PARTICIPANTS

* N = 246 (46% male); mean age = 14.5 (range=11-17)
* Race mix was generally representative of MA; most were middle/upper middle class

MEASURES

* CU behaviors
  + Assess lack of guilt, empathy, and affect
  + 5 items each with 3 levels of prevalence (0-2)
* Prosociality
  + Assess fairness, empathy, kindness, sharing, etc.
  + 11 items on 0-2 scale
* Hyperactivity (SDQ): parent- and self-assessments
  + 25 items, 5 of which assess hyperactivity (each on 0-2 scale)
  + note parent report is more reliable than self (alpha .84 vs .70)
* Aggression (EATQ)
  + Parent report: 7 items, each on (1-5 scale)
  + Child report: 9 items, each on (1-5 scale)
  + Parent and child report have similar accuracy
* Bullying and victimization (IBS)
  + Bullying: 9 items (1-5 scale), assess tendency to be a bully
  + Victimization: 4 items (1-5 scale), assess tendency to be a victim of bullying

PRISONER’S DILEMMA

* Payoffs (child/partner): C/C=3/3, C/D=0/4, D/C=4/0, DD=0/0
* 30 test trials; 10 trials with each of 3 different ‘partners’
  + Tit-for-tat partner: mirrors player moves in the following round
  + Cooperative partner: cooperates 80% of the time (defects in rounds 3,7)
  + Defecting partner: defects 80% of the time (cooperates in rounds 3,7)

TYPES OF AGGRESSION

* Reactive aggression
  + View negative interactions as intentional as opposed to a mistake
  + Retaliate and hold a grudge
  + With cooperative partner, expect continued defection as a result of initial “betrayal”
* Proactive aggression
  + Premeditated defection

QUESTIONS OF INTEREST

* Can we detect a preference change in response to prior interactions?
* Can we identify which children are more likely to aggress or forgive based on personality traits?
* Can we identify different mental processes that affect decision?
  + True preference to cooperate/defect
  + Initial bias to cooperate/defect
  + Deliberative vs intuitive responding