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# Data Collection Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interview Language</strong></th>
<th>German / Swiss-German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewee</strong></td>
<td>Target child: median age 97 months (8.1 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Interview Setting**  |  - Computer aided personal face-to-face interviews.  
  - No other persons than the interviewer and the target child were present during the interviews.  
  - Interviews were conducted at the child’s school in a separate room during regular class hours. Children who moved away from a study school were interviewed at home ($$ cases) |
| **Fieldwork**          | 31.10.2005 – 6.12.2005 (Fieldwork in study schools, N=1302)  
  18.01.2006 – 17.02.2006 (Home assessments for children who left study schools; N=33) |
| **Number of Completed Interviews** | 1335 (of 1361 at Wave 1) |
| **Interview Duration (Median)** | 45:52 minutes |

**Note**: Instruments are listed in the same order as in the questionnaire.
### School I

**Source/Developer**: z-proso Project Team  
**Description**: A brief assessment of the child’s attachment to school and of troubles encountered at school.  
**Number of Items**: 3  
**Response Categories**: 4-point Likert scale & multiple-choice lists of likes and dislikes  
**Item Example**: “What do you most like to do at school?”  
**Administration**: Wave 2  
**History**

### The “Coach Game” – Peer Nomination/Class Sociometrics

**Source/Developer**: Françoise Alsaker (University of Bern)  
**Adaptations**: The game board was redesigned for the z-proso study.  
**Description**: The “Coach Game” is used as a basic sociometric instrument aimed at measuring a child’s degree of popularity in the class. Each child is asked to nominate up to six classmates to join him/her on a nice trip with a traditional black and yellow public-transport coach (positive nominations). Each child is represented by a drawn comic-like face that can be placed in one of the coach’s windows. In order to also allow computing explicit rejection scores, from wave 2 on, children were further asked whether there are children in the class they would never ever take with on such a trip.  
**Measured Concepts/Subdimensions**:  
- Peer Popularity  
- Peer Rejection  
- Class Sociometrics  
**Number of Items**: Up to 6 positive and 6 negative nominations  
**Administration**: Wave 1 (positive nominations only), Wave 2  
**History**

**Instrument Image**: [Image of a coach with children's faces on it.]

---

2
### PATHS

**Source/Developer**  
z-proso Project Team

**Description**  
An instrument aimed at assessing to what extent PATHS-curriculum lessons are perceived and appreciated by the children. As such a measure of implementation quality and programme fidelity.

**Number of Items**  
10

**Item Example**  
“What is the current Child-of-the-Week’s name?”

**Administration History**  
Wave 2

### Bullying

**Source/Developer**  
Dan Olweus (University of Bergen)

**Adaptations**  
The protocol and the item selection were adapted to the needs of CAP-Interviews with 8-year olds. Amongst others, pictures representing bullying situations are used as a support. Both these pictures as well as the verbal descriptions of the four types of bullying were provided by the “Pathways to Victimization in Kindergarten” study directed by Prof. Alsaker (University of Bern).

**Description**  
A comprehensive measure of four types of bullying at school (teasing, stealing/damaging belongings, threatening, and exclusion) from three perspectives: Observer, victim, and offender. The reference period is “since last summer holidays”, i.e., approx. 2-3 months.

**Measured Concepts/Subdimensions**  
For each of the four types of bullying the following characteristics are measured:
- Prevalence/incidence from the observer’s perspective
- Prevalence/incidence from the victim’s perspective
- Description of last victimisation (open)
- Location of last victimisation
- Offender characteristics (number, gender, age/grade)
- Report of last victimisation to others
- Prevalence/incidence from the observer’s perspective

**Number of Items**  
48 (4*12)

**Response Categories**  
**Incidences:** “(Almost) daily”, “once week”, “a few times but more than twice”, “once or twice”

**Item Example**  
“Since summer holidays, here at your school, did it happen that children laughed at other children, told mean things to them, or poke their tongues out at them?”

**Administration History**  
Wave 2
### Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART)

**Source/Developer**
- Carl Lejuez (University of Maryland)

**Adaptations**
- Abbreviated version (20 instead of 30 turns)

**Description**
The Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART) is a computer-based behavioural assessment of risk taking. Subjects are told that they have to earn as many points as possible. Points are collected by first inflating a balloon by clicking the "pumpen" ("pump") button several times (see instrument image below) and then by transferring the collected pumps by clicking on "Punkte sammeln" ("collect points"). The more the balloon is inflated, the more points can be collected. However, the balloon can burst at any additional pump and all points of that turn are then lost. A total of twenty turns are played, each turn being either ended by a click on “collect points” or by a burst. Depending on the total score after 20 turns, subjects are rewarded with a small, a medium or a big prize (i.e., real balloons of different sizes).

Based on this design, risk taking is indicated by the total of collected points and the number of bursts. A high level of risk taking is characterised by a high total number of bursts and by a high average number of pumps. Calculated risk taking will result in a high total number of collected points and a limited number of bursts while over-cautiousness will result in a low total score coupled with very few bursts.

To quantify risk taking the authors of the game recommend to use adjusted values defined as “the average number of pumps excluding balloons that exploded (i.e., the average number of pumps on each balloon prior to money collection)” (Lejuez et al. 2002, 78).

**Administration History**
- Wave 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instrument Image</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Instrument Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviated version (20 instead of 30 turns)**

The Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART) is a computer-based behavioural assessment of risk taking. Subjects are told that they have to earn as many points as possible. Points are collected by first inflating a balloon by clicking the "pumpen" ("pump") button several times (see instrument image below) and then by transferring the collected pumps by clicking on "Punkte sammeln" ("collect points"). The more the balloon is inflated, the more points can be collected. However, the balloon can burst at any additional pump and all points of that turn are then lost. A total of twenty turns are played, each turn being either ended by a click on “collect points” or by a burst. Depending on the total score after 20 turns, subjects are rewarded with a small, a medium or a big prize (i.e., real balloons of different sizes).

Based on this design, risk taking is indicated by the total of collected points and the number of bursts. A high level of risk taking is characterised by a high total number of bursts and by a high average number of pumps. Calculated risk taking will result in a high total number of collected points and a limited number of bursts while over-cautiousness will result in a low total score coupled with very few bursts.

To quantify risk taking the authors of the game recommend to use adjusted values defined as “the average number of pumps excluding balloons that exploded (i.e., the average number of pumps on each balloon prior to money collection)” (Lejuez et al. 2002, 78).

**Administration History**
- Wave 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instrument Image</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Instrument Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Moral Emotion Attribution**

**Source/Developer**

**Adaptations**
- Adapted from Nunner-Winkler & Sodian (1988) by Luciano Gasser (Team of Prof. Alsaker, University of Bern)
- For the purpose of the Z-proso study all pictures were redrawn.

**Description**
This test measures children's expectancies and reasoning concerning the emotional consequences of a story protagonist in response to antisocial and prosocial actions. Four stories include a moral transgression and one story includes a prosocial act. In the prosocial story (helping) it is morally right to attribute positive feelings to the “moral hero”, an attribution that would be morally wrong in the case of antisocial stories.

First children have to evaluate and justify the moral transgressions. Then they are asked to place themselves in the role of the transgressor and to predict and justify the emotion they themselves would feel in these situations. Children's justifications are coded as deontic, empathic, sanction-oriented or hedonistic. Children get one point in each story if they (a) make an appropriate moral emotion attribution (negative emotion attribution in the antisocial stories and positive emotion attribution in the prosocial story) and (b) justify the emotion attribution with deontic or empathic reasons.

*Description provided by the Alsaker Prevention Team*

**Number of Items**
64 (4*16)

**Response Categories**
- **Rule knowledge**: Yes/no
- **Justifications**: Open record and instant coding by the interviewer in one of the following seven categories: “Golden rule (reciprocity)”, “normative/moral”, “empathic/victim-oriented”, “hedonistic/outcome-oriented”, “authoritarian/sanction-oriented”, “repetition”, “inappropriate/undifferenciated”.
- **Feelings**: 4-point Likert scale from very good to very bad

**Item Example**
- “John is being teased and bullied by other kids during recess. He's hardly able to defend himself and not to cry out loudly.” (Story)
- “Is it OK to tease and bully other kids?” (Rule knowledge)
- “Why is that (not) OK?” (Rule justification)
- “How would you feel if you’d tease and bully other kids?” (Self-attribution)
- “Why would you feel so?” (Justification of self-attribution)

**Administration History**
Wave 2

**Instrument Image**
![Image of children engaged in activities](image-url)
### Social Desirability Scale for Children

**Source/Developer**  
z-proso Research Team

**Description**  
The newly developed *Social Desirability Scale for Children* is aimed at detecting a tendency of the study subjects toward socially desirable answers in the interview situation. The scale consists of eight substantial and three filler items. Items are worded in such a way that the socially desirable answer option is most unlikely and respondents are requested to answer with yes or no. If they opt for yes, which is always the socially desired answer, they are further asked whether they are really sure about their answer. Preliminary exploratory factor analyses suggest that the eight substantial items are all indicators of one single factor.

**Number of Items**  
11 (8 substantial + 3 filler)

**Response Categories**  
- “Yes” (despite inquiry)
- “No” (on inquiry)
- “No” (spontaneous)

**Item Example**  
“You like all the kids you know.” Follow-up question if answer is yes: “Are you sure that you really like ALL the kids you know?”

**Administration History**  
Wave 2
### Draw a Line Slowly

**Source/Developer**
- Hagen, J. W. & Degerman, R. (cited in Maccoby et al., 1965; see below)

**Adaptations**
The version used here is the same as the one used by the Alsaker Prevention Team.

**Description**
The DALS paradigm originates in the 60ies and is still used for brief – and consequently somewhat rudimentary – assessments of impulsivity in children. The assumption is that impulsive children have more difficulties to draw a line in a maze (i.e., crossing the borders of the maze and lifting the pencil from the paper more often).

Based on Milich et al.’s (1984) observation that differences between impulsive and nonimpulsive children are more pronounced when children are told to draw the line as fast as they want rather than to instruct them to draw line as slowly as possible, we opted for the former task. (Description adapted from the one provided by the Alsaker Prevention Team)

**Measured Concepts/Subdimensions**
- Total time
- Number of lifts
- Number of crossings

**Administration History**
Wave 2

**Instrument Image**
“Tom & Tina” – Adapted Social Behaviour Questionnaire

Source/Developer
Social Behaviour Questionnaire (item wordings):
- Richard E. Tremblay (Université de Montréal)

Child-friendly multimedia adaptation:
- z-proso Project Team

Description/adaptations
“Tom and Tina” is a new instrument designed to measure self-reported problem behaviour amongst primary-school children. It is an adapted computer-based multimedia version of Tremblay’s Social Behaviour Questionnaire that fits the needs of an anonymous assessment of pro- and anti-social behaviours among primary school children. Basically, the instrument consists of a series of drawings that display specific behaviours of a child called “Tom” or “Tina” depending on the child’s gender. For each drawing the child is asked by a voice recorded on the computer whether he/she happens to do what is shown on the drawing. It is then asked the specific question pertaining to the drawing. There are “Yes” and “No” buttons at the bottom of each screen and the child is instructed how to use them.

“Tom & Tina” comprehensively assesses the target child’s social behaviour and 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 further allows assessing subtypes of aggression, such as indirect, reactive, and instrumental aggression. The Social Behaviour Questionnaire is also repeatedly administered to teachers (paper-and-pencil) and to the target child’s primary caregiver (CAPI).

Measured Concepts/Subdimensions
Prosocial Behaviour
1. Prosocial Behaviour (Helping, Empathy)
2. Anxiety
3. Depression

Internalising Problem Behaviour (not measured at Wave 2)
4. Attention Deficit
5. Hyperactivity

Attention-Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (not measured at Wave 2)
6. Non-Aggressive Externalising Problem Behaviour
7. Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder (Stealing, Lying, Vandalism)

Aggression
8. Physical Aggression
9. Indirect Aggression
10. Instrumental Aggressions/Dominance
11. Reactive Aggression

Psychopathy
12. Cruelty to Animals (as a psychopathy proxy)

Number of Items
37 (out of 54)

Response Categories
Yes/No

Item Example
- “Do you have to cry sometimes, just so like Tom/Tina?” (Anxiety)
- “Have you ever stolen something in a store?” (Non-Aggressive CD)
- “When you’re mad at someone, do you sometimes say bad things behind the others’ back?” (Indirect Aggression)
- “Do you easily recognise whether somebody is happy or sad?” (Prosociality)

Administration History
Wave 1, Wave 2 (except scales “Internalising Problem Behaviour” and “ADHD”), Wave 3

cont.
The Trust Game

Source/Developer
- Ken J. Rotenberg (University of Keele, UK)

Adaptations
Contrary to the original measure based on two assessments of trust, namely secret keeping and promise keeping, we only assessed the latter.

Description
A sociometric measure of trustfulness (trust beliefs) and trustworthiness. Participants are asked to rate each of their classmates as to whether they would “always”, “sometimes”, or “never” keep a promise. Basically, the average of given ratings is used as a measure of trustfulness while the average of received ratings indicates the level of trustworthiness.

Measured Concepts/Subdimensions
- Trustfulness
- Trustworthiness

Response Categories
3-point Likert scale (always, sometimes, never)

Administration
Wave 2
# Child Assessment Form

**Source/Developer**  
z-proso Project Team

**Description**  
An assessment, by the interviewer, of selected characteristics of the assessed child as well as of the interview situation. In order to enhance standardisation interviewers were provided detailed written instructions.

**Adaptations**  
In wave 2 an additional measure on potentially stigmatising characteristics (race, salient physical characteristics, etc.) was added.

**Measured Concepts/Subdimensions**

- **Characteristics of the setting**
  - Quality of the interview setting
  - Involvement in the assessment
  - Attention/impulsivity
  - Aggression
  - Need for confirmation *(only measured at Wave 1)*
  - Shyness
  - General mood
  - Linguistic skills *(active/passive)*
  - Clothing
  - Physical appearance *(weight & size)*
  - Potentially stigmatising characteristics *(not measured at Wave 1)*
    - Race/ethnicity
    - Conspicuous clothing
    - Language difficulties
    - Salient physical and motor characteristics

**Number of Items**  
31

**Response Categories**  
5-point Likert scales, except stigmatising characteristics which are measured in terms of presence/absence.

**Administration History**  
Wave 1, Wave 2, Wave 3