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Abstract

Research indicates youth who face family instability have more negative outcomes than youth who remain in stable families. A gap in the literature is whether following family instability youth will move to a neighborhood with more disorder. Individuals that transition to neighborhoods with more disorder have profound negative effects in comparison to those who remain in higher quality neighborhoods. This study employs longitudinal data from the Fragile Families Study to determine whether family instability increases youths’ risk of movement to a lower quality neighborhood, and whether the effects of family instability in conjunction with movement to lower quality neighborhood impact educational outcomes, internalizing problem behaviors, and externalizing problem behaviors in comparison to youth only experiencing family instability. We find family instability significantly increases the odds of youth moving to lower quality neighborhoods, and youth display increased internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors following both family instability and movement to lower quality neighborhoods.
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Introduction

More youth in the United States today than in previous decades will undergo a period of instability in their families (Brown, Stykes, and Manning, 2016; Bumpass & Lu, 2001; Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008). Brown and colleagues find that over half (52%) of youth experience at least one family transition by the age of twelve, up from 41% in 1995 (Brown et al. 2016). Broken down by race/ethnicity, instability rates for White and Hispanic children are while slightly increasing are comparable over time, but there has been a drastic increase in family instability among black children, specifically an increase in non-marital births, particularly births to black single mothers who eventually formed partnerships (Brown et al. 2016). Family instability has been linked to negative outcomes for children, such as hindered parent-child relationships (Bank et al. 1993), educational development (Martinez & Forgatch, 2002), and increased delinquency (Brown, 2006) (see Waldfogel, Craigie, and Brooks-Gunn 2010 for a recent review). Most of the literature focuses on comparing youth from stable families to youth from unstable families, with little thought to compare youth from unstable families to each other. While instability has been shown to have negative effects for children, little research has investigated whether family instability (other than divorce) influences residential mobility to lower socioeconomic status (SES) neighborhoods. Movement to lower quality neighborhoods has found to increase youth delinquency/externalizing problem behavior (Fowler et al. 2014; Gasper et al. 2010; Haynie & South, 2005), and internalizing problem behavior (Roy et al. 2014). In this paper, we build upon the literature by considering the neighborhood context in which children reside and move to, following a period of family instability. Using the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, we examine whether the inclusion of various forms of family instability lead to movement to a lower quality neighborhood, and further examine children’s developmental outcomes (cognitive,
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internalizing, and externalizing behaviors) in the context of family instability in conjunction with neighborhood quality.

Family instability

From the 1960s until the mid-2000s there was a steady increase in the share of cohabiting couples (Brown, 2016; Bumpass & Lu, 2000; Cherlin, 2010; Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008; Raley & Wildsmith, 2004). During the same period, the share of non-marital births increased, with many of these births occurring to cohabiting couples (Bumpass & Lu, 2000; Cherlin, 2010; Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008; Raley & Wildsmith, 2004). Children in these alternative family structures experience more instability than their peers with married parents (Brown & Booth, 1996; Bumpass & Lu, 2000; Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008; Manning, 2015; Manning & Bulanda, 2003; Raley & Wildsmith, 2004). This greater risk for instability has been attributed to a number of factors such as, choosing not to marry because of financial insecurity rather than a lack of desire to marry, (Smock et al. 2005), and having lower quality relationships (greater disagreement, greater amount of fights/violence, lower levels of happiness, and lower levels of fairness) (Brown & Booth, 1996). One consequence of these emerging alternative family structures is that more youth experience family instability by the age of 12, than before (Brown et al. 2016). A consensus has developed from the literature that family instability increases negative outcomes for youth, but there has been little research conducted on potential mediating factors. Our study attempts to fill this gap by examining neighborhood quality for youth experiencing family instability.

Family Instability and Negative Juvenile Outcomes

Parental factors
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Youth from unstable families have increased hardships with family functioning and relationships with both their custodial and noncustodial parents. Family instability (specifically divorce) has found to have a long duration of conflict for both parents and youth (Amato, 2010; Amato & Keith, 1991; Cherlin et al., 1991). This long duration is due to the fact that conflict is present before and after the divorce (Amato, 2010; Amato & Keith, 1991; Cherlin et al., 1991). Repartnering (through marriage or a cohabiting relationship) can have negative impacts on a child’s relationship with their noncustodial parent (Cherlin et al., 1991; Coleman et al., 2000), and the stepparent or cohabiting partner themselves can increase negative outcomes through undermining the custodial parent, and ambiguous parental roles (Hoffereth & Anderson, 2003; Williams et al. 2008). Reduced attachment to both parents is a common consequence following a period of instability (Schroeder et al. 2010). Custodial parents following a period of instability have been found to provide less supervision of their children (potentially due to new romantic relationships), more maltreatment, and poorer parenting practices (Bank et al., 1993; Cookston, 1999; Griffen et al., 2000; Heck and Walsh 2000). Noncustodial parents, typically the father (although this trend is changing), face reduced closeness to their children, which leads to less school engagement, more depression, and greater delinquency for their children (Brown, 2006; Carlson, 2006; Videon, 2002).

Externalizing/Internalizing behaviors

A propensity towards delinquency and externalizing problem behaviors directly and indirectly stemming from youth experiencing family instability is a prominent finding in the literature. Indirect effects increase risk factors for delinquency such as, less supervision from parents (Cookston, 1999), and negative peer interactions (Krohn et al. 2009). Directly, youth from unstable families are prone to greater future delinquency (Brown, 2006; Fomby & Cherlin,
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2007; Fomby & Osborne, 2016; Hao & Xie, 2002; Juby & Farrington 2001; Krohn et al., 2009; Maguson & Berger, 2009; Manning & Bulanda, 2003; Najman et al., 1997), with this relationship remaining significant even controlling for other related factors such as, well-being of the youth before instability occurs and for negative parent characteristics (Brown, 2006; Hao & Xie, 2002; Manning & Bulanda, 2003). This relationship is not limited to delinquency but applies to externalizing problem behaviors in general (Cavanagh & Huston, 2006; Cavanagh & Huston, 2008; Lee & McLanahan, 2015; Najman et al. 2007).

Similarly, family instability negatively influences internalizing problem behaviors as well. Considerable research has been conducted on the consequences for youth experiencing parental divorce, finding that youth from divorced families have much more psychological distress than youth in stable households (Amato & Keith, 1991, Kelly & Emery, 2003). This outcome is not limited to youth who experience divorce, other forms of family instability have been shown to negatively impact youth as well (Brown, 2006; Najman et al. 2007). For example, Brown (2006) found that youth who transitioned from a married stepfamily to single mother, from a single mother to married stepfamily, and from a single mother to cohabiting partner all faced significantly higher odds of depression.

School and Neighborhood quality/factors

The consequences of family instability are not limited to just parental factors, behavior, and emotional aspects. Youth experiencing family instability have lower math and reading skills, are at a greater risk of not graduating high school, receive lower academic skill encouragement, and evidence suggests parents from unstable families have lower educational standards than parents who are stably married (Fomby & Cherlin, 2007; Hansen et al. 1998; Maguson & Berger, 2009; Martinez and Forgatch 2002; Manning & Bulanda, 2003; Pong & Ju, 2000).
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Following divorce, children move to lower SES neighborhoods than their peers in stably married families (Amato, 2000; Amato, 2010; Griffen et al. 2000; South et al. 1998). Considering family instability more broadly (including but not limited to divorce), children experiencing family instability face greater residential mobility than youth in stable households. Youth from unstable families have a higher prevalence of moving locally, moving over long distances, and a greater number of non-routine school changes (Fomby & Sennott, 2013). While the literature has established that instability often results in residential mobility for children, there has been little research into the quality of neighborhoods where these youth are moving. Additionally, these studies have largely focused on residential outcomes following divorce, but it is important to consider if youth from other types of unstable families experience the same negative outcomes as youth of divorce.

Neighborhood disorder

We use a measure of neighborhoods physical disorder to assess neighborhood quality, and as a proxy for assessing neighborhood SES. Physical disorder in neighborhoods has been frequently linked to crime (Perkins & Taylor, 1996; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999; Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004) and health outcomes, particularly depression (Caughy et al., 2001; Cutrona et al., 2006; Latkin & Curry, 2003; Ross & Mirowsky, 2001). Furthermore, links between neighborhood disorder and the SES standing of the neighborhood have been established in the literature (Feldman & Steptoe, 2004; Ross & Mirowsky, 2001). Specifically, the more disorder present in the neighborhood, the higher odds it is a lower SES neighborhood. For example, Ross and Mirowsky (2001) found that in neighborhoods with higher neighborhood physical disorder, also displayed higher percentages of single mother residences and a greater share of people living in poverty.
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Physical disorder has been measured as presence of broken windows, boarded-up
buildings, litter in streets and on sidewalks, abandoned vehicles, and graffiti (Caughey et al. 2001;
Cutrona et al. 2006; Latkin & Curry, 2003; Perkins & Taylor, 1996; Sampson & Raudenbush,
1999; Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004; Ross & Mirowsky, 2001). Percent of single mother
households and percent in poverty are also measures commonly used in calculating concentrated
disadvantage scores for neighborhoods, and are reliable indicators of neighborhood SES
(Sampson 2012). Most frequently, data on physical disorder is measured by interviewer
observation, or systematic social observation (Jones, Pebley, & Sastry, 2011; Mooney et al.,
2014; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Our measure of neighborhood disorder is interviewer
observed, which has been shown to be a reliable way of assessing neighborhood physical
disorder.

Current Study

The current study adds to the literature in several ways. First, while there has been prior
evidence that divorce leads to movement to lower quality neighborhoods (Gatti, 2000; South et
al. 1998), and that the inclusion of other forms of family instability leads to residential mobility
in general (Fomby & Sennott, 2013). No research to our knowledge has looked at how the
inclusion of all forms of family instability predicts movement to a lower SES/higher
disadvantaged neighborhood. Thus, our first hypothesis is: 1) Youth who experience family
instability will be at higher risk for moving to a lower SES neighborhood (one with more
physical disorder). Another aspect that has been mentioned is that youth who experience family
instability perform more poorly academically than youth who are from stable families (Brown,
2004; Brown, 2006; Fomby & Cherlin, 2007; Lee & McLanahan, 2015; Manning & Bulanda,
2003; Martinez and Forgatch 2002; Pong & Ju, 2000). In tandem, youth who experience
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Residential mobility have been found to perform more poorly academically (Gasper et al. 2010). No study has looked at how the effects of experiencing family instability and movement to a more disadvantaged neighborhood influence educational outcomes for youth. Our second hypothesis is then: 2) Youth who experience family instability and movement to a lower quality neighborhood will have more educational disadvantage than youth who just experience family instability, but do not move. As previously mentioned youth who experience family instability are at greater risk of increased externalizing problem behavior (Lee & McLanahan, 2015; Najman et al. 2007). It has also been stated that lower quality neighborhoods are linked to increased crime. Therefore, our third hypothesis is: 3) Youth who experience family instability and move to a lower SES neighborhood (one with greater neighborhood physical disorder) will be at greater risk for later externalizing problem behaviors than youth who just experience family instability. Finally, youth from unstable families have displayed increased internalizing problem behaviors following a period of instability (Brown, 2006; Lee & McLanahan, 2015). Separately, youth who have moved to lower quality neighborhoods are at increased risk for displaying more internalizing problem behaviors (Roy et al. 2014). Our final hypothesis is: 4) Youth who experience family instability and movement to a neighborhood with greater physical disorder (lower SES) will have higher internalizing problem behaviors compared to youth who just experience family instability but do not move.

Data and Methods

Data

To test the following hypotheses we utilize data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (Fragile Families), a longitudinal birth cohort study of 4,898 children born between 1998 and 2000 in 20 U.S. cities with populations of 200,000 or more (Reichman et al.,
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(2001). Fragile Families oversamples births to unmarried parents, yielding a sample where one-quarter of births were to married parents and three-quarters were to unmarried parents. The baseline interviews were conducted shortly after the child’s birth with follow-up interviews one, three, five, and nine years later.

Fragile Families is an ideal dataset for these analyses as the disadvantaged population faces greater risk for family instability. Additionally, Fragile Families collects detailed information on family instability, children’s developmental outcomes, and neighborhood context at several time points from birth to age 9. Our analysis is based on 2,702 mother-child pairs. Our analyses utilize only those mothers and children who either stayed in their homes between waves, or those who moved to neighborhoods with greater physical disorder. We exclude those mothers and children who move to neighborhoods with the same or less physical disorder.

Measures

Dependent Variables

This study uses four dependent variables. Our first set of analyses use a dichotomous indicator for if children moved to a neighborhood with more physical disorder between waves, classified as a worse neighborhood. Our measure of neighborhood physical disorder is similar to the one developed by Sampson and Raudenbush (1999). We measure neighborhood physical disorder through a 6-item scale of interviewer observed physical disorder based on the literature (Caughey et al., 2001; Cutrona et al., 2006; Latkin & Curry, 2003; Perkins & Taylor, 1996; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999; Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004; Ross & Mirowsky, 2001). This scale includes measures for presence of graffiti, litter, abandoned vehicles, and boarded up buildings within 100 yards of the home. Each of these variables was measured on a four point scale, 1= “almost none,” 2= “yes, but not a lot,” 3= “yes, quite a bit,” and 4= “almost
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everywhere.” Two additional measures of general building condition and condition of the street in front of the home were coded on four point scales of 1= “good condition,” 2= “fair condition,” 3= “poor condition,” and 4= “badly deteriorated.” These six observed facets of physical disorder are combined into a scale measuring neighborhood disorder and ranging from 6-24 (α =0.81) where higher scores indicate greater neighborhood disorder. If children moved, and their neighborhood physical disorder score is lower than at the previous wave, we classify them as having moved to a worse neighborhood (1), if they did not move they are coded as (0).

Our next set of analyses use three measures of child cognitive and socioemotional development measured at Time 9. We use the same measures and coding scheme for these measures of child development as Lee and McLanahan (2015). Children’s cognitive development is measured using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R), which assesses the size and range of words children understand. Higher scores indicate better outcomes for children. We use two measures for children’s socioemotional development, derived from the Child Behavioral Checklist (Achenbach and Rescorla 2000). Mothers were asked to respond to a series of questions about their child’s internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors and respond using a 3-point Likert Scale, “not true (0),” “sometimes or somewhat true (1),” or “often or very true (2).” Externalizing behavior is measured using the sum of the aggregation and rule breaking scales (α = 0.81) and ranges from 0-30 where higher scores indicate more externalizing behavior. The aggression subscale consists of items that ask about disobedience at home or at school, getting in fights, attacking people, screaming, and being usually loud. The rule-breaking subscale contains items that ask whether children hang around with others who get in trouble, cheat, prefer being with older children, run away from home, set fires, steal at or outside of home, swear, and vandalize. Internalizing behavior is measured using the sum of
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anxious/depressive and withdrawn behavior subscales (α = 0.70) and ranges from 0-23 where higher scores indicate more problem behavior. The anxious/depressive subscale consists of items that ask whether children fear they might think or do something bad, worry that they have to be perfect, complain no one loves them, feel guilty, are easily embarrassed, and worry in general. The withdrawn subscale contains items on being alone rather than with others, uninvolved in social activities, secretive, shy, underactive, and refusing to talk. By measuring these outcomes for children at Time 9, we are able to assess both immediate (experiencing instability between Times 5 and 9) and longer-term (experiencing instability between Times 3 and 5) impacts of family instability on children’s cognitive and socioemotional outcomes.

Independent Variable

Our key independent variable is *family instability*, a dichotomous indicator where 1 indicates that the child’s biological mother experienced a relationship transition between waves (Time 3 and 5 or Time 5 and 9) with either the child’s biological father, or a current partner and 0 indicates that the child lives in a stable family that did not experience a transition between waves. Using this family instability variable and the dichotomous indicator for *worse neighborhood* we create a second family instability variable for use in later regressions predicting PPVT scores, externalizing, and internalizing behaviors. This second instability variable is a dichotomous indicator where youth who experienced family instability and moved to a worse neighborhood were coded as 1, while youth who experienced family instability but did not move were coded 0.

Control Variables

We include a series of controls that may be associated with family instability and children’s developmental outcomes. Mother’s race/ethnicity is measured with a series of dummy
variables for white, black (reference), Hispanic, and other race. Mother’s educational attainment at the child’s birth (Fragile Families baseline interview) is measured using a series of dummies for less than high school, high school (reference), some college, college degree or more. We also control for mother’s age at Time 5 and mother’s household income at Time 5. We performed analyses using income and age at Time 9, but our results did not change.

**Analytic Strategy**

We first present descriptive statistics for our dependent, independent, and control variables. Our first set of multivariate analyses uses nested logistic regression models to assess the effect of experiencing family instability on children’s odds of moving to a worse neighborhood (one with greater physical disorder). Model 1 examines just the effect of family instability on moving to a worse neighborhood, and Model 2 adds controls for mother’s race/ethnicity, educational attainment at child’s birth, age, and income. Our second set of analyses performs nested ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions for the effect of experiencing a family transition on each of the cognitive and socioemotional development variables. For each set of analyses, the first model includes only the effect of family instability on cognitive and socioemotional development, and the second model adds controls for mother’s race/ethnicity, educational attainment at her child’s birth, age, and income. We discuss only results from the complete models (Models 2, 4, and 6 for each set of analyses) below.

**Results**

Forty percent of children experienced family instability between ages 3 and 9. Twenty-six percent moved to a worse neighborhood. Children’s cognitive achievement (PPVT-R scores) at age 9 ranged from 37 to 159 with a mean score of 92.72. Externalizing problem behavior at age 9 ranged from 0 to 30 with a mean of 2.49, while internalizing problem behavior at age 9
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ranged from 0 to 23 with a mean of 3.19. Twenty-three percent of mothers are white, 49% are black, 28% are Hispanic, and 5% are some other race. Twenty-two percent of mothers had less than a high school education when their child was born, 21% had a high school diploma, 41% had some college, and 16% had a college degree or more. Mother’s ages at Time 5 ranged from 20 to 50 with a mean age of 30. Mother’s household income at Time 5 ranged from $0 to $800,000 with a mean of $37,509.05.

Analyses testing our first hypothesis, youth who experience family instability have a greater risk for moving to a lower SES neighborhood, are reported in Table 3. Looking at the results of the logistic regression we see that experiencing a family transition increases the odds (25%) of moving to a worse neighborhood, and is significant controlling for demographic variables. Following family instability, children with white mothers have 26% lower odds of moving to a worse neighborhood than children with black mothers; while children with Hispanic mothers have 126% greater odds of moving to a worse quality neighborhood than children with black mothers. Children whose mother is of some other race did not significantly differ from children with black mothers. Children of older mothers have 6% lower odds of moving to worse neighborhoods. As income increases, children have lower odds of moving to worse neighborhoods.

Table 4 presents nested OLS regressions predicting PPVT, externalizing, and internalizing behaviors at age 9, and tests hypotheses 2, 3, and 4. Model 1 and 2 test hypothesis 2 that youth who experience family instability and move to a higher disadvantaged neighborhood
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have decreased cognitive development. Results from Model 1 and 2 indicate that experiencing family instability and movement to lower quality neighborhood is not significant in reducing cognitive development for youth compared to youth who experience family instability but do not move. Looking at demographic characteristics, children of white mothers scored higher (0.31) than children of black mothers. Children whose mother had some college (0.14) or a college degree or more (0.16) scored higher than children whose mothers only had a high school degree at the time of their birth. As income increases, children have higher PPVT-R scores (0.11).

Models 3 and 4 in Table 4 test hypothesis 3 that children who experience family instability and move to more disadvantaged neighborhood will have more externalizing problem behaviors. When looking at the bivariate nested regression, youth who experience family instability and move to a lower quality neighborhood display more future externalizing problem behaviors than youth who are from unstable families but did not move. Model 4 adds in demographic control variables in conjunction with family instability and neighborhood movement. While controlling for demographic factors our family instability and movement variable did significantly increase externalizing problem behaviors (.70). This model should be interpreted with caution however, as the R-square is low, and much of the variance is not explained.

The final two models (5 and 6) in Table 4 test the final hypothesis that youth who experience family instability and move to neighborhoods with greater physical disorder are at a higher risk of displaying future internalizing problem behavior. Model 5 is the bivariate nested regression testing this relationship. Results indicate that youth who face family instability and move to a neighborhood with more physical disorder are at significantly higher risk of internalizing problem behaviors in comparison to youth who just experience family instability.
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Additionally, this relationship remains significant when controlling for demographic factors, however, these models should again be interpreted with caution as only 3% of the variance is explained with the final model.

<Table 4 about here>

Discussion

Results indicate that youth who experience family instability are at higher risk for moving to a neighborhood with greater physical disorder. This study has expanded upon the existing literature by including other forms of instability beyond divorce in the analyses. Our results indicate youth facing any form of family instability face a greater risk for movement to a neighborhood with greater physical disorder, and provides support for our first hypothesis. This finding remains significant even after controlling for factors such as race/ethnicity, mother’s education, mother’s age, and household income. Furthermore, our analyses demonstrate the compounded risk that both family instability and movement to lower quality neighborhood (one with greater physical disorder) have on youth, and gives support, to our hypotheses. We do not find support for Hypothesis 2, youth who experienced family instability and movement to lower quality neighborhood had no effect on PPVT scores. However, we found strong support for Hypotheses 3 and 4, as youth who experience family instability and move to lower quality neighborhoods predicted future increases in internalizing and externalizing problem behavior compared to youth who experienced family instability but do not move.

These findings indicate some theoretical developments. First, looking beyond divorce, and including other forms of family instability highlights the risks of moving to a more disadvantaged neighborhood for youth experiencing instability. Future research should work to further unpack this relationship by parsing out whether specific forms of family instability put
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youth at higher risk for movement to a lower quality neighborhood. In line with this, we found strong support for the hypotheses that youth who moved to a higher disadvantaged neighborhood and experienced family instability were at higher risk for displaying externalizing and internalizing problem behaviors. Again, we encourage future scholars to further parse out this relationship as prior literature already has established that different forms of family instability put youth at higher risk for displaying internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors (Brown, 2006; Lee & McLanahan, 2015), but it is not known how neighborhoods might impact this relationship.

In general, these findings also suggest that family literature might benefit by connecting with risk factor literature, and focusing on research for problem behavior of youths. Specifically, determining whether youth who experience family instability in conjunction with other specific forms of risk factors including but not limited to: peer, school, community, and individual factors might help prevention programs be designed more effectively to intervene before this sizable population of youth become more delinquent. Our findings suggest that lumping youth who experienced family instability into one category does not provide the most accurate picture, as youth who experienced instability along with movement to lower quality neighborhood were at higher risk for problem behaviors than youth who experience instability but did not move. This is an important finding, as prior scholarship indicates identifying risk factors in prevention science can aid in preventing youth from serious forms of delinquency and violent delinquency (Hawkins et al., 2000; Lipsey & Derzon, 1998; Wiebush, Baird, Kinsberg, & Onek, 1995).

This paper is not without some limitations. As mentioned before we did not disaggregate family instability by type given our relatively small sample size. It could be that children experiencing certain types of instability are at higher risk for movement to more disadvantaged
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neighborhoods, something which future research should explore. However, we believe that this study provides the first step and addresses the initial gap in knowledge for future scholars to expand on this topic. Another limitation is our models did not include measures of relationship quality between youth and their parents. Prior literature has found that the negative effects of family instability are reduced through positive parental relationships with at least one parent (Schroeder et al. 2010). Additionally, our models did not account for a high portion of the variance in externalizing and internalizing problem behaviors. More elaborate models might change this relationship. Another limitation is the proxy variable we used for lower SES neighborhoods (neighborhood physical disorder), while there are clear connections between neighborhood disorder and the SES standing of that neighborhood, researchers with the available data to see explicit movement to low SES neighborhoods might reveal a more accurate picture. Finally, this study utilized data that sampled individuals who were at higher risk for family instability in the first place, the utilization of a more generalizable sample might yield different results than ones presented.

However, despite these limitations, our study makes several important contributions, this is the first study, to our knowledge, that has looked at how family instability (beyond divorce) predicts movement to a higher disadvantaged neighborhood. Additionally, we compared youth who experienced family instability in conjunction with movement to a lower quality neighborhood to youth who faced family instability but did not move, and predicted later cognitive and behavioral outcomes. Our results suggest that instability and neighborhood quality are important in determining later youth outcomes and should be considered in future analyses.
Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for Fragile Families Youth (Variables of Interest)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Instability and movement to lower quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability &amp; Movement</td>
<td>368 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability no movement</td>
<td>628 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pooled Family Instability (Ages 3 through 9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>996 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Instability</td>
<td>1,706 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pooled Moved to Higher Disordered Neighborhood (Ages 3 through 9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>833 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Move</td>
<td>1,869 (69%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Sociodemographic Control Variables using Fragile Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s educational attainment at child’s birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree or more</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s age</strong></td>
<td>30.548</td>
<td>6.062</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household income</strong></td>
<td>38226.68</td>
<td>43525.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>688444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3. *Nested Logistic Regression Models Predicting Movement to Higher Disadvantaged Neighborhood (Comparison of Family Instability Youth to All Stable Household Youth)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1 (Instability Only)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Instability and Demographic characteristics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Instability</td>
<td>1.60**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.26*</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: High School</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: Some College</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: College</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Age at Time 5</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Time 5</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01
Table 4. Nested Regression Models Predicting PPVT, Externalizing and Internalizing Problem Behavior at Time 9 (Comparison of Family Instability and Movement to Disadvantaged Neighborhood Youth to Family Instability and No Movement Youth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1:</th>
<th>Model 2: PPVT (Demographic characteristics)</th>
<th>Model 3: Externalizing Problem Behavior (Family Instability only)</th>
<th>Model 4: Externalizing Problem Behavior (Demographic characteristics)</th>
<th>Model 5: Internalizing Problem Behavior (Family Instability only)</th>
<th>Model 6: Internalizing Problem Behavior (Demographic characteristics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPVT</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B SE</td>
<td>B SE</td>
<td>B SE</td>
<td>B SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Instability</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.86 1.00</td>
<td>.76** .26</td>
<td>.70* .26</td>
<td>.47* .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10.36**</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.36  .31</td>
<td>1.02** .27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-.89  .95</td>
<td>-.07  .84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-.54  .71</td>
<td>.72  .61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: Less Than</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.60  .40</td>
<td>-.36  .34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Instability Neighborhood Context</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: Some</td>
<td>3.83**</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>- .34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: College</td>
<td>7.23**</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Age at Time 5</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Time 5</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>- .00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>- .00*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>90.83</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>81.71**</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.60**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.37**</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05 **p<.01
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