

Sociometrics
Grade 1/Year 2
Fast Track Project Technical Report
Cynthia Rains
February 28, 2006

Table of Contents

- I. Scale Description
- II. Report Sample
- III. Scaling
- IV. Differences between Groups
- V. Recommendations for Use
- VI. Item and Scale Means and SDs
- VII. Item Correlations

Appendix

SAS Scoring program

Citations

Instrument

Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., & Coppotelli, H.A. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 18*, 557-570.

References

Asher, S.R. & Dodge, K.A. (1986). Identifying children who are rejected by their peers. *Developmental Psychology, 22*, 444-449.

Bukowski, W.M. & Newcomb, A.F. (1984). Stability and determinants of sociometric status and friendship choice: A longitudinal perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 20*, 941-952.

Coie, J.D. & Dodge, K.A. (1983). Continuities and changes in children's social status: A five-year longitudinal study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29*, 261-281.

Terry, R. & Coie, J.D. (1991). A comparison of methods for defining sociometric status among children. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 867-880.

Reports

Rains, C. (2006). *Sociometrics*. (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project Web site: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org>

Rains, C. (2006). *Sociometrics*. (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project Web site: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org>

Maumary-Gremaud, A. & Miller-Johnson, S. (1995). *Sociometric Interview*. (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Durham, NC: Duke University.

Data Sources

Raw: C2E

Scored: SCM2

I. Scale Description

The sociometric interview assesses peer's perceptions of children in their classroom on a variety of dimensions (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982). The interview is administered individually at school. Children are presented with a roster of all the students in their classroom. They first rate how much they

like, or do not like, to play with each child in their classroom. On the 1st and 2nd grade forms, these ratings were made on a 3-point scale; for the 3rd grade form, this was expanded to a 5-point scale. For grade 4, no roster ratings were collected. After completing the roster ratings the children are then asked to nominate other children in their classroom on the following dimensions: liked most, liked least, aggression (who are the kids who start fights and say mean things), withdrawn (who are the kids who are shy and act afraid to be around other kids) behavior, prosocial (who are the kids who cooperate, help, and share) behavior, hyperactivity (who are the kids who get out of their seats and bother people), and victim (who gets picked on and teased by other kids) behavior. In grades 1, 2, and 3, children responded to these questions using both unlimited and fixed (top 3) nominations. In grade 4, only unlimited nominations were included. Adequate reliability and cross-contextual stability has been demonstrated for these assessments.

Social preference and social impact scores were also calculated, based on the like least and like most scores. This was done to assess the degree to which a child might be considered cooperative and supportive (a high social preference score) and the degree to which a child has influence in the classroom, positive or negative (high social impact).

In addition to sociometric items, a series of questions was developed for the Fast Track project that assess children's liking of school and loneliness. The number of items for this section has gradually increased over time, from 8 in grades 1 and 2 to 12 items in grade 3 to 21 items in grade 4.

II. Report Sample

These analyses were conducted on the first cohort on the high-risk control sample (n = 155) and the normative sample (n = 387, 463 with overlap) from the second year of the study. Sociometric scores are based on the responses by a child's peers, so it is possible for a child to have scores even if he or she did not actually respond. As a result, data on the number of missing responses is broken into two parts: one reflecting the sociometric scores and the other reflecting the self-report items.

For the sociometric scores, 56 records were missing the complete measure. Twelve records were missing from the control sample (2 from Durham, 2 from Nashville, 1 from Pennsylvania, and 7 from Washington) and 50 records were missing from the normative sample (12 from Durham, 21 from Nashville, 3 from Pennsylvania, and 14 from Washington). These numbers may reflect some overlap between the two samples.

For the self-report items, 142 records were missing; 40 from the control sample (13 from Durham, 11 from Nashville, 5 from Pennsylvania, and 11 from Washington) and 123 records were missing from the normative sample (32 from Durham, 45 from Nashville, 16 from Pennsylvania, and 30 from Washington). These numbers may reflect some overlap between the two samples.

III. Scaling

The first step in obtaining data was to use roster ratings. Subjects received mean scores for nominations **given** to others in their class and nominations **received** from other students in their classroom. For the roster ratings, a low value signified high 'like to play' scores either given or received. For instance, when the three-point scale was used, a "1" signified that a child liked another child a lot, while a "3" signified that the child did not like the other child at all. The same is true of the five-point scale, where a "1" still signified that a child liked another child a lot and a "5" meant that the child did not like the other child at all. For nominations for the like most/like least categories and for the behaviors (aggression, hyperactivity, withdrawn behavior, prosocial behavior, and victim behavior) students were simply asked to name children who fit each described category.

The next step was to determine the sociometric scores for each student. As stated earlier, children responded to the roster ratings using both unlimited and fixed (top 3) nominations. Some users of

sociometric measures rely on receiving a person's top 3, or fixed, nominations for a category. Others rely on allowing the person to nominate an unlimited number of people for a category. Both types of nominations were used in this year 2 version of the measure.

Individual items were scored by summing nominations across all children in the classroom. Both raw scores and z scores are available for both types of sociometric scores (unlimited and fixed). The z-scores are standardized within each classroom group. In addition, standardized social preference and social impact items were scored as follows:

Social Preference: standardized Liked Most - standardized Liked Least (score is then re-standardized)

Social Impact: standardized Liked Most + standardized Liked Least (score is then re-standardized)

In 1997 new standardized variables were created by standardizing scores within classroom and by sex. Generally children's peer interactions are typically sex-segregated, particularly in elementary school. By including only same-sex children in the computation of sociometric scores, the assessments of peer status would be more valid, and would better reflect the peer reality of elementary school. The variables that break down the data by sex replace the "z" in the variables' names with a "g," but are otherwise similar in name to the original standardized variable. For example, C2EZAGGS represents "Aggressive sum z-score" for the original standardized variable and C2EGAGGS represents "Aggressive z-score by sex" for the new standardized variable.

In addition, peer status variables were created to identify the subject's classification in one of the five status groups (Average, Popular, Neglected, Rejected, or Controversial) using combinations of the Social Preference, Social Impact, Like Least, and Like Most variables (see table below).

Peer Status	
Popular	Social Preference z-score ≥ 1 + Like Least sum z-score < 0 + Like Most sum z-score > 0
Rejected	Social Preference z-score ≤ -1 + Like Least sum z-score > 0 + Like Most sum z-score < 0
Neglected	Social Impact z-score ≤ -1
Controversial	Social Impact z-score ≥ 1 + Like Least sum z-score ≥ 0 + Like Most sum z-score ≥ 0
Average	Does not fit any of the other categories

These status groupings were calculated in the same way for both the unlimited and fixed nominations.

Finally, the self-report items were completed by the child using "yes" or "no" responses. These questions included 1 (is school fun for you), 2 (do nice things happen to you at school), 3 (do you feel unhappy at school-reversed), 4 (do you like your school), 5 (do you have kids to play with at school), 6 (are you lonely at school-reversed), 7 (is it hard to make friends at school-reversed), and 8 (do kids at school like you). A summary scale score, *School Satisfaction*, based on factor analysis, can be used for these self-report items. The "yes" responses were converted to "1" and the "no" responses were converted to "0." Thus, a high score for this scale would be an 8.

Cronbach's alphas were calculated for both samples of the *School Satisfaction* scale: .52 for the control sample and .61 for the normative sample.

IV. Differences between Groups

A series of t-tests between the high-risk control sample and the normative sample (including the overlap) indicated significant differences for 24 of the 29 z-score and mean roster rating items. Respondents from the normative sample tended to score higher in the categories such as 'like most' (both top 3 and unlimited), being withdrawn, being prosocial, and the social preference scores. Respondents from the

control sample, on the other hand, scored higher in categories such as 'like least' (both top 3 and unlimited), being aggressive, being hyperactive, the social impact scores, and the mean roster ratings.

Two z-scores approached significance, *Victim Sum Z-Score (C2EZVICS, p = 0.08)* and *Social Impact Z-Score (unlimited) by Sex (C2EGSIMU, p = 0.09)*, with the respondents from the control sample scoring higher than those from the normative sample for both scores.

A t-test for the scale, *School Satisfaction*, did not indicate significant differences between the samples.

Comparison of Means for Normative and Control for Sociometrics Y2								
Variable	Label	Normative		Control		DF	t Value	Pr > t
		Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
C2EZLMS3	Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	0.11	1.03	-0.44	0.66	405	-5.71	<.0001
C2EZLMSU	Like Most sum z-score (unl)	0.12	1.00	-0.47	0.77	405	-6.16	<.0001
C2EZLLS3	Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	-0.20	0.78	0.69	1.27	405	8.69	<.0001
C2EZLLSU	Like Least sum z-score (unl)	-0.15	0.83	0.75	1.18	405	9.01	<.0001
C2EZAGGS	Aggressive sum z-score	-0.16	0.78	0.80	1.30	405	9.32	<.0001
C2EZWDRS	Withdrawn sum z-score	0.07	0.98	-0.24	0.73	405	-3.27	0.0012
C2EZPROS	Prosocial sum z-score	0.10	1.05	-0.44	0.67	405	-5.54	<.0001
C2EZHYPS	Hyperactive sum z-score	-0.15	0.82	0.82	1.33	405	9.04	<.0001
C2EZVICS	Victim sum z-score	-0.00	0.93	0.18	1.17	405	1.75	0.0804
C2EZPRFU	Social Preference diff z-score (unl)	0.17	0.92	-0.75	1.01	405	-9.28	<.0001
C2EZPRF3	Social Preference diff z-score (top 3)	0.19	0.92	-0.72	1.01	405	-9.22	<.0001
C2EZSIM3	Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	-0.08	0.96	0.21	1.07	405	2.81	0.0051
C2EZSIMU	Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	-0.03	1.00	0.27	1.05	405	2.87	0.0044
C2EGLLSU	Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	-0.11	0.88	0.55	1.09	405	6.62	<.0001
C2EGLLS3	Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.16	0.85	0.49	1.14	405	6.49	<.0001
C2EGLMSU	Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	0.08	0.97	-0.41	0.84	405	-5.04	<.0001
C2EGLMS3	Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	0.09	0.98	-0.39	0.76	405	-5.10	<.0001
C2EGAGGS	Aggressive z-score by sex	-0.11	0.83	0.57	1.12	405	6.99	<.0001
C2EGHYPS	Hyperactive z-score by sex	-0.12	0.84	0.63	1.19	405	7.38	<.0001
C2EGPROS	Prosocial z-score by sex	0.04	0.97	-0.35	0.75	405	-4.17	<.0001
C2EGVICS	Victim z-score by sex	0.01	0.94	0.12	1.09	405	1.07	0.2862
C2EGWDRS	Withdrawal z-score by sex	0.05	0.96	-0.15	0.79	405	-2.10	0.0365
C2EGPRFU	Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	0.11	0.96	-0.60	1.01	405	-7.05	<.0001
C2EGPRF3	Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	0.16	0.96	-0.58	0.99	405	-7.31	<.0001
C2EGSIM3	Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.07	0.96	0.09	1.06	405	1.53	0.1269
C2EGSIMU	Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	-0.04	1.01	0.14	1.04	405	1.70	0.0896
C2ERRGIV	Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	1.67	0.32	1.67	0.32	321	0.00	0.9999
C2ERRREC	Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	1.62	0.34	1.92	0.35	398	8.48	<.0001
C2ERRSTD	Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	0.69	0.18	0.79	0.13	397	5.55	<.0001
SCM2SCS	School Satisfaction - Sociometrics Yr2	5.45	0.75	5.38	0.98	319	-0.71	0.4810

The frequency distribution of the *Status Grouping of the Top 3* between the high-risk control and normative samples was:

Table of C2ESTAT3 by group			
C2ESTAT3 (Status Grouping (Based on top 3))	Group		Total
Frequency Column Percent	Control	Normative	
AVERAGE	60 41.96	143 54.17	203
CONTROVERSIAL	5 3.50	16 6.06	21
NEGLECTED	20 13.99	47 17.80	67
POPULAR	4 2.80	39 14.77	43
REJECTED	54 37.76	19 7.20	73
Total	143 35.14	264 64.86	407 100.00
Frequency Missing = 56			

With $\chi^2 (4, N = 407) = 65.6798$, $p < 0.0001$, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk control) and diagnosis of the status grouping of the top 3 was rejected for these data.

The frequency distribution of the *Status Grouping unlimited* between the high-risk control and normative samples was:

Table of C2ESTATU by group			
C2ESTATU (Status Grouping (Based on unl))	Group		Total
Frequency Column Percent	Control	Normative	
AVERAGE	60 41.96	143 54.17	203
CONTROVERSIAL	12 8.39	13 4.92	25
NEGLECTED	16 11.19	38 14.39	54
POPULAR	3 2.10	45 17.05	48
REJECTED	52 36.36	25 9.47	77
Total	143 35.14	264 64.86	407 100.00
Frequency Missing = 56			

With $\chi^2 (4, N = 407) = 58.3399$, $p < 0.0001$, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk control) and diagnosis of the status grouping unlimited was rejected for these data.

In comparing *Status Grouping by Top 3* versus *Status Grouping unlimited*, the normative sample in both cases tended to have more students in the average, popular, and neglected groupings. The control sample tended to have more students classified as rejected, with 38% by the top 3 ratings and 36% by the unlimited ratings. For the controversial classification, the normative sample had double the percentage of students than did the control students for the top 3 ratings, but the control sample had double the percentage of students in the unlimited ratings.

The frequency distribution of the *Status Grouping of the Top 3 by sex* between the high-risk control and normative samples was:

Table of C2EGSTA3 by group			
C2EGSTA3 (status groupings (top 3) by sex)	Group		Total
	Control	Normative	
Frequency Column Percent			
AVERAGE	58 40.56	109 41.29	167
CONTROVERSIAL	7 4.90	17 6.44	24
NEGLECTED	24 16.78	57 21.59	81
POPULAR	5 3.50	53 20.08	58
REJECTED	49 34.27	28 10.61	77
Total	143 35.14	264 64.86	407 100.00
Frequency Missing = 56			

With $\chi^2 (4, N = 407) = 46.8009$, $p < 0.0016$, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk control) and diagnosis of the status grouping of the top 3 by sex was rejected for these data.

Chi square tests were also run on the status groupings that are by sex. The frequency distribution of the *Status Grouping unlimited by sex* between the high-risk control and normative samples was:

Table of C2EGSTAT by group			
C2EGSTAT (status groupings (unl) by sex) Frequency Column Percent	Group		Total
	Control	Normative	
AVERAGE	55 38.46	114 43.18	169
CONTROVERSIAL	13 9.09	19 7.20	32
NEGLECTED	18 12.59	44 16.67	62
POPULAR	7 4.90	57 21.59	64
REJECTED	50 34.97	30 11.36	80
Total	143 35.14	264 64.86	407 100.00
Frequency Missing = 56			

With χ^2 (4, N = 407) = 44.6630, $p < 0.0001$, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk control) and diagnosis of the status grouping unlimited by sex was rejected for these data.

In examining the status groupings by sex where the ratings were limited to the top 3, researchers should note that there were more students from the normative group for the categories of average, neglected, controversial, and popular 3, while the control sample tended to have a higher percentage of students in the rejected category. For the ratings that were unlimited and by sex, the normative sample had more students in the average, neglected and popular categories, while a higher percentage of control students were in the controversial and rejected categories.

V. Recommendations for Use

Analysts should note that 18 of the z-scores were normally distributed for both the normative and the control samples. One z-score, C2EZWDERS (withdrawn behavior sum z-score), was positively skewed for both samples.

Five z-scores were positively skewed for the normative sample but were normally distributed for the control sample: C2EZLLS3 (like least sum z-score top 3), C2EZAGGS (aggressive sum z-score), C2EZHYPS (hyperactive sum z-score), C2EZPROS (prosocial z-score by sex), and C2EGHYPS (hyperactive z-score by sex). Two z-scores were positively skewed for the control sample and normally distributed for the normative sample: C2EGLMS3 (like most top 3 z-score by sex) and C2EZLMS3 (like most top 3 z-score).

Two scores, the mean roster rating given by respondent (C2ERRGIV) and the mean roster rating received by the respondent (C2ERRREC), were normally distributed for both samples. Another score, the standard deviation of the mean roster rating received by the respondent (C2ERRSTD), was negatively skewed for both of the samples.

Finally, the *School Satisfaction* scale was normally distributed for both the control and the normative samples.

VI. Item Means and SDs

Sociometrics Self-Report Items Normative Sample Year 2

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C2ESR1	Self-Report 1: School fun?	264	0.943	0.232	0.000	1.000
C2ESR2	Self-Report 2: Nice things happen?	264	0.856	0.352	0.000	1.000
C2ESR3r	Reversed-Self-Report 3: Feel unhappy?	264	0.754	0.432	0.000	1.000
C2ESR4	Self-Report 4: Like your school?	264	0.958	0.200	0.000	1.000
C2ESR5	Self-Report 5: Kids to play with?	264	0.989	0.106	0.000	1.000
C2ESR6r	Reversed-Self-Report 6: Lonely at school?	264	0.890	0.313	0.000	1.000
C2ESR7r	Reversed-Self-Report 7: Hard to make friends?	264	0.629	0.484	0.000	1.000
C2ESR8	Self-Report 8: Kids like you?	264	0.947	0.225	0.000	1.000

Sociometrics Z-Score and Mean Roster Rating Items Normative Sample Year 2

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C2EZLMS3	Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	337	-0.013	0.987	-1.643	3.284
C2EZLMSU	Like Most sum z-score (unl)	337	-0.016	0.985	-1.969	3.014
C2EZLLS3	Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	337	-0.008	0.967	-1.238	3.486
C2EZLLSU	Like Least sum z-score (unl)	337	0.048	0.977	-1.664	2.961
C2EZAGGS	Aggressive sum z-score	337	0.041	0.966	-1.138	3.363
C2EZWDRS	Withdrawn sum z-score	337	0.001	0.949	-1.325	4.174
C2EZPROS	Prosocial sum z-score	337	-0.019	1.004	-1.525	3.756
C2EZHYPS	Hyperactive sum z-score	337	0.066	1.024	-1.490	3.330
C2EZVICS	Victim sum z-score	337	-0.001	0.958	-1.526	3.457
C2EZPRF3	Social Preference diff z-score (top 3)	337	-0.005	1.010	-2.820	2.623
C2EZSIM3	Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	337	-0.021	0.982	-1.944	3.267
C2EZPRFU	Social Preference diff z-score (unl)	337	-0.043	1.010	-2.724	2.346
C2EZSIMU	Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	337	0.027	0.996	-2.631	3.157
C2EGLLSU	Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	337	0.036	0.958	-1.759	3.103
C2EGLLS3	Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	337	-0.024	0.953	-1.737	2.747
C2EGLMSU	Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	337	-0.035	0.962	-2.361	2.387
C2EGLMS3	Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	337	-0.020	0.952	-1.840	2.482
C2EGAGGS	Aggressive z-score by sex	337	0.031	0.930	-1.464	3.175
C2EGHYPS	Hyperactive z-score by sex	337	0.058	0.979	-1.581	3.638
C2EGPROS	Prosocial z-score by sex	337	-0.056	0.939	-1.709	2.798
C2EGVICS	Victim z-score by sex	337	0.003	0.948	-1.740	2.780
C2EGWDRS	Withdrawal z-score by sex	337	0.008	0.932	-1.357	3.328
C2EGPRFU	Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	337	-0.050	1.008	-2.941	1.972
C2EGSIMU	Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	337	-0.005	1.008	-2.763	3.588
C2EGPRF3	Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	337	-0.000	1.012	-2.980	2.169
C2EGSIM3	Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	337	-0.044	0.977	-2.088	3.471
C2ERRGIV	Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	265	1.669	0.323	1.000	2.444
C2ERRREC	Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	332	1.688	0.368	1.000	3.000
C2ERRSTD	Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	331	0.712	0.180	0.000	1.000

Sociometrics Self-Report Items Control Sample Year 2

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C2ESR1	Self-Report 1: School fun?	115	0.887	0.318	0.000	1.000
C2ESR2	Self-Report 2: Nice things happen?	115	0.809	0.395	0.000	1.000
C2ESR3r	Reversed-Self-Report 3: Feel unhappy?	115	0.730	0.446	0.000	1.000
C2ESR4	Self-Report 4: Like your school?	115	0.939	0.240	0.000	1.000
C2ESR5	Self-Report 5: Kids to play with?	115	0.974	0.160	0.000	1.000
C2ESR6r	Reversed-Self-Report 6: Lonely at school?	115	0.887	0.318	0.000	1.000
C2ESR7r	Reversed-Self-Report 7: Hard to make friends?	115	0.530	0.501	0.000	1.000
C2ESR8	Self-Report 8: Kids like you?	115	0.922	0.270	0.000	1.000

Sociometrics Z-Score and Mean Roster Rating Items Control Sample Year 2

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C2EZLMS3	Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	143	-0.438	0.662	-1.419	3.026
C2EZLMSU	Like Most sum z-score (unl)	143	-0.470	0.769	-1.969	2.180
C2EZLLS3	Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	143	0.685	1.266	-1.150	3.883
C2EZLLSU	Like Least sum z-score (unl)	143	0.751	1.180	-1.168	3.672
C2EZAGGS	Aggressive sum z-score	143	0.800	1.296	-1.291	4.075
C2EZWDRS	Withdrawn sum z-score	143	-0.236	0.731	-1.325	2.768
C2EZPROS	Prosocial sum z-score	143	-0.440	0.672	-1.723	1.983
C2EZHYPS	Hyperactive sum z-score	143	0.818	1.335	-1.162	4.215
C2EZVICS	Victim sum z-score	143	0.183	1.166	-1.396	3.932
C2EZPRF3	Social Preference diff z-score (top 3)	143	-0.718	1.013	-2.861	2.218
C2EZSIM3	Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	143	0.213	1.069	-1.944	3.047
C2EZPRFU	Social Preference diff z-score (unl)	143	-0.749	1.006	-3.171	1.410
C2EZSIMU	Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	143	0.270	1.048	-2.273	3.157
C2EGLLSU	Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	143	0.549	1.092	-1.293	3.142
C2EGLLS3	Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	143	0.490	1.138	-1.737	3.133
C2EGLMSU	Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	143	-0.407	0.841	-2.067	1.914
C2EGLMS3	Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	143	-0.394	0.759	-1.620	2.327
C2EGAGGS	Aggressive z-score by sex	143	0.568	1.115	-1.423	3.474
C2EGHYPS	Hyperactive z-score by sex	143	0.632	1.191	-1.581	3.638
C2EGPROS	Prosocial z-score by sex	143	-0.353	0.750	-1.656	1.936
C2EGVICS	Victim z-score by sex	143	0.117	1.087	-2.000	3.009
C2EGWDRS	Withdrawal z-score by sex	143	-0.145	0.790	-1.502	2.475
C2EGPRFU	Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	143	-0.600	1.012	-2.894	1.810
C2EGSIMU	Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	143	0.143	1.038	-2.429	3.588
C2EGPRF3	Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	143	-0.578	0.986	-2.688	2.022
C2EGSIM3	Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	143	0.088	1.063	-2.234	3.471
C2ERRGIV	Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	116	1.665	0.320	1.000	2.381
C2ERRREC	Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	140	1.924	0.354	1.176	3.000
C2ERRSTD	Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	139	0.789	0.134	0.000	0.972

Sociometrics Scale Year 2

	Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Normative	SCM2SCS	School Satisfaction	264	5.420	0.756	3.000	8.000
Control	SCM2SCS	School Satisfaction	115	5.383	0.979	2.000	8.000

VII. Item Correlations

Sociometrics Self-Report Items Report Sample Year 2

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 321 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0								
	C2ESR1	C2ESR2	C2ESR3r	C2ESR4	C2ESR5	C2ESR6r	C2ESR7r	C2ESR8
C2ESR1 Self-Report 1: School fun?	1.000	0.238 0.000	0.288 0.000	0.457 0.000	0.170 0.002	0.141 0.011	0.145 0.009	0.040 0.471
C2ESR2 Self-Report 2: Nice things happen?	0.238 0.000	1.000	0.240 0.000	0.264 0.000	0.017 0.768	0.091 0.104	0.167 0.003	0.077 0.168
C2ESR3r Reversed-Self-Report 3: Feel unhappy?	0.288 0.000	0.240 0.000	1.000	0.250 0.000	0.220 0.000	0.224 0.000	0.185 0.001	0.102 0.068
C2ESR4 Self-Report 4: Like your school?	0.457 0.000	0.264 0.000	0.250 0.000	1.000	0.229 0.000	0.025 0.658	0.155 0.005	0.082 0.141
C2ESR5 Self-Report 5: Kids to play with?	0.170 0.002	0.017 0.768	0.220 0.000	0.229 0.000	1.000	0.191 0.001	0.154 0.006	0.075 0.180
C2ESR6r Reversed-Self-Report 6: Lonely at school?	0.141 0.011	0.091 0.104	0.224 0.000	0.025 0.658	0.191 0.001	1.000	0.164 0.003	0.075 0.181
C2ESR7r Reversed-Self-Report 7: Hard to make friends?	0.145 0.009	0.167 0.003	0.185 0.001	0.155 0.005	0.154 0.006	0.164 0.003	1.000	0.254 0.000
C2ESR8 Self-Report 8: Kids like you?	0.040 0.471	0.077 0.168	0.102 0.068	0.082 0.141	0.075 0.180	0.075 0.181	0.254 0.000	1.000

Sociometrics Z-Score and Mean Roster Rating Items Report Sample Year 2

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EZLMS3	C2EZLMSU	C2EZLLS3	C2EZLLSU	C2EZAGGS	C2EZWDRS	C2EZPROS
C2EZLMS3 Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	1.000 0.000	0.802 0.000	-0.366 0.000	-0.384 0.000	-0.138 0.013	0.186 0.001	0.683 0.000
C2EZLMSU Like Most sum z-score (unl)	0.802 0.000	1.000	-0.462 0.000	-0.499 0.000	-0.237 0.000	0.160 0.004	0.683 0.000
C2EZLLS3 Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	-0.366 0.000	-0.462 0.000	1.000	0.937 0.000	0.671 0.000	-0.141 0.011	-0.427 0.000
C2EZLLSU Like Least sum z-score (unl)	-0.384 0.000	-0.499 0.000	0.937 0.000	1.000	0.677 0.000	-0.144 0.009	-0.470 0.000
C2EZAGGS Aggressive sum z-score	-0.138 0.013	-0.237 0.000	0.671 0.000	0.677 0.000	1.000	-0.165 0.003	-0.326 0.000
C2EZWDRS Withdrawn sum z-score	0.186 0.001	0.160 0.004	-0.141 0.011	-0.144 0.009	-0.165 0.003	1.000	0.261 0.000
C2EZPROS Prosocial sum z-score	0.683 0.000	0.683 0.000	-0.427 0.000	-0.470 0.000	-0.326 0.000	0.261 0.000	1.000
C2EZHYPS Hyperactive sum z-score	-0.170 0.002	-0.307 0.000	0.643 0.000	0.658 0.000	0.731 0.000	-0.156 0.005	-0.348 0.000
C2EZVICS Victim sum z-score	0.065 0.246	0.062 0.270	0.254 0.000	0.265 0.000	0.287 0.000	0.066 0.236	0.083 0.134
C2EZPRF3 Social Preference diff z-score (TOP 3)	0.811 0.000	0.756 0.000	-0.841 0.000	-0.812 0.000	-0.503 0.000	0.197 0.000	0.666 0.000
C2EZSIM3 Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	0.517 0.000	0.262 0.000	0.607 0.000	0.535 0.000	0.498 0.000	0.028 0.613	0.190 0.001
C2EZPRFU Social Preference diff z-score (UNL)	0.678 0.000	0.855 0.000	-0.817 0.000	-0.875 0.000	-0.538 0.000	0.177 0.001	0.663 0.000
C2EZSIMU Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	0.369 0.000	0.443 0.000	0.525 0.000	0.554 0.000	0.471 0.000	0.001 0.981	0.165 0.003
C2EGLLSU Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	-0.394 0.000	-0.476 0.000	0.835 0.000	0.902 0.000	0.519 0.000	-0.121 0.030	-0.432 0.000
C2EGLLS3 Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.365 0.000	-0.442 0.000	0.899 0.000	0.839 0.000	0.511 0.000	-0.125 0.025	-0.377 0.000
C2EGLMSU Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	0.780 0.000	0.924 0.000	-0.430 0.000	-0.454 0.000	-0.144 0.010	0.138 0.013	0.619 0.000
C2EGLMS3 Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	0.940 0.000	0.737 0.000	-0.339 0.000	-0.351 0.000	-0.068 0.220	0.151 0.006	0.604 0.000
C2EGAGGS Aggressive z-score by sex	-0.138 0.013	-0.201 0.000	0.531 0.000	0.535 0.000	0.775 0.000	-0.100 0.074	-0.232 0.000
C2EGHYPS Hyperactive z-score by sex	-0.189 0.001	-0.302 0.000	0.542 0.000	0.566 0.000	0.525 0.000	-0.121 0.030	-0.311 0.000
C2EGPROS Prosocial z-score by sex	0.657 0.000	0.640 0.000	-0.378 0.000	-0.408 0.000	-0.203 0.000	0.182 0.001	0.906 0.000
C2EGVICS Victim z-score by sex	0.085 0.129	0.077 0.169	0.231 0.000	0.229 0.000	0.260 0.000	0.053 0.345	0.089 0.112
C2EGWDRS Withdrawal z-score by sex	0.154 0.005	0.110 0.048	-0.087 0.120	-0.085 0.127	-0.062 0.265	0.905 0.000	0.179 0.001
C2EGPRFU Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	0.674 0.000	0.801 0.000	-0.731 0.000	-0.782 0.000	-0.386 0.000	0.150 0.007	0.604 0.000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EZLMS3	C2EZLMSU	C2EZLLS3	C2EZLLSU	C2EZAGGS	C2EZWDRS	C2EZPROS
C2EGSIMU Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	0.370 0.000	0.435 0.000	0.427 0.000	0.469 0.000	0.385 0.000	0.014 0.803	0.175 0.002
C2EGPRF3 Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	0.777 0.000	0.705 0.000	-0.752 0.000	-0.722 0.000	-0.355 0.000	0.166 0.003	0.587 0.000
C2EGSIM3 Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	0.491 0.000	0.245 0.000	0.525 0.000	0.460 0.000	0.404 0.000	0.019 0.739	0.188 0.001
C2ERRGIV Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	0.044 0.427	0.004 0.937	0.021 0.704	0.033 0.552	-0.028 0.619	0.040 0.469	0.054 0.329
C2ERRREC Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	-0.506 0.000	-0.643 0.000	0.701 0.000	0.709 0.000	0.490 0.000	-0.186 0.001	-0.530 0.000
C2ERRSTD Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	-0.396 0.000	-0.420 0.000	0.355 0.000	0.404 0.000	0.299 0.000	-0.186 0.001	-0.457 0.000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0								
	C2EZHYPS	C2EZVICS	C2EZPRF3	C2EZSIM3	C2EZPRFU	C2EZSIMU	C2EGLLSU	C2EGLLS3
C2EZLMS3 Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	-0.170 0.002	0.065 0.246	0.811 0.000	0.517 0.000	0.678 0.000	0.369 0.000	-0.394 0.000	-0.365 0.000
C2EZLMSU Like Most sum z-score (unl)	-0.307 0.000	0.062 0.270	0.756 0.000	0.262 0.000	0.855 0.000	0.443 0.000	-0.476 0.000	-0.442 0.000
C2EZLLS3 Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	0.643 0.000	0.254 0.000	-0.841 0.000	0.607 0.000	-0.817 0.000	0.525 0.000	0.835 0.000	0.899 0.000
C2EZLLSU Like Least sum z-score (unl)	0.658 0.000	0.265 0.000	-0.812 0.000	0.535 0.000	-0.875 0.000	0.554 0.000	0.902 0.000	0.839 0.000
C2EZAGGS Aggressive sum z-score	0.731 0.000	0.287 0.000	-0.503 0.000	0.498 0.000	-0.538 0.000	0.471 0.000	0.519 0.000	0.511 0.000
C2EZWDRS Withdrawn sum z-score	-0.156 0.005	0.066 0.236	0.197 0.000	0.028 0.613	0.177 0.001	0.001 0.981	-0.121 0.030	-0.125 0.025
C2EZPROS Prosocial sum z-score	-0.348 0.000	0.083 0.134	0.666 0.000	0.190 0.001	0.663 0.000	0.165 0.003	-0.432 0.000	-0.377 0.000
C2EZHYPS Hyperactive sum z-score	1.000	0.266 0.000	-0.504 0.000	0.445 0.000	-0.565 0.000	0.386 0.000	0.513 0.000	0.495 0.000
C2EZVICS Victim sum z-score	0.266 0.000	1.000	-0.120 0.032	0.295 0.000	-0.120 0.031	0.340 0.000	0.222 0.000	0.216 0.000
C2EZPRF3 Social Preference diff z-score (TOP 3)	-0.504 0.000	-0.120 0.032	1.000	-0.081 0.144	0.908 0.000	-0.115 0.039	-0.753 0.000	-0.776 0.000
C2EZSIM3 Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	0.445 0.000	0.295 0.000	-0.081 0.144	1.000	-0.172 0.002	0.801 0.000	0.433 0.000	0.515 0.000
C2EZPRFU Social Preference diff z-score (unl)	-0.565 0.000	-0.120 0.031	0.908 0.000	-0.172 0.002	1.000	-0.084 0.133	-0.803 0.000	-0.747 0.000
C2EZSIMU Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	0.386 0.000	0.340 0.000	-0.115 0.039	0.801 0.000	-0.084 0.133	1.000	0.474 0.000	0.441 0.000
C2EGLLSU Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	0.513 0.000	0.222 0.000	-0.753 0.000	0.433 0.000	-0.803 0.000	0.474 0.000	1.000	0.920 0.000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0								
	C2EZHYPS	C2EZVICS	C2EZPRF3	C2EZSIM3	C2EZPRFU	C2EZSIMU	C2EGLLSU	C2EGLLS3
C2EGLLS3 Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	0.495 0.000	0.216 0.000	-0.776 0.000	0.515 0.000	-0.747 0.000	0.441 0.000	0.920 0.000	1.000
C2EGLMSU Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	-0.233 0.000	0.058 0.295	0.723 0.000	0.271 0.000	0.784 0.000	0.413 0.000	-0.509 0.000	-0.477 0.000
C2EGLMS3 Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.127 0.022	0.050 0.373	0.759 0.000	0.489 0.000	0.621 0.000	0.340 0.000	-0.402 0.000	-0.378 0.000
C2EGAGGS Aggressive z-score by sex	0.517 0.000	0.258 0.000	-0.414 0.000	0.368 0.000	-0.433 0.000	0.354 0.000	0.553 0.000	0.535 0.000
C2EGHYPS Hyperactive z-score by sex	0.848 0.000	0.265 0.000	-0.451 0.000	0.336 0.000	-0.506 0.000	0.293 0.000	0.571 0.000	0.547 0.000
C2EGPROS Prosocial z-score by sex	-0.245 0.000	0.087 0.119	0.619 0.000	0.213 0.000	0.601 0.000	0.188 0.001	-0.451 0.000	-0.404 0.000
C2EGVICS Victim z-score by sex	0.251 0.000	0.944 0.000	-0.095 0.089	0.289 0.000	-0.092 0.099	0.317 0.000	0.203 0.000	0.207 0.000
C2EGWDRS Withdrawal z-score by sex	-0.049 0.382	0.047 0.398	0.144 0.009	0.050 0.369	0.113 0.042	0.012 0.828	-0.121 0.030	-0.120 0.031
C2EGPRFU Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	-0.431 0.000	-0.092 0.098	0.850 0.000	-0.097 0.082	0.913 0.000	-0.041 0.468	-0.872 0.000	-0.808 0.000
C2EGSIMU Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	0.292 0.000	0.296 0.000	-0.053 0.346	0.712 0.000	-0.038 0.492	0.902 0.000	0.513 0.000	0.465 0.000
C2EGPRF3 Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.381 0.000	-0.102 0.068	0.924 0.000	-0.029 0.606	0.825 0.000	-0.071 0.202	-0.803 0.000	-0.838 0.000
C2EGSIM3 Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	0.341 0.000	0.251 0.000	-0.044 0.430	0.902 0.000	-0.137 0.014	0.708 0.000	0.490 0.000	0.583 0.000
C2ERRGIV Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	-0.049 0.379	0.040 0.473	0.015 0.787	0.061 0.277	-0.013 0.810	0.041 0.465	0.046 0.412	0.046 0.412
C2ERRREC Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	0.519 0.000	0.103 0.063	-0.736 0.000	0.211 0.000	-0.784 0.000	0.111 0.046	0.644 0.000	0.628 0.000
C2ERRSTD Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	0.255 0.000	0.111 0.046	-0.452 0.000	-0.007 0.903	-0.474 0.000	0.016 0.777	0.365 0.000	0.317 0.000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EGLMSU	C2EGLMS3	C2EGAGGS	C2EGHYPS	C2EGPROS	C2EGVICS	C2EGWDRS
C2EZLMS3 Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	0.780 0.000	0.940 0.000	-0.138 0.013	-0.189 0.001	0.657 0.000	0.085 0.129	0.154 0.005
C2EZLMSU Like Most sum z-score (unl)	0.924 0.000	0.737 0.000	-0.201 0.000	-0.302 0.000	0.640 0.000	0.077 0.169	0.110 0.048
C2EZLLS3 Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	-0.430 0.000	-0.339 0.000	0.531 0.000	0.542 0.000	-0.378 0.000	0.231 0.000	-0.087 0.120
C2EZLLSU Like Least sum z-score (unl)	-0.454 0.000	-0.351 0.000	0.535 0.000	0.566 0.000	-0.408 0.000	0.229 0.000	-0.085 0.127
C2EZAGGS Aggressive sum z-score	-0.144 0.010	-0.068 0.220	0.775 0.000	0.525 0.000	-0.203 0.000	0.260 0.000	-0.062 0.265
C2EZWDRS Withdrawn sum z-score	0.138 0.013	0.151 0.006	-0.100 0.074	-0.121 0.030	0.182 0.001	0.053 0.345	0.905 0.000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EGLMSU	C2EGLMS3	C2EGAGGS	C2EGHYPS	C2EGPROS	C2EGVICS	C2EGWDRS
C2EZPROS Prosocial sum z-score	0.619 0.000	0.604 0.000	-0.232 0.000	-0.311 0.000	0.906 0.000	0.089 0.112	0.179 0.001
C2EZHYPS Hyperactive sum z-score	-0.233 0.000	-0.127 0.022	0.517 0.000	0.848 0.000	-0.245 0.000	0.251 0.000	-0.049 0.382
C2EZVICS Victim sum z-score	0.058 0.295	0.050 0.373	0.258 0.000	0.265 0.000	0.087 0.119	0.944 0.000	0.047 0.398
C2EZPRF3 Social Preference diff z-score (TOP 3)	0.723 0.000	0.759 0.000	-0.414 0.000	-0.451 0.000	0.619 0.000	-0.095 0.089	0.144 0.009
C2EZSIM3 Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	0.271 0.000	0.489 0.000	0.368 0.000	0.336 0.000	0.213 0.000	0.289 0.000	0.050 0.369
C2EZPRFU Social Preference diff z-score (unl)	0.784 0.000	0.621 0.000	-0.433 0.000	-0.506 0.000	0.601 0.000	-0.092 0.099	0.113 0.042
C2EZSIMU Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	0.413 0.000	0.340 0.000	0.354 0.000	0.293 0.000	0.188 0.001	0.317 0.000	0.012 0.828
C2EGLLSU Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	-0.509 0.000	-0.402 0.000	0.553 0.000	0.571 0.000	-0.451 0.000	0.203 0.000	-0.121 0.030
C2EGLLS3 Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.477 0.000	-0.378 0.000	0.535 0.000	0.547 0.000	-0.404 0.000	0.207 0.000	-0.120 0.031
C2EGLMSU Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	1.000	0.808 0.000	-0.204 0.000	-0.298 0.000	0.670 0.000	0.072 0.195	0.134 0.016
C2EGLMS3 Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	0.808 0.000	1.000	-0.115 0.039	-0.190 0.001	0.649 0.000	0.081 0.146	0.152 0.006
C2EGAGGS Aggressive z-score by sex	-0.204 0.000	-0.115 0.039	1.000	0.542 0.000	-0.236 0.000	0.270 0.000	-0.093 0.097
C2EGHYPS Hyperactive z-score by sex	-0.298 0.000	-0.190 0.001	0.542 0.000	1.000	-0.297 0.000	0.270 0.000	-0.099 0.076
C2EGPROS Prosocial z-score by sex	0.670 0.000	0.649 0.000	-0.236 0.000	-0.297 0.000	1.000	0.088 0.115	0.172 0.002
C2EGVICS Victim z-score by sex	0.072 0.195	0.081 0.146	0.270 0.000	0.270 0.000	0.088 0.115	1.000	0.047 0.402
C2EGWDRS Withdrawal z-score by sex	0.134 0.016	0.152 0.006	-0.093 0.097	-0.099 0.076	0.172 0.002	0.047 0.402	1.000
C2EGPRFU Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	0.864 0.000	0.695 0.000	-0.441 0.000	-0.502 0.000	0.645 0.000	-0.074 0.182	0.148 0.008
C2EGSIMU Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	0.473 0.000	0.389 0.000	0.351 0.000	0.281 0.000	0.205 0.000	0.289 0.000	0.006 0.915
C2EGPRF3 Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	0.770 0.000	0.822 0.000	-0.397 0.000	-0.449 0.000	0.631 0.000	-0.079 0.159	0.164 0.003
C2EGSIM3 Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	0.274 0.000	0.530 0.000	0.384 0.000	0.333 0.000	0.200 0.000	0.270 0.000	0.021 0.708
C2ERRGIV Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	-0.007 0.902	0.017 0.767	-0.045 0.420	-0.015 0.784	0.004 0.943	0.042 0.457	0.009 0.875

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EGLMSU	C2EGLMS3	C2EGAGGS	C2EGHYPS	C2EGPROS	C2EGVICS	C2EGWDRS
C2ERRREC Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	-0.562 0.000	-0.449 0.000	0.446 0.000	0.479 0.000	-0.451 0.000	0.086 0.124	-0.138 0.013
C2ERRSTD Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	-0.327 0.000	-0.322 0.000	0.278 0.000	0.255 0.000	-0.372 0.000	0.064 0.251	-0.150 0.007

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EGPRFU	C2EGSIMU	C2EGPRF3	C2EGSIM3	C2ERRGIV	C2ERRREC	C2ERRSTD
C2EZLMS3 Like 3 Most sum z-score (top 3)	0.674 0.000	0.370 0.000	0.777 0.000	0.491 0.000	0.044 0.427	-0.506 0.000	-0.396 0.000
C2EZLMSU Like Most sum z-score (unl)	0.801 0.000	0.435 0.000	0.705 0.000	0.245 0.000	0.004 0.937	-0.643 0.000	-0.420 0.000
C2EZLLS3 Like 3 Least sum z-score (top 3)	-0.731 0.000	0.427 0.000	-0.752 0.000	0.525 0.000	0.021 0.704	0.701 0.000	0.355 0.000
C2EZLLSU Like Least sum z-score (unl)	-0.782 0.000	0.469 0.000	-0.722 0.000	0.460 0.000	0.033 0.552	0.709 0.000	0.404 0.000
C2EZAGGS Aggressive sum z-score	-0.386 0.000	0.385 0.000	-0.355 0.000	0.404 0.000	-0.028 0.619	0.490 0.000	0.299 0.000
C2EZWDRS Withdrawn sum z-score	0.150 0.007	0.014 0.803	0.166 0.003	0.019 0.739	0.040 0.469	-0.186 0.001	-0.186 0.001
C2EZPROS Prosocial sum z-score	0.604 0.000	0.175 0.002	0.587 0.000	0.188 0.001	0.054 0.329	-0.530 0.000	-0.457 0.000
C2EZHYPS Hyperactive sum z-score	-0.431 0.000	0.292 0.000	-0.381 0.000	0.341 0.000	-0.049 0.379	0.519 0.000	0.255 0.000
C2EZVICS Victim sum z-score	-0.092 0.098	0.296 0.000	-0.102 0.068	0.251 0.000	0.040 0.473	0.103 0.063	0.111 0.046
C2EZPRF3 Social Preference diff z-score (TOP 3)	0.850 0.000	-0.053 0.346	0.924 0.000	-0.044 0.430	0.015 0.787	-0.736 0.000	-0.452 0.000
C2EZSIM3 Social Impact diff z-score (top 3)	-0.097 0.082	0.712 0.000	-0.029 0.606	0.902 0.000	0.061 0.277	0.211 0.000	-0.007 0.903
C2EZPRFU Social Preference diff z-score (unl)	0.913 0.000	-0.038 0.492	0.825 0.000	-0.137 0.014	-0.013 0.810	-0.784 0.000	-0.474 0.000
C2EZSIMU Social Impact diff z-score (unl)	-0.041 0.468	0.902 0.000	-0.071 0.202	0.708 0.000	0.041 0.465	0.111 0.046	0.016 0.777
C2EGLLSU Like-least (unl) z-score by sex	-0.872 0.000	0.513 0.000	-0.803 0.000	0.490 0.000	0.046 0.412	0.644 0.000	0.365 0.000
C2EGLLS3 Like-least (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.808 0.000	0.465 0.000	-0.838 0.000	0.583 0.000	0.046 0.412	0.628 0.000	0.317 0.000
C2EGLMSU Like-most (unl) z-score by sex	0.864 0.000	0.473 0.000	0.770 0.000	0.274 0.000	-0.007 0.902	-0.562 0.000	-0.327 0.000
C2EGLMS3 Like-most (top 3) z-score by sex	0.695 0.000	0.389 0.000	0.822 0.000	0.530 0.000	0.017 0.767	-0.449 0.000	-0.322 0.000
C2EGAGGS Aggressive z-score by sex	-0.441 0.000	0.351 0.000	-0.397 0.000	0.384 0.000	-0.045 0.420	0.446 0.000	0.278 0.000
C2EGHYPS Hyperactive z-score by sex	-0.502 0.000	0.281 0.000	-0.449 0.000	0.333 0.000	-0.015 0.784	0.479 0.000	0.255 0.000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 323 Prob > r under H0: Rho=0							
	C2EGPRFU	C2EGSIMU	C2EGPRF3	C2EGSIM3	C2ERRGIV	C2ERRREC	C2ERRSTD
C2EGPROS Prosocial z-score by sex	0.645 0.000	0.205 0.000	0.631 0.000	0.200 0.000	0.004 0.943	-0.451 0.000	-0.372 0.000
C2EGVICS Victim z-score by sex	-0.074 0.182	0.289 0.000	-0.079 0.159	0.270 0.000	0.042 0.457	0.086 0.124	0.064 0.251
C2EGWDRS Withdrawal z-score by sex	0.148 0.008	0.006 0.915	0.164 0.003	0.021 0.708	0.009 0.875	-0.138 0.013	-0.150 0.007
C2EGPRFU Social pref (unl) z-score by sex	1.000	-0.030 0.587	0.907 0.000	-0.129 0.020	-0.025 0.655	-0.698 0.000	-0.395 0.000
C2EGSIMU Social impact (unl) z-score by sex	-0.030 0.587	1.000	-0.056 0.315	0.772 0.000	0.042 0.449	0.090 0.105	0.047 0.396
C2EGPRF3 Social pref (top 3) z-score by sex	0.907 0.000	-0.056 0.315	1.000	-0.046 0.409	-0.015 0.787	-0.653 0.000	-0.381 0.000
C2EGSIM3 Social impact (top 3) z-score by sex	-0.129 0.020	0.772 0.000	-0.046 0.409	1.000	0.061 0.272	0.179 0.001	0.013 0.812
C2ERRGIV Mean Roster Rtg Given by respondent	-0.025 0.655	0.042 0.449	-0.015 0.787	0.061 0.272	1.000	0.054 0.336	0.040 0.478
C2ERRREC Mean Roster Rtg Received by respondent	-0.698 0.000	0.090 0.105	-0.653 0.000	0.179 0.001	0.054 0.336	1.000	0.580 0.000
C2ERRSTD Std Dev of mean Roster Rtg Received	-0.395 0.000	0.047 0.396	-0.381 0.000	0.013 0.812	0.040 0.478	0.580 0.000	1.000