

**SKIN-DEEP RESILIENCE: SELF-CONTROL FORECASTS BETTER PSYCHOSOCIAL
OUTCOMES BUT FASTER EPIGENETIC AGING IN LOW-SES YOUTH**

Gregory E. Miller ¹, Tianyi Yu ², Edith Chen ¹, & Gene H. Brody ²

¹Department of Psychology and Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University

²Center for Family Research, University of Georgia

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES AND FIGURES

Table S1. Results of regression analyses predicting behavioral outcomes from self-control and socioeconomic disadvantage ($n=292$).

Predictors	Substance Use				Depressive Symptoms			
	(Age 20)				(Age 20)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>
1. Gender (male)	.118	.031	.180	.000	.608	.825	.037	.462
2. AIM Intervention (yes)	-.022	.034	-.031	.516	-.274	.906	-.015	.762
3. Outcome at age 17	.753	.072	.511	.000	.380	.056	.388	.000
4. Disadvantage (age 17-19)	.009	.015	.029	.545	.395	.405	.050	.330
5. Self-control (age 17-19)	-.036	.016	-.114	.022	-1.68	.443	-.215	.000
6. Disadvantage \times Self-control	-.030	.015	-.093	.050	-.508	.393	-.065	.197
Predictors	Aggressive Behavior				Internalizing Problem			
	(Age 20)				(Age 20)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>
1. Gender (male)	.124	.272	.021	.649	.245	.268	.044	.361
2. AIM Intervention (yes)	-.146	.299	-.022	.626	-.081	.295	-.013	.784
3. Outcome at age 17	.531	.048	.548	.000	.421	.047	.473	.000
4. Disadvantage (age 17-19)	.059	.134	.021	.658	.122	.131	.046	.351
5. Self-control (age 17-19)	-.509	.143	-.177	.000	-.464	.142	-.174	.001
6. Disadvantage \times Self-control	-.114	.131	-.040	.382	-.211	.129	-.079	.103

Figure S1. Young adult substance use as a function of socioeconomic disadvantage and self-control during adolescence. The slopes are regression lines at different levels of disadvantage (less: 1.5 *SD* above the sample mean = 0.2; med: sample mean = 2; more: 1.5 *SD* below sample mean = 3.8).



Table S2. Results of regression analyses predicting epigenetic age acceleration from self-control and socioeconomic disadvantage ($n=292$).

Predictors	Epigenetic Age Acceleration							
	Hannum Method				Horvath Method			
	(Age 22)				(Age 22)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>p</i>
1. Gender (male)	1.20	.630	.110	.057	1.33	.519	.148	.011
2. AIM intervention (yes)	-.620	.693	-.052	.372	.269	.571	.027	.637
3. Behavioral problems (age 17)	.105	.143	.051	.464	-.025	.118	-.015	.831
4. Disadvantage (age 17-19)	.650	.310	.123	.037	.239	.256	.055	.350
5. Self-control (age 17-19)	-.005	.364	-.001	.990	.144	.300	.033	.631
6. Disadvantage \times Self-control	.921	.303	.175	.003	.726	.249	.168	.004

Table S3. Model fit indices from latent-class growth analyses.

	Model Fit Indices			BLRT		Proportion of Individuals in Class					
	Likelihood	BIC	Entropy	2 Log Likelihood	<i>p</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Two class	-3858.33	7807.60	.79	320.59	<.001	.35	.65				
Three class	-3777.41	7679.86	.79	161.85	<.001	.25	.27	.48			
Four class	-3720.30	7599.75	.79	114.21	<.001	.14	.26	.27	.33		
Five class	-3677.01	7547.25	.83	86.60	<.001	.07	.13	.17	.26	.37	
Six class	-3627.06	7481.46	.85	99.90	<.001	.07	.08	.13	.16	.27	.29

Table S4. Unconditional latent growth curve model for parallel growth processes.

Growth Parameters				
Socioeconomic Disadvantage	Intercept		Linear Slope	
Mean (<i>SE</i>)	1.955***	(.077)	0.057	(.045)
Variance (<i>SE</i>)	1.256***	(.163)	0.020	(.146)
Self-Control	Intercept		Linear Slope	
Mean (<i>SE</i>)	8.664***	(.261)	0.952***	(.146)
Variance (<i>SE</i>)	16.124***	(1.816)	2.370	(1.473)
Covariance	1	2	3	4
1. Intercept (Disadvantage)	-			
2. Intercept (Self-control)	-.506	-		
3. Slope (Disadvantage)	-.028	-.012	-	
4. Slope (Self-control)	-.174	-.647	-.093	-

Model fit: $\chi^2(7) = 5.793$, $p = .564$, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0 (0, .064).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S5. Latent-class growth analyses: Unstandardized parameter estimates of behavioral outcomes.

Growth Parameters	Less Disadvantaged, High Self-Control <i>n</i> = 97	Less Disadvantaged, Low-Stable Self-Control <i>n</i> = 77	More Disadvantaged, Low-Stable Self-Control <i>n</i> = 41	More Disadvantaged, High Self-Control <i>n</i> = 79
Disadvantage				
Intercept	0.913***	1.535	3.570***	2.757***
Linear slope	0.054	0.074	0.103	0.017
Self-Control				
Intercept	10.806***	4.813***	4.829***	11.453***
Linear slope	1.193***	0.972	-0.015	1.168**
Depressive Symptoms				
Intercept	9.747***	15.099***	15.397***	11.338***
Linear slope	-0.241	-1.392***	-0.134	-0.995**
Substance Use				
Intercept	0.143***	0.233***	0.204***	0.144***
Linear slope	0.067***	0.066**	0.100***	0.061***
Aggressive Behaviors				
Intercept	1.776***	3.686***	5.389***	1.944***
Linear slope	-0.303***	-0.358*	-0.668**	-0.270*
Internalizing Problems				
Intercept	1.521***	3.270***	4.612***	1.178***
Linear slope	-0.319***	-0.502**	-0.421	-.124

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .00$

Table S6. Comparison of epigenetic age acceleration values among trajectory groups in latent-class growth analyses.

	Less Disadvantaged, High-Increasing Self-Control		Less Disadvantaged, Low-Stable Self-Control		More Disadvantaged, Low-Stable Self-Control		More Disadvantaged, High-Increasing Self-Control		<i>F</i> (3,289)	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>		
Epigenetic Age (Hannum)	-1.28 ^a	0.53	0.86 ^b	0.59	-0.48	0.81	0.98 ^b	0.58	3.72*	.012
Epigenetic Age (Horvath)	-0.45 ^a	0.43	-0.18 ^a	0.48	-1.02 ^a	0.66	1.25 ^b	0.48	3.48*	.016

Note. Means designated with different superscript are significantly different based on LSD post-hoc comparisons ($p < .05$); means without a superscript are not significantly different from any other group.

Table S7. Mediation models testing body mass and life stress as pathways linking self-control and epigenetic aging.

	Body Mass	Life Stress
Hannum Method		
Self-control x Disadvantage → Mediator	.309	.073
Mediator → Epigenetic aging	.089**	-.243
Indirect Effect	.028	-.018
95% CI	[-.067, .161]	[-.142, .020]
Horvath Method		
Self-control x Disadvantage → Mediator	.309	.073
Mediator → Epigenetic aging	-.001	-.353
Indirect Effect	-.000	-.026
95% CI	[-.051, .038]	[-.133, .015]

Note. ** $p < .01$