INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN LEARNING DISABILITIES
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas, 66045
Emphasis on Adolescents and Young Adults

AN EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDY OF LEARNING DISABLED ADOLESCENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: SUPPORT SERVICES

Donald D. Deshler, Gordon R. Alley,
Michael M. Warner, Jean B. Schumaker, and
Frances L. Clark

Research Report No. 19

January, 1980

The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities is supported by a contract (#300-77-0494) with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U. S. Office of Education, through Title VI-G of Public Law 91-230. The University of Kansas Institute, a joint research effort involving the Department of Special Education and the Bureau of Child Research, has specified the learning disabled adolescent and young adult as the target population. The major responsibility of the Institute is to develop effective means of identifying learning disabled populations at the secondary level and to construct interventions that will have an effect upon school performance and life adjustment. Many areas of research have been designed to study the problems of LD adolescents and young adults in both school and non-school settings (e.g., employment, juvenile justice, military, etc.)

Co-Directors: Edward L. Meyen
Richard L. Schiefelbusch

Research Coordinator: Donald D. Deshler

Associate Coordinator: Jean B. Schumaker

Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities
The University of Kansas
313 Carruth-O'Leary Hall
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

The preparation of this document was supported by a government contract. The views expressed here are those of the Institute, and do not necessarily reflect official positions of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, DHEW, USOE.

Cooperating Agencies

Were it not for the cooperation of many agencies in the public and private sector, the research efforts of The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities could not be conducted. The Institute has maintained an on-going dialogue with participating school districts and agencies to give focus to the research questions and issues that we address as an Institute. We see this dialogue as a means of reducing the gap between research and practice. This communication also allows us to design procedures that: (a) protect the LD adolescent or young adult, (b) disrupt the on-going program as little as possible, and (c) provide appropriate research data.

The majority of our research to this time has been conducted in public school settings in both Kansas and Missouri. School districts in Kansas which are participating in various studies include: United School District (USD) 384, Blue Valley; USD 500, Kansas City; USD 469, Lansing; USD 497, Lawrence; USD 453, Leavenworth; USD 233, Olathe; USD 305, Salina; USD 450, Shawnee Heights; USD 512, Shawnee Mission, USD 464, Tonganoxie; USD 202, Turner; and USD 501, Topeka. Studies are also being conducted in Center School District and the New School for Human Education, Kansas City, Missouri; the School District of St. Joseph, St. Joseph, Missouri; Delta County, Colorado School District; Montrose County, Colorado School District; Elkhart Community Schools, Elkhart, Indiana; and Beaverton School District, Beaverton, Oregon. Many Child Service Demonstration Centers throughout the country have also contributed to our efforts.

Agencies currently participating in research in the juvenile justice system are the Overland Park, Kansas Youth Diversion Project and the Douglas, Johnson, and Leavenworth County, Kansas Juvenile Courts. Other agencies have participated in out-of-school studies--Achievement Place and Penn House of Lawrence, Kansas, Kansas State Industrial Reformatory, Hutchinson, Kansas; the U.S. Military; and the Job Corps. Numerous employers in the public and private sector have also aided us with studies in employment.

While the agencies mentioned above allowed us to contact individuals and supported our efforts, the cooperation of those individuals--LD adolescents and young adults; parents; professionals in education, the criminal justice system, the business community, and the military--have provided the valuable data for our research. This information will assist us in our research endeavors that have the potential of yielding greatest payoff for interventions with the LD adolescent and young adult.

AN EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDY OF LEARNING DISABLED ADOLESCENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Abstract

In recent years, professionals in the field of learning disabilities have begun to address the impact of learning disabilities on adolescents and young adults. Although substantial attention has been directed to the manifestations of learning disabilities in elementary school age populations, the significantly different and increasingly complex demands on adolescents both in and out of school necessitate the development of systematic research on this population. The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities has collected a broad array of data to form an epidemiological data base on LD adolescents and young adults. Data have been collected from learning disabled, low-achieving, and normal-achieving adolescents as well as from their parents and teachers. In addition, information from the environmental setting of the LD adolescents which pertains to interventions applied on behalf of the student, relationships with others, conditions under which he/she operates and support systems available for his/her use has also been collected. These data have been considered in relation to data on specific learner characteristics to gain a more complete profile of the older LD individual.

Research results presented in Research Reports 12 through 20 detail findings from this comprehensive epidemiology study conducted during 1979-80 by the Institute. It is important for the reader to study and view each of these individual reports in relation to this overall line of research. An understanding of the complex nature of the learning disability condition only begins to emerge when each specific topic or finding is seen as a partial, but important, piece of a larger whole.

The specific aspects of the total study presented in individual Research Reports are listed below:

Research Report No. 12:	Details of the Methodology
Research Report No. 13:	Achievement and Ability, Socioeconomic Status, and School Experiences
Research Report No. 14:	Academic Self-Image and Attributions

Research Report No. 15:	Health and Medical Factors
Research Report No. 16:	Behavioral and Emotional Status from the Perspective of Parents and Teachers
Research Report No. 17:	The Relationship of Family Factors to the Condition of Learning Disabilities
Research Report No. 18:	Social Status, Peer Relationship, Activities In and Out of School, and Time Use
Research Report No. 19:	Support Services
Research Report No. 20:	Classification of Learning Disabled and Low-Achieving Adolescents

AN EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDY OF LEARNING DISABLED ADOLESCENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS:

SUPPORT SERVICES

Since the inception of the learning disability field in the early 1960s, emphasis for treatment and intervention has been on younger children. Only recently has attention been turned to addressing the educational and life adjustment needs of adolescents and young adults as well (Alley & Deshler, 1979). A prerequisite step to developing sound instructional systems and procedures for the older-aged learning disabled is for the field to achieve a thorough understanding of the complex nature of the condition of learning disabilities in older populations.

There are some unique problems related to adolescents with learning disabilities (LD) which have not been adequately addressed within the research on learning disabilities in elementary populations. Among these are the following. The demands of the curriculum in secondary schools or job requirements in employment settings are significantly different from the demands placed on LD students in elementary settings. Thus, the manifestations of the specific learning disability may be altered. Second, there are many variables associated with the condition of learning disabilities. It would appear that the complexity and interaction of these increase as the adolescent moves from school to non-school settings and as the number and variety of his/her social groupings increase (Deshler, 1978). Thirdly, there is very little knowledge

about the conditions confronting the LD adolescent and young adult in non-school settings and the degree to which these individuals can cope with these circumstances.

The complex nature of the condition of learning disabilities and the unique features of the conditions and the environment facing the LD adolescent and young adult demonstrate the need for systematic research on this population. Most research efforts on LD populations have centered on the attributes of the learner alone, and thus have focused upon the intrinsic behavioral or cognitive causes of the disability. Such attempts have resulted in limited breakthroughs regarding population identification and intervention development. A potentially productive research approach is one that considers not only learner attributes, but environmental factors as well as a means of describing and understanding the learning disabled adolescent and young adult. Lewin's (1935) formulation to explain human behavior, B = f (PE), where B = behavior, P = person, and E = environment, may be a more appropriate means of conceptualizing and researching learning disabilities. Through such an approach, learning disability would be viewed as a condition which results from a complex interaction between the learner and the environment. Therefore, the purpose of a major line of research conducted by The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities has been to collect a broad array of data to form an epidemiological data base on older LD populations. Data have been collected from the environmental setting of the LD adolescent which pertain to interventions applied on behalf of the student, conditions under which he/she operates, and support systems available for his/her use. These data

have been considered in relation to data on specific learner characteristics to gain a more complete profile of the older LD individual.

Research results presented in The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities Research Reports 12 through 20 detail findings from this comprehensive epidemiology study conducted during 1979-80 by the Institute. It is important for the reader to study and view each of these individual reports in relation to this overall line of research. An understanding of the complex nature of the learning disability condition only begins to emerge when each specific topic or finding is seen as a partial, but important, piece of a larger whole. This specific research report will present findings on the family conditions surrounding learning disabled adolescents in secondary schools.

The presence of adequate support services is viewed as being central to meeting the needs of learning disabled populations (Johnson & Myklebust, 1967; Lerner, 1976; Wallace & McLoughlin, 1979). While learning disabilities is primarily seen as an educational problem (Larsen, 1978), most professionals acknowledge the need to provide a broad array of support services to learning disabled individuals in addition to direct educational services from the learning disability specialist. In that most LD students receive only about one hour of direct service per day in secondary resource programs (Deshler, Lowrey, & Alley, 1979), additional support systems to allow them to cope with the numerous curricular, social and career related demands of secondary schools are seen as essential. Furthermore, instructional time in LD resource rooms is usually devoted to work on academic deficits (Alley, 1977) whereas nonacademic needs such as peer relations, personal and career counseling,

etc., often go unmet by the LD specialist through the avenue of direct services in the resource room.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if there was any difference between learning disabled (LD) adolescents and low-achieving (LA) adolescents on the degree to which they would ask for and receive help from a broad array of support sources both in and external to secondary school settings. A related purpose of this study was to determine the use of such support services by a contrast group of normal-achieving (NA) students.

Methodology

Subjects

Three groups of adolescents and their parents participated in this part of the study. The adolescents included LD students, low-achieving students, and normal-achieving students in grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. LD students were those currently being served in programs for learning disabled students and validated by the IRLD Validation team. Low-achieving (LA) students were students who had recently received one or more failing grade in required subjects, scored below the 33rd percentile on group administered achievement tests, and who were not receiving special educational services. Normal-achieving (NA) students were those who had passing grades, scored above the 33rd percentile in achievement, and who were not receiving special educational services. The students and their parents agreed to participate in this study. For more details on student selection, see The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities Research Report No. 12 (Schumaker,

Warner, Deshler, & Alley, 1980). Two hundred thirty-four LD students and 162 of their parents, 222 low-achieving students and 144 of their parents, and 215 normal-achieving students[1] and 184 of their parents took part.

Settings

Three school districts in northeast Kansas agreed to participate (USDs #500, #512, and #202). The students provided information for this study in small, quiet rooms selected by their schools. Parents provided information at their leisure at home. (For more information regarding settings see Schumaker et al., 1980.)

Measurement Systems

Two assessment instruments, the Youth Instrument and the Parent Instrument, were utilized in this analysis. This instrument was designed with a set of questions regarding the types of support services youths ask for help and from which they receive effective help. Students were asked to respond on a Likert-type scale. (For more information about the instruments see Research Report No. 12, Details of the Methodology.)

Procedures

In individual sessions, the students were read the questions (and possible answers) by an interviewer. The students' responses were recorded on the instrument either by the interviewer or the student, at the student's choice. The parent instruments were either mailed or carried home by the students. Follow-up letters and phone calls prompted delayed returns.

Data Analysis

The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Dis-

abilities Research Reports in which data from the first phase of the comprehensive Level I epidemiological study are numbered (including the present report) 12 through 20. A thorough discussion of the specific procedures used in data analysis for the complete study as a whole as well as the rationale for those procedures is contained in Research Report Number 12, Details of the Methodology (Schumaker et al., 1980). The following comments are condensed from that report.

In general, two types of variables are discussed in Research Reports 12-20: (a) individual items from the Youth, Parent, or Regular Teacher Assessment Instruments, or specific ability or achievement test scores and (b) FSCALES. The FSCALES were derived by equally weighting and averaging performance on two or more items from one of the assessment instruments. Based on a factor analysis of each assessment instrument, items were combined into an FSCALE if they had a moderate to strong loading on the same factor. A complete listing of the items which made up each FSCALE is contained in Research Report Number 12.

In order to test for significant group differences on individual assessment instrument items, test scores, or FSCALES, the following procedure was adopted. The BMDP7D computer program (Dixon, 1975) was used to conduct a univariate F test for each variable under consideration. For each variable, if the p value associated with F was less than or equal to .01, confidence bands for each mean were constructed. Two standard errors of the mean ($SE = SD/\sqrt{n}$) were added and subtracted from each mean. If the confidence bands for a given pair of means did not overlap, the means were considered significantly different.[2]

Results

The students were asked to answer a number of questions about the types of support services they ask for help and from which they receive effective help. The data for those variables in which a significant difference was found between at least one pair of subject groups (LD and LA, LD and NA, LA and NA) are shown in Table 1 - 19. In each table are shown: (a) the question(s) asked and possible answers, (b) the mean answer for each group, (c) the standard deviation for each group, (d) the F value, (e) the number of persons responding, and (f) an indication of whether the confidence bands for each pair of groups overlapped. If the overlap indication is listed as "no", this means that there is no overlap between the means for a given pair of groups. Thus, there is a significant differenct between the means for these two groups in the given pair. If the overlap indication is "yes" then there is overlap between the means and no signfiicant difference was found between members of the listed pair. The data presented in all the tables represents data collected in both junior and senior high schools for the LD and LA groups and collected in a senior high school for the NA group.

Support Services Students Ask for Help

In general, items related to support services were not found to separate learning disabled from low-achieving adolescents. While F tests for several variables (19 of 36) compared the involvement of the three groups with support services, only one (asking teachers for support) reached significance ($p < .01$) where the confidence bands for the means were overlapping. No grade level effects (between junior and senior high school populations) were found on the support services variables.

Tables 1-12 show the youth responses to questions about the person/services the student would ask for help if he/she were having problems in school, such as getting along with teachers or students or in doing school work. In all cases, except teachers (Table 2), the significant difference was found between LD/LA groups and the NA group. In other words, the LD and LA groups were very familiar in their responses as to the support services they would ask to help. In the case of teachers (Table 2) LD students reported being more likely to ask teachers for help than the LA and NA groups. Table 21 reports the variables which yielded no significant difference among the groups in asking support services/persons for help.

Insert Tables 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5, 6, 7,
8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 about here

To get an indication of the support services/persons most likely to be used by students, the percentage of students responding "likely" or "very likely" to ask a given support service/person for help was calculated. These data are reported in Table 13. Thus, for example, 61% of the LD students responded that they would likely or very likely ask a teacher for help if they were experiencing difficulty in school, whereas 47% of the LA group responses and only 42% of the NA group responses fell in the category of "likely" or "very likely". The data in Table 13 indicate that the support service/person to be most likely asked for help is, first, friends and, secondly, parents. This ranking was consistent across all three groups. The third most likely source of support was different for the three groups. LD students reported

teachers; LA students, guidance counselors; and NA students, a brother or sister.

Insert Table 13 about here

Support Services Reported as Being Effective

Tables 14 - 19 show the youth responses to a question about the support service/person the student would view as being effective in actually helping the student with a problem of getting along with teachers or other students or in doing school work. While 7 of 16 variables yielded significant values none of the variables were found to differentiate the LD from the LA group. All observed significant differences (i.e., no overlap of the confidence bands) were between the NA and LD/LA groups. With the exception of friends (Table 18), the responses of the LD and LA groups indicate that students in these groups feel the help received from grandparents, school principal, school vice principal, school nurse, and family doctor (Tables 14, 15, 16, 17, and 19) was more effective than reports from NA students. NA students, on the other hand, report help from their friends as more effective than the reports of LD and LA students (Table 18). Table 21 shows those variables which yielded no significant difference among the groups in reported effectiveness of help from support services.

Insert Tables 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 about here

To get an indication of the support services reported as being

most effective in helping students the percent of students responding "likely" or "very likely" to the effectiveness of a support service was calculated. These data are reported in Table 20. Thus, for example, 68% of the LD students responded that they felt the help given to them by teachers would likely to very likely be effective in helping them. Sixty-three percent of the LD students reported that help from teachers would be effective as opposed to 57% of the NA students. The data in Table 20 indicates that the three support services viewed as being most effective in rendering help by the three groups (i.e., LD, LA, NA) are the same, specifically, parents, friends, and teachers. However, LD and LA students report parents as being their most effective support service, whereas NA students report friends as being theirs.

Insert Tables 20 and 21 about here

Discussion

The results obtained in this investigation indicate that student responses regarding the support services they would ask help from and receive assistance from do not differentiate learning disabled from low-achieving adolescents. Responses of LD and LA groups, however, were often in contrast to those of the NA group. Overall, the LD and LA groups rely much more on many of the support services listed than do normal-achieving students. The heavier use of support services by students experiencing difficulty in the secondary schools (LD and LA) seems to underscore the fact that learning disabilities

in older populations is manifested in ways that require nonacademic related services; in short, multidisciplinary input.

LD, LA and NA adolescents are similar in their reliance on immediate family members (parents and brothers/sisters) for support (67% LD, 62% LA, 70% NA and 48% LD, 48% LA, 49% NA respectively). However, the degree to which LD and LA students rely on support services beyond the immediate family (support both in and out-of-school) is significantly greater than NA students. This seems to suggest that the nature of frequency of problems encountered by students in these two groups are such that they seek additional assistance beyond sources close to them. The apparent reliance of these two groups on the various support sources implies a trust on their part in receiving assistance from outside sources and a willingness to use such supports.

While not large in total percent of LD or LA students who see the school nurse (13% and 10%), the percentage is significant compared to the NA students (.5%). Similar differences are noted with the family doctor as a support service. This finding corroborates the data reported in Research Report No. 15 about LD individuals using significantly more prescription drugs than other students. Apparently, LD and LA students experience more health related problems than the contrast sample.

While it is apparent the LD and LA students tend to use existing support services more in secondary school settings than NA students, it can be seen that there are many support services which traditionally have been viewed as strong support sources that a sizable group of students responded they "did not consider it likely at all to use

as a support". For example, 29% would not use guidance counselors, 61% would not use school principals, and 25% would not use teachers. This finding is consistent with data presented in the NIE survey by Abramowitz and Tenebaum (1978) on secondary schools that indicated students felt the atmosphere of large secondary schools was not conductive to individual help and attention from key personnel.

The data reported by the three groups on the degree to which they asked and received help from friends reflects an interesting contract. On the one hand the data in Tables 13 and 20 indicate that LD and LA students are not the social isolates devoid of any friendships as suggested by some authors. The most likely person to be asked for help reported by the LD and LA groups are their friends (71% and 70% respectively). Similarly, the LD and LA groups report that it is likely that they would get effective help from their friends (66% and 64% respectively). On the other hand, the high figures reported by the LD and LA groups in asking for and receiving help are relatively low in comparison to the NA students (92% and 84%). These data seem to suggest that while a sizable portion of the LD and LA students relate to and rely on their friends there appears to be a subgroup(s) of these students who do not view their friends as being close enough to ask for or receive help from them. As reported in Research Report No. 18, on the whole, our data do not suggest that LD students are social isolates or without friends; but, there may be a small group who do encounter significant peer interaction problems and thus do not have close friends to rely upon for assistance. It should be emphasized that the data collected for this study are relatively gross measures that merely suggest

broad trends or directions of behavior. In the case of interactions with friends, precise measures will be required to determine the exact nature of the interactions and relationships between LD and LA students and their friends.

Footnotes

[1]This includes 60 normal-achieving junior high students for whom data have not been analyzed to date.

[2]Because of the large number of means that are being compared in the epidemiology study as a whole, it is likely that some of these will be "significantly" different on the basis of sampling error alone. A cross-validation study is currently under way in an attempt to substantiate differences found in Research Reports 13-20.

Acknowledgements

The process of data collection in a study as large as the Epidemiology Study is a complex one. Many research assistants spend numerous hours searching through school files, contacting teachers and parents, testing students, and scoring tests. The assistance of these individuals is gratefully acknowledged. In particular, the following individuals made major contributions to the procedures and communications with the school districts and with school personnel: Pegi Denton, Bob LaGarde, Patty Lee, Tes Mehring, Sue Nolan, John Schmidt, and Alice Vetter.

References

Abramowitz, S., & Tenenbaum, E. High school '77: A survey of public secondary school principals. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Alley, G. R. Grouping secondary learning disabled students. Academic Therapy, 1977, 13(1).

Alley, G. R. & Deshler, D. D. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: Strategies and methods. Denver: Love, 1979.

Deshler, D. D. Psychoeducational aspects of learning disabled adolescents. In L. Mann, L. Goodman, & J. L. Wiederholt (Eds.), Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Deshler, D. D., Lowrey, N., & Alley, G. R. Programming alternatives for learning disabled adolescents: A nationwide survey. Academic Therapy, 1979, 14(4).

Johnson, D. J., & Myklebust, H. R. Learning disabilities: Educational principles and practices. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1967.

Larsen, S. Learning disabilities and the professional educator. Learning Disability Quarterly, 1978, 1(1).

Lerner, J. W. Children with learning disabilities: Theories, diagnosis, teaching strategies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Wallace, G., & McLoughlin, J. A. Learning disabilities: concepts and characteristics. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1979.

TABLE 1

Youth Asking for Help from Grandparents

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) grandparent(s) for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	.742	.576	.318	LD/LA: Yes
SD	1.064	.945	.631	LD/NA: No
n	233	217	211	LD/NA: No

F = 12.3112
P ≤ .0000

TABLE 2

Youth Asking for Help from Teacher

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Teacher for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	1.716	1.436	1.372
SD	1.080	1.081	.953
n	232	220	215

$F = 6.9559$

$P \leq .001$

OVERLAY

LD/LA: No

LD/NA: No

LD/NA: Yes

TABLE 3

Youth Asking for Help from School Principal

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) School Principal for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	.718	.679	.279
SD	1.035	.977	.585
n	234	221	215

F = 16.2170
P $\leq$ .0000

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

TABLE 4

Youth Asking for Help from School Vice Principal

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) School Vice Principal for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	.679	.727	.316	LD/LA: Yes
SD	.952	1.001	.628	LD/NA: No
n	234	220	215	LD/NA: No

F = 14.2480
P $\leq$ .0000

TABLE 5

Youth Asking for Help from Guidance Counselor

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Guidance Counselor for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	1.457	1.562	1.186
SD	1.092	1.113	.987
n	234	219	215

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: Yes
LD/NA: No

F = 7.1724
P ≤ .0008

TABLE 6

Youth Asking for Help from School Nurse

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) School Nurse for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	.406	.317	.061
SD	.825	.738	.292
n	234	221	214

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

F = 15.9158
P $\leq$ .0000

TABLE 7

Youth Asking for Help from School Psychologist

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) School Psychologist for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	.406	.317	.061
SD	.825	.738	.292
n	234	221	214

F = 15.9158
P ≤ .0000

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

TABLE 8

Youth Asking for Help from Minister/Rabbi/Priest

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Minister/Rabbi/Priest for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	.601	.458	.347	LD/LA: Yes
SD	.951	.823	.600	LD/NA: No
n	233	216	213	LD/NA: Yes

F = 5.055

P $\leq$ .0043

TABLE 9

Youth Asking for Help from Friend

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Friend for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	1.901	1.855	2.556	LD/LA: Yes
SD	.949	.942	.653	LD/NA: No
n	233	221	214	LD/NA: No

F = 44.9571

P ≤ .0000

TABLE 10

Youth Asking for Help from Family Doctor

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Family Doctor for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	.552	.450	.178	LD/LA: Yes
SD	.957	.872	.472	LD/NA: No
n	232	220	213	LD/NA: No

F = 12.7311
P ≤ .0000

TABLE 11

Youth Asking for Help from Psychologist in Community

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Psychologist in Community for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	.341	.294	.079	LD/LA: Yes
SD	.788	.696	.333	LD/NA: No
n	229	218	214	LD/NA: No

F = 10.2982
P ≤ .0000

TABLE 12

Youth Asking for Help from Social Worker

YOUTH Question: If you were having problems in school, in getting along with teachers or students or in doing your work, how likely would it be that you would ask your (the) Social Worker for their help?

0 Not likely at all
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA	OVERLAY
$\bar{x}$	.524	.349	.238	LD/LA: Yes
SD	.911	.736	.601	LD/NA: No
n	229	218	214	LD/NA: Yes

F = 7.9221
P ≤ .0004

TABLE 13

Percent of Students Reporting that they would "likely" or "very likely" Ask for Support Services from Different Sources

Support Service	LA	LA	NA
Parents	67% *	62%	70%
Brother/Sister	48	48	49
Grandparent	25	18	8
Teacher	61	47	42
School Principal	24	20	4
School Vice Principal	25	25	5
Guidance Conselor	51	52	39
School Nurse	13	10	5
School Psychologist	10	16	6
Minister/Rabbi/Priest	18	13	5
Friend	71	70	92
Family Doctor	18	15	3
Psychologist in Community	10	8	1
Coach	23	22	15
Friend's Parent	27	22	15
Social Worker	18	10	5

* These percentages were calculated by combining the number of student responses in the "likely" and "very likely" category.

TABLE 14

Youth Report on Effectiveness of Help from Grandparent

YOUTH Question: If you were having trouble in school, in getting along with teachers or other students or in doing your work, how likely is it that your (the) grandparents would effectively help you?

0 Not at all likely
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	1.034	.845	.689
SD	1.195	1.124	.963
n	232	213	209

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: Yes

F = 5.4436
P $\leq$ .0045

TABLE 15

Youth Report on Effectiness of Help from School Principal

YOUTH Question: If you were having trouble in school, in getting along with teachers or other students or in doing your work, how likely is it that your (the) school principal would effectively help you?

0 Not at all likely
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	1.280	1.153	.692
SD	1.178	1.144	.892
n	232	215	214

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

F = 17.9720
P $\leq$ .0000

TABLE 16

Youth Report on Effectiveness of Help from School Vice Principal

YOUTH Question: If you were having trouble in school, in getting along with teachers or other students or in doing your work, how likely is it that your (the) school vice principal would effectively help you?

0 Not at all likely
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	1.121	1.145	.671
SD	1.129	1.123	.893
n	232	214	213

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

F = 13.7499
P $\leq$ .0000

TABLE 17

Youth Report on Effectiveness of Help from School Nurse

YOUTH Question: If you were having trouble in school, in getting along with teachers or other students or in doing your work, how likely is it that your (the) school nurse would effectively help you?

0 Not at all likely
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	.565	.556	.215
SD	.924	.880	.549
n	232	214	214

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

F = 13.3295
P $\leq$ .0000

TABLE 18

Youth Report on Effectiveness of Help from Friend

YOUTH Question: If you were having trouble in school, in getting along with teachers or other students or in doing your work, how likely is it that your (the) friend would effectively help you?

0 Not at all likely
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	1.789	1.756	2.280
SD	.977	1.026	.886
n	232	213	214

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

F = 20.0275
P $\leq$ .0000

TABLE 19

Youth Report on effectiveness of Help from Family Doctor

YOUTH Question: If you were having trouble in school, in getting along with teachers or other students or in doing your work, how likely is it that your (the) family doctor would effectively help you?

0 Not at all likely
1 Somewhat likely
2 Likely
3 Very likely

	LD	LA	NA
$\bar{x}$	.604	.623	.318
SD	.978	.988	.637
n	230	212	214

OVERLAY

LD/LA: Yes
LD/NA: No
LD/NA: No

F = 8.0578
P ≤ .0003

TABLE 20

Percent of Students Reporting that Support Services from Different Sources Would be Effective in Helping Them.

Support Service	LA	LA	NA
Parents	79% *	76%	76%
Brother/Sister	55	51	51
Grandparent	34	29	20
Teacher	68	63	57
School Principal	44	40	19
School Vice Principal	38	39	19
Guidance Conselor	55	61	50
School Nurse	17	17	4
School Psychologist	21	19	15
Minister/Rabbi/Priest	26	24	20
Friend	66	64	84
Family Doctor	20	20	7
Psychologist in Community	17	16	6
Coach	25	29	21
Friend's Parent	32	32	25
Social Worker	18	17	12

* These percentages were calculated by combining the number of student responses in the "likely" and "very likely" category.

TABLE 21

Non significant Variables in Asking for and Reports of Receiving Effective Help

Asking for Help	Question #	Variable #
Parents	22	46
Brother/Sister	22	47
Coach	22	59
Friend's Parent	22	60
Receiving Effective Help		
Parents	23	63
Brother/Sister	23	64
Teacher	23	66
Guidance Counselor	23	69
School Psychologist	23	71
Minster/Rabbi/Priest	23	72
Psychologist in Community	23	75
Coach	23	76
Friend's Parent	23	77
Social Worker	23	78