***Stress about Eviction or Loss of Housing and Child Mental Health***

Jamie L. Hanson, Ph.D.[1,2]

1. Learning, Research & Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA USA
2. Department of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA USA

**Contact info:**
Jamie Hanson
University of Pittsburgh
Murdoch Building
3420 Forbes Ave., Rm. 532
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
Email: jamie.hanson@pitt.edu

**Word Count**: 3,493

***Key Points:***

***Question****: What are the associations between caregivers' stress about eviction or housing loss and children's mental health outcomes across different ages?*

***Findings****: In this cross-sectional study of 36,638 children, stress about eviction or housing loss was associated with increased odds of internalizing symptoms (e.g., depression; anxiety), with stronger relations seen for depression in younger children. No consistent associations were found with ADHD or behavioral problems after adjusting for different sociodemographic factors.*

***Meaning****: Stress about eviction or housing loss may differentially impact children's mental health outcomes, particularly internalizing symptoms in younger children. This underscores the importance of housing stability interventions for child mental health.*

## Abstract

***Importance***: Eviction and housing loss are pressing public health concerns. Understanding how caregivers' stress about eviction or loss of housing relates to specific childhood psychiatric issues across development is important.

***Objective***: To examine associations between stress about eviction or loss of housing and caregiver-reported child depression, anxiety, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), and behavioral problems, adjusting for sociodemographic factors.

***Design***: Cross-sectional analysis of a nationally representative survey, collected between July 2022 to January 2023.

***Setting***: United States.

***Participants***: Over 36,000 caregivers and children from a national survey.

***Main Outcomes and Measures***: Caregiver-reported child depression, anxiety, ADHD, and behavioral problems. Generalized linear mixed models were used to test associations with stress about eviction or loss of housing.

**Results**: Analyses from a sociodemographically diverse sample of 36,710 children indicated that stress about eviction or loss of housing was associated with 4-35% increased odds of internalizing psychopathology (i.e., depression and anxiety) in children. Relations were sometimes moderated by age, with stronger associations for younger children. No consistent relations emerged between stress about eviction or loss of housing and ADHD or behavioral problems after adjustment.

**Conclusions and Relevance**: This study provided new insights into how stress about eviction or loss of housing is differentially associated with internalizing versus externalizing psychopathology across child development. Prospective longitudinal research is still needed to fully understand these complex relations over time. Findings underscored the importance of policies and interventions to address housing instability and its mental health consequences for children.

Eviction, foreclosures and housing instability presents significant threats to the well-being of millions of Americans each year[1,2]. Millions of families face evictions, removal from their homes[3], or foreclosures[4]. This is of incredible import for public health and public policy, as adults under threat of eviction or foreclosure report and evince multiple negative physical and mental health outcomes[2,5,6]. Notably, eviction and foreclosures are not equally distributed across demographics– it disproportionately affects communities of color, the economically marginalized, and families with children in their home[7]. Despite these alarming facts, there are many open questions related to the impacts of eviction, foreclosures and housing loss on child mental health where deeper investigation is needed, especially regarding the etiology and occurrence of different psychiatric issues.

Research finds that eviction, foreclosures, and housing instability have significant health impacts on families and children, including premature birth, maternal depression, and parenting stress[8–11]. Housing loss and eviction have been linked to decreased social support[12], food insecurity[13,14], increased conflict in the home[15], and harsh parenting[16–20]. These challenges may cascade to significantly impact child development and mental health[21–24]. For example, housing instability and experiencing multiple moves in childhood is associated with more externalizing problems[25] – or aggression, rule-breaking, and other disruptive behaviors that are expressed outwardly through actions[26]. Similarly, household and residential changes in adolescence were related to depression and internalizing problems, or issues that are inwardly directed, with distress in internal thoughts and feelings[27]. Examined collectively, research generally suggests housing instability impacts child mental health, but further study is needed to understand the consequences of these experiences on child and adolescent functioning.

While existing research has provided insights into links between housing instability and child mental health, important gaps remain in fully understanding these relations. First and foremost, while individuals and families can be formally evicted via court order, informal evictions are much more common. Informal eviction is the most common reason (~72%) for a forced move[28], as landlords may pressure, intimidate, or deceive a renter to leave without court proceedings[29]. While foreclosures happen through court orders, there may be anticipatory shame, loss, and regret occurring as a borrow starts defaulting[30–32]. As such, it is important to think about the psychological pressures and concerns related to eviction or foreclosure to more fully understand these issues. Second, additional work is needed to examine eviction's or foreclosure's associations with mental health in relation to children's age. Eviction or loss of housing at specific points in development could have larger impacts on health; for example, younger children may be more impacted by stress and experiences as: they are more dependent on caregivers and substantial brain development is occurring earlier in time[33,34]. Age may moderate the impact of eviction or foreclosures given that different forms of psychopathology show differential onsets in childhood versus adolescence. Finally, there is significant variability in how the impacts of eviction or foreclosures are isolated, and what confounding variables are used in adjusting statistical models. Nearly all projects include child demographics, while only some projects adjust for other developmental challenges common to families who face eviction (i.e., food insecurity; low birth weight). Moving forward, it will be critical to think about psychological pressures and anxiety related to eviction or loss of housing, while comprehensively adjusting statistical models and considering potential interactions with age.

To overcome these limitations, in this study, we used a national survey to test associations between caregivers' stress about being evicted or housing loss and indicators of four forms of psychopathology– depression, anxiety, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), behavioral/conduct problems. We were interested in the main effect of stress about eviction or loss of housing; and the interactions between stress about eviction or loss of housing and child

age to potentially understand differential developmental impacts of mental health. Given the wide-reaching impacts of eviction, we hypothesized: 1) Caregiver stress about eviction or loss of housing will be positively associated with risk for these four types of mental health problems; and 2) the association between caregiver stress about eviction or loss of housing and child mental health problems will be moderated by age, with greater relations seen in younger children.

## METHOD

*Participants*

We leveraged the 2022 National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH), an ongoing population-based survey that collected responses from over 50,000 caregivers in the United States[35,36]. Administered by the U.S. Census Bureau, the NSCH is a cross-sectional, high-quality survey and was collected across all 50 U.S. states between July 2022 and January 2023. The survey collected data from 54,103 households (~1,061 per state). Parents or other knowledgeable adult caregivers answered questions about one specific child (0–17 years old) under their care. These caregivers completed a large battery of questions about their child, their demographics, their family circumstances, and multiple other domains.

*Measures*

To measure stress about eviction or loss of housing, caregivers were asked one question about how often they were worried or stressed about being evicted, foreclosed on, or having their house condemned during the past year. Responses included "*Always, Usually, Sometimes, Rarely, Never*". We reverse the coding of this item, so that higher scores indicated greater concern and stress about these issues. Related to mental health, we focused on caregiver reports of whether their children currently had, or they were previously told that their children had the following conditions: depression, anxiety, ADHD, or behavioral/conduct problems. We recoded these questions to be a binary indicator, with 1="Currently has condition" and 0="Does not have condition" or "Ever told, but does not currently have condition".

Regarding statistical covariates, we adjusted models for a basic set of demographic factors, including child sex, child age, child race/ethnicity, family structure, caregiver's highest education level, and household poverty level based on federal guidelines and caregiver-reported family income (as noted in Table 1). Race/ethnicity was based on parental self-report data on the selected child's Hispanic origin and race, with imputation for missing cases. We also more stringently adjusted our statistical models for factors correlated with, but independent of, eviction stress. These included: the number of places the child lived in the past year, if the child ever experienced homelessness, premature birth, low birth weight, poor maternal mental health, food insecurity over the past year, and exposure to adverse childhood experiences. We employed these two sets of covariates motivated to balance under- and over-adjustment biases. While it is critical to rule out potential confounding variables, "overadjustment" in social science can skew estimates away from the true total causal effect, prevent consistent estimation of associations, and introduce additional errors (e.g., collider-stratification)[37,38].

This study adheres to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline for observational studies[39]. Of note, this work did not meet the definition of human research and was, therefore, "exempt" from Institutional Review Board oversight at the University of Pittsburgh.

*Statistical Analyses*

We ran separate generalized linear mixed models with a logistic link function, where each form of psychopathology (a binary indicator) was entered as the dependent variable; in base or stringently adjusted models, eviction stress and different covariates were entered as independent variables, and we included a random factor for geographic location (50 US states, plus the District of Columbia). These multiple statistical adjustments were a way to address potential sources of bias. For parsimony, we included the interaction between stress about eviction or loss of housing and age in all models. We calculated adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for our independent variables of interest (stress about eviction or loss of housing; stress about eviction or loss of housing X age). For significant interactions, we tested differences for the simple slopes of the association between stress about eviction or loss of housing at different values of child age in relation to each form of psychopathology. Analyses were conducted using R version 4.4.0[40,41] and only included participants with complete data for all variables across the two sets of covariates (*Analytic N=36638*).

## RESULTS

*Descriptive Statistics of the Sample*

The full NSCH sample included 54,103 families, while the analytic sample included 36,638 families. Both samples were predominantly White, non-Hispanic, followed by Hispanic. Black, non-Hispanic and Asian, non-Hispanic participants comprised a smaller portion of the samples. The average age of the full sample was 8.6 years and for the analytic sample was 9.9 years. Most participants in both samples came from families with two parents who were currently married. The highest level of education in the household for most participants was a college degree or higher. These demographic statistics are noted in Table 1.

*Models Examining the Presence of Depression or Anxiety*

Our statistical models with a base set of covariates found several factors significantly associated with the presence of depression, including family structure, race/ethnicity, caregiver education, poverty status, and sex assigned at birth (as noted on the left side of Table 2). Stress about eviction or loss of housing was significantly associated with higher odds of current depression, with an adjusted OR of 1.35 [CI=1.27-1.44], z= 9.348, p<.001. The interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age was significant (z=-2.415, p=0.016). The slope for stress about eviction or loss of housing was continually significant, but varied, at different levels of age (at lower levels of age -1 SD, CI=0.26-0.48, z=6.45, p<.001; at higher levels of age +1 SD CI=0.19-0.27, z=11.38, p<.001). More stringent model adjustment attenuated some of these connections, as shown on the right side of Table 2. Stress about eviction or loss of housing was again significantly associated with higher odds of depression, with an adjusted OR of 1.10 [CI=1.02-1.18], z=2.650, p=0.008. The interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age was significant (z=-2.505, p=0.012). For these models, the slope for stress about eviction or loss of housing was significant in younger participants, but not for older participants (-1SD age CI=0.05-0.29, z=2.76, p=0.006; at higher levels of age +1 SD CI= -0.03-0.06 z=0.76, p=0.445). For graphically depiction, please see our *Supplemental Materials*.

Like depression, the base adjusted model found anxiety was related to many sociodemographic factors (as noted on the left side of Table 3). Connected to our primary hypotheses, greater reported stress about eviction or loss of housing was significantly associated with higher odds of reported anxiety, with an adjusted OR of 1.26 [CI=1.22-1.31], z=12.792, p<.001. The interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age was significant (z= -2.030, p=0.042). Again, the slope for stress about eviction or loss of housing was continually significant, but varied, at different levels of age (at lower levels of age -1 SD, CI=0.21-0.33, z=8.46, p<.001; at higher levels of age +1 SD CI=0.16-0.23, z=11.71 p<.001). More stringent model adjustment

attenuated relations between anxiety and sociodemographic factors (as noted on the right side of Table 3). Diverging slightly from results with depression, in stringently adjusted models, stress about eviction or loss of housing was not significantly associated with higher odds of anxiety, with an adjusted OR of 1.04 [CI=1.00-1.08], z= 1.879, p=0.06. The interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age was not significant (z= -1.881, p=0.06).

*Models Examining the Presence of ADHD or Behavioral Problems*
Focusing on ADHD, we see increased incidence of this disorder was related to family structure, level of caregiver education, poverty status, and sex assigned at birth (see Table 4, left side). Stress about eviction or loss of housing was related to greater rates of ADHD, OR=1.19 [CI=1.15-1.23], z=9.519, p < 0.001. The interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age was not significant (z=-1.670, p=0.09). When adjusting for a more stringent set of covariates, there were connections between ADHD and different covariates (e.g., having low birthweight, childhood adversity, see Table 4, right side). Of important note, in these models, ADHD was not related to stress about eviction or loss of housing (OR=1.03, CI=0.99-1.07, z=1.441, p=0.15) or the interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age (z=-1.486, p=0.14).

Finally, regarding behavioral/conduct problems, in our base adjusted models, we see increased incidence of this disorder was related to race/ethnicity, family structure, and some indices of socioeconomic status (as noted on the right side of Table 5). Stress about eviction or loss of housing was related to greater rates of behavioral/conduct problems, OR=1.22 [CI=1.18-1.26], z=11.151, p < 0.001. The interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age was not significant (z=-0.175, p=0.86). Stringent adjustment did not change most of these associations, but there were significant connections between behavioral/conduct problems and different covariates (e.g., low birth weight, premature birth, food insecurity, childhood adversity, as shown on the right side of Table 5). Again, of important note and in contrast to results for internalizing issues, behavioral/conduct problems were not related to stress about eviction or loss of housing (OR=1.00, CI: 0.96-1.03, z=0.122, p=0.90) or the interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing X age (z=0.158, p=0.87).

Please see *Supplemental Materials* for statistical models: probing eviction X race interactions, re-running models after utilizing multiple data imputation techniques for missing data and investigating relations when removing younger (> 4 years of age) participants. This latter analysis was motivated by recent American Academy of Pediatrics guidelines noting that certain mental health diagnoses are uncommon or not appropriate for children younger than 4 years of age[42]. Our *Supplemental Materials* contain R-Markdown for all analysis in this main document.

## DISCUSSION

This study explored the association between caregivers' stress about eviction or loss of housing and children's mental health, namely depression, anxiety, ADHD, and behavioral/conduct problems. We probed whether these mental health outcomes were related to the main effect of stress about eviction or loss of housing, as well as the interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing and age. We saw the strongest relations between stress about eviction or loss of housing and two forms of internalizing psychopathology, depression and anxiety. Stress about eviction or loss of housing was related to a 10-35% increase in incidence of these types of disorders. Relations between stress about eviction or loss of housing, ADHD, and behavioral/conduct problems were less robust, with models adjusting for a base set of covariates finding relations; however, these associations were not significant when adjusting estimates using a more stringent set of potential confounders. We saw some notable relations

between mental health and the interaction of stress about eviction or loss of housing and age; specifically, relations between stress about eviction or loss of housing and depression and anxiety were strongest in younger samples, often becoming non-significant in older participants. Examined collectively, these findings provide valuable information to researchers interested in the role of eviction in child development, and in particular how this may influence mental health.

These results fit with past findings that eviction, foreclosures and housing loss may significantly impact development. Our findings connect to work noting increased depression in adolescents experiencing household and residential changes. We, however, did not see consistent relations between stress about eviction or loss of housing and externalizing problems. This diverges from past work noting that housing instability and experiencing more than three moves in childhood was associated with aggression and other disruptive behaviors[25]. This may be in part driven by our statistical modeling choices and the use of a stringent set of covariates. In both sets of models, we see that stress about eviction or loss of housing is related to depression; however, associations between stress about eviction or loss of housing and externalizing were only present in models adjusted for a base set of covariates and not in more stringently adjusted models. Externalizing problems were more associated with a child's perinatal risk (i.e., low birth weight; premature birth), but not all projects have controlled for these variables. The impact of eviction, foreclosures and housing loss may be through more indirect developmental pathways, as it may contribute to perinatal risk, and this is then associated with externalizing challenges. As such, future research is needed to comprehensively understand relations between stress about eviction or loss of housing and externalizing problems.

Critical for future work, our results are unable to parse potential differential impacts of eviction versus housing foreclosure. Study participants were asked about multiple types of housing loss in one prompt (i.e., eviction, foreclosure, or having a house condemned). Few projects, to date, have thoroughly investigated whether one type of housing loss may exert greater impacts on child and family well-being. Some scholars have suggested that foreclosure may be stressful for a more prolonged duration compared to eviction[43], while other researchers have lumped them under a similar category of "disruptive events"[44]. Work by Diamond and colleagues[45] found renters who suffered eviction, due to landlords' foreclosures, had fewer adverse effects, compared to those facing their own foreclosures; in this work, foreclosure on one's own home was related to later housing instability, reduced homeownership, financial distress, moves to lower-quality neighborhoods, and elevated divorce rates. However, further comparative research, with direct comparison between eviction and foreclosure, is needed to fully understand the impacts of these different types of housing loss.

Reflecting on our work, this cohort was nationally representative and had a good deal of diversity in age, family structure, and socioeconomic status. Related to age, many past studies have only examined a very confined age range (e.g., middle childhood), but our work had participants from 3-17 years of age. With family structure, some past publications have used cohorts oversampling unmarried parents in large U.S. cities[46]. While appropriate, one must use statistical weights to have a truly nationally representative sample and make estimates generalizable to all families. Finally, connected to socioeconomic status, it is important to note that while eviction or housing loss is concentrated in families at or below the federal poverty line[7], stress related to these experiences still occurs for those not considered "poor" (as detailed in our Supplement). Examined collectively, this dataset allows for a more inclusive assessment of how the stresses associated with eviction or loss of housing are linked to child well-being.

*Limitations*

This study has several limitations. First, the work is cross-sectional in nature. Moving forward, longitudinal studies are needed to richly isolate the developmental impacts of eviction. This could be particularly informative related to the age X stress about eviction or loss of housing interactions that we described here. We find that at the highest levels of age in the cohort, stress about eviction or loss of housing was often no longer related to the presence of different disorders. This result, though very interesting, could be indexing conflicting, developmental phenomena. One possibility is that stress related to housing loss occurring early in life have outsized influences on development. Gaps in critical developmental skills may emerge early in childhood due to experiences before 5 years of age[47]. Alternatively, adolescents spend increasingly more time outside the home[48,49] and the stress about loss of housing may have less "opportunity" to affect youth's mental health. Prospectively following participants and seeing how families deal with stress about eviction or loss of housing will be important to fully understand potential interactions between housing loss and development. Second, and also connected to age, certain diagnoses are uncommon or not appropriate to diagnose in particularly young children[42]. While we find some significant age X stress about eviction or loss of housing interactions, we must be mindful that the incidence of many of these disorders is very low in the younger age range of our sample. We ran sensitivity analyses for child participants who were older than four years of age (see our *Supplemental Materials*) and find some similar age X stress about eviction or loss of housing interactions. Third, we were not able to incorporate rich geographical information into our statistical models. The NSCH only provided information about which states a family was residing in and we used this as a random factor in our statistical models. Other information could be incorporated (e.g., data from Princeton University's Eviction Lab) to refine estimates and understand neighborhood-related impacts of eviction. Given variable state policies in eviction and housing protections, geographic variations could be important to understand. Finally, we used caregiver self-reports of mental health challenges; our work would have been strengthened by getting independent measures or clinical interviews of psychopathology. Use of multiple informants (e.g. teachers, clinicians) would have provided a comprehensive picture of the child's functioning across different contexts (i.e., home; school[50]). This could be advantageous to help guide treatment and intervention strategies.

*Conclusions*

Here, we find that stress about eviction or loss of housing is associated with an increased incidence of certain mental health problems in childhood. Given the profound long-term economic and social impacts of these problems[51], it will be critical for communities to think about lessening housing precarity and better supporting families facing eviction, foreclosure or other housing loss. This could take many forms including rental assistance, legal aid for tenants, eviction diversion programs, and expanded social safety nets[52,53]. With millions facing evictions or foreclosures annually, those in public health and public policy must continue to push for expansion of these programs to reduce inequities and this key social determinant of child health.

**Conflicts of Interest and Financial Disclosures**: None to report

**Funding/Support and Role of Funder/Sponsor**: The work was supported by internal funds provided to Dr. Hanson by the University of Pittsburgh; that university played no role in any element of the work

**Author Contributions**: Dr Hanson had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

**Data Sharing Statement:** All data is publicly available from the Census website: https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/nsch/data/datasets.html

**Disclaimer**: The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) or the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), nor does mention of HHS or HRSA imply endorsement by the US government.

## References


1. Desmond M. Eviction and the reproduction of urban poverty. *American journal of sociology*. 2012;118(1):88-133.
2. Hoke MK, Boen CE. The health impacts of eviction: Evidence from the national longitudinal study of adolescent to adult health. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2021;273:113742.
3. Gromis A, Fellows I, Hendrickson JR, et al. Estimating eviction prevalence across the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2022;119(21):e2116169119.
4. Statista. Foreclosure rate in the United States from 2005 to 2023. Published online 2024. https://www.statista.com/statistics/798766/foreclosure-rate-usa/
5. Vásquez-Vera H, Palència L, Magna I, Mena C, Neira J, Borrell C. The threat of home eviction and its effects on health through the equity lens: a systematic review. *Social science & medicine*. 2017;175:199-208.
6. Fowler KA, Gladden RM, Vagi KJ, Barnes J, Frazier L. Increase in suicides associated with home eviction and foreclosure during the US housing crisis: findings from 16 national violent death reporting system states, 2005–2010. *American journal of public health*. 2015;105(2):311-316.
7. Graetz N, Gershenson C, Hepburn P, Porter SR, Sandler DH, Desmond M. A comprehensive demographic profile of the US evicted population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2023;120(41):e2305860120.
8. Desmond M, Kimbro RT. Eviction's fallout: housing, hardship, and health. *Social forces*. 2015;94(1):295-324.
9. Sealy-Jefferson S, Jackson B, Francis B. Neighborhood eviction trajectories and odds of moderate and serious psychological distress during pregnancy among African American women. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online 2024:kwae025.
10. Leifheit KM, Schwartz GL, Pollack CE, et al. Severe housing insecurity during pregnancy: association with adverse birth and infant outcomes. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2020;17(22):8659.
11. Khadka A, Fink G, Gromis A, McConnell M. In utero exposure to threat of evictions and preterm birth: evidence from the United States. *Health services research*. 2020;55:823-832.
12. Desmond M. Disposable ties and the urban poor. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2012;117(5):1295-1335.
13. Lee CY, Zhao X, Reesor-Oyer L, Cepni AB, Hernandez DC. Bidirectional relationship between food insecurity and housing instability. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2021;121(1):84-91.
14. Leifheit KM, Schwartz GL, Pollack CE, et al. Eviction in early childhood and neighborhood poverty, food security, and obesity in later childhood and adolescence: evidence from a longitudinal birth cohort. *SSM-population health*. 2020;11:100575.
15. DeLuca S, Rosen E. Housing insecurity among the poor today. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2022;48:343-371.
16. Marçal K. Housing insecurity and adverse parenting of adolescents: The roles of maternal stress and depression. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*. 2022;13(2):199-217.
17. Bullinger LR, Fong K. Evictions and neighborhood child maltreatment reports. *Housing Policy Debate*. 2021;31(3-5):490-515.
18. Tang S, Bowen DA, Chadwick L, Madden E, Ghertner R. Are home evictions associated with child welfare system involvement? Empirical evidence from national eviction records and child protective services data. *Child maltreatment*. 2024;29(1):66-81.
19. Warren EJ, Font SA. Housing insecurity, maternal stress, and child maltreatment: An application of the family stress model. *Social Service Review*. 2015;89(1):9-39.

20. Marcal KE. The impact of housing instability on child maltreatment: A causal investigation. *Journal of family social work*. 2018;21(4-5):331-347.
21. Schwartz GL, Leifheit KM, Chen JT, Arcaya MC, Berkman LF. Childhood eviction and cognitive development: Developmental timing-specific associations in an urban birth cohort. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2022;292:114544.
22. Fowler PJ, McGrath LM, Henry DB, et al. Housing mobility and cognitive development: Change in verbal and nonverbal abilities. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2015;48:104-118.
23. Cutts DB, Ettinger de Cuba S, Bovell-Ammon A, et al. Eviction and household health and hardships in families with very young children. *Pediatrics*. 2022;150(4).
24. Coley RL, Leventhal T, Lynch AD, Kull M. Relations between housing characteristics and the well-being of low-income children and adolescents. *Developmental psychology*. 2013;49(9):1775.
25. Gaylord AL, Cowell WJ, Hoepner LA, Perera FP, Rauh VA, Herbstman JB. Impact of housing instability on child behavior at age 7. *International journal of child health and human development: IJCHD*. 2018;10(3):287.
26. Kauten R, Barry CT. Externalizing behavior. *Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences*. Published online 2020:1509-1512.
27. Fowler PJ, Henry DB, Marcal KE. Family and housing instability: Longitudinal impact on adolescent emotional and behavioral well-being. *Social science research*. 2015;53:364-374.
28. Gromis A, Desmond M. Estimating the prevalence of eviction in the United States. *Cityscape*. 2021;23(2):279-290.
29. Desmond M, Shollenberger T. Forced displacement from rental housing: Prevalence and neighborhood consequences. *Demography*. 2015;52(5):1751-1772.
30. Nettleton S, Burrows R. Mortgage debt, insecure home ownership and health: an exploratory analysis. *Sociology of health & Illness*. 1998;20(5):731-753.
31. Libman K, Fields D, Saegert S. Housing and health: a social ecological perspective on the US foreclosure crisis. *Housing, Theory and Society*. 2012;29(1):1-24.
32. Houle JN. Mental health in the foreclosure crisis. *Social science & medicine*. 2014;118:1-8.
33. Hanson JL, Hair N, Shen DG, et al. Family poverty affects the rate of human infant brain growth. *PloS one*. 2013;8(12):e80954.
34. Hair NL, Hanson JL, Wolfe BL, Pollak SD. Low household income and neurodevelopment from infancy through adolescence. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(1):e0262607.
35. US Census Bureau UD of C. *2022 National Survey of Children's Health: Methodology Report*. US Census Bureau; 2024. https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/nsch/technical-documentation/methodology/2022-NSCH-Methodology-Report.pdf
36. Child and Adolescent Health Measurement Initiative. *2022 National Survey of Children's Health: SPSS Dataset*. Data Resource Center for Child and Adolescent Health; 2024. Accessed August 1, 2024. https://childhealthdata.org
37. van Zwieten A, Tennant PW, Kelly-Irving M, Blyth FM, Teixeira-Pinto A, Khalatbari-Soltani S. Avoiding overadjustment bias in social epidemiology through appropriate covariate selection: a primer. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2022;149:127-136.
38. Schisterman EF, Cole SR, Platt RW. Overadjustment bias and unnecessary adjustment in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology*. 2009;20(4):488-495.
39. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9596):1453-1457.
40. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2024. https://www.R-project.org/
41. RStudio Team. *RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R*. RStudio, PBC.; 2020. http://www.rstudio.com/

42. Wolraich ML, Hagan JF, Allan C, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics*. 2019;144(4).
43. Bennett GG, Scharoun-Lee M, Tucker-Seeley R. Will the public's health fall victim to the home foreclosure epidemic? *PLOS medicine*. 2009;6(6):e1000087.
44. Torche F, Fletcher J, Brand JE. Disparate Effects of Disruptive Events on Children. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*. 2024;10(1):1-30.
45. Diamond R, Guren A, Tan R. *The Effect of Foreclosures on Homeowners, Tenants, and Landlords*. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020.
46. Reichman NE, Teitler JO, Garfinkel I, McLanahan SS. Fragile families: Sample and design. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2001;23(4-5):303-326.
47. Heckman JJ. Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science*. 2006;312(5782):1900-1902.
48. Larson RW, Richards MH, Moneta G, Holmbeck G, Duckett E. Changes in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from ages 10 to 18: Disengagement and transformation. In: *Adolescents and Their Families*. Routledge; 2013:118-128.
49. Larson RW. How US children and adolescents spend time: What it does (and doesn't) tell us about their development. *Current directions in psychological science*. 2001;10(5):160-164.
50. De Los Reyes A, Augenstein TM, Wang M, et al. The validity of the multi-informant approach to assessing child and adolescent mental health. *Psychological bulletin*. 2015;141(4):858.
51. Vergunst F, Commisso M, Geoffroy MC, et al. Association of childhood externalizing, internalizing, and comorbid symptoms with long-term economic and social outcomes. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(1):e2249568-e2249568.
52. Desmond M. *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City*. Crown; 2016.
53. Foster JC, Hodges H, Beloborodova A, et al. Integrating developmental neuroscience with community-engaged approaches to address mental health outcomes for housing-insecure youth: Implications for research, practice, and policy. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*. Published online 2024:101399.

***Table 1.***

| Characteristic | Full Sample N = 54,103[1] | Analytic Sample N = 36,638[1] |
|---|---|---|
| Parent's Sex Assigned at Birth | | |
| Male | 16,478 (31%) | 10,345 (28%) |
| Female | 35,959 (69%) | 26,273 (72%) |
| Missing | 1,666 | 20 |
| Parent's Age in Years | 42.08 (9.50) | 42.38 (8.20) |
| Missing | 1,692 | 74 |
| Child's Sex Assigned at Birth | | |
| Male | 27,911 (52%) | 18,901 (52%) |
| Female | 26,192 (48%) | 17,737 (48%) |
| Child's Age in Years | 8.60 (5.31) | 9.91 (4.62) |
| Child's Race/Ethnicity† | | |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 3,307 (6.1%) | 2,042 (5.6%) |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 3,292 (6.1%) | 1,884 (5.1%) |
| Hispanic | 8,370 (15%) | 5,298 (14%) |
| Multi-racial, non-Hispanic | 4,401 (8.1%) | 2,921 (8.0%) |
| White, non-Hispanic | 34,733 (64%) | 24,493 (67%) |
| Household Poverty Status | | |
| 0-99% FPL | 6,867 (13%) | 4,044 (11%) |
| 100-199% FPL | 8,629 (16%) | 5,447 (15%) |
| 200-399% FPL | 15,674 (29%) | 10,735 (29%) |
| 400% FPL or greater | 22,933 (42%) | 16,412 (45%) |
| Family Structure | | |
| Two parents, currently married | 37,133 (71%) | 28,293 (77%) |
| Two parents, not currently married | 3,084 (5.9%) | 2,101 (5.7%) |
| Single parent (mother or father) | 10,441 (20%) | 6,189 (17%) |
| Grandparent household | 1,412 (2.7%) | 4 (<0.1%) |
| Other family type | 483 (0.9%) | 51 (0.1%) |
| Missing | 1,550 | |
| Highest Level of Education in Household | | |
| Less than high school | 1,433 (2.6%) | 746 (2.0%) |
| High school or GED | 7,046 (13%) | 4,080 (11%) |
| Some college or technical school | 11,394 (21%) | 7,549 (21%) |
| College degree or higher | 34,230 (63%) | 24,263 (66%) |

[1]n (%); Mean (SD); † Multi-racial, non-Hispanic includes: American Indian or Alaska Native Non-Hispanic, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Non-Hispanic, and other Multi-Race Non-Hispanic Groups

***Caption****: Descriptive statistics of NSCH variables for full and analytic samples used in the project.*

| Table 2. | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | — | — | | — | — | |
| Hispanic | 0.77 | 0.66, 0.89 | **<0.001** | 0.75 | 0.64, 0.87 | **<0.001** |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 0.35 | 0.27, 0.46 | **<0.001** | 0.38 | 0.29, 0.50 | **<0.001** |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 0.30 | 0.21, 0.42 | **<0.001** | 0.38 | 0.27, 0.54 | **<0.001** |
| Multi-racial, non-Hispanic | 1.00 | 0.84, 1.19 | >0.9 | 0.82 | 0.68, 0.98 | **0.032** |
| Family Structure | | | | | | |
| Two parents, currently married | — | — | | — | — | |
| Two parents, not currently married | 1.87 | 1.53, 2.28 | **<0.001** | 1.07 | 0.86, 1.32 | 0.6 |
| Single parent (mother or father) | 1.85 | 1.64, 2.09 | **<0.001** | 0.92 | 0.80, 1.05 | 0.2 |
| Grandparent household | 8.58 | 0.79, 92.7 | 0.077 | 5.85 | 0.49, 70.0 | 0.2 |
| Other family type | 5.57 | 2.39, 13.0 | **<0.001** | 2.19 | 0.90, 5.34 | 0.085 |
| Highest Level of Education in Household | | | | | | |
| Less than high school | — | — | | — | — | |
| High school or GED | 1.80 | 1.24, 2.62 | **0.002** | 1.56 | 1.05, 2.31 | **0.026** |
| Some college or technical school | 1.95 | 1.35, 2.82 | **<0.001** | 1.62 | 1.10, 2.39 | **0.014** |
| College degree or higher | 1.68 | 1.16, 2.44 | **0.006** | 1.67 | 1.13, 2.47 | **0.010** |
| Household Poverty Status | | | | | | |
| 0-99% FPL | — | — | | — | — | |
| 100-199% FPL | 0.95 | 0.80, 1.13 | 0.5 | 0.90 | 0.75, 1.08 | 0.3 |
| 200-399% FPL | 0.89 | 0.75, 1.05 | 0.2 | 0.96 | 0.81, 1.15 | 0.7 |
| 400% FPL or greater | 0.79 | 0.67, 0.95 | **0.011** | 1.03 | 0.85, 1.24 | 0.8 |
| Child's Sex Assigned at Birth | | | | | | |
| Male | — | — | | — | — | |
| Female | 1.88 | 1.71, 2.08 | **<0.001** | 1.91 | 1.73, 2.12 | **<0.001** |
| Child's Age in Years | 5.01 | 4.59, 5.46 | **<0.001** | 4.90 | 4.47, 5.37 | **<0.001** |
| Eviction Stress/Concern | 1.35 | 1.27, 1.44 | **<0.001** | 1.10 | 1.02, 1.18 | **0.008** |
| Child's Age in Years * Eviction Stress/Concern | 0.93 | 0.88, 0.99 | **0.016** | 0.93 | 0.87, 0.98 | **0.012** |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Places Lived, Last Year | | | | | | |
| 0-2 times | | | | — | — | |
| 3 or more times | | | | 1.87 | 1.42, 2.46 | **<0.001** |
| Ever Homeless | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.42 | 1.12, 1.81 | **0.004** |
| Mother's Mental health | | | | | | |
| Excellent or very good | | | | — | — | |
| Good | | | | 2.23 | 1.98, 2.50 | **<0.001** |
| Fair or poor | | | | 3.30 | 2.82, 3.86 | **<0.001** |
| Low Birth Weight | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.02 | 0.83, 1.24 | 0.9 |
| Born Premature | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.09 | 0.92, 1.31 | 0.3 |
| Food Insecurity | | | | 1.16 | 1.05, 1.27 | **0.003** |
| Adverse Childhood Experiences | | | | | | |
| 0 ACEs | | | | — | — | |
| 1 ACE | | | | 1.83 | 1.58, 2.11 | **<0.001** |
| 2+ ACEs | | | | 4.85 | 4.22, 5.58 | **<0.001** |

[1]OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

***Caption**: Odds ratios from generalized linear mixed models examining associations between caregiver eviction stress and child depression. The left side of the table shows adjustment using a base set of covariates, while the right side has a more stringent set of model adjustments/covariates.*

| *Table 3.* | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| Child's Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | — | — | | — | — | |
| Hispanic | 0.73 | 0.66, 0.81 | **<0.001** | 0.72 | 0.65, 0.80 | **<0.001** |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 0.33 | 0.27, 0.40 | **<0.001** | 0.35 | 0.29, 0.42 | **<0.001** |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 0.26 | 0.21, 0.32 | **<0.001** | 0.31 | 0.24, 0.38 | **<0.001** |
| Multi-racial, non-Hispanic | 0.84 | 0.74, 0.95 | **0.005** | 0.73 | 0.64, 0.83 | **<0.001** |
| Family Structure | | | | | | |
| Two parents, currently married | — | — | | — | — | |
| Two parents, not currently married | 1.37 | 1.19, 1.58 | **<0.001** | 0.89 | 0.77, 1.03 | 0.12 |
| Single parent (mother or father) | 1.55 | 1.42, 1.69 | **<0.001** | 0.86 | 0.78, 0.95 | **0.002** |
| Grandparent household | 2.42 | 0.24, 24.6 | 0.5 | 1.89 | 0.17, 20.7 | 0.6 |
| Other family type | 2.91 | 1.46, 5.80 | **0.002** | 1.36 | 0.67, 2.80 | 0.4 |
| Highest Level of Education in Household | | | | | | |
| Less than high school | — | — | | — | — | |
| High school or GED | 1.58 | 1.20, 2.09 | **0.001** | 1.36 | 1.02, 1.82 | **0.035** |
| Some college or technical school | 1.89 | 1.44, 2.49 | **<0.001** | 1.60 | 1.20, 2.12 | **0.001** |
| College degree or higher | 2.03 | 1.54, 2.66 | **<0.001** | 2.01 | 1.51, 2.67 | **<0.001** |
| Household Poverty Status | | | | | | |
| 0-99% FPL | — | — | | — | — | |
| 100-199% FPL | 1.07 | 0.95, 1.22 | 0.3 | 1.04 | 0.91, 1.18 | 0.6 |
| 200-399% FPL | 1.03 | 0.91, 1.16 | 0.6 | 1.09 | 0.96, 1.24 | 0.2 |
| 400% FPL or greater | 0.96 | 0.85, 1.09 | 0.5 | 1.19 | 1.04, 1.35 | **0.010** |
| Child's Sex Assigned at Birth | | | | | | |
| Male | — | — | | — | — | |
| Female | 1.52 | 1.43, 1.62 | **<0.001** | 1.55 | 1.45, 1.66 | **<0.001** |
| Child's Age in Years | 2.44 | 2.34, 2.54 | **<0.001** | 2.34 | 2.24, 2.44 | **<0.001** |
| Eviction Stress/Concern | 1.26 | 1.22, 1.31 | **<0.001** | 1.04 | 1.00, 1.08 | 0.060 |
| Child's Age in Years * Eviction Stress/Concern | 0.96 | 0.93, 1.00 | **0.042** | 0.97 | 0.93, 1.00 | 0.060 |
| Places Lived, Last Year | | | | | | |

| *Table 3.* | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| 0-2 times | | | | — | — | |
| 3 or more times | | | | 1.29 | 1.05, 1.60 | **0.018** |
| Mother's Mental health | | | | | | |
| Excellent or very good | | | | — | — | |
| Good | | | | 1.88 | 1.74, 2.03 | **<0.001** |
| Fair or poor | | | | 2.79 | 2.49, 3.12 | **<0.001** |
| Ever Homeless | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.29 | 1.06, 1.57 | **0.011** |
| Low Birth Weight | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.00 | 0.87, 1.14 | >0.9 |
| Born Premature | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.26 | 1.12, 1.41 | **<0.001** |
| Food Insecurity | | | | 1.22 | 1.14, 1.31 | **<0.001** |
| Adverse Childhood Experiences | | | | | | |
| 0 ACEs | | | | — | — | |
| 1 ACE | | | | 1.78 | 1.62, 1.94 | **<0.001** |
| 2+ ACEs | | | | 3.36 | 3.05, 3.70 | **<0.001** |

[1]OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

***Caption**: Odds ratios from generalized linear mixed models examining associations between caregiver eviction stress and child anxiety. The left side of the table shows adjustment using a base set of covariates, while the right side has a more stringent set of model adjustments/covariates.*

| Table 4. | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| Child's Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | — | — | | — | — | |
| Hispanic | 0.72 | 0.64, 0.80 | **<0.001** | 0.72 | 0.64, 0.80 | **<0.001** |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 0.57 | 0.48, 0.67 | **<0.001** | 0.60 | 0.50, 0.70 | **<0.001** |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 0.31 | 0.25, 0.39 | **<0.001** | 0.36 | 0.28, 0.45 | **<0.001** |
| Multi-racial, non-Hispanic | 0.92 | 0.81, 1.04 | 0.2 | 0.84 | 0.73, 0.95 | **0.006** |
| Family Structure | | | | | | |
| Two parents, currently married | — | — | | — | — | |
| Two parents, not currently married | 1.33 | 1.16, 1.54 | **<0.001** | 0.95 | 0.82, 1.10 | 0.5 |
| Single parent (mother or father) | 1.43 | 1.30, 1.56 | **<0.001** | 0.87 | 0.79, 0.97 | **0.008** |
| Grandparent household | 0.00 | 0.00, | >0.9 | 0.00 | 0.00, | >0.9 |
| Other family type | 5.09 | 2.72, 9.52 | **<0.001** | 2.57 | 1.36, 4.85 | **0.004** |
| Highest Level of Education in Household | | | | | | |
| Less than high school | — | — | | — | — | |
| High school or GED | 1.45 | 1.10, 1.90 | **0.008** | 1.28 | 0.97, 1.69 | 0.084 |
| Some college or technical school | 1.52 | 1.16, 1.98 | **0.002** | 1.30 | 0.99, 1.71 | 0.059 |
| College degree or higher | 1.33 | 1.02, 1.75 | **0.035** | 1.28 | 0.97, 1.69 | 0.076 |
| Household Poverty Status | | | | | | |
| 0-99% FPL | — | — | | — | — | |
| 100-199% FPL | 0.89 | 0.78, 1.01 | 0.074 | 0.87 | 0.77, 0.99 | **0.039** |
| 200-399% FPL | 0.91 | 0.81, 1.03 | 0.14 | 0.95 | 0.84, 1.07 | 0.4 |
| 400% FPL or greater | 0.87 | 0.77, 0.99 | **0.036** | 1.02 | 0.90, 1.16 | 0.7 |
| Child's Sex Assigned at Birth | | | | | | |
| Male | — | — | | — | — | |
| Female | 0.51 | 0.47, 0.54 | **<0.001** | 0.49 | 0.46, 0.53 | **<0.001** |
| Child's Age in Years | 1.86 | 1.78, 1.94 | **<0.001** | 1.74 | 1.67, 1.82 | **<0.001** |
| Eviction Stress/Concern | 1.19 | 1.15, 1.23 | **<0.001** | 1.03 | 0.99, 1.07 | 0.15 |
| Child's Age in Years * Eviction Stress/Concern | 0.97 | 0.94, 1.01 | 0.095 | 0.97 | 0.94, 1.01 | 0.14 |
| Places Lived, Last Year | | | | | | |
| 0-2 times | | | | — | — | |

| Table 4. | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| 3 or more times | | | | 1.23 | 0.99, 1.53 | 0.065 |
| Mother's Mental health | | | | | | |
| Excellent or very good | | | | — | — | |
| Good | | | | 1.55 | 1.43, 1.68 | **<0.001** |
| Fair or poor | | | | 1.66 | 1.47, 1.87 | **<0.001** |
| Ever Homeless | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.51 | 1.24, 1.84 | **<0.001** |
| Low Birth Weight | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.29 | 1.13, 1.47 | **<0.001** |
| Born Premature | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.18 | 1.05, 1.33 | **0.006** |
| Food Insecurity | | | | 1.14 | 1.07, 1.23 | **<0.001** |
| Adverse Childhood Experiences | | | | | | |
| 0 ACEs | | | | — | — | |
| 1 ACE | | | | 1.78 | 1.63, 1.95 | **<0.001** |
| 2+ ACEs | | | | 2.77 | 2.51, 3.07 | **<0.001** |

[1]OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

***Caption**: Odds ratios from generalized linear mixed models examining associations between caregiver eviction stress and child ADHD. The left side of the table shows adjustment using a base set of covariates, while the right side has a more stringent set of model adjustments/covariates.*

| Table 5. | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| Child's Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | — | — | | — | — | |
| Hispanic | 0.84 | 0.75, 0.95 | **0.006** | 0.86 | 0.76, 0.97 | **0.016** |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 0.81 | 0.68, 0.96 | **0.018** | 0.92 | 0.76, 1.10 | 0.3 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 0.41 | 0.32, 0.53 | **<0.001** | 0.52 | 0.41, 0.68 | **<0.001** |
| Multi-racial, non-Hispanic | 0.96 | 0.83, 1.11 | 0.6 | 0.85 | 0.73, 0.99 | **0.035** |
| Family Structure | | | | | | |
| Two parents, currently married | — | — | | — | — | |
| Two parents, not currently married | 1.30 | 1.11, 1.53 | **0.001** | 0.85 | 0.72, 1.01 | 0.065 |
| Single parent (mother or father) | 1.52 | 1.37, 1.69 | **<0.001** | 0.82 | 0.73, 0.92 | **<0.001** |
| Grandparent household | 2.55 | 0.25, 26.2 | 0.4 | 1.79 | 0.13, 24.0 | 0.7 |
| Other family type | 9.44 | 5.24, 17.0 | **<0.001** | 3.98 | 2.14, 7.42 | **<0.001** |
| Highest Level of Education in Household | | | | | | |
| Less than high school | — | — | | — | — | |
| High school or GED | 1.05 | 0.79, 1.39 | 0.7 | 0.89 | 0.66, 1.19 | 0.4 |
| Some college or technical school | 1.14 | 0.86, 1.50 | 0.4 | 0.93 | 0.70, 1.24 | 0.6 |
| College degree or higher | 0.99 | 0.75, 1.31 | >0.9 | 0.95 | 0.71, 1.26 | 0.7 |
| Household Poverty Status | | | | | | |
| 0-99% FPL | — | — | | — | — | |
| 100-199% FPL | 0.94 | 0.82, 1.09 | 0.4 | 0.94 | 0.81, 1.09 | 0.4 |
| 200-399% FPL | 0.86 | 0.75, 0.99 | **0.032** | 0.92 | 0.80, 1.07 | 0.3 |
| 400% FPL or greater | 0.78 | 0.68, 0.91 | **0.001** | 1.01 | 0.86, 1.17 | >0.9 |
| Child's Sex Assigned at Birth | | | | | | |
| Male | — | — | | — | — | |
| Female | 0.41 | 0.37, 0.44 | **<0.001** | 0.39 | 0.36, 0.43 | **<0.001** |
| Child's Age in Years | 1.06 | 1.01, 1.11 | **0.016** | 0.94 | 0.90, 0.99 | **0.023** |
| Eviction Stress/Concern | 1.22 | 1.18, 1.26 | **<0.001** | 1.00 | 0.96, 1.04 | >0.9 |
| Child's Age in Years * Eviction Stress/Concern | 1.00 | 0.96, 1.03 | 0.9 | 1.00 | 0.97, 1.04 | 0.9 |
| Places Lived, Last Year | | | | | | |

| Table 5. | Base Model | | | Stringent Model | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** | **OR[1]** | **95% CI[1]** | **p-value** |
| 0-2 times | | | | — | — | |
| 3 or more times | | | | 1.50 | 1.19, 1.89 | **<0.001** |
| Mother's Mental health | | | | | | |
| Excellent or very good | | | | — | — | |
| Good | | | | 1.91 | 1.74, 2.10 | **<0.001** |
| Fair or poor | | | | 2.53 | 2.23, 2.87 | **<0.001** |
| Ever Homeless | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.67 | 1.36, 2.05 | **<0.001** |
| Low Birth Weight | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.38 | 1.19, 1.61 | **<0.001** |
| Born Premature | | | | | | |
| No | | | | — | — | |
| Yes | | | | 1.14 | 1.00, 1.31 | 0.057 |
| Food Insecurity | | | | 1.18 | 1.09, 1.28 | **<0.001** |
| Adverse Childhood Experiences | | | | | | |
| 0 ACEs | | | | — | — | |
| 1 ACE | | | | 2.00 | 1.79, 2.24 | **<0.001** |
| 2+ ACEs | | | | 3.81 | 3.38, 4.29 | **<0.001** |

[1]OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

***Caption**: Odds ratios from generalized linear mixed models examining associations between caregiver eviction stress and child behavioral/conduct problems. The left side of the table shows adjustment using a base set of covariates, while the right side has a more stringent set of model adjustments/covariates.*