

Behavioral Functioning among Mexican-origin Children: Does Parental Legal Status Matter?

Journal of Health and Social Behavior
2015, Vol. 56(1) 2–18
© American Sociological Association 2015
DOI: 10.1177/0022146514567896
jhsb.sagepub.com



Nancy S. Landale¹, Jessica Halliday Hardie²,
R. S. Oropesa¹, and Marianne M. Hillemeier¹

Abstract

Using data on 2,535 children included in the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey, we investigate how the legal status of immigrant parents shapes their children's behavioral functioning. Variation in internalizing and externalizing problems among Mexican youth with undocumented mothers, documented or naturalized citizen mothers, and U.S.-born mothers is analyzed using a comparative framework that contrasts their experience with that of other ethnoracial groups. Our findings reinforce the importance of differentiating children of immigrants by parental legal status in studying health and well-being. Children of undocumented Mexican migrants have significantly higher risks of internalizing and externalizing behavior problems than their counterparts with documented or naturalized citizen mothers. Regression results are inconsistent with simple explanations that emphasize group differences in socioeconomic status, maternal mental health, or family routines.

Keywords

children, externalizing, immigrants, internalizing, mental health, Mexican, undocumented

Previous research on ethnoracial diversity in mental health outcomes in the United States has shown that Mexican-origin adults, especially immigrants, have a lower risk of depression than do non-Latino whites (Delgado et al. 2006; Marin, Escobar, and Vega 2006). In contrast, Mexican-origin children have relatively high risks of anxiety, mood disorders, and behavior problems compared to their non-Latino white peers (Canino and Alegria 2009; Flores 2013). These divergent patterns are often explained in terms of intergenerational shifts in the balance of risk and protective factors. Adult immigrants typically are more insulated from possible negative consequences of socioeconomic and environmental risk factors by their strong ethnic identities, collectivist and familistic values, and continued use of Mexico as a point of comparison for assessing their lives. Their offspring experience the erosion of protective cultural factors and greater awareness of

barriers to full inclusion in American society (Flores 2013).

At the same time, there is evidence of variation in mental health among Mexican-origin youth by parental nativity, with children of immigrants exhibiting better outcomes than children with U.S.-born parents (Flores 2013; Gonzales et al. 2008; Gonzales, Fabrett, and Knight 2009). However, prior research has not systematically considered

¹The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

²Hunter College, City University of New York, New York, NY, USA

Corresponding Author:

Nancy S. Landale, Department of Sociology, The Pennsylvania State University, 211 Oswald Tower, University Park, PA, 16802, USA.

E-mail: nsl3@psu.edu

the legal status of immigrant parents as a potential source of heterogeneity among the former group. Given the high prevalence of unauthorized migrants among foreign-born Mexicans (Passel and Cohn 2011), parental legal status may be a critical element of children's lives that affects their immediate and long-term well-being. Thus, scholars increasingly recognize immigration status as a central but understudied dimension of stratification in the United States (Glick 2010; Massey and Bartley 2005; Viruell-Fuentes, Miranda, and Abdulrahim 2012).

We extend the literature on children's mental health by considering this important dimension of stratification as a factor in children's internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. Although our primary interest is in the roles of parental nativity and legal status among Mexican-origin youth, we place their experience in comparative perspective by considering their outcomes in comparison with those of non-Latino white, non-Latino black, non-Latino Asian, and other Latino children.¹

Several issues guide our analysis. First, we provide new evidence on differences in children's behavioral functioning by parental legal status. Because legal status is intertwined with both ethnicity and nativity, groups defined by these three characteristics considered jointly are compared. The second issue is whether group differences in behavior problems can be explained by sociodemographic risk factors that vary with ethnicity and immigration status. The implications of the severe disadvantages that undocumented migrants face are largely unknown due to the absence of direct measures of legal status in most representative surveys. Third, we assess the roles of several key family and neighborhood attributes in the relationship between parental legal status and children's behavioral functioning, net of sociodemographic risk factors. These issues are addressed with data from the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (LA FANS), one of the few representative surveys with measures of legal status.

BACKGROUND

The steady growth of the foreign-born population in the United States has stimulated widespread interest in immigrants and their children. The Census Bureau estimates that in 2012, there were 40.8 million immigrants—or roughly 13 out of every 100 U.S. residents. Immigration has shaped the child population even more dramatically. Currently, 25% of U.S. children have at least one

foreign-born parent, and most of those children (88%) are native-born citizens (Nwosu, Batalova, and Auclair 2014). Among both immigrants and their offspring, Mexicans are of great importance because they are the largest single national-origin group. In 2012, fully 41% of the children of immigrants were of Mexican origin (Child Trends 2013).

Immigration scholars have rapidly expanded knowledge about distinct migration streams, the characteristics of migrants relative to both their origin populations and diverse U.S. subgroups, and the challenges of incorporation that unfold over time. However, less progress has been made in understanding the critical role of legal status in shaping outcomes. This is not due to a lack of interest. The potential impact of undocumented status on both children and their parents is at the forefront of the national debate on immigration (Menjívar and Kanstroom 2013; Motomura 2014). Rather, progress has been impeded by the lack of information on the legal status of immigrants in the vast majority of large-scale surveys. Legal status is an unmeasured source of heterogeneity in most empirical studies of immigrants and their children, and this could lead to inaccurate conclusions about the role of nativity. As Massey and Bartley (2005: 481) note,

Given the very different prospects for social, economic, and political incorporation experienced by naturalized citizens, legal resident aliens, legal nonimmigrants, and undocumented migrants, in combination with the marked shifts in the distribution of immigrants among these categories, to be truly valid studies of immigrant adaptation and incorporation must control directly for legal status.

This is particularly the case for immigrants from Mexico since approximately half of Mexican immigrants are undocumented and Mexican-origin children comprise 70% of children with unauthorized immigrant parents in the United States (Gonzalez-Barrera and Lopez 2013; Passel and Cohn 2011).

Parental Legal Status and Behavioral Functioning

Much of what is known about the challenges faced by undocumented migrants and their children comes from ethnographic studies. These studies provide rich description but are limited with respect to sample size and representativeness (e.g., Abrego

and Menjívar 2011; Dreby 2010; Menjívar and Abrego 2009; Zavella 2011). Other studies are based on proxy measures rather than direct measures of documentation status (Yoshikawa 2011). Despite these drawbacks, this research reveals common difficulties among undocumented migrants, including limited resources, exploitation by employers, living with the threat of deportation, marginalization, and adjustment to a new culture (Yoshikawa and Kholoptseva 2013). Such circumstances may foster high levels of stress among undocumented migrants and their children, leading to heightened vulnerability to physical and mental health problems.

An alternative view is that the well-known immigrant health advantage characterizes undocumented as well as documented immigrant parents (Cunningham, Ruben, and Narayan 2008). Positive selection on mental health could be even stronger for undocumented migrants, given that they have overcome very high barriers to settle in the United States. If positive selection is present and sufficiently strong to override the unique disadvantages associated with undocumented status, children with undocumented parents might have similar or even better physical and mental health than children with documented parents. However, the likelihood of observing this pattern seems low at the outset given the disadvantaged profile, limited opportunities, and residential contexts of undocumented migrants. Immigrants with few resources, dark skin, or legal status barriers have elevated risks of poor outcomes, especially if they live in disadvantaged areas with limited receptivity to immigrants (Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

In addition to the external stressors shared by parents and children alike, having an unauthorized parent may present other difficulties for children. Family routines and positive parenting practices that promote children's development may be disrupted if the challenges mentioned above lead to high levels of psychological distress among undocumented parents. Thus, the structural position of undocumented migrant parents, in combination with parental psychological well-being and family practices, may greatly influence children's development.

Children's behavioral functioning is generally regarded as a significant developmental outcome that has implications for adjustment later in life. Behavioral functioning typically is partitioned into internalizing and externalizing problems (Gutmanova, Szanyi, and Cali 2008). Internalizing problems involve expressions of anxiety, depression, and low self-worth as well as social withdrawal, excessive need

for attention, and dependency (Cicchetti and Toth 1991). Such behaviors in childhood are linked to later adverse outcomes, such as major depression during adolescence, poor school performance, high school dropout, and illegal substance use (King, Iacono, and McGue 2004; McLeod and Kaiser 2004). Externalizing behavior problems include rule breaking and displays of irritability and aggression. These problems are precursors of illegal substance abuse, antisocial outcomes, poor school achievement, and high school dropout (Hinshaw 1992; King et al. 2004; McLeod and Kaiser 2004; Moffitt 1993).

Although some evidence suggests that Mexican-origin youth have higher levels of distress and behavior problems than their white counterparts (Canino and Alegría 2009; Flores 2013), less is known about differences by parental nativity and legal status. One analysis of parental concerns about their children's development based on the California Health Interview Survey found that Mexican children with undocumented parents have higher levels of developmental risk than both Mexican and white children with citizen parents (Ortega et al. 2009). Yet the subjective measure of parental concerns used in the study did not identify the specific behaviors or domains of functioning that were cause for concern. Another small-scale study of 281 Latino immigrant youth in a new destination state found that undocumented adolescents had a higher risk of anxiety than documented adolescents (Potochnick and Perreira 2010). Unfortunately, differences among all Latino adolescents by parental nativity and documentation status could not be examined because the sample was limited to foreign-born youth. Reflecting the general state of the literature, the *Handbook of U.S. Latino Psychology* (Villarruel et al. 2009) includes no systematic discussion or empirical analysis of the role of parental legal status in children's mental health outcomes, despite its otherwise comprehensive treatment of conceptual and empirical issues.

Family Socioeconomic Status and Family Routines

If parental legal status plays a role in children's behavioral functioning, it does so in tandem with other risk and protective factors. Children are exposed to multiple environments, including their families, schools, and neighborhoods, but the family is often viewed as the principal and most immediate social context for children's development. Because children are dependents, many sources of

risk and resilience stem directly and indirectly from their families.

A voluminous literature has established that children's well-being is strongly associated with indicators of their family's structural position within the larger society (for reviews, see Bradley and Corwyn 2002; Conger, Conger, and Martin 2010). However, some scholars argue that families with similar socioeconomic characteristics may utilize their resources in distinct ways in their everyday lives to mitigate risks (Christiansen 2004). This ecocultural approach (Weisner 2002) emphasizes families' daily routines as distinct from their socioeconomic resources and argues that the former are critical to children's development. In line with this approach, Fuller and García Coll (2010) identify culturally bounded family practices that may influence child development, such as having a steady dinner hour, consistently reading to a child, and regular church attendance. Parental socialization goals, which may differ by race-ethnicity or nativity, are enacted through such family routines. Values supporting the centrality of the family, for example, are reinforced by children's consistent participation in family meals (Fuller and García Coll 2010). An implication of this perspective is that the disruption of family routines and disorder within the home may be problematic for children's functioning.

In general, prior studies indicate that immigrant families often operate in ways that protect children's well-being (Flores 2013; Van Hook, Landale, and Hillemeier 2013). The primary explanation of the health advantages of Mexican immigrants and their children is that immigrants are resilient in the face of vulnerabilities associated with poverty and low education because they retain healthy aspects of their origin-country lifestyles. These include health-promoting daily routines and strong family ties. Still, these protections may fade with acculturation and time in the United States. An alternative perspective suggests that immigration adds to the risks that are associated with socioeconomic disadvantage. It entails adjusting to unfamiliar communities and establishing new household living arrangements, which may be complex, transient, and less than ideal. Chaotic home environments may result from unstable household composition, irregular parental work schedules, and low supervision and monitoring (Brooks-Gunn, Johnson, and Leventhal 2010; Evans and Wachs 2010). Such disruptions of established routines and parental roles may be particularly common for children when their immigrant parents are undocumented.

The literature is largely silent on whether the protective effects of origin cultures operate similarly for children of undocumented and documented migrants. It is clear that the former group faces a unique set of social and economic disadvantages that may influence their behavioral functioning, but the extent to which these risk factors overshadow protective family practices has not been investigated with representative survey data.

Parental Stress and Depression

Some scholars argue that the immigrant experience includes considerable acculturative stress emanating from the dual challenges of dealing with separation from the origin country and adapting to life in a new destination (Berry 2003; Flores 2013; Schwartz et al. 2010). Although this characterization has considerable face validity, it is inconsistent with studies that find lower levels of distress among immigrants who arrived as adults compared to their U.S.-born counterparts and immigrants who arrived as children (Breslau et al. 2009). Still, acculturative stress might be higher for undocumented migrants than for documented migrants.

Sullivan and Rebm (2005) conclude that undocumented Mexican immigrants have a unique risk profile. The psychological burden of immigration is amplified by dangerous border crossings, isolation from family members in Mexico due to the danger of cross-border travel, helplessness in the face of exploitation, marginalization, and high levels of stress. Although there is little empirical research comparing the psychological well-being of undocumented and documented Mexican immigrants, Yoshikawa and Kholoptseva (2013) argue that parental psychological stress and economic hardship are risk factors for children with unauthorized parents. Flores (2013) draws a similar conclusion about the risks to all children of immigrants when their parents experience acculturative difficulties, chronic economic problems, trauma, or abuse of alcohol or drugs. To the extent that undocumented migrants are more likely to face such problems than documented migrants, her argument implies that undocumented parents are especially likely to have high levels of distress. Moreover, access to ameliorative mental health care is limited for undocumented migrants, who are less likely to be insured and to use health services than documented immigrants (Ortega et al. 2007). Last, Suarez-Orozco and her colleagues (2011) note that stressed and depressed parents have compromised

parenting abilities, which may contribute to behavior problems among their children.

Neighborhood Social Closure and Control

The neighborhood environment may be an additional source of risk or protection. Neighborhood structural characteristics and social organization have received particular attention. Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls (1999) argue that collective efficacy, or the activation of social ties to attain some intended result, is a major dimension of neighborhoods that influences children. Positive child outcomes may be enhanced by intergenerational closure (ties between the adults and children in a neighborhood) and informal social control (the active involvement of adults in a neighborhood to protect children). These aspects of collective efficacy may vary by parental legal status. In particular, undocumented migrants live in neighborhoods with relatively few social and material advantages where the cost of living and the perceived chances of detection are low (Hall and Greenman 2013).

Current Study

This research addresses the understudied issue of how parental legal status affects Mexican-origin children's behavioral functioning. This topic is important because Mexican-origin children are an increasingly large segment of the child population, a large share of this group has immigrant parents, and Mexican youth comprise seven out of every 10 children with unauthorized immigrant parents in the United States (Passel and Cohn 2011). Prior studies conclude that Mexican children with immigrant parents exhibit lower rates of mental health problems than Mexican children with U.S.-born parents (Flores 2013), but this conclusion may be biased by unmeasured heterogeneity among the former group vis-à-vis parental legal status. Using one of the few representative data sources that asks direct questions about the legal status of immigrants, we examine whether and how children's behavioral functioning varies by ethnicity, nativity, and legal status. In so doing, we evaluate several potential explanations for the observed associations.

DATA AND METHODS

Our analysis is based on the first wave of the LA FANS. Conducted in 2000–2002, this survey was administered to families living in Los Angeles

County. LA FANS employed a stratified random sample of 65 neighborhoods (identified via census tract), with 50 households within each neighborhood evenly distributed across blocks. Houses, apartments, mobile homes, and converted garages were eligible for inclusion as households. Poor neighborhoods and households with children were oversampled. Within each selected household, one adult was sampled at random to answer an adult survey, and one child was sampled at random if children were present. To report on sampled children, a primary caregiver (almost always the mother) was selected to answer the primary caregiver and parent modules. These individuals also completed the adult survey if they had not already done so as the randomly selected adult in the household. In addition, one sibling of the focal child was randomly selected for inclusion among those in the household who were younger than age 18 and had the same mother and primary caregiver. All survey components were available in both English and Spanish.

A total of 2,308 households included children, with 3,687 children selected for inclusion as focal children ($N = 2,308$) or siblings ($N = 1,379$) (Peterson et al. 2004). Our analytic sample was limited to focal children and siblings who were matched to a primary caretaker who completed an adult questionnaire, a parent questionnaire, and a primary caregiver questionnaire ($N = 3,122$). We excluded those missing on the sample stratification indicator ($n = 66$), those younger than 3 ($n = 514$), and children of undocumented white and Asian parents ($n = 7$). We deleted this final group because they are too few in number to analyze separately and too distinct to combine meaningfully with other categories. The final sample includes 2,535 focal children and siblings.

Proc MI in SAS was used to impute missing data. Twenty-five imputed datasets were created to take the uncertainty of imputed values into account (see Rubin 1987). Results were generated for each imputed dataset with the appropriate adjustments for the complex sample design and then combined to arrive at the correct parameter estimates and standard errors.

Measures

Behavioral Functioning. Children's behavioral functioning was measured with the internalizing and externalizing subscales of the Behavior Problems Index, which are widely used measures developed from the seminal work of Parcel and Menaghan

(1988). The questions that form the basis for these measures ask parents whether specific behaviors are often, sometimes, or never true of their child. The *internalizing subscale* reflects responses to 11 questions ($\alpha = .73$) indicating sad or withdrawn behavior on the part of the child, such as “has been too fearful or anxious,” “has felt worthless or inferior,” and “has cried too much.” The *externalizing subscale* indicates problems such as aggressiveness that are directed outward toward others. It is measured using 17 questions ($\alpha = .87$), including whether the child “has argued too much,” “has been impulsive or acted without thinking,” and “has demanded a lot of attention.” To compute the internalizing and externalizing behavior scales, the LA FANS reverse coded the component items so that higher scores reflect more behavior problems (i.e., 2 = *often true*; 1 = *sometimes true*; 0 = *not true*). For each subscale, responses were summed so that higher numbers indicate more behavior problems (Peterson et al. 2004). The internalizing behavior problems scale ranges from 0 to 22, and the externalizing behavior problems scale ranges from 0 to 33.²

Race-ethnicity, Nativity, and Legal Status. The primary independent variable is constructed from information about parental nativity and documentation status. Parental status is emphasized because 90% of the offspring of immigrants in our sample either were born in the United States or arrived before age 13 (the 1.5 generation, often considered part of the second generation). Given the small number of immigrant youth who arrived as teenagers, we do not separately control for the youth’s nativity or documentation status.

All foreign-born adult sample members were asked a series of questions that can be used to determine their legal status at the time of the survey. The first was whether they were naturalized citizens. Those who were not citizens were then asked whether they had a “green card” or legal permanent residence. Immigrants who were not citizens and did not have a green card were next asked whether they had refugee, asylee, or temporary protected status. Finally, those who did not have one of these statuses were asked if they had a valid visa for temporary residence. These questions were used to identify those who were authorized (naturalized citizen or documented) and those who were not authorized (undocumented) to live in the United States. Immigrants who were not naturalized, not permanent residents, not refugees/asylees, and not in possession of a valid visa were coded as

undocumented. Bachmeier, Van Hook, and Bean (2014) demonstrate that respondents to the LA FANS were willing to answer these questions, and the profile of undocumented immigrants resulting from these procedures is consistent with profiles produced from other sources.

The design of the survey ensured that all primary caregivers (i.e., mothers) completed the adult interview. However, when the sampled adult was the mother, no adult interview is available for resident fathers. Thus, we measure *ethnicity/immigration status* jointly with a categorical variable indicating whether the mother was 1 of 12 categories: (1) Mexican undocumented migrant, (2) Mexican naturalized or documented immigrant, (3) Mexican U.S. born, (4) other Latino undocumented, (5) other Latino naturalized or documented, (6) other Latino U.S. born, (7) white naturalized or documented, (8) white U.S. born, (9) black naturalized or documented, (10) black U.S. born, (11) Asian naturalized or documented, and (12) Asian U.S. born. After excluding two undocumented white immigrants and five undocumented Asian immigrants, all undocumented parents in our analytic sample were Mexican or other Latino.

Additional Measures. Other demographic, family, and neighborhood characteristics were included as explanatory or control variables. *Sex* (1 = *female*, 0 = *male*) and *age* (ranging from 3 to 17) were demographic control variables. Socioeconomic circumstances and family structure were measured with *maternal education*, *poverty*, and *single parenthood*. Maternal education was coded ‘1’ if the mother did not complete high school and ‘0’ if she completed high school or more. Family poverty was measured using the federal poverty thresholds for 2001.

Maternal depression was a dichotomous variable constructed from scores on the Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short-Form (CIDI-SF) depression inventory. The CIDI-SF yields a score that ranges from .0 to 1.0 and represents the probability that a respondent would meet the criteria for major depression if they were given the full CIDI interview. Respondents were coded as depressed (‘1’) if their probability of depression was greater than .5 and not depressed (‘0’) otherwise.³

A measure of *family routines* was constructed using questions about the number of days per week (from zero to seven) that four activities occurred at a regular time: children’s breakfast, family dinner, household chores, and children’s bedtime. Scores on these variables were summed to create a scale that ranges from 0 to 28.

Last, we created an index of the mother's perceptions of the neighborhood. Two dimensions of collective efficacy that are specific to children form the basis of our measure of child-centered closure and social control. Following Sampson et al. (1999), *intergenerational closure* was ascertained by the mother's level of agreement with statements about whether (1) there are adults in the neighborhood that children can look up to, (2) adults watch out to be sure that children are safe, (3) parents in the neighborhood know their children's friends, (4) neighborhood adults know the local kids, and (5) parents in the neighborhood know each other. *Child-centered social control* was based on agreement with statements about whether (1) neighbors would do something if children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, (2) neighbors would do something if youth were spray-painting graffiti on a building, and (3) neighbors would scold a child who was showing disrespect to an adult. Each question was answered on a scale that ranged from 1 to 5, and responses to all of these questions were summed to create an index that ranges from 1 to 40.

Analysis

We used ordinary least squares regression to estimate the relationships between parental legal status and children's internalizing and externalizing behavior. A series of four models was estimated for each dependent variable. Using Mexican children with undocumented mothers as the reference group, we first examined the association between group membership and internalizing behavior problems, controlling only for child sex and age. Subsequent models sequentially added (1) family background measures, including maternal education, poverty, and family structure; (2) maternal depression; and (3) family routines and child-centered closure/social control. These models allowed us to assess whether family and neighborhood processes alluded to in the literature explained the relationship between parental legal status and children's internalizing behavior. This sequence of four models was repeated for externalizing behavior. All analyses were weighted using the child sample weight. Standard errors were adjusted for the complex sample design and for the clustering of children within households.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for all variables by ethnoracial group. Significant differences

are identified at $p < .05$ for contrasts between each group and both Mexicans^(a) and whites^(b). The mean scores for internalizing behavior problems suggest a distinction between Mexican and non-Latino children. Specifically, Mexican children (3.6) have higher scores than white (2.2), black (2.6), and Asian (2.2) children. Moreover, the differences among the non-Latino groups are not significant. In contrast, Mexican, white, and black children are similar on externalizing behavior problems with scores between 6.5 and 7.0. The only significant differences for this dimension are between Mexicans (6.9) and other Latino (6.0) and Asian (5.1) youth.

These results show considerable variation in potential explanatory factors across ethnoracial groups. A salient difference is in the distribution of mother's immigration status. Among the Mexican-origin children, about 27% had an undocumented mother, 49% had a naturalized citizen or documented immigrant mother, and 24% had a U.S.-born mother. Among other Latino youth, the comparable figures are 16% undocumented, 64% naturalized citizen or documented immigrant, and 21% U.S. born. The vast majority of white (82%) and black (91%) children had U.S.-born mothers. Mothers of Asian children were primarily naturalized citizens or documented immigrants (77%).

Another striking difference across groups is in maternal education. About 61% of Mexican youth and 44% of other Latino youth had a mother who did not complete high school, compared to 7% of whites, 20% of blacks, and 9% of Asians. Differences in family poverty are ordered similarly but are less pronounced. About half of Mexican and other Latino youth lived in a poor family, compared to 29% of whites, 39% of blacks, and 31% of Asians. Only whites and Asians had significantly lower poverty rates than Mexicans. In contrast, Mexican children were significantly less likely to live in a single-parent family (40%) than other Latino (52%) and black (82%) youth but significantly more likely than white (30%) and Asian (24%) youth.

The likelihood of having a depressed mother is similar for Mexican, white, and black children, but the differences between other Latinos and Mexicans (20% versus 12%) as well as Asians and whites (7% versus 16%) are significant. Despite these variations in maternal depression, the means for family routines do not differ across groups. Further, Mexican-origin youth differ only from their white counterparts in maternal perceptions of neighborhood child-centered closure and social control.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Dependent and Independent Variables, by Race-ethnicity (Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey, 2000–2002, $N = 2,535$).

	Total	Mexican	Other Latino	White	Black	Asian
Behavior problems Index						
Internalizing (\bar{X})	2.98	3.56 ^b	3.38 ^b	2.24 ^a	2.64 ^a	2.18 ^a
Externalizing (\bar{X})	6.48	6.88	5.99 ^a	6.48	7.01	5.13 ^a
Child characteristics						
Female (%)	49.56	50.38	50.38	47.88	48.97	49.53
Age (\bar{X})	9.67	9.36 ^b	9.47	10.10 ^a	9.91	10.02
Mother/family characteristics						
<i>Mother's immigration status</i>						
Undocumented (%)	13.59	27.42	16.00	.0	.0	.0
Naturalized citizen or documented (%)	42.52	48.84 ^b	63.50 ^{a,b}	17.53 ^a	8.78 ^a	76.55 ^{a,b}
U.S. born (%)	43.89	23.74 ^b	20.51 ^b	82.47 ^a	91.22 ^a	23.45 ^b
Mother's education < high school (%)	36.13	61.28 ^b	44.30 ^{a,b}	6.79 ^a	19.74 ^{a,b}	9.03 ^a
Poor family (%)	42.09	51.03 ^b	48.23 ^b	29.39 ^a	39.02	30.91 ^a
Single parent (%)	41.54	39.62 ^b	51.51 ^{a,b}	29.97 ^a	82.29 ^{a,b}	24.40 ^a
Mother depressed (%)	14.05	12.42	19.86 ^a	15.74	17.45	6.63 ^b
Family routines (\bar{X})	20.10	20.15	20.11	20.37	19.01	20.33
Perceived neighborhood characteristics						
Child-centered closure and control (\bar{X})	25.66	25.12 ^b	24.92 ^b	26.93 ^a	25.90	25.73
Unweighted N						
Weighted %	2,535	1,217	387	506	212	213
	100.00	41.76	13.40	23.50	10.09	11.25

Note: Analysis based on weighted data.

^aSignificantly different from Mexicans.

^bSignificantly different from whites.

Table 2 presents means for the Behavior Problems Indexes by mother's immigration status for each ethnoracial group. Mexican youth show a clear pattern of differences in internalizing behavior: The mean score is highest for children of undocumented migrants (4.7), intermediate for children of citizens/documented immigrants (3.4), and lowest for children of U.S.-born mothers (2.6). A very similar set of differences is evident for other Latinos. This contrasts with results that show that nativity matters less for other ethnoracial groups, if it matters at all. The nativity difference is relatively small for whites and not significant for black and Asian children. Still, the pattern for whites is intriguing because it suggests that children of native-born mothers (2.3) have more difficulties than children of naturalized citizen or documented mothers (1.8).

There are fewer differences in externalizing behavior within ethnoracial groups by the mother's immigration status. Among Mexican youth, the mean for externalizing problems is significantly

higher for children with undocumented mothers (7.9) than for the other two groups (6.4, 6.7). This is not evident for other Latino youth. In addition, white and Asian children with U.S.-born mothers have higher mean values for externalizing problems than do their co-ethnic counterparts whose mothers are naturalized citizens or documented immigrants.

Multivariate Models

More comprehensive analyses of the roles of ethnicity and immigration status in behavioral functioning are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Here we focus on the categorical variable that jointly measures maternal ethnicity, nativity, and legal status. Children of Mexican undocumented migrants are used as the reference group to allow us to determine whether they have uniquely problematic outcomes with respect to internalizing and externalizing problems.

Table 3 presents unstandardized coefficients from ordinary least squares regression models of

Table 2. Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Problems, by Race-ethnicity and Mother's Immigration Status (Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey, 2000–2002, $N = 2,535$).

	Total	Mexican	Other Latino	White	Black	Asian
Mother's immigration status						
	Internalizing (\bar{X})					
Undocumented	4.62 ^b	4.66 ^b	4.46 ^b			
Naturalized citizen or documented	3.01 ^{a,b}	3.43 ^{a,b}	3.52 ^{a,b}	1.75 ^b	2.17	2.22
U.S. born	2.44 ^a	2.59 ^a	2.10 ^a	2.34	2.69	2.07
	Externalizing (\bar{X})					
Undocumented	7.57 ^b	7.87 ^b	6.02			
Naturalized citizen or documented	5.74 ^{a,b}	6.42 ^a	6.20	4.21 ^b	5.02	4.48 ^b
U.S. born	6.86 ^a	6.68 ^a	5.32	6.96	7.20	7.23

Note: Analysis based on weighted data.

^aSignificantly different from undocumented.

^bSignificantly different from U.S. born.

Table 3. Ordinary Least Squares Regression Analysis of Children's Internalizing Behavior Problems (Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey, 2000–2002, $N = 2,535$).

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Ethnicity/mother's immigration status				
Mexican undocumented	(reference)	(reference)	(reference)	(reference)
Mexican naturalized/documentated	-1.20***	-.94**	-1.02***	-1.04***
Mexican U.S. born	-2.07***	-1.60**	-1.79***	-1.90***
Other Latino undocumented	-.21	-.22	-.49	-.45
Other Latino naturalized/documentated	-1.10**	-.81*	-1.04**	-1.08**
Other Latino U.S. born	-2.58***	-2.19***	-2.33***	-2.43***
White naturalized/documentated	-2.86***	-2.19***	-2.49***	-2.42***
White U.S. born	-2.28***	-1.64***	-1.84***	-1.82***
Black naturalized/documentated	-2.52*	-2.82*	-2.66*	-2.75*
Black U.S. born	-1.93***	-1.63***	-1.84***	-1.87***
Asian naturalized/documentated	-2.40***	-1.72***	-1.77***	-1.78***
Asian U.S. born	-2.57***	-1.99**	-2.09**	-2.16**
Child characteristics				
Female	.08	.06	.06	.06
Age	-.03	-.04 ^a	-.04*	-.05**
Mother/family characteristics				
Mother's education < high school		.42 ^a	.32	.29
Poor family		.55*	.51*	.48*
Single parent		.55**	.46*	.42*
Mother depressed			1.73***	1.71***
Family routines				-.04**
Perceived neighborhood characteristics				
Child-centered closure and control				-.03*

Note: Analysis based on weighted data.

^a $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

internalizing behavior problems. A simple and pronounced pattern is evident in Model 1, which controls only for the child's sex and age: The children of Mexican undocumented mothers have significantly higher rates of internalizing problems than all other children except other Latino youth with undocumented mothers. Among Mexican youth, there is a difference of 1.20 between children of undocumented and documented mothers and a difference of 2.07 between children of undocumented and U.S.-born mothers. Expressed in terms of the standard deviation of the internalizing problems scale, the scores of children with documented mothers are about .38 standard deviations lower than those of children with undocumented mothers; scores of children with U.S.-born mothers are about .66 standard deviations lower.⁴ Similarly, the coefficient for white children of U.S.-born mothers (-2.28) corresponds to about .72 standard deviations.

The coefficients for all groups (except other Latino youth) remain significant but are attenuated with controls for maternal education, family poverty, and family structure in Model 2. As expected, children living in poor families and single-parent families are more likely than other children to exhibit internalizing problems. Model 3 adds a measure of maternal depression. Youth with depressed mothers are substantially more likely to have internalizing problems than other youth. However, because undocumented Mexican mothers are *less* likely to be depressed than the mothers in almost all other ethnoracial groups, inclusion of maternal depression in Model 3 results in wider group differences than in Model 2. The final model shows that family routines and living in a neighborhood with a relatively high level of child-centered intergenerational closure and social control are associated with lower levels of internalizing behavior. Nonetheless, differences between Mexican children of undocumented migrants and others remain in Model 4.

A parallel analysis is provided for externalizing behavior in Table 4. The group differences in Model 1 are similar in some ways to those for internalizing behavior even though they are less consistent overall. With one exception, Mexican children of undocumented migrants have significantly higher levels of externalizing behavior problems than the children of naturalized or documented immigrants, regardless of their ethnicity. The coefficients range from -1.41 (.25 standard deviations on the externalizing problems scale) for Mexican children with naturalized/documented parents to -3.51 (.62 standard deviations) for

white children with naturalized/documented parents. The exception is the nonsignificant coefficient for black children of naturalized or documented immigrants. The sign of this coefficient is consistent with the others, and the failure to achieve significance may reflect the small number of such children in the sample. At the same time, Mexican children with undocumented mothers do not differ on the externalizing index from children with U.S.-born mothers in any ethnic group except other Latinos.⁵ Model 1 also shows that girls are less likely to have externalizing problems than boys and older children are less likely to have such problems than younger children.

In Models 2 and 3, the pattern for the mother's immigration status is highly similar to that in Model 1. As was the case for internalizing behavior, however, once the relatively low level of depression of Mexican undocumented mothers is controlled in Model 3, the ethnoracial differences become larger than in Model 2. In the full model, living in a single-parent family and having a depressed mother are positively associated with externalizing behavior problems, while family routines appear to be protective.

Further Consideration of the Hispanic Health Paradox

A persistent puzzle in studies of Mexican immigrants is that they are able to achieve positive health outcomes in the presence of high levels of socioeconomic disadvantage. The existence of this paradox for mental health among the Mexican mothers in our sample is illustrated by the contrast between family poverty and depression. About 71% of the undocumented Mexican mothers in our sample were poor, compared to 48% of naturalized citizen or documented mothers and only 27% of U.S.-born mothers. In contrast, parental depression was lowest for undocumented mothers (10%) and naturalized or documented mothers (12%) and considerably higher for U.S.-born Mexican mothers (16%). These contrasting patterns indicate that one cannot assume that the hardships associated with undocumented migration to the United States necessarily translate into elevated levels of psychological distress.

To illustrate how these risk and protective factors intersect to influence youth behavior problems, the two panels in Table 5 provide mean scores for internalizing and externalizing problems within categories of maternal depression and poverty. The top panel (Panel A) provides actual values, and the

Table 4. Ordinary Least Squares Regression Analysis of Children's Externalizing Behavior Problems (Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey, 2000–2002, $N = 2,535$).

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Ethnicity/mother's immigration status				
Mexican undocumented	(reference)	(reference)	(reference)	(reference)
Mexican naturalized/documented	-1.41**	-1.02 ^a	-1.15*	-1.24*
Mexican U.S. born	-1.18	-.56	-.86	-1.23
Other Latino undocumented	-1.92*	-1.99*	-2.44**	-2.41**
Other Latino naturalized/documented	-1.61*	-1.23 ^a	-1.61*	-1.74**
Other Latino U.S. born	-2.52***	-2.05*	-2.26*	-2.59**
White naturalized/documented	-3.51***	-2.38**	-2.87***	-2.72***
White U.S. born	-.86	.09	-.22	-.30
Black naturalized/documented	-3.12 ^a	-3.78 ^a	-3.53 ^a	-3.99*
Black U.S. born	-.57	-.32	-.66	-.87
Asian naturalized/documented	-3.32***	-2.24**	-2.31**	-2.34**
Asian U.S. born	-.54	.29	.14	-.21
Child characteristics				
Female	-.74*	-.77**	-.78**	-.74**
Age	-.09*	-.10**	-.11**	-.14***
Mother/family characteristics				
Mother's education < high school		.71	.55	.49
Poor family		.58	.51	.48
Single parent		1.26**	1.11**	1.05**
Mother depressed			2.80***	2.76***
Family routines				-.13***
Perceived neighborhood characteristics				
Child-centered closure and control				-.04

Note: Analysis based on weighted data.

^a $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

bottom panel (Panel B) provides predicted values calculated from models equivalent to the full multivariate models in Tables 3 and 4, with the sample restricted to Mexicans.⁶

Focusing first on internalizing behavior problems, both the actual and predicted values show parallel patterns by maternal immigration status regardless of family poverty or maternal depression: Youth with undocumented mothers consistently have the highest mean values. Although these are also the poorest youth, there are relatively small differences in internalizing behavior by family poverty within categories of immigration status. Focusing on the majority of youth whose mothers were not depressed, for example, the predicted values in Panel B for those who were not poor and poor, respectively, are 4.0 versus 4.5 if the mother is undocumented, 3.0 versus 3.6 if the mother is documented, and 2.3 versus 2.9 if the mother is

U.S. born. In contrast, the predicted (and actual) values for internalizing problems differ substantially by maternal depression, regardless of poverty status. For example, the mean predicted scores for impoverished youth with nondepressed and depressed mothers, respectively, are 4.5 versus 6.6 for those with undocumented mothers, 3.6 versus 5.7 for those with documented mothers, and 2.9 versus 4.9 for those with U.S.-born mothers.

Turning to externalizing behavior problems, poverty again plays a less prominent role than maternal depression. The predicted values show a difference of .3 in the scores for not poor and poor children, regardless of maternal depression, but youth with depressed mothers have substantially higher scores for externalizing than youth whose mothers are not depressed. The mean predicted scores among poor youth with nondepressed and depressed mothers, respectively, are 6.7 versus

10.5 for those with undocumented mothers, 5.5 versus 9.3 for those with documented mothers, and 5.6 versus 9.4 for those with U.S.-born mothers.

Overall, these results indicate that it is too simplistic to assume that because Mexican youth with undocumented parents concurrently experience high socioeconomic disadvantage and elevated risks of behavior problems, the two phenomena are necessarily strongly connected. Parental human capital is lower and family poverty higher in families with undocumented mothers than in other families. However, other family resources do not follow suit. In fact, a key indicator of maternal mental health—depression—suggests that undocumented Mexican parents may have greater psychological resources to bring to parenting than other Mexican mothers, especially U.S.-born mothers.

DISCUSSION

A major challenge to progress in understanding the health of children of immigrants is the lack of systematic attention to the legal status of their parents. Due to data constraints, this major source of heterogeneity within the immigrant population is regularly ignored, threatening both the accuracy of findings and knowledge of how barriers to immigrant incorporation may affect children's outcomes. We addressed this challenge in a study of behavioral functioning among Mexican-origin youth, relative to youth in four other ethnorracial groups. Using data from the LA FANS, one of the few representative surveys with direct questions with which to measure immigrants' legal status, we compared youth with undocumented mothers, documented or naturalized citizen mothers, and U.S.-born mothers. Among the Mexican children of immigrants in our sample, more than one in every three (36%) had an unauthorized mother, attesting to the significance of this issue.

Our findings for Mexican youth reinforce the call for recognition of parental legal status in studies of health among children of immigrants. Mexican-origin youth with undocumented mothers have significantly higher levels of internalizing and externalizing behavior problems than their co-ethnic counterparts with documented or naturalized citizen mothers. Thus, treating Mexican children with immigrant parents as a single undifferentiated group masks important differences in outcomes by parental legal status. Moreover, Mexican children with unauthorized mothers exhibit higher levels of internalizing behavior than children in all other ethnorracial/

legal status groups except children of unauthorized migrants from other Latin American countries.

Differences between Mexican youth with undocumented mothers and other youth are less sweeping for externalizing behavior. Such youth are similar to Mexican, white, black, and Asian children of U.S.-born mothers in having higher levels of externalizing behavior than their peers with legal immigrant parents. Although prior studies have not distinguished youth with undocumented and documented immigrant mothers, a pattern of elevated risk of externalizing behavior for children of native-born mothers relative to children with foreign-born mothers has been documented in other studies (Gonzales et al. 2008; Gonzales et al. 2009; Harris 1999). The usual explanation of this elevated risk is the loss of protective aspects of the home culture, an explanation that is not applicable to children with undocumented immigrant parents. Thus, we may observe similar behaviors among Mexican youth with undocumented parents and U.S.-born parents, but these behaviors may be spurred by distinct circumstances in each group.

Our overall conclusions regarding the risk and protective factors considered in our analysis are multifaceted. Clearly, socioeconomic resources are fundamental to children's health, and Mexican youth with undocumented parents have fewer such resources than other youth. Still, socioeconomic status plays only a small role in the relatively poor behavioral functioning of Mexicans who have undocumented mothers. The findings also suggest that undocumented parents are able to at least partially offset their lack of material resources with other types of resources, such as better-than-expected maternal mental health and family routines that are comparable to those of more advantaged groups. The Hispanic health paradox is evident in nativity differences in maternal depression, but we extend the story by showing that depression is even less common among undocumented Mexican mothers than among documented Mexican mothers. Undocumented mothers exhibit traits that are consistent with positive selection on mental health or strong retention of protective aspects of the home culture. Still, these traits cannot fully protect their children from the hardships associated with living with one or more undocumented parents.

Although we were able to include measures reflecting many important intervening processes, there is ample room for further research. In particular, the LA FANS did not include measures of perceived discrimination, acculturation and enculturation, or

Table 5. Child Behavior Problems by Maternal Depression, Poverty, and Mother's Immigration Status, Mexican Children (Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey, 2000–2002, $N = 1,217$).

Panel A. Actual Values				
	Child Internalizing Behavior (\bar{X})		Child Externalizing Behavior (\bar{X})	
	Mother Not Depressed	Mother Depressed	Mother Not Depressed	Mother Depressed
Not poor				
Undocumented	4.4	7.1	7.6	12.7
Naturalized/documentated	2.7	5.2	5.8	10.1
U.S. born	1.9	3.6	4.9	9.9
Poor				
Undocumented	4.3	7.9	7.5	11.2
Naturalized/documentated	3.7	5.6	6.1	9.9
U.S. born	3.5	4.2	8.5	11.2

Panel B. Predicted Values ^a				
	Child Internalizing Behavior (\bar{X})		Child Externalizing Behavior (\bar{X})	
	Mother Not Depressed	Mother Depressed	Mother Not Depressed	Mother Depressed
Not poor				
Undocumented	4.0	6.0	6.4	10.2
Naturalized/documentated	3.0	5.1	5.2	9.0
U.S. born	2.3	4.4	5.3	9.0
Poor				
Undocumented	4.5	6.6	6.7	10.5
Naturalized/documentated	3.6	5.7	5.5	9.3
U.S. born	2.9	4.9	5.6	9.4

Note: Analysis based on weighted data.

^aPredicted values calculated from models equivalent to Model 3 in Tables 4 and 5, with sample restricted to Mexican children. Prediction equation sets all cases to female child, mother less than high school, two-parent family. Child age, family routines, and child-centered closure and social control set to their mean values.

coping strategies employed by youth or their parents. This limited our ability to consider some possible mechanisms through which maternal documentation status may influence youth behavior problems. In addition, this study was based on cross-sectional data because of high attrition for children across the two waves of the LA FANS. The use of longitudinal data in future studies could more explicitly rule out the possibility that child behavior problems may have contributed to maternal depression or disruption of family routines. This seems unlikely for Mexicans, though, because depression and irregular family routines were not more common in the families of undocumented immigrants.

An additional avenue for future research is investigation of these issues in other geographic

areas. Los Angeles County is typical of the most populous counties in the United States in that it is a majority-minority county, meaning that more than half of the population self-identifies as being in a racial-ethnic category other than non-Hispanic white alone. Currently, about 11% of all counties and 75% of the most populous counties in the United States are majority-minority counties, and this demographic profile is becoming more common across America (U.S. Census Bureau 2013). Our analysis of children's behavioral functioning sheds light on what it means to grow up as a racial-ethnic minority in a multiethnic environment. Future research is needed to determine whether associations observed for children in Los Angeles are similar in other types of residential environments, such as new

destination counties that are not heavily populated with co-ethnic residents or other minority groups (Singer 2009).

This research also suggests a challenge that is relevant to public policy. Specifically, children of undocumented mothers are relatively likely to experience behavior problems that have implications for their life chances (e.g., via performance in school). These children also live in families that often have insufficient discretionary resources and limited access to private health insurance. These limitations potentially restrict their access to outside assistance with their problems. Undocumented mothers may also lack awareness of outside resources or be unwilling to seek assistance from publicly funded programs because they fear detection and deportation (even though eligibility is a function of the child's status, not the parent's status). Thus, a challenge for future research is to assess the extent to which there is an unmet need for services among those who are most vulnerable and an awareness of unmet needs among teachers, health professionals, and others who might be in a position to help.

Overall, our research makes new contributions to the literature by examining the critical role of parental legal status in the health of Mexican children of immigrants. Most notably, our finding that parental legal status matters for mental health among youth with immigrant parents reinforces the recent call for making this distinction in future research (Glick 2010; Massey and Bartley 2005; Viruell-Fuentes et al. 2012). Further, the fact that no facile explanation was found for the relatively high risks of behavior problems among Mexican youth with undocumented mothers suggests that additional research is needed to unravel how legal status influences children's everyday lives and perceptions. Hopefully, the next comprehensive review of the literature on Latino mental health will be able to include a growing body of scholarship on this increasingly critical topic.

FUNDING

The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This study was supported by NICHD grants 5P01HD062498-04 and R24HD041025. This research was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), which provided salary support to Dr. Landale, Dr. Oropesa, and Dr. Hillemeier. The NICHD's interest is in the creation of scientific knowledge.

NOTES

1. For ease of presentation, we refer to non-Latino whites, non-Latino blacks, and non-Latino Asians as whites, blacks, and Asians in the remainder of this article. Along with Mexican and other Latino youth, these groups are referred to collectively as "ethnic" or "ethnoracial" groups. At times, we use the term "immigration status" to refer to distinctions based on both nativity and legal status.
2. We also examined the internal consistency of the Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Problems Indexes within each of the ethnoracial groups in our data. The Cronbach's alpha values suggest a high degree of internal consistency within each group.
3. There are eight values for the probability of major depression: 0, .0001, .0568, .2352, .5542, .8125, .8895, and .9083. We tested the sensitivity of our results to the cut-point used in the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (.5) by rerunning all analyses using a more stringent cut-point of .8. The results did not differ substantively from those presented here. Although some scholars prefer to measure depression using a continuous scale, the distribution of the eight-value probability measure is highly skewed. Moreover, 82% of cases have a value of 0. We therefore elected not to run models using a continuous measure of depression.
4. Since the Behavior Problems measures are additive indexes based on items that range in value from 0 to 2 (2 = *often true*, 1 = *sometimes true*, 0 = *never true*), the ordinary least squares regression coefficients reflect both the *number* of behavior problems and their *intensity*. To illustrate, additional analyses showed that the average *number* of internalizing problems was almost one greater for Mexican children with undocumented mothers than for their counterparts with documented mothers and slightly more than one greater than for those with native-born parents. Such differences are nontrivial given that the mean *number* of internalizing behavior problems in the overall sample is 2.4. Furthermore, the *intensity* of some problems was greater for the children with undocumented parents.
5. Because the other Latino group is a heterogeneous residual category, we do not attempt to interpret this pattern here.
6. We also tested for interactions between poverty and depression, immigration status and poverty, and immigration status and depression. None of these interactions were significant.

REFERENCES

- Abrego, Leisy and Cecilia Menjivar. 2011. "Immigrant Latina Mothers as Targets of Legal Violence." *International Journal of Sociology of the Family* 37(1):9–26.

- Bachmeier, James D., Jennifer Van Hook, and Frank D. Bean. 2014. "Can We Measure Immigrants' Legal Status? Lessons from Two Surveys." *International Migration Review* 48(2):538–66.
- Berry, John W. 2003. "Conceptual Approaches to Acculturation." Pp. 17–37 in *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research*, edited by K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, and G. Marin. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bradley, Robert H. and Robert F. Corwyn. 2002. "Socioeconomic Status and Child Development." *Annual Review of Psychology* 53(1):371–99.
- Breslau, Joshua, Gihherme Borges, Yolanda Hagar, Daniel Tancredi, and Stephen E. Gillman. 2009. "Immigration to the USA and Risk for Mood and Anxiety Disorders: Variation by Origin and Age at Immigration." *Psychological Medicine* 39(7): 1117–27.
- Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Anna D. Johnson, and Tama Leventhal. 2010. "Disorder, Turbulence, and Resources in Children's Homes and Neighborhoods." Pp. 155–70 in *Chaos and Its Influence on Children's Development: An Ecological Perspective*, edited by G. W. Evans and T. D. Wachs. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books.
- Canino, Glorisa and Margarite Alegria. 2009. "Understanding Psychopathology among the Adult and Child Latino Population: An Epidemiologic Perspective." Pp. 31–44 in *Handbook of Latino Psychology: Developmental and Community-based Perspectives*, edited by F. A. Villarruel, G. Carlo, J. M. Grau, M. Azmitia, N. Cabrera, and T. J. Chahin. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Child Trends. 2013. "Immigrant Children." Retrieved September 19, 2014 (<http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=immigrant-children>).
- Christiansen, Pia. 2004. "The Health-promoting Family: A Conceptual Framework for Future Research." *Social Science & Medicine* 59(2):377–87.
- Cicchetti, Dante and Sheree L. Toth. 1991. "A Developmental Perspective on Internalizing and Externalizing Disorders." Pp. 1–19 in *Internalizing and Externalizing Expressions of Dysfunction*, edited by D. Cicchetti and S. L. Toth. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conger, Rand D., Katherine J. Conger, and Monica J. Martin. 2010. "Socioeconomic Status, Family Processes, and Individual Development." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3):685–704.
- Cunningham, Solveig, Julia D. Ruben, and K. M. Venkat Narayan. 2008. "Health of Foreign-born People in the United States: A Review." *Health & Place* 14(4):623–35.
- Delgado, Peter L., Margarita Alegria, José M. Cañive, Esperanza Diaz, Javier I. Escobar, Alex Kopelowicz, Maria A. Oquendo, Pedro Ruiz, and William A. Vega. 2006. "Depression and Access to Treatment among U.S. Hispanics." *Focus* 4(1):38–47.
- Dreby, Joanna. 2010. *Divided by Borders: Mexican Migrants and Their Children*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Evans, Gary W. and Theodore D. Wachs, eds. 2010. *Chaos and Its Influence on Children's Development: An Ecological Perspective*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Flores, Yvette G. 2013. *Chicana and Chicano Mental Health*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Fuller, Bruce and Cynthia Garcia Coll. 2010. "Learning from Latinos: Contexts, Families, and Child Development in Motion." *Developmental Psychology* 46(3):599–65.
- Glick, Jennifer E. 2010. "Connecting Complex Processes: A Decade of Research on Immigrant Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3):498–515.
- Gonzales, Nancy A., Fairlee C. Fabrett, and George P. Knight. 2009. "Psychological Impact of Latino Youth Acculturation and Enculturation." Pp. 115–34 in *Handbook of Latino Psychology: Developmental and Community-based Perspectives*, edited by F. A. Villarruel, G. Carlo, J. M. Grau, M. Azmitia, N. Cabrera, and T. J. Chahin. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Gonzales, Nancy A., Miguel Germán, Su Yeong Kim, Preethy George, Fairlee C. Fabrett, Roger Millsap, and Larry E. Dumka. 2008. "Mexican American Adolescents' Cultural Orientation, Externalizing Behavior and Academic Engagement." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 41(1/2):151–64.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, Ana and Mark Hugo Lopez. 2013. *A Demographic Portrait of Mexican-origin Hispanics in the United States*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved September 19, 2014 (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/05/01/a-demographic-portrait-of-mexican-origin-hispanics-in-the-united-states/>).
- Gutmannova, 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(2008):676–94.
- Hall, Matthew and Emily Greenman. 2013. "Neighborhood and Housing Quality among Undocumented Immigrants." *Social Science Research* 42(6):1712–25.
- Harris, Kathleen Mullan. 1999. "The Health Status and Risk Behaviors of Adolescents in Immigrant Families." Pp. 286–347 *Children of Immigrants: Health, Adjustment and Public Assistance*, edited by D. J. Hernandez. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Hinshaw, Stephen P. 1992. "Externalizing Behavior Problems and Academic Underachievement in Childhood and Adolescence: Causal Relationships and Underlying Mechanisms." *Psychological Bulletin* 111(1):127–55.
- King, Serena M., William G. Iacono, and Matt McGue. 2004. "Childhood Externalizing and Internalizing

- Psychopathology in the Prediction of Early Substance Use." *Addiction* 99(12):1548–59.
- Marin, Humberto, Javier I. Escobar, and William A. Vega. 2006. "Mental Illness in Hispanics: A Review of the Literature." *Focus* 4(2006):23–37.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Katherine Bartley. 2005. "The Changing Legal Status Distribution of Immigrants: A Caution." *International Migration Review* 39(2):469–84.
- McLeod, Jane D. and Karen Kaiser. 2004. "Childhood Emotional and Behavioral Problems in Educational Attainment." *American Sociological Review* 69(5):636–58.
- Menjívar, Cecilia and Leisy Abrego. 2009. "Parents and Children across Borders: Legal Instability and Intergenerational Relations in Guatemalan and Salvadoran Families." Pp. 160–89 in *Across Generations: Immigrant Families in America*, edited by N. Foner. New York: New York University Press.
- Menjívar, Cecelia and Daniel Kanström, eds. 2013. *Constructing Immigrant "Illegality": Critiques, Experiences, and Responses*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Moffitt, Terrie E. 1993. "Adolescence-limited and Life-course-persistent Antisocial Behavior: A Developmental Taxonomy." *Psychological Review* 100(4):674–701.
- Motomura, Hiroshi. 2014. *Immigration Outside the Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nwosu, Chiamaka, Jeanne Batalova, and Gregory Auclair. 2014. "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States." *Migration Information Source*, April 28. Accessed September 19, 2011 (<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states>).
- Ortega, Alexander N., Hai Fang, Victor H. Perez, John A. Rizzo, Olivia Carter-Pokras, Steven P. Wallace, and Lillian Gelberg. 2007. "Health Care Access, Use of Services, and Experiences among Undocumented Mexicans and Other Latinos." *Archives of Internal Medicine* 167(21):2354–60.
- Ortega, Alexander N., Sarah M. Horwitz, Hai Fang, Alice A. Kuo, Steven P. Wallace, and Moira Inkelas. 2009. "Documentation Status and Parental Concerns about Development in Young US Children of Mexican Origin." *Academic Pediatrics* 9(4):278–82.
- Parcel, Toby L. and Elizabeth G. Menaghan. 1988. *Measuring Behavior Problems in a Large Cross-sectional Survey: Reliability and Validity for Children of the NLS Youth*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Department of Sociology. Accessed September 19, 2014 (<http://www.nlsinfo.org/site/childya/nlsdocs/otherdocs/other/ParcelMenaghanBP11988.pdf>).
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and D'Vera Cohn. 2011. "Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010." Pew Hispanic Center. Accessed April 11, 2014 (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/133.pdf>).
- Peterson, Christine E., Narayan Sastry, Anne R. Pebley, Bonnie Ghosh-Dastidar, Stephanie Williamson, and Sandraluz Lara-Cinisomo. 2004. *The Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey Codebook*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Portes, Alejandro and Rubén Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Potochnick, Stephanie R. and Krista M. Perreira. 2010. "Depression and Anxiety among First-generation Immigrant Latino Youth: Key Correlates and Implications for Future Research." *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 198(7):470–77.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1987. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley.
- Sampson, Robert T., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Felton Earls. 1999. "Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children." *American Sociological Review* 64(5):633–60.
- Schwartz, Seth J., Jennifer B. Unger, Byron L. Zamboanga, and José Szapocnik. 2010. "Rethinking the Concept of Acculturation: Implications for Theory and Research." *American Psychologist* 65(4):237–51.
- Singer, Audrey. 2009. *The New Geography of United States Immigration*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Suarez-Orozco, Carola, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Robert T. Teranishi, and Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco. 2011. "Growing Up in the Shadows: The Developmental Implications of Unauthorized Status." *Harvard Educational Review* 81(3):438–72.
- Sullivan, Margaret M. and Roberta Rebm. 2005. "Mental Health of Undocumented Mexican Immigrants: A Review of the Literature." *Advances in Nursing Science* 28(4):240–51.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2013. "Six More Counties Become Majority-minority." Accessed August 14, 2013 (<http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb13-112.html>).
- Van Hook, Jennifer, Nancy S. Landale, and Marianne M. Hillemeier. 2013. *Is the United States Bad for Children's Health? Risk and Resilience among Young Children of Immigrants*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Villarruel, Francisco A., Gustavo Carlo, Josefina M. Grau, Margarita Azmitia, Natasha Cabrera, and T. Jaime Chahin, eds. 2009. *Handbook of U.S. Latino Psychology: Developmental and Community-based Perspectives*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Viruell-Fuentes, Edna A., Patricia Y. Miranda, and Sawsan Abdulrahim. 2012. "More than Culture: Structural Racism, Intersectionality Theory, and Immigrant Health." *Social Science & Medicine* 75(12):2099–2106.

- Weisner, Thomas S. 2002. "Ecocultural Understanding of Children's Developmental Pathways." *Human Development* 45(4):275–81.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu. 2011. *Immigrants Raising Citizens: Undocumented Parents and Their Young Children*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu and Jenya Kholoptseva. 2013. *Unauthorized Immigrant Parents and Their Children's Development: A Summary of the Evidence*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Zavella, Patricia. 2011. *I'm Neither Here nor There: Mexicans' Quotidian Struggles with Migration and Poverty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Nancy S. Landale is a Liberal Arts Research Professor of Sociology and Demography at The Pennsylvania State University. Her research focuses on the intersection of immigration, family processes, and health. She is currently working on a study of the health and development of Mexican-origin children in the United States and Mexico. A key issue in this research is the role of parental legal status in shaping family circumstances and children's well-being.

Jessica Halliday Hardie is an assistant professor of sociology at Hunter College, City University of New York. Her program of research focuses on the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage. She is particularly interested in the role of families and schools in explaining inequality among young people and how this contributes to patterns of attainment in adulthood. Recent published work has examined adolescent future plans and social capital, the role of economic hardship in young adults' romantic relationships, and the association between maternal health and child well-being.

R. S. Oropesa is a professor of sociology and demography at The Pennsylvania State University. His research focuses broadly on issues related to the assimilation of Latin American immigrants and their descendants in the United States. Currently, he is investigating the role of legal status in the health and health care of Mexican-origin children in California.

Marianne M. Hillemeier is a professor of health policy and administration and demography at The Pennsylvania State University. Her research interests focus on socio-economic, racial-ethnic, and geographic disparities in health and health care for infants and children.