Chapter 4
Maladaptive Social Behaviour: Why and how do we want to assess it?

Abstract

This study addresses the external validation of the Questionnaire for Maladaptive Social Behaviour (QMSB). The QMSB is a self-report questionnaire designed to measure adolescents’ maladaptive social behaviour (MSB) at school. The questionnaire is designed from a self-regulation perspective and aims to measure specific types of MSB in a specific context. The QMSB comprises five scales: MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules, Delinquent Behaviour, Unfriendly Behaviour, Withdrawn Behaviour, and Impolite Behaviour. Three studies were conducted to investigate convergent and discriminant validity. First, answers of 369 students were compared over a 3-4 month period. Secondly, student-reports on the QMSB were compared with self-reports on the Youth Self Report (Verhulst, Ende, Van der Koot, 1997) (N = 391). Thirdly, student-reports were compared with teacher-reports (N = 71). The results revealed substantial support for the convergent validity and moderate support for discriminant validity.
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Introduction

Different theoretical frameworks

Norm deviant behaviour has been an important research topic in the social sciences and many terms have been used to indicate this type of behaviour, for example problem behaviour, maladaptive behaviour and antisocial behaviour. Jessor and Jessor (1977) defined ‘problem behaviour’ as “Behaviour that is socially defined as a problem, a source of concern, or as undesirable by the norms of conventional society and the institutions of adult authority, and its occurrence usually elicits some kinds of social control response.” (p. 33). Olweus, Block and Radke-Yarrow (1986) defined ‘antisocial behaviour’ as “...a violation of a formal or informal rule, including serious criminal acts or flagrant disregard for conventional standards of approved behaviour, as well as more private and momentary oppositional and hurtful acts.” (p. 2). Though concepts are differently described, both definitions agree that antisocial or problem behaviour is behaviour that is deviant from the conventional standards. We prefer the term ‘maladaptive social behaviour’ (MSB) because it refers to the undesirability of the deviance from conventional standards. We add ‘social’ to the definition, to emphasize the importance of the social dimension, namely the interaction with the context in which the behaviour occurs. We are especially interested in MSB of students in secondary vocational education. In this type of education several examples of MSB are frequently reported, such as being a victim of verbal violence, being threatened or carrying a weapon (Neuvel, 2004).

Explanations for MSB have been sought and found in biological characteristics, personality traits and environmental circumstances, and researchers described the effects of MSB on biological (e.g., Barry, Frick, & Killian, 2003; Edelbrock, Rende, Plomin, & Thompson, 1995), psychological (e.g., Romero Luengo & Sobral, 2001; Arbona & Power, 2003), and learning processes (e.g., Williams, Mulhall, Reis, & DeVille, 2002; McGee & Spencer, 2002). These theories have contributed a great deal to our understanding of what it is, who is most vulnerable to this type of behaviour, and how it occurs. Researchers have also described several risk and protective factors that are related to delinquent behaviour (e.g., McGee, & Spencer, 2002; Storvoll & Wichstrom, 2002). However, these theories contributed little to our knowledge on why adolescents act in a maladaptive way. More recently, theories that focus on the interaction process between person and environment, have gained momentum. These theories aim at describing process variables, so that the underlying mechanism can be understood.

Self-regulation theories belong to this category. Self-regulation refers to the strategic use of one’s cognitive, motivational and volitional strategies to reach one’s own goals (Boekaerts & Corno, 2005). In these theories it is assumed that individuals target their own cognitions, feelings and actions as well as features of the environment for modulation in the service of their own goals (Boekaerts, Maes & Karoly, 2005). Accordingly, we assume that when adolescents feel that their important personal goals, needs and interests can not be attained or are thwarted by others, they feel goal frustration and this could lead to MSB. It is important to note that MSB might also be used to attain personal goals, for example popularity. In a study by Rose, Swenson and Waller (2004) it was found that some types of maladaptive behaviour were positively related to perceived popularity. Bru (in press) also found that oppositional behaviour of students was related to the belief that...
going against school norms would increase peer status. From this perspective, MSB is neither considered to be the outcome of a static personality trait nor is it assumed to be triggered by stimuli from the environment; from this perspective MSB is the outcome of the interaction between personal characteristics and features of the environment.

**Measurement of maladaptive social behaviour in a school context**

Up to now, antisocial behaviour in school has been studied in a rather general way. Koerhuis and Boekaerts (in preparation) conducted a review on available empirical research on MSB in adolescence and concluded that agreement exists on the definition of problem behaviour as behaviour that is deviant from formal and informal rules, yet that limited attention is paid to the (subtle) deviation from informal rules. Several types of MSB that may occur in the school context have not been the focus of social research, including both deviances from formal and informal rules. Koerhuis & Boekaerts came to the conclusion that although reliably instruments have been developed to measure MSB, these instruments do not provide information on the students’ sensitivity to the local context. We were unable to find self-report questionnaires that measured the wide range of MSB of adolescents in a school context. The most frequently used self-report instrument to measure adolescents’ general MSB was the Youth Self-Report (YSR), which was originally developed by Achenbach (1991). This instrument is useful, provided the aim of the study is to identify at risk groups or to divide groups into high and low on antisocial behaviour. However, it is less suitable to measure the students’ perception of their own antisocial behaviour in close connection to their conception of the antecedents of that behaviour. In order to measure MSB from a self-regulation perspective it is necessary that students are presented with situation specific statements that are relevant to the context of secondary vocational education.

Furthermore, in the YSR students are asked to indicate to what extent each statement applies to them, and no information is gathered about the frequency of occurrence of the maladaptive behaviour. In our view, frequency information is absolutely essential because it is an indicator of the changeable outcome of an interaction process. Koerhuis, De Koning & Boekaerts (submitted) argued that an instrument is needed that is sensitive to the specific context in which the MSB occurs. The wording of the various statements should invite students to reflect on social situations and prompt them to report on the frequency of occurrence of their MSB in the school context during a fixed period of time. Because existing instruments did not meet our criteria for measuring adolescents’ MSB at school we developed the Questionnaire for Maladaptive Social Behaviour (QMSB) which is a self-report questionnaire that can reliably describe adolescents’ MSB, on condition that confidentiality is guaranteed.

**The Questionnaire for Maladaptive Social Behaviour**

In a previous study (Koerhuis, De Koning & Boekaerts, submitted) the construction and psychometric properties of the QMSB have been described. Based on literature and situational analyses (observations in class and interviews with students and staff at a secondary vocational school) questionnaire items were
formulated. In three pilot studies ($N_{\text{pilot1}} = 101$, $N_{\text{pilot2}} = 776$, $N_{\text{pilot3}} = 1020$) items were added, removed, or rephrased to optimize the internal structure of the questionnaire. The final version of the QMSB consists of 49 statements about MSB. Five scales were identified. The first scale, Maladaptive Social Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules consists of 15 items. Statements concern disruptive behaviour in class and undesired behaviour concerning school assignments or rules, for example ‘skipping classes’, ‘handing in work too late’ and ‘distracting other students in classes’. Delinquent Behaviour comprises 11 items. Items concern physical violence, involvement with drugs at school and stealing. The third scale consists of nine items on Unfriendly Behaviour. Statements describe provoking behaviour toward teachers and students. Withdrawn Behaviour comprises nine items on passive and active isolating behaviour, for example ‘avoiding conversations with fellow students’ and ‘isolating yourself from other students between lessons’. The final scale on Impolite Behaviour comprises five items, for example ‘not thanking a teacher when he/she does something for you’. Appendix 1 shows all items per scale. Students are asked to report on every statement how often they showed that behaviour during the last three months at school on a 5 point Likert Scale (1= never, 2= not often, 3 = sometimes, 4 = pretty often, 5 = very often). Explained variance of the questionnaire was 53 % and Cronbach’s alphas for the five scales varied between .84 and .89. In two data-waves ($N_{\text{datawave1}} = 830$, $N_{\text{datawave2}} = 550$) the robustness of these five scales was tested for both boys and girls. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with maximum likelihood confirmed that five types of MSB underlie the construct of maladaptive behaviour in relation to school (.94 ≤ NFI ≥ .97, .95 ≤ CFI ≥ 1.00). Furthermore, it was found that the internal structure of the QMSB held for boys as well as for girls.

Although CFA showed that the five types of MSB could reliably be distinguished, the intercorrelations between the five scales were quite high (.35-.65), which suggested an underlying common trait. Therefore we tested an alternative model; a model with the five constructs and a higher order factor for MSB. Exact the same fit indices were found for this alternative model compared to the original model. Next, we assessed the relationship between predictive measures of MSB and MSB as operationalized in the two models, to determine which of the two models could provide best information. Best fit indices were found for the five factor model, thus the model without an overall factor. Moreover, distinguishing different types of MSB is of practical relevance, because in this way more detailed information can be drawn from the data, which can provide more concrete guidelines for interventions. See Koerhuis, De Koning & Boekaerts (submitted) for a detailed description of the development and internal validity of the QMSB. The present study aims to examine convergent (correspondence between similar constructs) and discriminant (correspondence between dissimilar constructs) validity of the QMSB.

This study

The psychometric properties of the QMSB need to be established for our findings on MSB to be of value to researchers and practitioners. In fact we are trying to access students’ thoughts and feelings in relation to a number of social descriptors, which prompt them to reflect on different types of MSB in school. Unlike trait questionnaires that require students to respond to a general statement, such as ‘I prefer to be alone’, ‘I am shy’, and ‘I refuse to talk’ (these are three items form the
YSR that measure Withdrawn Behaviour as a subscale of general problem behaviour), the QMSB asks them to take account of contextual variables when considering their response (e.g., not joining discussion in class, trying to avoid contact with particular students, not joining in conversation with students in class). It is important that we can classify the different social descriptors of the QMSB according to the different types of maladaptive social reactions they elicit. Hence the identification of patterns of MSB that carry meaning to the students themselves and establishing the internal consistency of the resulting patterns is an important task we set ourselves. Messick (1995) argued that the meaning of a score on a test or questionnaire derives from the set of relevant convergent and discriminant findings. Three studies were conducted to test the convergent and discriminant validity of the QMSB. First, results of two data-waves were used to investigate the stability of the constructs in the QMSB. Secondly, convergent and discriminant validity were investigated by comparing the scales of the QMSB with scales of the Youth Self Report (Achenbach, 1991). Finally, students’ self-report on the QMSB were compared with teacher ratings. A common way to interpret result of validity studies is to use the multitrait-multimethod matrix of Campbell and Fiske (1959). In this method a correlation matrix is computed, consisting of the intercorrelations between the different traits (scales) of each method, between the same traits measured by different methods and between different traits of the different methods. Campbell and Fiske formulated four criteria to read the matrix: First, convergent validity can be demonstrated if correlations between the same constructs of different methods are significant. These correlations are represented in the ‘validity diagonal’. Second, discriminant validity is achieved when the correlations on the validity diagonal are higher than correlations with the other constructs of the other method. Third, discriminant validity can be investigated by comparing the correlations on the validity diagonal with the correlations between the traits within each method. The correlations on the validity diagonal should be higher than the correlations between different traits, because they are supposed to measure different concepts. Fourth, the correlation patterns between the constructs within each method should be similar. This can be an indication of the structure of the different methods. Equivalent methods should have similar structures, because this indicates how respondents view the content of the items. Our hypotheses are that our studies will fulfil the criteria set by Campbell and Fiske. Due to the high intercorrelations between the five scales of the QMSB, evidence for discriminant validity might be hard to find with respect to the third criterion. In the next sections the results of the three studies are presented and discussed.

Study 1: (In)consistency of Maladaptive Social Behaviour

To examine the consistency of the self-reported MSB on the QMSB, two data-waves were compared. The QMSB was administered to second year students half way and at the end of the academic year. The time-period covered three to four months. Prior research on the consistency of problem behaviour with Dutch samples showed a variety in results. For example, a test-retest (two-week interval) with the Dutch version of the Youth Self Report (YSR) (Verhulst, van der Ende & Koot, 1997) showed correlations that ranged from .63 to .83. between the same scales. Test-retest reliability is commonly reported as a form of reliability in relation to questionnaire data. Ainley & Hidi (2002) argued that test-retest reliability is a less
appropriate procedure when assessing students’ thinking and feelings in relation to a specific task or descriptor. Very often this research is set up to study changes in students' perceptions or beliefs about social issues or a learning domain. Hence, high test-retest correlations would indicate that hardly any change in perception has occurred or that the instrument is insensitive to pick up that change. On the other hand, low test-retest correlations may imply that the different ways in which students perceive and appraise the descriptors is not consistent across measurement points. Ideally, test-retest correlations should be moderately strong, thus indicating that students recognize the same pattern in the different descriptors over time and that this information can be used to guide and direct their action in school. For illustration, Hamid & Cheng (1996) found correlations of .43 and .47 in a test-retest period separated by one month for two state scales and correlations of .67 and .71 for two trait scales.

Sample and procedure

Students in vocational education reported the frequency of their MSB at school halfway during their second year at school and at the end of that year. The period between these two data-waves varied from three to four months. In total 369 students filled in both questionnaires (81 boys, 251 girls, 37 did not report gender). Their mean age was 17 years and eight months. Students from eight schools, from several regions in the Netherlands participated. Students were informed about the objective of the study. In order to guarantee confidentiality a personal code was assigned to every student so that their answers could be linked later. They completed the questionnaires during regularly scheduled classes.

Results

Table 1 shows the correlations between the 5 scales of the QMSB at the two data-waves. The reliabilities (shown in the table between brackets) of the five scales of the QMSB at both data-waves were good (.88-.96). The data distribution on the Delinquency scale was extremely skewed at both measurement points. Spearman correlations were computed for these scales and Pearson correlations were computed for the other scales. Although students consistently reported lower frequencies of MSB at the second measurement point, only Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules (t (368) = 2.10, p = .036) and Unfriendly Behaviour (t (368) = 3.85, p < .001) differed significantly.

The first criterion of Campbell and Fiske was met: Convergent validity was confirmed, because correlations between the same traits of the different methods were all significant and varied between .31 for Delinquent and Impolite Behaviour to .49 for Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules. We also computed an overall score for Maladaptive Social Behaviour at time 1 and time 2. The correlation between these scores was .48 (p < .001) (α T1 = .96, α T2 = .94).

To examine Campbell and Fiske’s second criterion the correlations on the validity diagonal were compared with the correlations coefficients between the traits of the different methods. Each of the five correlations on the validity diagonal was therefore compared with the 20 heterotrait-heteromethod correlations. Discriminant validity was not confirmed in four of these comparisons. The correlations of
Delinquent and Impolite Behaviour on the validity diagonal were lower than the correlations between MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules and Unfriendly Behaviour. These scales showed relatively high correlations. The proportion of comparisons that did not confirm discriminant validity was $p = 4/100 = .04$, which is lower as could be expected by chance. Therefore we conclude that, overall, the second criterion was not violated.

Table 1: Intracorrelations and test-retest correlations of the QMSB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.Qmsb1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Qmsb2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.341*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Qmsb3</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Qmsb4</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Qmsb5</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.515**</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIQmsb1</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIQmsb2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.155**</td>
<td>.210**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIQmsb3</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.583**</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIQmsb4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.089**</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIQmsb5</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: p<.05, **p<.001

To assess Campbell and Fiske’s third criterion, the five correlations on the validity diagonal were compared with the 20 correlations between the traits of the same method. In more than half of the comparisons violations were noted. The proportion of violations was $p = 54/100 = .54$. Therefore we must conclude that this criterion for discriminant validity was not met.

The final criterion mentioned by Campbell and Fiske was investigated by comparing the correlation patterns of the heterotrait-monomethod and heterotrait-heteromethod triangles. All triangles shared the highest and the lowest correlation. Highest correlations were found between MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules and Unfriendly Behaviour, lowest between Delinquent and Withdrawn Behaviour. The rank order of the other correlations differed within each triangle. However, this difference in rank should not be taken too heavily, because several correlations were very similar in height. We computed that 86% of the correlation coefficients were equally ranked or ranked one to three places higher or lower. Therefore we conclude that this criterion was not violated.

**Conclusion**

Convergent validity was supported by the significant positive correlations between each of the five equivalent scales. As expected, the correlations were moderately strong. The smallest correlation (.31) was found between the equivalent scales of Delinquent and Impolite Behaviour. For Delinquent Behaviour, the relatively low relation might be due to the low frequency of this type of behaviour in our sample, which makes it sensitive to small changes. The same correlation was found for Impolite Behaviour. Possibly this scale is more context-sensitive. The overall moderate nature of the correlations turned out as expected and can be explained by the situation-specificity of the behaviour that the QMSB is designed to
measure. The period of time between the two data-waves (three to four months) is probably enough to cause variability in the frequency of the reported behaviour. Changing features in the environment and in personal and school characteristics may have caused this variability (inconsistency) in the students’ frequency reports of MSB.

Discriminant validity was only partly supported. One criterion with regard to discriminant validity was confirmed, one criterion was partly supported, and several violations were found in relation to one other criterion.

**Study 2: Comparing the QMSB with the YSR**

In a second study, validity was tested by comparing the scales of the QMSB to five scales of the Youth Self-Report (Achenbach, 1991). As both questionnaires are constructed to measure MSB, they should be related significantly. However, the relationships between constructs of the different questionnaires are expected to be moderate, because the operationalization is different, in accordance with the aim of each questionnaire. The YSR comprises some items on behaviour in the school context, but this behaviour is treated as a sign of general problem behaviour. Although research has shown a relationship between general delinquent behaviour and school problems like bullying (e.g., Junger-Tas & Van Kesteren, 1999), it is also clear that not all students with school problems show delinquent acts. Only a small number of the students who show delinquent behaviour have school problems (Vettenburg, 1998). Hence, considering these behaviours as the same side of a coin seems misconceived. As mentioned previously, the YSR asks students to indicate to what extent every statement applies to them in order to detect adolescents with an extreme score on a trait-like dimension. The QMSB asks for the frequency of a specific behaviour in the school context during the last three months. Therefore we expected only moderate correlations between these two instruments. However, (moderate) significant relationships were expected between comparable constructs. In the present study five scales of the Dutch version of the YSR (Verhulst, Van der Ende & Koot, 1997) were used: 1) Withdrawn Behaviour, 2) Social Problems, 3) Attention Problems, 4) Criminal Behaviour, 5) Aggressive Behaviour. Delinquent Behaviour (QMSB) and Criminal behaviour (YSR) and Withdrawn Behaviour of the QMSB and YSR are considered to be comparable constructs. Therefore, these scales should be related significantly. Content analysis of the Aggressive Behaviour scale (YSR) also suggested a significant relationship with Delinquent Behaviour, because the two scales share statements on vandalizing, fighting and threatening. The Aggressive Behaviour scale was also expected to be related to Unfriendly Behaviour (QMSB) and to Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules (QMSB). Some items refer to verbal aggression to others (i.e., ‘I tease others a lot’, ‘I am mean to others’ (YSR) which seem similar to ‘provoke other students’, ‘calling names at other students’ (QMSB)). Topics on disturbing behaviour that could be situated at school (i.e., ‘I try to get a lot of attention’, ‘I brag or act tough’ (YSR) seem related to ‘distracting other students’, ‘making up stories’ (QMSB)). Furthermore, Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules was also expected to be related significantly to Attention Problems (YSR). These scales share maladaptive behaviour in the classroom, such as daydreaming. The scale Social Problems (YSR) seems to be different from the scales of the QMSB, but was expected to be moderately related to Withdrawn Behaviour (QMSB), because both scales share an
item on avoiding people/ students. A comparable construct to Impolite Behaviour (QMSB) is not available in the YSR. Hence, this construct is not expected to be significantly related to any of the scales of the YSR.

Sample, procedure, instruments

The sample that completed both QMSB and YSR consisted of 391 students (131 male, 253 female, 7 missing). Students were from 9 secondary vocational schools in the Netherlands. Mean age was 17.7 years (SD = 1.71). Students were informed about the objective of the study. They completed the QMSB (description see the section ‘The Questionnaire for Maladaptive Social Behaviour’) and the five scales of the YSR during regular lessons. The administered version from the YSR consisted of 51 items referring to Attention Problems, Criminal Behaviour, Aggressive Behaviour, Withdrawn Behaviour and Social Problems. Students were asked to report on a three point scale (0 = not at all, 1 = a little/sometimes, 2 = very much) how much every statement applied to them during the last 6 months. Three items belonged to two scales. See appendix 2 for the items per scale for the YSR and appendix 1 for the items per scale of the QMSB.

Results

Table 2 shows the correlations between the scales of the QMSB and YSR. Again Delinquent Behaviour in the QMSB was not normally distributed. For this scale Spearman correlations were computed. All other scales had an approximately normal distribution.

Table 2: Correlations between the scales of the QMSB and YSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb1</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb3</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.567***</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb4</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.127*</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb5</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.090**</td>
<td>.176**</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR3</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR4</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: p<.05, **p<.001
Qmsb1 = Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules, Qmsb2 = Delinquent Behaviour, Qmsb3 = Unfriendly Behaviour, Qmsb4 = Withdrawn Behaviour, Qmsb5 = Impolite Behaviour, YSR1 = Attention Problems, YSR3 = Aggressive Behaviour, YSR4 = Withdrawn Behaviour.

Underlined correlations are Spearman correlations, bold are expected significant correlations.

The reliability coefficients for the QMSB were sufficient to good. The reliability coefficients of the scales Attention Problems, Withdrawn Behaviour and Aggressive Behaviour of the YSR were sufficient (≥ .60) but internal consistency of the scales Criminal Behaviour and Social Problems was too low (< .60). Careful inspection of these scales did not give clues as to why these reliabilities were low. The low internal consistency was not caused by one or two specific items and did not seem
to be due to a specific subgroup (based on gender, class, school, educational level, age). Regrettably, these scales can not be used in further analyses.

Overall, the correlations between the scales of the QMSB and YSR were, as expected, low to moderate. Of the 15 possible correlations (between the 5 scales of the QMSB and the 3 scales that were left of the YSR) 6 reached significance at the .001 level and 2 at the .05 level. Convergent validity was confirmed, as the expected significant correlations were found (correlations are bold in the table). The correlations between MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules (Qmsb1) and Attention Problems (YSR1) and Aggressive behaviour (YSR3) were moderate. Delinquent Behaviour showed a small but significant relation with Aggressive Behaviour. Unfriendly Behaviour was significantly related to Aggressive Behaviour, as was Withdrawn Behaviour (QMSB) with its equivalent scale in the YSR. Cronbach’s alpha for the total YSR was .85 and for the total QMSB .88. The correlation coefficient between the mean of all reported MSB and the total score on the administered scales of the YSR was .42.

Two violations were noted of the first criterion concerning discriminant validity. The correlation coefficient between Aggressive Behaviour (YSR) and Delinquent Behaviour (QMSB) was lower than the correlation coefficients of Attention Problems (YSR) and Unfriendly Behaviour (QMSB) and Attention Problems andWithdrawn Behaviour (QMSB). The proportion of violations was \( p=2/50=.04 \). Hence, we conclude that this criterion for discriminant validity was not violated.

The second criterion for discriminant validity was not met. The proportion of violations was \( p=22/65=.34 \). The different constructs within the methods appeared frequently to be more strongly related with each other than with the equivalent constructs of the other method.

The fourth criteria set by Campbell and Fiske (1959) does not seem to apply to this study. After all, the QMSB and YSR are not measuring the same constructs and therefore it is not useful to compare the pattern of correlations coefficients between their scales.

**Conclusion**

Evidence for the convergent validity of the scales of the QMSB was found. All expected significant correlations were confirmed. Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules (QMSB) was significantly related to Attention Problems (YSR) and Aggressive Behaviour (YSR). Delinquent Behaviour (QMSB) and Unfriendly Behaviour (QMSB) were significant related to Aggressive Behaviour (YSR), although the correlation between Delinquent Behaviour and Aggressive Behaviour was lower than expected. This can be understood by the small variance of both scales. The scales on Withdrawn Behaviour of both questionnaires were substantially related to each other. Furthermore, the weak correlations between Impolite Behaviour and scales of the YSR provide evidence that this is indeed a different type of MSB, though a weak significant relation was found with Withdrawn Behaviour. Possibly Withdrawn Behaviour (YSR) can act as a reason, a cause for acting Impolite. After all, the YSR aims at identifying students’ position in relation to a trait and from the self-regulation perspective a trait is part of the interaction process leading to specific behaviour. Hence, being withdrawn might cause Impolite Behaviour (for example ‘refuse to talk’ (YSR) may lead to ‘not greeting when
someone greets you’ (QMSB)). From this perspective the small but significant correlations between Attention Problems (YSR) and Unfriendly Behaviour, and between Aggressive (YSR) and Withdrawn Behaviour (QMSB) can also be explained. These scales do not seem to share a content or underlying factor, but their relationship might be understood by considering Attention Problems as a reason for acting unfriendly. Aggressive Behaviour may also be a cause for acting Withdrawn. ‘I am nervous or tensed’ or ‘I do something without thinking’ (Attention Problems) might cause ‘making fun of a student or teacher’ (Unfriendly Behaviour). Also, ‘I am easily angry’, or ‘I am stubborn’ (Aggressive Behaviour), can be a reason for students to ‘sitting apart from other students’ or ‘trying to avoid contact with students’ (Withdrawn Behaviour). Finally, an unexpected significant relation was found between Withdrawn Behaviour and Attention Problems. A closer look at the items of these scales suggests that they share a factor that assesses withdrawal from school activities (e.g., ‘not joining discussions in class’, ‘trying to avoid cooperation tasks’ (QMSB) versus ‘I have difficulties concentrating’, ‘I daydream a lot’ (YSR)).

Unfortunately the internal consistency of the scales Criminal Behaviour and Social Problems of the YSR was too low to be included in the analysis. These scales could have provided more information about the construct validity of the scales of the QMSB.

**Study 3: Self-Report – Teacher-Report**

Although research has failed to show a clear relationship between self-reports and teacher-reports, it is interesting to study to what extent two measures do or do not converge. A meta-analysis (21 samples, 17 studies) by Achenbach, McConaughy and Howell (1987) found an average correlation between teacher and child reports on problem behaviour of .20. Phares, Compas and Howell (1989) found no significant correlations between teacher report on the Teacher Report Form (Achenbach, 1991) and adolescent report on the YSR, neither for internalizing and externalizing, nor for total problem behaviour. Low correlations between self-reports and teacher reports might be due to several reasons. First, teachers and adolescents may judge problem behaviour in different ways. Second, teachers can only report on problem behaviour of an adolescent if they have actually perceived it, while adolescents can report about their own behaviour in all relevant situations. Third, students and teachers might report different frequencies, due to effects of social desirability, or random measurement error and method variance (Bagozzi, 1993).

The present research tried to combat social desirable answers by guaranteeing anonymity to the students. A few dummy questions on prosocial behaviour were added to keep students from answering in an automatic way, thus increasing the reliability of their answers. The problem of different access to relevant situations is partly taken into account, as the QMSB is restricted to the school-context in which both students and teachers participate. The teacher report form is an equivalent of the QMSB, meaning that exactly the same questions were answered by students and teachers. To increase reliability of teacher ratings, an extra answer category namely ‘don’t know’, was added. Expected disadvantage of this option is that missing data might increase, but the ‘don’t know’ category might
also restrain teachers from guessing. Furthermore, this missing value category is also an informative category, as it can provide information about the descriptors of MSB that teachers feel confident and not confident about and of which descriptors they can provide an accurate estimation. In summary, we expect that correlations in this study will fulfil the criteria set by Campbell and Fiske (1959). Thus, we expect the correlations to be significant between the same traits, higher between the same traits than between other traits of both the same and the other method (instrument), and to show a comparable pattern.

To increase interpretability of the data, we asked students to fill in the Youth Self Report and the QMSB and teachers to fill in the teacher versions of both questionnaires; the Teacher Report Form (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986), and the TQMSB. Because both questionnaires were administered to the same students and teachers, the correlation between the YSR and the TRF could be compared to the correlation of the QMSB and the TQMSB, and hence serve as an extra validity check. The former questionnaires are already validated, so we expect a significant correlation between the YSR and TRF. We hypothesize that this correlation is comparable to the correlation between the QMSB and TQMSB.

Sample, instruments and procedure

The sample consisted of teacher reports on 71 students (26 boys, 44 girls, 1 missing, mean age 18.3 yrs). Twenty-six teachers participated. Each teacher completed the TQMSB for 1 to 3 second year secondary vocational students that participated in the study.

To measure teacher estimations of student MSB an equivalent version of the QMSB was used. This Teacher Questionnaire for Maladaptive Social Behaviour (TQMSB) thus also contained 49 items referring to 5 categories (1) Maladaptive Behaviour Toward Schoolwork and Rules, 2) Delinquent Behaviour, 3) Unfriendly Behaviour, 4) Withdrawn Behaviour and 5) Impolite Behaviour). The formulation of the items was adapted for teachers. They were asked to report on the 5-point Likert scale (1= never, 2= not often, 3 = sometimes, 4 = pretty often, 5 = very often) how often the specific student had shown a behaviour during the last three months. An extra answering category 'don’t know’ was added.

The administered version from the YSR is the same as the version used in Study 2 and thus consisted of 51 items referring to five scales (See Appendix 2). The administered TRF consisted of 73 items referring to equivalent scales. The TRF scales consisted of more items per scale than the YSR (see appendix 3). Teachers are asked how much statements apply to the students on a three point scale (not at all, a little/sometimes, very much). Three items belonged to two scales.

The heads of departments of several schools were asked by letter and telephone to participate in the study. If they agreed to participate, they coordinated the participation of the mentors, who coordinated the participation of the students. Participation was voluntarily. The students filled in the YSR and QMSB during regular lessons. Mentors were asked to select one to three students on whom to report. Usually the whole class filled in the questionnaires to prevent selected students from feeling suspicious and influence their answers. The mentors completed the questionnaires approximately at the same time as the students.
Results

In forty teacher-reports all questions of the TQMSB received estimations and in thirty-one teacher-reports one or more questions were answered with ‘I don’t know’. ‘I don’t know’ was most frequently used on variables concerning delinquent behaviour and on items referring to behaviour that is hidden from the teachers perception, for example ‘blacken a teachers reputation’, ‘quit working when the teacher leaves the classroom’, and ‘not thanking other students when they do something for you’. Due to relatively high number of missing data on Delinquent Behaviour, the scale could not be computed for 5 teachers. Table 3 shows the correlations between the QMSB and the TQMSB. Delinquent Behaviour was again extremely skewed in the sample of students and teachers. Impolite Behaviour was also not normally distributed in the student sample. For these scales Spearman correlations were computed.

Table 3: Correlations between the QMSB and TQMSB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb4</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qmsb5</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.305*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQmsb1</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQmsb3</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>.316*</td>
<td>.394*</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.690**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQmsb4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.314*</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.323*</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQmsb5</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.265*</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.649**</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: p<.05, **p<.001
Qmsb1/TQmsb1 = Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules, Qmsb2 = Delinquent Behaviour, Qmsb3/TQmsb3 = Unfriendly Behaviour, Qmsb4/TQmsb4 = Withdrawn Behaviour, Qmsb5/TQmsb5 = Impolite Behaviour
Underlined numbers are Spearman correlations, bold are expected significant correlations.

Cronbach's alpha for Delinquent Behaviour was too low in the teacher sample and this scale will therefore not be used in the analyses. The low internal consistency was due to zero variance on several items. The first criterion of Campbell and Fiske, on convergent validity, was met for MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules, Unfriendly Behaviour and Withdrawn Behaviour. Students' reports of Impolite Behaviour were strongest related to teachers' reports of Impolite Behaviour, but this correlation was not significant. Convergent validity was found for the overall factor of MSB. The correlation between the total scores of the QMSB ($\alpha = .83$) and TQMSB ($\alpha = .88$) was $$.51, p <.001$). Because Campbell & Fiske’s first criterion was not met for Impolite Behaviour, the second, third and fourth criteria will not be discussed for this construct. According to Campbell and Fiske it is not useful to investigate discriminant validity if convergent validity was not found.

On the second criterion, in which correlations on the validity diagonal should be higher than correlations with the other constructs of the other method, two violations were found. The correlations between the equivalent scales of Unfriendly and Withdrawn Behaviour were lower than the correlation between MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules (self-report) and Unfriendly Behaviour (teacher-report).
Proportion of violations was \( p = 2/18 = .11 \), which is more than could be expected by chance.

Also several violations of the third criteria were found (correlations on the validity diagonal should be higher than correlations between trait within one method). The proportion of violations was \( p = 7/18 = .39 \). Again discriminant validity could not be confirmed.

The final criterion was confirmed (the pattern of the correlations in each triangle should be comparable). The rank order in every triangle was the same, except for one. The correlation coefficient of MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules with Unfriendly Behaviour was in one case lower than the correlation coefficient of MSB toward Schoolwork and Rules with Withdrawn Behaviour, while in the other triangles this was the other way around.

Table 4: Correlations between the YSR and TRF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YSR1</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR3</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.699*</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.432*</td>
<td>.244*</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF1</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.325*</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.385*</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>.259*</td>
<td>.765**</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.668**</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF4</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.287*</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF5</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.358*</td>
<td>.336*</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>.696**</td>
<td>.705**</td>
<td>.401*</td>
<td>.599**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: \( p<.05 \), **: \( p<.001 \)


Underlined numbers are Spearman correlations, in bold are expected significant correlations.

Table 4 shows the correlations between scales of the YSR and TRF. Cronbach’s alphas for the YSR and TRF were sufficient, except for Criminal Behaviour and Social Problems of the YSR. This is a similar finding as in Study 2. Attention Problems and Criminal Behaviour in the TRF were not normally distributed and for these scales Spearman correlations were computed. Correlations between equivalent scales range from .33 to .44 and were all significant. The correlation between the total score of the YSR (\( \alpha = .91 \)) and TRF (\( \alpha = .93 \)) is .41 (\( p < .001 \)).

Conclusion

For three of the five scales of the QMSB support for convergent validity was found. Expected correlations between equivalent scales on the teacher-report and self-report for Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules, Unfriendly Behaviour and Withdrawn Behaviour were confirmed. They were positive and statistically significant, ranging from .31 to .43. Also for the overall score of MSB of the QMSB and TQMSB a significant correlation was found (\( r = .51 \)). Compared to other studies on the relationship between self and teacher-report these correlations are quite high and comparable with correlations between the YSR and TRF in this study. Apparently, teachers can give a rather accurate estimation of the MSB of the participating students that is observable in the classroom.
The correlation between Impolite Behaviour of the self and teacher report was .18 and not significant. For this scale no evidence for convergent validity was found in this study. This applies to Delinquent Behaviour as well. Because this scale could not be measured reliably in the teacher sample, the self and teacher report could not be compared. Therefore, convincing evidence for discriminant validity was not found.

An important limitation to this conclusion is that the sample is small and not randomly selected. Results can therefore not be generalized. It is possible that the teachers chose students of whom they expected to be able to give most accurate information. This could indicate that the relationship between the QMSB and TQMSB in this study is the upper limit and would be lower for self-report data of other students.

Comparing the correlations between the QMSB and the TQMSB with the correlations between the validated YSR and TRF we can conclude that these are comparable. Based on this comparison, we conclude that overall convergent validity is supported for the QMSB and specifically for three scales (Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules, Unfriendly and Withdrawn Behaviour). More research is needed on behalf of discriminant validity.

**General Discussion**

It was the aim of the present study to explore the convergent and discriminant validity of the QMSB. We conducted three studies: A test-retest study, a comparison between the QMSB and the YSR (a frequently used instrument to measure problem behaviour) and a comparison between student and teacher data gathered with the QMSB. Our hypotheses were that the results of the three studies would fulfil the criteria set by Campbell and Fiske (1959); relations between comparable or equivalent constructs were expected to be stronger than the relationships with dissimilar constructs. Also, we expected that the patterns of the interrelationships between the scales of the different methods would be comparable. Summarizing the results from the three conducted studies we conclude that in general, convergent validity for the QMSB was obtained. Correlations between the overall score on the QMSB and the overall score of the other methods (QMSB at time 2, YSR, TQMSB) varied between .42 and .50.

With respect to the separate scales, the best evidence for convergent validity was found for Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and Rules, Unfriendly Behaviour, and Withdrawn Behaviour. Expectations concerning convergent validity were confirmed for these scales in each study. Moderate, significant correlations were found between equivalent scales in the two data-waves, the self and teacher reports, and between comparable constructs of the YSR. Evidence for convergent validity for Delinquent and Impolite Behaviour was found in the first study only. Unfortunately the scales Criminal Behaviour of the YSR and Delinquent Behaviour of the teacher report could not reliably be measured in our sample. Hence, Delinquent Behaviour could not be compared to a similar construct. Moreover, self-reported Impolite Behaviour in the latter study was not significantly related to the teacher-reported Impolite Behaviour. In this study we did not find convergent validity for Impolite Behaviour.

Discriminant validity was partly found. In two studies the correlations coefficients on the validity diagonal were higher than the other correlation...
coefficients in heterotrait-heteromethod triangles. This indicates that equivalent constructs are indeed more alike than different constructs. The patterns of the heterotrait-heteromethod and heterotrait-monomethod triangles were compared in the first and third study; the patterns showed moderate to good comparability thus offering some support for discriminant validity. As expected, the third criterion of Campbell and Fiske could not be met in any of the three studies due to the high intercorrelations in the heterotrait-monomethod triangles. This finding implicates that constructs that theoretically should be dissimilar, in fact are related to each other, which suggests a common construct. As mentioned before, in a previous study we already noticed the high interrelationships between the five scales of the QMSB. Therefore, an alternative model (a five factor model with an overall factor for MSB) was assessed and equal fit indices for both models were found. In a following study we found that the five factor model provided the best fit for the data when the relationship with predictive measures was assessed. Furthermore, distinguishing different types of MSB can provide more detailed information for practitioners in education, to develop more practical guidelines for intervention. Hence, we believe that it is both justified and useful to distinguish five separate scales.

The most important criticism on the method developed by Campbell and Fiske is that it is subjective and does not take into account the amount of method variance. Though we are aware of this shortcoming, we think that analyzing several multitrait-multimethod matrices can offer a detailed overview of convergent and discriminant validity of a questionnaire. However, we want to point out that the essence of the assessment method used in the QMSB is that it is a situation specific instrument. Our aim was to develop a valid instrument that is context-sensitive. It is important to realize that the purpose of administrating the QMSB is not to classify students into categories of high and low on maladjusted behaviour, but to link their responses to their salient personal goals and to perceived aspects of classroom and school climate. In our perception, specific types of maladjusted social behaviour might be triggered in a school context by specific contextual features. As mentioned previously, we assume that MSB can both be a reaction to goal frustration and an attempt to attain goals. Accordingly, Bru, Stephens and Torsheim (2002) found that students’ perception of class management (i.e., teacher support, teacher monitoring) accounted for more variance in Off-task Orientation (i.e., not concentrating on school tasks) and Opposition toward Teachers (i.e., quarrel with teacher) than for Bullying. A possible explanation for this finding is that off-task and oppositional behaviour is triggered by goal frustration (i.e., their need for academic support is thwarted). Bullying would not be a logic response to that frustration, because this behaviour seems unrelated to the cause of their goal frustration at that moment. Bullying behaviour might be used by students to protect their sense of self-esteem or popularity, or a reaction on experienced frustration with respect to their social goals. To be able to distinguish these different processes, instruments are needed that can assess specific behaviours, personal and school goals, and specific context perceptions. So far, little research has been done on the relationship between school- and classroom features and MSB at this situation specific level. The QMSB will enable researchers and teachers to gain insight into the person and environment variables that trigger MSB in a school context. It will also help them to communicate with students about the cues that trigger their MSB, and the measures they can take to reduce and eventually prevent socially maladaptive behaviour.
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Appendix 1: Scales and items of the QMSB/TQMSB

How often did you show this behaviour at school in the past three months? (never, not often, sometimes, pretty often, very often)

I: Maladaptive Behaviour toward Schoolwork and School rules
   1. Handing in work too late
   2. Losing things for school
   3. Making up excuses why you did not finish your homework
   4. Making up excuses so you do not have to join a lesson
   5. Handing in work that you did not entirely make yourself
   6. Skipping school/ classes.
   7. Acting particularly kind to a teacher to get your way
   8. Pretending you did not see or hear something, so you do not have to react
   9. Talking when another student is doing a presentation
  10. Making up stories
  11. Jumping the queue
  12. Showing that you are bored during a lesson.
  13. Distracting other students
  14. Quit working when the teacher leaves the classroom
  15. Not participating in class.

II: Delinquent Behaviour
   1. Taking someone’s stuff without asking
   2. Beating up a student so bad, that he/she probably need medical care.
   3. Hit a teacher.
   4. Using hard drugs at school.
   5. Selling drugs at school.
   6. Damaging someone’s things on purpose.
   7. Damaging things in or around school.
   8. Carrying weapons at school.
   9. Fighting with a group against another group at school.
  10. Drinking so much alcohol at school that you get (a little bit) drunk.
  11. Threatening someone to hurt him/her.

III: Unfriendly Behaviour
   1. Making fun of a student.
   2. Provoking a student.
   3. Calling names at a student.
   4. Excluding a student.
   7. Provoking a teacher.
   8. Calling names at a teacher.

IV: Withdrawn Behaviour
   1. Not joining conversations with other students.
   2. Not taking initiatives, but waiting until other students come to you.
   3. Avoiding conversations with other students.
   4. Not joining discussions in class.
   5. Waiting, during cooperation tasks, until someone else takes the lead.
   6. Sitting apart from other students.
   7. Isolating yourself from other students between lessons.
   8. Trying to avoid cooperation tasks.
   9. Trying to avoid contact with (particular) students.

V: Impolite Behaviour
   1. Not thanking a student when he/she does something for you.
   2. Not thanking a teacher when he/she does something for you.
   3. Not apologizing when you are late for class.
   4. Not greeting when someone greets you.
   5. Not thanking someone when he/she gives you something.
Appendix 2: Scales and items of the Youth Self Report

I: Attention Problems
1. I behave too young for my age.
2. I have difficulties concentrating.
3. I have difficulties sitting still.
4. I feel confused.
5. I daydream a lot.
6. I do something without thinking.
7. I am nervous or tensed.
8. My school results are bad.
9. I am unhandy.

II: Criminal Behaviour
1. I do not feel guilty when I do something I should not have done.
2. I hang out with boys and girls who get into trouble.
3. I lie or cheat.
4. I prefer being with older boys and girls than with children of my age.
5. I run away from home.
6. I set things on fire.
7. I steal from my house.
8. I steal outside my house.
9. I curse.
10. I skip school.
11. I use alcohol or drugs.

III: Aggressive Behaviour
1. I argue a lot.
2. I brag or act tough.
3. I am mean to others.
4. I try to get a lot of attention.
5. I destroy my own things.
6. I destroy the things of others.
7. I disobey at school.
8. I am jealous at others.
9. I fight a lot.
10. I attack others physically.
11. I scream and yell a lot.
12. I act weird to get attention.
13. I am stubborn.
14. My mood or emotions can suddenly change.
15. I talk a lot.
16. I tease others a lot.
17. I am easily angry.
18. I threaten to hurt people.
19. I make more noise than other boys or girls.

IV: Withdrawn Behaviour
1. I prefer being alone than with others.
2. I refuse to talk.
3. I am closed; other people can not easily tell what goes inside my head.
4. I am shy.
5. I do not have a lot of energy.
6. I am unhappy, sad or depressed.
7. I try to avoid other people as much as possible.

V: Social Problems
1. I behave too young for my age.
2. I am too dependent from adults.
3. I do not get along well with other boys and girls.
4. I get bullied a lot.
5. Other boys and girls do not like me.
6. I am unhandy.
7. I prefer being with younger boys and girls than with children of my age.
8. I try to avoid other people as much as possible.

Appendix 3: Scales and items of the TRF
I: Attention Problems
1. Behaves to young for his/her age.
2. Hums or makes other strange noises in class.
3. Does not finish what he/she started.
4. Can not concentrate.
5. Can not sit still.
6. Is restless, wiggles or twiddles.
7. Daydream.
8. Finds it hard to follow hints.
9. Is impulsive, or acts without thinking.
10. Is nervous or tensed.
11. Has difficulties with learning.
12. Indifferent, listless or unmotivated.
13. Has bad school results.
14. Unhandy or bad coordination.
15. Works messy.
16. Inattentive, easily distracted.
17. Looks with an empty or blank expression.
18. Achieves beneath his/her ability.
19. Does not execute ordered assignments.

II: Criminal Behaviour
1. Does not seem to feel guilty when he/she has misbehaved.
2. Hangs out with boys or girls who get into trouble.
3. Lies, or cheats.
4. Prefers being with older boys or girls.
5. Steals.
6. Curses.
7. Comes in late for school or class.
8. Plays truant or skips school without a reason.
9. Uses alcohol or drugs.

III: Aggressive Behaviour
1. Contradicts or argues a lot.
2. Provoking, bold.
3. Brags, acts tough.
4. Cruel, bullies or is mean to others.
5. Demands a lot of attention.
6. Destroys his/her own things.
7. Destroys things of others.
8. Is disobedient at school.
9. Disturbs other students.
10. Is easily jealous.
11. Fights a lot.
12. Talks before asked to.
13. Attacks others physically.
15. Screams or yells a lot.
17. Shows explosive or unpredictable behaviour.
18. Is easily frustrated, wishes need to be fulfilled immediately.
19. Is stubborn, surly, or irritable.
21. Talks a lot.
22. Teases a lot.
23. Has blazes of anger, or short-tempered.
24. Threatens other people.
25. Is very loud.
IV: Withdrawn Behaviour.
1. Prefers being alone.
2. Refuses to talk.
3. Is closed, other people can not tell what goes inside his/her head.
4. Is shy or timid.
5. Looks with an empty or blank expression.
6. Sulks, pouts.
7. Too little active, moves slow, lack of energy.
8. Unhappy, sad, depressed.
9. Withdrawn, does not contact with other people.

V: Social Problems
1. Behaves too young for his/her age.
2. Clings on to adult, or is too dependent.
3. Complains about feeling lonely.
4. Cries a lot.
5. Can not get along well with other students.
6. Complains about feeling nobody loves him/her.
7. Feels others have it in for him/her.
8. Feels worthless or inferior.
9. Often has accidents or injuries.
10. Gets teased a lot.
11. Other students do not like him/her.
12. Unhandy or bad coordination.
13. Prefers being with younger boys or girl.