

Things That Happen to Me
Grade2/Year 3
Fast Track project Technical Report
Ernie Valente
January 18, 1995

Table of Contents

- I. Scale Description
- II. Subscale Sum Scores and Combined Scores
- III. Reliability and Validity
- IV. Conclusions

Appendix

- Table A. Subscale Reliability Coefficients
- Table B. Subscale Means
- Table C. Subscale Scores Correlations
- Table D. Things That Happen To Me Subscale Scores Correlations with SHP Subscale Scores

Citation

Instrument

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPPRG). (1995). Things That Happen to Me. Available from the Fast Track Project Web site, <http://www.fasttrackproject.org>

Report

Valente, E. (1995). Things That Happen to Me (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.

I. Scale Description

The *Things That Happen to Me* scale was administered by the child interviewer to cohort 1 study children in the summer of their third year of participation in the study (summer, 1993), which is after grade 2 for most children. During administration of the Things That Happen to Me, the interviewer reads eight social situations in which the respondent is asked to imagine himself as a principal actor. In the eight situations, other children are obstructing a goal desired by the respondent. For example:

James/Jean was playing a Nintendo game on his/her TV when you walked in. You ask if you can play, too. James/Jean says "No."

The interviewer reads one situation, then asks the respondent to answer two sets of questions about how effective assertive and aggressive responses would be in that situation. Three questions ask the respondent to answer yes or no to whether he thinks an **assertive** or **aggressive** response would be effective at attaining: 1) the desired (**instrumental**) goal, 2) **friendship** with the obstructive children, and 3) general social acceptance (**liking**).

An example of the assertive response questions:

- A Let's say you said to James/Jean "How about if we both play?"
1. Would James/Jean let you play?
 2. Would James/Jean still want to be your friend?
 3. Would other kids like you if you did that?

An example of the aggressive response questions:

- B Let's say you grabbed the Nintendo controls away from James/Jean and said "You can't stop me from playing."
1. Would James/Jean let you play?
 2. Would James/Jean still want to be your friend?
 3. Would other kids like you if you did that?

A final question asks whether the respondent feels the desired goal or social acceptance is the more important goal:

- C. What's more important to you...
1. = to play the game?
 - or-
 2. = to have the other kids like you?

The interviewer asks a similar set of seven questions after each of the eight social situations.

In summary, the Things That Happen to Me includes eight presentations of seven questions (like A, B, and C above), a total of 56 items. Forty-eight of the items are **response** questions concerning three goal types (instrumental, friendship, liking) and two response types (assertive, aggressive). Crossing the goal- and response-type dimensions yields six conceptual categories (see Table 1). The scale also includes eight **relationship goal** questions (instrumental or social).

II. Subscale Sum and Combined Scores

The Things That Happen To Me scale has three types of combined scores. The first (type 1) are sum scores that result from the addition of individual items from the scale. The second (type 2) are sum scores that result from the addition of two or more type 1 scores. Type 3 scores result from the subtraction of type 1 scores.

Six type 1 subscale sum scores follow directly from the conceptual organization of the Things That Happen to Me scale. We calculated these scores by giving respondents one point for every yes response to the eight questions within each of the six conceptual categories. Missing values were considered "No" responses (no individual item had more than three missing values at any site). We then computed six sum scores, with possible ranges from zero to eight. Scale names and descriptions are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Things That Happen to Me Type 1 (Item Sum) Scale Names and Descriptions*

<u>Sum Score Names</u>	<u>What Scores Indicate</u>
Assertive Instrumental Aggressive Instrumental	Belief that assertive or aggressive responses are effective in attaining instrumental goals
Assertive Friendship Aggressive Friendship	Belief that assertive or aggressive responses are effective in promoting friendships
Assertive Liking Aggressive Liking	Belief that assertive or aggressive responses are effective in promoting general social acceptance (liking)

In addition to the six scores, we computed scores that result from the addition or subtraction of two or more of the type 1 scores (see Table 2). For example, we summed the three type 1 assertive scores to develop an index of belief that assertive responses are effective for any goal type. Similarly, we calculated difference scores as indices of the relative preference of one response type over another for each of the goal types. For example, we subtract the Aggressive Instrumental score from the Assertive Instrumental score to calculate the Nonaggressive Instrumental Endorsement score. This score indicates the respondent's preference for assertive responses over aggressive responses as a strategy for attaining instrumental goals. Ranges for these scores, which differ depending on their composition, are shown in Table 2. A positive score indicates preference for assertive (and therefore nonaggressive) responses while a negative score indicates preference for aggressive responses.

Table 2. *Things That Happen to Me* Subscale Composition

Type 1: Conceptual Category Item-Sum Scores (Range 0-8)

A1. Assertive Instrumental	B1. Aggressive Instrumental
A2. Assertive Friendship	B2. Aggressive Friendship
A3. Assertive Liking	B3. Aggressive Liking

Type 2: Scores Resulting From the Addition of Type 1 Scores

<u>Score Name</u>	<u>How Composed</u>	<u>Range</u>
S1. Assertive Endorsement	= (A1 + A2 + A3)	0 - 24
S2. Aggressive Endorsement	= (B1 + B2 + B3)	0 - 24
S3. Instrumental Self-Efficacy	= (A1 + B1)	0 - 16
S4. Friendship Confidence	= (A2 + B2)	0 - 16
S5. Liking Confidence	= (A3 + B3)	0 - 16
S6. Goal Optimism Score	= (A1 + A2 + A3) - (B1 + B2 + B3)	0 - 48

Type 3: Scores Resulting From the Subtraction of Type 1 Scores

<u>Score Name</u>	<u>How Composed</u>	<u>Range</u>
D1. Nonaggr. Instrumental Endorsement	= (A1 - B1)	-8 - 8
D2. Nonaggr. Friendship Endorsement	= (A2 - B2)	-8 - 8
D3. Nonaggr. Liking Endorsement	= (A3 - B3)	-8 - 8
D4. Endorsement of Nonaggression	= (A1 + A2 + A3) - (B1 + B2 + B3)	-24 - 24

Names and descriptions of the Things That Happen To Me type 2 and 3 score are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Things That Happen To Me *Type 2 (Additive) and Type 3 (Subtractive) Score Names and Descriptions*

<u>Additive Score Names</u>	<u>What Scores Indicate</u>
Assertive Endorsement Aggressive Endorsement	Belief that either assertive or aggressive responses are better for all goal types
Instrumental Self-Efficacy Friendship Confidence Liking Confidence	Belief that specific goal will be attained regardless of response type used
Goal Optimism	Belief that any goal will be attained regardless of response type used
 <u>Subtractive Score Names</u>	
Nonaggressive Instrumental Endorsement Nonaggressive Friendship Endorsement Nonaggressive Liking Endorsement	Relative preference for either assertive or aggressive responses within goal type
Endorsement of Nonaggression	Relative preference for either assertive or aggressive responses for all goal types

We calculated one other score to indicate the respondents' judgment of the relative importance of instrumental versus social acceptance goals: The Relationship Goals Instrumental/Social score. One point was added to this score every time the respondent chose the social acceptance goal as more important, and one point was subtracted for every instrumental goal choice. Missing values did not affect the score either way. This score has a possible range of -8 to 8; positive scores indicate belief in the importance of social acceptance goals, while negative scores indicate belief in the importance of instrumental goals.

III. Reliability and Validity

We analyzed the data from 355 complete summer, 1993 Things That Happen To Me s from the children in the cohort 1 normative sample to assess the reliability and validity of the Things That Happen To Me Tables showing the results of these analyses in Tables A, B, C, and D in the Appendix.

Appendix Table A shows reliability coefficients for all Things That Happen To Me scales. Inter-item reliability coefficients (KR-20) for the six Things That Happen To Me type 1 scales were moderate, ranging from .65 - .82. These results indicate that the Things That Happen To Me type 1 scales are reasonably reliable; especially considering each scale comprises only eight items.

Reliability coefficients were calculated for the combined (type 2 and type 3) scales by computing KR-20 for the items from their component type 1 scales. These coefficients, ranging from .74 - .90, are higher than those of the type 1 scales. This is likely due to the fact the combined scales include more items.

Appendix Table B shows the simple statistics for the Things That Happen To Me subscale scores. Means of subscale scores for the normative sample show that the scores tend toward the assertive end of the scale (and away from the aggressive end). All but two means are within one standard deviation of the scale midpoint (The Nonaggressive Liking Endorsement and Nonaggressive Friendship Endorsement Scores did not meet this condition). No score mean is within one standard deviation of a scale endpoint. Taken together, these results suggest that restriction of range is not a problem in the Things That Happen To Me. All subscale score standard deviations are greater than one but less than scale midpoints, indicating that the scale allows variability among the respondents, but not so much variability as to invalidate statistical comparison among subgroups.

We analyzed the construct validity of the Things That Happen To Me scale using 355 cohort 1 normative sample observations. First, we intercorrelated all score types to gain information about convergent and discriminant validity. We then correlated subscale scores of all types with spring, 1993 SHP scores to assess concurrent criterion validity. The results of these analyses are shown in Tables C and D in the Appendix.

Correlations among Things That Happen To Me type 1 subscales fell into three tiers of magnitude corresponding to their degree of conceptual relatedness. The highest correlations, .49 - .64, were among subscales with similar response types (assertive or aggressive) but different goals (instrumental, friendship, social acceptance). Correlations among subscales concerning similar goals but different response types were next highest, .29 - .46. Scales with neither response type nor goal type in common had the lowest intercorrelations, .14 - .30.

This pattern of correlations provides evidence for the convergent validity of the Things That Happen To Me subscales, because conceptually related scales are more highly correlated than unrelated ones measured in the same way. The fact that the correlations for similarly measured but conceptually unrelated subscales are much lower than the scale reliabilities provides some evidence for discriminant validity.¹

As one might expect on the pattern of intercorrelations of the type 1 scores, type 2 (summative) scores are highly, positively intercorrelated, as are type 3 (difference) scores. Nonaggressive Endorsement scores are highly intercorrelated, and strongly, negatively correlated with The Aggressive Endorsement score. Correlations between type 1 scores and type 2 and 3 scores were calculated (see Appendix Table C) but are not interpreted, because they are linearly related.

Correlations between Summer, 1993 Things That Happen To Me type 2 and 3 subscales and spring, 1993 SHP scores showed evidence for construct validity. The most relevant finding is that the correlations between the mean total SHP score and the assertive and nonaggressive endorsement scores are small and negative (-.15 to -.23). This indicates that children who were scored as less disruptive by teachers on the Spring, 1993 SHP tended to choose nonaggressive responses over aggressive ones on the Things That Happen to Me.

¹ These correlations are similar to heterotrait-monomethod correlations of a multitrait-multimethod matrix. While evidence for divergent validity is reduced without heterotrait-heteromethod values for comparison, Campbell and Fiske (1959) do indicate that if heterotrait-monomethod correlations are larger than the corresponding scale reliabilities, the scales have inadequate discriminant validity (p. 84). The Things That Happen to Me scale heterotrait correlations are smaller than their corresponding scale reliabilities, so they are not invalid by this criterion.

IV. Conclusions

This analysis of the summer, 1993 Things That Happen to Me data for cohort 1 normative children provides evidence for the reliability and validity of the Things That Happen To Me. It therefore seems that the Things That Happen to Me is a valuable source of data on the project. In sum, Things That Happen To Me type 2 and 3 scores show whether the respondent believes that assertive responses are more effective in achieving various social goals than aggressive responses. Things That Happen to Me type 1 (simple) scores are not as useful as the composite type 2 and 3 scores.

Please note that items concerning assertive responses are modestly (less than .50) but positively correlated with those of aggressive responses, even when the goal types differ. This indicates that children who believe assertive goals are effective also tend to believe that aggressive goals are effective. It is probably best to focus on the relative preference for assertive responses as indicated by the assertive-aggressive difference scores (type 3 scores). The negative correlations between the type 3 assertive-aggressive scores and the type 2 aggressive scores provide further evidence for the appropriateness of the difference scores. However, please keep the following in mind when analyzing Things That Happen To Me type 2 and type 3 scores:

- (1) The belief that any response will be effective influences the possible magnitude of the assertive and aggressive additive (type 2) scores. The Goal Optimism score can be used to correct for this effect in statistical models.
- (2) A large assertive-aggressive difference (type 3) score indicates a relative preference for assertive responses over aggressive responses. This does not necessarily indicate a belief that aggressive responses are ineffective. That is, assertive responses tend to occur with rather than replace aggressive responses.

Reference

Campbell, D.T & Fiske, D.W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81-105.

Table A. Reliability Coefficients for Things That Happen to Me Subscales

Type 1 Scores	
Assertive Instrumental	.646
Assertive Friendship	.706
Assertive Liking	.736
Aggressive Instrumental	.737
Aggressive Friendship	.790
Aggressive Liking	.816
Type 2 Scores	
Assertive Endorsement	.854
Aggressive Endorsement	.891
Instrumental Self-Efficacy	.744
Friendship Confidence	.816
Liking Confidence	.818
Type 3 Scores	
Nonaggressive Instrumental Endorsement	.744
Nonaggressive Friendship Endorsement	.816
Nonaggressive Liking Endorsement	.818
Endorsement of Nonaggression/Goal Optimism	.900
Other Score	
Relationship Goals Instrumental/Social	.894

NOTE; Coefficients for type 2 and 3 scores are based on the items from the type 1 scales of which they are composed.

Table B. Things That Happen To Me Subscale Means (Normative Children only)

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum
C3FASIN	355	4.816901	1.887439	1710
C3FASFR	355	5.360563	1.904387	1903
C3FASLK	355	5.969014	1.997639	2119
C3FAGIN	355	2.802817	2.169510	0995
C3FAGFR	355	2.053521	2.103255	0729
C3FAGLK	355	2.205634	2.350615	0783
C3FRELG	355	13.969014	2.631115	4959
C3FAGOAL	355	3.980282	5.247238	1413
C3FASEND	355	16.146479	4.905429	5732
C3FAGEND	355	7.061972	5.614911	2507
C3FISE	355	7.619718	3.264110	2705
C3FFRCON	355	7.414085	3.428087	2632
C3FLKCON	355	8.174648	3.589522	2902
C3FNAGIE	355	2.014085	2.425692	0715
C3FNAGFE	355	3.307042	2.085416	1174
C3FNAGLE	355	3.763380	2.479363	1336
C3FENDNA	353	9.093484	5.966268	3210
C3FGOPT	353	23.274788	8.680298	8216

Variable	Min	Max	Variable Label
C3FASIN	0	8	Assertive Instrumental Sum Score
C3FASFR	1	8	Assertive Friendship Sum Score
C3FASLK	0	8	Assertive Liking Sum Score
C3FAGIN	0	8	Aggressive Instrumental Sum Score
C3FAGFR	0	8	Aggressive Friendship Sum Score
C3FAGLK	0	8	Aggressive Liking Sum Score
C3FRELG	8	16	Relationship Goals Sum Score
C3FAGOAL	-8	8	Relationship Goals Instrumental/Social Sum Score
C3FASEND	2	24	Assertive Endorsement Sum Score
C3FAGEND	0	24	Aggressive Endorsement Sum Score
C3FISE	0	16	Instrumental Self-Efficacy Sum Score
C3FFRCON	1	16	Friendship Confidence Sum Score
C3FLKCON	0	16	Liking Confidence Sum Score
C3FNAGIE	-5	8	Nonaggressive Instrumental Endorsement Sum Score
C3FNAGFE	-2	8	Nonaggressive Friendship Endorsement Sum Score
C3FNAGLE	-2	8	Nonaggressive Liking Endorsement Sum Score
C3FENDNA	-7	22	Endorsement of Nonaggressive Sum Score
C3FGOPT	2	48	Goal Optimism Sum Score

Table C. Things That Happen To Me Subscale Correlations (Normative Children only N=355)

	C3FASIN	C3FASFR	C3FASLK	C3FAGIN	C3FAGFR	C3FAGLK	C3FRELG	C3FAGOAL	C3FASEND	C3FAGEND	C3FISE	C3FFRCON	C3FLKCON	C3FNAGIE	C3FNAGFE	C3FNAGLE	C3FENDNA	C3FGOPT
C3FASIN Assertive Instrumental	1.000 0.000	0.639 0.0001	0.530 0.0001	0.291 0.0001	0.299 0.0001	0.138 0.0094	0.103 0.0526	0.100 0.0605	0.849 0.0001	0.282 0.0001	0.772 0.0001	0.538 0.0001	0.385 0.0001	0.518 0.0001	0.283 0.0001	0.297 0.0001	0.433 0.0001	0.660 0.0001
C3FASFR Assertive Friendship	0.639 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.564 0.0001	0.166 0.0017	0.462 0.0001	0.161 0.0023	0.193 0.0003	0.189 0.0003	0.864 0.0001	0.305 0.0001	0.480 0.0001	0.890 0.0001	0.419 0.0001	0.349 0.0001	0.447 0.0001	0.301 0.0001	0.424 0.0001	0.683 0.0001
C3FASLK Assertive Liking	0.530 0.0001	0.564 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.209 0.0001	0.290 0.0001	0.359 0.0001	0.191 0.0003	0.185 0.0005	0.830 0.0001	0.339 0.0001	0.446 0.0001	0.491 0.0001	0.791 0.0001	0.226 0.0001	0.223 0.0001	0.466 0.0001	0.364 0.0001	0.684 0.0001
C3FAGIN Aggressive Instrumental	0.291 0.0001	0.166 0.0017	0.209 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.478 0.0001	0.623 0.0001	-0.209 0.0001	-0.215 0.0001	0.262 0.0001	0.827 0.0001	0.833 0.0001	0.386 0.0001	0.525 0.0001	-0.668 0.0001	-0.331 0.0001	-0.423 0.0001	-0.564 0.0001	0.681 0.0001
C3FAGFR Aggressive Friendship	0.299 0.0001	0.462 0.0001	0.290 0.0001	0.478 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.622 0.0001	-0.165 0.0018	-0.171 0.0012	0.412 0.0001	0.820 0.0001	0.491 0.0001	0.870 0.0001	0.568 0.0001	-0.196 0.0002	-0.587 0.0001	-0.356 0.0001	-0.435 0.0001	0.761 0.0001
C3FAGLK Aggressive Liking	0.138 0.0094	0.161 0.0023	0.359 0.0001	0.623 0.0001	0.622 0.0001	1.000 0.000	-0.203 0.0001	-0.210 0.0001	0.262 0.0001	0.892 0.0001	0.494 0.0001	0.471 0.0001	0.854 0.0001	-0.450 0.0001	-0.480 0.0001	-0.659 0.0001	-0.629 0.0001	0.722 0.0001
C3FRELG Relationship Goals	0.103 0.0526	0.193 0.0003	0.191 0.0003	-0.209 0.0001	-0.165 0.0018	-0.203 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.997 0.000	0.192 0.0003	-0.228 0.0001	-0.080 0.1341	0.006 0.9131	-0.026 0.6208	0.267 0.0001	0.343 0.0001	0.346 0.0001	0.374 0.0001	0.042 0.4353
C3FAGOAL Relationship Goals Instrumental/Social	0.100 0.0605	0.189 0.0003	0.185 0.0005	-0.215 0.0001	-0.171 0.0012	-0.210 0.0001	0.997 0.000	1.000 0.000	0.187 0.0004	-0.235 0.0001	-0.085 0.1083	0.000 0.9979	-0.035 0.5120	0.270 0.0001	0.345 0.0001	0.348 0.0001	0.378 0.0001	-0.043 0.4207
C3FASEND Assertive Endorsement	0.849 0.0001	0.864 0.0001	0.830 0.0001	0.262 0.0001	0.412 0.0001	0.262 0.0001	0.192 0.0003	0.187 0.0004	1.000 0.000	0.365 0.0001	0.665 0.0001	0.733 0.0001	0.633 0.0001	0.426 0.0001	0.373 0.0001	0.421 0.0001	0.480 0.0001	0.798 0.0001
C3FAGEND Aggressive Endorsement	0.282 0.0001	0.305 0.0001	0.339 0.0001	0.827 0.0001	0.820 0.0001	0.892 0.0001	-0.228 0.0001	-0.235 0.0001	0.365 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.712 0.0001	0.672 0.0001	0.773 0.0001	-0.520 0.0001	-0.548 0.0001	-0.573 0.0001	-0.645 0.0001	0.851 0.0001
C3FISE Instrumental Self-Efficacy	0.772 0.0001	0.480 0.0001	0.446 0.0001	0.833 0.0001	0.491 0.0001	0.494 0.0001	-0.080 0.1341	-0.085 0.1083	0.665 0.0001	0.712 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.568 0.0001	0.572 0.0001	-0.145 0.0064	-0.056 0.2905	-0.109 0.0397	-0.125 0.0192	0.834 0.0001
C3FFRCON Friendship Confidence	0.538 0.0001	0.890 0.0001	0.491 0.0001	0.386 0.0001	0.870 0.0001	0.471 0.0001	0.006 0.9131	0.000 0.9979	0.733 0.0001	0.672 0.0001	0.568 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.582 0.0001	0.074 0.1659	-0.111 0.0358	-0.051 0.3356	-0.031 0.5583	0.847 0.0001
C3FLKCON Liking Confidence	0.385 0.0001	0.419 0.0001	0.791 0.0001	0.525 0.0001	0.568 0.0001	0.854 0.0001	-0.026 0.6208	-0.035 0.5120	0.633 0.0001	0.773 0.0001	0.572 0.0001	0.582 0.0001	1.000 0.000	-0.169 0.0014	-0.190 0.0003	-0.172 0.0011	-0.213 0.0001	0.855 0.0001
C3FNAGIE Nonaggressive Instrumental Endorsement	0.518 0.0001	0.349 0.0001	0.226 0.0001	-0.668 0.0001	-0.196 0.0002	-0.450 0.0001	0.267 0.0001	0.270 0.0001	0.426 0.0001	-0.520 0.0001	-0.145 0.0064	0.074 0.1659	-0.169 0.0014	1.000 0.000	0.516 0.0001	0.609 0.0001	0.841 0.0001	-0.095 0.0732
C3FNAGFE Nonaggressive Friendship Endorsement	0.283 0.0001	0.447 0.0001	0.223 0.0001	-0.331 0.0001	-0.587 0.0001	-0.480 0.0001	0.343 0.0001	0.345 0.0001	0.373 0.0001	-0.548 0.0001	-0.056 0.2905	-0.111 0.0358	-0.190 0.0003	0.516 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.634 0.0001	0.825 0.0001	-0.143 0.0069
C3FNAGLE Nonaggressive Liking Endorsement	0.297 0.0001	0.301 0.0001	0.466 0.0001	-0.423 0.0001	-0.356 0.0001	-0.659 0.0001	0.346 0.0001	0.348 0.0001	0.421 0.0001	-0.573 0.0001	-0.109 0.0397	-0.051 0.3356	-0.172 0.0011	0.609 0.0001	0.634 0.0001	1.000 0.000	0.887 0.0001	-0.139 0.0091
C3FENDNA Endorsement of Nonaggressive	0.433 0.0001	0.424 0.0001	0.364 0.0001	-0.564 0.0001	-0.435 0.0001	-0.629 0.0001	0.374 0.0001	0.378 0.0001	0.480 0.0001	-0.645 0.0001	-0.125 0.0192	-0.031 0.5583	-0.213 0.0001	0.841 0.0001	0.825 0.0001	0.887 0.0001	1.000 0.000	-0.147 0.0057
C3FGOPT Goal Optimism	0.660 0.0001	0.683 0.0001	0.684 0.0001	0.681 0.0001	0.761 0.0001	0.722 0.0001	0.042 0.4353	-0.043 0.4207	0.798 0.0001	0.851 0.0001	0.834 0.0001	0.847 0.0001	0.855 0.0001	-0.095 0.0732	-0.143 0.0069	-0.139 0.0091	-0.147 0.0057	1.000 0.000

Table D. Things That Happen To Me Subscale Correlations with SHP Subscale Scores (Normative Children only N=355)

	C3FASIN	C3FASFR	C3FASLK	C3FAGIN	C3FAGFR	C3FAGLK	C3FRELG	C3FAGOAL	C3FASEND	C3FAGEND	C3FISE	C3FFRCON	C3FLKCON	C3FNAGIE	C3FNAGFE	C3FNAGLE	C3FENDNA	C3FGOPT
T3FAUTM3 Mean Factor 2: Authority Acceptance	-0.094 0.0861	-0.091 0.0956	-0.075 0.1715	0.130 0.0176	0.108 0.0487	0.080 0.1440	-0.1196 0.0003	-0.196 0.0003	-0.102 0.0626	0.124 0.0238	0.032 0.5600	0.015 0.7825	0.011 0.8467	0.193 0.0004	-0.191 0.0005	-0.137 0.0123	-0.204 0.0002	0.022 0.6896
T3FCOM3 Mean Factor 1: Cognitive Concentration	-0.154 0.0048	-0.192 0.0004	-0.231 0.0001	0.039 0.4830	0.070 0.2013	-0.018 0.7390	-0.246 0.0001	-0.249 0.0001	-0.227 0.0001	0.033 0.5461	-0.062 0.2550	-0.064 0.2426	-0.140 0.0102	-0.157 0.0041	-0.244 0.0001	0.169 0.0019	-0.220 0.0001	-0.108 0.0501
T3FSOCM3 Mean Factor 3: Social Contact	-0.101 0.0650	-0.133 0.0153	-0.148 0.0067	0.002 0.9746	-0.015 0.7866	-0.052 0.3444	-0.066 0.2260	0.067 0.2453	-0.151 0.0058	-0.027 0.6283	-0.057 0.3029	-0.083 0.1286	-0.116 0.0337	-0.081 0.1378	-0.106 0.0537	-0.071 0.1984	-0.101 0.0657	-0.103 0.0607
T3FSHPM3 Mean of SHP Items	-0.147 0.0071	-0.170 0.0018	-0.180 0.0010	0.087 0.11.32	0.083 0.1303	0.021 0.7069	-0.246 0.0001	-0.246 0.0001	-0.196 0.0003	0.073 0.1839	-0.027 0.6277	-0.044 0.0001	-0.086 0.1148	-0.195 0.0003	-0.238 0.0001	-0.165 0.0025	-0.233 0.0001	-0.064 0.2447