12-1993

A Comparative Study of the Coping Ability of Mobile and Nonmobile Elementary Pupils

Solomon Mokone Lebese

Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1893

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE COPING ABILITY OF MOBILE AND NONMOBILE ELEMENTARY PUPILS

by

Solomon Mokone Lebese

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1993
Frequent moves by parents of elementary-aged children can cause these children a considerable amount of stress, thus creating adjustment problems and straining their coping abilities to the limits. How do these children cope with such problems compared to those who do not move frequently?

The above question was the focus of investigation to determine whether or not there was a difference between the mobile (children whose parents have moved at least once in the past 3 years) and nonmobile (children whose parents have not moved from a particular school district in the past 3 years) elementary children in the way they cope and adjust in their varied environments.

Two surveys developed by Achenbach (1991), the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Teacher’s Report Form (TRF), were used to collect data. The population studied consisted of children in Grades 3-6 from four public schools in the Danbury, Connecticut, School District. Parents responded to the CBCL, and teachers to the TRF. Three hundred and seventy six surveys were sent to parents and 96 completed surveys were returned. Then, TRF forms were sent to the teachers of the 96 children whose parents completed the CBCL survey. Of these, 50 were returned completed. A final sample of 50 children was studied.
where the researcher had both a completed CBCL and a completed TRF survey. The data were grouped into mobile and nonmobile, and upper and lower socioeconomic status (SES) groups.

The data were then analyzed using a t test to compare mobile and nonmobile children. Analyses revealed no differences between the mobile and nonmobile elementary children in the way they cope and adapt as perceived by both parents and teachers.

Future research was suggested in terms of better control of the variables of mobility and SES to identify which had a greater effect on children's coping and adaptive functioning. It was suggested also that mobile and nonmobile children themselves be used as informants and unobtrusively observed to compare how they cope. Since administrators are entrusted with the custody of school children, it would be well to use them as informants, thus actively involving them in mobile and nonmobile children's needs assessment.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Coping is the term used by Lazarus (1976) to describe one's efforts to deal with or master annoying situations. Annoying situations cause stress in many people. How should people deal with these stressful situations? Several researchers have tackled the question. Pelsma (1988) prepared material for a workshop setting to help educate parents on the topic of children coping with stress; Monat, Averill, and Lazarus (1972) discussed stress and coping reactions under various conditions of uncertainty; Anderson (1977) looked at coping behaviors and performance in a stress setting; Antonovsky (1979) related health, stress, and coping; Averill (1973) studied personal control over aversive stimuli and stress; Bean, Cooper, Alpert, and Kipnis (1980) explained coping mechanisms of cancer patients; Cohen and Lazarus (1973) showed how active coping processes and coping dispositions helped recovery from surgery; Folkman (1984) reviewed the coping process.

Lazarus and his colleagues developed their theory of psychological stress and coping (e.g., Lazarus, 1966, 1976; Lazarus & DeLongis, 1983; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Their theory identified the processes of cognitive appraisal and coping as well as the role of these processes as critical mediators of stressful person-environment relationships and their immediate and long-range outcomes.
Lazarus and his colleagues moved away from trait-oriented re-
search to look at the processes themselves. They theorized that a study
of the processes would lead them to look at the contextual variables that
influence the coping processes. They concluded that a correct under-
standing of the coping process requires an inter-individual approach in
which people are compared to each other with respect to the ways they
cope with diverse stressful encounters.

Statement of the Problem

One of the causes of stress is what Moos (1976) described as life
transitions, Johnson (1986) as life events, and DeLongis, Coyne, Dakof,
Folkman and Lazarus (1982) as daily hassles. Observing people in tran-
sitions, Moos argued that people often experience significant stress in
leaving their homes, close friends, and familiar places, and in encounter-
ing new physical conditions, customs, and interpersonal relationships.
He further argued that the basic problems faced by people who move are
the same--the loss of a home, the disruption of a social network, and the
need to find a new place for oneself amid unfamiliar places and people.
He contended that the duration of the move is not significant, nor does
it matter whether the move is voluntary or forced; the dual stresses
were always present.

These life transitions and events have to be manipulated and dealt
with by all people. How well each individual deals with the events,
changes, or moves varies. Compas (1988) noted that children and
adolescents react and cope differently to adverse events because of the
differences in resources available and methods used. These differences
underscore the uniqueness of each individual.

Individual personality characteristics and external circumstances determine the appropriate strategy for coping with this disruption and social continuity, according to Moos (1976) and Meichenbaum (1985). The pervasive nature of stress makes it essential, therefore, that new ways of coping be devised.

Moos (1976) argued that there are limits to the amount of change with which a human being can cope at any given time. He did not envisage that change and lack of permanence would stop. Therefore, he suggested that humans must learn how to employ methods of coping with decision making and change. Moos cited Toffler in his book *Future Shock* that "in the most rapidly changing environment to which man has ever been exposed, we remain pitifully ignorant of how the human animal copes" (p. 4).

Another area of concern related to the coping process is that of mobility. Moos (1976) observed that people often experience significant stress in leaving their homes, close friends and familiar places, as well as encountering new physical conditions, customs, and social networks. These moves have affected children significantly.

When examining elementary school children, with respect to the uniqueness of each individual, the hassles and the stresses caused by change and relocation, one could ask: How well does each child cope with these transitions and life events they encounter? The focus of this investigation, therefore, was: How well do mobile elementary school children cope with the demands of their environments?
The Random House Dictionary (Urdang, 1968) defined mobility sociologically as the movement of people in a population from place to place, from job to job, or from one social class to another. To speak of mobility implies specialness about movement. It is a unique pattern of movement that invariably draws attention.

Mobile elementary school children show an unusual pattern of movement from place to place and from school to school. The assumption in this study was that mobile elementary school children were unstable, and do not develop a behavior and learning repertoire to enhance them in all aspects of learning because of the duration of their stay in any one place. Also, the socioeconomic status of a family has an inverse proportional effect on the potential for movement.

Harrington's (1987) description of the migrant child's mobility noted that the average migrant student could be in three different schools in a year with resulting fragmentation, and also that the average migrant child lagged from 6 to 18 months behind the expected grade level for his or her age group.

Wells (1986) contended that stress was public enemy number one and is the affliction of the 20th century. He claimed that stress was a "dis-ease" that causes disease and that it was what made it so pervasive.

Johnson (1986) described stress as an individual's response to various stimuli, as person-environment interactions, with emphasis on the role of cognitive appraisal as a primary determiner of the actual stressfulness of events. He emphasized that change was a great factor in stress. Youngs (1985) also confirmed the above by stating that
stress is a major problem in an era characterized by accelerated change and rapid growth of knowledge and technology in an expanding and competitive population. Students, in particular, pay a high price for stress.

Lazarus (1976) considered the coping process of an individual as a form of problem solving in which a person is faced with challenges that have no clear-cut solutions.

Research Questions

How well do mobile elementary children cope with the demands of their environments compared to their nonmobile counterparts? What is the relationship of socioeconomic status to both mobility and coping effectiveness?

Definitions

There are a number of terms used in this study whose meaning has been defined below in order to enhance understanding of the concepts discussed.

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) is an instrument developed by Achenbach (1991b) reportable by parents and parent surrogates, designed to measure the competency level of children. It was intended to distinguish between children who coped with the demands of their environments and those who did not.

Clinical concern: The word clinical is derived from the word clinic, which refers to a place connected with a hospital or a medical school where people receive medical treatment. So, clinical concern refers to a
human condition that deserves treatment at a clinic or a condition linked to some disease needing medical treatment.

**Competence scales:** Competence means fitness, or the state of being able or properly qualified. So, competence scales refer to measures that discriminate between fitness and unfitness. In this study competence scales refer to measures that distinguish between children who are competent or fit and those who are not.

**Coping** comes from the word *cope* which means to fight with some degree of success, to struggle and not fail.

**Elementary pupils** refers to children in the primary grades of school. The word elementary emphasizes the idea of being basic and applies to the first steps or beginning facts and principles of anything. In this study it refers to pupils in Grades 1-6.

**Mobility:** This term means the ability or readiness to move or be moved. It comes from the word *mobile*, which means easy to move. It was used in this study to mean frequency in movement.

**Referred children:** To refer is to direct attention or to turn for information or help. Referred children are those children with problems who are sent to a specialist for attention or help. Unreferred children are those without concerns to merit attention and assistance.

**Socioeconomic status** is a status that has to do or involves factors which are both social and economic. The definition used in this study refers to factors that involve a person's social and financial status.

**Stress** refers to great pressure or force. Essentially, it is strain or tension.
Teachers Report Form (Achenbach, 1991c) is another measure which grew out of the CBCL, reportable by teachers in distinguishing children who adapt well in the school environment from those who do not.

Organization of the Study

The rest of the dissertation focuses on a review of the literature and methodology used in addressing the major question of this study. The review of the literature outlines and provides an overview of the coping process. Studies which used the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and related materials in the areas of stress, coping, mobility, and cognitive development of the elementary pupil are also examined.

The methodology describes the variables studied, the subjects and criteria of selection, and the measures and procedures used in data collection and analysis. The results chapter summarizes the findings of the study, and discussed in the last chapter are the findings in terms of studies on mobility and coping, implications for school leadership, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

From a brief review of literature, it became apparent that the concept of coping was not new. It has been an important focus in psychology for over 40 years. It has received much more attention in the last 15 years by both lay people and scientists (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Monat and Lazarus (1991) observed that although much attention has been given recently to the concept of stress and coping, finding a consensus of multiple definitions of stress and related concepts is still likely to remain a difficult endeavor.

Commenting on the concept of coping, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) stated that recent research was incoherent and confused, resulting in the inability to define coping and its function in the process of adaptation appropriately. Given the varied definitions of stress and coping, the researcher has selected some that were considered promising. These will be used to guide the research.

Coping

The Concept of Coping

According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), coping is defined as constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific
external and/or internal demands that were appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person. It refers to two distinct but related tasks. One must respond to the requirements of the external situation and also to one's own feelings about that situation.

The words constantly changing and specific demands imply that coping is a process. Coping, according to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), concerns itself with what the person actually thinks or does in a specific context and with changes in thoughts and actions across encounters as they unfold. They also emphasized that coping involved all the efforts to manage the demands, regardless of the outcome.

In attempting to narrow the meaning of the word coping, Lazarus (1976) divided coping into two main categories: direct actions and palliative forms. Direct actions refer to any behavioral effort of a person to deal with harm, threat, or challenge by altering his or her troubled relationship with his or her environment. Palliation is directed at reducing, eliminating, or tolerating any bodily, motor, or subjective distress in relation to the environment. In other words, palliation means softening and moderating distress to create comfort.

Moos (1976) further explained that coping has been used to describe the ability to deal with a radically new environment. He stated that the situation could be less drastic but unusual in the subject's life and that coping was adaptation under relatively difficult conditions.

Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) definition has three key features that deserve consideration: (1) It is process oriented, focusing on what a person actually thinks and does in a specific encounter and how the changes take place as the encounter unfolds; (2) it is contextual--
influenced by the individual's appraisal of the actual demands in the
encounter and resources for managing them, the implications being that
the situational and personal variables together shape coping efforts; and
(3) it regulates stressful emotions (emotion-focused coping) and alters
the troubled person-environment relation which has caused the distress
(problem-focused).

The way a person copes, therefore, is determined in part by his or
her resources--that is, health, energy, beliefs about God or beliefs about
control, and commitments--which help in sustaining the coping be-
haviors.

The Variability Factor in Coping

The key word in the definition which underscores the variability of
individuals in coping is appraisal. The external and/or internal demands
that are considered taxing, or beyond individual resources, are so be-
cause of the individual's appraisal process. Lazarus and Folkman (1984)
stated that there are always individual differences in thoughts, feelings,
and behaviors. The differences are brought out by what Lazarus and his
colleagues (Lazarus, 1966, 1976; Lazarus & DeLongis, 1983; Lazarus &
Folkman, 1984) called cognitive appraisal, which referred to evaluating
processes which intervene between the encounter and the response.
They regarded cognitive appraisal and coping as critical mediators of
stressful person-environment relations.

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) concluded their treatise on the
concept of coping by stating that coping should not be equated with
mastery over the environment because many sources of stress cannot be mastered.

**Transactional Coping**

This perspective, advocated by Meichenbaum (1985), underscored the influence of both the individual and the environment in the coping process. He argued that while the individual could do something to cope, other sources for help must be considered. He affirmed that the need for interventions goes beyond the level of the individual.

Meichenbaum (1985) based his model on individual needs analysis: Is the individual stressed because he or she lacks the interpersonal or parental skills that would help to avoid or palliate environmental demands?

The implication is that the individual has been impoverished by the environment to the extent that he or she does not have resources to deal with environmental demands. The cognitive appraisal looks into the "bank," which Meichenbaum called the built-in repertoire. This process is the way people automatically, or unconsciously, process information, including search and storage mechanisms, as well as inferential and retrieval processes. Such search and storage mechanisms imply that the individual scans the thought processes in order to discover events and thoughts that have been registered earlier to determine how those thoughts could be used to deal with the new encounter.
Introduction

Stress has been defined differently by scientists and laymen. A few promising definitions will be considered.

The father of the General Adaptation Syndrome, Selye (1974), defined stress as the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it. By nonspecific, he meant that it did not matter whether the demand faced was pleasant or not; the determining factor is the intensity of the demand for adjustment or adaptation. In his opinion, stress could be associated with pleasant or unpleasant experience.

Miller (1982), studying child-stress, based her definition on Selye's (1974) work. Her emphasis was not on the concept of stress, but on how a child is stressed and what can be done to relieve it.

Woolfolk and Richardson (1978), Lazarus (1976), Lazarus and Folkman (1984), and Wells (1980) base their general understanding of stress on Selye's (1974) work, too. However, they extend the concept further to include in their definitions "perception" and "appraisal" (that is, what the demand or event means to the individual). It is this extension of Selye's original concept which is responsible for the current definition of stress. Wells (1980) noted that what causes stress reactions is one's perception that one has been left in a dangerous situation.

Lazarus (1976) argued that events do not in themselves produce stress reactions, but are neutral, that it is primarily a person's perceptions or appraisals of events that make him or her stressful. He
observed that environments place demands or requirements on an individual only to the extent that the demands are perceived or experienced.

Woolfolk and Richardson (1978), in agreement with Lazarus (1976), defined stress as a perception of threat or expectation of future discomfort that arouses, alerts, or otherwise activates the organism.

The definition that guides this research is the one proposed by Lazarus (1976) and Woolfolk and Richardson (1978) which includes the elements of perception and appraisal.

The Concept of Stress

The evolution of the stress concept is described in some detail by Selye (1974). He outlined that the concept was very old, although in prehistoric times man did not write down the theoretical explanations of the feeling of exhaustion that overcame him in hard labor, prolonged exposure to cold and heat, or loss of blood; but when the feeling came, he must have realized instinctively that he had exceeded the limits of what he could reasonably handle. This is person-environment interaction.

Besides the external environment, Selye (1974) wrote about the internal environment (that is, the environment in which all body cells live) where nothing must be allowed to deviate far from the norm. The internal environment must stay constant, despite the changes in its external environment. Selye called this "homeostasis" (staying power).

Selye (1976) later proposed the idea of general adaption syndrome (GAS), or the biological stress syndrome. This GAS, he suggested, gives the first indication that the body's adaptability, or adaptation energy, is
finite. GAS has three stages, Selye asserted: (1) the alarm reaction, (2) the stage of resistance, and (3) the stage of exhaustion. This, he claimed, was the adaptive process of the internal environment to the external environment which places demands on the body.

In the first stage, arousal by external stimuli is made on the body (alarm reaction). After this reaction, the body becomes adapted and begins to resist. The duration of resistance, Selye (1976) stated that it depended upon the body's innate ability (what has earlier been described as the adaptation energy). When this staying power or energy has been exceeded, exhaustion takes place. According to Lazarus (1976), stress occurs when there are demands on the person which tax or exceed his or her adaptive resources.

Monat and Lazarus (1991) observed that there are three basic types of stress: (1) systematic or physiological, (2) psychological, and (3) social. Systematic stress is concerned primarily with the disturbances of tissue systems. Psychological stress is concerned with cognitive factors that lead to the evaluation of threat. Social stress relates to the disruption of a social unit or system. These three are closely related and lead the internal environment in its attempt to maintain homeostasis.

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) argued that systematic or physiological stress assumes that certain situations are stressful but do not allow for individual differences in the evaluation of events, although they take into account the characteristics of that individual. Selye (1974) called it biological stress.

The psychological stress, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) claimed, depends upon the relationship between a person and an environment,
which is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her re-
sources and endangering his or her well-being. It is here that evaluative
processes as to the availability of sufficient adaptive energy are made.

The third type of stress (social stress) refers to the disruption of a
social unit or system. Mobility is implied in social stress. This type of
stress is discussed under the concept of mobility.

Mobility

The term mobility is a noun from the word mobile, which means
capable of moving or being moved. An analysis of this term reveals that
mobility has two elements: movement and change. Mobility causes the

Movement refers to forward, backward, sideways, upward, and
downward progression. It is progression from point "A" to point "B". A
move from point "A" to point "B" is usually purposeful and effortful. It
is essentially relocation. It is movement from the familiar to the unfa-
miliar. Such moves can be unsettling to some individuals. The new posi-
tion "B" is an uncertain location in that not all the variables about it are
known and controllable. Change refers to altering or swapping one thing
for another or to pass from one phase of life to another.

D. U. Levine and Havighurst (1984) discussed at length social
mobility, its nature, classes of people involved, and the effects on or
results of the coping ability of people. They also examined the mobility
of ethnic, racial, and religious groups. This type of mobility refers to
movement of these groups of people across social class structures.
Movement and change involves the cognitive, emotional, and physical aspects of the human organism. These movements and changes can be made voluntarily or involuntarily. The effects of such changes have a great significance on every person involved. Such moves and changes are well described by the term mobility--pulling together all the elements of the human organism for progression. This means that the whole person's emotional, cognitive, and physical being are pulled together to make it possible for progression to take place.

Mobility also implies the concept of existence. VanVuuren (1976) explained that the word existence is derived from the Latin, which underscores the fundamental fact about humans. He asserted that human existence is seen as open and incomplete; will continually occupy a different stand (Latin: sistere); and will step out of (ex) a previous situation. Thus humans are constantly entering new situations where new decisions have to be made.

This existence, to some people, is very taxing. Moos and Tsu (cited in Moos, 1976) posed it this way: Rapid change occurs in every facet of life, and it strains the adaptive capacities to the breaking point. This is, no doubt, because of the rate of change which is so fast that the human organism is unable to deal with it.

When the rate is faster than the organism can adjust in a new situation, frustration ensues; disorientation and stress result. The ability of the organism to adjust to a new situation and be ready to move on to another is its coping ability. It is not surprising that rapid change does strain a human's adaptive capacities. The time, the situation, and the organism itself need to be synchronized for a smooth transition.
This then leads to the fact of population movements and their toll on the coping ability of people. More and more Americans are on the move everyday. The highways, airways, waterways, and railroads are packed with people on the move. With this constant movement, human relationships have become shorter and less permanent. More professionals and nonprofessionals change jobs very frequently. The changes in one's physical environment, interpersonal relationships, and jobs all involve some stress. This stress thus calls for new ways of coping.

Naisbitt (1982) observed that young adults are very mobile, and tend to seek employment away from the geographical area of their parents. He also noted that the massive north to south migration has played havoc with the physical and social infrastructure that supports economic activity.

Moos (1976), in his anthology on human adaptation, underscored the idea of movement by the use of the term life transitions. He was referring to the whole span of human development. Three articles in his anthology discussed residential changes and the effects on people who cope with such changes.

Moos (1976) claimed that many people often experience significant stress in leaving their homes, close friends, and familiar places. Also, when one encounters new physical conditions, customs, and interpersonal relationships, significant stress is experienced.

These life transitions and relocations are filled with events that affect every person. The events might be aversive or pleasant, thus invariably arousing a response from an individual. Instantly, a person will put forth efforts to respond to the stimuli. The kind of response will
depend on the nature and timing of the stimuli and contextual variables.

A study conducted by the New York Department of City Planning (1977) on demographic analysis 1974-1976, examines pupil mobility to determine population movements within the city. This study reveals that in the 1970s there was a high volume of pupil movement, reflecting an important city-wide phenomenon (that is, the relatively high mobility of younger families with children).

If younger families show this high mobility rate, then all other variables in such events come into play. Young children are thrust into situations with which they have to cope. How well do these children cope?

The Elementary Child

What is the nature of the elementary pupil? As an independent unit, how does this child cope? What can be learned about his or her coping abilities? These questions and many others can be raised to form the basis for needs assessment. They address the present status of the child in order to identify the strengths and the deficits for a more intelligent and effective design of curriculum materials.

Developmental psychology has brought a lot of information into view about the life-span of humans. Every stage of human development is unique and sets the stage for the next. There is, at present, a deep awareness of the far reaching implications of each structure and function of growth in the developmental process. Life can now be viewed as an ever-changing series of intimately related life cycles. These transitions are, in one sense, changes (that is, mobility). These transitions call forth
both cognitive and emotion-focused, decision-making efforts, resulting in observable actions and reactions.

Children ages 9 to 12 constituted the group studied from a multi-disciplinary approach using research and theoretical findings of the biological, cognitive, affective, and social domains.

Lugo and Hershey (1979) emphasized that each individual, at each stage of development, allows external forces to exert a great influence on the biological, cognitive, affective, and social domains in order to permit the unique "me" or "self" to emerge. They further noted that as the self becomes increasingly more important as the reference point for guiding and judging, the child begins to behave as an active participant in determining his or her own behavior.

Basic theory and research on the 6 to 12-year-olds note that the child is more concerned about actual physical growth and motor competency. Piaget (cited in Lugo & Hershey, 1979) believed that physical structures (body organs) are instruments of the cognitive functions for exhibiting certain functions and behaviors. Lugo and Hershey indicated that without the motor responses, the chances that new learning will occur are decreased. Also, without motor responses, it will be difficult to observe behavior, thus difficult to determine objectively how well children deal with the demands of their environment.

Besides Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs, Millian, in her undated article on "Helping Children Cope When a Parent Has Cancer," discussed how children can be helped to cope. Her view supports Meichenbaum's (1985) view of transactional coping discussed earlier. Both suggest that the ability to cope is enhanced by outside
intervention. However, anybody so involved must understand what the child needs in order to effectively intervene.

**Intervention**

Millian (undated) discussed five basic needs of children which will now be briefly outlined:

**Need for information:** This need is highlighted by a quote she took from a 12-year-old that "not knowing what's going on makes me feel madder and more scared" (p. 2). She said that watching the behavior and activities of children gives clues as to what information they need. Also, when adults welcome children's questions, it helps children to cope better with the uncertainties of life. She noted that the children's freedom to express their thoughts and to probe into what parents think is a desire for information.

**Emotional support:** She emphasized that children need emotional support, and that they need to feel cared for and loved. In the event that feelings of fear, anger, and guilt overwhelm them, they need to know that such feelings are normal and must be addressed.

**Room to act:** Just as children need physical space to play, so they need emotional space to help them feel useful and active when circumstances are topsy-turvy, Millian (undated) asserted. In this way, she argued that they will feel stable when they take on responsibilities or when allowed to make choices.

**Respite and renewal:** Children, she argued, have stress just as adults do. For that reason, they need a break and rest to feel refreshed. At times, she said, children take on adult roles in times of illness. At
such times, they need a break to be children. The break will provide fun, especially when families do more together.

**Hope:** The last of the needs she discussed is hope; because life has many uncertainties, children must be provided realistic hopefulness. A clear understanding of what is happening in the present gives them reassurance. They need to know that all problems are temporary. This, she said, will give them strength to go on with their lives.

These five points by Millian (undated) are windows that shed light onto how children generally feel, regardless of age. Such a knowledge of children enhances strategies that parents, teachers, and clinicians use in helping them cope. This is transactional coping as Meichenbaum (1985) argued. As much as the individual tries to cope, there is need for outside intervention. This concept validates the pedagogical relations of teacher/student, parent/child, and adult/youngster for successful living.

In view of this, a determination of how well elementary children cope with their unique situations takes into account the processes in the cognitive realm which are usually translated into observable motor responses, giving meaning to observed behaviors.

**Developmental Perspectives**

Elementary children are in the process of development towards maturity. They show changes that are characteristic of their body functions in an emotional state. Steckle (1957) argued that the thalamus has a lot to do with the normal expression of feeling and emotion. Also, babies' needs and their expressions are synonymous until they learn when and how to express their needs. He further said that some adults
never get beyond the puppy stage where the control of needs is concerned. When the puppy has to go, he said, he goes! When he is angered, he bites. When he is hungry, neither he nor his master rests until he is fed.

The emotions directed by the thalamus call for immediate expression. This thalamus Steckle (1957) called "old brain." It does not replace the new. The new brain, he claimed, is where interpretation occurs in the light of the person's past experience and in terms of what he knows to be acceptable behavior.

Steckle (1957) also acknowledged that communication between the old and new, takes time; and during this delay, events that trigger behaviors which are commonly labeled "judged," "foresightful," "intelligent," "thoughtful," "cooperative," and "social" occur (p. 33).

The implication is that during the delay in the transmission of messages between the old and the new, thought processes are happening. The pros and cons are weighed, balancing the desire against past experience, hope for the future, the relative desires of the present, and consequences. The results of such processes are considered as behavior, or "socialized" behavior, with all the awareness for the rights of others. Adults, therefore, should behave not only in terms of what they want, but also in terms of what they know they should have.

It is this learned behavior that enables human beings to deal with the situations they encounter in their new environment. The behavior results from the coordinated activity of the cognitive and emotional interactions. Without the control of the new brain (cognitive and rational functions), the emotions run riot, and the organism regresses to the
state of "puppyhood." Unfulfillment of the wants will then call forth the powers of the puppy to deal with the situation. It is the rational powers that look at the problem, reinterpreting it to arrive at a compromise that will enable the puppy to live satisfactorily with unfulfilled wants. This ability could be called its coping ability.

When the pressure is unbearable in human beings, Steckle (1957) likened it to human behavior which occurs when the "brakes" (new brain-rational functions) have been released artificially with drugs or some overwhelming threat, resulting in blackouts, uncoordinated movements, irrational fears, extreme restlessness, hysteria, and violent emotions.

His conclusion was that man's recently learned behaviors, controlled by the highest levels of the brain (new brain) hold in check the behaviors of the old brain, as the foreman may govern the behavior of the supervisor who in turn controls the output of the worker. In this way, if the higher level is not functioning, a lower level can function unchecked and uncontrolled resulting in antisocial behaviors.

The inability of a human being to cope is his inability to function within social inhibitions. These inhibitions are the social controls and constraints of the new environment in which a mobile finds himself or herself. Since each child is different from all others, it is likely that its ability to control behavior to fall within the environmental constraints is its ability to cope. Such ability also takes into account both present and future consequences.
Education and Coping

A child is born with the basic equipment—emotionality and the latent cognitive ability, which may be aroused to activity by various situations encountered in its life.

When the child is hungry, or has some discomfort, it will cry. It is the child's way to manipulate the environment to meet its needs. This is, however, a spontaneous reaction. As the child matures, it learns that hunger or discomfort may not be eliminated by crying. Other strategies should be employed to solve the problem.

The attempt to seek alternatives in solving a problem is the function of the cognitive processes. As long as the cognitive functions are invoked, the chances of a negotiated settlement (coping) can be reached. According to Steckle (1957), failure to generate alternatives may result in blacking out, uncoordinated movements, irrational fears, extreme restlessness, hysteria, and violent emotions. This failure is because of overloaded circuits or overwhelming threat or stress. In this state the coping mechanism is "strained to its breaking point" (Moos, 1976, p. 4).

Education, therefore, is that process through which the young person is led to discover available alternatives in dealing with difficult life situations.

Pelsma (1988) suggested that a child's conduct reflects the ways of his or her parents. Watching others and their reactions to everyday problems and stress is a primary way for children to acquire the coping
skills necessary for surviving and managing the problems they encounter. Invariably, then, coping is learned behavior.

**Children and Problems**

The study done by Achenbach, Frank, Verhulst, Edelbrock, et al. (1987) on the epidemiological comparisons of American and Dutch children was intended to help understand the behavioral and emotional problems of children 6 to 11 years old. The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and related materials were used in this study. The focus was to determine children's functioning in different settings and with different interaction partners. The basic question of the study was essentially this: How do children in different countries of the world cope with their problems?

The sources used to answer the question were parents and teachers. Parents answered questions designed to discover their children's functioning at home. Teachers were the second source because they are usually the second most important adults in children's lives. Also, they could answer questions about children's functioning not necessarily known to parents.

The study examined two types of problems for these children: internalizing and externalizing. Internalizing problems are those that mainly involve internal conflicts and distress. Externalizing problems are those that involve conflicts in the child's environment—for example, conflicts that the child has with other people and their expectations for him or her. The "other" people include both peers and adults.
It is legitimate for studies such as this one to want to identify children's problems and how they deal with them. The whole business of life, as the researcher sees it, is a business of problem solving. One could ask: Why are problems never ending? The answer is simple. Life is dynamic and uncertain. Humans are in a quest to find out what is out there for them thus are destined to be continuously engaged in solving problems of change and uncertainty. Each new environment comes with its own set of problems.

Do children have problems? The following descriptions by fourth grade pupils give insights about their perceptions of problems: "A problem is something you can't handle." "It's something that interferes with your life." "When your parents get the big D and you get in the middle. Like this, your mom asks what your dad said, and your dad what your mom said. Now you have a problem." "When someone bugs you and they don't stop, you have a problem." "A problem is when you get into a situation that you don't want to get into. Like me, my dad is in the hospital, that's a problem." "Something that's in your mind that you can't get rid of." "Something you have difficulty doing." It is for these reasons that in this study a determination of how well children deal with such problems was investigated.

Elementary children are daily learning to solve other problems relating to academics. In order for them to move from one grade to another, they must be able to solve problems related to that transition. The inability to solve such problems could result in the child being retained in the same grade, as some school systems still practice.
Transition from one grade to another is usually measured by how children solve study and social problems. Mathematics, reading, science, and social studies problems all hone the problem-solving skills of children. An inability to cope with such problems could result in a lot of emotional problems. These emotional problems could further lead to behavior problems that disrupt classroom discipline. Continued behavior problems could result in children referred for clinical treatment. This referral is an admission that the child could not cope, thus could need clinical intervention.

How well do children cope? This becomes the needs assessment question whose answers could provide information for either clinical intervention or support systems.

**Appraisal Functions**

Based on the above discussion, appraisal could be likened to information processing—using that information to make decisions, thus directing how the individual will act in response to the demand at hand.

The appraisal functions are very complex. They depend on a number of factors which could be likened to those of a computer, to use that analogy. The human child could be likened to computer hardware. It comes with a certain amount of memory-potential. In this instance, according to Nightingale's (1990) audio program, the potential is unlimited but hardly used to full capacity.

Why is this so? Nightingale (1990) claimed that men don't think. Essentially, the information processing functions are not fully utilized. For the computer to perform certain functions, it must have a program.
The program determines the parameters for the functions that can be performed. Like a computer program, various functions can be performed. For instance, the program comes with editing functions of cut, paste, or copy; the search functions to help retrieve information; format functions to give ideas their structure and form; font functions to give the type a certain look; document functions for better management of the mechanics of the document; spelling, paragraphs, outlining, indexing, and table of contents. All these functions operate within the potential (memory) of the hardware.

Likewise, the elementary child (hardware) is endowed with potential (memory). The program is the result of environmental stimulation, lack of which leaves the child idea-impoverished. Without ideas and information the ability to solve problems is drastically reduced. Environmental stimulation could be the sights and sounds that constantly bombard the child through the five senses, or through direct instruction by adults and peers.

In the event that the child is faced with a problem, the search function is triggered. Unless stimulation is registered in the memory of the child, there will be no ideas or facts to process in order to cope with the demand encountered.

Also, the analogy of the dictionary function in the program, enables the child to define the reality perceived. Unless there is enough vocabulary power, the meaning of events will be unclear. Lack of clarity will result in erratic behavior or inability to cope or solve problems.

The appraisal process utilizes the information stored in the memory to evaluate and interpret the events encountered. Based on the
amount of information given by adults and the environment, the child may have sufficient or insufficient data to help him or her to cope. It is in this process that biases and prejudices are manifested. These then portray correctly or incorrectly the reality encountered. As a result, these biases and prejudices then determine how well the child copes. In other words, much of this basic information needed comes from the environment of the child.

This is transactional coping advocated by theorists such as Meichenbaum (1985), Millian (undated), Bernstein (1983), Fassler (1978), Grollman (1976), and LeShan (1976).

Paradigms in Coping

Cognitive developmental theories show that children develop structures (physical and psychological competencies) which are not fixed or predetermined at birth. The development of structures is a function of the continuous interplay between the continuously changing internal structures of the child with the continuously changing aspects of the complex environmental forces (Bringuier, 1980; Lugo & Hershey, 1979).

All children go through a series of stages in the evolution of intelligence which are always the same. The difference occurs in cases of delay or acceleration. Piaget observed that children in Martinique were four stages behind their peers in other countries. He claimed that the reason was that their society was lazy (Bringuier, 1980). In other words, the slower the interaction with the environment, the slower the development of structures.
Bringuier (1980) recorded that cognitive development is not complete at 3 years. New constructions of structures continue through adolescence. Also, every stage has a corresponding set of structures. Individual differences are evident because there are necessary interactions with the environment. As the child grows, the structures become new and richer compared to the sensory-motor structures which were evident in the first stages of development.

VanVuuren (1976) argued that humans are constantly entering and exiting new situations. Each entry into a new situation presents the individual with new challenges. These challenges lead to the construction of new structures used to deal with the new reality.

The endeavor to keep equilibrium in the formation of structures at each stage leads to the construction of new structures. The need for new structures is linked to a need for internal consistency and organization, without which there would be internal anarchy, disorder, and inconsistency (Bringuier, 1980).

According to Barker (1992), the inability of old structures to provide effective solutions to the new problems in a new situation leads to a paradigm shift, which is a new way of thinking about the new problems. This new way leads to the formation of new structures.

Barker (1992) called the cognitive structures "paradigms" around which knowledge is organized. He defined them as any set of rules and regulations or procedures, standards, and routines which tell people how to be successful by solving problems within those parameters. Nightingale (1990) also called them "paradigm of rules-guidelines" (p. 8).
However, Barker (1992) argued that this constant development of new structures is not automatic. Individuals choose to lock themselves into one specific way of solving problems, disregarding the fact that new situations may call for new approaches. This refusal to change Barker called paradigm paralysis. In this set, individuals become blinded by the success of their old paradigm and their investments in it. When confronted with a profoundly new and different way to continue success into the future, individuals reject it because it doesn’t fit the rules they have already been so good in.

Gunning (1992) referred to these cognitive structures as schemata. They are an organizational framework for knowledge. He claimed that the schemata are units in the cognitive domain in which knowledge is packaged, and that a schema thus provides a framework for comprehending a story and making inferences. In this instance, the story is a new problem in a new situation not encountered before.

How do these cognitive structures, paradigms, or schemata influence the coping activity? Coping is a problem-solving activity. According to Bringuier (1980), the structures help in maintaining equilibrium. Also, the formation of structures called genesis, takes place whenever an individual is faced with a problem in a new situation. That interaction with the environment is adaptation, and the endeavor to adapt is a coping activity.

Barker (1992) suggested that paradigms establish boundaries and tell people how to be successful by solving problems within those boundaries. In problem solving, or in the attempt to make sense of any situation one has encountered, the individual has to activate the
appropriate schema and fill in the slots. It is organized knowledge in schemata that will provide the clue in solving the new problem (Gunning, 1992).

Curry and Johnson (1990) suggested that the individual in the new encounter or situation will appraise it before activating the schema. In a sense, the individual scans the cognitive structures to determine whether there is information, procedures, or guidelines that can help in dealing with the new reality. It is after the appraisal process that either paradigm paralysis or genesis takes place.

When an individual appraises a situation, he or she creates a mental model of the circumstances in which that person finds himself. One brings into the appraisal process prior knowledge. This prior knowledge may or may not enhance the individual (Gunning, 1992). The richer the background, the more options the individual has for coping. This prior knowledge may be experiences he or she has had, thus making transfer of knowledge and coping possible.

The elementary child is just beginning on the road of continuing education. These are critical years which will color his or her educational world-view. It is, therefore, important to make sure the right color is made for a better and clearer view of life. These early years are most impressionable, and first impressions last long. At this early period, the stage is set for future operations based on the cognitive structures formed.
The Migrant Versus Mobile Child

Harrington (1987), discussing the migrant child, noted a number of issues of concern:

1. The future of migrant children is full of uncertainty. They are doomed to live the hopeless and uncertain lives of their ancestors and they, too, will drop out of school.

2. Migrant children are at risk. They are among the most vulnerable in America's classrooms. Harrington (1987) claimed that relationships between migrant children and other students are strained, and migrant children are often isolated and misunderstood.

3. Theirs is a history of poverty, mobility, cultural alienation, and low expectations becoming self-fulfilling prophecies.

4. Their school attendance is often interrupted because of moves with parents to "greener pastures." Their program has little continuity.

Lutz (1974) observed that a majority of the identified needs of migrant children appear to be common to almost all economically and educationally deprived groups in the United States.

Studies done by Ingersoll, Scamman, and Eckerling (1988), which investigated the impact of mobility on pupils, found that mobility had a negative effect on achievement.

Besides, such children are generally misunderstood by nonmobile pupils. This misunderstanding leads to isolation and to a feeling of being unwanted. This further impacts on the child's self-concept.

Low income families usually keep moving to find greener pastures. This constant movement towards something better and more stable
affects the pupils who are in school. A change of location necessitates a change of school. A change of school means a loss of familiar environments and loss of friends. Loss of continuity, according to Moos (1976), is clearly a problem for school children who change residence in the midst of a school term.

Child Behavior Checklist and Related Materials

In one study done by Achenbach, Hensley, Phares, and Grayson (1990) on problems and competencies reported by parents of Australian and American children, significant findings were observed. When randomly selected and compared, children in Sydney, Australia, scored significantly higher than their U.S.A. counterparts.

The Australian children scored higher on 82 problem items with a mean total problem score of 31.6 versus 20.1 for the U.S.A. The item scores correlated .92 between countries. It was observed that the similarity of patterns in scores permitted calibration of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) between the U.S.A. and Australia.

The American and Dutch studies supported the use of the same syndrome scales by clinicians and researchers in both countries. For each age group, the construct validity on the seven empirically derived syndromes was supported by cross-national correlations ranging from .80 to .98.

The above studies were designed to test the cross-national applicability of standardized procedures for obtaining information from teachers and parents on children’s emotional and behavioral problems. Achenbach’s et al. (1990) conclusion was that these studies support
standardized cross-national assessment of both teacher/parent-reported behavioral/emotional problems.

**Competency and Adaptive Scales**

Competency scales are measures that have been developed to help discriminate between children who cope and those who do not. These measures are reportable by parents. On the other hand, there are adaptive scales which are measures reportable by teachers to help discriminate between children who adapt well versus those who need help for behavioral and emotional problems in a school setting.

The competency scales are part of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), whereas the adaptive scales are part of the Teacher’s Report Form (TRF) both designed to discriminate between children who were referred for mental health services and those who were not referred. These measures were constructed and standardized by Achenbach (1991b, 1991c) of the University of Vermont in Burlington.

Referred children, according to Achenbach (1991b), are all those children who have received mental health services or special remedial school classes within the preceding 12 months. Referred children are children judged not able to cope without professional intervention. Achenbach further noted that this criterion could fail to exclude children who had significant problems but did not receive professional help for various reasons including a lack of parental concern.

The criterion for distinguishing between referred and nonreferred children has had an item on "special education classes for behavioral/emotional problems" added to it for comprehensiveness in
discrimination, said Achenbach (1991b). This was done, he further claimed, because schools have assumed greater responsibility for mental health services outside of school.

On the competence scales, each child is evaluated in three areas: activities, social, and school competency. For activities, the number of sports, participation, and skill are rated and scored. Also, the time the child spends and how well that child performs in these activities are examined. The child's favorite hobbies, games, organizations, clubs, and teams are part of the competencies sought. Under this section, too, the jobs or chores the child does at home are included.

On the social criterion, questions such as the following form the evaluation base: How many close friends does the child have? How much time in a given week does the child spend with other children outside school hours? Compared with others of his or her age, how well does the child get along with brothers and sisters, other kids, and parents?

Parental perspectives and impressions on the school evaluation are solicited. How the parent/guardian thinks the child is doing in such areas as reading, English, language arts, history, social studies, mathematics, and science is rated. Under this section the parent indicates any special classes (and kind) the child attends. If there are any problems, all these are shown.

How are the competence scales scored? The cross-informant computer program does that automatically; however, they can be hand scored. Achenbach (1991b) has explained in detail how this is done.
The adaptive scales appear in the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) and are reportable by teachers on academic performance and four adaptive characteristics: How hard the child is working, how appropriately he or she is behaving, how well he or she is learning, and how happy the child is. These are rated on a scale of 1-5 from far below grade to far above grade.

The Danbury School District

The Danbury school district is located in a medium city with a population of 25,000-100,000, according to the Danbury Public Schools' Individual Assessment Profile Report of 1990. The city is the same size as 16 other Connecticut towns with similar socioeconomic characteristics.

According to the report, the city has higher proportions of single-parent families in which English is not the primary home language. The median family income of $20,325 is below the state average. An average of 16% of residents spoke another language at home and 17% of the families were headed by single parents.

The report further indicates that the school district used specific state income guidelines to establish eligibility for free or reduced lunch. These guidelines have been widely used to identify the poverty level. Through this method students below the poverty level are identified for this study's purposes.

The report defines mobility as the percentage of change in the student body during the school year. It is calculated as the total number of students moving in and out of the school from September to June,
divided by the October 1 enrollment. Within each school building, there is a range of mobility from 9% to 33%.

Summary

Coping has been defined as constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that were appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person. It includes appraisal functions of evaluation of the situation and a determination of whether or not the demand encountered is stressful.

In such stressful encounters it is necessary to have interventions from others. These stressful encounters are demands on the body, pleasant or not, which result in adjustments or adaptations. These demands are neutral but are appraised differently by individuals, either as manageable or not.

Mobility is a social stress appraised by some as a disruption or loss of the familiar environment and by others as growth and opportunity for exposure and advancement. Mobility is an essential element of existence enabling individuals to experience the whole range of events of life. This is what contributes to the major stresses of life.

The elementary child in its development goes through life's transitions that are part of existence. The process through these transitions causes significant stress in children demanding that they cope. Since children are inexperienced, the need for interventions from adults is necessary to enhance their adaptation. These interventions are components of education in helping children solve their problems.
As children develop, they go through cognitive changes called
cognitive structures around which knowledge is organized. This knowl-
edge is useful in providing clues in the solution of new problems.

In assessing the competence level of these children, the CBCL and
related materials have been useful both in the U.S.A. and abroad. These
uses have verified the applicability of standardized procedures across
national boundaries.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This was a descriptive study using surveys to investigate the mobility, socioeconomic status, background, current status, and environmental interactions of a sample of elementary students as perceived by their parents and teachers in the Danbury Public School District, Connecticut, United States of America.

Purpose

The intent of the study was to investigate the relationship between mobile and nonmobile elementary children in the way they cope with the demands of their environments as perceived by parents and teachers. The second objective was to investigate the implications of mobility and coping for school leadership.

Statement of the Problem

Recent studies on mobility, such as those done by Ingersoll et al. (1988), investigated its impact on academic achievement. They also observed that economic and sociocultural forces impel high mobility and instability among various population groups. They found that mobility had a negative effect on students' overall academic achievement. The same study recommended that school administrators discourage moves of a relatively small distance in order to maintain continuity and stability
in their schools. Another study done by Ligon and Paredes (1992) reviewed methods currently in use in the study of student mobility. This special focus on mobility attests to the significance of the problem in school districts all over the country. This study has investigated how mobile children compare with the nonmobile in the way they cope with the demands of their environments. In other words, do frequent moves of families affect those children involved more than those who do not move frequently?

**General Problem**

What is the relationship between parents and teachers' perceptions on how mobility affects children's competence and adaptive functioning?

**Subproblem:** Does socioeconomic status have any relationship to mobility? Since mobility is a variable that affects school children, what implications are there for school leadership?

**Hypotheses Tested**

1. Parents of mobile, elementary school pupils will rate them different from parents of nonmobile, elementary school pupils in terms of how they cope with the demands of their environment. (a) Mobile and nonmobile children rated by their parents at or below the T score of 33 are referred, or clinical, children. (b) Mobile and nonmobile children rated by their parents at the T score of 34 and above are considered nonreferred, or normal, children.
2. Teachers of mobile, elementary school students will rate them different from teachers of nonmobile, elementary school students in terms of how they adapt in the school environment. (a) Mobile and nonmobile children rated by their teachers at or below the T score of 33 are referred, or clinical, children. (b) Mobile and nonmobile children rated by their teachers at the T score of 34 and above are considered nonreferred, or normal, children.

**Competence Hypothesis**

There is a significant difference between the parent ratings of nonmobile and mobile elementary pupils in how they cope with the demands of their home environment.

**Adaptive Functioning Hypothesis:** There is a significant difference between the teacher's ratings of nonmobile and mobile elementary pupils in how they adapt in the school environment.

**Limitations of the Study**

The study has been limited by a number of factors:

1. There were few available willing subjects to participate in the study.

2. The low level of education and language barrier for some parents made the survey form intimidating. At least one parent returned the form because she could not complete it.

3. The amount of time involved in completing the surveys led some teachers to decline involvement. Other teachers who had agreed, commented that if they had known how much time it took to complete
the form they would have declined involvement.

4. The presence of the researcher in one school as a teacher could have influenced data collection. Some teachers felt compelled to complete the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) because of their relationship to the researcher. This pressure might have affected the ratings.

Subjects and Population

The focus of investigation of this study was the Danbury, Connecticut, Public School District. All the parents and teachers of third to sixth grade enrolled elementary school children 9 to 12 years of age in this district were the target population.

There are 11 K-6 elementary schools in the Danbury School District. Schools are located all over the city, but pupils are limited to attend the school in their zone. However, in 1992 a School District Reorganization was forged. This has led to a better mix of both inner city and suburban children.

The Danbury Public School District, like other school districts in the country, reflects school demographics relating to the problem of mobility. The reorganization took pupils from one school to another, in a sense creating mobility issues. Table 1 provides a demographic profile of schools for the 1992-93 school year.

It will be noticed that there is a wide range of school mobility from 6% to 31%. It is noteworthy, too, to comment about a few schools that had a high mobility rate of over 20%, such as Morris Street (23%), Park Avenue (29%), Pembroke (21%), Roberts Avenue (23%), and South Street (31%). This is due to parents in low income levels who
Table 1

Percentages of Students in 1992-93 Demographic Profile of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Free or reduced lunch</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>English not dominant language</th>
<th>Minority rate</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Plain</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayestown</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St. Intermediate</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Ridge Int.</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Street</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Avenue</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Rock</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Street</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadley Rough</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tend to find housing in the inner city where house rents are lower.

The socioeconomic status (SES) was determined from the lunch application forms based on Section 652 (a) and (b) of Public Law 99-425 under the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986 that outlines the qualifications for free lunch or reduced lunch based on parent income. Parents whose income levels are higher than the federal cutoff guidelines are not eligible for their children to qualify for free or reduced lunch.

The district had a total of 23% free or reduced lunch and a 94% attendance rate for the 1992-93 school year.

Sample Selection Criteria

The sample consisted of the parents and teachers of Grades 3-6 mobile and nonmobile boys and girls, ages 9-12. The sample was selected on the basis of mobility rate and socioeconomic status. Children and/or parents who had moved at least once in the past 3 years were considered mobile. Parents of children who received free or reduced lunch were considered to be in the low socioeconomic status. The teachers of these children where thus selected to participate in the study. The schools were purposively selected based on the high mobility rate and a large percentage of low socioeconomic status subjects.

Description of Variables

Independent Variables

The independent variables in this study were mobility and socioeconomic status. The variable of mobility has two levels to be
observed, that is, mobile and nonmobile. In this study mobile referred to movement in and out of the school district at least once in the past three school years. Nonmobile referred to no movement in and out of the school district in the past three school years.

The second independent variable was socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status in this study referred to family income levels. This, too, has two levels: namely, upper and lower socioeconomic status.

The upper socioeconomic status referred to those families whose income levels restricted their children from getting free lunch in school by federal guidelines. The lower socioeconomic status referred to those families whose income levels, based on federal guidelines, qualified their children to receive free or reduced lunch in school.

The purpose of the study was to determine how mobility and socioeconomic status of pupils were related to how they coped with the demands of their environment at home and school.

These independent variables are interdependent because they could not be randomly selected and assigned. One pupil could be affected by both mobility and socioeconomic status simultaneously. It would be difficult to separate their effects on the dependent variable.

Dependent Variable

Coping was the dependent variable. Coping means effective management of environmental demands. This study examined how this variable is related to the two independent variables mentioned above—essentially, how mobile and nonmobile elementary pupils cope
with the demands of their environment.

The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach, 1991b) and the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) (Achenbach, 1991c) were used to measure the dependent variable as reported by parents and teachers.

Instrument Description

Achenbach (1991b, 1991c) has developed instruments that have been identified as suitable for measuring the dependent variable and to answer the questions raised in this study. The two instruments he developed which were used in this study are the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Teacher's Report Form (TRF).

The use of multiple sources of data provides an overview of variations in the pattern and prevalence of problems as seen by different informants. According to Pratt (1980), no single source of information is adequate to provide a basis for wise and comprehensive decisions about the objectives of the school. McConaughy and Achenbach (1988) added that the CBCL and TRF could provide a wealth of information about the child's functioning from multiple perspectives and that this information would enable the practitioner to determine the strengths and deficits of the child.

Child Behavior Checklist

The CBCL (Achenbach, 1991b) for ages 4 through 16 is an instrument designed to obtain standardized data on children's competencies and problems, as reported by their parents or parent-surrogates. It can be self-administered or administered by an interviewer. It can also
be readministered to assess changes over time or following treatment.

Twenty competence items obtain parents' reports on the amount and quality of their child's participation in sports, hobbies, games, activities, jobs and chores, and friendships. It also measures how well the child gets along with others, how the child plays and works alone, and his or her school functioning. It has 118 specific problem items and two open-ended problem items.

This instrument is scored on a 3-step response scale. Achenbach (1991b) argued that more differentiated scales for scoring are vulnerable to respondent characteristics, thus reducing the discriminative power below that obtained by a 3-step scale.

The CBCL is scored on the competence and problem scales of the Child Behavior Profile, which has separate forms for each sex at ages 4-5, 6-11, and 12-16. The scales were constructed from factor analyses of parents' ratings of 2,300 clinically-referred children and normed on 1,300 nonreferred children. Only the competence scales were used in this study to measure how children cope as perceived by their parents.

Scales that compose competence scales are entitled: Activities, Social, and School. The total competence score comprises the sum of the three scale scores. A child who scores below a T score of 33 is considered a clinical concern, according to Achenbach (1991b), or qualifies to be referred for professional help.

**Teacher's Report Form**

The second instrument used is the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) (Achenbach, 1991c). It was designed to obtain teachers' ratings of
many of the same problems that parents rate on the CBCL, plus additional items ratable by teachers.

The TRF was designed to obtain teachers' reports of children's school performance, adaptive functioning, and behavioral/emotional problems. The children are rated on a 7-point scale in four areas: how hard the child is working, how appropriately he or she is behaving, how much he or she is learning, and how happy he or she is. These scales measure the adaptive functioning of the child.

Ninety-three items on this instrument have counterparts on the CBCL/4-16 rated by parents, while the remaining items concern school behaviors that parents would not observe in school, such as difficulty following directions, failing to complete tasks, and disrupting class discipline.

Teachers' responses are scored on the TRF Profile, which consists of scales for school performance and adaptive functioning as well as empirically-derived problem scales. The scales are standardized separately for each sex for ages 6-11 and 12-16. In order for a child to be considered a clinical concern, he or she would have to score below the T score of 33 according to Achenbach (1991c).

Reliability and Validity

Child Behavior Checklist

The CBCL's reliability was assessed by Achenbach (1991b) in terms of test-retest reliability, inter-rater agreement, and longer-term stability. The intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) between item
scores was in the .90s. The ICC is calculated from one-way analysis of variance to reflect the proportion of total variance in item scores. It is related to the differences in items themselves after a specific source of unreliability was removed. The ICC for social competence items was .97.

Pearson correlation for 1-week test-retest reliability of mothers' ratings was .89. The median Pearson correlation between mothers' and fathers' ratings was .66. The test-retest correlations over a 3-month period averaged .74 for parents' ratings and .73 for child care workers' ratings of behavior problems. Test-retest correlations for outpatients' scores over a 6-month period were in the .60s for both behavior problem and competence scores. Over an 18-month period, the mean correlations ranged from .46 to .76 for problem and competence scores.

The content validity of the CBCL was viewed in terms of whether its items were related to the clinical concerns of parents and mental health workers. It was found that 116 of the 118 behavior problem items and all 20 of the social competence items were significantly associated with clinical status, according to Achenbach and Edelbrock (1983).

Teacher's Report Form

Achenbach and Edelbrock (1986) claimed that the TRF over a 7-day test-retest showed that the tendency for scores to decline was quite small. The median test-retest Pearson correlation was .90, with negligible changes in mean scale scores.
The longer the time, over a 15-day period, Achenbach and Edelbrock (1986) claimed that the median test-retest correlation was .84. This, they say, showed a tendency for the mean scores to drop .7 of a point. Over a 2-month period, they reported that the correlation was .74 and continued to drop over a 4-month period to .68.

With reference to the instrument's validity, Achenbach and Edelbrock (1986) argued that many of the instrument's items were descriptions of competencies and problems that were of concern both to parents and mental health workers. The authors found that on all but two problem items, referred children scored significantly higher than nonreferred children. In other words, the problem items were associated with judgments of children's need for mental health services. These children could not cope.

In order to judge the school functioning of these children, items such as the following were used: hums or makes other odd noises in class; fails to finish things he or she starts; defiant; talks back to staff; fidgets and has difficulty following directions; replaces the CBCL items: allergy, asthma, bowel movements outside toilet; cruelty to animals; and disobedience at home. The replacement items would obtain judgments that teachers are able to make with respect to school functioning.

Achenbach and Edelbrock (1986) found in their study that all but one problem item and all adaptive functioning items were significantly associated (p < .005) with referral status. This significance was established independently of the TRF, they claimed. They also argued that the TRF corresponded well with the Conner's Revised Teachers Rating
Scale, ranging from .62 to .90. These ratings are considered large enough to compare favorably with well-standardized ability tests.

Data Collection

Sampling Procedures

Purposive sampling method was used to select the schools to be studied. Schools that were selected for use in the sample because of the high socioeconomic status and mobility percentages were: Hayestown, King Street Intermediate, Morris Street, and South Street. Due to the district reorganization, some students from Morris Street School went to Rogers Park School and King Street Intermediate. In one sense the Rogers Park School was thus involved.

Mill Ridge Intermediate, with 15% mobile children, was selected. However, when the principal saw the survey instruments and what would be done, he refused to have his teachers involved. Consequently, King Street Intermediate was added to the list.

There were, however, problems encountered in the selection of subjects for study. The original plan was to obtain a list of both mobile and nonmobile upper and lower SES children first, then from that pool draw a random sample of subjects.

There was a critical element overlooked in that original plan. In order to obtain a list of sought-for children with the required characteristics, their school records had to be examined. No child's record could be examined without parental permission.
The difficulties associated with seeking permission led to a change of strategy and confounded the groupings. Letters requesting permission from all parents of third through sixth grade pupils were sent home with the survey form enclosed. The return of the signed letter and a completed Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) meant that the parents had acceded to examination of the child's record for the required information.

Another problem encountered after the return of the CBCL from the parents was the school district reorganization. This spread the children and teachers throughout the district. The school records for the children were moved to the new schools. Consequently, the previous teachers could not complete the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) without the school record. Many of the children from Morris Street School went to Rogers Park. Teachers at the new school had to complete the forms.

The upper socioeconomic status (SES) pupils tended to be in the same zone, and the lower SES pupils, because of their low income, found themselves in low-income housing zones. The redistricting changed this somewhat.

Procedures

Three hundred and seventy-six surveys were sent home with the children in a sealed envelope addressed to parents. In some schools, the secretaries were requested to coordinate the effort. In two schools, Morris Street and King Street Intermediate, the researcher himself gave out surveys to teachers for them to send home with children.
The children were instructed to tell the parents that a response to the letters was due back within a week. When the week was over without a returned response, the children were given another reminder. In the other two schools, the secretaries were asked to send reminders to the children. These reminders were sent three times.

**Scoring Procedures**

Scoring of data in this study was done by computer. This researcher used the Cross-Informant Computer Program (Achenbach, 1991a) to code and score all the data. This program, developed by Achenbach, is a computer program that enables the user to do the following:

1. Enter data from Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and Teacher's Report Form (TRF) for a single child or groups of children.
2. Score data from checklists, creating raw and T scores for all scales. The scores can be stored in files for analyses later or printed in profiles to display the scores.
3. Calculate cross-informant comparisons of item scales and scale scores plus correlations between scores from different informants.

The program consists of two parts: The first one is called the "Enter/Score" program which accomplishes the first two functions listed above. The second is called the "Cross-Informant" program which accomplishes the third.

The scored data can be used in different analyses and read directly by statistical packages such as Statistical Package for Social Sciences.
(SPSS), Biomedical Program (BMDP), and Statistical Analysis Systems (SAS). After the data were entered in the computer and scored for the CBCL and TRF for this study, the percentiles and $T$ scores were automatically computed. The SAS (1979) statistical package was used to analyze data.

The following section explained the general procedure (Achenbach, 1991b) for assigning percentiles and $T$ scores to both competence and adaptive scales. A careful examination of Figure 1 shows the logic.

At the top of each competence scale, a $T$ score of 55 was assigned to all raw scores at the 69th percentile and above. This was done, claimed Achenbach (1991b), because a large percentage of the subjects in the CBCL normative samples obtained the highest possible score on the school scale. This, he said, meant that a very small difference in raw scores (5.5 versus 6.0) could produce a disproportionately large difference in $T$ scores. He observed further that differences at the high end of the competence scales were not likely to be important because they are all well within the normal range.

At the low end of the scales, $T$ scores were based on percentiles down to the second percentile ($T$ score = 30). The remaining raw scores were divided into equal $T$-score intervals to a $T$ score of 20. As a result of few raw scores below the second percentile of the competence scales, low competence scores were assigned a range of only 10 $T$ scores (29 through 20).

The borderline clinical range is spanned by broken lines at $T$ scores of 30 and 33 from the second to the fifth percentile of the normative sample. Achenbach (1991b) said that this range was chosen
Figure 1. 1991 Child Behavior Checklist Profile for Girls—Competence Scales.

to approximate the same degree of deviance from the middle of the normative sample by the borderline clinical range from $T = 67$ to $T = 70$ for Total Problem Syndromes. It should be noted that the syndrome scales, which are not part of this study, have been assigned a $T$ score from 50 at the base to 100 at the top, for reasons not discussed here.

The borderlines were chosen to discriminate between referred and unreferred samples. This process, Achenbach claimed, minimizes the number of "false positives" (that is, normal children who score in the clinical range).

The hypothetical Jenny's score on the social scale is slightly above the second percentile which equals $T$ score of 31. This score is between the borderlines, indicating that Jenny is a concern in this area. Her school raw score of 2 is below 2.5 percentile, and clearly this is a considerable concern because she is below the cutoff $T$ score of 30 when compared with a normative sample of 6- to 11-year-old girls. The Cross-Informant computer program automatically computes the $T$ scores for total competence.

The assignment of $T$ scores for the TRF is done differently from the CBCL. In order to get an overall picture how the percentiles and $T$ scores were assigned, Figure 2 shows a hand-scored TRF adaptive functioning for a hypothetical 12-year-old boy named Raymond.

A look at the profile shows that Raymond scored on the academic scale 2.40, 3 for working hard, 4 for behaving appropriately, 4 for learning, and 2 for happy.

For example, in order to determine an equivalent $T$ score for the raw score for working hard (3), a straight line from 3 across to the right,
Figure 2. 1991 Teacher's Report Form Profile for Boys--Adaptive Functioning.

the $T$ score is about 46. The raw score of 4 for learning gives a $T$ score of 48. For each column, one must read the raw score under the related age group. For Raymond's score, the 12- to 18-year-olds column must be observed.

However, to get the total $T$ score for the adaptive functioning scales, the sum of Scales 1 (working hard), 2 (behaving appropriately), 3 (learning), and 4 (happy) equals 13 ($3 + 4 + 4 + 2 = 13$). Now, under the 12- to 18-year-olds column on the right side of the profile, one would find the number 13 which equals a $T$ score of 44. In this instance, Raymond is far above the cutoff $T$ score of 33, implying that he is in the normal range.

Data Analysis

The unit of analysis of this research was the score given by parents and teachers on two different measures. The hypotheses were tested by using different statistical procedures at .05 alpha level. Hypotheses 1 and 2, which sought for differences of ratings by parents and teachers, respectively, for mobile and nonmobile elementary students, were examined by using $T$ scores. It has been determined previously that a student whose score is at or below 33 is considered a referred, or clinical, child.

Two hypotheses dealing with competence in the parents' survey were tested using a $t$ test for independent means and a chi square. These two hypotheses looked for differences between parents of mobile and nonmobile elementary school children in how they cope with the demands of their environment.
The hypotheses dealing with adaptive functioning in the teacher survey were tested by using a $t$ test. Table 2 shows a synthesis of the statistical procedures used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Statistical procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$t$ scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$t$ test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive functioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$t$ scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$t$ test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Assumptions

As indicated by Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1985), some assumptions should be satisfied in using the chi-square test of independency:

1. The data are frequency data only.
2. The observed frequencies in each cell are independent.
3. The subjects of the sample are selected on a random basis.
4. The selected sample is fairly large.

Assumptions 3 and 4 posed some problems. The sample was selected voluntarily: 96 parents out of 376 parents and 15 teachers decided freely to participate in the study. However, these two assumptions are considered met when the expected values for each cell are at least five. This test could not be used.
A $t$ test for independent means has a number of assumptions underlying its use: (a) normal distribution of data, (b) interval scale of the instruments, (c) two independent groups, (d) random sampling, and (e) that the variances must be equal. Again, random selection of the sample presented a problem in the study. The sample was voluntarily drawn. The number of subjects (parents and teachers) was not large enough in both groups of mobile and nonmobile to allow comparison. The competence score sample had mobile lower SES = 20, mobile upper SES = 1, nonmobile lower SES = 9, and nonmobile upper SES = 66. The TRF sample had mobile lower SES = 8, mobile upper SES = 1, nonmobile lower SES = 5, and nonmobile upper SES = 36.

It was then feasible to compare the mobile lower SES and the nonmobile lower SES pupils on both competence and adaptive functioning; also, to compare the two group mean scores to determine if there were any significant differences.

Summary

This was a descriptive study analyzing the perceptions of parents and teachers on a sample of elementary pupils in the Danbury, Connecticut, Public Schools. The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between mobile and nonmobile elementary pupils in the way they cope with the demands of their environments at home and school as perceived by parents and teachers.

The problem of mobility has been a big issue in many school districts. This has been confirmed by recent findings showing that it has a negative effect on students' overall academic achievement. Also, the
socioeconomic forces have been shown to create instability among many population groups. This problem led to the investigation of the relationship between mobility and competence and mobility and adaptiveness.

The hypothesis of the study has been based on the preponderance of recent findings that mobility has an effect on students' performance. It indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between nonmobile and mobile and upper and lower socioeconomic status variables with regard to the variable coping.

Four schools were purposively selected for study. The sample was selected on the basis of mobility and socioeconomic status. Mobility and socioeconomic status are independent variables and coping the dependent variable.

The instruments used in the study were developed by Achenbach (1991b, 1991c) of the University of Vermont. The two selected instruments are the CBCL and the TRF reportable by parents and teachers, respectively.

The CBCL's reliability was done in terms of 1-week test-retest (.89), agreement between mothers and fathers (.66), and long-term stability ranging from .46 to .76. For the TRF, test-retest was .90. It tended to decline over a longer period.

The data collected was scored on computer using the Cross-Informant Computer Program developed by Achenbach (1991a). The computer assigned percentiles and $T$ scores automatically to the raw data generated.

In order to understand how Achenbach (1991a) interpreted scored data, a few hypothetical situations were given to explain how data were
scored and \( T \) scores and percentiles assigned.

Hypotheses testing was done using different statistical procedures at .05 alpha level. For example, two hypotheses were examined using the \( T \) scores; two dealing with the children's competence used \( t \) test for independent means. The adaptive functioning hypotheses used a \( t \) test. The \( t \) test for hypotheses had major assumptions underlying its use which must always be met. However, the CBCL and the TRF samples were not large enough to allow comparison. Instead, the mean scores for both the CBCL and the TRF were compared to observe any differences.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of this study. Essentially, what did this study find in terms of the major question: How do mobile and nonmobile elementary children relate in the way they cope with the demands of their environment, at home and school, as perceived by parents and teachers? Also, how does mobility relate to socioeconomic status in terms of elementary school? Four sections are identified: (1) response rate, (2) demographic analysis, (3) hypothesis testing, and (4) summary.

Response Rate

A total of 376 Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach, 1991b) surveys were sent out and 96 completed by parents were returned. Of the 96 Teacher’s Report Forms (TRF) (Achenbach, 1991c) sent out to teachers, 50 were returned. Table 3 shows the breakdown of returned responses by school and the total sample for both CBCL and TRF.

King Street and Morris Street had more returns (30% and 45%, respectively, for CBCL and 55% and 59%, respectively, for the TRF). Hayestown and South Street had the lowest return (14% and 5%, respectively, for CBCL and for TRF 22% and 33%, respectively). The response rate of the CBCL was 26% and the TRF was 52%. The TRF
Table 3
Survey Return Rate by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>CBCL</th>
<th>TRF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayestown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street Intermediate</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Street</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percentage is based on the 96 CBCL responses. A special follow-up was done with the help of the school secretaries who were coordinating this effort. This yielded a few more returns. Many of the teachers were spoken to personally and encouraged to respond. Those who did not respond said that the form took too long to complete. Others went as far as to say that if they had known how involved they would be in responding to the survey, they would have declined.

In King Street Intermediate no groupings by either mobility or SES were done before the return of the CBCL from the parents. Survey forms were sent to parents of all Grades 4 and 5 children. Of the 184 surveys sent out, only 55 responses were returned.

Returned surveys were grouped according to the following categories: mobile versus nonmobile and upper SES versus lower SES.
Demographic Analysis

Table 4 presents the demographic profile of the school district by school.

A careful examination of Table 4 reveals a number of factors relating to the school district’s demographics. The first column shows the percentages of free or reduced lunch by school. Since free or reduced lunch is based on the income levels of families in the district, it is evident that more than a quarter of the population is below the federal guidelines for financial self-sufficiency.

The second column shows 19% of the families are mobile; that is, they have moved at least once in the last three school years. This column shows a relationship between low socioeconomic status (SES) and mobility in some of the schools.

Sample Demographics

For a better understanding of the composition of the sample, Table 5 presents gender, mobility, and group demographics.

The sample consisted of more girls ($n = 56$) than boys ($n = 39$), all ranging in age between 9 and 12. The mobile children represented a third of the nonmobile (21:75). For socioeconomic status, more children are in the upper level ($n = 67$), and the rest in the lower level ($n = 29$, which represents 30.2% of the sample).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Free or reduced lunch</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>English not dominant language</th>
<th>Minority rate</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Plain</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayestown</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St. Intermediate</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Ridge Int.</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Street</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Avenue</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Rock</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Street</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadley Rough</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent averages and total enrollment</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>3,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Demographics of Gender, Mobility, and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>39(^a)</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>56(^a)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mobile</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)No response for one child.

Hypothesis Testing

**Competence Hypothesis**

Is there a difference between the ratings of the parents of mobile elementary school children and the parents of the nonmobile elementary school children in terms of how they cope with the demands of the home environment?

In order to test this hypothesis, a \(t\) test was used. First, the \(T\) scores were used to determine the differences of the parents' ratings for the children under study, whether or not they were clinical concerns. The \(t\) test followed the use of \(T\) scores. It should be understood that
mobile and nonmobile children rated by their parents at or below the T score of 33 are referred, or clinical, children. Also, 3 T scores below 33 or above could be considered borderline cases. In a sense, these scores are low enough to cause concern. However, Achenbach (1991b) suggested that a T score of 30 and below determines the deviance with more certainty that the child is a definite clinical concern.

Table 6 presents T scores and frequencies of the children on competence. This table shows how many children are or are not clinical concerns based on the T-score cutoff.

There are four mobile and six nonmobile elementary children who are clinical concerns, rated by parents at or below the T score of 35. The T score of 35 is above the cutoff score of 33 but is very close to the borderline. Hence, the two children who scored 35 are considered clinical because they are close enough to the cutoff point to cause concern. The differences in ratings are not significant when one considers the fact that there are many more nonmobile subjects than mobile. There is no difference between the nonmobile and mobile elementary children in the way they cope based on their T scores for the CBCL.

To test the hypothesis regarding differences between the ratings of the parents of mobile elementary school children and the parents of the nonmobile elementary school children in terms of how they cope with the demands of the home environment, a t test for independent means was used. According to Ary et al. (1985), this test is used to compare two sample means when the samples have been drawn independently from a population. It is intended to find whether the differences between two sample means is statistically significant. Table 7
Table 6

T-Score Frequencies for Competence (CBCL)
Comparison for Clinical Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T scores</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>NML</th>
<th>NMU</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical concern</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal/nonreferred</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ scores</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>NML</td>
<td>NMU</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | 20 | 1  | 9   | 66  | 96 |

**Note.** ML = mobile lower SES; MU = mobile upper SES; NML = nonmobile lower SES; NMU = nonmobile upper SES; $T$ = row totals.

presents a summary of $t$-test analyses for competence of mobile low SES and nonmobile low SES elementary school children.

The null hypothesis that there is no difference between the ratings of the parents of the mobile and nonmobile elementary school children in the way they cope is retained. Only the mobile low SES and nonmobile
Table 7

Summary of t Test for Competence of Mobile Low SES and Nonmobile Low SES Elementary School Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>tobt</th>
<th>tcv</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mobile</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > .05.

low SES are compared because the samples allow for comparisons. The critical value of 2.05 is greater than the observed value of t (1.70), with a df = 27. This means that there was no evidence to support the argument of differences between the mobile and nonmobile elementary school children in the way they cope with the demands of their environment.

Table 8 summarized the competence mean scores by scales. This table shows the mean variances between the groups.

This summary on Table 8 revealed a number of facts: On the total mean scores, the nonmobile lower SES (64.11) apparently scored higher than the mobile lower SES (48.80). The same is true for Activities (nonmobile = 60.77 and mobile = 43.60) and School performance (nonmobile = 49.66 and mobile = 47.55). Only for the Social mean score, the mobile lower SES scored higher (46.35) than the nonmobile lower SES (44.00).

The nonmobile upper SES apparently scored higher than the mobile upper SES on the total mean score (nonmobile = 54.00 and
Table 8

Summary of Competence Mean Scores by Scales and Comparison by Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Not mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower (n = 20)</td>
<td>Upper (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>43.60 53.00</td>
<td>60.77 49.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>46.35 51.00</td>
<td>44.00 49.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>47.55 37.00</td>
<td>49.66 47.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grand mean</td>
<td>48.80 48.00</td>
<td>64.11 54.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mobile = 48.80). This is true for School performance only (nonmobile = 47.74 and mobile = 37.00). On the Activities (nonmobile = 49.59 and mobile = 53.00) and Social (nonmobile = 49.47 and mobile = 51.00), the reverse is true. One could conclude that there is an apparent difference between the mobile and nonmobile in the way they cope based on their total competence mean scores, and on individual scales, although that difference is not significant.

Adaptive Functioning Hypothesis

This section examined the TRF scores. Are there differences between the ratings of the teachers of mobile elementary school children and those of the teachers of the nonmobile elementary school children in terms of how they adapt at school?
Table 9 presents a frequency of adaptive functioning $T$ scores to help determine the differences between the ratings of teachers of mobile and nonmobile elementary children in their adaptation at school. This table helps to show whether or not the children are clinical.

Table 9

$T$-Score Frequencies for Adaptive Functioning (TRF) and Comparison for Clinical Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$ scores</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>NML</th>
<th>NMU</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>NML</td>
<td>NMU</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** ML = mobile lower SES; MU = mobile upper SES; NML = nonmobile lower SES; NMU = nonmobile upper SES; T = row totals.

There are 5 nonmobile upper SES who are borderline clinical, 1 nonmobile lower SES borderline clinical, and 1 mobile lower SES borderline clinical. These are above the cutoff T score of 33 but are very close to cause concern. Those children who are in the normal range are: 7 mobile lower SES, 1 mobile upper SES, 3 nonmobile lower SES, and 32 nonmobile upper SES. There are no truly clinical cases as rated by the teachers. All children are rated above the cutoff T score of 33.

This hypothesis also used a t test for independent means to test the differences between the teacher’s ratings of mobile and nonmobile elementary school children in the way they adapt in the school environment.
As noted earlier, the $t$ test for independent means is used to find the significance of the difference between the means of two samples. Table 10 presents a summary of $t$-test data for adaptive functioning of mobile low SES and nonmobile low SES elementary children. The sample sizes allow for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t_{ob}$</th>
<th>$t_{cv}$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mobile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p > .05$.

There are no differences between the ratings of the teachers of mobile and nonmobile children. The $t$ test shows the means of the two groups as similar (mobile = 60.5; nonmobile = 60.6). Also, with $df = 11$, the $t$-critical value of 2.20 exceeds the $t$-observed value of .007. The $p$ value (.99) is greater than .05. The null hypothesis that there is no difference between the ratings of the teachers of mobile low SES and nonmobile low SES elementary children in the way they adapt in the school environment is true. In other words, it is not true that nonmobile low SES children adapt better in school than the mobile low SES, as perceived by their teachers.
Table 11 presents a summary of the TRF mean scores to compare the mobile and nonmobile in terms of socioeconomic status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not mobile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower (n = 8)</td>
<td>Upper (n = 1)</td>
<td>Lower (n = 5)</td>
<td>Upper (n = 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>50.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hard</td>
<td>60.87</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>60.20</td>
<td>53.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behave</td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>53.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>53.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>61.75</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>54.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grand mean</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>53.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 11, there is no difference between the mobile lower SES (60.50) and the nonmobile lower SES (60.60). There are, however, differences on the individual scales. The mobile lower SES has performed better than the nonmobile lower SES on Working Hard (mobile = 60.87; nonmobile = 60.20), Behaving (mobile = 63.50; nonmobile = 61.80), and Happy (mobile = 61.75; nonmobile = 60.60). The nonmobile lower SES did better than the mobile lower SES in Academic performance (nonmobile = 45.60; mobile = 42.25), and Learning (nonmobile = 61.40; mobile = 59.12).
Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings of this study on how mobile and nonmobile elementary children relate in the way they cope and adapt in their environment. Also, to present findings on how mobility and socioeconomic status, relate in terms of the children under study.

The response rate of the CBCL was 96 out of a total of 376 surveys sent out to parents. Following the return of the CBCL, 96 surveys were sent to the teachers of the children involved. Only 50 surveys were returned by the teachers. Follow-up was done with no significant returns.

Demographics for the district were presented, showing each elementary school’s free lunch percentages, mobility rates, minority composition of the district, the percentages for dominant languages spoken at home other than English, and the total enrollment of each school.

Also, the sample demographics given showed that there was 41% boys, 59% girls, 21% mobile children, 78% nonmobile children, 30% children in the low socioeconomic status, and 69% in the upper socioeconomic status.

In order to test the competence hypotheses of this study, a $t$ test was used. A comparison using the $T$ scores was first used to determine whether or not the children were clinical concerns. It was observed that the $T$ scores did not vary much between the mobile and the nonmobile children. Very few children were clinical concerns. The $t$ test did not
show any differences between the mobile and the nonmobile children. This indicated that the ratings of the parents of nonmobile and those of the mobile did not vary significantly, and no significant differences were found.

For adaptive functioning hypothesis, using the T score to compare for clinical concern, no differences were observed. There were 7 borderline clinical children out of the 50 rated by the teachers. The borderline scores indicate that they could not be definitely identified as truly clinical. The t test showed no differences between the mobile and the nonmobile in the way they adapted in the school environment.

A comparison of competence mean scores for SES showed that the nonmobile lower SES scored higher than the mobile lower SES on the total score. This was true also for Activities and School performance. The mobile lower SES scored higher only on Social competence.

A comparison for adaptive functioning mean scores for SES showed no differences on the total mean score. However, differences were seen in Academic performance and Learning where the nonmobile lower SES scored higher than the mobile lower SES. For Working Hard, Behaving, and Happy, the lower SES mobile scored higher than the lower SES nonmobile. It was noted that the comparison for upper SES mobile and nonmobile could not be realistic because mobile upper SES had $n = 1$ and nonmobile upper SES had $n = 36$. 
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CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between mobile and nonmobile elementary school children in the way they cope and adapt. This chapter presents discussion of results, limitations, future research, recommendations, and conclusions in the light of related literature.

Discussion

The findings of this study revealed the following: The T scores on competence showed no difference between mobile and nonmobile children. There were 4 mobile clinical and 4 nonmobile clinical. For adaptive functioning there were no differences shown. There were no truly clinical children rated by teachers.

The t test for competence showed no differences between the mobile and nonmobile. This meant that using a .05 level of significance there were no observed differences between the mobile and nonmobile children in coping. There were apparent differences shown when the mobile lower socioeconomic status (SES) and the nonmobile lower SES were compared. The total competence mean scores for nonmobile lower SES (64.11) were greater than the mobile lower SES (48.80). This apparent, insignificant difference was also observed in Activities for nonmobile lower SES (60.77) versus mobile lower SES (43.60), and for
School (nonmobile lower SES 49.66 versus mobile lower SES 47.55).

On adaptive functioning total there were no differences between the mobile lower SES (60.50) and the nonmobile lower SES (60.60). However, there were apparent differences in Academic (nonmobile lower SES = 45.60, mobile lower SES 42.25) and Learning (nonmobile lower SES = 61.40, mobile loser SES 59.12). These apparent differences do not support the hypothesis that there is a difference in the way children cope.

In a comparison of the total mean scores on competence, non-mobile children scored 55.21 and the mobile 48.76. The adaptive functioning total mean score for nonmobile (54.53) was less than that of the mobile (59.55). This apparent difference is not significant.

The studies done by Ingersoll et al. (1988) observed that mobility has a negative effect on academics, and SES results in instability of pupils. Their recommendation indicated that there are differences between mobile and nonmobile. Another study done by Ligon and Paredes (1992) showed that mobility has an adverse influence upon achievement. Students who had moved in the past and were moving in the present scored higher than those who had moved for the first time, thus showing that the current year moves had a great effect on achievement.

Matter and Matter (1988) showed that children’s feelings associated with relocation lead to frustration, and to aggression or withdrawal. Children in the process of relocation exhibited a variety of nonverbal signs of stress, such as withdrawal, psychosomatic ailments, and developmental regression.
It seems clear from these studies that mobility has a negative effect on children compared to those children who do not move frequently. With the evidence presented from other studies on the differences caused by mobility, it seems likely to conclude that this study has indicated the presence of a Type II error. Type II errors lead to a maintenance of the status quo when change is warranted (Ary et al., 1985). In other words, no new programs are designed when they should be.

Also, Ary et al. (1985) argued that a larger sample is likely to be more accurate and that statistical precision is increased when the sample size is large. In this study, the sample was very small.

Limitations in the Study

The problems of this study have been the result of a number of factors:

1. The response rate was very poor. As a result, the findings cannot be generalized to the target population.

2. The amount of time it took to complete surveys made some teachers react negatively. The form would take about 20 minutes to complete. If a teacher had five forms to complete, that meant it would take about an hour and half to complete. For many teachers, that much time was not easy to donate. The principal of Mill Ridge Intermediate declined involvement of his teachers for this same reason.

3. The presence of the researcher as a teacher in one of the schools studied could have contaminated data collection. Some teachers endured the process of completing the form because of their relationship with the researcher. This relationship, however, did not reduce
the amount of time it took to complete the surveys. The pressure could lead to affected ratings in order simply to get by or to get done with the surveys.

4. Lack of willing subjects to participate in the study limited this study. The conditions to which studies dealing with human subjects must adhere are a great limitation. Subjects must participate out of free choice. Many worthy studies cannot be legitimately completed if willing subjects are not available.

Conclusion

The tests done in this study indicated that there are no differences between the mobile and nonmobile in the way they cope and adapt. The means on individual scales did show some differences, particularly in competence scales, although the differences were not significant. The differences that were observed should be noted by school leaders in the light of other research on mobility and coping. It is obvious that in order to determine conclusively, more and better research is recommended.

Future Research

The following recommendations on the study of mobility and coping are apt at this time. First, a better control of the variables of mobility and socioeconomic status should be done to identify clearly which one has a greater effect. Second, to guarantee a better return of responses from the informants, the following strategies seem appropriate:
1. Establish a cordial working relationship between research team, parents, and teachers in the identification of children's strengths and deficits.

2. Select a few mobile and nonmobile children and do a qualitative study on them. That is, interview and unobtrusively observe the children to determine how they compare in the way they cope.

Summary

The study's findings indicated that there is no difference between the mobile and nonmobile elementary children in the way they cope in their environment. These findings could lead to the conclusion that it is not necessary to spend money designing intervention school programs. However, it is appropriate to balance these findings with findings of other studies in the area of mobility and coping and design school programs in that context.

Interventions should be based on the needs of the particular elementary school children than on findings of general studies. In this way outlay of means could be justified.

Parents and teachers were the main informants in the study. There were 96 parents of mobile and nonmobile children involved in the study. The parents rated their children on the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach, 1991b). The teachers rated 96 mobile and nonmobile students on the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) (Achenbach, 1991c). However, only 50 responses were returned by the teachers. These children were divided into mobile, nonmobile, upper and lower socioeconomic status.
It was observed from the data that:

1. More mobile students were in a lower socioeconomic class. It was observed, too, that mobility and socioeconomic status are not independent of each other. This fact supports the idea advocated by Harrington (1987) that mobile children, like migrant children, are at risk. If they are at risk, interventions to support them should be designed. This risk factor is identified in the study as "clinical concern."

2. Mobile children scored lower on the activities scale than non-mobile children. This implies that the children are underexposed to activities that could enhance their development. This fact is a call to school leaders to provide the needed support in providing age-appropriate activities to enhance the children academically.

3. There is no strong evidence from the data to suggest that more mobile children are of clinical concern for the total score. There is, however, very close approach to significance. With a larger sample, it is probable that significance could be reached if the study were replicated.

4. All the statistical tests done on the hypotheses of the study failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the ratings of parents and teachers on the mobile and nonmobile elementary children in the way they cope with the demands of their environments.

In spite of the findings of the study, it is appropriate, in the light of the study limitations, to look at other studies on mobility and coping to make decisions on the needs of elementary children, rather than base conclusions merely on one study. Besides the justification of other studies in the design of interventions in elementary school children, a
need identification of the specific children the school is serving would do
them more good. It should not be assumed that all children have the
same needs.

Future studies would do well to: interview or observe the children
directly, control variables under study in order to identify which one has
the greatest effect, and maintain a good rapport between the research
team and the informants for maximum extraction of information on the
variables studied. With such information, it will be possible to design
intervention programs that are tailored to the specific identified needs of
the children.
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# CHILD BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST FOR AGES 4-16

**CHILD'S NAME**

**SEX**
- [ ] Boy
- [ ] Girl

**AGE**

**ETHNIC GROUP OR RACE**

**TODAY'S DATE**

**CHILD'S BIRTHDATE**

**GRADE IN SCHOOL**

**SCHOOL NOT ATTENDING**

**PARENTS' USUAL TYPE OF WORK, even if not working now. (Please be specific—for example, auto mechanic, high school teacher, homemaker, laborer, lathe operator, shoe salesman, army sergeant.)**

**FATHERS**
- [ ] TYPE OF WORK:

**MOTHERS**
- [ ] TYPE OF WORK:

**THIS FORM FILLED OUT BY:**
- [ ] Mother (name): __________________________
- [ ] Father (name): __________________________
- [ ] Other—name & relationship to child:

## I. Please list the sports your child most likes to take part in. For example: swimming, baseball, skating, skateboarding, bike riding, fishing, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to other children of the same age, about how much time does he/she spend in each?</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Less Than Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>More Than Average</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Please list your child's favorite hobbies, activities, and games, other than sports. For example: stamps, dolls, books, piano, crafts, singing, etc. (Do not include listening to radio or TV.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to other children of the same age, about how much time does he/she spend in each?</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Less Than Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>More Than Average</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## III. Please list any organizations, clubs, teams, or groups your child belongs to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to other children of the same age, how active is he/she in each?</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Less Active</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>More Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IV. Please list any jobs or chores your child has. For example: paper route, babysitting, making bed, etc. (Include both paid and unpaid jobs and chores.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to other children of the same age, how well does he/she carry them out?</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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V. About how many close friends does your child have? □ None □ 1 □ 2 or 3 □ 4 or more (Do not include brothers & sisters)

2. About how many times a week does your child do things with friends outside of regular school hours? □ Less than 1 □ 1 or 2 □ 3 or more (Do not Include brothers & sisters)

VI. Compared to other children of his/her age, how well does your child:

- a. Get along with his/her brothers & sisters? □ Worse □ About Average □ Better □ Has no brothers or sisters
- b. Get along with other children? □ □ □
- c. Behave with his/her parents? □ □ □
- d. Play and work by himself/herself? □ □ □

VII. For ages 6 and older—performance in academic subjects: (If child is not being taught, please give reason)

- a. Reading, English, or Language Arts □ Falling □ Below average □ Average □ Above average
- b. History or Social Studies □ □ □
- c. Arithmetic or Math □ □ □
- d. Science □ □ □

- e. Other academic subjects—for example: computer courses, foreign language, business, Do not include gym, shop, driver’s ed., etc. □ □ □
- f. □ □ □
- g. □ □ □

2. Is your child in a special class or special school? □ No □ Yes—what kind of class or school?

3. Has your child repeated a grade? □ No □ Yes—grade and reason

4. Has your child had any academic or other problems in school? □ No □ Yes—please describe

When did these problems start?

Have these problems ended? □ No □ Yes—when?

Does your child have any illness, physical disability, or mental handicap? □ No □ Yes—please describe

What concerns you most about your child?

Please describe the best things about your child:
Below is a list of items that describe children. For each item that describes your child now or within the past 6 months, please circle the 2 if the item is very true or often true of your child. Circle the 1 if the item is somewhat or sometimes true of your child. If the item is not true of your child, circle the 0. Please answer all items as well as you can, even if some do not seem to apply to your child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acts too young for his/her age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Allergy (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Argues a lot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asthma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Behaves like opposite sex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bowel movements outside toilet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bragging, boasting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can't get his/her mind off certain thoughts; obsessions (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can't sit still, restless, or hyperactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clings to adults or too dependent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Complains of loneliness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Confused or seems to be in a fog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cries a lot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cruel to animals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cruel, bullying, or meanness to others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Daydreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Deliberately harms self or attempts suicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Demands a lot of attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Destroys his/her own things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Destroys things belonging to his/her family or other children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Disobedient at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Disobedient at school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Doesn't eat well</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Doesn't get along with other children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Easily jealous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Eats or drinks things that are not food—don't include sweets (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Fears certain animals, situations, or places, other than school (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Fears going to school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see other side

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Physically attacks people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Picks nose, skin, or other parts of body</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Plays with own sex parts in public</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Plays with own sex parts too much</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Poor school work</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Poorly coordinated or clumsy</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Prefers playing with older children</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Prefers playing with younger children</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Refuses to talk</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Repeats certain acts over and over; compulsions</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Runs away from home</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Screams a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Secretive, keeps things to self</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Sees things that aren’t there; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Self-conscious or easily embarrassed</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Sets fires</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Sexual problems; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Showing off or clowning</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Shy or timid</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Sleeps less than most children</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Sleeps more than most children during day and/or night; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Smears or plays with bowel movements</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Speech problem; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Stares blankly</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Steals at home</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Steals outside the home</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Stores up things he/she doesn’t need; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Strange behavior; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Strange ideas; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Stubborn, sulky, or irritable</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Sudden changes in mood or feelings</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Sulks a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Suspicious</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Swearing or obscene language</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Talks about killing self</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Talks or walks in sleep; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Talks too much</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Teases a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Temper tantrums or hot temper</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Thinks about sex too much</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Threatens people</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Thumb-sucking</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Too concerned with neatness or cleanliness</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Trouble sleeping; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Truancy, skips school</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>Unhappy, sad, or depressed</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Unusually loud</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Uses alcohol or drugs for nonmedical purposes; (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>Wets self during the day</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>Wets the bed</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Whining</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Wishes to be of opposite sex</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Withdrawn, doesn’t get involved with others</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Worrying</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL ITEMS. UNDERLINE ANY YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT.
Appendix C
Teacher's Report Form

Copyright T. M. Achenbach, Ph.D. Reproduced by permission.
TEACHER'S REPORT FORM

Your answers will be used to compare the pupil with other pupils whose teachers have completed similar forms. The information from this form will also be used for comparison with other information about this pupil. Please answer as well as you can, even if you lack full information. Scores on individual items will be combined to identify general patterns of behavior. Feel free to write additional comments beside each item and in the spaces provided on page 2.

1. How long have you known this pupil? _______ months


3. How much time does he/she spend in your class per week?

4. What kind of class is it? (Please be specific, e.g. regular 5th grade, 7th grade math, etc.)

5. Has he/she ever been referred for special class placement, services, or tutoring?
   □ Don't Know 0. □ No 1. □ Yes—what kind and when?

6. Has he/she ever repeated a grade?
   □ Don't Know 0. □ No 1. □ Yes-grade and reason

7. Current school performance—list academic subjects and check column that indicates pupil's performance:

   Academic subject 1. Far below grade 2. Somewhat below grade 3. At grade level 4. Somewhat above grade 5. Far above grade

   1. ____________________ □ □ □ □ □
   2. ____________________ □ □ □ □ □
   3. ____________________ □ □ □ □ □
   4. ____________________ □ □ □ □ □
   5. ____________________ □ □ □ □ □
   6. ____________________ □ □ □ □ □
VIII. Compared to typical pupils of the same age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. Most recent achievement test scores (if available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of test</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Percentile or grade level obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. IQ, readiness, or aptitude tests (if available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of test</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>IQ or equivalent scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this pupil have any illness, physical disability, or mental handicap? ☐ No ☐ Yes – please describe

What concerns you most about this pupil?

Please describe the best things about this pupil:

Please feel free to write any comments about this pupil's work, behavior, or potential, using extra pages if necessary.
Below is a list of items that describe pupils. For each item that describes the pupil now or within the past 2 months, please circle the 2 if the item is very true or often true of the pupil. Circle the 1 if the item is somewhat or sometimes true of the pupil. If the item is not true of the pupil, circle the 0. Please answer all items as well as you can, even if some do not seem to apply to this pupil.

0 = Not True (as far as you know)  
1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True  
2 = Very True or Often True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acts too young for his/her age</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hums or makes other odd noises in class</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Argues a lot</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fails to finish things he/she starts</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Behaves like opposite sex</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Defiant, talks back to staff</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bragging, boasting</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can't get his/her mind off certain thoughts; obsessions (describe:)</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can't sit still, restless, or hyperactive</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clings to adults or too dependent</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Complains of loneliness</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Confused or seems to be in a fog</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cries a lot</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fidgets</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Daydreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Deliberately harms self or attempts suicide</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Demands a lot of attention</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Destroys his/her own things</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Destroys property belonging to others</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Difficulty following directions</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Disobedient at school</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Disturbs other pupils</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Doesn't get along with other pupils</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Easily jealous</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Eats or drinks things that are not food—don't include sweets (describe:)</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Fears certain animals, situations, or places other than school (describe:)</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Fears going to school</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</td>
<td>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</td>
<td>2 = Very True or Often True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 57. Physically attacks people</td>
<td>0 1 2 58. Picks nose, skin, or other parts of body (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 84. Strange behavior (describe):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 59. Sleeps in class</td>
<td>0 1 2 60. Apathetic or unmotivated</td>
<td>0 1 2 85. Strange ideas (describe):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 61. Poor school work</td>
<td>0 1 2 62. Poorly coordinated or clumsy</td>
<td>0 1 2 86. Stubborn, sullen, or irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 63. Prefers being with older children or youths</td>
<td>0 1 2 64. Prefers being with younger children</td>
<td>0 1 2 87. Sudden changes in mood or feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 65. Refuses to talk</td>
<td>0 1 2 66. Repeats certain acts over and over; compulsions (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 88. Sucks a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 67. Disrupts class discipline</td>
<td>0 1 2 68. Screams a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2 89. Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 69. Secretive, keeps things to self</td>
<td>0 1 2 70. Sees things that aren't there (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 90. Swearing or obscene language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 71. Self-conscious or easily embarrassed</td>
<td>0 1 2 72. Messy work</td>
<td>0 1 2 91. Talks about killing self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 73. Behaves irresponsibly (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 74. Showing off or clowning</td>
<td>0 1 2 92. Underachieving, not working up to potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 75. Shy or timid</td>
<td>0 1 2 76. Explosive and unpredictable behavior</td>
<td>0 1 2 93. Talks too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 77. Demands must be met immediately, easily frustrated</td>
<td>0 1 2 78. Inattentive, easily distracted</td>
<td>0 1 2 94. Teases a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 79. Speech problem (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 80. Stares blankly</td>
<td>0 1 2 95. Temper tantrums or hot temper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 81. Feels hurt when criticized</td>
<td>0 1 2 82. Steals</td>
<td>0 1 2 96. Seems preoccupied with sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 83. Stores up things he/she doesn't need (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 84. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 97. Threatens people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 85. Fails to carry out assigned tasks</td>
<td>0 1 2 86. Tardy to school or class</td>
<td>0 1 2 98. Too concerned with neatness or cleanliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 87. Introvert, shuns crowds, avoids excitement</td>
<td>0 1 2 88. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 99. Unusually loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 89. Uses alcohol or drugs for nonmedical purposes (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 90. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 100. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 91. Dislikes school</td>
<td>0 1 2 92. Tardy to school or class</td>
<td>0 1 2 101. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 93. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 94. Tardy to school or class</td>
<td>0 1 2 102. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 95. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 96. Tardy to school or class</td>
<td>0 1 2 103. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 97. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 98. Tardy to school or class</td>
<td>0 1 2 104. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 99. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 100. Tardy to school or class</td>
<td>0 1 2 105. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 101. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 102. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 106. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 103. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 104. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 107. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 105. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 106. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 108. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 107. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 108. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 109. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 109. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 110. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 111. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 110. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 111. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 112. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 111. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 112. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
<td>0 1 2 113. Underactive, slow moving, or lacks energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL ITEMS
Appendix D

Cover Letters
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Dear Parent,

I am a 4th grade teacher at the above school and currently completing my studies at Western Michigan University. As part of the Doctoral dissertation in the department of Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University, I am attempting to determine how well mobile and non-mobile elementary children compare in the way they deal with the demands of their environment.

Young families tend to move around frequently to look for employment in promising cities and towns. Their children are thus forced to leave their familiar environments and friends to new locations. This subjects them to a lot of problems. How well do these children deal with such problems? I will not know this without your involvement in sharing what you know about your child.

Your role will be to answer questions about your child, which will provide information about his/her strengths. You will need to take about 15-25 minutes to answer a few questions on the enclosed form. This will be a one time response on your part. There are no known risks connected with this except the time you will take to answer the questions on the form.

This information should be useful to school leaders and teachers in designing curriculum materials for the support of elementary pupils. You are under no obligation to answer questions on the form if you do not feel like it. However, your response will be useful in answering questions about children that will enhance school leaders' and teachers' ability to provide supportive environments. Besides, you will help me complete this important study in my educational career. The fact that as a teacher, I am still studying, will be a motivating factor to King Street students. Help me provide that model that our children so need.

Your child's record is a private document. I would like to solicit your permission to access two documents: child's school record and the lunch application form in order to determine the frequency of moves your child made from school to school and whether or not your child receives free lunch. You do not have to participate in this study. Be assured that your participation or lack of it will not negatively influence the relationship of your child to the school. Your signature below will signify that you permit me to examine your child's two records and also agree to complete the enclosed form.
I would like you to know that I may not personally examine the records but through the help of your child’s principal and teacher this information will be obtained. In this way some confidential information in your child’s records known to you and your school will be kept away from me.

All information will be kept secret. While I might write about the study, your name will never be used. If you wish to see the competency score your child obtained, feel free to indicate at the bottom of this form.** If you have any questions after today, please feel free to contact me at (203)778-9640 or at King Street Intermediate School 797-4861. Please respond quickly to help me meet my deadlines. Thank you so much for your participation.

Sincerely,

Solomon M Lebese

I, __________________________ have read this statement and have had all my questions answered and accede to your request.

Date: ____________________________________________

Signature: ______________________________________

** I will like to see the individual profile form of my child. ( )

Address: _______________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
Dear Teacher,

As part of the Doctoral dissertation in the department of Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University, I am attempting to determine how well mobile and non-mobile elementary children compare in the way they deal with the demands of their environment. Families tend to move around from place to place thus forcing their children to leave their familiar environments and friends to new locations. This subjects them to a lot of problems. How well do these children deal with such problems? I will not know this without your involvement in sharing what you know about your pupil.

I have gotten parental consent to collect data. I kindly ask you to take 15 - 20 minutes of your time to complete the enclosed forms and return them to the school secretary or to me as soon as possible. Your participation is voluntary and will not be reported to any school officials. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Solomon Lebese
Appendix E

Approval Letter From Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: April 13, 1992
To: Solomon M. Lebese
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 92-02-31

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "A Comparative Study of the Coping of Mobile and Non-Mobile Elementary Pupils" has been approved after full review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any change in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: April 13, 1993

xc: Brinkerhoff, EDLD
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