**Appendix A**

**Model Specifications**

As preregistered, we started each ML-VAR(1) model with a minimum of 5,000 iterations and the default of maximal 50,000 iterations, thinning factor of two, and accounting for unequal time intervals due to missing values by setting TINTERVAL to 1. By default, DSEM analyses are estimated with Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC). The ML-VAR(1) model convergences if the Potential Scale Reduction (PSR) is close to zero. We further inspected model convergence by checking whether the trace plots looked like fat caterpillars and were not showing irregularities such as trends or spikes (Hamaker et al., 2018). If no convergence issue emerged, we checked whether the PSR was initially not close to zero by chance by setting the minimum iterations to 10,000. If a convergence issue emerged, we increased the minimum iterations to 10,000 or higher and the thinning factor to 5 for more stable estimates.

**Table A1**

*Overview of Model Specifications of Final ML-VAR(1) Models*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Min. iterations | Max. iterations | Thinning | Correlations random slopes |
| 1. Parental psychological control and self-esteem | 50,000 | 500,000 | 5 | yes |
| 2. Parental psychological control and depressive symptoms | 20,000 | default | 5 | no |
| 3. Parental psychological control and anxiety symptoms | - | - | - | - |
| 4. Parental support and  self-esteem | 10,000 | default | 5 | yes |
| 5. Parental support and  depressive symptoms | 20,000 | default | 5 | no |
| 6. Parental support and  anxiety symptoms | 20,000 | default | 5 | yes |

*Note.* Default = maximum of 50,000 iterations.

**Appendix B**

**Table B1**

*Overview of compliance across adolescent participants*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Completed bi-weekly questionnaires | Number of participants |
| 1 to 5 (4-19%) | 23 (9.0%) |
| 6 to 10 (23-38%) | 33 (12.9%) |
| 11 to 15 (42-58%) | 29 (11.3%) |
| 16 to 20 (62-77%) | 26 (10.2%) |
| 21 to 25 (81-96%) | 65 (25.4%) |
| 26 (100%) | 80 (31.3%) |

**Appendix C**

**Table C1**

*Detailed Overview of Responsivity Patterns*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Lagged effect of parenting to adolescent psychological functioning | | | | | |  | |  | |
| Responsivity pattern | PPC 🡪 ASE | PPC 🡪 ADS | PS 🡪 ASE | PS 🡪 ADS | PS 🡪 AAS |  | | *n* | |
| **Predicted patterns (H3)** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| 1. Adverse sensitive (“for better”) |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **15** | |
|  | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | | 5 | |
|  | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | | 6 | |
|  | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | | 2 | |
| 2. Vantage sensitive (“for worse”) |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **8** | |
|  | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | - |  | | 4 | |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  | | 2 | |
|  | 0 | 0 | + | - | - |  | | 1 | |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  | | 1 | |
| 3. Differentially susceptible  (“for better and for worse”) |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **67** | |
|  | **-** | **+** | **+** | **-** | **-** |  | | 12 | |
|  | - | 0 | + | 0 | - |  | | 12 | |
|  | - | + | + | 0 | - |  | | 9 | |
|  | - | + | 0 | 0 | - |  | | 7 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | … | |
| 4. Unsusceptible (“for neither”) |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **0** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| **Unpredicted patterns** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| 5. Opposing effect of PPC |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **6** | |
|  | +\* | 0 | + | - | - |  | | 2 | |
|  | +\* | 0 | + | - | 0 |  | | 1 | |
|  | +\* | 0 | + | 0 | - |  | | 1 | |
|  | +\* | 0 | 0 | - | - |  | | 1 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | … | |
| 6. Opposing effect of PS |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **73** | |
|  | - | + | -\* | +\* | +\* |  | | 7 | |
|  | - | + | + | +\* | - |  | | 4 | |
|  | - | 0 | -\* | +\* | +\* |  | | 3 | |
|  | - | + | 0 | 0 | +\* |  | | 3 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | … | |
| 7. Opposing effect of PPC and PS |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **17** | |
|  | +\* | 0 | -\* | +\* | +\* |  | | 4 | |
|  | +\* | 0 | -\* | - | - |  | | 2 | |
|  | +\* | -\* | -\* | +\* | 0 |  | | 1 | |
|  | +\* | -\* | 0 | +\* | +\* |  | | 1 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | … | |
| 8. Unperceptive |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **72** | |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **256** | |

*Note*. For each pattern, we displayed a maximum of four possible combinations of effects. Unpredicted, opposing effects are indicated with an asterisk. PPC = parental psychological control. PS = parental support. ASE = adolescent self-esteem. ADS = adolescent depressive symptoms. AAS = adolescent anxiety symptoms. *n* = number of participants in this subgroup. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation.

0 = null effect (-.05 > β < .05), + = positive effect (β ≥ .05), - = negative effect (β ≤ -.05)

**Appendix D**

**Table D1**

*Correlations Between Absolute Effect Sizes and Highly Sensitive Child Scale (HSC)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Within-family lagged effect | Correlation with HSC | Corrected  *p*-valuea |
| 1. PPC to ASE | .01 | 1.000 |
| 2. PPC to ADS | .05 | 1.000 |
| 3. PS to ASE | .06 | 1.000 |
| 4. PS to ADS | .20 | .015 |
| 5. PS to AAS | .09 | .904 |

*Note***.** PPC = parental psychological control. PS = Parental support. ASE = Adolescent Self-esteem. ADS = Adolescent Depressive symptoms. AAS = Adolescent anxiety symptoms.

a Corrected for multiple testing by multiplying the unadjusted *p*-value by five.

**Appendix E**

**Multi-Informant Models**

**Table E1**

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Parent-Reported Parenting and Adolescent-Reported Adolescent Psychological Functioning*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Correlations | | | | | |
| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. |
| 1. Parental supporta | - | -.19\*\*\* | .07\*\* | -.07\*\* | -.04 | - |
| 2. Parental psychological controla | -.46\*\*\* | - | -.03 | .02 | .04 | - |
| 3. Adolescent self-esteemb | .35\*\*\* | -.07 | - | -.52\*\*\* | -.45\*\*\* | - |
| 4. Adolescent depressive symptomsb | -.38\*\*\* | .14 | -.78\*\*\* | - | .53\*\*\* | - |
| 5. Adolescent anxiety symptomsb | -.26\*\* | .06 | -.79\*\*\* | .84\*\*\* | - | - |
| 6. Trait environmental sensitivityb | .01 | -.02 | -.28\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | .35\*\*\* | - |
| *M* | 4.56 | 1.20 | 3.72 | 1.68 | 1.59 | 4.44 |
| *SD* | 0.44 | 0.36 | 0.82 | 0.58 | 0.51 | 0.81 |
| Range | 2.0 – 5.0 | 1.0 – 3.5 | 1.0 – 5.0 | 1.0 – 4.0 | 1.0 – 3.0 | 1.8 – 6.7 |
| ICC | .73 | .61 | .72 | .71 | .74 | - |
| ωbetween | .92 | .92 | .90 | .87 | .86 | .77 |
| ωwithin | .63 | .56 | .59 | .74 | .71 | - |
| *Nc* | 177 | 177 | 176 | 176 | 176 | 173 |
| *%* missing | 0.2% | 0.5% | 17.2% | 17.3% | 17.3% | 2.7% |
| *T* | 3905 | 3894 | 3236 | 3236 | 3236 | 174 |

*Note*. Correlations above the diagonal line represent within-family correlations and below the diagonal line represent between-family correlations. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation. ICC = intraclass correlation. ω= omega. *N* = sample size. *T* = number of bi-weekly observations. Data of repeated measures were not missing at random, χ2 (13) = 145.12, *p* < . 001. \*\* *p* < .01. \* *p* < .05  
a parent-reported

b adolescent-reported

c Twelve adolescents had two participating parents, and, therefore, data of their secondary caregiver were excluded, resulting in an analytical sample of 177 parents.

**Table E2**

*DSEM analyses with Parent-Reported Parenting and Adolescent-Reported Adolescent Psychological Functioning (APF)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Models with parental psychological control (PPC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1. Self-esteem | | |  | 1. Depressive symptoms | | |  | 1. Anxiety symptoms | | |
| Fixed lagged effects  (within-family average) | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |
| PPC 🡪 PPC | 0.29 | **.29\*** | [.23, .36] |  | 0.26 | **.26\*** | [.20, .33] |  | - | - | - |
| APF 🡪 APF | 0.39 | **.39\*** | [.32, .46] |  | 0.48 | **.47\*** | [.41, .54] |  | - | - | - |
| **PPC 🡪 APF(H1a-b)** | **-0.03** | **-.02** | **[-.12, .06]** |  | **0.02** | **.02** | **[-.05, .09]** |  | **-** | **-** | **-** |
| APF 🡪 PPC (t) | -0.01 | -.02 | [-.05, .03] |  | 0.00 | .01 | [-.06, .06] |  | - | - | - |
| Random effects  (between-family variance) | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |
| PPC 🡪 PPC | 0.06 | 0.84 | [.04, .10] |  | 0.06 | 0.94 | [.04, .09] |  | - | - | - |
| APF 🡪 APF | 0.11 | 0.85 | [.08, .15] |  | 0.09 | 0.63 | [.06, .12] |  | - | - | - |
| **PPC 🡪 APF (H2)** | **0.05** | **7.45** | **[.01, .12]** |  | **0.04** | **10.00** | **[.02, .09]** |  | **-** | **-** | **-** |
| APF 🡪 PPC | 0.04 | 20.00 | [.02, .05] |  | 0.10 | 105.41 | [.07, .14] |  | - | - | - |
|  | **Models with parental support (PS)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1. Self-esteem | | |  | 1. Depressive symptoms | | |  | 1. Anxiety symptoms | | |
| Fixed lagged effects  (within-family average) | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |
| PS 🡪 PS | 0.30 | **.30\*** | [.25, .36] |  | 0.29 | **.29\*** | [.24, .35] |  | 0.29 | **.29\*** | [.23, .34] |
| APF 🡪 APF | 0.40 | **.39\*** | [.33, .47] |  | 0.46 | **.46\*** | [.40, .53] |  | 0.50 | **.49\*** | [.43, .56] |
| **PS 🡪 APF (H1c-d)** | **0.01** | **.01** | **[-.07, .09]** |  | **-0.04** | **-.03** | **[-.10, .02]** |  | **-0.06** | **-.05** | **[-.11, -.01]** |
| APF 🡪 PS | 0.01 | .02 | [-.02, .04] |  | -0.04 | -.05 | [-.08, .01] |  | -0.04 | -.05 | [-.10, .01] |
| Random effects  (between-family variance) | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |
| PS 🡪 PS | 0.04 | 0.67 | [.03, .07] |  | 0.05 | 0.77 | [.03, .07] |  | 0.05 | 0.77 | [.03, .07] |
| APF 🡪 APF | 0.10 | 0.79 | [.07, .14] |  | 0.08 | 0.61 | [.06, .12] |  | 0.08 | 0.57 | [.05, .12] |
| **PS 🡪 APF (H2)** | **0.03** | **17.32** | **[.00, .10]** |  | **0.03** | **4.33** | **[.01, .07]** |  | **0.02** | **2.36** | **[.00, .05]** |
| APF 🡪 PS | 0.02 | 14.14 | [.01, .03] |  | 0.05 | 5.59 | [.03, .07] |  | 0.07 | 6.61 | [.05, .11] |

*Note*. Parameters whose 95% credible interval does not contain zero are shown with an asterisk. PPC = parental psychological control. PS = parental support. APF = adolescent psychological functioning. Est = unstandardized estimate. Est. St. = standardized estimate (i.e., STDYX standardization). *P* = one-sided *p*-value. 95% CI = Bayesian Credible Intervals. *SD* = standard deviation. *SD*/Est. = standard deviation fixed effect ratio, to inspect whether variance is meaningful, with a criterium of ≥ 0.25 (Bolger et al., 2019). Not all parameter estimates are reported here and for full output see (<https://osf.io/8egxf/?view_only=c154523c7f73468b81cd1b5cee180279>).

**Table E3**

*Distribution of Individual Effect Sizes based on Parent-Reported Parenting*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Within-family effect of parenting on adolescent psychological functioning | | | | |
|  | PPC 🡪 ASE  (*n* = 138) | PPC 🡪 ADS  (*n* = 138) | PS 🡪 ASE  (*n* = 164) | PS 🡪 ADS  (*n* = 166) | PS 🡪 AAS  (*n* = 165) |
| Negative effect  (β ≤ -.05) | **18%** | 12% | 4% | **23%** | **43%** |
| Null effect  (-.05 > β < .05) | 78% | 66% | 90% | 69% | 53% |
| Positive effect  (β ≥ .05) | 4% | **22%** | **6%** | 8% | 4% |

*Note*. Expected theoretical parenting effects (see H1) are displayed in bold. PPC = parental psychological control. PS = parental support. ASE = adolescent self-esteem. ADS = adolescent depressive symptoms. AAS = adolescent anxiety symptoms.

**Table E4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parent-reported parenting | | | |  | Adolescent-reported parentinga | |
| Responsivity pattern | *n* | *%* | HSC  *M* (*SD*) | *T*  *M* (*SD*) |  | *n* | % |
| **Predicted patterns (H3)** | **102** | **57.6%** |  |  |  | **62** | **35.2%** |
| 1. Adverse sensitive (“for worse”) | 15 | 8.5% | 4.27 (1.00) | 22.6 (5.79) |  | 10 | 5.7% |
| 2. Vantage sensitive (“for better”) | 33 | 18.6% | 4.51 (0.61) | 21.4 (6.12) |  | 6 | 3.4% |
| 3. Differentially susceptible  (“for better and for worse”) | 23 | 13.0% | 4.44 (1.04) | 19.9 (6.74) |  | 46 | 26.1% |
| 4. Unsusceptible (“for neither”) | 31 | 17.5% | 4.35 (0.57) | 19.5 (7.55) |  | 0 | 0.0% |
| **Unpredicted patterns** | **75** | **42.4%** |  |  |  | **114** | **64.8%** |
| 5. Opposing effect of PPC | 16 | 9.0% | 4.19 (1.00) | 17.4 (8.49) |  | 5 | 2.8% |
| 6. Opposing effect of PS | 11 | 6.2% | 4.89 (0.71) | 21.7 (5.26) |  | 56 | 31.8% |
| 7. Opposing effect of PPC and PS | 4 | 2.3% | 5.40 (0.78) | 13.5 (6.66) |  | 9 | 5.1% |
| 8. Unperceptive | 44 | 24.9% | 4.43 (0.81) | 20.7 (7.77) |  | 44 | 25.0% |
| Total | 177 | 100% | 4.45 (0.81) | 20.3 (7.13) |  | 176 | 100% |

*Responsivity Patterns Based on Parent-Reported Parenting and Adolescent-Reported Adolescent Psychological Functioning*

*Note*. PPC = parental psychological control. PS = parental support. HSC = Highly Sensitive Child Scale. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation. *T* = number of bi-weekly observations.

a Subsample of adolescents who had a participating parent.

**Table E5**

*Cross-Tabulation of Responsivity Patterns based on Parent-Reported Parenting vs. Adolescent-Reported Parenting*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parent-reported parenting | | | | | | | | |
| Adolescent-reported parenting | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | Total |
| 1. Adverse sensitive | **0**  **(0%)** | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| 2. Vantage sensitive | 0 | **1**  **(17%)** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 3. Differentially susceptible | 7 | 13 | **7 (15%)** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 46 |
| 4. Opposite control | 1 | 0 | 0 | **1 (20%)** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| 5. Opposite support | 3 | 8 | 11 | 6 | **4**  **(7%)** | 1 | 8 | 15 | 56 |
| 6. Opposite control and support | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | **1 (11%)** | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| 7. Unsusceptible | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0**  **(0%)** | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Unperceptive | 4 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | **16 (36%)** | 44 |
| Total | 15 | 33 | 23 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 31 | 43 | **176 (100%)** |

*Note*. Agreement shown in bold font.

**Appendix F**

**Concurrent Models**

**Table F1**

*DSEM analyses with Concurrent Effects of Parenting and Adolescent Psychological Functioning (APF)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Models with parental psychological control (PPC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Self-esteem | | |  | (2) Depressive symptoms | | |  | (3) Anxiety symptoms | | |
| Fixed effects  (within-family average) | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |
| APF (t-1) 🡪 APF (t) | 0.39 | .38\* | [.33, .44] |  | 0.47 | .46\* | [.41, .52] |  | - | - | - |
| **PPC (t) 🡪 APF** **(t) (H1a-b)** | **-0.18** | **-.14\*** | **[-.25, -11]** |  | **0.19** | **.20\*** | **[.14, .24]** |  | **-** | **-** | **-** |
| Random effects  (between-family variance) | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |
| APF (t-1) 🡪 APF (t) | .10 | 0.81 | [.07, .13] |  | .08 | .61 | [.06, .10] |  | - | - | - |
| **PPC (t) 🡪 APF** **(t) (H2)** | **.06** | **1.36** | **[.03, .11]** |  | **.03** | **.91** | **[.02, .05]** |  | **-** | **-** | **-** |
|  | **Models with parental support (PS)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) Self-esteem | | |  | (5) Depressive symptoms | | |  | 1. Anxiety symptoms | | |
| Fixed effects  (within-family average) | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |  | Est. | Est. St. | 95% CI |
| APF (t-1) 🡪 APF (t) | 0.41 | **.40\*** | [.35, .46] |  | 0.49 | **.48\*** | [.44, .54] |  | 0.51 | **.50\*** | [.46, .56] |
| **PS (t) 🡪 APF** **(t) (H1c-d)** | **0.20** | **.13\*** | **[.14, .27]** |  | **-0.13** | **-.12\*** | **[-.19, -.08]** |  | **-0.08** | **-.09\*** | **[-.13, -.04]** |
| Random effects  (between-family variance) | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |  | σ2 | *SD*/Est | 95% CI |
| APF (t-1) 🡪 APF (t) | .10 | 0.77 | [.07, .13] |  | .08 | 0.58 | [.06, .11] |  | .07 | 0.52 | [.05, .10] |
| **PS (t) 🡪 APF** **(t) (H2)** | **.04** | **1.00** | **[.01, .07]** |  | **.05** | **1.72** | **[.03, 07]** |  | **.03** | **2.17** | **[.02, .05]** |

*Note*. All data are adolescent-reported. Bold effects are significant fixed effects. Est = unstandardized estimate. Est. St. = standardized estimate (i.e., STDYX standardization). *p* = one-sided *p*-value. 95% CI = Bayesian Credible Intervals. SD = standard deviation. *SD*/Est = standard deviation fixed effect ratio to inspect whether variance is meaningful, with a criterium of ≥ 0.25 (Bolger et al., 2019). Not all parameter estimates are reported here and for full output see (<https://osf.io/8egxf/?view_only=c154523c7f73468b81cd1b5cee180279>).

**Table F2**

*Distribution of Individual Effect Sizes based on Concurrent Effects*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Within-family effect of parenting on adolescent psychological functioning | | | | |
|  | PPC (t) 🡪 ASE (t)  (*n* = 208) | PPC (t) 🡪 ADS (t)  (*n* = 207) | PS (t) 🡪  ASE (t)  (*n* = 216) | PS (t) 🡪  ADS (t)  (*n* = 217) | PS (t) 🡪  AAS (t)  (*n* = 213) |
| Negative effect (β ≤ -.05) | **80%** | 0% | 0% | **76%** | **68%** |
| Null effect  (-.05 > β < .05) | 22% | 5% | 10% | 22% | 24% |
| Positive effect  (β ≥ .05) | 1% | **94%** | **90%** | 1% | 8% |

*Note*. Data are adolescent-reported. Expected theoretical parenting effects (see H1) are displayed in bold. ASE = adolescent self-esteem. ADS = adolescent depressive symptoms. AAS = adolescent anxiety symptoms.

**Table F3**

*Overview of Responsivity Patterns Based on Concurrent Parenting Effects*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Concurrent effects (sensitivity analysis) | | | |  | Lagged effects (main analysis) | |
| Responsivity pattern | *n* | *%* | HSC  *M (SD)* | *T*  *M* (*SD*) |  | *n* | *%* |
| **Predicted patterns (H3)** | **163** | **63.7%** |  |  |  | **88** | **34.4%** |
| 1. Adverse sensitive   (“for worse”) | 4 | 1.6% | 4.8 (0.5) | 25.0 (1.4) |  | 13 | 5.1% |
| 2. Vantage sensitive  (“for better”) | 3 | 1.2% | 5.2 (1.0) | 19.7 (11.0) |  | 8 | 3.1% |
| 3. Differentially susceptible  (“for better and for worse”) | 156 | 60.9% | 4.5 (0.7) | 18.8 (8.0) |  | 67 | 26.2% |
| 4. Unsusceptible  (“for neither”) | 0 | 0.0% | - | - |  | 0 | 0% |
| **Unpredicted patterns** | **93** | **36.3%** |  |  |  | **168** | **65.6%** |
| 5. Opposing effect of PPC | 3 | 1.2% | 5.0 (0.5) | 25.3 (0.6) |  | 6 | 2.3% |
| 6. Opposing effect of PS | 19 | 7.4% | 4.9 (0.7) | 20.3 (6.3) |  | 73 | 28.5% |
| 7. Opposing effect of PPC and PS | 0 | 0.0% | - | - |  | 17 | 6.6% |
| 8. Unperceptive | 71 | 27.7% | 4.1 (1.1) | 17.5 (8.8) |  | 72 | 28.1% |
| Total | 256 | 100% | 4.44 (0.9) | 18.8 (8.1) |  | 256 | 100.0% |

*Note*. Data are adolescent-reported. HSC = Highly Sensitive Child Scale. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation. *T* = number of bi-weekly observations.

**Table F4**

*Cross-Tabulation of Responsivity Patterns based on Concurrent vs. Lagged Effects*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Concurrent effects | | | | | | | | |
| Lagged effects (main results) | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | Total |
| 1. Adverse sensitive | **1**  **(8%)** | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 |
| 2. Vantage sensitive | 0 | **0**  **(0%)** | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 3. Differentially susceptible | 0 | 2 | **62 (93%)** | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| 4. Opposite control | 1 | 0 | 4 | **0**  **(0%)** | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 5. Opposite support | 2 | 0 | 56 | 2 | **12 (16%)** | 0 | 1 | 73 |
| 6. Opposite control and support | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 4 | **0**  **(0%)** | 0 | 17 |
| 7. Unperceptive | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **69**  **(96%)** | 72 |
| Total | 4 | 3 | 156 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 71 | **256 (100%)** |

*Note*. Agreement shown in bold font.

**Appendix G**

**Sensitivity Analyses**

**Table G1**

*Comparing the Classification Based on a* *SESOI of .05 and .10*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cut off .05  (main analysis) | | |  | Cut off .10  (sensitivity analysis) | |
| Responsivity pattern | *n* | *%* |  | | *n* | *%* |
| **Predicted patterns (H3)** | **88** | **34.4%** |  | | **56** | **21.9%** |
| 1. Adverse sensitive   (“for worse”) | 13 | 5.1% |  | | 35 | 13.7% |
| 2. Vantage sensitive  (“for better”) | 8 | 3.1% |  | | 8 | 3.1% |
| 3. Differentially susceptible  (“for better and for worse”) | 67 | 26.2% |  | | 52 | 20.3% |
| 4. Unsusceptible  (“for neither”) | 0 | 0% |  | | 8 | 3.1% |
| **Unpredicted patterns** | **168** | **65.6%** |  | | **153** | **59.8%** |
| 5. Opposing effect of PPC | 6 | 2.3% |  | | 3 | 1.2% |
| 6. Opposing effect of PS | 73 | 28.5% |  | | 61 | 23.8% |
| 7. Opposing effect of PPC and PS | 17 | 6.6% |  | | 17 | 6.6% |
| 8. Unperceptive | 72 | 28.1% |  | | 72 | 28.1% |
| **Total** | **256** | **100.0%** |  | | **256** | **100.0%** |

*Note.* SESOI = smallest effect size of interest.

**Table G2**

*Sensitivity Analyses Excluding Participants with Few Observations*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Main analysis | | |  | | Excluding participants with ≤ 5 observations | |
| Responsivity pattern | *n* | *%* |  | | *n* | | *%* |
| **Predicted patterns (H3)** | **88** | **34.4%** |  | | **82** | | **35.2%** |
| 1. Adverse sensitive   (“for worse”) | 13 | 5.1% |  | | 11 | | 4.7% |
| 2. Vantage sensitive  (“for better”) | 8 | 3.1% |  | | 7 | | 3.0% |
| 3. Differentially susceptible  (“for better and for worse”) | 67 | 26.2% |  | | 64 | | 27.5% |
| 4. Unsusceptible  (“for neither”) | 0 | 0% |  | | 0 | | 0% |
| **Unpredicted patterns** | **168** | **65.6%** |  | | **151** | | **64.8%** |
| 5. Opposing effect of PPC | 6 | 2.3% |  | | 5 | | 2.1% |
| 6. Opposing effect of PS | 73 | 28.5% |  | | 70 | | 30.0% |
| 7. Opposing effect of PPC and PS | 17 | 6.6% |  | | 17 | | 7.3% |
| 8. Unperceptive | 72 | 28.1% |  | | 59 | | 25.3% |
| **Total** | **256** | **100.0%** |  | | **233** | | **100.0%** |

**Table G3**

*Sensitivity Analyses Excluding Participants without Over-Time Fluctuations in Parenting (“Unperceptive subgroup”) in the DSEM models*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Main analysis | | |  | Excluding participants without over-time variance | |
| Responsivity pattern | *n* | *%* |  | | *n* | *%* | |
| **Predicted patterns (H3)** | **88** | **34.4%** |  | | **103** | **40.2%** | |
| 1. Adverse sensitive   (“for worse”) | 13 | 5.1% |  | | 35 | 13.7% | |
| 2. Vantage sensitive  (“for better”) | 8 | 3.1% |  | | 8 | 3.1% | |
| 3. Differentially susceptible  (“for better and for worse”) | 67 | 26.2% |  | | 52 | 20.3% | |
| 4. Unsusceptible  (“for neither”) | 0 | 0% |  | | 8 | 3.1% | |
| **Unpredicted patterns** | **168** | **65.6%** |  | | **153** | **59.8%** | |
| 5. Opposing effect of PPC | 6 | 2.3% |  | | 3 | 1.2% | |
| 6. Opposing effect of PS | 73 | 28.5% |  | | 61 | 23.8% | |
| 7. Opposing effect of PPC and PS | 17 | 6.6% |  | | 17 | 6.6% | |
| 8. Unperceptive | 72 | 28.1% |  | | 72a | 28.1% | |
| **Total** | **256** | **100.0%** |  | | **256** | **100.0%** | |

*Note*. The subgroup of Unperceptive adolescents were not included in the DSEM models that estimate the individual effect sizes of parenting on adolescent well-being. The effect sizes correlated between .81 and .99 with the effect sizes of the main analyses.