated, widowed, and never married) were examined.

Moderator: Mother's immigrant status (nativity and documentation status) Using questions about the mother's place of birth and a series of questions about their documentation status, we measured mother's immigration status with a categorical variable: (1) U.S. born, (2) documented immigrant, and (3) undocumented immigrant. First, we identified foreign-born mothers by their place of birth (US-born vs. foreign-born). Next, mother's legal status was determined by whether they were naturalized citizens; and if not, whether they had a green card, or permanent residence. Immigrants who were neither citizens nor permanent residents were asked whether they had been granted asylum or refugee status. Finally, respondents who did not answer any of the aforementioned questions in the affirmative were asked whether they had a valid visa. Those who were neither naturalized citizens, permanent residents, nor documented were coded as undocumented. We used mother's immigrant status because mostly mothers (99%) responded to the parent, primary caregiver, and adult questionnaires; because there were more missing cases for father's place of birth; and more importantly, because mothers play a more critical role than fathers do in shaping their children's developmental trajectories (Kao & Tienda, 1995). Mother's legal status can be reliably used to measure family immigrant status, given the considerable homogeneity by legal status in the marital and cohabiting unions of undocumented immigrants (Hall et al., 2019).

Controls Children's age (3-17) and sex (0=female, 1=male) were controlled. For children of immigrants, their place of birth was controlled (0=US-born, 1= foreign-born). For immigrant mothers only, their duration of residence in the U.S. was controlled (0=0-5 years, 1=5-10 years, 2=10-20 years, and 3=20+ years). Mother's ethnicity was self-reported and was controlled for a potential difference among Latinx families (0=Mexican, 1=Central American). Mother's educational attainment was categorically measured: 0=less than high school; 1=graduated from high school; 2: Bachelor's degree or higher. Some control variables were time-variant (i.e., family income, depressive symptoms, employment status), and the differences between Wave 1 and Wave 2 were calculated. Family income was the sum of income from head of household, spouse/partner of head, and adult children, and the value was logged for the analysis. Mother's employment status was categorical (0= not employed, 1= employed). Analyses controlled for mothers' depressive symptoms because they were potentially associated with extended household structures as well as with child behavioral development. A short form questionnaire about major depressive episodes (MD) provided a probability that the mother suffered from major depression, ranging between 0 and 1. Due to the "regression to the mean" effect, in which respondents with unusually low scores at Wave 1 tend to have improved scores at Wave 2 and vice versa, we controlled for Wave 1 scores.

Analytical plan

To examine the relationships between extended household structures and children's behavioral functioning, we performed difference-score regression analyses using the panel data sample. The difference in the behavioral problem scores between W1 and W2 was regressed on the predictor variables, transitions in family household organization. Difference-score models were appropriate to use because there were pre-existing population differences at baseline;

otherwise, the estimates will necessarily be biased (Castro-Schilo & Grimm, 2018). We chose a difference-score model over a fixed effects model. Fixed effects models do not allow researchers to separate the effects of losing and gaining kin because they estimate the aggregate effects of all transitions (do not distinguish between gaining and losing kin), even though gaining kin and losing kin mean different things and have different associations. In addition, when no changes occurred between time points (e.g., keeping kin over W1 and W2), those cases were dropped out of the fixed effects model. Difference-score models can distinguish between the estimates of gaining versus losing kin associations, and also allow for examining the estimates of keeping kin.

We performed the analyses separately by immigrant status group based on our preliminary Chow test results (Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones, 2007). All measures were interacted with maternal immigrant status in a fully interacted model that combined all immigrant groups, and Chow tests were conducted to see if the results differed across the immigrant groups. Due to the insufficient number of horizontal kin transitions among US-born families, the interaction terms with horizontal kin transitions were tested in a separate model using immigrant families only. Chow test results showed significant differences across maternal immigrant status (see Table 3).

Descriptive Results

Table 1 presents the sample characteristics of Latinx children across maternal immigrant status. Although we use difference scores for time-variant variables (e.g., behavioral scores, family income), we show their values at Wave 1 and Wave 2 for descriptive purposes. Children of undocumented mothers have the highest levels of internalizing and externalizing behavioral problems in both waves (Brabeck & Sibley, 2016; Landale et al. 2015), but the differences become smaller at Wave 2. Notably, the levels of internalizing and externalizing behavioral

problems decrease (improve) over time, except for children of US-born mothers. Although the worsening behaviors among Latinx children of US-born mothers have not been reported in cross-sectional research (Degboe et al., 2011), the improvement of children of immigrants to fare as well as children with US-born mothers is consistent with prior research (Hao & Woo, 2012; Smokowski et al., 2010).

[Table 1 about here]

There are differences in family household organization. In both W1 and W2, children of immigrant mothers, especially those of undocumented mothers, were less likely to live with grandparents but more likely to live with horizontal kin, compared with those of US-born mothers. For example, 26 percent of children of undocumented mothers lived with horizontal kin at W1, compared with 13 percent for documented families and 2 percent for US-born families. By contrast, 32 percent of children of US-born mothers lived with grandparents at W1, while only 9 percent children of undocumented mothers did. About five years later, the likelihood of having either grandparents or horizontal kin in the household decreased for all immigrant groups, except for vertical kin in undocumented families. Undocumented Latinx families were slightly more likely to live with grandparents than in the prior survey (9 percent at W1 and 11 percent at W2).

Table 2 presents the different types of transitions in family household structure between W1 and W2. Although losing extended kin, regardless of the type, was the most common life event for all groups, there were significant differences in family household organization across immigrant groups. When it comes to grandparent transitions, gaining grandparents did not differ much among groups (5-6 percent). However, children of both documented and undocumented mothers were less likely to keep grandparents than those of US-born mothers, which may be

related to the fact that the former groups were less likely than children of US-born mothers to have ever lived with grandparents. Regarding horizontal kin transitions, children of US-born mothers rarely gained, kept or lost them (0-1 percent), whereas such events were more common among children of Latinx immigrant mothers, especially those of undocumented mothers. Children of undocumented mothers were more likely to gain (6 percent), keep (11 percent) or lose (15 percent) horizontal kin, compared with US-born (0, 1, and 1 percent) and documented families (2, 2, and 11 percent). Regarding mother's marital status changes, there were no visible differences across immigrant groups.

[Table 2 about here]

Analytical Results

Table 3 presents the results of difference-score regression analyses for internalizing and externalizing behavioral problems for children of US-born, documented, and undocumented Latina mothers. All models controlled for child and family control variables (for US-born families, child nativity and mother's duration of residence variables were not controlled).

Children of US-born Latina mothers

For children of US-born Latina mothers, gaining grandparents is associated with higher risks of internalizing behaviors by about 4.50 points ($=2^{2.171}$, $p<.001$), but no differences in externalizing behaviors emerged ($=2^{1.022}$, ns). The association of gaining grandparents for internalizing behaviors is significantly larger than for documented- and undocumented Latinx families. By contrast, losing grandparents is associated with lower risks of internalizing behaviors by 2.11 points ($=2^{-1.080}$, $p<.01$) and lower externalizing behaviors by about 1.61 points ($=2^{-0.688}$, $p<.05$). Union transitions have no significant association with internalizing behaviors, but living with

stably cohabiting mothers is associated higher risk for externalizing behaviors by 1.89 points ($=2^{0.916}$, $p<.01$).

[Table 3 about here]

Children of documented Latina mothers

For children of documented Latina mothers, losing grandparents is associated with lower risks of internalizing behaviors by about 1.46 points ($=2^{|-0.544|}$, $p<.05$). Neither gaining nor keeping grandparents has significant associations with behavioral problems. Keeping horizontal kin is associated with lower risks of internalizing behaviors by 1.95 points ($=2^{|-0.961|}$, $p<.01$). Losing a parental figure is associated with higher risks of internalizing behaviors and externalizing behaviors by about 2.02 points ($=2^{1.012}$, $p<.01$) and 1.98 points ($=2^{0.982}$, $p<.01$), respectively. Living with stably cohabiting parents is associated with lower risks of internalizing behaviors by about 1.60 points ($=2^{|-0.674|}$, $p<.01$), which is distinct from the patterns of US-born and undocumented Latinx families.

Children of undocumented Latina mothers

For children of undocumented Latina mothers, gaining grandparents is associated with higher risks of externalizing behaviors by about 1.67 points ($=2^{0.738|}$, $p<.05$). By contrast, keeping grandparents is associated with lower risks of internalizing behaviors by about 1.91 points ($=2^{|-0.932|}$, $p<.05$). These associations between grandparent transitions and child behaviors are distinct from the patterns found for documented families. Keeping horizontal kin is associated with lower risks of both internalizing and externalizing behaviors by about 1.82 points ($=2^{|-0.861|}$, $p<.01$), and 2.21 points ($=2^{|-1.142|}$, $p<.001$), respectively. Gaining a parental figure is associated with higher risks of internalizing behaviors by about 1.84 points ($=2^{0.881|}$, $p<.05$).

Additional Analyses

The results were generally consistent with our expectations, but it would be useful to explore why gaining grandparents is associated with worse externalizing behaviors for children of undocumented mothers; and why keeping grandparents or horizontal kin is associated with improved behaviors for children of immigrants, especially those with undocumented mothers. Table 4 shows whether each type of extended kin transition relates to an improvement or deterioration in family conditions, or if there is any selectivity. Gaining grandparents relates to losing a partner for US-born and undocumented mothers; it also relates to a lower level of education. Those undocumented mothers who kept grandparents are distinct from US-born or documented mothers; the former is highly educated (52 percent BA+), and those undocumented mothers more often lose a partner while keeping grandparents. The results suggest negative selection in mothers' human capital for gaining grandparents, as opposed to positive selection for keeping grandparents. As for keeping horizontal kin, evidence also supports a positive selection in mothers' education. Both documented and undocumented mothers who kept horizontal kin were more educated than those who gained or lost them. Notably, those undocumented mothers who kept horizontal kin were more likely to be single and remain single, but they were less likely to be employed than at W1 (34 to 11 percent). Those mothers' economic reliance on horizontal kin will be high. Keeping horizontal kin may help documented mothers to be employed (59 to 77 percent), but they seem to be benefiting the least economically ($e^{10.25}$ to $e^{10.56}$). Overall, these results suggest that the negative selection in mother's education (as well as marital disruption) for gaining grandparents, and the positive selection for keeping grandparents and horizontal kin, play a role in their children's behavioral changes for Latinx families in Los Angeles.

[Table 4 about here]

Discussion and Conclusion

For a representative sample of children in Los Angeles, this paper showed how the different types of extended family members and their transitions into and out of the household are associated with children's internalizing and externalizing behaviors for each immigrant status group: US-born, documented, and undocumented Latinx families. Descriptive statistics showed that the family structures of undocumented Latinx families are largely similar to those of documented Latinx families, but there are some differences by maternal legal status. Although both documented and undocumented Latinx families were more likely to live with horizontal kin, the latter were even more likely to gain and keep horizontal kin than were documented Latinxs. The greater reliance on horizontal kin among undocumented Latinx families could be the product of US immigration policy that selects younger, working-age individuals and places restrictions on family reunification (Enchautegui & Menjívar, 2015; Glick et al., 1997; Gubernskaya & Tang, 2017; Landale et al., 2011).

The associations between extended household structures and children's behavioral development varied across mother's nativity and legal status. Consistent with our expectation, gaining grandparents was associated with higher (worse) internalizing behaviors, but losing grandparents was associated with lower (better) problem behaviors of both types for children of US-born Latina mothers. The additional analyses show that mother's marital status changes and negative selection in mother's human capital might explain the associations of grandparent transitions for children of US-born mothers (Blank, 1998; Blank and Torres 1998; Fuller-Thomson & Minkler, 2007; Burnette, 1997). By contrast, gaining grandparents had no association for children of documented mothers, possibly because grandparents joined in a less stigmatized family context, such as family reunification. For children of undocumented mothers,

gaining grandparents was associated with higher (worse) externalizing behaviors. Although gaining grandparents could imply increased family support (Gubernskaya & Tang, 2017), the associated effects of family disruption appeared to be stronger (Chavez, 1990, 2012). Notably, undocumented mothers tended to have lost a partner when they gained older parents (whether a parent's deportation relates to this loss event is not discernible in these data). The loss of a parental figure, coupled with their mother's low human capital, could explain the adverse associations of gaining grandparents for children of undocumented mothers.

Consistent with our expectation, horizontal kin as well as grandparents played an important role in undocumented Latinx families (Chavez, 2012; Glick 1999; Rodriguez, 1987). Keeping grandparents was associated with lower risks for internalizing behaviors. The finding suggests that grandparents can act as a stabilizing force in undocumented families. Keeping horizontal kin was associated with lower risks for both internalizing and externalizing behaviors for children of undocumented mothers; it was also associated with lower risks of internalizing behaviors for children of documented mothers. Although the number of lateral resource exchanges is expected to be lower than the number of intergenerational exchanges, horizontal kin were as influential as vertical kin in Latinx immigrant families (Hogan et al., 1993; Kana'iaupuni et al. 2005). The additional analyses (Table 4) showed a potentially positive selection, especially in undocumented families, behind families who kept living with extended kin. Possibly, those undocumented mothers who were able to manage continuous living with extended kin were able to access greater resources (Glick, 1999; Gubernskaya & Tang, 2017) and diversify family strategies for survival and caregiving (Chen et al., 2015), which contributed to their children's behavioral development. Although the associations with extended kin transition should be

interpreted with caution due to the selection, our results seem to suggest that the benefits of family security may exceed the harms of family complexity (Chavez, 1990, 2012).

Although mother's union status changes were not a focus of the current study, they were significantly associated with children's behaviors. For children of US-born mothers, mother's cohabitation was associated with increased externalizing behaviors. For children of undocumented Latinxs, gaining a parental figure was associated with increased internalizing behaviors. For children of documented Latinxs, losing a parental figure was associated with increased risks for both types of behavioral problems; and living with stably cohabiting mothers was associated with decreased risks for internalizing behaviors. The benefits of living in a stably cohabiting family could be due to the majority of mothers maintaining their union with the same partner (available upon request). A prior study found that Mexican children of cohabiting mothers fared as well as those of married mothers (Fomby & Estacion, 2011). Overall, the differential associations with regard to marital status across immigrant groups are consistent with the patterns found for various forms of extended household organization.

Limitations and directions for future study

Limitations of this study should be noted. First, the findings from data collected in Los Angeles in 2000-2002 may not represent the experiences of undocumented immigrant families in the larger U.S. The availability of kin could be greater in Los Angeles than in other regions, since the city contains one of the largest Latinx immigrant populations and has well-established communities. Many undocumented immigrant families in the United States today might be in deeper social isolation, given the current political stance on immigration. Nonetheless, the findings provide some insight into how children of undocumented immigrants experience complex living arrangements and navigate their development.

Second, the mechanism through which the transitions of extended kin into and out of the household advance or affect children's behavioral development was not explored. For example, it was unclear why gaining grandparents was harmfully associated with only externalizing behaviors for children of undocumented mothers. The changes in family environment associated with the entry of grandparents might have worked more negatively for externalizing behaviors. Future research should identify the pathways through which extended kin influence children.

Third, because only two waves of data were available, neither the number of household transitions nor the timing of transitions could be assessed, except for those captured when surveys were administered. Ideally, future research should use data with multiple survey waves with smaller time lapses, although it is rare to find such longitudinal data sets with a substantial number of undocumented immigrant families and information on their children. Fourth, difference-score regression analyses do not remove the potential confounding effects of unmeasured variables that change with time (Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones, 2007). However, our control of behavioral outcomes at Wave 1 reduced the "regression-to-the mean" effect to provide more accurate estimates. Lastly, the level of attrition was considerable. However, no significant difference emerged in the sample characteristics assessed before and after attrition (Appendix). Thus, the possibility that attrition bias affects our results should be low.

Contributions and policy implications

This paper expanded the literature on the development of children of both documented and undocumented immigrants by highlighting their family experience and behavioral functioning in extended family living arrangements, which are common in this population but remain understudied. Despite the demographic and societal significance of this population, undocumented immigrants have been largely ignored in previous research. To the best of our

knowledge, this research is the first longitudinal study that examined the changes in children's problem behaviors by various extended kin transitions for undocumented immigrant families. In particular, we provided evidence for the significant role of extended kin in children's behavioral adjustment for this population. In doing so, we advanced previous research in multiple ways. The importance of extended kin networks was proven to benefit immigrant families. Researchers should go beyond parent-child relationships to examine child development, especially in immigrant families. The life course theory of family organization should also incorporate US immigration policy and family migration history to study this population in context.

US immigration policy has defined the family lives of millions of immigrants and their children. The differential kin availability and transitions of extended kin are the products of this immigration policy and accompanying adaptational family processes. Since the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, which increased the number of deportable offenses, militarized the southern border, and increased federal and local enforcement activities, undocumented immigrant families have been living in constant fear of family disruptions (Gonzales, 2016). Keeping available kin in the home may be one familial strategy to maintain family stability against potential apprehension and deportation. Given that undocumented Latinxs are the most likely to rely on horizontal kin, it is an encouraging finding that their children receive the most benefits from a prolonged horizontally extended household. These private support networks, however, cannot protect these children from the fear of losing parents, brothers, sisters, and other family members. The limitations of private support networks raise the need for revisions to current immigration policy. Reconsidering the categories and extent of deportable offenses should be included in the on-going immigration policy discourse. Those who have strong ties to the community (including parents raising children) should be

released from the constant danger of deportation (Gonzales, 2016). Although such policy implications may not be feasible given the current political climate, we argue that the inclusion of marginalized groups into society is a necessary condition for future prosperity and children's well-being.

References

- Blank, Susan. (1998). Hearth and Home: The Living Arrangements of Mexican Immigrants and U. S.-Born Mexican Americans. *Sociological Forum*, 13(1), 35–59.
- Blank, S., & Torrecilha, R. S. (1998). Understanding the Living Arrangements of Latino Immigrants: A Life Course Approach. *The International Migration Review*, 32(1), 3–19.
- Brabeck, K. M., & Sibley, E. (2016). Immigrant Parent Legal Status, Parent–Child Relationships, and Child Social Emotional Wellbeing: A Middle Childhood Perspective. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(4), 1155–1167.
- Burnette, D. (1997). Grandparents raising grandchildren in the inner city. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 78(5), 489–501.
- Castro-Schilo, Laura., and Kevin. J. Grimm (2018). Using residualized change versus difference scores for longitudinal research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35(1), 32–58.
- Chavez, L. R. (1990). Coresidence And Resistance: Strategies For Survival Among Undocumented Mexicans And Central Americans In The United States. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, 19(1/2), 31–61.
- Chavez, L. R. (2012). *Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society*. Cengage Learning.

- Chen, F., Mair, C. A., Bao, L., & Yang, Y. C. (2015). Race/Ethnic Differentials in the Health Consequences of Caring for Grandchildren for Grandparents. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 70(5), 793–803.
- Child Trends. (2018). *Immigrant Children—Child Trends*.
<https://www.childtrends.org/indicators/immigrant-children>
- Degboe, A., BeLue, R., & Hillemeier, M. (2011). Parental immigrant status and adolescent mental health in the United States: Do racial/ethnic differences exist? *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 17(4), 209–215.
- DeLeire, T., & Kalil, A. (2002). Good things come in threes: Single-parent multigenerational family structure and adolescent adjustment. *Demography*, 39(2), 393–413.
- Dunifon, R., & Kowaleski-Jones, L. (2007). The Influence of Grandparents in Single-Mother Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(2), 465–481.
- Elder, G. H. (1998). The Life Course as Developmental Theory. *Child Development*, 69(1), 1–12.
- Elder, Glen H., Monica K. Johnson, and Robert Crosnoe (2003). The Emergence and Development of Life Course Theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the Life Course* (pp. 3–19).
- Enchautegui, María E. and Cecilia Menjívar (2015). Paradoxes of Family Immigration Policy: Separation, Reorganization, and Reunification of Families under Current Immigration Laws. *Law & Policy*, 37(1–2), 32–60.
- Fanti, K. A., & Henrich, C. C. (2010). Trajectories of pure and co-occurring internalizing and externalizing problems from age 2 to age 12: Findings from the National Institute of

- Child Health and Human Development Study of Early Child Care. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(5), 1159–1175.
- Fuller-Thomson, Esme and Meredith Minkler (2007). Central American Grandparents Raising Grandchildren. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 29(1), 5–18.
- Gilbertson, Greta and Douglas T. Gurak (1992). Household Transitions in the Migrations of Dominicans and Colombians to New York. *The International Migration Review*, 26(1), 22–45.
- Glick, Jennifer E. (1999). Economic Support from and to Extended Kin: A Comparison of Mexican Americans and Mexican Immigrants. *The International Migration Review*, 33(3), 745–765.
- Glick, Jennifer E, Frank D. Bean , and Jennifer Van Hook. 1997. “Immigration and Changing Patterns of Extended Family Household Structure in the United States: 1970-1990.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59: 177–91.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, R. (2015). The Punishment/El Castigo: Undocumented Latinos and US Immigration Processing. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 41(14), 2235–2252.
- Gonzales, R. G. (2016). *Lives in limbo undocumented and coming of age in America*. University of California Press.
- Gubernskaya, Zoya, and Zequn Tang. (2017). Just Like in Their Home Country? A Multinational Perspective on Living Arrangements of Older Immigrants in the United States. *Demography*, 54(5), 1973–1998.
- Guttmannova, Katarina, Jason M. Szanyi, and Philip W. Cali. (2008). Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Problem Scores: Cross-Ethnic and Longitudinal Measurement

- Invariance of the Behavior Problem Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68(4), 676–694.
- Hagan, Jacqueline, Karl Eschbach, and Nestor Rodriguez. (2008). U.S. Deportation Policy, Family Separation, and Circular Migration. *The International Migration Review*, 42(1), 64–88.
- Hall, M., Musick, K., & Yi, Y. (2019). Living Arrangements and Household Complexity among Undocumented Immigrants—Hall—2019—Population and Development Review—Wiley Online Library. *Population and Development Review*, 45(1), 81–101.
- Hamilton, Haley A. (2005). Extended families and adolescent well-being. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 36(3), 260–266.
- Hao, L., & Woo, H. S. (2012). Distinct Trajectories in the Transition to Adulthood: Are Children of Immigrants Advantaged? *Child Development*, 83(5), 1623–1639.
- Hernandez, Donald J. (2004). Demographic Change and the Life Circumstances of Immigrant Families. *The Future of Children*, 14(2), 17–47.
- Hogan, Dennis P., David J. Eggebeen, and Clifford C. Clogg. 1993. “The Structure of Intergenerational Exchanges in American Families.” *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (6): 1428–58.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette (1994). *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration*.
- Jacobsen, L. A., Mather, M., & Dupuis, G. (2012). *Household change in the United States* (Vol. 67). Population Reference Bureau Washington, DC.
- Kana’iaupuni, S. M., Donato, K. M., Thompson-Colón, T., & Stainback, M. (2005). Counting on Kin: Social Networks, Social Support, and Child Health Status. *Social Forces*, 83(3), 1137–1164.

- Kang, Jeehye, and Philip N. Cohen. (2017). Extended kin and children's behavioral functioning: Family structure and parental immigrant status. *Social Science & Medicine*, 186, 61–69.
- Landale, N. S., Hardie, J. H., Oropesa, R. S., & Hillemeier, M. M. (2015). Behavioral Functioning among Mexican-origin Children Does Parental Legal Status Matter? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 56(1), 2–18.
- Landale, Nancy S., Kevin J.A. Thomas, and Jennifer Van Hook. 2011. "The Living Arrangements of Children of Immigrants." *Future of Children* 21: 43–70.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Kerstin Gentsch. (2014). Undocumented Migration to the United States and the Wages of Mexican Immigrants. *International Migration Review*, 48(2), 482–499.
- Menjívar, C. (2006). Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(4), 999–1037.
- Mollborn, Stefanie., Paula Fomby, and Jeff A. Dennis. (2011). Who Matters for Children's Early Development? Race/Ethnicity and Extended Household Structures in the United States. *Child Indicators Research*, 4(3), 389–411.
- Mollborn, Stefanie, Paula Fomby, and Jeff A. Dennis. (2012). Extended Household Transitions, Race/Ethnicity, and Early Childhood Cognitive Outcomes. *Social Science Research*, 41(5), 1152–1165.
- Monserud, Maria A., and Glen H. Elder Jr. (2011). Household Structure and Children's Educational Attainment: A Perspective on Coresidence with Grandparents - *Journal of Marriage and Family*, (73), 981 – 1000.
- Oldehinkel, A. J., Hartman, C. A., De Winter, A. F., Veenstra, R., & Ormel, J. (2004). Temperament profiles associated with internalizing and externalizing problems in preadolescence. *Development and Psychopathology*, 16(02), 421–440.

- Passel, J. S., Cohn, D., & Gramlich, J. (2018). U.S. births to unauthorized immigrants have fallen since 2007. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/11/01/the-number-of-u-s-born-babies-with-unauthorized-immigrant-parents-has-fallen-since-2007/>
- Perle, Jonathan G., Alison B. Levine, Anthony P. Odland, Jessica L. Ketterer, Megan A. Cannon, and Craig D. Marker (2013). The Association Between Internalizing Symptomology and Risky Behaviors. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 22(1), 1–24.
- Pessar, Patricia R. (1982). The Role of Households in International Migration and the Case of U.S.- Bound Migration from the Dominican Republic. *The International Migration Review*, 16(2), 342–364.
- Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1986). Marital Disruption, Parent-Child Relationships, and Behavior Problems in Children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 48(2), 295–307.
- Pittman, Laura D., and Michelle K. Boswell (2008). Low-Income Multigenerational Households: Variation in Family Functioning by Mothers' Age and Race/Ethnicity. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(7), 851–881.
- Portes, Alejandro (1995). *The economic sociology of immigration : essays on networks, ethnicity, and entrepreneurship*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rodriguez, Nestor P. (1987). Undocumented Central Americans in Houston: Diverse Populations. *The International Migration Review*, 21(1), 4–26.
- Smokowski, P. R., Rose, R. A., & Bacallao, M. (2010). Influence of Risk Factors and Cultural Assets on Latino Adolescents' Trajectories of Self-Esteem and Internalizing Symptoms. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 41(2), 133–155.

- Van Hook, Jennifer, and Jennifer E. Glick. 2007. "Immigration and Living Arrangements: Moving beyond Economic Need versus Acculturation." *Demography* 44 (2): 225–49.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu. (2011). *Immigrants raising citizens: Undocumented parents and their young children*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1. Weighted Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables by Maternal Immigrant Status

	All		US-born		Documented		Undocument	
	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.
US-born Latinx	.22	(.03)						
Documented Latinx	.55	(.04)						
Undocumented Latinx	.23	(.03)						
Child characteristics								
Internalizing W1 (log2)	1.43	(.08)	.87	(.15)	1.46	(.12)	2.02	(.11)
Internalizing W2 (log2)	1.12	(.07)	1.04	(.15)	1.07	(.11)	1.42	(.12)
Externalizing W1 (log2)	2.31	(.08)	2.20	(.22)	2.30	(.11)	2.63	(.15)
Externalizing W2 (log2)	2.15	(.09)	2.21	(.21)	2.10	(.14)	2.40	(.12)
Child sex (ref. girl)	.49	(.03)	.51	(.07)	.53	(.04)	.45	(.05)
Child age at W1	6.56	(.13)	6.25	(.33)	6.77	(.18)	6.52	(.21)
Child age at W2	13.29	(.13)	13.28	(.31)	13.27	(.19)	13.32	(.20)
Foreign-birth (ref. US-born)					.06	(.02)	.19	(.05)
Mother/Family characteristics								
Central American	.20	(.03)	.07	(.03)	.27	(.05)	.18	(.04)
Mother age	34.06	(.51)	31.97	(1.02)	35.84	(.80)	31.94	(.66)
Duration < 5 yrs					.04	(.02)	.13	(.04)
Duration 6-10 yrs					.08	(.02)	.27	(.05)
Duration 10-15 yrs					.52	(.06)	.56	(.06)
Duration 20+ yrs					.36	(.06)	.04	(.02)
Less than High school	.54	(.04)	.12	(.05)	.57	(.06)	.81	(.04)
High school	.21	(.03)	.25	(.06)	.28	(.06)	.04	(.02)
Some college	.19	(.03)	.58	(.08)	.08	(.02)	.07	(.02)
Bachelor's or more	.06	(.02)	.04	(.02)	.07	(.04)	.07	(.03)
Family income W1 (ln)	9.85	(.12)	10.39	(.26)	9.82	(.21)	9.40	(.17)
Family income W2 (ln)	10.62	(.05)	10.97	(.09)	10.59	(.08)	10.34	(.06)
Mother depressed W1	.08	(.02)	.13	(.05)	.06	(.02)	.11	(.03)
Mother depressed W2	.09	(.02)	.12	(.04)	.06	(.02)	.14	(.04)
Mother employed W1	.50	(.04)	.77	(.07)	.47	(.06)	.31	(.06)
Mother employed W2	.59	(.04)	.84	(.06)	.57	(.06)	.40	(.06)
Family/HH structures								
Married W1	.64	(.04)	.61	(.09)	.65	(.06)	.60	(.06)
Married W2	.72	(.03)	.72	(.06)	.75	(.04)	.65	(.06)
Single-parent W1	.19	(.02)	.22	(.06)	.16	(.04)	.22	(.05)
Single-parent W2	.18	(.02)	.22	(.06)	.17	(.04)	.19	(.04)
Cohabiting W1	.18	(.03)	.17	(.09)	.19	(.05)	.18	(.04)
Cohabiting W2	.10	(.02)	.06	(.03)	.08	(.03)	.17	(.04)
Vertical W1	.16	(.03)	.32	(.09)	.13	(.03)	.09	(.03)
Vertical W2	.11	(.02)	.17	(.05)	.09	(.03)	.11	(.04)
Horizontal W1	.13	(.02)	.02	(.02)	.13	(.03)	.26	(.06)
Horizontal W2	.07	(.02)	.01	(.01)	.04	(.01)	.16	(.06)
N	477		95		236		146	

Table 2. Transitions in Family Households Between W1 and W2 by Maternal Immigrant Status

	All	US-born Latino	Documented Latino	Undocumented Latino
Vertical kin				
Never	0.79	0.63	0.82	0.84
Gain	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06
Keep	0.05	0.12	0.03	0.04
Lose	0.11	0.20	0.10	0.05
Horizontal kin				
Never	0.84	0.98	0.85	0.68
Gain	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.06
Keep	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.11
Lose	0.09	0.01	0.11	0.15
Mother's marital status				
Stably married	0.61	0.56	0.61	0.59
Stably cohabiting	0.15	0.15	0.18	0.13
Stably single parent	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.13
Lose partner	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.05
Gain partner	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.09

Table 3. Results of difference-score regression analyses on Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors (log₂)

	Internalizing BPI			Externalizing BPI		
	US-born	Documnt	Undocmnt	US-born	Documnt	Undocmnt
Vertical kin (ref. never had kin)						
Gain	2.171*** (.544)	.288 ^a (.302)	-.525 ^a (.397)	1.022 (.634)	.059 (.309)	.738* ^c (.322)
Keep	-.201 (.430)	.249 (.321)	-.932* ^c (.458)	-.570 (.448)	-.630 (.569)	-.321 (.399)
Lose	-1.080** (.394)	-.544* (.240)	.010 (.427)	-.688* (.310)	-.274 (.326)	.007 (.439)
Horizontal kin (ref. never had kin)						
Gain		-.363 (.446)	.337 (.447)		-.380 (.359)	.122 (.418)
Keep		-.957** (.368)	-.861** (.275)		-.340 (.417)	-1.142*** (.273)
Lose		-.127 (.233)	.091 (.315)		-.386 (.276)	.189 (.249)
Marital transitions (ref. stably married)						
Lose partner	.026 (.409)	1.012** (.341)	-.467 ^c (.477)	.613 (.410)	.982** (.283)	.309 (.417)
Stably single	.669† (.381)	.257 (.317)	.035 (.318)	.606 (.365)	.581 (.390)	-.050 (.309)
Gain partner	-.168 (.499)	.248 (.431)	.881* (.359)	.441 (.411)	.345 (.407)	.896† (.474)
Stably cohabit	.326 (.416)	-.674** ^a (.209)	.283 ^c (.257)	.916** (.323)	-.639 ^a (.313)	.228 ^c (.268)
Intercept	1.508 (1.027)	.923 (.834)	-1.709 (.913)	.771 (.945)	1.010 (.890)	.230 (.878)
R-squared	.458	.480	.412	.364	.379	.482

Note: ***: $p < .001$, **: $p < .01$, *: $p < .05$, †: $p < .10$. All models controlled for child and family control variables (for US-born families, child nativity and mother's duration of residence variables were not controlled).

^a : Difference in coefficient between US-born and Documented groups is significant at $p < .05$.

^b : Difference in coefficient between US-born and Undocumented groups is significant at $p < .05$.

^c : Difference in coefficient between Documented and Undocumented groups is significant at $p < .05$.

Table 4. Descriptive results of family characteristics by extended kin transitions across Latinx immigrant groups

Vertical Kin Transition	US-born				Documented				Undocumented			
	Never	Gain	Keep	Lose	Never	Gain	Keep	Lose	Never	Gain	Keep	Lose
Stably married (%)	75	58	45	3	61	49	52	65	58	64	71	40
Lose partner (%)	8	42	1	0	6	8	10	0	4	31	24	0
Stably single (%)	9	0	45	20	13	28	0	3	16	0	0	0
Gain partner (%)	3	0	8	20	3	0	30	11	8	0	0	50
Stably cohabit (%)	5	0	0	58	18	15	8	20	15	5	5	10
Mother Depressed W1	16	0	5	11	6	0	15	10	12	4	0	0
Mother Depressed W2	12	34	19	0	6	11	23	4	15	0	17	10
Mother Employed W1 (%)	80	0	76	83	50	18	27	45	34	5	5	33
Mother Employed W2 (%)	83	100	56	100	58	35	63	57	40	36	43	33
(ln) Family income W1	10.75	10.55	10.21	9.30	9.78	10.22	9.78	9.99	9.47	9.89	9.92	7.33
(ln) Family income W2	11.02	10.86	10.43	11.17	10.58	10.61	10.55	10.80	10.33	9.91	10.79	10.29
< High school (%)	13	42	1	12	62	35	32	65	84	95	5	88
High school (%)	28	58	37	0	25	48	51	14	5	0	0	7
Some college (%)	52	0	61	88	7	6	9	21	6	5	43	4
Bachelor's or more (%)	7	0	0	0	7	11	8	0	5	0	52	0
Horizontal Kin Transition	Never	Gain	Keep	Lose	Never	Gain	Keep	Lose	Never	Gain	Keep	Lose
Stably married (%)	61	49	52	65	56	67	63	63				
Lose partner (%)	6	8	10	0	7	0	0	7				
Stably single (%)	13	28	0	3	13	0	24	12				
Gain partner (%)	3	0	30	11	13	5	0	0				
Stably cohabit (%)	18	15	8	20	11	28	13	18				
Mother Depressed W1	6	9	3	3	9	10	1	24				
Mother Depressed W2	7	12	7	4	13	10	35	7				
Mother Employed W1 (%)	50	58	59	19	32	23	34	27				
Mother Employed W2 (%)	59	43	77	38	43	31	11	46				
(ln) Family income W1	10.09	8.17	10.25	7.83	9.32	10.04	9.41	9.51				
(ln) Family income W2	10.64	10.60	10.56	10.29	10.31	10.64	10.25	10.32				
< High school (%)	57	86	48	80	81	77	77	86				
High school (%)	28	6	30	15	5	23	0	0				
Some college (%)	8	8	23	5	9	0	12	0				
Bachelor's or more (%)	7	0	0	0	5	0	11	14				

Note: US-born families do not contain enough cases for Horizontal kin transition

Appendix. Child and family characteristics for the panel sample

	All Latinx children in Panel sample		All Latinx children in W1 sample		All Latinx children missing at W2 sample	
	Mean	<i>S.E.</i>	Mean	<i>S.E.</i>	Mean	<i>S.E.</i>
Internalizing W1 (log2)	1.43	.08	1.48	.06	1.49	.08
Externalizing W1 (log2)	2.31	.08	2.29	.06	2.26	.09
US-born Latino	.22	.03	.22	.02	.22	.03
Documented	.55	.04	.51	.03	.48	.04
Undocumented	.23	.03	.26	.02	.29	.03
Child sex (ref. girl)	.49	.03	.49	.02	.50	.03
Child age W1	6.56	.13	6.85	.10	6.93	.16
Family income W1 (ln)	9.85	.12	9.85	.08	9.75	.11
Mother depressed W1	.08	.02	.11	.01	.12	.02
Mother employed W1	.45	.03	.50	.04	.40	.04
Less than High school	.54	.04	.58	.03	.62	.04
High school	.21	.03	.20	.02	.20	.03
Some college	.19	.03	.17	.02	.15	.03
Bachelor's or more	.06	.02	.04	.01	.03	.01
Married W1	.64	.04	.62	.03	.60	.04
Single-parent W1	.19	.02	.23	.02	.27	.03
Cohabiting W1	.18	.03	.15	.02	.13	.02
Vertical W1	.16	.03	.15	.02	.13	.02
Horizontal W1	.13	.02	.16	.02	.18	.03