



## Technical Report

## Parent Wave 3

### Alabama Parenting Questionnaire

<b>Source/Developer</b>	Shelton, K. K., Frick, P. J., & Wootton, J. (1996). "Assessment of parenting practices in families of elementary school-age children", <i>Journal of Clinical Child Psychology</i> , 25(3), 317-329.
<b>Description</b>	A comprehensive assessment of different aspects of parenting practices which are related to disruptive problem behaviour in elementary school children: parental involvement, positive parenting, monitoring, the use of inconsistent discipline techniques and corporal punishment. The purpose of this scale is to differentiate families with children who display disruptive problem behaviour from families with less problematic children.
<b>Measured Concepts/ Subdimensions</b>	Six subscales: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Involvement</i></li> <li>2. <i>Positive parenting</i></li> <li>3. <i>Poor monitoring</i></li> <li>4. <i>Inconsistent discipline</i></li> <li>5. <i>Corporal punishment</i></li> <li>6. <i>"Other discipline"</i></li> </ol>
<b>Number of Items</b>	40
<b>Response Categories</b>	5-point Likert scale (from "never" to "always")
<b>Item Examples</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "You play games or do other fun things with CHILD." (Involvement)</li> <li>• "You compliment CHILD when he/she does something well." (Positive parenting)</li> <li>• "CHILD is out with friends you don't know." (Poor monitoring)</li> <li>• "You threaten to punish CHILD and then do not actually punish him/her." (Inconsistent discipline)</li> <li>• "You spank CHILD with your hand when she/he has done something wrong." (Corporal punishment)</li> <li>• "You use time out, that is, make him/her sit or stand in a corner, as a punishment." (Other discipline)</li> </ul>
<b>Administration History</b>	Wave 1, Wave 2, Wave 3, Wave 4

## Alabama Parenting Questionnaire – Subscale “Involvement”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- almost never
  - 3- sometimes
  - 4- often
  - 5- always
  
  - 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 (%)
P3_8010_1	Involvement 1	You have a friendly talk with <CHILDNAME>	1 (0.1%)
P3_8010_2	Involvement 2	You volunteer to help with special activities that <CHILDNAME> is involved in	53 (4.5%)
P3_8010_3	Involvement 3	You play games or do other fun things with <CHILDNAME>	0 (0.0%)
P3_8010_4	Involvement 4	You ask <CHILDNAME> about his/her day at school	0 (0.0%)
P3_8010_5	Involvement 5	You help <CHILDNAME> with his/her homework or when he/she has to prepare something for school	6 (0.5%)
P3_8010_6	Involvement 6	You ask <CHILDNAME> what his/her plans are for the coming day	2 (0.2%)
P3_8010_7	Involvement 7	You talk with <CHILDNAME> about his/her friends	1 (0.1%)
P3_8010_8	Involvement 8	<CHILDNAME> helps plan a family activity	2 (0.2%)
P3_8010_9	Involvement 9	You attend a PTA meeting, parent-teacher conference, or some other meeting at <CHILDNAME>'s school	0 (0.0%)
P3_8010_13	Involvement 10	You drive <CHILDNAME> to a special activity	44 (3.7%)

Total N = 1181

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .665$ )
P3_8010_1	Involvement 1	4.33	.619	1	5	-.658	1.36	.360	.638
P3_8010_2	Involvement 2	4.36	.828	1	5	-1.42	2.25	.331	.640
P3_8010_3	Involvement 3	3.66	.695	1	5	-.691	1.57	.382	.633
P3_8010_4	Involvement 4	4.56	.623	2	5	-1.45	2.76	.400	.632
P3_8010_5	Involvement 5	3.80	1.07	1	5	-.575	-.385	.253	.664
P3_8010_6	Involvement 6	3.81	.889	1	5	-.576	.363	.371	.632
P3_8010_7	Involvement 7	3.98	.750	1	5	-.440	.314	.436	.621
P3_8010_8	Involvement 8	3.80	.883	1	5	-.420	.059	.379	.630
P3_8010_9	Involvement 9	4.70	.649	1	5	-2.48	6.70	.192	.663
P3_8010_13	Involvement 13	3.82	1.03	1	5	-.739	.162	.272	.658

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

*Involvement Subscale* (P3\_involv)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,181	3.08	.411	1.10	4.00	-.396	.363			
Gender								1	1.91	.167
Girls	567	3.10	.421	1.67	4.00	-.382	-.056			
Boys	614	3.07	.402	1.10	4.00	-.426	.834			
Treatment								3	1.30	.272
Control	319	3.07	.416	1.80	4.00	-.213	-.099			
Triple P	279	3.12	.400	1.88	4.00	-.290	-.070			
PATHS	329	3.06	.420	1.10	4.00	-.660	1.40			
Combination	254	3.08	.406	1.90	4.00	-.363	-.144			

Language								8	12.74	.000
German	788	3.05	.380	1.88	4.00	-.223	-.069			
Albanian	67	2.91	.459	1.80	4.00	-.181	-.129			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	3.29	.377	2.00	3.90	-.874	1.03			
English	17	3.04	.391	2.40	3.70	.269	-.841			
Italian	19	2.98	.587	1.50	3.80	-.874	.717			
Portuguese	71	3.16	.443	1.89	4.00	-.503	.169			
Spanish	45	3.08	.554	1.10	3.90	-1.37	3.00			
Tamil	51	3.48	.302	2.60	4.00	-.755	.607			
Turkish	37	2.94	.321	2.40	3.60	.234	-.840			

*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 language groups ( $F(8,1172) = 12.74, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for either the gender groups ( $F(1,1179) = 1.91, p > .05$ ) or the treatment groups ( $F(3,1177) = 1.30, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Involvement Subscale* (P3\_involv)

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	P2	N	r	P2	N	r	P2	N
<b>Subscales</b>									
<i>Positive Parenting</i>	.496	***	1179	.547	***	565	.450	***	614
<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	-.330	***	1180	-.303	***	567	-.353	***	613
<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	-.153	***	1165	-.126	**	555	-.176	***	610
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	.023	ns	1180	.066	ns	566	-.013	ns	614
<b>Parent SBQ</b>									
<i>Aggression</i>	-.173	***	1177	-.151	***	565	-.187	***	612
<i>Prosociality</i>	.392	***	1167	.383	***	561	.404	***	606
<b>Teacher SBQ</b>									
<i>Aggression</i>	.005	ns	1130	.036	ns	537	-.006	ns	593
<i>Prosociality</i>	.013	ns	1126	-.020	ns	537	.019	ns	589
<b>Child SBQ</b>									
<i>Aggression</i>	-.075	*	1166	-.088	*	558	-.060	ns	608
<i>Prosociality</i>	.057	ns	1166	.003	ns	558	.084	*	608

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

*Comments :* The Parental Involvement subscale is positively correlated with the other positive APQ subscale and with corporal punishment (though not significantly) and negatively correlated with the two negative APQ subscales. The correlations are highly significant (except for the corporal punishment) and range from low to high. The high correlations with the positive parenting subscale cast doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. The correlations between the Parental Involvement and child aggression are very low and significant only when the informant is either the parent or the child. The correlation between the Parental Involvement and child prosociality is moderate and significant only when the informant is the parent. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

## Alabama Parenting Questionnaire – Subscale “Positive Parenting”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- almost never
  - 3- sometimes
  - 4- often
  - 5- always
  
  - 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 (%)
P3_8010_10	Positive Parenting 1	You let <CHILDNAME> know when he/she is doing a good job with something	2 (0.2%)
P3_8010_11	Positive Parenting 2	You reward or give something to <CHILDNAME> for obeying you or behaving well	4 (0.3%)
P3_8010_12	Positive Parenting 3	You compliment <CHILDNAME> when he/she does something well	0 (0.0%)
P3_8010_14	Positive Parenting 4	You hug or kiss <CHILDNAME> when he/she has done something well	4 (0.3%)
P3_8010_15	Positive Parenting 5	You tell <CHILDNAME> that you like it when he/she helps around the house	13 (1.1%)

Total N = 1181

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .671$ )
P3_8010_10	Positive Parenting 1	4.42	.626	2	5	-.716	.039	.537	.589
P3_8010_11	Positive Parenting 2	3.44	1.08	1	5	-.392	-.310	.343	.686
P3_8010_12	Positive Parenting 3	4.47	.639	1	5	-1.04	1.28	.540	.586
P3_8010_14	Positive Parenting 4	4.34	.737	1	5	-1.12	1.69	.486	.596
P3_8010_15	Positive Parenting 5	4.10	.916	1	5	-1.00	1.04	.359	.655

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Positive Parenting Subscale (P3\_pospar)**

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,179	3.16	.538	.200	4.00	-.541	.855			
Gender								1	.052	.819
Girls	565	3.15	.537	1.00	4.00	-.405	.155			
Boys	614	3.16	.539	.200	4.00	-.665	1.51			
Treatment								3	1.36	.253
Control	318	3.11	.520	1.00	4.00	-.341	.413			
Triple P	279	3.17	.539	1.20	4.00	-.433	.031			
PATHS	328	3.16	.532	.800	4.00	-.621	.885			
Combination	254	3.19	.563	.200	4.00	-.808	2.24			
Language								8	18.67	.000
German	786	3.05	.496	.200	4.00	-.315	.958			
Albanian	67	3.18	.598	1.00	4.00	-.892	1.31			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	3.48	.533	1.20	4.00	-2.23	6.65			
English	17	3.21	.450	2.40	3.80	-.269	-1.33			
Italian	19	3.47	.657	2.00	4.00	-1.33	.854			
Portuguese	71	3.29	.443	2.00	4.00	-.526	.437			
Spanish	45	3.22	.689	.800	4.00	-1.59	3.45			
Tamil	51	3.73	.368	2.60	4.00	-1.84	3.30			
Turkish	37	3.26	.495	2.00	4.00	-.488	.212			

**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 language groups ( $F(8,1170) = 18.67, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results

for either the gender groups ( $F(1,1177) = .052, p > .05$ ) or the treatment groups ( $F(3,1175) = 1.36, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Positive Parenting Subscale* (P3\_pospar)

Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
<b>Subscales</b>									
<i>Involvement</i>	.496	***	1179	.547	***	565	.450	***	614
<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	-.224	***	1178	-.253	***	565	-.209	***	613
<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	-.037	ns	1165	-.042	ns	555	-.033	ns	610
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	.178	***	1178	.206	***	564	.153	***	614
<b>Parent SBQ</b>									
<i>Aggression</i>	-.098	***	1175	-.090	*	563	-.108	**	612
<i>Prosociality</i>	.296	***	1165	.317	***	559	.292	***	606
<b>Teacher SBQ</b>									
<i>Aggression</i>	.084	**	1128	.078	ns	535	.089	*	593
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.002	ns	1124	-.035	ns	535	.029	ns	589
<b>Child SBQ</b>									
<i>Aggression</i>	.001	ns	1164	-.059	ns	556	.040	ns	608
<i>Prosociality</i>	.037	ns	1164	.017	ns	556	.053	ns	608

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

*Comments:* The Positive Parenting subscale is negatively correlated with the two negative APQ subscales and positively correlated with parental involvement and corporal punishment. The correlations are highly significant (except for the inconsistent discipline) and range from nil to high. Positive correlations with the corporal punishment subscale and high correlations with the involvement subscale cast doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. The correlation between Positive Parenting and child aggression is generally very low but significant only when the informant is either the parent or the teacher. However, the direction of the correlation is unexpectedly positive when the informant is the teacher. The correlation between the Positive Parenting and child prosociality is moderate and significant only when the informant is the parent. Overall, the subscale yields very low predictive validity.

## Alabama Parenting Questionnaire – Subscale “Poor Monitoring”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- almost never
  - 3- sometimes
  - 4- often
  - 5- always
  
  - 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 (%)
P3_8010_16	Poor Monitoring 1	<CHILDNAME> fails to leave a note or to let you know where he/she is going	2 (0.2%)
P3_8010_17	Poor Monitoring 2	<CHILDNAME> stays out in the evening past the time he/she is supposed to be home	10 (0.8%)
P3_8010_18	Poor Monitoring 3	<CHILDNAME> is out with friends you don't know	2 (0.2%)
P3_8010_19	Poor Monitoring 4	<CHILDNAME> goes out without a set time to be home	3 (0.3%)
P3_8010_20	Poor Monitoring 5	<CHILDNAME> was out after dark without an adult with him/her	0 (0.0%)
P3_8010_21	Poor Monitoring 6	You are so busy that you forget where <CHILDNAME> is and what he/she is doing	1 (0.1%)
P3_8010_22	Poor Monitoring 7	You check whether <CHILDNAME> comes home at the time he/she is supposed to	14 (1.2%)
P3_8010_23	Poor Monitoring 8	You leave your house without telling <CHILDNAME> where you are going	0 (0.0%)
P3_8010_24	Poor Monitoring 9	<CHILDNAME> comes home from school more than an hour past the time you expected him/her	5 (0.4%)
P3_8010_25	Poor Monitoring 10	You don't know where <CHILDNAME> is out	1 (0.1%)

Total N = 1181

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .740$ )
P3_8010_16	Poor Monitoring 1	1.27	.575	1	5	2.33	5.92	.526	.703
P3_8010_17	Poor Monitoring 2	1.50	.759	1	5	1.60	2.57	.510	.700
P3_8010_18	Poor Monitoring 3	1.77	.875	1	5	.896	.137	.316	.739
P3_8010_19	Poor Monitoring 4	1.40	.712	1	5	1.96	4.06	.524	.698
P3_8010_20	Poor Monitoring 5	1.33	.650	1	5	1.98	3.42	.424	.715
P3_8010_21	Poor Monitoring 6	1.24	.532	1	5	2.51	7.38	.467	.712
P3_8010_22r	Poor Monitoring 7	1.38	.792	1	5	2.60	7.32	.181	.758
P3_8010_23	Poor Monitoring 8	1.16	.478	1	5	3.81	17.85	.276	.734
P3_8010_24	Poor Monitoring 9	1.14	.411	1	4	3.43	13.36	.345	.729
P3_8010_25	Poor Monitoring 10	1.46	.737	1	5	1.83	3.88	.562	.691

Comments: The variable P3\_8010\_22 has been reverse-scored.

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Poor Monitoring Subscale (P3\_ctrl)**

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,180	.365	.363	.000	2.10	1.24	1.51			
Gender								1	26.05	.000
Girls	567	.310	.325	.000	2.10	1.44	2.74			
Boys	613	.416	.389	.000	2.00	1.06	.756			
Treatment								3	1.78	.150
Control	319	.391	.351	.000	1.60	.779	-.026			

<i>Triple P</i>	279	.369	.384	.000	2.10	1.58	2.75			
<i>PATHS</i>	328	.370	.369	.000	1.80	1.09	.679			
<i>Combination</i>	254	.322	.343	.000	2.00	1.61	3.33			
Language								8	14.71	.000
<i>German</i>	788	.442	.379	.000	2.10	1.06	1.07			
<i>Albanian</i>	67	.245	.280	.000	1.30	1.54	2.38			
<i>Bos./Cro./ Serb.</i>	86	.203	.287	.000	1.40	1.83	3.62			
<i>English</i>	17	.229	.269	.000	.800	1.00	-.181			
<i>Italian</i>	19	.200	.343	.000	1.10	1.84	2.27			
<i>Portuguese</i>	71	.177	.250	.000	1.20	1.98	4.45			
<i>Spanish</i>	45	.258	.297	.000	1.20	1.65	2.67			
<i>Tamil</i>	50	.208	.218	.000	.700	.782	-.776			
<i>Turkish</i>	37	.178	.230	.000	1.00	1.61	3.13			

**Comments:**

- 1) The variable P3\_8010\_22 has been reverse-scored and then 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 ( $F(1,1178) = 26.05, p < .001$ ) and the language groups ( $F(8,1171) = 14.71, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ( $F(3,1176) = 1.78, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Poor Monitoring Subscale (P3\_ctrl)*

Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales									
<i>Involvement</i>	-.330	***	1180	-.303	***	567	-.353	***	613
<i>Positive Parenting</i>	-.224	***	1178	-.253	***	565	-.209	***	613
<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	.258	***	1164	.211	***	555	.291	***	609
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	-.017	ns	1179	-.037	ns	566	-.016	ns	613
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.351	***	1176	.318	***	565	.356	***	611
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.217	***	1166	-.189	***	561	-.200	***	605
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.026	ns	1129	-.062	ns	537	.041	ns	592
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.028	ns	1125	.054	ns	537	-.007	ns	588
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.154	***	1165	.113	**	558	.146	***	607
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.106	***	1165	.000	ns	558	-.126	**	607

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

**Comments :** The Poor Monitoring subscale is negatively correlated with the two positive APQ subscales and with corporal punishment, though the latter is not significant. The subscale is also positively correlated with the other negative APQ subscale. The correlations –except with the corporal punishment- are highly significant and moderate, pointing to good divergent validity. Among all the measures of child aggression and prosociality, parent-reported measures show the highest and strongest correlations with Poor Monitoring. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

## Alabama Parenting Questionnaire – Subscale “Inconsistent Discipline”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- almost never
  - 3- sometimes
  - 4- often
  - 5- always
  
  - 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 (%)
P3_8010_26	Inconsistent Discipline 1	You threaten to punish <CHILDNAME> and then don't actually punish him/her	11 (0.9%)
P3_8010_27	Inconsistent Discipline 2	<CHILDNAME> talks to you out of being punished after he/she has done something wrong	28 (2.4%)
P3_8010_28	Inconsistent Discipline 3	You feel that getting <CHILDNAME> to obey you is more trouble than it's worth	5 (0.4%)
P3_8010_29	Inconsistent Discipline 4	You let <CHILDNAME> out of a punishment early, like you lift restrictions earlier than you originally said (E.g., he/she is allowed to watch TV again earlier than originally said)	70 (5.9%)
P3_8010_30	Inconsistent Discipline 5	You don't punish <CHILDNAME> when he/she does something wrong	21 (1.8%)
P3_8010_31	Inconsistent Discipline 6	You give <CHILDNAME> a more severe punishment than usual because you are in a bad mood	12 (1.0%)

Total N = 1181

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .598$ )
P3_8010_26	Inconsistent Discipline 1	2.23	.940	1	5	.257	-.598	.508	.476
P3_8010_27	Inconsistent Discipline 2	2.32	1.01	1	5	.242	-.607	.442	.503
P3_8010_28	Inconsistent Discipline 3	1.86	.881	1	5	.651	-.463	.285	.572
P3_8010_29	Inconsistent Discipline 4	2.50	.980	1	5	-.029	-.580	.459	.496
P3_8010_30	Inconsistent Discipline 5	2.56	1.07	1	5	.352	-.282	.118	.643
P3_8010_31	Inconsistent Discipline 6	1.92	.866	1	5	.400	-.968	.215	.597

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Inconsistent Discipline Subscale (P3\_erratic)**

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,165	1.23	.548	.000	3.00	.026	-.250			
Gender								1	3.31	.069
Girls	555	1.20	.563	.000	3.00	.069	-.198			
Boys	610	1.25	.533	.000	2.83	-.003	-.302			
Treatment								3	.426	.735
Control	316	1.23	.508	.000	2.67	-.185	-.160			
Triple P	274	1.22	.577	.000	3.00	.055	-.406			
PATHS	323	1.21	.526	.000	2.50	.072	-.440			
Combination	252	1.26	.592	.000	2.83	.092	-.121			
Language								8	2.43	.013
German	773	1.22	.522	.000	2.83	.077	-.224			
Albanian	67	1.34	.511	.000	3.00	.304	.915			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	1.20	.666	.000	2.67	-.008	-.838			
English	17	1.39	.597	.170	2.50	-.190	.565			



<i>Italian</i>	19	1.58	.622	.000	2.33	-1.83	3.25
<i>Portuguese</i>	71	1.14	.661	.000	2.83	.101	-.472
<i>Spanish</i>	45	1.07	.595	.000	2.50	.220	-.427
<i>Tamil</i>	50	1.29	.398	.330	2.00	-.347	-.199
<i>Turkish</i>	37	1.27	.570	.330	2.50	.335	-.782

*Comments:*

- 1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 2. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.
- 2) The results of the ANOVA are moderately significant for the language groups ( $F(8,1156) = 2.43, p < .05$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for either the gender ( $F(1,1163) = 3.31, p > .05$ ) or the treatment groups ( $F(3,1161) = .426, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Inconsistent Discipline Subscale (P3\_erratic)*

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	P2	N	r	P2	N	r	P2	N
<i>Subscales</i>									
<i>Involvement</i>	-.153	***	1165	-.126	**	555	-.176	***	610
<i>Positive Parenting</i>	-.037	ns	1165	-.042	ns	555	-.033	ns	610
<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	.258	***	1164	.211	***	555	.291	***	609
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	.229	***	1164	.224	***	554	.229	***	610
<i>Parent SBQ</i>									
<i>Aggression</i>	.313	***	1161	.259	***	553	.355	***	608
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.164	***	1153	-.128	**	550	-.183	***	603
<i>Teacher SBQ</i>									
<i>Aggression</i>	.061	*	1115	.014	ns	526	.083	*	589
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.056	ns	1111	-.015	ns	526	-.062	ns	585
<i>Child SBQ</i>									
<i>Aggression</i>	.106	***	1150	.071	ns	546	.121	**	604
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.055	ns	1150	.034	ns	546	-.099	*	604

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

*Comments:* The Inconsistent Discipline subscale is negatively correlated with the two positive APQ subscales and positively correlated with the other two negative APQ subscales. The correlations are all significant (except for the positive parenting subscale) and low, pointing to good divergent validity. Among all the measures of child aggression and prosociality, parent-reported measures generally show the highest and strongest correlations with the Inconsistent Discipline. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

## Alabama Parenting Questionnaire – Subscale “Corporal Punishment”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- almost never
  - 3- sometimes
  - 4- often
  - 5- always
  
  - 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 (%)
P3_8010_32	Corporal Punishment 1	You spank <CHILDNAME> with your hand when he/she has done something wrong	1 (0.1%)
P3_8010_33	Corporal Punishment 2	You slap <CHILDNAME> when he/she has done something wrong	1 (0.1%)
P3_8010_34	Corporal Punishment 3	Hit <CHILDNAME> with a belt, switch, or other object when he/she has done something wrong	2 (0.2%)

Total N = 1181

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .550$ )
P3_8010_32	Corporal Punishment 1	1.66	.830	1	5	.931	-.186	.470	.289
P3_8010_33	Corporal Punishment 2	1.30	.610	1	4	2.01	3.37	.397	.395
P3_8010_34	Corporal Punishment 3	1.10	.407	1	4	4.50	20.45	.305	.556

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Corporal Punishment Subscale (P3\_corporal)**

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,180	.353	.464	.000	2.67	1.52	2.26			
Gender								1	3.82	.051
Girls	566	.325	.460	.000	2.67	1.78	3.46			
Boys	614	.378	.466	.000	2.33	1.31	1.37			
Treatment								3	1.21	.306
Control	318	.375	.458	.000	2.33	1.43	2.08			
Triple P	279	.344	.473	.000	2.67	1.64	2.88			
PATHS	329	.317	.449	.000	2.33	1.73	2.94			
Combination	254	.379	.478	.000	2.33	1.31	1.40			
Language								8	41.83	.000
German	787	.229	.336	.000	1.67	1.61	2.35			
Albanian	67	.537	.525	.000	2.00	.745	-.327			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	.384	.404	.000	1.67	.878	.364			
English	17	.706	.525	.000	1.67	.107	-.857			
Italian	19	.684	.766	.000	2.33	.851	-.532			
Portuguese	71	.549	.455	.000	2.00	.670	.160			
Spanish	45	.541	.625	.000	2.00	.840	-.440			
Tamil	51	1.144	.697	.000	2.67	.012	-.712			
Turkish	37	.550	.395	.000	1.33	.102	-.839			

**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 language groups ( $F(8,1171) = 41.83, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the gender ( $F(1,1178) = 3.82, p > .05$ ) and the treatment groups ( $F(3,1176) = 1.21, p > .05$ ).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	Corporal Punishment Subscale (P3_corporal)									
	Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales										
	<i>Involvement</i>	.023	ns	1180	.066	ns	566	-.013	ns	614
	<i>Positive Parenting</i>	.178	***	1178	.206	***	564	.153	***	614
	<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	-.017	ns	1179	-.037	ns	566	-.016	ns	613
	<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	.229	***	1164	.224	***	554	.229	***	610
Parent SBQ										
	<i>Aggression</i>	.196	***	1176	.197	***	564	.184	***	612
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.025	ns	1166	.061	ns	560	.021	ns	606
Teacher SBQ										
	<i>Aggression</i>	.131	***	1129	.056	ns	536	.173	***	593
	<i>Prosociality</i>	-.023	ns	1125	-.022	ns	536	.008	ns	589
Child SBQ										
	<i>Aggression</i>	.039	ns	1165	.008	ns	557	.046	ns	608
	<i>Prosociality</i>	-.032	ns	1165	.003	ns	557	-.039	ns	608

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

*Comments:* The Corporal Punishment subscale is positively correlated with positive parenting and inconsistent discipline subscales. The correlations are significant and low. Corporal punishment does not yield any significant correlation with parental involvement or poor monitoring. The correlation between Corporal Punishment and child aggression is generally low and significant only when the informant is either the parent or the teacher. The Corporal Punishment does not show any correlation with child prosociality, regardless of the type of the informant. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

## Alabama Parenting Questionnaire – Subscale “Other Discipline”

- Variable Values**
- 5-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- almost never
  - 3- sometimes
  - 4- often
  - 5- always
  
  - 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 (%)
P3_8010_35	Other Discipline 1	You take away privileges or money from <CHILDNAME> as a punishment	13 (1.1%)
P3_8010_36	Other Discipline 2	You send <CHILDNAME> to his/her room as a punishment	9 (0.8%)
P3_8010_37	Other Discipline 3	You yell or scream at <CHILDNAME> when he/she had done something wrong	1 (0.1%)
P3_8010_38	Other Discipline 4	Calmly explain to <CHILDNAME> why his/her behaviour was wrong when he/she misbehaves	4 (0.3%)
P3_8010_39	Other Discipline 5	Use time out, that is make him/her sit or stand in a corner, as a punishment	5 (0.4%)
P3_8010_40	Other Discipline 6	You give extra <CHILDNAME> extra chores as a punishment	8 (0.7%)

Total N = 1181

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
P3_8010_35	Other Discipline 1	2.74	1.01	1	5	-.165	-.316
P3_8010_36	Other Discipline 2	2.49	1.02	1	5	.020	-.629
P3_8010_37	Other Discipline 3	2.79	.906	1	5	.175	.192
P3_8010_38	Other Discipline 4	3.96	.762	1	5	-.380	.056
P3_8010_39	Other Discipline 5	1.37	.776	1	5	2.09	3.60
P3_8010_40	Other Discipline 6	1.83	.995	1	5	.809	-.472

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Other Discipline:** (P3\_8010\_35)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,168	2.74	1.01	1	5	-.165	-.316			
Gender								1	15.42	.000
<i>Girls</i>	558	2.62	1.02	1	5	-.072	-.396			
<i>Boys</i>	610	2.85	.988	1	5	-.244	-.174			
Treatment								3	.554	.646
<i>Control</i>	318	2.78	1.05	1	5	-.058	-.398			
<i>Triple P</i>	275	2.73	1.01	1	5	-.240	-.368			
<i>PATHS</i>	323	2.69	.948	1	5	-.241	-.185			
<i>Combination</i>	252	2.77	1.03	1	5	-.197	-.320			
Language								8	2.15	.029
<i>German</i>	779	2.71	.964	1	5	-.161	-.262			
<i>Albanian</i>	66	2.85	.899	1	5	-.742	.639			
<i>Bos./Cro./ Serb.</i>	86	2.88	1.07	1	5	-.417	-.205			
<i>English</i>	17	2.41	1.18	1	5	.370	-.224			
<i>Italian</i>	18	2.44	.984	1	4	-.244	-.921			
<i>Portuguese</i>	71	2.59	1.28	1	5	.271	-.848			
<i>Spanish</i>	45	3.18	1.13	1	5	-.268	-.208			
<i>Tamil</i>	49	2.86	1.17	1	5	-.277	-.960			
<i>Turkish</i>	37	2.73	.769	1	4	-1.42	1.49			

*Comments:* The results of the ANOVA are significant for the gender ( $F(1,1166) = 15.42, p < .001$ ) and the language groups ( $F(8,1159) = 2.15, p < .05$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ( $F(3,1164) = .554, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Other Discipline: (P3\_8010\_35)*

Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales									
<i>Involvement</i>	.009	***	1168	.127	**	558	.081	*	610
<i>Positive Parenting</i>	.170	***	1167	.202	***	557	.139	***	610
<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	-.004	ns	1167	-.020	ns	558	-.021	ns	609
<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	.090	**	1157	.136	**	550	.035	ns	607
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	.138	***	1167	.178	***	557	.091	*	610
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.076	*	1164	.088	*	556	.039	ns	608
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.014	ns	1155	.043	ns	552	-.021	ns	603
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.120	***	1119	.147	***	529	.072	ns	590
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.118	***	1115	-.102	*	529	-.075	ns	586
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.103	***	1153	.065	ns	549	.102	*	604
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.003	ns	1153	.046	ns	549	.000	ns	604

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

*Comments:* This single item is significantly and positively correlated with all the APQ subscales, except with poor monitoring. The correlations between this item and child aggression are positive and significant but very low across all the informants. This item is negatively and significantly correlated with child prosociality and only when the informant is the teacher.

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics** *Other Discipline: (P3\_8010\_36)*

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,172	2.49	1.02	1	5	.020	-629			
Gender										
<i>Girls</i>	563	2.41	1.02	1	5	.134	-.575	1	6.00	.014
<i>Boys</i>	609	2.56	1.02	1	5	-.084	-.626			
Treatment										
<i>Control</i>	317	2.44	.985	1	5	.075	-.429	3	.689	.559
<i>Triple P</i>	279	2.46	1.03	1	5	.082	-.662			
<i>PATHS</i>	323	2.55	1.01	1	5	-.095	-.692			
<i>Combination</i>	253	2.50	1.08	1	5	.024	-.687			
Language										
<i>German</i>	783	2.54	.941	1	5	-.068	-.489	8	5.21	.000
<i>Albanian</i>	67	2.69	1.10	1	5	-.039	-.338			
<i>Bos./Cro./Serb.</i>	86	2.48	1.21	1	5	.283	-.524			
<i>English</i>	17	2.35	1.22	1	5	.387	-.476			
<i>Italian</i>	18	2.94	.938	1	4	-.844	.334			
<i>Portuguese</i>	70	2.06	1.05	1	4	.350	-1.30			
<i>Spanish</i>	45	2.42	1.25	1	5	.294	-.833			
<i>Tamil</i>	49	1.86	1.14	1	4	.913	-.726			
<i>Turkish</i>	37	2.59	1.04	1	5	-.345	-.341			

*Comments:* The results of the ANOVA are significant for the gender groups ( $F(1,1170) = 6.00, p < .05$ ) and for the language groups ( $F(8,1163) = 5.21, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ( $F(3,1168) = .689, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Other Discipline: (P3\_8010\_36)*

Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales									
<i>Involvement</i>	.014	ns	1172	.052	ns	563	-.019	ns	609
<i>Positive Parenting</i>	.101	***	1171	.127	**	562	.076	ns	609
<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	.081	**	1171	.021	ns	563	.113	**	608
<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	.115	***	1157	.121	**	552	.104	*	605
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	.126	***	1171	.195	***	562	.057	ns	609
Parent SBQ									

Aggression	.198	***	1169	.173	***	562	.207	***	607
Prosociality	-.073	*	1159	-.050	ns	558	-.069	ns	601
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.116	***	1121	.063	ns	533	.141	***	588
Prosociality	-.069	*	1117	-.067	ns	533	-.040	ns	584
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.108	***	1157	.087	*	554	.108	**	603
Prosociality	-.020	ns	1157	.011	ns	554	-.021	ns	603

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

Comments: This item is positively and significantly correlated with all the APQ subscales except with parental involvement. Overall, the correlations between this item and child aggression/prosociality are very low, though the correlations are slightly higher for the parent-reported measures.

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics	Other Discipline: (P3_8010_37)										
	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
									df	F	p
Full sample		1,180	2.79	.906	1	5	.175	.192			
Gender									1	7.00	.008
Girls		566	2.72	.899	1	5	.128	.055			
Boys		614	2.86	.907	1	5	.218	.301			
Treatment									3	.777	.507
Control		318	2.82	.928	1	5	.173	.086			
Triple P		279	2.72	.882	1	5	.008	.277			
PATHS		329	2.80	.834	1	5	.163	.408			
Combination		254	2.82	.989	1	5	.296	-.066			
Language									8	25.14	.000
German		787	2.61	.794	1	5	.130	.376			
Albanian		67	3.22	.997	1	5	.003	-.106			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.		86	2.94	.859	1	5	-.229	1.32			
English		17	3.00	.866	1	5	.000	2.17			
Italian		19	3.79	.918	2	5	-.020	-.977			
Portuguese		71	2.93	1.07	1	5	-.142	-.281			
Spanish		45	2.84	1.09	1	5	-.123	-.197			
Tamil		51	4.04	.662	2	5	-.472	.897			
Turkish		37	2.89	.737	1	5	-.264	2.63			

Comments: The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender ( $F(1,1178) = 7.00, p < .01$ ) and the language groups ( $F(8,1171) = 25.14, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ( $F(3,1176) = .777, p > .05$ ).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	Other Discipline: (P3_8010_37)										
	Variable	r	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
			P2	N	r	P2	N	r	P2	N	
Subscales											
Involvement	-.023	ns	1180	.017	ns	566	-.055	ns	614		
Positive Parenting	.162	***	1178	.185	***	564	.142	***	614		
Poor Monitoring	.046	ns	1179	-.006	ns	566	.068	ns	613		
Inconsistent Discipline	.301	***	1164	.313	***	554	.285	***	610		
Corporal Punishment	.443	***	1180	.440	***	566	.442	***	614		
Parent SBQ											
Aggression	.266	***	1176	.209	***	564	.302	***	612		
Prosociality	-.024	ns	1166	.000	ns	560	-.016	ns	606		
Teacher SBQ											
Aggression	.117	***	1129	.045	ns	536	.151	***	593		
Prosociality	.000	ns	1125	-.006	ns	536	.052	ns	589		
Child SBQ											
Aggression	.055	ns	1165	-.023	ns	557	.088	*	608		
Prosociality	.003	ns	1165	.031	ns	557	.010	ns	608		

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

Comments: This item is positively and significantly correlated with the two negative and one positive APQ subscale. Overall, the correlations between this item and child aggression are significant only when the informant is either the parent or the teacher, though the correlations are

relatively higher for the parent-reported measures. This item does not yield any significant correlation with child prosociality, irrespective of the type of the informant.

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics	<i>Other Discipline: (P3_8010_38)</i>										
	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
									df	F	p
Full sample	1,177	3.96	.762		1	5	-.380	.056			
Gender									1	.324	.569
Girls	563	3.97	.766		2	5	-.310	-.403			
Boys	614	3.95	.759		1	5	-.449	.493			
Treatment									3	1.82	.142
Control	319	3.91	.728		1	5	-.303	.187			
Triple P	278	3.97	.764		1	5	-.391	.079			
PATHS	327	3.93	.788		2	5	-.286	-.461			
Combination	253	4.05	.765		1	5	-.617	.848			
Language									8	13.34	.000
German	784	3.82	.685		2	5	-.213	-.017			
Albanian	67	4.12	.808		2	5	-.579	-.269			
Bos./Cro./Serb.	86	4.03	.832		1	5	-.567	.425			
English	17	4.35	.702		3	5	-.634	-.576			
Italian	19	4.26	.653		3	5	-.314	-.506			
Portuguese	71	4.45	.842		1	5	-1.76	3.49			
Spanish	45	4.07	.889		1	5	-.946	1.51			
Tamil	51	4.55	.577		3	5	-.850	-.236			
Turkish	37	4.11	1.05		1	5	-.991	.483			

Comments: The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the language groups ( $F(8,1168) = 13.34, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the gender ( $F(1,1175) = .324, p > .05$ ) and the treatment groups ( $F(3,1173) = 1.82, p > .05$ ).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	<i>Other Discipline: (P3_8010_38)</i>										
	Variable	r	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
			P2	N	r	P2	N	r	P2	N	
Subscales											
Involvement	.260	***	1177	.244	***	563	.276	***	614		
Positive Parenting	.258	***	1176	.274	***	562	.245	***	614		
Poor Monitoring	-.205	***	1176	-.195	***	563	-.213	***	613		
Inconsistent Discipline	-.222	***	1164	-.219	***	554	-.223	***	610		
Corporal Punishment	-.015	ns	1176	.045	ns	562	-.069	ns	614		
Parent SBQ											
Aggression	-.163	***	1173	-.148	***	561	-.175	***	612		
Prosociality	.219	***	1163	.192	***	557	.244	***	606		
Teacher SBQ											
Aggression	.005	ns	1127	.049	ns	534	-.026	ns	593		
Prosociality	-.006	ns	1123	.024	ns	534	-.038	ns	589		
Child SBQ											
Aggression	-.079	**	1162	-.067	ns	554	-.086	*	608		
Prosociality	.015	ns	1162	.034	ns	554	.000	ns	608		

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

Comments: This item is positively correlated with the two positive APQ subscales and negatively correlated with the two negative APQ subscales. The correlations are all significant and moderate. The correlations between this item and child aggression are low and significant only when the informant is either the parent or the child. This item yields moderate and significant correlations with child prosociality only when the informant is the parent.

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics	<i>Other Discipline: (P3_8010_39)</i>										
	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
									df	F	p
Full sample	1,176	1.37	.776		1	5	2.09	3.60			
Gender									1	11.75	.001
Girls	563	1.29	.687		1	5	2.47	5.72			
Boys	613	1.44	.843		1	5	1.81	2.34			

Treatment									3	.178	.911
Control	319	1.39	.843	1	5	2.18	4.05				
Triple P	279	1.35	.703	1	4	1.84	2.07				
PATHS	325	1.37	.782	1	5	2.01	3.10				
Combination	253	1.35	.760	1	5	2.20	4.26				
Language									8	6.62	.000
German	785	1.40	.804	1	5	2.00	3.24				
Albanian	67	1.70	.905	1	3	.636	-1.49				
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	1.23	.645	1	4	2.71	6.25				
English	17	1.76	1.25	1	5	1.59	1.65				
Italian	19	1.84	.958	1	3	.346	-1.95				
Portuguese	71	1.08	.368	1	3	4.58	2.85				
Spanish	45	1.07	.330	1	3	5.30	29.03				
Tamil	49	1.18	.635	1	4	3.91	15.29				
Turkish	37	1.11	.393	1	3	3.93	16.05				

Comments: The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender ( $F(1,1174) = 11.75, p < .001$ ) and the language groups ( $F(8,1167) = 6.62, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ( $F(3,1172) = .178, p > .05$ ).

<b>Correlations with Subscales &amp; DVs</b>	<b>Other Discipline: (P3_8010_39)</b>									
	<b>Variable</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>Full Sample P2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>Girls P2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>Boys P2</b>	<b>N</b>
	Subscales									
	Involvement	.064	*	1176	.107	*	563	.040	ns	613
	Positive Parenting	.080	**	1175	.115	**	562	.055	ns	613
	Poor Monitoring	.034	ns	1175	-.028	ns	563	.051	ns	612
	Inconsistent Discipline	.059	*	1162	.006	ns	553	.093	*	609
	Corporal Punishment	.114	***	1175	.088	*	562	.126	**	613
	Parent SBQ									
	Aggression	.133	***	1172	.097	*	561	.141	***	611
	Prosociality	-.017	ns	1162	.022	ns	557	-.012	ns	605
	Teacher SBQ									
	Aggression	.096	**	1126	.018	ns	534	.118	**	592
	Prosociality	-.087	**	1122	-.085	ns	534	-.043	ns	588
	Child SBQ									
Aggression	.057	ns	1161	.004	ns	554	.063	ns	607	
Prosociality	-.033	ns	1161	-.047	ns	554	.000	ns	607	

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

Comments: This item is positively and significantly correlated with all the APQ subscales except with poor monitoring. The item is weakly correlated with child aggression and the association is significant only when the informant is either the parent or the teacher. Further, the correlations between this item and child prosociality are very low and significant only for the teacher measures.

<b>Sum Index Descriptive Statistics</b>	<b>Other Discipline: (P3_8010_40)</b>										
	<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>ANOVA</b>		
									<b>df</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
	Full sample	1,173	1.83	.995	1	5	.809	-.472			
	Gender								1	10.45	.001
	Girls	562	1.73	.953	1	5	.964	-.207			
	Boys	611	1.91	1.02	1	5	.677	-.650			
	Treatment								3	.234	.872
	Control	318	1.86	1.00	1	5	.750	-.600			
	Triple P	276	1.80	1.01	1	5	.889	-.380			
	PATHS	326	1.84	.993	1	5	.787	-.449			
	Combination	253	1.79	.975	1	5	.837	-.386			
	Language								8	3.68	.000
	German	781	1.84	.966	1	5	.721	-.660			
	Albanian	67	2.03	1.07	1	5	.547	-.754			
	Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	2.10	1.14	1	5	.330	-1.28			
	English	17	1.76	.970	1	3	.531	-1.87			
	Italian	19	1.84	.898	1	3	.339	-1.75			
	Portuguese	71	1.55	.858	1	5	1.59	2.46			
	Spanish	45	1.93	1.27	1	5	1.11	.149			
Tamil	50	1.38	.855	1	4	2.23	3.88				
Turkish	37	1.54	.900	1	4	1.32	.262				



Comments: The results of the ANOVA are significant for the gender ( $F(1,1171) = 10.45, p < .01$ ) and the language groups ( $F(8,1164) = 3.68, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ( $F(3,1169) = .234, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs** *Other Discipline: (P3\_8010\_40)*

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	P2	N	r	P2	N	r	P2	N
Subscales									
<i>Involvement</i>	.012	ns	1173	.073	ns	562	-.035	ns	611
<i>Positive Parenting</i>	.097	***	1172	.116	**	561	.080	*	611
<i>Poor Monitoring</i>	.160	***	1172	.085	*	562	.195	***	610
<i>Inconsistent Discipline</i>	.096	**	1161	.055	ns	554	.125	**	607
<i>Corporal Punishment</i>	.051	ns	1172	.096	*	561	.004	ns	611
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.128	***	1169	.135	**	560	.103	*	609
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.068	*	1159	-.005	ns	556	-.087	*	603
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.089	**	1123	.075	ns	532	.074	ns	591
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.053	ns	1119	.010	ns	532	-.051	ns	587
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.043	ns	1158	-.032	ns	553	.069	ns	605
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.058	*	1158	.001	ns	553	-.069	ns	605

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

Comments: This item is positively and significantly correlated with the two negative and one positive APQ subscales. The correlations between this item and child aggression/prosociality are very low and relatively stronger for the parent-reported measures.