

APPENDIX 8a: RESULTS OF MANOVA ANALYSES COMPARING THE LOW/NON ANTISOCIAL, THE LOW RISK PERSISTENTLY ANTISOCIAL, AND THE HIGH RISK PERSISTENTLY ANTISOCIAL GROUPS FROM MID CHILDHOOD TO EARLY ADULTHOOD

Table 1: Significant differences between the *low/non* antisocial (Low), '*high risk*' *persistently antisocial* (HR) and '*low risk*' *persistently antisocial* (LR) groups during mid childhood (5-6 and 7-8 years).

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
5-6 YEARS (1988)			
PARENT REPORT Manova F (16,1350) = 4.11 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Inflexibility	8.96 ***	.30 (M)	HR more inflexible than Low & LR
▪ Persistence	5.34 **	.23 (S)	HR less persistent than Low
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	15.05 ***	.39 (M)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	9.84 ***	.43 (L)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
TEACHER REPORT Manova F (14,1220) = 2.75 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
• Reactivity	5.35 **	.15 (S)	HR more reactive than Low
• Task orientation	5.45 **	.21 (S)	HR lower task orientation than Low
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	12.97 ***	.30 (M)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	6.83 ***	.29 (M)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
7-8 YEARS (1990)			
PARENT REPORT Manova F (24, 1362) = 3.72 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Inflexibility	15.58 ***	.33 (M)	HR more inflexible than Low & LR
▪ Persistence	5.22 **	.23 (S)	HR less persistent than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	23.68 ***	.41 (L)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	25.14 ***	.50 (L)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality of parent-child relationship	6.02 **	.25 (M)	HR poorer relationship quality than Low & LR
<i>Parental Stress</i>			
How difficult life currently is	4.94 **	.25 (M)	No two groups significantly differ
How well parents are coping	3.63 *	.22 (S)	HR coping less well than Low & LR
TEACHER REPORT Manova F (18, 1152) = 2.58 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Reactivity	5.08 **	.21 (S)	HR more reactive than Low
▪ Task orientation	14.82 ***	.35 (M)	HR lower task orientation than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	10.24 ***	.31 (M)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	9.91 ***	.26 (M)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant differences on:

Parent report of approach-sociability, rhythmicity, anxiety-fearfulness, quality of parent-child relationship, and family socio-economic status at 5-6 years; approach-sociability, rhythmicity, anxiety-fearfulness, family stress, and family socio-economic status at 7-8 years

Teacher report of flexibility, anxiety-fearfulness, and school readiness at 5-6 years; flexibility, anxiety-fearfulness, academic skills, reading ability and social skills at 7-8 years;

Table 2: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during late childhood (9-10 and 11-12 years)

Domains	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
9-10 YEARS (1992)			
PARENT REPORT Manova F (24, 1348) = 3.89 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
• Activity	3.59 *	.15 (S)	HR more active than Low
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	21.77 ***	.39 (M)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	28.41 ***	.49 (L)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
▪ Anxious-fearful	5.60 **	.28 (M)	HR more anxious-fearful than Low & LR
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Self-confidence	4.00 *	.16 (S)	HR more self-confident than Low
▪ Empathic	9.31 ***	.38 (M)	HR less empathic than Low & LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality of parent-child relationship	6.97 ***	.26 (M)	HR poorer relationship quality than Low & LR
11-12 YEARS (1994)			
PARENT REPORT Manova F (38, 1212) = 4.58***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Negative reactivity	25.06 ***	.48 (L)	HR more reactive than Low & LR
▪ Task persistence	36.25 ***	.55 (L)	HR less task persistent than Low & LR
▪ Activity	34.99 ***	.66 (L)	HR more active than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	20.64 ***	.44 (L)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	37.00 ***	.69 (L)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
▪ Anxious-fearful	3.83 *	.20 (M)	HR more anxious-fearful than Low
▪ Depression	7.30 ***	.26 (M)	HR more depressed than Low & LR
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Co-operation	31.61 ***	.55 (L)	P less co-operative than Low & LR
▪ Self-control	22.84 ***	.43 (L)	P less self-control than Low & LR
▪ Responsibility	8.90 ***	.36 (M)	P less co-operative than Low & LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality of parent-child relationship	15.48 ***	.37 (M)	HR poorer relationship quality than Low & LR
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
• Quality of peer relationships	8.43 ***	.33 (M)	HR less positive peer relationships than Low & LR
▪ Antisocial peer affiliations	35.08 ***	.55 (L)	HR more antisocial peer affiliations than Low & LR
CHILD REPORT Manova F (24, 1352) = 7.51***			
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	34.27 ***	.48 (L)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	25.79 ***	.53 (L)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
▪ Depression	6.03 **	.15 (M)	HR more depressed than Low
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Assertiveness	33.19 ***	.49 (L)	HR less assertive than Low & LR
▪ Co-operation	51.14 ***	.60 (L)	P less co-operative than Low & LR
▪ Empathy	19.01 ***	.37 (M)	P less empathic than Low & LR
▪ Self-Control	25.61 ***	.43 (L)	P lower self-control than Low & LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Relationship with parents	35.14 ***	.32 (M)	HR poorer relationship with parents than Low & LR

<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
▪ Relationship with peers	5.22 **	.22 (M)	HR poorer relationship with peers than Low
TEACHER REPORT Manova F(20, 1160) = 5.78***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Task Orientation	38.57 ***	.55 (L)	HR lower task orientation than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	35.93 ***	.38 (M)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	24.75 ***	.38 (M)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
▪ Depression	17.07 ***	.37 (M)	HR more depressed than Low & LR
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Assertiveness	8.72 ***	.26 (M)	HR less assertive than Low
▪ Co-operation	37.57 ***	.47 (L)	HR less co-operative than Low & LR
▪ Self-Control	20.26 ***	.40 (L)	HR lower self-control than Low & LR
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
• Quality of peer relationships	10.30 ***	.29 (M)	HR less positive peer relationships than Low & LR
<i>Academic Competence</i>			
▪ Academic Competence	11.93 ***	.33 (M)	HR lower academic competence than Low

Highlighted = variable used in risk index

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant differences on:

Parent report of negative emotionality, shyness, sociability, quality of parent-child relationship and family socio-economic status at 9-10 years; approach-sociability, assertiveness, mother's educational level, father's educational level, father's occupation, family stress, and number of children in family at 11-12 years;

Teacher report of anxiety-fearfulness at 11-12 years; and

Child report of anxiety-fearfulness, negative and positive aspects of friendship quality at 11-12 years.

Table 3: Significant differences between the low/non antisocial (Low), 'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR) and 'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR) groups during early adolescence (12-13 years)

Domains	Univariate F	Effect size	Scheffe group differences
PARENT REPORT 12-13 years (1995) Manova F(26, 1264) = 5.67 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Negative reactivity	15.60 ***	.42 (L)	HR more reactive than Low & LR
▪ Activity	21.03 ***	.46 (L)	HR more active than Low & LR
▪ Persistence	22.87 ***	.41 (L)	HR less task persistence than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	24.29 ***	.43 (L)	HR more aggressive than Low & LR
▪ Hyperactivity	30.75 ***	.48 (L)	HR more hyperactive than Low & LR
▪ Depression	7.00 ***	.29 (M)	HR more depressed than Low & LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality – Parent-teen relationship	20.22 ***	.41 (L)	HR poorer relationship quality than Low & LR
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ School difficulties	47.27 ***	.63 (L)	HR more school difficulties than Low & LR
TEEN REPORT 12-13 years (1995) Manova F(26, 1220) = 7.04 ***			
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Aggression	50.94 ***	.60 (L)	HR & LR more aggressive than Low
▪ Hyperactivity	17.03 ***	.36 (M)	HR more hyperactive than Low
▪ Depression	4.18 *	.15 (S)	No 2 groups significantly different
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Co-operation	44.09 ***	.58 (L)	HR & LR less co-operative than Low
▪ Empathy	12.91 ***	.32 (M)	HR less empathic than Low
▪ Self-Control	43.46 ***	.58 (L)	HR & LR lower self-control than Low; HR lower self-control than LR
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ School difficulties	71.14 ***	.71 (L)	HR & LR more school difficulties than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant differences on:

Parent report of: anxiety-fearfulness, approach-sociability, depression, family socio-economic status, and family stress and
Teenager report of: anxiety-fearfulness, assertiveness at 12-13 years.

Table 4: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during early adolescence (13-14 years)

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
PARENT REPORT 13-14 years (1996) Manova F (54, 1278) = 4.62 ***			
<i>Temperament</i>			
▪ Negative reactivity	13.97 ***	.38 (M)	HR more reactive than Low & LR
▪ Persistence	31.55 ***	.49 (L)	HR less task persistence than Low & LR
▪ Activity	18.08 ***	.46 (L)	HR more active than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Conduct disorder	28.52 ***	.47 (L)	HR higher conduct disorder than Low & LR
▪ Socialised aggression	56.20 ***	.69 (L)	HR higher socialised aggression Low & LR
▪ Attention problems	37.14 ***	.43 (L)	HR more attention difficulties than Low & LR
▪ Anxiety-withdrawal	7.19 ***	.37 (M)	HR more anxious/withdrawn than Low & LR
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Co-operation	16.76 ***	.44 (L)	HR less co-operative than Low & LR
▪ Responsibility	19.98 ***	.44 (L)	HR less responsible than Low & LR
▪ Self-Control	19.83 ***	.40 (M)	HR lower self-control than Low & LR
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ School difficulties	51.02 ***	.43 (L)	HR more school difficulties than Low & LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality of parent-teen relationship	20.41 ***	.40 (L)	HR poorer relationship quality than Low & LR
<i>Parenting Practices</i>			
▪ Monitoring	13.15 ***	.33 (M)	HR lower parental monitoring than Low
▪ Harsh discipline	6.64 ***	.22 (M)	HR more harsh discipline than Low
▪ Warmth of relationship	9.11 ***	.21 (M)	HR less warmth in parent-teen relationship than Low
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
▪ Antisocial peer associations	54.85 ***	.65 (L)	HR more antisocial peer associations than Low & LR
▪ Group participation	7.80 ***	.23 (M)	HR less involved in organised group activities than Low
<i>Parental Substance Use</i>			
▪ Father's substance use **	4.88 **	.18 (S)	HR higher paternal substance use than Low
▪ Mother's substance use **	5.66 **	.18 (S)	HR higher maternal substance use than Low
TEEN REPORT Manova F (30, 1322) = 10.79 ***			
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Oppositional behaviour* **	81.97 ***	.75 (L)	HR & LR more oppositional than Low
▪ Hyperactivity	42.64 ***	.56 (L)	HR & LR more hyperactive than Low; HR more hyperactive than LR
▪ Anxiety *	3.22 *	.14 (S)	No two groups significantly different
▪ Depression	12.25 ***	.31 (M)	HR more depressed than Low
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Co-operation	69.69 ***	.74 (L)	HR & LR less co-operative than Low; HR less co-operative than LR
▪ Empathy	11.85 ***	.30 (M)	HR less empathic than Low
▪ Self-Control	50.84 ***	.63 (L)	HR & LR lower self-control than Low;

			HR lower self-control than LR
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ School Difficulties	70.75 ***	.80 (L)	HR & LR more school difficulties than Low; HR more school difficulties than LR
<i>Relationships with Parents</i>			
▪ Attachment to parents	25.20 ***	.43 (L)	HR I& LR lower attachment to parents than Low
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
▪ Attachment to peers **	6.46 **	.22 (M)	HR lower peer attachment than Low
▪ Antisocial peer associations	91.77 ***	.80 (L)	HR I& LR more deviant peer activities than Low
<i>Interests</i>			
▪ Breadth of Interests	14.63 ***	.36 (M)	HR greater breadth of interests than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant differences on:

Parent report of: approach-sociability, assertiveness, peer involvement, parenting style - use of inductive reasoning, physical punishment or obedience orientation, family socio-economic status, and paternal unemployment; and **Teenager report** of: friendship quality at 13-14 years.

Table 5: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during mid adolescence (15-16 years)

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
PARENT REPORT Manova F (46, 1348) = 5.34 ***			
<i>Temperament/Personality</i>			
▪ Negative reactivity	14.87 ***	.35 (M)	HR more reactive than Low & LR
▪ Persistence	44.46 ***	.60 (L)	HR less task persistence than Low & LR
▪ Activity	14.03 ***	.35 (M)	HR more active than Low & LR
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Conduct disorder	21.87 ***	.43 (L)	HR higher conduct disorder than Low & LR
▪ Socialised aggression	52.64 ***	.87 (L)	HR & LR more socialised aggression than Low
▪ Attention problems	16.02 ***	.36 (M)	HR more attention problems than Low & LR
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Assertiveness	5.44 **	.25 (M)	LR less assertive than Low
▪ Responsibility	8.54 ***	.25 (M)	HR less responsible than Low
▪ Self-control	16.11 ***	.35 (M)	HR lower self-control than Low
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ School Difficulties	38.68 ***	.50 (L)	HR & LR more school difficulties than Low; HR more school difficulties than LR
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality of parent-teen relationship	27.42 ***	.45 (L)	HR & LR poorer relationship quality than Low
<i>Parenting Practices</i>			
▪ Monitoring	17.47 ***	.35 (M)	HR & LR lower parental monitoring than Low
▪ Harsh discipline	13.23 ***	.31 (M)	HR more harsh discipline than Low
▪ Warmth	18.38 ***	.36 (M)	HR less warmth in parent-teen relationship than Low
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
▪ Antisocial peer friendships	40.26 ***	.47 (L)	HR & LR more antisocial peer friendships than Low
▪ Organised peer group activities	3.99 *	.15 (S)	No two groups significantly different
▪ Involvement with peers/friends	6.67 ***	.17 (S)	LR lower peer involvement than Low
TEEN REPORT Manova F (46, 1324) = 7.72 ***			
<i>Temperament/Personality</i>			
▪ Agreeableness	25.23 ***	.41 (L)	HR & LR less agreeable than Low
▪ Conscientiousness	25.84 ***	.42 (L)	HR & LR less conscientious than Low
▪ Extraversion	4.49 *	.21 (M)	HR more extraverted than Low??
▪ Emotional control	3.76 *	.16 (S)	No two groups significantly different
<i>Sensation -Seeking and Risk- Taking</i>			
▪ Attraction to risk-taking	35.00 ***	.61 (L)	HR & LR higher attraction to risk-taking than Low
▪ Sensation-seeking	4.62 **	.42 (L)	HR higher thrill & sensation-seeking than Low
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Oppositional Behaviour	88.44 ***	.76 (L)	HR & LR more oppositional than Low
▪ Hyperactivity	49.74 ***	.60 (L)	HR & LR more hyperactive than Low
▪ Depression	9.76 ***	.27 (M)	HR & LR more depressed than Low
<i>Social Competence</i>			
▪ Assertiveness	8.79 ***	.25 (M)	HR more assertive than Low
<i>Civic Mindedness</i>			
▪ Civic Responsibility/ Efficacy	13.37 ***	.29 (M)	HR & LR lower civic responsibility/efficacy than Low

▪ Prosocial Behaviours	7.00 ***	.21 (M)	HR less prosocial behaviour than Low
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ Confidence in Ability/Success	32.08 ***	.43 (L)	HR & LR less confident than Low
▪ Relevance of Schooling	20.78 ***	.37 (M)	HR & LR less relevance than Low
▪ Positive Affect Towards School	34.00 ***	.48 (L)	HR & LR less positive affect towards school than Low
▪ Relationship with Teachers	52.35 ***	.62 (L)	HR & LR poorer relationship with teachers than Low
▪ School provides prestige and status	3.18 *	.18 (S)	No two groups significantly different
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
▪ Antisocial peer friendships	94.00 ***	.79 (L)	HR & LR more antisocial peer friendships than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant differences on:

Parent report of: anxiety-withdrawal, approach-sociability, mother's use of inductive reasoning, family stress, socio-economic status and parental unemployment at 15-16 years; and **Teenager report** of: anxiety-fearfulness, openness to experience, friendship quality, and political activity, at 15-16 years.

Table 6: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial* (Low), '*high risk*' *persistently antisocial* (HR) and '*low risk*' *persistently antisocial* (LR) groups during late adolescence (17-18 years)

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
PARENT REPORT Manova F (42, 1166) = 6.05 ***			
<i>Temperament/Personality</i>			
▪ Reactivity	6.49 **	.28 (M)	HR more reactive than Low & LR
▪ Persistence	18.60 ***	.43 (L)	HR less task persistent than Low
▪ Agreeableness	10.82 ***	.33 (M)	HR less agreeable than Low
▪ Conscientiousness	21.42 ***	.44 (L)	HR & LR less conscientious than Low
▪ Neuroticism	4.21 *	.21 (M)	HR more neurotic than Low
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Conduct disorder	13.53 ***	.37 (M)	HR higher conduct disorder than Low
▪ Socialised aggression	101.71 ***	.91 (L)	HR & LR more aggressive than Low
▪ Attention problems	18.26 ***	.42 (L)	HR more attention problems than Low
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Quality of parent-teen relationship	11.99 ***	.33 (M)	HR poorer relationship quality than Low
▪ Parent-teen conflict	8.19 ***	.27 (M)	HR more parent-teen conflict than Low
<i>Parenting Practices</i>			
▪ Monitoring	26.91 ***	.41 (L)	HR & LR lower parental monitoring than Low
▪ Harsh discipline	6.04 **	.23 (M)	HR more harsh discipline than Low
<i>Family Environment</i>			
▪ Family cohesion	9.52 ***	.27 (M)	HR & LR lower family cohesion than Low
▪ Intact family	7.09 ***	.28 (M)	HR less likely to have an intact family than Low
▪ Marital conflict	6.82 ***	.15 (L)	HR higher parental marital conflict than Low
<i>Peer Relationships</i>			
▪ Antisocial peer friendships	36.14 ***	.60 (L)	HR & LR more antisocial peer friendships than Low; HR more antisocial peer friendships than LR
<i>School adjustment and achievement</i>			
▪ School problems	32.00 ***	.56 (L)	HR more school problems than Low & LR
TEEN REPORT Manova F (58, 1436) = 6.90			
<i>Temperament/Personality</i>			
▪ Agreeableness	44.31 ***	.54 (L)	HR & LR less agreeable than Low; HR less agreeable than LR
▪ Conscientiousness	23.15 ***	.38 (M)	HR & LR less conscientious than Low
▪ Emotional control	13.03 ***	.31 (M)	HR lower emotional control than Low
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>			
▪ Oppositional behaviour	72.16 ***	.68 (L)	HR & LR more oppositional than Low
▪ Hyperactivity	21.85 ***	.38 (M)	HR & LR more hyperactive than Low
▪ Depression	3.05 *	.13 (S)	No two groups significantly different
<i>Coping Strategies</i>			
▪ Use Drugs	145.19 ***	.96 (L)	HR & LR use drugs to cope more than Low

▪ Ventilate Feelings	35.68 ***	.49 (L)	HR & LR cope by ventilating feelings more than Low
<i>Future Orientation</i>			
▪ Optimism	11.31 ***	.28 (M)	HR less optimistic than Low
▪ Identity clarity	5.03 **	.18 (S)	No two groups significantly different
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>			
▪ School attachment / bonding	35.40 ***	.26 (M)	HR & LR less attached to school than Low
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>			
▪ Warmth and Communication	5.19 **	.18 (S)	HR lower warmth and communication than Low
▪ Alienation	3.99 *	.14 (S)	No two groups significantly different
▪ Supervision / monitoring	21.10 ***	.38 (M)	HR less supervised than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant differences on:

Parent report of: anxiety-withdrawal, approach-sociability, extraversion, openness to experience, and family stress and socio-economic status at 17-18 years; and

Self report of: anxiety-fearfulness, neuroticism, openness to experience, self-esteem, attachment to peers (communication), attachment to peers (trust), attachment to peers (alienation), attachment to mother (trust), coping (support seeking), coping (use humour), coping (via diversion), coping (wishful thinking), cope (independent action), the future (desire for privacy), the future (readiness for intimacy) at 17-18 years.

Table 7: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups on young adult participants' life circumstances at 19-20 years

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
SELF REPORT Manova F (26,1152) = 3.94, p<.001			
Completed secondary school	29.66 ***	.52 (L)	HR & LR less often completed secondary school than Low; LR less often completed secondary school than Low
Has undertaken university education	15.75 ***	.33 (M)	HR & LR had less often undertaken university study than Low
Currently studying	25.12 ***	.41 (L)	HR & LR less often currently studying than Low
Current income	15.58 ***	.32 (M)	HR & LR higher weekly income than Low
Parents' financial support	8.38 ***	.24 (M)	HR & LR had less often received parental financial support than Low
PARENT REPORT Manova F (16, 1140) = 2.05, p<.009 TREND			
Parents paid educational course fees #	4.48 *	.22 (M)	parents of HR less often paid fees than parents of Low
Parents gave/ their ATP son/daughter a regular allowance #	3.16 *	.22 (M)	parents of HR less often gave an allowance than parents of Low
Family socio-economic background #	5.40 *	.23 (M)	LR lower socio-economic background than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

Shown for reader interest only. Technically, these are not inspected following a non-significant multivariate finding.

There were no significant group differences on –

Self Reports of employment pattern since leaving secondary school; currently working; living with parents; income derived from paid employment or from government assistance; experiencing financial strain, has undertaken TAFE or other types of further education courses

Parent Reports of family parent/s recently unemployed; family experience of financial strain; parents helped ATP son/daughter with bills or rent; parents gave or loaned their ATP son/daughter money; parents provided other material support for ATP son/daughter

Table 8: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups on individual attributes at 19-20 years

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
SELF REPORT Manova F (26.1150) = 3.13 p<.001			
Temperament Positive Emotionality	6.55 **	.22 (M)	HR less positive in mood than Low
Temperament Persistence	4.84 **	.17 (S)	HR less persistent than Low
Temperament Negative Reactivity	4.62 **	.20 (M)	HR more negatively reactive than Low
Social skills Empathy	11.04 ***	.30 (M)	HR less empathic than Low
Social skills Responsibility	27.56 ***	.44 (L)	HR & LR less responsible than Low
Social skills Self Control	8.71 ***	.29 (M)	HR less self controlled than Low
Emotional Control	3.01 *	.15 (S)	No two groups significantly different
Management of Emotions	3.18 *	.15 (S)	No two groups significantly different
PARENT REPORT Manova F (26,1182) = 4.01 p<.001			
Temperament Positive Emotionality	8.02 ***	.20 (M)	HR & LR less positive in mood than Low
Temperament Negative Reactivity	10.26 ***	.28 (M)	HR more negatively reactive than Low
Temperament Flexibility	9.50 ***	.10 (S)	HR less flexible than Low
Temperament Persistence	17.30 ***	.37 (M)	HR & LR less persistent than Low
Temperament Activity	5.10 **	.19 (S)	HR more active than Low
Temperament Distractibility	5.12 **	.21 (M)	HR more distractible than Low
Social skills Empathy	11.39 ***	.30 (M)	HR less empathic than Low
Social skills Responsibility	34.24 ***	.52 (L)	HR & LR less responsible than Low
Social skills Self Control	17.78 ***	.38 (M)	HR less self controlled than Low
Emotional control	19.37 ***	.39 (M)	HR & LR lower control of emotions than Low
Management of emotions	10.45 ***	.29 (M)	HR poorer management of emotions than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant group differences on –

Self Reports of temperament factors of approach-sociability, flexibility, activity and distractibility; religious faith; and the social skills assertiveness scale

Parent Reports of temperament factor of approach-sociability; and the social skills assertiveness scale.

Table 9: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups on young adults' adjustment at 19-20 years

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
SELF REPORT Manova F (20,1194) = 9.00, p<.001			
Experienced victimisation	16.96 ***	.34 (M)	HR & LR experienced victimisation more often than Low
Smokes cigarettes	34.34 ***	.63 (L)	HR & LR smoke cigarettes more often than Low
Binge drinking	23.48 ***	.42 (L)	HR & LR binge drink more often than Low
Deleterious effects of alcohol use	59.09 ***	.72 (L)	HR & LR more deleterious effects of alcohol use than Low
Marijuana use	55.57 ***	.68 (L)	HR & LR more marijuana use than Low
Deleterious effects of marijuana use	58.23 ***	.72 (L)	HR & LR more deleterious effects of marijuana use than Low
Other illicit substance use	28.41 ***	.53 (L)	HR & LR more illicit substance use than Low
Engages in risky driving	35.90 ***	.52 (L)	HR & LR more risky driving than Low
Number of speeding offences	14.21 ***	.31 (M)	HR & LR detected speeding more often than Low
PARENT REPORT Manova F (12, 1180) = 13.81, p<.001			
Socialised Aggression	51.58 ***	.64 (L)	HR & LR more aggressive than Low
Conduct Disorder	31.64 ***	.51 (L)	HR & LR higher conduct disorder than Low
Anxiety-withdrawal	7.54 ***	.24 (M)	HR more anxious/withdrawn than Low
Criminal justice contacts	11.68 ***	.41 (L)	LR more criminal justice contacts than HR & Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

S = small effect size (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant group differences on –

Self Reports of experience of depression anxiety, stress; life satisfaction; alcohol use in past month; number of road crashes when the driver.

Parent Reports of ATP son/daughter has a long-term health problem

Table 10: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, '*high risk*' *persistently antisocial (HR)* and '*low risk*' *persistently antisocial (LR)* groups on interpersonal and community relationships

Domain	Univariate F	Effect Size	Scheffe group differences
SELF REPORT Manova F (38,1142) = 5.58 p<.001			
Emotional support from parents	3.09 *	.21 (M)	No 2 groups significantly different
Negative appraisal by parents	4.61 **	.20 (M)	No 2 groups significantly different
Conflict with parents	4.58 *	.20 (M)	HR more conflict with parents than Low
Negative appraisal by friends	4.29 *	.16 (S)	No 2 groups significantly different
Antisocial peer friendships	73.10 ***	.84 (L)	HR & LR more antisocial friends than Low
In an romantic relationship	3.31 *	.19 (S)	No 2 groups significantly different
Partner's antisocial behaviour	3.75 *	.21 (M)	No 2 groups significantly different
Perception of the risk of apprehension for an offence	7.77 ***	.24 (M)	HR & LR perceived less risk of apprehension than Low
Confidence in the police	62.45 ***	.53 (L)	HR & LR less confidence in police than Low
Confidence in the courts	13.20 ***	.33 (M)	HR & LR less confidence in courts than Low
Trust in organizations	7.28 ***	.27 (M)	HR less trust than Low
PARENT REPORT Manova F (14,1116) = 11.19, p<.001			
Emotional support	11.10 ***	.30 (M)	HR less emotional support than Low
Instrumental support	4.31 *	.20 (M)	HR less instrumental support than Low
Negative appraisal of ATP young adult	8.17 ***	.27 (M)	parents of HR more negative to young adult than parents of Low
Conflict with parents	11.72 ***	.31 (M)	HR more conflict with parents than Low
Antisocial peer friendships	77.03 ***	.84 (L)	HR & LR more antisocial friends than Low; LR more antisocial friends than Low

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

S = small effect size. (.10 - .19);

M = medium effect size (.20 - .39);

L = large effect size (.40 or above);

-- = below effect size criteria (below .10)

There were no significant group differences on –

Self Reports of parents' informational and instrumental support; friends' emotional, informational and instrumental support; number of close friends; size of friendship network; civic engagement; participation in community groups.

Parent Reports of informational support for ATP son/daughter; ATP son/daughter's civic engagement.

APPENDIX 8b: RESULTS OF MANCOVA ANALYSES COMPARING THE LOW/NON ANTISOCIAL, THE LOW RISK PERSISTENTLY ANTISOCIAL, AND THE HIGH RISK PERSISTENTLY ANTISOCIAL GROUPS FROM MID CHILDHOOD TO EARLY ADULTHOOD, CONTROLLING FOR GENDER COMPOSITION DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GROUPS

Table 11: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during mid childhood (5-6 and 7-8 years), controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
5-6 YEARS (1988)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (16,1348) = 3.61 ***	
Temperament	
▪ Inflexibility	7.99 ***
▪ Persistence	3.45 *
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Aggression	12.24 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	8.30 ***
TEACHER REPORT Mancova F (14,1218) = 2.31; p<.004; TREND	
Temperament	
• Reactivity #	3.86 *
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Aggression #	9.78 ***
▪ Hyperactivity #	5.07 **
7-8 YEARS (1990)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (24, 1360) = 3.20 ***	
Temperament	
▪ Inflexibility	13.06 ***
▪ Persistence	3.32 *
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Aggression	17.71 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	18.80 ***
Parent-child Relationship	
▪ Quality of parent-child relationship	4.00 **
Parental Stress	
How difficult life currently is	4.90 **
TEACHER REPORT Mancova F (18, 1150) = 1.91; p<.012 TREND	
Temperament	
▪ Reactivity #	3.32 *
▪ Task orientation #	9.70***
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Aggression #	7.87 ***
▪ Hyperactivity #	6.36 **

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shown for reader interest only. Technically, these are not inspected following a non-significant multivariate finding.

Table 12: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during late childhood (9-10 and 11-12 years), controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domains	Univariate F
9-10 YEARS (1992)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (24, 1346) = 3.30 ***	
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>	
▪ Aggression	17.46 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	22.07 ***
▪ Anxious-fearful	5.28 **
<i>Social Competence</i>	
▪ Self-confidence	4.75 **
▪ Empathic	5.72 **
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>	
▪ Quality of parent-child relationship	6.17 **
11-12 YEARS (1994)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (38, 1210) = 3.98 ***	
<i>Temperament</i>	
▪ Negative reactivity	22.35 ***
▪ Persistence	28.20 ***
▪ Activity	29.10 ***
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>	
▪ Aggression	18.03 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	32.10 ***
▪ Anxious-fearful	4.33 *
▪ Depression	9.55 ***
<i>Social Competence</i>	
▪ Co-operation	26.39 ***
▪ Self-control	19.44 ***
▪ Responsibility	7.40 ***
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>	
▪ Quality of parent-child relationship	11.41 ***
<i>Peer Relationships</i>	
• Quality of peer relationships	6.66 ***
▪ Antisocial peer affiliations	32.13 ***
CHILD REPORT Mancova F (24, 1350) = 7.01***	
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>	
▪ Aggression	30.56 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	21.28 ***
▪ Depression	7.70 ***
<i>Social Competence</i>	
▪ Assertiveness	28.84 ***
▪ Co-operation	41.84 ***
▪ Empathy	11.78 ***
▪ Self-Control	20.73 ***
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>	
▪ Relationship with parents	32.89 ***
<i>Peer Relationships</i>	
▪ Relationship with peers	3.88 *

TEACHER REPORT <i>Mancova F(20, 1158) = 4.64 ***</i>	
<i>Temperament</i>	
▪ Task Orientation	25.77 ***
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>	
▪ Aggression	30.24 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	18.77 ***
▪ Depression	16.82 ***
<i>Social Competence</i>	
▪ Assertiveness	6.02 **
▪ Co-operation	25.59 ***
▪ Self-Control	15.50 ***
<i>Peer Relationships</i>	
• Quality of peer relationships	8.93 ***
<i>Academic Competence</i>	
▪ Academic Competence	12.70 ***

Highlighted = variable used in risk index

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

Table 13: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial* (Low), *'high risk' persistently antisocial* (HR) and *'low risk' persistently antisocial* (LR) groups during early adolescence (12-13 years), controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domains	Univariate F
12-13 YEARS (1995)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (26, 1262) = 5.11 ***	
<i>Temperament</i>	
▪ Negative reactivity	15.01 ***
▪ Activity	16.10 ***
▪ Persistence	16.96 ***
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>	
▪ Aggression	21.48 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	26.28 ***
▪ Depression	7.22 ***
<i>Parent-child Relationship</i>	
▪ Quality – Parent-teen relationship	19.62 ***
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>	
▪ School difficulties	4.17 ***
TEEN REPORT Mancova F(26, 1218) = 6.29 ***	
<i>Behaviour Problems</i>	
▪ Aggression	44.27 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	14.31 ***
▪ Depression	5.62 **
<i>Social Competence</i>	
▪ Co-operation	36.09 ***
▪ Empathy	4.36 *
▪ Self-Control	41.01 ***
<i>School Adjustment and Achievement</i>	
▪ School difficulties	60.33 ***

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

Table 14: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during early adolescence (13-14 years), controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition (* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001).

Domain	Univariate F
13-14 years (1996)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (54, 1276) = 4.37 ***	
Temperament	
▪ Negative reactivity	14.55 ***
▪ Persistence	22.73 ***
▪ Activity	14.56 ***
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Conduct disorder	25.50 ***
▪ Socialised aggression	52.19 ***
▪ Attention problems	29.35 ***
▪ Anxiety-withdrawal	8.01 ***
Social Competence	
▪ Co-operation	13.41 ***
▪ Responsibility	15.73 ***
▪ Self-Control	18.81 ***
School Adjustment and Achievement	
▪ School difficulties	41.16 ***
Parent-child Relationship	
▪ Quality of parent-teen relationship	19.55 ***
Parenting Practices	
▪ Monitoring	11.63 ***
▪ Harsh discipline	5.13 **
▪ Warmth of relationship	7.72 ***
Peer Relationships	
▪ Antisocial peer associations	48.32 ***
▪ Group participation	8.83 ***
Parental Substance Use	
▪ Father's substance use **	5.92 **
▪ Mother's substance use **	6.24 **
TEEN REPORT Mancova F (30, 1320) = 9.93 ***	
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Oppositional behaviour* **	73.94 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	35.56 ***
▪ Depression	18.23 ***
Social Competence	
▪ Co-operation	69.87 ***
▪ Assertiveness	3.92 *
▪ Self-Control	49.19 ***
School Adjustment and Achievement	
▪ School Difficulties	63.03 ***
Relationships with Parents	
▪ Attachment to parents	25.73 ***
Peer Relationships	
▪ Antisocial peer associations	88.48 ***
Interests	
▪ Breadth of Interests	10.55 ***

Table 15: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during mid adolescence (15-16 years), controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
15-16 years (1998)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (46, 1346) = 5.19 ***	
Temperament/Personality	
▪ Negative reactivity	17.11 ***
▪ Persistence	34.28 ***
▪ Activity	10.96 ***
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Conduct disorder	19.87 ***
▪ Socialised aggression	50.60 ***
▪ Attention problems	11.18 ***
▪ Anxiety-withdrawal	3.45 *
Social Competence	
▪ Assertiveness	8.07 ***
▪ Responsibility	8.40 ***
▪ Self-control	16.52 ***
School Adjustment and Achievement	
▪ School Difficulties	30.57 ***
Parent-child Relationship	
▪ Quality of parent-teen relationship	26.50 ***
Parenting Practices	
▪ Monitoring	16.38 ***
▪ Harsh discipline	11.14 ***
▪ Warmth	16.27 ***
Peer Relationships	
▪ Antisocial peer friendships	41.26 ***
▪ Organised peer group activities	5.30 **
▪ Involvement with peers/friends	10.07 ***
TEEN REPORT Mancova F (46, 1322) = 7.55 ***	
Temperament/Personality	
▪ Agreeableness	26.91 ***
▪ Conscientiousness	20.96 ***
▪ Extraversion	5.25 **
▪ Openness to experience	3.07 *
▪ Emotional control	6.97 ***
Risk- Taking	
▪ Attraction to risk-taking	24.70 ***
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Oppositional behaviour	86.03 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	49.77 ***
▪ Depression	18.88 ***
Social Competence	
▪ Assertiveness	8.15 ***
Civic Mindedness	
▪ Civic responsibility/ efficacy	8.78 ***
▪ Prosocial behaviours	4.17 *
School Adjustment and Achievement	
▪ Confidence in ability/success	27.05 ***

▪ Relevance of schooling	19.82 ***
▪ Positive affect towards school	27.49 ***
▪ Relationship with teachers	47.55 ***
▪ School provides prestige and status	3.11 *
Peer Relationships	
▪ Antisocial peer friendships	106.18 ***
▪ Friendship quality	5.30 **

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

Table 16: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups during late adolescence (17-18 years), controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
17-18 years (2000)	
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (42, 1164) = 5.44 ***	
Temperament/Personality	
▪ Reactivity	12.48 ***
▪ Persistence	16.28 ***
▪ Agreeableness	14.77 ***
▪ Conscientiousness	16.57 ***
▪ Neuroticism	4.97 **
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Conduct disorder	15.19 ***
▪ Socialised aggression	109.41 ***
▪ Attention problems	18.87 ***
Parent-child Relationship	
▪ Quality of parent-teen relationship	9.19 ***
▪ Parent-teen conflict	11.93 ***
Parenting Practices	
▪ Monitoring	21.75 ***
▪ Harsh discipline	6.12 **
Family Environment	
▪ Family cohesion	12.43 ***
▪ Intact family	9.19 ***
▪ Marital conflict	6.81***
Peer Relationships	
▪ Antisocial peer friendships	53.05 ***
School adjustment and achievement	
▪ School problems	26.00 ***
TEEN REPORT Manova F (58, 1434) = 5.21 ***	
Temperament/Personality	
▪ Agreeableness	30.60 ***
▪ Conscientiousness	15.08 ***
▪ Emotional control	14.34 ***
Behaviour Problems	
▪ Oppositional behaviour	55.99 ***
▪ Hyperactivity	25.10 ***
▪ Depression	8.17 ***
▪ Anxiety	4.47 *
Coping Strategies	
▪ Use Drugs	115.80 ***

▪ Ventilate Feelings	34.84 ***
▪ Support seeking	3.24 *
▪ Wishful thinking	7.23 ***
Future Orientation	
▪ Optimism	9.15 ***
▪ Identity clarity	5.69 **
School Adjustment and Achievement	
▪ School attachment / bonding	27.51 ***
Parent-child Relationship	
▪ Alienation	4.19 *
▪ Supervision / monitoring	6.28 **
Self Esteem	
▪ Self esteem general scale	5.28**

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* $p < .05$;

** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$

Table 17: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial* (Low), *'high risk' persistently antisocial* (HR) and *'low risk' persistently antisocial* (LR) groups on young adult participants' life circumstances at 19-20 years, controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
19-20 years (2002)	
SELF REPORT Manova F (26,1150) = 3.51, p<.001	
Completed secondary school	24.01 ***
Has undertaken university education	13.08 ***
Currently studying	22.31 ***
Current income	13.83 ***
Parents' financial support	6.73 ***
Living at home	3.82 *
PARENT REPORT Manova F (16, 1138) = 1.96, p<.013 TREND	
Parents paid educational course fees #	3.69 *
Family socio-economic background #	3.36 *

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shown for reader interest only. Technically, these are not inspected following a non-significant multivariate finding.

Table 18: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial* (Low), *'high risk' persistently antisocial* (HR) and *'low risk' persistently antisocial* (LR) groups on young adults' individual attributes at 19-20 years, controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
19-20 years (2002)	
SELF REPORT Mancova F (28, 1148) = 2.91 p<.001	
Temperament Positive Emotionality	4.07 *
Temperament Persistence	5.62 **
Temperament Negative Reactivity	9.75 ***
Temperament Flexibility	3.16 *
Social skills Empathy	4.47 *
Social skills Responsibility	25.47 ***
Social skills Self Control	9.60 ***
Emotional Control	5.31 **
Management of Emotions	8.14 ***
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (26, 1180) = 4.01 p<.001	
Temperament Positive Emotionality	5.78 **
Temperament Negative Reactivity	12.31 ***
Temperament Flexibility	7.94 ***
Temperament Persistence	15.60 ***
Temperament Activity	3.67 *
Temperament Distractibility	5.18 **
Social skills Empathy	4.93 **
Social skills Responsibility	26.16 ***
Social skills Self Control	16.45 ***
Emotional control	17.48 ***
Management of emotions	13.94 ***

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Table 19: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial* (Low), *'high risk' persistently antisocial* (HR) and *'low risk' persistently antisocial* (LR) groups on adjustment at 19-20 years; controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
19-20 years (2002)	
SELF REPORT Mancova F (20, 1192) = 8.64, p<.001	
Experienced victimisation	15.22 ***
Smokes cigarettes	33.95 ***
Binge drinking	16.63 ***
Deleterious effects of alcohol use	51.07 ***
Marijuana use	52.35 ***
Deleterious effects of marijuana use	53.30 ***
Other illicit substance use	26.47 ***
Engages in risky driving	27.93 ***
Number of speeding offences	8.83 ***
PARENT REPORT Mancova F (12, 1178) = 13.27, p<.001	
Socialised Aggression	49.18 ***
Conduct Disorder	32.12 ***
Anxiety-withdrawal	9.37 ***
Criminal justice contacts	10.84 ***

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Table 20: Significant differences between the *low/non antisocial (Low)*, *'high risk' persistently antisocial (HR)* and *'low risk' persistently antisocial (LR)* groups on interpersonal and community relationships, controlling for differences between the groups in gender composition.

Domain	Univariate F
19-20 years (2002)	
SELF REPORT Manova F (38.1140) = 5.08 p<.001	
Negative appraisal by parents	3.87 *
Conflict with parents	4.50 *
Antisocial peer friendships	63.60 ***
In an romantic relationship	6.44 **
Partner's antisocial behaviour	5.26 **
Perception of the risk of apprehension for an offence	5.59 **
Confidence in the police	37.92 ***
Confidence in the courts	10.73 ***
Trust in organizations	7.28 **
PARENT REPORT Manova F (14, 1114) = 10.25, p<.001	
Emotional support	10.15 ***
Instrument al support	3.79 *
Negative appraisal of ATP young adult	7.93 ***
Conflict with parents	8.89 ***
Antisocial peer friendships	69.21 ***

Low = Low/non antisocial; HR = High risk persistently antisocial; LR = Low risk persistently antisocial

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001