Published in final edited form as:
J Sch Psychol. 1998 April 1; 36(1): 45–58.

Patterns of Home and School Behavior Problems in Rural and Urban Settings

Timothy L Hope and **Karen L Bierman**
The Pennsylvania State University and The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group1

Abstract

This study examined the cross-situational patterns of behavior problems shown by children in rural and urban communities at school entry. Behavior problems exhibited in home settings were not expected to vary significantly across urban and rural settings. In contrast, it was anticipated that child behavior at school would be heavily influenced by the increased exposure to aggressive models and deviant peer support experienced by children in urban as compared to rural schools, leading to higher rates of school conduct problems for children in urban settings. Statistical comparisons of the patterns of behavior problems shown by representative samples of 89 rural and 221 urban children provided support for these hypotheses, as significant rural-urban differences emerged in school and not in home settings. Cross-situational patterns of behavior problems also varied across setting, with home-only patterns of problems characterizing more children at the rural site and school-only, patterns of behavior problems characterizing more children at the urban sites. In addition, whereas externalizing behavior was the primary school problem exhibited by urban children, rural children displayed significantly higher rates of internalizing problems at school. The implications of these results are discussed for developmental models of behavior problems and for preventive interventions.

Keywords

Behavior problems; Home-school influences; Rural/urban communities

Disruptive behavior problems are the most prevalent mental health problems of childhood and predict serious negative outcomes, including delinquency, school failure, and substance abuse (Loeber & Dishion, 1983; Parke & Slaby, 1983). Developmental models suggest that three phases characterize the early development of disruptive behavior problems. Behavior problems typically emerge first in family contexts, fostered by high rates of parental commands and harsh, inconsistent, and punitive discipline practices (Eron, 1982; Patterson, 1982). Then children generalize the aggressive and oppositional behavior they have learned at home to the school context, engaging in noncompliant and disruptive behavior in the classroom and aggressive behavior with peers (Bierman & Smoot, 1991; Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1990). Interactions with other aggressive children in the school context may support the third step toward negative outcomes, as aggressive children affiliate with deviant peers who, by early adolescence, provide a gateway into delinquent activities (Cairns, Neckerman, & Cairns, 1989; Dishion & Skinner, 1989).

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Karen L, Bierman, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, 522 Moore Building, University Park, PA 16802.

[1]Members of the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (in alphabetical order) are Karen L. Bierman (Pennsylvania State University), John D. Coie (Duke University), Kenneth A. Dodge (Vanderbilt University), Mark T. Greenberg (University of Washington), John E. Lochman (Duke University), and Robert J. McMahon (University of Washington).

Considerable evidence suggests that this three-phase trajectory characterizes the developmental pattern shown by many of the children who exhibit early delinquent activity in adolescence and stable, long-term patterns of maladjustment (Offord, Boyle, & Racine, 1991). However, not all children with disruptive behavior problems follow this developmental trajectory. For example, whereas some of the children who exhibit high rates of behavioral problems at home generalize these problems to school, many do not. Instead, some children continue to show stable patterns of behavior problems in home settings only, with adequate adjustment in the school setting (Bierman & Smoot, 1991). In addition, the nature of the behavioral demands in the school setting may lead to the emergence of behavioral problems for some children who did not show prior adjustment problems at home. Indeed, the average cross-setting correlation for behavior problems at home and at school is $r = .27$ (Achenbach, McConnaughy, & Howell, 1987), suggesting that the specific characteristics of the home and school settings may exert a substantial influence on the exhibition of child behavior problems in each setting.

Recent studies have begun to explore contextual factors that may increase the likelihood that children will display aggressive behaviors in home or school settings, such as family characteristics and characteristics of the peer group. Still needed are studies looking at the larger context of the community and how differences at the community level, such as rural versus urban setting, might have an impact on patterns of disruptive behavior problems.

Consider first how differences in rural and urban settings might affect the family characteristics linked with child oppositional and aggressive behaviors in home settings. In general, aggressive behavior at home is associated with low socioeconomic status (SES; Harnish, Dodge, Valente, & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1995; Offord et al., 1991), marital discord and instability (Rutter & Giller, 1983), and insularity and single-parent status (Dumas & Wahler, 1983). Families in both rural and urban settings may experience these types of adversity. Rates of unemployment, low educational attainment, insularity, marital discord and economic stress occur at equivalent rates in rural and urban settings (Sherman, 1992). To the extent that these contextual factors increase risk for the development of child behavior problems at home, one would expect few rural/urban differences in home-based behavior problems.

In contrast, rural and urban communities may be quite different when the context of the school is considered. That is, school-based behavior problems appear fostered by classrooms that contain many aggressive children, perhaps because aggressive behavior is more likely to be viewed as acceptable by peers (Wright, Giammarino, & Parad, 1986), teachers are more likely to find it difficult to manage aggression effectively and suppress it consistently (Werthamer-Larson, Kellam, & Wheeler, 1991), and peers are more likely to react to aggression with escalating negative chains of counteraggression (Asarnow, 1983; Cairns et al., 1989). Although rural school districts face some disadvantages when compared to urban districts, such as lower per-pupil school expenditures, a narrower curriculum, and more poorly paid and less well-trained teachers (Sherman, 1992), they are at an advantage in terms of school characteristics associated with child aggression. Indeed, urban schools report significantly more frequent and more severe violence than rural schools, even when differences in socioeconomic and ethnic/racial status are controlled (Quinton, 1980; Rutter, 1982; Sherman, 1992). The higher density of children from disadvantaged backgrounds, the larger school size, and the use of ability tracking may all contribute to urban classrooms containing high proportions of disruptive children, which provide children with more peer exposure to deviant community models and negative peer influence. Hence, children in urban settings may be at increased risk relative to rural children for the development of child behavior problems at school. Correspondingly, the patterns of conduct problem development may be different for children in rural and urban settings. Whereas children in rural settings may be less likely to generalize home problem

behaviors to the school setting, urban children may be at increased risk for the initiation of deviant behaviors at school.

The present study was designed to test three hypotheses about potential differences in the patterns of disruptive behavior problems exhibited by children in rural and urban settings at the time of school entry. First, it was anticipated that the prevalence of disruptive behavior problems in home settings would not vary significantly across rural and urban areas, whereas rates of disruptive behavior problems at school were expected to be significantly higher in urban than in rural areas. These rural/urban differences were expected specifically for externalizing behavior problems, reflecting the greater exposure urban children have to violent community models and to hard-to-manage classrooms containing a high density of aggressive children; rural and urban children were not expected to differ in rates of internalizing problems in home or school settings.

Second, it was hypothesized that different patterns of home-school behavior problems would emerge for children in rural and urban settings. In both settings, it was anticipated that some children would show the “typical” cross-situational pattern of conduct problem development, in which problems were evident in both home and school settings. However, due to the lower density of behavior problems in rural as compared to urban schools, it was anticipated that rural teachers would be more effective at suppressing behavioral problems at school and there would be less peer support for the display of aggression. Consequently it was hypothesized that in rural settings, a number of children would develop behavior problems at home but would not generalize these problems to the school setting, increasing the prevalence of a “home only” pattern of conduct problems. In contrast, the greater density of problems in the urban schools was expected to elicit behavioral problems in a number of children who did not show such problems at home, resulting in more urban than rural children showing a “school only” pattern of conduct problems.

Finally, it was hypothesized that differences in the patterns of behavioral problems displayed by children in rural and urban areas would have qualitative as well as quantitative features. That is, it was anticipated that, in addition to higher rates of externalizing problems in urban schools, externalizing problems would be a more common characteristic of those children experiencing problems at school. In rural settings, in contrast, more diversity was expected in the types of behavior problems displayed by children at school, including more internalizing and comorbid internalizing-externalizing problem patterns.

To test these hypotheses, parent and teacher ratings were examined for a large normative sample of children completing kindergarten. The sample included families from three urban centers and one tricounty rural area who were participating in a longitudinal study of home and school adjustment (the normative sample of the Fast Track program, Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1992).

METHODS

Subjects

In both rural and urban areas, the sample was selected from school districts that were in economically disadvantaged and high-risk areas. Thirty-eight schools in urban areas (13 in Durham, NC, 10 in Nashville, TN, 15 in Seattle, WA) and 17 schools in a rural tricounty area in central Pennsylvania provided the sampling population. Kindergarten teachers in each of these schools completed an interview that included ratings on 14 behavior problem items (selected from the TOCA-R, Werthamer-Larson et al., 1991). Approximately 100 children from each site were selected to create a normative sample that was representative of the kindergarten population in terms of gender, race, and behavior problem scores on these teacher

ratings.[1] This study included ratings for 310 children (89 from the rural area; 221 from the urban areas) for whom complete parent and teacher data were available.

Half of the children in the sample were male, half were female. Other sample characteristics included: (a) ethnic/racial group representation— 98% Caucasian in the rural sample, 62% Caucasian and 40% African American in the urban sample; (b) SES—mean Hollingshead (1975) score of 3.39 for the rural sample and 3.81 for the urban sample; and (c) single parent status—24% single parents in the rural sample and 58% single parents in the urban sample.

Measures

Parent ratings of child behavior problems in home settings were acquired using the Child Behavior Checklist–Parent Rating Form (CBCL–PRF; Achenbach, 1991). On this standardized instrument, parents indicated the presence of 113 behavior problems using a 0- to 2-point scale for each item. The scale provided scores on two broadband dimensions of child behavior problems—externalizing problems (aggressive, disruptive, and antisocial behaviors), and internalizing problems (anxiety, depression and social withdrawal). *T*-scores for externalizing and internalizing problems (based upon the scoring procedures and national norms reported by Achenbach, 1991) were used as the dependent measures for the present study.

Teacher ratings were acquired using the Child Behavior Checklist–Teacher Rating Form (CBCL–TRF; Achenbach, 1991), which included a similar set of 113 behavior problem items. *T*-scores for externalizing and internalizing behavior problems reported by teachers on this measure were used to assess child problems exhibited at school.

Procedures

Parents were visited by a home interviewer in the summer following their child's kindergarten year. In addition to a number of other measures, the interviewer read aloud the CBCL–PRF to the parents, noting their rating responses. Information on child gender, ethnic/racial group identification and on family SES was also collected during this home interview.

Teachers were asked to rate students in the spring (April–May) of the kindergarten year. CBCL–TRF forms were left with teachers along with instructions. Teachers completed the instruments and then returned them to the research staff.

RESULTS

The first hypothesis was that rates of externalizing behavior problems would be similar in home settings for rural and urban children, but higher in urban school settings than in rural school settings. In contrast, rates of child internalizing problems were not expected to differ across rural and urban settings. To test this hypothesis, a repeated measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted on child externalizing problems. The parent/teacher rating was the repeated (within subject) factor and site (rural vs. urban setting) was the between subject factor; child gender, family SES, and child racial ethnicity (White or African American) were included as covariates. The main effect for rural/urban setting was nonsignificant, but a significant setting by rater interaction effect emerged, $F(1, 302) = 4.61$, $p < .05$. As shown in Table 1, rural and urban parents reported similar levels of child externalizing problems at home, whereas urban teachers reported higher levels of school externalizing problems for children than did

[1]The Fast Track Project also includes a high-risk sample of children and families who are involved in an efficacy trial of a preventive intervention. The normative sample of children used in this study did not overlap with the high-risk sample receiving intervention and was not selected to be high-risk. Instead, the normative sample used in this study was selected to be representative of the school populations at each of the sites.

rural teachers. SES explained a significant amount of variance in both parent and teacher ratings of behavior problems (higher levels of child behavior problems for lower SES families), gender explained a significant amount of variance in parent ratings (boys rated higher than girls), and child ethnicity explained a significant amount of variance in teacher ratings (African American students rated higher than White students).[2]

A similar analysis conducted on child internalizing problems revealed no significant main effect for setting and no significant interaction effect for setting and rater (all *p*s > .05), As with externalizing problems, SES accounted for a significant amount of variance in both teacher and parent ratings of internalizing problems. In both cases, children from lower SES backgrounds exhibited higher levels of problems than did children from higher SES backgrounds. Gender accounted for a significant amount of variance in parent ratings, with girls receiving higher ratings of internalizing problems from parents than boys (see *F*-values in Table 1).

These results offered support for the first hypothesis, that children living in urban communities would exhibit higher levels of externalizing problems at school but not at home when compared to children living in rural communities. Furthermore, these results suggested that although higher teacher ratings of externalizing behavior problems may be affected by SES, gender and ethnic/racial group status, the elevated rates received by urban children compared to rural children existed even when the contributions of these factors were accounted for.

The second hypothesis was that, although some children in both rural and urban settings would show cross-situational patterns of disruptive behaviors in both home and school settings, more rural children would show home-only patterns whereas more urban children would show school-only patterns of disruptive behavior problems. To test this hypothesis, children with elevated levels of behavior problems (an externalizing *T*-score of 60+, 1 *SD* above the national mean) in either home or school settings were identified and divided into three groups: (a) those who showed elevated externalizing problems in home settings only, (b) those who showed elevated externalizing problems in school settings only; and (c) those who showed elevated externalizing problems in both home and school settings. Then, a chi-square was computed to determine whether the proportion of children showing various patterns of cross-situational externalizing behavior problems differed in rural versus urban settings. The chi-square was significant, χ^2 (2) = 12.73, $p < .01$. As shown in Table 2, 31 of the 89 children in the rural sample exhibited elevated rates of externalizing behavior problems in either home or school settings. Of these 31 children, 15 (48%) showed home-only patterns of problems whereas only 9 (29%) showed school-only patterns of problems. In contrast, 128 of the 221 children in the urban sample showed elevated levels of disruptive behavior problems. Of these, 62 (48%) showed school-only patterns of problems whereas only 23 (18%) showed home-only patterns. The relative proportion of children who showed home and school patterns of externalizing behavior problems was similar for children living in rural and urban settings (23% and 34%, respectively). As hypothesized then, children living in rural settings were relatively more likely to show home-only patterns of conduct problems whereas children in urban settings were more likely to show school-only patterns[3] (see Table 2).

[2]Additional analyses were undertaken to determine whether similar patterns of findings held when first-order level dimensions of Aggression. Delinquency, and Attention Problems were analyzed. Parent ratings revealed no significant differences between urban and rural children on any of these scales: teacher ratings showed a significant site effect for Delinquency and Aggression (*ps* < .05) and a near-significant effect for Attention Problems ($p < .10$), with urban children receiving higher ratings than rural children. Hence, effects on these first-order factors were consistent with the effect shown on the overall Externalizing scale.

[3]Additional analyses were undertaken to determine whether patterns of cross-situational externalizing problems varied as a function of child gender. Although more boys exhibited externalizing problems than did girls, cross-situational patterns were comparable. When the 88 boys and 71 girls who exhibited elevated rates of externalizing problems were considered, similar proportions exhibited home-school patterns (24 or 34% of the girls; 26 or 29% of the boys), home-only patterns (16 or 23% of the girls; 22 or 25% of the boys) and school-only patterns (31 or 44% of the girls and 40 or 45% of the boys).

Finally, the third hypothesis was that, for high-risk children in urban settings, disruptive behaviors would be the prevalent form of problems exhibited in school settings, whereas in rural settings, more diversity was expected in the school problems exhibited by children. No differences were expected in family settings. To test this hypothesis, rates of externalizing, internalizing, and comorbid (externalizing plus internalizing) patterns of behavior problems were compared for rural and urban children in home and school settings. Again, *T*-scores above 60 were used to indicate elevated levels of problems. As shown, in Table 3, a chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the kinds of problems displayed by rural and urban children in home settings. In contrast, significant differences emerged in the school settings, χ^2 (2) = 8.77, $p < .05$. Children in urban settings who had school problems were considerably more likely to show externalizing or comorbid patterns of problems (57% and 30%, respectively) than internalizing problems alone (13%). In contrast, in rural schools, patterns of child behavior problems were evenly divided among the three types of externalizing only, internalizing only and comorbid problems (32%, 36%, and 32%, respectively)[4] (see Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Theory and previous research suggested that contextual factors may play a significant role in the development of externalizing behavior problems (Quinton, 1980; Rutter, 1982). Although a number of contextual factors have been explored, the potential effects of rural versus urban communities on patterns of disruptive child behavior problems remained largely unexplored. Based upon the extensive research linking punitive discipline practices and coercive family interactions to the emergence of disruptive behavior problems in home settings (Dumas & Wahler, 1983; Patterson, 1982), it was postulated that conduct problems exhibited in home settings would be affected primarily by parenting practices and family dynamics rather than by the broader context of the community. That is, although some of the factors that stress families may vary across rural and urban settings, discordant parent–child interactions that contribute to child aggression were expected to act in similar ways in rural and urban settings (Dumas & Wahler, 1983; Sherman, 1992). In fact, in the present study, no differences emerged between rural and urban sites in parent ratings of externalizing or internalizing behaviors in home settings, even when controls were included for SES, gender, and ethnic/racial group status.

In contrast to the home setting, rural-urban differences were anticipated in the display of child conduct problems at school. It was hypothesized that schools offer opportunities for social referencing, modeling, and peer reinforcement that might either support or suppress escalating cycles of negative peer interactions that can lead to the increased development of externalizing behavior problems (Asarnow, 1983; Cairns et al., 1989), Given the greater density of conduct problems and exposure to violence that children may experience in urban as compared with rural areas (Attar, Guerra. & Tolan, 1994), it was hypothesized that urban children would be at increased risk for the development of externalizing problems at school. Support for this hypothesis was found, as teacher ratings of externalizing behavior problems were significantly higher in urban areas than in rural areas, even when the contribution of SES, gender, and ethnic/racial group status were partialled out. This effect did not appear to be simply a function of a rating bias on the part of urban teachers, as only ratings of externalizing (and not internalizing problems) showed rural/urban differences.

[4]Additional analyses were undertaken to determine whether patterns of internalizing-externalizing problems varied as a function of child gender. Although more boys than girls exhibited problems, problem patterns were comparable, When the 141 boys and 113 girls who exhibited elevated rates of either internalizing or externalizing problems were considered, similar proportions exhibited externalizing only patterns (60 or 53% of the girls: 67 or 47% of the boys), internalizing only patterns (38 or 16% of the girls; 27 or 19% of the boys) and comorbid externalizing-internalizing problems (35 or 31% of the girls and 47 or 33% of the boys).

The differential impact of community on school-based conduct problems was also expected to result in different home-school patterns of conduct problems in rural than in urban areas. In fact, children in rural areas were significantly more likely to show home-only patterns of conduct problems—problems reported by parents that were not evident in the school setting, suggesting that in rural schools teachers may be more able to suppress negative peer influence and escalating aggression. In contrast, children in urban areas were more likely to show school-only patterns of behavior problems than were children in rural areas. The effects of the more violent urban communities and the denser congregation of high-risk children in classrooms may thus increase the risk for children to develop disruptive and aggressive behavior problems in the school settings via peer modeling and reinforcement (even when similar problems were not evident in their homes).

The different patterns of conduct problem development shown by rural and urban children at school entry may have important implications for the future course of their problems and their long-term outcomes. One might anticipate, for example, that the higher prevalence of school conduct problems and deviant peer affiliation opportunities might lead to an increased risk for later school failure and delinquent activity for youth in urban settings than in rural settings. On the other hand, children in rural settings who show high rates of conduct problems at home may be at risk for other negative outcomes, including dysfunctional family relationships and domestic violence. Clearly, future research is needed in this area. To be sensitive to possible rural/urban differences in long-term developmental trajectories, such research will need to include an assessment of child behavior problems in both home and school settings and should include outcomes focused on domestic as well as community violence.

The present findings have implications for school practices and the design of preventive interventions. If screenings to identify at-risk children for intervention include school behavior problems only, a number of high-risk children may be missed, particularly in rural settings. In addition, intervention efforts that focus on only improving behaviors in school contexts may be only partially effective; collaborative interventions that target family interactions as well as school problems may be critical for effective prevention (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1992). Implementing collaborative prevention programs that link school-based and family-based services requires a sensitivity and responsivity to the different characteristics of rural and urban communities, but can be done effectively in both types of communities (Bierman & the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1997).

The present results also suggest that schools must take an active part in efforts to reduce child aggression. Al though families may play a critical role in the initial development of child aggression (Patterson, 1982), exposure to deviant peers in community and school settings may function as a distinct risk factor for later child maladjustment (Loeber & Dishion, 1983). Peer influence may be particularly hazardous for children attending urban schools where a high density of aggressive behavior makes classroom management difficult and encourages normative beliefs that support aggression (Boivin, Dodge. & Coie, 1995; Wright et al., 1986). Programs designed to reduce aggression in the school are warranted, including attempts to improve student conflict resolution skills and improve teacher skills at managing problem behavior in the classroom (Weissberg & Greenberg, 1998).

Several limitations of the present study warrant mention. One limitation is that the present study relied solely on parent and teacher ratings to assess child behavior problems. It is possible that such ratings are biased, due either to a lack of comparative norms or to negative or positive expectancy effects. Hence, future research in this area could benefit from the use of multiple measures, including direct observations.

Second, although the pattern of results presented here is consistent with the theoretical model, the actual process variables postulated to have a causal influence were not assessed directly. For example, potential causal mediators accounting for the increased risk of children in urban areas for school behavior problems might include classes with a high density of aggressive children that reduce a teacher's ability to monitor individual children and suppress negative behavior and/or increase exposure to deviant peer models and peer support for disruptive behaviors. Some investigators have argued that the use of ability tracking in large urban schools may result in the dense congregation of low-achieving and high-aggressive children into some classrooms (Werthamer-Larsson et al., 1991). Classrooms that contain a high proportion of children with aggressive propensities may, in turn, serve as breeding grounds for further aggressive development, as peer influences contribute to the negative escalation of behavior problems and facilitate deviant peer affiliations (Cairns et al., 1989). Future research might test these causal models more directly by including a comparison of the density of aggression in classrooms, classroom management problems and peer reactions to aggression in rural compared to urban schools.

There may be variation within, as well as between, urban and rural sites in the community characteristics that contribute to child behavior problems. Indeed, anecdotal observations of the mean levels of child behavior problems at the three different urban sites studied here suggested that variations did exist across the urban sites. A more complete analysis of the characteristics of various urban and rural sites may clarify the specific factors accounting for differences in child problem development.

In addition, the potential effects of ethnic/racial group influences on the development of child behavior problems was not explored in this study. Ethnic/racial group status was confounded with urban/rural status, as the rural sample was predominantly White. ANCOVA was employed to control statistically for the effects of ethnic/racial status and supplementary analyses were undertaken on the White sample alone; both types of analyses suggested that the rural/urban differences found here were not due to ethnic/racial group differences. Nonetheless, the potential influence of ethnic/racial group status on child social development warrants exploration. Potential effects of culture may exist in the domains of child-rearing practices, teacher practices, and in peer group and community norms and pressures. In addition, cultural differences may affect the assessment of behavior problems and/or may contribute to rater biases in assessment. Hence, both potential "true" and potential "artifactual" effects of ethnic/racial group status on the development of child behavior problems should be examined in future research.

Gender differences influencing the development of aggression also warrant further study. In this study, main effects for gender emerged, with boys exhibiting higher rates of externalizing problems than girls in school settings. Gender differences did not vary as a function of rural/urban community. In addition, when the different base rates of externalizing problems were controlled for, the home-school and externalizing-internalizing problem patterns shown by children did not vary as a function of gender. Recent conceptualizations suggest that aggressive behavior problems may often take a different form for girls than for boys, as girls may express hostility in "relational" rather than overt ways—by excluding others or spreading gossip (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). A fuller exploration of gender differences in future research would require a more comprehensive measurement scheme, in which relational as well as overt aggression was assessed.

In summary, understanding the factors and processes that contribute to disruptive behavior problems in childhood is a critical area for future research. Risk factors at a number of levels require exploration, including individual characteristics at the child level, systems level characteristics of families and schools, and factors associated with the broader context of the

community. Given the stability and long-term risks associated with externalizing behavior problems in childhood, understanding the developmental processes associated with these problems and designing effective preventive intervention programs remain important goals.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by National Institute of Mental Health grants R18MH48083, R18MH50951, R18MH50952, and R18MH50953. The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention also has provided support for Fast Track through a memorandum of support with the NIMH. Support has also come from the Department of Education Grant S184430002 and NIMH grants K05MH00797 and K05MH01027.

References

Achenbach, TM. Integrative guide for the 1991 CBCL/4–18, YSR and TRF profiles. Burlington: University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry; 1991.

Achenbach TM, McConnaughy SH, Howell CT. Child/adolescent behavioral and emotional problems: Implications of cross-informant correlations for situational specificity. Psychological Bulletin 1987;102:213–232. [PubMed: 3562706]

Asarnow JR. Children with peer adjustment problems: Sequential and non-sequential analyses of school behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 1983;51:709–717. [PubMed: 6630684]

Attar BK, Guerra NG, Tolan PH. Neighborhood disadvantage, stressful life events, and adjustment in urban elementary school children. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology 1994;23:391–400.

Bierman KL. Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. Implementing a comprehensive program for the prevention of conduct problems in rural communities: The Fast Track experience. American Journal of Community Psychology 1997;25:493–514. [PubMed: 9338956]

Bierman KL, Smoot DL. Linking family characteristics with poor peer relations: The mediating role of conduct problems. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 1991;19:341–356. [PubMed: 1865049]

Boivan M, Dodge KA, Coie JD. Individual-group behavior similarity and peer status in experimental play groups of boys: The social misfit revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1995;69:269–279. [PubMed: 7643305]

Cairns, RB.; Neckerman, HJ.; Cairns, BD. Social networks and the shadows of synchrony. In: Adams, GR.; Montemayor, R.; Gulotta, TP., editors. Biology of adolescent behavior and development. Advances in adolescent development: An annual book series. Vol. 1. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage; 1989. p. 275-305.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. A developmental and clinical model for the prevention of conduct disorders: The FAST Track program. Development and Psychopathology 1992;4:509–527.

Crick NR, Grotpeter JK. Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. Child Development 1995;66:710–722. [PubMed: 7789197]

Dishion, TJ.; Skinner, M. A process model for the role of peer relations in adolescent social adjustment. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development; Kansas City, MO. 1989.

Dodge KA, Bates JE, Pettit GS. Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. Science 1990;250:1678–1683. [PubMed: 2270481]

Dumas JE, Wahler RG. Predictors of treatment outcome in parent training: Mother insularity and socioeconomic disadvantage. Behavioral Assessment 1983;5:301–313.

Eron LD. Parent–child interaction, television violence, and aggression of children. American Psychologist 1982;37:197–211. [PubMed: 7091864]

Harnish JD, Dodge KA, Valente E. Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. Mother-child interaction quality as a partial mediator of the roles of maternal depressive symptomatology and socioeconomic status in the development of child behavior problems. Child Development 1995;66:739–753. [PubMed: 7789199]

Hollingshead, AB. Four-factor index of social status. 1975. Unpublished manuscript

Loeber R, Dishion TJ. Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. Psychological Bulletin 1983;74:68–99. [PubMed: 6353467]

Offord, DR.; Boyle, MC.; Racine, YA. The epidemiology of antisocial behavior in childhood and adolescence. In: Pepler, DJ.; Rubin, KH., editors. The development and treatment of childhood aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1991. p. 31-54.

Parke, RD.; Slaby, RG. The development of aggression. In: Mussen, PH., editor. Handbook of child psychology. Vol. 4. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1983. p. 547-641.

Patterson, GR. Coercive family process. Vol. 3. Eugene, OR: Castalia; 1982. A social learning approach to family intervention.

Quinton, D. Family life in the inner city: Myth and reality. In: Marland, M., editor. Education for the inner city. London: Heinemann; 1980.

Rutter M. The city and the child. Annual Progress in Child Psychiatry and Child Development 1982;67:353–370.

Rutter, M.; Giller, H. Juvenile deliquency: Trends and perspectives. New York: Guilford Press; 1983.

Sherman, A. Falling by the wayside: Children in rural America. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund; 1992.

Weissberg, RP.; Greenberg, MT. School and community competence-enhancement and prevention programs. In: Damon, W.; Sigel, IE.; Renninger, KA., editors. Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 5. Child psychology in practice. Vol. 5. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1998. p. 877-954.

Werthamer-Larson L, Kellam SG, Wheeler L. Effects of first-grade classroom environment on shy behavior, aggressive behavior, and concentration problems. American Journal of Community Psychology 1991;29:585–602.

Wright JC, Giammarino M, Parad HW. Social status in small groups: Individual-group similarity and the social misfit. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1986;50:523–536.

Table 1

Rates of Child Behavior Problems at Home and at School for Children Living in Rural versus Urban Settings

	Mean Values		*F*-Values			
Problems	**Rural**	**Urban**	**Site (*df* 1,308)**	**SES**	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**
Home Problems						
Externalizing	53.64 (8.03)	54.45 (10.92)	.04	15.74***	.13	4.07*
Internalizing	53.25 (8.74)	51.34 (9.69)	1.40	15.56***	1.78	8.73**
School Problems						
Externalizing	50.70 (10.26)	58.45 (11.88)	6.51**	9.96**	7.92**	1.50
Internalizing	48.84 (10.78)	52.22 (10.29)	1.23	12.03***	1.17	.01

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

SES = socioeconomic status.

* $p = .05$

** $p = .01$.

*** $p = .001$.

J Sch Psychol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2009 October 14.

Table 2

Patterns of Home Only, School Only, or Cross-Situational Externalizing Problems for Children in Rural and Urban Settings

	Pattern of Externalizing Problems		
Site	**Home-Only**	**School-Only**	**Home-School**
Rural (31)	48% (15)	29% (9)	23% (7)
Urban (128)	18% (23)	48% (62)	34% (43)

Note. This table includes children who showed elevated rates of externalizing problems in one or both settings—31 of the 89 children in the rural sample (35%) and 128 of the 221 children in the urban sample (58%). Number of cases is shown in parentheses. Percentages indicate the proportion of the children with problems at each site who show the specified problem pattern.

Table 3

Patterns of Externalizing Only, Internalizing Only, or Comorbid (Externalizing and Internalizing) Problems in Home and School Settings for Children Living in Rural and Urban Areas

	Pattern of Problems		
Setting and Site	**Externalizing Only**	**Internalizing Only**	**Comorbid**
Home Settings			
Rural (27)	43% (14)	31% (10)	25% (8)
Urban (76)	47% (36)	13% (10)	39% (30)
School Settings			
Rural (25)	32% (8)	36% (9)	32% (8)
Urban (121)	57% (69)	13% (16)	30% (36)

Note. This table includes children who showed elevated rates of externalizing or internalizing problems—27 and 25 of the 89 children in the rural sample (30% and 28 %) and 76 and 121 of the 221 children in the urban sample (34% and 55%) in home and school settings, respectively. Number of cases is shown in parentheses. Percentages indicate the proportion of children with problems at each type of site who show the specified problem pattern.