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ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of the absence of the military parent due to a temporary duty assignment (TDY) on student adjustment in terms of TDY-induced negative affect and school performance. Data were also collected with regard to student coping responses used to manage negative TDY affect, perceived social support, and emotional conceptualization. Participants were 42 elementary school students attending a public school operating on an United States Air Force Base in southern Arizona. Data were collected by individual student interviews and supplemented with teacher and parent surveys that measured teacher rating of student academic performance and personal adjustment, and parental perception of the role of school attendance in facilitating their child’s TDY adjustment and satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY. Results indicated that while the majority of students reported experiencing negative affect during TDY; compared to non-TDY report of these same emotions, report of negative affect during TDY did not appear significantly pronounced. Further, the majority of students did not report experiencing difficulties in school performance during TDY. Individual differences in TDY emotional experience emerged as a function of gender, teacher rating of academic performance, and characteristics of the TDY. While students were able to cogently discuss characteristics of the coping responses they would use to manage negative TDY affect and available social support providers, these variables were not found to organize individual differences in student TDY emotional experience. Individual differences in coping responses emerged as a function of age, grade level, gender, and parental report of satisfaction with school TDY
efforts. Students were also able to cogently discuss emotional conceptualization.

Individual differences in emotional conceptualization emerged in terms of student age, grade level, gender, and TDY emotional experience.
CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM UNDER INVESTIGATION

Historically, times of family separation due to military service have been considered periods of heightened stress and risk, especially where children are concerned (Boss, 1980; Hill, 1945, 1949; Pederson, 1966). With the end of the Cold War, the number of military personnel was reduced and the majority of the overseas military bases were closed. Ironically, this downsizing of military personnel was accompanied by an increase in what the United States military terms “Military Operations Other Than War.” These overseas operations increasingly require military personnel to temporarily deploy from their bases and families in the United States for periods of time ranging from several weeks to a year to locations such as Panama, Somalia, Rwanda, the Middle East, and Bosnia. The problem emerges, that the United States military, though smaller in size than it was during the Cold War, is participating in more real-world deployments, thus resulting in a per capita increase in temporary duty assignments (TDYs). This increase in TDYs has renewed interest in family separation due to military service, and made this a salient issue for military families and those who work with military families.

This study was solicited by the faculty of a public elementary school operating on an United States Air Force Base in southern Arizona. School faculty attributing increased adjustment problems within the school to increased deployments of the students' parents, desired a study to determine the extent and nature of adjustment problems created within their school by parental TDY. They desired extensive, descriptive results that could aid them in formulating a theory-based, research-driven
intervention targeting students who were having trouble adjusting to parental absence due to TDY. This study was designed to meet this practical outcome.

Based on an extensive review of the military family literature addressing the effects of the absence of the military family member from the home due to military service, and couched within a stress theory paradigm, an individual student interview was designed to investigate the prevalence and nature of adjustment problems related to TDY occurring at the study school. As the results of previously conducted studies of the effects of TDY indicated that age and gender are salient individual background variables, these variables were considered the primary background variables. Age was measured both in years and by grade to allow for the differentiation of maturation effects and additive learning effects. Salient military family background variables under investigation included: gender of the parent who served in the military, number of moves made by the family, student perception of family TDY load at the study base, student perception of recent change in family TDY load, and longest TDY experience. Based on results of previously conducted studies examining typical emotional reactions to separation from the military parent, student TDY emotional experience with loneliness, anxiety, worry, depression, separation anxiety, and guilt was investigated as well. In addition to collecting information on salient background variables and TDY emotional experience, information was also collected on non-TDY emotional experience with loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, depression, and guilt. The purpose in collecting data on non-TDY emotional experience was two-fold: (a) this information provided a baseline measurement in terms of how prevalent these emotions were outside of a TDY
experience, thus enhancing the context into which TDY emotional experience was placed, and (b) this information allowed for an examination of developmental change in emotional conceptualization, which in turn, allowed for an examination of the ways in which TDY emotional experience informs emotional conceptualization. The interview also addressed TDY functioning in the areas of: somatization, household organization, and school performance. Feedback was solicited from teachers in terms of student academic performance and personal adjustment, and also from parents regarding parental perception of how school attendance facilitated their child’s adjustment to TDYs and parental satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDYs. Teacher feedback was expected to provide insight into whether the adjustment problems associated with parental TDY could be attributed in part to a global perception of poor student adjustment. Parental feedback was expected to provide insight into parental attitudes towards the school as a TDY coping resource. As with the information collected on non-TDY emotional experience, both sources of feedback were expected to deepen the understanding of the context in which student TDY experiences were occurring.

The role two stress theory components played in student management of negative TDY affect was also investigated (Boss, 1988; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The two components of stress theory that were directly assessed in the interview were: (a) secondary appraisals measured via three characteristics of the coping responses generated in response to negative TDY affect (i.e., number of coping responses, coping function of the coping response, and social locus of the coping response) and (b) coping
resources in terms of perceived social support measured as the number of social support providers reported by the student and the identity of these providers (Hiew, 1992, Reid et al., 1989, & Werner, 1989). The information on secondary appraisal processes and perceived social support not only provided a theoretical test of the utility of these two stress theory components in understanding students' TDY emotional experiences, but it was also expected that knowledge of student coping response patterns in response to negative TDY affect would provide useful information regarding possible approaches or goals for intervention.

The final topic addressed in the interview was emotional conceptualization in terms of: (a) word knowledge, (b) type of definition offered, (c) accuracy of the definition, (d) behavioral expression of the emotion, and (e) congruency between verbal and behavioral report. As with the data collected on the stress theory components, it was expected that the collection of emotional conceptualization data would provide both theoretical and practical utility. Specifically, the collection of information on emotional conceptualization was expected to provide theoretical information about developmental change in the ways students conceptualize emotional experiences and insight into the ways in which TDY emotional experience informs emotional conceptualization with the expectation that this information could be useful for intervention.

In sum, the three objectives of this study were: (a) based on a comparison of the types of adjustment problems that would be expected from a review of the literature, to determine the nature and extent of problems caused by parental TDY within the study school, (b) to test the theoretical utility of two stress theory components in
understanding how students manage negative affect due to parental TDY and identify components of this affective management that have implications for intervention, and (c) examine student emotional conceptualization in terms of developmental change and the ways in which TDY emotional experience informs emotional conceptualization, again with the expectation that such information would not only add to a theoretical understanding of the problem, but also provide useful information in terms of intervention approaches.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This review commences with a demographic description of the typical United States Air Force (USAF) member. Following that, the effects of parental deployment on military children’s adjustment will be addressed from two perspectives. First, the consequences of parental deployment on children’s adjustment will be discussed from the perspective of the child embedded within the family. Within this section “classic” military family studies will be reviewed and interwoven with contemporary studies and feminist concerns related to military family life. From there the discussion will move to the effects of parental deployment on the child’s individual adjustment. Much of this literature was initiated when Operation Desert Storm renewed the saliency of military child outcomes for the first time since the end of the Vietnam Conflict. After reviewing the military child literature, stress theory will be reviewed to establish a framework for understanding reasons why children adjust differently to the deployment of their military parent.

Who Is In the United States Air Force?

Over the course of the second half of this century, the military has become a much more diverse and family-oriented organization. As of September 30, 1997 (Air Force Personnel Center) 373,356 individuals were on active duty with the USAF. This breaks down to 73,983 officers and 299,373 enlisted personnel. This makes for an officer:enlisted ratio of approximately 1:4. The average age of USAF personnel is 35 years for officers, and 29 years for enlisted personnel, however approximately one third
of all USAF personnel are under the age of 26 with the majority of these being enlisted personnel (AFPC, 1997). The average number of years of service is 11 for officers and 9 for enlisted (Airman, 1997). Approximately 17% of all USAF personnel are females, with the number of women serving in the USAF being nearly doubled since 1975 (Airman, 1997, AFPC, 1997). The USAF remains a largely Caucasian organization, with approximately 77% of personnel being white (Airman, 1997). The remaining personnel are African-American (14.80%), Hispanic (3.97%), or fall into other minority categories (3.85%). Minority representation in the USAF has risen from 14% in 1975 to 23% in 1997 (AFPC, 1997). The majority of USAF personnel are married, with 67% of the total force being married. By rank, this breaks down to 75% for officers and 65% for enlisted personnel (Airman, 1997). Taken as a whole, USAF personnel support 576,794 family members (AFPC, 1997). Approximately 83% of these family members reside in the same household as their military sponsor (AFPC, 1997). In sum, these numbers suggest that the majority of USAF personnel are young white enlisted men who are likely to have family obligations that they must meet on a day-to-day basis.

**Studies of The Effects of Parental Absence**

**Studies of The Effects of Non-Military-Related Parental Absence**

Normative parental absence. A review of the parental absence literature leads Riggs (1990) to conclude that although there is a historical precedent for parents, particularly fathers, to be absent from their families in order to provide food and protection, the norms of modern society make parental absence a stressful event because most Americans have jobs that permit them to spend evenings and weekends with their
families. Riggs states that while separations of six months to one year are not uncommon for military families, the majority of parental work-related absences are under one week in duration. Though shorter, frequent parental absences like those experienced in sales, commercial air travel, and truck driving can also cause significant family disturbance. The stress of parental absence is compounded in dual-career families where the absence of one parent magnifies the burden of child care.

In addition to generally increasing stress within the family, Riggs notes that career-related travel is most likely to occur during early and mid-career stages. These early career stages often coincide with the births and early years of one's children. Riggs points out that absence during early family life is considered more detrimental to family adjustment than absence during other stages of family life. Another detrimental effect of copious business travel is the de-valuing of family life. Riggs points out that corporate travel is often more exciting and glamorous than contending with the mundane realities and responsibilities of family life. Taken together, these two factors can result in a situation in which frequently absent parents not only miss out on many crucial moments in their child’s early development, but also find family life less appealing and engaging when at home.

Riggs reports the following adjustment problems as being frequently observed in children experiencing parental absence: increased acting out behavior, increased somatic complaints, feelings of abandonment, guilt, anger, and insecurity. Riggs likens the emotional reaction associated with parental work-related absence to the grieving response exhibited by children who have lost a parent through death or whose parents
are divorcing. Riggs also reports that children under two years of age have the greatest
difficulty in readjusting to the absent parent's return, whereas seven year old children
seem to have the greatest difficulty adjusting to the actual parental absence.

Parental unavailability is also associated with heightened anxiety, tension, and
loneliness on the part of children. Parents who are absent frequently may find that they
lose authority in disciplining and consoling their children. This is especially true in older
children who have the capacity to compensate for parental absence by seeking
relationships with adults outside the home.

In addition to problems caused by one parent being absent, adjustment problems
may arise as a result of the stay-at-home parent's response to the absence. For instance,
when one parent is frequently absent, the stay-at-home parent may parentify one of the
children. This means the child is put in the role of comforter and confident of the stay-at-
home parent. Not only does this cause dysfunction in the parentified child, but can cause
disruption in all family relationships upon the absent parent's return. Finally, Riggs
reports that parents who are frequently absent report having a difficult time establishing
deep parent-child bonds. Riggs notes that while her review of literature suggests that
parental absence is detrimental to children's development, it is difficult to discern if the
dysfunction is due to the absence of the parent or the stay-at-home parent's reaction to
the absence.

Non-normative parental absence. Gabel (1992) presents a literature review of
the effects of non-normative paternal absence due to incarceration. Specifically, this
study investigated whether increased rates of delinquent and anti-social behavior in males
ranging from 6-11.9 years in age was due more to paternal incarceration or the physical absence of the father from the home. For a comparison group, Gabel used sons of military personnel on deployment, sons of divorced men, and sons whose fathers had died. Gabel reports that, regardless of reason for paternal absence, across all groups of male children higher reports of anxiety and depression were prevalent.

In offering explanations as to why paternal absence of all kinds would result in disturbed behavior Gabel points to factors other than the physical absence of the father. Gabel suggests that positive adjustment to paternal absence is most closely predicted by the psychological adjustment of the custodial parent. Specifically, there was an inverse relationship between healthy adjustment on the part of the custodial parent and the level of stress experienced by the child, such that when the custodial parent's adjustment was high, the child experienced less stress. Due to this finding, Gabel stresses that the effects of paternal absence can only really be deciphered within the context of how the remaining family unit functions in the father's absence. Factors contributing to the remaining family unit's adjustment include: the psychological adjustment of the custodial parent and the child's historical and current relationship with this parent, the coping resources and social support available to the remaining family, and the meaning of the father's absence for the family (i.e., paternal absence due to military deployment probably carries a more positive valance than paternal absence due to incarceration or abandonment.)

The two studies reviewed above suggest that parental absence due to many diverse causes may be disturbing to children. Further, these two reviews insinuate that
children’s adjustment to parental absence may be mediated by complex relationships within the family system. In light of this, the review of the military literature will start with an overview of the effects of parental absence due to military deployment at the level of the family unit.

The Military Family Literature

The Classics

The studies presented first have earned the label of “classics” on the basis of two criteria: (a) they are based on studies conducted following World War II and the Vietnam Conflict, and (b) the authors conducting these studies are recognized as important contributors to the area of military family studies. Proceeding through the literature review, one will find that many of the observations and recommendations made in the early studies are reiterated in military studies conducted more recently. As an aside, although this study does not directly address interventions and coping techniques that might be helpful in ameliorating the negative impact of parental military deployment, a list of suggestions for facilitating adjustment to deployment made by nine of the reviewed authors can be found in Appendix A.

Hill. In 1945, Hill published an essay addressing the challenges faced by families whose husband-father was returning from service in World War II. He broke the essay into a discussion of the challenges faced by husbands, wives, and children as the family struggled to reintegrate a family member who had often been absent for some time. For returning husbands, Hill suggested that challenges include: (a) readjusting to civilian life in general with a special emphasis on coming to terms with the more independent roles...
available to women, particularly his wife, (b) reestablishing bonds of intimacy with his wife and children, and (c) coming to terms with the realities and chaotic nature of family life, which may be quite different from the fantasy images of home conjured up while trying to survive in combat conditions. For wives, Hill suggested that the biggest challenge would be renegotiating her role within the home and work place. Mothers may also have to deal with the aftereffects of "mother-smother love," as they renegotiate their relationship with their children due to the husband regaining his role as primary source for the wife's affection needs. Hill notes that children are likely to have a strong reaction to the return of their father. Hill notes that young children who do not have strong memories of their fathers may not experience much emotional trauma at the father's departure. However, upon his return, the father should expect to be regarded as a stepfather or other non-biological male relative. Young children will take a while to warm up to their fathers. Older children, who according to Hill often experience a period of bereavement when the father deploys, often adjust quickly to the father's return. Hill assures parents that problem behavior such as poor academic performance, somatic complaints, and loss of interest in activities often amend themselves shortly after the father's return.

Following this essay, Hill (1949) published the results of a longitudinal study of family adjustment to the crises of separation and reunion during World War II. Participants were 135 middle to low-middle socio-economic status (SES) families residing in the Midwestern United States whose husband-father had been drafted into military service for World War II. Hill's goal was to delineate characteristics of families
who attained higher levels of reorganization following the crises of separation and reunion as compared to families that did not adjust as well. The crises of separation and reunion were analyzed separately to allow for differing adjustment factors in each crisis.

At the time of the study, the prevailing school of thought was that family adjustment to separation and reunion would be largely determined by the individual background variables that contribute to marital adjustment. In selecting factors that he thought would accurately predict family adjustment, Hill hypothesized that the results would not implicate simple factors. He believed that more complex variables would interact to produce a family adjustment outcome. Variables he thought would prove salient in the prediction of family adjustment included: (a) good marital adjustment prior to induction, (b) hardships and resources facing the family at the time of induction, (c) events occurring to the remaining family during military service, (d) the effects of military service on the absent father, (e) specific hardships facing the family during the separation and reunion periods, and (f) a factor called family organization which was comprised of family integration, family adaptability, and marital adjustment. Hill also emphasized the importance of the family’s definition of the hardship of separation and reunion in predicting adjustment. He reasoned that definition played an important role because induction did not create a crisis situation in all cases and reunion was not a cause of relief for all families. Specifically, Hill noticed that frequently children adjusted quickly and well to their father’s induction once the initial shock wore off. Likewise, he noticed that for a certain category of families the father’s departure provided welcome relief, but unfortunately these families adjusted very poorly upon the father’s return. Additionally,
when questioning families about hardships faced before and during induction, Hill noticed that some families listed events as severe hardships whereas other families experiencing the same events did not list these events as hardships, but rather as things that just had to be dealt with.

Hill's intuitions about the complexity of the situation were correct. His results indicated that no individual, couple, or family level background variable predicted adjustment as well as the compound family organization variable which combined family integration, family adaptability, and marital adjustment. Surprisingly, the factors considered paramount to good marital adjustment were not the same factors that boded well for good separation and reunion adjustment. The best predictor of positive adjustment was high levels of family integration and family adaptability. Positive family adjustment was characterized by: (a) closing of the ranks and shifting family responsibilities upon the father's departure, (b) maintaining family routines in the father's absence, (c) maintaining both the husband-wife bond and father-child bonds through frequent correspondence and as many furloughs as possible, (d) high utilization rates for familial and community resources, and (e) carrying on of reunion plans. In sum, separation adjustment seemed to be facilitated by high levels of adaptability that allowed for family members to shift roles while still maintaining the father's presence in the home. In reunion, the integration factor became paramount with families that were capable of easily accommodating the father back into the family system adjusting best. Reunion adjustment was also facilitated by good adjustment to the separation and a lower number of family hardships faced during the separation period. Interestingly, although high
numbers of furloughs and letters were associated with better adjustment, Hill found no relationship between length of deployment and either separation or reunion adjustment, McCubbin and Dahl. In 1976, McCubbin and Dahl presented the results of a longitudinal study addressing the separation and reunion adjustment of families experiencing a prisoner-of-war situation during the Vietnam Conflict. Participants were 100 families identified as having the military family member taken prisoner while on active-duty in Southeast Asia. The majority of the families were from the officer ranks and the majority of the prisoners had been incarcerated 5-8.5 years. The average age of the wives was 31. The 100 families had a total of 204 children, the majority of whom ranged in age from 8-15 years-old. In-depth structured interviews were conducted with the wives at the time of the husband’s incarceration. Upon the father’s repatriation, extensive questionnaires were mailed to the families. Returned questionnaires were supplemented with data from the returned serviceman’s military personnel file, medical records, and results of post-repatriation psychological evaluation reports. Results indicated that three variables were paramount in determining separation and reunion adjustment. The three variables were: length of marriage prior to the casualty, marital satisfaction prior to the casualty, and level of the wife’s separation dysfunction. Longer length of marriage, higher levels of marital satisfaction, and lower levels of maternal dysfunction were related to better adjustment outcomes. Though these results seem to run counter to Hill’s (1949) finding that no individual or marital variable predicted family adjustment better than family integration and adaptability, the families in the current study were facing an extended and ambiguous separation. It may be that the
circumstances surrounding the father's military absence mediate the importance of various variables when predicting adjustment.

In a secondary analysis within the same data set, McCubbin and Dahl (1976) analyzed the separation adjustment of 99 of the 204 children. Data were collected at the time of the maternal interview. For the majority of children in this sample personal and social adjustment scores, as measured by the California Test of Personality, fell well below established norms for their age groups. Particular problems arose in the areas of family relations, withdraw tendencies, and anti-social tendencies. Two interesting asides arose from this analysis. First, although adolescents in this sample, exhibited decreased personal and social adjustment, they also exhibited higher than normal levels of personal self-worth. Second, as the length of father's imprisonment increased children's personal and social adjustment scores improved.

**Boss.** In 1980, Pauline Boss published the a study which considered variables predicting wife and family dysfunction in families whose husband-fathers had been listed as missing in action (MIA) since the Vietnam Conflict and who could no longer be realistically expected to return home. Earlier work by Boss had indicated that increased levels of psychological father presence, the practice of keeping the father psychologically present in the home, were linked to higher levels of wife and family dysfunction. Knowing that being able to close out the father's role in the home facilitated adjustment to the ambiguously absent father, Boss aimed to delineate personality characteristics of the wife that enabled her to close out her missing husband's role in the family. Boss hypothesized that women possessing higher levels of androgynous personality
characteristics would more easily close the father's role and take on both the mother's expressive and the father's instrumental family roles. In this study, Boss replicated the importance of low psychological father presence in predicting high levels of family reorganization and functioning for families with an ambiguously absent member. Contrary to hypotheses, the results indicated that it was not androgyny itself, but high levels of masculine/instrumental qualities that predicted the mother's ability to close out the father's role. In other words, it was not so much that women loading high on androgynous personality characteristics, as those who exhibited high levels of instrumental or masculine qualities, who were able to close out the father's role and functionally reorganize the remaining family unit.

Contemporary Military Family Studies

Lagrone. The military is often not perceived to be an environment conducive to raising a family, and Lagrone's (1978) research supports that this perception is held among members of the military community. Lagrone reviewed the case records of 792 military dependents seen in a military mental health clinic over the span of two years. Using a comparison group from a mental health clinic located in the same community as the military facility, Lagrone discovered that mental health diagnoses were much more prevalent in the military community than they were in the adjacent civilian community. Over the two year period of investigation, nearly 12% of the families, which comprised about 6% of the children living within the military community, were seen in the military clinic for a diagnosable behavior disorder. Lagrone notes that in 12% of the families seen in the clinic, the father was absent at the time the referral was made. Lagrone attributes
higher rates of behavior disorder in military families to an “acting out” against the autocratic and rigid military system. Lagrone theorizes that the military comprises a total institution, meaning that the military has primary control of the military member’s time and well-being. The family, according to Lagrone, runs a distant second. This creates a triangle between the service member, the military, and the family. This triangulation of communication creates a pathological environment in which disordered behavior is likely to emerge. Lagrone notes seven areas in which military families seeking mental health intervention are likely to experience problems: (a) the military-family relationship, (b) father absence, (c) transiency, (d) an over-reliance on authoritarian parenting skills, (e) scapegoating of family members, (f) difficulties in the husband-wife relationship, and (g) resistance to seeking mental health assistance due to fears of negative repercussions. For future reference, Lagrone is not the only author in this review to cite the total institutional characteristics of the military as detrimental to the well-being of the family unit.

Kohen. Kohen (1984) also describes the military and family at odds in such a way as to be detrimental to the family, particularly the wife. According to Kohen, this situation arose because in the post-World War II era the military, due to the higher levels of technical training of service members and the need for a large all-volunteer peacetime service, had to accept married military members. Historically, married individuals were not accepted for military service under peacetime conditions. The military’s policy has been to adapt families to meet the military’s needs and goals rather than to adapt military policy to accommodate families. Traditionally, military family policy was based on the
assumption of a father-military member and a full-time mother. Dual-career families, higher divorce rates, single parents serving in the military, and other social trends make families less likely to easily conform to the traditional pattern into which the military expects families to fit. This primacy of military needs over family needs results in stressful demands being placed on families by the military. These demands include: (a) high levels of irregularity in family life, (b) high mobility resulting in isolation from the civilian community in which they live, (c) a continued expectation that the non-military spouse will sacrifice to the military member’s career and meet the families emotional and instrumental needs when the military member cannot be available, and (d) financial hardship created by loss of real estate incurred in recurrent moves and the inability of military family members to seek gainful employment outside the home owing largely to high rates of transiency and the isolation from the civilian community. In 1984, Kohen noted that the military would likely be forced to come to terms with the needs of family members, especially wives because growing consciousness among women would not allow them to be content to accept the dependent role prescribed for them. Kohen warned that without addressing the underlying tensions, Band-Aid approaches implemented by the military would prove fruitless. Ironically, despite the fact that the military and family seems to be at odds, Kohen argues that because of family members’ isolation from civilian social agencies additional support, especially for dealing with deployments, should be provided through military channels. She will not be the first or last author to make this assertion.
Bowen, Bowen (1985) notes that military families are subject to stressors beyond those routinely experienced by families such as: (a) high rates of mobility, (b) long-separations from family members on temporary duty or remote assignments, (c) isolation from the extended family, (d) threat of injury, imprisonment, or death of the military member, and (e) an expectation that family needs will be subservient to military goals.

To tap how these stressors effect family life and what resources military families might use to deal with them, Bowen interviewed 664 married couples in which at least one partner was a USAF member serving at 24 bases located throughout the continental United States, Europe, and Asia. Couples were randomly selected for study participation and each member of the couple was individually interviewed about: (a) levels of overall marital satisfaction, (b) satisfaction with child rearing within the military community, and (c) knowledge of and expected utilization rates of marital and parenting services available to them through their military community. Couples comprising the sample were mostly white, in their early thirties, been married on average eight years, and a majority of the couples had a child under 12 living in the house. Overall, the majority of couples expressed satisfaction with their marital relationship. Marital satisfaction did vary by military rank such that middle to senior enlisted and junior officer personnel and their spouses expressed higher levels of marital satisfaction than did junior enlisted and senior officer personnel and their spouses. Of the marital domains of satisfaction, communication, sexual relations, and companionship, the couples reported being least satisfied with companionship. This lack of companionship in marriage was attributed to long and irregular duty hours and temporary duty and remote assignments. The majority
of parents were satisfied with their relationships with their children. However, fewer than half of the parents interviewed reported that they believed the USAF provided a good environment for raising children. Parents attributed these beliefs to the transient, irregular, and highly mobile environment within the military community. An interesting finding of this study involved couples’ reports of the nature of their social support networks. The majority of couples reported not feeling close to or dependent on individuals within their immediate community. In fact, most couples prided themselves on being independent, reporting that in the event of a family emergency they would rather handle the problem themselves. When pressed, these families reported that in an emergency they would rely on their parents which is interesting finding since most of these families lived too far from their parents to expect any tangible assistance.

The major obstacle confronting these USAF families when it came to obtaining services was a lack of knowledge about services available to them. Many of the families simply did not know that their local military community offered marriage and parenting enrichment programs. Another big obstacle to obtaining services was fear that utilizing services on base would result in stigma, a breach of confidence, or negatively impact the military member’s career. This resistance to using military -provided services, coupled with families reported isolation from their military communities, leads Bowen to recommend that services for military families be offered through private civilian channels. This stands in direct contrast to Kohen’s (1984) suggestion that resources for military families be provided through military channels.
In a later study, Bowen et al. (1993) investigated the levels of family adaptation in single-parent military families serving in the United States Army. The authors report that although only 2% of United States Army personnel are single parents, the challenges they face in struggling to balance family and work demands makes them a group deserving of special attention. A frequently found hindrance to high levels of adaptation in any single-parent family is the conflict between work demands and family life. However adaptation levels for single-parent families can be facilitated by the availability of formal and informal resources (Bowen et al., 1993). Emphasizing the unique stressors faced by military families including: high rates of mobility, frequent and long family separations, isolation from extended family, and subservience of family needs to military objectives, Bowen et al. point out that the demands of military life, particularly the potential to be separated from one's children and long and irregular duty hours, probably magnifies the burden of single military parents to reconcile work and family demands. Therefore, they hypothesize that for single-parent military families, the availability of formal and informal resources may become particularly salient in predicting family adjustment levels.

Bearing in mind the mediative impact of family resources, this study examined the effects of family and community resources and United States Army resource variables in mediating outcomes for 238 single-parent United States Army families. The goal of the study was to determine the differential contribution of family and work resource variables in predicting family adjustment. Family and community resources included the following variables: family strength/cohesion, relationship status, and social
support availability. United States Army resources were considered from two levels: (a) the official United States Army policy on single-parent families, and (b) the military member’s relationship with his or her unit supervisor (i.e., the implementation of informal policy at the level of the unit). The effect of gender and work stressor variables, which included predictability of work hours and level of energy left for dealing with children at the end of the day, were also analyzed. An interesting caveat of this study is the way in which the authors defined the dependent variable: family adaptation. In this study, family adaptation is defined as family adaptation to the demands of military life. The authors assert that when studying military families the appropriate unit of analysis is not family adaptation to life in general, but adaptation to specific demands made by military life.

Results indicated that the level of family adaptation attained by single-father and single-mother military families was predicted by different variables. For single-father families high levels of community and family resources were associated with higher levels of family adaptation. These community and family resource variables were more predictive of family adjustment than were either work stressors or United States Army resource variables. While both work stressors and United States Army resource variables contributed significantly to family adjustment, neither contributed as much to family adaptation as did family and community variables. Good family adjustment in single-father families was also associated with high levels of family strength/cohesion, feeling support from United States Army family policy, and commitment to a relationship, in
that order. Further, single-father families adjusted better when there were no children under five in the house.

For single-mother families, both community and family variables, and United States Army support resources in combination contributed significantly to the prediction of good family adaptation. Single-mother family adaptation was also predicted by high levels of feeling support from United States Army family policy, family strength/cohesion, and predictable work hours, in that order. Further, single-mother families adjusted better when the mother’s pay grade was higher. What these results suggest is that for both single father and single mothers serving in the military, resource variables are more predictive of family adjustment than are work stressor variables; however, single fathers and mothers rely on different types of resource variables. Whereas single fathers may be benefited by interventions that increase family and community resources, single mothers seem most benefited by a combination of resources that include both family and community variables and United States Army support resource variables.

Black, Black (1993) reports that about 3.5% of the United States population serves in the military or is a dependent of a military member. Additionally, military veterans and their dependents comprise about one third of the United States population. Black contends that these figures coupled with the renewed interest in military family life that was generated by Operation Desert Storm, give credence for a need for studies addressing the stressors unique to military families and interventions that may help ameliorate these stressors.
According to Black, some of the stressors that impact military families include:

(a) frequent moves, (b) the potential for combat deployments, (c) frequent periods of family separation, (d) potential for serious injury, captivity, or death of family military member, (e) geographic isolation from the extended family, (f) low pay, (g) the average young age of military members, and (h) a high incidence of young children living in the home. Black points out that while any one of these stressors has potential to overload a family system, these stressor variables usually act in conjunction especially when a deployment is in the picture. Black therefore concludes that military families are at high risk for experiencing crisis due to stressor pile-up.

Black notes that the above stressors should be expected to create a more stressful family separation situation than would be expected in civilian families experiencing family separation. In fact, Black reports that military spouses list separation from their spouse as their primary source of dissatisfaction with the military lifestyle. Wives whose spouses are deployed complain of loneliness, lack of companionship, decrease in problem-solving skills, lack of social outlets, discipline problems with the children, financial problems, and a sense that the military is unconcerned with their well-being. Furthermore, spouses whose husbands are deployed, may display a high tendency towards depression and psychosomatic complaints, and are thus subject to a higher number of mental health referrals. Spouses often experience a predictable grief reaction to the deployment. Shock is a common reaction to the notification of an impending deployment and may ensue all the way until the actual deployment takes place. Anger often replaces shock with guilty feelings arising over the anger towards the deploying/deployed spouse. Once the spouse
has deployed, depression, loneliness, and a general increase in moodiness and tension usually sets in. The grief reaction usually dissipates approximately six weeks after deployment. Those spouses unable to adapt to the separation after that time may succumb to despair and withdrawal. These wives and their children would be expected to adjust more poorly.

Black reports that children whose parents are deployed are likely to exhibit higher levels of anxiety, anger, sadness, resentment, and fear. Children adjust more poorly when the mother is having difficulty managing daily activities, is not involved in social activities of her own, and has a low sense of personal independence. Children adjust better when the mother expresses a positive attitude towards the separation, marital satisfaction was high prior to the deployment, and the mother possesses effective coping strategies. If the family system is dysfunctional prior to deployment, the children can be expected to exhibit more extreme emotional reactions to the deployment in terms of aggression, introversion, internalizing behaviors, helplessness, and impulsiveness.

Black also notes that families that are organized before a stressor or crisis hits tend to stay more organized while dealing with the stressor or crisis, the opposite is true of disorganized families. Finally, families who have effectively coped with deployments before can be expected to cope effectively with future deployments. For these reasons, Black suggests the use of interventions that target young families who are preparing to face their first deployment by using families who have successfully managed a deployment as models. Black concludes by stating that even if family members cope well
with the deployment, it should be expected that it will take 4-8 weeks for the family to completely readjust to the service member’s return.

Kelley. In this study, Kelley (1994) examined through maternal self-report the effects of routine and combat Naval deployments on a variety of family level variables indicative of healthy family functioning and internalizing/externalizing behavior in children. Data were acquired to analyze: (a) family and maternal structure and support, (b) family warmth, discipline practices, and (c) levels of internalizing and externalizing behavior exhibited by the children. Based on studies indicating that predeployment presents the greatest amount of difficulty to families, it was hypothesized that mother-child dyads would experience more difficulties at predeployment than during the deployment or reunion periods. Additionally, due to the unexpected rerouting of 14 deployed service member’s to Operation Desert Storm, this study allowed for a comparison between the effects of deployment during routine and combat deployment. It was expected that this comparison would indicate that while families experiencing the routine deployment had more difficulties during the predeployment stage, families experiencing a combat deployment would experience more difficulties during the deployment and reunion periods.

Participants were 61 mothers of children ranging in age from 5 -13 years who had recently experienced a deployment of about six months. Fourteen of the families participating in the study experienced a rerouting of a routine deployment to a combat deployment when Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990. These fourteen families were matched with families experiencing the routine deployment and were analyzed separately. The
participants completed three self-report measures. The first was the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales. This measure assesses family level cohesion and adaptability. Higher scores in each domain are associated with more healthy family configurations. Mothers also completed the Parenting Dimensions Inventory which addresses parental warmth, discipline practices, and parental structure including parental consistency and organization levels. The final measure completed by participants was the Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach, 1991; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). Mothers were asked to determine whether the behaviors presented in the Child Behavior Checklist were relevant to their child's behavior in the past one to two months. All measures were administered three times: three to four weeks before the deployment, mid-deployment, and three to four weeks postdeployment.

Results were divided into two categories: a peacetime deployment category and a combat versus peacetime deployment category. Results for the peacetime category indicated that family organization levels were affected by the age of the child and phase of deployment in such a way that families with younger children (< 8 years) in the house experienced decreases in family organization from predeployment to middeployment. Families with older children in the house remained constant in their levels of family organization. For the families experiencing a peacetime deployment, gender interacted with family adaptability such that mothers of boys reported higher levels of family adaptability than mothers of girls. This result seems to contradict results suggesting boys fare more poorly during deployments (Pederson, 1966, Hillenbrand, 1976, Jensen et al. 1996). Family cohesiveness was affected by phase of deployment such that cohesiveness
was higher in the postdeployment phase than in either the predeployment or deployment phases. These results suggest that important variables in maintaining healthy family functioning may be compromised during a peacetime deployment and this may be especially true when there are young children in the house.

In terms of discipline practices used during deployment, mothers relied mostly on reasoning and yelling. Of the four discipline practices surveyed (i.e., reasoning, yelling, physical punishment, and material consequences), physical punishment and material consequences were not significantly used. This is interesting in that it has been postulated that deployment puts children at increased risk for physical abuse (Mitchum, 1991), at least in this sample the incidence of increased physical abuse during the deployment itself seemed low. Mothers differed in preferred discipline practice by the gender of the child such that they were significantly more likely to reason with girls and yell at boys. The frequency of use of these discipline techniques increased steadily through mid-deployment and then remained constant until the reunion period when they dropped off sharply. Mothers also reported significant increases in externalizing and internalizing behaviors during the deployment as compared to the predeployment and reunion periods. It should be noted that higher levels of family cohesiveness and maternal nurturance were found to be related to lower levels of child internalizing/externalizing behaviors. Additionally, in families experiencing peacetime deployments, child behavior steadily improved over the course of the deployment. In sum, the peacetime deployment results seem to indicate that deployment may be associated with decreased family functioning, changes in discipline, and increased disturbed child behavior. However, these results also
suggest that families quickly regain their previous levels of family and child adjustment during the reunion phase.

The combat versus peacetime deployment analysis yielded different results. Levels of family cohesion and maternal nurturance were significantly lower when the family was experiencing a combat deployment. Recall that family cohesion and maternal nurturance mediated poor internalizing/externalizing outcomes in the children experiencing a peacetime deployment. As might be expected, mothers experiencing a combat deployment reported significantly more child internalizing/externalizing behavior. Unlike families experiencing peacetime deployments, child behavior in the combat deployment families did not improve over time. No effects of preferred discipline practice by type of deployment effects were found. These results suggest that combat deployments are associated with greater disturbances to family adjustment and more lasting disruptions in child behavior.

In closing, the author mentions that this study design could be improved by incorporating two additional data collections. The first could be conducted prior to the family’s knowledge of an impending deployment which could serve as an individual control for family and child adjustment level. The second data collection could be conducted at a later postdeployment time, so as to examine eventual family readjustment. This might prove particularly helpful in understanding how families experiencing a combat deployment eventually reorganize.

A few words about the deployed parent. A perspective on parental military deployment that is not usually examined is that of the deployed parent (Blaisure &
Arnold-Mann, 1992, Kleiger et al., 1993). The adjustment of the deployed parent became more salient during deployments for Operation Desert Storm. For the first time, many mothers of young children as well as both parents in dual-military member families were deployed, making grieving the absence from one’s child a readiness issue for the military. Discussing findings from an intervention project conducted aboard the USNS Comfort during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, Kleiger et al. (1993) report that deployed parents experienced high levels of rage and grief which they often attempted to mask fearing that expressing these emotions would expose weakness and a lack of dedication to the military mission. These parents also expressed concern over the following: (a) how their children were functioning at home, in school, and in their peer relationships, (b) similar concern over the functioning of their spouse with a emphasis on how the spouse was functioning as a single parent, (c) envy over the special relationship their child and spouse might be forming and how they would fit back into the family upon their return, (d) fear that they would not recognized their child upon their return and/or that their child would not recognize them, and (e) agony over how much of their grief and anxiety to express to their family at home. The deployed service members experienced heightened anxiety and grief surrounding these concerns on their children’s birthdays and holidays they would have normally spent with their children. Support groups for these deployed parents focused on striking a balance between denial and expression of these concerns coupled with exercises aimed at ameliorating feelings of helplessness arising from being separated from one’s child. These exercises often utilized creative ways of communicating with one’s child through making audiotapes of the
child's favorite bedtime stories, making video tapes to mail home, and mailing home a personal object with some of the parent's perfume/cologne on the object.

A Feminist Concern With The Military Family Literature

In concluding the discussion of the military family literature, it is apropos to address a recurring theme in this literature from a feminist perspective. This recurring theme is the role of the mother's psychological adjustment in explaining family adjustment to deployment of the husband-father. The argument has been made that the adjustment of the mother is paramount in determining the adjustment of the family, especially the children, to the husband-father's absence. It may seem odd that in a system of related individuals one member's adjustment would be designated as more paramount than others. A review of feminist literature offers two theories as to why mothers might be charged with the bulk of the responsibility for family adjustment during deployments. The first theory rests upon the principle of the greedy institution, and the second theory rests upon the concept of mother-blaming.

Greedy institutions. According to Segal (1986), a greedy institution is one which demands much of its members in terms of time, loyalty, energy and commitment. Additionally, a greedy institution exerts pressures on its component individuals to weaken or not form ties with other institutions or organizations that might weaken member commitment to the greedy institution. Often, dedication to the greedy institution is accomplished not by physical force, but by non-physical mechanisms which separate the insider from the outsider and establish symbolic boundaries between them. For example, in military families, reinforcement for compliance and support of the mission is
provided through non-monetary incentives such as: no-cost housing, subsidized shopping and day care on-base, no-cost medical care, and on-base recreation facilities. These inducements not only “sweeten the pot,” but also reinforce membership in the military community. Segal stresses that when studying military families one is examining the juncture of two greedy institutions, the military and the family, and that the resulting conflict could breed resentment on the part of both institutions.

Segal presents a paradigm explaining why conflict may actually be increasing between these two institutions and how this could result in criticism of women. Historically, the family has relied on women to be the primary managers for the family. This has freed men up for military service and dedication to the greedy institution of the military. Women, as full-time household managers, have traditionally facilitated the juncture at which these two greedy institutions have met thus reducing tension between the military member and other family members. Recent societal changes in the role of women have challenged both the notion that the woman should manage the home and the primacy of the male partner’s career. This means that women may no longer be able or willing to play the role of facilitator between the military and the family. When this happens women must call on their spouses to take on some of their household responsibilities. This may result in men being less committed to the military and may cause women to become scapegoated by the military. In other words, the less available military wife may become a scapegoat when poor family adjustment interferes with deployment goals.
Segal notes that the military is greedy not only in the demand of commitment from the military member, but also in the living requirements and the behavioral expectations placed on military families. Examples of greedy demands placed on the family by the military include: (a) risk of injury or death to a loved one, (b) high levels of mobility, (c) family separations, (d) residence in foreign countries, and (e) explicit normative expectations of how family members should behave and support the military mission. As the role of women within the family and society has changed coupled with demographic changes within the military such as: higher numbers of married members, higher number of female members, and higher numbers of single-parents members; military members and their families have become less willing to unconditionally support the military mission. Rather than blaming women for foisting more domestic demands on their spouses, thus decreasing the military member’s potential for unlimited commitment to the military, Segal suggests that if the military wants to maintain high morale among it members, the military might do well to implement new programs that accommodate changing family needs. Programs should specifically address programs that facilitate the fit between the military and the family when the female partner must or chooses to work outside the home.

In a study of the work/family fit in military families, Pittman (1994) provides further support for the salutary benefits that can be derived by increasing the fit between the two institutions. Pittman defined family/work fit as the quality of exchange that the family makes with the organization for which a family member works. Pittman predicted that higher levels of family/work fit would be associated with higher levels of marital
satisfaction suggesting a reduction in tension between the two institutions. In surveying 407 military couples, Pittman uncovered that it was not work hours of the military member per se that predicted marital satisfaction via family/work fit, but rather, the levels of satisfaction with the hours worked and satisfaction with the job on the part of each spouse that predicted family/work fit. Additionally, the better the family/work fit the higher were levels of marital satisfaction. In summary, Pittman found it was not total hours worked or even family income that predicted families' satisfaction and willingness to support the military. Rather military families were basing their perceptions of family/work fit on a complete examination of the exchange between family sacrifices and compensating benefits. This finding seems to compliment Segal's position that enhancing accommodations for military families may be a viable way to ameliorate the increasing competition between family and military. In other words, if the modern military wants members and families who support the mission, the military may need to work harder to offset the sacrifices made by military families.

Mother-blaming. The practice of mother-blaming is another reason women might tend to take more than the fair share of blame when deployment outcomes are poor. Chowdorow and Contratto (1992, see also Baber & Allen, 1992) state that there is a tendency in our society to dichotomize mothers as omnipotent or completely incompetent with either interpretation opening avenues for blaming mothers not only for shortcomings in their own children, but society as a whole. The tendency to blame mothers for poor child outcomes has its origins in the Industrial Revolution. At that time, the mother became a symbol of refuge and security from the rapidly changing societal
culture. Also at that time, the division of labor between men and women became more differentiated such that men earned an income outside the home and women became responsible for the care and raising of the children. More recently, the psychological theories of Freud and others have implicated the faults of the mother in poor child outcomes. Freudian and related theories not only emphasize the primacy of infancy and early childhood, which is spent almost entirely in the company of the mother (or another woman), but also emphasize the generally poor or hysterical psychological constitution of women. The result is that a situation is created in which the person who is primarily responsible for children during the most crucial period of development is considered less psychologically intact than her male counterparts. This results in a near-perfect scapegoat as can be witnessed in the popular press as well as fictional accounts (Baber & Allen, 1992). With the precedent set, it may be just easier or at least not as challenging to blame mothers for poor child outcomes during deployments. The fact that during deployments the mother and child are more isolated than usual (i.e., without the moderating force of the father) may serve to exacerbate the likelihood that the mother blaming justification will be used. Tying this back into the greedy institution, blaming the mother, not only lends a legitimate way to censure the mother’s inadequate dedication to the family and military mission, but also provides an easy way to absolve the military member of guilt for poor child outcomes manifesting during a deployment.

The Military Child Literature

Pederson. Unlike other authors discussed so far, Pederson (1966), saw military dependents as an optimal group for studying the isolated effect of paternal absence.
According to Pederson, military families represent an optimal group for studying the effect of paternal absence because when working with military families one can often eliminate the confounding variables of family financial instability and long-term marital discord as might be found in families experiencing paternal separation due to divorce or abandonment. Pederson hypothesized that in his sample of 27 white military dependents ranging in age from 11-15 years, emotionally disturbed participants would have a history of longer periods of father-absence and that the degree of disturbance would be positively related to the total amount of paternal absence. Pederson also examined the effect of developmental period with an expectation that earlier father absence would bode poorer outcomes and the effect of maternal emotional disturbance as a mediator of child disturbance due to paternal absence.

Pederson’s sample was derived from children referred to a mental health clinic operating within a military hospital on a United States Army post. Potential participants were ruled out if the presenting problem involved psychotic behavior, mental disability, physical disability, or either of the parents were unwilling to participate. Thirty control/normal participants were selected on the basis of being seen in other clinics of the hospital for routine well-child care. Control participants were matched for birth order, age of parents, father’s branch and rank of service, and SES. The control participants normal adjustment status was determined by parental report that the child achieved satisfactorily in school, had no history of socially disruptive behavior, delinquency, or truancy, and the family had not at a previous time sought mental health services for the child.
Data were collected in two areas, history of father-absence and measures of emotional disturbance for the child and parents. In a detailed interview with both parents, information on father-absence was obtained. Parents reported all periods of father-absence extending over one month from the time of the child's birth until the time of the interview. Total length of father-absence was complied in terms of total months of father-absence and data were collected in such a way as to allow for the computation of subtotals of father-absence by developmental period. Children's level of emotional disturbance was measured by the application of the Rogers Test of Personality Adjustment (Rogers, 1931), a paper and pencil self-report measure that contains four subscales (Personal Inferiority, Social Maladjustment, Family Maladjustment, Daydreaming) and a total maladjustment score. Significant differences between the disturbed and control groups were found for each subtest and the total maladjustment score suggesting that the measure has discriminant validity. In order to obtain information on parental adjustment levels, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) was administered to both parents.

Results indicated that while the children in the disturbed group has experienced longer periods of father-absence, there was not a significant difference between total amount of father-absence experienced by the two groups. When father-absence was delineated by developmental period (i.e., 0-3 years, 3-5 years, and 5-9 years) the disturbed group showed higher total amounts of father-absence in two of the age groupings, but again the difference in total father-absence between the disturbed and control groups was not statistically significant. A secondary analysis within the disturbed
group indicated that in terms of total maladjustment scores, when the effects of previous paternal absences were controlled, paternal absence in none of the three developmental periods contributed significantly to total maladjustment. In other words, paternal absence did not exert a more deleterious effect in any of the three age groups studied. Within the disturbed group, higher amounts of paternal absence was associated with significant scores on the social maladjustment, daydreaming, and total maladjustment scores on the Rogers Test of Personality Adjustment. For the control group, higher levels of paternal absence were only associated with significant scores on the daydreaming subtest. On some of the other scales (e.g., social maladjustment, family maladjustment, and total maladjustment), participants in the control group actually produced negative scores, indicating that for boys with normal adjustment moderate periods of father-absence may facilitate healthy adjustment. Pederson seems to be saying that while total length of father-absence did not differ for the two groups, the father-absence was more distressing to the children in the disturbed group. This finding suggests that there is a mediating variable between amount of father-absence and adjustment. Pederson looked for this mediating variable within the parental adjustment scores.

There were significant differences in MMPI total adjustment scores between mothers of children in the disturbed and control groups, such that mothers of disturbed children were significantly more disturbed than mothers of control children. The following MMPI subscales contributed most strongly to this finding: hypochondria, hysteria, paranoia, and schizophrenia. No significant differences in adjustment were found between fathers of the disturbed and control children. After determining that the
elevated maternal MMPI scores were not correlated with either paternal absence or child maladjustment, Pederson dismisses the idea that child maladjustment is actually caused by maternal disturbance and only spuriously related to paternal absence. Rather, despite the elevated maternal maladjustment scores, Pederson ties child maladjustment directly to paternal absence by emphasizing the importance of the father’s healthy adjustment in moderating the effects of maternal dysfunction. Pederson postulates that when the father is in the home, his more stable and well-adjusted presence acts as a buffer between mother and child. However, upon his deployment, the child is directly exposed to the mother’s maladjustment thus resulting in higher levels of maladjustment on the part of the child. What is really needed here is a control group of families with disturbed mothers and well-adjusted fathers who are always present. If the children in this sample did not exhibit higher levels of maladjustment, the plausibility of this hypothesis would be increased. Pederson concludes that paternal absence owing to military service does not exert deleterious effects on all children, but that the child’s adjustment outcome must be examined in terms of the custodial parent’s adjustment.

Hillenbrand. Using a sample of 126 sixth grade students (73 males and 53 females) attending a school for military children, Hillenbrand (1976) measured the effects of paternal absence on cognitive outcomes. Special emphasis was given to the mediating variables of developmental period in which paternal absence first occurs, gender, and birth order. The goal of this study was to delineate the deleterious effects associated with paternal absence especially in terms of how father absence relates to poor cognitive outcomes in males. Specifically, it was hypothesized that via increased levels of maternal
dominance and identification increased paternal absence would prove problematic to boys. Students were assessed on the following variables: intelligence, classroom behavior, parental dominance, parental identification, and birth order.

The author notes that as the majority of the sample were children of officers, the sample was skewed not only in the favor of males, but also in the favor of higher SES students. Students ranged in amount of paternal absence from none (in one case) to 63 months with an average of approximately 26 months. In this sample, children of officers and enlisted military members did not differ significantly in terms of amount of paternal absence experienced. It seems important to note that data were collected in 1968 and 1969 at the time of the Vietnam Conflict. It is reported that some of the families had experienced combat deployments, but this variable was not controlled for. In sum, this is a Vietnam Era study that focuses on poor outcomes for males due to the increased influence of the mother during the time of the father's deployment.

Independent measures included two teacher rating scales: the Rating Scale for Pupil Adjustment and a Dependency Striving Scale. The Rating Scale for Pupil Adjustment assesses overall emotional adjustment, tendency towards depression, tendency towards aggression, extroversion-introversion, emotional security, motor control, impulsiveness, irritability, school achievement, school conduct, and specific physical handicaps. The Dependency Striving Scale measures five types of classroom behavior belonging to the dependency complex. These behaviors are: physical contact, proximity, attention-getting, help-seeking, and recognition seeking. Based on detailed descriptions of instrumental behaviors representing each of the five types of behaviors,
teachers filled out checklists to describe each student's behavior. Participants completed self-report behavior checklists in the domains of parental identification and maternal dominance. The parental identification measure assessed the degree to which the child judged her/himself to be similar to each of his or her parents. The maternal dominance measure assessed how many household decisions and rules were made by the mother in comparison to the father. These two measures were used to determine the degree to which the child identified with his or her mother and the degree to which the mother performed activities within the home. Additionally, participants were administered the Kuhlmann-Anderson Test, Form EF, 7th Edition, as a proxy of cognitive development. Besides producing a qualitative, quantitative, and full scale score, difference scores between the qualitative and quantitative scores were computed.

The results focused on three groups of children: first-born sons, latter-born sons, and girls. Paternal absence turned out to not be such a bad thing for first-born sons. These children tended to experience an increase in quantitative functioning, and while they tended to identify with the mother as the dominant parent, this resulted in desirable traits such as lowered aggression. Latter-born males did not fare well with paternal absence. These boys tended to not be affected in terms of cognitive functioning so much as in the development of undesirable personality traits like aggression and dependency. While these latter-born sons did not exhibit a decrease in cognitive functioning, they did exhibit a feminization of cognitive patterning such that qualitative scores were higher than quantitative scores. Results for girls were mentioned only in that, for girls increased paternal absence was associated with decreased quantitative scores. Girls were also
highlighted in terms of being older siblings such that for latter-born sons having an older sister as opposed to an older brother was associated with poorer outcomes. Overall, the author indicates that paternal absence is not as crucial of a developmental issue for girls.

Addressing the results in terms of age at first absence, total amount of absence, and birth order, in terms of age at first absence, for boys, earlier absence was associated with higher levels of aggressiveness, irritability, depression, and impulsiveness. Also, boys experiencing higher total amounts of father absence, were reported as seeming more depressed to their teachers. For girls, earlier first absence was associated with lower quantitative ability. Contrary to hypothesis, maternal dominance was positively related to boys verbal, quantitative, and total scale intelligence scores. For girls, maternal dominance did not effect intelligence scores, but higher levels of maternal dominance were associated with lower aggression and dependency.

Having an older sister boded poorly for good adjustment. Boys with an older sister were characterized by their teachers as more aggressive, dependent, and impulsive, less socially and emotionally mature, and poorer achievers in school. Girls with older sisters were also seen by their teachers as more aggressive, but were also seen as higher achievers. Having an older brother favored girls in terms of cognitive abilities and positive teacher report. Having an older brother exerted no significant effect for males. To reiterate, when analyzing the effect of birth order in males, Hillenbrand found different effects for first-born and latter-born males. Her analysis suggested that first-born sons tend to grow adaptively from coping with paternal absence whereas latter-born sons, particularly when they have older sisters, do not gain positively from father-
absence. The primary difference between the two groups of boys was that while first-
born sons tended to exhibit cognitive gains and lessened aggression, latter-born sons
experiencing early paternal separation showed deficits in cognitive development in terms
of a feminine cognitive pattern of higher verbal than quantitative scores and also
exhibited more aggression and dependency.

In sum, it looks like early paternal absence is bad for both boys and girls, but that
maternal dominance and identification does not exert extremely deleterious
consequences. Contrary to hypothesis, the suspected vehicle for poor deployment
outcomes, maternal dominance, actually resulted in higher intelligence scores for boys.
While maternal dominance did not contribute in any direct way to girls' intellectual
development, it did contribute to their character development in terms of lowered
aggression and dependency. In closing, Hillenbrand speculates that under the
circumstances of an absent father a dominating mother with whom her children can
identify may serve an adaptive function for her family. This seems closely related to the
position put forth by Boss (1980).

Yeatman. In a questionnaire study of 258 parents bringing their children to a
military pediatric clinic, Yeatman (1981) found that parents reported that parental
absence due to military deployment was frequently associated with adjustment problems
in their children. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the severity and
prevalence of somatic and behavioral problems in children experiencing parental
deployment. The questionnaire also addressed the sex of the child, age of all siblings,
number and duration of TDYs, the deployed parent's awareness of problems associated
with the TDY, and whether the parents thought the military should exercise guidelines for the protection of the children of service members when planning TDYs.

In this sample, 54% of the families had experienced parental absence due to TDY and 46% of the families had not. Of the participants who had experienced deployment, approximately two thirds of the families reported adjustment problems in their children during the deployment. The remaining one third of the families who had experienced a deployment indicated they had not experienced any adjustment problems during times of the service member’s absence. For parents reporting adjustment difficulties the following problems were most frequently registered: (a) disobedience and discipline problems, (b) aggressiveness, (c) somatic complaints particularly stomach ailments, headaches, stuttering, and asthma attacks, (d) phobias, (e) paranoia about loss of love or punishment, (f) withdrawal, (g) crying, (h) insecurity, (i) poor self-esteem, (j) resentment and hatred towards the deployed parent, (k) regressive behavior including enuresis, encopresis, and finger-sucking, (l) nightmares, night terrors, and insomnia, (m) decreased academic performance, and (n) dishonesty. Although adjustment problems during the separation did not appear to be more frequent in any given age or sex category, children under two seemed to have the most difficult time readjusting to the parent’s return. Yeatman also notes that while parents of infants less than a year old did not report any adjustment problems due to the parent’s absence, deployment-related behavioral disruptions were evident at any age over twelve months. In sum, while deployment related adjustment problems could be found in any child over twelve months old, they
were not more prevalent at any particular age or in either gender. Younger children seemed especially vulnerable during the reunion period.

An interesting result involved parental perception of TDY-related adjustment problems. While two thirds of the wives who had experienced separation reported adjustment problems during the TDY, only one third of their corresponding spouses reported that they believed there had been adjustment problems during the TDY. Yeatman attributes this to the tendency of military wives to underreport difficulties to their spouses during deployment (see Cove et al. 1969). The majority of spouses and service members who had experienced family separation, along with the majority of sample respondents who had not experienced family separation, reported that military guidelines to minimize traumatic separation would be appropriate.

Amen et al. Based on their experience at a military mental-health facility, Amen et al. (1988) describe the impact of parental deployment from a developmental perspective. These authors present their experiences with families experiencing deployment in a two factor model that examines the role of the stage of deployment (i.e., predeployment, deployment, reunion) with stage of development (i.e., preschool, early elementary, adolescence). This results in a 3 X 3 model of TDY adjustment that examines deployment stage X developmental stage.

Predeployment is a confusing time for preschoolers. Preschoolers are often aware that something is awry in the household. However, many parents prefer not to tell young children of the impending deployment until immediately beforehand. Amen et al. note that this is not a helpful tactic as the child is often aware that something is going on
anyway. Additionally, Amen et al., note that by not giving the preschooler adequate time
to work through what is known as "repetition and mastery" (Erickson, 1963) they deny
their child the opportunity to constructively work through his or her feelings.
Predeployment is often a hectic time and parents may be prone to withdraw from their
children as they prepare for the military member's departure and work through their own
feelings about the deployment. Due to this, preschool children may also be affected by a
decrease of parental attention during the predeployment period. Amen et al. state that
with the above factors in operation, preschoolers are likely to become highly demanding
of attention or regressive in their behavior as the family prepares for the deployment.
Amen et al. also note that a guilty response is frequently witnessed in preschoolers
facing an impending deployment. This is often due to magical thinking which is the
irrational belief on the part of the child that he or she has done something bad to a make
mommy/daddy go away. Amen et al. note that once the military parent has departed
preschoolers have increased difficulty negotiating the developmental tasks associated
with object-constancy and separation-individuation. This is due to the fact that the child
must struggle with the loss of an object he or she believed to be permanent (i.e. the
deployed parent). Additionally, children tend to become clinging and more dependent on
the custodial parent while the military parent is deployed. This interferes with
independence seeking. The above, coupled with young children's inability to conceive of
large amounts of time, can result in an inconsolable grief reaction. This is marked by
eating and sleeping disturbances, mood swings, irritability, and withdrawal. During the
reunion period, preschoolers are apt to be overwhelmed with joy and very tenacious in
their demands for attention and reassurance from the returning parent that they will not leave again. However, sometimes the preschooler will reject the returning parent. This is usually a temporary situation and can be predicated by fear, or in the case of older preschoolers, used as a form of punishment towards the returning parent.

The early elementary-aged child may also experience guilt during the predeployment phase. According to Amen et al. this often represents confusion caused by the Oedipal complex, such that the child both wants to have the custodial parent (i.e., the mother) to himself, but fears repercussions from the father for dominating the mother’s attention in his absence. Amen et al. report that this age child may also experience a lot of loneliness prior to the deployment. This loneliness is attributed to parental inattention due to preoccupation with the deployment. This age child is also capable of worrying about the custodial parent’s reaction to the deployment. This may be especially true if there has been problems before. In the deployment phase, early elementary school children may also become very clinging with the custodial parent. Additionally, this age child may become very protective of the custodial parent. Males may become hypermasculine and aggressive if their fathers’ absence causes them sex-role confusion. On the other hand, males may also react to sex-role confusion by adopting more feminine behaviors. If Dad is a pal or a bud, his absence may cause intense loneliness and feelings of abandonment. Finally, increased bed-wetting may be a problem for this age child. During the reunion period the early elementary child often feels anger and/or jealously along with happiness over the parent’s return. In fact, Amen et al. note
that when there are early elementary children in the house, jealousy during reunion is a common reaction for the child as well as both parents.

In the predeployment stage, adolescents may also feel lonely and have a sense of anticipation regarding the custodial parent’s adjustment to the deployment. Additionally, the authors note that adolescents are more likely than early elementary school children to directly express their anger, resentment, and fears, sometimes in a rebellious manner. On the other hand, adolescents might often react to the impending deployment with denial, aloofness, and a tendency to exit the family unit. During the actual deployment, adolescents usually adjust better than children in the other two age groups. This is especially true when the adolescent has previous experience with deployments. Adolescents occasionally respond to parental absence by affiliating with the "wrong crowd". This is considered a variant of acting out. Adolescents may also cope with the deployment by separating themselves from their families and spending more time outside the home. Amen et al. also emphasize that during parental deployment positive change such as increased independence and responsibility-taking on the part of the adolescent is often witnessed. Amen et al. report that particularly if the deployment phase was non-troublesome, reunion is usually easiest on the adolescent child. However, problems can arise when the custodial parent has let the adolescent have “free reign” and the returning parent immediately clamps down.

In their discussion Amen et al. reiterate the notion put forth by Gabel (1992) and many others, namely that much of a child’s adjustment during a deployment is related to the adjustment of the custodial parent. Custodial parents with better adjustments have
children who adapt more positively to deployment. The authors (Amen et al., 1988) note that deployments occurring during a period of marital discord or with custodial parents who attempt to meet their own psychological needs through their children are associated with poorer adjustments. Additionally, these authors emphasize that school administrators and teachers working with military children need to be made aware of the problems students might encounter or present during a deployment.

Jensen et al. (1986). In a literature review, Jensen et al. (1986) address the prevalence of dysfunction in the military, define risk factors faced by military families, and discuss prevention programs available to military families. In addition to providing a comprehensive overview of the military family literature, Jensen et al. also provide a thorough commentary on methodological issues in military family studies. Starting with methodological concerns, Jensen et al. conclude that there are very few studies of military families whose results can be trusted with any sense of confidence. They note that military family studies tend to be conducted intermittently and with inadequate or inconsistent funding necessary to perform a reasonably sound study and that methodology tends to be poorly executed in these studies. For instance, according to Jensen et al., military family studies tend examine the effects of one or two rather simplistic variables to explain complicated family processes. Additionally, these studies are often conducted as doctoral dissertations or by government agencies such that they end up published in government archives making them relatively inaccessible to individuals interested in studying or making intervention plans for this population.
Jensen et al. discuss the prevalence of dysfunction in the military community. They dispel the commonly held notion that military families may be more dysfunctional than their civilian counterparts particularly in terms of divorce, psychiatric disorder, child abuse, and alcoholism. Jensen et al. note that rates of divorce are probably lower for military families than for a similar civilian population. They attribute this to the increased pay and social benefits of having a spouse in terms of rank promotion, the difficulty of maintaining a single parent family in the military community, and routine family separations which may serve to diffuse marital tension on a regular basis. Jensen et al. report that while several studies have indicated higher rates of psychiatric disorder in military children, the only study they know of that used controls indicated that military children were less subject to psychiatric disorder than their civilian counterparts. Jensen et al. attribute strict screening processes that prohibit severely disturbed individuals, and thus their families, from serving in the military and the provision of no-cost mental health services as factors that may reduce severe psychiatric disorder within the military community. Jensen et al. report that they believe child abuse within the military community is lower than within the civilian community. They assert that when figures appear higher for military families it is a reporting effect due to the highly reliable and rigorous reporting system used within the military community. With regard to alcoholism, Jensen et al. state that there is indeed increased risk within the military community. But they temper this finding with evidence that substance abuse rates within the military have been declining due to aggressive prevention and intervention policies.
In sum, while divorce, psychiatric disturbance, and child abuse rates are probably lower for the military community, alcoholism is probably higher.

Jensen et al. discuss next risk factors that pertain to military families. Among these they include: (a) husband-father absence, (b) combat and war stress, (c) geographic mobility, (d) the authoritarian military structure, and (e) cross-cultural families. For the purposes of this study, only the findings concerning husband-father absence will be reviewed. In commencing their discussion of the effects of husband-father absence, Jensen et al. remind the reader that few reliable military studies have been conducted. According to the authors, a reliable and rigorous study of husband-father absence would have to include a well-defined, nonclinical sample with a carefully matched control group of father-present children and a longitudinal design that incorporates the crisis of reunion and eventual family readjustment levels. According to Jensen et al., longitudinal studies could prove particularly insightful for female children because not only have female children been less of a focus in father-absent studies, but many authors have concluded that father deployment does not as detrimentally affect girls as it does boys. Jensen et al. stress that no one has ruled out the possibility that girls exhibit delayed reactions. As a general finding, temporary father absence due to military deployment seems to result in increased emotional and behavioral disruptions especially in male children. Longer deployments and those associated with combat or other crisis situations may be expected to be associated with greater emotional and behavioral disruptions. Extensive father-absence in the child’s early years may exert deficits in cognitive functioning especially in terms of children performing higher on verbal tasks than quantitative tasks. Father-
absence has also been associated with decreased academic achievement. Jensen et al. note the literature which suggests that the custodial parent's adjustment to the deployment likely influences how well the children adjust and the literature that indicates in some instances, particularly when family adjustment is high, a deployment may result in positive growth in children especially in the domain of personality adjustment.

In conclusion, Jensen et al. stress that an overview of the literature does not support the notion that military families are inherently dysfunctional, even in terms of father-absence due to deployment. Jensen et al. wrap up the article by stressing two shortcomings in military prevention/intervention programs. First, they state that while prevention/intervention programs abound, they have not been adequately evaluated and are not evenly distributed among all bases, even among bases with higher need. Second, the authors note that while programs abound, often essential resources are not available to truly facilitate healthy functioning. As an example, they point to the profound lack of child psychiatrists in the military noting that 23% of USAF military children have no access to psychiatric care.

Jensen et al. (1989). In a retroactive study of 213 military families who had experienced one month or more of father absence due to military service in the previous 12 months, Jensen et al. (1989) examined the effect of paternal absence on children's adjustment and investigated the plausibility of variables postulated to mediate deployment effects. The intervening variables under consideration were maternal psychiatric disturbance and number of life stressors experienced by the family in the past 12 months. Jensen et al. theorized that father absence due to military deployment could
be considered a routine stressor for military families which is buffered by the provision of no-cost medical services, no-cost legal support and no-cost recreational facilities, as well as a stable income throughout the separation. Under these circumstances, Jensen et al. expected to find no significant effect of parental deployment once maternal disturbance and family life stressors were controlled. The effect of total number of father absences two weeks or more in length and total time the father spent deployed was also considered.

The sample included families with one or more children in the age range of 6-11.9 years in age. Families were solicited by post housing lists, with equal numbers of on-post and off-post residing families selected. Due to the preponderance of data collection associated with the study, only one child from each family was selected to participate. Although enlisted personnel ended up being overrepresented in the sample due to a lack of eligible officer families, the sample was limited to officer and senior enlisted military personnel to control for family income. All families were on active-duty with the United States Army. In all, 213 families, 183 mothers, 166 fathers, 178 children, and 169 teachers participated in the study. Participating families were divided into two groups: those experiencing more than one month of father-absence in the past 12 months and those experiencing less than 1 month of father-absence in the past 12 months.

Parental psychological status and the presence of child emotional and/or behavior disturbances were measured with the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL) and Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach, 1978; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1979), respectively. The Teacher Report Form (TRF) of the CBCL (Achenback & Edelbrock,
1983) was used to measure children’s emotional and behavioral problems within the academic setting. Child self-report of emotional and behavioral disturbances were measured with the Child Depression Inventory (CDI) and the Revised Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS). Finally, mothers completed the Life Events Record (Coddington, 1972) to register levels of stressors experienced by the family in the past 12 months.

Results indicated that children who had experienced more than one month of father-absence in the past 12 months self-reported significantly higher levels of depression and anxiety. The intriguing caveat of this finding is that parent and teacher report of depression and anxiety levels did not indicate any significant differences between father-absent and father-present groups, meaning that children experiencing more than one month of parental absence reported elevated feelings of depression and anxiety that were not detected by their parents or teachers. There were no significant differences between the two groups of participants in terms of maternal psychological disturbance or family stressor events in the past twelve months. Results also indicated that while total number of absences did not significantly relate to children’s levels of emotional and behavioral disturbance, total length of father absence was related to levels of child disturbance with longer total periods of absence being associated with more disturbance. A final finding indicated that when levels of maternal psychological disturbance and family stressor events were controlled, no significant effects of father deployment on child adjustment were found. Jensen et al. note that reports of father psychological adjustment appeared to have no bearing on child outcome.
In concluding this article, Jensen et al. report that there seems to be some evidence that increased length of paternal absence in the past twelve months seems to be associated with heighten anxiety and depression in children. However, significant adults in the children's lives were apparently unaware of the children's disturbance. Jensen et al. note that in previous studies they have conducted with military children (see for instance Jensen et al., 1988a, 1988b) they have found that military children tend to "keep a stiff upper lip" during parental deployments. Due to this, Jensen et al. emphasize that direct questioning of military children's experience with disturbing internalizing behaviors during deployments is methodologically appropriate. Jensen et al. lament that the direct effects of paternal absence become even more tenuous when coupled with the finding that when maternal psychological disturbance and family stressor events are controlled paternal absence seems to exert no significant effect on children's adjustment. The authors conclude that relatively brief father absences coupled with good family adjustment prior to deployment are not likely to significantly effect children's adjustment.

Mitchum. This pilot intervention study examined the efficacy of using group therapy within public schools to increase the coping skills and social support networks of Navy (USN) children whose fathers were currently on deployment. All the families involved in this pilot study adhered to a traditional two parent, father as military member configuration. Participants were 22 fifth grade students attending four different public elementary schools in Norfolk, Virginia. Schools were selected on the basis that they served many children whose fathers were stationed at a nearby USN base. Additionally,
all four schools had a final-semester graduate student completing a practicum in counseling. These student-practitioners met weekly with the author to discuss how the counseling sessions were proceeding and to troubleshoot problems with specific children. The graduate students facilitated the counseling program.

Mitchum notes that the literature supports that children have a generalized emotional response to the deployment of a parent. This response follows the sequence of protest, despair, and detachment (Bowlby, 1973, 1988). The resulting emotional and/or behavioral disturbances include: (a) increased stranger anxiety in younger children, (b) increased internalizing behaviors, (c) increased generalized anxiety, (d) sex-role confusion among male children, and (e) increases in aggression, disobedience, and antisocial behavior. Mitchum attributes emotional and behavioral disruptions in children who have experienced multiple deployments to the continual shifting of household authority. She hypothesizes that increased acting out behavior comes to be a method of testing the waters in terms of what behaviors will be tolerated at each changing of household authority. Mitchum postulates that children who internalize their confusion and grief over the constant departure and return of their military parent may eventually act out and rebel in adolescence. Mitchum also reports that children with deploying parents are at a higher risk for suffering physical abuse immediately before, during, and immediately after the deployment due to the increased stress in the home. Reunion is a particularly vulnerable time because many returning parents feel a need to take back their authority in the household in an abrupt manner.
Mitchum's perspective is quite different from that of Jensen et al.'s (1986, 1989). Unlike Jensen et al., Mitchum works from the assumption that persistent military deployments will eventually cause some disturbance in a child's life and the child will probably not have the resources to cope with it. Therefore, she proposes an intervention that while not costing much in time, effort, or money may help military children bolster their coping resources particularly in terms of social support. For several reasons, Mitchum states that group counseling within the public school is appropriate for pursuing these intervention goals. First, she notes that many military children may experience loneliness even before a deployment looms simply due to high rates of mobility. In other words, these children may be new to their school and without adequate peer supports even before their parent departs. This deficit only serves to handicap these children in coping with deployment. According to Mitchum, the public school with its access to many peers and atmosphere of learning is a prime location for building social support and teaching more effective coping strategies. Second, teachers and school counselors are in a good position to identify children who due to minimal social support or inadequate coping responses might benefit from group therapy. Third, school counselors may be able to provide group therapy to children without causing further financial hardship on the family or imposing one more scheduling consideration on an already stressed family unit. In other words, an in-school intervention ameliorates adjustment problems without causing further hardship to the family and without causing a reliance on family cooperation to get children to the sessions. Finally, Mitchum notes that providing counseling through the school also provides students with a sense that
their teachers and school administrators care about the difficulties imposed on them by their military life-style, thus creating more individuals children can incorporate into their social support network.

The goal of the intervention was to decrease loneliness while simultaneously increasing coping skills and the child’s social support network. The author chose to use a pre- and posttest of self-esteem to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Specifically, participants completed the Self-Esteem Inventory (Cooper-Smith, 1981) one week before the commencement of counseling and one week following the completion of counseling. This measure is comprised of five subscales: General Self, Social Self-Peers, Home-Parents, Lie Scale, and School-Academic. The counseling regimen consisted of six sessions. A curriculum was established that focused on increasing children’s general coping skills as well as increasing children’s awareness of how the deployment/reunion cycle affected their relationship with their parents and roles within the family. Special emphasis was put on helping children devise ways to get their needs met during these deployment-related transitions. In addition to providing anecdotal reports of the effectiveness of the counseling program, Mitchum also reports that t-tests indicated significantly improved self-esteem in the areas of general and academic self-esteem. Mitchum postulates that the increase in academic self-esteem is related to the participants feeling that their lifestyle and the problems caused by it are important to the adults at their school. One might also speculate that establishing bonds with more of one’s peers might result in increased self-esteem at school. Though it is possible to argue for misgivings in terms of the validity of using self-esteem as the dependent variable to
measure coping response to deployment (i.e., is there any reason to believe that lowered self-esteem is a problem/causal factor in explaining why military children have difficulty dealing with deployment?) this study does offer practical and convincing arguments for the utility of offering deployment intervention within public schools serving military children.

Hiew. In this study, Hiew (1992) examines the impact of maternal social support on children's adjustment to paternal deployment and the effect of the appraisals and coping strategies used by children during each of the three stages of deployment (i.e., predeployment/anticipation, deployment, and reunion). This study involved 66 Canadian military families who had experienced a deployment sometime within the past eight months. The most recent deployment ranged in length from several weeks to six months. The participants were students in grades 4-6 attending schools adjacent to a nearby Canadian Forces Base. This mean age of participants was 9.6 years and their mother's mean age was 33 years.

Hiew presents results of other studies of Canadian Forces families experiencing deployment that indicate that paternal deployment is often associated with adjustment problems for both the family unit as a whole and the children in particular. For example, Hiew reports that in one study, 22% of the children participants were reported by their mothers as not adjusting well to the father's absence. Examples of poor adjustment included: increased aggression; inappropriate behavior at school and/or a noticeable decrease in academic performance; disregard for authority; over-dependency on the custodial parent; regressive behavior such a bed-wetting; and increased incidence of
minor illnesses and psychosomatic complaints. However, Hiew notes these results must be tempered by the fact that approximately 60% of the mothers in this sample reported that during the father’s absence their children became more self-reliant, cooperative, and responsible within the home. Mothers reported loneliness and feelings of isolation resulting in depression and increased tension as their primary problems in adjusting to their husband’s absence.

In another study of 50 Canadian Forces military families experiencing deployment over 50% of the families reported experiencing problems in the following four domains: (a) inability of the children to understand and accept the father’s absence and in some cases ensuing adjustment problems which included increased illness and aggression, (b) marital difficulties and intense loneliness on the part of the non-military spouse, (c) increased stress in the non-military spouse created by the pressures of being double-billeted as mother and father (i.e., spouses felt overwhelmed and stressed by the responsibility left to them), and (d) an increase of crises and emergencies ranging from major household repairs and illness in the home or military member to death in the extended family.

The purpose of the study was to examine maternal social support as a mediator of children’s adjustment to paternal deployment. Specifically, it was hypothesized that children’s adjustment would improve as the mother’s perceived and actual levels of social support increased. Additionally, children’s coping responses and their adjustment at school was examined. Independent variables included the Supportive Functions Questionnaire (Tetzloff & Barrere, 1987) which was completed by mothers. This self-
report measure not only measures the number of specific social support persons the mother believes she can count on, but also measures perceived social support in four domains: parenting, emotional/social, tangible, and directive guidance support. Mothers also completed the Parent Evaluation Form (Pedro-Carroll & Cowen, 1985). This measure addresses mother's self-report of their children's general emotional adjustment and adjustment to paternal absence. Homeroom teachers completed the Classroom Adjustment Rating Scale (Lorion, Cowen, & Caldwell, 1975). This measure addresses children's adjustment in the classroom in three domains: acting out behaviors, shy-anxious behaviors, and learning-academic problems. Children participated in a 30 minute interview which assessed on a four point Lickert Scale their appraisals of how stressful their parent's deployment was for them in each stage of the deployment. The children were also questioned about the likelihood of use of one of three coping responses: (a) emotion-focused responses (e.g., emphasis is on regulating emotional distress, or "what can I do to control these bad feelings"), (b) problem-focused responses (e.g., attempts to manage the environment or alter the situation causing distress), and (c) social support responses (e.g., a mixture of the above two responses with an emphasis on bolstering one's resources through interactions with others).

Results indicated that higher levels of school adjustment were found as mothers' perceived social support network and actual size of their social support network increased. Additionally, mothers reporting larger social support networks also reported better at-home child adjustment to the father's absence. The child interviews indicated that the deployment phase was appraised as most stressful, followed by the
predeployment/anticipation stage. The reunion stage was appraised as not being stressful for the majority of the children. Hiew also found that across all deployment stages (predeployment/anticipation, deployment, and reunion) emotion-focused responses were most frequent. The highest rates of these coping responses were seen in the predeployment and deployment stages and their prevalence dropped sharply during the reunion stage presumably due a decrease in negative emotions. Over all stages and all coping responses, the highest total number of coping responses was seen during the deployment stage validating that this was indeed a difficult period for the children.

Social-support seeking responses were used mostly during the deployment stage. There was only one significant relationship between choice of coping strategy and adjustment and that relationship emerged between amount of social support seeking during the deployment and acting out behavior. The negative relationship indicated that as social support seeking increased, children’s acting out behavior decreased. Another effect of increased social support seeking was that increased social support was associated with increased problem-solving strategies during the deployment and reunion stages. Apparently, social support seeking resulted in the children being exposed to more adaptive problem-solving strategies. In sum, this study indicated that social support is an important mediating variable in determining child adjustment to parental absence. Increased maternal social support improves child adjustment within the home and school and increased social support seeking by the child is associated not only with better adjustment to the parental absence but the enactment of more adaptive coping strategies.
D'Andrea & Daniels. The perspective taken by D'Andrea and Daniels (1992) is very similar to the perspective put forth by Mitchum (1991). Specifically these authors, like Mitchum, stress the saliency of implementing deployment intervention programs within the public schools. And, as with Mitchum, they stress the appropriateness of using the school counselor as the coordinator for these deployment interventions. These authors also ascribe to a stage theory of emotional responses to the stress caused by the deployment of a parent. They devote much of the article to delineating the stages of coping only alluded to by Mitchum (i.e., protest, despair, detachment). And as with Mitchum, these authors emphasize the primacy of increased social support in enhancing deployment adjustment.

Based on the personal loss literature (i.e., Bowlby, 1980; Daniels, 1990; Parkes, 1986; Whiting, 1986) and their clinical experience working with children whose parents served in Operation Desert Storm, D'Andrea and Daniels theorize that children work through a four stage grieving process when they lose a parent to military deployment. Loss is defined in this article as, "any experience which robs a person of something that is personally significant and/or familiar" (Whiting, 1986). From this perspective, the deployment of a parent represents a loss issue. D'Andrea and Daniels stress that before school counselors can even hope to effectively work with students experiencing a parental deployment or educate faculty and administrators in their school about what to expect when dealing with these students, they must be fully familiar with the four grieving stages associated with deployment.
The first stage is the Numbness Stage. The psychological numbness that characterizes this stage is characterized by high distractibility and a general demeanor of confusion and haziness. When questioned, children report that despite their outwardly placid appearance internally they feel like they are close to exploding. The authors postulate that the emotional stagnation associated with this stage is a protective measure against being overwhelmed by the painful emotions caused by the separation. The Yearning Phase follows the Numbness Phase. This phase is characterized by high levels of separation anxiety which are likely to be expressed as acting out or disruptive behavior. It is during this phase that behavior disruptions at home and at school begin to surface. Most frequently these behaviors include restlessness and agitation, insomnia, nightmares, uncontrollable crying, somatic complaints, panic, irritability, and misplaced anger. D’Andrea and Daniels note that this acting out behavior likely originates from the frustration and irritation caused by the constant longing to be reunited with the absent parent. During the Disorientation and Depression Phase, children's behavior is depressed, apathetic, and withdrawn. According to D’Andrea and Daniels, this is caused by the realization and slow acceptance that reunion with the parent is impossible in the present time. The authors note that this period is often most aggravating to adults in the child’s life. These children are frustrating to work with because they are often unresponsive to the most valiant of efforts to make them feel better as well as punitive discipline to “shape them up”. Adults have a tendency to try to “snap the child out of” his or her depression and apathy, however, D’Andrea and Daniels warn that attempting to prematurely resolve the child’s depression is not in the child’s best interest in terms of
long-term adjustment. During this stage, personal disorganization becomes apparent and can lead to disruptions at school if the child becomes chronically unprepared for academic and extracurricular activities. The final stage is the Reorganization Phase, it is in this phase that the manifestation of personal growth becomes evident. Children who have worked through the Reorganization Phase are characterized by increased independence and hardiness. D’Andrea and Daniels suggest that this is the stage in which the school counselor wants to maximize personal growth.

D’Andrea and Daniels also discuss issues that school counselors need to help children address as the child cycles through the grieving process. For instance, the authors state that children will experience high levels of cognitive dissonance when a parent is deployed. The child must not only deal with the dissonance caused by having someone who is usually readily available disappear, but they must try to reconcile concerns about: (a) the parent’s safety, (b) a lack of communication that does not reflect the deployed parent’s feelings of affection and concern, and (c) in times of combat deployment, children must cope with public demonstrations protesting the involvement of service member’s who include their deployed parent. According to the authors, children also need confirmation that what they are experiencing due to their parents’ deployment is normal and acceptable. Children need to know it is OK to be “where they are” in terms of resolving negative feelings associated with the deployment. The school counselor is in a good position to provide this type of feedback through the use of individual and group counseling. D’Andrea and Daniels also suggest that counselors can help children maintain a sense of continuity in their lives as they attempt to deal with the
upheaval caused by having a parent deploy. This may be especially important when the remaining family unit becomes too disorganized to provide a sense of stability to the child. In closing, D'Andrea and Daniels stress the importance of the school counselor as a source of accurate and realistic information as to what teachers and parents should expect when dealing with a child experiencing a deployment. Not only can counselors educate teachers and parents having difficulty dealing with a child experiencing deployment, but they can also provide suggestions for more effective interaction with the child. In other words, the counselor becomes not only a source of accurate information, but also helps parents and teachers feel efficacious about interacting with children coping with deployments.

Jensen revisited. Jensen et al. (1996) commence this article by noting that there is a generally held notion that parental deployment during Operation Desert Storm caused significant disturbance. However, they note that they have only been able to identify two studies pertaining to the effects of parental deployment on military children during Operation Desert Storm and neither of these studies indicated what could be called significant disturbance. Additionally, Jensen et al. report that these studies contained formidable methodological flaws including: (a) lack of an appropriate measure of child symptomatology which according to these authors must include child self-report of symptoms, (b) possible response bias due to the use of one source of information, usually the mother (i.e., Jensen et al. discuss studies indicating that parents may overestimate child disturbance due to projection of their own disturbance or may underestimate child
disturbance if the child is keeping a "stiff upper lip" in order to protect that parent), (c) and the absence of appropriate controls in terms of pre- and postdeployment adjustment.

Jensen et al. report that the study they present here vastly improves on the methodology of other studies used to investigate the effects of parental deployment during Operation Desert Storm. For instance, this study included child self-report of disturbance caused by the deployment and parental report of child disturbance coupled with measures of parental disturbance caused by the deployment. This was deemed important because other studies have indicated that parental adjustment to the deployment mediates the child's adjustment. Two other mediating variables that have been identified as salient in previous studies are the age and gender of the child with young and male children showing more vulnerability to disturbance caused by parental deployment. These variables were addressed in this study. Finally, this study utilized appropriate controls such that analysis allowed for comparison of deployed and non-deployed families, including a subset of families who had been assessed on measures of stress and child adjustment prior to any knowledge of deployments for Operation Desert Storm.

Participants were 383 children and their caretaker living on a United States Army post near Washington, DC. Participating families had at least one child aged 4-17 years living in the home. The sample contained roughly equal numbers of male and female children. Sample selection gets a little complicated. The majority of this sample had participated in a study conducted by these same authors a year earlier. At the time of this earlier data collection, there was no concern for future problems in Iraq or impending
combat deployments. In other words, a large portion of the sample had participated in a previous study that measured the variables measured in the current study: namely family stress and child adjustment. This group of participants had a baseline measurement of family adjustment under non-deployment times. This group also comprised the majority of the sample for the Operation Desert Storm study. The remaining participants were gathered either randomly from a post housing list or through direct solicitation of volunteers at two units that had deployed for Operation Desert Storm. Jensen et al. assured that the participants recruited during Operation Desert Storm did not differ significantly on any salient variables as compared to participants derived from the pre-Operation Desert Storm study.

Measures were completed by both parents when possible (i.e., the father was not deployed) or by the remaining caretaker in the deployment situation. Over 90% of the time the remaining caretaker was the mother. Children also completed relevant measures. Parental measures included the Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983), the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977) this is an adult measure of depressive symptomatology, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Sharpley & Cross, 1982) which is a measure of global marital functioning, the Life Events Record (Coddington, 1972), the Psychological Coping Resources Scale (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978) which measures coping styles, and the Social Assets Scale which is a measure of instrumental and affective social support modified for military families. Children completed the Children’s Depression Inventory (Kovacs & Beck, 1977) and the Revised
Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale (Reynolds & Richmond, 1978). These measure children’s depressive and anxious symptomatology respectively.

For the sake of analysis, the entire sample was divided into two groups, families experiencing deployment and families not experiencing deployment. These two groups were compared with respect to family and child adjustment. Additionally, the subset of the sample that had previously completed measures under non-deployment situations was analyzed separately to examine the effect of previous family and child adjustment on deployment adjustment. In other words, for the first set of analyses the entire sample was utilized while in the second set of analyses only participants who had filled out adjustment measures under non-deployment times were included. It should be reemphasized that the same measures were used for each data collection.

In the comparison of families experiencing deployment due to Operation Desert Storm and families not experiencing deployment, the children of deployed parents self-reported higher levels of depression, but not anxiety. Parental report of internalizing and externalizing behavior did not differ between the two groups of children. Parents in families experiencing deployment also reported higher levels of depression and a higher number of stressor events experienced in the past twelve months. However, deployed and non-deployed parents did not differ on perceived levels of social support. In other words, parents in the deployed group did not report a social support deficiency as compared to their military cohorts not experiencing deployment. So in terms of examining the effects of deployment on child and family adjustment without regard for adjustment prior to deployment, both the children and their parents experienced
increased depression, and the families had been subjected to higher levels of stressor events.

Analysis then shifted to a comparison of deployment adjustment as mediated by non-deployment time child and family adjustment. Initial analyses indicated that at the time of the non-deployment baseline assessment there were no significant differences between children and families that eventually did or did not experience deployment to Operation Desert Storm. Difference scores computed between predeployment and deployment data confirmed the results found in the larger sample. Specifically, children of deployed parents showed significantly elevated depression scores compared to their predeployment depression scores. Anxiety and parental report of internalizing and externalizing behaviors remained unchanged from predeployment to deployment time. These results suggest that children from deployed and non-deployed families did not differ significantly on depression, anxiety, and internalizing/externalizing behaviors prior to Operation Desert Storm. Additionally, because the two groups started on equal footing and the deployment group alone showed increased depression scores, this strengthens the argument that having a parent deployed to a combat situation is associated with increased depression levels. In terms of looking at family and parental adjustment, the results reiterate the whole sample deployment versus non-deployment findings. Namely, increases in parental depression and family stressor events remained significant even when predeployment levels of depression and stress were controlled. Jensen et al. report that these parental/family level findings seem to suggest that it is deployment per se and not prior deficits in parental or family functioning that lead to
parental/family disruption during deployment. Additional analyses confirmed that boys were significantly more susceptible to significant increases in depression and internalizing behaviors during deployment. Another analysis indicated that within the deployment group, higher internalizing child behavior scores were associated with higher parental depression and stress levels. Also within the deployment group, younger age was associated with elevated depression scores, indicating that younger children may be especially susceptible to depression resulting from the combat deployment of a parent.

What these results suggest is that the combat deployment of the husband-father is likely to be associated with increased depression on both the parts of the children and the remaining caretaker and that levels of stress are likely to be increased within the home during such a deployment. These effects remain significant even when predeployment family and child adjustment is controlled. However, Jensen et al. point out that even with the increase in depressive and internalizing behaviors, increases remain below the clinical level. Jensen et al. also conclude that when child difficulties arise during a deployment they are best viewed as a family effect. They support this view in that children experiencing more symptoms have parents who report more symptoms and higher levels of stress within the home. They stress that the increased distress in the house is likely due to the deployment itself and not to any preexisting caretaker dysfunction. Due to this, these authors recommend interventions that target family functioning, with a special emphasis on meeting the needs of younger and male children. This is a tempered view of the cause of child and family disturbance during deployment. Rather than attributing adjustment problems to poor caretaker adjustment this study seems to attribute
difficulties arising out of a deployment to the detrimental adjustment changes in the child and family.

**Applewhite and Mays.** This literature review has addressed many topics concerning parental deployment. One issue that has not yet been specifically covered is maternal deployment. In this study, Applewhite and Mays (1996) investigate the differential effects maternal and paternal deployment have on child psychosocial adjustment. In their literature review, Applewhite and Mays note that very little systematic research in the area of maternal deployment has been conducted. They review the results of two previously conducted studies on this topic. The first study they review examined the effects of maternal deployment on the children of 19 female veterans who had served in World War II (Stolz, 1951). The results of this study indicated that maternal separation is much more disturbing to children than separation from the father, particularly when in the father's absence, the mother is able to shield the child from her own anxieties surrounding the deployment. Under favorable paternal deployment circumstances, the children were described as being content. However, maternal separation was found to result in predictable patterns of behavior disturbance. Infants who were separated from their mothers due to maternal deployment developed into shy, fearful, worried children. In older children, separation due to maternal deployment created a time-limited fear that the mother would not be returning. The second study of maternal deployment reviewed by Applewhite and Mays (Kelley et al., 1994) addressed the concerns of 118 female Navy personnel who were preparing to leave on deployment. These women were found to experience increased levels of tension and anxiety.
particularly around the issues of their role as parents and disciplining their children. Additionally, single mothers preparing for deployment exhibited increased anxiety concerning the adequacy of the care their children would receive in their absence. This study did not address the actual reactions and adjustment of the children to their mother's deployment.

Based on the assumption that a disruption in the child's primary attachment relationship will result in disturbed adjustment (see Bowlby, 1973, 1988), Applewhite and Mays hypothesized that children will be more disturbed by maternal absence due to deployment than paternal absence due to deployment. Applewhite and Mays expected to find the disruptions frequently associated with parental deployment in larger amounts in military children experiencing maternal deployment. Applewhite and Mays justify this as a crucial area of study due recent demographic changes in the military. They point to the all-volunteer, largely married military force that has developed since 1973 as major reason for explaining the increased number of children facing parental deployment. They point out that during Operation Desert Storm approximately 37,000 children experienced the deployment of one or both parents. Applewhite and Mays also emphasize that even though women's enlistment in the military has grown from 2% to 12% in the past 20, and single mother homes represent 35% of all the single-parent homes in the military, very little is know about the effects of maternal deployment.

One hundred female service members were randomly selected from a housing list of families living on an United States Army post in Maryland. One hundred male service members, who were matched for military rank, were also invited to participate. Dual
military couples were excluded from this study. The resulting sample contained a total of 288 children ranging in age from 4-18 years. One hundred and thirty-nine of these children lived with a mother who was the military member and 149 lived with a military father. One measure addressing child psychosocial functioning, age at first separation of more than 30 days, and level of stressor events experienced within the family in the past 12 months was utilized. In order to tap all these variables, the measure combined the Psychosocial Functioning Inventory (Timberlake, 1979), the Family Stresses Index (McCubbin, Patterson, & Wilson, 1982), and questions written by the authors. The Psychosocial Functioning Inventory contains eleven subscales (e.g., self-image, peer relationships, self-control, motivation, handling learning demands, learning style, expression of feelings, indicators of physical health, handling academic content, learning approach, and adult relationships). This measure was completed by one or both parents in response to their memories of the target child’s first deployment experience. The target child was the child most recently experiencing his or her first parental deployment. This study did not directly involve the target child. The measure was mailed to participants and returned anonymously to the authors.

Initial analyses indicated that the military mother and military father groups differed in significant ways. A significantly higher number of the military mother children lived in single parent homes than did the military father children. In fact, the majority of children in the military mother group lived in a single parent home, while a majority of the children in the military father group lived in a two parent home. There were also significant differences in the 2 groups with regard to rank, with significantly more of the
military mothers being enlisted. Additionally, the two groups differed significantly on age at first separation, birth order, and number of moves such that: (a) children in the military mother group were older at the time of first separation (a little over 4 years-old for the military mother group versus a little over two years-old for the military father group), (b) more of the target children in the military father group were first-borns, and (c) in the military mother group there was significantly more variation in the number of moves experience by the family, whereas families in the military father group were more likely to have adhered to the average number of moves for the entire sample. What these differences suggest is that the military mothers in this sample tended to be single enlisted mothers, which insinuates that they may not have the social and financial resources available to the military fathers in this sample. Due to this, these woman may have attempted to guide (sacrifice) their career progression to fit their family situation. This could be accomplished by delaying deployment for as long as possible and taking or avoiding moves according to family needs (i.e., perhaps based on proximity to extended family, the noncustodial parent, etc.).

Despite these initial differences, absolutely no significant differences were found in the children's psychosocial adjustment as a function of which parent was deploying. In other words, in this study, the effects of maternal deployment on children's adjustment was no worse that the effects of paternal adjustment. In critiquing their study the authors indicate that their lack of findings could be due to methodological concerns such as inadequate sample size and a possibly non-representative cross selection of families due
to poor return rates of the surveys. The authors also suggest that the retroactive nature of the data collection may have influenced parental report of child disturbance. It might added that lack of child self-report may have influenced the report of symptoms (Jensen et al. 1989, 1996). Additionally, the caretaker during the deployment and not the deployed parent might have been a more accurate source of child response to the deployment. The authors conclude that in practice their results could be appropriately used to help deploying military mothers allay their guilt and anxiety over leaving their children.

Summary

A review of the literature concerning the effects of parental absence due to military deployment indicates that adjustment problems are common, but usually temporary. Commonly reported complaints include sleep disturbances, increased somatic complaints, an increase in both externalizing and internalizing behaviors, increased aggression, clinging behavior with the custodial parent and other attachment figures, and sex-role confusion in males. It seems that TDYs are likely more difficult for younger children and males, and that less TDY is probably better for all children. Additionally, the literature stresses that it is difficult to separate which behavior changes are due to the actual deployment and which are due to increased stress on the part of the custodial parent and/or the family system as a whole.

In spite of the provision of detailed descriptions of behavior disruptions likely to occur during parental absence due to TDY, the results of many of the studies presented in the literature review should be tempered by the presence of methodological problems.
First, few of the studies emphasize the age/developmental stage of the children experiencing parental deployment. This is critical because children's reactions to parental deployment are likely to differ vastly according to age. While a four year old may experience increased bed-wetting and clinging behavior with the custodial parent, an adolescent may become increasingly absent from the home as he or she seeks extra-familial adult support. Second, many of these studies do not differentiate between the effects of deployments of different lengths. For example, a four week deployment is probably not going to result in the same type or intensity of adjustment problems and reunion difficulties as a one year deployment. Third, most of these studies are not theory-driven or empirically based. The results are often descriptive and explanations are assembled post-hoc. Interventions, when offered, are piecemeal. The lack of theory is most noticeable when comparing results across articles because the lack of a uniform vocabulary leaves a lot of interpretation to the reader. Additionally, it seems that many of the stringently conducted studies of military children occur during war time or under extreme circumstances, such as missing in action parents. While providing useful insight, studies conducted in times of national and family duress may not inform our understanding of the majority of military deployments that occur during peacetime.

A Review of Stress Theory

No matter how defined, stress is nearly an inevitable part of life (Walker, 1985). Frequently when speaking of stress one is referring to certain events or hassles. In fact, individuals seem to carry around archetypes of events that are generally considered stressful events. For example, the in-law visit, moving, being fired or laid off, and illness,
especially when prolonged or severe, are considered events that would be stressful to
most. While researchers continue to demonstrate that the accumulation of stressful
events over time contributes to both physical and psychological problems (Johnson,
1986; Lazarus, 1991), it is anecdotally obvious that not all individuals respond to similar
stressor events in the same way. This is where stress theory makes its entrance. Stress
theory provides a model for examining the influence of mediating factors in determining
differential individual outcomes to similar stressor events. Specific mediating variables
examined in a stress theory paradigm include: the characteristics of the stressor event,
available coping resources, and cognitive appraisals (i.e., personal definitions of the
amount of threat created by the stressor event) surrounding the event.

Stress Models

McCubbin and Patterson. McCubbin and Patterson (1983) delineate the
components of the double ABCX model of adjustment and adaptation. This model takes
Hill's (1949) ABCX model of family stress one step further in that it investigates the
levels of readjustment or maladjustment following the initial stressor. The A factor
comprises the actual stressor event. For example, news of an impending deployment or
the actual departure of the military family member may represent a stressor event.
McCubbin and Patterson distinguish between stressor events and hardships. Stressor
event is defined as:

A life event or transition impacting upon the family unit which produces, or has the
potential of producing, change in the family social system. This change may be in
various areas of family life such as its boundaries, goals, patterns of interaction, roles or values (p. 8).

Hardships are demands placed on the family by the stressor event. For example, an impending deployment may require a family to seek legal counsel in terms of updating wills and obtaining powers of attorney. The B factor is composed of resources that the family has available to help them manage the fallout of the stressor event. For example, a handy neighbor who is willing to help with yard work may be a valuable asset to a family about to experience the departure of their military father (if he is the one who usually handles yard work). However, many stress theorists have emphasized [cf., Hill's (1949) study of military families] that some of the most important stress resistance variables are comprised of less tangible resources such as family integration, organization, and shared affection. Shared goals, economic interdependence, and common interests are also important contributors to family stability in times of stress. The C factor is the appraisal or definition of the stressor event. Using the impending deployment of the father as an example of a stressor event, families may appraise the deployment differently. For a couple who has been experiencing marital strain, a deployment may offer "time off" from their problems. However, for a family with an infant and a toddler, the loss of one parent to deployment may create serious obstacles to maintaining the family’s level of organization (Kelley, 1994). The important caveat here is even though society may have standards for determining the seriousness of a stressor event, the appraisal under discussion here is the individual’s or family’s subjective experience of the event.
Variables such as family values and goals as well as previous experience with stressor events help determine the level of threat assigned to the stressor event.

In discussing the X factor, which is the level of adjustment or maladjustment resulting from attempts to manage the stressor event, McCubbin and Patterson distinguish between stress and distress. Stress is “A state which arises from an actual or perceived demand-capability imbalance in the family’s functioning and which is characterized by a multidimensional demand for adjustment or adaptive behavior” (p. 9). McCubbin and Patterson emphasize that stress has to be distinguished from the stressor event, which may or may not cause stress. Distress involves an unpleasant or disorganized state which arises from an actual or perceived imbalance in family functioning and which is also characterized by a multidimensional demand for adjustment or adaptive behavior. The distinguishing characteristic between stress and distress is valance. Whereas stress is not necessarily unpleasant, distress is marked by negative affect. Additionally, neither stress nor distress automatically arise from a stressor event. Rather, the valance of the stressor event is designated during the appraisal process. The stressor event coupled with family resources (B factor) and appraisals (C factor) results in a state of stress or distress which may or may not invoke a crisis (the X factor). Crisis occurs when the family is unable to adjust or adapt to the demands of the stressor, possesses inadequate resources or is unable to effectively utilize the resources available to it, or is unable to define the situation in such a way as to stave off distress. In other words, crisis results from an inability to restore stability to the family unit.
As conceived by McCubbin and Patterson, the double ABCX model incorporates four additional factors that contribute to family readjustment or maladjustment over time. These additional four factors are: the pile-up factor (aA), family adaptive resources (bB), family definition and meaning factor (cC), and family adaptation balancing (xX). Pile-up refers to the fact that crises rarely occur in isolation so that a family is likely to be managing more than one stressor event at a time. Pile-up also refers to the fact that a crisis may beget more crises. For example, if an enlisted military member worked a night or weekend job to make extra income his or her deployment may cause the family economic hardship. Pile-up stressors originate out of five sources: the initial stressor and its hardships, normative transitions, prior strains, the consequences of family efforts to cope, and ambiguity at both intra-family and societal levels. Both the hardships incurred by a stressor event and family efforts to cope with the stressor may contribute to pile-up. For example, it was mentioned previously that deployment may create economic hardship for families that lose additional income in the military member’s absence. If these families deal with the anticipatory stage of the deployment by taking an expensive family vacation, they may soon realize that their effort at coping with anticipatory anxiety magnified their economic concerns. Pile-up may also occur when issues from previous stressor events has not been adequately resolved. For instance, if one spouse was unfaithful during a previous deployment, news of an impending deployment may create heightened anxiety and resentment. Normative developmental events can also contribute to pile-up. For instance, parental deployment at a major transition time such as starting school or graduating from school, may result in increased stress because the
family must not only manage the stress inherent in a developmental transition, but must also coordinate efforts to cope with the deployment. Finally, ambiguity contributes to pile-up. Ambiguity is a likely component of any stressor event as coping efforts may change roles, family rules and norms, or goals. The ambiguity associated with a stressor event may not only affect relationships within the family, but may also cause confusion when interacting with the community. For example, a military spouse whose partner is on deployment may have socialization needs similar to those of a single parent. However, even though living alone, the waiting spouse is still married, making many forms of adult socialization inappropriate.

The family adaptive factor (bB) examines the role of expanded family resources in contributing to the family’s adjustment over time. Expanded family resources include resources that are developed or strengthened as a result of the stressor event or its pile-up. For instance, to better manage economic hardship created by a deployment, the custodial parent could seek employment so as to bolster the family income. According to McCubbin and Patterson, one of the most important resources available to families is social support. Spouses who are experiencing severe loneliness due to a deployment could avail themselves of military spouse clubs, church groups, or parent-day-out activities to bolster social support. The cC factor of family definition and meaning refers to family efforts to define the stressor event leading to the crisis and the ensuing pile-up in such a way as to: encourage a coherent understanding of the stressor event that incorporates the events leading up to the stressor event and the consequences of the stressor event, decrease the emotional pitch surrounding the stressor event, and
effectively moving on and restoring family stability. The family adaptation balancing factor (xX) examines the post-crisis adjustment of the family to determine if balance at three intersecting points is achieved. The three intersection points involve the individual family member, the family system, and the community in which the family resides. Bonadaptation is achieved when balance is achieved and maintained at each of these three intersections. Bonadaptation is marked by the maintenance of family integrity, the promotion of positive development for both individual family members and the family unit, and the maintenance of family independence and control over environmental autonomy. Maladaptation results when imbalance occurs at the intersections. Maladaptation is characterized by a deterioration in family integrity, demise in the personal health and development of individual family members or the family as a whole, and a loss of familial independence and environmental autonomy.

Mederer and Hill. Mederer and Hill (1983) present a slightly different application of stress theory in their discussion of how stress theory can be used to provide a process vehicle for understanding normative family development transitions. Specifically, these authors suggest that a shortcoming with family development theory (for further information see: Cater & McGoldrick, 1989; Rodgers & White, 1993) is that while sufficient attention has been given to the characteristics of each developmental stage, the processes moving families from one stage to the next have been neglected. By coupling family stress theory with family development theory, we are provided with a means for understanding how families move in and out of transition. In other words, family development theory is a “stage discrete model” while stress theory is a “stage transitional
model," combining the advantages of each model allows for a more complete understanding of family adjustment and adaptation to stress over time. Combining stress theory with family development theory also accounts for variation among families with regards to "smoothness of transition" (i.e., why do some families adapt easily to normative transitions while others have more difficulty). The coupling of stress theory and family development theory also permits an analysis of the effects of non-normative stressors that are likely to influence family development. Finally, incorporating stress theory into our understanding of family coping over time challenges the notion that families enter periods of transition with equal amounts of family stability and adaptability and that families exit a transition period with equal amounts of these variables, or even with the same amount of stability and adaptability they entered the transition period (i.e., family adjustment could be lower or higher than the pretransition period). In other words, stress theory offers a way to address individual differences.

In reviewing how stress theory could supplement family development theory, Mederer and Hill discuss some caveats of stress theory that may redress areas of weakness in the family development model. Unlike family development theory, the events studied in a stress theory paradigm often have different origins. While family development theory tends to be concerned with normative events signaling a change in family developmental period (i.e., age of oldest child, employment status of the breadwinner) stress theory often examines acute, unexpected, or prolonged chronic stressors that impact family stability. These acute, chronic, or otherwise unpredictable stressors can arise from within the family system, be imposed from outside the family (as
might be the case with most deployments), result from changes in the psychological or physical needs of family members, or can be imposed by the larger societal context.

Mederer and Hill point out that unlike family development models, in which a transition phase is assumed to cause at least temporary family disorganization, in stress theory models stressor events cannot be assumed to cause a need for family reorganization. They emphasize that in some instances, the level of family disorganization caused by a stressor event may be determined in part by the amount of pile-up the family is experiencing. Of two families experiencing the same stressor event, the one with more pile-up issues may experience more distress. Mederer and Hill also accentuate that just because a family enters a period of “crisis” or a period with heightened needs for family reorganization, this should not be assumed to be detrimental. Sometimes, a family crisis is an impetus to positive family change resulting in enhanced family adjustment. In a final aside concerning the delineation of the stressor event, Mederer and Hill stress that it is crucial to attempt to not confound the stressor event with its hardships, and the stressor event and its concomitant hardships with the crisis factor. All three components are independent factors and the presence of one does not automatically herald the presence of the others.

In their discussion of how family resources and appraisals mediate whether a stressor event results in crisis, Mederer and Hill note that it is likely that resources and appraisals are the actual vehicles that launch the family into transition and predict family outcome in dealing with the stressor event. Important resources mentioned by Mederer and Hill include: individual family member’s personal resources, the family system’s
internal resources, social support, and coping. The amount of these resources available for family use combined with family appraisals likely determines if the transition period is rough or smooth. For example, a military family that appraises an upcoming deployment as a time of heightened loneliness and anxiety, but also believes it will be able to successfully meet family member's needs during the deployment, and has the resources available to continue fulfilling important family functions in the military member's absence, will probably adjust better to deployment than a family that makes high threat appraisals and has fewer available resources for maintaining family integrity.

Walker. In her discussion of stress theory, Walker (1985) presents an interesting critique of shortcomings of the way in which stress models are usually applied to families dealing with a stressor event. What follows is a brief review of her suggestions for updating the model. With a Bronfenbrenner (see Bronfenbrenner, 1986) flare, Walker implores one to: more carefully define the stressor event, take a contextual approach to the study of family resource and appraisal variables, and consider the impact of macrolevel variables on individual family members and the family system as a whole. Walker gives special emphasis to the common mistake of measuring variables at one level and unwarrantedly extrapolating them to another level (i.e., assuming that the resources of an individual family member contribute to the resource variables available to the entire family.)

Walker argues that the defining of the stressor event in traditional stress models has been short-sighted and often uninformative. In Walker's contextual conception of stress management, it is nearly futile to identify a singular stressor event. According to
Walker, stressor events are constantly occurring under the maxim that life is constantly filled with stress. The identification of specific stressors often results in an arbitrary assignment of responsibility for family stress or distress to one variable. The arbitrary nature of the identified stressor event coupled with the common confounding of the stressor event, hardships, and resulting stress or distress makes the identification of a specific stressor event nearly impossible and of not much predictive utility in determining family adjustment outcome. Walker suggests that rather than focusing on one stressor event as a locus of family stress or distress, researchers need to incorporate the occurrence of daily hassles and long-standing issues that likely effect the family’s reaction to events. Also, the specific aspect of the stressor event that taxes the family should be considered. For example, is it financial hardship, lack of social support, or concerns of infidelity that contribute to the stress/distress caused by a deployment. Additionally, more attention should be directed at identifying at what point in time the stressor event gained its potential to cause family stress/distress. Was the potential of an impending deployment to cause family stress/distress initiated in childhood when one spouse experienced a parental extramarital affair, was it at the time of notification of the deployment, was it when the non-military spouse was laid off in the middle of the deployment, or was is a difficult reunion. As these questions are difficult to adequately answer, Walker suggests that we focus on honing our conception of the resource and appraisal components of the stress model which according to her are likely more informative in understanding family outcome.
In expanding one's view of resources or, "those things that help a family cope with a stressful event" (Hill, 1949, p. 830), Walker suggests we attend to three domains: the importance of individual resources, individual resources and coping responses, and family resources. Walker’s admonishments regarding resources can be summarized by this statement: do not assume that resources that facilitate individual coping facilitate family coping. In other words, resources measured at one level should not be extrapolated to other levels. For instance, Walker addresses the common mistake of assuming that the stressor event produces crisis and a motivation for reorganization to equal degrees in all family members. It is possible that a stressor event may not invoke crisis in all family members. Some family members may remain impervious to the stressor or only be indirectly strained by the stressor to the degree that other family member’s coping efforts negatively impact them. In a similar vein, Walker emphasizes that the resources that are salient and available to individual family members may not be available for family utilization. For individuals, the most important resource variables include: perceived social support, opportunities to express feelings and reactions to the stressor event, an ability to find meaning in the event, and prior experience with stressors. Family resources are more than the accumulation of each individual’s resources and include things like interdependence, integration and adaptability, affection, pride in family tradition, and sharing of common activities and goals. One can easily surmise how individual resources may impede family resources. For instance, an individual family member’s need to ventilate negative feelings concerning the stressor event may undermine family-level unity of goals and feelings of interdependence.
In her discussion of appraisals, Walker reiterates the futility of accepting that individual appraisals inform the family appraisal. Walker emphasizes the need to accept the possibility of multiple working appraisals surrounding a singular crisis event. Walker notes that little effort has been put forth in examining how a family appraisal is formed. Walker also notes that although individual and family appraisals may be the most important factor for determining family outcome in a stress model, they have been the least validly studied.

Walker states that the most important addition that could be made to the stress model is a consideration of the socio-historical context. Not only do macrolevel socio-cultural variables impact whether an event is considered stressful within a particular time period, but the social institutions with which an individual must interact may facilitate or impede the attainment of important resources and goals in managing the event. For instance, Walker notes that while Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome has been associated with combat experience in other wars this century, it was not until the Vietnam Conflict that it was officially recognized as a legitimate stressor. The socio-historical context is also likely to circumscribe what resources are available to members of different subgroups and communities. For example, being a member of a military community extends different resources for coping with parental absence due to deployment than might be available if the absent spouse worked for different employer. In sum, Walker suggests that the stress model could be enhanced by being more careful to separate individual and family resources and appraisals and the inclusion of macrolevel variables that influence family coping processes.
McCubbin and McCubbin. In a later discussion, McCubbin and McCubbin (1987) further expand on the ABCX model to bring us the T-Double ABCX model. This model examines two possible avenues of family reaction to a stressor event and delineates the variables that, in addition to the variables contained in the original ABCX model, inform our understanding of family adjustment to a stressor event. The two possible avenues of family reaction to a stressor event are adjustment and adaptation. An adjustment reaction involves a normative event that is more aptly described as a transition rather than a crisis. The type of coping responses required to manage an adjustment transition requires little direct action and frequently involves avoidance, elimination, or assimilation behaviors.

Adaptation occurs in response to a non-normative event and can best be described as a crisis. The types of coping responses involved in effectively managing a crisis involve direct and active changes to the family unit. It is reasonable to surmise that healthy responses to adjustment and adaptation situations probably involve different mediating variables. Before specifying what these variables might be, it should be stressed that the additional variables considered in the adjustment and adaptation phases are added onto the original Double ABCX model, so that with more detail, the variables involved in determining responses to stressor events of varying magnitudes can be specified. Three variables are added to the Double ABCX model when specifying the components of the T-Double ABCX model. These three variables are: family vulnerability (factor V), family typology (factor T), and the PSC factor which describes the family’s problem-solving and coping skills used in dealing with the stressor event and its concomitant hardships. The V and T factors intervene between the stressor event (factor A) and the
family’s resources and appraisal of the stressor event (B and C factors respectively).

The vulnerability factor represents the family’s current interpersonal and organization structure and is determined in part by current levels of pile-up and the family’s developmental stage. For instance, a military family, that is experiencing its first parenthood and has experienced a series of pile-up stressors such as death of a parent/grandparent as well as a recent relocation, may be more vulnerable to negative outcomes when dealing with normative transitions and crises. The family typology factor categorizes “A set of basic attributes about the family system which characterizes and explains how a family typically appraises, operates, and/or behaves” (p. 5). Identifying a family’s typology is assumed to provide a basic framework for predicting how the family will respond to a stressor event and likely outcomes of such coping responses. The PSC factor describes family management of the stressor event via problem-solving and coping. McCubbin and McCubbin define problem-solving as, “The family’s ability to define the stressor and the situation into manageable components, to identify alternative courses of action, and to initiate steps to resolve the discrete issues and ultimately to resolve the problem” (p. 11).

Coping is defined as:

The family’s strategies, patterns, and behaviors designed to maintain or strengthen the organization and stability of the family unit, maintain the emotional stability of the family unit, maintain the emotional stability and well being of family members, obtain and/or utilize family and community resources to manage the situation, and initiate efforts to resolve the family hardships created by the stressor/transition. (p. 11)
The PSC factor intervenes between family resources and appraisals and the amount of stress or distress caused by the stressor (X factor). In other words, this variable operationalizes how family resources and appraisals, as filtered through family vulnerability and typology, is translated into an outcome variable (X factor).

In terms of the processes involved in adjustment and adaptation responses, adjustment responses usually require very little change to the family structure or organization level because the family has adequate resources to allocate to the problem and therefore a threat-harm or threat-loss appraisal pattern is unnecessary. In other words, in an adjustment situation, the problem is not defined as a situation calling for more resources than the family has readily available therefore nullifying the need for extensive problem-solving and coping behaviors.

The family adaptation response model can be described as a longitudinal model whose purpose is to describe how families adjust over time to a crisis situation. The purpose of examining mediating variables at this phase is to monitor and describe long-term family adjustment to an event that is expected to require serious changes in the family structure. Specifically, the adaptation phase of the T-Double ABCX model answers post-crisis questions regarding: (a) additional life stressors and pile-up which may influence the family's ability to achieve adaptation, (b) the psychological, family, and social factors the family utilizes in order to achieve adaptation, (c) the processes by which families facing a stressor event come to achieve successful adaptation, and (d) the outcome of the above-mentioned efforts. This phase of the model is more concerned with eventual family adjustment outcome than the initial stressor event. The components
examined in the adaptation phase are added onto the variables outlined in the adjustment phase model. The goal of the adaptation model is to determine which variables predict the XX factor. The XX factor describes the family’s long-term adjustment to the crisis and the possibility that the family’s response to the crisis recycles the family into further crisis or a state of complete exhaustion. One of the first contributors to family outcome is the pile-up associated with the original stressor event. As mentioned in the discussion of the adjustment model, pile-up contributes to family vulnerability which when combined with family typology, sets the stage for family resource utilization and appraisal making. In considering the resources available to the family, this model incorporates the effect of community resources and supports (the BBB factor) on the family’s perceived supports. McCubbin and McCubbin define community resources and supports as, “Those characteristics, competencies, and means of persons, groups, and institutions outside of the family which the family may call upon, access, and use to meet their demands” (p. 18). Health care professionals, religious groups, and schools may be sources of community support. McCubbin and McCubbin point out that community resources may even be extrapolated to include government polices that foster healthy family development. It would seem that the BBB factor incorporates the macrolevel variables Walker (1985) suggested should be included in a complete discussion of family response to the stressor event. In the adaptation response model, an additional factor is also added to the appraisal factor. This new factor (the CCC factor) considers the contribution of global appraisals and schemata to appraisals of discrete stress events. The beliefs about shared purpose, collectivity, frameability, relativism, and shared control are
considered more stable than the appraisals surrounding a specific stressor event and likely inform appraisals of the stressor event under consideration. The BBB and CCC factors, through their contribution to the resource assessment and appraisal processes, indirectly contribute to the problem-solving and coping skills factor, which is the factor that directly feeds into the level of adaptation achieved following a crisis. As mentioned previously, it is possible that the family, having not achieved satisfactory adjustment, will recycle through the adaptation process a second or third time. It is assumed that if an acceptable level of adaptability cannot be achieved, the family will enter a period of exhaustion and probable disintegration.

Two Influential Pieces

The conception of stress theory that primarily influenced the design of this study was based largely on the works of Boss (1988) and Lazarus and Folkman (1984) (see Thompson, 1995 for a complete review). What follows is a brief discussion of the components of each piece that were most informative in designing the present study.

**Boss.** A review of Boss provides information about the salient antecedents and the nature of the stressor event or A factor (parental military deployment in this study). Specifically, Boss discusses the external and internal contexts which describe the context the family finds itself in when learning of an impending deployment, and salient characteristics of the stressor event. By delineating the family's place in time at the advent of the stressor event and the nature of the stressor event the family is facing, Boss sets the stage for examining how the stressor event might be perceived and responded to.
The external context is comprised of five dimensions that are considered to be beyond the family's control. These five dimensions are: the historical, economic, cultural, developmental, and hereditary dimensions. The historical, economic, and cultural dimensions describe conditions proscribed by the larger community and/or society. The developmental and hereditary dimensions originate from within the family, but are still considered beyond the family’s control. The historical dimension describes the macro historical events that shape the contingencies under which the family must operate. The economic dimension describes the financial solvency of the community/larger society in which the family lives. The cultural dimension describes the societal values and expectations that guide family behavior. If the family is not only influenced by the values of the dominant culture but also by a subculture, the effects of the subculture must also be considered. The developmental dimension describes the stage in the family life cycle in which the family is embedded when the stressor event occurs. For instance, terminal illness of a spouse is different when it occurs with young children in the house than when it occurs during retirement. The hereditary dimension describes those constitutional and temperamental factors that are assumed to influence reactions to stress and are presumably determined by genetic factors. Taken together, these five dimensions comprising the family's external context describe the place and time the family finds itself when the stressor event occurs. These dimensions of the external context also suggest constraining or facilitating factors through which the family must filter the stressor event.

Specific examples of how these five dimensions of the external context likely effect military families follows. The historical dimension likely affects the degree to
which the family's affiliation with the military is salient. For example, during the World War I and II eras, Vietnam, and Desert Storm, having a family member in the military was probably much more salient than was having a family member in the military during the 1970's. Families with military members likely feel more threatened during wartime than during peacetime. The economic conditions may affect the degree to which putting up with the sacrifices of military life are outweighed by the financial security associated with military jobs. For instance, during times of widespread financial trouble and unemployment, having Dad away three months of the year is likely considered a smaller sacrifice to ensure a roof over one's head and meals on the table. However, when good-paying jobs that involve less family sacrifice than military jobs are readily available, the military lifestyle may not seem quite as appealing. The developmental dimension describes the family's place in the family life cycle when deployment occurs. As one might imagine, if a deployment causes a parent to miss the births of his children, special birthdays (i.e., first or 16th), or landmark events like confirmation or graduation, the deployment may cause more family stress than if it had occurred during some more mundane time in the family life cycle. The hereditary dimension of the family's external context may interact with membership in the military in interesting ways. For example, a family with a chronically sick child or a family that is plagued by multiple illnesses each winter, may truly appreciate the low-cost health care available to military families. On the other hand, a family of generally healthy individuals may find their routine encounters with the bureaucratic military medicine machine infuriating. Coming from another direction, families with strong constitutions (i.e., lesser tendency towards somatization)
may cope better with the chronic stress conditions imposed by military life than families in which physical tolerance to stress is not as high. From a cultural perspective, the military lifestyle imposes the constraints associated with being the member of a subculture. Military families, especially those living overseas, may find themselves at odds with the community around them. Even within the United States, military families often live far from their region of origin (i.e., a New Englander may find herself in the Deep South). This may lend some explanation as to why military families are often isolated from the community in which they live (Montalvo, 1976). Additionally, the norms and mores of the military often clash with those expressed in the wider society. For instance, while body piercing may be all the fashion, the military subculture may frown upon military members and dependents who attempt to emulate this look.

The internal context in which the stressor event unfolds is described by three dimensions that are considered to be within the family's control. These three dimensions are the structural, psychological, and philosophical dimensions. The structural dimension refers to the form and function of family boundaries, role assignments, and rules for determining who is within the family and who is not. With regards to military families, a salient example of family structure discussed in the military literature review is the psychological presence of the absent military parent in the home and the ability of the custodial parent to fulfill both expressive and instrumental functions (Boss, 1976). The psychological dimension describes how a family perceives, defines, and assesses a stressor event. The psychological component houses the appraisal process and as such renders a subjective judgment of the impending deployment. For instance, the family may
arrive at one of three primary appraisal types when assessing the likely impact of a deployment: harm/loss appraisal, threat/stress appraisal, or challenge/stress appraisal. The type of appraisal arrived at determines the valance associated with a stressor event and the resource and coping options that will be seen as viable. The philosophical dimension defines the value system within a particular family as well as the family schema. For instance, many military families highly value patriotism and "service before self." While military deployments might still be painful for these families, they can at least feel pride in partaking in a mission that supports values that are important to them. As with the dimensions of the external context, the dimensions of the internal context help us understand the framework the family brings to the stressor event and based on the constraining or facilitating forces within these contexts, the course of action might be taken for managing the stressor.

Having reviewed factors contributing to where the family is at the time of notification of an impending deployment, the discussion moves to types of stressor events. Boss (1988) differentiates between twelve types of stressor events. Four of the twelve, which most readily apply to the context of families experiencing military deployment, will be reviewed. The four types of stressors are: external, chronic, ambiguous, and non-volitional. Preemptively, it should be stated that these four categories of stressor events do not accurately categorize every deployment or each family's particular experience with a particular deployment, but in general these categories are sufficient for describing most deployments.
External stressors are events over which the family has no control and which begin with someone or something outside the family. This is often the case with deployments in that the family is not included in making the decision as to whether their loved one will deploy. Occasionally, the military member volunteers for a particular deployment or remote assignment (i.e., a one-year assignment to a location that it is not possible to bring family). When deployment is optional, it is hoped that the family was at least consulted by the military member before making the decision. Often, deployments can also be described as non-volitional. In other words, the family has not actively pursued the separation as a family might pursue buying a car or moving. As a result, family resources may not be concentrated in the direction of supporting a deployment when the news of an impending deployment arises. Chronic stressors are those that are ever-present and/or of long duration. It is fair to classify deployment as a chronic stressor not because military members are always or even usually deployed, but because the threat of deployment is always present. Further when deployment does occur, it is usually of a considerable duration, making the actual deployment a long-standing problem to manage. Ambiguous stressor events are those in which gaining adequate information about the stressor event is near impossible. Such stressors are described as unclear and this is frequently the case with deployments. Often, the exact time of the service member’s departure is open to multiple changes, thus making it difficult for family members to say good-bye as good-byes may be cut short by hours if not days or prolonged to the same degree. Occasionally, for security reasons, family members may not even know the location where the military family member is deploying. Return dates
can be even more flexible than departing dates, making it difficult for family members to make reunion plans. There is also the ambiguity associated with not knowing how fast mail will travel back and forth and how frequently telephone calls will be placed. These characteristics of deployment may make it difficult for military families to perceive deployments as manageable events. The nature of the stressor event coupled with each individual family’s external and internal contexts sets the stage for understanding how different families respond differentially to deployment.

Lazarus and Folkman commence their discussion of the components of stress theory with a discussion of the preeminence of the psychological dimension over the physical dimension in understanding individual’s reactions to stressor events. The physical nature of an event describes the objective aspects of an event. These objective aspects are measurable facets of the situation and could be agreed upon and verified by most perceivers. Delineating the psychological dimension of a stressor event is the focus of stress theory. The psychological aspects of the event involve each individual’s subjective assessment of the situation and include cognitive appraisals and personal vulnerabilities that cause certain individuals to be more prone to suffering the negative consequences of the stressor event. For instance, in the current study being male, younger in age, or experiencing greater amounts of parental absence due to military deployment are personal vulnerabilities considered riskier for deleterious outcomes.

Lazarus and Folkman also discuss the primacy of appraisals in understanding how similar stressor events render different individual outcomes. They address two types of
appraisals: primary appraisals and secondary appraisals. Primary appraisals are personal assessments of the level of threat imposed by the stressor event. There are three types of primary appraisals: harm/loss primary appraisals, stress/threat primary appraisals, and stress/challenge primary appraisals. The first two types of primary appraisals are associated with negative valance and may result in poor coping outcomes, the third type, stress/challenge primary appraisals, are associated with more positive valance and are likely to result in positive coping behaviors that foster personal growth and development.

Lazarus and Folkman speak of commitments and beliefs as powerful determinants of the level of threat associated with a stressor event, and thus the ensuing type of primary appraisal. Commitments and beliefs influence appraisals by determining what is salient to an individual in a particular encounter. Commitments and beliefs not only determine the individual's understanding of the event and the emotional responses and coping behaviors that go with it, but commitments and beliefs also determine how individuals evaluate the outcomes of their coping behaviors (i.e., was the coping response successful). In distinguishing commitments from beliefs, Lazarus and Folkman note that commitments have a motivational aspect and help sustain coping efforts. Commitments also reflect values and may be emotion-laden. Beliefs on the other hand, are more cognitive in nature and are in essence affectively neutral. Beliefs concern what one thinks is true or not true. Commitments concern what one prefers or considers desirable. Beliefs may regulate emotion, but beliefs themselves are affect free. Lazarus and Folkman note that it is difficult to determine how an individual arrived at a particular
primary appraisal without understanding the beliefs and commitments that guide the individual's goal-oriented behavior.

Like Boss, Lazarus and Folkman give attention to salient situational factors that may press the appraisal outcome. The five situational factors influencing the outcome of the appraisal process are: novelty, event predictability, temporal factors (i.e., imminence, duration, and temporal uncertainty), ambiguity, and timing. Due to the unique aspects of military family life, it is relevant to discuss these situational variables in some depth. Lazarus and Folkman define novel situations as ones with which the individual has no previous experience. It is expected that a completely novel situation will not generate threat/stress appraisals or challenge appraisals because the individual will not have the information or expectations necessary to generate these appraisals. However, it is rarely the case that a situation is completely novel as direct experience with a scenario is not required to formulate expectations about it. Additionally, most situations bear some resemblance to situations the individual has encountered before and individuals carry around a schema of general knowledge that enables them to generate predictions about how events will turn out. For example, when facing a first deployment a military family may look to the experiences of neighbors who have experience with deployments to guide what types of appraisals they should make and what types of resources they can use to manage the impending deployment. Lazarus and Folkman state that predictability implies that there are predictable environmental characteristics that can be discovered, discerned, or learned. It is assumed that high predictability is a very desirable situation factor. In support of this, animal studies have indicated that organisms prefer longer,
stronger, more densely signaled shock over shorter, weaker, less densely unsignaled shock. In other words, animals would rather endure a more aversive but predictable stimulus, than a more benign but unpredictable stimulus. Lazarus and Folkman suggest that predictability is desirable because it provides two important pieces of information: control over the environment and feedback.

Two aspects of controllability are particularly salient in the appraisal process. These are event predictability and field-dependent versus field-independent cognitive processes. Event predictability describes the likelihood of an event occurring. The determination of this likelihood can occur through either subjective or objective cognitive processes. Objective probability refers to the statistical probability of an event occurring. For example, a 50% chance of rain, or a one in a million chance of winning the lottery represent objective probabilities. Subjective probability refers to the probability an individual assigns to an event. Although individuals may realize the chances of winning the lottery are one in a million, they may believe their personal chances of winning the lottery are higher or at least high enough to convince them that they should buy a ticket. One can imagine how subjective probabilities affect appraisal. Individuals may act very differently if they believe a very unlikely event is likely to happen to them or if they believe a very likely event is unlikely to happen to them.

Lazarus and Folkman also discuss the influence of field-dependence and field-independence orientations on perceived control. Field-independent individuals are those for whom the physical environment does not greatly affect their perceptions. On the other hand, field-dependent individuals tend to scrutinize their physical surroundings
more closely. Subjective probabilities for negative events tend to be higher for individuals who are field-independent, whereas field-dependent individuals tend to use cues from the environment to make more realistic probability estimates. For instance, a field-dependent individual may hear on the news there is a 15% chance of rain, look outside, see a clear sky and decide it is not necessary to pack an umbrella. On the other hand, a field-independent individual may hear there is a 15% chance of rain today, see the clear sky, yet still pack an umbrella for work. In sum, uncertainty associated with an event is salient in that when the certainty of an event is unknown individuals tend to find their anticipatory coping resources immobilized. Additionally, uncertain events are associated with vacillation between two or more alternative courses of action, which is a mental activity that can leave an individual too tired and confused to adequately muster anticipatory coping resources. Therefore, uncertainty is not considered facilitative of positive appraisal processes and resource management.

Lazarus and Folkman speak of three temporal factors influencing appraisal: imminence, duration, and temporal uncertainty. Imminence describes how much time there is before an event occurs or the interval during which an event is anticipated. Imminent events are associated with more intense and complex appraisals, whereas less imminent events are associated with less intense and complex appraisals. Research indicates that making appraisals under imminent circumstances is very stressful for individuals, particularly if the event is so imminent that it is impossible to make a well-thought-out decision. For example, an unplanned deployment (i.e., perhaps less than three days notice) is probably associated with less well-thought-out decisions than a
deployment in which adequate time to prepare has been provided. Lazarus and Folkman also speculate on the effect of having too much time to prepare for a stressful event. They suggest that while having a lot of time to prepare may allow for well-thought-out decisions, they review research that suggests that increased anticipatory time is associated with greater feelings of threat. Specifically, when the imminence associated with a threatening event is very low (i.e., a deployment that is six months off) individuals' stress levels tend to increase to levels similar to those experienced in higher imminence conditions. Lazarus and Folkman suggest this may be due to the fact that prolonged imminence allows individuals to ruminate about the event. As is the case with most of the background variables effecting perceptions and appraisals of the stressor event, the relationship between imminence and stress levels is nonlinear.

Duration refers to the time over which a stressful event lasts. For example, a final examination is a stressful event that lasts but hours, whereas many military deployments last for several months. As an example of how duration affects stress responses, Lazarus and Folkman address contrasting explanations concerning diminished stress responses to long-standing stressors. Selye's General Adaptation Syndrome is a stage-driven theory that concludes that exposure to prolonged stress will result in total exhaustion accompanied by a diminishment in response to the stressor. Folkman and Lazarus counter this argument by suggesting that diminishment of the response to a chronic stressor may represent effective coping strategies rather than complete exhaustion. They refer to this process as emotional habituation.
The final temporal factor discussed by Lazarus and Folkman is temporal uncertainty. Temporal uncertainty refers to not knowing when an event is going to happen. Lazarus and Folkman provide the examples of knowing your geographic region is under a hurricane warning but not knowing when the storm will hit, or being told that layoffs in your department are inevitable, but not being told when these layoffs will occur. It seems intuitive that the higher the level of temporal uncertainty the more stress the individual would feel. Lazarus and Folkman discuss evidence that supports the opposite, namely that high levels of temporal uncertainty are sometimes associated with lower levels of arousal than time-locked events (events in which the exact time of occurrence is known and inflexible). It is hypothesized that when temporal uncertainty is high individuals engage in more avoidance-type coping responses. These type of coping strategies are associated with lower levels of arousal. On the other hand, when individuals are faced with a time-locked event they tend to engage in high vigilance coping skills which are associated with high arousal.

Ambiguity refers to a situation in which the environment provides information that is insufficient or unclear in terms of making appraisals. Lazarus and Folkman distinguish ambiguity from uncertainty. Ambiguity arises from a lack of information in the environment. Uncertainty is a state internal to the individual that arises from conflicting goals, values, and commitments. For example, a military family may experience ambiguity because the time of the military member’s departure and the location of the deployment has not been exposed. Whether ambiguity is present, the family may experience uncertainty because they are not sure if the family functions that
the military member performs can be carried out successfully in the military member’s absence. Lazarus and Folkman note that whenever ambiguity is high person factors become much more salient in determining appraisals. This is because in an ambiguous situation the individual must infer or project meaning onto the situation. Therefore, in an ambiguous situation the role of personal efficacy beliefs, attribution styles, and existential beliefs may become more paramount in determining appraisals than the actual features of the stressor event. Lazarus and Folkman note that as with the other situational variables affecting appraisal there is a dual nature to ambiguity. Specifically, although ambiguity would seem to make a situation more stressful thus causing individuals to seek ambiguity reduction, this is not always the case, and in fact sometimes the opposite is true. By maintaining a sense of ambiguity about a situation individuals can maintain hope about the situation’s outcome and make appraisals that are less threatening to them.

Timing refers to the concepts and expectations individuals hold regarding when certain events will happen. For example, individuals expect to graduate from college by a certain time. Likewise, many individuals hope to wed and have children by a certain age. Timing issues become situational factors influencing appraisal when events become off-time (i.e., occurring earlier or later than expected.) Off-time events are stressful for several reasons. First, an event that happens too early may deprive one of suitable peer support. Second, off-time events may not provide one with adequate time to prepare for a new role. Third, off-time events can deprive one of the sense of satisfaction that would have occurred if the event had happened on-time. A military deployment may result in timing issues if for example it sets back or speeds up the time of a normative event. For
example, if a deployment excels or postpones a wedding date timing issues may become salient. Also, in the case of military deployments, timing issues can be construed to suggest that some times are more advantageous for deployments than others. When a deployment coincides with an important developmental event (i.e., the birth of a child) than timing issues may result.

The final topic Lazarus and Folkman discuss is the outcome of an individual’s primary and secondary appraisal processes in terms of coping functions. Primary appraisals address the level of threat or challenge the stressor event presents to the individual. Secondary appraisals address the question, “What can be done to manage the consequences of this stressor?” Secondary appraisals result from the appraisal process as it interacts with available resources is coping behavior. According to Lazarus and Folkman, coping behavior can render two functions: emotion-focused coping outcomes and problem-focused coping outcomes. Lazarus and Folkman state that emotion-focused coping outcomes are likely associated with higher levels of threat surrounding the stressor as this type of coping response is usually the result of an individual’s perception that little can be done to directly manage the stressor. Specifically, emotion-focused coping functions are behaviors and cognitive patterns that are palliative in nature and aim to control the valance and pitch of the emotional response elicited by the stressor event. Emotion-focused coping responses include tactics such as avoidance, minimizing, distancing, wresting positive meaning from the experience, and making normative comparisons that diminish the seriousness of one’s situation. Problem-focused coping functions are designed to manipulate the person or the environment in such a way as to
lessen the distress associated with the stressor event. This might be accomplished through weighing the pros and cons of various response possibilities, focusing on resource development, or changing one’s motivational orientation so that the loss/harm caused by the stressor event is reframed. In terms of the salience of emotion-focused and problem-focused coping in the current study, recall that the most frequent coping response in children experiencing a parental military deployment was emotion-focused coping (Hiew, 1992). However, Hiew also reported that children who utilized higher levels of social support resources made use of higher levels of problem-focused coping functions. The utilization of higher levels of problem-focused coping functions was associated with lower levels of acting-out behavior.

The contribution of Boss and Lazarus and Folkman. A review of Boss and Lazarus and Folkman seems to leave one with a sense that more questions have been proposed than answered. Despite the fluidity with which Boss and Folkman and Lazarus present their conceptions of stress theory, their discussion of contextual factors that influence stressor event perception and appraisal processes is worthwhile. The discussion of these contextual factors gives a sense that the stress theory paradigm is not based on inserting discrete variables into a logarithm that produces an answer regarding coping outcomes. Rather, this dialogue of contextual factors takes into account the complexity of understanding individual differences under similar circumstances. This is particularly important when dealing with a group that is a subculture or subject to different constraints than the majority. It is reasonable to assume that military life imposes different constraints than does civilian life, and that these differences best be considered
before embarking on an investigation of coping processes and outcomes within the military population.

**Stress Theory And This Study**

Throughout the literature review, the use of stress theory models to explain the effects of military deployment on children and the families in which they are embedded has been exemplified (Bowen, 1993; 1985; Hill, 1945, 1949; Jensen, 1996). Further, it is widely accepted that children are affected by stressor events, in that stressful situations have the potential to negatively impact physical health and psychological adjustment (for example, see Johnson, 1986). The historical precedent of using stress theory paradigms to study the effects of military deployment, coupled with research that indicates that stressor events are associated with heightened risk for physical and psychological problems, supports the appropriateness of using a stress theory paradigm to study the impact of parental military deployment on the present sample.

This study was initiated at the request of school personnel who attributed increased adjustment problems of students attending the school to increasing levels of military deployments. Therefore, the primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of occurrence of adjustment problems related to parental deployment and to describe what types of problems were most prevalent in this sample. The school personnel desired a theory-driven study which could capture in detail, the problems being caused by parental TDY. They intended to use the results of the study to develop and implement a research-based intervention program. Due to the fact that school personnel identified parental military deployment as the precipitating event to adjustment problems,
the stressor event was defined as the occurrence of a parental military deployment. Primary appraisals were defined as the level of distress caused by the parental military deployment. The level of distress caused by parental deployment was inferred from the level of student report of negative affect associated with TDY. In other words, higher levels of student report of negative affect associated with parental TDY were taken to indicate higher levels of stress surrounding the parental TDY. Secondary appraisal processes were directly assessed by asking students what they could do to make themselves feel better if a parental deployment caused them to experience loneliness, tension, and/or worry. Coping responses were coded for number of coping responses, coping function of the coping response (i.e., emotion-focused coping, problem-focused coping, or a mixed emotion- and problem-focused coping style), and social locus of the coping response (i.e., self, others, a mixed self- and other- orientation). Student coping resources were evaluated by asking students about perceived social support (Hiew, 1992; Reid et al., 1989; Werner, 1989). Perceived social support responses were coded for number of persons reported and the identity of these persons.

Additionally, parents and teachers were surveyed as a means of gaining insight into the context in which students’ experiences with TDY were occurring. Teachers were asked to rate students participating in the study compared to other students in their class on academic performance and personal adjustment. Parents were asked to report on the effect they perceived the school played in influencing their child’s adjustment to TDYs and their personal satisfaction with the way the school handled TDY-related issues. As previously discussed, it is probably not wise to assume that the conception of
the stressor event is the same across all contexts involving the individual (Boss, 1988; Walker, 1985). Verifying the multiplicity of perspectives within the context of TDY, it has been noted that student self-report of disturbance associated with TDY may not coincide with parent and teacher report of the disturbance caused by TDY (Jensen et al., 1989, 1996). It was expected that the collection of perceptual information from teachers and parents would aid in developing a richer context into which to place student self-report of TDY experiences. Additionally, it was hoped that teacher and parent report would shed light on problem-ownership issues in this sample.

A secondary investigation focused on developmental changes in student conceptualization of the emotions of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. The purpose of this investigation was to examine the ways in which students' sophistication of emotional conceptualization varies as a function of age, grade level, and gender and to examine the effects of non-TDY and TDY emotional experience on students' sophistication of emotional conceptualization. In terms of linking the emotional conceptualization investigation to stress theory, it was expected that level of emotional conceptualization sophistication would mediate or moderate characteristics of the coping responses and/or social support resource utilization, which in turn would mediate or moderate experiences with negative affect.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 55 students in grades K-5 attending a public elementary school on an United States Air Force Base in Southern Arizona. All students attending the school were invited to participate in the study via a letter sent home by the student’s teachers explaining the study to parents, see Appendix C for copy of the parental consent letter. The consent form attached to the bottom of the letter offered parents the option to grant permission, grant permission conditionally, or deny permission for their child to participate in the study. Parents were requested to return the letter to their child’s teacher regardless of whether they were granting permission. Students were included in the pool of participants if their parent had given permission for full-study participation. Of the 156 returned consent forms, 87 granted full consent to participate. In other words, approximately 56% of the returned consent forms granted permission for participation.

Of the 87 students with full permission to participate, 59 (67.8%) participated in either a pilot or experimental interview. There were two sample groups, a piloting sample and what came to known as the experimental sample. The piloting sample contained 16 (18.3%) of the students who had been granted permission to participate in the study. These students were not randomly selected for participation. The purpose of the piloting sample was to provide an opportunity to standardize the interview format and ensure that the questions were being presented in a developmentally appropriate
manner. The piloting sample also provided interviews upon which to pilot the coding systems. Of the remaining students with full permission to participate, 43 (49.4% of the original participant pool) were randomly selected for participation in the experimental sample. Analysis was conducted on the experimental sample. In other words, students with parental consent were not automatically enrolled in the study. This was done because it was felt necessary to add some form of control to biases that might have been working in the sample.

Piloting Sample

Sixteen (18.3%) of the 87 participants with parental consent took part in piloting of the interview format. It should be noted, that four of the pilot interviews could not be transcribed due to an audio tape problem that degraded tape quality to the point that transcribing was impossible. This left a total of twelve usable pilot interviews. Another caveat, is that the participants in the piloting sample were not randomly selected for participation. Rather, pilot participation was based on availability of students for scheduling. To this end, pilot students were volunteered by their teachers, adding further to the concern of bias in the piloting sample. It is possible that the pilot sample is biased with students who for one reason or another could easily be released from class and whose teachers, for one reason or another, felt they should be interviewed. Of the remaining twelve pilot participants, eight (67%) of the participants were males, and four (33%) were females. Six (50%) of the pilot participants were in kindergarten, four (33.3%) were in first grade, one (8.3%) was in second grade, and one (8.3%) was in fourth grade. In sum, the pilot interview participants were mostly male and in the lowest
grades. Although there were larger numbers of students in the lowest grades attending this school, that does not necessarily explain their inordinate representation in the pilot interview sample. Two alternate possibilities come to mind. First, pilot participants were selected by availability for scheduling. Scheduling students in the lower grades generally proved less problematic as missed class work could more easily be made up. It seemed that the nature of class work in the lower grades made it easier for teachers in those grades to accommodate student absence. In fact, several of the kindergarten teachers specifically stated that since it was kindergarten (emphasis theirs), classroom activities could be missed for a short period of time without detriment to overall student performance. In addressing the second alternative explanation for the pilot sample composition, the literature suggests that males and younger children have more difficulty coping with parental deployment, and it is hard not to notice that the pilot sample is largely composed of young, male students. Perhaps the lower grade teachers more readily volunteered their students for pilot participation because the effects of parental deployment were more pronounced in their classrooms.

**Experimental Sample**

Once piloting of the interview format was complete, eight students were randomly selected from each grade to participate in an experimental interview (i.e., one that would be coded with the piloted coding system and included in the data analysis). The only exception to this was in regard to fourth graders. The fourth grade was initially underrepresented in the sample. Specifically, only six fourth graders had consent to participate in the study. Two of the six fourth-grade students participated in the piloting
phase, however, one of these interviews was lost to a defective audio tape. The remaining four fourth graders were included in the experimental sample. In a stroke of incredibly bad luck, one of the fourth grade experimental interviews was also lost due to audio tape defect, leaving 3 fourth grade interviews in the experimental sample. Additionally, one of the first grade experimental interviews was consequently omitted from coding and analysis due to the fact that the student reported that she had never experienced parental TDY and was not able to provide coherent answers to many of the interview questions, including inquiries that were not TDY-related. Based on eight randomly selected students from kindergarten, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th grades, the three 4th grade students, and the 7 remaining 1st grade participants, the number of students participating in an experimental interview was 42.

**Background variables for the experimental sample.** Twenty (47.6%) of the 42 participants were males while 22 (52.4%) of the participants were females. Participant age ranged from 5 to 12 years-old. The mean age for participants was 7.9 years, which is approximately 7 years 11 months in age. Of the 41 codeable responses, the largest category of students by age (19.5%) was comprised of eight year-olds, the smallest number of students by age (2.4%) was comprised of twelve year-olds. Breaking the sample into 5-8 year-olds (61%) and 9-12 year-olds (39%), the sample is comprised of more students in the lower grades. For a complete breakdown by age, or any other variable discussed in this section, see Appendix I. In terms of breakdown by grade, 19% of the sample was composed of kindergartners, 16.7% of the sample was comprised of
first graders, 19% were second graders, 19% were third graders, 7.1% were fourth graders, and 19% of the sample was comprised of fifth graders.

The majority of the participants had one sibling (59.5%), the second largest category for number of siblings was two (23.8%). Four (9.5%) of the participants had three siblings, and three (7.1%) of the participants were only children. No participant had more than three siblings. In terms of birth order, the largest category of students were first-born children (45.2%). The second largest category of students was second-born children (28.6%), six of the participants were third-born children (14.3%), and two of the participants were fourth-born children (4.8%). The remaining three participants (7.1%) were only children. Excluding only children, approximately equal percentages of the sample were first-born versus other-born children (45.2% and 47.7% respectively).

Military family background variables for the experimental sample. In terms of which parent was the active-duty military member, the category receiving the largest number of responses was fathers with 76.2% of the participants reporting their father was the military parent. The second largest response category for military parent was mothers with 11.9% of the students reporting that their mother was the active-duty parent. Of the remaining 4 response categories, there was a less than 5% response rate in each (i.e., both parents, step-dad, step-mom, and other custodial relative). In terms of number of times the family had moved, of the 34 codeable responses, the category receiving the largest number of responses was 2-3 moves with 38.2% of the students experiencing 2-3 moves. The number of moves category with the second highest response rate was 4-6 moves with 29.4% of students reporting they had moved 4-6
times. Additionally, 20.6% of the students reported that they had moved one time, and
11.8% reported that they had never moved. No students reported moving more than six
times.

Participants were asked if it seemed to them like their military parent had gone on
many TDYs since moving to the study base. Of the 37 codeable responses, nearly equal
numbers of students reported that their military parent had, or had not, gone on more
TDYs since moving to the base. Specifically, while 51.4% of the students reported that it
seemed like their military parent had not gone on many TDYs while at the base, 48.6%
of the students reported that it seemed like their military parent had gone on many TDYs
since moving to the base. In terms of reporting whether the number of TDYs
experienced had changed since moving to the study base (i.e., did the student perceive a
significant change in family TDY load as compared to what had been experienced at
other bases), of the 17 codeable responses: 47.1% of the students reported that the
number of TDYs experienced at this base had decreased as compared to the TDY load at
other bases at which they had been stationed, 29.4% of the students reported that the
number of TDYs they had experienced at the study base seemed about the same as they
had experienced at other bases, and 23.5% of the students reported that the number of
TDYs they experienced had increased. A major impairment children experienced in
answering this question was that they either had not ever lived at another base or were
too young to recall TDY experiences at previous bases.

Duration of longest TDY experienced was broken into categories representing
typical TDY lengths. Duration of longest TDY ranged from 1-10 days to over one year
in length. The mean length for longest TDY was 3-4 months. The modal length was 2-3 months. Of the 35 codeable responses: 22.9% of the students reported their longest TDY experience as 2-3 months in length, 17.1% of the students reported their longest TDY as one year, another 17.1% reported that their longest TDY was 2-4 weeks in length, 14.3% reported their longest TDY was 3-4 months in length, another 14.3% reported that their longest TDY experience was one to 10 days in length, 5.7% reported that their longest TDY was over one year in length, and another 5.7% of the students reported that their longest TDY was 4-6 month in length. Less than 5% of the students reported that their longest TDY experience was between 6 and 12 months in length.

In terms of whether there was an impending or concurrent TDY at the time of the interview, 71.4% of the students reported that they were not experiencing or anticipating a TDY at the time of the interview, while 28.6% students reported that at the time of the interview, a TDY was impending or underway. In terms of gauging whether the student seemed resistant to answering the interview questions, 85.7% of the students were coded as not seeming resistant to participation, while 14.3% of the students were coded as seeming resistant to participation.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Individual Student Interview

Each student interview was conducted individually with only the participating student and interviewer present. All interviews were conducted by the author. Interviews took place outside of the classroom, usually in either the school counselor's office on days when that individual was working at other schools, or in a small "resource room".
The interviewer provided the principal with an advanced schedule of interviews for the upcoming week. The interviewer also signed in and introduced herself to the principal each time she entered the building. When the principal was not available the interviewer introduced herself to the school's administrative assistants. Interview times were arranged in advance with the teacher. Care was taken to not schedule interviews too close to lunch, recess, end of the day, during activities the students tended to mind missing (i.e., the most notable example was computer class), or during days with holiday celebrations, field trips, and other special activities. The interviewer attempted to work with teachers to ensure not only that student absence at the time of the interview would not be detrimental to academic pursuits, but that each interview was scheduled at an optimal time for student motivation to be high. The interviewer went to the classroom to pick up the student for the interview. On the way to the interview room, the interviewer would remind students of who she was and what they would be talking about during the interview. This was necessary for students from classrooms where the teacher did not initiate the introduction because in most cases it had been a couple months since the student returned the parental consent form. In cases where the student was previously apprised of the interviewer's identity and the purpose of the interview, the interviewer engaged the student in "small talk," usually regarding classroom activities that day, during the walk to the interview room. The interviewer also walked each student back to class following the interview. Returning the student to the class not only ensured that students returned to class in timely manner, but gave the student an additional opportunity to vent any emotions or comments about the interview or TDYs.
The interview lasted from 25 minutes to over an hour with an average length of approximately 45 minutes. The interview was designed by the interviewer with all questions theoretically based in the military or stress theory literature. The interview commenced with an introduction of the interviewer, an explanation of the purpose for the interview, and a review of the ways in which the student's anonymity would be protected. It was explained to students that measures were being taken to ensure that no one would ever be able to identify them as a participant in the study. Students were questioned to be sure they understood this important aspect of study participation. Additionally, students were admonished that their participation was voluntary and they had the right to refuse to answer any question they found uncomfortable. All interviews were recorded on audio tape. Students were informed that they were being taped prior to the initiation of any questions. Prior to the commencement of the interview questions, students were provided an opportunity to express any questions or concerns the introduction had brought up.

With the introduction completed, the interview questions commenced. Interview questions were broken into eleven domains: background information (i.e., general and military family background), loneliness, anxiety/tension, worry, depression, separation anxiety, guilt, perceived social support, somaticization, classroom issues, and student feedback regarding interventions that could help alleviate the distress caused by parental TDY. The six emotion states under investigation can be further categorized by: (a) non-TDY versus TDY emotional experience, (b) coping responses generated to the emotions, and (c) emotional conceptualization. The majority of the interview questions
involved an examination of the student's emotional experience during parental TDY.

Interview items concerning these behaviors were based almost exclusively on typical behavior disruptions noted in the military literature as being likely during parental TDY. The expression of these emotions, when not based on descriptions from the military literature, was based on generally accepted psychological knowledge about these emotions (e.g., in the depression section items regarding sleep and eating disturbances were included as it is generally accepted that disturbances in these domains may be a manifestation of depression). Besides surveying the incident and nature of emotional disruptions caused by parental TDY, characteristics of the coping responses used to manage the negative affect associated with these emotions and perceived social support were assessed in the areas of loneliness, anxiety, and worry. Characteristics of the coping responses were derived from responses to the question, “What could you do to make yourself feel better if you were feeling _____?” in terms of: (a) number of coping responses generated, (b) coping function of the coping responses (i.e., emotion-focused, problem-focused, and mixed emotion- and problem-focus), and (c) the social locus of the coping responses (i.e., self-oriented response, other-oriented response, mixed self- and other-oriented response). To survey perceived social support, students were repeatedly asked who they thought could help them if they were experiencing a particular emotion due to a parental TDY. Later in the interview, students were asked to recap all the people who could help them out if they were having a hard time with a parental TDY. This recap not only provided an opportunity to verify people who had
been previously mentioned, but also allowed for the investigation of others who might not have been previously thought of.

What follows is a brief description of the material covered in each of the eleven interview domains. For a full-description, see Appendix B for the interview format. The background section was initiated with school-related questions concerning the student’s grade level and things he or she liked and/or disliked about his or her grade level in school. Next, sibling information was covered with an emphasis on number and ages of siblings. Questions about pets were asked between the sibling questions and military background questions, not only to provide the interviewer and student a chance to establish rapport over a topic that many people find easy to talk about, but also to provide students with a little break from what could be seen as intrusive questions. The military background questions including things such as which parent served in the military, number of moves the student could recall, and descriptive information on TDYs including the student’s perception of the parent’s recent TDY schedule and longest TDY the student recalled experiencing. The background section was concluded with a brief discussion of “what a regular day is like for the student” and how a regular day might be changed if the child’s military parent was TDY.

The loneliness domain, as was true for the majority of the other domains, started with questions regarding the student’s general experience with the emotion, phrased as, “What is it like to feel lonely?” and “How do you act when you are lonely?” Students were asked next: if they felt lonely specifically when their military parent was TDY, if there was a particular time they felt most lonely, and what could make them feel better if
they were lonely. The anxiety/tension domain included: a general assessment of whether
the student could recall having felt nervous before, a survey of non-TDY topics that
evoked feelings of nervousness, and an examination of how the student acts when
nervous. Anxiety questions then shifted to a discussion of topics that generated TDY
anxiety and the expression of anxiety during a TDY. Additionally, within the
anxiety/tension domain, students were asked, “What’s good about being nervous?” and
“What’s not so good about being nervous?” These questions were asked to get a handle
on how students think about anxiety in terms of whether children perceive anxiety
differently than adults, who mostly seem to find anxiety an aversive affect that should be
reduced. Tension levels were evaluated as a subcategory of anxiety, with the assumption
that tension represents a more cognitive and internalizing domain of the general emotion
of anxiety. Tension was presented to the students as similar to being “stressed out”.
Students were asked if they had experienced a number of behavioral and cognitive
indicators of tension, during times when their military parent had been TDY. The anxiety
section closed with a discussion of what students could do to reduce anxiety levels. The
worry domain opened with a discussion of whether the student had ever felt worried and
topics that generated non-TDY worry. Additionally, students were asked questions
about experiencing recurrent or obsessive thoughts. The objective of these questions was
not only to get a perspective of topics that caused the students excessive concern, but
also to identify students who worried more than the norm before attempting to delineate
why some students worry more than others during TDY. The worry questions followed
the same format as the other emotions discussed so far with an emphasis on topics that
cause worry during TDYs, and coping responses the student could use to reduce TDY-related worry.

Due to the widespread mention in the military literature of increased health problems during TDY, the interview addressed health issues next. Students were first asked if they thought they were generally healthy. Then students were quizzed regarding whether they frequently experienced during TDY six ailments mentioned in the military child literature: stomach aches, sore throats, fatigue, colds/flu, allergies, and asthma. Students were probed to be sure report of an ailment represented a problem that occurred with some intensity or regularity during TDY as opposed to an isolated event (e.g., "I once had a stomach ache during a TDY"). The final question in the health status domain addressed whether students perceived that they were sick more frequently when their military parent was TDY. The next interview domain addressed depression. This domain, as with most of the others, started with questions regarding if the student had ever felt depressed (or sad for a very long time), and what had been the source of the sadness. The student was then asked if prolonged sadness had ever occurred during a TDY. With regard to TDY depression, students were asked at what point in the TDY process (i.e., predeployment, departure, the deployment phase, or reunion) was the sadness the worst. Students were asked if their sadness improved over the course of the TDY, remained constant, or worsened. Students were also questioned regarding what phase or part of the TDY was hardest for them independent of depression levels. Students were also asked to explain why, in their opinion, that was the hardest part. This question was asked to try to get a grip on how and when the TDY was difficult
independent of feelings of TDY depression. The remainder of the depression questions focused on behaviors considered covert expressions of depression such as: increased frequency of crying during TDY, sleep and eating disturbances during TDY, and the ability to enjoy previously enjoyed activities during TDY.

The next domain addressed in the interview was perceived social support. Throughout the interview, students had been asked in nearly every emotional experience section what they could do to make themselves feel better when a parental TDY caused emotional disturbance, and who might they rely on to help them with these coping responses. However, the perceived social support section specifically addressed the number and identity of people the student reported as being able to provide him or her with social support. Students were asked first to generate a list of social support providers. Then, the interviewer questioned the student regarding persons the student had not mentioned (e.g., “Now what about your teacher could she help you out if a TDY made you feel bad?”), as well as people the student had mentioned previously, but had failed to mention in response to this particular question (e.g., “Earlier when we were talking about people who could help you out when you were lonely, you mentioned your baby sitter, do you think he could help you out with TDYs?”)

Also within the perceived social support domain, students were asked about whether they had regular household chores, and if these chores changed when their parent went TDY. Students were also asked if they ever felt guilty for not helping their custodial parent enough during a TDY. As declines in family organization were mentioned in the literature as being symptomatic of familial difficulties in managing the
military parent's absence (Kelley, 1994), the household chores questions were asked as a proxy for determining changes in family organization during TDY.

The domain of separation anxiety was investigated next. Students were first asked if they ever felt "clinging" or resistant to leave their parents' presence. Then they were asked if this ever happened when their military parent was TDY. As a means of verifying this information, students were asked if they checked in more (i.e., touched base) with their custodial parent during TDY and if their preferred location for play changed during a TDY (i.e. in the custodial parent’s presence versus outside of the parent’s presence). The last two questions in the separation anxiety section addressed whether students ever found it difficult (i.e. anxiety-producing) to come to school during a TDY and if they perceived that they intentionally spent more time with their teacher during a TDY.

The next interview domain addressed TDY-induced confusion as it relates to school performance (Mitchum, 1991). Students were asked if they were regularly prepared for class, able to keep track of directions, and get their school work done on-time. Students were also asked how these school-related behaviors might change if their military parent was TDY. Students were asked whether listening to and successfully carrying out directions given by their teacher was difficult during TDY. Students were also asked how they enjoyed spending recess and if these activities were still enjoyable during a TDY.

The next interview domain addressed guilt. Students were asked: if they knew what guilt was, if they had ever felt guilty, and what had caused them to experience
guilty feelings. Students were then asked if they had ever felt guilty during a TDY and what had caused them to feel this way. In the final section of the interview, students were questioned about what the adults in their lives, with an emphasis on the adults at their school, could do to help them cope with TDYs. Special emphasis was given to obtaining student opinion regarding an in-school support group for students with TDY parents. At the conclusion of the interview, students were asked if they had any questions for the interviewer, and assured that if they thought of some later they could tell their teacher and the interviewer would be available to talk to them again. Students were offered stickers and pencils to thank them for their participation.

Teacher Survey

The purpose of the teacher survey was to get a feel for how teachers viewed participating students' academic performance and personal adjustment, and how teacher perceptions mapped onto student self-report of adjustment. The expectation was that with the teacher feedback, it would be possible to get a better grip on problem-ownership of TDY-related problems than could be determined by student self-report alone. Additionally, it seemed important to determine if the students reporting higher levels of TDY negative affect tended to be viewed by their teachers as generally lower in academic performance and/or personal adjustment (i.e., were students who indicated TDY adjustment problems rated by their teachers as globally less well-adjusted).

Initially, each teacher who had students participating in the study was asked to rank order study students as compared to their classroom peers on the variables of academic performance and personal adjustment. The teachers were instructed that even
though study students were to be ranked in comparison to their classroom peers, information was only to be provided on study participants (i.e., no information was being obtained on students without parental consent). The teachers were also assured that the information would be kept in strictest confidence. Teachers were solicited for this information either before or after school so as not to disrupt class, and a confidential drop box was placed in the main office near the teacher mailboxes so that returning the information to the author would be convenient for teachers. Teacher cooperation with this request was low. Of the 14 participating teachers, only 4 (28.5%) completed the task.

In response to the low return rate, the teacher survey was redesigned to create what was hoped would be a more convenient and less ambiguous task, see Appendix D for teacher survey. A pencil-and-paper survey, designed to take 3-5 minutes to complete, was left in each teacher's mailbox. Each survey contained the names of participating students and two Likert-type scales next to each name. One of the Likert-type scales addressed student academic adjustment, and the other Likert-type scale addressed student personal adjustment. Each scale offered teachers the option of rating each student as “Above Average,” “Average,” or “Below Average” in each of the two domains. Teachers were instructed to rank study students in comparison to their classmates. The drop box was left in the main office. Forms that had not been returned within a week were directly solicited by the author either before or after school. With the new format, data were successfully collected for all pilot and experimental students participating in the study.
Parent Survey

The purpose of the parent survey as to ascertain parents' perceptions of the role school played in helping their child adjust to parental TDY and to map this information onto students' self-report of the role of school in helping them adjust to parental TDY. Parents were also asked about their level of satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY. The satisfaction information was intended to not only provide concerned school personnel with a feel for how parents thought they were doing with regards to managing TDY-related problems, but also to compare student and parent report of school efforts. After obtaining student home phone numbers from school attendance cards, a script was designed in order to administer each parent survey over the phone in identical format, see Appendix E for a copy of the parental phone survey. In addition to designing an introduction and two multiple response questions addressing the role of school attendance in facilitating TDY adjustment and parent satisfaction, the author designed pat answers to probable parent questions that presented issues of confidentiality (i.e., questions about how their child responded and requests for general results). After practicing the script sufficiently to achieve uniformity, the author placed calls to each student's home between the hours of 5-6 PM and 7-8 PM on week nights. If no one could be contacted at the number the author called back another day. After two attempts to the same phone number, the author left a message on the answering machine with the author's home number and a request to return the author's call. In eight instances (13.5 % of entire sample), the parents could not be reached by phone because they had moved. In each of these eight instances, a survey and a self-addressed, stamped...
envelope was sent to either the forwarding address left with the school or the family's local address in hopes the survey would be forwarded to the new address. Three (37.5%) of the eight mailed surveys were completed and returned. In total, 54 (91.5% of total sample) parent surveys were completed.

When parents were contacted by phone, they were thanked for allowing their child to participate in the study, and asked if they would answer two quick questions; the telephone survey was designed to take approximately 3-5 minutes. In no instance did the parent refuse to participate. The first question asked about the effect attending school had on the child during a TDY. Optional responses included: “No effect,” “Makes things worse,” and “Makes things better”. The second question addressed parent satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY. Optional responses included: “Parent is satisfied” and “Parent is not satisfied.” Two additional responses had to be added due to frequency of these responses. These two additional responses were: “Parent has no opinion” and “Parent does not believe it is the school’s place to deal with TDY”. At the conclusion of the phone call, the author informed parents that a copy of their child’s permission slip would be sent home as a receipt of their child’s participation in the study. Parents were also offered a timeline of when the study would be completed.

After data had been collected on all three measures (i.e., the student interview, the teacher survey, and the parental phone survey), copies were made of all parental consent forms giving permission for student participation. The copied forms were returned to participating students' teachers and sent home with students.
Data Management

Transcribing and Verification

Each interview was recorded to an audio tape, and each audio tape was transcribed by a professional and reputable transcriber with long-standing experience transcribing data for the type of study under investigation. Upon return of the transcribed interviews, the author listened again to each interview, and compared the transcription to the taped interview. The purpose in doing this was fourfold: (a) comparing the audio tape to the transcribed interview verified that the interview had been accurately transcribed (b) the comparison of audio tape to transcript afforded an opportunity for the author, with her greater familiarity with the interview content, to fill in pieces of conversation that the transcriber may not have been able to decipher, (c) the comparison allowed the author to be sure that the “essence” of each student’s self-report was captured in the transcript, and (d) the comparison gave the author an opportunity to refamiliarize herself with the data set before commencing any coding or analysis plans.

Coding

The coding system was comprised of two parts which were coded separately, see Appendix F for a copy of each coding system. In other words, each interview was coded twice. The Part I coding system addressed background information and student experiences with parental TDY. Within the Part I coding system, 187 variables were assessed. The content of these 187 variables was reviewed in the discussions of the interview format, teacher survey, and parental survey. As the data were largely qualitative, the coding system rendered mostly categorical variable values. It took
approximately 60 minutes to apply the Part I coding system to an interview. The Part II coding system addressed student conceptualizations of the emotions discussed in the interview (i.e., loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, depression, and guilt). This information was pulled from students' responses to questions about non-TDY emotional experience. Special care was taken to be sure coded responses in Part II could not be attributed to parental TDY. A rule of “no double-dipping” (i.e., coding the same information in both coding systems) was strictly enforced; see Appendix G for the Code Book. The specific information coded in the Part II coding system addressed the following topics: (a) had the student ever experienced the emotion in question for a non-TDY reason (b) student word knowledge for the emotion (i.e., student can define the word, student states he or she can use the word in a sentence, but cannot offer a verbal definition, student states he or she has heard the word, but does not know what it means), (c) type of definition offered (i.e., abstract, intrapersonal, interpersonal, or bodily/concrete) (d) accuracy of the definition, (e) behavioral expression of the emotion (i.e., internalizing versus externalizing behavior), and (f) congruency between verbal and behavioral report. Additionally, in the anxiety, worry, depression, and guilt domains, topics causing the emotion under non-TDY circumstances was recorded. In all, 68 variables were coded for each transcribed interview. It took approximately 30 minutes to apply the Part II coding system to an interview.

Reliability for each coding system was established in an identical manner. Each coding system was piloted on the 12 pilot interviews. During the piloting of the coding system, each interview was coded by the author and a second independent coder. When
each coder had independently coded the interview, a reliability check was conducted, see Appendix H for piloting and experimental inter-rater reliability coefficients for both coding systems. As an aside, coding variables were entered in Excel 7.0 with each coder using a separate workbook. This eliminated redundancy in both recording coded variables and data entry and saved considerable typing hours. A logarithm was entered into the Excel program that allowed the inter-rater reliability coefficients to be figured by the computer, thus reducing the effects of human error. Upon learning the inter-rater reliability coefficient for the interview being piloted, the two coders would review items upon which there had been disagreement. When agreement could not be easily met, a coding rule was created for that case of question, see Appendix G for the Code Book. The coders went through each pilot interview in this manner until all twelve pilot interviews had been coded. Acceptable inter-rater reliability was set at 90% inter-rater agreement. At the completion of the piloting phase, the grand mean of inter-rater reliability coefficients was 88.3% for the Part I coding system, and 87.8% for the Part II coding system. In consultation with the dissertation advisor, it was decided that these coefficients were close enough to 90% to proceed with the coding of the experimental transcripts. The author coded every transcript (total 42) in the experimental set. The experimental transcripts were broken into sets representing tenths of the entire set of transcripts (i.e., approximately every 8 transcripts). When a complete set of interviews had been coded, one transcript in the set was randomly selected for a reliability check. The second coder would then independently code the selected transcript and a check of the inter-rater reliability coefficient was conducted in the manner described above. The
experimental inter-rater reliability checks were conducted with the understanding that if any of the inter-rater reliability coefficients were below 90%, all the transcripts in that set would be dual-coded until acceptable reliability could be reestablished. Though none of the inter-rater reliability checks on the experimental transcripts were below 90%, the two coders continued to discuss items that were not agreed upon, and made additional coding rules as necessary. These new rules were then applied to previously coded transcripts and the remainder of the data set.

Analysis Strategy: Descriptive Statistics

Format

The descriptive results are broken into four sections: (a) non-TDY emotional experience, (b) TDY emotional experience, (c) TDY experience in other domains, and (d) teacher, parent, and student perspectives. The purpose of the descriptive statistics is to provide the reader with a picture of the TDY experience of the typical student in this study. The idea is to get a feel for how the students responded to the interview questions without regard to individual differences. In other words, the descriptive results are intended to provide information about how the students in this study generally experienced TDY. To this end, for each coded item, the reader is provided with the number of codeable responses for that item and a breakdown of student responses per level of the coded item. This breakdown is provided as percentages. A rule of five percent was established, such that within a coded item, coding levels capturing less than 5% of the total responses for that item were excluded from report. On noted items, there were multiple, independent coding levels, making it possible that students could respond
to more than one coding level for that item. Since on these items students could be
included in more than one coding category, the reported percentages may not sum to
100%. Readers preferring to review the descriptive frequencies in table format should
refer to Appendix I and Appendix J.

Student report of non-TDY emotional experience is presented first. The
information on non-TDY emotional experience not only provided a context into which
TDY emotional experience could be placed, but also provided information on emotional
conceptualization. In addition to providing information on the prevalence of non-TDY
emotional experience with six emotions (i.e., loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry,
depression, and guilt), the non-TDY emotional experience section also provided
information on five facets of emotional conceptualization. After establishing whether the
student had ever experienced the emotion under non-TDY circumstances, the student
response was coded for the following five pieces of emotional conceptualization
information: (a) word knowledge (i.e., student is able to offer a definition of the
emotion, student states he or she could use the word in a sentence, but cannot offer a
verbal definition, student states he or she has heard the word before, but does not know
what it means), (b) type of definition offered (i.e., abstract, intrapersonal, interpersonal,
or bodily), (c) accuracy of the definition (i.e., inaccurate, accurate, precise), (d)
behavioral expression of the definition (internalizing versus externalizing behavior), and
(e) congruency in verbal and behavioral reports. For a more detailed explanation of these
codes, see the Coding System Part II Appendix F, or the Code Book Appendix G.
Information concerning topics that created feelings of non-TDY anxiety, worry, and guilt is also provided in the non-TDY emotional experience section.

In the TDY emotional experience section, information about the prevalence of six emotions experienced under TDY circumstances is presented (i.e., loneliness, anxiety, worry, depression, separation anxiety, and guilt). Information about the characteristics of the coping responses used to manage the negative affect created by these TDY emotional experiences is also provided in the TDY emotional experience section. The following three characteristics of the coping responses are addressed: (a) number of coping responses generated in response to a specific emotion, (b) the coping function of the coping response (i.e., emotion-focused, problem-focused, or a mixed emotion- and problem-focused function), and (c) the social locus of the coping response (i.e., is the coping response directed at the self, others, or a mixed self- and other-orientation). For a more detailed explanation of these codes, see the Coding System Part I Appendix F, or the Code Book Appendix G. Additional information provided in the TDY emotional experience section includes: (a) reasons for loneliness during TDY, as well as information about the times when loneliness occurs, (b) topics invoking TDY anxiety and behavioral indicators of increased anxiety, (c) topics invoking TDY worry, and (d) the behavioral expression of TDY depression.

In the next section of the descriptive results four additional domains of TDY experience are addressed. These four domains are: TDY health status, TDY-induced changes in household chores, perceived social support in terms of number of persons available to provide social support and identity of these social support persons, and the
effect of TDY on school performance. The final section of the descriptive results addresses the perspectives of teachers, parents, and students with regard to TDY experiences.

**Analysis Strategy: Inferential Analysis**

**Experiment-wise Error**

When designing a research study, the objective often is to determine the influence of certain independent variables, which frequently take the form of intervention or treatment techniques, on dependent variables relevant to the outcome the intervention is designed to render. In order to have confidence that the results of such a study represent true effects of the independent variables, it is considered paramount that the research questions being addressed in the analysis have a theoretical basis, informed by a review of the literature of similar studies conducted by others, and that the analysis plan be spelled out a priori, especially in terms of expected results. Another important issue to consider when designing a study is how experiment-wise error, or the increased probability of type I errors that occurs with increased number of analyses conducted, will be controlled. A lack of a priori attention to controlling experiment-wise error is considered a sign of a poorly planned study or a poorly trained researcher (Keppel, 1991). One method for controlling experiment-wise error is to utilize planned comparisons. When this technique is used, the researcher specifies, prior to undertaking any analyses, the levels of the independent variable in which mean differences are expected to exert a statistically significant effect. Another technique for controlling experiment-wise error is to use a restricted alpha value, thus creating a more stringent
criterion for identifying a relationship as statistically significant. While both of these techniques will control experiment-wise error, thus increasing the confidence with which we might conclude that a statistically significant relationship represents a true effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, they also increase the probability of a type II error. However, in intervention or treatment studies, it is often deemed that not reporting a result that is statistically significant is less consequential than reporting a result that is incorrectly deemed statistically significant.

The Design of This Study

This study adheres to the hallmarks of properly conducted, theory-based research. Specifically, each interview question, and hence each analysis, was designed with special attention to the TDY literature, and where pertinent clinical judgment garnered from the interview process (i.e., insider information about how things might be working differently at this school compared to how things work in the literature.) Additionally, each analysis was spelled out prior to undertaking any analyses. Therefore, each analysis was judged to be potentially able to provide salient information on the way the students in this sample organized their TDY experiences and/or useful information for intervention design.

In terms of statistical strategy, this study used quantitative tools to organize patterns within a qualitative data set. The purpose of the analysis was not strict statistical procedure, but rather to use statistical tools to legitimately and with academic rigor identify patterns that organize students’ experiences with TDY and to eliminate patterns that do not organize these experiences. In other words, the purpose of this study was not
to examine the effect of different levels of an independent variable on a dependent variable, but rather to determine the extent and nature of a phenomenon deemed disruptive within the study school, and to locate variables that organize how this phenomenon is experienced by students. It does not seem practical to narrow this study to a simple cause and effect relationship involving a small number of variables; this study involves the examination of multiple variables. The complexity presented by this study should be expected as it is unlikely that the nature of a problem caused by the intersection of two salient membership groups (i.e., the family and the school) would be adequately described by a small set of discrete variables (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). If this study tests anything, it tests the veracity of the assumption that the effects of TDY in this school played out as they would be predicted to based on a review of the literature. But again, the primary purpose of this study was to provide a detailed description of the problem by judiciously using quantitative tools to organize qualitative data.

The reader will find that many analyses have been conducted, and if placed within a conventional statistics framework, this study would certainly be subject to criticism on the count of experiment-wise error. However, it is argued that in this study, concern was greater for type II errors than type I errors. Since this study was solicited by a school that had identified increasing TDYs as problematic, enough so that they were willing to solicit a study of the problem, it seemed important to make certain that a clear picture of the problem was obtained. This task was complicated by seeming discrepancies between student description of the problem and the description of the problem given by adults working in the school. Specifically, comparing student and adult report, it seemed as if
the issue of TDY was more problematic for the adults in the school than the students. Recall that Jensen et al. (1989, 1996) found that discrepancies in child and adult report surrounding the effects of TDY are not uncommon. However, Jensen et al.'s (1989, 1996) results suggested that adults tend to underestimate the level of distress children experience due to TDY. Therefore, in approaching the analysis it seemed important to be sure that in the interviewing process the students' report had not been wrongly judged so as to minimize their issues with TDY. Every chance was afforded to let the numbers identify the problem as it was explained by the adults in the school. Additionally, as this study involved real students dealing with an issue that had potential to cause disturbance in both their family and school lives, it seemed more ethical to be accused of overanalyzing the data without strict attention to experiment-wise error than of missing a salient aspect describing how the students' were organizing the issues surrounding TDY. However, it should be reiterated that the analyses undertaken were spelled out a priori and addressed variables that for theoretical reasons were believed to have high potential of organizing students' experience with TDY.

In sum, the object of this analysis was to use statistical analysis as a tool for locating variables that were important in understanding how these students organized their experience with TDY. Not only does this type of understanding contribute to the theoretical knowledge base about how TDYs affect elementary school students, but it also allows for recommendations to be made to school personnel about what types of TDY-induced behavior to expect from different categories of students and where intervention measures might be most effectively inserted. Although from a strictly
statistical standpoint the results could be argued as tenuous, I am not arguing for absolute statistical truth, but rather for the emergence of overall patterns that organize how the students in this study experienced TDY. In closing, I ask the reader to consider that in understanding how children organize their understanding of parental TDY and concomitant emotional experiences, nonsignificant findings may be as informative as statistically significant findings (Greenwald, 1975).

Another Analysis Issue That Needs Addressing

Another analysis design issue that needs to be addressed is whether the use of nested variables was warranted with regard to classroom effects. Due to seemingly divergent perceptions of the effect of TDY among teachers, and the seemingly discrepant reports between teacher and student TDY experience, it was deemed important to determine, prior to starting the analysis, if students in certain classrooms reported significantly more negative TDY affect than students in other classrooms. If such an effect was found, nesting of the classroom variable would be necessary. In order to determine if nesting of the classroom variable was necessary, six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher assignment and student report of TDY emotional experience. No statistically significant relationships between teacher assignment and TDY emotional report were found, indicating that it was not necessary to nest the classroom variable.

Format

Presentation of the results parallels the interview format. Staying within the framework of the interview, results are presented under three subcategories, (a)
emotional experience during TDY, (b) characteristics of student reported coping responses used to manage negative affect and perceived social support, and (c) developmental trends in emotional conceptualization. Within each subcategory, the primary independent variables of interest were: (a) age of the student, (b) grade level of the student, (c) student gender, (d) teacher report of student academic performance and personal adjustment, and (e) parental report of the effect of school attendance on their child's adjustment to TDY and parental satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY. Within the TDY emotional experience subcategory, analyses were conducted to examine how salient student background variables, including military family background variables, organized TDY emotional experience. Additionally, student TDY adjustment with regard to school performance, somatization, and household organization levels was addressed. Within the characteristics of coping responses subcategory, an investigation of how (a) the number of coping responses generated, (b) the coping function, and (c) the social locus of the coping response organized TDY emotional experience was pursued. Characteristics of the coping responses were analyzed for the emotions of loneliness, tension, and worry. Additionally, within the coping response subcategory, the importance of perceived social support on student emotional experience was addressed. Within the emotional conceptualization subcategory, key variables included: (a) student word knowledge of the emotion, (b) type of definition given for the emotion, (c) accuracy of the definition, (d) student report of behavioral expression of the emotion, and (e) congruency between the student’s verbal definition of the emotion and reported behavioral expression.
Except for the age variable, which was subjected to one-way analysis of variance, variables were subjected to either the Mann-Whitney U test or the Kruskal-Wallis test. The Mann-Whitney U test is a nonparametric parallel of the Independent Groups t test, and is appropriate for use when one or both of the sample sizes is less than 10 (Jaccard & Becker, 1990). The Kruskal-Wallis test is a nonparametric parallel of the one-way analysis of variance test. Presentation of the results is patterned after the format recommended by Jaccard and Becker (1990). When statistically significant results are reported, they are supplemented by an index of the strength of the relationship. The indices of the strength of the significant relationship include: (a) eta-squared used with the one-way analysis of variance test, (b) the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient used with the Mann-Whitney U test, and (c) epsilon-squared used with the Kruskal-Wallis test. Eta-squared and epsilon-squared can vary in value from 0 to 1, with larger values indicating greater strength of the relationship. The Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient can vary in value from -1.0 to 1.0 and is interpreted in the same manner as a Pearson correlation coefficient (Jaccard and Becker, 1990).

In order to apply statistical rigor to the process of discerning the nature of a statistically significant result found with a Kruskal-Wallis test, a Tukey HSD test was applied to the data to discern the nature of the significant omnibus test. Additionally, reported means for dichotomous variables reflect mean proportion scores. Mean proportion scores are obtained by averaging the scores within each level of the independent variable with the resulting score representing the proportion of students
responding affirmatively within that level of the independent variable. Means for scaled variables were figured in the standard way.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Non-TDY Emotional Experience

Loneliness. Starting with an examination of student report of non-TDY experiences with loneliness, of the 14 codeable responses, 71.4% of the students reported they had felt lonely for a non-TDY reason. Moving to an examination of student conceptualization of loneliness in terms of word knowledge for loneliness, of the 33 codeable responses: 87.9% of the students were able to offer a definition for loneliness, 6.1% of the students reported that although they could use the word in a sentence they could not verbally define it, and another 6.1% of the students reported that they had heard the word before, but did not know what it meant. With regard to type of definition given for loneliness, of the 29 codeable responses: 69% of the definitions were abstract, 20.7% of the definitions were interpersonal, and 10.3% of the definitions were intrapersonal. No bodily-focused definitions were reported for loneliness. Addressing the accuracy of the definitions, of the 29 codeable responses: 62.1% of the definitions were accurate, 27.6% of the definitions were inaccurate, and 10.3% of the definitions were precise. When asked to describe how they behaviorally expressed loneliness, of the 30 codeable responses: 80% of the students reported internalizing behaviors, 10% of the students reported externalizing behaviors, and 10% of the students reported a mix of internalizing/externalizing behaviors. In terms of congruency between verbal and behavioral report, of the 14 codeable responses, 92.9% of the responses exhibited
congruency between verbal and behavioral report of loneliness experiences. In sum, the majority of students coded for these items had experienced non-TDY loneliness, and were able to offer a definition for loneliness. These definitions tended to be abstract in nature. The majority of the definitions were accurate. Students tended to report expressing loneliness in internalizing ways and to exhibit verbal and behavioral congruency in their report of loneliness experiences.

**Anxiety.** Addressing non-TDY emotional experiences with anxiety, of the 38 codeable responses, 94.7% of the students reported they had felt anxious for a non-TDY reason. When queried as to the cause of their non-TDY anxiety, of the 36 codeable responses, the reasons given for non-TDY anxiety included: “other answers” (58.3%), see Appendix K for a list of these responses, school-related topics (30.6%), fantasy or self-generated topics (13.9%) (e.g., “At night, I am afraid there is someone outside my bedroom window”), family-related issues (11.9%), animals (11.9%), medical appointments and procedures (11.9%), and peer group-related issues (5.5%). It should be noted that on the non-TDY anxiety topics item, codeable students had the opportunity to respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%. When asked about behavioral expression of anxiety, of the 25 codeable responses: 72% of the students reported internalizing behavior, 24% of the students reported externalizing behavior, and a negligible percentage (< 5%) reported mixed internalizing/externalizing behavior. In sum, the majority of the students reported having felt anxious for a non-TDY reason and most frequently this anxiety was expressed in internalizing ways. The most frequently coded category for anxiety topics
was “other answers”. This seems to suggest that individual differences might have played
a central role in determining issues that caused students non-TDY anxiety. It is also
possible that the coding categories for this item were too inclusive to adequately capture
the range of topics that caused students anxiety.

Students were also asked their opinions regarding the emotional valance
associated with anxiety. Specifically, students were asked, “Is there anything good about
being nervous?” and “Is there anything not so good about being nervous?” Of the 40
codable responses to the question, “Is there anything good about being nervous?,” 80% of
the students responded with no. In other words, the majority of the students did not
see anything good about being nervous. Of the 37 codeable responses to the question,
“Is there anything not so good about being nervous?,” 54.1% of the students responded
with yes. In other words, slightly over half of the respondents reported that there is an
undesirable component to anxiety. It seems that in general these students associated a
negative valance with anxiety.

Tension. Turning to non-TDY emotional experience with tension, of the 28
codable responses, 71.4% of the students reported having felt tense or “stressed-out”
for a non-TDY reason. In terms of word knowledge for tension, of 17 codeable
responses: 64.7% of the students were able to offer a definition, 29.4% of the students
reported that while they had heard the word before, they didn’t know what it meant, and
5.9% of the students reported that they could use the word in a sentence, but they were
not able to offer a definition. Regarding the type of definition offered, of the 11 codeable
responses: 81.8% of definitions were abstract, 9.1% of the definitions were
intrapersonal, and another 9.1% of the definitions were interpersonal. No bodily-focused definitions were offered. In terms of accuracy of definition offered for tension, of the 10 codeable responses: 60% of the definitions were inaccurate, 30% of the definitions were precise, and 10% of the definitions were accurate. Of the 30 codeable responses regarding behavioral expression of tension: 56.7% of the students reported internalizing behavior, 36.7% of the students reported externalizing behavior, and 6.6% of the students reported mixed internalizing/externalizing behavior. Examining verbal to behavioral congruency for tension, of the 8 codeable responses, 62.5% exhibited congruency. In sum, the majority of students reported having felt tense for a non-TDY reason, and were able to offer a definition for tension. The definitions given tended to be abstract in nature, but not necessarily accurate. An interesting observation is that there seemed to be less variation in definition accuracy for tension, such that in the vast majority of cases the definition was either inaccurate or precise. This may suggest that tension is an emotion that students either know or do not know (i.e., steeper learning curve). The primary behavioral expression of tension was internalization, and the majority of the students exhibited congruency between their verbal report and behavioral expression.

Worry. Turning the investigation to emotional experience with non-TDY worry, of the 35 codeable responses, 91.4% of the students reported they had felt worried for a non-TDY reason. In terms of word knowledge for non-TDY worry, of the 30 codeable responses: 90% of the students were able to offer a definition, 6.7% of the students reported they had heard the word, but did not know what is meant, and a negligible
percentage (< 5%) of the students reported they could use the word in a sentence, but were not able to compose a verbal definition. With regard to type of definition offered, of the 26 codeable responses: 53.8% of the students offered an abstract definition, 26.9% of the students offered an interpersonal definition, and 7.7% of the students offered a bodily-focused definition. It should be noted that worry is the only emotion under investigation that registered a notable percentage of bodily-focused definitions. In terms of the accuracy of the definition for worry, of the 24 codeable responses: 45.8% of the definitions were accurate, 41.7% of the definitions were inaccurate, and 12.5% of the definitions were precise. In sum, the vast majority of the students reported having felt worried for a non-TDY reason, and were able to offer a definition of worry. While abstract definitions were the majority, interestingly, worry had the largest number of bodily-focused definitions of all the emotions considered under non-TDY circumstances. This may suggest that autonomic arousal is a salient cue in identifying an emotion as worry. The vast majority of the definitions offered for worry were accurate or precise.

In terms of topics inducing non-TDY worry, the 32 codeable responses included: family-related issues (53.1%), “other answers” (43.8%) see Appendix K for a list of these responses, school issues (21.9%), concerns over future TDYs (6.2%), and concerns regarding a specific peer (6.2%). It should be noted that on the non-TDY worry topic item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, the reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

**Depression.** Investigating non-TDY emotional experience with depression, of the 41 codeable responses, 61% of the students reported feeling depressed due to a non-
TDY issue. Delineating the topics associated with non-TDY depression, of the 23 codeable responses, issues causing prolonged sadness included: “other answers” (56.5%), see Appendix K for a list of these responses, loss of an extended family member (13%), loss of a pet (8.7%), and parental divorce (8.7%). It should be noted that on the non-TDY depression topics item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%. It is interesting to note that as with non-TDY anxiety, topics related to non-TDY depression may be largely influenced by individual differences, as evidenced by the large number of “other answers”.

**Guilt.** Turning to an examination of non-TDY emotional experience with guilt, of the 32 codeable responses regarding whether the student had ever felt guilty for a non-TDY reason, 53.1% of the students reported having felt guilty for a non-TDY reason. In terms of word knowledge for guilt, of the 27 codeable responses, 74.1% of the students could offer a definition. The remaining 25.9% of the students reported that while having heard the word before they did not know what it meant. With regard to type of definition, of the 20 codeable responses, 55% of the students offered an abstract definition, 25% of the students offered an interpersonal definition, and 20% of the students offered an intrapersonal definition. With regard to accuracy of the definition, of the 19 codeable responses, 47.4% of the definitions were inaccurate, 31.6% of the definitions were precise, and 21% of the definitions were accurate. As was the case with tension, it seems as if guilt may be an emotion that students either know or do not know, as evidenced by the large number of students who could not define it and the large
number of inaccurate definitions. Again, this may suggest that tension and guilt are "all or none" emotional concepts, such that students do not master them as early as other emotions, but when they do master these concepts it is a quicker process.

Examining non-TDY guilt-evoking topics, of the 12 codeable responses, topics causing non-TDY guilt included: family-related issues (50%), problems with a specific peer (25%), school-related issues (16.7%), and "other answers" (16.7%), see Appendix K for these responses. It should be noted that on the non-TDY guilt topics item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

**Emotional Experiences During TDY**

**Loneliness.** Of the 40 codeable responses to the question "Have you ever felt lonely during a TDY?," 82.5% of the students reported that they had felt lonely during a TDY. Students were asked to explain why they felt lonely during TDY or why they did not feel lonely during a TDY. In terms of explanations of why they felt lonely during TDY, of the 11 codeable responses: 36.4% of the students reported they were lonely because their TDY parent was a playmate, 9.1% of the students reported they missed their TDY parent because that parent had valuable resources that the custodial parent did not (i.e., someone to play football with, someone to talk over problems with in the case of a 5th grade girl whose mother was the military member, or in cases where the custodial parent was an English-as-second-language speaker, someone who could help with homework), and another 9.1% of the students reported missing their TDY parent because he or she helps prevents boredom. Addressing within the same 11 codeable
responses, explanations of why the students did not feel lonely during TDY: 18.2% of the students reported that they were not lonely for their TDY parent because they had the rest of their family members to keep them company, and 9.1% of the students reported that they did not feel lonely for their TDY parent because the parent would be home soon. In addition to reasons already reported for feeling lonely or not lonely during TDY, another 9.1% of the students responding to this item reported “other answers”. These responses can be found in Appendix K. It should be mentioned that on this item, codeable students could reply to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

Students were asked about the times when they felt lonely for their TDY parent. Of the 32 codeable responses: 40.6% of the students gave “other answers” concerning when they felt most lonely for their TDY parent, these responses can be found in Appendix K, 34.4% of the students reported feeling most lonely for their TDY parent in the evening, 21.9% of the students reported that they felt lonely for their TDY parent all the time, and a negligible percentage of the students reported feeling lonely for their TDY parent in the morning.

Turning to an examination of the coping responses use to manage loneliness, in terms of number of coping responses, of the 38 codeable responses: 57.9% of the students reported one coping response, 39.5% of the students reported 2-3 coping responses, and a negligible percentage (< 5%) of the students reported that there was nothing they could do to cope with their loneliness. With regard to the coping function of the coping response (i.e., emotion-focused versus problem-focused coping function).
of the 38 codeable responses: 94.9% of the coping responses were emotion-focused, and the remaining 5.1% of the coping responses were comprised of helpless or low-efficacy responses. In terms of the social locus of the coping response (i.e., self- versus other-oriented), of the 38 codeable responses: equal numbers of students relied on self-oriented or other-oriented coping responses for social support needs in managing loneliness (39.1% each). The remaining 20.5% of the students coded for this item reported using a mixed self- and other-orientation. In terms of the individuals towards whom the other-oriented coping responses were directed, of the 22 codeable responses: 50% of the other-oriented coping responses were directed towards peers, 31.8% of the other-oriented coping responses were directed towards the mother, another 31.8% of the other-oriented coping responses were directed towards siblings, 18.2% of the students reported relying on their pets when lonely, and 9.1% of the students reported relying on their fathers to help them out when lonely. It should be noted that on this item codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%. In sum, the vast majority of the students were able to generate a coping response for managing loneliness, and these coping responses were mostly aimed at managing the negative affect. The majority of the coping responses involved receiving social support from others; most notably peers, followed by mom or siblings.

Anxiety. Turning to TDY anxiety, of the 41 codeable responses to the question "Do you feel anxious when your parent goes TDY?,” 68.3% of the students responded that they had felt anxious during a TDY. Of the 22 codeable responses examining topics
causing anxiety during a TDY, the two most frequently coded categories were: fear of the parent on TDY being harmed or killed (41.7%), and harm to self or the family at home (16.6%). Additionally, 8.3% of the students reported “other answers” on this item, see Appendix K for these responses. It should be noted that on the TDY anxiety topics item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%. Students were also asked about their experiences with a battery of anxiety and tension indicators during TDY. The most frequently reported indicators of anxiety and tension during TDY included: difficulty sitting still (63.9% of 36 codeable responses), feeling of being tied in knots inside (52.8% of 36 codeable responses), increased crying (52.6% of 19 codeable responses), feelings of shakiness or trembling inside (50% of 26 codeable responses), and increased energy levels (46.9% of 32 codeable responses).

Turning to an examination of coping response characteristics for tension, in terms of the number of coping responses generated in reply to the question, “What could make you feel better if you were stressed-out or tense?,” of the 33 codeable responses: 72.7% of the students reported one coping response, and 27.3% of the students reported 2-3 coping responses for dealing with their anxiety. No students reported that nothing could be done in response to anxiety. In terms of the coping function of the coping response generated to tension, of the 40 codeable responses: 55% of the coping responses were emotion-focused, equal percentages of the coping responses were either helpless/low efficacy or problem-focused (20% for each coding option), and 5% of the reported coping responses utilized a mixed emotion- and problem-focused orientation. In terms of
the social locus of the coping responses for tension, of the 33 codeable responses: 57.6% of the coping responses were self-oriented, 33.3% of the coping responses were other-oriented, and 9.1% of the coping responses utilized a mixed self- and other-orientation. In terms of the individuals towards whom the other-oriented coping responses were directed, of the 11 codeable responses: 54.5% of the students reported relying on their mothers when anxious, equal percentages of students (27.3% for each of the three coding options) reported relying on their father, siblings, and/or peers for social support when they felt anxious, and 9.1% of the students reported relying on their pets for support when anxious. It should be noted that on this item codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%. In sum, all the students coded (79% of the sample) were able to generate a coping response for managing tension/anxiety. As with loneliness, the primary function of these coping responses was to manage negative affect. The majority of the responses were oriented towards the self. However, when social support was sought from others, mom was the first choice.

Worry. Examining student emotional experience with TDY worry, students were asked first about the occurrence of recurring thoughts. The emphasis of this question was not on TDY worry, but rather the goal was to get insight into the kinds of things that concerned these students outside of the TDY context. When asked if they had ever experienced recurring thoughts, of the 41 codeable responses, 70.7% of the students reported that they had experienced recurring thoughts at some time or another. In terms of the content of these recurring thoughts, of the 25 codeable responses: 48% of the
students reported "other answers," these responses can be found in Appendix K, 20% of the students reported they repeatedly thought of songs or nonsense-type thoughts, 16% of the students reported that they had recurring thoughts about home-related issues, and 12% of the students reported that they repeatedly thought about TDY. It should be noted that on the recurring thoughts topic item, students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, the reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

In response to the question, "Do you ever feel worried when your parent is on TDY?", 64.3% of the students reported they had felt worried during a TDY. Topics causing worry during TDY closely followed the topics reported to cause anxiety during TDY. Specifically, of the 25 codeable responses: 94.1% of the students reported that they worried about their TDY parent being hurt or killed, 44% of the students reported that they worried about home-related topics during TDY, and 12% of the students reported that they worried about harm coming to themselves or their family at-home during TDY. It should be noted that on this item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories with the ensuing consequence that reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

Turning to an examination of the characteristics of the coping responses generated to worry, in terms of the number of coping responses, of the 34 codeable responses: 55.9% of the students offered one coping response, 32.3% of the students generated 2-3 coping responses, and 11.8% of the students reported there was nothing that could be done to help them cope with worry. It should be noted that this is the largest number of helpless/low efficacy responses made to any of the TDY emotions. In
terms of the coping function of the coping responses generated to worry, of the 40 codeable responses: 70% of the coping responses utilized an emotion-focused function, 22.3% of the coping responses were helpless or low efficacy in nature, and 5% of the coping responses utilized a problem-focused coping function. This high response rate of helpless/low efficacy coping function responses, goes hand in hand with the high response rate indicating that no coping responses could manage the negative affect associated with worry. These two findings seem to suggest that worry was viewed as a rather unmanageable emotion by many of the students in this sample. In terms of the social locus of the coping responses generated to worry, of the 31 codeable responses: 45.2% of the coping responses were self-oriented, 35.5% of the coping responses were other-oriented, and 19.4% of the coping responses utilized both types of social orientation. In delineating the individuals towards whom the other-oriented coping responses were directed, of the 17 codeable responses: 64.7% of the students reported utilizing their mother for support when worried, 47.1% of the students reported relying on their fathers, 29.4% of the students reported relying on their siblings for social support when worried, 17.6% of the students reported that they used their pets for social support, and 5.9% of the students reported relying on their peers for social support when worried. It should be noted that on this item codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, the reported percentages may not sum to 100%. It is interesting to note that in terms of the other-orientation, worry coping responses focused more on receiving social support from within the family unit, compared to other emotions. In sum while the majority of students coded for these
items, were able to generate a coping response for worry, and these coping responses tended to focus on managing negative affect, a sizable number of students exhibited a helpless/low efficacy orientation to worry. This seems to indicate that worry may be an emotion that was more difficult for students to manage.

**Depression.** In terms of TDY depression, of the 40 codeable responses, 65% of the students reported feeling sad when their military parent was TDY. A series of questions followed to indicate the seriousness of TDY-related depression via behavioral report of depressed behavior. Of the 40 codeable responses to the question of “Do you cry more when your parent is on TDY?,” 65% of the students reported that they did not cry more during TDY. Changes in sleeping and waking patterns were also examined. Of the 40 codeable responses to questions about non-TDY sleep habits, 67.5% of the students reported having difficulty sleeping or waking at some point in time. When the question was addressed to TDY sleep patterns, of the 38 codeable responses, 55.2% of the students reported difficulty sleeping or waking up during TDY. It is interesting that students report more non-TDY sleep difficulties. Perhaps this is due to cue saliency. It may be easier to recall sleep difficulties occurring during a discrete period of time (i.e., TDY), whereas the question of general sleep patterns may be more difficult to accurately answer (e.g., “Well, I know I have had trouble sleeping at some point in time.”) Students were also queried as to whether their eating habits changed during TDY, 71.4% of the sample reported that their eating habits did not change during TDY. The final behavioral depression marker that students were questioned about involved the ability to enjoy activities that had been previously enjoyed. Of the 40 codeable responses, 97.5% of the
students reported that they did enjoy activities they had previously enjoyed while their parent was TDY. It would seem that while the majority of the students report feeling sad due to parental TDY, for the majority of the students the sadness does not seem to be expressed in a manner consistent with clinical depression.

The investigation of TDY depression turned next to the course of sadness over the TDY period. Students were asked which of five phases of a TDY was most sad to them (i.e., predeployment, departure, deployment, reunion, or the whole thing). Of the 23 codeable responses: 39.1% of the students said the actual deployment was the saddest time, 21.7% of the students reported that the predeployment phase was saddest, 13.2% of the students reported the parent's departure as the saddest part, and 8.7% of the students reported the reunion period as the saddest part. The question was retooled so that it addressed what part of the TDY was the overall hardest, or most difficult independent of experiences with sadness. Of the 33 codeable responses: 36.4% of the students reported that the actual deployment was the hardest part, 27.3% of the students reported that the parent's departure was the hardest part, 21.2% of the students reported the reunion period as being the hardest overall, and 15.1% of the students reported the predeployment phase as the hardest. Interestingly, no students reported that the whole TDY made them sad or that they found the whole TDY difficult. The final item in the depression section addressed whether sadness associated with parental TDY abated over the course of the TDY. This was considered to be a proxy of positive adjustment to the parent's absence. Of the 17 codeable responses, 88.2% of the students reported that their TDY-induced sadness improved over the course of the TDY.
Separation anxiety. Turning to an examination of TDY separation anxiety, of the 38 codeable responses, 63.2% of the students reported experiencing separation anxiety during TDY as evidenced by increased levels of clinging behavior (i.e., an increased emotional need to be in the presence of the custodial parent or teacher) during TDY. Confirming this increase in separation anxiety owing to TDY, of the 39 codeable responses, 61.5% of the students reported that when their military parent was on TDY, they checked-in or touched base with their custodial parent more often. As a proxy for looking at the intensity of the need to be with the custodial parent, students were asked about where they preferred to play when their military parent was TDY. The choices offered were: no preferred play place during TDY, in their home, or outside the home (i.e., outside or at a friend’s house). Equal numbers of students (38.1% each), reported that they either did not have a preference or preferred to play outside the home during TDY; 23.8% of the students reported that they preferred to play at their house during a TDY. TDY separation anxiety, like TDY depression seemed relatively prevalent in this sample, but as with depression, it did not seem to reach clinical levels as evidenced by student self-report of the ability to leave the custodial parent’s presence without extreme distress.

Guilt. The final emotion examined under TDY circumstances was guilt. Students were asked if they had ever felt guilty while a TDY was occurring. Of the 37 codeable responses, 70.2% of the students reported that they had not felt guilty during a TDY. This seems consistent with the students’ report of their general experiences with guilt. Under both non-TDY and TDY circumstances, guilt was the least reported emotional...
response. When guilt was reported, it was more prevalent under non-TDY than TDY circumstances.

**TDY Experience In Other Areas**

TDY experience in four other domains was examined. These four domains were: somaticizing, household chores, perceived social support, and school performance.

**Somaticization.** Although somatization is frequently mentioned in the military child literature as a common response to the absence of the military parent, according to student report, it did not appear to be a common outcome of parental TDY in this sample. Of the 40 codeable responses, 92.5% of the students reported that they were usually healthy. When asked if they believed they got sick more when their parent was on TDY, of the 40 codeable responses, 62.5% reported that they did not believe that they got sick more during TDY. The low incidence of student report of six health complaints frequently mentioned in the military child literature (i.e., headache, stomach ache, sore throat, tiredness or a general sense of malaise, colds, allergies, and asthma) seemed to verify the students' report of good health overall, and under TDY circumstances.

**Household chores.** Students were queried about how their performance of household chores might change during a TDY. These questions were asked to get a feel for how household organization, as evidenced through the child's participation in household tasks, might change due to a TDY. Students were first asked if they performed regular household chores and what those chores might be. With regard to student report of participation in household chores, 95.2% of the sample reported that they engaged in regular household chores. In terms of types of chores performed, of the
39 codeable responses: 76.9% of the students reported cleaning their own rooms, 60% of the students reported helping with additional cleaning tasks, 48.7% of the students reported that they assisted with meal preparation, 41% of the students reported that they provided care to their pets, 7.7% of the students reported they assisted with lawn care, and another 7.7% of the students reported “other answers,” a list of these responses can be found in Appendix K. It should be noted that on the chore-type item codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, the reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

Students were then asked if their household chores changed when their parent was on TDY. Of the 40 codeable responses, 60% of the students reported that their chores did not change during TDY. For those students reporting TDY-related chore changes, of the 15 codeable responses: 53.3% of the students reported the number of chores they performed deceased, 33.3% of the students reported that the number of chores they performed increased, and 13.3% of the students reported that their chores neither increased nor decreased during a TDY, but the types of chores they performed changed. Students were also asked if they ever worried that they did not help their custodial parent enough during TDY. Of the 38 codeable responses, 63.9% of the students reported that they did not worry about not helping their custodial parent enough with household chores during TDY. This seems consistent with student self-report of low guilt levels during TDY.

Perceived social support. Student report of perceived social support was assessed as an important coping resource for managing stress associated with parental TDY
(Hiew, 1992, Reid et al., 1989, Werner, 1989). Students were asked to list all the people who could help them out if they were having difficulty coping with a TDY. The answer to this question was coded for both sheer number of available social support persons, and the identity of these individuals. With regard to number of individuals available to offer them social support, of 41 codeable responses: 61% of the students reported 5-8 persons who could provide them with social support, 22% of the students reported 2-4 persons who could provide them with social support, and 9.8% of the students reported that there was one person who could provide them with social support. Negligible percentages (<5%) of students reported that either they had no one who could provide them with social support or that they had more than eight persons who could provide them with social support. In terms of the identity of these social support providers, of the 40 codeable responses: 80% of the students listed their mother as a social support provider, 75% of the students listed their fathers as a social support provider, 70% of the students listed their peers, 67.5% of the students listed their teachers, 45% of the students listed extended relatives, 42.5% of the students listed their siblings as social support providers, 35% of the students listed the school counselor as a social support provider, 25% of the students listed their pets, 20% of the students listed adult friends, 17.5% of the students listed their neighbors, 15% of the students listed adults who supervised their extracurricular activities, and another 15% of the students listed “other answers,” these responses can be found in Appendix K. It should be noted that on this item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, the reported percentages may not sum to 100%. 
School performance. An investigation of school performance was undertaken from two perspectives: students were first asked to report on how they regularly did in school and then to report on how their school performance might change if their military parent went TDY. In terms of non-TDY school performance, students were asked if they were regularly prepared for class and 90.5% of the sample reported that they were regularly prepared for class. Students were also asked if they were regularly able to keep track of classroom activities (i.e., level of on-task behavior), and of the 41 codeable responses, 92.7% of the students reported that they were regularly able to keep track of classroom activities. In sum, the vast majority of the students reported being regularly prepared for class, and able to keep track of classroom activities. Next, five questions, examining how things at school would change if their parent was on TDY, were addressed. Students were asked about whether they ever found it difficult to want to come to school when a TDY was occurring. Of the 36 codeable responses, 52.8% of the students reported that they did not find it difficult to come to school during a TDY. Students were then asked if they believed that they spent more time around their teacher during a TDY. Of the 34 codeable responses, 58.8% of the students reported that they did not spend more time with their teacher during TDY. Students were also queried about whether they were able to keep track of classroom activities during TDY and 65.7% of the students reported that they were able to keep track of classroom activities during TDY. Students were also asked if they had experienced difficulty getting their classwork done on-time during TDY. Of the 37 codeable responses, 64.9% of the students reported that they did not have difficulty getting their classwork done on-time.
during TDY. Lastly, students were queried as to whether they were able to enjoy recess during TDY. Of the 37 codeable responses, 94.6% of the students reported that they still enjoyed recess during TDY. These results seem to indicate that for the majority of students in this sample, parental TDY did not significantly impact their daily school lives. However, though not the majority, a sizable percentage of students, reported school difficulties arising out of parental TDY. Although nearly none of the students reported being unable to enjoy recess due to TDY, the following school difficulties were reported in descending order: difficulty wanting to come to school (47.2% of 36 codeable responses), increased need or desire to spend time with the teacher (41.2% of 34 codeable responses), difficulties getting classwork done on-time (35.1% of 37 codeable responses), and difficulty keeping track of school activities (34.3% of 35 codeable responses).

Perspectives

This section embodies three perspectives of the effects of parental TDY in terms of feedback from teachers, parents, and students.

Teacher report. Teachers were asked to report on the academic performance and general personal adjustment of the students from their classroom who participated in the TDY study. Students were ranked according to their standing on these two variables relative to the other students in their classroom. In terms of teacher report of student academic performance, of the 31 codeable responses: 51.6% of the students who participated in the study were rated by their teachers as average in their academic performance, 41.9% of the participating students were rated by their teachers as above
average in academic performance, and 6.5% of the participating students were rated by their teachers as below average in academic performance. In terms of personal adjustment, 45.2% of the students who participated in the study were rated by their teachers as being average in personal adjustment, 40.5% the participating students were rated by their teachers as being above average in personal adjustment, and 14.3% of the participating students were by their teachers as being below average in personal adjustment. On both academic performance and personal adjustment, the largest number of students were rated as average, followed by above average, for each of the two variables the smallest number of students were rated as below average. In sum, the majority of the sample was rated by their teacher as average or above average in both academic performance and personal adjustment.

**Parent report.** Parent feedback was solicited in terms of perceived effect of school attendance on adjustment to TDY, and parental satisfaction with the study school's efforts to help their child cope with TDY. In terms of the effect school attendance rendered upon adjustment to parental absence due to TDY, of the 37 codeable responses: 64.9% of the parents reported that they believed that school attendance facilitated adjustment to TDY, 32.4% of the parents reported that attending school rendered no significant effect on TDY adjustment, and a negligible percentage (< 5%) of the parents reported that it was their perception that school attendance made adjustment to TDY worse. In terms of parental satisfaction with school efforts to help their child deal with TDY, of the 38 codeable parental responses: 73.7% of the parents reported that they were satisfied with the school's efforts to help their child cope with
TDY, 18.4% of the parents reported that they did not believe that parental absence due to TDY was an appropriate issue for the school to deal with (i.e., parental TDY is an issue that should remain within the realm of the immediate family), 5.3% of the parents reported that they were not satisfied with the school's efforts to help their child adjust to TDY, and a negligible percentage (< 5%) of the parents reported that they had no opinion on the subject.

**Student feedback.** Student feedback was solicited in terms of actions the students thought could be taken to make it easier for them to deal with parental TDY. Of the 32 codeable responses: 75% of the students gave "other answers," see Appendix K for a list of these responses, 37.5% of the students reported that changing the nature of TDYs could make them easier to deal with. Suggestions made by students for changing TDYs included things like making them shorter, having one long TDY rather than a bunch of shorter ones occurring over a brief period of time, and letting kids visit their parent on TDY. Other student suggestions included offering a school-based support group (34.4%), and increasing communication with the deployed parent (15.6%). It should be noted that on this item, codeable students could respond to multiple, independent categories. Therefore, reported percentages may not sum to 100%.

**The Results Of The Inferential Analysis**

**Emotional Experience During TDY**

**Emotional experience correlation.** The first analyses involved the examination of three correlation matrices for statistically significant relationships. The purpose of these analyses was to get a feel for how student emotional experience was correlated among
emotions occurring under the same emotional context, and among emotions experienced under different emotional contexts (non-TDY versus TDY). The correlation matrices involved (a) student report of non-TDY emotional experience with loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, depression, and guilt, (b) student report of TDY emotional experience with loneliness, anxiety, worry, depression, separation anxiety, and guilt, and (c) student report of both non-TDY and TDY emotional experience. In terms of non-TDY emotional experience, a Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between non-TDY report of worry (M = .91, SD = .28) and non-TDY report of depression (M = .61, SD = .49) was found to be statistically significant, r (32) = .42, p < .01. In terms of TDY emotional experience, three statistically significant relationships were found. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between TDY report of depression (M = .65, SD = .48) and TDY report of anxiety (M = .68, SD = .47) was found to be statistically significant, r (38) = .39, p < .01. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between TDY report of depression (M = .65, SD = .48) and TDY report of separation anxiety (M = .63, SD = .49) was found to be statistically significant, r (35) = .53, p < .001. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between TDY report of depression (M = .65, SD = .48) and TDY report of guilt (M = .30, SD = .30) was found to be statistically significant, r (33) = .43, p < .01. No statistically significant correlational relationships were found between non-TDY and TDY report of emotional experience, suggesting the possibility that the same emotion may be experienced differently depending on its triggering stimulus (i.e., non-TDY event versus TDY).
Student age and non-TDY emotional experience. Six one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student age and student report of non-TDY emotional experience with loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, depression, and guilt. It was expected that older students would exhibit higher levels of non-TDY affective reporting than younger students. This expectation was based on the hypothesis that older students would report more non-TDY emotional experience, whereas younger students, due to their reliance on salient concrete cues in the social context, would report more TDY emotional experiences. Of the six one-way analysis of variance tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. The result of a one-way analysis of variance examining age and non-TDY report of worry was found to be statistically significant, $F(7, 26) = 4.75$, $p < .01$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by eta-squared was .56. A Tukey HSD test indicated that 5 ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$), 7 ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$), 8 ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$), 9 ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$), 10 ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$), and 11 ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$) year-olds differed significantly from six year-olds ($M = .40$, $SD = .55$) on their report of non-TDY worry, such that the 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 year-olds reported significantly more worry than six year-olds. It should be mentioned that on this analysis involving age, and on all analyses involving age throughout the results report, one twelve year-old female was eliminated from analysis. She was eliminated from analysis not because she differed in any meaningful way from her fifth grade peers, but being the only twelve year-old in the study, her presence impacted the running of analyses in a detrimental manner.
Student grade level and non-TDY emotional experience. Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student grade level and student report of non-TDY loneliness, anxious, tension, worry, depression, and guilt. The influence of grade was considered apart from age based on the expectation that grade, with its concomitant additive learning, might better organize student emotional experience than chronological age. It was again hypothesized that older students would report more non-TDY emotional experiences than younger students. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Student gender and non-TDY emotional experience. Six Mann-Whitney U tests comparing males and females on non-TDY report of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, depression, and guilt were conducted. It was expected that girls would have higher non-TDY emotional report than boys. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were identified.

Student age and TDY emotional experience. Six one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student age and student report of TDY loneliness, anxiety, worry, depression, separation anxiety, and guilt. It was expected that younger children, with their lower social inhibitions and reliance on salient concrete cues for organizing personal experience, would report more TDY emotional experiences than older students, but contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Student grade level and TDY emotional experience. Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to investigate the relationship between student grade level and student
report of TDY emotional experience. As previously outlined, it was expected that younger students would report more TDY emotional experiences as compared with older students. However, no statistically significant results were found.

Student gender and TDY emotional experience. Six Mann-Whitney U tests compared males and females on report of TDY emotional experience. It was expected that girls would have higher report of TDY emotional experience than boys. It should be noted that on this set of Mann-Whitney U tests and throughout the result report, two levels of significance are reported for each test. The first is the asymptotic significance level which is appropriate when the data set is large, the second is the exact significance level which is more appropriate when dealing with small sample sizes. Both pieces of information are presented so that the reader can evaluate the robustness of the result, however, based on the premise of this study: this is not a statistical study, but rather the use of statistical tools is geared at locating patterns in the data that organize student experience with TDY, it is argued that the less conservative significance value is an appropriate indicator of a finding that may help organize students' experience with TDY. Recall that in this study, the greater concern is with type II errors.

Of the six Mann-Whitney U tests performed, two found statistically significant differences between the two groups. A Mann-Whitney U test comparing males (n = 18) and females (n = 20) on report of TDY separation anxiety, indicated that the mean ranks were significantly different, U = 97.00, p < .01. The exact significance level for this result was p < .05. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .11. The nature of the relationship was such that girls (M =
.85, SD = .36) reported more TDY separation anxiety than boys (M = .39, SD = .49). A Mann-Whitney U test comparing males (n = 17) and females (n = 20) on report of TDY guilt, indicated that the mean ranks were significantly different, U = 113.50, p < .05. The exact significance level for this result was p = .09. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .16. The nature of the relationship was such that girls (M = .45, SD = .49) reported more TDY guilt than boys (M = .12, SD = .32).

**Military family background variables and TDY emotional experience.** The first military family background variable examined was who was the military member (i.e., father, mother, both parents, step-dad, step-mom, or other custodial relative). Based on a study by Applewhite and Mays (1996), it was expected that there would not be a statistically significant effect of military parent on student TDY emotional experience. Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between military parent and TDY emotional experience with loneliness, anxiety, worry, depression, separation anxiety, and guilt. As expected, no statistically significant results were found.

The second military family background variable examined was number of relocations made by the family. As moving is a stressful event which could contribute to a pile-up effect, students reporting more moves were expected to report experiencing more negative affect during TDY. However, none of the six Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted to examine the relationship between number of moves and TDY emotional report, found statistically significant results.
The third military family background variable examined was student perception of TDY load while residing on-base (i.e., many TDYs, not many TDYs, same as at other bases). It was expected that a report of a heavy TDY load would be associated with more report of negative TDY affect. Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to investigate this relationship. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

The fourth military family background variable taken under investigation was student perception of a change in TDY load. The thinking was that maybe change in the TDY load predicted TDY emotional experience better than sheer number of TDYs. Six Kruskal-Wallis tests examining student perception of change in recent TDY load and student report of TDY emotional experience were conducted. Of the six Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, only one yielded a statistically significant result. A Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that a statistically significant relationship existed between student perception of a change in TDY load and student report of experiencing TDY guilt, $H(2, N = 15) = 7.33$, $p < .05$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .49. A Tukey HSD test indicated that students who reported there had been an increase in TDY load reported more guilt ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0$) than students who reported that TDY load had not changed ($M = .0$, $SD = 0$). The mean proportion of guilt responses for students reporting that TDY load had lessened ($M = .43$, $SD = .49$) did not significantly differ from the mean proportions for either of these groups.

The final military family background variable addressed was student report of longest TDY. It was expected that longer TDYs would result in higher levels of negative
TDY affect. Of the six Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, only one yield a statistically significant result. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test investigating the relationship between student report of longest TDY experience and student report of TDY worry, was found to be statistically significant, $H(7, N = 35) = 15.40, p < .05$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .34. A Tukey HSD test could not be applied to the data due to a small number of responses in one level of the independent variable. An examination of the mean differences across levels of the independent variable suggested that students who reported their longest TDY as a one year remote assignment ($M = 1.00, SD = 0$) and students who reported their longest TDY as 90 days ($M = 1.00, SD = 0$) reported more TDY worry than students who reported their longest TDY as over a year ($M = 0, SD = 0$), 121-180 days ($M = 0, SD = 0$), 60 - 89 days ($M = .50, SD = .50$), 11 - 30 days ($M = .66, SD = .48$), and 1 - 10 days ($M = .80, SD = .53$). Only one student reported that his parent had been on a TDY lasting 6 - 11 months. This student reported he had been worried, but due to the small response rate at this level of the independent variable, this student was not included in the mean comparison. Though this significant finding may indicate that students whose parents are on three month or one year TDYs experience more worry than students experiencing TDYs of other lengths, the nature of this particular base's deployment schedule creates the possibility of a confound between length of TDY and location of TDY. Specifically, military member's deploying from the study base for periods of three months or one year, are likely to be going to the Middle East or Korea. Both of these locations are areas of political unrest, and are generally considered dangerous and undesirable assignments. The salience of
these locations was heightened after the bombing of the Khobar Towers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia in June 1996. It seems plausible that students experiencing TDYs that are three months or one year in length may report more worry due to the location of their parent rather than the length of the TDY per se.

**Resistance to interview participation and age and grade.** There was an expectation that older students, whether measured by age or grade, would be more resistant to answering interview questions. This expectation was predicated on the belief that older students would be more subject to social desirability biases, particularly where family issues were concerned. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine the relationship between age and resistance to interview participation, and a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to examine the relationship between grade level and resistance to interview participation. Contrary to expectations, the results of both tests were found to be nonsignificant.

**Gender and impending TDY and resistance to interview participation.** There was an expectation that boys were more resistant to answering interview questions than were girls. This expectation was born out by a Mann-Whitney U test comparing males (n = 20) and females (n = 22) on resistance to answering interview questions. The mean ranks were found to be significantly different, \( U = 154.00, p < .01 \), such that boys (\( M = .30, SD = .46 \)) were more resistant to answering interview questions than were girls (\( M = 0, SD = 0 \)). The strength of this relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .30.
It was also hypothesized that students who were anticipating or experiencing a TDY at the time of the interview would be more resistant to answering interview questions than students who were not anticipating or experiencing a TDY. A Mann-Whitney U test compared students who had a TDY impending or occurring at the time of the interview (n = 12) with students who were not anticipating or experiencing a TDY at the time of the interview (n = 30), on a measure of resistance to answering interview questions. A statistically significant difference between the groups was found, \( U = 132.00, \ p < .05 \), such that students who were anticipating or experiencing a TDY at the time of the interview (\( M = .33, SD = .54 \)) were more resistant to answering interview questions than students who were not anticipating or experiencing a TDY (\( M = .07, SD = .25 \)). The exact significance level for this result was \( p < .19 \). The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .27.

A follow-up analysis examined the possibility that students who were resistant to answering interview questions would differ in their TDY emotional report as compared to nonresistant students. The question being addressed was, "What type of questions might these students be resistant to answering?" To investigate the possibility that students who were resistant to answering interview questions might report different TDY emotional experiences than students who were not resistant, six Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted. Of the six tests conducted, one was statistically significant. The result of a Mann-Whitney U test indicated statistically significant mean differences between resistant students (n = 5) and nonresistant students (n = 33) on the report of TDY separation anxiety, \( U = 22.50, \ p < .01 \). The exact significance level for this result
was $p < .01$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was -.73. The nature of the relationship was such that nonresistant students ($M = .73, SD = .44$) report significantly more separation anxiety than resistant students ($M = 0, SD = 0$).

**Impending TDY and TDY emotional experience.** Bearing in mind, that students who were anticipating or experiencing a TDY at the time of the interview, were found to be more resistant to answering interview questions, and that resistant students were found to report lower levels of TDY separation anxiety, as compared to nonresistant students, it was expected that students who were anticipating or experiencing a TDY at the time of the interview would report significantly less negative TDY affect than students who were not anticipating or experiencing a TDY. To explore this possibility, six Mann-Whitney $U$ tests examining the relationship between impending or concurrent TDY and student report of TDY emotional experience were conducted. Contrary to hypothesis, none of the six Mann-Whitney $U$ tests found statistically significant differences between the two groups.

**TDY and health.** A Pearson correlation addressed the relationship between student report of non-TDY health status ($M = .93, SD = .27$) and TDY health status ($M = .38, SD = .49$). This was found to be nonsignificant. Next, six Mann-Whitney $U$ tests were conducted to compare students who reported they got sick more during TDY and students who reported they did not get sick more during TDY, in terms of student report of TDY emotional experience. The expectation was that students who reported poor health during TDY would report experiencing more negative TDY affect. Contrary to
hypothesis, no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups. This is consistent with the frequency data for this sample that indicated that approximately 63% of the students reported not experiencing increased health problems during TDY. While reported as prevalent in the literature, somatization did not appear to be a TDY-related problem for many of the students in this study.

**TDY and preferred play location and household chores.** A Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported TDY separation anxiety and students who reported they did not experience TDY separation anxiety, on preferred location for play during TDY (i.e., at home versus away from home) was conducted. It was expected that students who reported TDY separation anxiety would prefer to play in proximity of their custodial parent. Contrary to hypothesis, the result was nonsignificant. Six Mann-Whitney U tests comparing students who reported that their household chores changed during TDY and students who reported that their household chores did not change during TDY, in terms of student reported TDY emotional experience were conducted. Using change in household chores as a proxy for family organization level, it was expected that students reporting a change in household chores during TDY would report more negative TDY affect. Of the six Mann-Whitney U tests conducted, one yielded statistically significant results. A Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported their household chores changed during TDY (n = 16) with students who reported their household chores did not change during TDY (n = 24), on student report of TDY worry was found to be statistically significant, $U = 128.00, p < .05,$ such that students who reported that their chores changed during TDY ($M = .88, SD = .32$) reported
experiencing more TDY worry than students who reported their chores did not change during TDY ($M = .54$, $SD = .49$). The exact significance level for this result was, $p = .08$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .40.

**TDY and school.** The first analyses addressing the effect of TDY on students’ school life involved three correlation matrices examining (a) relationships among non-TDY school variables, (b) relationships among TDY school variables, (c) relationships between non-TDY and TDY school variables. No statistically significant correlational relationships were found among the non-TDY school variables. Specifically, there was not a statistically significant relationship between student report of being prepared for class and student report of the ability to keep track of classroom activities. The correlation matrix of TDY school variables yielded one statistically significant correlation. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between the ability to keep track of classroom activities during TDY ($M = .66$, $SD = .48$) and the ability to get classwork done on-time during TDY ($M = .35$, $SD = .48$) was found to be statistically significant, $r (30) = -.57$, $p < .01$. This correlation indicated that students who reported they were able to keep track of classroom activities during TDY also reported being able to get classwork done on-time during TDY. The correlation matrix examining the relationship between the non-TDY and TDY variables found two statistically significant correlational relationships. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between student report of the ability to keep track of classroom activities during non-TDY ($M = .93$, $SD = .26$) and student report of the ability to keep track of classroom activities
during TDY (M = .66, SD = .48) was found to be statistically significant, r (32) = .45, p < .01. This relationship indicated that students who reported they could keep track of classroom activities during non-TDY also reported being able to keep track of classroom activities during TDY. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between student report of the ability to keep track of classroom activities during non-TDY (M = .93, SD = .26) and student report of enjoying recess during TDY (M = .95, SD = .23) was found to be significant, r (34) = .47, p < .01. This correlation indicated that students who reported being able to keep track of classroom activities during non-TDY time also reported enjoying recess during TDY.

Teachers were asked to rate students on academic performance and personal adjustment. It was expected that a positive correlation would exist between these two variables such that high ratings on one would be associated with high ratings on the other. This hypothesis was based on the tendency of teachers to form global expectations for student performance. This hypothesis was supported. A Pearson correlation addressing the relationship between teacher rating of student academic performance (M = 2.35, SD = .61) and teacher rating of personal adjustment (M = 2.26, SD = .70) was found to be statistically significant, r (29) = .50, p < .01.

Seven one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student age and student report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. Nonsignificant differences were expected for student age and student report of non-TDY performance. However, it was expected that younger students would report more TDY-induced school disruptions than would older students. Of the seven
one-way analysis of variance tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. The result of a one-way analysis of variance test, examining the relationship between student age and report of clinging behavior directed toward the teacher during TDY was found to be statistically significant, $F(7, 26) = 2.73, p < .05$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by eta-squared was .42. The result of a Tukey HSD test indicated that eight year-olds ($M = .83, SD = .41$) and nine year-olds ($M = 0, SD = 0$) differed significantly on their report of clinging behavior directed at the teacher during TDY, such that eight year-olds reported directing more clinging behavior towards the teacher during TDY than nine-year-olds. The mean proportion of clinging responses for 5 ($M = .33, SD = .52$), 6 ($M = .17, SD = .41$), 7 ($M = .75, SD = .50$), 10 ($M = 0, SD = 0$), and 11 ($M = .50, SD = .58$) year-olds did not differ significantly from the other two groups.

Seven Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student grade level and student report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. Again, nonsignificant differences were expected for non-TDY school performance, but students in the lower grades were expected to report more TDY school performance difficulties than students in the higher grades. Of the seven Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test, examining the relationship between student grade level and report of clinging behavior directed towards the teacher during TDY, was found to be statistically significant, $H(5, N = 34) = 12.80, p < .05$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .29. A Tukey HSD test applied to the data indicated significant mean differences in reporting of clinging behavior during TDY between first ($M = .17$,
SD = .37) and second graders (M = 1.00, SD = 0), and also between second graders and third graders (M = .17, SD = .40), such that second graders reported significantly more clinging behavior in the classroom during TDY than either first or third graders. The mean proportion of clinging responses for kindergartners (M = .38, SD = .48), fourth (M = 0, SD = 0), and fifth (M = .50, SD = .50) graders did not differ significantly from the other three groups. This result coincides with the result found for age in that second graders, who tend to be about eight years-old, reported directing more clinging behavior towards their teacher during TDY than students of other ages.

Seven Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine if males and females differed significantly in terms of their report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. It was expected that males would report more non-TDY and TDY school difficulties than females. Contrary to hypothesis, none of the seven Mann-Whitney U tests yielded statistically significant results.

Seven Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher rating of student academic performance and student report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. It was expected that students rated by their teacher as below average in academic performance, would report more school difficulties under both the non-TDY and TDY circumstances. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found. An additional seven Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher rating of student personal adjustment and student report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. Similar to the previous analyses, it was expected that students rated by their teachers as below average in personal adjustment
would report more school difficulties under both the non-TDY and TDY circumstances. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Seven Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of the effect of school in facilitating their child's adjustment to TDY and student report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. It was expected that parents who reported that school attendance facilitated TDY adjustment would have children who reported fewer school difficulties under both the non-TDY and TDY circumstances. Of the seven Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, two yielded statistically significant results. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between parental report of the role of school attendance in facilitating TDY adjustment and student report of being prepared for class under non-TDY circumstances was found to be statistically significant, $H(2, N = 37) = 9.51, p < .05$. However, upon examination of the cells, this result became suspect because one level of the independent variable contained only one participant (i.e., only one parent reported that school attendance made TDY adjustment worse), thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test. When a Mann-Whitney U test was run with only the two groups containing sufficient participants, the result was nonsignificant, and consequently the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test was dismissed. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between parental report of the role of school attendance in facilitating TDY adjustment and student report of being able to keep track of classroom activities under non-TDY circumstances was found to be statistically significant, $H(2, N = 36) = 11.23, p < .05$. Upon examination of the cells, this result also became suspect due to the fact that one group had only one participant in
it (i.e., one parent who reported that school attendance made adjustment to TDY worse). Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine if the significant result held when the two levels of the independent variable with adequate participants were examined. The result of this test was nonsignificant, and the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test was dismissed.

Seven Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of satisfaction with school TDY efforts and student report of non-TDY and TDY school performance. It was expected that parents who reported they were satisfied with school TDY efforts or who reported that they did not believe that TDY was an appropriate issue for the school to address, would have children who reported less school difficulties under both the non-TDY and TDY circumstances. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher report of student academic performance and student report of TDY emotional experience. The expectation was that students rated as high in academic performance would report less negative TDY affect. Of the six Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, two yielded statistically significant results. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that a statistically significant relationship existed between teacher report of student academic performance and student report of TDY anxiety, $H (2, N = 31) = 7.94$, $p < .05$. However, upon examination of the cells, this result became suspect due to the fact that one level of the independent variable contained only two participants (i.e., two students rated by their teacher as below average in academic performance), thus pushing the
reasonable limits of the test. Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to
determine if the significant relationship remained when the two levels of the independent
variable containing adequate participants were compared. The result of a Mann-Whitney
U test comparing differences in TDY report of anxiety between students rated by their
teacher as average in academic performance \((n = 16)\) and students who were rated by
their teacher as above average in academic performance \((n = 13)\), was found to be
statistically significant, \(U = 69.00, p < .05\). The exact significance level for this result
was, \(p = .13\). The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial
correlation coefficient was .34. The nature of the relationship was such that students
rated by their teachers as being average in academic performance \((M = .88, SD = .32)\)
reported more TDY anxiety than students rated as above average \((M = .54, SD = .49)\).

The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that a statistically significant
relationship existed between teacher report of student academic performance and student
report of TDY depression, \(H(2, N = 30) = 6.74, p < .05\). However, upon examination of
the cells, this result also became suspect due to the fact that one level of the independent
variable contained only two participants (i.e., two students rated by their teacher as
below average in academic performance), thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test.

Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine if the significant
relationship remained when the two levels of the independent variable containing
adequate participants were examined. The result of this test was nonsignificant, and
consequently the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test was dismissed.
Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher rating of student personal adjustment and student report of TDY emotional experience. It was expected that students rated as below average in personal adjustment would report more negative TDY affect compared to students rated as average or above average in personal adjustment. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Thirty Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student report of TDY school experiences (i.e., difficulty coming to school, increased clinging behavior directed at the teacher, ability to keep track of classroom activities, ability to get work done on-time, and ability to enjoy recess) and TDY emotional experience. The issue being addressed was whether students who reported having difficulty in school during TDY, reported more negative TDY affect. The expectation was that students who reported having trouble in school during TDY, would report higher levels of negative TDY affect. Of the thirty Mann-Whitney U tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. A Mann-Whitney U test examined the relationship between students who reported they had trouble getting classwork done on-time during TDY (n = 11) and students who reported they could get classwork done on-time during a TDY (n = 22), in terms of student report of separation anxiety during TDY. A statistically significant difference was found between the two groups, \( U = 76.5, p < .05 \), such that students who reported they had trouble getting their work done on-time during a TDY reported less separation anxiety (\( M = .36, SD = .48 \)) than students who reported they got their classwork done on-time during TDY (\( M = .77, SD = .42 \)).
The exact significance level for this result was $p < .06$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .39. While statistically significant, this result is not in the predicted direction. One possible explanation for this finding is that when a teacher realizes a student is having trouble getting classwork done on-time due to TDY, the teacher may attempt to spend more time monitoring the student’s progress, thus increasing proximity between teacher and student. This increased contact between teacher and student may moderate student TDY separation anxiety.

**Parental report and TDY emotional experience.** Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of the effect of school attendance on their child’s adjustment to TDY (i.e., no effect, makes things better, makes things worse) and student report of TDY emotional experience. The expectation was that parents who reported that school attendance facilitated their child’s TDY adjustment would have kids who report lower levels of negative TDY affect. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Six Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of satisfaction with the study school’s efforts to help their child to positively adjust to TDYs and student report of TDY emotional experience. It was hypothesized that parents who reported they were satisfied with school TDY efforts would have children who report less negative TDY affect. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant relationships were found.
Coping Responses

Student age and characteristics of coping responses to loneliness, tension, and worry. Nine one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine the effect of student age on three characteristics of student coping responses generated in response to loneliness, tension, and worry. The three characteristics of the coping response under consideration in this analysis and throughout this section were: (a) number of coping responses, (b) coping function of the coping response (i.e., helpless, emotion-focused, problem-focused, mixed emotion- and problem-focused, and (c) the social locus of the coping response (i.e., self-oriented, other-oriented, or a mix of self- and other-orientation). The expectation was that older students would report higher numbers of coping responses, use more problem-focused coping, and rely on self or self and others for social support. In other words, older students were expected to possess a broader and more differentiated coping response repertoire than younger students. Of the nine one-way analysis of variance tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. A one-way analysis of variance compared student age and number of coping responses generated for tension, this was found to be statistically significant, $F(6, 24) = 3.18, p < .05$. The strength of this relationship as indexed by eta-squared was found was .44. A Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean number of coping responses reported by 11 year-olds ($M = 3.00, SD = 0$) was significantly higher than the mean number of coping responses reported by 6 ($M = 2.00, SD = 0$), 7 ($M = 2.00, SD = 0$), and 8 ($M = 2.14, SD = .38$) year-olds. The mean number of coping responses reported by 5 ($M = 2.25, SD = 0$)
.50), 9 (M = 2.25, M = .50), and 10 (M = 2.40, M = .55) year-olds did not differ significantly from these other groups.

Grade level and characteristics of coping responses to loneliness, tension, and worry. Nine Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student grade level and the three coping response characteristics outlined above. Again, the expectation was that older students would possess broader and more differentiated coping response repertoires than younger students. Of the nine Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between grade level and social locus of the coping responses generated to loneliness was found to be statistically significant, H (5, N = 38) = 10.90, p < .05. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .18. After verifying the existence of the omnibus significant relationship with the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Tukey HSD test was applied to the data to discern the nature of the significant relationship. However, the location of the significant mean differences could not be discerned with the Tukey HSD test due to a small number of responses in several levels of the independent variable. An examination of the mean differences across levels of the independent variable, suggested that kindergartners (M = 2.14, SD = .64), second graders (M = 2.25, SD = .83), and fourth graders (M = 2.33, SD = .47), as compared to first graders (M = 1.20, SD = .40), third graders (M = 1.43, SD = .73), and fifth graders (M = 1.63, SD = .40), were more likely to report relying on others or a self and others mix for social support needs for coping with loneliness.
Gender and characteristics of coping responses to loneliness, tension, and worry.

Nine Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student gender and coping response characteristics. It was expected that girls would use more emotion-focused coping responses than boys and that girls would report relying on others or a self and other combination for their social support needs. Nonsignificant differences were expected for number of coping responses. Of the nine Mann-Whitney U tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. A Mann-Whitney U test comparing males (n = 20) and females (n = 19) on coping function of the coping responses generated to worry, found statistically significant differences between the groups, U = 130.50, p < .05. The exact significance level for this result was, p = .10. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .31. The nature of the significant relationship was such that, boys (M = 1.65, SD = .47) were significantly more likely than girls (M = 2.10, SD = .62) to report using a coping response with a low efficacy or helplessness function for the management of worry. This relationship, while statistically significant is not in the predicted direction. Girls did report utilizing emotion-focused coping responses most frequently, but they did not differ significantly from boys in terms of use of emotion-focused coping responses.

Background variables and perceived social support. Three analyses examined the relationship between three student background variables: age, grade level, and gender and perceived social support, measured as numbers of support people reported by the student in response to the question, "If you were having a bad day, who could help you out?" It was expected that older students would report higher levels of perceived social
support than younger students, and that girls would report higher levels of perceived social support than boys. Contrary to hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance examining age and perceived social support, a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between grade level and perceived social support, and a Mann-Whitney U test comparing males and females on perceived social support were all found to be nonsignificant.

**Characteristics of the coping responses and TDY emotional experience.** Nine Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between the characteristics of the coping responses for loneliness, tension, and worry and student report of TDY experience with these three emotions. The expectation was that students reporting higher numbers of coping responses, more problem-focused or emotion-and problem-focused focused coping, and who reported they relied on themselves and others for social support (i.e., the mixed social orientation), would report lower levels of negative TDY affect. Contrary to hypothesis, none of the nine Kruskal-Wallis tests yielded statistically significant results.

**Teacher rating of academic performance and personal adjustment and characteristics of the coping responses.** Nine Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher rating of student academic performance and student report of characteristics of the coping responses used to manage loneliness, tension, and worry. The thinking here was to determine if students of differing academic performance levels manage negative affect in significantly different ways, and if so, what types of implications might be found for helping students of various academic levels cope
more effectively with negative TDY affect. However, no statistically significant results were found between teacher rating of student academic performance and characteristics of the coping responses reported for managing loneliness, tension, and worry.

An additional nine Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine whether there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher rating of student personal adjustment, and the characteristics of the coping responses used by students to ameliorate feelings of loneliness, tension, and worry, such that students of differing levels of personal adjustment rely on different types of coping responses to manage negative affect. Again, the location of such a relationship could prove useful in determining target students who need extra help managing negative affect, particularly as it relates to TDY. As with the teacher rating of academic performance analyses, no statistically significant results emerged from these nine Kruskal-Wallis tests.

Parental rating of the effect of school attendance on TDY adjustment and characteristics of coping responses. Nine Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of the effect of school attendance on their child’s adjustment to TDY and coping response characteristics. The thinking was that student coping repertoires could be influenced by parental attitudes about the role of the school in helping the child cope with TDY. The expectation was that when parents perceived the school as playing a positive role in TDY adjustment, coping responses would be enhanced such that the social locus of the coping response would be more likely to involve others, or self and others. This hypothesis was predicated on the assumption that positive parental attitude about the role of the school in facilitating TDY
adjustment, would increase student awareness of social resources within the school environment. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant relationships were found.

**Parental rating of satisfaction with school TDY efforts and characteristics of coping responses.** Nine Kruskal-Wallis tests examining the relationship between parental satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY and the characteristics of the coping responses given for loneliness, tension, and worry were conducted. Again, the expectation was that when parents view the school as an ally in facilitating TDY adjustment, this mediates student perception of the school as a resource for enhancing positive coping. Of the nine Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between parental satisfaction with school TDY efforts and student report of number of coping responses for loneliness was found to be statistically significant, $H (3, N = 34) = 10.08, p < .05$. However, upon examination of the cells, this result became suspect because two levels of the independent variable (i.e., parents who reported "no opinion" and parents who reported that school attendance made TDY adjustment worse) contained a small number of participants, thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test. Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to examine whether the significant relationship remained when the two levels of the independent variable containing adequate participants were examined. The result of a Mann-Whitney U test comparing differences in number of coping responses generated to worry between students whose parents reported that they were satisfied with school TDY efforts ($n = 27$) and students whose parents reported that TDYs were not an appropriate issue for the school to address ($n = 7$), was found to
be statistically significant, \( U = 29.00, p < .01 \). The exact significance level for this result was \( p < .01 \). The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .65. The nature of the relationship was such that students of parents who reported they did not believe that TDY was a school issue were more likely to report 2-3 coping responses to loneliness (\( M = 2.86, SD = .48 \)), whereas students of parents who reported they were satisfied with school TDY efforts were more likely to report one coping response for loneliness (\( M = 2.17, SD = .47 \)). This finding is contrary to the hypothesis. It seems that it was children of parents who did not expect the school to act as a positive TDY coping resource that reported the highest number of coping responses. A possible explanation for this finding is that in households where the school is not expected to provide coping response coaching, parents may provide higher levels of active coaching on how to deal with negative affect.

**Perceived social support and teacher ratings.** As perceived social support is theorized to be an important variable in facilitating healthy adjustment to negative or stressful situations (Werner, 1989), two Kruskal-Wallis tests were undertaken to investigate whether students who differed in reported perceived social support, differed in the way their teachers perceived their academic performance and personal adjustment. The expectation was that students reporting higher levels of perceived social support would be rated by their teachers as higher in academic performance and personal adjustment compared to their peers reporting lower levels of perceived social support. Contrary to hypothesis, neither of the two Kruskal-Wallis tests were found to be statistically significant.
Parental ratings and perceived social support. In a further analysis of the role of perceived social support, two Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between parental attitudes about the role of school in facilitating positive adjustment to TDY and parental satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY and student perceived social support. The expectation was that parents with a more positive view of the school as a resource in aiding their child cope with TDY would have children who reported higher levels of perceived social support based on a more positive utilization of social resources within the school setting. Contrary to hypothesis, neither of the Kruskal-Wallis tests found statistically significant results.

Perceived social support and TDY emotional experience. Six Kruskal-Wallis tests examining the relationship between student perceived social support and student report of TDY emotional experience were conducted. The expectation was that students reporting higher levels of perceived social support would report less negative TDY affect. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.

Perceived social support and characteristics of coping responses. Nine Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student perceived social support and characteristics of coping responses for loneliness, tension, and worry. It was expected that students reporting higher levels of perceived social support would report higher levels of problem-focused coping responses, and a higher report of other- or self- and other-mixed social locus. Contrary to hypothesis, no statistically significant results were found.
**Emotional Conceptualization**

*Student age and emotional conceptualization.* Seventeen one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine the relationship between student age and emotional conceptualization of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. The five facets of emotional conceptualization addressed in these analyses, and throughout the emotional conceptualization section, were: (a) word knowledge (i.e., student offers definition, student reports he or she could use the word in a sentence, but cannot offer a definition, or student reports having heard the word before, but does not know what it means), (b) type of definition offered for the word (i.e., abstract definition, intrapersonal definition, interpersonal definition), (c) the accuracy of the definition, (d) the behavioral expression of the emotion (i.e., internalizing, externalizing, or an internalizing/externalizing mix), and (e) the congruency exhibited between the student’s definition of the emotion and student report of behavioral expression of the emotion. For a full description, see Coding System Part II Appendix F, or the Code Book Appendix G. The expectation was that with increasing age students would be more likely to be able to define emotions and that the accuracy of the definition would increase. Additionally, it was expected that with increasing age congruency between verbal and behavioral report would increase. Of the seventeen one-way analysis of variance tests conducted, one yielded a statistically significant result. The result of a one-way analysis of variance test examining the relationship between student age and accuracy of the definition for guilt was found to be statistically significant, $F (7, 11) = 4.13, p < .05$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by eta-squared was $\eta^2 = .72$. A Tukey HSD test could not be
conducted due to a small number of responses in one level of the independent variable. However, an examination of the mean differences across levels of the independent variable suggested that 9 \( (M = 1.75, SD = .96) \), 10 \( (M = 2.75, SD = .50) \), and 11 \( (M = 2.5, SD = .71) \) year-olds were more likely to give a precise definition of guilt than were 5 \( (M = 1.00, SD = 0) \), 6 \( (M = 1.00, SD = 0) \), and 8 \( (M = 1.00, SD = 0) \) year-olds. This result seems to support the hypothesis that older students have a more accurate emotional conceptualization of guilt than younger students. One seven year-old respondent was eliminated from the mean comparison.

**Student grade level and emotional conceptualization.** An analysis parallel to the one just described was conducted substituting student grade level for age and using the exact same set of dependent variables for emotional conceptualization. Similar expectations were held for this analysis. Namely, it was expected that older students would be more likely to be able to define emotions, and that the accuracy of the definition would increase with age. Additionally, it was expected that with increasing age, congruency between verbal and behavioral report would increase. Of the seventeen Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, three yielded statistically significant results. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between grade level and word knowledge for tension was found to be statistically significant, \( H (3, N = 17) = 8.29, p < .05 \). The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .41. After identifying the existence of a statistically significant omnibus test with the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Tukey HSD test was applied to the data to discern the nature of the significant relationship. The result of this test indicated that third graders \( (M = 1.00, SD = 0) \) and
fifth graders (M = 1.43, SD = .72) were significantly more likely to offer a definition for tension, than were second graders (M = 3.00, SD = 0). The mean word knowledge for fourth graders (M = 1.67, SD = .94) did not differ significantly from any of the other grades reported. No kindergartners or first graders were coded for this item. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that students in higher grades would be more able to define emotions as compared to students in lower grades.

The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test addressing the relationship between grade level and word knowledge for guilt was found to be statistically significant, H (5, N = 27) = 11.12, p < .05. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .29. After identifying the statistically significant omnibus result with the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Tukey HSD test was applied to the data to discern the nature of the relationship. The results of this test indicated a significant mean difference between kindergartners (M = 1.00, SD = 0) and second graders (M = 2.60, SD = .80), such that kindergartners were significantly more likely than second graders to offer a definition for guilt. The mean ability of first graders (M = 1.00, SD = 0), third graders (M = 1.67, SD = .94), fourth graders (M = 1.00, SD = 0), and fifth graders (M = 1.33, SD = .75) to offer a definition of guilt did not differ significantly from kindergartners or second graders. Although this result is contrary to hypothesis, it is not uncommon to find curvilinear patterns in developmental analysis. A possible explanation lies in the accuracy of the definition given. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test that examined the relationship between grade level and accuracy of the definition given for guilt was found to be statistically significant, H (4, N = 19) = 14.36, p < .01. The strength of the relationship as indexed by
epsilon-squared was .74. After identifying the statistically significant omnibus result with the Kruskal-Wallis test, a Tukey HSD test was applied to the data to discern the nature of the significant relationship. The results of the Tukey HSD test indicated that significant mean differences existed between fourth (M = 2.33, SD = .58) and fifth (M = 2.60, SD = .45) graders and first (M = 1.33, SD = .47) and third (M = 1.20, SD = .40) graders, such that fourth and fifth graders were more likely to offer a precise definition for guilt than either first graders or third graders. Additionally, significant mean differences existed between fourth graders (M = 2.33, SD = .58) and kindergartners (M = 1.00, SD = 0), such that fourth graders were significantly more likely to give a precise definition than were kindergartners. It should be noted, that no second graders were coded for this item. The result of this analysis is consistent with the hypothesis that older students would offer more precise definitions for emotions. The result also sheds light on the previous finding that kindergartners were more likely to offer a definition for guilt than second graders. While kindergartners may have been able to out-respond second graders on word knowledge for guilt, it may be that their definitions were not as accurate as those given by older children.

Student gender and emotional conceptualization. Seventeen Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to examine the relationship between gender and emotional conceptualization of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. Although no directional hypotheses were given a priori, it seemed important to discern if males and females differed in any notable way with regard to emotional conceptualization. Of the seventeen Mann-Whitney U tests conducted, two yield statistically significant results. A
Mann-Whitney U test comparing males (n = 10) and females (n = 10) on type of definition given for guilt found statistically significant differences between the two groups, U = 24.50, p < .05. The exact significance level for this result was p < .05. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .51. The nature of the relationship was such that boys (M = 1.30, SD = .64) were significantly more likely than girls (M = 2.10, SD = .83) to give an abstract definition for guilt. A Mann-Whitney U test comparing males (n = 7) and females (n = 4) on type of definition offered for tension found statistically significant differences between the groups, U = 7.00, p < .05. The exact significance level for this result was p = .23. The strength of this relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .50. The nature of this significant finding was such that, as with the statistically significant relationship found between gender and type of definition given for guilt, boys (M = 1.00, SD = 0) reported significantly more abstract definitions for tension than girls (M = 1.75, SD = .66).

Both of these results seem to suggest that boys may conceive emotions in a more abstract way than girls. However, these two findings could also represent a confounding of a resistance effect with the abstract definition code. Recall, that boys were found to be significantly more resistant to answering interview questions than girls. The criteria for an abstract definition, as laid out in the coding system, states “considered apart from concrete existence” or “stated without reference to a particular instance.” It could be, that boys were found to use more abstract emotion definitions than girls due to a
manifestation of their higher resistance in less comfort using personal references to define emotions.

**Non-TDY emotional experience and emotion conceptualization.** Seventeen Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to compare students who reported having non-TDY experience with loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, or guilt, with students who reported not having non-TDY experience with these emotions, in terms of emotional conceptualization. It was expected that students who reported they had experienced these emotions for non-TDY reasons would have more accurate verbal report and higher levels of congruency between verbal report and behavioral expression. Of the seventeen Mann-Whitney U tests conducted, three were found to be statistically significant. The result of a Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported they had experienced loneliness for a non-TDY reason (n = 10) and students who reported they had not experienced loneliness for a non-TDY reason (n = 1), in terms of word knowledge for loneliness, was found to be statistically significant, U = .50, p < .05. However, this result was suspect due to the fact that one of the groups had only one participant in it (i.e., one participant reported having not felt lonely for a non-TDY reason), thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test. Therefore, this result was dismissed. A Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported that they had been lonely for a non-TDY reason (n = 6) and students who reported they had not been lonely for a non-TDY reason (n = 2), in terms of reported behavioral expression of loneliness found statistically significant differences between the two groups, U = .00, p < .05. However, the result of this test was also suspect due to the fact that one of the groups contained only two participants
(i.e., two students reported that they had not experienced loneliness due to a non-TDY reason), which pushes the reasonable limits of the test. Consequently this result was dismissed. A third Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported they had felt worried for a non-TDY reason \((n=24)\) and students who reported they had not felt worried for a non-TDY reason \((n=1)\), on their word knowledge for worry, found statistically significant differences between the two groups, \(U = .50, p < .01\). As with the previous two results, this result was also suspect because one of the groups had only one participant in it (i.e., one participant reported having not felt worried for a non-TDY reason), and consequently this result was dismissed. It is interesting to note that in terms of non-TDY emotional experiences, very few numbers of students speak of having not experienced loneliness and worry, suggesting that experience with these emotions is common for students. In terms of word knowledge for non-TDY loneliness and worry, of the students who responded that they had experienced the emotion under non-TDY circumstances, the vast majority of them were able to offer a definition for each emotion. This might suggest that with larger sample sizes, students who had experienced the emotion would be found to be more likely to be able to define it.

**TDY emotional experience and emotion conceptualization.** Twelve Mann-Whitney U tests comparing students who reported they had experienced TDY loneliness, anxiety, worry, or guilt with students who reported they had not experienced these emotions during TDY, in terms of emotional conceptualization, were conducted. As with non-TDY emotional experience, it was expected that who students reported they had experienced these emotions for TDY reasons would have more accurate verbal report
and more congruency between verbal report and behavioral expression. Of the twelve Mann-Whitney U tests conducted, three found statistically significant differences between the groups. A Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported they had experienced TDY loneliness \((n = 23)\) and students who reported they had not been lonely during TDY \((n = 6)\), on the accuracy of the definition given for loneliness found statistically significant differences between the two groups, \(U = 33.00, p < .05\). The exact significance level for this result was \(p < .05\). The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was .52. The nature of this relationship was such that students who reported they had felt lonely during TDY \((M = 1.69, SD = .55)\) were significantly more likely to offer an inaccurate definition of loneliness than those students who reported they had not been lonely during TDY \((M = 2.33, SD = .47)\). This result, while statistically significant, is not in the predicted direction. It may be that while experience with an emotion allows one to verbally define it, experience itself does not inform the accuracy of the definition. It may also be, that TDY loneliness is unique from loneliness triggered by non-TDY causes, such that it does not share the same defining features as loneliness experienced for non-TDY reasons. This would fit with the lack of a statistically significant correlational relationship between non-TDY and TDY loneliness.

A Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported that they had felt lonely during TDY \((n = 12)\) and students who reported they had not felt lonely during TDY \((n = 2)\), on congruency between verbal and behavioral report of loneliness found statistically significant differences between the groups, \(U = 6.00, p < .01\). However, this
result was suspect due to the fact that one of the groups contained only two participants (i.e., two students reported that they had not felt lonely during TDY), thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test. Therefore, this result was dismissed. It is interesting to note that all of the students who reported they had felt lonely during TDY were coded as exhibiting congruency in their verbal report and behavioral expression of loneliness.

A Mann-Whitney U test comparing students who reported they had felt guilty during TDY (n = 3) and students who reported they had not felt guilty during TDY (n = 13), on accuracy of the definition given for guilt found statistically significant differences between the two groups, $U = 4.50$, $p < .05$. The exact significance level for this result was $p < .05$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was -.77. The nature of the relationship was such that students who reported they had not felt guilty during TDY were significantly more likely to offer an inaccurate definition for guilt, ($M = 1.69$, $SD = .85$) than students who reported they had felt guilt during TDY ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0$). While this relationship is in the predicted direction, it creates dissonance between this result and the finding that accuracy of loneliness is not enhanced by TDY experience with loneliness. If the “defining features” theory is correct, this result might be explained by the assumption that guilt is a more “universal” emotional experience than loneliness (i.e., guilt experienced under non-TDY or TDY circumstances shares many defining features).

Age and valance associated with anxiety. Two one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine developmental change in the valance associated with anxiety. It was expected that younger students would report higher levels of positive valance...
associated with anxiety owing to older students more "adult-like" conception of anxiety (i.e., acceptance of societal norms that anxiety experiences are not good). The first one-way analysis on variance test examined the relationship between age and negative valance associated with anxiety. The result of this test was nonsignificant. The result of the second one-way analysis of variance test, which examined the relationship between age and positive valance associated with anxiety, was found to be statistically significant, $F(6, 31) = 4.46, p < .01$. This relationship addressed the question, "Is there anything good about being nervous?" The strength of the relationship as indexed by eta-squared was .46. The results of a Tukey HSD test indicated that 11 ($M = 1.00, SD = 0$) year-olds, differ significantly from 5 ($M = 0, SD = 0$), 7 ($M = 0, SD = 0$), 8 ($M = .13, SD = .36$), 9 ($M = 0, SD = 0$), and 10 ($M = .20, SD = .45$) year-olds, in that 11 years-olds were significantly more likely than other age groups to report that there can be a positive valance to anxiety. The mean proportion of affirmative responses given by six year olds ($M = .42, SD = .53$) differed nonsignificantly from any of the groups. This result, while statistically significant, is contrary to hypothesis. A possible explanation for this finding, is that it captures older students' greater flexibility in thinking. In other words, what is being captured is older students' ability to inspect a concept from many angles, rather than the value they personally assign to anxiety. An interesting addition to this question could have been, "And in your personal life, do you ever think anxiety is good?"

**Grade level and valance associated with anxiety.** Two Kruskal-Wallis tests were run to examine the relationship between grade level and student report of negative and
positive valance associated with anxiety. Both of these analyses yielded nonsignificant results.

**Teacher rating of student academic performance and emotional conceptualization.** Seventeen Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher rating of student academic performance and student emotional conceptualization of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. It was expected that for both teacher rating of academic performance and personal adjustment, higher teacher ratings would be associated with more sophisticated verbal conceptualization and more verbal to behavioral congruency. Of the seventeen Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, two yielded statistically significant results. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between teacher rating of student academic performance and student report of behavioral expression of loneliness was found to be statistically significant, \( H(2, N = 23) = 6.19, p < .05 \). However, upon examination of the cells, this result became suspect due to the fact that one level of the independent variable contained only one participant (i.e., one participant was rated as below average in academic performance), thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test. Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine if the significant result remained when the two levels of the independent variable containing adequate participants were examined. The result of the Mann-Whitney U test was found to be statistically nonsignificant, and consequently the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test was dismissed. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between teacher rating of academic performance and student word knowledge for worry, was found to be
statistically significant, $H(2, N = 22) = 9.37, p < .01$. However, upon examination of the cells this result became suspect because one level of the independent variable contained only one participant (i.e., one student was rated as below average in academic performance), thus pushing the reasonable limits of the test. Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine if the significant result held when the two levels of the independent variable containing adequate participants were examined. The result of this test was nonsignificant, and consequently the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test was dismissed.

**Teacher rating of student personal adjustment and emotional conceptualization.** Seventeen Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher rating of student personal adjustment and student conceptualization of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. No statistically significant relationships were identified.

**Parental rating of the effect of school attendance on TDY adjustment and emotional conceptualization.** Seventeen Kruskal-Wallis test were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of the effect of school attendance on their child's adjustment to TDY, and student emotional conceptualization of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. It was expected that parents who reported that school attendance facilitated TDY adjustment would have children with more sophisticated emotional conceptualization in terms of verbal definitions and congruency of verbal to behavioral report. It was also expected that parents who reported that school attendance facilitated TDY adjustment would have children who reported more internalizing than
externalizing behavior. Of the seventeen Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted, one yielded significant results. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between parent perception of the role of school attendance in facilitating adjustment to TDY and student report of behavioral expression of anxiety was found to be statistically significant, $H (1, N = 22) = 8.23, p < .01$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .36. Although a Tukey HSD could not be applied to the data due to a small number of responses in several levels of the independent variable, an examination of the mean differences across levels of the independent variable suggested that parents who reported that attending school facilitated their child's adjustment to TDY had children who reported more internalizing behavior for anxiety ($M = 1.08, SD = .27$) than parents who reported that attending school has no affect on their child's adjustment ($M = 1.78, SD = .63$).

**Parental satisfaction with school TDY efforts and emotional conceptualization.** Seventeen Kruskal-Wallis test were conducted to examine the relationship between parental report of satisfaction with school efforts to help their child adjust to TDY and student report of emotional conceptualization for loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry, and guilt. It was expected that parents who were satisfied with school efforts would have children with more sophisticated emotional conceptualization in terms of verbal definitions and congruency of verbal to behavioral report. It was also expected that satisfied parents would have children who reported more internalizing than externalizing behavior. None of these seventeen Kruskal-Wallis tests yielded statistically significant results.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Revisiting The Problem Under Investigation

This study undertook three areas of investigation: (a) TDY experience most notably in terms of emotional experience and school performance, (b) the role of two components of stress theory in informing our understanding of how students manage negative affect associated with TDY and the ways in which this information might serve the designing of interventions, and (c) developmental change in emotional conceptualization and the ways in which emotional experience contributes to emotional conceptualization.

Recapping The Results

TDY Experiences

Emotional experience. Based on an examination of the frequencies of student report of negative TDY affect, it seems reasonable to conclude that the majority of the students who participated in the study reported experiencing negative affect due to TDY. Reported frequencies of emotional experience with the six emotions examined under TDY experiences indicated that: 82.5% of the students experienced loneliness during TDY, 68.3% of the students experienced anxiety during TDY, 65% of the students experienced depression during TDY, 64.3% of the students experienced worry during TDY, 63.2% of the students experienced separation anxiety during TDY, and 29.8% of the students experienced guilt during TDY. It would seem that with the exception of
guilt, TDYs created negative affect in the majority of students who participated in the study, with loneliness being the most frequently experienced of the TDY emotions.

It may be helpful to frame these frequencies of TDY negative affect in terms of student report of non-TDY experiences with these emotions. For instance, 71.4% of the students reported experiencing loneliness for a non-TDY reason, 94.7% of the students reported feeling anxious for a non-TDY reason, 91.4% of the students reported feeling worried for a non-TDY reason, 61% of the students reported feeling depressed for a non-TDY reason, and 53.1% of the students reported feeling guilty for a non-TDY reason. In terms of sheer frequency, when compared with non-TDY frequency of report of these emotions, the report of TDY-induced negative affect seems a bit tempered. For instance, more students reported feeling anxious, worried, and guilty for a non-TDY reason than for a TDY reason. While this in no way negates the fact that the majority of the students reported experiencing negative affect due to TDY, it does suggest that parental TDY does not monopolize student experience with these emotions. An interesting distinction that could be investigated in future studies is the difference between quantitative and qualitative emotional report. The issue at stake is this: although students reported similar frequency of experience with TDY and non-TDY negative affect, does this suggest similarity of emotional experience, or do experiences with the same emotion vary as a function of the context in which the emotion takes place? For instance, compared to anxiety occurring under non-TDY circumstances, is the emotional pitch associated with anxiety experienced under TDY circumstances significantly more intense? This could be an important piece of information for placing student affective
experience with TDY into the larger context of students' general affective experiences.

In terms of school performance, frequencies examining student report of school performance under non-TDY circumstances indicated that the vast majority of students reported that they were regularly prepared for class and were able to keep track of classroom activities. Teacher ratings seemed to verify student report of academic performance. An examination of student report of TDY school performance indicated that while a sizable number of students reported experiencing school difficulties during TDY, the majority of students did not report a change in school performance owing to parental TDY. Of those students reporting TDY school performance difficulties, 47.2% of the responding students reported they sometimes had difficulty going to school during TDY, 41.2% of the students reported that they directed higher levels of clinging behavior at their teacher during TDY, 34.3% of the students reported that they had difficulty keeping track of classroom activities during TDY, and 35.1% of the students reported that they had trouble getting classwork done on-time during TDY.

In terms of feedback, teachers rated the vast majority of the students as average or above average in academic performance and personal adjustment, suggesting that adjustment problems attributed to TDY were not likely the result of school-wide problems caused by poor student academic achievement or personal adjustment. Parents generally reported a positive view of the school, with the majority reporting that school attendance during TDY had salutary effects on their child's TDY adjustment and that they were generally satisfied with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY. Although many of the teachers and some of the parents expressed concern about the
deleterious effects associated with TDY, their global ratings of the school environment seemed positive.

Knowing total numbers of students that experienced TDY-related negative affect is helpful in terms of gauging how prevalent the problems is. However, in terms of organizing how TDY is experienced by individual students, it becomes more useful to examine TDY emotional experience as it varies by: age, grade, gender, military family background, school performance, and teacher ratings. Student report of TDY emotional experience differed nonsignificantly as a function of both age and grade, suggesting that the processes of maturation or additive learning were not particularly useful in terms of organizing student TDY emotional experience. Additionally, impending TDY, somatization, teacher ratings of student personal adjustment, as well as parental ratings of the effect of school attendance on TDY adjustment and parental satisfaction with school efforts to help their child cope with TDY, proved unhelpful in organizing student experience with negative TDY affect. Five variables proved useful in organizing students' experience with negative TDY affect. These five variables were: gender, a recent change in family TDY load, length of longest TDY, student report of school performance in terms of getting classwork done on-time during TDY, and teacher rating of academic performance.

Girls reported higher levels of negative TDY affect than boys in terms of report of separation anxiety and guilt. While it should be recalled that other analyses indicated that TDY levels of separation anxiety did not appear to not reach clinical levels as expressed in student ability to leave the custodial parent's presence without extreme
distress and the ability to attend school without difficulty during TDY, and that guilt was one of the least frequently reported emotions under both TDY and non-TDY circumstances; in as much as this result represents a real effect of girls experiencing more negative TDY affect than boys it may have important implications. Based on classic military studies (for example, see Pederson, 1966, and Hillenbrand, 1976) the prevailing wisdom has been that parental absence due to TDY is more distressing for boys than girls. One possible explanation for finding the opposite result in this study is that the previous studies finding that boys adjust more poorly to TDY than girls have often been based on measures of behavioral indicators of distress. It may be that this study, with its direct questioning of emotional experience during TDY, was more sensitive to girls’ affective experience with TDY than are studies utilizing behavioral measures. An interesting methodology question for future studies in this area would be an examination of gender differences in TDY emotional experience based on the type of instrumentation used. Of course, the finding that girls reported higher levels of TDY separation anxiety and guilt than boys should be tempered by the fact that boys were found to be more resistant to answering interview questions than girls, and one of the emotions resistant students under-reported was separation anxiety. However, it may still be worthwhile for a future study on the effects of TDY to investigate a gender by instrumentation interaction with regard to differential report of TDY negative affect as a function of gender.

Two military family background variables proved salient in organizing student report of TDY-induced negative affect, suggesting that the nature of the parent’s
absence may have more bearing on student TDY emotional experience than the absence of the military parent per se. The first military family background variable that proved helpful in organizing student TDY experience was perception of a recent change in family TDY load, such that students who reported that the TDY load experienced in their family had recently increased reported more TDY guilt than students who reported that family TDY load had not recently changed. The second military family background variable that proved helpful in organizing student TDY emotional experience was length of longest TDY, such that students who reported their longest TDY as three months or one year reported more worry than students who gave other lengths for their longest TDY experience. While it was mentioned that within this particular sample there could be a length by location confound, these two variables may still be useful in identifying students who may need extra help managing negative affect due to parental TDY. These finding are consistent with results of other studies that indicate that it may not be the absence of the military parent per se, but the circumstances surrounding the absence that predict TDY adjustment (Pederson, 1966, Hillenbrand, 1976, Jensen et al., 1989, and Kelley, 1994).

Student TDY emotional report was also found to be related to one facet of TDY school performance. Specifically, students who reported that they had difficulty getting classwork done on-time during TDY reported lower levels of TDY separation anxiety. It was postulated in the results that student difficulty in getting classwork done on-time during TDY may cue teachers that the student requires additional monitoring and coaching. This additional teacher support may moderate student feelings of separation
anxiety. The result also suggested that increased clinging behavior directed at the teacher during TDY could be organized by age such that eight year-olds/second graders reported more clinging behavior than other students. Teacher rating of academic adjustment also proved helpful in organizing student TDY emotional experience. Specifically, it was found that students rated by their teachers as average in academic performance reported more TDY anxiety than did students rated by their teachers as above average in academic performance. The results suggest that although students did not generally report experiencing school difficulties owing to TDY, second graders and students rated as average in academic performance might have more difficulty than others.

Coping responses and perceived social support. Turning to an examination of how two components of stress theory organize students’ experience with TDY an unexpected and surprising conclusion is reached. Specifically, although the majority of the students were able to intelligently verbalize their use of coping responses and social support resources, these constructs did not help organize students’ TDY emotional experiences. Students were able to discuss the characteristics of their coping responses and perceived social support providers cogently. For instance, the majority of the students were able to generate at least one coping response for managing negative TDY affect with the most frequently reported coping function of these coping responses being emotion-focused. This report of high levels of emotion-focused coping is consistent with coping patterns found by Hiew (1992) in a study of Canadian military families experiencing routine TDY. Specifically, Hiew found that the children in her study relied largely on emotion-focused coping. Hiew found the heavily reliance of emotion-focused
coping to be appropriate as there was nothing the children could do to actually change the circumstances surrounding their parents' absence. Student report of the social locus of the coping responses varied as a function of the emotion under study. For loneliness, the majority of the coping responses were oriented towards others or self and others, whereas for anxiety and worry, the majority of the coping responses were self-oriented.

In terms of perceived social support, the majority of the students reported five to eight persons who were available to provide them with social support. Almost all the rest of the students reported they had between one and four social support providers they could rely on. Less than five percent of the students reported that they did not have anyone who could provide them with social support. Overall, this seems to suggest that the students were well-integrated in their social environments and had adequate social support. In terms of the individuals upon which students relied for their social support, family members, especially mom, and peers were mentioned most frequently. This is consistent with results presented by Reid et al. (1989) in terms of student report that mom is a good multipurpose support provider whereas peers are best suited for meeting companionship needs. This may explain the finding within the loneliness coping responses; the only affective category yielding higher numbers of coping responses directed at others than at self, that students listed peers as their preferred social support source for dealing with loneliness. As loneliness was the most frequently reported TDY emotions, future studies in this area may wish to focus in detail on the role peers play in managing loneliness.
Individual differences in characteristics of the coping responses emerged as a function of age, grade, gender, and parental ratings of satisfaction with school TDY efforts. No statistically significant individual differences emerged between student background variables and report of perceived social support. Characteristics of the coping responses, in terms of number of coping responses, coping function, and social locus, did not appear to organize the students' TDY emotional experience. Likewise, perceived social support did not appear to organize the students' TDY emotional experience either. In other words, although students were able to discuss the coping strategies they used to manage negative affect and reported on persons available to provide social support, these factors did not appear to mediate TDY experience. This is consistent with results presented by Hiew (1992), which indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between coping strategies (i.e., emotion-focused versus problem-focused) and TDY adjustment. However, Hiew (1992) reported that higher levels of maternal social support were found to be related to better child adjustment to TDY both at home and at school. Combining the results of this study with the results presented by Hiew (1992), future studies may wish to examine further the possibility that parental perceived social support is an important family-level coping resource that predicts TDY adjustment for all family members. It could be particularly interesting to investigate whether a parental perceived social support by child perceived social support interaction exists, such that knowledge of the child's perceived social support is only predictive when considered in conjunction with parental perceived social support. The primacy of the perceived social support of the custodial parent (Hiew,
1992) and the finding in this study that individual student coping responses did not organize TDY emotional experience, fits with the results of studies that suggest that child adjustment to TDY is mediated by the adjustment of the custodial parent (e.g., Jensen et al., 1989).

Another family-level explanation for the finding that student report of coping responses and perceived social support did not organize TDY emotional experience is that it could be that coping responses and perceived social support do not mediated negative TDY affect as well as certain aspects of the military subculture in terms of the practice of family rituals (Wolin & Bennet, 1984). It seems plausible that within the military subculture, processes for taking leave of the military family member and integrating him/her back into the family may become ritualized. So much so perhaps, that family celebration rituals surrounding these events are nearly officially disseminated, thus providing a ready-made framework for managing these events. Additionally, within the military subculture, individual family differences in the practice of family traditions and family interactions may structure family experience with TDYs in such a way as to lessen the perception that TDYs are an unmanageable problem in need of specialized coping responses. Combining the role of family rituals with results of others who have found that family organization levels during TDY predict TDY adjustment (Hill 1945, 1949, Boss 1980) may prove useful in exploring family-level and subculture-level coping resources that might organize TDY emotional experience better than individual coping responses.
Emotional Conceptualization

Reviewing general trends in student emotional conceptualization of loneliness, anxiety, tension, worry and guilt, the majority of students were able to offer a definition for loneliness, tension, worry, and guilt. Additionally, in the majority of cases, students offered an abstract definition for the emotion, and with the exception of the definitions offered for tension, these definitions tended to be accurate. The majority of the students reported that they expressed loneliness, anxiety, and tension in internalizing ways, and students tended of exhibit congruency between their verbal and behavioral report of loneliness and tension.

TDY emotional experience was found to organize emotional conceptualization of loneliness and guilt in interesting ways. TDY emotional experience with loneliness appeared to influence emotional conceptualization of loneliness in terms of accuracy. Interestingly, students who reported they had felt lonely during TDY were more likely to report an inaccurate definition of loneliness than were students who reported that they had not felt lonely during TDY. Conversely, in terms of TDY experience with guilt, students who reported they had felt guilty during TDY were more likely than students who reported they had not felt guilty during TDY to report an accurate definition for guilt. It seems as if in the case of guilt, TDY experience was associated with greater definitional accuracy, whereas in the case of loneliness, TDY experience with the emotion did not add to conceptual accuracy. As mentioned in the results section, it is possible that the defining characteristics of emotions vary as a function of the triggering stimulus of the emotion (i.e., non-TDY versus TDY event), such that the experience of
the emotion under certain circumstances may be more informative of a general knowledge of that emotion than under other circumstances. In this case, it may be that TDY loneliness is differentiated enough from other cases of loneliness that it does not accurately inform a general knowledge of loneliness. On the other hand, guilt experienced under TDY circumstances may share more features in common with guilt experienced under other circumstances, such that TDY guilt is more informative in building an accurate conception of guilt in general. This idea of different defining features of emotions elicited by different triggering stimuli would fit with the finding of no statistically significant correlational relationships between non-TDY and TDY emotional experience. Future studies may want to address the possibility that the defining features of emotions vary depending on the circumstances under which the emotion is experienced.

Individual differences in student emotional conceptualization emerged around age, grade, gender, and parental satisfaction with school TDY efforts. In terms of student age, whether measured in years or grade, older students were found to have more precise definitions of guilt than were younger students. Differences by grade were also found in terms of word knowledge for tension and guilt, such that third and fifth graders were significantly more likely to be able to offer a definition for tension than were second graders, and kindergartners were found to be more able to offer a definition for guilt than were second graders. In terms of gender, boys were more likely than girls to offer an abstract definition for both tension and guilt. It was also found that in terms of behavioral expression of anxiety, children of parents who reported that school
attendance facilitated TDY adjustment, reported expressing anxiety in internalizing ways compared to students whose parents reported that school attendance had no effect on TDY adjustment. A possible explanation for this finding is that when students internalize, parents may be more likely to have more positive interactions with the school. Another possible explanation for this finding is that when students internalize parents may have less overt information that counters the positive effect of school, thus leading to more positive appraisals.

Critique of the Results

The topics taken under consideration in this section include: (a) issues with the power of the statistical analysis in terms of significance level and information provided by the indices of strength of the relationship, and (b) within-group variance issues. The purpose of this critique is to provide helpful information for designing future studies in this area.

Issues of Power

Significance level. Some researchers have suggested that the conventional .05 level of statistical significance may not be appropriate for studies in the behavioral sciences (Cohen, 1969; Greenwald, 1975; Skipper, et al., 1972). According to these authors, strict adherence to the .05 significance level has resulted in a preoccupation with type I errors at the expense of type II errors and a lack of attention to the purpose for which the results will be used. Bearing in mind that the practical application of the results of this study make it arguable that type II errors are as salient as type I errors, it was decided that it was appropriate to conduct a secondary analysis of the results with a less
stringent significance level of .10. The purpose in doing this was to determine if results
with practical utility had been missed due to the stringent significance level (i.e.,
identification of type II errors). Seven statistically significant results were indicated.
Three of these relationships pertained to emotional experience during TDY and
expanded the findings that were statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.
The results of two of these three tests supported the importance of family background
variables surrounding TDY in terms of number of moves and report of TDY guilt and
perception of a change in family TDY load and report of TDY depression. Specifically,
the result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated the existence of a statistically significant
relationship between number of moves and TDY report of guilt, $H (3, N = 30) = 6.38, p$
< .10. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .15. The nature
of the relationship was such that students who reported they had never moved ($M = .75,
SD = .43$) reported more TDY guilt than students who reported they had move 2 to 3
times ($M = .08, SD = .28$). Additionally, the result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated a
statistically significant relationship between change in family TDY load and report of
TDY depression, $H (2, N = 15) = 5.70, p < .10$. The strength of the relationship as
indexed by epsilon-squared was .31. The nature of the relationship was such that
students who reported that family TDY load had increased reported more TDY
depression ($M = 1.00, SD = 0$) than students who reported that family TDY load was the
same as always ($M = .20, SD = .40$). A third statistically significant result was identified
within the emotional experience domain. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated a
statistically significant relationship between teacher report of student personal adjustment
and TDY loneliness, $H(2, N = 40) = 5.05, p < .10$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .08. The nature of the relationship was such that students rated by their teacher as above average ($M = .88, SD = .40$) or average ($M = .88, SD = .31$) in personal adjustment reported more TDY loneliness than students rated by their teachers as below average ($M = .50, SD = .50$) in personal adjustment.

Two statistically significant results emerged between developmental variables and perceived social support. These two results provided new information that had not been discerned at the .05 level of statistical significance. The results of both tests indicated that developmental variables influenced perceived social support such that whether measured by age or grade level younger students reported more social support providers than older students. Specifically, the result of a one-way analysis of variance test indicated the existence of a statistically significant relationship between student age and perceived social support, $F(6, 32) = 2.07, p < .10$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by eta-squared was .28. The nature of the relationship was such that five year-olds ($M = 4, SD = 1$) reported more social support providers than ten year-olds ($M = 2.60, SD = 1.02$). Additionally, the result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated the existence of a statistically significant relationship between grade level and perceived social support, $H(5, N = 41) = 9.73, p < .10$. The strength of this relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .14. An examination of mean differences across levels of the independent variable suggested that kindergartners ($M = 4.00, SD = .75$), first graders ($M = 3.71, SD = .70$), second graders ($M = 3.75, SD = .66$), and fourth graders ($M = 3.67, SD = .47$)
reported more social support providers than third graders ($M = 3.29, SD = .45$) or fifth graders ($M = 3.00, SD = 1.00$).

In the area of emotional conceptualization, two statistically significant relationships emerged involving teacher and parent ratings. The result of a Kruskal-Wallis test indicated a statistically significant result between teacher rating of personal adjustment and word knowledge for guilt, $H (2, N = 27) = 5.68, p < .10$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by epsilon-squared was .15. The nature of the relationship was such that students who were rated by their teachers as above average ($M = 1.33, SD = 1.17$) or average ($M = 1.36, SD = .77$) in personal adjustment were more likely to offer a definition of guilt than were students who were rated as below average ($M = 2.50, SD = .87$) in personal adjustment. Additionally, the result of a Mann-Whitney U test indicated statistically significant differences between students whose parents reported that school attendance facilitated TDY adjustment ($n = 17$) and students whose parents reported that school attendance had no effect on TDY adjustment ($n = 9$) in terms of behavioral expression of loneliness, $U = 55.00, p < .10$. The strength of the relationship as indexed by the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient was -.28. The nature of the relationship was such that students whose parents reported that school attendance facilitated TDY adjustment ($M = 1.06, SD = .24$) were more likely to report expressing loneliness in internalizing ways as compared to students whose parents reported that school attendance had no effect on TDY adjustment ($M = 1.44, SD = .69$). As with the results reported for emotional experience, the emotional conceptualization
results that were significant at the .10 level expanded on the results that had been previously identified with the more stringent .05 significance level.

**Indices of strength.** Two issues that arise with regard to indices of strength of the relationship are: (a) comparison between types of indices of strength used across the statistical tests conducted in this study and implications for effect size and type II errors, and (b) the computation of indices of strength for nonsignificant results in order to identify areas where nonsignificant results might have been due to small sample size rather than lack of relationship between the variables. In terms of the comparability of indices of strength across results reported in this paper, it should be noted that eta-squared and epsilon-squared are indexed on a scale of 0 to 1, while the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient is interpreted in the same manner as a Pearson correlation coefficient (i.e. a non-squared value). This suggests that the first two indices of strength are not directly comparable to the Glass rank biserial correlation coefficient unless the square root of eta-squared or epsilon-squared is taken. Taking the square root of these indices will increase their value, indicating that the strength of the relationships between the variables subjected to one-way analysis of variance and Kruskal-Wallis are stronger than may seem at first glance of the results. This finding also has important implications for the likelihood of committing type II errors. Specifically, with the larger effect size the probability of committing type II errors is decreased.

The procedure of computing indices of strength for nonsignificant results is recommended by Jaccard and Becker (1990) as a method for identifying analyses in which a small sample size may have hindered the identification of statistically significant
results. The premise underlying this procedure is that if a moderate or large index of strength is found for a nonsignificant result it may suggest that the nonsignificant result was due to small sample size rather than a lack of relationship between the variables.

Computing indices of strength for nonsignificant results identified broad areas where future research with a larger sample may be appropriate, see Appendix L for a list of the indices of strength that were computed. Within the area of emotional experience, the computation of indices of strength for nonsignificant results suggested that future research into the relationship between age and non-TDY and TDY emotional experience may be warranted. The computation of indices of strength for nonsignificant results within the school performance analyses suggested that future investigations into the relationship between student report of TDY school performance difficulties and TDY emotional report may be fruitful. The indices of strength computed within the area of coping response characteristics suggested that future investigations examining the relationship between age and characteristics of the coping responses may be warranted. The computation of indices of strength for nonsignificant emotional conceptualization analyses identified that future research into the relationships between age, gender, and non-TDY emotional experience and emotional conceptualization variables may be fruitful.

**Within-Group Variance**

In the report of the means and standard deviations for statistically significant results, a phenomenon emerged in which for some levels of the independent variable a standard deviation of zero was reported. This is problematic because it indicates a lack
of within-group variance, which for the parametric tests represents a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance and calls into question the validity of the result.

This problem was handled by rerunning the parametric tests (i.e., one-way analysis of variance with age as the independent variable) in which standard deviations were reported as zero as nonparametric tests. While nonparametric tests are not assumption free (Bradley, 1972) they are free from assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance. When the one-way analysis of variance tests were rerun as Kruskal-Wallis tests the results remained statistically significant suggesting that the results were valid.

However, while the results of the suspect one-way analysis of variance tests remained statistically significant when run with nonparametric tests not requiring distribution assumptions, the methodological issue of why there was restricted within-group variance remained. Four possible explanations were generated. First, the sample size was small (i.e., N = 42), perhaps with a larger sample size a more representative level of variation would have been found. Second, it is possible that the data were affected by a coder bias. Although the coding system was found to be reliable, there could have been a reliable bias applied to the data such that less variation was identified and coded than was really there. Third, it is possible that the coding categories were too inclusive. It may have been that the coding categories were too broad to capture the within-group variation that was present in the sample. Fourth, it is possible that that the lack of within-group variation represents a phenomenological effect, such that for some subgroups of students TDY experience is not highly variable. Future research in this area
may want to address methodological issues that could truncate within-group variation prior to undertaking data collection, coding, and analysis.

In Closing

In terms of the impact of TDY on students attending this school, the majority of the students reported experiencing negative affect in terms of loneliness, anxiety, worry, depression, separation anxiety, and guilt. These experiences with TDY negative affect can be meaningfully organized in terms of individual differences in gender, teacher rating of academic performance, and specific aspects of the TDY experience. In discussing how student coping responses organized experiences with TDY-induced negative affect, while students were able to cogently discuss their coping repertoires in terms of number of coping responses, coping function of the coping response, and social locus of the response they would use to manage negative TDY affect, and indicated in their report of social support resources that they were well-integrated within their social context, this information did not appear to organize student experience with negative TDY affect. Interesting patterns emerged in terms of the effect of TDY emotional experience on emotional conceptualization as well as in individual differences in emotional conceptualization as a function of age, grade, gender, and parental rating of the effect of school attendance on TDY adjustment.

Although the results of this study indicated that parental TDY was associated with negative affect for most students, the effect of parental TDY did not appear to be extremely deleterious. However, the problem remains that the school faculty solicited a
study to examine the extent and nature of the problems facing the school due to TDY. Two possible explanations for the discrepancy between teacher and student perception emerge. First, although student report did not verify the existence of severe adjustment problems associated with TDYs, as reported by Jensen et al. (1989, 1996) adult and student report do not always agree in terms of the effect of TDY on student adjustment. While the results presented by Jensen et al. suggest that adults tend to minimize the problems created for children by TDYs, in this study it appears that adult perception exaggerated the magnitude of the problem TDY presented to these students. In light of the findings of this study, and those presented by Jensen et al. (1989, 1996), it might be commendable when conducting research in this area to solicit from both adults and children their perceptions of how poor adjustment to TDY manifests itself and incorporate this information into what is known about this problem based on a review of the literature.

Besides sheer perceptual differences between adults and students, a second possible explanation for the discrepancies in student and teacher report is that an attributional bias may be motivating teacher or student report. For instance, it is possible that the teachers might be making external attributions to parental TDY for some other problem that is operating within the school. Operating on a military base increases the saliency of the students' membership in the military community, thus heightening the possibility that difficulties with students might be attributed to the external environment. The students might also be reporting their TDY experiences from an attributionally biased perspective. Specifically, as TDYs have become less predictable in their
occurrence and duration (i.e., as evidence by recent international events, military parents are more likely than previously to depart unexpectedly for an unknown period of time), the ambiguity surrounding TDYs has probably increased. Forced to cope with loss issues surrounding an ambiguous task, students may be more likely to attribute their negative affect surrounding TDY to some personal quality, thus diminishing the amount of distress attributed to the TDY. Internal attributions can increase a sense of control, perhaps making TDYs seem more manageable.

It seems that in many ways the results of this study reinforce the results found by others: while TDY experiences often create negative affective states and mild disruption in adjustment, for the majority of students, parental absence due to military service does not create extreme distress (e.g., Pederson, 1966, Jensen et al., 1989, and Jensen et al. 1996). Perhaps, it is true that most military children are well-adjusted and consider experiences with TDY normative events. In any event, within this sample parental TDY did not appear to create severe hardships. In conclusion, in addition to the frequency information describing what TDY experiences were generally like for students in this sample, student TDY emotional experience seemed to be best organized by individual differences in student age, grade, gender, and teacher ratings.
APPENDIX A

SUGGESTIONS MADE IN THE LITERATURE FOR FACILITATING DEPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

• Hill (1945). Letters are of the utmost importance. Letters should be candid, realistic, and full of as much detail as possible. The goal is to keep the waiting family and the absent father in touch with the reality of each other's lives. Pictures are good as they reinforce the reality each is presenting in the letter (i.e., don't keep weight gain and recently-grown mustaches a secret). Fathers should be sure to write letters to their children that describe blow-by-blow the activities of their military days. Husbands and wives should attempt to maintain marital intimacy by providing emotional support in their letters. Husbands support your wives, wives look after your husbands need for tenderness to contradict the stark realities of military life. Upon the father's return, the family should go easy on planning too much entertainment and festivities. Allow the veteran to relax and have a say in family outings and visits. Realize it will take awhile for the veteran to adjust to family life, he may be full of complaints, restlessness, and a willingness to be dictatorial in decision-making at one moment but, incapacitated to act at the next. Be patient, do not worry needlessly about small disagreements. If things get out of hand, get professional help. Fathers: do not try to take back discipline too quickly!!
• Hill (1949). What follows is a brief summary of a four prong military family policy plan that Hill believed should be enacted by the military as well as, other government and community agencies concerned with military family welfare.

• Do not separate fathers from families unless it is a matter of national security—respect the sanctity of family life.

• Allotments should be paid for general child care and family medical expenses—demonstrate a shared responsibility for military child welfare

• Provide community resources to promote military family well-being and integrity.

• Provide furloughs and other recreational benefits to boost family morale and emotional well-being at expense to the military

• Sum: If the military must separate families, the military should assume greater responsibility for the family’s physical, financial, and emotional well-being.

• Montalvo (1976). While studying the resource utilization patterns of military families who had recently relocated off-post due to the remote deployment of their sponsor, Montalvo found that military families preferred access to military resources over civilian resources and this was especially true for families facing severe stressors. The military subculture is characterized by reciprocal, non-dependent help-giving among military members, and this is where most military families would prefer to get help. Not only do military families prefer to use military resources, they indicate that they believe that having adequate military resources readily available serves as a
preventative or protective measure. Montalvo concluded that the services and support provided within the military subculture buffer the hardships associated with family separation and that military families experiencing dismemberment from their military sponsor should only be removed from military community if absolutely necessary.

• Bowen (1985). An interesting finding in this study was military couples’ reports of the nature of their social support networks. Specifically, the majority of couples surveyed reported not feeling close or dependent on the individuals within their immediate community. In fact, most couples prided themselves on being independent and reported that in the event of a family emergency they would rather handle the problem themselves. When pressed, these families reported that they would rely on their parents. An interesting finding, since most of these families lived too far from their parents to expect any tangible assistance. The major obstacle confronting these Air Force families when it came to obtaining services was a lack of knowledge about services available to them. Many of the families simply did not realize the breadth of the social support services offered by their local Air Force community including marriage and parenting enrichment programs. The second obstacle to obtaining services, was fear that utilizing services on base would result in stigma, a breach of confidence, or otherwise negatively impact the service member’s career. This resistance to using military-provided services coupled with families reported isolation from their military communities, leads Bowen to recommend that services for military families be offered through private civilian channels.
• **Bowen (1993).** The adjustment of single military fathers may be facilitated by offering support groups for single fathers, who seem to be more socially isolated than single military mothers. As Army support policy was an important contributor to family adjustment for both single military fathers and mothers, continued energy should be put into fostering official policies supporting single parent military families. With this, the support of the immediate unit supervisor proved crucial in explaining how well supported the single military parent felt. Therefore, unit supervisors should be educated to understand the stressors facing single parents in the military and do what they can to be flexible in times of military deployment or family crisis. Finally, the military should adopt a policy of accepting diverse family configurations including families headed by single parent military members.

• **Black (1993).** Black is a proponent of self-help support groups for military families having trouble adapting to deployment. Military spouses tend to be very wary of any support services that may attach a stigma of not being able to handle their own problems to the family or the military member. Self-help support groups, especially if run by other military spouses who have successfully managed deployments, allow military spouses needing help to gracefully obtain it. Black suggests that these groups be run by military spouses with indirect social worker supervision. The social worker can help the military spouse facilitator establish the group, understand group dynamics, and allow for easy and direct access to professional help if it should be needed. The focus of these groups should be self-enhancement and education with an emphasis on building coping skills for dealing with deployments, rather than
psychopathology. This emphasis creates a nonthreatening environment where spouses can freely seek help. As military spouses tend to be isolated both from their extended families and the community in which they live, social outreach should be considered an essential component of any deployment intervention. Black notes that it is also important to offer child care during these meetings and to schedule meetings at times that are convenient to military spouses. Black also recommends pre- and postdeployment groups in which both spouses are encouraged to participate. Black notes that the first week after the service member's return should be saved for immediate family only: work, school, and visitors should be highly discouraged.

Black suggests that deployments can also be facilitated if the deploying military member openly discusses his or her feelings regarding the separation and allows family members to express their feelings as well. The stay-at-home spouse should continue to enforce all the routine family rules and norms, and the military member should write separate letters to each family member whenever possible. Black concludes that even with the best preparation and coping skills, families should expect a 4-8 week readjustment period once the military member returns.

- **Blalzure & Arnold-Mann (1992).** Offering the Return and Reunion Program aboard deployed Navy (USN) ships, this psycho-educational program is based upon three assumptions: 1) separations due to military deployment are normative events for military families and should not be assumed to represent a crisis 2) military families are not pathological 3) increasing family resources such as cohesion, adaptability, and communication during the deployment will “make a good thing (i.e., reunion) even
better.” Topics broached in this program include: addressing feelings of insecurity about the marriage relationship coming to an end due to the deployment; expectations and responses of oneself and one’s spouse at the time of reunion with an emphasis on how people change over the course of deployment in terms of increased independence and behavior; the need of the stay-at-home spouse for reinforcement and feedback concerning household and personal decisions that had to be made in the service member’s absence with a special emphasis on working to avoid playing the “I had it worse than you did” game; service members are cautioned not to stage a “domestic change of command” upon their return, but to ease back into the family system taking special care to not act in a dictatorial manner with their spouses and children; taking time for all family members to share their experience of the deployment so the family can reunite their sense of reality; and finally realistic expectations are discussed in terms of homecoming activities and the service member’s readjustment to civilian life. Service members and family’s are reminded that reunion can be exhausting especially for the service member who may not be on the same schedule as the rest of the family. Families are also reminded that the service member may not feel like socializing right away and in fact he or she may just need some time to be alone.

- Kleiger et al. (1993). Taking the perspective of the deployed parent, Kleiger et al. advocate for military policy to educate all military personnel who are parents of the emotional reaction they should expect upon deployment from their children and tools they can use to strike a balance between expressing their grief and rage and
maintaining a professional image within the military community. To help service members cope with their feelings of helplessness about not being able to communicate regularly with their children Kleiger et al. came up with some neat ideas for creative communication. Suggestions included: making audiotapes of favorite bedtime stories; sending pictures or small sentimental objects home that children could use for attachment items; sending home items with the parent’s perfume or cologne on it; and making video tapes that not only include the parent singing, reading, or talking to the child, but also contain footage of the parent’s living quarters, mess hall, work space, etc. Extra support should be offered to deployed military parents around the time of their children’s birthdays and during holidays that would usually be spent with their children.

- Amen et al. (1988). These authors make suggestions for how families can handle the unique stressors associated with each stage of a deployment. In the predeployment stage parents should be careful to spend individual time with each child and create an atmosphere where children can openly discuss their feelings about the impending deployment. It can also be helpful to carefully explain where the military parent is going and for how long. Maps, encyclopedias, etc. may be particularly illustrating. With younger children, parents should also make the length of time the parent will be gone concrete. This can be done by crossing days off a calendar, making paper chains, putting beans in a jar, etc. It is also helpful to take a picture of the child with the deploying parent and give the child the picture to keep with him/her. Finally, the deploying parent can leave his or her presence in the house by making tapes of
favorite bedtime stories, buying ahead of time gifts for special occasions that will be missed, leaving a box of notes to be read on bad days, etc. During the deployment the most important thing the custodial parent can do is maintain a sense of family routine. The custodial parent should take special care to spend plenty of time with each child, this is especially true when the parent uses excess activity to deal with his or her loneliness. The children should be encouraged to frequently write the deployed parent and the deployed parent should in turn, write each child individually. At the reunion, the initial meeting period should be spent with the immediate family only! Once things have settled down a bit, special plans should be made for the couple to have time alone. Family members should avoid the "I had it worse" game and everyone should give each other a little bit of extra space and personal time. The returning parent needs to exercise care to not force him/herself back into the family system, especially where discipline is concerned.
APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT INTERVIEW FORMAT

* Guiding model: Establish normal patterns of behavior to determine main effects. Then establish behavior during deployments so as to look for interaction effects. In other words, look for contrasts between regular-time and deployment-time behavior.

**Recorder on.**

**Introduction**

Hi ______, I’m Mrs. Thompson. If you want, during the interview you can call me by my first name which is Elisa. Is it OK if I call you _____ or do you have another name you like to be called? I am a student and for one of my projects I am looking at what TDYs are like for students at Smith Elementary School. Do you know what a TDY is?

I am going to ask you some questions about what things are like for you during TDYs. Whenever I am not clear please let me know. Feel free to stop me and ask whatever questions you want. Also, if you find a question uncomfortable let me know about that. You do not have to answer a question if you find it uncomfortable.

Everything you tell me will be just between you and me. That means what you tell me stays between you and me unless you want to tell somebody. No one will be able to tell you were one of the students who took part in this study unless you tell them. So you can tell anybody you want what we talked about, but I am not going to tell anyone, OK? One thing I do to make sure no one can tell you were in the study is assign you a special number so that we don’t have to use your name. Your number is ________. You don’t have to remember it. No one but you and me will know that this number
belongs to you. If at any time after the interview you want to get together and talk about the interview, let your teacher know and we can do that. One last thing, I am using a tape recorder today to help me remember what we talk about, so we need to talk loudly. How about if we listen to how our voices sound before we start with the questions.

Do you have any questions for me? OK, are you ready to get started?

*Interview Questions*

**Background**

**School**

1. How old are you?

2. What grade are you in?

3. What do you like about being a ___-grader?

4. What's not so great about being a ___-grader?

5. What do you like about being a student at Smith?

6. What's not so great about being a student at Smith?

7. Do you have a favorite thing you like to learn? Tell me about it?

**Home Life**

**Siblings**

1. Do you have any brothers or sisters?

2. What are their names?

3. How old are they?

4. What grades are they in?
5. Is it your mom or dad who is the AF?

**Pets**

1. Do you have any pets?
2. What are your pets' names?

**Deployments**

1. How many times do you remember moving?
2. How long have you lived on base?
3. *(Perceptual question)* Has your dad/mom gone on many TDYs since you moved here?
4. Does that seem like more or less often than usual?
5. Last time your mom/dad went TDY where did s/he go?
6. What's the longest your mom/dad has been gone? Has s/he ever missed both Christmas and spring break, or your birthday and Halloween, etc. *(Tie to holidays and other events.)*
7. Did your mom/dad go to Desert Storm? How old were you during Desert Storm?

**Internalizing Behavior**

1. What is a regular day like for you? *(Like what kinds of stuff do you do on a school day? What do you do on a weekend day?)*
2. What are your days like when your mom/dad is TDY? Do things change?

**LONELINESS**

a. What is it like to feel lonely? *(Like when you really miss someone and you think about them a lot and wish you could be with them)*
b. How do you act when you are lonely? How could we tell you were lonely?

c. Do you feel lonely when your mom/dad goes TDY?

d. When your mom/dad is TDY, when do you feel lonely? Any special part of the day? 
   Or certain days? *(Bedtime, going to school, special occasions)*

e. What makes you feel better when you are lonely?

**PROMPT:** Other kids have told me that when they feel lonely they play with brothers or sisters or friends, Spend with their parent who is at home or the person who is taking care of them during the TDY, spend extra time with the teacher or a special grown-up friend, or play sports/work out. Do you think any of these things would help you?

**ANXIETY**

**NERVOUSNESS**

d. Have you ever felt scared inside? Everybody does sometimes and we call that feeling nervous.

e. What kinds of things make you feel nervous?

f. How do you act when you are nervous? Like how could we tell that *_(name)_* was nervous?

g. Do you feel nervous when your mom/dad goes TDY? Is that more or less than usual?

h. What kinds of things make you nervous when your mom/dad is TDY?

i. Is it harder to sit still or concentrate on things when your mom/dad is TDY?

j. Do you feel shaky inside when your mom/dad is TDY?
k. Do you feel that your heart goes too fast when your mom/dad is TDY?

l. Is it hard to catch your breath when your mom/dad is TDY?

m. Do you feel like you have too much energy when your mom/dad is TDY?

n. Do you have any habits like biting your nails, twirling your hair, or chewing on stuff a lot? Do you do that more when your mom/dad is TDY?

o. What’s good about being nervous?

p. What’s not so good about being nervous?

**TENSION**

MM. Do you know what it means to be stressed out? Can you tell me what it is like?

(It’s like when a lot is going on at once and you feel you can’t keep up with everything.)

NN. How do you think you would act if you were stressed out?

OO. When your mom/dad is TDY, do you feel tied in knots or tight inside a lot?

PP. Do you feel like you are going to explode inside?

QQ. Do you feel like crying inside?

RR. Do you ever feel like hiding?

SS. Do you think you get cranky a lot? Does that happen more when your mom/dad is TDY?

TT. Do you ever feel like things are spinning around inside your head.

UU. If you feel tight or stressed out inside when your mom/dad is TDY what do you do to make yourself feel better?
WORRY

k. Do you know what it means to be worried? Can you tell me what it’s like? (It is like when you cannot stop thinking that things are not going to work out OK)

l. Everybody worries about some things sometimes. What kinds of things do you worry about?

m. Do you ever keep having the same thought over and over? (If yes, what is that thought?)

n. Do you worry more about things when your mom/dad is TDY?

n. What kinds of things do you worry about when your mom/dad is TDY?

PROMPT: Other kids have told me that they worry about getting hurt, something bad like a fire or a tornado happening to your house, strangers, doing bad at school, not being liked by friends or the teacher, my deployed parent not coming back, something bad happening to my mom/dad who is at home with me, not having anyone who takes care of me. Does any of that sound like things you worry about? Can you tell me which ones?

o. If you are feeling worried about something, what do you do to make yourself feel better? Does that work?

PROMPT: Other kids have told me that they talk to a parent, another adult, a friend or a brother or sister when they are worried. Or they try to distract themselves so they won’t think about what is bothering them. Does any of that sound like it would help you out when you are worried?
SOMATIZING

a. Are you usually healthy?
   Do you get:
   Headaches
   Stomach Aches
   Sore Throats
   Tiredness: Just in morning and at night or all day?
   Colds/Flu
   Allergies
   Asthma

b. Do you feel sick more when your mom/dad is TDY?

DEPRESSION

O. Everybody feels sad sometimes. Sometimes we feel very sad for a very long time
   and we call that depression. Have you heard that word, depression, before? Have
   you ever felt sad for a very long time? What was going on at that time?

P. Have you ever felt sad for a long time when a TDY was going on?

Q. When TDYs make you feel sad, when do you feel sad: Before the TDY, during
   the TDY, or at the coming home part?

R. When you feel sad during the deployment does it get better or worse as the TDY
   goes on?

S. So overall, what is the hardest part of a TDY, before, during, or at the coming
   home part? Why is that?
T. Everybody cries sometimes, do you feel like you cry a lot when your mom/dad is on TDY? Is that more or less than you usually cry?

U. What time do you go to bed? Do you have any TV shows you like to watch before bed? Do you ever have trouble falling asleep? Do you know what time you get up usually? Is it still dark out when you get up? Do you have trouble sleeping or getting up when your mom/dad is TDY?

V. Do you ever get to stay up late or anything special like that when your mom/dad is TDY?

W. What do you like to do to have fun? Do you still like doing those things when your mom/dad is TDY?

X. Does the way you eat change when your mom/dad is TDY? Like do you eat more or less than usual?

Y. Do you ever get to have any special treats when your mom/dad is TDY? Does your mom/dad ever bring you stuff back from the TDY?

Z. DEPENDENCY ISSUES

AA. I have asked you about who the people are who help you out. You have mentioned ________________, is there anybody else? Some kids mention that grandparents or aunts, uncles, and cousins help them out. Others mention pets or sometimes heroes? Do any of those people help you out?

BB. Some kids make their breakfast or lunch. Others bathe or dress themselves. Some might walk their sibs to school and others might care for younger sibs or pets. On a typical day, what kinds of things do you do around the house?
CC. When your mom/dad goes TDY do your chores change? Do you think you do less or more chores?

DD. Do you worry that you don’t do enough to help out your mom/dad at home?

SEPARATION ANXIETY

EE. Everyone sometimes feels like they want to be with their parents, like right there. Right there next to them, right where you can touch and see them. You just want to be right by them. Do you sometimes feel like that? Do you feel like that more when your mom/dad is TDY?

FF. Do you feel you should check in with your mom/dad more when your mom/dad is TDY?

GG. Do you prefer to play at home when your mom/dad is TDY?

HH. Is it ever hard to want to go to school? What kinds of things make it hard to want to go to school? Is it hard for you to want to go to school when your mom/dad is TDY?

II. Do you usually hang around your teacher a lot? (If yes, more than other kids in your class?) Do you think you ask more questions of or spend more time around your teacher when your mom/dad is TDY?

CONFUSION

GG. Are you usually pretty ready for school, got your pencils, homework, lunch money, and all that? When your mom/dad is TDY does that change?

HH. How do you usually do in class? Can you keep track of all the directions and get your work done on-time?
II. When your mom/dad is TDY it harder to keep track of what’s going on in your classroom?

JJ. Is it harder to get your class work done on-time when your mom/dad is TDY?

KK. Do you have more trouble listening to and following directions from the teacher when your mom/dad is TDY?

LL. What do you typically play during recess?

MM. Do you still like to do those things at recess when your mom/dad is TDY?

GUILT

RR. Do you know what it means to feel guilty? It is kind of like when you feel bad because something that happened might be your fault. Everybody feels guilty sometimes, even if what happened wasn’t really their fault. Have you ever felt guilty?

What made you feel that way? When your mom/dad is TDY, do you worry that things that aren’t going right might be your fault? What kinds of things do you feel might be your fault?

Conclusion

XX. I have one last question for you today. What do you think could be done to make TDYs easier for kids?

Well, that’s all my questions, do you have any questions for me? Thanks for talking with me today about TDYs. The information you told me will help me understand how TDYs might be made easier for students at Smith School.
APPENDIX C

PARENTAL CONSENT LETTER

Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a graduate student from the University of Arizona and a resident of this Air Force Base. I am conducting a study about how deployment influences children. This study will be conducted under the direction of Mary McCaslin, Ph. D, a professor in the Department of Educational Psychology. We, along with the faculty at _____ Elementary School, would like to invite your child to participate in this study. Your child’s participation in this study will enable the principal and teachers to help students at _____ Elementary School do their best in school when a parent is deployed.

This project has been approved by the TUSD school district and the principal, ________. Of course, results of all study activities will remain confidential, and reports of the study will not include the names of any children. If you and your child are willing to give permission for your child to participate in this study, please sign on the line below and return the form to your child’s teacher. Your child’s participation in this important project is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Elisa Thompson, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate

If you have any questions about this project, please feel free to call me at 748-8307 or Dr. Mary McCaslin at 621-1906.

Please check all that apply.
I give my consent:

_____ 1. For my child to complete common measures of psychological well-being, in one group session that will require him/her to be out of the regular classroom for approximately 30 minutes.

_____ 2. For my child to participate in either an individual interview or a small peer group interview with Elisa Thompson. This will require students to be out of the regular classroom approximately 30 minutes.

_____ 3. For Elisa Thompson to read my child’s educational history in his/her school file.

I do not give my consent. I do not wish for my child to participate.

Signed _________________________________________
Parent’s Name (Please print) ____________________________
Child’s Name ____________________________ Date ________
Dear Teacher:

The following students from your classroom participated in an interview for the TDY study. Please take a moment to rate each student on academic performance and personal adjustment. For each of these two categories, please circle the response that best describes the student now, in the spring of the school year.

Thank you,

Elisa Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student and teacher names have been deleted to protect anonymity.*
APPENDIX E
PARENTAL PHONE SURVEY

Hello Mr./Mrs. _____, this is Elisa Thompson, I am the student who has been conducting the TDY study at _____ Elementary School. I wanted to personally thank you for letting your child participate and I was hoping I could ask you two questions that will help me in understanding the results of the study.

First, how do you think attending school affects your child when there is a TDY going on? Does going to school:

1. _____ Help your child adjust better
2. _____ Really has no affect on how your child does with the TDY
3. _____ Makes things worse for your child

The other question is this: Do you think that the school is meeting your child’s needs when it comes to TDYs?

1. _____ I am satisfied with the school’s efforts
2. _____ I am not satisfied with the school’s efforts

WHY IS PARENT SATISFIED/DISSATISFIED?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Well, that’s it for my questions are there any questions I could answer for you? ...... Well, if that’s everything, I want to let you know that I will be sending a copy of your child’s signed consent form home as a receipt that your child took part in the study. Let me give you my phone number in case you want to contact me later. It is 748-8307. Thanks for your time.

TROUBLE SHOOTING
1. For questions about a specific child: Well, when I interviewed your child, I promised him/her that what we talked about would be kept private, so I need to keep that promise. However, by the rules that guide ethical research I CAN absolutely assure you that if your child had told me anything that made me think he/she was in any kind of danger, I would have contacted you at the time of the interview.

Requests for general results: The results aren’t complete at this time, but when they are I will be sending you a copy of them.
APPENDIX F
CODING SYSTEMS: PART I AND PART II

CODING SYSTEM PART I: REVISED 10/06/97

0 = (NA/NC): Data is nonapplicable/non-codable. Use this code when the question was not asked, when no response is given, or when response does not correspond to coding categories.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. GENDER
   1 = MALE  2 = FEMALE

2. AGE
   5, 6, 7, 8...ETC.

3. GRADE
   K = 8, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

4. NUMBER OF SIBLINGS (0, 1,2,...N)
   0 = ONLY CHILD/NO SIBLINGS REPORTED

5. BIRTH ORDER (0,1,2,...N)
   0 = ONLY CHILD; 1 = OLDEST, ETC.

6. AGE OF SIBS (RECORD FOR EACH SIBLING): (0, 1,2,....N)
   0 = ONLY CHILD, NO SIBLINGS REPORTED, OR AGES FOR SIBLINGS NOT GIVEN: FOR SIBLINGS < 1 YEAR RECORD AS 1.
   • If student gives a grade instead of an age code by assigning:
     K = 5  3rd = 9  6th = 12  9th = 15  12th = 18
     1st = 7  4th = 10  7th = 13  10th = 16
     2nd = 8  5th = 11  8th = 14  11th = 17

7. WHICH PARENT IS IN THE MILITARY?
   0 = NEITHER
   1 = DAD
   2 = MOM
   3 = BOTH
4 = STEP-DAD
5 = STEP-MOM
6 = OTHER (*RECORD RESPONSE*)

8. (HOW MANY TIMES DO YOU REMEMBER MOVING?)
NUMBER OF TIMES STUDENT REMEMBERS MOVING
0 = NA/NC (i.e., STUDENT CANNOT REMEMBER/DOES NOT REPORT)
1 = NEVER
2 = ONCE
3 = 2-3 TIMES
4 = 4-6 TIMES
5 = MORE THAN 6

9. (HAS YOUR DAD/MOM GONE ON MANY TDYs SINCE YOU MOVED HERE?)
PERCEPTION OF TDYs
0 = NA/NC
1 = SEEMS LIKE MANY TDYs
2 = SEEMS LIKE NOT VERY MANY TDYs
3 = SEEMS ABOUT THE SAME AMOUNT AS ALWAYS

10. (DOES THAT SEEM LIKE MORE/LESS THAN USUAL?)
HAS THERE BEEN A CHANGE IN NUMBER OF TDYs THE FAMILY IS EXPERIENCING?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES, IT'S MORE
2 = NO, IT'S LESS
3 = IT'S ABOUT THE SAME AS ALWAYS

11. *RECORD LOCATIONS GIVEN FOR TDYs AND LENGTH OF TIME.*

12. (WHAT'S THE LONGEST YOUR DAD/MOM HAS BEEN TDY?)
LENGTH OF TIME GIVEN FOR LONGEST TDY:
0 = NA/NC
1 = MORE THAN A YEAR
2 = 1 YEAR
3 = OVER 6 MONTHS BUT NOT A FULL YEAR
4 = 121-180 DAYS
5 = 90-120 DAYS
6 = 60 - 89 DAYS
7 = 11-30 DAYS
8 = 1 -10 DAYS
LONELINESS

13. (DO YOU FEEL LONELY WHEN YOUR PARENT IS TDY?)
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

14. WHY OR WHY NOT? CATEGORIZE THE RESPONSE AS BEST AS POSSIBLE.
   a. NA/NC: 0, 1 (i.e., QUESTION NOT ASKED/NO RESPONSE GIVEN)
   b. PARENT IS A PLAYMATE: 0, 1
   c. CUSTODIAL PARENT LACKS IMPORTANT RESOURCES THAT THE DEPLOYED PARENT HAS: 0, 1
   d. PARENT KEEPS CHILD FROM BEING BORED: 0, 1
   e. PARENT INSTILLS SENSE OF SECURITY: 0, 1
   f. CHILD HAS MANY FRIENDS: 0, 1
   g. CHILD IS RELIANT ON OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS FOR SUPPORT: 0, 1
   h. PARENT IS TOO STRICT/NOT FUN: 0, 1
   i. PARENT WILL BE BACK SOON: 0, 1
   j. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

15. (WHEN YOUR D/M IS TDY, WHEN DO YOU FEEL LONELY?)
WHEN DOES STUDENT MISS PARENT:
0 = NA/NC
1 = ALL THE TIME
2 = AT NIGHT
3 = IN THE MORNING
4 = SPECIAL OCCASIONS
5 = OTHER TIME (*RECORD RESPONSE*)

RESOURCE QUESTIONS
(IF YOU WERE LONELY, WHAT WOULD MAKE YOU FEEL BETTER?)
16. NUMBER OF RESPONSES IN COPING REPERTOIRE:
0 = NA/NC
1 = NOTHING WILL HELP
2 = ONE
3 = 2-3
4 = 4-6
5 = 7-8
6 = OVER EIGHT
17. TYPE OF COPING RESPONSE:
NA/NC = 0
HELPLESS/LOW EFFICACY LEVELS IN ENVIRONMENT = 1
EMOTION-FOCUSED = 2
PROBLEM-FOCUSED = 3
MIXED EMOT./PROB. FOCUSED = 4

18. ARE THE COPING RESPONSES SELF OR OTHER ORIENTED?
0 = NA/NC
1 = SELF
2 = OTHER
3 = BOTH/MIXED

19. IF THE RESPONSE IS OTHER ORIENTED, IS IT DIRECTED TOWARDS
a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. MOM: 0, 1
c. DAD: 0, 1
d. SIBLINGS: 0, 1
e. PEERS: 0, 1
f. TEACHER: 0, 1
g. OTHER RELATIVES: 0, 1
h. ADULT FRIENDS: 0, 1
i. PETS: 0, 1
j. NEIGHBORS: 0, 1
k. EXTRACURRICULAR DIRECTORS: 0, 1
l. SCHOOL COUNSELOR: 0, 1
m. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

ANXIETY

20. (DO YOU FEEL MORE NERVOUS WHEN YOUR D/M GOES TDY?)
DOES STUDENT FEEL NERVOUS WHEN PARENT IS TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

21. (WHAT KINDS OF THINGS MAKE YOU FEEL NERVOUS WHEN YOUR PARENT IS TDY?)
a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. HOME RELATED (i.e., PARENTS DIVORCING/SIBLING CONFLICT): 0, 1
c. SCHOOL RELATED: 0, 1
d. PEER GROUP RELATED: 0, 1

e. CLOSE FRIENDS: 0, 1

f. SELF-GENERATED/FANTASY RELATED: 0, 1

g. ANIMALS: 0, 1

h. MEDICALLY RELATED EVENTS: 0, 1

i. PARENT ON TDY BEING HURT OR KILLED: 0, 1

j. HARM TO SELF OR FAMILY AT HOME: 0, 1

k. NATURAL DISASTERS: 0, 1

l. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

22. MEASURE OF GENERAL AROUSAL LEVEL DURING TDY. *BE SURE
STUDENT ATTRIBUTES AROUSAL TO PARENT BEING ON TDY.
FOR EACH PART, A - M, ANSWER: 0 = NA/NC 1 = Y 2 = N

a. HARD TO SIT STILL

b. SHAKY INSIDE

c. HEART GOES TOO FAST

d. SHORTNESS OF BREATH

e. TOO MUCH ENERGY

f. NERVOUS HABITS

g. FEELS TIED IN KNOTS OR TIGHT INSIDE

h. FEELS LIKE EXPLODING INSIDE

i. FEELS LIKE CRYING INSIDE

j. FEEL LIKE THINGS ARE SPINNING INSIDE HEAD:

k. FEELS LIKE HIDING (NOT HIDING FOR A SURPRISE OR FOR A GAME)

l. CRANKY A LOT

m. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*)

TENSION

RESOURCE QUESTIONS
(IF YOU WERE STRESSED OUT, WHAT WOULD MAKE YOU FEEL
BETTER?)

23. NUMBER OF ITEMS IN COPING REPERTOIRE:

0 = NA/NC

1 = NOTHING WILL HELP

2 = ONE

3 = 2-3

4 = 4-6

5 = 7-8

6 = OVER EIGHT
24. TYPE OF COPING RESPONSE:
0 = NA/NC
1 = HELPLESS/LOW EFFICACY LEVELS IN ENVIRONMENT
2 = EMOTION-FOCUSED
3 = PROBLEM-FOCUSED
4 = MIXED EMOT./PROB. FOCUSED

25. ARE THE COPING RESPONSES SELF OR OTHER ORIENTED?
0 = NA/NC
1 = SELF
2 = OTHER
3 = BOTH/MIXED

26. IF THE RESPONSE IS OTHER ORIENTED, IS IT DIRECTED TOWARDS
a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. MOM: 0, 1
c. DAD: 0, 1
d. SIBLINGS: 0, 1
e. PEERS: 0, 1
f. TEACHER: 0, 1
g. OTHER RELATIVES: 0, 1
h. ADULT FRIENDS: 0, 1
i. PETS: 0, 1
j. NEIGHBORS 0, 1
k. EXTRACURRICULAR DIRECTORS 0, 1
l. SCHOOL COUNSELOR 0, 1
m. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

WORRY

27. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING RECURRING THOUGHTS?
0 = NA/NC
1 = Y
2 = N

28. CATEGORIZE NATURE OF RECURRING THOUGHT:
a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. HOME RELATED: 0, 1
c. SCHOOL RELATED: 0, 1
d. PEER GROUP RELATED: 0, 1
e. NONSENSE THOUGHT/SONGS: 0, 1
29. (DO YOU WORRY MORE ABOUT THINGS WHEN YOUR D/M IS TDY? WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DO YOU WORRY ABOUT?) DOES STUDENT REPORT WORRYING MORE WHEN PARENT IS TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = Y
2 = N

30. WHAT KINDS OF THINGS CAUSE WORRY DURING A TDY?
   a. NA/NC: 0, 1
   b. HOME RELATED (i.e., PARENTS DIVORCING/SIBLING CONFLICT): 0, 1
   c. SCHOOL RELATED: 0, 1
   d. PEER GROUP RELATED: 0, 1
   e. CLOSE FRIENDS: 0, 1
   f. SELF-GENERATED/FANTASY RELATED: 0, 1
   g. ANIMALS: 0, 1
   h. MEDICALLY RELATED EVENTS: 0, 1
   i. PARENT ON TDY BEING HURT OR KILLED: 0, 1
   j. HARM TO SELF OR FAMILY AT HOME: 0, 1
   k. NATURAL DISASTERS: 0, 1
   l. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

RESOURCE QUESTIONS
(IF YOU WERE WORRIED, WHAT WOULD MAKE YOU FEEL BETTER?)

31. NUMBER OF ITEMS IN COPING REPERTOIRE:
0 = NA/NC
1 = NOTHING WILL HELP
2 = ONE
3 = 2-3
4 = 4-6
5 = 7-8
6 = OVER EIGHT

32. TYPE OF COPING RESPONSE:
NA/NC = 0
HELPLESS/LOW EFFICACY LEVELS IN ENVIRONMENT = 1
EMOTION-FOCUSED = 2
PROBLEM-FOCUSED = 3
MIXED EMOT./PROB. FOUSED = 4
33. ARE THE COPING RESPONSES SELF OR OTHER ORIENTED?
0 = NA/NC
1 = SELF
2 = OTHER
3 = BOTH/MIXED

34. IF THE RESPONSE IS OTHER ORIENTED, IS IT DIRECTED TOWARDS
a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. MOM: 0, 1
c. DAD: 0, 1
d. SIBLINGS: 0, 1
e. PEERS: 0, 1
f. TEACHER: 0, 1
g. OTHER RELATIVES: 0, 1
h. ADULT FRIENDS: 0, 1
i. PETS: 0, 1
j. NEIGHBORS 0, 1
k. EXTRACURRICULAR DIRECTORS 0, 1
l. SCHOOL COUNSELOR 0, 1
m. OTHER: *(RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

SOMATIZING

35. (ARE YOU USUALLY HEALTHY?)
0 = NA/NC
1 = Y
2 = N

36. (WHAT KINDS OF THINGS MAKE YOU NOT FEEL WELL?)
DOES STUDENT INDICATE EXPERIENCING FREQUENT:
FOR EACH PART, A - G, ANSWER: 0 = NA/NC  1 = Y  2 = N
a. HEADACHES
b. STOMACH ACHES
c. SORE THROATS
d. TIREDNESS ALL THE TIME
e. COLDS/FLU
f. ALLERGIES
g. ASTHMA
*A LACK OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT ALLERGIES AND ASTHMA CAN BE CODED AS NO
37. (DO YOU THINK YOU GET SICK MORE WHEN YOUR D/M IS ON TDY?)
DOES STUDENT REPORT FEELING ILL MORE WHEN PARENT IS TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO
*IF STUDENT OFFERS A THEORY ABOUT INCREASED ILLNESS, RECORD IT*

DEPRESSION

38. (HAVE YOU EVER FELT SAD FOR A LONG TIME WHEN A TDY WAS GOING ON?)
DOES THE STUDENT REPORT EVER FEELING SAD DURING A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

39. (WHEN TDYs MAKE YOU FEEL SAD, WHEN DO YOU FEEL SAD:
BEFORE THE DEPLOYMENT, AT THE BEGINNING, IN THE MIDDLE, OR TOWARDS THE END?)
DURING WHAT PART OF THE TDY IS THE STUDENT SADDEST:
0 = NA/NC
1 = BEFORE
2 = DURING
3 = REUNION PERIOD
4 = DEPARTURE
5 = WHOLE THING

40. (DOES THE SADNESS LESSEN AS THE TDY GOES ON?)
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

41. (SO, OVERALL WHAT IS THE HARDEST PART OF THE TDY?)
0 = NA/NC
1 = BEFORE
2 = DURING
3 = REUNION PERIOD
4 = DEPARTURE
5 = WHOLE THING
42. (EVERYBODY CRIES SOMETIMES, DO YOU FEEL LIKE YOU CRY A LOT WHEN YOUR D/M IS ON TDY?)
DOES STUDENT REPORT CRYING MORE DURING TDYS?
*CODE YES ONLY IF STUDENT VALIDATES THAT THIS IS MORE CRYING THAN USUAL.
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

43. SLEEP QUESTIONS
FOR EACH PART, A - B, ANSWER: 0 = NA/NC, 1 = Y, 2 = N
a. DOES STUDENT REPORT REGULAR DIFFICULTY SLEEPING OR WAKING?
b. DOES STUDENT REPORT DIFFICULTY SLEEPING OR WAKING DURING A TDY?

44. (DO YOU LIKE DOING THE THINGS YOU USUALLY LIKE TO DO WHEN YOUR M/D IS TDY?)
DOES STUDENT REPORT STILL ENJOYING ACTIVITIES WHILE PARENT IS TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

45. (DOES THE WAY YOU EAT CHANGE WHEN YOUR M/D IS TDY?)
DO EATING PATTERNS CHANGE DURING A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO
*IF STUDENT REPORTS YES, RECORD WHAT TYPES OF EATING CHANGES ARE DESCRIBED.

DEPENDENCY ISSUES
PEOPLE WHO CAN HELP YOU OUT/RESOURCE QUESTIONS
(I HAVE ASKED YOU ABOUT WHO THE PEOPLE ARE WHO HELP YOU OUT. YOU MENTIONED ____, IS THERE ANYBODY ELSE?)
46. BREADTH OF SOCIAL SUPPORT NETWORK.
0 = NA/NC
1 = NOBODY
2 = ONE
3 = 2-4
4 = 5-8
57. EXTENT OF SOCIAL SUPPORT NETWORK.
   a. NA/NC: 0, 1
   b. MOM: 0, 1
   c. DAD: 0, 1
   d. SIBLINGS: 0, 1
   e. PEERS: 0, 1
   f. TEACHER: 0, 1
   g. OTHER RELATIVES: 0, 1
   h. ADULT FRIENDS: 0, 1
   i. PETS: 0, 1
   j. NEIGHBORS 0, 1
   k. EXTRACURRICULAR DIRECTORS 0, 1
   l. SCHOOL COUNSELOR 0, 1
   m. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1

48. (SOME KIDS MAKE THEIR BREAKFAST OR LUNCH..........WHAT KINDS OF CHORES DO YOU DO AROUND THE HOUSE?)
   DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING REGULAR HOUSEHOLD CHORES?
   0 = NA/NC
   1 = YES
   2 = NO

49. WHAT TYPES OF CHORES DOES THE STUDENT REGULARLY PERFORM:
   a. NA/NC: (i.e., CHILDREN WHO REPORT DOING NO CHORES) 0,1
   b. CLEANING OF OWN ROOM: 0,1
   c. ADDITIONAL CLEANING: 0,1
   d. CARE OF PETS: 0,1
   e. CARE OF SIBS: 0,1
   f. MEAL ASSISTANCE: 0,1
   g. LAWN CARE: 0,1
   h. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0,1

50. (DO YOUR CHORES CHANGE WHEN YOUR M/D GOES TDY?)
   DOES STUDENT REPORT A CHANGE IN CHORES AS A RESULT OF TDYS?
   0 = NA/NC
   1 = YES
   2 = NO
51. DOES CHANGE IN CHORES RESULT IN A CHORE:
0 = NA/NC
1 = INCREASE
2 = DECREASE
3 = NEITHER AN INCREASE OR DECREASE, BUT A CHANGE IN TYPES OF CHORES DONE

52. (DO YOU EVER WORRY THAT YOU DON'T DO ENOUGH TO HELP OUT YOUR MOM/DAD AT HOME?)
DOES STUDENT WORRY ABOUT NOT HELPING OUT THE NON-DEPLOYED PARENT ENOUGH?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

SEPARATION ANXIETY

53. (EVERYONE FEELS A LITTLE CLINGING ON THEIR PARENTS OR TEACHER SOMETIMES, DO YOU EVER FEEL A LITTLE CLINGING DURING A TDY?)
DOES STUDENT REPORT EXPERIENCING SEPARATION ANXIETY DURING TDYs?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

54. (DO YOU FEEL YOU SHOULD CHECK IN MORE WITH YOUR M/D WHEN YOUR M/D IS TDY?)
DOES STUDENT REPORT CHECKING IN MORE WITH THE NON-DEPLOYED PARENT MORE DURING A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

55. (DO YOU PREFER TO PLAY AT HOME WHEN YOU M/D IS TDY?)
0 = NA/NC (i.e., NO PREFERENCE)
1 = AT HOME
2 = AWAY FROM HOME
CONFUSION/SCHOOL RELATED ISSUES

56. HOW DOES STUDENT REGULARLY DO?
FOR EACH PART, A - B, ANSWER: 0 = NA/NC  1 = Y  2 = N
a. DOES STUDENT REPORT BEING REGULARLY PREPARED FOR CLASS?
b. DOES STUDENT REPORT THAT S/HE IS REGULARLY ABLE TO KEEP TRACK OF CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES?

57. HOW DOES SCHOOL CHANGE DURING A TDY?
FOR EACH PART, A - E, ANSWER: 0 = NA/NC  1 = Y  2 = N
a. DOES STUDENT REPORT THAT IT IS HARD TO COME TO SCHOOL WHEN M/D IS TDY?
b. DOES STUDENT REPORT ASKING MORE QUESTIONS OF OR SPENDING MORE TIME AROUND HIS/HER TEACHER WHEN M/D IS TDY?
c. DURING A TDY IS STUDENT ABLE TO KEEP TRACK OF CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES?
d. IS IT HARDER FOR THE STUDENT TO GET CLASS WORK DONE ON-TIME DURING A TDY?
e. DOES STUDENT ENJOY RECESS ACTIVITIES DURING A TDY?

GUILT

58. HAS STUDENT EVER FELT GUILTY DURING A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO
*IF STUDENT REPORTS HAVING FELT GUILTY DURING A TDY, RECORD SOURCES OF THE GUILT.*

STUDENT FEEDBACK

59. RECORD ANY SUGGESTIONS STUDENT OFFERS FOR HELPING KIDS OUT WITH TDYS. CATEGORIZE SUGGESTIONS.
a. NA/NC: (STUDENT CANNOT THINK OF ANY SUGGESTIONS) 0, 1
b. CHANGE NATURE OF TDYS (I.E., DON’T MAKE PARENTS GO ON TDY/MAKE TDYS SHORTER OR LESS FREQUENT): 0, 1
c. INCREASE COMMUNICATION WITH DEPLOYED PARENT: 0, 1
d. OFFER SCHOOL SUPPORT GROUP: 0, 1
e. OTHER: (*RECORD RESPONSE*) 0, 1
TEACHER/PARENT SURVEYS

60. STUDENT'S TEACHER (LAST 2 DIGITS OF STUDENT ID) *Teacher codes deleted to protect teachers' anonymity.

61. TEACHER REPORT OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE:
0 = NO DATA AVAIL.
1 = BELOW AVERAGE
2 = AVERAGE
3 = ABOVE AVERAGE

62. TEACHER REPORT OF PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT:
1 = BELOW AVERAGE
2 = AVERAGE
3 = ABOVE AVERAGE

63. PARENT REPORT OF AFFECT OF SCHOOL ON STUDENT'S ADJUSTMENT:
0 = NO DATA (FAMILY MOVED, ETC.)
1 = NO AFFECT
2 = MAKES THINGS WORSE
3 = MAKES THINGS BETTER

64. PARENT'S SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL:
0 = NO DATA (FAMILY MOVED)
1 = PARENT HAS NO OPINION
2 = PARENT NOT SATISFIED
3 = PARENT SATISFIED
4 = PARENT DOES NOT BELIEVE SCHOOL PLAYS A ROLE: TDY IS NOT A SCHOOL ISSUE

65. DOES STUDENT SEEM RESISTANT TO ANSWERING QUESTIONS?
0 = CANNOT DETERMINE
1 = YES
2 = NO

66. IS A TDY CURRENTLY OCCURRING/IS ONE IMPENDING?
1 = YES
2 = NO
EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT SECTION:

BACKGROUND

1. GENDER
   1 = MALE  2 = FEMALE

2. AGE

3. GRADE
   K = 8

LONELINESS-REFERENCE: INTERVIEW P. 5

EXPERIENCE WITH THE EMOTION

4. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING EVER FELT LONELY FOR A REASON OTHER THAN A TDY?
   0 = NA/NC
   1 = YES
   2 = NO

DEFINITION

QUESTIONS

5. HOW DOES STUDENT RESPOND TO QUESTION: "WHAT IS IT LIKE TO FEEL LONELY?"

THE RESPONSE GIVEN (DOES STUDENT RECOGNIZE THE EMOTION):
   0 = NA/NC (QUESTION NOT ASKED/STUDENT MAKES NO RESPONSE/STUDENT REPORTS: "I DON'T KNOW")
   1 = STUDENT IS ABLE TO OFFER A DEFINITION
   2 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE KNOWS THE EMOTION BUT IS UNABLE TO DESCRIBE IT
   3 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE HAS HEARD THE WORD BEFORE, BUT DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT MEANS
6. TYPE OF DEFINITION
0 = NA/NC
1 = ABSTRACT RESPONSE
(STUDENT DESCRIBES EMOTION AS A STATE OR A
TRAIT……"LONELINESS HAPPENS BECAUSE PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE
ENOUGH FRIENDS.")
2 = INTRAPERSONAL EXPERIENCE RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION AFFECTS HIM/HER
PERSONALLY……...“I HAVE A HUGE LUMP IN MY THROAT WHEN I FEEL
LONELY.”)
3 = INTERPERSONAL CONSEQUENCES RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION MAKES HIM/HER BEHAVE……...
"I TRY TO GET MY FRIENDS TO PLAY WITH ME WHEN I AM LONELY")
4 = BODILY/CONCRETE RESPONSE: (STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE
EMOTION IS EXPERIENCED….. “I FEEL EMPTY INSIDE AND HAVE TO
WORK HARD NOT TO CRY”)

7. ACCURACY OF DEFINITION:
0 = NA/NC
1 = INACCURATE
2 = GENERALLY ACCURATE
3 = PRECISE

BEHAVIORAL EXPERIENCE OF THE EMOTION
8. CATEGORIZE THE DESCRIPTION GIVEN FOR HOW THE STUDENT
ACTS WHEN LONELY. IN THE INTERVIEW THE QUESTION IS POSEd AS:
“How do you act when you are lonely? How could we tell
you were lonely? Could we tell by looking at you?”
0 = NA/NC
1 = INTERNALIZING RESPONSE
2 = EXTERNALIZING RESPONSE
3 = MIXED

9. IS THERE CONGRUENCY BETWEEN PERSONAL DEFINITION AND
BEHAVIOR?
0 = NA/NC
1 = NOT CONGRUENT
2 = CONGRUENT
EXPERIENCE WITH THE EMOTION

10. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING EVER FELT NERVOUS FOR A REASON OTHER THAN A TDY?
   0 = NA/NC
   1 = YES
   2 = NO

BEHAVIORAL EXPERIENCE OF THE EMOTION

11. CATEGORIZE THE DESCRIPTION GIVEN FOR HOW THE STUDENT ACTS WHEN ANXIOUS. IN THE INTERVIEW THE QUESTION IS POSED AS: "HOW DO YOU ACT WHEN YOU ARE NERVOUS? LIKE HOW COULD WE TELL THAT (NAME) WAS NERVOUS?"
   0 = NA/NC
   1 = INTERNALIZING RESPONSE
   2 = EXTERNALIZING RESPONSE
   3 = MIXED

SPECIFIC NON-TDY TIME ANXIETY TOPICS

12. CATEGORIZE STUDENT RESPONSE TO QUESTION: "WHAT KINDS OF THINGS MAKE YOU FEEL NERVOUS?"
   a. NA/NC: 0, 1
   b. FAMILY RELATED: 0, 1
   c. SCHOOL RELATED: 0, 1
   d. PEER GROUP RELATED: 0, 1
   e. MAKE BELIEVE FRIEND: 0, 1
   f. SPECIFIC PEERS: 0, 1
   g. SELF-GENERATED: 0, 1
   h. ANIMALS: 0, 1
   i. MEDICALLY RELATED EVENTS: 0, 1
   j. PARENT ON TDY BEING HURT OR KILLED: 0, 1
   k. HARM TO SELF OR FAMILY AT HOME: 0, 1
   l. NATURAL DISASTERS: 0, 1
   m. OTHER: 0, 1 (RECORD RESPONSE)

QUESTIONS ADDRESSING VALENCE ASSOCIATED WITH NERVOUSNESS

13. DOES STUDENT THINK THERE IS ANYTHING GOOD ABOUT BEING NERVOUS?
   0 = NA/NC
   1 = YES
   2 = NO
14. DOES STUDENT THINK THERE IS ANYTHING NOT SO GOOD ABOUT BEING NERVOUS?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

TENSION-REFERENCE: INTERVIEW P. 8

EXPERIENCE WITH THE EMOTION
15. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING EVER FELT TENSE OR STRESSED OUT FOR A REASON OTHER THAN A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

DEFINITION QUESTIONS
16. HOW DOES STUDENT RESPOND TO QUESTION: "DO YOU KNOW WHAT IT MEANS TO BE STRESSED OUT? CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT IT'S LIKE?"
THE RESPONSE GIVEN (DOES STUDENT RECOGNIZE THE EMOTION):
0 = NA/NC (QUESTION NOT ASKED/STUDENT MAKES NO RESPONSE/STUDENT REPORTS: "I DON'T KNOW")
1 = STUDENT IS ABLE TO OFFER A DEFINITION
2 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE KNOWS THE EMOTION BUT IS UNABLE TO DESCRIBE IT
3 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE HAS HEARD THE WORD BEFORE, BUT DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT MEANS

17. TYPE OF DEFINITION
0 = NA/NC
1 = ABSTRACT RESPONSE
(STUDENT DESCRIBES EMOTION AS A STATE OR A TRAIT......"PEOPLE FEEL STRESSED OUT WHEN THEY HAVE MORE GOING ON THAN THEY CAN HANDLE")
2 = INTRAPERSONAL EXPERIENCE RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION AFFECTS HIM/HER PERSONALLY....... "I FEEL LIKE MY HEAD IS SPINNING AND I CANNOT FIGURE OUT WHAT TO DO FIRST")
3 = INTERPERSONAL CONSEQUENCES RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION MAKES HIM/HER BEHAVE…….
“I AM MEAN TO PEOPLE AND WANT THEM TO GO AWAY WHEN I AM
STRESSED OUT”)
4 = BODILY/CONCRETE RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION IS EXPERIENCED….. “I GET A
HEADACHE AND SOMETIMES IT IS HARD TO BREATHE”)

18. ACCURACY OF THE DEFINITION:
0 = NA/NC
1 = INACCURATE
2 = GENERALLY ACCURATE
3 = PRECISE

BEHAVIORAL EXPERIENCE OF THE EMOTION
19. CATEGORIZE THE DESCRIPTION GIVEN FOR HOW THE STUDENT
ACTS WHEN STRESSED OUT. IN THE INTERVIEW THE QUESTION IS
POSED AS: “HOW DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD ACT IF YOU WERE
STRESSED OUT?”
0 = NA/NC
1 = INTERNALIZING RESPONSE
2 = EXTERNALIZING RESPONSE
3 = MIXED

20. IS THERE CONGRUENCY BETWEEN DEFINITION AND BEHAVIOR?
0 = NA/NC
1 = NOT CONGRUENT
2 = CONGRUENT

WORRY-REFERENCE: INTERVIEW P. 9

EXPERIENCE WITH THE EMOTION
21. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING EVER FELT WORRIED FOR A
REASON OTHER THAN A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO
DEFINITION QUESTIONS

22. HOW DOES STUDENT RESPOND TO QUESTION: "DO YOU KNOW WHAT IT MEANS TO BE WORRIED? CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT IT'S LIKE?"

THE RESPONSE GIVEN (DOES STUDENT RECOGNIZE THE EMOTION):
0 = NA/NC (QUESTION NOT ASKED/STUDENT MAKES NO RESPONSE/STUDENT REPORTS: "I DON'T KNOW")
1 = STUDENT IS ABLE TO OFFER A DEFINITION
2 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE KNOWS THE EMOTION BUT IS UNABLE TO DESCRIBE IT
3 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE HAS HEARD THE WORD BEFORE, BUT DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT MEANS

23. TYPE OF DEFINITION
0 = NA/NC
1 = ABSTRACT RESPONSE (STUDENT DESCRIBES EMOTION AS A STATE OR A TRAIT......."WORRYING IS SOMETHING PEOPLE DO WHEN THEY FEEL SOMETHING MIGHT NOT TURN OUT AS THEY WANT IT TO")
2 = INTRAPERSONAL EXPERIENCE RESPONSE: (STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION AFFECTS HIM/HER PERSONALLY....... "I CANNOT STOP THINKING ABOUT BAD THINGS HAPPENING WHEN I FEEL WORRIED.")
3 = INTERPERSONAL CONSEQUENCES RESPONSE: (STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION MAKES HIM/HER BEHAVE........ "I CANNOT LISTEN WELL TO OTHERS WHEN I AM WORRIED")
4 = BODILY/CONCRETE RESPONSE: ("MY STOMACH HURTS WHEN I AM WORRIED")

24. CAN THE STUDENT DESCRIBE THE EMOTION?
0 = NA/NC
1 = INACCURATE
2 = GENERALLY ACCURATE
3 = PRECISE

SPECIFIC NON-TDY TIME WORRY TOPICS

25. CATEGORIZE STUDENT RESPONSE TO: "EVERYBODY WORRIES ABOUT SOME THINGS SOMETIMES, WHAT KINDS OF THINGS DO YOU WORRY ABOUT?"

a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. FAMILY RELATED: 0, 1
c. TDY RELATED: 0, 1
d. SCHOOL RELATED: 0, 1
e. PEER GROUP RELATED: 0, 1
f. SPECIFIC PEERS: 0, 1
g. SELF-GENERATED (FANTASY IDEATION/OBSESSIONS): 0, 1
h. OTHER: 0, 1 (RECORD RESPONSE)

DEPRESSION-REFERENCE: INTERVIEW P. 11

EXPERIENCE WITH THE EMOTION
26. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING EVER FELT SAD FOR A REASON OTHER THAN A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO

SPECIFIC NON-TDY TIME SADNESS TOPICS
27. CATEGORIZE STUDENT RESPONSE TO: "WHAT WAS GOING ON AT THAT TIME?"
   a. NA/NC 0, 1
   b. LOSS OF PET 0, 1
c. LOSS OF IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER 0, 1
d. LOSS OF EXTENDED FAMILY MEMBER 0, 1
e. FAMILY MOVING 0, 1
f. FRIEND MOVING 0, 1
g. TDY RELATED 0, 1
h. PARENTS DIVORCING/SEPARATED 0, 1
i. SCHOOL PROBLEMS 0, 1
j. OTHER 0, 1

GUILT-REFERENCE: INTERVIEW P. 16

EXPERIENCE WITH THE EMOTION
28. DOES STUDENT REPORT HAVING EVER FELT GUILTY FOR A REASON OTHER THAN A TDY?
0 = NA/NC
1 = YES
2 = NO
DEFINITION QUESTIONS

29. HOW DOES STUDENT RESPOND TO QUESTION, DO YOU KNOW WHAT IT MEANS TO FEEL GUILTY?
0 = NA/NC (QUESTION NOT ASKED/STUDENT MAKES NO RESPONSE/STUDENT REPORTS: "I DON'T KNOW")
1 = STUDENT IS ABLE TO OFFER A DEFINITION
2 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE KNOWS THE EMOTION BUT IS UNABLE TO DESCRIBE IT
3 = STUDENT STATES THAT S/HE HAS HEARD THE WORD BEFORE, BUT DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT MEANS

30. TYPE OF DEFINITION
0 = NA/NC
1 = ABSTRACT RESPONSE
(STUDENT DESCRIBES EMOTION AS A STATE OR A TRAIT......"GUILT IS THE WAY PEOPLE TRY TO MAKE YOU FEEL WHEN THEY WANT YOU TO DO SOMETHING YOU DON'T WANT TO DO."
2 = INTRAPERSONAL EXPERIENCE RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION AFFECTS HIM/HER PERSONALLY....... "I CANNOT STOP THINKING ABOUT WHAT I DID.")
3 = INTERPERSONAL CONSEQUENCES RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION MAKES HIM/HER BEHAVE........... "I TRY TO REALLY NICE SO NO ONE WILL KNOW WHAT I DID")
4 = BODILY/CONCRETE RESPONSE:
(STUDENT DESCRIBES HOW THE EMOTION IS EXPERIENCED....."MY FACE FEELS HOT WHENEVER I THINK SOMEONE IS GOING TO BRING WHAT I DID UP").

31. CAN THE STUDENT DESCRIBE THE EMOTION?
0 = NA/NC
1 = INACCURATE
2 = GENERALLY ACCURATE
3 = PRECISE

SPECIFIC NON-TDY TIME GUILT TOPICS

32. CATEGORIZE STUDENT RESPONSE TO: "WHAT MADE YOU FEEL THAT WAY?"
a. NA/NC: 0, 1
b. FAMILY RELATED: 0, 1
c. TDY RELATED: 0, 1
d. SCHOOL RELATED: 0, 1
e. PEER GROUP RELATED: 0, 1
f. SPECIFIC PEERS: 0, 1
g. SELF-GENERATED (FANTASY IDEATION/OBSESSIONS): 0, 1
h. OTHER: 0, 1 (RECORD RESPONSE)
APPENDIX G

CODE BOOK

Coding System Part I

General Information

1. If the question did not get asked, the student did not respond, or the student response cannot be coded, code it as 0 = NA/NC.

2. Remember to consider if the behavior is TDY-induced. Just because a student indicates he or she has experienced the emotion before do not assume the report is relevant to the question being asked.

3. Do not make inferences. Your job is to accurately record student self-report not to interpret or make inferences. If a student response is not clear, record it as such, do not guess or estimate what the student is trying to say. On the other hand, if the student response is not clear, but it is obvious that the interviewer parroted the student answer, you may infer. Be aware that the interviewer often verbalized student body language (nods of head, shrugs, etc.).

4. Remember within any section, the interview contains many similar questions. If you are not sure what question is being asked or answered, refer to the interview format contained in the front pocket of the code book. Distinguish and discriminate between similar questions/responses!

5. If the student contradicts him/herself on factual information (i.e., which parent is in USAF), and the accurate response cannot be determined, go with the first response to the question.

6. When a student reports a friend as siblings, count as a sibling. Student report must be treated with the same validity in every case, even when we have contradicting information about the student’s background.

7. In general, if a student responds to a question with, “a little” it can be coded 1 = yes, such as, “When your dad goes TDY do you ever feel lonely?” And student responds: “a little bit.” Similarly, in most cases “sometimes” can also be coded as 1 = yes.

8. If student gives a conditional or ambiguous answer (i.e., “Do you feel lonely when your dad goes TDY?” “Well, probably not, but maybe a little bit”), code as 0 = NA/NC unless the direction of the response can be easily inferred.

9. On item # 6 if the student reports he or she has a sibling who is less than one year old, code as 1. The code 1 includes siblings from birth to 23 months of age. Also, do not round-up on age. For example, if a student reports “I am 7 and a half” or “My 8th birthday is in two weeks” record student age as 7.

10. On item # 8, if student reports moving “lots,” “so many times I cannot remember,” etc. code as 0 = NA/NC.

11. On item # 8, code the number of times the student reports he or she has moved, even if some of them were from Tucson to DMAFB, or from one base house to another. Code however many number of moves the student reports.
Lonely
1. On item #15, code responses indicating that the deployed parent is missed most at the end of the work day, dinnertime, or about the time the deployed parent would normally return from work as 5 = other, and then record time given by student.

Anxiety
1. On item #21, under response b “Home-related anxiety,” include statements such as, “Missing my parent makes me nervous,” “It makes me nervous not having my parent around” and any other statements about how parent’s physical absence causes anxiety.
2. On item #21, under response I “Parent on TDY being hurt or killed,” include responses about the parent not returning, such as, “I am worried that my mom/dad will never come home.”
3. On item #21, if student reports that being nervous while the parent is TDY causes a change in relationships within the house (i.e., “I act like a wild man,” “I fight a lot with my brother,” “My mom gets cranky; she makes me nervous”) code 1 = item b “home related anxiety”.
4. On item #22, the code 0 = NA/NC should be used when the student reports a symptom of general arousal, but indicates it is not TDY related (i.e., “My heart goes too fast if I run around a lot.”)

Worry
1. On item #28, be sure you are coding material of recurring or obsessive-type thoughts and not topics the student reports as regular/routine worry issues. We are looking for perseverative thought here!
2. On item #30, be sure to code worry-material that is directly related to TDYs. Again, be careful not to code topics that are regular/routine worry topics.
3. On item #30, response b “Home related worry,” should be used when student indicates that he or she worries that something may happen which would cause the deployed parent’s resources to be missed, (i.e., if we all, even mom got sick, we might need dad; dad can fix stuff that none of us can, dad is the only one who can help me with homework).
4. On item #30, code item b “Home related worry,” if student indicates he or she is worried because he or she wonders what their deployed parent is doing or how the deployed parent is doing.

Somatizing
1. On item #35, responses such as “I eat well,” “I get plenty of exercise and sleep,” and other responses making reference to good-health behaviors, can be coded as 1 = yes. These type responses are seen as an explanation for the student’s good health.
2. On item #36, health problems coded as 1 = yes, need to occur with some regularity or recency. For example do not code “yes” if student reports having a headache once, or when he or she was three years-old.
3. Also on item #36, when reporting health complaints, symptoms need to be illness related, not self-induced (i.e., if I drink too much water and run around a lot my stomach will hurt.)
4. On item # 36, if symptoms are self-induced or not illness-related, code 0 = NA/NC.

Depression
1. On items # 39 & 41, if student lists two of the possible responses (i.e., I feel sad when he's leaving and when he's gone) choose the period that is longer or the one upon which the student puts more emphasis.

Dependency Issues
1. On item # 49, emptying the trash should be coded as 1 = additional cleaning. Other household chores such as dusting, cleaning the bathrooms, sweeping floors, etc. fall under this same code.

Resource Questions/Coping Responses
These rules apply to items #:16 - 19, 23 - 26, 31 - 34, 46, 47.

1. If the student responds, “I don't know” to the questions about “what would make you feel better?” code this as 0 = NA/NC. On the items about type of coping response, code “I don't know” answers as 1 = Helplessness/low efficacy levels in the environment.

2. Under the number of coping response items, record coping responses initiated by the student only. Do not include suggestions made by interviewer because of children's tendency to agree with adults.

3. On items addressing “breadth of social support network” and “who can help you out,” mom and dad each count as a separate person, count “parents” as two people. Siblings, other relatives, peers, etc. each count as one additional person to the “breadth of social support network” question. In instances in which a student lists that some of their siblings will not be helpful, you can still count siblings in both items as long as the student lists at least one sibling who can be helpful.

4. On number of coping responses items, talking to multiple people counts as one coping response. But under the question about to whom is the coping response directed, count each individual person named.

5. Playing with friends is an emotion-focused coping response, unless the student specifically states that playing changes the situation somehow.

6. When students list avoidance or distraction-type coping responses (i.e., sleeping, reading, watching TV, puzzles, computer games, etc.) the responses should be coded as 2 = emotion-focused, for type of response items. Avoidance or distraction-type responses should be coded as 1 = self for orientation of response items unless student specifically mentions they would do the activity with someone else.


8. Stuffed animals/imaginary friends do not count as an “other-directed coping response” because such interactions are a reflection of the student’s intra-psychic activity.
9. Activities done in public (i.e., going to mall, BX, etc.) counts as an “other-directed coping response”.

10. Unless student mentions specific people with whom they would engage in their coping response activity, code as 1 = self for orientation of response.

11. When students agree that people mentioned by interviewer could help them out, count these people as resource people in items 46 & 47. In other words, save all affirmative responses about resource people suggested by the interviewer for items 46 & 47. Interviewer-initiated coping suggestions are often framed as: “How about your teacher/your neighbor/etc. could he or she help you out if you were feeling ___?”

**Student Feedback**

1. On item # 59, response “b” include statements like, “They should be able to take kids with them.”

**Coding System Part II**

1. “I don’t know” responses still get coded 0 = NA/NC. Also if the question is not asked code 0 = NA/NC.

2. When student agrees with interviewer suggestions (i.e., “Do you ever worry about doing bad on math tests”) do not code these responses, again we are trying to control for children’s tendency to agree with adults. However, if the child agrees and adds more details such that it seems obvious this is something the child experiences (i.e., “I only worry about math tests with fractions because adding and taking away is easy for me”) or the child has previously mentioned the experience on his or her own and the interviewer is just refreshing the child’s memory (i.e., “Now I thought you told me that math tests make you worried”), code as 1 = yes.

3. **DO NOT DOUBLE DIP!** We are only coding student responses that were not coded in the Part I coding system. This part of the coding system deals with different interview questions than those addressed in Part I. If you are not sure, look at the interview format.

4. Occasionally, there will be a section of questions that apparently did not get asked. If you cannot find the actual question as posed in the interview format, or an obvious derivative, code as 0 = NA/NC.

5. Related to double-dipping: on items # 4, 10, 15, 21, 26, 28- be sure you are recording emotions experienced during a non-TDY time. If student reports feeling sad when his mom was TDY code as 0 = NA/NC. However, if the student reports something to the effect, “I get worried because my mom might have to go TDY” that can be coded as 1 = yes.

6. If student reports in items # 4, 10, 15, 21, 26, 28 that he or she has not experienced the emotion in question, but then goes on to give a non-TDY related example of a time when she experienced the emotion, code the above items 1 = yes, rather than 2 = no.

7. On items # 6, 17, 23, 30 you are asked to determine the type or nature of the definition of the emotion given by the student. Use the following as a guide. Use 0 = NA/NC as it has been applied throughout. Use 1 = abstract when the definition is
“Considered apart from concrete existence” or “stated without reference to a particular instance” Berube, M. S. (1985). The American Heritage Dictionary (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. Use 2 = intrapersonal experience when the student describes the emotion in terms of how the emotion is experienced within her/his own mind or consciousness. Use 3 = interpersonal consequences when the student defines the emotion in terms of his or her relationship to other people or how the emotion effects his or her relationship with others. Use 4 = Bodily response when the definition centers largely around what is going on inside the student’s body when he or she feels the emotion (i.e., psychosomatic symptoms) or when the definition rests largely on physical metaphors that describe how the emotion feels.

8. On items # 7, 18, 24, 31 the following are “precise definitions”:

- **Loneliness**: Interviewer definition- “When you really miss someone and you think about them a lot and wish you could be with them.” Dictionary definition- “Without companions” or “Dejected due to a lack of companions.”
- **Nervousness**: Interviewer definition- “Feeling scared inside.” Dictionary definition- “Easily excited or distraught; high strung” or “Marked by uneasiness or fearfulness: apprehension.”
- **Tension/Stressed Out**: Interviewer definition- “How you feel when a lot is going on all at once and you feel you cannot keep up with everything.” Dictionary definition- “A mentally or emotionally disrupting influence” or “To cause anxiety, strain, or suffering.”
- **Worry**: Interviewer definition- “It is like when you cannot stop thinking that something bad is going to happen or things are not going to work out OK.” Dictionary definition- “To feel uneasy about; be troubled” or “A source of nagging concern or uneasiness”
- **Depression**: Interviewer definition- “To feel very, very sad for a long period of time.” Dictionary definition- “The condition of feeling sad or melancholy.”
- **Guilt**: Interviewer definition- “When you feel bad because something that happened might be your fault. Everybody feels guilty sometimes, even if what happened really wasn’t his or her fault.” Dictionary definition- “Remorseful awareness of having done something wrong.”


9. Also on accuracy of definition items (items # 7, 18, 24, 31), code a response 1 = inaccurate when student offers a definition fitting an emotion other than the one at hand or states an example of the emotion but no formalized definition. If the student uses the emotion word in the definition (i.e., For the word worry: “When my friends have to move I think about them and worry”) then the definition cannot be coded as 3 = precise. In other words a precise definition cannot include the word being defined. If the student gives back the word being defined (i.e., For the word worry: “It means you’re worried about something”) code as 0 = NA/NC.
10. On items #8, 11, 19 use the following definition for internalization-externalization. Internalization-externalization represents a continuum along which behavior can be categorized. This dimension can be thought of as representing who is disturbed by the child’s emotional experience. When children’s outward behavior is acceptable but their internal state is disturbing to them, they are considered internalizers. When children act out their emotional experience in such a way as to disturb others they are considered externalizers. (Wenar, C. 1990. The Bridge to the Psychopathologies. In C. Wenar, Developmental Psychopathology From Infancy Through Adolescence (2nd ed., pp. 66-96). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.) Examples of internalizing behavior: “When I get lonely I get a bad stomach ache”; “When I am depressed my chest aches”; “When I am worried I just go off by myself.” Examples of externalizing behavior: “When I get lonely I go harass my friends until someone agrees to play with me”; “When I am depressed I act bad at school and get the teacher mad at me”; “When I am worried I hit my brother”. Often times whether the child’s behavior is internal or external to him/her can be inferred by looking at the answers to the following questions: “How do you act when you feel _____?” or “Could I tell by looking at you, you were _____?”

11. Also on items #8, 11, 19 if the student names another emotion in response to the question: “How do you act when you feel _____?” (i.e., I feel sad when I am lonely) and the student doesn’t describe how he or she acts when experiencing the second emotion, code as 0 = NA/NC.

12. The following defense mechanisms can often be thought of as internalizing behavior because in a psychodynamic perspective they are considered to be an intra-psychic interaction between the ego and id: repression, rationalization, reaction formation, denial, and avoidance. Some of the defense mechanisms could be expressed in an externalizing manner such as: regression, displacement, projection, and sublimation, though these might be expressed intra-psychically. (Rathus, S. A. & Nevid, J. S., 1991. Theoretical Perspectives. In Rathus & Nevid, Abnormal Psychology (pp. 34-74). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Incorporated).

13. Internalizing behavior can involve activity, even activity with other people. For example talking with a friend could result in internalizing behavior if the conversation is about the student’s internal world, how upset they are, rumination, etc. Our guidepost is determining who is most disturbed by the student’s emotional experience.

14. In this coding system, we are coding behavioral reactions to an emotion that involve activity directed at remedying the situation creating the emotion as externalizing behavior. For example, if a student replies to the question: “How do you act when you are lonely?” by saying, “I call my friends and see if they can play” code this as externalizing behavior.

15. On items #12, 25, 32, code student statements that scary movies cause the emotion in question as other = 1. Code emotions caused by bad dreams the same as they are coded for scary movies (i.e., other = 1). Also when students report that being picked on causes the emotion in question, code as peer group related = 1. Fear of the dark
per se can also be coded other = 1. However, if student says something about there being monsters or other harmful creatures being present in the dark, or that looking out a window into the night frightens them because something may be watching them, code as self-generated = 1.
APPENDIX H

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS

### Coding System Part I

**Pilot Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>By-Item Coefficient</th>
<th>By-Response Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11104P-A</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11106P-B</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12104P-C</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12105P-D</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41112P-E</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean:</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81102P-F</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81101P-G</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81102P-H</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81103P-I</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean:</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21107P-J</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82103P-K</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82103P-L</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean:</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean:</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Randomly-Selected Interviews: Inter-rater Reliability Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>By-Item Coefficient</th>
<th>By-Response Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22107-S</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52114-W</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32110-KK</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11106-O0</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82101-WW</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Coding System Part II

### Pilot Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>By-Item Coefficient</th>
<th>By-Response Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11104P-A</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11105P-B</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12104P-C</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12105P-D</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean:</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41112P-E</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81102P-F</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81101P-G</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81102P-H</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean:</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81103P-I</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21107P-J</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82103P-K</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82103P-L</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean:</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean:</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Randomly-Selected Interviews: Inter-rater Reliability Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>By-Item Coefficient</th>
<th>By-Response Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22107-S</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81101-Y</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82102-EE</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32110-KK</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32111-UU</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11104-SS</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 1</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 2*</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean 2 is figured without transcript 32111-UU as that reliability check was inadvertently deleted.*
APPENDIX I

FREQUENCIES OF CODEABLE RESPONSES PER LEVEL OF EACH CODED ITEM IN PERCENTS: CODING SYSTEM PART I

Background Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Age In Years</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Number Of Siblings</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Only Child</th>
<th>First Born</th>
<th>Second Born</th>
<th>Third Born</th>
<th>Fourth Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Dad</th>
<th>Mom</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Step-Dad</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Military Parent</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-3 Moves</th>
<th>4-6 Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Number Of Moves</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Many TDYs</td>
<td>Not Many TDYs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception Of TDYs At Study Base</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>More Than Other Bases</th>
<th>Less Than Other Bases</th>
<th>Same As At Other Bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Change In Number Of TDYs Since Moving To Study Base</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>More Than One Year</th>
<th>More Than 6 Months</th>
<th>4-6 Months</th>
<th>3-4 Months</th>
<th>2-3 Months</th>
<th>2-4 Weeks</th>
<th>1-10 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Longest TDY</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Impending TDY</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Resistant To Answering Questions</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loneliness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Loneliness During TDY</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reasons For Feeling Lonely Or Not Feeling Lonely During TDY</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

Key:
B = TDY parent is a playmate.
C = Custodial parent lacks important resources that the TDY parent has.
D = TDY parents keeps child from becoming bored.
F = Child is not lonely because s/he has many friends.
G = Child is not lonely because s/he is reliant on other family members for support.
I = Child is not lonely because TDY parent will be back soon.
J = Other responses, please see Appendix K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All The Time</th>
<th>At Night</th>
<th>In The Morning</th>
<th>*Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>When Is Student Lonely</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please see Appendix K for other responses.

**Coping Responses-Lonely**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Number Of Loneliness Coping Responses</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Helpless/Low Efficacy</th>
<th>Emotion-Focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Coping Function</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Mixed-Self &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Social Locus Of Response</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Support Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mom</th>
<th>Dad</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Other Relatives</th>
<th>Pets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

### Anxiety

**Anxiety During TDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Anxiety During TDY</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TDY Anxiety Topics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TDY Anxiety Topics</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

**Key:**
- B = Home-related topics.
- C = School-related topics.
- I = Parent on TDY being hurt or killed.
- J = Harm to self or family at home.
- L = Other responses, please see Appendix K.

### Measure of General Arousal During TDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hard To Sit Still</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Shaky Inside</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Heart Goes Too Fast</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Shortness Of Breath</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Too Much Energy</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nervous Habits</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Feels Tied In Knots</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Feels Like Exploding</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Feels Like Crying Inside</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Feels Like Things Are Spinning Inside Head</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Feels Like Hiding</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cranky</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coping Responses - Tension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Number Of Coping Responses</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Helpless/ Low Efficacy</th>
<th>Emotion-Focused</th>
<th>Problem-Focused</th>
<th>Mixed-Emotion &amp; Problem-Focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coping Function</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Mixed-Self &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Social Locus Of Response</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9/1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mom</th>
<th>Dad</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Pets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Social Support Person</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

### Worry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Recurring Thoughts</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nature Of Recurring Thoughts</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- B = Home-related thoughts.
- E = Nonsense thoughts/songs
- F = TDY related.
- G = Other responses, please see Appendix K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Worry During TDY</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TDY Worry Topics</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- B = Home-related topics.
- I = Parent on TDY being hurt or killed.
- J = Harm to self or family at home.

**Coping Responses - Worry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Number Of Coping Responses</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Coping Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Helpless/Low Efficacy</th>
<th>Emotion-Focused</th>
<th>Problem-Focused</th>
<th>Mixed-Emotion &amp; Problem-Focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coping Function</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Mixed-Self &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Social Locus</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mom</th>
<th>Dad</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Pets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Social Support Persons</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Somatization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Usually Healthy</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Stomach Ache</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sore Throat</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tired</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Colds</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Allergies</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sick More During TDY</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Depression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codeable Number Of Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sadness During TDY</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Reunion</th>
<th>Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Saddest Phase Of TDY</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does Sadness Get Better As TDY Goes On</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Reunion</th>
<th>Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Overall Hardest Phase Of TDY</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Do You Cry More During TDY</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Regular Sleeping Difficulties: Non-TDY</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Regular Sleeping Difficulties: TDY</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Enjoyment Of Previously Enjoyed Activities</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Do Eating Habits Change During TDY</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived Social Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Nobody</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>2-4 Persons</th>
<th>5-8 Persons</th>
<th>More Than 8 Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Number Of Social Support Persons Available</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Social Support Network Composition</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reported values are percentages.*

**Key:**

F = Teacher  
G = Other Relatives  
H = Adult Friends  
I = Pets  
J = Neighbors  
K = Extra-Curricular Activity Directors  
L = School Counselor  
M = Other, please see Appendix K

**Household Chores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Do You Have Regular Chores</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Types Of Chores Performed</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

Key:
- E = Care of siblings
- F = Meal assistance
- G = Lawn care
- H = Other, please see Appendix K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Changes In Chores Due To TDY</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Change In Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>How Do Chores Change</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Do You Worry About Not Helping Enough During TDY</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Separation Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Separation Anxiety During TDY</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Do You Check-In More During TDY</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Preference</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Away From Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Preferred Playing Location-TDY</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Issues: Non-TDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Regularly Prepared For Class</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Able To Keep Track Of Classroom Activities</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Issues: TDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Is It Hard To Come To School During TDY</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Do You Spend More Time With Teacher</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Able To Keep Track Of Classroom Activities</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Is It Hard To Get Work Done On Time</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Enjoy Recess</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guilt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Guilty During TDY</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parent Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Affect</th>
<th>Makes Things Worse</th>
<th>Makes Things Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Affect Of School On TDY Adjustment</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not A School Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Satisfaction With School TDY Efforts</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suggestions About How To Make TDYs Easier</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- B = Change nature of TDYs.
- C = Increase communication with deployed parent.
- D = Offer school-based support group.
- E = Other, please see Appendix K.
APPENDIX J

FREQUENCIES OF CODEABLE RESPONSES PER LEVEL OF EACH CODED ITEM IN PERCENTS: CODING SYSTEM PART II

**Loneliness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lonely: Non-TDY</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Able To Use In Sentence, Cannot Define</th>
<th>Heard Before, Do Not Know Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Level Of Word Knowledge</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Intra-Personal</th>
<th>Inter-Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Type Of Definition</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
<th>Precise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Accuracy Of Definition</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Mixed-Internalizing &amp; Externalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Not Congruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Verbal-Behavioral Congruency</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Anxiety: Non-TDY</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Mixed-Internalizing &amp; Externalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Anxiety Topics: Non-TDY</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

**Key:**
- B = Family-related.
- C = School-related.
- D = Peer group-related.
- F = Problems with a specific peer.
- G = Self-generated/fantasy.
- H = Animals.
- I = Medical procedures.
- M = Other, please see Appendix K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Anything Good About Nervousness</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Anything Not So Good About Nervousness</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tension: Non-TDY</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Able To Use In Sentence, Cannot Define</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Level Of Word Knowledge</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Intra-Personal</th>
<th>Inter-Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Type Of Definition</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
<th>Precise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Accuracy Of Definition</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Mixed-Internalizing &amp; Externalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Not Congruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Verbal-Behavioral Congruency</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Worry: Non-TDY</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Able To Use In Sentence, Cannot Define</th>
<th>Heard Before, Do Not Know Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Level Of Word Knowledge</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Codeable Responses</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Intra-Personal</td>
<td>Inter-Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Type Of Definition</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
<th>Precise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Accuracy Of Definition</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Worry Topics: Non-TDY</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

Key:  
F = Problems with a specific peer.  
G = Self-generated/fantasy.  
H = Other, please see Appendix K.

Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Depression: Non-TDY</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Depression Topics: Non-TDY</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values reported are percentages.

Key:  
E = Family moving.  
F = Friend moving.  
H = Parents divorcing/separated.  
I = School problems.  
J = Other, please see Appendix K.
## Guilt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Guilt: Non-TDY</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Heard Before, Do Not Know Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Level Of Word Knowledge</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Intra-Personal</th>
<th>Inter-Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Type Of Definition</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
<th>Precise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Accuracy Of Definition</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Of Codeable Responses</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guilt Topics: Non-TDY</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- B = Family-related.
- D = School-related.
- F = Problems with specific peers.
- H = Other, please see Appendix K.
APPENDIX K

VERBATIM STUDENT RESPONSES TO "OTHER" CODING OPTIONS

FOR CODING SYSTEM PARTS I AND II

*Coding system items can be found in Appendix F

Coding System Part I-Item 14: Reasons for Feeling Lonely or Not Feeling Lonely

During Parental TDY

- "Well it’s kind of a bit more because my dad also, my dad, my mom got divorced so my dad’s away and we only get to see him like twice a year and so, when my step-dad goes away it’s like I have no dad around and so I really, that makes me really sad."—Fifth grade girl.

Coding System Part I-Item 15: When Does Student Report Feeling Lonely For TDY Parent?

- "Yeah when the bomb happened" (Bombing of Khobar Towers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia-6/25/96).—Second grade girl.

- "I kinda feel lonely sometimes ."—Third grade boy.

- "Yeah, sort of like when, hmm, like when mom’s at her work then I just kind of like go play with my friends and stuff."—Fifth grade girl.

- "Well most of the days it’s different every time but it’s probably usually when the time he’s supposed to come home and he doesn’t come home, is probably."—Fifth grade girl.

- "At bedtime and when I get up."—Kindergarten girl.
• "Huh uh, sometimes, it's like when he's gone a long, long time, like when’s he’s at Italy."—Fifth grade boy.

• "Well like the first week, two weeks it was okay, but then right in the middle it did."—Fifth grade boy.

• "Yeah, usually in the night and morning, because in the like middle of the day I’m usually playing with my friends, so I don’t really think about it."—Fifth grade girl.

• "All day when my friends are punished and no one to play with in my house."—First grade boy.

• "Well like the first day he leaves is when I feel the most lonely and then slowly it starts to go away... But then, like when he calls or something and we talk to him then it goes back up again and then it goes down, it just keeps going up and down like that."—Fifth grade girl.

• "Um, I think on Wednesdays because he always leaves on Wednesdays."—Kindergarten girl.

• "Well, if he says been gone, he’s gonna be gone for four days, and once my dad said that, and but he was really going away for five days and if my mom didn’t tell him he was going away for five days and I hadn’t heard it I’d feel lonely, I’d miss him... Yeah, longer than he told me."—Second grade boy.

• "Mostly in the, yeah, in the afternoon. ‘Cause me and my dad play catch together."—Fourth grade boy.
Coding System Part I: Item 21-Topics Causing Anxiety During a TDY

- "Um sometimes, like if my dad’s going out of the United States, I’m like, I’ve never been out of the United States, so, except in Mexico, but, I’m not sure really what it’s like so I.”—Fifth grade girl.

- "When nobody’s nice to me.”—Third grade girl.

Coding System Part I-Item 28: Nature of Recurring Thought

- "Like if I do something wrong it’ll go over and over in my mind and I can never forget about it.”—Fourth grade boy.

- "I want to have cookies and cookies and cookies.”—First grade girl.

- "The same thing like I make out of my Legos and try to get the same thing I already made.”—Third grade boy.

- "Um, being in the Army.”—First grade boy.

- "My sister and me once a long time ago did this, mom was going somewhere and she left her kids in the car a little boy and a little girl and they didn’t know how to open the windows, to have enough fresh air.....Yeah, and her mother had to go to jail because they died.” —Kindergarten girl.

- "I forget sometimes. Like I have this one thought, just like when I was in Germany, I always think of this, like there’s a slide somewhere like this and there’s like a cabinet and I go in there and there’s a slide in it, then you go on and it comes out right up this side where it begins. But sometimes I remember what happened when I was little
kid. When I was three and when I got bitten by a dog, like I didn’t know what to do so I started, I, so I bit back.”—Fifth grade boy.

- “I had the dream over and over again almost all the time. This dream, but the thought, I have a little bit almost all the time. I think I am going to get hurt all the time when I get, when I like, um, when I play outside I always think I’m going to get hurt. But sometimes I get a little bit scratches, but it isn’t really hurt, but I do get hurt a lot sometimes.”—Third grade girl.

- “When my _____ like when my babysitter’s playing a game and then I just said no, and I just keep on thinking it and thinking they said yes.”—First grade boy.

- “Like when I have a bad dream.”—First grade boy.

- “I used to always have the thought that aliens were going to come down and stuff and like harm the people in my house and stuff and like just really weird thoughts.”—Fifth grade girl.

- “I try and think about something else, but it keeps on coming to my mind. Like me getting mad at someone, real mad.”—Fourth grade boy.

- “Trying to get to sleep at night.”—Third grade boy.

**Coding System Part I-Item 47: Identity of Social Support Persons**

- “And sometimes Sasha comes down and she looks down from the clouds (pet who had died).”—Kindergarten boy.

- “Um, the Incredible Hulk and Spider Man and Superman.”—First grade boy.

- “Superman. Yeah, or Flash because he can run fast.”—First grade boy.
• “And then if it was the day that I was going to go see the lady that I always see I would go to, tell her” (referring to therapist).—Fifth grade girl.

• “At England we have a, one who has a baby and she's from church.”—Kindergarten girl.

• “I'd take the phone and call, and listen the Parent/Teacher Hotline.”—Third grade boy.

Coding System Part I-Item 49: Types of Household Chores Performed

• “And if it’s a library day I have to look for a book too.”—First grade girl.

• “Not much stuff, just homework.”—Third grade boy.

• “Yes I draw mama one (a picture).”—Kindergarten girl.

Coding System Part I-Item 59: Student Feedback About How To Help Kids Cope With TDY

• “Just don’t worry and stuff.”—Second grade girl.

• “For them to do good in class. And let, tell their dad about it and their dad can tell their mom or dad.”—Second grade girl.

• “Call their friends and play with them and tell them that can you do something about it. Tell the teacher and not do as much work.”—First grade girl.

• “Um maybe some (after school) activities or something. Maybe get more equipment or something. Try not to worry so much. Just kind of keep your mind on fun stuff.”—Fifth grade girl.

• “It’s not the end of the world, he’ll come back.”—Fifth grade girl.
• "Um, play on the jungle gym outside."—First grade boy.

• "Just playing with somebody or something."—Kindergarten boy.

• "Wait 'til he gets back."—Kindergarten girl.

• "Help. Um, talk to you and you might feel better. Talk to your dog."—Kindergarten girl.

• "Talk to 'em" (How teachers could help kids whose parents are TDY).—Second grade girl.

• "If they could, help 'em and try to get the kids to talk to which other parent is there. Or whoever they're staying with."—Fifth grade boy.

• "Give us fun stuff to do. They can let us play new games and stuff that we might like" (How teachers could help kids whose parents are TDY)—Second grade boy.

• "Just play." And "Um, just help other people." (How teachers could help kids whose parents are TDY)—First grade boy.

• "Tell the President or something" (How teachers could help kids whose parents are TDY).—Third grade girl.

• "Um, I don't know. Um, maybe if, um, they could, if they have a hard time they could like kind of see, like a counselor, not maybe a school counselor, but they should like hire someone that knows about these things and what it's like to have your dad or mom TDY when they were young too and they were sad and stuff and they'd know about that stuff and people could, if he doesn't want to just do it for
free, they could pay him maybe like five dollars a session, an hour session, like talk
about stuff. "—Fifth grade girl.

• "To think of something you could do every time your dad goes on TDY or
something. Different things every day. Just play."—Second grade girl.

• "I'd just stay over at his house more" (How the student would help a friend whose
parent was TDY). —First grade boy.

• "Oh wow. I'd probably tell you that all the kids are going to feel a different way
about it and....Yeah. You'd probably have to have like different things" (How
teachers could help kids whose parents are TDY)—Fifth grade girl.

• "To let the guys have a little more days off, more days that they have to work. Well,
when my dad comes home he has days to come off, so that's good." And "I would
tell her to maybe you can come over and you can probably have dinner with us and
try to cheer her up and stuff" (How the student would help a friend whose parent
was TDY).—Third grade girl.

• "We can help our teachers do work and we can help her find stuff when she's lost
something." And "Tell her to don't be afraid 'cause she be afraid then you're gonna
be a scardy cat then everybody will laugh at you. And it's not gonna be good."—
Kindergarten girl.

• "Well you know, we could always watch TV. And we could play. And go shopping
some."—Second grade boy.

• "Hang out with your mother and father."—Fourth grade boy.
• "I'd usually ask him to come over to my house" (How the student would help a friend whose parent was TDY).—Third grade boy.

• "It's to stop thinking about it and get thinking about your work."—First grade girl.

Coding System Part II-Item 12: Non-TDY Anxiety Topics

• The interview.—Fourth grade boy.

• "I hate the zoo too."—Second grade boy.

• "Whenever I have bad dreams." First grade girl.

• The interview.—Fifth grade girl.

• "Like if I have to do something...in front of a lot of people."—Fifth grade girl.

• "Hitting and bitching."—Kindergarten boy.

• "Um, sometimes. The first time I went Disneyland I was scared on the Pirate ride.....Some fast things."—Kindergarten boy.

• "It's turning off the light."—Kindergarten girl.

• "I don't know just things. Having nobody to play with."—Second grade girl.

• "Going on the orbit" (Amusement park ride).—Third grade boy.

• "Um, when I get scared a lot. When I think I'm going to get in trouble if I do something. I think I'm going to get in trouble and I get nervous, when I get real nervous I cry sometimes."—Third grade girl.

• "...And when I was playing football, right before games I'd get real jumpy."—Fifth grade boy.
• "...Like I feel nervous because if I go on stage and have to talk to all the people I'd be nervous because I'd be embarrassed how, if I be nervous then I'd have to be talking weird and I can't talk as fast and stuff."—Second grade boy.

• "Like if I'm watching a show that's not good for you."—Third grade girl.

• "Uh huh. Because sometimes I'm afraid that I might get kidnapped or something." And "Bad dreams."—Second grade girl.

• "The dark."—First grade boy.

• "...Especially when I'm flying on a plane."—Fifth grade girl.

• "Like when people ask me weird questions (reference to the interview). And "If I like, if a boy asks me anything."—Fifth grade girl.

• "And when people I don't know, like my mom's friends ask me a question."—Fourth grade boy.

• "When you fall down or something, you get really scared." And "When you get nightmares."—First grade girl.

• "Like when we go to the store and I have to ask somebody on my own when my mommy wants me to."—Kindergarten girl.

Coding System Part II-Item 25: Non-TDY Worry Topics

• "Cord's not plugged in" (Reference to tape recorder used in interview)—Kindergarten girl.

• "I'm worried about when I go to sleep I don't know if somebody is going to break in or I might not wake up."—Fourth grade boy.
• “My mom and dad we were going to this one guy’s birthday party but he was real sick and he got up but on his birthday he had a heart attack and he died. And my mom started to cry but my dad he tried to stop her. “Cause I was the only one that knew and they never told me.”—First grade girl.

• “When I eat an orange.”—Kindergarten boy.

• “Just scorpions”—Kindergarten boy.

• “That somebody’s going to hurt me.”—Kindergarten girl.

• “Sometimes when I’m hanging upside down on the bars and I think I am going to fall, I get kind of scared.”—Third grade girl.

• “Like when I’m afraid I’m doing something, like that it’s not good for you.”—Third grade girl.

• “Or about myself, if I get like into a fight or something.”—Fifth grade girl.

• “…And sometimes I worry that I get kidnapped or something and I worry that I might break my leg or something when I fall off the monkey bars.”—Second grade girl.

• “That something’s going to come like a tornado. And that I’m going to die or worse, like getting a gangster come and starts shooting.”—First grade boy.

• “I get worried about, well I get worried about it, I do something and somebody catches me or me and my friends or somebody do something and we get in trouble.”—Third grade girl.
• "Well, sometimes I worry that the base is going to get under attack. And sometimes I worry that when those loud sounds like guns firing and tanks shooting. Yeah, and planes flying around shooting, I worry about if I’m going, I worry that there’s going to be another war. Like a World War III."—Second grade boy.

• "I worry about, at night when like if we have someone doesn’t lock the door and someone comes in."—Fourth grade boy.

Coding System Part II-Item 27: Non-TDY Sadness Topics

• "When somebody dies." And "When my parents cry."—First grade girl.

• "When fire ants bite me."—Kindergarten boy.

• "When I, when mom said I just didn’t finish my supper so I couldn’t have anything to eat and I was getting hungry, but I didn’t want to eat my supper."—Kindergarten girl.

• "My friend’s dad died."—Second grade girl.

• "When I was like four years-old people called me pig nose."—Fifth grade boy.

• "Um, like my sister does something to me I’m scared I’m going to get in trouble like if I, because sometimes my sister pulls her hair, pulls my hair, and I go like that and just pulls a little bit, I do it to my sister a little bit but I don’t do it real hard and I think I’m going to get in trouble."—Third grade girl.

• "Like if I tried to say something to my mom but my mom is still talking to her friend and I keep saying it but she won’t listen."—Second grade boy.

• "Like when my brother mad a bad choice."—Third grade girl.
• "When my brother hits me and makes me cry a lot."—Second grade girl.

• "I was at my grandma's house and we had to drive a long way and when somebody was not home we had to in and the door was open and I think he went to his next door neighbor and then I was watching a movie and then he came back in and then he had to eat breakfast. We had to spend the night at his house. I missed my mom."—Kindergarten girl.

• "When my parents got divorced and I didn't think, when my dad said that he would come down and spend like a month with me but he didn't."—Fifth grade girl.

• "When Sky Racer won't work."—Third grade boy.

• "When my mom yells at me. And when my friends say they don't like me and they don't want to play with me or they say, then I'm going to home because of the way you're acting and I didn't do anything."—First grade girl.

Coding System Part II-Item 32: Non-TDY Guilt Topics

• "Um, someone blamed something on me."—First grade boy.

• "I've felt guilty about stuff like,.....taking something."—Fifth grade boy.
## APPENDIX L

### INDICES OF STRENGTH FOR NONSIGNIFICANT RESULTS

#### Emotional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Non-TDY Loneliness</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Non-TDY Tension</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Non-TDY Guilt</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>TDY Loneliness</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>TDY Separation Anxiety</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>TDY Depression</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Impending TDY</td>
<td>TDY Loneliness</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Impending TDY</td>
<td>TDY Guilt</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>TDY Anxiety</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>TDY Depression</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>TDY Guilt</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Change in Chores</td>
<td>TDY Anxiety</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Keep Track: Non-TDY</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Keep Track: TDY</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Attend School-TDY</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>On-time: TDY</td>
<td>TDY Anxiety</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>On-time: TDY</td>
<td>TDY Depression</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Attend School-TDY</td>
<td>TDY Worry</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Attend School-TDY</td>
<td>TDY Guilt</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Separation Anxiety-Teacher</td>
<td>TDY Worry</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Separation Anxiety-Teacher</td>
<td>TDY Depression</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coping Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Number of Coping Responses-Loneliness</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Social Locus-Tension</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Social Locus-Worry</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emotional Conceptualization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Word Knowledge-Loneliness</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Type of Definition-Loneliness</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Accuracy of Definition-Loneliness</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression-Loneliness</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Congruency-Loneliness</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression-Anxiety</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Word Knowledge-Tension</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Type of Definition-Tension</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Accuracy of Definition-Tension</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression-Tension</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Congruency-Tension</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Accuracy of Definition-Worry</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Word Knowledge-Guilt</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Type of Definition-Guilt</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Emotional Conceptualization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Type of Definition-Loneliness</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression-Anxiety</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Word Knowledge-Tension</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Accuracy of Definition-Tension</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression-Tension</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Congruency-Tension</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Non-TDY Tension</td>
<td>Behavioral Expression-Tension</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Non-TDY Worry</td>
<td>Type of Definition-Worry</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Non-TDY Guilt</td>
<td>Word Knowledge-Guilt</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Non-TDY Guilt</td>
<td>Type of Definition</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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