|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table S.6.** Model building process | | | |
|  | Maximum Score | Mother Report | Teacher Report |
| *Temperament* |  |  |  |
| Difficult | +\* | +\* | -- |
| Resistant to control (RTC) | +\* | +\* | **+\*** |
| Unadaptable | -- | -- | -- |
| Modeling decision | Higher RTC significantly predicted higher initial levels of dysregulation, across measures. Likelihood ratio tests showed significantly improved model fit with the inclusion of this predictor relative to a model with only the respective growth parameters (Max: χ2 = 529.7, df = 1, *p* < 0.001; Mother: χ2 = 324.7, df = 1, *p* < 0.001; Teacher: χ2 = 418.1, df = 1, *p* < 0.001). | | |
|
|
| *Parenting Practices* |  |  |  |
| Harsh | + \* | -- | -- |
| Reactive | -- | -- | -- |
| Proactive | -- | -- | -\* |
| Effective | -- | -- | -- |
| Warmth | -- | -- | -\* |
| Modeling decision | Parenting practices were not significantly associated with change in mother-reported dysregulation. Harsh parenting was significantly associated with growth in the maximum dysregulation score, and model fit improved with the inclusion of this predictor (χ2=4196.3, df = 1, *p*< 0.001). Both proactive and warm parenting were associated with reductions in teacher-reported dysregulation. Based on the AIC and BIC fit statistics^, warmth was retained because lower values demonstrate better fit (AIC = 7613.8 and BIC = 7647.8 for warmth, AIC =7929.6 and BIC = 7963.9 for proactive). Model fit improved with the inclusion of this predictor, relative to the model with just temperament and growth parameters (χ2 = 604.4, df = 1, *p* < .001) | | |
|
|
| *Stress* | -- | -- | -- |
| *Parenting X Child Temperament* |  |  |  |
| Warm Parenting X RTC | NA | -- | NA |
| Harsh Parenting X RTC | NA | -- | NA |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
|  | Maximum Score | Mother Report | Teacher Report |
| *Stress X Parenting* |  |  |  |
| Warm Parenting X RTC | -- | -- | -- |
| Harsh Parenting X RTC | -- | -- | -- |
| *Early Social Preference* | -\* | -\* | -\* |
| Modeling decision | Early social preference is associated with reduction in dysregulation, but the effect of harsh parenting diminished and is no longer significant. Early social preference is still significantly predictive if harsh is dropped from the model, but the full model with harsh parenting still included fits significantly better than the reduced model (χ2 = 2687.6, df = 1, *p*< .001). | Early social preference is associated with reduction in dysregulation, and the full model with early social preference fits significantly better than the reduced model with only RTC and growth parameters (χ2 = 1718.5, df = 1, *p* < .001) | Early social preference is associated with reduction in dysregulation, but the effect of warm parenting diminished and is no longer significant. Early social preference is still significantly predictive if warmth is dropped from the model, and the full model with social preference fits significantly better than the reduced model (χ2 = 484.1, df = 1, *p*< .001). |
|
|
|
|
|
| *Early Language Ability* | -\* | -- | -\* |
| Modeling decision | More advanced early language ability is associated with reduction in dysregulation, and the inclusion of this predictor significantly improves model fit (χ2 = 2122, df = 1, *p* < .001). |  | More advanced early language ability is associated with reduction in dysregulation, and the inclusion of this predictor significantly improves model fit (χ2 = 385.4, df = 1, p < .001). |
| *Note.* \*significant predictors based on conventional p values. + or – reflect the direction of effect. --non-significant effect. Temperament was used to predict the intercept. All other predictors predicted change in dysregulation. Parenting X temperament was only tested for mother-reported dysregulation, which showed no main effect of parenting. | | | |