



Technical Report

Children Wave 2

Moral Emotion Attribution

Source/Developer	Nunner-Winkler, G. & Sodian, B. (1988). „Children’s understanding of moral emotions”, <i>Child Development</i> , 59, 1323-1338.
Adaptations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adapted from Nunner-Winkler & Sodian (1988) by Luciano Gasser (Team of Prof. Alsaker, University of Bern) For the purpose of the <i>z-proso</i> study all pictures were redrawn.
Description	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Description provided by the Alsaker Prevention Team</i></p>
Measured Concepts/ Subdimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of moral rules Justification of moral rules Self-attribution of feelings in situations of moral transgression Justification of self-attributed feelings in situations of moral transgression
Number of Items	64 (4*16)
Response Categories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Rule knowledge</i>: Yes/no <i>Justifications</i>: 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/undifferentiated”. <i>Feelings</i>: 4-point Likert scale from very good to very bad
Item Example	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “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 teas and bully other kids?” (Rule knowledge) “Why is that (not) OK?” (Rule justification) “How would you feel if you’d teas and bully other kids?” (Self-attribution) “Why would you feel so?” (Justification of self-attribution)
Administration History	Wave 2
Instrument Image	

Rule knowledge

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	"yes"	"no"
K2_6110_1	3 (0.2%)	1296 (97.1%)	36 (2.7%)
K2_6200_1	1 (0.1%)	1332 (99.8%)	2 (0.1%)
K2_6300_1	0	1334 (99.9%)	1 (0.1%)
K2_6400_1	0	1305 (97.8%)	30 (2.2%)

Comment: There was no scale to be derived from this distribution.

Rule Justification

- Scheme**
1. “Golden rule”
 2. “normative / moral”,
 3. “empathic / victim-oriented
 4. “hedonistic / outcome-oriented”,
 5. “authoritarian / sanction-oriented”,
 6. “undifferentiated / repetition”
 7. “no answer”

	Golden Rule	Normative / Moral	Empathic / Victim-oriented	Hedonistic / outcome-oriented	Authoritarian / sanction-oriented	Repetition	Undifferentiated	No answer
Sharing K2_6110_1	37 (2.8 %)	776 (58.1 %)	198 (14.8 %)	22 (1.6 %)	16 (1.2 %)	133 (10.0 %)	130 (9.7 %)	23 (1.7 %)
Bullying K2_6200_1	59 (4.4 %)	674 (50.5 %)	445 (33.3 %)	1 (0.1 %)	42 (3.1 %)	34 (2.5 %)	65 (4.9 %)	15 (1.1 %)
Laughing at (perpetrator) K2_6300_1	72 (5.4 %)	674 (50.5 %)	405 (30.3 %)	2 (0.1 %)	62 (4.6 %)	30 (2.2 %)	71 (5.3 %)	19 (1.4 %)
Laughing at(aide) K2_6400_1	15 (1.1 %)	415 (31.1%)	453 (33.9 %)	29 (2.2 %)	12 (0.9 %)	193 (14.5 %)	185 (13.9 %)	33 (2.5 %)

Golden rule

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .325$)
RJgoldenrule1	23 (1.7%)	0.03	0.16	5.76	31.23	.073	.364
RJgoldenrule2	15 (1.1%)	0.04	0.21	4.44	17.74	.236	.174
RJgoldenrule3	19 (1.4%)	0.05	0.23	3.95	13.65	.257	.135
RJgoldenrule4	33 (2.5%)	0.01	0.11	9.29	84.33	.130	.313

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis.
- 2) Item RJgoldenrule1 with low item-scale-correlation and increased alpha when removed.

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1335	0.14	0.42	0	3	3.42	12.87			
Gender								1	1.70	.192
<i>Girls</i>	657	0.15	0.44	0	3	3.22	10.97			
<i>Boys</i>	678	0.12	0.39	0	3	3.65	15.34			
Treatment								3	0.58	.631
<i>Control</i>	342	0.16	0.43	0	3	3.03	10.25			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	0.14	0.41	0	2	2.99	8.66			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	0.13	0.43	0	3	3.81	16.10			
<i>Combination</i>	302	0.12	0.39	0	3	3.92	17.27			

Comments:

- 1) All subgroups with excessive skewness and high kurtosis.

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	Variable	r	p	N	Boys			Girls		
					r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales										
Rule justification										
	<i>normative/moral</i>	-.135	***	1335	-.132	**	678	-.146	***	657
	<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.137	*	1335	-.142	***	678	-.131	***	657
	<i>hedonistic</i>	-.049	ns	1335	-.027	ns	678	-.070	ns	657
	<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.006	ns	1335	.040	ns	678	-.051	ns	657
	<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.110	*	1335	-.092	*	678	-.123	**	657
	<i>no answer</i>	-.028	ns	1335	-.020	ns	678	-.038	ns	657
Subscales										
Self-attribution justification										
	<i>golden rule</i>	.164	***	1335	.135	***	678	.179	***	657
	<i>normative/moral</i>	.032	ns	1335	.007	ns	678	.055	ns	657
	<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.083	**	1335	-.103	**	678	-.063	ns	657
	<i>hedonistic</i>	.094	**	1335	.142	***	678	.055	ns	657
	<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.050	ns	1335	.126	**	678	-.017	ns	657
	<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.101	***	1335	-.107	**	678	-.093	*	657
	<i>no answer</i>	-.049	ns	1335	-.039	ns	678	-.057	ns	657
	Self-attributed feeling	-.068	*	1335	-.050	ns	678	-.086	*	657
Child SBQ										
	<i>Aggression W2</i>	-.014	ns	1334	-.056	ns	677	.045	ns	657
	<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.031	ns	1334	.015	ns	677	.041	ns	657
	<i>Aggression W1</i>	.005	ns	1323	-.008	ns	672	.023	ns	651
	<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.025	ns	1323	.039	ns	672	.001	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1										
	<i>Total Aggression</i>	-.038	ns	1306	-.077	*	664	.015	ns	642
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.032	ns	1307	.014	ns	664	.026	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2										
	<i>Aggression</i>	.028	ns	1174	.012	ns	615	.057	ns	559
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.036	ns	1172	-.009	ns	616	.069	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlation with self-attributed feeling disappears for boys subgroup
- 2) Significant correlations with Self-attributed justification empathic/victim-oriented and hedonistic disappear for girls subgroup

Normative / moral

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .438$)
RJcnm1	23 (1.7%)	0.58	0.49	-0.33	-1.89	.207	.407
RJcnm2	15 (1.1%)	0.50	0.50	-0.02	-2.00	.315	.295
RJcnm3	19 (1.4%)	0.50	0.50	-0.02	-2.00	.264	.349
RJcnm4	33 (2.5%)	0.31	0.46	0.82	-1.33	.198	.414

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with low kurtosis

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1335	1.90	1.19	0	4	0.02	-0.90			
Gender								1	8.78	.003
<i>Girls</i>	657	2.00	1.18	0	4	-0.02	-0.87			
<i>Boys</i>	678	1.81	1.20	0	4	0.06	-0.92			
Treatment								3	0.89	.444
<i>Control</i>	342	1.94	1.21	0	4	0.00	-0.87			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	1.94	1.13	0	4	-0.03	-0.74			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	1.92	1.23	0	4	0.06	-0.97			
<i>Combination</i>	302	1.80	1.20	0	4	0.04	-1.01			

Comments:

- 1) Gender group differences with significant F-value
- 2) Combination subgroup with low kurtosis

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Variable	r	p	N	Boys			Girls		
				r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.135	***	1335	-.132	**	678	-.146	***	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.634	***	1335	-.634	***	678	-.636	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.085	**	1335	-.059	ns	678	-.113	**	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.196	***	1335	-.200	***	678	-.194	***	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.410	***	1335	-.382	***	678	-.433	***	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.144	***	1335	-.143	***	678	-.144	***	657
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.025	ns	1335	-.038	ns	678	.032	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	.331	***	1335	.398	***	678	.255	***	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.179	***	1335	-.233	***	678	-.119	**	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.033	ns	1335	-.039	ns	678	-.032	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.084	**	1335	-.047	ns	678	-.123	**	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.101	***	1335	-.148	***	678	-.043	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.097	***	1335	-.117	**	678	-.063	ns	657
Self-attributed feeling	.040	ns	1335	.057	ns	678	.018	ns	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	.005	ns	1334	.040	ns	677	-.013	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.057	*	1334	.076	*	677	.001	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	.031	ns	1323	.025	ns	672	.052	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.040	ns	1323	.064	ns	672	-.013	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	.004	ns	1306	.010	ns	664	.024	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.003	ns	1307	-.014	ns	664	-.027	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	.021	ns	1174	.025	ns	615	.038	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	.044	ns	1172	-.022	ns	616	.099	*	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlations with Rule justification hedonistic and Self-attribution sanction-oriented disappear for boys subgroup
- 2) Significant correlations with Self-attribution justification inappropriate/repetition and Child SBQ Prosociality W2 disappear for girls subgroup
- 3) Significant correlations with Self-attribution golden rule and hedonistic get insignificant after division in boys and girls subgroups

Empathic / victim-oriented

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .407$)
RJempatic1	23 (1.7%)	0.15	0.36	1.98	1.93	.191	.374
RJempatic2	15 (1.1%)	0.33	0.47	0.71	-1.50	.293	.259
RJempatic3	19 (1.4%)	0.30	0.46	0.86	-1.27	.252	.308
RJempatic4	33 (2.5%)	0.34	0.47	0.68	-1.54	.167	.404

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) RJempatic1 with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) RJempatic2, RJempatic3 and RJempatic4 with low kurtosis

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation		Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA			
			Min.	Max.			df	F	p	
Full sample	1335	1.12	1.06	0	4	0.70	-0.27			
Gender								1	0.57	.449
<i>Girls</i>	657	1.10	1.03	0	4	0.75	-0.05			
<i>Boys</i>	678	1.15	1.10	0	4	0.66	-0.45			
Treatment								3	6.65	.000
<i>Control</i>	342	0.93	0.96	0	4	0.76	-0.16			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	1.12	1.01	0	4	0.64	-0.26			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	1.16	1.15	0	4	0.81	-0.23			
<i>Combination</i>	302	1.30	1.10	0	4	0.47	-0.64			

Comments:

- 1) Treatment group differences with significant F-value

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Variable				Boys			Girls		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.137	***	1335	-.142	***	678	-.131	***	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.634	***	1335	-.634	***	678	-.636	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.092	**	1335	-.095	*	678	-.088	*	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.070	*	1335	-.063	ns	678	-.079	*	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.221	***	1335	-.242	***	678	-.203	***	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.081	**	1335	-.089	*	678	-.076	ns	657
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.040	ns	1335	.001	ns	678	-.066	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.225	***	1335	-.249	***	678	-.197	***	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	.309	***	1335	.372	***	678	.237	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	.038	ns	1335	.012	ns	678	.064	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.029	ns	1335	-.016	ns	678	.077	*	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.034	ns	1335	-.017	ns	678	-.055	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	.000	ns	1335	-.007	ns	678	.008	ns	657
Self-attributed feeling	.005	ns	1335	-.011	ns	678	.023	ns	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	-.006	ns	1334	-.031	ns	677	.022	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	-.016	ns	1334	-.007	ns	677	-.021	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	-.007	ns	1323	.000	ns	672	-.020	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.020	ns	1323	.008	ns	672	.042	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	-.027	ns	1306	-.038	ns	664	-.021	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.026	ns	1307	.033	ns	664	.031	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	-.041	ns	1174	-.033	ns	615	-.054	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	.010	ns	1172	.105	**	616	-.108	*	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlation with Rule justification sanction-oriented disappears for boys subgroup
- 2) Significant correlation with Rule justification no answer disappears for girls subgroup
- 3) Significant correlation with Parent SBQ Prosociality gets insignificant for total group

Hedonistic / outcome-oriented

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = -.031$)
RJhedonistic1	23 (1.7%)	.017	.127	7.61	55.91	-.020	-.006
RJhedonistic2	15 (1.1%)	.001	.027	36.54	1335.00	-.006	-.033
RJhedonistic3	19 (1.4%)	.002	.039	25.81	664.99	-.008	-.031
RJhedonistic4	33 (2.5%)	.022	.146	6.57	41.22	-.021	-.006

N= 1335

Comments:

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1335	.040	.197	0.00	1.00	4.670	19.843			
Gender								1	.026	.873
<i>Girls</i>	657	.039	.195	0.00	1.00	4.734	20.475			
<i>Boys</i>	678	.041	.199	0.00	1.00	4.621	19.409			
Treatment								3	.161	.922
<i>Control</i>	342	.041	.198	0.00	1.00	4.654	19.777			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	.046	.209	0.00	1.00	4.354	17.060			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	.036	.186	0.00	1.00	5.032	23.450			
<i>Combination</i>	302	.0397	.196	0.00	1.00	4.736	20.567			

Comments:

Correlations with Subscales & DVs				Boys			Girls			
	Variable	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales										
Rule justification										
<i>golden rule</i>	-.049	ns	1335	-.027	ns	678	-.070	ns	657	
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.085	**	1335	-.059	ns	678	-.113	**	657	
<i>Empathic / victim-oriented</i>	-.092	**	1335	-.095	ns	678	-.088	*	657	
<i>Sanction-oriented</i>	.073	*	1335	.005	ns	678	.151	***	657	
<i>Inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.005	ns	1335	-.005	ns	678	-.005	ns	657	
<i>No answer</i>	.004	ns	1335	-.026	ns	678	.052	ns	657	
Subscales										
Self-attribution justification										
<i>golden rule</i>	.014	ns	1335	.031	ns	678	.006	ns	657	
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.037	ns	1335	-.014	**	678	.037	ns	657	
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.032	ns	1335	-.036	ns	678	-.028	ns	657	
<i>hedonistic</i>	.073	*	1335	.144	***	678	.007	ns	657	
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.18	ns	1335	-.042	ns	678	.007	ns	657	
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	.014	ns	1335	.067	ns	678	-.046	ns	657	
<i>no answer</i>	.032	ns	1335	.047	ns	678	.013	ns	657	
<i>Self-attributed feeling</i>	-.069	*	1335	-.153	ns	678	.018	ns	657	
Child SBQ										
<i>Aggression W2</i>	.033	ns	1334	.071	ns	677	-.019	ns	657	
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	-.051	ns	1334	-.082	*	677	-.008	ns	657	
<i>Aggression W1</i>	.046	ns	1323	.109	**	672	-.027	ns	651	
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	-.041	ns	1323	-.024	ns	672	-.061	ns	651	
Teacher SBQ W2.1										
<i>Total Aggression</i>	.048	*	1306	.088	*	664	-.007	ns	642	
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.015	ns	1307	-.017	ns	664	-.010	ns	643	
Parent SBQ W2										
<i>Aggression</i>	.005	ns	1174	.023	ns	615	-.023	ns	559	
<i>Prosociality</i>	.015	ns	1172	.035	ns	616	-.005	ns	556	
1 *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, ns p>.05										
Comments:										

Authoritarian / sanction-oriented

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .264$)
RJsanctionauthoritarian1	23 (1.7%)	0.01	0.11	8.98	78.75	.146	.210
RJsanctionauthoritarian2	15 (1.1%)	0.03	0.17	5.37	26.92	.179	.142
RJsanctionauthoritarian3	19 (1.4%)	0.05	0.21	4.32	16.65	.192	.120
RJsanctionauthoritarian4	33 (2.5%)	0.01	0.09	10.42	106.66	.022	.306

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Item RJsanctionauthoritarian4 with low item-scale-correlation and increased alpha when removed

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1335	0.10	0.35	0	3	3.94	17.64			
Gender								1	0.00	.995
<i>Girls</i>	657	0.10	0.33	0	2	3.53	12.71			
<i>Boys</i>	678	0.99	0.36	0	3	4.25	21.17			
Treatment								3	3.71	.011
<i>Control</i>	342	0.14	0.43	0	3	3.33	12.08			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	0.08	0.30	0	2	4.06	17.36			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	0.06	0.26	0	2	4.47	21.24			
<i>Combination</i>	302	0.11	0.37	0	3	3.84	18.22			

Comments:

- 1) All subgroups with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Significant F-value for Treatment group differences

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Variable				Boys			Girls		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.006	ns	1335	.040	ns	678	-.051	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.196	***	1335	-.200	***	678	-.194	***	657
<i>empathic/victim-orientated</i>	-.070	*	1335	-.063	ns	678	-.079	*	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	.073	**	1335	.005	ns	678	.151	***	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.035	ns	1335	-.049	ns	678	-.020	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.057	*	1335	-.059	ns	678	-.056	ns	657
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	.032	ns	1335	.039	ns	678	.029	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.086	**	1335	-.060	ns	678	-.115	**	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.050	ns	1335	-.087	*	678	-.007	ns	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	.026	ns	1335	.048	ns	678	.004	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.209	***	1335	.207	***	678	.212	***	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	.002	ns	1335	-.004	ns	678	.009	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.050	ns	1335	-.041	ns	678	-.061	ns	657
Self-attributed feeling	.008	ns	1335	-.013	ns	678	.031	ns	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	.019	ns	1334	.084	*	677	-.071	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.016	ns	1334	-.014	ns	677	.062	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	-.014	ns	1323	.026	ns	672	-.061	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	-.029	ns	1323	-.050	ns	672	.000	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	.005	ns	1306	.024	ns	664	-.024	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.005	ns	1307	.036	ns	664	-.024	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	.008	ns	1174	.016	ns	615	-.007	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.011	ns	1172	-.022	ns	616	.010	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlations with Rule justification empathic/victim-oriented and hedonistic, Self-attribution feeling normative/moral disappear for boys subgroup
- 2) Significant correlation with Rule justification no answer gets insignificant after division in boys and girls subgroups

Inappropriate / undifferentiated&repetition

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .305$)
RJundrep1	23 (1.7%)	0.20	0.40	1.53	0.33	.216	.163
RJundrep2	15 (1.1%)	0.07	0.26	3.25	8.60	.184	.233
RJundrep3	19 (1.4%)	0.08	0.26	3.21	8.34	.088	.314
RJundrep4	33 (2.5%)	0.28	0.45	0.96	-1.07	.161	.258

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) RJundrep1, RJundrep2 and RJundrep3 with excessive skewness
- 2) RJundrep2 and RJundrep3 with high kurtosis
- 3) RJundrep4 with low kurtosis
- 4) RJundrep3 with low item-scale-correlation and increased alpha when removed

No answer

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .568$)
RJnoanswer1	23 (1.7%)	0.02	0.13	7.43	53.27	.359	.490
RJnoanswer2	15 (1.1%)	0.01	0.11	9.29	84.33	.435	.448
RJnoanswer3	19 (1.4%)	0.01	0.12	8.21	65.53	.287	.544
RJnoanswer4	33 (2.5%)	0.03	0.16	6.13	35.61	.356	.504

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis

Justification of self-attribution

Scheme	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. "golden rule"2. "normative / moral",3. "empathic / victim-oriented"4. "hedonistic / outcome-oriented",5. "authoritarian / sanction-oriented",6. "undifferentiated / repetition"7. "no answer"
--------	--

Golden Rule

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .305$)
SAJgoldenrule1	87 (6.5%)	0.02	0.15	6.34	38.24	.154	.250
SAJgoldenrule2	50 (3.7%)	0.03	0.17	5.52	28.52	.253	.113
SAJgoldenrule3	92 (6.9%)	0.04	0.20	4.58	18.96	.207	.177
SAJgoldenrule4	81 (6.1%)	0.01	0.09	10.42	106.66	-.003	.370

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Item SAJgoldenrule4 with low item-scale-correlations and increased alpha when removed

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation		Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
			Min.	Max.			df	F	p
Full sample	1335	0.10	0.360						
Gender							1	13.99	.000
Girls	657	0.14	0.44	0	3	3.42	12.26		
Boys	678	0.07	0.26	0	2	3.92	15.51		
Treatment							3	0.84	.471
Control	342	0.12	0.38	0	3	3.69	15.91		
Triple P	326	0.12	0.38	0	2	3.33	11.05		
PATHS	365	0.09	0.34	0	2	4.04	16.72		
Combination	302	0.09	0.34	0	3	4.78	26.80		

Comments:

- 1) All subgroups with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Gender group differences with significant F-value

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Variable				Boys			Girls		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.110	***	1335	-.132	**	678	-.109	**	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.044	ns	1335	-.007	ns	678	-.066	ns	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.018	ns	1335	.036	ns	678	-.052	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.087	**	1335	-.045	ns	678	-.118	**	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.083	**	1335	-.052	ns	678	-.102	**	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.062	*	1335	-.051	ns	678	-.068	ns	657
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	.164	***	1335	.135	***	678	.179	***	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.025	ns	1335	-.038	ns	678	-.032	ns	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.040	ns	1335	.001	ns	678	-.066	ns	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	.014	ns	1335	.031	ns	678	.006	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.032	ns	1335	.039	ns	678	.029	ns	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	.001	ns	1335	-.021	ns	678	.032	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.033	ns	1335	-.027	ns	678	-.034	ns	657
Self-attributed feeling	.004	ns	1335	-.028	ns	678	.019	ns	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	.052	ns	1334	.045	ns	677	.096	*	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.094	**	1334	.059	ns	677	.110	**	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	-.002	ns	1323						
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.043	ns	1323						
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	.071	*	1306	.127	**	664	.069	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.003	ns	1307	-.022	ns	664	-.035	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	.021	ns	1174	.051	ns	615	.026	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	.002	ns	1172	-.010	ns	616	-.023	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlations with Self-attribution justification sanction-oriented, inappropriate/repetition and Child SBQ Prosociality W2 disappear for boys subgroup
- 2) Significant correlation with Teacher SBQ Aggression disappears for girls subgroup
- 3) Significant correlation with Self-attribution justification no answer gets insignificant after division in boys and girls subgroups

Normative / moral

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .493$)
SAJcnm1	87 (6.5%)	0.40	0.49	0.40	-1.84	.260	.447
SAJcnm2	50 (3.7%)	0.41	0.49	0.38	-1.86	.332	.379
SAJcnm3	92 (6.9%)	0.43	0.49	0.30	-1.91	.332	.379
SAJcnm4	81 (6.1%)	0.28	0.45	0.98	-1.03	.227	.473

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with low kurtosis

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation		Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA			
			Min.	Max.			df	F	p	
Full sample	1335	1.51	1.21	0	4	0.35	-0.85			
Gender								1	1.16	.281
<i>Girls</i>	657	1.55	1.19	0	4	0.32	-0.79			
<i>Boys</i>	678	1.48	1.24	0	4	0.38	-0.89			
Treatment								3	2.91	.034
<i>Control</i>	342	1.60	1.21	0	4	0.18	-0.98			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	1.54	1.20	0	4	0.40	-0.70			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	1.56	1.22	0	4	0.36	-0.86			
<i>Combination</i>										

Comments:

- 1) Treatment group differences with significant F-value

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Variable				Boys			Girls		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.110	***	1335	-.132	**	678	-.109	**	657
<i>empathic/ victim-oriented</i>	-.351	***	1335	-.350	***	678	-.351	***	657
<i>Hedonistic</i>	-.260	***	1335	-.261	***	678	-.263	***	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.312	***	1335	-.289	***	678	-.338	***	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.355	***	1335	-.363	***	678	-.345	***	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.234	***	1335	-.274	***	678	-.181	***	657
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	.032	ns	1335	.007	ns	678	.055	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	.331	***	1335	.398	***	678	.255	***	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.225	***	1335	-.249	***	678	-.197	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.037	ns	1335	-.104	**	678	.037	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.086	**	1335	-.060	ns	678	-.115	**	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.125	***	1335	-.153	***	678	-.088	*	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.095	**	1335	-.100	**	678	-.087	*	657
Self-attributed feeling	.230	***	1335	.244	***	678	.215	***	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	-.012	ns	1334	-.029	ns	677	.020	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.073	**	1334	.082	*	677	.052	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	.004	ns	1323	.008	ns	672	.004	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.120	***	1323	.145	***	672	.083	*	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	-.057	*	1306	-.072	ns	664	-.027	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.023	ns	1307	.036	ns	664	-.009	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	.004	ns	1174	-.012	ns	615	.035	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	.026	ns	1172	.032	ns	616	.006	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlation with Child SBQ Prosociality W2 disappears for girls subgroup
- 2) Significant correlation with Teacher SBQ Aggression gets insignificant after division in boys and girls subgroups
- 3) Significant correlation with Rule justification sanction-oriented disappears for boys subgroup

Empathic / victim-orientated

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .422$)
SAJempatic1	87 (6.5%)	0.15	0.35	2.02	2.06	.215	.372
SAJempatic2	50 (3.7%)	0.16	0.36	1.89	1.58	.251	.335
SAJempatic3	92 (6.9%)	0.13	0.33	2.27	3.15	.267	.324
SAJempatic4	81 (6.1%)	0.21	0.41	1.42	0.02	.210	.385

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1335	0.64	0.88	0	4	1.48	1.90			
Gender								1	0.54	.464
<i>Girls</i>	657	0.62	0.87	0	4	1.54	2.19			
<i>Boys</i>	678	0.65	0.89	0	4	1.41	1.67			
Treatment								3	3.08	.026
<i>Control</i>	342	0.59	0.85	0	4	1.66	2.80			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	0.67	0.88	0	4	1.24	1.02			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	0.56	0.87	0	4	1.74	2.76			
<i>Combination</i>	302	0.75	0.92	0	4	1.29	1.39			

Comments:

- 1) All subgroups with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Significant F-value for treatment group differences

**Correlations with
Subscales & DVs**

Variable	r	p	N	Boys			Girls		
				r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.044	ns	1335	-.007	ns	678	-.066	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.351	***	1335	-.350	***	678	-.351	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.128	***	1335	-.134	***	678	-.122	**	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.161	***	1335	-.185	***	678	-.137	***	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.173	***	1335	-.157	***	678	-.193	***	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.134	***	1335	-.142	***	678	-.129	**	657
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.083	**	1335	-.103	**	678	-.063	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.179	***	1335	-.233	***	678	-.119	**	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	.309	***	1335	.372	***	678	.237	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.032	ns	1335	-.036	ns	678	-.028	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	-.050	ns	1335	-.087	*	678	-.007	ns	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.044	ns	1335	-.033	ns	678	-.062	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.061	*	1335	-.054	ns	678	-.079	*	657
Self-attributed feeling	.145	***	1335	.163	***	678	.129	**	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	-.036	ns	1334	-.064	ns	677	-.008	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.014	ns	1334	.022	ns	677	.011	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	-.034	ns	1323	-.017	ns	672	-.056	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.005	ns	1323	.016	ns	672	-.003	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	.017	ns	1306	.033	ns	664	-.009	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.023	ns	1307	-.043	ns	664	.011	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	-.097	**	1174	-.101	*	615	-.098	*	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	.074	*	1172	.120	**	616	.027	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlations with Rule justification golden rule and Parent SBQ Prosociality disappear for girls subgroup
- 2) Significant correlation with Rule justification "no answer" disappears for boys subgroup

Hedonistic/ outcome orientated

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .358$)
SAJhedonistic1	87 (6.5%)	0.09	0.29	2.86	6.16	.162	.329
SAJhedonistic2	50 (3.7%)	0.06	0.24	3.58	10.82	.299	.187
SAJhedonistic3	92 (6.9%)	0.06	0.24	3.74	12.01	.317	.176
SAJhedonistic4	81 (6.1%)	0.13	0.34	2.21	2.88	.054	.485

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Item SAJhedonistic4 with low item-scale-correlation and increased alpha when removed

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation		Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA			
			Min.	Max.			df	F	p	
Full sample	1335	0.34	0.65	0	4	2.17	5.16			
Gender								1	0.79	.373
<i>Girls</i>	657	0.36	0.69	0	4	2.17	4.87			
<i>Boys</i>	678	0.33	0.61	0	4	2.12	5.24			
Treatment								3	2.31	.075
<i>Control</i>	342	0.28	0.55	0	3	1.97	3.47			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	0.37	0.70	0	4	2.08	4.49			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	0.40	0.72	0	4	2.16	5.27			
<i>Combination</i>	302	0.32	0.62	0	3	2.18	5.04			

Comments:

- 1) All subgroups with excessive skewness and high kurtosis

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Variable				Boys			Girls		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.018	ns	1335	.036	ns	678	-.052	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.260	***	1335	-.261	***	678	-.263	***	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.128	***	1335	-.134	***	678	-.122	**	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.003	ns	1335	.048	ns	678	-.037	ns	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.171	***	1335	-.159	***	678	-.182	***	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.101	***	1335	-.088	*	678	-.115	**	657
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	.094	**	1335	.142	***	678	.055	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.033	ns	1335	-.039	ns	678	-.032	ns	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	.038	ns	1335	.012	ns	678	.064	ns	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	.073	**	1335	.144	***	678	.007	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.026	ns	1335	.048	ns	678	.004	ns	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.055	*	1335	-.059	ns	678	-.048	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.057	*	1335	-.048	ns	678	-.072	ns	657
Self-attributed feeling									
	-.473	***	1335	-.463	***	678	-.484	***	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	.083	**	1334	.123	**	677	.049	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	-.022	ns	1334	-.037	ns	677	-.014	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	.002	ns	1323	.005	ns	672	.003	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.004	ns	1323	.052	ns	672	-.056	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	-.016	ns	1306	-.001	ns	664	-.026	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.022	ns	1307	.022	ns	664	.010	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	.011	ns	1174	.008	ns	615	.021	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.008	ns	1172	-.045	ns	616	.021	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlations with Rule justification golden rule and hedonistic and Child SBQ Aggression W2 disappear for girls subgroup
- 2) Significant correlations with Rule justification inappropriate/repetition and "no answer" get insignificant after division in boys and girls subgroup

Authoritarian / sanction-oriented

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .367$)
SAJsanctionauthoritarian1	87 (6.5%)	0.07	0.26	3.25	8.60	.223	.281
SAJsanctionauthoritarian2	50 (3.7%)	0.16	0.37	1.82	1.30	.264	.212
SAJsanctionauthoritarian3	92 (6.9%)	0.17	0.37	1.79	1.20	.276	.195
SAJsanctionauthoritarian4	81 (6.1%)	0.03	0.16	5.85	32.24	.009	.430

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) Item SAJsanctionauthoritarian4 with low item-scale-correlation and increased alpha when removed

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Standard			Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
			Deviation	Min.	Max.			df	F	p
Full sample	1335	0.43	0.72	0	4	1.71	2.58			
Gender								1	0.05	.816
<i>Girls</i>	657	0.44	0.73	0	4	1.73	2.72			
<i>Boys</i>	678	0.43	0.71	0	3	1.69	2.46			
Treatment								3	2.32	.074
<i>Control</i>	342	0.46	0.71	0	4	1.59	2.58			
<i>Triple P</i>	326	0.35	0.62	0	3	1.99	4.23			
<i>PATHS</i>	365	0.44	0.72	0	3	1.68	2.36			
<i>Combination</i>	302	0.48	0.80	0	3	1.59	1.65			

Comments:

- 1) All subgroups with excessive skewness and high kurtosis

**Correlations with
Subscales & DVs**

Variable				Boys			Girls		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Subscales									
Self-attribution justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	-.087	**	1335	-.045	ns	678	-.118	**	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.312	***	1335	-.289	***	678	-.338	***	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	-.161	***	1335	-.185	***	678	-.137	***	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	.003	ns	1335	.048	ns	678	-.037	ns	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	-.141	***	1335	-.179	***	678	-.101	**	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.059	*	1335	-.050	ns	678	-.069	ns	657
Subscales									
Rule justification									
<i>golden rule</i>	.050	ns	1335	.126	**	678	-.017	ns	657
<i>normative/moral</i>	-.084	**	1335	-.047	ns	678	-.123	**	657
<i>empathic/ victim-orientated</i>	.029	ns	1335	-.016	ns	678	.077	*	657
<i>hedonistic</i>	-.018	ns	1335	-.042	ns	678	.077	ns	657
<i>sanction-oriented</i>	.209	***	1335	.207	***	678	.212	***	657
<i>inappropriate/ repetition</i>	.002	ns	1335	-.007	ns	678	.013	ns	657
<i>no answer</i>	-.064	*	1335	-.088	*	678	-.032	ns	657
Self-attributed feeling									
	-.001	ns	1335	-.037	ns	678	.035	ns	657
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression W2</i>	.004	ns	1334	.047	ns	677	-.049	ns	657
<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.019	ns	1334	-.003	ns	677	.047	ns	657
<i>Aggression W1</i>	-.004	ns	1323	.014	ns	672	-.021	ns	651
<i>Prosociality W1</i>	-.014	ns	1323	-.055	ns	672	.033	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1									
<i>Total Aggression</i>	-.041	ns	1306	-.057	ns	664	-.020	ns	642
<i>Prosociality</i>	.050	ns	1307	.040	ns	664	.064	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2									
<i>Aggression</i>	.016	ns	1174	.034	ns	615	-.005	ns	559
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.018	ns	1172	-.063	ns	616	.034	ns	556

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

Comments:

- 1) Significant correlations with Self-attribution justification golden rule and Rule justification normative/moral disappear for boys subgroup
- 2) Significant correlation with Rule justification no answer disappears for girls subgroup
- 3) Significant correlation with Self-attribution justification no answer gets insignificant after division into boys and girls subgroups

Undifferrenciated & repetition

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .380$)
SAJundrep1	87 (6.5%)	0.20	0.40	1.51	0.27	.217	.301
SAJundrep2	50 (3.7%)	0.14	0.35	2.07	2.28	.234	.287
SAJundrep3	92 (6.9%)	0.11	0.32	2.46	4.05	.201	.323
SAJundrep4	81 (6.1%)	0.28	0.45	0.96	-1.08	.183	.351

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) SAJundrep1, SAJundrep2 and SAJundrep3 with excessive skewness and high kurtosis
- 2) SAJundrep4 with low kurtosis

No answer

Case Summary & Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Missings (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item removed ($\alpha = .627$)
SAJnoanswer1	87 (6.5%)	0.07	0.25	3.53	10.46	.424	.545
SAJnoanswer2	50 (3.7%)	0.04	0.19	4.88	21.83	.346	.601
SAJnoanswer3	92 (6.9%)	0.07	0.25	3.41	9.63	.391	.572
SAJnoanswer4	81 (6.1%)	0.06	0.24	3.69	11.59	.479	.503

N= 1335

Comments:

- 1) All items with excessive skewness and high kurtosis

Justification of self-attributed Feelings

- Scheme**
1. "golden rule"
 2. "normative / moral",
 3. "empathic / victim-oriented
 4. "hedonistic / outcome-oriented",
 5. "authoritarian / sanction-oriented",
 6. "undifferentiated / repetition"
 7. "no answer"

	Golden Rule	Normative / Moral	Empathic / Victim-oriented	Hedonistic / outcome-oriented	Authoritarian / sanction-oriented	Repetition	Undifferentiated	No answer
Sharing	31 (2.3 %)	537 (40.2 %)	194 (14.5 %)	121 (9.1 %)	99 (7.4 %)	84 (6.3 %)	182 (13.6 %)	87 (6.5 %)
Bullying	40 (3.0 %)	544 (40.7 %)	209 (15.7 %)	85 (6.4 %)	219 (16.4 %)	55 (4.1 %)	133 (10.0 %)	50 (3.7 %)
Laughing at (perpetrator)	56 (4.2 %)	568 (42.5 %)	167 (12.5 %)	79 (5.9 %)	223 (16.7 %)	33 (2.5 %)	117 (8.8 %)	92 (6.9 %)
Laughing at (aide)	12 (0.9 %)	373 (27.9 %)	281 (21.0 %)	173 (13.0 %)	36 (2.7 %)	187 (14.0 %)	192 (14.4 %)	81 (6.1 %)

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	Variable	Boys			Girls					
		r	p	N	r	p	N			
Subscales										
Rule justification										
	<i>Golden Rule</i>	-.068	ns	1335	-.050	ns	678	-.086	*	657
	<i>Normative / moral</i>	.040	ns	1335	.057	ns	678	.018	ns	657
	<i>Empathic/ victim-oriented</i>	.005	ns	1335	-.011	ns	678	.023	ns	657
	<i>Hedonistic</i>	-.069	*	1335	-.153	***	678	.018	ns	657
	<i>Sanction-oriented</i>	.008	ns	1335	-.013	ns	678	.031	ns	657
	<i>Inappropriate / Repetition</i>	.009	ns	1335	.037	ns	678	-.014	ns	657
	<i>No answer</i>	-.063	*	1335	-.081	*	678	-.035	ns	657
Subscales										
Self-attribution justification										
	<i>Golden Rule</i>	.004	ns	1335	-.028	ns	678	.019	ns	657
	<i>Normative / moral</i>	.230	***	1335	.244	***	678	.215	***	657
	<i>Empathic/ victim-oriented</i>	.145	***	1335	.163	***	678	.129	**	657
	<i>Hedonistic</i>	-.473	***	1335	-.463	***	678	-.484	***	657
	<i>Sanction-oriented</i>	-.001	ns	1335	-.037	ns	678	.035	ns	657
	<i>Inappropriate / Repetition</i>	-.041	ns	1335	-.039	ns	678	-.041	ns	657
	<i>No answer</i>	-.099	***	1335	-.136	***	678	-.051	ns	657
Child SBQ										
	<i>Aggression W2</i>	-.145	***	1334	-.176	***	677	-.101	*	657
	<i>Prosociality W2</i>	.156	***	1334	.168	***	677	.138	***	657
	<i>Aggression W1</i>	-.050	ns	1323	-.092	*	672	-.001	ns	651
	<i>Prosociality W1</i>	.057	*	1323	.056	ns	672	.051	ns	651
Teacher SBQ W2.1										
	<i>Total Aggression</i>	.037	ns	1306	.057	ns	664	.024	ns	642
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.016	ns	1306	.004	ns	664	.013	ns	643
Parent SBQ W2										
	<i>Aggression</i>	-.039	ns	1174	-.031	ns	615	-.043	ns	559
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.063	*	1172	.077	ns	616	.040	ns	556

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

Comments: