CHILDREN'S LIVING ARRANGEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH MEXICO-U.S. MIGRATION

Berna M. Torr* and Michael S. Rendall* and

September 21, 2007

Extended Abstract Submission for PAA

We examine the influence of own and parents' migration on the living arrangements of first and second-generation immigrant Mexican-American children. To do this, we use census microdata in Mexico and census and survey data in the U.S. in which household structure, country of birth, and recent migration of both parents and children may be observed. We contribute to the literature on immigrant children's living arrangements and well-being by considering not just coresidence with parents but with extended family members (and kin type) and non-kin. Extending our analysis to both sides of the border provides for a fuller understanding of the impact of international migration on both nuclear and extended family structure. Analysis of both first- and second-generation Mexican-American children, including coresident siblings, provides insights into the strategies of family-building of first-generation adult migrants and the effect of these strategies on children's experience of living apart from one or both parents.

* RAND Labor and Population program and Population Research Center. Address correspondence to btorr@rand.org

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge support from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under investigator grant R03-HD052691, post-doctoral training grant T32-HD007329, and research infrastructure grant R24-HD050906.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the substantial attention paid to how extended family networks facilitate migration from Mexico to the U.S. (Winters et. al 2001; see also Blank and Torrecilha 1998 for a review), only recently have researchers begun to look at the living arrangements of Mexican migrants with children. The literature on the living arrangements of first- and second-generation children in the U.S. primarily looks at parental coresidence and absence (Brandon 2002; Landale and Oropesa 1995), although sometimes including grandparents where parents are absent (Brandon 2002). The literature on family structure among immigrant adults, meanwhile, has primarily focused on extended family living arrangements (Blank and Torrecilha 1998; Van Hook and Glick 2007). While cultural factors have figured prominently among explanations for greater propensities of Hispanics, including Mexican-American immigrants, to live in extended family households, Van Hook and Glick (2007) compared living arrangements in the U.S. and Mexico and concluded that the process of migration itself is a more important determinant of extended-family and extended-household living arrangements.

In the present study, we extend consideration of the effects of Mexico-U.S. migration to the household structures specifically of children. We examine both parental coresidence/absence and coresidence with extended family members and non-kin for first- and second-generation Mexican-American children. Analysis of Mexican data provides not only comparative family structure, but also consideration of child and parental migration by analyzing the family and household structures of second-generation children and the countries of birth of their co-resident siblings. By comparing these with the family and household structures of Mexican-immigrant children of both first and

second generations in the U.S., and with non-migrant Mexican and Mexican-origin families on both sides of the border, we are able to gain insights into the migration processes and the resulting effects on family structure that explicitly take into account recent migration of both parents and children.

BACKGROUND

While neoclassical theories of migration suggest that individuals move to maximize their own individual gain, the "new economics of migration" theory suggests that migration decisions are made collectively, typically by families or households (Massey et al. 1993; Stark and Lucas 1988), making the family or household the more appropriate unit of analysis. However, work examining the gendered nature of household power suggests that the interests of all household members may not match, nor does everyone in the household have an equal say in migration decisions (Hodagneu-Sotelo 1992, 1994; King 2007). Hodagneu-Sotelo (1992, 1994) suggests that in the typical pattern of staged family migration, where the husband migrates from Mexico to the U.S. first and may later be joined by his wife and children, the initial migration decisions are made by husbands, often despite the vehement objections of their wives. These decisions may have profound effects on the remaining household members and their communities. Social network theory suggests that once migration streams have been established migrant networks, based on extended families, friendship, and communities of origin, help maintain migration streams. These networks may facilitate the later migration of women and children (Hodagneu-Sotelo 1992; Massey et al. 1993; Winters et al. 2001) reuniting families.

In addition to use of existing family networks, the building of networks through family-demographic processes is another potential component of migration strategies. While the role of marriage between co-ethnic men and women with different legal migration statuses is an obvious example of this, family-building through bearing children in the U.S. may also play an important role. Lindstrom and Saucedo (2002) find that migration has a strong relationship to the timing of fertility in the U.S. versus in Mexico among Mexican-born women, indicating that women's migration and fertility are likely to be codetermined to favor childbearing in the U.S. over childbearing in Mexico. This is unsurprising given the strong incentives for giving birth in the U.S., even if the child will be raised principally in Mexico. For the children themselves, U.S. citizenship clearly improves their adult labor-market opportunities in the U.S., since they are not hampered by the unauthorized residence or work-status problems of those born to Mexican parents in Mexico. For the family, having one or more children born in the U.S. builds the family's U.S. legal migration capital, in an overall migration context in which kin networks are very important (Massey and Espinosa 1997)

While family-building associated with Mexico-U.S. migration has potentially important advantages for migrants, there are also costs related to disruption of nuclear family households and the need for forming extended-family households including children. In particular, the presence or absence of a parent may affect children's well-being through loss of economic resources, loss of care and supervision, or loss of social networks. The literature on family structure and child-wellbeing in the United States suggests that living in a single-parent family (generally single-mother families) rather than in a two-parent family has negative consequences for children on a wide range of

outcomes, including substance abuse, early sexual activity and teen pregnancy, school enrollment, school achievement, educational attainment, and aspirations (Deleire and Kalil 2002; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). Living apart from one or both parents has also been associated with lower school enrollment of children in Mexico (Rendall and Torr 2007; Saucedo 2005). While it is likely that the effects of separation through migration have important differences from separation through marital disruption, qualitative research (King 2007) suggests that these two processes of separation may also be closely intertwined. Issues of family stability are particularly relevant for children in high immigration contexts because migration is by nature a disruptive process, and even local moves, often associated with changes in family structure, have been shown to have a negative effect on children's outcomes in the U.S. (Haveman, Wolfe, and Spaulding 1991; Adam and Chase-Lansdale 2002).

There is a substantial literature which suggests that racial and ethnic minorities are more likely than whites in the United States to live in extended families (Beck and Beck 1989; Goldscheider and Bures 2003; Kamo 2000; Ruggles 1994a, 1994b; Tienda and Angel 1982; Torr, Goldscheider, and Short 2007). Structural theories of family extension suggest that people use coresidence as a means of providing economic support and other forms of care (including childcare) in the face of economic constraints (e.g. Angel and Tienda; Blank and Torrecilha 1998; Stack 1974; Tienda and Angel 1982), including those associated with the absence of a parent. The literature on children's family structure which has looked at extended families suggests that the presence of other adults in the household, especially grandparents, may mitigate the negative effect of single parenthood on some of child outcomes, especially those involving school

attendance and achievement (Aquilino 1996; Deleire and Kalil 2002; Entwisle and Alexander 1996). Since migration may both disrupt nuclear family structures and may also result in at least temporary economic strains due to the cost of migration and establishing economically stable lives in the destination country, living with extended family members may be especially important for this group. Black and Torrecilha (1998) looking at adult immigrants find that life-course constraints and migration opportunities particularly influence extended family living arrangements.

In contrast to structural theories, cultural theories suggest that extended families are preferred as a result of cultural differences, especially the familism of Mexican culture (Kamo 2000; Rumbaut 1994). However, the conflation of ethnicity and immigrant status makes it hard to disentangle the structural constraints that result from immigration and cultural differences. Highlighting the value of using data on both the U.S. and Mexico when looking at Mexican immigrants to the U.S., Van Hook and Glick (2007) suggest that the cultural theory of family extension cannot explain their finding that recent immigrants from Mexico to the U.S. are more likely to live in extended family or non-kin households, even though these households are not the norm in Mexico.

While this migration explanation of living arrangements is fairly new in quantitative studies, ethnographic research had already suggested it's often overlooked significance for families with children. In her qualitative studies of Mexican women migrating to the US with or without their children, Hondagneu-Sotelo (1994) provides the following telling footnote to her study of gender relations in the Mexico-U.S. migration process, following her discovery through interviews of the importance of migrants' children in the decision to return to Mexico or stay in the US: "As I approached

the completion of fieldwork for this study, I realized that by not including interviews with children and adolescents, I had overlooked their participation in the migration and resettlement process" (p.226).

DATA AND METHODS

Data

We use the 2000 census microdata from the University of Minnesota's IPUMS-International and IPUMS-USA projects (Minnesota Population Center 2006; Ruggles et al. 2004), along with the IPUMS-CPS data for 2004, 2005, and 2006 (King et al. 2004) for the U.S. to identify U.S.-born children (ages 0–17) of Mexican-born mothers in both the U.S. and Mexico (second generation), along with Mexican-born children in the U.S. (first generation), and compare them to non-migrant children in the two countries. The Mexican second-generation population is by far the largest, and among the youngest, of second-generation immigrant populations in the United States. Rumbaut (2004) estimates their number in 1998-2002 at 7.05 million, with a median age of 12.

We begin to fill the gap in knowledge about children living arrangements among Mexican-American and Mexican-immigrant children by describing children's family structure including coresidence with parents, and broadening the definition of family structure to include coresidence with extended family (by kin type) and with nonrelatives. Unlike past research on family structure and immigration we include the second generation living both in the U.S. and Mexico. This is important because about one in ten second-generation Mexican-Americans will live at least some part of their childhood in Mexico (Rendall and Torr 2007). We assess the relationship between migration status,

generation, and length of time since immigration and family structure. Looking at children's living arrangements on both sides of the border allows us to examine how both country of residence and migrant status are related to living arrangements. In addition, we can compare across co-resident siblings with different countries of birth and migration histories. This will inform both questions about the relationship between migration and children's family structure and well-being, as well as provide insight into the migration process itself.

The Mexican census microdata include a stratified cluster sample design with an overall sampling fraction of 10.6 percent (with sample weights provided to account for this design). We use the U.S. 5 percent IPUMS samples for 2000. These samples also have clustered designs, requiring the use of sample weights to account for this design. The U.S. census data require the use of presence of parents and parental birthplace information to identify the second generation. Hill and Wong's (2005) estimates of net migration between Mexico and the U.S. between 1990 and 2000 alternately using the Mexican and U.S. censuses reveal a basic compatibility of the two countries in terms of enumeration by age and gender, including both unauthorized and authorized Mexican-born residents of the U.S.

The CPS data are multi-stage stratified samples and require the use of sample weights to account for this design. Starting in 1994, the CPS included a question on parents' birthplace even when parents were not present in the home. Thus, the CPS allows the identification of first and second-generation Mexican-American children even when parents are not present in the household. We pool the 2004, 2005, and 2006 CPS

samples[1]. The 2005 data include a question on living arrangements five years ago which is compatible with the census questions, while the 2004 and 2006 samples contain information on living arrangements one year ago.

Measures

Immigrant Children and Second Generation. Census household member information has been used successfully in the identification and analyses of second-generation immigrants in the 1990 U.S. Census PUMS (Jensen and Chitose 1994; Landale, Oropesa, and Llanes 1998). The derived family relationship in the IPUMS and recently implemented in the IPUMS-CPS greatly facilitates this identification, allowing us to link children to both their mother and father where they are present in the household. The derived family relationship variables are quite similar in the IPUMS-USA and IPUMS-CPS facilitating comparisons across both datasets (King et al. 2004; Ruggles et. al. 2004)[2].

The main challenge in using census household data is the identification of second-generation Mexican-American children that are not living with their mother or father. For children observed in Mexico, this is relatively straightforward: We consider having been born in the U.S. as sufficient to establish their second-generation Mexican-American status. This requires only the uncontroversial assumption that the number of U.S.-born children that were not born to Mexican-born parents, but that nevertheless lived in Mexico away from their parents, is small. For the U.S. census data we rely on the country of birth of the child's *mother* in defining "second-generation" children, because the

[1] Because of our focus on children, we may limit the analysis to 2005 and 2006 CPS samples, which include a new weighting procedure, in order to better represent children by single year of age in the data. On the other hand, if sample size becomes a concern we can pool across additional years.

[2] However, they are not identical, primarily as a result of the more limited detail on relationship to head of household in the CPS (see King et al. 2004).

mother is more likely to be present in the census household with the child. If we cannot identify a mother in the household, we rely on father's birthplace, and if we cannot identify either parent we relay on ethnicity and ancestry questions. However, this potentially includes third and higher generations among the second generation not living with either parent.

As a result we include an additional analysis which relies on the CPS, which through the inclusion of information on parental birthplace, allows the identification of second-generation Mexican-Americans even when those parents are not coresident (Brandon 1998; Farley and Alba 2002; Rumbaut 2004). We use these data to distinguish between second and higher generation Mexican-Americans living apart from their parents. While the CPS provides better identification of second-generation Mexican immigrants where both parents are absent, it contains a much smaller sample of children and contains less detailed information on relationship to head of household. We identify first generation Mexican immigrants who are under age 18 by their own birthplace information regardless of parental coresidence. Following Rumbaut (2004) we also consider age at entry into the U.S. (e.g., 1.25 generation, 1.5 generation). To account also for the possibility that the emigration of second-generation children results in a non-linear relationship of first to second generation to years lived in the U.S., we also analyze the length of time since immigration among the first generation and the migration histories of first-generation parents of second-generation Mexican-American children.

Family Structure. We start by looking at coresidence with parents. We rely on the IPUMS derived family information to facilitate the identification of mothers and fathers. Next, we identify coresidence with other relatives by kin type as well as non-relatives. If

one of the child's parents is the head of household we use information on each person in the household's relationship to the head of household to identify their relationship to the child. We can also use the family structure information to identify coresident siblings along with their country of birth and migration history.

Where the child's parent is not the head the household, the parent and child's relationship to the head of household along with each person's relationship to the head of household are used to identify the relationship of each person in the household to the child. For this latter group, especially when the child is not related to the household head, it may be difficult to determine relationships to other persons in the household besides parents and siblings. However, our preliminary analysis of the parent-child links in the IPUMS-USA and IPUMS-CPS for all children suggests that this situation is quite rare for those under age 18.

Reunions. The question on place of residence five years ago allows us to identify reunions among children currently living with a parent but who were not living with that parent five years ago. The question on country of residence five years ago, when used together with parental residence five years ago, allows the identification of reunions and of international moves jointly with a family member. We can also identify whether currently coresident siblings share the same migration histories. These reunions allow the assessment of the fluidity of family structure in the context of migration.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

This section presents some descriptive results from the 2000 U.S. and Mexico Censuses. These descriptive results highlight some of the major differences in

coresidence that we plan to explore further in the final version of this paper. Also note that we currently compare first and second-generation Mexican-Americans to all U.S. children and all Mexican children. In future versions we plan to restrict these comparison groups to native-born Mexican children and third and higher generation U.S.-born children, although this is unlikely to substantially alter the figures for those groups presented here. In addition, we do not yet include the analysis of living arrangements including extended family members and nonkin.

Table 1 shows the distribution of children by family structure and migrant/generation status and country of residence. Table 1 suggests that the traditional patriarchal staged family migration process, where the father migrates to the U.S. and the family members follow, seems to apply even when mothers and children have already been to the U.S. Twenty-two percent of second-generation Mexican-Americans in Mexico are living apart from their father, compared to just 14% of all Mexican children, and less than 14% of first and second generation children in the U.S.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

However, the story is more complicated than a simple staged family migration story, as many children are also living apart from their mothers. Combining those who lived apart from their mother but lived with their father, and those who were living apart from both parents, shows that first- and second-generation children are much more likely to live apart from their mothers than all Mexican or all U.S. children. In 2000, 10% of the second-generation Mexican-American children living in Mexico lived apart from their mother, as did 17% of the second-generation living in U.S. An even higher figure, 21% of first-generation immigrant children from Mexico, lived apart from both parents.

In contrast, just 7% of those in Mexico and 11% of all children in the U.S. lived apart from both parents in 2000.

Table 2 presents the distribution of past separations/reunions and continued coresidence over the last five years for children by generation and country of residence. This table also provides evidence of a staged family migration process in which fathers live separately from children in the U.S. In addition, children's migration may also follow mothers, albeit to a lesser extent. However, these results also suggest that there is joint family migration, primarily from Mexico to the U.S. for the first generation, and from the U.S. to Mexico for the second generation.

[Insert Table 2]

In staged family migration, fathers typically migrate first and may be followed later by wives and children. Among the first-generation children, over 14% were reunited with their fathers in the U.S. after a migration from Mexico to join their fathers in the U.S. Just over five percent migrated to the U.S. to be reunited with their mothers, while another two percent had mothers who joined them in the U.S. The reunions among the first generation clearly follow the staged family migration pattern. There is also some evidence of this staged migration pattern among second-generation children living in Mexico. Just over 8% of second-generation Mexican-American children living in Mexico with their father lived apart from their father five years ago. In addition, 7% of those currently living with their mother in Mexico lived apart from her five years ago. The vast majority of these separations from both parents and children occurred when the child was in the U.S. but the parent was in Mexico (6% of children). Although, fathers were much more likely to have been in the U.S. while the child was in Mexico (3%) than mothers

(less than 1%), suggesting that staged family migration may also apply when wives and children have already migrated.

However, the roughly similar rate of temporary separations from mothers and fathers, and the rejoining of children with their parents by emigrating from the U.S. to Mexico to join their parents suggest a less patriarchal and unidirectional process of staged family migration. In addition, these reunions have implications for current family structure, suggesting that the high rate of current separation of parents and children among the second generation may be temporary. If the process continues as observed in 2000, then we would expect a substantial portion of the first- and second-generation children currently living apart from their parents to reunite with them with in five years.

Table 2 also shows substantial joint migration of parents and children. Over 20% of first-generation migrants moved to the U.S. from Mexico along with their mother in the last five years and 12% moved jointly with their father. While the movement of mothers and children may be part of a staged family migration process (joining fathers), the joint movement of fathers and children suggests that the story may be more complicated. In addition, parents and second-generation children were likely to return to Mexico together. Twenty-one percent of second-generation children living with their mothers in Mexico and 19% of those living with their fathers, were living in the U.S. with that parent five years ago. Together the high rate of reunion and high rates of linked migration suggest that some of the current high separation rate of second-generation Mexican Americans from their parents is likely temporary, and due to the migration of the parent or child.

[Insert Table 2]

REFERENCES

Adam, E.K. and P.L. Chase-Landsdale (2002) Home sweet home(s):parental separations, residential moves, and adjustment problems in low-income adolescent girls *Developmental Psychology* 38(5):792-805.

Angel R. and M. Tienda (1982) Determinants of extended household structure: cultural pattern or economic need? *American Journal of Sociology* 87:1360-83.

Aquilino, W.S.(1996) The lifecourse of children born to unmarried mothers: childhood living arrangements and young adult outcomes *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58:293-310.

Beck, R.W. and S.H. Beck (1989) The incidence of extended households among middle-aged black and white women: estimates from a 15-year panel study *Journal of Family Issues* 10:147-68.

Blank, S. and R.S. Torecilha (1998) Understanding the living arrangements of Latino immigrants: A life course approach *International Migration Review* 32:3-19.

Brandon, P.D. (2007) The living arrangements of children in immigrant families in the United States *International Migration Review* 36(2):416-436.

Deleire, T. and A. Kalil (2002) Good Things Come in Threes: Single-Parent Multigenerational Family Structure and Adolescent Adjustment *Demography* 39(2):393-413.

Driscoll, A.K. (1999) Risk of high school dropout among immigrant and native Hispanic youth *International Migration Review* 33(4):857-875

Durand, J. and D.S. Massey (2004) “What we have learned from the Mexican Migration Project” pp.1-14 in J. Durand and D.S. Massey (eds) *Crossing the Border: Research from the Mexican Migration Project* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Durand, J., D.S. Massey, and R.M. Zenteno (2001) Mexican immigration to the United States: Continuities and changes *Latin American Research Review* 36(1):107-127.

Entwisle, D. and K. Alexander (1996) Family type and children’s growth in reading and math over the primary grades *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58:341-355.

Farley, R. and R. Alba (2002) The new second generation in the United States *International Migration Review* 36(3):669-701.

Feliciano, C. (2005a) Does selective migration matter? Explaining ethnic disparities in educational attainment among immigrants’ children *International Migration Review* 39(4):841-871.

Glick, J.E. and B. Hohmann-Mariott (2007) Academic performance of young children in immigrant families: The significance of race, ethnicity, and national origins *International Migration Review* 41(2):371-402.

Goldscheider, F.K. and R.M. Bures (2003) The Racial Crossover in Family Complexity in the United States *Demography* 40(3):569-587.

Haveman, R., B. Wolfe, and J. Spaulding (1991) Childhood events and circumstances influencing high school completion *Demography* 28(1):133-157.

Hill, K., and R. Wong (2005) Mexico-U.S. migration: Views from both sides of the border *Population and Development Review* 31(1):1-18.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1994) *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration* Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. (1992) Overcoming patriarchal constraints: the reconstruction of gender relations among Mexican immigrant women and men *Gender and Society* 6(3):393-415.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. and E. Avila (1997) "I'm here, but I'm there": The meanings of Latina transnational motherhood *Gender and Society* 11(5):5448-571.

Jensen, L., and Y. Chitose (1994) Today's second generation: Evidence from the 1990 U.S. Census *International Migration Review* 28(4):714-735.

Kamo, Y (2000) Racial and ethnic differences in extended family households *Sociological Perspectives* 43:211-229.

King, M.C. (2007) Even Gary Becker wouldn't call them altruists! the case of Mexican migration: a reply to Sana and Massey, SSQ June 2005. *Social Science Quarterly* 88(3):898-907.

King, M., S. Ruggles, T. Alexander, D. Leicach, and M. Sobek. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 2.0*. [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], 2004. cps.ipums.org/cps.

Landale, N.S., R.S. Oropesa, and D. Llanes (1998) Schooling, work, and idleness among Mexican and non-Latino white adolescents *Social Science Research* 27:457-480.

Lindstrom, D.P., and S.G. Saucedo (2002) The short- and long-term effects of U.S. migration experience on Mexican women's fertility *Social Forces* 80(4):1341-1368.

Lopez, D.E. and R.D. Stanton-Salazar (2001) “Mexican Americans: a second generation at risk” pp 57-90 in R. Rumbaut and A. Portes (eds) *Ethnicities: children of immigrants in America* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, D.S., and K.E. Espinosa (1997) What’s driving Mexico-U.S. migration? A theoretical, empirical, and policy analysis *American Journal of Sociology* 102(4):939-999.

McLanahan, S. and G. Sandefur (1994) *Growing up with a single parent: what hurts what helps* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Minnesota Population Center (2006) *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series-International: Version 2.0*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. http://international.ipums.org.

Passel, J.S., and M. Tienda (2005) “From native to immigrant and back again: A historical and prospective analysis of generational changes in the Hispanic population, 1960-2030.” *Paper presented at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Philadelphia*.

Rendall, M.S. and B.M. Torr (2007) Emigration and schooling among second generation Mexican-American children. *RAND Working Paper.*

Ruggles, S (1994a) The origins of African American family structure *American Sociological Review 59(1):136-151.*

_____ (1994b) The transformation of American family structure *American Historical Review 99(1):103-128.*

Ruggles, S., M. Sobek, T. Alexander, C.A. Fitch, R. Goeken, P. Kelly Hall, M. King, and C. Ronnander (2004). *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Version 3.0*

[machine readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], 2004. http://usa.ipums.org/usa.

Rumbaut, R.G. (2004) Ages, life stages, and generational cohorts: Decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States *International Migration Review* 38(3):1160-1205.

Saucedo, S.E. (2005). School dropout, adolescent labor and family structures in Mexico *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America.*

Stack, C. (1974) *All our kin: strategies for survival in a black community*. New York: Harper and Row.

Stark, O. and R.E.B. Lucas (1988) Migration, remittances, and the family *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 36(3):465-481.

Tienda, M. and R. Angel (1982) Headship and household composition among blacks, Hispanics, and other whites *Social Forces* 61:508-31.

Torr, B.M., F.K. Goldscheider, and S.E. Short (2007) Black-white differences in the coresidential experience of mothers of young children, 1880 to 2000 *Presented at the Population Association of America Meetings, April 2007, New York, New York.*

Van Hook, J. and J. Glick (2007) Immigration and living arrangements: moving beyond economic need versus acculturation *Demography* 44(2):225-249.

Winters, P., A. de Janvry, E. Sadoulet (2001) Family and community networks in Mexico-U.S. Migration *Journal of Human Resources* 36(1):159-184.

Table 1. Distribution of Children by Family Structure, 2000

	Children under 18 years old				
Presence of parents	All Mexican children (%)	second-generation Mexican-American children in Mexico (%)	second-generation Mexican-American children in the U.S. (%)	Mexican-Immigrant Children in the U.S.	All U.S. children (%)
No Mother or Father	5.2	7.5	10.4	15.0	4.9
No Father (Mother only)	14.0	22.2	13.9	13.1	21.5
No Mother (Father only)	2.0	2.4	6.8	6.1	5.7
Both Parents	78.8	68.0	68.9	65.8	68.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sample N	4,267,910	24,558	196,200	66,890	3,653,472
Weighted N	72,122,304	244,628	3,938,455	1,355,443	39,259,340

Source: Rendall and Torr 2007; Authors Tabulations of IPUMS data for Mexico and the U.S., 2000

Table 2. Reunions Between Parents and Children by Generation and Country of Residence

Children 5+ With Mother in Household	**All Mexico**			**2nd Gen in Mexico**			**2nd Gen in U.S.**			**1st Gen in U.S.**		
Lived with Mother 5 Years Ago	25,954,847	99.43%		119,929	92.79%		2,125,677	99.12%		856,202	93.67%	
Lived in Mexico with Mother 5 Years Ago	25,891,551		*99.18%*	93,191		*72.10%*	26,165		*1.22%*	193,013		*21.12%*
Lived in US with Mother 5 Years Ago	56,253		*0.22%*	26,611		*20.59%*	2,099,512		*97.90%*	663,094		*72.54%*
Lived Elsewhere 5 Years Ago	7,043		*0.03%*	127		*0.10%*	0		*0.00%*	95		*0.01%*
Lived Apart 5 Years Ago	149,783	0.57%		9,321	7.21%		18,843	0.88%		57,881	6.33%	
Child in US, Mother in Mexico	*11,110*		*0.04%*	7,353		*5.69%*	14,274		*0.67%*	15,082		*1.65%*
Child in Mexico, Mother in US	*11,771*		*0.05%*	657		*0.51%*	4,519		*0.21%*	42,768		*4.68%*
Other	*126,902*		*0.49%*	1,311		*1.01%*	50		*0.00%*	31		*0.00%*
Weighted Total	26,104,630		100.00%	129,250		100.00%	2,144,520		100.00%	914,083		100.00%
No Mother in Household	2,363,317			16,480			404,592			249,225		

Children 5+ With Father in Household	**All Mexico**			**2nd Gen in Mexico**			**2nd Gen in U.S.**			**1st Gen in U.S.**		
Lived with Father 5 Years Ago	22,450,611	99.11%		91,847	89.75%		1,884,369	98.74%		708,543	84.63%	
Lived in Mexico with Father 5 Years Ago	22,404,055		*98.90%*	72,347		*70.69%*	16,818		*0.88%*	104,527		*12.48%*
Lived in US with Father 5 Years Ago	40,876		*0.18%*	19,415		*18.97%*	1,867,551		*97.86%*	603,940		*72.13%*
Lived Elsewhere 5 Years Ago	5,680		*0.03%*	85		*0.08%*	0		*0.00%*	76		*0.01%*
Lived Apart 5 Years Ago	201,679	0.77%		10,495	8.12%		23,999	1.12%		128,730	14.08%	
Child in US, Father in Mexico	10,494		*0.05%*	6,431		*6.28%*	13,848		*0.73%*	11,441		*1.37%*
Child in Mexico, Father in US	77,278		*0.34%*	2,977		*2.91%*	10,067		*0.53%*	117,202		*14.00%*
Other	113,907		*0.50%*	1,087		*1.06%*	84		*0.00%*	87		*0.01%*
Weighted Total	22,652,290		100.00%	102,342		100.00%	1,908,368		100.00%	837,273		100.00%
No Father in Household	5,814,757			43,388			640,744			326,035		