



Technical Report

Parent Wave 2

Social Behaviour Questionnaire

Source/Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard E. Tremblay (Université de Montréal) Tremblay, R. E., Loeber, R., Gagnon, C., Charlebois, P., Larivee, S. & LeBlanc, M. (1991). Disruptive boys with stable and unstable high fighting behavior patterns during junior elementary school. <i>Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology</i>, 19, 285-300.
Description	A comprehensive assessment of the target child's social behaviour. Focuses also on prosociality, not only on problem behaviour. As compared to the original scale the more recent version used in the z-proso study also allows assessing subtypes of aggression, such as indirect, reactive, and instrumental aggression. This measure is also repeatedly administered to teachers (paper-and-pencil) and – in an adapted computer-based multimedia version – to the target children.
Measured Concepts/ Subdimensions	<p><i>Internalising Problem Behaviour (not measured at Wave 2)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Anxiety Depression <p><i>Attention-Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)(not measured at Wave 2)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Attention Deficit Hyperactivity <p><i>Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Opposition/Defiance ODD Non-Aggressive CD <p><i>Prosocial Behaviour</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prosocial Behaviour (Helping, Empathy) <p><i>Aggression</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Physical Aggression Indirect Aggression Instrumental Aggressions/Dominance Reactive Aggression <p><i>Psychopathy Proxy</i></p>
Number of Items	32 (of 55)
Response Categories	5-point Likert scale (from “never” to “very often”)
Item Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “CHILD does not obey his/her mother.” (ODD) “CHILD steals outside the home.” (Non-Aggressive CD) “CHILD kicks, bites, hits other children.” (Physical Aggression) “CHILD listens to others’ points of view.” (Prosociality)
Administration History	Wave 1, Wave 2 (adapted), Wave 3, Wave 4

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Opposition/Defiance Subscale (ODD)”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
 - 1- never
 - 2- rarely
 - 3- sometimes
 - 4- often
 - 5- very often

 - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
 - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
 - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

11,12,13,14,15 Erroneous coding of the interviewer 722 (P2_12010_5 and P2_12010_6)

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P2_12010_4	Opposition/Defiance 1	<CHILDNAME> is disobedient at school/kindergarten	17 (1.4%)
P2_12010_5	Opposition/Defiance 2	<CHILDNAME> doesn't obey his/her mother	35 (2.9%)
P2_12010_6	Opposition/Defiance 3	<CHILDNAME> doesn't obey his/her father	71 (6.0%)
P2_12010_7	Opposition/Defiance 4	<CHILDNAME> ignores you when you say something	0 (0.0%)

Total N = 1191

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .710$)
P2_12010_4	Opposition/Defiance 1	1.51	.715	1	5	1.43	2.14	.343	.728
P2_12010_5	Opposition/Defiance 2	2.28	.875	1	5	.124	-.460	.629	.561
P2_12010_6	Opposition/Defiance 3	2.03	.889	1	5	.486	-.302	.543	.618
P2_12010_7	Opposition/Defiance 4	2.26	.928	1	5	.230	-.500	.485	.657

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Opposition/Defiance (ODD) Subscale (P2_ODD)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1157	1.02	.625	.000	4.00	.251	-.036			
Gender								1	10.76	.001
Girls	553	.962	.597	.000	3.00	.198	-.264			
Boys	604	1.08	.645	.000	4.00	.257	.060			
Treatment								3	1.29	.277
Control	309	1.03	.594	.000	2.50	-.034	-.617			
Triple P	274	1.05	.647	.000	2.75	.086	-.493			
PATHS	323	1.05	.626	.000	4.00	.602	1.12			
Combination	251	.958	.638	.000	3.00	.308	-.364			
Language								8	24.09	.000
German	789	1.17	.571	.000	4.00	.279	.496			
Albanian	69	.599	.561	.000	2.25	.770	.028			
Bos./Cro./Serb.	85	.595	.573	.000	2.25	.666	-.530			
English	18	1.10	.574	.000	2.00	-.662	-.051			
Italian	17	1.18	.617	.000	2.50	.045	.430			
Portuguese	70	.777	.648	.000?	2.50?	.730	.067			
Spanish	46	.920	.607	.000	2.00	-.027	-.978			
Tamil	48	.516	.687	.000	3.00	1.88	3.92			
Turkish	15	.617	.399	.000	1.50	.434	.474			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 1. For the

purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1155) = 10.76, p < .01$) and the language groups ($F(8,1148) = 24.09, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1153) = 1.29, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Opposition/Defiance (ODD) Subscale (P2_ODD)*

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
Subscales									
NAGCD	.497	***	1157	.468	***	553	.507	***	604
Prosocial Behaviour	-.327	***	1153	-.309	***	549	-.325	***	604
Aggression	.506	***	1155	.439	***	552	.548	***	603
Psychopathy Proxy	.180	***	1155	.160	***	552	.181	***	603
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.506	***	1155	.439	***	552	.548	***	603
Prosociality	-.327	***	1155	-.309	***	549	-.325	***	604
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.164	***	1127	.145	***	538	.159	***	589
Prosociality	-.133	***	1127	-.121	**	539	-.106	*	588
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.213	***	1142	.217	***	544	.195	***	598
Prosociality	-.066	*	1142	-.047	ns	544	-.054	ns	598

¹ *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, ns p > .05

Comments: The Opposition-Defiance subscale is positively correlated with the other negative SBQ subscales and negatively correlated with the positive prosocial behaviour subscale. The correlations are highly significant and range from low to substantial for nagcd and aggression subscales, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. Further, the subscale has significant but relatively lower correlations with the teacher and child-reported aggression/prosociality measures than with the parent measures, pointing to low predictive validity.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder (NAGD)”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
 - 1- never
 - 2- rarely
 - 3- sometimes
 - 4- often
 - 5- very often

 - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
 - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
 - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P2_12010_1	NAGCD 1	<CHILDNAME> steals at home	0 (0.0%)
P2_12010_2	NAGCD 2	<CHILDNAME> steals outside the home	5 (0.4%)
P2_12010_3	NAGCD 3	<CHILDNAME> destroys his/her own things	0 (0.0%)
P2_12010_8	NAGCD 4	<CHILDNAME> destroys things belonging to his/her family, or other children	1 (0.1%)
P2_12010_9	NAGCD 5	<CHILDNAME> tells lies and cheats	1 (0.1%)

Total N = 1191

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .549$)
P2_12010_1	NAGCD 1	1.09	.331	1	4	4.13	18.76	.329	.507
P2_12010_2	NAGCD 2	1.05	.235	1	3	5.39	31.43	.233	.548
P2_12010_3	NAGCD 3	1.40	.708	1	5	1.85	3.47	.384	.447
P2_12010_8	NAGCD 4	1.24	.529	1	5	2.52	7.54	.406	.441
P2_12010_9	NAGCD 5	1.83	.821	1	5	.624	-.264	.351	.497

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics *Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder (NAGCD) Subscale (P2_NAGCD)*

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1191	.323	.341	.000	2.00	1.33	2.00			
Gender								1	20.59	.000
Girls	569	.276	.309	.000	2.00	1.43	2.68			
Boys	622	.365	.363	.000	1.80	1.22	1.45			
Treatment								3	.599	.616
Control	318	.327	.331	.000	1.80	1.17	1.59			
Triple P	283	.320	.340	.000	1.80	1.29	1.69			
PATHS	334	.338	.338	.000	1.60	1.20	1.46			
Combination	256	.301	.357	.000	2.00	1.73	3.52			
Language								8	6.82	.000
German	799	.360	.347	.000	2.00	1.34	2.13			
Albanian	69	.286	.344	.000	1.20	1.23	.683			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	85	.158	.247	.000	1.20	1.85	3.57			
English	18	.422	.422	.000	1.60	1.19	2.14			
Italian	17	.412	.384	.000	1.20	.507	-.611			
Portuguese	70	.297	.290	.000	1.20	.760	.183			
Spanish	46	.283	.317	.000	1.20	1.09	.669			
Tamil	48	.129	.208	.000	.800	1.83	3.09			
Turkish	39	.231	.369	.000	1.40	1.65	1.98			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the variables. The maximum number of missing values was 1. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1189) = 20.596, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1182) = 6.82, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1187) = .599, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder (NAGCD) Subscale (P2_NAGCD)*

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N
Subscales									
ODD	.497	***	1157	.468	***	553	.507	***	604
Prosocial Behaviour	-.267	***	1187	-.285	***	565	-.227	***	622
Aggression	.498	***	1189	.432	***	568	.531	***	621
Psychopathy Proxy	.196	***	1189	.152	***	568	.204	***	621
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.498	***	1189	.432	***	568	.531	***	621
Prosociality	-.267	***	1187	-.285	***	565	-.227	***	622
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.134	***	1159	.092	*	554	.135	***	605
Prosociality	-.076	*	1160	-.051	ns	555	-.035	ns	605
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.188	***	1175	.194	***	560	.161	***	615
Prosociality	-.072	*	1175	.057	ns	560	-.117	**	615

¹ *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, ns p > .05

Comments: The NAGCD Subscale is positively correlated with the three other negative SBQ subscales and negatively correlated with the positive prosocial behaviour subscale. The correlations are highly significant and range from low to substantial for the odd and aggression subscales, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. Further, the subscale has relatively lower correlations with the teacher and child-reported aggression/prosociality scores than with the parent-reported ones, pointing to low predictive validity.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Prosocial Behaviour”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
 - 1- never
 - 2- rarely
 - 3- sometimes
 - 4- often
 - 5- very often

 - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
 - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
 - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P2_12010_17	Prosocial behaviour 1	<CHILDNAME> shows sympathy to someone who has made a mistake	33 (2.8%)
P2_12010_18	Prosocial behaviour 2	<CHILDNAME> volunteers to help clear up a mess someone else has made	10 (0.8%)
P2_12010_19	Prosocial behaviour 3	<CHILDNAME> if there is a quarrel or dispute, will try to stop it	36 (3.0%)
P2_12010_20	Prosocial behaviour 4	<CHILDNAME> will try to help someone who has been hurt	35 (2.9%)
P2_12010_21	Prosocial behaviour 5	<CHILDNAME> will invite bystanders to join in a game	8 (0.7%)
P2_12010_22	Prosocial behaviour 6	<CHILDNAME> spontaneously helps to pick up objects, which another child has dropped (e.g., pencils, books, etc.)	29 (2.4%)
P2_12010_23	Prosocial behaviour 7	<CHILDNAME> comforts a child who is crying or upset	9 (0.8%)
P2_12010_24	Prosocial behaviour 8	<CHILDNAME> listens to others' points of view	7 (0.6%)
P2_12010_25	Prosocial behaviour 9	<CHILDNAME> is good at understanding other people's feelings	13 (1.1%)
P2_12010_26	Prosocial behaviour 10	<CHILDNAME> shares things with others	3 (0.3%)

Total N = 1191

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .794$)
P2_12010_17	Prosocial behaviour 1	3.55	.861	1	5	-.239	.042	.520	.770
P2_12010_18	Prosocial behaviour 2	2.89	1.07	1	5	.139	-.533	.421	.784
P2_12010_19	Prosocial behaviour 3	3.25	1.06	1	5	-.290	-.359	.439	.781
P2_12010_20	Prosocial behaviour 4	4.12	.798	1	5	-.657	.233	.578	.765
P2_12010_21	Prosocial behaviour 5	3.91	.845	1	5	-.716	.746	.429	.780
P2_12010_22	Prosocial behaviour 6	3.59	1.01	1	5	-.417	-.244	.499	.772
P2_12010_23	Prosocial behaviour 7	3.90	.893	1	5	-.454	-.189	.614	.758
P2_12010_24	Prosocial behaviour 8	3.71	.801	1	5	-.513	.566	.354	.788
P2_12010_25	Prosocial behaviour 9	3.99	.809	1	5	-.490	-.088	.460	.777
P2_12010_26	Prosocial behaviour 10	3.97	.841	1	5	-.724	.699	.383	.785

**Sum Index
Descriptive
Statistics**

Prosocial Behaviour Subscale (P2_PROSO)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skew- ness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1187	2.69	.529	1.00	4.00	-.064	-.136			
Gender								1	35.94	.000
Girls	565	2.78	.499	1.30	4.00	.030	-.359			
Boys	622	2.60	.542	1.00	4.00	-.061	-.078			
Treatment								3	.343	.794
Control	318	2.67	.519	1.22	4.00	.100	-.094			
Triple P	283	2.71	.520	1.30	3.90	-.142	-.235			
PATHS	333	2.67	.550	1.00	4.00	-.176	-.014			
Combination	253	2.70	.526	1.10	4.00	.003	-.241			
Language								8	9.62	.000
German	799	2.63	.494	1.10	4.00	-.088	-.157			
Albanian	68	2.81	.553	1.60	3.88	-.264	-.483			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	85	2.89	.565	1.50	4.00	-.062	-.283			
English	18	2.52	.546	1.30	3.70	.133	.885			
Italian	17	2.50	.687	1.30	3.78	-.124	-.177			
Portuguese	70	2.77	.535	1.00	4.00	-.308	.906			
Spanish	45	2.75	.642	1.20	3.90	-.134	-.276			
Tamil	47	3.16	.459	2.00	4.00	-.387	.018			
Turkish	38	2.55	.512	1.40	3.60	-.047	-.504			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 3. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1185) = 35.94, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1178) = 9.62, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1183) = .343, p > .05$).

**Correlations
with
Subscales
& DVs**

Prosocial Behaviour Subscale (P2_PROSO)

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
ODD	-.327	***	1153	-.309	***	549	-.325	***	604
NAGCD	-.267	***	1187	-.285	***	565	-.227	***	622
Aggression	-.261	***	1185	-.202	***	564	-.277	***	621
Psychopathy Proxy	-.125	***	1185	-.088	*	564	-.123	***	621
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	-.261	***	1185	-.202	***	564	-.277	***	621
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	-.080	**	1155	-.076	ns	550	-.043	ns	605
Prosociality	.137	***	1156	.124	**	551	.066	ns	605
Child SBQ									
Aggression	-.098	**	1171	-.073	ns	556	-.080	*	615
Prosociality	.087	**	1171	.060	ns	556	.062	ns	615

¹ *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, ns p > .05

Comments: The Prosocial Behaviour Subscale is negatively correlated with all the negative SBQ subscales. The correlations are significant and range from low to moderate. It does not, however, have much correlation with the aggression scores derived from the teacher- and child-assessments. Further, the Prosocial Behaviour Subscale has very low correlation with the other measures of prosociality (teacher and child-assessed), pointing to very low convergent validity.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Overall Aggression”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
 - 1- never
 - 2- rarely
 - 3- sometimes
 - 4- often
 - 5- very often

 - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
 - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
 - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P2_12010_10	Physical aggr 1	<CHILDNAME> gets into fights	3 (0.3%)
P2_12010_11	Physical aggr 2	<CHILDNAME> physically attacks people	3 (0.3%)
P2_12010_12	Physical aggr 3	<CHILDNAME> kicks, bites, hits other children	5 (0.4%)
P2_12010_13	Physical aggr 4	<CHILDNAME> is cruel, bullies or is mean to others	3 (0.3%)
P2_12010_16	Physical aggr 5	<CHILDNAME> kicks, bites, hits his/her mother	0 (0.0%)
P2_12010_27	Instrumental aggr 1	<CHILDNAME> encourages other children to pick on a particular child	18 (1.5%)
P2_12010_28	Instrumental aggr 2	<CHILDNAME> tries to dominate other children	11 (0.9%)
P2_12010_29	Instrumental aggr 3	<CHILDNAME> scares other children to get what he/she wanted	10 (0.9%)
P2_12010_14	Instrumental aggr 4	<CHILDNAME> threatens people	4 (0.3%)
P2_12010_30	Reactive aggr 1	<CHILDNAME> reacts in an aggressive manner when teased	13 (1.1%)
P2_12010_31	Reactive aggr 2	<CHILDNAME> reacts in an aggressive manner when something was taken	27 (2.3%)
P2_12010_32	Reactive aggr 3	<CHILDNAME> reacts in an aggressive manner when contradicted	6 (0.5%)

Total N = 1191

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .813$)
P2_12010_10	Physical aggr 1	1.46	.693	1	4	1.34	1.02	.456	.800
P2_12010_11	Physical aggr 2	1.46	.686	1	5	1.40	1.42	.539	.793
P2_12010_12	Physical aggr 3	1.50	.700	1	4	1.15	.284	.489	.797
P2_12010_13	Physical aggr 4	1.37	.617	1	5	1.69	2.84	.526	.795
P2_12010_16	Physical aggr 5	1.23	.532	1	5	2.70	8.60	.333	.809
P2_12010_27	Instrumental aggr 1	1.22	.509	1	4	2.35	5.28	.431	.804
P2_12010_28	Instrumental aggr 2	1.90	1.01	1	5	.889	-.032	.415	.807
P2_12010_29	Instrumental aggr 3	1.25	.553	1	4	2.34	5.35	.438	.802
P2_12010_14	Instrumental aggr 4	1.23	.541	1	4	2.63	7.04	.476	.800
P2_12010_30	Reactive aggr 1	2.60	1.07	1	5	.084	-.713	.537	.794
P2_12010_31	Reactive aggr 2	2.56	1.06	1	5	.153	-.590	.522	.795
P2_12010_32	Reactive aggr 3	2.23	.963	1	5	.397	-.327	.548	.791

**Sum Index
Descriptive
Statistics**

Aggression Subscale (P2_AGGRESS)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skew- ness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1189	.664	.444	.000	2.58	.747	.614			
Gender								1	20.59	.000
Girls	568	.603	.419	.000	2.50	.716	.460			
Boys	621	.719	.459	.000	2.58	.738	.617			
Treatment								3	1.88	.131
Control	317	.655	.435	.000	2.17	.770	.601			
Triple P	283	.663	.435	.000	2.42	.636	.342			
PATHS	333	.706	.475	.000	2.58	.797	.796			
Combination	256	.620	.418	.000	2.08	.677	.302			
Language								8	16.66	.000
German	798	.739	.424	.000	2.58	.767	1.05			
Albanian	68	.647	.457	.000	1.75	.630	-.293			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	85	.418	.397	.000	1.75	1.30	1.78			
English	18	.806	.522	.250	1.67	.423	-1.67			
Italian	17	.590	.618	.000	2.08	1.14	.751			
Portuguese	70	.345	.317	.000	1.25	1.26	1.30			
Spanish	46	.367	.355	.000	1.33	1.05	.276			
Tamil	48	.766	.442	.000	1.92	.384	-1.73			
Turkish	39	.444	.440	.000	2.00	1.72	3.39			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 4. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1187) = 20.59, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1180) = 16.66, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1185) = 1.88, p > .05$).

**Correlations
with
Subscales
& DVs**

Aggression Subscale (P2_AGGRESS)

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
ODD	.506	***	1155	.439	***	552	.548	***	603
NAGCD	.498	***	1189	.432	***	568	.531	***	621
Prosocial Behaviour	-.261	***	1185	-.202	***	564	-.277	***	621
Psychopathy Proxy	.242	***	1187	.209	***	567	.247	***	620
Parent SBQ									
Prosociality	-.261	***	1185	-.202	***	564	-.277	***	621
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.176	***	1157	.138	**	553	.175	***	604
Prosociality	-.080	**	1158	-.044	ns	554	-.047	ns	604
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.222	***	1173	.198	***	559	.217	***	614
Prosociality	-.076	**	1173	-.013	ns	559	-.085	*	614

¹ *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, ns p > .05

Comments: The Aggression Subscale is positively correlated with the three other negative SBQ subscales and negatively correlated with the positive prosocial behaviour subscale. The correlations are highly significant and range from moderate to substantial for the odd and nagcd subscales, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. The subscale has lower correlations with the prosociality scores derived from the teacher and child-assessments than with the one derived from the parent-reports. Further, the Aggression Subscale has significant but low correlations with the other measures of aggression (teacher and child-assessed), pointing to low convergent validity.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Psychopathy Proxy”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
 - 1- never
 - 2- rarely
 - 3- sometimes
 - 4- often
 - 5- very often

 - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
 - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
 - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P2_12010_15	Psychopathy	<CHILDNAME> is cruel to animals	2 (0.2%)

Total N = 1191

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
P2_12010_15	Psychopathy	1.09	.330	1	3	3.83	15.13

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Psychopathy Proxy Subscale (P2_psycho)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,189	1.09	.330	1.00	3.00	3.83	15.13			
Gender								1	13.93	.000
Girls	568	1.05	.257	1.00	3.00	5.12	28.14			
Boys	621	1.13	.381	1.00	3.00	3.17	9.96			
Treatment								3	2.35	.071
Control	316	1.13	.386	1.00	3.00	3.20	10.13			
Triple P	283	1.06	.266	1.00	3.00	4.80	24.74			
PATHS	334	1.10	.337	1.00	3.00	3.60	13.35			
Combination	256	1.07	.304	1.00	3.00	4.44	20.81			
Language								8	2.49	.011
German	798	1.11	.355	1.00	3.00	3.24	10.50			
Albanian	69	1.07	.356	1.00	3.00	5.05	25.09			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	85	1.02	.152	1.00	2.00	6.40	39.90			
English	18	1.22	.647	1.00	3.00	2.71	5.98			
Italian	17	1.00	.000	1.00	1.00	.	.			
Portuguese	69	1.00	.000	1.00	1.00	.	.			
Spanish	46	1.02	.147	1.00	2.00	6.78	46.00			
Tamil	48	1.08	.347	1.00	3.00	4.54	21.59			
Turkish	39	1.05	.223	1.00	2.00	4.23	16.78			

Comments: The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1187) = 13.93, p < .001$) and moderately significant for the language groups ($F(8,1180) = 2.49, p < .05$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1185) = 2.35, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Psychopathy Proxy Subscale (P2_psycho)*

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
Subscales									
<i>ODD</i>	.180	***	1155	.160	***	552	.181	***	603
<i>NAGCD</i>	.196	***	1189	.152	***	568	.204	***	621
<i>Prosocial Behaviour</i>	-.125	***	1185	-.088	*	564	-.123	**	621
<i>Aggression</i>	.242	***	1187	.209	***	567	.247	***	620
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.242	***	1187	.209	***	567	.247	***	620
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.125	***	1185	-.088	*	564	-.123	**	621
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.051	ns	1157	.102	*	553	.002	ns	604
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.040	ns	1158	-.024	ns	554	-.002	ns	604
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.091	**	1173	.028	ns	559	.104	*	614
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.096	**	1173	-.030	ns	559	-.105	**	614

¹ *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, ns p>.05

Comments: The Psychopathy Proxy Subscale is negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale and positively correlated with the three other negative SBQ subscales. The correlations are highly significant and low, pointing to good divergent validity. Further, the scale also does not have much correlation with the teacher- and child-assessed measures of aggression and prosociality. Overall, the Psychopathy Proxy yields low predictive validity.