9-2022

Impact of Immigration Parent-Child Separation Policies on Children's Attachment Experiences

Daisy Casasnovas

Impact of Immigration Parent-Child Separation Policies on Children's Attachment Experiences

Daisy Casasnovas

Florida School of Professional Psychology

Lisa Costas, Ph.D.
Chair

Marcia Pita, Ph.D.
Member

A Clinical Research Project submitted to the Faculty of the Florida School of Professional Psychology at National Louis University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Psychology in Clinical Psychology.

Tampa, Florida
August, 2022

The Doctorate Program in Clinical Psychology
Florida School of Professional Psychology
at National Louis University

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL
_____

Clinical Research Project

_____

This is to certify that the Clinical Research Project of

Daisy Casasnovas

has been approved by the
CRP Committee in August, 2022
as satisfactory for the CRP requirement
for the Doctorate of Psychology degree
with a major in Clinical Psychology

Examining Committee:

_____
Lisa Costas, Ph.D.
Committee Chair: Lisa Costas, Ph.D.

_____
Marcia E. Pita, Ph.D.
Member: Marcia Pita, Ph.D.

Abstract

This critical literature review (CRP) project explores the consequences of child-parent separation by deportation laws. Considering the number of Latinx immigrant families immigrating to the United States, this review focused how the unexpected separation by deportation impacted immigrant families and how these separations affect their children's development, attachment style, and overall well-being. The review explored the short- and long-term consequences for immigrant children and their families, including children who are U.S.-born and remain in the country without their parents. Results from the review indicate an extensive and significant impact on attachment style and overall developmental impairments. The unexpected separation of immigrant children from their parents appears to be associated with avoidant attachment styles, anxious-ambivalent attachment styles, low- performance at school, medical conditions, relational problems, mental health conditions, and family disintegration. Findings are presented in terms of theoretical and practical implications and directions for future investigations. Recommendations for clinicians are also included based on the review of the literature.

IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION PARENT-CHILD SEPARATION POLICIES ON

CHILDREN'S ATTACHMENT EXPERIENCES

Copyright ©2022

Daisy Casasnovas

DEDICATION

This literature review study is devoted to the thousands of immigrant families, especially their children and youth, who get separated from their parents, and caregivers. This is a tribute to those who suffered due to the deportation policies and for us all to understand and stand on their sides.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND IMMIGRATION HISTORY OVERVIEW

Enforcement of immigration laws and policies has increased significantly in recent years with minimum publicity or attention to the ripple effects on the children separated from their parents when detained or deported. Immigration policies continue to be a contentious issue in the nation's social and political environments. Using the historical approach, Loumbouzi and Olenga (2019) concluded:

People permanently move from different places to establish in America for various reasons and no government policy should stop immigration but strictly control it, as it has always been a relevant contribution to the making and the future of America. (p. 88)

Exploring immigrant families can assist in understanding critical migratory procedures as well as broader societal machines of change. Immigration to the United States takes place in the context of families (Menjívar et al., 2016).

Modern American society has been a transformation from the New World constructed by immigrants. From the discovery to colonial times and from colonial times to independence, immigration to the United States did not stop after 1776, even when the U.S. Constitution came into effect in 1789. There was massive immigration from Europe, Mexico, Latin America, Asia, and Africa (Tindall & Shi, 1989). Nevertheless, a significant immigration period in the United States was the mid-1800s. There was massive immigration from Europe, Mexico, and China within that period. Immigration continued, and "the increase in population it brought contributed to economic growth" (Tindall & Shi, 1989, p. 296).

Not surprisingly, for historical and geographic reasons, immigrants also came from Mexico and other Latin American countries. Mexico and the United States share a common border; throughout history, their people moved from one country to another (Tindall & Shi,

1989). Texas, then part of Mexico, proclaimed its new independence in 1845. There was a peaceful agreement among Mexico and the United States; however, in 1846, the Mexican-American War began (Tindall & Shi, 1989). Finally, Mexico surrendered to the United States the present states of California, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming. With a treaty and extended citizenship with about 80,000 Mexicans living in the southwest, mostly in Texas and California, the Mexican-American War ended in 1848. Mexicans did not stop migrating to the United States, even with the new border (Loumbouzi & Olenga, 2019).

As described by Menjívar et al. (2016), immigrant families are a collection of members, parents, siblings, grandparents, stepparents, stepsiblings, and all with various legal statuses and immigrant pasts. Not all family members migrate, and others migrate separately (Menjívar et al., 2016). In some cases, the oldest son or daughter migrates first, while in others, it is the parents. Some actions alter the family composition when separated parents establish new unions or have new children (Menjívar et al., 2016). Hawthorne (2007) expanded more, indicating that the immigration laws and the changes in procedures of the laws are what control the shape of the immigrant families. When it comes to immigration families, the immigration laws regulate who is allowed in the nation, how long, how long the members stay apart, and which family relatives take precedence for immigration resolution (Lee, 2013). Related to this, Gratton et al. (2007) concluded, after studying 90 years of census statistics, that the immigration rule in past periods of U.S.-bound migration primarily affected the family structure.

Since the founding of the United States, immigrants have been coming as members of families. In the 19th century, immigrants mostly migrated in the context of the family, even if it took them months or years to be reunited because they migrated one by one (Thomas &

Znaniecki, 1996). MacDonald and MacDonald (1964) regularly denoted this method as "chain" migration. According to Piore (1979), the individuals who migrate alone looking for work with the idea of improving their family lives to then return to the origin country, are called "birds of passage." The forms of migration mentioned above have continued over the years. Nonetheless, what has changed is the lawful agenda within which family members have been allowed into the United States (Menjívar et al., 2016).

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (as cited in Menjívar et al., 2016) shared that U.S. immigration laws have ranked families concerning legal status since 1960. About two-thirds of the one million immigrants who became legal permanent citizens through 2011 were family-sponsored (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2011). President Obama strengthened the significance of the family group deserving legality in the country in November of 2014 when he dispensed an executive order providing release from banishment to undocumented parents of U.S. citizens or lawful permanent resident children (Menjívar et al., 2016).

Johnson (2007) (as cited in Menjívar et al., 2016) reported that in an effort to set boundaries on the passage of some cultural groups and nationalities, immigration decrees focused directly on national and ethnic streams of configuration. According to Johnson (2007) (as cited in Menjívar et al., 2016), diverse groups of people were believed to be unwelcome. Irrespective of the work or the people's needs, the history of U.S. immigration laws contains "periodic waves of harsh exclusion and deportation campaigns" (Johnson, 2007, as cited in Menjívar et al., 2016, p. 48). One of the most egregious examples is the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, banning all labor migration from China to the United States. Matthews (2002) stated that Asians were left out, discriminated against, and banned from taking their spouses with them.

Defended in different contexts until the 1940s, this law banned Chinese immigrants already in the country from flourishing as a communal group (Takaki, 1989).

Menjívar et al. (2016) stated that advances from the 1950s provided supremacy to family migration or family reunification and have controlled a different type of chain migration, which is less founded on race. After 1965, the immigration office primarily organized chain migration by law. Another change occurred in 1952 when the McCarran-Walter Act edited the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), eradicating ethnic limitations and generating a route for the visa preference system, which is mainly still active today (Menjívar et al., 2016). Although the law limited the annual visas granted to one-sixth of the U.S. continental people, it did not include spouses and children of U.S. citizens.

The INA, also known as the Hart-Celler Act, stopped the national origin quotas in place since 1924, seeking to eliminate the system of its racist bias. The INA created a system directed to family favorite visas listing "family reunification" first (Menjívar et al., 2016). Menjívar et al. (2016) stated that with this act, migration changed from primarily European immigrants to immigration from Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. In the 1950s, legal immigration from Latin America equaled close to 500,000 individuals. By the 1990s, it extended to 4.2 million, making up 44% of the entire flow of migration (Massey & Pren, 2012).

Though upholding the primary categories of the visa system, family reintegration, employment-based, and refugee passage, the INA experienced significant modifications such as the 1990 Immigration Act. These categories of visas are mainly demarcated by strategy and partisan convenience; they are shaped by the receiving state and are used to control the acceptability of immigrants at the entrance (Schrover & Moloney, 2013). Luibhéid (2002) indicated that the 1990 Act shaped fresh entry visas, comprising diversity visas for immigrants

from countries less represented in migratory flows. In addition, the 1990 Act removed homosexuality as a base for barring immigration (Luibhéid, 2002). The demographic configuration and topographical sources of immigration to the United States were greatly transformed. Substantial events in the rising world pushed thousands to emigrate. Civil wars, revolutions, political disturbances, and the enactment of organizational change programs added to the deteriorating economies of nations worldwide, all leading to increased immigration (Coe, 2013).

The evolution of the American deportation system can, in part, be accredited to the unclear status of immigration law in the Constitution. Though the Constitution allows Congress "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," it says nothing regarding the entrance or banishment of noncitizens (U.S. Constitution, Art. I Sec. 8). The right to vote and run for a federally selected position are the only examples in which the Constitution differentiates between citizens' rights and noncitizens, being those kept to citizens (Cole, 2003). With a lack of clearly defined rights and vague limits to government power, America's first deportation laws set long-lasting guides in deportation policy (Jácome, 2015).

The shift in legal authority, based on sovereign authority rather than the commerce clause, had long-lasting consequences on how immigration law would function. In the Supreme Court case of Chae Chan Ping v. the United States (1889), the court determined, "the power of exclusion of foreigners (was) an incident of sovereignty belonging to the federal government" and that this power could not be "restrained on behalf of anyone" (p. 56). According to this statement, the Supreme Court granted the political branches of government exclusive authority in immigration affairs and would defer ruling on executive or congressional action. Through this logic, deportation would be treated as administrative from countries less represented in migratory

flows. In addition, the 1990 Act removed homosexuality as a base for barring immigration

(Luibhéid, 2002). The demographic configuration and topographical sources of immigration to

the United States were greatly transformed.

Through this logic, "deportation would be treated as an administrative which . . . is to

prevent terrorist attacks," was granted the authority to oversee immigration law enforcement

(U.S. Department of Homeland Security Act, 2001, p. 203a).

Gonzalez-Barrera and Krogstad (2014) stated that two agencies deal with deportation in

the United States, the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Immigration and Customs

Enforcement (ICE), making sure to ramp up the deportation of noncitizens due to fears of

terrorism. Jácome (2015) voiced that, over time, the deportation system has developed in size

and power, becoming less democratic and safeguarding fewer rights for noncitizens to challenge

their deportation. The deportation law growth cannot be detached from the cultural and intolerant

attitudes that have permeated American society. Prejudice has not only encouraged the

banishment of certain racialized populations; it has also eased their segregation from suitable

democratic respect. As nations disregard political contributions, noncitizens have been deported

in the name of "national interest" while separating families (Jácome, 2015).

Explaining how policies passed after the tragic events on September 11 in the United

States, Jácome (2015) affirmed that the implementation of deportation has become progressively

biased while imitating the same xenophobic fears that urged Congress to enlarge the

government's powers to deport noncitizens in the 1700s. Racist fears have permitted

policymakers to justify unparalleled proliferation in governmental power targeted at

marginalized populations (Jácome, 2015). Deportations have continued increasing regularly

every year. Gonzalez-Barrera and Krogstad (2014) reported that the administration of President Obama extradited more immigrants than any former president in U.S. history.

In 2016, ICE removed 240,255 aliens (Mathema, 2017). This was a 2% increase over the 2015 fiscal year. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce (Noonan, 2017), children of immigrants represent one-quarter of all children in the United States and comprise the fastest-growing segment of the U.S. children, resulting in a population in the U.S. where an excess of 20% are from families where at least one parent comes from abroad (Mathema, 2017).

One study of children aged 10 years-old and below, from five nations, reported that 85% were separated from at least one parent (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). More recently, it was estimated that nearly 23% of youths, under age 18, have immigrant parents. By 2030, it is projected that this will have grown to 30% (Nicholson & CAPP Immigration Team, 2017).

With the children of undocumented parents exposed to traumatic and erratic immigration execution, these children are vulnerable to major stressors and changes that harshly threaten their mental, physical, and social well-being. These children are often abruptly separated from their parents when their parents are deported from the United States, and many, if not most of them, end up living in foster homes, homes of relatives, or in the homes of family, friends, or acquaintances (Lieberman & Bucio, 2018) while some remain living alone.

The powerlessness to physically reside with loved ones can be demanding for families (Abrego, 2016). Anthropologist Cati Coe (2013) affirmed, in her analysis of how Ghanaian immigrants cope with parent-child separations, which immigrants use their "repertoires" to make sense of, experience, and respond to the trials of immigration. Composed of a "multiplicity of cultural resources and frameworks" (Coe, 2013, p. 5), the repertoires are an assortment of practices, knowledge, and beliefs that allow people to envision what is possible, believe certain

things, and value certain goals. Those repertoires that Coe conceptualized on the origin of the Ghanaian case also exist among other immigrant groups (Menjívar et al., 2016).

Suárez-Orozco et al. (2011) indicated that more than 13% of the people in the United States today is foreign-born, and immigrant homes are raising over 20% of U.S. children. Many of the more than 214 million immigrants and refugees from around the globe have left members of their family behind (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). Frequently, in the process of immigration, family reunification does not happen before enduring lengthy periods of separation. Typically, immigration takes place in steps, with one family member immigrating first, then followed by the rest of the family. Usually, fathers have immigrated first, found employment, supported the family by sending remittances home, and later sent for the wife and children as soon as it is financially feasible. In some cases, the mother takes care of other family members, including children. In those cases, where the mother leaves the country of origin first, the children are cared for by trusted extended family or the father, if he remains behind. There are some cases in which the children are left in the protection of extended family members due to the mother and father immigrating together. More recently, immigrant families have been separated through raids at places of employment and residence. In these cases, usually, the father is deported, leaving behind the mother with the children. In many instances, the parents are deported, and the citizen-children are left in the U.S. states with friends' families or a caregiver with power of attorney (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011).

When immigrant families are separated, often they assume they will be reunited quickly. The process frequently takes several years, however, usually due to economic issues or complicated guidelines. Today's advanced technology provides the advantage for the family to keep connected throughout the separation by email, affordable telephone service, FaceTime, and

in some cases, convenient travel availability. In spite of maintaining technological contact during separation, the process of getting back together is psychologically difficult for parents and children. For the children, immigration results in two stages of separations interfering in their attachments (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). During the process of separation and reunification, children first experience the separation from at least one parent, and then they experience a second separation from the interim caregiver. Immigration creates a different quality of life, which marks individuals by opportunity and separation (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011).

An area of the possible impact of family separation is the impact on attachment. Attachment refers to enduring bonds, particularly those molded between infants and primary caregivers (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). However, attachment also includes social, emotional, cognitive, and behavioral components. It is fundamental for the human condition to search for attachment, relationship, and love (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Attachment is seen as the adult's continual struggle through life to relate and become intimate with others. Attachment theory was developed through the combined efforts of John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Bowlby (1988) indicated that the natural role of the parents is to be the secure base for the child to succeed in normal development. Through a caregiver's availability, acceptance, nurturance, accurate empathy, structure, and appropriate limits, the parents give the child a secure base. When the protection of a secure base is established, the child's attachment proceeds and no disruption or anxiety may be present. In the absence of a secure base, when not formed, psychopathology potentially forms (Bowlby, 1988). Bowlby's attachment theory was tested using the "strange situation" research. This research led to the formulation of four attachment styles: secure attachment, dismissing attachment, preoccupied attachment, and fearful attachment (Bowlby, 1988; Main & Solomon, 1990).

In general, society tends to accept and adhere to the notion that parents and children reside together, at least until the children are old enough to move out on their own. Even though families are very diverse, the social expectation is that children will share a home with at least one parent. For immigrant families, these family expectations may change during the immigration process. Abrego (2016) described her conversations with youths from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico about their educational trajectories in the United States; several students reported painful separations and challenging reunifications with their biological parents. She reported that their stories reveal that family separation has life-altering repercussions for countless Latinx immigrant families (Abrego, 2016). In her biography, *My Family Divided*, Erica Moroz (2018) described how she was left alone without a police officer or a government official to check up on her after her parents were deported to Colombia. Moroz stayed with friends for the next four years so she could finish school. Halfway through college, she began suffering from depression that resulted in cutting and a suicide attempt. She was fortunate to get therapy, learning to finally deal with her emotions about what had happened to her. Moroz described that anything from the whir of a police siren down the block to the simple ring of the doorbell was enough to make her panic. She expressed the difficulty of talking about what happened to her family "even years after trying to hide it" (p. 33). Moroz's story shines a light on children whose lives are affected by an undocumented status in their families and abrupt separation. Moroz added a reminder that behind every one of the sudden separations and immigration headlines on deportation, there is a family: parents and innocent children (Moroz, 2018).

In addition to the impact on mental health and attachment, the status of the family members becomes a legal and social shame that influences the structure of the family for future generations. Parents' legal status has affected upcoming generations, even when those

generations are born in the United States (Bean et al., 2015). Thus, it has been argued that legal status constitutes an affiliation of social stratification that is like other signs, including gender, social class, and race (Gee & Ford, 2011; Massey, 2007, 2013; Menjívar, 2014). The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2011) reported that almost two thirds of people who became permanent residents in the previous year had citizen sponsorship from family. Because of this family-based immigration procedure used in the U.S., many families are kept separated with no indication when reunification will take place. Distinguishing how immigration laws disrupts the family through elongated separation, Hong et al. (2014) pled for the increase in the field arena of "famigration," connecting immigration law more with family law. Originally, the family-based procedure included the trust that such a method hurries the incorporation of immigrants (Kandel, 2013). Enchautegui and Menjívar (2015) stated that immigration laws impact the different practices of the immigrant's families and their economic and emotional well-being, having a long-term influence when attempting family reunification. Immigration laws have been associated with new kinds of stratification, causing life-long changes in the immigrants and their families (Jasso, 2011; Massey, 2007; Menjívar, 2006, 2014). Adaptation problems may develop when the youth reunify with the mother or the father after prolonged separations (Menjívar, 2012; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002).

The meaning of family in immigration law as a nuclear entity limits the projections immigrants who characterize family as far greater or simply not the same as the nuclear family ideal (Hawthorne, 2007). It ignores family groups that are well-known worldwide but are not incorporated in what sociologist Dorothy Smith (1993) described as the standard North American family. Enchautegui and Menjívar (2015) added that the family construction preference visas are not equal to the diversity of family relationships among immigrants. Acosta

(2013) clarified that until 2013 under the creation of the Defense of Marriage Act, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer partners were not allowed to enjoy family reunification. Enchautegui and Menjívar (2015) saw deportation as the separation of relatives by taking away people from the United States, making evident the contradictions of immigration law promoting family unity and integration while containing many requirements that promote the continued separation of family members. Menjívar (2012) asserted that current immigration policies have entrenched family separation in such a way that it drives some families apart through deportation on the one hand (Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2011), while baring other families from reuniting on the other (Cruz, 2010; Enchautegui, 2013; Landale et al., 2011).

A few studies have delivered a preview of how immigration rules could disturb family structure. Landale et al. (2011) found a high percentage of immigrant children are living with extended family members and suggested that decreasing visa backlogs will enhance the youngsters' lives. Extraditions frequently remove a father from a household, leaving it ruled by the mother (Dreby, 2012). The unexpected increase in vertically and horizontally stretched families from 1960 on could be linked to the adoption of family favored groups in the INA (Gratton et al., 2007). Menjívar et al. (2016) reported that indeterminate family farewells can be traumatizing, especially for children, and can lead to couples' unions ending. When parents get arrested, children are left with no definite timeframe for reunification; they may sometimes feel abandoned or unloved (Abrego, 2016; Dreby, 2014) and often report feeling resentment.

Detention and deportations have reached historic highs in the past several years. There were 419,384 deportations in 2012. Between 2009 and 2012, there were 1.6 million deportations (Gonzales-Barrera & Krogstad, 2014). Wessler (2011) estimated that of the 397,000 deportations in the fiscal year 2011, 22% were parents of U.S. citizen-children. The term *involuntary*

transnational families was created by Cardoso et al. (2014) to describe families separated by deportation. This is different from those who chose to be transnational families in that a family member is removed enforced by law, and spouses and children are left behind in the destination nation instead of being left behind in the nation of origin (Menjívar et al., 2016).

Menjívar et al. (2016) called attention to detention, which has not had as much attention in the context of family separation, but the researchers explained that detentions contribute to removing a family member and consequently reorganizing immigrant families in ways that make them similar to deportations. For example, 440,500 people were held in detention in 2013, up from 200,000 in 2001 (Simanski, 2014, p. 5), and Menjívar and Kanstroom (2014) described there are typically 31,000 immigrants captive on any one day in the United States today, with an normal length of detention of 30 days. Immigrant TRAC (2013) reported that in 2012, close to 5,000 individuals were captive for at least six months, and approximately the same number were held for one year or longer.

The Human Rights Watch (2011) explained that detainees are located in secluded detention facilities away from their families and have limited access to telephone communication; additionally, they have often moved around from facility to facility. Chaudry et al. (2010) and Dreby (2012) expanded on the families of the immigrant detainees describing financial adversities that result when a family member is no longer able to contribute financially, including home foreclosure proceedings. Families experience significant long-term consequences with challenges, such as a limited support network, lack of a driver's license, limited English language, lack of funds, lack or limited food supply, and others. Moller (2014) stated that Latinx have been tremendously emotionally and financially embattled and advises increasing support for legal status as a proxy for race. Douglas Massey (2007) observed that

today's race-based enforcement system has come to affect Latinx in ways similar to those in which the criminal justice system has affected blacks. In this framework of increased deportation, many children, particularly those from the cultural origins targeted, are being left without parents. For example, in the first 6 months of 2011 alone, more than 46,000 mothers and fathers of U.S. citizen-children were deported (Wessler, 2011). Families needed to decide to either send the children back to their nations of origin to avoid separation from the parents or make arrangements for the children to stay in the United States with the remaining parent or other relatives (Enchautegui & Menjívar, 2015). Research by Chaudry et al. (2010) constructed on cases from six locations across the United States and examined the effects of parent arrest, custody, and deportation of the children from Mexican, Guatemalan, Salvadoran, and Haitian immigrants. Results showed the grave pressures that parent-child separations pose for the children's present well-being and long-term development (Chaudry et al., 2010).

Maddali (2014) asserted that, in some cases, children of deported parents have been removed to Child Protective Services, and occasionally parents have lost parental rights in the process. In 2011, there were about 5,100 children in foster care due to the detention or deportation of their parents (Wessler, 2011). Enchautegui and Menjívar (2015) revealed that the children are a mixture of U.S.-born citizens and undocumented immigrants. People in mixed-status families may have immensely diverse experiences and projections for the future, as a documented status has developed to be progressively important for immigrants' access to services. At least nine million people are living in mixed-status households (Pew Research Center, 2013). Menjívar et al. (2016) voiced that the laws that are directed to only target undocumented immigrants, in reality, have significant results for all members of mixed-status families. The application and implementation of the law may minimize the parents' power while

adding responsibilities for parents and children. Present immigration laws and policies redesign immigrant families, regulate their efforts to flourish, and differentiate the life changes of family members.

Menjívar and Abrego (2012) affirmed that those who do not qualify for legalization face significant barriers to their integration and live through lengthy times of susceptibility. Other aspects of inequality, including social class, gender, and generation, facilitate those trials (Menjívar & Abrego, 2012). According to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2017), deportations in 2017 were more than 340,056. Only about two fifths of deported individuals in 2016 had any run-ins with the law before they were deported (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2017), clearly demonstrating the focus on those with no other legal record than their illegal immigration status (Brabeck et al., 2014; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010, 2011). Close to 10% of U.S. families with offspring have at minimum one member deprived of citizenship, and 5.9 million U.S. citizen-children have at minimum one caregiver who does not have authorization to live in the United States (Mathema, 2017; Romero, 2003). Aggressively severing the family unit psychologically affects the youth adversely as well as other household members, as has been evidenced by numerous scholarships (Adames & Chávez-Dueñas, 2017; Capps et al., 2007, 2015; Chaudry et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2011). Brabeck et al. (2014) agreed with Dreby (2012) that the effects of the separation are more serious for those families because their separation is involuntary and generally abrupt, unforeseen, and with little or no preparation.

Separation of immigrant families by force also has a significant impact on the well-being of children and adolescents. Trauma, at various levels, may be experienced by the children whose parents are forcefully deported (Lovato et al., 2018), especially when they see it happen,

which also results in an unexpected loss of their parent(s) and then possibly moving due to lack of finances (McLeigh, 2010). Dreby (2012) and Gulbas et al. (2016) expressed that these experiences place the youths and children at a higher risk for depression, behavioral difficulties, and poor academic outcomes. Additionally, due to the increasing figures of deportations, the schools and daycare centers in the United States are experiencing a deterioration in presence by Latinx immigrant youths and families; and social service organizations and health clinics are seeing a reduction in use amongst Latinx immigrants due to the fear of being arrested (Fernanda, 2016; Lowrey, 2017).

In this way, detaining and deporting parents interrupts families and jeopardizes their children who are left behind and have to manage financial trials, loss, and the trauma of estrangement (Dreby, 2015a). Knowing the ever-increasing amount of children and young people facing the exile of a parent, as well as the possibility that such separations will continue, it is essential to consider what the literature reveals about the impact of family separation, how to influence the overall development of the child, their attachment style, and how it restructures the family system.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are used to assist in the understanding of the concepts presented throughout this review:

- *Attachment:* The bond between mother and child meant to guarantee the safety and survival of the child achieved through maintaining close, physical proximity with one another (Gabbard, 2005). It has the primary function of developing a mind capable of making inferences about others' thoughts, motivations, ideas, and intentions (Fonagy,

2001). Through development, physical safety transforms into psychological safety through feeling close with the mother.

- *Deportation:* This term is defined as the formal removal of a foreign national from the United States for violating an immigration law (Immigration and Citizenship, 2010). Also, Jácome (2015) stated that deportation would be preserved as an administrative procedure rather than criminal law, thus, excluding noncitizens from constitutional rights normally guaranteed in a criminal trial.

- *Family:* For this review, two different definitions of family are considered. One is provided by the legislation to authorize a family system to stay together: the heteronormative nuclear family, which is ideologically assumed to best fit into U.S. society (Menjívar et al., 2016) and spouse, unmarried minor children under 18 years of age and parents who regularly reside in the household of the family group.

- *Immigrant:* An individual who comes to a nation to take up lasting residence (Menjívar et al., 2016). For this review, an immigrant is an individual who has come to the United States to take up permanent residence. A person is referred to as an immigrant regardless of legal status.

- *Latinx:* This term is currently used to reflect the inclusivity of various gender identifications within the Latinx population and will be used throughout this research paper (Lopez et al., 2020). The Latinx term has emerged as an alternative to Hispanic and Latino to describe the nation's Hispanic population; Latinx is a gender and LGBTQ+ inclusive term (Lopez et al., 2000).

- *Latino/Hispanic:* The term Hispanic came from the passage of public law 94-311 in 1976, which was created to identify those who were of Spanish origin or descent (Lopez

et al., 2020). In 1997, the Office of Management and Budge added the term Latinx (Taylor et al., 1997), focusing on geography and referring to those who come from Latin America. The Spanish-speaking part of Latin America has heterogeneity that exists in close to 20 countries with Spanish speakers (Lombana, 2021). For the purpose of this review, the terms Latinx and Hispanic are utilized interchangeably, referring to both concepts.

- *Transnational families*: Family members, nuclear or extended, living in different nations with a level of interaction that involves dealing with international limitations (Cardoso et al., 2014).

- *Undocumented*: For this review, the term *undocumented* refers to immigrants existing in the United States deprived of the standing of citizenship or lawful permanent residency (Androff et al., 2011).

- *U.S.-citizen children:* Kretsedemas and Aparicio (2004) defined citizen children as native-born (U.S. citizen) children of undocumented immigrant parents.

Statement of Problem

Through a systematic examination of peer-reviewed and evidence-based literature, this clinical research project intended to explore how family separation, created by deportation policies, affects the development, attachment style, and family support of children in immigrant families. It examined the documented theoretical framework that deportation can have severe and lifelong consequences. When one or both parents are deported, it can negatively influence the family's nucleus in a multitude of ways (Adames & Chávez-Dueñas, 2017).

Vinick (2017) said that in 2017, President Trump delivered a memo that placed undocumented families at additional danger of deportation and separation and extended the

classes of people categorized as "priorities for removal." This rule led ICE officials to radically increase deportations above the annual 400,000 people that occurred throughout President Obama's administration. Additionally, President Trump's administration tightened the southern border by augmenting scrutiny, erecting a more extensive border wall, hiring more CBP agents and ICE officers, and bodily remove newly arrived undocumented parents from their offspring at the U.S. border (Vinick, 2017). According to Coutin (2010) and De Genova (2002), immigrants' workspaces and vicinities are flooded with immigration patrols unlike any other period in U.S. history, and deportability is more likely for undocumented families than ever before. Lovato et al. (2018) stated that the current arrest and expulsion of Latinx immigrants will probably continue to have a strong influence on youngsters' psychosocial welfare for years to come with the dread of or the actuality of, familial deportation. Teachers, social workers, mental health workers, and other health workers will increasingly meet children and youths who have experienced involuntary familial separations. Thus, they must be conscious of the singularity of mandated family separation and reflect on its effects as experts.

Most deportees resided in the U.S. for more than ten years, and many are raising natural born citizens (Brabeck et al., 2014; Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012). Individuals, families, and neighborhoods (Langhout et al., 2018) feel the effects of deportation. Financial adversity, nutritional uncertainty, and housing insecurity are related to family separation due to deportation (Capps et al., 2015; Dreby, 2012). Chaudry et al. (2010) reported that new familial responsibilities are frequently taken up by the youth to keep the rest of the family's head above water; frequently, grown-up children come to be the main caretakers of younger family members, or they need to labor to provide for the family, impacting academic achievement. Dreby (2012) and Brabeck et al. (2014) reported that children have many behavioral and

emotional problems, like isolation, eating and sleeping disorders, anxiety, with depression, internalizations, and externalizations. Researchers have indicated that even if the family is eventually bought back together, the baleful effects linger on (Brabeck et al., 2014; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010). For these reasons, a review of the pertinent research is necessary to highlight the various challenges and the developmental and attachment consequences that immigrant children, youths, and families experience during separation by deportation.

Purpose of the Review

The purpose of this clinical research project was to review the available literature that explores the impact that unexpected separations have on immigrant families and how these separations affect their children's development, attachment style, and overall well-being. The review explored the short-term and long-term costs for immigrant children and their families, including offspring who are U.S.-born and stay in the country without their parents. Understanding the impact and consequences of these separations on immigrant families is crucial in providing adequate services to immigrant children, families, and whole communities.

Implications for clinical work, advocacy, and education are discussed built on the findings of this review. The findings of this review may assist providers in selecting effective interventions when working with immigrant families and their children and when engaging in advocacy for these clients. In addition, this review could assist in developing strategies to address separations at community and societal levels.

Literature Review Questions

The primary questions guiding this critical review of the literature were:

1. How does separation in immigrant families affect their children's overall developmental well-being?

2. How does the separation of immigrant families impact their children's attachment experiences?

3. How does separation in immigrant families influence their family system?

Research Procedure

A detailed search of the published literature utilizing the EBSCO database was completed for this project. These searches utilized MEDLINE, Psych INFO, Psych ARTICLES, Psych EXTRA, American Psychological Association articles, and the Psychological and Behavioral Sciences Collection for research published from 1998 to the present. Considering the growth in the threat of deportability amid immigrant families above the past twenty years and the growth of immigration enforcement policies, the specific time period was designated. Certain books directed to immigrant separation and families were also utilized as references. To discover supplementary resources, the reference sections of the articles were examined. Important texts on immigration history, attachment, deportation and trauma, and children's development, when separated from parents, were also reviewed to offer an inclusive theoretical and conceptual foundation for these topics.

Considering the primary focus of this study was separation by deportation, articles excluded included those referring to immigrant families arrested when they crossed the U.S. borders, articles related to families separated when arrested at the U.S. border, articles related to families and children left in their nation of origin, and articles related to attachment in families left behind. Key indices terms were used for the search, such as *deportation and family, immigrant families, family separation, children of immigrants, children-parents' separation, history of immigration, immigration in U.S., immigration and Latinx, Latinx immigrants, Latinx immigrant families,* and *effects of family separation.* Other key indices included *family*

separation and attachment, attachment styles, development of immigrants, separation and child development, deportation, detention and deportation, deportation and families, school and immigrant children, health and immigration, social services and immigrant families, effects of deportation, deportation, and health, immigrant communities, interventions with immigrants, and *children of deported.*

Limitations

This author acknowledges the limitations of this clinical research project's review of the literature available. An attempt was made to be as comprehensive as possible, and every effort was made to include extensive literature and books when available. In addition, this author acknowledges that considering the magnitude of the deportation phenomenon, access and availability to nationwide research may have been restricted.

CHAPTER II: HOW DOES SEPARATION IN IMMIGRANT FAMILIES AFFECT

THEIR CHILDREN'S OVERALL DEVELOPMENTAL WELL-BEING?

Presently, 15 million Mexican and Central American people live in the United States, with this amount likely to increase in the years to come (Torres et al., 2018). Irrespective of legal status, numerous Latinx children and adults are constantly affected by immigration rules and their applications in the United States nowadays, comprising of banishments, of limited admissibility for public assistance, and of complications linked to fitting into a mixed-status family, which is defined as relatives with a minimum of one U.S.-born child (Torres et al., 2018).

Dreby (2015a) described two influential U.S. immigration policies significantly impacting the lives of children and immigrant families of the 21st century. One policy limited the relocation to the United States, which has led to children not knowing the long- and short-term departures when their mothers and fathers are imprisoned or immigrate leaving the youngster. The other policy was approval by the U.S. government to involuntarily separate parents and children upon arrival in the country and detaining and deporting those parents who were in the country unlawfully. Abruptly, youngsters suddenly find themselves in a home with a single parent or in conditions where their parents were apprehended or extradited, and the child is placed within a child welfare organization. Due to their parents' arrest and deportation, these children had their health, well-being, and development significantly impacted (Dreby, 2015b).

More than 100,000 U.S. citizen-children parents were deported from 1998 to 2007 (Henderson et al., 2013). Throughout the first four years of the Obama administration, 1.5 million individuals were extradited. More than 46,000 parents were repatriated in 2011 because of the strengthened immigration policies. In 2013, more than 5,100 children in the United States

remained located in temporary appointed care after the arrest or extradition of their parents (Henderson et al., 2013).

Most recent laws displayed a fundamental role in developing an antagonistic and biased situation for immigrants, which has had a negative effect on their children (Torres et al., 2018). Those guidelines tend to create an environment of dread, distrust, and judgement against the immigrant community, which leads to poverty, inadequate use of services, and, ultimately, to the separation of children from their parents (Torres et al., 2018). Dreby (2015b) mentioned a group of regulations known as omnibus laws passed in ten states since 2009. These regulations enforce consequences for the hiring of or sheltering of undocumented immigrants, permitting law enforcement to stop individuals for the only intention of checking their residence status. Nine of the ten states also limit immigrants' access to public services (Dreby, 2015b). State-level restrictive rules present damaging impact on undocumented and documented families, particularly when almost nine million U.S. people are in mixed-status families and approximately one in ten natural-born children in the United States each year have one undocumented father or mother (Philbin et al., 2018).

The administration of former President Trump passed rules excluding federal grants for sanctuary cities, refusing simple nourishment and health services to help new immigrant households, and intensifying the punishments for those accused of unlawfully returning to the United States (Tristi & Herrera, 2018). Additionally, in 2017 Trump implemented several strategies that enhanced border security, exiled of unlawful immigrants, and approved construction of a wall at the southern border of the United States (Torres et al., 2018).

Wood (2018) indicated that from April to June 2018, more than 2,300 immigrant children were moved to isolated child confinement within the United States to wait for the determination

of their parents' legal situation and, with any luck, parental reunification. These immigrant

children allegedly included preverbal and breastfed infants (Wood, 2018).

To comprehend the effect of these previously described immigration policies on

immigrant children's developmental well-being, it is important to consider some foundational

developmental theories. These theories assist in providing a framework for understanding

specific impacts on immigrant children's development.

Developmental Context

The family separation experienced by immigrants can be considered an enduring, long-

term stressor, particularly given the more restrictive U.S. policies hindering movement across

borders today (Hagan et al., 2010; Massey et al., 2002; Ward, 2010). Suárez-Orozco et al. (2011)

explained that, developmentally, precise experiences are formed by numerous environmental

settings, systems, and methods, which, in turn, impact the development of children growing up in

undocumented families (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011).

Berk (2007) described how human development theories present diverse ideas about what

individuals are like and how they variate. The complexity of humans includes physical, mental,

emotional, and social variances. Defined by one of the views of development, infants and

children have characteristic ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving that are quite dissimilar from

adults. Given that human development could be defined as discontinuous, new, and diverse ways

of thinking and answering to the world arise at precise times. It is important to highlight that

there is no unique description that clarifies or accounts for every feature of human development

(Berk, 2007).

Berk (2007) stated how important it is to accept the irregular viewpoint and respect

development as taking place in stages, with qualitative variations in thinking, feeling, and

behaving that describe exact periods of development. In stage theories, development is described as ascending a staircase, with each step conforming to a more mature, restructured way of operating. The stage concept also assumes that people undergo periods of rapid transformation as they move from one step to the next. In other words, modification is fairly abrupt instead of gradual and constant (Berk, 2007, p. 6).

Berk (2007) added another layer indicating that, respectively, each theory takes a position regarding the age-old argument of the nature-nurture quarrel. Nature is well-defined as innate biological absolutes or the genetic data obtained from parents at the instant of formation (Berk, 2007). Alternatively, nurture denotes the multifaceted powers of the physical and societal domains that impact the biological individuality and psychological uniqueness each person forms after birth (Berk, 2007). All development philosophies honor at least some part of both nature and nurture. However, they vary in the importance assigned to each.

Huttenlocher (2009), Reiss (2003), and Rutter (2002) specified that modern philosophers believe that both continuous and discontinuous variations occur during development. Some recognize that development has universal features and features unique to the individual and their contexts. A growing number of theories regard heredity and environment as inseparably interwoven, each affecting the potential of the other to modify the child's traits and capacities (Huttenlocher, 2009; Reiss, 2003; Rutter, 2002). Increasingly, researchers are envisioning development as a dynamic system, a perpetually ongoing process extending from conception to death that is molded by a complex network of biological, psychological, and social influences (Lerner et al., 2005), which is a leading, dynamic systems approach from a lifespan perspective.

According to the lifespan perspective, no age period is supreme in its impact on the life course. Events occurring during each major period can have equally powerful effects on future

change. In its place, events happening during each major stage can have similarly influential effects on future change (Berk, 2007). Inside each development period, modification happens in three broad domains: physical, cognitive, and emotional. These areas are not separate; they overlap and interact. Every age range has its own agenda, its unique demands, and opportunities that yield certain similarities in development across many individuals (Berk, 2007).

Every age period has its own plan, its sole strains, and chances that produce some resemblances in development through many individuals. Lifespan development is also multidirectional. Moreover, lifespan scientists accentuate that development is soft at all ages. Also, according to the lifespan perspective, trails of change are very different because development is predisposed by multiple forces: biological, historical, social, and cultural. These wide-ranging impacts work collectively, joining in exclusive ways to fashion each life course (Berk, 2007).

Berk (2017) described human development using eight stages of development. The first stage is a *prenatal* period, comprising conception to birth, and is characterized by the alteration of a one-celled entity into a human baby with extraordinary abilities to adjust to life outside the womb. The second stage is *infancy and toddlerhood,* which describes the development from birth to age two. Described in this stage are dramatic changes in the body and brain supporting the emergence of a wide array of motor, perceptual, and intellectual capacities and first relations to others. *Early childhood*, the third stage, integrates ages two to six and is considered the "play years" (Berk, 2017), promoting the advance of motor skills and the growth of thought and language at an astonishing speed. Researchers have established that at this stage, children start to create bonds with peers and a sense of morality (Berk, 2017). The next stage described by Berk (2017) is *middle childhood*, covering the ages 6 to 11, and described by the school years.

Noticeable progress occurs in children's athletic skills, rational thought processes, elementary literacy abilities, thoughts of self, morals, friendships, and peer-group association. The stage covers ages 11 to 18, adolescence, puberty, to an adult-sized body and sexual development. For many, the stage involves developing beliefs about a serious sense of achievement in school, and cognitions become more abstract and idealistic. Adolescents pay attention to developing a sense of independence from the family and defining personal standards and goals.

Subsequent stages include the *early adulthood* stage, which covers ages 18 through 40. Most young individuals leave home during this development phase, finish their education, and start full-time work. Main apprehensions experienced during this stage center on an evolving career, starting a cherished partnership, getting married, raising children, or creating other lifestyles. The *middle adulthood* phase, between ages 40 and 65, is where countless individuals are at the peak of their professions and achieve management positions. People in this stage typically help their parents adapt to aging and aid their offspring in beginning autonomous lives. During this stage, individuals develop a sense of their mortality. The last period is *late adulthood*, which ranges from age 65 until death, including tasks such as reflecting on the significance of one's existence, modifying life for retirement, diminished physical power and well-being, and frequently changes due to the death of a spouse (Berk, 2017).

The most significant of the neo-Freudian development theorists is Erik Erikson (1902-1994) (Berk, 2017). Erikson's psychosocial theory of human development accentuated that the ego does not just arbitrate between id instincts and superego burdens. It also proposed that the ego obtains abilities and attitudes that make the person a lively member of humanity. In his theory, Erickson included a basic psychological conflict for each stage, which is resolved with

positive to negative outcomes and defines healthy or maladaptive consequences at each stage (Berk, 2017).

The psychosocial stages Erikson described begin with *basic trust versus mistrust*, referring to the period from birth to age one, and it described development during heartfelt, receptive care where the infant increased a sense of trust or self-assurance that the world is predictable, and their wants will be provided by their caregivers. However, a sense of mistrust occurs when babies need to wait too long for coziness and are touched severely. Children raised by consistently unreliable, unpredictable parents who failed to meet their basic needs eventually develop an overall sense of mistrust (Erikson, 1950). Erikson's second phase, ranging from age one to three, is named *autonomy versus shame and doubt*. In this phase, Erickson described that by utilizing new mental and motor skills, youngsters want to select and make choices for themselves. When caregivers allow realistic free choice and do not over-power or shame the child, autonomy is nurtured (Erikson, 1950).

Initiative versus guilt is Erikson's (1950) third stage covering ages three to six years. In this stage, children discover the kind of persons they could be or roles they can play out through make-believe play. Initiative in this stage grows when parents support their youngster's new sense of drive. Excessive guilt is produced when the caregivers request too much self-control. The following stage, *industry versus inferiority*, ranges from age 6 to 11; this is when the youngsters advance their ability to labor and collaborate with others at school. When the child experiences negative experiences at home, school, or with peers, these can provoke a sense of incompetence and a sense of inferiority (Erikson, 1950).

Erikson's following stage is *identity versus role confusion* (Erikson, 1950). This is defined as adolescence. This stage involves the individual trying to answer the questions of

identity and belonging. The young individual develops their individuality by discovering different values and occupational objectives. Role confusion emerges as a mix-up concerning forthcoming adult roles. The next stage, *intimacy versus isolation*, describes when the individual is in early adulthood. In this phase, Erikson indicates that young adults labor on establishing close bonds with others. However, some persons cannot develop intimate relations due to previous disappointments. Usually, individuals with those experiences stay secluded (Erikson, 1950).

Erikson's last two stages are *generativity versus stagnation* and *ego integrity versus despair* (Erikson, 1950). Generativity versus stagnation manifests during the middle adulthood period. It defines the adult, middle-aged, and grown-up that gives to the following generation through child nurturing, concern for other people, or through industrious effort. Ego integrity versus despair is evident through the late adulthood stage in which seniors reflect on the type of individual they have been. When the elder feels that their life was of value, living as it occurred, they sense a feeling of integrity. When individuals are displeased with their past, they dread death. According to Erikson (1950), Erikson's comprehensive summary of lifetime variation captures the spirit of personality development during each primary period of life's progression (Erikson, 1950).

Other relevant developmental theories address cognitive development. Shapiro (2018) discussed some of the cognitive theories that emphasize how individuals' mental processes or thoughts alter over time. One of the most prominent cognitive theorists was Jean Piaget (1896-1980), who proposed that the child develops as a performer within a social world of rooted meanings (Shapiro, 2018). In other words, cognitive theorists defined development through communication between the child and the environment. Piaget focused on the logic of a child's

response, not in whether a child's reply was correct (Piaget, 1930). He instead paid attention to the mental process that led to the answer. Piaget (1930) suggested that children's intelligence changes over time and that children of diverse ages understand the world differently (Shapiro, 2018). Piaget (1930) thought that young children *construct* information in a thoughtful sequence around physical activities and that children are recurrently reordering their thoughts about the world as they interrelate with persons and objects. Piaget's (1930) developmental theory posited that children progress over four extensive phases of thinking as their brains advance and they know the world through action. Piaget's stages are more open to understanding the world and qualitatively diverse. The age ranges of Piaget's cognitive development stages of children are subjective and are focused on their capabilities and the surrounding environment. Similarly, the cognitive-developmental age ranges are approximate, and there is a significant difference between cultures on what children can do at certain ages (Shapiro, 2018). For example, the *sensorimotor* stage, ranging from birth to age two, is Piaget's first cognitive development stage. This stage is described as the infants and toddlers accepting the world in terms of physical actions on the environment (Piaget, 1930). Piaget's (1930) second stage ranges from ages two to seven, and it is known as the *preoperational* stage. In this stage, Piaget described young children as focused on building a world of permanent objects. The preschool children use rational symbols to denote objects and events, and linguistics is emerging quickly over dramatic play. Children develop to be progressively involved in societal play with peers, social games, and games with rules (Piaget, 1930).

Piaget's (1930) third stage, named *concrete operational,* which he delineated from ages 7 to 11. In this phase, youngsters' mental skills become more logical, and thinking develops as decentered, active, and alterable. Also, during this period, the children can organize objects into

hierarchies of programs and have established a scheme of mind, although they may still have problems taking on another person's perspective. Likewise, children start to take intents into interpretation in their ethical judgments. Piaget's last stage goes from age 11 on, and it is termed *formal operational*. In the formal operational stage, the adolescent can think about non-concrete ideas, comprehend ethics and scientific reasoning, and reflect methodically. The adolescent can reason ethically to comprehend that guidelines result from a shared contract, and they can produce theories (Piaget, 1930).

Cognitive development has several concepts where *evolutionary thinking* turns particularly salient, leading to new findings and understandings of cognitive development (Bjorklund, 2018). For evolutionary theorists, instead of perceiving nonsocial reasoning as the basis for social thought, several researchers suggested that human intellectual skills developed mainly to manage congeners and not with the physical world. According to Dunbar (2003), this social brain hypothesis highlights the significance of knowledge and that natural selection have readied humanity from birth to route environmental data efficiently for social purposes. The ability of understand their environment supports the social interaction and comprehension of children. Researchers with an evolutionary developmental perspective consider the actual social environment of youngsters and try to ascertain what abilities are needed to efficiently navigate and absorb their social field (Bjorklund, 2018). For instance, from the very beginning, infants gravitate toward biological attachment (Bardi et al., 2014) and mirroring facial expressions (Mondloch et al., 1999). Throughout their first year, babies experience others as intentional beings who react to them and carry out recognizable care (Tomasello & Carpenter, 2007), which is essential for life instruction and teaching (Bjorklund, 2018).

Early experience in later development has formed a significant theme in evolutionary developmental psychology. From a *predictive adaptive response* explanation, children have considerable intellectual and conduct plasticity that allows them to try their present surroundings and change features of their growing route in expectation of new settings (Bjorklund, 2018). In an editorial, Belsky et al. (1991) suggested:

"A principal evolutionary function of early experience, the first 5-7 years of life, is to induce in the child an understanding of the availability and predictability of resources broadly defined in the environment, of the trustworthiness of other, and of the enduringness of close interpersonal relationships, all of which will affect how the developing person apportions reproductive effort" (p. 650).

Bjorklund (2018) reported on long-term studies following the philosophies of the life-history model, that have observed the human responses to environments that are diverse in severity and consistency. He explained that this theory is based on the viewpoint of natural selection, and it is an overall outline that observes choices creatures work out as they navigate and grow through life. He added that environmental circumstances dictate, to some degree, the amount of reserves that must be dedicated to somatic development as compared to reproduction, or, more generally, to present growth as compared to later growth. Ellis et al. (2009) indicated that some life-history philosophers suggest that children raised in punitive and unstable settings incorporate a fast life-history approach to life, enter into unbalanced sexual relationships early, and devote less time to their children. This is different from the children raised in reassuring and consistent surroundings, who incorporate a slow life-history approach (Ellis et al., 2009).

Baldwin (1906) contended that the social network of the child has to be accounted for when seeking to understand a child's mental and emotional growth. Baldwin pointed out that no

one is "isolate and in his body alone situated abstraction" (p. 328). On the contrary, children learn about others by realizing the others' own personhood and deriving a sense of self through emulation of their conduct (Baldwin, 1906).

Considering all developmental philosophies from around the early 1900s, Bretherton (1993) identified several assumptions about the parent-child relationship. First, the connection between the parents and the children is essential in developing one's own identity and the ability to connect with other people. Bretherton also acknowledged Watson's (1928) observation that a thoughtful and consistent parental attentiveness is vital to build a joyful, wholesome life.

Second, outlines of personal contact with parents are adopted and describe an individual's ability for personal relationships separate from the family of origin (Bretherton, 1993). This also sets the direction for parental care in the next generation. Third, the parental contribution functions as the youngsters are able to process it. To comprehend the growth of family relationships then involves understanding how the family members comprehend that growth (Bretherton, 1993).

Fourth, Bretherton (1993) identified the senior generation's cultural values mark the designing of the parent-child relationship (Erikson, 1950; Lewin, 1931). These ideals are conveyed to the grandchildren as they adopt outlines of connections through their parents, guiding them to their own moral personality (Baldwin, 1911) or conscience (Erikson, 1950). The last and fifth assumption mentioned is generativity, or the necessity to nurture, an essential stage in growth development (Erikson, 1950). Because of the joint parameter involved in parent-child associations, children are also a driving force in their parents' growth (Erikson, 1950; Gesell, 1928).

Bretherton (1993) continued highlighting the importance of parent and child functioning together, each affecting the other while socially growing in the family structure. Individual modifications in the co-development of parent and child are contingent on the exclusive features they carry into their connection to each other and the relationship characteristics they co-create as each impacts the other. The ultimate result of this experience for the youngster is a capability to have their own personal relations with others and the incorporation of parental-society principles. Constantly, the relational procedure functions through their own individual insight, understanding, or misunderstanding-bias of settings and circumstances. The theorists have not completely elaborated on how this relates as much to the parent as to the children (Bretherton, 1993). Collins and Steinberg (2007) indicated that affinity and parental sensitivity create the best basic setting for developing the child's unique potential.

Currently, studies are investigating the association of culturally specific dogmas and practices to development (Berk, 2007). Berk (2007) indicates that the influence of psychologist Vygotsky (1896-1934) has played a primary role in this avenue. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory focuses on how a social group's culture, values, beliefs, customs, and abilities are conveyed to the next generation. In this reference, Rowe and Wertsch (2002) reported that social contact, specifically cooperative interchanges with more well-informed members of society, is essential for children to obtain the ways of thinking and behaving that make up a population's culture. As cited in Berk (2007), Vygotsky (1896-1934) believed that as children need adults and more skillful peers to help them dominate culturally significant events, the communication between them becomes part of children's thinking (Berk, 2007). As children adopt the vital structures of these discussions, they can use the language within them to guide their thoughts and actions and to obtain new abilities (Berk, 2003).

Current theoretical outlines propose that immigration encounters may raise cultural tension and trigger developmental psychopathology in immigrant youngsters (Berk, 2007). However, these outlines neither prepare people to meet the stressors, nor do they reckon for all the different paths by which the stressors are activated when the immigrants try to integrate into society. The bioecological development theory by Bronfenbrenner's (2005) presents a multilevel outline that plans ecological procedures. Based on plenty of experimental evidence, Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model of human development claims that a person's surroundings in conjunction with their physical abilities work together to develop that individual's conduct, thinking, and abnormalities (Bronfenbrenner, 1974, 1986; Bronfenbrenner & Evans, 2000; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). Realizing the important function of the surroundings, this theory also includes essentials involving proximity, the individual, contexts, and extent.

In Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems philosophy of development, a person's growth is impacted by all in their nearby environment (Berk, 2017). Bronfenbrenner (2005) imagined the environment as a series of nested structures, counting but spreading outside the home, school, neighborhood, and workplace location where people occupy their everyday lives. Each coating of the environment is regarded as having an influential impact on development (Berk, 2017). Berk (2017) presented that Bronfenbrenner separated the person's setting into five levels: the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, the microsystem, and the chronosystem. The proximal developments happen within the microsystem and involve every day and existing chores that form development, containing, for instance, playing with others, finding solutions of difficult situations, participation in sports, and mealtime (Miller, 2002, p. 439). Distinct features

(the being) denote bio-psychological issues related to environmental features over time to either disturb or care for development.

Bronfenbrenner and Morris (1989) enlarged the component of the ecological in developing procedures and consequences by differentiating between relating ecological stages, starting from closer to further away, the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem. Primarily, being the closest, the microsystem involves intimate connections of individuals with the youngster (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). A youngster's household, place of education, and friends of nearly the same age are significant microsystems (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989).

Bronfenbrenner and Morris (1989) also included the mesosystem, which links additional situations in the developing individual's life (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). For instance, two distinct microsystems, school and home, connect to form a youngster's moral principles development. Therefore, a mesosystem is one that is comprised of combined microsystems. Thirdly, Bronfenbrenner and Morris (1989) added the exosystem, which comprises connections of two or more sceneries, which typically do not contain the individual described (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). Events in this system affect practices inside the youngster's direct scenery but do not contain the youngster. An instance of this "exosystem" could be a parent's employment, which may generate and increase parental pressure (Berk, 2017, p. 25). After a demanding work day, a youngster's parents might transfer negative emotions (e.g., anxiety, depression, pressure) to the household setting, affecting the meso- and microsystem outcomes.

The exosystem might contain the financial structure, the transport structure, government, mass broad casting, or additional more localized social organizations (Miller, 2002, p. 438).

Lastly, the outermost stage is the macrosystem. It is a structure usually recognized as the larger, overall or typical culture of the area where the individual lives. Bronfenbrenner and Morris (1989), point out that the macrosystem includes all the previous systems specific to a certain culture, subgroup, or an additional larger setting. Essential mechanisms of this comprehensive environmental level contain values and conviction systems, wealth, threats, lifestyles, opportunity structures, life path choices, and shapes of community relations (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). The macrosystem may be described as an overarching worldview that effects how the adults in the youngster's circle think, plan, work, and generally behave (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989; Miller, 2022, pp. 438-439). These four systems make up the settings that help shape the individuals living in them.

Time is a component of Bronfenbrenner's model that enhances the impact of proximal methods, the individual, and the stages of ecological setting (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). Time interrelates every aspect that impacts development. Components inside and amidst ecological stages have the prospective to intermingle with up close procedures and physical features through time to create developmental avenues that impact the emotional results. Children practice dangerous and defensive aspects in a similar manner at various echelons of their setting, from the outermost to the nearest ones. Outermost features such as financial strain and parents' work worry may influence proximal issues, like parental emotional well-being and childrearing, thus distressing children (Conger et al., 1990; Ramirez García et al., 2014). In the community-environmental perspective, while a mother or father is undocumented and in danger of exile, a child is impacted through the additional settings impacted by the parent's susceptibility. The parent may have sub-par employment, greater monetary pressure, and complex emotional pressures, and all the while, the household may be facing accommodation

uncertainty and dealing with low academic achievement (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011; Yoshikawa & Kalil, 2011).

Bretherton (1993) stated that the helpful result of an evolving individual's exosystem is enhanced when family members can contribute to exosystem choices that nurture the whole household. These changes can resound throughout the intertwined structures that impact development right away or later, thus, could deliver valuable chances for appreciating change (Bretherton, 1993).

Impact of Separation on Children's Development

Fluctuations in U.S. immigration rule during the previous twenty years have produced inflated extraditions of undocumented individuals living in the United States. Knowing the present partisan environment around undocumented immigrants, mental health staff need to comprehend the impact of their parents' exile on childhood and adolescents' emotional and developmental well-being. Previous research has revealed the strain that immigrants suffer while being assimilated triggering psychopathologies from anxiety to post-trauma disorders (García Coll & Magnuson, 2005) But, theorists, such as Greenspan and Shanker (2004), Masten and Reed (2002), Nelson (2002), and Werner and Smith (2001), accepted a more hopeful view of development. These theorists emphasized plasticity, meaning that change is possible and even likely if new practices support it.

Immigrant youngsters' development is influenced by proximal and distal settings (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989). These settings include friends, household, extended family, (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989), as well as rules, organizations, community governments, and guidelines. Distal setting add to various developmental trials for the offspring of immigrant families, with Latinx immigrant families affected in particular (Brabeck et al., 2014). For

instance, investigators have found that living without funds, shelter, or food distress youngsters'

development, adding to inferior developmental marks on a variety of assessment tools (Aber et

al., 1997). Twenty-eight percent of all children residing in impoverished households in 2005

within the U.S., were part of immigrant homes regardless of national origin (Capps & Fortuny,

2006). More recently, 34% of first-generation Latinx children reside are impoverished, as

compared to 26% of persons in the next generation (Fry & Passel, 2009).

The undocumented status of families leaves youth confused between developmental

stages that shadow the normative phases of development in many areas (Suárez-Orozco et al.,

2011). Life is lined up from birth to death in a conventional order of rites by religious,

institutional, and social practices, such as baptisms, bar or bat mitzvahs, graduations,

quinceañeras, marriages, children, and retirements. Each of them defines a new domain of life.

Debating the new roles, rights, and duties, van Gennep (1960) categorized the key moments of

life as "rites of passage" (p. 1). Van Gennep contended that before enduring these rituals to enter

the new roles, individuals exist in a space of provisional liminality.

Referring to immigrant youth, Suárez-Orozco et al. (2011) contended that "liminality is

the provisional instant flanked by circles of fitting-in when community players stop belonging in

the group they are leaving, and yet they do not completely fit in their new community circle" (p.

444). According to Turner (2002), the marginal persons are "betwixt and between the positions

assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremony" (p. 4). Those states of vague

fitting-in or "ambiguous belonging leave individuals without the communal bundles of rights and

obligations that structure social behavior and make it predictable" (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011, p.

444).

Mittal et al. (2015) suggested that depending on the diverse quality of early childhood surroundings, executive functions may be impacted. The researchers found that individuals who go through punitive and unpredictable early settings have problems with inhibition but show better task shifting (e.g. cognitive flexibility) relative to individuals experienced more stability in their environment. Mittal et al. (2015) articulated that, though being able to restrain oneself is important for reaching lasting goals, it may be detrimental if while environmental situations benefit resourcefulness. Therefore, one possible benefit to early upheaval in the life of a child is the skill to change efficiently from one task to another, and this is essential for adjusting to changing environments.

Immigrant children and their families often face harsh and changing environments that require rapid adaption. Survival in those environments may require increased risky and aggressive behaviors that may impact negatively mental health (Ellis et al., 2009, 2017). In addition, there may be exposure to harsh conditions without the necessary supportive resources. For example, children of immigrants, mainly while their parents are considered undocumented, do usually receive medical coverage (Capps & Fortuny, 2006) and probably do not receive community or public services (Capps et al., 2007). Although the children may be U.S. citizens, often undocumented parents do not realize the rights and privileges their citizen child has, or they may be afraid to seek help due to risk of deportation (Capps et al., 2007), which deprives the children and families from securing important services. All the laws and rules limiting access to basic assistance to immigrant noncitizen children and their families have an indirect effect on the growth of the children and on their parents' emotional state and economic status (Fuligni & Yoshikawa, 2003). There are few studies regarding parental immigration status and

its impact as a significant element of the distal setting that touches immigrant Latinx children's growth (Yoshikawa & Way, 2008).

Most research regarding immigrant children and their development has been limited due to small sample sizes or limited focus on children seeking medical care (Adams, 2000; Falicov, 2007; Lashley, 2000). However, Suárez-Orozco et al. (2002, 2011) evaluated a survey of 400 immigrant children, who had settled in two U.S. cities from various countries, including Mexico, Central American, and the Dominican Republic. The research found that those separated from parents at some point, reported more symptoms of anxiety and depression than those who were never separated. This was most evident during the initial period of family reunification.

Gindling and Poggio (2012) through their investigation of nationwide statistics concluded that immigrant students, ages 6-16, who were separated from their parent at some point, had a higher likelihood of falling behind academically. Capps et al. (2007) evaluated three regions after significant employment area raids took place, involving mostly undocumented Latinx laborers. They stated that about 500 youngsters, mainly U.S.-born citizens, found themselves separated from their parents, many permanently. The authors reported finding that these youngsters and their families were found to have symptoms of trauma, fear, isolation, depression, and family fragmentation as feelings of abandonment (Capps et al., 2007). Financial strain following deportation was also reported as a consequence for family members left behind (Kremer et al., 2009).

After separation, those adults left behind to care for the children are confronted with not only extra domestic tasks around the house and care of the children, but they also are confronted with communal and psychological burdens to familial restructuring (Lu, 2012). The physical and psychological burdens of these additional responsibilities increase levels of distress and time

constraints on the remaining caregivers. Under the distress of new responsibilities, the caregivers left behind to care for the children may struggle to show warmth and support and may be more punitive in their interactions with children (Yeung et al., 2002). Raising children under these conditions weakens the overall psycho-social health of the youngsters. The overwhelmed and compromised emotions of the remaining caregiver will probably, though unintentionally, be transmitted to the youngsters, resulting in psychological unpredictability and depression (Hammen et al., 2012). The effect of separation and reunification differs depending on the area of development affected. The consequences might be particularly damaging in areas of development related to the family, social connections, and non-material assets, like psychosocial health (Yeung et al., 2002). These same ranges are adversely impacted the most while separated, and hardest to repair when reunited. In the situation of youngsters, actions that disturb developments inside the microsystem might provoke parent pressure, scarcity, and negligence. When immigrants arrive to the U.S., usually their beliefs and expectations clash with their experiences on their journey and experiences upon arrival that anxieties triggered by cultural differences may be harmful to their psychological well-being.

New research has revealed that both a parent's undocumented status (Finno-Velasquez et al., 2016; Gulbas & Zayas, 2017) and deportation actions might harmfully influence the overall life of their children (Brabeck et al., 2014; Zayas et al., 2015). Basic necessities and barriers to important resources for citizen-children affected by parents' deportation were recognized in 2015 by the Urban Institute and Migration Policy Institute (Koball et al., 2015). Those youngsters whose parents remained confined or deported stopped their school attendance in favor of laboring to care for their families (Koball et al., 2015). Additionally, scholars established that "linguistically and culturally appropriate mental health services" remained missing for citizen-

children of deportees (Koball et al., 2015, p. 9). Some experts propose the need for more comprehensive study to include how "family separation and loss of parental income affect children's well-being and health and social service needs in the short and long term" (Capps et al., 2015, p. 8).

Gulbas and Zayas (2017) explained the effect of immigration implementation on citizen-children in the "mixed-status family niche" (p. 58) after interviewing those who had a minimum of one undocumented parent. The "varied assemblages of legal statuses" was a good indicator of whether a family had access to needed services (Gulbas & Zayas, 2017, p. 61). The ability to obtain services frequently revealed the amount to which families remained stressed post-parental custody or deportation. Gulbas and Zayas (2017) established a "framework for understanding the effects of immigration enforcement on citizen-child outcomes" (p. 67). This framework ties to ecocultural models of child development, highlighting the way inner-family features are obstructed by immigration implementation, admission to services, and a "cultural script of silence" that avoids conversation of legal status of parents or family members or acknowledgment of their deportation from the United States (Gulbas & Zayas, 2017, p. 55).

A research in 2016 utilized a mixed-methods approach and interviewed 48 citizen-children from mixed-status families using the Children's Depression Inventory Second Edition (Gulbas et al., 2016). Twelve of the 16 children who scored in the "likely depressed" range had a parent who was imprisoned or deported (Gulbas et al., 2016). Another investigation conducted that same year obtained comparable results when probing posttraumatic stress disorder amid 91 Latinx U.S. citizen-children from mixed-status families (Rojas-Flores et al., 2017). Using the UCLA Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Reaction Index, the researchers found that children whose parents had been imprisoned or deported had substantially higher number of possibly traumatic

situations than those with lawful inhabitant parents. This investigation likewise offered a "parent report" counting the outcomes of the Behavior Assessment System for Children−2nd Edition, Parent Rating Scales–Child (BASC-2 PRS-C) and the Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children, Spanish Version (TSCYC-SP), and found that children of imprisoned or deported parents acknowledged experiencing more psychological distress, higher internalizing difficulties ($p = 0.02$), higher levels of depression ($p = 0.0009$) and higher degrees of somatization ($p = 0.04$) than the children of documented status parents (Rojas-Flores et al., 2017).

The targeting of Latinx men for deportation has created an increased strain on their partners and spouses who remain in the United States (Baker & Marchevsky, 2019; Doering-White et al., 2016). For instance, the adults left behind, as heads of single-parent households, to care on their own for their youngsters without the financial assistance of their partners and having to endure the struggles of obtaining employment to care for their household (Dreby, 2012; Koball et al., 2015). It has been already well established that citizen single mothers generally live in poverty with their children, even with federal assistance (Garcia & Franchim, 2013). Immigrant mothers, however, have the additional hurdle of frequently being banned from those services (Dreby, 2012; García & Franchim, 2013). Many immigrant households already having food insecurity (Capps et al., 2015), face rules preventing immigrants from accessing nutritional services (Cerza, 2018). Even with U.S. born citizen-children or with access to nutritional support services, immigrant families are too frightened to use them (Ojeda et al., 2020). Mothers left behind in the U.S. have a higher possibility of depression and feeling abandoned after a partner's deportation, which may damage the welfare of youngsters in their custody (Koball et al., 2015). For example, many spouses of deportees in California have lost their transportation or homes and are destabilized by having to move, and frequently the students

curtailed or ended their academics by dropping out of high school and entering the work force to provide for the household (Baker & Marchevsky, 2019).

The lingering impact of the level of stress hormones in children can lead to "organ damage with lifelong developmental and health" sequelae (Felitti et al., 1998, p. 251). Stress hormones cascade and activate inflammatory and immune changes, considered a reaction to the amplified danger of physical damage and the recovery needed in dangerous circumstances. These kinds of events lead to various illnesses and ailments. During the life span of youngsters with significant hardship experiences, there is three times the risk of lung cancer, three and a half times the risk of heart disease, and about a 20-year drop in life expectancy (Felitti et al., 1998). Toxic stress is strongly associated with cancer, diabetes, autoimmune disease, as well as other medical difficulties (Felitti et al., 1998). Disturbingly, the results clearly connected to high-level childhood stress, namely substance misuse, violence, and psychological disease, also affect the subsequent generation (Hughes et al., 2017).

Considering the complicated, harmful conditions confronted by immigrants across their family's generations while in search of refuge in the United States, there is strong feeling that youngsters may need psychological help in addressing possible trauma before they enter the U.S. (Jordan et al., 2018). These youngsters, taken from their principal support system, their parents, upon arrival to the U.S., held indefinitely in inappropriate accommodations, and isolated from their main interpersonal relationships that provide stability and elasticity, face the sequelae of toxic stress and severe, complex type III trauma (Wood, 2018).

Psychological trauma happens when a youngster experiences strong dread and powerlessness to deal with their present circumstances (Perry & Szalavitz, 2011). Responses to trauma can be conceptualized in a continuum based on the specific traumatic incident(s), the

youngster's own inner resilience, and the specific post-trauma setting (De Thierry, 2015). An intense event that is short-lived, with no major harm, and with good adult support, like what happens at various minor accidents, is described as a Type I trauma. Trauma that is recurrent and endured over a long period of time, like sexual or emotional abuse, is categorized as Type II trauma (Terr, 1991). The next level of trauma, Type III, happens when a youngster experiences numerous, widespread, protracted, vicious actions starting at the beginning of life, even in the mother's womb, making an unfavorable setting for development (Heide & Solomon, 1999). It is crucial to distinguish the various types and the harshness of adverse actions toward a youngster to provide a guide to the degree of traumatic stress and injury to the juvenile brain (Wood, 2018).

In a press release of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP, 2018), the president of the AAP, Dr. Colleen Kraft, stated, "Separating parents from their kids contradicts everything we know about children's welfare" (Simha, 2019, p. 95). On the AAP policy statement, Langhout et al. (2018) urged that the separation of a parent or primary caregiver from their children should never occur except for when the home environment calls for safety reasons. Extremely stressful experiences, including family separation, can disrupt a child's brain architecture and cause irreversible damage to lifelong development.

Another health threat to the children is being exposed to toxic stress. According to Jack Shonkoff et al. (2009), toxic stress is the most hazardous. It is "strong, frequent, and prolonged activation of the stress response system in the absence of the buffering protection of a supportive adult relationship" (Shonkoff et al., 2009, p. 2255). Shonkoff et al. (2009) indicated that toxic stress disrupts the brain and other organs, affecting a still-developing brain. The authors explained that this is done when there is an increase in the stress hormones disrupting the structure. The receptors that recognize these stress hormones, glucocorticoid receptors, when

plentiful, are established in three parts of the brain: learning, memory, and decision-making, with a high possibility of altering the size and structure of these areas.

Studies by the Stress at the Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (Stress, 2018) have shown that persistent "stress can change the brain architecture by damaging neurons in the prefrontal cortex and hippocampus" (p. 2). These are core to decision-making and short-term recollection that control thoughts, feelings, and activities (Stress, 2018). According to Wood (2018), it is the mixture of conscious and innate subconscious risk experiences that lead to the neural and physical harm instigated by childhood adversity and trauma. When the absence of security or when danger is apparent, main neural action in the brainstem begins the fight, flight, or freeze reaction, endorsing the outburst of stress hormones epinephrine and cortisol that make the corporeal body to react in a defensive way (Wood, 2018).

In a more recent study, Jones-Mason et al. (2021) concluded that secure children show less arousal related to stress and higher flexibility in the face of stress compared to insecure children because secure youngsters rely on parental emotional support. The authors add that children of parents who are inconsistent or completely absent recover more gradually from stress or do not recuperate at all. Amazingly, when youngsters experience temporary separation from a parent in a lab setting, fluctuations in hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis or autonomic nervous system function can be noticed (Jones-Mason et al., 2021). Other studies have indicated that repeated stimulation of the stress response illuminates the relation of premature adversity and developmental results (Danese & McEwen, 2012; Jones-Mason et al., 2021; Laurent et al., 2014).

The National Scientific Council on the Developing Child (2014) has indicated that the prefrontal cortex is bypassed when one is terror stricken, pushing rational thought to side, and

leading to actions deeply propelled by the limbic system. Youngsters' brains have an extraordinary level of neuroplasticity, and in circumstances of numerous, lengthy, unescapable difficulty, their brains continually acclimatize to a level of working that searches to reserve and guard life at the expenditure of most everything else (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2014).

Siegel (1999) reported that immigrant children develop protective defenses such as hyperarousal-hypervigilance, nervousness, intrusive memories, and emotional reactivity, or hypoarousal-dissociative reactions such as emotional numbing, passive obedience, and difficulty accessing cognitive functioning. Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is not able to fully describe the broader outcomes of complex trauma, especially the effect on preverbal youngsters, and it must not be the solitary indicator of trauma reaction (Siegel, 1999).

Hegarty (2018) reported that from May to June of 2017, 2,342 children were separated from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border. Human Impact Partners (2018) stepped in to study immigration. In this study, Impact Partners examined the health effects of family separation in the Rio Grande Valley. The study surveyed 200 residents in the valley, focusing on families that have been impacted by a parent being deported. It is similar to a separation at the border; a child is separated from their parent. The children in both circumstances shared the separation from a caregiver. Capps et al. (2007) argued that children separated from their parents are at a higher risk of PTSD than other children in the United States. One report stated that numerous families experienced emotional trauma, mental tension, and psychological difficulties presenting symptoms of depression, anxiety, PTSD, and suicidal thoughts (Capps et al., 2007). Nevertheless, the majority did not pursue assistance due of the dread of being captured. The authors recommend that ICE consider that when arresting illegal immigrants, these individuals

have also children that will need care and a strategy to assist those youngsters' is needed (Capps et al., 2007).

Cleveland et al. (2012) stated to the House of Commons that separating children from their parents and placing them in protective services away from family is worse than putting them all in jail, and its consequences for the children include a whole host of difficulties that will cause immediate mental and emotional delays, and they will continue to feel the effects for the rest of their lives.

Negative experiences early in life are powerfully related with adverse mental health consequences later in life. In particular, experiences of interpersonal trauma (e.g., physical or sexual abuse), persistent negative emotions (e.g., depression, anxiety), and a lack of secure relationship experiences (e.g., not feeling secure or supported) in childhood are risk factors for a variety of psychological health and attachment difficulties in adulthood (Kessler et al., 2010; van der Kolk et al., 1996). Negative experiences in adulthood can also precipitate or perpetuate mental health difficulties, although early life experiences are thought to mitigate through predisposing or protective factors (McLaughlin et al., 2011). There is also evidence that levels of biopsychosocial vulnerability vary across the lifespan (Gee & Casey, 2015; Kaufman et al., 2000; Romeo, 2013).

Children of undocumented immigrant families are impacted even if they do not have a loved one removed from the nation (Gonzalez, 2009). They experience serious fears of imminent family separation that generate incredible anxiety and alters how the youngsters perceive their own existence. This is reflected in how they describe themselves and interrelate with others (Gonzales, 2011). A qualitative investigation involved interviewing 91 parents, who had been deported or had family members deported, of 110 youngsters from 80 different families (Dreby,

2012). The investigator concluded that the dread of losing their youngsters was the main and shared component in all the parents and that the danger of deportation intensely impacted the majority of the youngsters and altered their sense of self. Many of the youngsters described long lasting emotional trauma related to the deportation of their mother or father and had continuous worry due to the possibility of deportation. The youngsters became wary and distrustful of law-enforcement because of the association with deportation and separation (Dreby, 2012).

Similar results were obtained in a study involving, which involved 385 early teen immigrants from five nations that suffered separation from parents or caregivers for diverse reasons (Suárez-Orozco, 2004). The investigation revealed that youngsters separated from their parents reported more depressive symptoms than youngsters who were not separated. According to Jarrati (2011), the best way to assist youngsters to manage loss is to inform them regarding the separation immediately upon its certainty since youngsters are susceptible to parents' concerns, worries, and anxiety. Children of undocumented parents are continually mindful of the pressure and nervousness connected to deportation. They live with this constant dread every day, knowing that deportation is a very real possibility. The importance of personal goodbyes in order to deal with the grief and what follows is highlighted. It gives the youngsters the opportunity to express feelings directly to those involved (Jewett, 1982). However, most youngsters of deported immigrant parents miss out on this opportunity. Expressing their personal goodbye might mean the difference between moving on through the stages of grief leading to possible closure at some point, and being locked in a complicated grief with no resolution.

Blank and Wener-Lin (2011) stated that with no parent present, a youngsters' thinking that is laced with guilt-based magical thinking, reunion fantasies, and constant regret related to the life that could have been. The authors stated that this experience drastically undermines the

youngster's development progress. The authors consider this loss through deportation to be similar to the loss related to the death of a parent. After a close relative or parent is deported, the remaining parent confronts having to care for the children, financial strain, and emotional problems of their own. In an effort to repair the fragmented household, the parent left behind is frequently overwhelmed. Youngsters often discover they have to deal with their hurt and sorrow by themselves. Blank and Wener-Lin (2011) point out that youngsters keep coming back to the loss as they go through life, reconsidering it, and, thereby, experiencing grief for life. Immigrant youngsters experience the trauma of their lives over and again as they journey through diverse stages of their growth process. Loss activates negative somatic, psychological, and behavioral reactions in youngsters separated from their mothers or fathers due their inability to mourn (Suárez-Orozco, 2004).

The separation by deportation provides hope for a potential reintegration; consequently, the grieving process does not even begin. Blank and Wener-Lin (2011) suggested that sorrow does not stop for youngsters whose father or mother dies; it simply morphs through their growth periods by making a more symbolic relationship and connection with the parent that is not present anymore in their daily living. But the children of deported parents hold onto a persistent belief for family reintegration. The expectation that the family will be together again in the future impacts their development and does not allow room for grief.

The loss of the main breadwinner in the family ultimately leads households into poverty, which can increase risk for child neglect (Johnson-Reid et al., 2013). Hearn (2013) contends that austerity may be one of the most vital indicators of for child negligence. Similarly, Steinberg et al. (1981) specified that adverse financial circumstances is a strong indicator of mistreatment of the youngsters, predominantly after the loss of employment. Researchers indicated that

negligence and mistreatment are greater in regions with greater amounts of low socioeconomic standing and low employment. Austerity and financial strain or poverty alter parenting styles and can lead to responding negatively to life pressures and subsequently to children. Parental psychological distress generated by these life circumstances as well as absence or disruption of the marital connection impact the children and how the parent reacts to them (McLoyd, 1990). As pressure and burdens escalate, mothers and fathers experience stress and depression, making them susceptible to being more reactive with their children. Parental discipline might be negatively impacted by depression and disrupt parental care, physical sustenance, and emotional support (England et al., 2009).

Confusion, loss, and grief make the remaining parent psychologically and emotionally vulnerable. But the immigrant's household is rapidly transformed from a two-parent home with guidelines and schedules to a sole parent household strained provide food for the rest of the family. Youngsters impacted by all those events experience fluctuations in their character and conduct, so they respond in unusual ways (Burlew et al., 2013). Some youngsters are filled with dread and apprehension while others become defiant and act out. For the left-behind mother or father, the changes of the household routines and practices is not simple and straight-forward to navigate. A nationwide questionnaire involving 6,000 homes revealed that a one-parent household is more likely to rely on more harmful discipline methods than two-parent households (Gelles, 1989).

Immigrant children who have recently arrived most frequently end up in schools that lack resources. These schools tend to be segregated (Orfield & Lee, 2006) and offer limited opportunities to students (Noguera, 2003; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). They place students at risk academically due to their racial and linguistic isolation (Orfield & Lee, 2006). These schools

also struggle problems of overcrowding, lack of resources, low student expectations, poor

standard test results, high dropout rates, and poor information to access colleges (Gandara &

Contreras, 2009; Orfield & Lee, 2006; Weinstein, 2002). In addition, because undocumented

households are frequently move due to unstable financial conditions, their children change

schools often also; school movement has been related to poor academic success (Rumberger &

Larsen, 1998; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2010).

A variety of research with Latinx teenagers identifies an amelioration of the negative,

undesirable properties of deportation, discrimination, and depression symptoms by having a

confident ethnic identity linked to higher degrees of self-esteem (Edwards & Romero, 2008;

Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). Coping skills form an additional inner strength for Latinx

youngsters (Taxis et al., 2004). Taxis et al. (2004) and Cardoso and Thompson (2010)

established that the incidence and efficiency of coping skills were connected to less stress and

physical difficulties in children.

Researchers hypothesized that protective elements interrelate with threat factors to make

a cushioning outcome that decreases or increases the significance of risk contact (Fergus &

Zimmerman, 2005; Fraser et al., 2004). Since shielding elements can function contrarily

contingent on the situation, Luthar and Cicchetti (2000) defined shielding elements as having a

calming or increasing effect on the consequences. Protective elements with calming

consequences counterbalance or amend the influence of risk issues. However, those with

increasing properties deteriorate the effect of risks on the consequences but do not

counterbalance the undesirable consequences (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005; Luthar & Cicchetti,

2000). Cardoso and Thompson (2010) suggested that protective elements have a superior impact

on results at a specific level of risk. Children and adolescents from immigrant families are very

diverse and confront numerous challenges to success in the face of adapting to separation by deportation. Additionally, aside from facing challenging experiences in their living communities, academic settings, and families, these children face food and housing instability (Chaudry et al., 2010). Moreover, children live with the chronic risk of deportation of family members or themselves; the constant reminders of their own legal status; the negative experiences with law enforcement; and the social influences they have moved into (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001), the worries about their future, such as access to education and labor (Gonzalez,, 2009); and the bombardment of critical representations of immigrants in the mass media, school, and public locations, especially of undocumented immigrants, that will form at the individual level an amount of serious developing consequences for these children and youth (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011).

However, in a recent research by Grafft et al. (2022), the researchers interviewed a small number of mental health providers ($n = 21$), mostly master's-level providers, and asked questions regarding their Latinx clients. The researchers found that providers reported that their clients were very intentional about finding services in the community for them and especially for their children, which is contrary to previously reported findings in this area. Findings revealed that after trust was developed with the providers, the parents were open to following up with recommendations concerning mental health counseling for their children and themselves (Grafft et al., 2022).

CHAPTER III: HOW DOES SEPARATION OF IMMIGRANTS IMPACT THEIR

CHILDREN'S ATTACHMENT EXPERIENCE?

There is agreement in the literature that in order to thrive, children need to grow up in environments that offer predictability, safety, and nurturance (Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University, 2011; National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). Barajas-Gonzalez et al. (2018) stated that regular caregiver responsivity to children influences neural development, attachment, and self-regulation. In sum, a sense of safety is crucial for child development (Barajas-Gonzalez et al., 2018). Therefore, deportations and detentions resulting in family separations may be particularly damaging to the 5.9 million offspring who are U.S. citizens living with an undocumented family member (Eskenazi et al., 2019; Wood, 2018), negatively impacting their attachment process and experiences.

To understand the impact of separation from parents that children in immigrant families face through detentions and deportations, important aspects of the attachment process and its foundational theoretical concepts need consideration. Wood (2018) stated that the separation of children from caregivers threatens their attachment connection, creating added dread and a sense of lack of safety this attachment connection is so essential to the children's basic feeling of security. In circumstances of parental imprisonment and deportation, children have no idea when parents will return home, which complicates the child's ability of be consoled. These separations can impact cognitive development, appetite and sleep, as well as lead to feelings associated with sadness and sense of guilt (Zayas & Bradlee, 2014).

Wood (2018) reported that neurologically, attachment associations are foundational to brain development and maturation. If there is a sudden separation from parents and lack of supportive caregiving, the attachment connection is endangered. In 2018, Rollins concluded that

children facing parental separation are exposed to substantial trauma, which can become toxic stress that is severe or long-lasting. Toxic stress can impact development of intellectual, social, and emotional abilities and might increase to possibility of illness and early decease (Rollins, 2018).

Lieberman and Bucio (2018) agreed that the lengthy separation of a child from the main attachment person could generate "fear, triggering the release of stress hormones that can become toxic at high levels" and create "damage to the child's capacity for regulation, trusting relationships, and the age-appropriate exploration and learning that define early childhood mental health" (p. 55). Lieberman and Bucio (2018) stated that when youngsters are separated detached from their immigrant parents, disruptions to attachment and changes in the immediate cultural, social, and linguistic surroundings occur. Because separations frequently happen suddenly, the youngsters' surroundings can be altered profoundly including their caregiving environment.

Attachment is described as the socio-emotional connections children form with caregivers (Caye et al., 1996). An infant's first attachment is typically shaped by its mother, though an alternative adult can come to be the main attachment figure in some situations. This other attachment person could be a family member or not (Caye et al., 1996).

Allen et al. (1983) described that attachment consists of the relationship between a child and their main caretaker. The process of attachment begins at birth and assists with development in cognition, logical thinking, perception, coping mechanisms, self-reliance, conscience, and close relations (Allen et al., 1983).

Optimal parent-child attachment develops under three conditions: continuity, stability, and mutuality (Hess, 1982). Hess defined continuity as the caregiver's reliability and recurrence

of the parent-child interaction. Stability includes having a harmless atmosphere where the parent and youngster can participate in the bonding development. The concept of mutuality denotes to the connections amid the parent and youngster relationship that strengthen their significance to each other. Hess (1982) stated that ideal attachment happens when a caretaker identifies and answers the baby's indications and signals, providing the baby's physical and psychological demands.

Based on Caye et al.'s (1996) study on infants raised in institutional sites, behavior alone to attend to basic needs is insufficient for secure attachment formation. For example, the researchers revealed that institutionalized babies were unsuccessful to establish strong enough attachments to caretakers providing their physical demands but did not involve the babies in social interactions. Equally, social interaction only is not sufficient: babies frequently develop social attachments to many other family members and friends who involve the babies in enjoyable social activities. Nevertheless, when the babies are exhausted, famished, or upset, infants frequently can be consoled only by the main caretaker who has traditionally acknowledged and replied to the baby's physical and emotional needs (Caye et al., 1996).

Overview of Attachment Theory

Levy et al. (2011) defined attachment style as a concept that originates from John Bowlby's (1982) attachment theory and denotes an individual's distinctive ways of connecting intimately with caregivers and establishing connections with "attachment figures," often one's parents, own children, and partner. The idea includes one's trust on the availability of the attachment figure to serve as a secure base from which one can look for comfort, safety, and support when distressed. This vantage point of safety allows one assess the world, the interactions with others, and one's own inner understanding (Levy et al., 2011).

Bretherton (1992) explained that the idea of the attachment figure as a secure base from which the infant can discover the world was a contribution of Ainsworth (1978). Additionally, Ainsworth framed the notion of maternal sensitivity to infant signs and its part in the growth of infant-mother attachment outlines.

One of Bowlby's (1951) original expositions is described children's aggressive fantasies of imaginations on reunifying with the father or mother after a lengthy separation and "the intense depression that humans experience as a result of hating the person they most dearly love and need" (p. 57). One of Bowlby's (1951) principal conclusions was that to grow up emotionally well, "the infant and young child should experience a way, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother (or permanent mother substitute) in which both find satisfaction and enjoyment" (p. 13). Additionally, Bowlby highlighted the significance of social networks, economic, and health issues in relation to healthy working mother-child associations.

Concerned about the needs of parents, Bowlby (1951) called on the general public to offer support to them:

> Just as children are absolutely dependent on their parents for sustenance, so in all but the most primitive communities are parents, especially their mothers, dependent on a greater society for economic provision. If a community values its children, it must cherish their parents. (p. 84)

Bowlby's (1951) main inference, based in the accessible experimental data of his time, was that to develop emotionally mature and strong, "the infant and young child should experience a warm, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother (or permanent mother substitute) in which both find satisfaction and enjoyment" (p. 13).

Ainsworth (1978) used Bowlby's theory as the base to develop a laboratory technique named the *Strange Situation* to assess differences in attachment security in babies. This method comprises a sequence of laboratory events in a playroom, through which the baby, their mother, and someone unknown to the baby interact, and the infant's actions are observed. Of most interest is the baby's behavior when reunited with their mother after their brief separation (Ainsworth, 1978).

Ainsworth (1978) identified three separate attachment styles in her *Strange Situation* research: secure, anxious-resistant or ambivalent, and avoidant. Results suggested that the three attachment styles identified could be conceptualized along two difference dimensions: anxiety and avoidance (Ainsworth, 1978).

Secure Attachment

The secure attachment style is associated with a warm response (Ainsworth, 1978). Ainsworth (1978) described secure attachment in childhood as the means the parent, especially the mother, is present, available, responsive, and helpful to the child.

Describing individuals with a secure attachment, Akhtar (2012) identified people with confidence. Akhtar (2012) described it as individuals with positive views of themselves and their parents, peers, and relationships. They have greater satisfaction and adjustment in their lives. These are people who feel comfortable and depend on others. Individuals with secure attachment have close intimate relations, and they welcome others who want to make close relationships with them. They are described as happy people. Individuals with a secure attachment perceive their parents as having a warm and close relationship and having happy marriages (Akhtar, 2012).

According to attachment theory, parents provide a secure base from which a child can engage in discovery. Bowlby (1979) indicated that attachment could generate very strong emotions such as joy when securely attached, suffering if attachment is broken in the breaking, or difficulties if ties developed have an insecure quality. According to Ainsworth (1991), attachments live at the core of domestic life. Families develop ties that provide care and protections across the life span.

A basic belief of attachment theory is that babies and young offspring need to develop secure dependency on their main caregivers (e.g. their parents) before venturing into unknown circumstances (Ainsworth, 1991). In her dissertation titled "An evaluation of adjustment Based on the Concept of Security," Mary Salter (1940) stated it this manner:

> Familial security in the early stages is of a dependent type and forms a basis from which the individual can work out gradually, forming new skills and interests in other fields. Where familial security is lacking, the individual is handicapped by the lack of what might be called a secure base from which to work. (Salter, 1940, p. 45)

Avoidant Attachment Style

Per Collins and Reed (1990), individuals with avoidant attachment style feel uncomfortable getting close to others. Akhtar (2012) described that these individuals want to make close relations, but they find it difficult to depend on others. In addition, they avoid close relations because they do not trust others. They experience contradicting feelings, desiring relationships but become nervous when others have close relations with them. People with avoidant attachment style suppress and hide their emotions because of their mixed feelings and the lack of trust in others (Akhtar, 2012).

This style has roots in repeated rejection in childhood (Akhtar, 2012). These individuals experienced their parents as less warm toward each other and themselves. The perception develops due to cold and rejecting attitudes from the parents (Akhtar, 2012). Passer and Smith (2007) described avoidant children as angry and aggressive, with tendencies toward isolation, and not accepted by peers.

Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment

Individuals with an anxious attachment style are described as conscious of their relations (Akhtar, 2012). Hazan and Shaver (1987) identified that people with an anxious attachment demand a high level of intimacy, warmth, and dependency from their parents and peers (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). People with this attachment style are anxious about the presence and availability of their mothers. These individuals are uncertain about their parents in childhood. The history of such feelings takes them to adulthood with this style (Akhtar, 2012).

Akhtar (2012) added that individuals with anxious attachment style value a high level of intimacy, and sometimes, they become over-dependent. Their high expectations and over-dependence scare other people. They experience fear of losing relations. They may perceive other people are reluctant to have close relations with them. Their perception is that others are not as warm toward them in their relations as they are. They experience fear of rejection. Their relationships are based on fear and abandonment and tend to be short-lived. As adults, they may describe their parent's relationship with less warmth, and they feel their parents have unhappy marriages (Akhtar, 2012).

Disorganized Attachment Style

The fourth style of attachment behavior, originally called "cannot classify," was described as disorganized/disoriented attachment style (van Ecke, 2007, p. 3). This name was

provided because the infant or child was short of any clear approach for connecting to the

attachment person and had conflicting actions such as an attempting to approach and freezing

(Main & Solomon, 1986). Hesse and Main (2000) expanded, describing it as a "diverse array of

inexplicable, odd, disorganized, disoriented, or overly conflicted behaviors in the parents'

presence" (p. 1099). Hesse and Main (2000) provided examples of the behaviors classified as

disorganized, including an infant rocking on his hands and knees after aborting an approach

toward the parent during a reunion or starting to get close to the parent while crying but then

dropping on the floor in silence and stopping movement. According to Hesse and Main, these

behaviors are thought to occur when conflicting behavioral tendencies are activated within the

infant competing for expression. However, it displays in the appearance of disorganized or

disoriented reactions (Hesse & Main, 2000).

Borelli et al. (2010) explained that disorganized attachment does not indicate

psychopathology and is not related to clinical cut-offs. However, they clarified that disorganized

attachment adds another danger for the growth of psychopathology but is not itself thought to be

indicative of psychopathology. As with many other types of psychosocial risk, insecure

attachment is recommended to be conceptualized within a diathesis stress model as an additional

factor that triggers vulnerability to psychological distress after experiencing intense stressors

(Borelli et al., 2010). According to van Ecke (2007), unsettled attachment surfaces "from

pressures of, actual abandonment, hurt, or being ignored by attachment figures" (p. 4). The

attachment person may have endangered the child creating distress and rendering the child

unable to resolve the crisis (Hesse, 2001). Bowlby stated that "systematic threats" of desertion

can be just as harmful as a real incident (Bowlby, 1988, p. 136).

Jones-Mason et al. (2021) discussed how the parents deliver critical defense to the child to counter to stress—identified as "parental buffering" (p. 9). They reasoned that some of the research that studied the stress reactions of youngsters to parental inattentiveness or transitory separation does not demonstrate the degree of dread or terror that youngsters at the border suffer during separation from parents. Nevertheless, studies do show that even in the milder circumstances of a laboratory research, parental separation or disconnectedness generates a stress response in the children (Jones-Mason et al., 2021).

Findings of extensive research on attachment theory (Ainsworth, 1978; Bowlby, 1979, 1988; Bretherton & Waters, 1985; Parkes et al., 1991) have generated outcomes that are relevant to the development of family environment and dynamics as well as therapy. For example, Belsky and Nezworski (1988) related insecure attachment to traits with a significant variety of dysfunctions. In other studies, Byng-Hall and Stevenson-Hinde (1991) presented that insecure attachment in infancy seems to impact development of psychological adjustment. Wynne (1984) suggested attachment behavior was the primary phase in the epigenetic growth progression within family systems (pp. 303-304).

An attachment figure can offer a secure base from which a youngster can search the environment safely with the awareness that the parent is accessible and will provide protection (Byng-Hall, 1995). Ainsworth (1967) initially employed the idea of a secure base in her research of Ugandan youngsters and their parents. She observed how babies would go far away from their mother to play, frequently coming back to talk with the mother:

He is content to move away, as long as he knows that she is there. He can even leave the room on his own initiative, and his assurance in so doing is sometimes in sharp contrast

to the consternation when his secure base gets up and moves away. (Ainsworth, 1967, p. 345)

Ainsworth and Bowlby (1991) indicated that attachment figures are utilized as secure bases through life. As youngsters grow older, the attachment relations changes and they assume additional responsibilities in managing this relationship and perhaps even serving in the role as caregiver to their parents. As adults, individuals then form other attachments with other adults (e.g. spouses, partners) (Weiss, 1982) that provide also a shared secure base, care in periods of sickness or when needed. When stressful or dangerous situations occur, temporary attachment figures can step in, such as psychotherapists or counselors. The awareness of having someone who is concerned about oneself is important to the effectiveness of the safe base during any developmental stage and in any situation (Byng-Hall, 1995).

Attachment, Immigration, and Deportation

Various studies have provided support to the value to diverse cultural differences and expressions in attachment behaviors. Harwood and Miller (1991) studied perceptions of attachment behavior in Caucasian and Puerto Rican mothers, and found that even though mothers in both groups indicated secure behavior was preferable, the Puerto Rican mothers emphasized the youngster's skill to be calm and grow a "close attachment relationship" (p. 394) whereas Caucasian mothers stressed their youngster's independence and exploratory behaviors. These findings support the need to consider cultural variations in attachment behaviors emphasized (Harwood & Miller, 1991).

In general, Latinx cultures have explicit expectations for their families, especially immigrant families residing in the United States. Many of them maintain strong connections with extended families in their country of origin creating emotional support. Others maintain and

transmit to their children cultural and religious or spiritual beliefs. Different families pass to their children their cultural pride as Latinx descendants maintaining and nurturing their language. Nevertheless, others transmit an identity crisis borne by their country's uncertain political status. Each subgroup of Latinx has specific challenges related to unique circumstances such as race, socioeconomic class, political ideology, physical location, linguistic issues, and immigration (Comas-Diaz, 2006). Exploring about these different predicaments that Latinx sub-groups confront, Comas-Diaz (2006) stated:

> Mexicans and Mexican Americans experience the pressures of legalities and legalism; Puerto Ricans confront the challenges of dual identities; Cubans face the joys and pains of economic assimilation, Dominicans are subjected to blatant racism because of their predominately Africans phenotype; and countless South Americans contend with the ambiguities of detachment and belonging. (pp. 436-453)

A significant conclusion from research on attachment theory is that all babies have fundamental attachment requirements, and all grow a main attachment to a caretaker. Attachment to a main caregiver is shaped by cultural background, values, and traditions. The features of secure attachment have been found to share like values across cultures such as China, Japan, Columbia, Germany, and the United States (Posada et al., 1995).

While there is agreement on basic aspects of attachment bonds across culture, the precise behaviors of a secure youngsters vary according to the cultural setting (Arbona & Power, 2003; Brandell & Ringel, 2007; van Ijzendoorn & Sagi, 1999). Bretherton (1992) declared that "attachment behavior is heavily overlaid with cultural prescriptions; even in a society that much more closely resembles the conditions of human evolution than our own" (p. 774).

Bowlby (1969) stated that the effects of a parent-child parting hinge on the nature of the early attachment. Bowlby (1988) noted that the absence of a steady motherly character interrupts the development of a permanent attachment bond that place the youngsters at danger for psychological trouble. While Bowlby's (1969) theory was largely established out of baby and caretaker relations, he and other researchers have extended the model by understanding that parent-child unions continue over infantile, puberty, and the life span (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1982; Heiss et al., 1994).

In their studies, Adam and Chase-Lansdale (2002) contended that parent separations in early childhood years might cause the greatest harm due to the dependency bonds in the relationships. However, attachment is also critical through middle childhood and puberty because children's sense of safety is linked to availability and accessibility of their attachment figures. Any threats to the accessibility of attachment figures still initiates deep feelings of anxiety, anger, and hopelessness (Kobak et al., 1998). Kobak and Sceery (1988) expanded by stating that separation from attachment figures in adolescence consequently generates suffering and wounds to the apparent safety and attachment, which may be an important factor in development of psychopathology and problem behaviors in older children and teenagers who are separated from deported parents (Kobak et al., 1998).

Two aspects of parental behavior impact attachment and separation behaviors: parental reaction or acknowledgment of distress and reassurance or protective behaviors toward the child (Ainsworth, 1978), and preparing the child for anticipated separation or situations that can cause distress (Hock et al., 1989; Weinraub & Lewis, 1977). Because immigration separations and deportations are sudden events, it is probably no preparation of the child for these events to help reduce their distress, anxiety, impact on the attachment relationship. The youngster's behaviors

through separation seems related to how the child was prepared by the caregiver for the separation and how the caregiver responds to the child upon reunification (Artico, 2003). When reunified, since separated from their parents, the children frequently have already developed an attachment to their alternate caregivers (e.g., another family member, grandparents, etc.). Therefore, the child experiences a second separation (e.g. from the temporary caregivers) just prior to reintegration with original caregivers (e.g. parents) (Artico, 2003; Sewell-Coker et al., 1985).

Jones-Mason et al. (2021) described detachment as an adaptation focused on enabling the creation of new attachment connections. As an example, they pointed out a video that depicts a baby rejecting her mother in favor of the facility caregiver when attempting to reunify with her mother. Although the child was situated in an intensely upsetting situation, it could represent the beginning of detachment.

According to Artico (2003), when reunited, some youngsters handle their discomfort with anger and rejection of parents. Research studies show that parents were frequently unprepared and unable to understand their children's reactions, and for the most part, they did not deal with reactions well. According to Artico's (2003) results, because of parental fears of being rejected by their children upon reunification, the parents tried one of two strategies: becoming emotionally distanced from the children or exerting control and authority to form an affectionate connection upon reunion (Artico, 2003).

As a result, the stiff exchanges between parents and children often lead to emotions of rejection and discontent, which deteriorates the parent-child bond to tolerate long-term attachment injury (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1989). If parents overall had trouble solving conflicts and additional barriers to their parent-child relationship come up, resolving these issues during

times of transition will be more difficult and much more problematic for the household to accomplish. This also includes dealing with the challenges of cultural factors that impact the family in unique ways (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1989).

Bowlby articulated that throughout grief, individuals have a provisional unsettled state of mind with respect to attachment before feeling a restructuring that is "cognitive and emotional" (Bowlby, 1980). Bowlby defined protection as caregiving and care-seeking, the complementary first two components of attachment. However, exploration of the third component is averse to attachment behavior (van Ecke, 2007, p. 4). Presented in Bowlby's (1988) words, "When an individual (or any age) is feeling secure, he is likely to explore away from his attachment figure. When alarmed, tired, unwell, or anxious, he feels an urge towards proximity" (p. 121).

Those who have relocated from another their country of origin motherland in a spirit of adventure can be considered secure to explore their new country, but people who emigrate to escape from persecution and other problems may be already distressed in their nation of origin (Bhui et al., 2003; den Velde et al., 2000; Perez-Foster, 2001). Departure from family and social support systems is usually described as severe continuing stressors among immigrants (Patel, 1992; Sinnerbrink et al., 1997). Situations may inspire one to seek closeness to attachment figures who are no longer accessible (van Ecke, 2007, p. 5).

Boneva and Frieze (2001) described that, at some level, individuals who decide to leave their native country in order to survive or seek better opportunities are inclined to be more motivated and achievement oriented while being more job-focused and less focused on family than those who do not want to immigrate (Boneva & Frieze, 2001; Frieze et al., 2004).

Those are features related to people with a dismissive attachment style. One of the youthful experience principles related to dismissive attachment status (George et al., 1984, 1985,

1996) is parental stress to achieve (George & West, 2003). Ali and Toner's (2001) study comparing immigrants' values of connections, work, and spirituality to native-born who chose not to immigrate found that Caribbean women, who did not immigrate, placed more significance from these relationships then women who immigrated from the Caribbean to Canada, who placed less significance on jobs and spirituality although they considered these still significant (Ali & Toner, 2001). It was not clear if relationships become less important for immigrant women or if the relationships were not as important to begin with. "Attachment status of the immigrants would more likely be insecure, and, more specifically, dismissive" (van Ecke, 2007, p. 19).

Mental Health and Attachment

Research strongly supports that facing too many losses during the developmental years places people at a greater danger of evolving emotional difficulties and psychopathology (Bowlby, 1988; Harris & Bifulco, 1991; Japel et al., 1999). Studies indicate that for numerous youngsters, separation from parental figures is the primary disaster. When there is separation from a mother or father, a child may display short-term and long-term adverse consequences (Bowlby, 1988; Harris & Bifulco, 1991; Japel et al., 1999).

Decreases in educational achievement, social adjustment, and emotional wellness are some of the short-term effects manifested by the children separated from their parents (Guidubaldi et al., 1987; Hetherington et al., 1992; Morrison & Cherlin, 1995; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Several extended and undesirable effects are psychosocial distress and health-related difficulties (Japel et al., 1999). Japel et al. (1999) indicated that after the parents' marriage has been disrupted for five years or more, these families' children had higher levels of problem behavior, lower academic performance, and more psychological distress and health problems than did those from intact families. Japel et al. (1999) conducted a study with three

groups of a sample of girls in Quebec, Canada. The researchers wanted to examine whether the separation of parents during different developmental stages would have different and long-lasting effects on the girls' behaviors. The authors found more externalizing behavior symptoms (e.g., bullying, fights, destroys, kicks-bites-hits, inconsiderate, squirmy, not liked, irritable, tells lies, disobedient) to be present more often among girls who experienced parental separation/divorce before age five. However, those experiencing very early family breakup, from birth to age two, seemed to be affected in the most negative and pervasive manner, including more internalizing behavior problems (e.g., fearful, cries, solitary, worried, distressed, stares into space) than the control group (Japel et al., 1999).

Some attachment studies show a positive association between individuals' severity of disturbance in attachment through childhood and mental illness and susceptibility to developing unsatisfying, conflict-based relationships as adults. A large research comparing immigrants to non-immigrants (n= 20,000 individuals) found that immigrants had greater psychological difficulties even when controlling for socioeconomic position (Angel et al., 2001). Angel et al. found that midlife immigrants displayed substantially higher risk for emotional distress (84%), but young adult immigrants displayed a moderate risk (37%). Measuring emotional distress, the researchers considered social connectedness or integration, social isolation, and support. When the investigators compared Hispanic immigrants with native-born persons, immigrants reported low household income (50.8% vs 41% respectively), had low or no housing assets (28.9% vs 19%, respectively), and 65.4% were more likely not to own their homes compare with 58.1% of native-born persons. Researchers concluded that immigrants' health disadvantages seem to partly reflect their unfavorable social class (Angel et al., 2001).

Van Ecke (2007) reported that the majority of studies has focused on common characteristics of immigrants such as language, income, color of their skin, and income. Less is known about immigrants that are more similar the U.S. culture. Bowlby (1973) claimed, "There is a marked tendency for humans, like animals of other species, to remain in a particular and familiar locale and in the company of particular and familiar people" (p. 147). However, immigrants are an exception to that expectation (van Ecke, 2007). To better understand immigrants as an exception, the aspect of attachment theory that should be considered postulates that individuals enjoy discovering while they have a secure base to return to (Bowlby, 1988). Four phases of susceptibility for immigrants have been presented in present immigrant psychological wellbeing works (van Ecke, 2007). Van Ecke (2007) described these stages as premigration or the circumstances that trigger immigration. The transit period of actual movement to the new country, the resettlement, and the longstanding period of adjustment and adaptation are the last three phases. As van Ecke (2007) presented, "separation does not devastate us [migrants' individuals] as long as we are confident of the possibility of return to our secure base" (p. 17).

A review of research by Mackey (2003) concluded that depression is more firmly connected to individuals with an insecure preoccupied attachment style than any other attachment style (Allen et al., 1998; Kobak et al., 1991; Mackey, 2003). Dismissive attachment style seems to be more associated to externalizing behaviors like substance misuse and behavioral problems (Rosenstein & Horowitz, 1996). Additionally, Suárez-Orozco et al. (2002) confirmed that long separations from family, six months to years, were related to reports of depression in the children (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002).

Grief and Loss

In a study at Harvard, Waters et al. (2000) indicated that the length of separation suffered by an amount of immigrant youngsters might be linked to insecure attachment representation. A risk factor for psychological illnesses within attachment theory is major separation or permanent loss of key attachment figures (Allen et al., 1996; Carlson & Sroufe, 1995; Cicchetti et al., 1995; Main, 1996). Van Ecke (2007) explained that immigration can unexpectedly separate permanently a person from their attachment figures, even when the immigrant did not expect that outcome. That loss and individual grief in children due to parental deportation may be explained in relation to of Bowlby's phases of mourning: initial emotional numbness, shock, and disbelief. These are all followed by despair, nostalgia, and yearning. Finally, a restructuring, completion of grieving and recognition of one's new part in the world follow (Arredondo-Dowd, 1981; Jones-Mason et al., 2021; Waters et al., 2002).

Another layer impacting the family is ambiguous loss; studies have examined its effect on family members (Boss, 2003, 2004). Boss (1999, 2004) explained that families try to cope with the trials of reconciliation of their loss with support from their societies and culture. However, ambiguous loss tests the person by freezing the grieving process and impacting the person's cognition, limiting managing and decision-making skills (Boss, 1999, 2004). Beckles Flores (2011) reaffirmed the previous literature statements when the participants disclosed emotions of misperception and trouble making closing through their time of separation from their fathers and mothers and other household members. Additional discussion about the extent of ambiguous loss impact indicates that families may feel not permitted to grieve their loss or that their loss is shameful or bad (Boss, 2002, 2004, 2006). Those emotions are particularly difficult for the family members because they suffer in silence (Boss, 2006). During times of

grief, family members frequently do not have the opportunity to be comforted by one another, which may create a feeling of isolation (Boss, 2006).

Beckles Flores (2011) witnessed this phenomenon when her study participants reported not being permitted to talk about what occurred and suffered isolation afterward. Other emotions related to this situation identified in Beckles Flores' (2011) study were shame and fear. To guard the family against additional shame or added penalties, the family members make significant efforts to remain quiet. Nonetheless, the cost of these efforts to protect the family while attempting to move through their loss is a greater risk of isolation (Boss, 2004, 2006). Bowlby's (1988) clinical and theoretical findings indicated that grief is diverse in force, even in psychologically well persons as well, and includes "anger, directed at third parties, the self, and sometimes at the person lost, disbelief that the loss has occurred and a tendency, often though not always unconscious, to search for the lost person in the hope of reunion" (p. 32). When youngsters show no indications of looking for comfort during grief, attachment connection may be provisionally or forever shut down (Bowlby, 1980). Self-protection seems to constrain the youngster's capacity to experience upsetting feelings and lead to a distraction from those emotions. Self-protective processes are an additional way to define depression (Bowlby, 1980; Bretherton, 1992).

Bowlby (1980) suggested that the same processes that lead individuals to selectively exclude information from awareness is also linked to engaging in self-protection through defensively excluding information from consciousness. According to Bretherton (1992), three situations may lead children to use defensive exclusion: 1) if they consider their parents' behaviors too unbearable to think about; 2) circumstances parents do not want the children to be aware of but they already have observed; and 3) circumstances in which youngsters either had

thoughts or did something that they are deeply embarrassed about. While defensive exclusion protects the person against undergoing intolerable psychological discomfort, misperception, or struggle, it interferes with incorporating their internal working models to the outside reality. Defensive processes become another manner to identify depression in children (Bowlby, 1980; Bretherton, 1992).

Loss is a circumstance of the human experience, and if the individual learned early in life their needs will be fulfilled in such situations, they learn to adjust to losses and create new relationships (van Ecke, 2007). According to attachment theory, separation and loss do not place individuals in danger of mental illnesses, but the risk is increased in the presence of major separations and long-lasting loss (van Ecke, 2007, p. 23).

Dovidio and Esses (2001) reminded that multiple changes happen at once with immigration, so the overall impact is more intense. Hovey (2000) studied Mexican immigrants in Los Angeles and determined that household dysfunction, physical separation from family, lack of positive future outlook, and low income were significantly related to high acculturative stress, which, in turn, predicted risk of depressive symptoms.

Hess (1982) identified three circumstances that lead to an ideal parent-child attachment: stability, continuity, and mutuality in the relationship. Stability requires a safe, stable atmosphere where the parent and child can participate in the closeness process of the relationship. Continuity was defined as the caregiver's devotion and recurrence of the parent-child collaborations. Mutuality involves the exchanges between the parent and child that strengthen their significance to each other (Hess, 1982).

Studying infants raised in institutional settings, Caye et al. (1996) concluded that none of the three circumstances (e.g., stability, continuity, and mutuality) alone is sufficient for the

formation of secure attachment. As previously stated, the author observed that institutionalized children failed to form resilient attachments to caregivers who did not engage them socially but provided for their physical needs but did not engage them in social relations. Equally, social interactions alone were proven insufficient. The infants often grow social attachments to siblings, fathers, and grandparents, involving them in enjoyable social activities. However, the authors presented that when exhausted, hungry, or upset, children frequently cannot be consoled by anyone other than the primary caregivers who in the past have acknowledged and reacted to their signs of physical and emotional necessity (Caye et al., 1996).

Even when necessary, Caye et al. (1996) stated that taking children away from their homes or parents hinders their growth. The chances for substantial destructive developmental concerns increase with the significance of the separation. Caye et al. (1996) continued reporting that recurring partings inhibit the development of healthy attachments and the child's skill and readiness to establish close relations as an adult. The familiarity of distress from a traumatic separation from their parents may be manifested in the children as low self-esteem, overall distrust of others, mood disorders, socio-moral naïveté, and lack of proper social skills. Other collective responses to separation have been identified as regressive behaviors (bedwetting) and interruptions of reasoning and linguistics (Caye et al., 1996; Jones-Mason et al., 2021).

As previously described, the Longitudinal Immigration Adaptive Study provided information about the side effects of children's separation from parents (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002). Their investigation named adverse results for youngsters separated from their parents including problems with attachment, depression, and behaviors (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002).

Mackey's (2003) review of studies reported that depression is more related to an insecure preoccupied attachment than with other attachment statuses, while dismissive attachment seems

related to the propensity to externalize into substance abuse and conduct problems (Rosenstein & Horowitz, 1996). According to van Ecke (2005), the long-term separation experienced by the immigrant youngsters in the Harvard research is connected to insecure attachment depiction. However, the depiction of attachment style can be altered when an inspiration is insistent and undesirable (Waters et al., 2000). Van Ecke (2005) stated that lengthy separations from parents do not help to secure attachment for youngsters and are practically sure to be harmful in relations of attachment depiction.

Artico (2003) found similar results to those obtained by Suarez-Orozco et al. (2002) discussed previously related to the impact of immigration relative to separation. Artico conducted a detailed qualitative research where teenagers from years 15 to 19 were questioned about their experiences of separation and reunification with their families. Following the dialogue, the participants were presented with an experimental sand tray activity for additional demonstration of their understanding. Unlike other investigations, this study is one of the first attentive to adolescent feelings, opinions, and recall around the experience. The teenagers spoke about flexibility, reconciliation, and support. Similar to Artico, Dreby (2007) stated that adolescence is the age where the effects of immigration, even when children do not actually move, are most pronounced (Artico, 2003; Dreby, 2007). Artico (2003) said that preceding results on immigration linked parent-child separation from the adult's viewpoint since most studies including the children's viewpoints involve interviews with either adult children or children who have since been reunified with their parents.

The developmental stages of pre-adolescence and adolescence are important phases in which children experience a sequence of significant but typical changes in physical growth, social relationships, sexuality, behaviors, identity, family and parent-child relations (Kegan,

1982; Simmons et al., 1987). However, separations due to immigration happen when youngsters are still young and dependent on parents as their single or main caretakers (Adam & Chase-Lansdale, 2002). Adam and Chase-Lansdale (2002) explained that the separation between a child and their caregiver cultivates uncertainty within the family atmosphere, creating severe stress for the children, especially during crucial developmental changes. The youngsters' sense of safety and aptitude to productively manage challenges as each developing stage is broken by the severity of the stress due to the separation from parents (Adam & Chase-Lansdale, 2002).

Ambiguous Loss

Separation due to immigration varies from expected separations between child-parent due to the unusual, unexpected environment. Neither the parents nor the child knows when or if they will be back together, and usually, the law forbids the parent's homecoming. Consequently, the parent and youngster live in different nations, and often substantial worry grows linked to the terror that additional non-legal household members will be exiled. This procedure can be significantly unclear and scary for youngsters (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2006).

Boss (2002) explained that one main issue that differentiates separation by immigration from other types of separation is that it is so seriously filled with uncertainty. Ambiguous loss has been recognized as caused by the sudden banishment of a loved one; not knowing if a loved one is alive or dead challenges emotional comprehension (Boss, 2002). Boss also indicated that individuals could experience ambiguous loss as a consequence of not knowing if a family member will come back or will be permanently gone, emotionally accessible or inaccessible, or ultimately deceased or alive.

Physical ambiguous loss happens when a precious one is actually not present, and since their status of being alive cannot be verified or disputed, the family is trapped in a state of

uncertainty (Beckles Flores, 2011). Physical ambiguous loss can happen as a consequence of abduction, human trafficking, deported immigrants, or family members who move to another country to pursue work (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002).

Psychological ambiguous loss occurs when someone close is physically present but unavailable or absent physiologically (Beckles Flores, 2011). These losses can happen when loved ones faces conditions such as dementia, depression, long-lasting psychological disease, brain damage, or numerous types of addiction (Beckles Flores, 2011). Experiencing psychologically ambiguous loss can also happen due to unanticipated, strong, or traumatizing experiences happenings that lead the person to become unavailable as they attempt to cope with the experience. Moving due to immigration and the loss of cultural values or identity can be confusing for family members and impact being connected and emotionally accessible to other family members (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002).

In ambiguous loss, the person experiences a freeze in the grieving process (Boss, 1999) and clouded reasoning, which prevents coping and decision-making. Consequently, closure of the loss is not completed, and families and children are left trying to find meaning and make sense of the loss and the process (Boss, 2002, 2004, 2006). Ambiguous loss might trigger substantial tension in relations as well as depression, substance misuse, aggression, and suicide (Boss, 2006).

Researchers have identified immigrants and refugees amid the most distressed and defenseless groups because they face difficulties that greatly impact them and their families. Researchers identify some of these difficulties as loss, poverty, racism, and discrimination (Hsu et al., 2004; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2005; Yu, 1997). Due to this history, many Latinx immigrants'

families and individuals experience a range of losses previous to the loss and separation from an undocumented parent (Weingarten, 2003).

In 2003, Weingarten highlighted the importance of considering the preceding stressors, hurts, and losses that immigrant households and their children experienced prior to the moment of parental deportation because it enhances the understanding of the immigration experience and outlines the loss, through deportation, experienced. For immigrants, loss is frequently a buildup of experiences of negligence, exploitation, abuse, loss of identity, and spiritual and community losses (Beckles Flores, 2011). Undocumented immigrants living in the United States are conscious that they are at risk daily of being imprisoned and sent back to their country of origin. However, in the U.S., immigrant families also face daily stressors such as violence, abuse, losses, and sorrow a long time before the extradition of an undocumented parent happens (Weingarten, 2003).

According to van Ecke (2005), immigrants who have a dismissive attachment style may have a higher positive early adjustment to the United States since they are familiar with not feeling in need and to being rough, while individuals with the preoccupied and autonomous attachment styles face more adjustment difficulties post-immigration (van Ecke, 2005). Van Ecke (2005) indicated that when an individual with a secure attachment style experiences a separation, they may be more conscious of their suffering than those with insecure attachment styles. This is because securely attached persons may be less motivated to deny their own hurt than individuals with dismissive attachment styles and also are not as likely to over focus on others' needs as individuals with preoccupied attachment styles. Thus, individuals with a dismissive attachment style would give less meaning to the family of origin and would adapt

better to early separation and the adversities of immigration since they have a mind frame that accepts no one but themselves are likely to meet their own needs (van Ecke, 2005).

In a recent study, Venta et al. (2020) interviewed and collected information from a small group of newly emigrated youth who came primarily from Central America. The researchers found that 62.1% of participants experienced the deportation of one of their parents. They also found that lower maternal attachment security was related to the departure from their mothers. In addition, they presented results confirming a high percentage of dismissing classification (17-31.3%) within those categorized as insecurely attached, followed by preoccupied attached individuals (3.3-7%) and few, if any, were classified as having a disorganized attachment (0.7-2.9%). The authors acknowledged that, although having a small sample from newly immigrated adolescents in the southwestern U.S. region, their results are similar to previous studies regarding the distribution of attachment organization (Venta et al., 2020).

An individual's self-esteem denotes the self-judgments of private value and overall emotional state of competency and self-recognition (Rosenberg, 1965). Research with teenagers has established that low self-confidence is related to negative outcomes, such as substance misuse, depression, unhappiness with life, and poor sense of well-being (Baldwin et al., 1989; Conway et al., 2020; Dekovic, 1999; Stacy et al., 1992).

Arbona and Power (2003) identified a positive, trusting parental relationship as facilitative of the development of an internalized, positive and confident view of self. This concept has been supported through a variety of studies with mainly European Americans who confirmed that secure attachment to the mother or father or both parents is linked with academic aged teenagers' self-esteem (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Kenny et al., 1998; Noom et al., 1999; Papini & Roggman, 1992; Paterson et al., 1995).

Results of investigations about the significance of maternal as opposed to paternal attachment to self-image are varied (Arbona & Power, 2003). In the Hoffman et al. (1988) study, attachment to the mother presented as more important related to self-worth; however, in studies such as Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) and LeCroy (1988), the attachment to the father is primary to self-worth. Interestingly, additional investigations have established that attachment to both parents is similarly predictive of self-confidence (Noom et al., 1999; Papini & Roggman, 1992; Paterson et al., 1995).

Arbona and Power (2003) described antisocial behaviors amid immigrant adolescents, including violent behavior, theft, deceitful, destruction, and drug participation. Dryfoos (1990) identified a constructive attachment with parents to help as a defending influence concerning teenage participation in these undesirable conducts (Conway et al., 2020; Dryfoos, 1990). Several studies suggest that teenagers who have a solid emotional connection with their parents are more likely to accept parents' rules and guidelines and to reflect on their parents' responses to situations they face that may involve misbehaviors compared to their less attached peers (Marcus & Betzer, 1996; Weber et al., 1995). Alternatively, the parental influence is condensed over the adolescents' conduct, and anger and aggression toward parents could be present without secure attachment (Allen et al., 1998). In recent research, Conway et al. (2020) confirmed the above findings in a study of 716 participants that included 60% of adolescents who were separated from one or both parents due to immigration. Interviews for the study were completed after reunification. What was unique with this study was the effect the separation had on the parent-child relationship, which, when positive, mitigates against negative influences surrounding the immigrant community, including the separation from parents. The study found that those youths who were separated from their mothers "were 4.7 times as likely to report a

poor relationship" with their mothers (Conway et al., 2020, p. 300) and 3.4 times as possible to have an unfortunate connection with their fathers.

Alternatively, if the emotional bond with parents is not as strong, insecure attachment organization may spot difficult constant difficulties in interactions with parents that make it hard for the adolescent to move spontaneously outside these relations. At that point, the parental influence is limited over the adolescents' conduct, and anger and aggression toward parents could be present without secure attachment (Allen et al., 1998).

Varied findings were established from studies among European American adolescents exploring the importance of mother and father attachment concerning antisocial behavior (Arbona & Power, 2003). Within the studies, one found that attachment to the mother and the father is likewise connected to inferior stages of antisocial behavior (Noom et al., 1999). However, additional studies identified the father's attachment as the one that appears to help as the shielding factor (Grant et al., 2000; Weber et al., 1995). Different results presented that the relational meaning of parental attachment appeared to be contingent on the adolescent's sex (Jackson & Foshee, 1998; Marcus & Betzer, 1996).

In a self-reported engagement in violent behaviors between high school students, the relationship of father and mother attachment was stronger for females than for male students (Jackson & Foshee, 1998). In Arbona and Power's (2003) study, two styles of parental attachment were identified: avoidance and anxiety. Avoidance was related to teenagers' wish for emotional separation from parents and absence of safety and optimistic affect in the parent-child association. Anxiety was related to feelings of worry and uneasiness in the parent-child connection. Results indicated lower levels of maternal avoidance in Mexican American adolescents than African American and European American adolescents (Arbona & Power,

2003). The previous results may be connected to the importance of traditional Mexican American families to the emotional relationship with their mothers (Falicov, 1996). According to Arbona and Power (2003), ethnic group variances existed only in connection to mother avoidance, and the scale of the dissimilarities was minor. The adolescents in these studies did not seem to differ in the strength of their attachments to their parents, although there are potential changes in morals and the view of the world amid culturally varied families (Arbona & Power, 2003). According to Sue and Sue (1990), Latinx families are often described by strong family loyalty and boundaries and by traditional gender roles. Smith and Krohn (1995) suggested that to endorse the development of adaptive social bonds, Latinx families may depend on the influence of family intimacy and respect rather than on parental control practices per se. These researchers also presented results indicating that family variables were more important in constraining delinquency for Latinx adolescents than their White and African American peers (Smith & Krohn, 1995).

Similarly, African American, European American, and Latinx university students and high-school-age youth reported important stages of attachment and participation with their parents (Lopez et al., 2000; Rice et al., 1997; Smith & Krohn, 1995). For example, Lopez et al. (2000) concluded that among Latinx and Black students, parental bonds meaningfully foretold adult attachment anxiety but not avoidance. Rice et al. (1997) studied the relationship of parental attachment bonds to emotional adjustment, concluding that the paternal figure serves as a link to work and society at large and may further serve as a model for the development of skills necessary to manage home-to-society transitions. Mothers may help as a connective bond to family relationships and may model abilities related to interpersonal intimacy, sensitivity, and self-disclosure.

Comparable, Smith and Krohn (1995) reviewed the overall role families play in the etiology of delinquency relative to the role of family involvement, family attachment, and family control among Hispanic, African American, and White male adolescents. When evaluating living in hardship, for Latinx adolescents, it is an issue directly related to attachment and indirectly related to delinquency, while for White adolescents, living in hardship is indirectly related to delinquency through the effect of hardship on attachment. The study concluded that a more important effect on Latinx adolescents' delinquency than either for White or African American was a single-parent home background. The results of this particular study endorsed that for Latinx children, including adolescents, family solidarity, cohesion, and interdependence are predominantly important (Smith & Krohn, 1995).

Development and Attachment

Bowlby (1973) wanted to preserve what he considered some of Freud's most valuable insights about human development and close relationships but using a prospective and observational approach. Bowlby (1973) documented that affect plays a significant organizing role in secure base relationships. Moreover, he highlighted the role of cognitive activity in regulating attachment-related affective states (Bowlby, 1973).

It is vital to contemplate the differences in developmental stages from infancy and beyond within families in the United States and additional cultures (Mirecki & Chou, 2013). Children live in more difficult and diverse surroundings than infants do. These differences in these living environments may lead to a larger need for complexity, difference, and specificity of organization inside the attachment of family members after infancy (Crittenden, 2000). The differences in developmental needs make an area of concern in attachment theory, which is the

children's maturation and the family's developmental trajectory. Even greater complexity and difference in surroundings are confronted by the immigrant family (Mirecki & Chou, 2013).

Mirecki and Chou (2013) explained how children develop into adolescence, where they are open to relationships outside the family. Their background is extended, and their caregivers' variety of answers must adapt to echo this variation. As children continue to mature, they grow the ability to fit in data about their situation and express themselves in more difficult ways that are more adjusted to the exclusive features of the setting (Crittenden, 2000).

Crittenden (2000) reported that flexibility is unavailable in infancy and early childhood. A child of an immigrant family will likely be progressively exposed to the leading culture through the classroom, peer groups, and social media, among other experiences (Mirecki & Chou, 2013). Children can impact their interpersonal approaches with the enlarged introduction to the new culture. As a result, the association and purpose of attachment approaches may have significant costs (Crittenden, 2000). A possible added layer of complexity may exist as children of immigrant families continue to extend their contexts within the new culture and the choice of their developmental interpersonal attachments (Mirecki & Chou, 2013).

Currently, it is commonly established that the aptitudes of symbolization, metallization, and referential processing start to be learned during infancy and early childhood, and though innate dispositional elements may be involved, the improvement of these aptitudes and their role in affect regulation are deeply influenced by the parent's reaction and the excellence of the child's attachment relationships (Taylor, 2010). Studies present evidence that the emergence of symbolic abilities and reflective functioning are enhanced in children with secure attachments to parents (Fonagy & Target, 1997; Kobak & Sceery, 1988). Early childhood experience of attachment impacts the attainment of linguistic and the growth of imagination, which has a main

influence on the child's developing ability to regulate affect (Taylor et al., 1997). In a longstanding study, insecurely attached and disorganized children presented an interruption in evolving a metalizing language to express emotions and other inner states (Lemche et al., 2004).

The relationship between a disorganized attachment style and the excellence of youngsters' reasoning functioning has been established in different studies (Lyons-Ruth & Jacobvitz, 1999). Jacobsen et al. (1994) observed the relationship between attachment security assessed at age 7 and later reasoning functioning in a 10-year longitudinal research evaluating 85 Icelandic youngsters. The study presented that disorganized children and other insecure children varied from secure children on Piagetian tasks evaluating concrete and formal operational reasoning from 7 to 15 years of age. These cognitive variances by attachment group vanished when self-confidence was controlled. Additional results, though, show that in the subsection of formal operational processes that measured syllogistic reasoning, disorganized style youngsters varied meaningfully from additional secure and insecure youngsters from ages 9 to 17, and these changes remained when self-assurance, IQ, and attention difficulties were added in the evaluation (Jacobsen et al., 1994). Jacobsen et al. (1994) proposed that disorganized children may achieve poorly because they are mainly susceptible to dysregulated thought processes produced by their anxieties regarding the reactions of others. Jacobsen et al. (1994) followed 35 children in Germany over 5 years and researched the association with attachment and with self-regulatory abilities related to cognitive functioning. Compared to other children, those classified as having a disorganized attachment had the most difficulty waiting on a standard delay-of-gratification task.

Academic problems may be present for children suffering difficulties with cognitive functioning due to disorganized attachment (Lyons-Ruth & Jacobvitz, 1999). Children between

ages five to seven classified as having disorganized attachment present with lower mathematics scores and lower academic self-esteem at age eight than children classified as having a secure attachment (Moss et al., 1998). Jacobsen et al. (1994) stated the relationship amid the disorganized attachment style and arithmetic performance vanished after children's self-confidence with schoolwork was controlled for. Jacobsen et al. (1994) explained that based on children's answers to a separation story and observations made by independent observers, attachment representations and self-confidence were assessed at age seven. Based on a battery of Piagetian chores assessing concrete and formal reason, youths' cognitive operation was measured at ages 7, 9, 12, 15, and 17 (Jacobsen et al., 1994).

Findings suggested that children with a secure attachment representation were favored in their cognitive performance in childhood and adolescence (Jacobsen et al., 1994). Mainly disadvantaged on deductive reasoning tasks were those children with an insecure-disorganized attachment representation. The study concluded that when assessing cognitive functioning, self-assurance played an important but fluctuating part in mediating the effects of attachment representations. Additionally, outcomes specified that youngsters with insecure-disorganized attachment representations seemed to have access to higher levels of reasoning but under supportive conditions. This may indicate that familiar content may have facilitated formal logical competence in these youths (Jacobsen et al., 1994).

In his study about attachment and development, Sroufe (2005) concluded that attachment is significant in a universal, organismic interpretation of development because of its place at the start of these difficult developments. Sroufe added that it is inappropriate to think attachment variants cause some results. However, child attachment is vital by virtue of its role in starting development alleyways and its association with so numerous important developing purposes—

93

social understanding, stimulation regulation, emotional control, and cognitive functioning (Sroufe, 2005). It is not presumed that both history and present circumstances are important but also that established patterns of adaptation may be transformed by new experiences while, at the same time, new experiences are framed by, interpreted within, and even in part created by prior history of adaptation (Sroufe, 2005).

Therefore, children who have disruptions in their attachments, such as immigrant children, are impacted in various areas of their lives. Impact identified by Sroufe (2005) concerning children with anxious histories and avoidant and resistant attachment styles included changes in child adaptation, symptoms of depression, intense vulnerability, and displayed less flexibility. They were perceived as helpless, passive, and easily frustrated, less persistent in social problems, and often applied the coping strategy of leaving the situation. In addition, Sroufe (2005) identified other behaviors such as isolation, asocial, "emotionally insulated" (p. 359), highly dependent, angry, displaying low expectations concerning their compliance, not likely to be involved in friendships, behavioral problems, and easily frustrated (Sroufe, 2005).

Family and Attachment

Van Ecke (2006) reported a relationship of insecure unresolved attachment to living apart from family of origin. From Bowen's family systems perspective, researchers reported that immigrants have a higher amount of unresolved attachment than non-immigrants living close to their family of origin (van Ecke et al., 2005). The points of conceptual agreement among attachment theory and intergenerational family systems theory are not small; instead, they are vital to each in that they agree on the power of interpersonal and family relationships as vital to healthy and troubled development (Holmes, 1993, 1996; Von Sydow, 2002).

Additionally, there are analogies between intergenerational family systems theory and an essential principle of attachment theory (van Ecke, 2006). Human growth is understood as a purpose for relationships and relationships as part of a system kept together by contrasting forces that are biological (Bowen, 1985; Bowlby, 1988). Van Ecke et al. (2006) reported a relationship of insecure unresolved attachment to living apart from family of origin. John Bowlby carved his theory on attachment from the same standpoint that Murray Bowen wrote his model on intergenerational family systems (van Ecke, 2006). Both theories conceptualize relationships as part of a system held together by opposing forces that are organic in nature and human development as a role of relationships (Bowen, 1985, 1999; Bowlby, 1988). Bowlby's attachment theory has developed widely as an example precisely because it exclusively sustains the need to bond from an evolutionary perspective with physiological and psychological components (van Ecke, 2006).

Both theories are based on the postulation that individuals are a product of evolution and that human conduct is considerably controlled by the same natural procedures that control the performance of all other living things (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). Bowlby and Bowen perceived the family as a natural system (Holmes, 1993; Kerr & Bowen, 1988). In Murray Bowen's family systems, becoming a differentiated individual means achieving an equilibrium between the appeal toward togetherness and the drive toward separation. The goal is for the individual to become independent within the system, which he calls differentiated. The power of *togetherness* can be seen as similar to the safety-seeking behavior in Bowlby's attachment theory. In attachment theory, the healthy individual maintains the same balance. This state is called secure in John Bowlby's attachment theory, caused by the activated attachment system when the individual can manage to resolve the anxiety. An activated attachment system means there is a

threat of loss, separation, or rejection. When this is the case, the individual uses various defenses to stay connected (van Ecke, 2006).

As presented by van Ecke (2006), in Bowen's intergenerational family systems theory, the consequence of an imbalance between togetherness and separation forces in the family system is experienced as anxiety within the individual. Bowen clearly recognized the need for balance, as he did the physiological and psychological aspects of family relationships. Imbalance creates anxiety. Equally experienced as anxiety within the person is the result of imbalance described by Bowen (van Ecke, 2006). Bowen extended that description as the consequence of the imbalance between intimacy and separation in the family system. In the family system, Bowen identified the importance of balance and family relationships' physiological and psychological traits. Bowen defined high levels of anxiety or a persistent anxious mood as fusion. Fusion means the individual's feelings drive the intelligent capability (Bowen, 1985). Fusion means the individual's intellectual capacity is driven by the emotion (van Ecke, 2006). Bowlby (1973) suggested that attachment behavior is activated when the youngster's or adult's attachment needs are unmet.

Attempting to evade dissatisfaction and suffering produced by attachment-figure inaccessibility, the person uses disabling tactics to retain the attachment system disengaged or controlled. This deactivation requires rejecting attachment needs, steering clear of closeness and interdependence in relationships, and separating oneself from threats that can cause undesirable activation of the attachment system (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Anxiety manifests in a person responding in different ways, which is the definition of activation of attachment behavior. As a consequence, the person responds by getting away from the attachment need (dismissive),

turning up the effort to meet the need (preoccupied), or stays unresolved, which is remaining shocked and confused as to what to do to get their needs met (van Ecke, 2006).

Van Ecke (2005) reported results of a greater occurrence of unresolved attachment among immigrants. Unresolved attachment presented by an immigrant family or individual may be addressed by Bowen's therapeutic techniques (van Ecke, 2006). Comas-Diaz (2001) concluded that immigrants are in greater danger having been displaced, separated, and showing to coercion. Immigrant families experience significant stressors, and parents may respond by withdrawing from the family members and feeling overcome by their experience of deportation (Artico, 2003; Falicov, 1998; Flores, 1992).

The penalties of separation due to deportation are presented in research as negative for youngsters when separated from parents, counting attachment problems, depressing reactions, and behavioral difficulties (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002). Adam and Chase-Lansdale (2002) concluded that parent-child departure generates uncertainty inside the family atmosphere, which is the root of severe stress for the youngsters. The sense of safety and the skill to cope positively with stressors present at each developmental stage get interrupted by the intensity of the stress (Adam & Chase-Lansdale, 2002). Children's challenges are seen in the literature as the trials of being separated from their parents and the consequences of where they lived during that separation (Mitrani et al., 2004).

Bowlby (1959) promoted the idea of the influence of associations and our human wish to have a significant connection with another person and to connect. In addition, both theories assume that the separation of parent-child promotes unpredictability within the family setting causing severe stress for the youngsters (Adam & Chase-Lansdale, 2002; Bowlby, 1969). Beckles Flores (2011) described the changes in bonds with family members and parent-child

relationships during the experience of parent deportation. These changes can include strengthening bonding upon reunification, parental withdrawal upon reunification, or the children experiencing feelings of ambivalence regarding their parent's return.

Separation anxiety was identified as a normal reply to a present danger or a different danger of loss (Robertson & Bowlby, 1952). According to Bowlby (1988), when a child has experienced a loss, the child may react through three phases to the separation: despair, protest, and renunciation or disinterest. Especially for elder offspring and teenagers, Bowlby (1988) added wrath in the presence of abandonment threats. Given the many studies above, what is the answer to the question, "How does separation of immigrants impact their children's attachment experience?" According to every study, to one degree or another, it is negative. In fact, the studies revealed an array of effects ranging from physiological impacts on the brain and body with higher cortisol levels lasting for decades (Jones-Mason et al., 2021) to the psychological and psychosocial impacts of depression, grief, anxiety, externalized behavior, and others (Adam & Chase-Lansdale, 2002; Bowlby, 1969; Jones-Mason et al., 2021; Venta et al., 2020). The longer and the more stressful the separation, and the more heightened the ambiguity of the situation, the more impact it has on the children, regardless of their age (Jones-Mason et al., 2021). Therefore, the separation impacts the attachment style that the children develop and can result in attachment styles that are associated with internalized emotions and externalized behaviors that negatively impact their present and future lives. However, this impact is not limited to them; their whole family system is affected. The next chapter explores how the family system is affected in detail.

CHAPTER IV: HOW DOES SEPARATION OF IMMIGRANTS INFLUENCE THEIR FAMILY SYSTEM?

The issue of separation of immigrant families by deportation is fairly new in research, and the impact needs to be extensively explored (Hagan et al., 2008). The lack of information on this topic is accredited to the inability to find or pinpoint people deported without government involvement, defaulting the process. To completely comprehend how a household is impacted by deportation, one need to consider similar experiences through writings that search family separation differently. For example, the sudden, unintentional, and unintended environment of family separation due to refugee/war experiences mirrors the family system's circumstances after the deportation of a parent (Hagan et al., 2008).

General Concepts of Family Systems Theory

The family systems theory was initially developed by Murray Bowen, a developer of family psychotherapy (Haefner, 2014). From 1946 to 1954, Bowen observed relational patterns in families of patients diagnosed with schizophrenia and developed his family theory (Haefner, 2014). By 1975, Bowen refined his theory and developed a transgenerational approach with a perspective that presents family patterns and difficulties inclined to recur over generations (Haefner, 2014). Bowen identified that families have their own emotional systems to provide a manner to diminish tension and preserve stability. Bowen believed lingering anxiety is the basis of family dysfunctions (Haefner, 2014).

By 1975, Bowen refined his model while at Georgetown University Medical Center and founded the Georgetown Family Center (Haefner, 2014). Bowen had a transgenerational approach with a perspective that presents family patterns and difficulties inclined to recur over generations. Bowen identified families have their emotional systems to provide a manner to

diminish tension and preserve stability. Bowen believed lingering anxiety is the basis of family dysfunctions (Haefner, 2014).

One key concept of Bowen's theory denotes the capability of an individual to discriminate themselves from the family of origin on an individual and knowledgeable degree. He called it *emotional fusion* (Bowen, 1978). The notion of *differentiation of self* is defined as the skill a person possesses to function separately from their family by building self-focused choosing while still associated emotionally with significant relationships in the family (Bowen, 1978). Bowen (1976) added that "A poorly differentiated person is trapped within a feeling world . . . and has a lifelong effort to get the emotional life into livable equilibrium" (p. 67).

The above concepts are part of Bowen's eight connecting forces that shape the family functioning in his theory (Haefner, 2014). Another of those forces is *triangles,* which he defined as a three-person connection that can soothe a two-person structure (dyad) feeling nervousness. *The nuclear family emotional system* is what Bowen described as the four elementary outlines of emotional working in an only generation: married struggle, dysfunction in one partner, damage in one or more youngsters, and emotional detachment. Another concept adopted by Bowen is the *family projection process,* which is the main course where parents pass along their psychological difficulties to a youngster. This process integrates three steps: the parent is full of dread that there is something wrong with a child; the parent takes the youngster's performance as approving their dread; and the parent treats the youngster as if somewhat is not right with the youngster (Haefner, 2014). Added is the notion of *emotional cutoff* that manifests when a family member cannot minimize or handle their unsettled emotional concerns with parents or additional family members and completely cuts off emotional interaction by limiting physical contact or by physically relocating (Haefner, 2014). *The multi-generational transmission process* is a family

projection process enduring over multiple generations. According to Bowen (1978), on this force, youngsters absorb the patterns of an emotional procedure alike to their outlines but with minor alterations. Bowen (1978) suggested these family customs and family principles can be either helpful or harmful.

On the force of *sibling position*, Bowen (1978) gave recognition to William Toman (1961), who established a sibling outline for respectively location in an effective family. According to Bowen (1978), the youngest child tends to follow while the oldest child tends toward a leadership position. The last force is *societal regression (societal emotional process).* In this concept, Bowen applied his theory to social organizations. He reported that society matches anxiety with the stress of the family (Haefner, 2014).

The separation of emotions from rational thinking, in other words, the ability to think through a situation, is defined as *autonomy* by Bowen. On the other end, *undifferentiated ego mass* implied emotional dependence on the family of origin, regardless of the geographical distance, "emotional stuck-togetherness of families" (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, pp. 94-95). According to Kerr and Bowen (1988) and Bowen (1985), the emotional system functions as if it is ruled by the interaction of two counterbalancing life powers, which they describe as individuality and togetherness.

Bowen (1976) stated that the observation of the details of family connections could reveal what family members think, feel, and say, and this mirrors an emotional practice that relates to the family as a whole. This emotional practice is expected to be regulated by the interaction of a force that inclines individuals to follow their own directives and be independent and a force that inclines them to reply to information from others and be connected. Bowen (1976) defined this as the "Differentiation of Self Scale." Bowen explained that people have all

degrees of differentiation of self and that individuals at one level have remarkably dissimilar lifestyles from those at other levels (Bowen, 1976). For Bowen, harmonizing individuality and togetherness is the differentiation of self-balance (Bowen, 1976). Differentiation is the process of freeing oneself from one's family's processes to define oneself. This means being able to have different opinions and values than one's family members but being able to stay emotionally connected to them (Kerr & Bowen, 1988).

Bowen (1978) defined *fusion* as dysfunctional family relationships among the family members. Bowen suggested that the chronic anxiety level is interrelated with the level of differentiation of self (Haefner, 2014). He suggested that individuals with chronic anxiety used four ways to address it: 1) engagement in marital conflict; 2) developing health or emotional problems; 3) focusing on health or behavioral problems of their children; or 4) triangulating other persons into the relationship. Each household seems to cope with anxiety by selecting from these four methods, but the goal is to reduce the degree of lingering anxiety experienced (Miller et al., 2004).

Paradox or Disadvantage of Family System

Rothbaum et al. (2002) emphasized the significance of grounding family theory in Western thoughts and experiences. They explained the use of the term *Western* due to the selection of European and North American cultures in which the theory has been tested. According to their findings, it is not recommended to accept that the theory applies to other cultures because the theoretical notions have not been regularly tested in other cultures. Tamura and Lau (1992) and other researchers identified Western bias evident in family systems theory (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Spence, 1985; Tamura & Lau, 1992).

Family systems theory highlights the adaptive dangers in mother-child interactions that are too close. The judgmental labels given to this type of association are overinvolved, entangled, undistinguishable, excessively dependent, and symbiotic (Rothbaum et al., 2002). Indication from Japan proposes that really close bonds between mother and youngster are more common, seemingly as adaptive, and the children report experiencing fewer contrary results from such relations than do offspring in the West (Rothbaum et al., 2002).

Family systems thinkers have indicated that the "enmeshed mother/disengaged father syndrome" is common in dysfunctional families (Nichols & Schwartz, 1998, p. 249). Minuchin and Nichols (1998) were clear about the significance of this condition, "The signature arrangement of the troubled middle-class family (in when) a mother's closeness to her children substitutes for closeness in the marriage" (p. 121). Marvin and Stewart (1990) were very clear in describing "one of the most common maladapted family structures" (p. 78) recognized by family systems theorists:

> mother and (at least one) child are overinvolved or enmeshed (Minuchin, 1974). This enmeshed relationship is usually characterized by a number of the following: reciprocally intrusive, controlling behavior on the part of mother and child; much insecurity and distress on the part of both over real or threatened separation; treatment of the child as if they were younger than is actually the case; a strong tendency for one or both to speak for the other and assume knowledge of what the other is thinking and feeling without "checking it out" (a really palpable lack of psychological boundaries); role reversals in attachment and caregiving behaviors; an inability to resolve conflict . . . (and a) degree of intimacy with one another inappropriate to their relative ages and positions in the family (p. 79).

Rothbaum et al. (2002) reported that certain characteristics of ambivalently attached youngsters seem to lead to developing enmeshed relationships with their parents. These youngsters are described as particularly challenging or worried with obtaining and getting and maintaining their caretaker's attention (Belsky & Cassidy, 1994; Kunce & Shaver, 1994); they have trouble maintaining boundaries between their own distress and other people's distress, and they do all they can to avoid separation (Fraley & Shaver, 1999). Because of these children's behavior, it is easy to comprehend how the caregiver can develop entangled with them. According to Kochanska (2001), even in infancy and contrary to other children whose fearfulness decreases, ambivalent youngsters are very dreadful, and their worriedness grows as they arrive early juvenile. These results concerning ambivalent preoccupied individuals and their attachment can impact family functioning (Rothbaum et al., 2002). Rothbaum et al. (2002), but results come from Western nations.

Rothbaum et al. (2002) concluded that the social competence and sensitivity displayed by individuals who have secure attachment and insecure-ambivalent attachment are expressed and conceptualized differently in other countries. For example, according to U.S. philosophers, Rothbaum et al. (2002) indicated that refugees in Eastern societies develop from very close and codependent mother-child exchanges that endorse insecure attachment. Furthermore, behaviors related to ambivalent attachment, such as dangerous dependence, are more adaptive in Eastern cultures than in the United States (Rothbaum et al., 2002).

Davies and Cummings (1994) concluded that youngsters' well-being is nurtured when they have exposure to a secure model of their parents' attachment to each other. Youngsters' sense of safety may be partly contingent on parents' attachment to one another (Davies & Cummings, 1994). Spousal distance is more accepted in other countries than in the United States.

Therefore, children in those families may interpret such distant relationships as safer, suggesting that the link between children's functioning and their perceptions of the security of their parents' relationship is more complex. A secure model of the parents' relationship probably differs through cultures (Rothbaum et al., 2002).

Marvin and Stewart (1990) postulated, "there will be frequent conflict within the family regarding how proximity and contact will be organized" (p. 365). However, another study (Byng-Hall, 1999) suggested that struggle amid family members and the manifestation of rage is "a functional part of family life" (p. 627). Rothbaum et al. (2002) reported that U.S. researchers believe that moderate levels of family conflict that are resolved can be regarded as adaptive, but unresolved, high levels of family conflict are dysfunctional.

Family Separation and Detention Center/Children's Environment

Hagan et al., (2008) state that even though crucial in understanding the experience of deportation, prevailing research does not focus on how the experience affects families. However, the few studies available present the grave impact of deportation on families (Hagan et al., 2008). Institutions such as the Royal College of Pediatrics and Child Health (Viner, 2018), the Canadian Pediatric Society (Craft, 2018), the Canadian Medical Association (CMA, 2018), and the International Society for Social Pediatrics and Child Health (2018) intensely responded against the regular separation of immigrant families, expressing worries for the immigrant youngster imprisonment and wellbeing in the United States and their countries to the forefront (Wood, 2018).

The Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG; 2016) estimated that millions of youngsters are impacted each day by individual or parental imprisonment (IAWG, 2016). The detention of immigrants still rests on prevalent human civil rights violations, child mistreatment, abuse, and

torture (UNICEF, 2016). In addition, the absence of transparency about immigration detention is prevalent, significantly obstructing the monitoring of detention practices and policies (Global Detention Project, 2015).

No current study has demonstrated that child detention is valuable to the children or a positive and effective tactic to control immigration (Wood, 2018). Specific U.S. administration policy has included the regular separation and custody of immigrant families in great quantities and without notice or the chance to challenge immigration (Bachega, 2018).

There is substantial worry about the amount of trauma and psychological needs immigrant children have faced previous to U.S. entrance, especially coming from Central America, including long standing generational adverse conditions (Keller et al., 2017). Passage from Mexico to the United States is exhausting and unsafe, with immigrants' reports of being targets of violence, abduction, sexual and physical exploitation, human traffic, coercion, and maltreatment by officers (Vogt, 2013). Securing housing, food, and health care is risky and sometimes dangerous. For example, shelter employees get death threats from both authorities and organized criminals who feel the shelters' purposes obstruct their business activities (Vogt, 2013). Vogt (2013) explained that shelters have turned into places where organized criminals, smugglers, and local gangs find immigrants to kidnap, recruit into Mexico's sex industry, or force into running drugs and weapons in exchange for providing them with a safe passage across the border. The research reaffirms how, when immigrating, individuals are susceptible to kidnapping and considered objects of sexual desire (Vogt, 2013). The sex industry is extremely lucrative, as women and children can be sold more than once to get what the captors desire (Cockcroft, 2010, p. 79).

When describing immigrants seeking medical assistance, Vogt (2013) described it as a necessity that becomes a point of fights and arguments among the local residents since many regard these immigrants as transitory and trespassers. Immigrants are regularly seen as not having a genuine claim to rights, resources, or pity within the communities they pass through. Nourishment is extremely limited, and Vogt (2013) indicated that it is a revenue business in the informal sector, with the creation of places such as the food stalls, carts, and money exchanges that run in transit areas where immigrants gather en route. As an example, Vogt (2013) explained how she interviewed local vendors who made their living by selling goods and services to immigrants; a local man went to one shelter every day to sell plastic cups of fresh marinated seafood (*ceviche*) to immigrants.

In their attempts to travel smuggled on top of trains, immigrants find themselves weak, exhausted, with little food, and often, they fall from the train and have their arms and legs trapped in connectors and wheels and cut off from their bodies (Vogt, 2013). The compounding experience of harmful social health factors and increasing adverse experiences places the children in imminent danger of developmental, mental, and physical damage as they reach the U.S.-Mexico border (Felitti et al., 1998).

Concerns about the custody of youngsters at the U.S. border (Wood, 2018). The AAP (2017) stated that the rudimentary values of maintenance for immigrant youngsters in custody have not happened. Unacceptable circumstances in processing centers involved insufficient washing and lavatory services, continuous light contact, youngsters sleeping on concrete grounds, repossession of properties, scarce food, refusal of access to medical care, absence of psychological care, and addition of corporeal and emotional mistreatment. Additionally, there is evidence of the performance of health evaluations and medical history without the presence of

parents (Linton et al., 2017). For imprisoned youngsters, it also included the habit of the "no touch" rules intended to stop unsuitable physical interaction (Phillips, 2018). With the possible intention to protect unaccompanied children but grudging much undeveloped youngsters of physical contact can increase stress and suffering in these children (Wood, 2018). Hidden, undertreated, aggravated, and new-onset health conditions are increased by such conditions. Though with safe and hygienic settings, studies are clear that separation of susceptible children from their parents may convey severe costs (Bowlby & Robertson, 1953).

Szalavitz (2011) defined that circumstances provoking a feeling of strong terror and powerlessness are the basis of developing trauma in childhood. Traumatic stress reactions are best noticed as a series and reliant on a variety of features of the traumatic event(s), internal youngster flexibility, and the post-trauma setting of the youngster (De Thierry, 2015). Type I trauma happens mainly next a time-limited experience of a dangerous event. Type II trauma is described by a recurrent, lengthy traumatic experience (Terr, 1991). Type III trauma happens when a youngster experiences numerous, unescapable, lengthy, fierce actions starting at an early age, including in the mother's utero, such as domestic aggression during gestation, making a very aggressive setting for development (Heide & Solomon, 1999). It is extremely vital to identify diverse methods and harshness of hostile infantile experiences as a conductor to the degree of traumatic stress and harm to the evolving youngster's brain (Wood, 2018).

Recent studies (Venta et al., 2020) reported that areas in Central America such as Honduras, Ecuador, and San Salvador are a triage of "critically, rampant gang/cartel violence" (p. 475). However, the U. S. government does not identify them on existing immigration policies as representative of harassment or conflict, and families being directed for gang enrolment or sensual exploitation are not automatically approved refugee or asylum assistance from

deportation in the United States, reinforcing the layers of trauma received by these individuals (Venta et al., 2020).

According to Jones-Mason et al. (2021), anxiety and trauma are not solitary trials in the lives of immigrant youngsters. Stress and trauma are snowballing for them. The immigrant families at the border are escaping war, ferocity, and scarcity or some other cause of trauma enough to make a hazardous voyage to the United States. Consequently, parent and youngster are practically sure to have the physical and emotional costs of previous traumatic experiences. Information from the Office of Inspector General (2019) show that violence is almost universally found among children arriving in the United States. Violence, such as kidnapping, rape, and physical abuse, is all too common (Office of Inspector General, 2019).

Walsdorf et al. (2022) questioned many adults in the Latinx community who were of mixed immigration status. Some participants were undocumented, others had limited permanent status, and others were full citizens. Some who were undocumented or were of limited status had citizen children and/or were under the DACA program. Unique in the study, the researchers found that there was a negative impact on those who had legal status, especially the children, when they saw the news and the trickledown effect from Trump era policies that played out with bullying and racism in their everyday lives. They experienced vicarious trauma through witnessing others being separated or simply deported and/or mistreated (Walsdorf et al., 2022).

Being detained for extended periods of time without adequate accommodations, deprived of supporting relationships that help decrease stress and enhance resilience, and experiencing separation from the parents or primary caregivers, create the conditions for toxic stress and severe, complex trauma (Wood, 2018). How many children have been or continue to be separated from their parents is still in question, despite that the U.S. government has been

mandated to reunify them (Jones-Mason et al., 2021). According to Jones-Mason et al. (2021), through the separation from parents, particularly when kept at a facility, the children probably experience deficiency or an absence of one-on-one care. An indispensable experience to normative development, particularly in the initial stages of development, is the recurrent contact with a specified caregiver.

Youngsters in a facility most likely live in stressful circumstances. As they probably will regularly face challenging conditions, the children do not have realistic options to face the stresses but to experience physiological arousal. For offspring who have experienced previous hardship, such as early separation from parents, their reactions may be even more powerful (Jones-Mason et al., 2021). These authors reported that youngsters separated from their parents at the border confront issues similar to those of immigrant youngsters separated from parents by ICE raids, such as absence of information regarding their parents' situation and safety, uncertainty about the length of the separation, and uncertainty ever seeing their parents again.

Families are significantly impacted when such children's complex patterns of protective responses are threatened, including outcomes of hyperarousal and hypoarousal (Cassidy & Shaver, 2002). Under those circumstances, children tend to respond, depending on the length of the separation, by detaching from the parents. Some children, experiencing despair, may be ambivalent or hostile to toward their parents upon reunion and may take longer to rebuild their connection to parents (Wood, 2018). Other children who are more detached may reject parents or relate to them as if they were strangers (Bowlby & Robertson, 1953).

Abrego (2016) reported that child-parent separations by deportation forces parents to have to reconnect with their children and reinstate parental authority during their reunification. Similarly, imprisoned or deported parents have to reestablish their connections to the children

upon return. Parents are challenged to, besides making sense of their detention and deportation experiences, reconnect with their families, adjust to any changes in their roles in the family, and re-engage in providing for the family's financial and emotional needs (Brotherton & Barrios, 2011; Dreby, 2006; Dreby & Adkins, 2010).

Participants of a research of 50 adults deported to the Dominican Republic, leaving spouses and children in the U.S., described feelings of abandonment, estrangement, suicidal thinking, depression, and isolation. Most of the participants reported trauma related to their treatment by U.S. government agencies and reported difficulty finding employment due to the negative connotation of being deported (Brotherton & Barrios, 2009).

Participants in a study exploring the experiences of Latinx adults who had a parent deported when they were youngsters identified that after deportation, the family experience was as if everything fell apart; they did not know what to do, the family sensed detachment and did not know how to find an emotional connection (Taschman & Muruthi, 2020). Additionally, the authors report that most participants described losing their family traditions and routines. Those times that were naturally celebrated as a family in the past lost their meaning and connection. The participants of this study believed that even with family disagreements or conflict related to the changes being experienced, their families were able to find connection to cope with the separations (Taschman & Muruthi, 2020).

Likewise, children could develop hypoarousal, such as dissociative responses, numbing, self-harm, passive obedience, and poor cognitive functioning (Siegel, 1999). Cook et al. (2005) concluded that the PTSD diagnosis does not capture the nuances of complex trauma and misses, for example, the influence of trauma on pre-verbal youngsters, and it should not be used as unique indicator of trauma response. The long-lasting impact of stress hormones over

youngsters' bodies threatens permanent consequences to their development and health (Wood, 2018).

Studies show that a child's exposure to significant adversity may face increased risk of over three times lifetime the danger of lung cancer, three and a half times risk of ischemic heart illness, and up to a 20-year decrease in life expectancy (Felitti et al., 1998). Other conditions, such as autoimmune disease, cancer, diabetes, and numerous other health difficulties, have been directly associated to toxic stress (Wood, 2018). Disturbingly, the stronger consequences associated with childhood adversity influence the next generation, particularly substance misuse, violence, and mental illness (Hughes et al., 2017). According to Deater-Deckard (2004), the child and parent influence each other, and their bidirectional relationship impacts each other's behaviors. The parent-child bidirectional influences are much more complex when the family stressors are not single events. Sudden complex events accompanied by changes in children's health, behavior, and emotional state bring on parenting stress, negatively impacting how parents relate with the children and how the entire family copes with and adapts to the different events (Deater-Deckard, 2004).

Studies that included deported immigrants from El Salvador show that deportation disturbs the family of the deported in many ways (Hagan et al., 2008). When a parent is deported, the terror of deportation is felt by the rest of the family and permeates in the immigrant community. The remaining family members avoid being in public due to fear of deportation but also due to now limited financial resources (Hagan et al., 2010, 2011).

Hagan et al. (2008) alluded to changes in family structure impacting the families that struggle to cope with changes in parental structure and acceptance of their status as a transnational family (Hagan et al., 2008). According to Dreby (2010), transnational families are

described as "individual families who are divided by international borders and who maintain significant emotional and economic ties in two countries" (p. 4). Zentgraf and Stoltz (2012) added that parents who immigrate across international borders and leave their children behind frequently defend their choice to do so on the grounds that the children and, in some cases, other household members, such as aging parents, lives will be better than if they had remained. The researchers continue reporting that regardless of the physical separation, many parents seek to retain their status as parents by carrying out old meanings of parenting in new ways or generating new definitions of what it means to be a parent without the advantage of physical proximity (Zentgraf & Stoltz, 2012). If successful as financial providers for their family throughout immigration, the parent believes they have made a valuable sacrifice by leaving their children. Nonetheless, deportees are unable to support their families in the U.S. financially and deportation does not allow them to be successful in their role as financial provider (Dreby, 2012). This is a significant disadvantage for the parents who struggle to maintain emotional bonds from a distance (Golash-Boza, 2014). In addition, as described by Zentgraf and Stoltz (2012), it is difficult to predict the costs and benefits of global immigration ahead of time.

The children are the ones most intensely affected by family structure changes. Research that primarily focuses on the impression of deportation on the family has found that a parent's deportation harmfully impacts a youngster's well-being (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012). Findings suggest that children are impacted both psychologically and emotionally by a parent's unexpected absence and probably will display poor attendance and academic performance (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012). Dreby (2012) reported that the development of a household led by a female single parent is one of the most devastating impacts of deportation. Females, who are usually also unauthorized immigrants, find themselves unexpectedly losing an employed

husband and unable to depend on support services designed as a temporary solution for families, such as workers' compensation, food stamps, or Social Security (Dreby, 2012). Dreby (2012) also reported that undocumented parents do not seek benefits of social services, available to the U.S.-born children, because of fears of revealing their undocumented status in the application forms required.

Additionally, Berger Cardoso et al. (2018) indicated that undocumented immigrants described how often their children had to take on significant responsibilities to help their families, including language brokering and family protection. Parents in the study reported that their children assumed responsibility for monitoring their immigration status; they experienced role reversal contributing to a shift in power dynamics. Older children needed to go to work to help the family, and they started caring for the youngest in the household (Berger Cardoso et al., 2018; Jones-Mason et al., 2021). From research led by national and international non-governmental organizations, precise data on the impact deportation has on the family can be found; however, academic studies have also delivered valuable knowledge relating to subjects and shapes that emerge during a family's deportation experience (Rodriguez & Hagan, 2013). An Urban Institute (Chaudry et al., 2010) report demonstrated the consequences of deportation on the lives of approximately 200 youngsters. The short- and longstanding variations amid youngsters are argued in this study. For example, with those changes, they found increased incidents of crying, worry, and rage. Additionally, they presented significant variations in the general and financial solidity of the family (Deckard (2004 et al., 2010). Alike outcomes were established in the research by the First Focus and Human Rights Watch organizations (Cervantes & Lincroft, 2010; Parker & Root, 2009).

Research on the psychological health of refugees in immigration detention has shown the negative consequences of detention. A methodical evaluation of investigators from the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia exploring the impression of immigration detention on the emotional health of youngsters, adolescents, and adults concluded that research steadily "supported an association between the experience of immigration detention practices and poor mental health. . . . (finding that) detention itself (has) an independent adverse effect on mental health" (Robjant et al., 2009, p. 310).

Deportation and U.S. Children

As estimated by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2011), there are around 11.5 million undocumented immigrants residing in the U.S., with most immigrants coming from Mexico. It is also assessed that 5.1 million youngsters in the United States have an undocumented parent (Passel & Taylor, 2010), and close to 80% of these youngsters are U.S. born (Passel & Taylor, 2010). De Minzi (2009) indicated that the lack of a parent could be concerning as parents are key in a youngster's emotional, psychological, and physical development. To avoid children growing developmentally affected or falling behind at school, teachers, counselors, and other agencies should provide adequate and necessary services (Gonzalez & Morgan Consoli, 2012).

Many of immigrant families have a mix of legal statuses. Families consisting of undocumented individuals and legal residents account for closely nine million persons (Passel & D'Vera Cohn, 2009). Out of this amount, undocumented adults make up 3.8 million people, and undocumented youngsters are half a million (Passel & D'Vera Cohn, 2009). The rest of the population represents U.S. citizens or legal residents, mostly youngsters (Passel & D'Vera Cohn, 2009). These statistics can be observed in the living make-up of undocumented families where

more than half of all undocumented homes include children; 47% of homes include couples and children; and 13% of homes with a different family system still has children at home (Passel & D'Vera Cohn, 2009).

The *Removals Involving Illegal Alien Parents of United States Citizen-Children Report* at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2009) indicated that amid 1998 and 2007, 108,434 undocumented parents had been repatriated (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2009). However, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security office reported that all data collected by ICE forces were attained through occurrences in which an ICE law enforcement willingly gathered data about parents and their youngsters. Because of this, information collection was occasional and unreliable and must be measured an imperfect measure of the deported parents. Additionally, ICE reported that they could not assure that an immigrant was expressing the fact around their standing as a parent as officers have confidence that countless immigrants were frightened of giving data that might lead to additional hostile effects amongst residual household members. Similarly, all those parents who were deported or left under conditions in which citizenship status was not primarily related to a lawful issue were excluded (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2009).

A newer ICE (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2012) document, the *Deportation of Parents of U.S.-Born Citizens*, described that from January 1, 2011, to June 30, 2011, ICE monitored the amount of deported persons who had at minimum one child born in the U.S. and determined that in this six-month time frame, 46,486 individuals were deported by ICE (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2012). Deported parents whose households become unintended transnational families confront the decision to either bring their children to their own nation of origin, leave the children in the U.S. with the remaining parent, or try to return illegally

to the U.S. to join their family there, risking severe legal consequences if caught again (Cardoso et al., 2014).

Specific information on the how many U.S.-citizen-children are living with their parents in the parents' country of origin is not available. Passel et al. (2012) estimated that between 5% and 35% of the 1.4 million Mexicans returning to their country from to 2005 and 2010 had done so due to deportation. The authors estimate that 300,000 U.S.-born children were included in that estimate. According to Capps et al., (2007) and Chaudry et al. (2010), the great majority of these children remain in the U.S. under the care of relatives when their parents are deported. Cardoso et al. (2014) reported that this may be due to deportees' anticipation of remigrating instead of remaining separated from their children and spouses.

Cardoso et al. (2014) stated that the development of unintentional transnational households because of deportation has profound and harmful consequences on everyone in the family. According to several studies, aggressive immigration enforcement and deportation programs meaningfully impact mixed-status and lawful immigrant households by snowballing anxiety, stress, depression, and fear. Results added that deportation reinforces social isolation and creates government mistrust in immigrant families and societies (Chaudry et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2011; Rodriguez & Hagan, 2004).

The banishment of parents has lengthy undesirable costs for family financial stability (Capps et al., 2007; Chaudry et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012; First Focus, 2010). Families usually face substantial financial adversity following the apprehension of a household member. This is especially impactful when the main source of the family's income is imprisoned or deported. Alterations in family structure are well-known, with families frequently shifting from a two-

parent, two-income household to a single-parent, frequently female-headed family (Dreby, 2012).

The early signs of family separation displayed in children affected by parental deportation involved eating and sleeping difficulties, community isolation, separation anxiety, and decreasing school achievement (Chaudry et al., 2010; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). The intensity of these symptoms was manifested in youngsters whose parents were detained at home, when the separation lasted more than a month, and the youngster's main caretaker was deported (Chaudry et al., 2010). Studies have demonstrated that Latinx are at risk for numerous stressors such as discrimination, prejudice, acculturative stress, and poor access to healthcare (Finch & Vega, 2003; Sullivan & Rehm, 2005).

Investigation has determined that immigrants who have reside in the United States for an extended time may decrease family unity and traditional ideals such as familismo and parental respect (Gil et al., 2000). A variety of research indicates that cultural factors such as family support and religiosity can be protective factors in the face of deportation (Grant et al., 2000; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2006).

Impact of Family Structure and Well-Being

Parallel to statistics from Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Migración (National Institute of Migration; 2011), Tijuana accepted 81,037 deported people in 2011 (Instituto Nacional de Migración, 2011), a medium of 222 deported persons every day. They added that Tijuana gets more deportees than any other metropolitan in Mexico (Instituto Nacional de Migración, 2011) and countless of these deported people are parents (Instituto Nacional de Migración, 2011). The Human Rights Watch (2009) reported that over one million families have been separated due to deportation.

118

Cardoso et al. (2014) pointed several characteristics that make up transnational families such as families in which household members in separate countries, whether the families are nuclear or extended, and the level of interaction between the family members across borders. To simplify it, Cardoso et al. (2014) defined transnational families as nuclear families (parents and their children) separated between the United States and any other Latin country as a result of deportation (Cardoso et al., 2014).

According to Dreby (2012), family systems may be forever impacted when a parent, typically a father, is deported. The greatest harmful consequence of compulsory departure on youngsters recognized by Dreby's (2012) study was the unexpected change from residing with two parents to having only parent, typically the mother. Most families participating in the study were headed by two parents (Dreby, 2012). Even when, for some subjects in the study, single parenthood was for a short period, family's experienced great adversity in the period surrounding the incident. Some participants identified long-lasting impacts after the family was reunified (Dreby, 2012).

For some youngsters participating in Dreby's (2012) study, a father's deportation impacted permanently the family structure. Dreby (2012) also described some implications as sudden single motherhood, divorce, or permanent separation of fathers after deportation, loss of communication or relationship with the biological father, the integration of a new "father," mothers integrating into the job force, or mothers having two jobs to be able to support the children financially. Many of these mothers had difficulties paying the rent after the deportation incident, and they could not rely on joblessness or worker's compensation (Dreby, 2012). A result of deportation for families then is housing uncertainties (Chaudry et al., 2010).

Numerous fathers in international families frequently use telephone contact, gifts, and payments to stay linked to the youngsters they are not in the same country with anymore (Dreby, 2010), but other fathers do not maintain contact with their children in a transnational family situation (Dreby, 2012). Latinx fathers who are unable to contribute financially may be perceived as ineffective as family breadwinners; this could lead fathers to limit or stop contact with their family members when the fathers are jobless and cannot provide financially. Not having sufficient money to provide for the offspring left behind in the United States, deportee parents struggle to sustain a bond with their children, which triggers the emotional connection to weaken, as shown by the absence of contact with the children and family (Dreby, 2012).

Also, Dreby's (2012) investigation also demonstrated the gendered influence of current deportation policies. Unexpectedly, single mothers need to decide whether to figure out how to reunite their families, including their attempting to bring their spouses back to the United States, or move back to their nation of origin. Single mothers suddenly face the costs of bringing their husbands back, incurring charges for the husband crossing the border; for detention payment; for bail costs; or for legal fees, for example (Dreby, 2012).

Sudden single parenthood leads to changes in a family's day-to-day habits and routines, particularly those involving childcare (Dreby, 2012). In addition, the family encounters changes in their housekeeping habits (e.g., finding a place to do laundry due to not driving and not having washing machines, and changes in children's roles such as babysitting for younger siblings) (Dreby, 2012). Alternatively, the couple may face tension in a long-distance relationship stemming from financial struggle or accusations of infidelity (Menjívar & Agadjanian, 2007).

In their study about the aftermath of deportation, Gonzalez and Morgan Consoli (2012) concluded that the most common lifestyle changes for the family consisted of changes in the

roles that each family member played, including the adoption of new responsibilities. In some cases, children helped more around the house; older children began contributing financially or took over the father's business. Also, it was found that family members usually had to work more hours to survive financially—meaning they spent less time at home and with the children (Gonzalez & Morgan Consoli, 2012).

Additionally, the families in Gonzalez and Morgan Consoli's (2012) study reported that when the father was the one being deported, others, such as employers or businesses, would take advantage of the family they work for or people the family hired, such as auto mechanics or construction workers. Dreby (2012) added that deportation practices have more indirect costs for children who because of fears related to family members' undocumented status, begin to distance themselves from their immigrant identity and cultural heritage (Dreby, 2012). Additionally, though most children were conscious of their parents' legal status, interviewed children defined longstanding emotional trauma afterward reunification with their parents. Children felt externally resentful toward their deported fathers. The deportation more frequently hurts the connection between fathers and their youngsters, leading to more resentment toward fathers as the children get older (Dreby, 2012).

In addition, Dreby (2012) described U.S.-citizen youngsters' awareness that their families could be separated because of deportation laws. Terror of deportation was reported regardless of the children's legal status. Dread of separation was reported, whether it is being related to family separation or separation from their way of life and relationships developed in the United States (Dreby, 2012). The fear of deportation has often been described as a concern about being separated from family and support system (Talavera et al., 2010).

Dreby (2012) reported that 68% of Latinx participants in the study were troubled about themselves, a household member, or a close friend being deported. Those findings attest to the difficulty of separating those who are undocumented immigrants from those who are documented in communities due to the high number of mixed-status families (Abrego & Menjívar, 2011). Dreby (2012) also discovered that youngsters who have not experienced the deportation of a close relative get intensely affected by the threat of deportation. Gonzalez and Morgan Consoli (2012) concluded that the primary emotion that all family member's felt when thinking about separation from a family member, was sadness, but they clarified that each family member appeared to have reacted differently to thoughts of separation. According to them, family members' age, environmental factors, or the stressors at the time seemed to influence their reactions. Participants in their research study identified feelings such as hurt and fear; they saw the event as traumatic, felt confused about what was going on, and were frustrated due to their inability to do anything (Gonzalez & Morgan Consoli, 2012).

Immigrant youngsters from Central America, China, Haiti, Mexico, and the Dominican Republic, in a longitudinal study by Suárez-Orozco et al. (2002), displayed higher depressive symptoms than those who were not separated from a parent during the immigration process. The information collected for this study was derived from an interdisciplinary study of 385 early adolescents. Outcomes of the study conveyed that 85% of the contributors had been disconnected from one or both parents for lengthy time. Results from data collected from youth, parent, and teacher viewpoints of the experience of deportation and reconsolidation provided evidence that the situations and contexts of the separations led to a variety of results (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002). Similarly, studies have concluded that undocumented people experience the stressor of knowing they are vulnerable to deportation, thus creating a bigger danger for other psychological

and physical wellbeing problems (Gonzalez & Morgan Consoli, 2012). However, the fear of deportation prevents many immigrants from seeking any type of help or services (Heyman et al., 2009). A common fear parents reported was the possibility of losing their children's if incarcerated or deported. Support for that fear has been documented since, in 2011, more than 5,100 U.S. youngsters were living in foster care after parents' imprisonment or deportation (Wessler, 2011).

Studies have presented that instability in immigrant families has significant adverse costs to children's welfare (Brown, 2010). As stated by the U.S. Congress, an intact family "is the foundation of a successful society and is an essential institution of a successful society which promotes interests of children" (Administration for Children and Families, n.d., p. 123). According to Brown (2010), there is evidence of an intact family on the welfare of youngsters. For example, family stability through high school has been related to positive outcomes such as high school completion, university registration, and beginning of a healthy sexuality (DeLeire & Kalil, 2002). Likewise, Wu and Thomson (2001) presented that family changes including prolonged exposure to a single-parent home or the extended absence of a father were related with premature sexual activity in teens. Albrecht and Teachman (2003) supported this conclusion; the amount of changes in the home seemed connected to the risk of early premarital sexual activities.

When the family structure is changed by the deportation of a parent, child poverty was reported to increase in from about 7% in homes with both parents present to nearly to 44% in single-parent homes where the mother was the only parent present (Manning & Brown, 2006). Financial deficits increase parental stress impacting parenting (Demo & Fine, 2007) and creating challenges to meet children's basic needs (Amato, 2005).

Family disruption, which often goes along with financial instability and inconsistent parenting, leads to stress, grief, and worry about the family's stability in children and compromises their well-being (Brown, 2010; Carlson & Corcoran, 2001; Demo & Fine, 2007). Unchanging family environments, in which well-adjusted parents have established consistent routines, are optimal for children's functioning (Brown, 2010). Family confusion, such as multiple school placements, parental employment changes, long separation from parental figures, or an intense weakening in parental well-being, are connected to reduced levels of youngster welfare (Teachman, 2008).

Several studies (e.g., Amato, 2005; Hill et al., 2001; Teachman, 2002, 2004) have reported short and long-term benefits to children in intact families. Benefits such as economic resources, parental socialization, and family support significantly impact the family structure and the children's well-being (Amato, 2005; Carlson & Corcoran, 2001; Demo & Fine, 2007).

Dreby (2012) interviewed 110 immigrant children and 91 parents within 80 households. Irrespective of their legal status or their involvement with immigration enforcements, children in these Mexican immigrant homes reported fears related to their families' stability and confusion related to their legal status. Gonzales (2011) indicated that children's awareness of parental legal statuses and their own legal status is better understood by them when they are exposed to external, physical discrimination. This explains differences found in older versus younger immigrants Dreby (2012) questioned. In her study, the older children comprehended legal status issues more clearly. However, the younger immigrant children seemed more aware of immigration status differences in their families. In Dreby's interviews, the younger children were more aware that immigrations status is to be kept confidential and that it is associated with

stigma in spite parents indicating that they did not discuss issues of legal status with their children.

The majority of children in the Dreby (2012) study reported although many desired their friends and others knew their parents spoke Spanish and came from Mexico, they also chose not to identify their mothers and father as immigrants. For example, Dreby quoted one eight-year-old girl who said she wanted to be cautious near others about what she said about her parents' immigrant status. Younger children related stigma to immigration status regardless of their legal status (Dreby, 2012).

Additionally, Dreby (2012) stated that deportation enforcement has more indirect costs for many children who, fearful of deportation, distance themselves from their immigrant inheritance and uniqueness. Equally U.S.-born and undocumented children expressed confusions about their own legal statuses. Additionally, similar to immigrant adults, undocumented students in the Abrego and Menjívar (2011) study and the young children in Dreby's (2012) study reported stigma related to immigration regardless of their legal status. Dreby (2012) reported that most children described pride in their parents' Mexican origins but few reported pride of their parents' immigrant status. Dreby (2012) concluded that the link immigrant children made between immigration and legal status is more harmful for children's identity and sense of self. Youngsters in Mexican immigrant households are often certain that all immigrant families are at danger of deportation due to the influence of news programs that describe worst-case scenarios for families. Dreby (2012) concluded that the overwhelming consequence of the risk of deportation on youngsters and their individuality comes from confusion about immigration and the children's immigrant heritage.

In 2008, a Pew Research Center survey established that 68% of Latinx participants are concerned that they, a household member, or a close friend may be deported. Statistics have demonstrated how Latinx have sensed the intimidation of deportation (Lopez & Minushin, 2008). Since today's immigrant families are primarily composed of members with various legal statuses, the abovementioned results suggest the difficulties in separating undocumented individuals from those who are legal immigrants (Abrego & Menjívar, 2011). In a study about involuntary transnational families, Cardoso et al. (2014) concluded that deportees with offspring in the U.S. are more inclined to try to remigrate compared to deportees that have no offspring in the U.S.: 52.5% compared to 32.9% respectively. These results suggest that transnational family structure is associated with the determination to remigrate. Deportees whose partners are in the United States have 2.7 higher chances of remigrating than those who are not married. The difficulties of having a transnational family is the vital factor for deportees in deciding to remigrate amid deportees (Cardoso et al., 2014).

The New Family Dynamics—Impact of New Family System and Family Relations

According to Gonzalez and Consoli (2012), the deportation of undocumented immigrants from the United States is a topic that has been barely researched despite much attention given in politics and the media. In 2008, Homeland Security reported 358,886 overseas-born immigrants deported from the United States. Additionally, in 2009 Human Rights Watch stated that since 1997, over 1 million families have been separated due to deportation. Considering the consequences that deportation can have on families' financial status and emotional well-being, this high number of divided families is concerning (Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012).

Families, in general, have felt fear or worry for the deported member. Similarly, they were anxious that immigration officers would return to their homes. Families not only were

emotionally impacted, but also they made changes in their lives (Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012). Gonzalez and Consoli (2012) stated that participants in their study had already experienced the deportation of a family member, and not surprisingly, they experienced a greater fear of having another family member deported. In cases where deportees returned, they feared being deported again, and these fears led them to take additional precautions, which sometimes resulted in changing their lifestyles, such as by avoiding work or changing residencies (Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012).

A rising worry for immigrants relates to the billions of dollars being spent on constructing larger fences around the southwestern border of the United States and the enactment of better immigration technology (The White House, August 12, 2010). Not only are border security procedures being strengthened, but in 2003, the U.S. ICE agency was formed to focus on implementing immigration laws such as finding and deporting undocumented immigrants (Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012).

De Genova (2002) stated that statements such as illegal alien and criminal alien have dehumanized immigrants. The side effects of the hostility against Latinx and non-Latinx immigrants have been shown to negatively affect the household welfare and everyday life of immigrants, irrespective of lawful status (Abrego, 2016).

Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo (2013) explained the variances of gender, especially the unequal number of Latinx men directed for deportation. The separation of work and responsibilities in the home has amplified for undocumented women who frequently depend on their spouses and worsened problems confronted by families when the leader of the home is imprisoned or deported (Abrego & Menjívar, 2011; Dreby, 2015a; Menjívar, 2006).

Cardoso et al. (2018) indicated that parenting is an area in which daily stressors may be worsened for undocumented parents. The presence of stress on parents due to everyday challenges exceeds their apparent individual and community resources accessible to deal with those challenges (Abidin, 1992; Belsky, 1984; Cooper et al., 2009). The stress experienced by immigrant parents may impact their skill to cope with their emotions, leading to results like lesser life gratification and depression and anxiety increased (Muslow et al., 2002; Williford et al., 2007). Additionally, immigrant families may face marital problems or a larger probability of split up or divorce (Belsky, 1984), and the use of unsuccessful parenting approaches, such as punitive discipline or disconnection due to the stress of deportation (Deater-Deckard, 2004).

Short- and long-term separations lead parents to attempt to re-establish parental authority and reconnect with their children upon reunion (Abrego, 2016). Youth reported distress related to difficulties connecting with friends, negative views of country of origin, loss of schools they were part of, difficult relationships with parents, and financial problems (Gulbas et al., 2016).

Living with deportation and family separation alters the household practices and how family members interact, not only as well as childrearing practices but also parent-child communications (Abrego, 2016; Dreby, 2015a; Yoshikawa & Kalil, 2011). One area well documented in the literature is language brokering (Morales & Hanson, 2005; Roche et al., 2015). Those youngsters who address language barriers through interpretation for their parents provide a significant assistance to them. While this process may increase parent-child intimacy and family unity (Dorner et al., 2008), having a child as an interpreter for parents may have deeply negative consequences such as the rise of psychological stress in the youth, limitations on the parents' information about the youngsters' school achievement and relationships with peers, and very importantly, reduction in the parenting authority in the process of making decisions

(Martinez et al., 2009). Cardoso et al. (2018) completed research to examine how raising

youngsters in the setting of deportation increased parental stressors for undocumented Latinx

parents. To comprehend parenting practices of undocumented individuals, the researchers

questioned 70 undocumented parents in two Southwest cities in the U.S. from 2012 to 2013.

Cardoso et al. (2018) concluded that deportation might change the roles within the family, and

many families restructure the family unit in general. In the same study, many parents reported

how their children increased participation in household tasks to help the family. Some of the

added responsibilities taken on by children and revealed by the parents included language

brokering and taking charge over tasks to protect the family. Many parents reported that their

deportation took away their authority as parents, leaving them hesitant to exercise it (Cardoso et

al., 2018).

Cardoso et al. (2018) indicated that at times, the amplified everyday home responsibilities

of youngsters and role reversals in these immigrant families changed parental power dynamics

and left parents feeling without any control in the household. Cardoso and associates (2018)

continue reporting that the change in parental power dynamics and control was most seen in

enforcing discipline. The context and fear of deportation risk and arrest as well as fears of losing

their children, impacted parents' decisions about discipline methods to use with their children

(Cardoso et al., 2018). Differences in cultural discipline practices, U.S. regulations concerning

children's discipline, but the children's own awareness of their rights impacted parents'

disciplinary decisions also. A few children in the study have told their parents things such as, "If

you spank or scold me, I am going to call the police, and they are going to deport you" (Cardoso

et al., 2018, p. 10).

Cardoso et al. (2018) also presented descriptions of parents' accounts of how they were concerned that their youngsters spoke about their strategies to defend the parents from deportation and even work to obtain for them legal. The parents described that their youngsters also have taken the responsibility of monitoring parents' behaviors so they would not be searched by immigration officers. This reflected how U.S.-born children have felt responsible for legalizing their parent's immigration status.

Gonzalez and Consoli (2012) reported that families of deportees stated they established emotional support from friends and family. Equally, they acknowledged that they received support from a friend or extended family member receiving cash from them while at the exile center or for the deportee's family to reside at someone else's house. Also, they reported receiving help from friends who knew people who could help them or from lawyers (Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012).

The concept of *familismo* stands out as an asset despite the negative effects that the deportation of a family member had on the rest of the family. Providing support to other family members seems to be the priority for families after the deportation. This support is an attempt to guarantee the family's cohesiveness. For example, to prevent a mother from feeling depressed to support her children emotionally, other family members might serve as motivators (Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012). This extent of the value of *familismo* on families experiencing deportation of a member is a source of strength, which has been described extensively for all Latinx communities (Carranza, 2007; Clauss-Ehlers & Wibrowski, 2007; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2006).

While reunification after separation from deportation is typically identified with relief and joy, it is frequently intertwined with contrary emotions. The family members generally articulate feelings of confusion. On occasion, the youngsters report not knowing the parent and

describe feeling like they are meeting a stranger. Children may show fear of the parent who they have not seen in many years. When the family has grown with the addition of new members, the child's difficulty connecting with new parental figures and siblings makes the reunification process more difficult (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002).

In the same manner that many studies find that infantile trauma, exploitation, and hardship can deeply impact youngsters' wellbeing and growth, much research has shown that countless children are particularly, with time, capable of overcoming severe danger and difficulty (Laurent et al., 2014; Masten, 2001).

Masten's (2001) interpretations come from early studies' reactions that related resilient individuals with labels like "invincible," "invulnerable," and even "super kids." The primary assumptions here were that resilient children had something extraordinary that allowed them to grow above circumstances that ordinary children would crumble under (Masten, 2001). Following that belief, Werner and Smith (1992) completed a longitudinal study with Hawaiian children born in 1955 on the island of Kauai. As elements of resilience, the researchers identified environmental aspects comprising small families, large age differences among siblings, availability of caregivers (other than the mother), and the employment status of the mother (Werner & Smith, 1992). An additional significance of the study was that the researchers observed precise assets that the individuals displayed, like good health, relative autonomy, good sensorimotor-language development, and pro-social behaviors (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Werner & Smith, 1992). Werner and Smith (1982) concluded by naming these resilient children as "vulnerable but invincible" (p. 98).

Masten (2001) has a different assumption. The research intensely advocated that resilience is a result of human adaptive systems that everyone possesses. Masten (2001)

continued, stating that the acceptance of statements that resilience is extraordinary suggests that normal human adaptation lacks the capacity to help us cope with difficult situations. To the researcher, resilience is rather ordinary to expect instead of something unusual to wonder at. A person will be resilient in a moment of danger if the person's adaptive schemes are working well. However, according to Masten (2001), a real risk comes when these schemes are impaired. Though Masten (2001) identified some unique factors, such as individual talents and positive situations, she maintained the belief that resilience is mainly the effect of these inherent adaptive schemes.

Investigators have progressively noted the resiliency of immigrants facing adversity and challenges, emphasizing the *immigrant paradox* (Hernández et al., 2012). This *immigrant paradox* is construed as the tendency for first- and second-generation immigrants to do better than U.S.-born persons in areas such as mental wellbeing, health, and education (Hernández et al., 2012, p. 100)

Geltman et al. (2005) defined resilience as remarkably resilient while comparing the experiences of the refugee and immigrant populations, indicating that both groups develop resilience under deep, multifaceted, complicated terrorizations, and hardships. Facing extreme challenges, immigrants' families as well as refugees confront solitude and seclusion in a new nation (Campbell, 2008; Narchal, 2012), deprived educational chances (Crosnoe, 2012), and financial trials (Fuligni, 2012; Parra-Cardona et al., 2006).

For these populations, resilience is described as having the skill and willpower to overcome the before and after adversities of immigration and lead prolific, healthy lives that meaningfully give back to their societies and host countries (Geltman et al., 2005). Additionally, a resilience outline welcomes a reflection of the assets and salient features that let immigrant

families overcome hardship. Following the family resilience outline (Walsh, 2006), the worth of family delivers a potent incentive amid immigrants to labor hard and advance academics. Fuligni (2011) postulated that a sense of family uniqueness could offer a sense of social identity and belonging. Moreover, Fuligni pointed out that in minority populations, family identity stimulates a sense of purpose, motivation, living well-being, and overall meaning. The children's skills for resilience may be hampered by different aspects of key social and ecological factors that compromise or improve the defensive systems around them (Fuligni, 2011, p. 116). The new country could implement opportunities to lessen additional damage to the asylum-seeking and immigrant children by considering the important and imminent need the child has to access security, guard, and wellbeing services, including access to culturally sensitive and adequate psychological and psychiatric services for youngsters impacted by trauma created by significant past and current experiences (Fazel et al., 2012).

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

Separation of children from parents in immigrant families has continued to have a significant impact on entire families and communities. Families and children who have a parent at risk for detainment or deportation often present with increased emotional, attachment, and overall well-being concerns and are less likely to reach out for related services. The reunion of separated families has been hindered by a grievous lack of foreplaning and difficult communication with parents regarding family reunification and deportation (Wood, 2018).

As of August 2018, about 700 children, as well as 40 children below the age of 4, continued to be separated from their parents in the United States due to deportation and detention (Wood, 2018). With circumstances of chronic and acute adversity, the separation of at-risk immigrant children from their parents or legal guardians makes a flawless tempest for attachment loss, poisonous worry, and trauma. These youngsters continue to be at a significant risk for physical, psychological, emotional, and interpersonal disorders in the short and long time. Additional walls to wellbeing service engagement and risk increase well-being inequalities, and the quantity of youngsters residing with without meeting their health necessities are increasing due to the immigrants' fear of hostility and deportation (Wood, 2018).

This clinical research project critically reviewed the literature on how separation by deportation impacts immigrant children's developmental well-being. Also, this review explored how these children's attachment style was impacted by separation due to deportation and how immigrant families' organization may change and be altered. The following chapter discusses the findings of the research questions, clinical implications, limitations, and recommendations based on this review.

Three questions guided this review:

1. How does separation in immigrant families affect their children's overall developmental well-being?

2. How does the separation of immigrant families impact their children's attachment experiences?

3. How does separation in immigrant families influence their family system?

Regarding question one, research has consistently indicated that when youngsters are abruptly separated from their parents, as happens through deportation, their development and well-being are negatively impacted (Dreby, 2015b; Hagan et al., 2010; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011; Torres et al., 2018; Ward, 2010). Over the social-environmental perspective, when a mother or a father is undocumented and at in danger of exile, their youngster is impacted via the numerous other settings impacted by the parents' susceptibility.

Studies have widely established that immigrant children's development is predisposed by proximal context, for example, peer, family, extended family, and distal contexts or "microsystems" (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1989), including laws, institutions, social structures, and policies. Investigators have stated that scarcity distresses all youngsters' development, adding to inferior developing marks on a variety of mechanisms (Aber et al., 1997). It was estimated that 28% of immigrant children in 2005 lived in low-income families (Capps & Fortuny, 2006). In a more recent study, Conway et al. (2020) collected data for a family of four having incomes below $44,955 (185% of the federal poverty line) and incomes below $31,590 (125% of the federal poverty line), therefore likely experiencing economic hardship and children eligible for reduced meals at school. Additionally, Grafft et al. (2022) concluded that immigrant

families change their hope of what life is in the United States with the recognition that "rural poverty was exchanged for urban poverty" (p. 8).

High numbers of Latinx men being deported has led to a burden and financial strain on Latinx immigrants (Baker & Marchevsky, 2019; Doering-White et al., 2016), who then become single parents in impoverished households. The circumstances lead to becoming the heads of the family without the incomes of their deported partners at the same time that they face challenges finding work. Poverty is also an issue that can source an upsurge in danger for youngster negligence (Jonson-Reid et al., 2013). Hearn (2013) added that the part of scarcity is possibly one of the greatest and significant related issues of child negligence. Investigators confirmed that children from deported parents experience uncertainties about food and housing (Chaudry et al., 2010). Moreover, the authors indicated poor access to education, low teacher expectations about the children's performance, poor accomplishment in academic test results, and scarcity of resources (Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Gonzales, 2009; Orfield & Lee, 2006; Weinstein, 2002).

Studies have reported that immigrant children impacted by separation and deportation experience physical and psychological burdens that inflict heightened distress, emotional instability, and depression (Hammen et al., 2012; Suárez-Orozco, 2004). They also reported children's disengagement from or dropping out of school, adolescents having to work to assist their families (Koball et al., 2015), and the growth of posttraumatic stress disorder (Capps et al., 2015; Cleveland et al., 2012; Dreby, 2012). Similarly, studies have shown that children of immigrants separated by deportation suffer from anxiety and suicidal thoughts (Capps et al., 2007), psychological distress, internalizing problems, somatization (Gulbas et al., 2016), toxic stress (Hughes et al., 2017), lack of secure relationship experiences (Kessler et al., 2010), guilt-

laden magical thinking, fantasies of reunification, regret, and loss and grief (Blank & Wener-Lin, 2011).

Additionally, the children can be at risk of lifelong developmental and health sequelae, including organ damage associated with toxic stress like cancer, diabetes, autoimmune illness, and other conditions (Hughes et al., 2017). Persistent stress experienced by lack of safety and threat of deportation can alter the brain structure by destructive neurons in the prefrontal cortex and hippocampus of the child (Stress, 2018) in addition to initiating fight, flight, or freeze responses (Wood, 2018). Such patterns may trigger hyperarousal-hypervigilance, anxiety, memories, emotional reactivity, hypoarousal-dissociative reactions, emotional shocking, passive obedience, and deficient use to cognitive operation (Siegel, 1999). Other long-term consequences linked with the impact of childhood adversity are substance use, violent conduct, and psychological illness (Hughes et al., 2017).

In the words of the AAP (2018), "separating parents from their kids contradicts everything we know about children's welfare" (Simha, 2019, p. 995). Children affected by separation and deportation experience variations in their character and conduct (Burlew et al., 2013; Gelles, 1989). Some youngsters of deported parents experience terror or coercion, and others show defiant behaviors that lead to negative consequences. All this impact is accompanied by the bombardment of critical representations of immigrants in the media, school, and public locations, especially of undocumented immigrants, which impact at the individual level and likely having serious consequences for the developing children and youth of immigrant families (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011).

The second question guiding this literature review explored how the separation of immigrant families impacted their children's attachment experiences. The literature is strong in

confirming that youngsters are in need of environments that provide protection, predictability, and nurturance in order to flourish (Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University, 2011). Barajas-Gonzalez et al. (2018) stated that feeling protected is essential for a strong youngster development. Therefore, the deportation and detention that separate immigrant families may be particularly damaging to the 5.9 million children who are living with an undocumented family member (Eskenazi et al., 2019; Wood, 2018),

In attachment theory, parents are theorized as being a secure base from which a youngster can discover the world; attachment lies as the center of the day to day household living (Ainsworth, 1991). Although attachment theory has been applied across cultures, as Harwood and Miller (1991) recommended, it is significant to consider the ethnic expression of attachment behaviors in Latinx families. Many of them maintain strong connections with extended families; others transmit to their children cultural and religious beliefs, such as *familismo*, while others transmit their cultural pride as Latinx descendants (Comas-Diaz, 2006).

Investigators, such as Suárez-Orozco et al. (2002), have confirmed that long separations from family, six months to years, were related to elevated reports of depressive symptoms in the children. The authors concluded that the children experienced increased depressive symptoms, as well as attachment difficulties and behavioral problems (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002). Lengthy separations from parents impact secure attachment for youngsters and are practically sure to be harmful in relations of attachment representation (van Ecke, 2005). Recurring separation inhibits the growth of strong attachments and the youngster's skills and readiness to establish close relations as an adult (Caye et al., 1996). Main separation from and lasting loss of the attachment figures has been linked to psychological illnesses is (Allen et al., 1996; Carlson & Sroufe, 1995; Cicchetti et al., 1995; Main, 1996).

Separations by deportation differentiate from other types of separation in that they are so seriously filled with uncertainty. Research reported that children suddenly separated from their parents' experience ambiguous loss, which involves a freeze in their grieving process (Boss, 1999) as well as an impact on their coping and decision-making skills. The long-term consequences of this type of loss may include depression, anxiety, substance misuse, violent behavior, and suicide (Boss, 1999). Emotional confusion and difficulty with closure through the children's time of separation from their parents and other family members have been reported (Beckles Flores, 2011). The family feels it is not permitted to grieve their loss or that their loss is dishonorable or bad (Boss, 2002, 2004, 2006). Attachment does not indicate that separation and loss put individuals in danger of psychological illnesses, but major separation and long-lasting loss stance a danger (van Ecke, 2007).

Studies show that children separated from their parents display attachment problems triggering a lack of ambition for the future (Hovey, 2000). Also, children show low self-esteem, self-acceptance, and self-worth (Arbona & Power, 2003; LeCroy, 1988; Noom et al., 1999; Rosenberg, 1965). In addition, adolescents manifest various antisocial and delinquency behaviors (Arbona & Power, 2003; Smith & Krohn, 1995), as well as negative cognitive issues (Conway et al., 2020; Jacobsen et al., 1994; Lyons-Ruth & Jacobvitz, 1999). Other consequences include minimum adaptation patterns causing vulnerability and frustration among other social shortcomings (Sroufe, 2005). As a result of disrupting their attachment style, immigrant children separated from their parents display the above consequences (Sroufe, 2005).

Question three focused on separation in immigrant families and how it influenced their family system. The issue of separation of immigrant families by deportation is fairly new in research, and the impact is waiting to be extensively explored (Hagan et al., 2008). The lack of

information is accredited to the inability to find people deported without government involvement defaulting the process. Multiple studies conducted among deported immigrants demonstrated that deportation affects the family of the deported on various levels (Hagan et al., 2008). When a mother or a father is deported, the fear of deportation emerges for the rest of the family members and even spreads to the rest of the immigrant community. The rest of the family may withdraw from everyday life due to fear of deportation and also due to new financial strains related to the deported parent (Hagan et al., 2008).

Children are reported as the ones most intensely affected by family structure changes due to deportation. Research has suggested that sudden parental absence impacts youngsters mentally and emotionally and leads to the likelihood of poor academic performance and school attendance (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012). Researchers also describe that the family experiences a shift in power dynamics with older children assuming responsibilities to protect the family, by language and culture brokering for the remaining family members, by monitoring their parents' immigration status, by working to help the family financially, and by taking care of the younger children (Berger Cardoso et al., 2018). Researchers also find that children who move to live in their parents' country of origin (U.S.-citizen children or not) (Passel et al., 2012) or live with extended family or under government care (Capps et al., 2007; Chaudry et al., 2010), withdraw from family and friends and develop governmental mistrust (Chaudry et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2011; Rodriguez & Hagan, 2004).

When children witnessed their parents' arrests related to deportation, they manifested eating and sleeping difficulties, community withdrawal, separation anxiety, and decreasing educational achievement (Chaudry et al., 2010; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). Dreby (2012) reported that the greatest harmful result of compulsory separation by deportation on youngsters

was the unexpected change from staying in a two parent household to living in a single parent household with usually their mother. When the family structure suddenly changes to a single-parent home, some of the permanent changes may include the following: divorce, permanent separation from fathers after deportation, loss of communication or relationship with the biological father, the integration of a new father figure, mothers entering the workforce or having two jobs to support their children financially (Dreby, 2012), and housing insecurity (Chaudry et al., 2010).

Other challenges faced in the family system relate to changes in housekeeping habits and parental relationship tensions (Menjívar & Agadjanian, 2007). In addition, the new single mothers face the challenge of trying to reunite their families (Dreby, 2012). Other documented challenges include changes in the roles that each family member plays, such as children taking over the father's business (Gonzalez & Morgan Consoli, 2012); younger children dreading undocumented status and detaching from their immigrant heritage and identity (Dreby, 2012); and parental fear of losing custody of U.S.-born youngsters if deported (Wessler, 2011).

Beyond all the above challenges of deportation of a parent, short- and long-term separations force separated parents to reestablish their parental authority and reconnect with their children during reunification (Abrego, 2016, p. 15). Children and youth experience anguish associated to difficulties connecting connect with peers, negative stereotypes of their parents' nation of origin, limited educational access, difficulties relating to their parents, and financial difficulties (Gulbas et al., 2016).

Systems in the extended community have been reported to play an essential part in the endurance and resiliency of immigrant Latinx families (Hull et al., 2008). As suggested by different studies, community supports positively impact health (Bender & Castro, 2000; Clauss-

Ehlers, 2003), psychological well-being (Hull et al., 2008; Thompson & Gurney, 2003), and academic accomplishment (Alfaro et al., 2006; Catterall, 1998). When looking at positive impacts on the immigrant adults' and youths' lives and outcomes, studies have identified the church, spirituality, and religiosity as important sources of support and endurance as well as superior resilience factors (Hull et al., 2008; Lindenberg et al., 1994; Thompson & Gurney, 2003). These resilience factors reinforce family relationships and function as a method of social regulation for teens and their families (Kelly, 2007).

Another important protective factor is that of the primary and extended family systems, which guard against a diversity of undesirable consequences. Likewise, Parra-Cardona et al. (2006) identified that family support, closeness, and *familismo* were significant elements of resiliency for immigrant families who have faced deportation, discrimination, and employment mistreatment.

Focusing on those issues within the family that helped reduce externalizing behavior of adolescents, Calzada et al. (2020) found that families where there was parental demanding control (parents questioning the children's behavior and choices outside the home environment) and watchfulness of activities outside the home with loving support and a corresponding *respeto* from the adolescents themselves, externalizing behavior was mitigated against, even when perceiving immigration issues negatively (Calzada et al., 2020). Walsdorf et al. (2022) confirmed the importance of community and political activism finding that a very positive effect happens perhaps due to the communal culture of the Latinx community. When adolescents respond with the intent to implement change through community and/or political activism, by studying hard to get educated for future change, and/or simply supporting others as they struggle through their immigration difficulties, they begin to thrive and feel thy belong (Walsdorf et al., 2022). An

additional primary cause of danger or resilience for youngsters is the school system. Negatively

influencing school accomplishment for Latinx youth are racism, discrimination, separation of

family members, and educational downgrading (Gonzalez, 2009; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999).

When immigrant children experience these negative influences, it can result in school isolation

and dropping out prematurely (Alfaro et al., 2006; Catterall, 1998; Gonzalez & Padilla, 1997).

Care shown to children by teachers, counselors, and other educational staff increases educational

resilience by increasing connections to schools (Gonzalez & Padilla; Park-Taylor et al., 2007),

educational achievement (Gonzalez & Padilla, 1997), inspiration (Alfaro et al.), and graduation

(Catterall, 1998). Furthermore, research on Latinx teenagers proposes that constructive peer

relations raise school incentives (Alfaro et al., 2006), school resilience (Gonzalez & Padilla,

1997), and a drop in substance misuse amid Latinx teenagers (Parsai et al., 2009). Likewise,

friends' supports seem to protect against pressures such acculturative anxiety, crime, and

marginalization (Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2005).

As concluded in much of the research, cultural orientation and biculturalism soften the

negative costs of anxiety resulting from deportation, prejudice, and racism serving as protection

from substance misuse and depression (Blanco-Vega et al., 2008; Castro et al., 2007; Gonzalez,

2009; Hull et al., 2008; Plunkett & Bamaca-Gomez, 2003; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007;

Villenas & Deyhle).

Clinical Implications

Tens of thousands of citizen-children see at least one close relative deported every year

(Chaudry et al., 2010). As such, it is vital for professionals to be knowledgeable about youths'

experiences to improve services of their psychosocial needs (Lovato, 2019). Additionally,

awareness of the protective role of cross-generational attachments and bonding among immigrant people is needed.

To offer culturally competent interventions and prevention programs for susceptible people impacted by family separation due to deportation, clinicians must be cognizant of the laws, cultural issues, and current policies. Access to safety, protection, and health services is the right of each child. Conway et al. (2020) recommended seeing the clear implications for political policies to keep families together as much as possible and to provide resources for communities and providers to assist more fully in the treatment and reunification of the families.

Access to culturally competent professionals offering psychological and psychiatric assistance is needed for youngsters who have been profoundly injured, and those who have been developmentally disrupted by trauma should also be included (Wood, 2018). Mental health clinicians must be better prepared to recognize psychological disorders like trauma, depression, anxiety, and ambiguous loss in immigrant children and youth after they have experienced family separation due to parental deportation. In Grafft et al.'s (2022) study, the providers interviewed found themselves reluctant to deal with the trauma while in session with the immigrant clients for various reasons, including lack of training, resources, or time. The authors recommended helping the providers with training and tools to assist them in feeling confident to address these pressing and universal issues burdening the immigrant community (Grafft et al., 2022). Clinicians should develop appropriate competencies to assist immigrant families in the reunification of parents and children, thereby prioritizing the unity of the family. To provide adequate services to promote healing in immigrant children and families, mental health clinicians must have information regarding the unpredictability and recurrent relocations immigrant

children experience and how to treat the whole family by applying their values and cultural beliefs to help mend their attachments and overall mental health (Wood, 2018).

When providing services to immigrant families for reunification, it is vital to make meaning of the separation, repair the attachment bond, restore boundaries of family members' roles, reestablish a family story based on strength, explore and assist in healing trauma at the family and individual level, and acknowledge fears of possible deportation and separation in the future (Falicov, 2007). The therapist can improve knowledge and interventions by gathering pertinent insights from the rising interdisciplinary field of immigration studies.

Clinicians need to keep in mind that maintaining family unity must be a precedence. Family separation, even the threat of separation, is damaging to youngsters (Berger Cardoso et al., 2018). Living life surrounded by the restrictions of not being documented impacts parents' welfare, childrearing, child development, parent-child relations, and the child attachment style, even in the absence of a deportation order in place. Frequently, parents need guidance to understand the shifting of family dynamics, and immigrant families need support in handling the insecurity of their lives (Berger Cardoso et al., 2018). Families benefit from receiving instructions to be able to engage in an active/monitoring parental system with a caring and supportive style to prevent externalizing behaviors in their children (Calzada et al., 2020). Maintaining traditional ideals such as *familismo* should be another clinical goal (Gil et al., 2000). For immigrant families, the concept of *familismo* is manifested as a strength and could function as an asset assisting as an emotional guard for immigrant children and their families (Carranza, 2007; Clauss-Ehlers & Wibrowski, 2007; Gonzalez & Consoli, 2012; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2006). Mental health providers could help immigrant families cope with the vagueness of their

lives during separations and deportations, particularly assisting parents who frequently required direction in comprehending the shifting of the household dynamics (Cardoso et al., 2018).

Mental health clinicians can assist immigrant families in navigating within the community's opportunities and limitations while honoring their family practices and cultural heritage to endorse childhood well-being. Established in the family function are the connections among culture, environmental factors, and everyday family life (Weisner, 2002, 2010). A mixed-status family function echoes both the micro-environment families generate as they make sense of balance between their needs and the daily trials related to having an undocumented family member.

When conducting their evaluations and clinical treatment procedures, mental health professionals and service providers need to be conscious of the impact of immigrant family separations as well as the experience of vague loss these families experience to provide the necessary support to children separated from their parents by deportation. When the professional practitioner acknowledges the signs of confusing loss (e.g., lengthy grief, depression, anxiety), the professional can support families in the course of adjustment by providing a harmless setting in which the child can explore and cope with their emotional state. Skilled experts working with this targeted population can construct and develop trust and good working relationships with children.

Another aspect clinicians should explore when serving immigrant families is the child's attachment style at the moment of treatment. There is strong support in the research (Levy et al., 2011) that the client's attachment style impacts the psychotherapy process development, the reactions of both client and clinician, the therapy alliance, and the treatment outcomes. As presented in previous chapters, children separated from their parents due to deportation tend to

experience attachment difficulties. A structured interview can be useful as part of the assessment process for immigrant children and families. The clinician should consider how the child and family members' attachment organization will impact their response to treatment and the psychotherapist. Levy et al. (2011) indicated that the attachment style could be altered throughout treatment. Consequently, change in attachment style can be conceived as a primary result, not just as a prognostic of patient characteristics, and could be considered a goal of treatment (Levy et al., 2011). Hence, in working with immigrant youth, clinicians would do well to search for parent-child attachment issues (Arbona & Power, 2003).

Interventions such as therapy groups, play therapy, expressive arts, narrative psychoanalysis, and psychoeducation can be used by professionals to address unclear losses when the family is separated by deportation (Betz & Thorngren, 2006; Wood & Near, 2010). Also, professionals and practitioners can help adolescents and their families by assisting in forming new habits and connections in the homebased and adjusting to youngsters' needs when a household member is not present (Walsh, 2006).

Professionals may also assist the family members in coping with the separation when endorsing connection and cohesion by maintaining the emotional attendance of the separated parent. An example could be recurrent phone communication amid the deported parent and youngster as an effective technique. Additionally, some technological equipment, such as Skype or virtual video conferencing, permit household members to be technologically present for lengthy times, thus permitting international families to contribute in family activities (Bacigalupe et al., 2015).

The existing body of studies showed the need for enlarged cultural competency training for mental health professionals, the community, and faith-based groups (Grafft et al., 2022;

Lovato, 2019; Yeater et al., 2012). Specific education could increase awareness of historical events, barriers faced by current and former immigrants to the United States, and the social norms for the cultures they are representative of. Through education, the ability of mental health experts grows to serve the families better. It is most effective for a trained professional to be alert to cultural obstacles and careful of the population distrust when working with children showing psychological effects such as emotional trauma related to parental separation by deportation. Social justice for this population involves genuine compassion, appreciation of cultural differences and norms, and working associations with a basis of trust (Yeater et al., 2012).

Based on the findings of this critical literature review, a series of questions in English and Spanish are suggested for clinicians to support their work with these populations to explore how attachment and other significant areas of the lives of children and their families may have been impacted as a result of separation by the deportation of one or both parents (see Appendix A and Appendix B). It is hoped that these questions serve to guide professionals assisting children and families of deported parents in identifying areas impacted to provide appropriate treatment and services.

These questions can assist in interviews with children and their parents helping the clinicians identify possible trauma. The information gathered will assist in understanding the environment of the child pre- and post-immigration, the family culture and beliefs, traumas experienced, and their protective factors. Furthermore, it will help to identify the impact of family separation on children and their families, providing information to develop appropriate treatment plans and other interventions. The suggested questions may provide the children with the opportunity to begin expressing their emotions concerning their experiences with family deportation and the fear of deportation.

These questions may also facilitate a safe avenue to assist immigrant children and their families to start understanding immigration, reduce or eliminate shame regarding immigrant heritage while disclosing experiences and emotions about immigration, and may open the door for developing a healthy self-identity and family reunification. Additional research and input from clinicians can assist in establishing the clinical usefulness of the questions.

Limitations

Current studies about immigrant children are scarce, particularly concerning young children (Edmonston, 1996; Oropesa & Landale, 1995). Some experiential studies of immigrant children and families are being launched by a growing number of investigators (Buriel, 1993; Cooper, 1994; Landale & Hauan, 1992; Stephen & Bean, 1992). Nevertheless, without a strong research base on immigrant children and families, state and local politicians are currently increasing programs for immigrants. The lack of consistent research with immigrant children and families increases the risk that policies and programs for newcomer children will be unconcerned rather than inclusive and effective (Board on Children and Families, 1995). Consequently, it becomes critical that researchers and others with full knowledge of the complex factors surrounding these susceptible people update the growth of such programs. Studies on immigrant children and families can shed light on the issues distressing these populations, removing them from anonymity and confirming their experiences (Board on Children and Families, 1995).

Although the findings from the different studies provide good support for the description of the implication of child-parent separation by deportation on youngsters' overall welfare, several limitations of the studies researched were identified. For example, although some of the research studied gender differences (Berger Cardoso et al., 2018), these were no sufficient to indicate gender-based differences regarding how families dealt with undocumented parenting

and childrearing. Nevertheless, one recent study by Conway et al. (2020) found that those youths who were separated from their mothers were more likely to have poor relationships with their mothers and fathers. Furthermore, none of the studies have live observations of child-parent exchanges within immigrant families before or after deportation. Much of the literature reviewed provided information based on previous studies without having direct contact with the immigrant children or only from interviewing undocumented parents. Several documented testimonies of how children regarded the deportation experiences and the family issues experienced after reunification are included in the literature (Artico, 2003). However, due to the constant fear and apprehension for immigrants to share their stories, studies still contain small samples or under-sampling.

Future research must explore the long term effect of separations due to deportation by gathering information directly from immigrant children and families. Longitudinal studies with significant samples of immigrant children and families are necessary to fully comprehend the extended impact separation by deportation has on the children of immigrant families.

Some areas of study need more attention, such as the adaptation of immigrant youngsters to life in the United States. Several investigators have linked this adaptation process to the central role of the families (Buriel, 1993; Cooper, 1994; Landale & Hauan, 1992; Stephen & Bean, 1992), including aspects such as family structure, immigration status, age, and circumstances when entering the United States. Other areas to study include the socioeconomic status of the family and community and where the child was born (Board on Children and Families, 1995).

The adaptation of the youngest immigrants has not been well investigated, such as the factors related to how some immigrant children thrive in school and others fail to do so. Other

areas needing research include examining factors that can explain why some insolvent immigrant groups show amazingly low infant death rates compared to U.S.-born groups with similar circumstantial characteristics. Also, in what situations and for whom do growth and schooling consequences worsen over time?

Recommendations

According to the recommendation by Cardoso et al. (2018), keeping the families together must be urgent, knowing that family separation and even the danger of separation is destructive to youngsters. Studies show that living a life without legal status or being undocumented has impacted the children and parents' welfare, childrearing, and parent-child relations, including when there is no deportation directive in place. Endorsements at the rule level also include not separating the families by force, given the destructive effects on youngsters, other household members, and the wider public (Cardoso et al., 2018). As indicated in the research, the emotional penalties of separating youngsters and relatives endure for a long time and upsetting to all participants. Politicians must also contemplate the civil rights side of household union (Brabeck & Sibley, 2016; Cardoso et al., 2016). The 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the 1969 American Convention on Human Rights offer a foundation for these positions (Langhout et al., 2018).

All professionals and the community, in general, must participate in advocating with leaders concerning endorsing wellbeing practices, allowing all youngsters to flourish and give confidently to humanity. Participation in advocacy to request leaders to end immigrant families' separation and detention, endorse justice, and respect of child privileges for all children is crucial (Wood, 2018). Similarly, local charities, religious nonprofits, and other groups may need

government and community support to provide therapeutic and other forms of help to the immigrant families (Jones-Mason et al., 2021).

Service providers, including school representatives, have a significant part in supporting childhood and relatives to manage and regulate new household situations. Educational institutions frequently turn out to be the access points for undocumented families: linking children and their families to wide-range of resources, particularly in communities with a larger concentration of immigrant persons (Chaudry et al., 2010). For example, in California, a total of 118, declared themselves safe havens for immigrant youngsters in 2017 (Chaudry et al., 2010). Through this program, the schools provide safe and welcoming spaces for all pupils regardless of immigration status and prepare plans to support youngsters who may experience a parental deportation.

In states where deportation and family separation occurred at higher levels, the safe haven concept could be considered a model example. In addition to developing a harmless setting for all pupils, teachers need to safeguard students who might be hurt by deportation, and help them endure to succeed and do well scholastically and socially (Lovato, 2019).

Despite the challenges, countless immigrant children succeed and show resilience in facing the new challenges (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2018). New research studies that focus on resiliency may recognize vital influential facts that enable effective coping and shape individuals' well-being (Gulbas & Zayas, 2017). Likewise, additional longitudinal investigation is needed to deeply explore the consequences of the toxic stress, intense constant fear, and the deportation separation on the youngsters' attachment style and general welfare.

Mental health providers trained in individual therapy, family systems, and group approaches are in an important place to recognize and use shared experiences to endorse

resilience within Latinx immigrant families and children. Focusing on a strengths-based standpoint, the mental health providers, teachers, and other community agencies can construct the assets of immigrant people by increasing their coping skills, supporting them to connect with services and different programs, peer relationships through carrying out personal skills teachings, cultural mindfulness courses, community and parental participation, and supplementary and training events that may improve the resiliency of Latinx immigrant childhood who battle with acculturation, and pressures related with deportation (Cardoso & Thompson, 2010).

It is difficult to identify how many parents, out of all those deported, and left their family or part of their family in the United States without a primary provider. Dreby (2012) concluded that it is important to contemplate how youngsters' lives are altered by both the more occasional, more invasive cases of deportation and the more collective cases in which the general policies of deportation impact youngsters. It is critical that the nations performing family separation by deportation and child immigration custody accelerate the reunification of immigrant families and end youngster custody and family separation. Pediatricians, healthcare professionals, and researchers must support children and families unnecessarily exposed to family separation due to deportation and immigration detention by collecting robust data concerning damages inflicted on immigrant families (Wood, 2018). Communities should endorse subtle site rules, which forbid ICE from searching for undocumented immigrants in health clinics, schools, houses of worship, law court workplaces, and community protests. This action may safeguard that people visiting any of these places are allowed to do so, lacking fear of apprehension (Lovato, 2019).

To alleviate the damage done to immigrant children separated from their parents, Jones-Mason et al. (2021) endorsed that immigrant youngsters still in custody must be reunited with their families; and if unable to reunited with their family, they must be placed in environments

closely resembling a family environment. Also, they proposed providing treatment to the family

through psychological and medical involvement. Finally, they recommended that the families

who were separated must obtain compensation to cover for psychological and physical wellbeing

care (Jones-Mason et al., 2021). This clinical research project explored the literature findings of

the extended impact that the separation by deportation has on immigrant children and their

families. Children need protection, nurturance, support, safety, and guidance to develop healthy

emotional and physical well-being. All of the above are elements primarily provided by the

parents based on their cultural values. It is hoped that psychological health specialists actively

advocate and provide well-informed services for the needs of immigrant youngsters and their

relatives impacted by separation and deportation.

References

AAP a leading voice against separating children, parents at border. (2018 June 18). [Press release]. AAP News. http://www.aappublications.org/news/2018/06/14/washington 061418

Aber, L., Bennett, N., Conley, D., & Li, J. (1997). The effects of poverty on child health and development. *Annual Review of Public Health, 18,* 463-483. doi:10.1196/annals.1425.023

Abidin, R. (1992). The determinants of parenting behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 21,* 407-412. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp2104_12

Abrego, L., & Menjívar, C. (2011). Immigrant Latina mothers as targets of legal violence. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 37,* 9-26. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23029784

Abrego, L. J. (2016). Illegality as a source of solidarity and tension in Latino families. *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies, 8*(1), 5-21. https://doi.org/10.18085/1549-9502-8.1.5

Acosta, C. (2013). Pedagogies of resiliency and hope in response to the criminalization of Latin@ students. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 9*(2), 63-71. http://jolle.coe.uga.edu

Adam, E. K., & Chase-Lansdale, P. L. (2002). Home sweet home(s): Parental separations, residential moves, and adjustment problems in low-income adolescent girls. *Developmental Psychology, 38*(5), 792-805. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.38.5.792

Adames, H. Y., & Chávez-Dueñas, N. Y. (2017). *Cultural foundations and interventions in Latino/a mental health: History, theory and within group differences*. Routledge/Taylor. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315724058

155

Adams, C. (2000). Integrating children into families separated by migration: A Caribbean-American case study. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, *9*(1), 19-27. doi:10.1023/A:1009454313002

Administration for Children and Families. (2002-2009). "The Healthy Marriage Initiative," U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. www.acf.hhs.gov/healthymarriage.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967). *Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love*. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1967-35025-000

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1978). The Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1*(3), 436-438. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00064955

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist, 44,* 709-716. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.4.709

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1991). Attachments and other affectional bonds across the life cycle. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp. 33-51). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203132470-6

Ainsworth, M. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist, 46*(4), 333-341. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.33

Akhtar, Z. (2012). Attachment styles of adolescents: Characteristics and contributing factors. *Academic Research International, 2*(2), 613-621. Francis Group. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231582212

Albrecht, C., & Teachman, J. D. (2003). Childhood living arrangements and the risk of premarital intercourse. *Journal of Family Issues*, *24*(7), 867-894. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03252731

Alfaro, E. E., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Bámaca, M. Y. (2006). The influence of academic support

    on Latino adolescents' academic motivation. *Family Relations, 55*(3), 279-291.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2006.00402.x

Ali, A., & Toner, B. B. (2001). Symptoms of depression among Caribbean women and

    Caribbean-Canadian women: An investigation of self-silencing and domains of meaning.

    Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25, 175-180. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00019

Allen, J. A., Fahlberg, V., Ellett, A., Montgomery, T. M., Overberger, C., Williams, C., &

    Swanson, K. (1983). *Special needs adoption curriculum: Preparation of children*. Florida

    Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., & Borman-Spurrell, E. (1996). Attachment theory as a framework for

    understanding sequelae of severe adolescent psychopathology: An 11-year follow-up

    study. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 64*(2), 254-263. doi:10.1037//0022-

    006x.64.2.254

Allen, J. P., Moore, C. M., Kupermine, G. P., & Bell, K. L. (1998). Attachment and adolescent

    psychosocial functioning. *Child Development, 69*(5), 1406-1419.

    https://doi.org/10.2307/1132274

Amato, P. R. (2005). The impact of family formation change on the cognitive, social, and

    emotional well-being of the next generation. *The future of children*, 15(2), 75-96.

    doi:10.1353/foc.2005.0012

American Academy of Pediatrics. (2017). *Adverse childhood experiences and the lifelong*

    consequences of trauma. https://www.aap.org/en-

    us/Documents/ttb_aces_consequences.pdf.

Androff, D., Ayon, C., Becerra, D., Gurrolla, M., Salas, L., Krysik, J., Gerdes, K., & Segal, E.
  (2011). U.S. immigration policy and immigrant children's well-being: The impact of
  policy shifts. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 38*(1), 77-98.

Angel, J. L., Buckley, C. J., & Sakamoto, A. (2001). Duration or disadvantage? Exploring
  nativity ethnicity, and health in midlife. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B:
  Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 56*(5), S275-S284.

Arbona, C., & Power, T. G. (2003). Parental attachment, self-esteem, and antisocial behaviors
  among African American, European American, and Mexican American adolescents.
  Journal of Counseling Psychology, *50*(1), 40-51. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-
  0167.50.1.40

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment:
  Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence.
  Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16(5)*, 427-454. doi:10.1007/BF02202939

Arredondo-Dowd, P. (1981). Personal loss and grief as a result of immigration. *Personnel and
  Guidance Journal, 59*(6), 376-378. doi:10.1002/j.2164-4918.1981.tb00573.x

Artico, C. I. (2003). *Latino families broken by immigration: The adolescent's perspective.* LFB
  Scholarly.

Bachega, H. (2018). *Separation of migrant families: What other countries do*. BBC News US &
  Canada. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/worl-us-canada-44374756

Bacigalupe, G., Parker, K., Suarez-Orozco, C., Abo-Zena, M., & Marks, A. K. (2015).
  Transitions: The development of children of immigrants, 61-79. New York University
  Press.

Baker, B., & Marchevsky, A. (2019). Gendering deportation, policy violence, and Latino/a family precarity. *Latino Studies, 17*(2), 207-224. doi:10.1057/S41276-019-00176-0

Baldwin, A. L., Baldwin, C. P., Kasser, T., Zax, M., Sammeroff, A., & Seifer, R. (1989). Contextual risk and resiliency during late adolescence. *Developmental Psychopathology. 5,* 741-761. doi:10.1017/S095457940000626X

Baldwin, J. M. (1906). *Mental development of the child and the race: Methods and processes*. Macmillan.

Baldwin, J. M. (1911). *The individual and society.* In R. G. Badger (Ed.) *Psychology and sociology* (p. 17-29). Goreham.

Barajas-Gonzalez, R. G., Ayón, C., & Torres, F. (2018). Applying a community violence framework to understand the impact of immigration enforcement threat on Latino children. *Social Policy Report, 31*(3), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1002/sop2.1

Bardi, A., Buchanan, K. E., Goodwin, R., Slabu, L., & Robinson, M. (2014). Value stability and change during self-chosen life transitions; Self-selection versus socialization effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(1), 131-147. doi:10.1037/a0034818

Bean, F. D., Brown, S. K., & Bachmeier, J. D. (2015). *Parents without papers: The progress and pitfalls of Mexican American integration.* Russell Sage Foundation.

Beckles Flores, E. (2011). *Waiting for your return: A phenomenological study on parental deportation and the impact of the family and the parent-child attachment bond*. Syracuse University.

Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development, 55,* 83-96. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1984.tb00275.x

Belsky, J., & Cassidy, J. (1994). Attachment and close relationships: An individual-difference perspective. *Psychological Inquiry*, *5*(1), 27-30. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0501_3

Belsky, J., & Nezworski, T. M. (1988). *Clinical implications of attachment.* Erlbaum. doi:10.4324/9781315825526

Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991). Childhood experience, interpersonal development, and reproductive strategy: An evolutionary theory of socialization. *Child Development*, *62*(2), 647-670. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131166

Bender, D. E., & Castro, D. (2000). Explaining the birth weight paradox: Latina immigrants' perceptions of resilience and risk. *Journal of Immigrant Health, 2*(3), 155-173. doi:10.1023/A:1009513020506

Berger Cardoso, J., Scott, J. L., Faulkner, M., & Barros Lane, L. (2018). Parenting in the context of deportation risk. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 8*(2), 301-316. doi:10.1111/JOMF.12463

Berk, L. E. (2003). *Child development* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Berk, L. E. (2007). *Theory and research in human development*. Pearson.

Berk, L. E. (2017). *Development through the lifespan* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Berman, W. H., & Sperling, M. B. (Eds.). (1994). *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives*. Guilford Press.

Betz, G., & Thorngren, J. M. (2006). Ambiguous loss and the family grieving process. *The Family Journal*, *14*(4), 359-365. doi:10.1177/1066480706290052

Bhui, K., Stansfeld, S., Hull, S., Priebe, S., Mole, F., & Feder, G. (2003). Ethnic variations in pathways to and use of specialist mental health services in the UK: Systematic review. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *182*(2), 105-116. doi:10.1192/bjp.182.2.105

Bjorklund, D. (2018). A metatheory for cognitive development (or "Piaget is dead" revisited). *Child Development*, *89*(5), 2288-2302. doi:10.1111/cdev.13019

Blanco-Vega, C. O., Castro-Olivo, S. M., & Merrell, K. W. (2008). Social-emotional needs of Latino immigrant adolescents: A sociocultural model for development and implementation of culturally specific interventions. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(1), 43-61. doi:10.1080/15348430701693390

Blank, N. M., & Wener-Lin, A. (2011). Growing up with grief: Revisiting the death of a parent over the life course. *Omega, 63*(3), 271-290. doi:10.2190/OM.63.3.e

Board on Children and Families. (1995). Immigrant children and their families: Issues for research and policy. *Critical Issues for Children and Youths, 5*(2), 72-89.

Boneva, B. S., & Frieze, I. H. (2001). Toward a concept of a migrant personality. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 477-491. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00224

Boss, P. (1999). *Ambiguous loss. Learning to live with unresolved grief.* Harvard University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctvjhzrh4

Boss, P. (2002). Ambiguous loss in families of the missing. *Lancet, 360,* S39-S40. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(02)11815-0

Boss, P. (2003). Ambiguous loss. In F. Walsh & M. McGoldrick (Eds.), *Living beyond loss: Death in the family* (2nd ed., pp. 164-175). Norton.

Boss, P. (2004). Ambiguous loss research, theory, and practice: Reflections after 9/11. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(3), 551-566. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00037.x

Boss, P. (2006). Ambiguous loss: Preventive interventions for family professionals. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 98*(2), 8-10.

Bowen, J. (1999). Bowen family systems theory and practice: Illustration and critique.
Australian New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 20(2)*,* 94-103.
https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1467-8438.1999.tb00363.x

Bowen, M. (1976). Theory in the practice of psychotherapy. *Family therapy: Theory and practice, 4*(1), 2-90.

Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy in clinical practice.* Aronson.

Bowen, M. (1985). *Family therapy in clinical practice.* Aaronson.

Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal care and mental health* (Vol. 2). Geneva: World Health Organization.

Bowlby, J. (1959). Über das wesen der mutter-kind-bindung. *Psyche, 13*(7), 415-456.

Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. I. Attachment.* Basic Books.
doi:10.2307/2798963

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss Vol. II: Separation anxiety and anger.* Basic Books.
doi:10.2307/583128

Bowlby, J. (1979). The Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 2*(4), 637-638. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00064955

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss Vol. III: Loss, sadness, and depression.* Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss Vol. III: Loss, sadness, and depression.* Basic Books.
doi:10.1177/000306518403200125

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Clinical applications of attachment theory.* Routledge.

Bowlby, J., & Robertson, J. (1953). A two-year-old goes to hospital. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 46*(6), 425-427. https://doi.org/10.1177/003591575304600603

Brabeck, K., Lykes, M., & Hunter, C. (2014). The psychosocial impact of detention and

deportation on U.S. migrant children and families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,*

84(5), 496-505. doi:10.1037/ort0000011

Brabeck, K., & Sibley, E. (2016). Immigrant parent legal status, parent-child relationships, and

child social-emotional well-being: A middle childhood perspective. *Journal of Child and*

Family Studies, 25, 1155-1167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-015-0314-4

Brabeck, K., & Xu, Q. (2010). The impact of detention and deportation on Latino immigrant

children and families: A quantitative exploration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral*

Sciences, *32*(3), 341-361. doi:10.1177/0739986310374053

Brandell, J., & Ringel, S. (2007). *Attachment theory and dynamic practice: An integrative guide*

for social workers and other clinicians. Columbia University Press.

doi:10.7312/bran13390

Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and

romantic relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21,* 267-

283. doi:10.1177/0146167295213008

Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth.

Developmental Psychology, 28(5), 759-775. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.28.5.759

Bretherton, I. (1993). Theoretical contributions from developmental psychology. In P. Boss, W.

J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds). *Sourcebook of family*

theories and methods (pp. 286-287). University of Wisconsin-Madison. doi:10.1007/978-

0-387-85764-0

Bretherton, I., & Waters, E. (1985). Growing points of attachment theory and research.

Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, *50*(1-2), 229-238.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). Developmental research, public policy, and the ecology of

    childhood. *Child Development*, *45*(1), 1-5. doi:10.1111/J.1467-8624.1974.TB00552.X

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research

    perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*(6), 723-742. doi:10.1037/0012-

    1649.22.6.723

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human

    development*. SAGE.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Evans, G. W. (2000). Developmental science in the 21st century:

    Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. *Social

    Development, 9*(1), 115-125. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00114

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1989). The ecology of developmental processes. In

    Handbook of child psychology, *Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development* (pp.

    993-1028). John Wiley.

Brotherton, D. C., & Barrios, L. (2009). Displacement and stigma: The social-psychological

    crisis of the deportee. *Crime, Media, Culture*, *5*(1), 29-55.

    doi:10.1177/1741659008102061

Brotherton, D. C., & Barrios, L. (2011). *Banished to the homeland: Dominican deportees and

    their stories of exile*. Columbia University Press.

Brown, S. (2010). Marriage and child well-being: Research and policy perspectives. *Journal of

    Marriage and Family, 72*(5)*,* 1059-1077. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00750.x

Buriel, R. (1993). Acculturation, respect for cultural differences, and biculturalism among three

    generations of Mexican American and Euro American school children. *The Journal of

    Genetic Psychology, 154*(4). 531-543. doi:10.1080/00221325.1993.9914751

Burlew, A. K., Copeland, V. C., Ahuama-Jonas, C., & Calsyn, D. A. (2013). Does cultural

adaptation have a role in substance abuse treatment? *Social Work in Public Health*, *28*(3-

4), 440-460. doi:10.1080/19371918.2013.774811

Byng-Hall, J. (1995). Creating a secure family base: Some implications of attachment theory for

family therapy. *Family Process, 34*(1), 45-58. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.1995.00045.x

Byng-Hall, J. (1999). Family and couple therapy. In J. Cassidy & P. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of

attachment. Theory, research, and clinical application* (pp. 625-649). Guilford Press.

Byng-Hall, J., & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1991). Attachment relationships within a family system.

Infant Mental Health Journal, *12*(3), 187-200. doi: 10.1002/1097-

0355(199123)12:3<187::AID-IMHJ2280120306>3.0.CO;2-O

Calzada, E. J., Roche, K. M., White, R., Partovi, R., & Little, T. D. (2020). Family strengths and

Latinx youth externalizing behavior: Modifying impacts of an adverse immigration

environment. *Journal of Latinx Psychology, 8*(4), 332-348.

Campbell, W. S. (2008). Lessons in resilience: Undocumented Mexican women in South

Carolina. *Affilia*, *23*(3), 231-241. doi:10.1177/0886109908319172

Canadian Medical Association. (2018). *Statement by the Canadian Medical Association on "zero

tolerance" U.S. immigration policy decision*. Cision. https://www.newswire.ca/news-

releases/ statement-by-the-canadian-medical-association-on-zero-toleranceus-

immigration-policy-686046641.htm

Capps, R., Castañeda, R. M., Chaudry, A., & Santos, R. (2007). *Paying the price: The impact of

immigration raids on America's children.* National Council of La Raza.

https://www.urban.org/research/publication/paying-price-impact-immigration-raids-

americas-children

Capps, R., & Fortuny, K. (2006). *Immigration and child and family policy*. Urban Institute.

    https://www.urban.org/research/publication/immigration-and-child-and-family-policy

Capps, R., Koball, H., Campetella, A., Perreira, K., Hooker, S., & Pedroza, J. M. (2015).

    Implications of immigration enforcement activities for the well-being of children in

    immigrant families: A review of the literature. *Urban Institute and Migration Policy*

    Institute (pp. 9-32). https://www.urban.org/research/publication/implications-

    immigration-enforcement-activities-well-being-children-immigrant-families-review-

    literature

Cardoso, J. B., Dettlaff, A. J., Finno-Velasquez, M., Scott, J., & Faulkner, M. (2014). Nativity

    and immigration status among Latino families involved in the child welfare system:

    Characteristics, risk, and maltreatment. *Children and Youth Services Review, 44,* 189-

    200. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.06.008

Cardoso, J. B., Hamilton, E. R., Rodriguez, N., Eschbach, K., & Hagan, J. (2016). Deporting

    fathers: Involuntary transnational families and intent to remigrate among Salvadoran

    deportees. *International Migration Review, 50*(1), 197-230.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12106

Cardoso, J. B., Scott, J. L., Faulkner, M., & Lane, L. (2018). Parenting in the context of

    deportation risk. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 80,* 301-316.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12463

Cardoso, J. B., & Thompson, S. J. (2010). Common themes of resilience among Latino

    immigrant families: A systematic review of the literature. *Families in Society, 91*(3), 257-

    265. https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.4003

Carlson, E. A., & Sroufe, L. A. (1995). Contribution of attachment theory to developmental

    psychopathology. In D. C. D. Cohen (Ed.), *Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 1.*

    Theory and methods (pp. 581-617). Wiley.

Carlson, M. J., & Corcoran, M. E. (2001). Family structure and children's behavioral and

    cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(3), 779-792.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00779.x

Carranza, M. E. (2007). Building resilience and resistance against racism and discrimination

    among Salvadorian female youth in Canada. *Child & Family Social Work*, *12*(4), 390-

    398. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2206.2007.00492.x

Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and*

    clinical applications. Rough Guides.

Castro, F. G., Garfinkle, J., Naranjo, D., Rollins, M., Brook, J. S., & Brook, D. W. (2007).

    Cultural traditions as "protective factors" among Latino children of illicit drug users.

    Substance Use & Misuse, *42*(4), 621-642. doi:10.1080/10826080701202247

Catterall, J. S. (1998). Risk and resilience in student transitions to high school. *American Journal*

    of Education, *106*(2), 302-333.

Caye, J., McMahon, J., Norris, T., & Rahija, L. (1996). *Effects of separation and loss on*

    attachment. School of Social Work, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University. (2011). *Building the brain's "air traffic*

    control system": How early experiences shape the development of executive function:

    Working paper no. 11. https://www.developingchild.harvard.edu

Cervantes, W., & Lincroft, Y. (2010). *The impact of immigration enforcement on child welfare.* http://www.firstfocus.net/library/reports/the-impact-of-immigration-enforcement-on-child-welfare

Cerza, S. (2018). *Fact sheet: Immigrants and public benefits*. National Immigration Forum.

Chaudry, A., Capps, R., Pedroza, J. M., Castañeda, R. M., Santos, R., & Scott, M. M. (2010). *Facing our future: Children in the aftermath of immigration enforcement* (pp. 1-96). Urban Institute. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/facing-our-future

Cicchetti, D., Toth, S. L., & Lynch, M. (1995). Bowlby's dream comes full circle: The application of attachment theory to risk and psychopathology. *Advances in Clinical Child Psychopathology, 17*(1), 1-75. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-9044-3_1

Clauss-Ehlers, C. C. (2003). Promoting ecologic health resilience for minority youth: Enhancing health care access through the school health center. *Psychology in the Schools*, *40*(3), 265-278. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10086

Clauss-Ehlers, C. S., & Wibrowski, C. R. (2007). Building educational resilience and social support: The effects of the educational opportunity fund program among first- and second-generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 574-584. doi:10.1353/csd.2007.0051

Cleveland, J., Rousseau, C., & Kronick, R. (2012). The harmful effects of detention and family separation on asylum seekers' mental health in the context of Bill C-31. *Brief submitted to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration concerning Bill C-31*, 1-96. ERIC database. (ED508226)

Cockcroft, James D. (2010). *Mexico's Revolution Then and Now*. Monthly Review Press.

Coe, C. (2013). *The scattered family: Parenting, African Americans, and global inequality*. University of Chicago Press.

Cole, D. (2003). *Enemy aliens: Double standards and constitutional freedoms in the war on terror*. Current Affairs.

Collins, N. L., & Reed, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(4), 644-663. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644

Collins, W. A., & Steinberg, L. (2007). Adolescent development in interpersonal context. *Handbook of Child Psychology.* John Wiley & Sons.

Comas-Diaz, L. (2001). Hispanics, Latinos, or Americanos: The evolution of identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*(1), 15-120.

Comas-Diaz, L. (2006). Latino healing: The integration of ethnic psychology into psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Theory, Research, Practice and Training, 43*(4), 436-453. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.43.4.436

Conger, R. D., Elder, G. H., Jr., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, K. J., Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Huck, S., & Melby, J. N. (1990). Linking economic hardship to marital quality and instability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *52*(3), 643-656. https://doi.org/10.2307/352931

Conway, C. A., Roy, K., Hurtado Choque, G. A., & Lewin, A. (2020). Family separation and parent-child relationships among Latinx immigrant youth. *Journal of Latinx Psychology, 8*(4), 300-316.

Cook, A., Spinazzola, J., Ford, J., Lanktree, C., Blaustein, M., Cloitre, M., DeRosa, R., Hubbard, R., Kagan, R., Liautaud, J., Mallah, K., Olafson, E., & van der Kolk, B. (2005). Complex trauma in children and adolescents. *Psychiatric Annals, 35*(5), 390-398. https://doi.org/10.3928/00485713-20050501-05

Cooper, C. (1994). Cultural perspectives on continuity and change in adolescents' relationships. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Personal relationships during adolescence* (pp. 78-100). SAGE.

Cooper, C., McLanahan, S., Meadows, S., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2009). Family structure transitions and maternal parenting stress. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 71,* 558-574. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00619.x

Coutin, S. B. (2010). Confined within: National territories as zones of confinement. *Political Geography*, *29*(4), 200-208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2010.03.005

Craft, C. (2018). *AAP statement opposing separation of children and parents at the border*. American Academy of Pediatrics. https://www.aap.org/en-us/about-the-aap/aap-press-room/Pages/StatementOpposing SeparationofChildrenandParents.aspx

Crittenden, P. M. (2000). A dynamic-maturational approach to continuity and change in pattern of attachment. In P. M. Crittenden & A. H. Claussen (Eds.), *The organization of attachment relationships: Maturation, culture, and context*, 343-357. Cambridge University Press.

Crosnoe, R. (2012). Studying the immigrant paradox in the Mexican-origin population. In C. G. Coll & A. K. Marks (Eds.). *The immigrant paradox in children and adolescents: Is becoming American a developmental risk?* (pp. 61-76). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13094-003

Cruz, E. H. (2010). Because you're mine, I walk the line: The trials and tribulations of the family visa program. *Fordham Urban Law Journal, 38*(1)*,* 1-27.

Danese, A., & McEwen, B. S. (2012). Adverse childhood experiences, allostasis, allostatic load, and age-related disease. *Physiology & Behavior, 106*(1), 29-39.

Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflicto and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin 116*(3)*,* 387-411. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.387

De Genova, N. P. (2002). Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*(1), 419-447. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085432

De Minzi, M. C. R. (2009). Influencia del modelado de los padres sobre el desarrollo del razonamiento prosocial en los ninos/as. *Journal of Psychology, 43,* 187-198.

De Thierry, E. (2015). *Teaching the child on the trauma continuum*. Grosvenor House Publishing.

Deater-Deckard, K. (2004). *Parenting stress.* Yale University Press.

Dekovic, M. (1999). Risk and protective factors in the development of problem behavior during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28,* 667-684.

DeLeire, T, & Kalil A. (2002). Good things come in threes: Single-parent multigenerational family structure and adolescent adjustment. *Demography, 39*(2), 393-413. doi:10.1353/dem.2002.0016

Demo, D. H., & Fine, M. A. (2007). *Beyond the average divorce.* SAGE. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452274713.n5

den Velde, W. O., Hovens, J. E., Bramsen, I., McFarlane, A. C., Aarts, P. G. H., Falger, P. R. J.,

      De Groen, J. H. M., & Van Duijn, H. (2000). A cross-national study of posttraumatic

      stress disorder in Dutch-Australian immigrants. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of*

      Psychiatry, *34*(6), 919-928. https://doi.org/10.1080/000486700266

Doering-White, J., Horner, P., Sanders, L., Martinez, R., Lopez, W., & Delva, J. (2016).

      Testimonial engagement: Undocumented Latina mothers navigating a gendered

      deportation regime. *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 17*(2), 325-340.

      doi:10.1007/s12134-014-0408-7

Dorner, L., Orellana, M., & Jimenez, R. (2008). It's one of those things that you do to help the

      family: Language brokering and the development of immigrant adolescents. *Journal of*

      Adolescent Research, 23, 515-543.

Dovidio, J. F., & Esses, V. M. (2001). Immigrants and immigration: Advancing the

      psychological perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(3), 378-387. doi:10.1111/0022-

      4537.00219

Dreby, J. (2006). Honor and virtue: Mexican parenting in the transnational context. *Gender &*

      Society 20(1), 32-59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205282660

Dreby, J. (2007). Children and power in Mexican transnational families. *Journal of Marriage*

      and Family, *69*(4), 1050-1064. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00430.x

Dreby, J. (2010). *Divided by borders; Mexican migrants and their children.* University of

      California Press.

Dreby, J. (2012). The burden of deportation on children in Mexican immigrant families. *Journal*

      of Marriage and Family, 74(4), 829-845. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-

      3737.2012.00989.x

Dreby, J. (2014). Children and power during separation. *The Urban Ethnography Reader*.

Dreby, J. (2015a). *Everyday illegal: When policies undermine immigrant families*. University of

California Press.

Dreby, J. (2015b). US immigration policy and family separation: The consequences for

children's well-being. *Social Science & Medicine, 132*, 245-251.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.08.041

Dreby, J., & Adkins, T. (2010). Inequalities in transnational families. *Sociology Compass*, *4*(8),

673-689. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00297.x

Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). *Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention.* Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.43.7.748

Dunbar, R. I. (2003). The social brain: Mind, language, and society in evolutionary perspective.

Annual Review of Anthropology, *32,* 163-181.

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.32.061002.093158

Edmonston, B. (Ed.). (1996). *U.S. immigration statistics: An assessment of data needs for future*

research. Committee on National Statistics, Committee on Population. National

Academy Press.

Edwards, L. M., & Romero, A. J. (2008). Coping with discrimination among Mexican descent

adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *30*(1), 24-39.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986307311431

Ellis, B. J., Bianchi, J., Griskevicius, V., & Frankenhuis, W. E. (2017). Beyond risk and

protective factors: An adaptation-based approach to resilience. *Perspectives in*

Psychological Science, 12, 561-587. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617693054

Ellis, B. J., Figueredo, A. J., Brumbach, B. H., & Schlomer, G. L. (2009). Fundamental

dimensions of environmental risk: The impact of harsh versus unpredictable

environments on the evolution and development of life-history strategies. *Human Nature,*

20, 204-268. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-009-9063-7

Enchautegui, M. E. (2013). *Broken immigration policy: Broken families.* Urban Institute.

Enchautegui, M. E., & Menjívar, C. (2015). Paradoxes of family immigration policy: Separation,

reorganization, and reunification of families under current immigration laws. *Law &*

Policy, 37(1-2), 32-60. https://doi.org/10.1111/lapo.12030

England, M. J., Sim, L. J., & National Research Council. (2009). Associations between

depression in parents and parenting, child health, and child psychological functioning. In

England, M. J. & Sim, L. J. (Eds.), pp. 53-122. *Depression in parents, parenting, and*

children: Opportunities to improve identification, treatment, and prevention. National

Academies Press.

Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and society*. Norton.

Eskenazi, B., Fahey, C. A., & Kogut, K., Gunier, R., Torres, J., Gonzales, N. A., Holland, N., &

Deardorff, J. (2019, June 24). Association of perceived immigration policy vulnerability

with mental and physical health among US-born Latino adolescents in California. *JAMA*

Pediatrics, 173(8), 744-753. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.1475

Falicov, C. J. (1996). Mexican families. *Ethnicity and Family Therapy, 2,* 182-249.

Falicov, C. J. (1998). *Latino families in therapy: A guide to multicultural practice.* Guilford.

Falicov, C. J. (2007). Working with transnational immigrants: Expanding meanings of family,

community, and culture. *Family Process*, *46*(2), 157-171. doi:10.1111/j.1545-

5300.2007.00201.x

Fazel, M., Reed, R. V., Panter-Brick, C., & Stein, A. (2012). Mental health of displaced and refugee children resettled in high-income countries: risk and protective factors. *The Lancet, 37*9(9812), 266-282. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60051-2

Feeney, J. A. (1995). Adult attachment and emotional control. *Personal Relationships*, *2*(2), 143-159. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1995.tb00082.x

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14*(4), 245-258. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-3797 (98)00017-8

Fergus, S., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2005). Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Review of Public Health, 26*(1), 399-419. doi:10.1146/annurev.publhealth.26.021304.144357

Fernanda, D. (2016, December 27). *When deportation fears keep kids out of school: A Florida case study*. http://www.scpr.org/news/2016/12/27/67427/when-deportation-fears-trickle-down-to-preschool-a/

Finch, B. K., & Vega, W. A. (2003). Acculturation stress, social support, and self-rated health among Latinos in California. *Journal of Immigrant Health. 5,* 109-117. doi:10.1023/a:1023987717921

Finno-Velasquez, M., Cardoso, J. B., Dettlaff, A. J., & Hurlburt, M. S. (2016). Effects of parent immigration status on mental health service use among Latino children referred to child welfare. *Psychiatric Services*, *67*(2), 192-198. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201400444

First Focus. (2010). *Immigration enforcement and family separation.*

http://www.firstfocus.net/sites/deault/files/f.2010_enforcement.pdf

Flores, J. (1992). Cortijo's revenge: New mapping of Puerto Rican culture. In C. J. Falicov (Ed.),

Divided borders: Essays on Puerto Rican identity, 1993-92, 182-189. Arte Publico Press.

Fonagy, P. (2001). *Attachment theory and psychoanalysis.* Other Press.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429472060

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1997). Attachment and reflective function: Their role in self-

organization. *Developmental Psychopathology 9,* 79-700.

doi:10.1017/s0954579497001399

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1999). Loss and bereavement: Attachment theory and recent

controversies concerning "grief work" and the nature of detachment. In J. Cassidy & P.

R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*

(pp. 735-759). The Guilford Press.

Fraser, M. W., Kirby, L. D., & Smokowski, P. R. (2004). Risk and resilience in childhood. *Risk*

and Resilience in Childhood: An Ecological Perspective, *2*, 13-66.

Frieze, I. H., Boneva, B. S., Šarlija, N., Horvaat, J., Ferligoj, A., Miluska, J., Popova, L.,

Korobanova, J., Sukhareva, N., Erokhina, L., & Jarošová, E. (2004). Psychological

differences in stayers and leavers: Emigration desires in Central and Eastern European

University Students. *European Psychologist, 9*(1), 15-23. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.9.1.15

Fry, R., & Passel, J. S. (2009). *Latino children: A majority are US-born offspring of immigrants*.

https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2009/05/28/latino-children-a-majority-are-us-

born-offspring-of-immigrants/

Fuligni, A. J. (2011). Social identity, motivation, and well-being among adolescents from Asian and Latin American backgrounds. In G. Carlo, N. J. Crockett, M. Carranza (Eds.) *Health disparities in youth and families* (pp. 97-120). Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.

Fuligni, A. J. (2012). The intersection of aspirations and resources in the development of children from immigrant families. In C. G. Coll & A. K. Marks (Eds.), *The immigrant paradox in children and adolescents: Is becoming American a developmental risk?* (pp. 299-307). American Psychological Association.

Fuligni, A. J., & Yoshikawa, H. (2003). Socioeconomic resources, parenting, and child development among immigrant families. In M. H. Bornstein & R. H. Bradley (Eds.), *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development* (pp. 107-124). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Gabbard, G. O. (2005). Mind, brain, and personality disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *162*(4), 648-655. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.162.4.648

Gandara, P. C., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.837119

García, A., & Franchim, S. (2013). *Facts you need to know about immigrant women*. Center for American Progress. https://www.americanprogress.org/article/10-facts-you-need-to-know-about-immigrant-women-2013-update/

García Coll, C., & Magnuson, K. (2005). The psychological experience of immigration: A developmental perspective. In C. S. Orozco, M., Suarez-Orozco, & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (Eds.) *The immigration handbook: An interdisciplinary reader,* Routledge. 105-133.

Gecas, V., & Schwalbe, M. L. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 48,* 37-46. https://doi.org/10.2307/352226

Gee, D. G., & Casey, B. J. (2015). The impact of developmental timing for stress and recovery. *Neurobiology of Stress*, *1*, 184-194. doi:10.1016/j.ynstr.2015.02.001

Gee, G. C., & Ford, C. L. (2011). Structural racism and health inequities: Old issues, new directions. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, *8*(1), 115-132. doi:10.1017/S1742058X11000130

Gelles, J. R. (1989). Child abuse and violence in single-parent families: parent absence and economic deprivation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59*, 492-501. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1989.tb02738.x

Geltman, P., & Grant-Knight, W., & Mehta, S., Lloyd-Travaglini, C., Lustig, S., Landgraf, J., & Wise, P. (2005). The "lost boys of Sudan": Functional and behavioral health of unaccompanied refugee minors resettled in the United States. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 159*, 585-591. doi:10.1001/archpedi.159.6.585

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1984). *Adult attachment interview* (2nd ed.). University of California at Berkeley.

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1985). *Adult attachment interview* (3nd ed.). University of California at Berkeley.

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1996). *Adult attachment interview* (4nd ed.). University of California at Berkeley.

George, C., & West, M. (2003). The adult attachment projective: Measuring individual differences in attachment security using projective methodology. In M. H. D. Segal (Ed.), *Objective and projective assessment of personality and psychopathology*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gesell, A. (1928). *Infancy and human growth.* Macmillan.

Gil, A. G., Wagner, E. F., & Vega, W. A. (2000). Acculturation, familism, and alcohol use

    among Latino adolescent males: Longitudinal relations. *Journal of Community*

    Psychology, *28*(4), 443-458. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(200007)28:4<443::AID-

    JCOP6>3.0.CO;2-A

Gindling, T. H., & Poggio, S. (2012). Family separation and reunification as a factor in the

    educational success of immigrant children. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*,

    38(7), 1155-1173. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.681458

Global Detention Project. (2015). *The uncounted: Detention of migrants and asylum seekers in*

    Europe—2015. https://www.globaldetentionproject.org

Golash-Boza, T. (2014). Forced transnationalism: Transnational coping strategies and gendered

    stigma among Jamaican deportees. *Global Networks*, *14*(1), 63-79.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12013

Golash-Boza, T., & Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2013). Latino immigrant men and the deportation

    crisis: A gendered racial removal program. *Latino Studies*, *11*(3), 271-292.

    doi:10.1057/lst.2013.14

Gonzales, R. (2011). Learning to be illegal: Undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in

    the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review, 76,* 602-619.

    doi:10.1177/0003122411411901

Gonzalez, D. (2009). Immigration college rads in legal limbo can't get jobs. *Arizona Republic,*

    A1, A20. https://www.latinamericanstudies.org/border/limbo.htm

Gonzalez, N., & Consoli, M. L. M. (2012). The aftermath of deportation: Effects on the family. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología/Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 46*(3), 459-467. https://doi.org/10.30849/rip/ijp.v46i3.307

Gonzalez, R., & Padilla, A. M. (1997). The academic resilience of Mexican American high school students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 19*(3), 301-317. https://doi.org/10.1177/07399863970193004

Gonzalez-Barrera, A., & Krogstad, J. M. (2014). *US deportation of immigrants reach record high in 2013*. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/10/02/u-s-deportations-of-immigrants-reach-record-high-in-2013/

Grafft, N., Rodrigues, K., Costas-Rodriguez, B., & Pineros-Leano, M. (2022). Latinx immigrant and complex layers of trauma: Providers' perspective. *Journal of Latinx Psychology.* doi:10.1037/lat0000210

Grant, K. E., Koon, J. F., Davis, T. H., Roache, N. A., Poindexter, L. M., & Armstrong, M. L. (2000). Protective factors affecting low-income urban African American youth exposed to stress. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 220,* 388-417. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431600020004002

Gratton, B., Gutmann, M. P., & Skop, E. (2007). Immigrants, their children, and theories of assimilation: Family structure in the United States 1880-1970. *History of the Family, 12,* 203-222. doi:10.1016/j.hisfam.2007.10.003

Greenspan, S., & Shanker, S. (2004). *The first idea: How symbols, language, and intelligence evolved from our primate ancestors to modern humans.* Da Capo Press. https://imh207-lecture3-greenspan_shanker_the_first_ideachapter1-with-cover-page-v2.pdf

Guidubaldi, J., Perry, J. D., & Nastasi, B. K. (1987). Growing up in a divorced family: Initial and long-term perspectives on children's adjustment. *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 7,* 202-237.

Gulbas, L. E., & Zayas, L. H. (2017). Exploring the effects of US immigration enforcement on the well-being of citizen children in Mexican immigrant families. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, 3*(4), 53-69. doi:10.7758/RSF.2017.3.4.04

Gulbas, L. E., Zayas, L. H., Yoon, H., Szlyk, H., Aguilar-Gaxiola, S., & Natera, G. (2016). Deportation experiences and depression among US citizen-children with undocumented Mexican parents. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 42*(2), 220-230. doi:10.1111/cch.12307

Haefner, J. (2014). An application of Bowen family systems theory. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 35*(11), 835-841. doi:10.3109/01612840.2014.921257

Hagan, J., Castro, B., & Rodriguez, N. (2010). The effects of U.S. deportation policies on immigrant families and communities: Cross-border perspectives. *North Carolina Law Review, 88,* 1799-1824. https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr/vol88/iss5/12/

Hagan, J., Eschback, K., & Rodriguez, N. (2008). U.S. deportation policy, family separation, and circular migration. *International Migration Review, 42,* 64-88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2007.00114.x

Hagan, J., Rodriguez, N., & Castro, B. (2011). Social effects of mass deportations by the United States government, 2000-10. *Ethnic Racial Studies*, *34*(8), 1374-91. https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr/vol88/iss5/12/

Hammen, C., Hazel, N. A., Brennan, P. A., & Najman, J. (2012). Intergenerational transmission

and continuity of stress and depression: Depressed women and their offspring in 20 years

of follow-up. *Psychological Medicine, 42*(5), 931-942. doi:10.1017/S0033291711001978

Harris, T., & Bifulco, A. (1991). Loss of parent in childhood, attachment style, and depression in

adulthood. In Parkes, C. M., Stevenson-Hinde, J., & Marris, P. (Eds.), *Attachment across

the life-cycle* (pp. 234-367). Routledge.

Harwood, R. L., & Miller, J. G. (1991). Perceptions of attachment behavior: A comparison of

Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 37,* 583-599.

Hawthorne, M. L. (2007). Family unity in immigration law: Broadening the scope of "family."

Lewis & Clark Law Review, 11(3), 809-832.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 511-524. doi:10.1037//0022-

3514.52.3.511

Hearn, J. (2013). Global crisis, national blame. In Tierney, S. (Ed.), *Nationalism and

globalisation* (pp. 124-155). Routledge.

Hegarty, A. (2018). *Timeline: Immigrant children separated from families at the border*. USA

Today. *https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2018/06/27/immigrant-children-family-

separation-border-timeline/734014002/*

Heide, K., & Solomon, E. (1999). Type III trauma: Toward a more effective conceptualization of

psychological trauma. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative

Criminology, 43*(2), 202-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X99432007

Heiss, W. D., Graf, R., Wienhard, K., Lottgen, J., Saito, R., Fujita, T., Rosner, G., & Wagner, R. (1994). Dynamic penumbra demonstrated by sequential multitracer PET after middle cerebral artery occlusion in cats. *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism, 14*(6), 892-902. doi:10.1038/jcbfm.1994.120

Henderson, S., Schuyler, W., & Baily, C. (2013). Parental deportation, families, and mental health. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 52*(5), 451-353. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2013.01.007

Hernández, D. J., Denton, N. A., Macartney, S., & Blanchard, V. L. (2012). Children in immigrant families: Demography, policy, and evidence for the immigrant paradox. In C. G. Coll & A. K. Marks (Eds.), *The immigrant paradox in children and adolescents: Is becoming American a developmental risk?* (pp. 17-36). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13094-001

Hesse, E., & Main, M. (2000). Disorganized infant, child, and adult attachment: Collapse in behavioral and attentional strategies. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 48(*4)*,* 1097-1127. doi:10.1177/00030651000480041101

Hess, P. (1982). Parent-child attachment concept: Crucial for permanency planning. *Social Casework, 63*(1), 46-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/104438948206300107

Hesse, E. (2001). *Unclassifiable and disorganized responses in the adult attachment interview and in the infant strange situation procedure: Theoretical proposals and empirical findings.* Leiden University.

Hetherington, E. M., Clingempeel, W. G., Anderson, E. R., Deal, J. E., Hagan, M. S., Hollier, E.

    A., Lindner, M. S., MacCoby, E. E., Brown, J. C., O'Connor, T. G. . Eisenberg, M., &

    Bennion, L. D. (1992). Coping with marital transitions: A family systems perspective.

    Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, *57*(2/3), 235-244.

    https://doi.org/10.2307/1166050

Heyman, J., Flores-Macias, F., Hayes, J., Kennedy, M., Lahaie, C., Alison, C., & Alison, E.

    (2009). The impact of migration on the well-being of immigrant families: New data from

    sending communities in Mexico. *Community, Work and Family, 12*(1), 91-103.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802155704

Hill, M. S., Yeung, W. J. J., & Duncan, G. J. (2001). Childhood family structure and young adult

    behaviors. *Journal of Population Economics*, *14*(2), 271-299.

    doi:10.1007/s001480000039

Hock, E., McBride, L. L., & Gnezda, T. (1989). Maternal separation anxiety: Mother-infant

    separation from the maternal perspective. *Child Development, 60,* 793-802.

    https://doi.org/10.2307/1131019

Hoffman, M. A., Ushipz, V., & Levy-Shiff, R. (1988). Social support and self-esteem in

    adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 17,* 307-316.

    https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537672

Holmes, J. (1993). *John Bowlby and attachment theory.* Routledge.

Holmes, J. (1996). *Attachment, intimacy, autonomy: Using attachment theory in adult*

    psychotherapy. Aaronson.

Hong, W., Chan, F. K., Thong, J. Y., Chasalow, L. C., & Dhillon, G. (2014). A framework and guidelines for context-specific theorizing in information systems research. *Information Systems Research*, *25*(1), 111-136. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2013.0501

Hovey, J. D. (2000). Psychosocial predictors of acculturative stress in Mexican immigrants. *Journal of Psychology, 134*(5), 490-502. doi:10.1080/00223980009598231

Hsu, E., Davies, C. A., & Hansen, D. J. (2004). Understanding mental health needs of Southeast Asian refugees: Historical, cultural, and contextual challenges. *Clinical Psychology Review, 24,* 193-213. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2003.10.003

Hughes, K., Bellis, M. A., Hardcastle, K. A., Sethi, D., Butchart, A., Mikton, C., Jones, L., & Dunne, M. P. (2017). The effect of multiple adverse childhood experiences on health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet. Public health, 2*(8), e356-e366. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(17)30118-4

Hull, P., Kilbourne, B., Reece, M., & Husaini, B. (2008). Community involvement and adolescent mental health: Moderating effects of race/ethnicity and neighborhood disadvantage. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(4), 534-551. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20253

Human Impact Partners. (2018). The effects of forced family separation in the Rio Grande Valley: A family unity, family health research update. FamilyUnityFamilyHealth.org. https://familyunitfamilyhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/HIP-LUPE_FUFH2018-RGV-FullReport.pdf

Human Rights Watch. (2009). *Forced apart (by the numbers): Non-citizens deported mostly for non-violent offenses.* http://hrw.org/node/82173

Human Rights Watch. (2011). *Human rights watch world report, 2011.*

    https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2011

Huttenlocher, P. R. (2009). *Neural plasticity: The effects of environment on the development of*

    the cerebral cortex. Harvard University Press.

Immigration TRAC. (2013). *Who are the targets of ICE detainers?* Syracuse University,

    Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse.

Immigration and Citizenship. (2010). *2010 yearbook of immigration statistics.* Office of

    Immigration Statistics, Homeland Security.

    https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_yb_2010.pdf

Instituto National de Migracion. (2011). *Eventos de repatriación de mexicanos desde Estados*

    Unidos, según entidad federativa y punto de recepción, 2011.

    http://www.inm.gob.mx/index.php/page/Repatriacion_de_Mexicanos_de_EUA-01

Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) to End Child Immigration Detention. (2016). Ending

    child detention. https://idcoalition.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/09/End-Child-Detenton-

    Advocacy-Brochure_web_spreads_190816-1.pdf

International Society for Social Pediatrics & Child Health. (2018). *ISSOP response to the U.S.*

    government's separation of families and violation of child and human rights.

    https://www.issop.org/2018/06/26issop-response-us-governments-separation-families-

    violation-child-human-rights

Jackson, C., & Foshee, V. A. (1998). Violence-related behaviors of adolescents: Relations with

    responsive and demanding parenting. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 13*(3), 343-359.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0743554898133006

Jacobsen, T., Edelstein, W., & Hofmann, V. (1994). A longitudinal study of the relation between

    representations of attachment in childhood and cognitive functioning in childhood and

    adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 30*(1), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-

    1649.30.1.112

Jácome, M. E. (2015). Deportation in the United States: A historical analysis and

    recommendations. *Michigan Journal of Public Affairs*, *12*, 22-34.

Japel, C., Tremblay, R. E., Vitaro, F., & Boulerice, B. (1999). Early parental separation and the

    psychosocial development of daughters 6-9 years old. *American Journal of

    Orthopsychiatry*, *69*(1), 49-60. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0080381

Jasso, G. (2011). Migration and stratification. *Social Science Research 40,* 1292-336.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.03.007

Jewett, C. L. (1982). *Helping children cope with separation and loss*. Harvard Common Press.

Johnson, K. R. (2007). *Opening the floodgates: Why America needs to rethink its borders and

    immigration laws*. NYU Press.

Jones-Mason, K., Behrens, K. Y., & Gribneau Bahm, N. I. (2021). The psychobiological

    consequences of child separation at the border: lessons from research on attachment and

    emotion regulation. *Attachment & Human Development*, *23*(1), 1-36.

    doi:10.1080/14616734.2019.169287

Jonson-Reid, M., Drake, B., & Zhou, P. (2013). Neglect subtypes, race, and poverty: Individual,

    family, and service characteristics. *Child Maltreatment*, *18*(1), 30-41.

    doi:10.1177/1077559512462452

Jordan, M., Benner, K., & Nixon, R. (2018). *As migrant families are reunited, some children don't recognize their mothers.* New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/10/us/politics/trump-administration-catch-and-release-migrants.html

Kandel, W. A. (2013). *US family-based immigration policy.* Congressional Research Service.

Kanstroom, D. (2007). *Deportation nation: Outsiders in American history.* Harvard University Press.

Kaufman, J., Plotsky, P. M., Nemeroff, C. B., & Charney, D. S. (2000). Effects of early adverse experiences on brain structure and function: clinical implications. *Biological Psychiatry*, *48*(8), 778-790. doi:10.1016/s0006-3223(00)00998-7

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development.* Harvard Press.

Keller, A., Joscelyne, A., Granski, M., & Rosenfeld, B. (2017). Pre-migration trauma exposure and mental health functioning among Central American migrants arriving at the U.S. border. *PLoS One, 12*(1), 1-11, Article e0168692. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0168692

Kelly, M. S. (2007). Faith and rebellion: Protective and risk factors for the adolescent children of religiously observant Mexican-American immigrants. *Social Work & Christianity*, *34*(3), 1-22. https://www.resserachgate.net/publication/242240044

Kenny, M. E., Lomas, R., Brabeck, M., & Fife, J. (1998). Longitudinal pathways linking adolescent reports of maternal attachment and paternal attachment to psychological well-being. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 18,* 221-243. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431698018003001

Kerr, M. E., & Bowen, M. (1988). *Family evaluation.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Kessler, R. C., McLaughlin, K. A., Green, J. G., Gruber, M. J., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A.
M., & Williams, D. R. (2010). Childhood adversities and adult psychopathology in the
WHO World Mental Health Surveys. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 97*(5), 378-385.
https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.110.080499

Kobak, R. R., Duemmler, S., Burland, A., & Youngstrom, E. (1998). Attachment and negative
absorption states: Implications for treating distressed families. *Journal of Systemic
Therapies*, *17*(2), 80-88.

Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect
regulation and representations of self and others. *Child Development 59,* 135-146.
https://doi.org/10.2307/1130395

Kobak, R. R., Sudler, N., & Gamble, W. (1991). Attachment and depressive symptoms during
adolescence: A developmental pathway analysis. *Development and Psychopathology, 3,*
461-474. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095457940000763X

Koball, H., Capps, R., Perreira, K., Campetella, A., Hooker, S., Pedroza, J. M., Monson, W., &
Huerta, S. (2015). *Health and social service needs of U.S.-citizen children with detained
or deported immigrant parents*. Urban Institute and Migration Policy Institute.

Kochanska, G. (2001). Emotional development in children with different attachment histories:
The first three years. *Child Development*, *72*(2), 474-490. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-
8624.00291

Kremer, J. D., Moccio, K. A., & Hammell, J. W. (2009). *Severing a lifeline: The neglect of
citizen children in America's immigration enforcement policy*. Urban Institute.

Kunce, L. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). An attachment-theoretical approach to caregiving in romantic relationships. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Attachment processes in adulthood* (pp. 205-237). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Landale, N. S., & Hauan, S. M. (1992). The family life course of Puerto Rican children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *54*(4), 912-924. https://doi.org/10.2307/353172

Landale, N. S., Thomas, K. J. A., & Van Hook, J. (2011). The living arrangements of children of immigrants. *Future of Children, 21,* 43-70. doi:10.1353/foc.2011.0003

Langhout, R. D., Buckingham, S. L., Oberoi, A. K., Chávez, N. R., Rusch, D., Esposito, F., & Suárez-Balcazar, Y. (2018a). Statement on the effects of deportation and forced separation on immigrants, their families, and communities. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *62*(1-2), 3-12. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12256

Lashley, M. (2000). The unrecognized social stressors of migration and reunification in Caribbean families. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *37*(2), 203-217. doi:10.1177/136346150003700203

Laurent, H. K., Gilliam, K. S., Bruce, J., & Fisher, P. A. (2014). HPA stability for children in foster care: mental health implications and moderation by early intervention. *Developmental Psychobiology, 56*(6), 1406-1415. doi:10.1002/dev.21226

LeCroy, C. (1988). Parent-adolescent intimacy: Impact on adolescent functioning. *Adolescence, 23*(89)*,* 137-147. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.32.061002.093158

Lee, C. (2013). *Fictive kinship: Family reunification and the meaning of race and nation in American immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Lemche, E., Klann-Delius, G., Koch, R., & Joraschky, P. (2004). Mentalizing language

    development in a longitudinal attachment sample: Implications for alexithymia.

    Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, *73*(6), 366-374. doi:10.1159/00008039

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., Naudeau,

    S., Jelicic, H., Alberts, A., Ma, L., Smith, L. M., & Von Eye, A. (2005). Positive youth

    development, participation in community youth development programs, and community

    contributions of fifth-grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of

    positive youth development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *25*(1), 17-71.

    doi:10.1177/0272431604272461

Levy, K. N., Ellison, W. D., Scott, L. N., & Bernecker, S. L. (2011). Attachment style. *Journal*

    of Clinical Psychology, *67*(2), 193-203. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20756

Lewin, K. (1931). Environmental forces in child behavior and development. In C. Murcheson

    (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology.* Clark University Press. doi:10.1037/13524-004

Lieberman, A. F., & Bucio, G. O. (2018). When migration separates children and parents. *Zero*

    to Three, 55-60. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1192313

Lindenberg, C. S., Gendrop, S. C., Nencioli, M., & Adames, Z. (1994). Substance abuse among

    inner-city Hispanic women: Exploring resiliency. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and*

    Neonatal Nursing, 23(7), 609-616. doi:10.1111/j.1552-6909.1994.tb01927.x

Linton, J. M., Griffin, M., & Shapiro, A. J. (2017). Detention of immigrant children. *Pediatrics,*

    139(5)*,* 3-15*.* doi:10.1542/peds.2017-0483

Lombana, Y. (2021). Possibilities and challenges in providing psychotherapeutic interventions to

    meet the needs of the Latinx population in the United States. *Genealogy, 5*(1), 1-13.

    https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy5010012

Lopez, F. G., Melendez, M. C., & Rice, K. G. (2000). Parental divorce, parent-child bonds, and adult attachment orientations among college students: A comparison of three racial/ethnic groups. *Psychology, 47*(2)*,* 177-186. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.2.177

Lopez, M. H., Krogstad, J. M., & Passel, J. S. (2020). *Who is Hispanic?* (pp. 1-5), Pew Research Center.

Lopez, M. H., & Minushin, S. (2008). *National survey of Latinos.* Pew Hispanic Center. http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=93

Loumbouzi, D. A., & Olenga, P. G. (2019). The history of immigration in the USA and its policy from 2009 to 2019. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research, 3*(12), 86-94.

Lovato, K. (2019). Forced separations: A qualitative examination of how Latino/a adolescents cope with parental deportation. *Child Youth Service Review, 98*, 42-50. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.12.012

Lovato, K., Lopez, C., Karimli, L., & Abrams, L. S. (2018). The impact of deportation-related family separations on the well-being of Latinx children and youth: A review of the literature. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *95*, 109-116. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.10.011

Lowrey, A. (2017). *Trump's anti-immigrant policies are scaring eligible families away from the safety net.* Atlantic. https://www.theatlantic. com/business/archive/2017/03/trump-safety-net-latino-families/520779/

Lu, Y. (2012). Household migration, social support, and psychosocial health: The perspective from migrant-sending areas. *Social Science & Medicine*, *74*(2), 135-142. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.10.020

Luibhéid, E. (2002). *Entry denied: Controlling sexuality at the border*. University of Minnesota Press.

Luthar, S. S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology, 12*(4), 857-885. doi:10.1017/S0954579400004156

Lyons-Ruth, K., & Jacobvitz, D. (1999). Attachment disorganization: Unresolved loss, relational violence, and lapses in behavioral and attentional strategies. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 520-554). Guilford Press.

MacDonald, J. S., & MacDonald, L. D. (1964). Chain migration, ethnic neighborhood formation, and social networks. *The Milibank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 42*(1), 82-97. doi:10.2307/3348581

Mackey, S. K. (2003). Adolescence and attachment: From theory to treatment applications. In P. Erdman & T. Caffery (Eds), *Attachment and family systems* (pp. 79-117). Brunner-Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203782699

Maddali, A. O. (2014). The immigrant other: Racialized identity and the devaluation of immigrant family relations. *Indiana Law Journal*, *89*(2), 643-702. https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol89/iss2/4

Main, M. (1996). Introduction to the special section on attachment and psychopathology 2. Overview of the field of attachment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*(2), 237-243. doi:10.1037//0022-006X.64.2.237

Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of an insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment
   pattern: Procedures, findings and implications for the classification of behavior. In T. B.
   Brazelton & M. Yogman (Eds.), *Affective development in infancy, (pp.* 95-124). Ablex
   Publishing.

Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented
   during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. In M. T. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & E. M.
   Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment in the preschool years. Theory, research, and intervention*
   (pp. 121-182). The University of Chicago Press.

Manning, W. D., & Brown, S. (2006). Children's economic well-being in married and cohabiting
   parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*(2), 345-362.
   doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00257.x

Marcus, R. F., & Betzer, P. D. (1996). Attachment and antisocial behavior in early adolescence.
   The Journal of Early Adolescence, 16(2), 229-248. doi:10.1177/0272431696016002006

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion,
   and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224-253. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Martinez, C., McClure, H., & Eddy, J. (2009). Language brokering contexts and behavioral and
   emotional adjustment among Latino parents and adolescents. *The Journal of Early
   Adolescence, 29*, 71-98. doi:10.1177/0272431608324477

Marvin, R. S., & Stewart, R. B. (1990). A family system framework for the study of attachment.
   In M. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & M. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment beyond the preschool
   years* (pp. 51-86). University of Chicago Press.

Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. Russell Sage.

Massey, D. S. (2013). *Space, place and gender*. John Wiley & Sons.

Massey, D. S., Durand, J., & Malone, N. J. (2002). *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigrant in an era of economic integration*. Russell Sage Foundation. doi:10.2307/3590948

Massey, D. S., & Pren, K. (2012). Unintended consequences of U.S. immigration policy: Explaining the post-1995 surge from Lain America. *Population and Development Review, 38*(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2012.00470.x

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, *56*(3), 227-238. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.56.3.227

Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. G. J. (2002). Resilience in development. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, *74*, 117-132.

Mathema, S. (2017). *Keeping families together: Why all Americans should care about what happens to unauthorized immigrants*. Center for American Progress. https://cddn.americanprogress.org/content/uploads/2017/03/15112450/KeepFamiliesTogether-brief.pdf

Matthews, G. (2002). *Silicon Valley, women, and the California dream.* Stanford University Press.

McLaughlin, K. A., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Mennin, D. S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2011). Emotion dysregulation and adolescent psychopathology: A prospective study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *49*(9), 544-554. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2011.06.003

McLeigh, J. (2010). How do immigration and customs enforcement (ICE) practices affect the mental health of children? *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 80,* 96-100. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01011.x

McLoyd, V. C. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on Black families and children: Psychological distress, parenting, and socioemotional development. *Child Development*, *61*(2), 311-346. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1990.tb02781.x

Menjívar, C. (2006). Family reorganization in a context of legal uncertainty: Guatemalan and Salvadoran immigrants in the United States. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 32,* 223-245. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254147133

Menjívar, C. (2012). Transnational parenting and immigration law: Central Americans in the United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 38*(2), 301-322. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2011.646423

Menjívar, C. (2014). The poli-migra: Multi-layered legislation, enforcement practices, and What we can learn about and from today's approaches. *American Behavioral Scientist, 58,* 1805-1819. doi:10.1177/0002764214537268

Menjívar, C., & Abrego, L. (2012). Legal violence: Immigration law and the lives of Central American immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*(5), 1380-1421. https://doi.org/10.1086/663575

Menjívar, C., Abrego, L. J., & Schmalzbauer, L. C. (2016). *Immigrant families (immigration and society).* Wiley. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.97

Menjívar, C., & Agadjanian, V. (2007). Men's migration and women's lives: Views from rural Armenia and Guatemala. *Social Science Quarterly, 88,* 1243-1262. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00501.x

Menjívar, C., & Kanstroom, D. (2014). Introduction–Immigrant "illegality": Constructions and

    critiques. In C. Menjívar & D. Kanstroom (Eds.). *Constructing immigrant "illegality":*

    Critiques, experiences and responses (pp. 1-36). Cambridge University Press.

    doi:10.1017/CBO9781107300408.001

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2003). *The attachment behavioral system in adulthood:*

    Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. Guilford Press.

Miller, J. G. (2002). Bringing culture to basic psychological theory—Beyond individualism and

    collectivism: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 97-

    109. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.97

Miller, P. (2022). Afterword: Quantifying, mediating and intervening: The R number and the

    politics of health in the twenty-first century. *Of Numbers*, 465-476. doi:10.1007/978-3-

    030-78201-6_14.

Miller, R., Anderson, S., & Keala, D. (2004). Is Bowen theory valid? A review of basic research.

    Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 30(4), 453-466. doi:10.1111/j.1752-

    0606.2004.tb01255.x

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy.* Harvard University Press.

Minuchin, S., & Nichols, M. P. (1998). *Family healing: Strategies for hope and understanding*.

    Simon and Schuster.

Mirecki, R. M., & Chou, J. L. (2013). A multicultural application of attachment theory with

    immigrant families: Contextual and developmental adaptations. *Contemporary Family*

    Therapy: An International Journal, 35(3), 508-515. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-012-

    9210-x

Mitrani, V. B., Santisteban, D. A., & Muir, J. A. (2004). Addressing immigrant-related separations in Hispanic families with a behavior-problem adolescent. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*(3), 219-229. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.74.3.219

Mittal, C., Griskevicius, V., Simpson, J. A., Sung, S., & Young, E. S. (2015). Cognitive adaptations to stressful environments: When childhood adversity enhances adult executive function. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*, 604-621. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000028

Moller, P. (2014). Restoring law and (racial) order to the old dominion: White dreams and new federalism in anti-immigrant legislation. *Cultural Studies, 28*(5-6), 869-910. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502326.2014.886487

Mondloch, C. J., Lewis, T. L., Budreau, D. R., Maurer, D., Dannemiller, J. L., Stephens, B. R., & Kleiner-Gathercoal, K. A. (1999). Face perception during early infancy. *Psychological Science*, *10*, 419-422. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00179

Morales, A., & Hanson, W. (2005). Language brokering: An integrative review of the literature. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27,* 471-502. doi:10.1177/0739986305281333

Moroz, E. (2018). *My family divided: One girl's journey of home, loss, and hope*. Henry Holt and Company.

Morrison, D. R., & Cherlin, A. J. (1995). The divorce process and young children's well-being: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 800-812. doi:10.2307/353933

Moss, E., Rousseau, D., Parent, S., St-Laurent, D., & Saintong, J. (1998). Correlates of attachment at school age: Maternal reported stress, mother-child interaction, and behavior problems. *Child Development, 69*, 1390-1405.

Muslow, M., Caldera, Y. M., Pursley, M., Reifman, A., & Huston, A. (2002). Multilevel factor influencing maternal stress during the first three years. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64,* 944-956. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00944.x

Narchal, R. (2012). Migration loneliness and family links: A case narrative. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *6*(4), 463-469. doi:10.5281/zenodo.1079034

National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine. (2016). *Addressing the social and cultural norms that underlie the acceptance of violence: Proceedings of a workshop-in brief.* The National Academies Press. doi:10.17226/25075

National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2014). *Excessive stress disrupts the architecture of the developing brain: Working paper 3.* Update Edition. http://www.developingchild.harvard.edu

Nelson, A. (2002). Unequal treatment: confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, *94*(8), 666-668.

Nichols, M. P., & Schwartz, R. C. (1998). *Family therapy: Concepts and methods.* Allyn & Bacon.

Nicholson, M. D., & the CAPP Immigration Team. (2017). *The facts on immigration today: 2017 edition*. Center for American Progress. https://wsww.americanprogress.org/article/facts-immigration-today-2017-edition/

Noguera, P. A. (2003). The trouble with Black boys: The role and influence of environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. *Urban Education*, *38*(4), 431-459. doi:10.1177/0042085903038004005

Noom, M. J., Deković, M., & Meeus, W. H. (1999). Autonomy, attachment and psychosocial adjustment during adolescence: A double-edged sword? *Journal of Adolescence, 22*(6), 771-783. doi:10.1006/jado.1999.0269

Noonan, R. (2017). *STEM Jobs: 2017 Update. ESA Issue Brief# 02-17*. US Department of Commerce. https://www.commerce.gov/sites/default/files/migrated/reports/stem-jobs-2017-update.pdf

Office of Inspector General. (2019). *Care provider facilities described challenges addressing mental health needs of children in HHS custody*. https://oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-09-18-00431.asp

Ojeda, V. D., Magana, C., Burgos, J. L., & Vargas-Ojeda, A. C. (2020). Deported men's and father's perspective: The impacts of family separation on children and families in the U.S. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *11*, 1-14. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00148

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2006). *Racial transformation and the changing nature of segregation*. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7519d9sh

Oropesa, R. S., & Landale, N. S. (1995). *Immigrant legacies: The socioeconomic circumstances of children by ethnicity and generation in the United States.* Population Research Institute, Pennsylvania State University.

Papini, D. R., & Roggman, L. A. (1992). Adolescent perceived attachment to parents in relation to competence, depression, and anxiety: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 12,* 420-440. doi:10.1177/0272431692012004005

Park-Taylor, J., Walsh, M. E., & Ventura, A. B. (2007). Creating healthy acculturation pathways: Integrating theory and research to inform counselors' work with immigrant children. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*(1), 25-34. doi:10.1177/2156759X0701100104

Parker, A., & Root, B. (2009). *Forced apart (by the numbers): Noncitizens deported mostly for non-violent crimes.* http://cw.routledge.com/testbooks/9780415996945/human-rights/hrw-april-2009.pdf

Parkes, C. M., & Stevenson-Hinde, J., & Marris, P. (1991). *Attachment across the life cycle.* Routledge.

Parra-Cardona, J., Bulock, L., Imig, D., Villarruel, F., & Gold, S. (2006). "Trabajando duro todos los días": Learning from the life experiences of Mexican-origin migrant families. *Family Relations, 55,* 361-375. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2006.00409.x

Parsai, M., Voisine, S., Marsiglia, F. F., Kulis, S., & Nieri, T. (2009). The protective and risk effects of parents and peers on substance use, attitudes, and behaviors of Mexican and Mexican American female and male adolescents. *Youth & Society*, *40*(3), 353-376. doi:10.1177/0044118X08318117

Passel, J. S., Cohn, D., & Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2012). *Net migration from Mexico falls to zero—and perhaps less.* Pew Research Center. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/23/net-migration-from-mexico-falls-to-zero-and-perhaps-less/

Passel, J. S., & D'Vera Cohn, D. (2009). *A portrait of unauthorized immigrants in the United States*. https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2009/04/14/a-portrait-of-unauthorized-immigrants-in-the-united-states/

Passel, J. S., & Taylor, P. (2010). *Unauthorized immigrants and their US-born children*. https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2010/08/11/unauthorized-immigrants-and-their-us-born-children/

Passer, M. W., & Smith, R. E. (2007). *Psychology: The science of mind and behavior* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Patel, N. (1992). Psychological disturbance, social support and stressors: A community survey of immigrant Asian women and the indigenous population. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *5*(3), 263-276. doi:10.1080/09515079208254472

Paterson, J., Pryor, J., & Field, J. (1995). Adolescent attachment to parents and friends in relation to aspects of self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24,* 365-376. doi:10.1007/BF01537602

Perez-Foster, R. (2001). When immigration is trauma: Guidelines for the individual and family clinician. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 71*(2), 153-170. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.71.2.153

Perry, B., & Szalavitz, M. (2011). *Born for love: Why empathy is essential and endangered*. Harper Collings.

Pew Research Center. (2013). *A nation of immigrants: A portrait of the 40 million, including 11 million unauthorized.* Pew Research Center.

Philbin, M. M., Flake, M., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & Hirsch, J. S. (2018). State-level immigration and immigrant-focused policies as drivers of Latino health disparities in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine, 199,* 29-38. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.04.007

Phillips, K. (2018). Reports have spread that shelter workers can't comfort migrant children. Rules aren't that simple. *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/p/2018/06/20/reports-have-spread-that-shelter-staf-can't-comfort-migrant-children-rules-aren't-that-simple/?utm_term=.d87979b8b0e0

Piaget, J. (1930). *The child's conception of the world.* Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Pianta, R. C., Egeland, B., & Adam, E. K. (1996). Adult attachment classification and self-reported psychiatric symptomatology as assessed by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory—2. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *64*(2), 273-281. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.64.2.273

Piore, M. J. (1979). *Birds of passage: Migrant labor and industrial societies*. CUP Interernet Archive. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511572210

Plunkett, S. W., & Bamaca-Gomez, M. Y. (2003). The relationship between parenting, acculturation, and adolescent academics in Mexican-origin immigrant families in Los Angeles. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *25*(2), 222-239. doi:10.1177/0739986303025002005

Posada, G., Waters, E., Crowell, J. A., & Lay, K. L. (1995). Is it easier to use a secure mother as a secure base? Attachment q-sort correlates of the adult attachment interview. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 60(*2/3), 133-145. https://doi.org/10.22307/1166175

Kretsedemas, P., & Aparicio, A. (2004). *Immigrants, welfare reform, and the poverty of policy*. Praeger.

Ramirez García, J. I. R., Manongdo, J. A., & Ozechowski, T. J. (2014). Depression symptoms among Mexican American youth: Paternal parenting in the context of maternal parenting, economic stress, and youth gender. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(1), 27-36. doi:10.1037/

Reiss, D. (2003). Child effects on family systems: Behavioral genetic strategies. In Crouter, A. C., & Crouter, A. C. (Eds.) *Children's influence on family dynamics* (pp. 13-36). Routledge.

Rice, K. G., Cunningham, T. J., & Young, M. B. (1997). Attachment to parents, social competence, and emotional well-being: A comparison of Black and White adolescents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44,* 89-101. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.44.1.89

Robertson, J., & Bowlby, J. (1952). Responses of young children to separation from their mothers. *Courier of the International Children's Centre, Paris, 2,* 131-140.

Robjant, K., Hassan, R., & Katona, C. (2009). Mental health implications of detaining asylum seekers: Systematic review. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *194*(4), 306-312. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.108.053223

Roche, K., Lamber, S., Ghazarian, S., & Little, T. (2015). Adolescent language brokering in diverse contexts: Associations with parenting and parent-youth relationships in a new immigrant destination area. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 44,* 77-89. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0154-3

Rodriguez, N., & Hagan, J. M. (2004). Fractured families and communities: Effects of immigration reform in Texas, Mexico, and El Salvador. *Latino Studies, 2,* 328-351. doi:10.1057/palgrave.lst.8600094

Rojas-Flores, L., Clements, M. L., Hwang Koo, J., & London, J. (2017). Trauma and psychological distress in Latino citizen children following parental detention and deportation. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 9*(3), 352-361. doi:10.1037/tra0000177

Rollins, J. A. (2018). Cruel decisions: What were they thinking? *Pediatric Nursing, 44*(4), 161-162.

Romeo, R. D. (2013). The teenage brain: The stress response and the adolescent brain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*(2), 140-145. doi:10.1177/0963721413475445

Romero, V. C. (2003). The child citizenship act and the family reunification act: Valuing the

    citizen child as well as the citizen parent. *Florida Law Review*, *55*, 489-509.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescents' self-image.* Princeton University.

    doi:10.1515/9781400876136

Rosenstein, D. S., & Horowitz, H. A. (1996). Adolescent attachment and psychopathology.

    Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64(2), 244-253. doi:10.1037//0022-

    006x.64.2.244

Rothbaum, F., Rosen, K., Ujiie, T., & Uchida, N. (2002). Family systems theory, attachment

    theory, and culture. *Family Process, 41*(3), 328-350. doi:10.1111/j.1545-

    5300.2002.41305.x

Rowe, S. M., & Wertsch, J. V. (2002). Vygotsky's model of cognitive development. *Blackwell*

    handbook of childhood cognitive development, *24,* 538-554.

    doi:10.1002/9780470996652.ch24

Rumberger, R. W., & Larson, K. A. (1998). Student mobility and the increased risk of high

    school dropout. *American Journal of Education, 107*(1), 1–

    35. https://doi.org/10.1086/444201

Rutter, M. (2002). Nature, nurture, and development: From evangelism through science toward

    policy and practice. *Child Development*, *73*(1), 1-21. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00388

Salter, M. D. (1940). *An evaluation of adjustment based upon the concept of security: Child*

    Development Series. University of Toronto Press.

Schrover, M., & Moloney, D. (2013). Gender, migration, and cross-categorical research. *Gender,*

    Migration and Categorisation, 1, 255-272.

Sewell-Coker, B., Hamilton-Collins, J., & Fein, E. (1985). Social work practice with West Indian immigrants. *The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, November, 66*(9), 563-568. doi:10.1177/104438948506600907.

Shapiro, J. (2018). *Digital play for global citizens: A guide from the Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop*. Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop.

Shonkoff, J. P., Boyce, W. T., & McEwen, B. S. (2009). Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the childhood roots of health disparities: Building a new framework for health promotion and disease prevention. *JAMA, 301*(21), 2252-2259. doi:10.1001/jama.2009.754

Siegel, D. (1999). *The developing mind: Towards a neurobiology of interpersonal experience*. Guildford.

Simanski, J. F. (2014). *Immigration enforcement actions: 2013*. Department of Homeland Security.

https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Enforcement_Actions_2013.pdf

Simha, S. (2019). The Impact of family separation on immigrant and refugee families. *North Carolina Medical Journal, 80*(2), 95-96. doi:10.18043/ncm.80.2.95

Simmons, R. G., Burgeson, R., Carlton-Ford, S., & Blyth, D. (1987). The impact of cumulative change in early adolescence. *Child Development, 58,* 1220-1234. doi:10.2307/1130616

Sinnerbrink, I., Silove, D., Field, A., Steel, Z., & Manicavasagar, V. (1997). Compounding of premigration trauma and postmigration stress in asylum seekers. *The Journal of Psychology*, *131*(5), 463-470. doi:10.1080/00223989709603533

Slack, K. S., Holl, J. L., McDaniel, M., Yoo, J., & Bolger, K. (2004). Understanding the risks of child neglect: An exploration of poverty and parenting characteristics. *Child Maltreatment*, *9*(4), 395-408. doi:10.1177/1077559504269193

Smith, C., & Krohn, M. D. (1995). Delinquency and family life among male adolescents: The

    role of ethnicity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24,* 69-93. doi:10.1007/BF01537561

Smith, D. E. (1993). The standard North American family: SNAF as an ideological code.

    Journal of Family Issues, *14*(1), 50-65. doi:10.1177/0192513X93014001005

Smokowski, P. R., & Bacallao, M. L. (2006). Acculturation, internalizing mental health

    symptoms, and self-esteem: Cultural experiences of Latino adolescents in North Carolina.

    Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 37, 273-292. doi:10.1007/S10578-006-0035-4

Spence, J. T. (1985). Achievement American style: The rewards and costs of individualism.

    American Psychologist, *40*(12), 1285-1295. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.40.12.1285

Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth

    to adulthood. *Attachment & Human Development, 7*(4), 349-367.

    doi:10.1080/14616730500365928

Stacy, A. W., Sussman, S., Dent, C. W., Burton, D., & Flay, B. R. (1992). Moderators of peer

    social influence in adolescent smoking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,*

    163-172. doi:10.1177/0146167292182007

Stanton-Salazar, R. D., & Spina, S. U. (2005). Adolescent peer networks as a context for social

    and emotional support. *Youth & Society*, *36*(4), 379-417.

    doi:10.1177/0044118X04267814

Steinberg, L. D., Catalano, R., & Dooley, D. (1981). Economic antecedents of child abuse and

    neglect. *Child Development*, 53(3), 975-985. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1981.tb03139.x

Stephen, E. H., & Bean, F. D. (1992). Assimilation, disruption and the fertility of Mexican origin

    women in the United States. *International Migration Review, 26*(1), 67-88.

    doi:10.1177/019791839202600104

Stress, T. (2018). *Toxic stress*. Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University.

    https://developingchild.harvard.edu/science/key-concepts/toxicstress/

Suárez-Orozco, C. (2004). Formulating identity in a globalized world. *Globalization: Culture*

    and Education in the New Millennium, *31,* 173-202. doi:10.1525/9780520930964-010

Suárez-Orozco, C., Gaytán, F. X., Bang, H. J., Pakes, J., O'Connor, E., & Rhodes, J. (2010).

    Academic trajectories of newcomer immigrant youth. *Developmental Psychology*, *46*(3),

    602-618. doi:10.1037/a0018201

Suárez-Orozco, C., Motti-Stefanidi, F., Marks, A., & Katsiaficas, D. (2018). An integrative risk

    and resilience model for understanding the adaptation of immigrant-origin children and

    youth. *American Psychologist, 73*(6), 781-796. doi:10.1037/amp0000265

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration.* Harvard

    University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a new land:*

    Immigrant students in American society. Harvard University Press. doi:10.1111/j.1741-

    3737.2008.00591.x

Suárez-Orozco, C., Todorova, I. L., & Louie, J. (2002). Making up for lost time: The experience

    of separation and reunification among immigrant families. *Family Process, 41*(4), 625-

    643. doi:10.1111/J.1545-5300.2002.00625.X

Suárez-Orozco, C., Yoshikawa, H., Teranishi, R. T., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2011). Growing up

    in the shadows: The developmental implications of unauthorized status. *Harvard*

    Educational Review, *81*(3), 438-473. doi:10.17763/haer.81.3.g23x203763783m75

Suárez-Orozco, M. M., Suárez-Orozco, C., & Qin-Hilliard, D. (2005). *The new immigration: An*

    interdisciplinary reader. Brunner-Routledge.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.2307/585569

Sullivan, M. M., & Rehm, R. (2005). Mental health of undocumented Mexican immigrants: A review of the literature. *Advances in Nursing Science. 28,* 240-251. doi:10.1097/00012272-200507000-00006

Szalavitz, M. (2011). *The math gender gap: Nurture trumps nature*. Time Healthland.

Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. M. (1989). *Breakthroughs in family therapy with drug abusing and problem youth*. Springer.

Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore*. Little Brown & Co. doi:10.2307/2057483

Talavera, V., Nuñez-Mchiri, G. G., & Heyman, J. (2010). Deportation in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands: Anticipation, experience, and memory. In N. De Genova & N. Peutz (Eds.), *The deportation regime* (pp. 166-195). Duke University Press. doi:10.1215/9780822391340-007

Tamura, T., & Lau, A. (1992). Connectedness versus separateness: Applicability of family therapy to Japanese families. *Family Process*, *31*(4), 319-340. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.1992.00319.x

Taschman, K., & Muruthi, B. A. (2020). "Family is family forever": Perceptions of family changes after deportation. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *42*(2), 108-120. doi:10.1007/s10591-019-09528-3

Taxis, J. C., Rew, L., Jackson, K., & Kouzekanani, K. (2004). Protective resources and perceptions of stress in a multi-ethnic sample of school-age children. *Pediatric Nursing*, *30*(6), 477-482.

Taylor, G. J. (2010). Affects, trauma, and mechanisms of symptom formation: A tribute to John C. Nemiah, MD (1918-2009). *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 79,* 339-349. doi:10.1159/000320119

Taylor, G. J., Bagby, R. M., & Parker, J. D. A. (1997). *Disorders of affect regulation: Alexithymia in medical and psychiatric illness*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511526831

Teachman, J. D. (2002). Childhood living arrangements and the intergenerational transmission of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *64*(3), 717-729. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00717.x

Teachman, J. D. (2004). The childhood living arrangements of children and the characteristics of their marriages. *Journal of Family Issues*, *25*(1), 86-111. doi:10.1177/0192513X03255346

Teachman, J. D. (2008). The living arrangements of children and their educational well-being. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*(6), 734-761. doi:10.1177/0192513X07309742

Terr, L. C. (1991). Childhood traumas: An outline and overview. *Psychotraumatology, 148*(1), 301-320. doi:10.1176/ajp.148.1.10

The White House (2010, August 12). Statement by the president on the passage of the Southwest border security bill. http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/08/12/statement-president-passage-southwestborder-security-bill

Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. (1996). *The Polish peasant in Europe and America: A classic work in immigration history*. University of Illinois Press.

Thompson, N. E., & Gurney, A. G. (2003). "He is everything": Religion's role in the lives of

    immigrant youth. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *2003*(100), 75-90.

    doi:10.1002/yd.64

Tindall, G. B., & Shi, D. E. (1989). *America, a narrative history* (2nd ed.). W. W. Norton.

Toman, W. (1961). *Family constellation.* Springer Publishing Company.

Tomasello, M., & Carpenter, M. (2007). Shared intentionality. *Developmental Science*, *10*, 121-

    125. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467.2007.00573.x

Torres, S., Santiago, C., Walts, K., Richards, M., & Kazak, A. E. (2018). Immigration policy,

    practices, and procedures: The impact on the mental health of Mexican and Central

    American youth and families. *American Psychologist, 73*(7), 843-854.

    doi:10.1037/amp0000184

Tristi, D., & Herrera, G. (2018). *Administration actions against immigrant families harming*

    children through increased fear, loss of needed assistance.

    https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/administration-actions-against-

    immigrant-families-harming-children

Turner, T. (2002). Representation, politics, and cultural imagination in indigenous video. In

    Altheide, D. L. & Snow, R. P. (Eds.) *Media worlds* (pp. 75-89). University of California

    Press. doi:10.1525/9780520928169-006

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Updegraff, K. A. (2007). Latino adolescents' mental health: Exploring

    the interrelations among discrimination, ethnic identity, cultural orientation, self-esteem,

    and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Adolescence, 30,* 549-567.

    doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2006.08.002

UNICEF. (2016). *Uprooted. The growing crisis for refugee and migrant children*, 17-39.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2006). *Detention & removal of illegal aliens: Office of Inspector General.* U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2009). *Removals involving illegal alien parents of United States citizen children.* Government Printing Office. http://www.oig.dhs.gov/assets/Mgmt/OIG_09-15_Jan09.pdf

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2011). *Estimates of the unauthorized immigrant population residing in the United States, 1-7.* http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statisticss/publications/ois_ill_pr_2011.pdf

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2012). *Deportation of parents of U.S.-born citizen.* Government Printing Office. http://www.lirs.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/ICE-DEPORT-OF-PARENTS-OF-US-CIT-FY-2011.pdf.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2017). *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics of 2017.* https://www.dhs.gov/immgration-statistics/yearbook/2017

U.S. Supreme Court. (1889). Chae Chan Ping v. U.S. (Chinese Exclusion Case), 130 U.S. 581-611. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/130/581/

van der Kolk, B. A., Pelcovitz, D., Roth, S., Mandel, F. S., McFarlane, A., & Herman, J. L. (1996). Dissociation, somatization, and effect dysregulation: The complexity of adaptation to trauma. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 153,* 83-93. doi:10.1176/AJP.153.7.83

van Ecke, Y. (2005). Immigration from an attachment perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 33*(5), 467-476. doi:10.2224/sbp.2005.33.5.467

van Ecke, Y. (2006). Unresolved attachment among immigrants: an analysis using the adult

    attachment projective. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 167*(4), 433-442.

    doi:10.3200/GNTP.167.4.433-442

van Ecke, Y. (2007). Attachment style and dysfunctional career thoughts: How attachment style

    can affect the career counseling process. *The Career Development Quarterly, 55*(4), 339-

    350. doi:10.5117/9789056294809

van Gennep, A. (1960). *Rites of passage*. Routledge. doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.131.3416.1801

van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Sagi, A. (1999). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: Universal and

    contextual dimensions. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.) *Handbook of attachment*

    theory, research and clinical applications (pp. 713-734). The Guilford Press.

Venta, A., Galicia, B., Bailey, C., Abate, A., Marshall, K., & Long, T. (2020). Attachment and

    loss in the context of U.S. immigration: Caregiver separation and characteristics of

    internal working models of attachment in high school students. *Attachment & Human*

    Development, *22*(4), 474-489. doi:10.1080/14616734.2019.1664604

Villenas, S., & Deyhle, D. (1999). Critical race theory and ethnographies challenging the

    stereotypes: Latino families, schooling, resilience and resistance. *Curriculum Inquiry*,

    29(4), 413-445. doi:10.1111/0362-6784.00140

Viner, R. (2018). RCPCH statement on Trump administration family separation policy. *Royal*

    College of Pediatrics and Child Health. https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/news-

    events/news/rcpch-statement-trump-administration-family-separation-policy

Vinick, D. (2017). *Four hidden policy changes in Trump's immigration memos*. Politico.

    https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2017/02/four-hidden-policy-changes-trump-

    immigration-memos-000323/

Vogt, W. A. (2013). Crossing Mexico: Structural violence and the commodification of

      undocumented Central American migrants. *American Ethnologist, 40,* 764-780.

      doi:10.1111/amet.12053

Von Sydow, K. (2002). Systemic attachment theory and therapeutic practice: A proposal.

      Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 9, 77-90. doi:10.1002/cpp.322

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. (1980). Effects of divorce on the visiting father-child

      relationship. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*(12), 1534-1539.

      https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.137.12.1534

Walsdorf, A. A., Roche, K. M., Caughy, M. O., & McGorge, C. R. (2022). Latinx Parents'

      perceptions of how the changing immigration climate has affected their adolescent

      children. *Journal of Latinx Psychology, 10*(1), 54. doi:10.1037/lat0000199

Walsh, F. (2006). *Strengthening family resilience* (2nd ed). Guilford Press.

Ward, L. S. (2010). Farmworkers at risk: The costs of family separation. *Journal of Immigration*

      Minor Health, *12*, 672-677. doi:10.1007/s10903-008-9207-6

Waters, E., Crowell, J., Elliott, M., Corcoran, D., & Treboux, D. (2002). Bowlby's secure base

      theory and the social/personality psychology of attachment styles: Work(s) in progress.

      Attachment & Human Development, 4(2), 230-242. doi:10.1080/14616730210154216

Waters, E., Hamilton, C. E., & Weinfield, N. S. (2000). The stability of attachment security from

      infancy to adolescence and early adulthood: General introduction. *Child Development,*

      71, 678-683. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00175 10.1111/1467-8624.00175

Watson, J. B. (1928). *The psychological care of infant and child*. (p. 15-28). Appleton.

Weber, L. R., Miracle, A., & Skehan, T. (1995). Family bonding and delinquency: Racial and ethnic influences among U.S. youth. *Human Organization, 54,* 363-372. doi:10.17730/humo.54.4.0322200442nw7701

Weingarten, K. (2003). *Common shock: Witnessing violence every day.* Dutton.

Weinraub, M., & Lewis, M. (1977). The determinants of children's responses to separations. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 42*(4), 1-78. doi:10.2307/1165949

Weinstein, R. S. (2002). Overcoming inequality in schooling: A call to action for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(1), 21-42. doi:10.1023/A:1014311816571

Weisner, T. S. (2002). Ecocultural understanding of children's developmental pathways. *Human Development*, *45*(4), 275-281. doi:10.1159/000064989

Weisner, T. S. (2010). *Well-being, chaos, and culture: Sustaining a meaningful daily routine*. In G. W. Evans & T. D. Wachs (Eds.), *Chaos and its influence on children's development: An ecological perspective* (pp. 211-224). American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/12057-013

Weiss, R. S. (1982). Attachment in adult life. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior* (pp. 171-184). Wiley.

Werner, E., & Smith, R. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. Adams, Bannister, and Cox.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1992). *Overcoming the odds: High-risk children from birth to adulthood*. Cornell University Press. doi:10.1086/230130

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (2001). *Journeys from childhood to midlife: Risk, resilience, and recovery*. Cornell University Press. doi:10.1542/peds.114.2.492

Wessler, S. F. (2011). *Shattered families: The perilous intersection of immigration enforcement and the child welfare system.* https://acr.org/shatteredfamilies.org

Williford, A., Calkins, S., & Keane, S. (2007). Predicting change in parenting stress across early childhood: Child and maternal factors. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 35,* 251-263. doi:10.1007/s10802-006-9082-3

Wood, D. D., & Near, L. L. (2010). Using expressive arts when counseling bereaved children. In Corr, C. A., & Balk, D. E. (Eds.) *Children's encounters with death, bereavement, and coping* (pp. 373-393). Springer Publishing Company.

Wood, L. C. N. (2018). Impact of punitive immigration policies, parent-child separation, and child detention on the mental health and development of children. *BMJ Paediatrics Open*, *2*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjpo-2018-000338

Wu, L. L., & Thomson, E. (2001). Race differences in family experience and early sexual initiation: Dynamic models of family structure and family change. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*(3), 682-696. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00682.x

Wynne, L. C. (1984). The epigenesis of relational systems: A model for understanding family development. *Family Process*, *23*(3), 297-318.

Yeater, E., Miller, G., Rinehart, J., & Nason, E. (2012). Trauma and sex surveys meet minimal risk standards: Implications for institutional review boards. *Psychological Science*, *23*(7), 780-787.

Yeung, W. J., Linver, M. R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for young

    children's development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child Development*,

    73(6), 1861-1879. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.t01-1-00511

Yoshikawa, H., & Kalil, A. (2011). The effects of parental undocumented status on the

    developmental contexts of young children in immigrant families. *Child Development*

    Perspectives, 5(4), 291-297. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00204.x

Yoshikawa, H., & Way, N. (2008). From peers to policy: How broader social contexts influence

    the adaptation of children and youth in immigrant families. *New Directions for Child and*

    Adolescent Development, *2008*(121), 1-8. doi:10.1002/cd.219

Yu, M. (1997). Mental health services to immigrants and refugees. In T. Watkins & J. W.

    Callicutt (Eds.) *Mental health policy and practice today* (pp. 164-181). SAGE.

    doi:10.4135/9781452243146.N10

Zayas, L. H., Aguilar-Gaxiola, S., Yoon, H., & Rey, G. N. (2015). The distress of citizen-

    children with detained and deported parents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies,*

    24(11), 3213-3223. doi:10.1007/s10826-015-0124-8

Zayas, L. H., & Bradlee, M. H. (2014). Exiling children, creating orphans: When immigration

    policies hurt citizens. *Social Work, 59*(2), 167-175. doi:10.1093/sw/swu004

Zentgraf, K. M., & Stoltz, N. (2012). Transnational family separation: A framework for analysis.

    Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 38(2), 345-366.

    doi:10.1080/1369183X.2011.646431

Appendix A

Deportation Separation Suggested Questions

The following questions can assist clinicians in obtaining the deportation separation history of children. Clinicians may read each item to the child. A caregiver may be present and provide additional information.

Child's Name: _____   Date: _____

Child's DOB: _____   Age: _____

Parents' Name: _____

Gender: Male: _____ Female: _____ Other: _____

Instructions for child "I am going to read some statements to you, and you can answer them with as much detail as you want to. Some statements are very easy, but others may be difficult to talk about. We are in no rush, so take your time. Let me know if you need me to repeat the statements."

1) What is your family's country of origin? _____

2) How did your family come to the U.S.? _____

3) What things do you like about your culture? _____

4) What was it like living in your family's country? _____

5) Do you know what deportation is?   Yes _____   No _____

If yes, could you tell me what it is? _____

6) Has someone in your family been deported?   Yes _____   No _____

If yes, when were they deported? _____

7) Relationship of the deported person with the child. _____

8) Have you ever been separated from all your family members? Yes _____ No _____

Please, describe the experience _____

_____

_____

9) Did you witness when your family member was deported?   Yes _____ No _____

Please, describe the experience _____

_____

_____

Additional instructions: "Now, I'm going to ask you to say some statements, and you will just answer saying 'yes' or 'no.' Let's start":

10) I experience fear that a member of my family may be deported.   Yes _____ No _____

11) I experience fear that I may be deported.   Yes _____ No _____

12) I have interest in my schoolwork even when a family member

was deported.   Yes _____ No_____

13) My family always has food to eat.   Yes _____ No _____

14) Adults can be trusted.   Yes _____ No _____

15) I feel close to my mother or caregiver.   Yes _____ No _____

16) I worry about my family.   Yes _____ No _____

17) I trust police officers.   Yes _____ No _____

18) I need to work to help my family.   Yes _____ No _____

19) I am happy.   Yes _____ No _____

20) I take care of my younger siblings.   Yes _____ No _____

21) I continue seeing my school friends.   Yes _____ No _____

22) I feel close to my father or caregiver.   Yes _____ No _____

23) I enjoy going to the park.   Yes _____ No _____

24) My parents care for each other.   Yes _____ No _____

25) I frequently speak to the deported family member.   Yes _____ No _____

26) When my parents moved to the USA,   I was _____ years old

27) Some of my siblings were born in the USA.   Yes _____ No _____

28) I feel safe.   Yes _____ No _____

29) I use electronic devices to contact my

deported family members   Yes _____ No _____

30) I miss my father/mother.   Yes _____ No _____

31) I sleep all night.   Yes _____ No _____

32) I always go to school.   Yes _____ No _____

33) I have fun with my school friends.   Yes _____ No _____

34) I cry during the night.   Yes _____ No _____

35) Even when I am a U.S. citizen, I may have to leave the country.   Yes _____ No _____

36) I would love to move to my parents' country.   Yes _____ No _____

37) I am sad when I am not with my parents.   Yes _____ No _____

38) I like to be alone.   Yes _____ No _____

39) I feel I belong in the USA.   Yes _____ No _____

40) I trust and visit my doctor as needed.   Yes _____ No _____

41) My parents care for me.   Yes _____ No _____

42) I enjoy cultural food.   Yes _____ No _____

43) My parents (I) moved to the USA because _____

44) I participate in spiritual/religious activities.   Yes _____ No _____

45) I show love to my parents and siblings.   Yes _____ No _____

46) I love animals.   Yes _____ No _____

47) I enjoy eating.   Yes _____ No _____

Appendix B

Preguntas sobre Separación por Deportación

Versión en Español

Las preguntas siguientes pueden ser hechas por el consejero clínico entrevistando a el niño(a).

Los padres o el tutor del niño podrán estar presente y proveer información adicional.

Nombre del Niño(a): _____ Fecha: _____

Fecha de Nacimiento del Niño(a): _____ Age: _____

Nombre del Encargado del Niño(a): _____

Sexo: Femenino: _____ Masculino: _____ Otro: _____

Instrucciones para los niños: "Voy a hacerte unas preguntas y puedes contestarlas con el mayor detalle que desees. Algunas preguntas son fáciles, pero otras pueden ser un poco más difíciles. No tenemos prisa alguna, así que puedes tomar tu tiempo antes de contestarme. Me dejas saber si necesitas que repita la pregunta."

1) ¿De qué país viene tu familia? _____

2) ¿Cómo llegó tu familia a los E.U.? _____

3) ¿Qué cosas disfrutas de tu cultura? _____

4) ¿Cómo fue vivir en el país de origen de tu familia? _____

5) ¿Sabes lo que significa deportación?   Sí _____ No _____

(En caso que el niño(a) conozca), me podrías decir qué es: _____

_____

6) ¿Conoces a alguien en tu familia que ha sido deportado(a)?   Sí _____ No _____

Si es cierto, ¿cuándo? _____

7) ¿Qué relación tiene la persona deportada con el niño(a)? _____

8) ¿Alguna vez has sido separada(o) de toda tu familia?   Sí _____No _____

Por favor, describe esta experiencia: _____

_____

_____

9) ¿Estabas presente cuándo el miembro de tu familia fue arrestado? Sí _____No _____

Por favor, describe esta experiencia: _____

_____

_____

Instrucciones adicionales- "Ahora, voy a hacerte otras preguntas y puedes responder

diciendo 'Sí' o 'No.' Comencemos":

10) Me da miedo que algún miembro de mi familia sea deportado.   Sí _____   No _____

11) Me da miedo que me deporten.   Sí _____   No _____

12) Disfruto de la escuela aun cuando un miembro de

mi familia fue deportado.   Sí _____   No _____

13) Mi familia siempre tiene comida.   Sí _____   No _____

14) Podemos confiar en los adultos.   Sí _____   No _____

15) Yo me siento cercano a mi madre o mi guardián.   Sí _____   No _____

16) Yo me preocupo por mi familia.   Sí _____   No _____

17) Yo confío en la policía.   Sí _____   No _____

18) Yo tengo que trabajar para ayudar las finanzas de mi familia. Sí _____   No _____

19) Yo soy feliz.   Sí _____   No _____

20) Yo cuido de mis hermanos menores.   Sí _____   No _____

21) Yo comparto con mis amigos de la escuela. Sí _____ No _____

22) Yo me siento cercano a mi padre o mi guardián. Sí _____ No _____

23) Yo disfruto yendo al parque. Sí _____ No _____

24) Mis padres se cuidan uno al otro. Sí _____ No _____

25) Yo hablo con mis familiares deportados frecuentemente. Sí _____ No _____

26) Cuándo mis padres se mudaron a los Estados Unidos (E. U.), Yo tenía _____ años

27) Algunos de mis hermanos(as) nacieron en los E. U. Sí _____ No _____

28) Yo me siento seguro(a). Sí _____ No _____

29) Yo utilizo sistemas electrónicos para comunicarme

con la familia que ha sido deportada. Sí _____ No _____

30) Yo extraño a mi mamá / papá. Sí _____ No _____

31) Yo duermo toda la noche. Sí _____ No _____

32) Yo siempre voy a la escuela. Sí _____ No _____

33) Me divierto con mis amigos en la escuela. Sí _____ No _____

34) En las noches, yo lloro. Sí _____ No _____

35) Aunque yo soy ciudadano americano, me tengo que ir del país. Sí _____ No _____

36) Me encantaría mudarme al país de mis padres. Sí _____ No _____

37) Yo me siento triste cuándo no estoy con mis padres. Sí _____ No _____

38) Prefiero estar solo(a). Sí _____ No _____

39) Yo me siento que pertenezco en los E. U. Sí _____ No _____

40) Yo confío y visito mi médico cuándo lo necesito. Sí _____ No _____

41) Mis padres me cuidan. Sí _____ No _____

42) Yo disfruto la comida relacionada a mi cultura/país. Sí _____ No _____

43) Mis padres y yo nos mudamos a los E. U. porque: _____

_____

_____

44) Yo participo de actividades espirituales/religiosas.   Sí _____ No _____

45) Yo le demuestro cariño y amor a mis padres y hermanos.   Sí _____ No _____

46) Me gustan los animales.   Sí _____ No _____

47) Me gusta comer.   Sí _____ No _____