



Technical Report

Parent Wave 3

Social Behaviour Questionnaire

Source/Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard E. Tremblay (Université de Montréal) Tremblay, R. E., Loeber, R., Gagnon, C., Charlebois, P., Larivee, S. & LeBlanc, M. (1991). Disruptive boys with stable and unstable high fighting behavior patterns during junior elementary school. <i>Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology</i>, 19, 285-300.
Description	A comprehensive assessment of the target child's social behaviour. Focuses also on prosociality, not only on problem behaviour. As compared to the original scale the more recent version used in the z-proso study also allows assessing subtypes of aggression, such as indirect, reactive, and instrumental aggression. This measure is also repeatedly administered to teachers (paper-and-pencil) and – in an adapted computer-based multimedia version – to the target children.
Measured Concepts/ Subdimensions	<p><i>Internalising Problem Behaviour</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anxiety 2. Depression <p><i>Attention-Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Attention Deficit 4. Hyperactivity <p><i>Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Opposition/Defiance ODD 6. Non-Aggressive CD <p><i>Prosocial Behaviour</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Prosocial Behaviour (Helping, Empathy) <p><i>Aggression</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Physical Aggression 9. Indirect Aggression 10. Instrumental Aggressions/Dominance 11. Reactive Aggression <p><i>Psychopathy Proxy</i></p>
Number of Items	55
Response Categories	5-point Likert scale (from “never” to “very often”)
Item Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “CHILD cries a lot.” (Anxiety) “CHILD fidgets.” (Hyperactivity) “CHILD does not obey his/her mother.” (ODD) “CHILD steals outside the home.” (Non-Aggressive CD) “CHILD kicks, bites, hits other children.” (Physical Aggression) “CHILD listens to others' points of view.” (Prosociality)
Administration History	Wave 1, Wave 2 (except scales “ADHD” and “Internalising Problem Behaviour”), Wave 3

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Internalising Problem Behaviour ”

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_1	Internalising problem behaviour 1	<CHILDNAME> cries a lot	0 (0.0%)
P3_10010_2	Internalising problem behaviour 2	<CHILDNAME> is nervous, highstrung or tense	1 (0.1%)
P3_10010_3	Internalising problem behaviour 3	<CHILDNAME>is too fearful or anxious	0 (0.0%)
P3_10010_4	Internalising problem behaviour 4	<CHILDNAME> is worried	2 (0.2%)
P3_10010_5	Internalising problem behaviour 5	<CHILDNAME> seems to be unhappy, sad or depressed	0 (0.0%)
P3_10010_6	Internalising problem behaviour 6	<CHILDNAME> is not as happy as other children	12 (1.0%)
P3_10010_7	Internalising problem behaviour 7	<CHILDNAME> has trouble enjoying him/herself	2 (0.2%)
P3_10010_8	Internalising problem behaviour 8	<CHILDNAME> appears miserable, distressed, or unhappy	2 (0.2%)
P3_10010_9	Internalising problem behaviour 9	<CHILDNAME>stares into space	7 (0.6%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .750$)
P3_10010_1	Internalising problem behaviour 1	2.62	1.03	1	5	.356	-.345	.260	.761
P3_10010_2	Internalising problem behaviour 2	2.05	.918	1	5	.540	-.258	.484	.718
P3_10010_3	Internalising problem behaviour 3	2.13	1.04	1	5	.698	-.114	.350	.745
P3_10010_4	Internalising problem behaviour 4	2.00	.855	1	5	.449	-.320	.503	.715
P3_10010_5	Internalising problem behaviour 5	1.69	.741	1	5	.739	-.200	.587	.705
P3_10010_6	Internalising problem behaviour 6	1.50	.742	1	5	1.37	1.31	.532	.713
P3_10010_7	Internalising problem behaviour 7	1.47	.744	1	5	1.66	2.59	.406	.731
P3_10010_8	Internalising problem behaviour 8	1.61	.725	1	5	.946	.255	.552	.711
P3_10010_9	Internalising problem behaviour 9	1.63	.846	1	5	1.23	.939	.309	.746

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Internalising Problem Behaviour Subscale (P3_anxdep)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,180	.855	.494	.000	2.56	.585	.148			
Gender								1	.035	.851
Girls	567	.858	.494	.000	2.56	.573	.083			
Boys	613	.853	.495	.000	2.56	.597	.219			

Treatment								3	1.59	.190
Control	318	.895	.511	.000	2.33	.419	-.392			
Triple P	279	.807	.495	.000	2.56	.669	.301			
PATHS	329	.858	.483	.000	2.56	.642	.675			
Combination	254	.857	.485	.000	2.44	.661	.274			
Language								8	1.88	.060
German	787	.879	.475	.000	2.56	.531	.157			
Albanian	67	.873	.488	.000	2.13	.619	-.032			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	.708	.553	.000	2.56	1.01	.664			
English	17	1.00	.541	.000	2.11	-.195	.700			
Italian	19	.772	.491	.000	2.00	.797	.761			
Portuguese	71	.857	.549	.000	2.22	.600	-.114			
Spanish	45	.867	.602	.000	2.56	.856	.411			
Tamil	51	.760	.418	.000	2.11	.755	.791			
Turkish	37	.757	.536	.000	2.11	.696	.017			

Comments:

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

2) ANOVA yielded no significant results for the gender groups ($F(1,1178) = .035, p > .05$), the treatment groups ($F(3,1176) = 1.59, p > .05$) or the language groups ($F(8,1171) = 1.88, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Internalising Problem Behaviour Subscale (P3_anxdep)*

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N
Subscales									
ADHD	.456	***	1179	.485	***	566	.443	***	613
ODD	.362	***	1179	.355	***	566	.373	***	613
NACD	.302	***	1180	.328	***	567	.293	***	613
Prosocial Behaviour	-.196	***	1167	-.189	***	561	-.212	***	606
Aggression	.382	***	1177	.407	***	565	.368	***	612
Psychopathy Proxy	.074	*	1175	.111	**	564	.059	ns	611
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.382	***	1177	.407	***	565	.368	***	612
Prosociality	-.196	***	1167	-.189	***	561	-.212	***	606
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.010	ns	1129	-.006	ns	537	.023	ns	592
Prosociality	-.052	ns	1125	-.090	*	537	-.030	ns	588
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.026	ns	1165	.014	ns	558	.038	ns	607
Prosociality	-.025	ns	1165	-.029	ns	558	-.027	ns	607

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

Comments: The Internalising Problem Behaviour Subscale is positively and significantly correlated with the other negative SBQ subscales (ADHD, ODD, NACD, Psychopathy proxy and Aggression) and negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale (Prosocial Behaviour). The correlations are generally moderate (except for ADHD) –pointing to the good convergent and divergent validity of the constructs. Further, the subscale does not have any significant correlations with the aggression/prosociality measures which are derived from the teacher- and child assessments.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Attention-Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)”

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_10	ADHD 1	<CHILDNAME> is impulsive, acts without thinking	4 (0.3%)
P3_10010_11	ADHD 2	<CHILDNAME> has difficulty awaiting turn in games or groups	16 (1.3%)
P3_10010_12	ADHD 3	<CHILDNAME> can't sit still, is restless, or hyperactive	1 (0.1%)
P3_10010_13	ADHD 4	<CHILDNAME> fidgets	4 (0.3%)
P3_10010_14	ADHD 5	<CHILDNAME> cannot settle to anything for more than a few moments	5 (0.4%)
P3_10010_15	ADHD 6	<CHILDNAME> is distractible, has trouble sticking to any activity	1 (0.1%)
P3_10010_16	ADHD 7	<CHILDNAME> can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long	2 (0.2%)
P3_10010_17	ADHD 8	<CHILDNAME> is inattentive	1 (0.1%)
P3_10010_18	ADHD 9	<CHILDNAME> gives up easily	1 (0.1%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .838$)
P3_10010_10	ADHD 1	2.30	.967	1	5	.412	-.138	.487	.827
P3_10010_11	ADHD 2	2.39	1.05	1	5	.290	-.589	.447	.832
P3_10010_12	ADHD 3	2.18	1.10	1	5	.648	-.377	.570	.818
P3_10010_13	ADHD 4	2.37	1.16	1	5	.485	-.620	.516	.825
P3_10010_14	ADHD 5	2.19	.956	1	5	.486	-.292	.639	.811
P3_10010_15	ADHD 6	2.48	1.04	1	5	.343	-.353	.694	.804
P3_10010_16	ADHD 7	2.25	.976	1	5	.508	-.110	.699	.805
P3_10010_17	ADHD 8	2.15	.936	1	5	.383	-.497	.524	.823
P3_10010_18	ADHD 9	2.41	1.00	1	5	.245	-.498	.381	.838

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) Subscale (P3_adhd)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,180	1.30	.675	.00	3.78	.411	.172			
Gender								1	26.19	.000
Girls	566	1.20	.638	.00	3.33	.374	.004			
Boys	614	1.40	.694	.00	3.78	.396	.212			
Treatment								3	.103	.958
Control	318	1.31	.709	.00	3.67	.419	.286			
Triple P	279	1.30	.653	.00	3.44	.433	.382			
PATHS	329	1.31	.696	.00	3.78	.447	.045			
Combination	254	1.29	.627	.00	3.22	.280	-.199			

Language								8	4.26	.000
German	788	1.36	.655	.00	3.78	.490	.252			
Albanian	66	1.22	.679	.00	3.33	.225	.267			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	1.15	.752	.00	3.44	.513	-.082			
English	17	1.42	.742	.00	2.89	-.006	.121			
Italian	19	1.22	.695	.33	2.89	.806	.281			
Portuguese	71	1.04	.695	.00	3.33	.497	.477			
Spanish	45	1.22	.744	.00	3.33	.436	.333			
Tamil	51	1.48	.545	.56	2.89	.673	.168			
Turkish	37	.997	.642	.00	2.44	.361	-.689			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the nine 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 ($F(1,1178) = 26.19, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1171) = 4.26, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1176) = .103, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) Subscale (P3_adhd)*

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N
Subscales									
Internalising Problem Behaviour	.456	***	1179	.485	***	566	.443	***	613
ODD	.511	***	1179	.472	***	565	.529	***	614
NACD	.432	***	1180	.440	***	566	.407	***	614
Prosocial Behaviour	-.214	***	1166	-.193	***	560	-.189	***	606
Aggression	.462	***	1176	.410	***	564	.485	***	612
Psychopathy Proxy	.125	***	1176	.202	***	564	.067	ns	612
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.462	***	1176	.410	***	564	.485	***	612
Prosociality	-.214	***	1166	-.193	***	560	-.189	***	606
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.154	***	1129	.116	**	536	.143	***	593
Prosociality	-.116	***	1125	-.045	ns	536	-.098	*	589
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.153	***	1165	.096	*	557	.156	***	608
Prosociality	-.076	*	1165	-.021	ns	557	-.069	ns	608

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

Comments: The Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Subscale is positively correlated with the other negative SBQ subscales and negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale. The correlations are highly significant and range from low to substantial, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. Further, the subscale has also significant but relatively lower correlations with the teacher and child aggression/prosociality measures than with the parent-reported measures.

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

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_27	Opposition/Defiance 1	<CHILDNAME> is disobedient at school	8 (0.7%)
P3_10010_28	Opposition/Defiance 2	<CHILDNAME> doesn't obey his/her mother	4 (0.3%)
P3_10010_29	Opposition/Defiance 3	<CHILDNAME> doesn't obey his/her father	55 (4.6%)
P3_10010_30	Opposition/Defiance 4	<CHILDNAME> ignores you when you say something	0 (0.0%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .727$)
P3_10010_27	Opposition/Defiance 1	1.53	.725	1	5	1.22	.986	.379	.737
P3_10010_28	Opposition/Defiance 2	2.20	.869	1	5	.202	-.414	.628	.598
P3_10010_29	Opposition/Defiance 3	1.99	.893	1	5	.507	-.368	.563	.638
P3_10010_30	Opposition/Defiance 4	2.23	.903	1	5	.151	-.615	.509	.673

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Opposition/Defiance (ODD) Subscale (P3_odd)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,180	.990	.633	.000	3.50	.207	-.384			
Gender								1	12.32	.000
Girls	566	.923	.589	.000	3.00	.195	-.443			
Boys	614	1.05	.666	.000	3.50	.157	-.426			
Treatment								3	.564	.639
Control	319	.999	.665	.000	3.00	.099	-.760			
Triple P	279	1.01	.621	.000	3.00	.220	-.225			
PATHS	328	.995	.624	.000	3.50	.367	.223			
Combination	254	.946	.618	.000	2.50	.142	-.776			
Language								8	23.09	.000
German	787	1.14	.589	.000	3.50	.175	.047			
Albanian	67	.720	.601	.000	2.00	.368	-1.04			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	.676	.640	.000	2.00	.490	-1.08			
English	17	1.25	.606	.000	2.00	-.534	-.576			
Italian	19	.895	.603	.000	2.00	.104	-.707			
Portuguese	71	.648	.601	.000	2.50	.796	.326			
Spanish	45	.819	.674	.000	2.75	.632	.099			
Tamil	51	.343	.450	.000	2.00	2.01	4.50			
Turkish	37	.773	.499	.000	1.50	.008	-1.27			

Comments:

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

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1178) = 12.32, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1171) = 23.09, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1176) = .564, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Opposition/Defiance (ODD) Subscale (P3_odd)*

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N	r	p ¹	N
Subscales									
<i>Internalising Problem Behaviour</i>	.362	***	1179	.355	***	566	.373	***	613
<i>ADHD</i>	.511	***	1179	.472	***	565	.529	***	614
<i>NACD</i>	.468	***	1180	.449	***	566	.468	***	614
<i>Prosocial Behaviour</i>	-.329	***	1166	-.271	***	560	-.355	***	606
<i>Aggression</i>	.462	***	1176	.408	***	564	.492	***	612
<i>Psychopathy Proxy</i>	.122	***	1175	.123	**	563	.109	**	612
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.462	***	1176	.408	***	564	.492	***	612
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.329	***	1166	-.271	***	560	-.355	***	606
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.092	**	1129	.144	***	536	.033	ns	593
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.128	***	1125	-.099	*	536	-.105	*	589
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.196	***	1165	.138	**	557	.211	***	608
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.075	*	1165	-.008	ns	557	-.086	*	608

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

Comments: The Opposition-Defiance Subscale is positively correlated with the other negative SBQ subscales (*Internalising Problem Behaviour*, *ADHD*, *NACD* and *Aggression*) and negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale (*Prosocial Behaviour*). The correlations are highly significant and range from low to substantial, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. Further, the subscale has also significant but lower correlations with the teacher and child aggression/prosociality measures than with the parent measures.

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

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_24	NACD 1	<CHILDNAME> steals at home	0 (0.0%)
P3_10010_25	NACD 2	<CHILDNAME> steals outside the home	5 (0.4%)
P3_10010_26	NACD 3	<CHILDNAME> destroys his/her own things	0 (0.0%)
P3_10010_31	NACD 4	<CHILDNAME> destroys things belonging to his/her family, or other children	1 (0.1%)
P3_10010_32	NACD 5	<CHILDNAME> tells lies and cheats	0 (0.0%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .590$)
P3_10010_24	NACD 1	1.07	.309	1	5	5.78	43.08	.388	.543
P3_10010_25	NACD 2	1.04	.238	1	4	6.43	48.49	.276	.584
P3_10010_26	NACD 3	1.30	.598	1	5	2.11	4.33	.388	.512
P3_10010_31	NACD 4	1.19	.480	1	4	2.66	7.37	.473	.472
P3_10010_32	NACD 5	1.74	.790	1	5	.784	.019	.394	.552

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder (NACD) Subscale (P3_nacd)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,181	.269	.327	.000	2.25	1.83	4.61			
Gender								1	27.37	.000
Girls	567	.217	.285	.000	2.20	2.14	7.26			
Boys	614	.316	.356	.000	2.25	1.59	3.19			
Treatment								3	.709	.547
Control	319	.274	.322	.000	1.60	1.57	2.78			
Triple P	279	.260	.304	.000	1.60	1.51	2.56			
PATHS	329	.286	.352	.000	2.20	1.96	5.26			
Combination	254	.249	.326	.000	2.25	2.19	7.24			
Language								8	8.62	.000
German	788	.312	.349	.000	2.25	1.69	3.83			
Albanian	67	.167	.227	.000	.800	1.29	.890			
Bos./Cro./Serb.	86	.128	.243	.000	1.20	2.09	4.55			
English	17	.447	.493	.000	1.60	.973	.155			
Italian	19	.379	.437	.000	1.80	2.01	5.55			
Portuguese	71	.186	.217	.000	.800	1.17	.634			
Spanish	45	.227	.211	.000	.600	.447	-1.03			
Tamil	51	.125	.160	.000	.600	1.03	.195			
Turkish	37	.124	.202	.000	.800	1.70	2.54			

Comments:

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

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1179) = 27.37, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1172) = 8.62, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1177) = .709, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Non-Aggressive Conduct Disorder (NACD) Subscale* (P3_nacd)

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
Subscales									
<i>Internalising Problem Behaviour</i>	.302	***	1180	.328	***	567	.293	***	613
<i>ADHD</i>	.432	***	1180	.440	***	566	.407	***	614
<i>ODD</i>	.468	***	1180	.449	***	566	.468	***	614
<i>Prosocial Behaviour</i>	-.235	***	1167	-.200	**	561	-.223	***	606
<i>Aggression</i>	.468	***	1177	.440	***	565	.473	***	612
<i>Psychopathy Proxy</i>	.212	***	1176	.286	***	564	.162	***	612
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.468	***	1177	.440	***	565	.473	***	612
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.235	***	1167	-.200	***	561	-.223	***	606
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.113	***	1130	.053	ns	537	.110	**	593
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.088	**	1126	-.014	ns	537	-.064	ns	589
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.116	***	1166	.085	*	558	.099	*	608
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.079	**	1166	.018	ns	558	-.090	*	608

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

Comments: The NACD Subscale is positively correlated with the other negative SBQ subscales (Internalising Problem Behaviour, ADHD, ODD, Aggression and Psychopathy proxy) and negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale (Prosocial Behaviour). The correlations are highly significant and range from low to substantial, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. Further, the subscale has also significant but lower correlations with the teacher and child aggression/prosociality measures than with the parent-reported measures.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Prosocial Behaviour”

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_40	Prosocial behaviour 1	<CHILDNAME> shows sympathy to someone who has made a mistake	40 (3.4%)
P3_10010_41	Prosocial behaviour 2	<CHILDNAME> volunteers to help clear up a mess someone else has made	17 (1.4%)
P3_10010_42	Prosocial behaviour 3	<CHILDNAME> if there is a quarrel or dispute, will try to stop it	46 (3.9%)
P3_10010_43	Prosocial behaviour 4	<CHILDNAME> will try to help someone who has been hurt	40 (3.4%)
P3_10010_44	Prosocial behaviour 5	<CHILDNAME> will invite bystanders to join in a game	10 (0.8%)
P3_10010_45	Prosocial behaviour 6	<CHILDNAME> spontaneously helps to pick up objects, which another child has dropped (e.g., pencils, books, etc.)	39 (3.3%)
P3_10010_46	Prosocial behaviour 7	<CHILDNAME> comforts a child who is crying or upset	14 (1.2%)
P3_10010_47	Prosocial behaviour 8	<CHILDNAME> listens to others' points of view	5 (0.4%)
P3_10010_48	Prosocial behaviour 9	<CHILDNAME> is good at understanding other people's feelings	10 (0.8%)
P3_10010_49	Prosocial behaviour 10	<CHILDNAME> shares things with others	1 (0.1%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .804$)
P3_10010_40	Prosocial behaviour 1	3.54	.860	1	5	-.140	-.082	.522	.782
P3_10010_41	Prosocial behaviour 2	2.79	1.10	1	5	.226	-.539	.426	.796
P3_10010_42	Prosocial behaviour 3	3.29	1.01	1	5	-.333	-.173	.396	.798
P3_10010_43	Prosocial behaviour 4	4.08	.792	1	5	-.583	.182	.606	.774
P3_10010_44	Prosocial behaviour 5	3.86	.855	1	5	-.632	.525	.453	.790
P3_10010_45	Prosocial behaviour 6	3.57	.998	1	5	-.411	-.191	.512	.783
P3_10010_46	Prosocial behaviour 7	3.85	.872	1	5	-.342	-.383	.617	.771
P3_10010_47	Prosocial behaviour 8	3.73	.777	1	5	-.449	.408	.341	.801
P3_10010_48	Prosocial behaviour 9	4.03	.775	1	5	-.529	.157	.507	.785
P3_10010_49	Prosocial behaviour 10	3.98	.799	1	5	-.595	.490	.477	.788

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Prosocial Behaviour Subscale (P3_proso)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,167	2.67	.535	.500	4.00	-.094	-.004			
Gender								1	43.99	.000
Girls	561	2.78	.513	.500	4.00	-.064	.072			
Boys	606	2.57	.537	.900	4.00	-.081	-.078			
Treatment								3	.716	.543
Control	315	2.67	.552	1.20	4.00	.226	-.245			
Triple P	275	2.71	.517	.900	4.00	-.161	-.102			
PATHS	328	2.65	.534	.900	4.00	-.134	-.131			
Combination	249	2.66	.534	.500	3.80	-.410	.616			
Language								8	12.30	.000
German	779	2.61	.490	1.20	4.00	-.009	-.210			
Albanian	67	2.67	.594	.500	3.70	-.696	1.38			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	2.81	.553	1.50	4.00	-.072	-.103			
English	17	2.46	.670	.900	3.90	-.101	1.49			
Italian	18	2.39	.542	1.50	3.50	.281	-.541			
Portuguese	70	2.81	.558	1.50	4.00	-.029	-.459			
Spanish	43	2.78	.582	1.30	3.80	-.238	-.377			
Tamil	50	3.27	.410	2.10	3.90	-.673	.535			
Turkish	37	2.67	.643	.900	3.60	-.845	1.43			

Comments:

- 1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the ten 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 ($F(1,1165) = 43.99, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1158) = 12.30, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1163) = .716, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Prosocial Behaviour Subscale (P3_proso)

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
Internalising Problem Behaviour	-.196	***	1167	-.189	***	561	-.212	***	606
ADHD	-.214	***	1166	-.193	***	560	-.189	***	606
ODD	-.329	***	1166	-.271	***	560	-.355	***	606
NACD	-.235	***	1167	-.200	***	561	-.223	***	606
Aggression	-.236	***	1165	-.182	***	560	-.246	***	605
Psychopathy Proxy	-.097	***	1164	-.058	ns	559	-.089	*	605
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	-.236	***	1165	-.182	***	560	-.246	***	605
Prosociality	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	-.030	ns	1116	.044	ns	531	-.025	ns	585
Prosociality	.127	***	1112	.022	ns	531	.114	**	581
Child SBQ									
Aggression	-.117	***	1152	-.054	ns	552	-.112	**	600
Prosociality	.177	***	1152	.103	*	552	.178	***	600

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

Comments: The Prosocial Behaviour Subscale is negatively and significantly correlated with all the negative SBQ subscales. The subscale does not yield any significant correlations with the teacher-reported measures of child aggression and has lower correlations with the aggression measures based on child assessments than with the parent measures. Further, the Prosocial Behaviour Subscale has significant but very low correlations with the other measures of prosociality (teacher and child), pointing to low convergent validity.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Overall Aggression”

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_33	Physical aggr 1	<CHILDNAME> gets into fights	4 (0.3%)
P3_10010_34	Physical aggr 2	<CHILDNAME> physically attacks people	4 (0.3%)
P3_10010_35	Physical aggr 3	<CHILDNAME> kicks, bites, hits other children	4 (0.3%)
P3_10010_36	Physical aggr 4	<CHILDNAME> is cruel, bullies or is mean to others	9 (0.8%)
P3_10010_39	Physical aggr 5	<CHILDNAME> kicks, bites, hits his/her mother	3 (0.2%)
P3_10010_37	Instrumental aggr 1	<CHILDNAME> threatens people	7 (0.6%)
P3_10010_50	Instrumental aggr 2	<CHILDNAME> encourages other children to pick on a particular child	29 (2.5%)
P3_10010_51	Instrumental aggr 3	<CHILDNAME> tries to dominate other children	19 (1.6%)
P3_10010_52	Instrumental aggr 4	<CHILDNAME> scares other children to get what he/she wanted	14 (1.2%)
P3_10010_53	Reactive aggr 1	<CHILDNAME> reacts in an aggressive manner when teased	7 (0.6%)
P3_10010_54	Reactive aggr 2	<CHILDNAME> reacts in an aggressive manner when something was taken	23 (1.9%)
P3_10010_55	Reactive aggr 3	<CHILDNAME> reacts in an aggressive manner when contradicted	6 (0.5%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed ($\alpha = .796$)
P3_10010_33	Physical aggr 1	1.48	.711	1	5	1.31	.997	.434	.782
P3_10010_34	Physical aggr 2	1.46	.678	1	5	1.38	1.57	.541	.773
P3_10010_35	Physical aggr 3	1.44	.669	1	4	1.31	.763	.543	.773
P3_10010_36	Physical aggr 4	1.34	.609	1	5	1.85	3.55	.507	.778
P3_10010_39	Physical aggr 5	1.15	.445	1	4	3.22	11.06	.309	.793
P3_10010_37	Instrumental aggr 1	1.23	.613	1	5	3.33	12.74	.328	.791
P3_10010_50	Instrumental aggr 2	1.18	.451	1	4	2.68	7.33	.379	.789
P3_10010_51	Instrumental aggr 3	1.96	1.08	1	5	.931	.104	.414	.789
P3_10010_52	Instrumental aggr 4	1.18	.474	1	5	3.01	1.54	.365	.789
P3_10010_53	Reactive aggr 1	2.65	1.11	1	5	.113	-.671	.528	.774
P3_10010_54	Reactive aggr 2	2.51	1.04	1	5	.210	-.504	.516	.774
P3_10010_55	Reactive aggr 3	2.22	.985	1	5	.467	-.334	.558	.768

**Sum Index
Descriptive
Statistics**

Aggression Subscale (P3_aggress)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skew- ness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,177	.651	.435	.000	2.78	.738	.755			
Gender								1	19.51	.000
Girls	565	.593	.419	.000	2.78	1.06	2.11			
Boys	612	.705	.442	.000	2.33	.479	-.004			
Treatment								3	1.14	.330
Control	317	.657	.435	.000	2.25	.675	.468			
Triple P	279	.651	.418	.000	2.00	.510	-.166			
PATHS	329	.677	.458	.000	2.50	.748	.729			
Combination	252	.611	.422	.000	2.78	1.03	2.28			
Language								8	16.37	.000
German	786	.704	.424	.000	2.78	.786	1.17			
Albanian	67	.636	.448	.000	1.83	.848	.669			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	86	.417	.420	.000	2.00	1.43	1.93			
English	17	.725	.501	.000	1.67	.239	-.845			
Italian	19	.614	.527	.000	1.92	1.14	1.16			
Portuguese	70	.371	.321	.000	1.10	.727	-.264			
Spanish	44	.489	.361	.000	1.33	.585	-.607			
Tamil	51	.984	.325	.250	1.83	.548	.945			
Turkish	37	.363	.318	.000	1.17	.868	.065			

Comments:

- 1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the 12 variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 4. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.
- 2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1175) = 19.51, p < .001$) and the language groups ($F(8,1168) = 16.37, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment groups ($F(3,1173) = 1.14, p > .05$).

**Correlations
with
Subscales
& DVs**

Aggression Subscale (P3_aggress)

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
Internalising Problem Behaviour	.382	***	1177	.407	***	565	.368	***	612
ADHD	.462	***	1176	.410	***	564	.485	***	612
ODD	.462	***	1176	.408	***	564	.492	***	612
NACD	.468	***	1177	.440	***	565	.473	***	612
Prosocial Behaviour	-.236	***	1165	-.182	***	560	-.246	***	605
Psychopathy Proxy	.134	***	1173	.108	*	563	.130	**	610
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prosociality	-.236	***	1165	-.182	***	560	-.246	***	605
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	.148	***	1126	.104	*	535	.148	***	591
Prosociality	-.082	**	1122	-.047	ns	535	-.046	ns	587
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.177	***	1162	.098	*	556	.201	***	606
Prosociality	-.076	**	1162	-.011	ns	556	-.082	*	606

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

Comments: The Aggression Subscale is positively correlated with all the other negative SBQ subscales and negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale. The correlations are highly significant and range from low to high, pointing to low divergent validity of the construct. The subscale has lower correlations with the teacher and child prosociality measures than with the parent-reported measures. Further, the Aggression Subscale has also significant but very low correlations with the other measures of aggression (teacher and child), pointing to very low convergent validity.

Social Behaviour Questionnaire – Subscale “Psychopathy Proxy”

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

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

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P3_10010_38	Psychopathy	<CHILDNAME> is cruel to animals	5 (0.4%)

Total N = 1181

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
P3_10010_38	Psychopathy	1.06	.272	1	3	4.51	21.63

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Psychopathy Proxy Subscale (P3_psych)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	1,176	1.06	.272	1	3	4.51	21.63			
Gender								1	15.84	.000
Girls	564	1.03	.195	1	3	6.71	49.42			
Boys	612	1.09	.325	1	3	3.60	13.30			
Treatment								3	2.47	.060
Control	316	1.09	.312	1	3	3.88	15.72			
Triple P	278	1.03	.167	1	2	5.67	3.34			
PATHS	329	1.06	.280	1	3	4.77	24.21			
Combination	253	1.08	.298	1	3	4.00	16.86			
Language								8	1.54	.138
German	786	1.08	.300	1	3	3.88	15.67			
Albanian	65	1.08	.367	1	3	4.89	23.45			
Bos./Cro./Serb.	86	1.01	.108	1	2	9.27	86.00			
English	17	1.06	.243	1	2	4.12	17.00			
Italian	19	1.05	.229	1	2	4.36	19.00			
Portuguese	70	1.03	.168	1	2	5.78	32.38			
Spanish	45	1.00	.000	1	1	.	.			
Tamil	51	1.02	.140	1	2	7.14	51.00			
Turkish	37	1.03	.164	1	2	6.08	37.00			

Comments: The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the gender groups ($F(1,1174) = 15.84, p < .001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the treatment ($F(3,1172) = 2.47, p > .05$) and the language groups ($F(8,1167) = 1.54, p > .05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs *Psychopathy Proxy Subscale (P3_psycho)*

Variable	r	Full Sample p ¹	N	r	Girls p ¹	N	r	Boys p ¹	N
Subscales									
<i>Internalising Problem Behaviour</i>	.074	*	1175	.111	**	564	.059	ns	611
<i>ADHD</i>	.125	***	1176	.202	***	564	.067	ns	612
<i>ODD</i>	.122	***	1175	.123	**	563	.109	**	612
<i>NACD</i>	.212	***	1176	.286	***	564	.162	***	612
<i>Prosocial Behaviour</i>	-.097	***	1164	-.058	ns	559	-.089	*	605
<i>Aggression</i>	.134	***	1173	.108	*	563	.130	**	610
Parent SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.134	***	1173	.108	*	563	.130	**	610
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.097	***	1164	-.058	ns	559	-.089	*	605
Teacher SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.025	ns	1125	.008	ns	534	.005	ns	591
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.072	*	1121	.060	ns	534	-.090	*	587
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	.073	*	1161	.017	ns	555	.071	ns	606
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.052	ns	1161	.011	ns	555	-.049	ns	606

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

Comments: The Psychopathy Proxy is positively correlated with all the other negative SBQ subscales and negatively correlated with the positive SBQ subscale. The correlations are all significant and low, pointing to good divergent validity. However, the correlations with the child aggression/prosociality measures are very low across all the informants (though slightly stronger for the parent measures), pointing to low predictive validity.