

Supplementary Material for
Examining a Developmental Pathway from Early Behavioral Inhibition to Emotion
Regulation and Social Anxiety: The Moderating Role of Parenting

Detailed descriptives for each study measure

Table S1 Means, standard deviations, sample size, and correlations for each subcomponent measure of the study.

Variable (age in years)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Gender	*	*	291																		
2. Maternal Ethnicity	**	**	290	.05																	
3. Maternal Education	1.21	0.72	273	-.01	.19																
4. Behavioral BI (2)	0.00	0.50	224	.03	-.00	-.02															
5. Behavioral BI (3)	-0.01	0.59	197	.06	-.02	.07	.33														
6. PR BI (2)	3.80	0.83	246	.01	-.01	.04	.30	.21													
7. PR BI (3)	3.44	0.96	243	-.06	-.09	.07	.36	.36	.58												
8. Oversolicitous Parenting (3)	0.28	0.21	205	.12	-.04	-.13	.04	-.03	.00	-.03											
9. Dismissive Parenting (3)	0.74	0.15	205	.04	.28	.09	-.03	-.09	-.06	-.07	-.15										
10. Task Directive Parenting (3)	0.41	0.21	205	-.09	-.20	-.18	-.14	-.10	-.02	-.09	.21	-.13									
11. Emotion Regulation (5)	4.65	1.85	206	-.23	-.00	.05	-.25	-.08	-.15	-.17	-.06	-.06	-.01								
12. PR Social Anxiety (10)	4.00	3.58	164	.11	-.00	-.07	.16	.15	.37	.36	.03	.04	.06	-.30							
13. CR Social Anxiety (10)	5.44	3.13	167	.07	-.11	-.15	.07	.15	.01	-.03	.17	-.08	.08	-.20	.27						
14. Social Anxiety Diagnosis (10)	+	+	141	.06	-.10	-.07	.17	.07	.13	.12	.27	-.19	.08	-.27	.34	.36					
15. Observed Social Anxiety (10)	-0.03	0.85	169	-.02	-.09	-.05	.01	.09	.07	.07	.08	-.13	-.09	-.20	.18	.19	.18				
16. PR Social Anxiety (13)	3.82	3.45	169	.18	-.05	-.21	.18	.21	.20	.20	.09	-.03	-.00	-.30	.62	.33	.33	.14			
17. CR Social Anxiety (13)	4.94	3.58	176	.29	-.10	-.16	.07	.06	.03	.06	.06	-.13	.05	-.17	.43	.36	.29	.19	.44		
18. Social Anxiety Diagnosis (13)	++	++	131	.20	-.18	-.02	.24	.19	.22	.29	.08	-.19	.05	-.34	.27	.24	.33	.09	.32	.34	
19. Observed Social Anxiety (13)	0.05	0.78	153	-.14	-.15	-.12	.06	.18	.10	.26	-.10	-.09	.14	-.21	.27	.09	.15	.27	.19	.21	.17

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. *1 = Females (53.6%) and 0 = Males; **1 = Non-Hispanic Caucasian (53.6%) and 0 = Other; +1 = Clinical Diagnosis of Social Anxiety (4.3%) and 0 = No Diagnosis; ++1 = Clinical Diagnosis of Social Anxiety (6.9%) and 0 = No Diagnosis

Results using observed measure of behavioral inhibition

In order to examine the robustness to the method for handling missing data, we examined if the results differed if we only included participants with complete data (i.e., listwise deletion). As in the main manuscript and shown in Table S2, results revealed the relation between BI and ER strategy was moderated by parenting behaviors. BI predicted less engaged ER strategy use at high levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = -1.50, p < 0.001$, but not at low levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = -0.08, p = 0.857$. In turn, more engaged ER strategies predicted less social anxiety in childhood and adolescence (Table S2). Importantly, the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was also conditional on parenting behaviors as indicated by a significant interaction indirect effect, $b = 0.79, SE = 0.48, p = 0.100, 95\% \text{ Bootstrapped CI } [0.006, 2.104]$. Probing this interaction revealed that for children receiving high levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, engaged ER strategies mediated the relation between BI and social anxiety symptoms, $b = 0.35, p = 0.022, 95\% \text{ Bootstrapped CI } [0.091, 0.751]$. This indirect effect was not significant at low levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = 0.02, p = 0.858, 95\% \text{ Bootstrapped CI } [-0.234, 0.234]$.

These findings are similar to the ones presented in the main manuscript, leading to the same conclusions. Although the delta method was a non-significant trend, the delta method is known to be a conservative and biased test of indirect effects, leading to low power (MacKinnon et al., 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). As such, we relied on the bootstrapped confidence intervals to determine significance (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). This sensitivity analysis suggests that our findings are robust to the BI composite used. We decided to present the BI composite that uses parent reports a priori, as we wanted to use the most comprehensive temperament measure and this most closely matches the ones used in a previous report linking BI to emotion regulation (Penela et al., 2015).

Table S2. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety using only observed measures of behavioral inhibition.*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.23	-0.86	0.001	-1.369	-0.357
Maternal Ethnicity	0.00	0.00	0.993	-0.608	0.603
Maternal Education	0.03	0.08	0.680	-0.299	0.458
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.08	0.26	0.452	-0.416	0.935
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.20	-0.79	0.005	-1.334	-0.244
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.09	-0.80	0.391	-2.623	1.025
BI x OP	-0.16	-3.39	0.033	-6.497	-0.279
Dismissive Parenting	-0.06	-0.11	0.487	-0.401	0.191
Task Directive Parenting	-0.08	-0.14	0.337	-0.436	0.149
BI x DP	-0.08	-0.32	0.354	-1.004	0.360
BI x TDP	-0.04	-0.17	0.624	-0.850	0.510
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Gender	0.15	0.49	0.019	0.079	0.906
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.11	-0.40	0.085	-0.865	0.056
Maternal Education	-0.16	-0.37	0.018	-0.673	-0.063
Emotion Regulation	-0.26	-0.24	0.001	-0.373	-0.100
Behavioral Inhibition	0.13	0.47	0.040	0.020	0.918

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting. Gender was coded as females = 1 and males = 0. Maternal Ethnicity was coded as Non-Hispanic Caucasian = 1 and Other = 0. Maternal Education was coded as High school graduate = 0, College Graduate = 1, Graduate school graduate = 2, and Other = missing.

Dimension reduction for parenting dimensions.

A principal component analysis (PCA) suggested three parenting dimensions based on eigenvalues greater than one and inspecting the scree plot. A parallel analysis for PCA and EFA suggested two components or two factors (not shown). However, this solution yielded factors that contained several items with small loadings ($<.5$), especially the Task Directive items (e.g., task directive loaded .3 on the Oversolicitousness component). As such, the component of interest for the current study, Oversolicitousness, would not change even using the solution suggested by the parallel analysis. Thus, in the main paper, we utilized the PCA solution indicated on Table S3 to create parenting composites.

Table S3. *Principal component analysis of the parenting measures.*

	Component		
	1	2	3
Proportion of Comfort-Verbal	0.81	-0.02	0.14
Proportion of Comfort-Physical	0.56	-0.25	0.04
Proportion of Verbal Instruction	0.80	0.20	0.12
Proportion of Narrating	0.14	0.59	-0.02
Proportion of Task Directing-Verbal	0.09	-0.31	0.70
Proportion of Task Directing-Physical	0.06	0.15	0.84
Proportion of Quiz Task	-0.04	0.66	-0.06
Proportion of Quiz/Label Feelings	0.60	-0.04	-0.04
Proportion of Dismissiveness	0.25	-0.68	0.02

Results while controlling for the child's level of frustration levels during the parenting task

In order to examine if results changed while controlling for the child frustration levels during the parenting task (i.e., Unpredictable Toy), we controlled for the child's expressed levels of frustration – in addition to the child's levels of sad/fear affect. As in the main manuscript and shown in Table S4, results revealed that oversolicitous parenting behaviors moderated the relation between BI and ER strategy. In turn, more engaged ER strategies predicted less social anxiety in childhood and adolescence (Table S4). Importantly, the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was also conditional on oversolicitous parenting behaviors as indicated by a significant interaction indirect effect, $b = 0.50$, $SE = 0.23$, $p = 0.033$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [0.115, 1.128]. Probing this interaction revealed the same patterns of results as shown in the paper.

Interestingly, after controlling for the child's levels of frustration, the interaction between dismissive parenting and BI became significant (Table S4). Probing this interaction showed that BI predicted less engaged ER strategy use at high levels of dismissive parenting behavior, $b = -0.90$, $p < 0.001$, but not at low levels of dismissive parenting behavior, $b = -0.17$, $p = 0.506$. However, the indirect effects for this interaction were not significant, suggesting that the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was not conditional on dismissive parenting. Given that this interaction was not significant in the main manuscript or the rest of the sensitivity analyses and the lack of significant indirect effects, we hesitate to make strong interpretations about this interaction.

In sum, these findings are similar to the ones presented in the main manuscript, leading to the same conclusions, supporting the main hypothesis of the manuscript; namely, that oversolicitous parenting behaviors during a fear-eliciting task would moderate the relation such that children high in BI and who received more oversolicitous parenting behaviors at age 3 would use less engaged ER strategies at age 5.

Table S4. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety while controlling for child frustration levels.*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.22	-0.83	0.001	-1.346	-0.319
Maternal Ethnicity	0.03	0.10	0.727	-0.481	0.690
Maternal Education	0.01	0.04	0.846	-0.326	0.398
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.09	0.29	0.376	-0.353	0.935
Child Frustration Affect	0.13	0.62	0.118	-0.158	1.403
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.22	-0.53	0.001	-0.845	-0.218
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.11	-1.01	0.268	-2.810	0.780
BI x OP	-0.18	-2.21	0.001	-3.527	-0.899
Dismissive Parenting	-0.05	-0.09	0.516	-0.374	0.188
Task Directive Parenting	-0.07	-0.12	0.390	-0.398	0.155
BI x DP	-0.14	-0.36	0.037	-0.708	-0.021
BI x TDP	-0.10	-0.23	0.195	-0.582	0.119
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Gender	0.15	0.49	0.021	0.074	0.897
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.10	-0.38	0.105	-0.836	0.079
Maternal Education	-0.16	-0.36	0.018	-0.666	-0.062
Emotion Regulation	-0.25	-0.23	0.001	-0.362	-0.090
Behavioral Inhibition	0.16	0.34	0.014	0.070	0.610

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting. Gender was coded as females = 1 and males = 0. Maternal Ethnicity was coded as Non-Hispanic Caucasian = 1 and Other = 0. Maternal Education was coded as High school graduate = 0, College Graduate = 1, Graduate school graduate = 2, and Other = missing.

Confirmatory factor analysis of social anxiety measure.

To create a social anxiety composite that included several measures and multiple informants during late childhood and early adolescence, we created factor scores by using a confirmatory factor analysis based on (Buzzell et al., 2021). In brief, the factor included 8 indicators: the observed socially anxious behavior composite from the GTKY task, child and parent reports of social anxiety from the SCARED, and clinical diagnoses of social anxiety from the 10- and 13-year time points. The residual variances for the individual indicators were allowed to co-vary across time points to account repeated measures. Because clinical diagnoses were coded as dichotomous variables, the confirmatory factor analysis used the WLSMV estimator, wherein missing data are excluded on a pairwise basis. All the indicators significantly loaded into the anxiety factor (see Table S5). The model yielded excellent model fit (RMSEA = .00, CFI = 1.0, SRMR = .052) and factor scores were extracted for subsequent analyses, such that higher scores indicate greater social anxiety. Sensitivity analyses examining social anxiety at 10 and 13 years separately, yielding the same pattern of results across both ages (see below) and showed that social anxiety is highly consistent across ages ($\beta = .88$). This supports our decision to examine these ages together in one composite and is in line with a previous report from this dataset (Buzzell et al., 2021).

Table S5. Factors loadings of social anxiety factor

Indicator	Loadings	p value
PR Social Anxiety (10)	0.59	0.000
CR Social Anxiety (10)	0.56	0.000
Social Anxiety Diagnosis (10)	1.00	0.000
Observed Social Anxiety (10)	0.29	0.003
PR Social Anxiety (13)	0.60	0.000
CR Social Anxiety (13)	0.68	0.000
Social Anxiety Diagnosis (13)	0.81	0.000
Observed Social Anxiety (13)	0.32	0.001

Note: All factor loadings are from the standardized solution. The residual variances for the individual indicators were allowed to co-vary across time points to account repeated measures.

Results with social anxiety measures examined for each age separately

In order to explore our decision to examine social anxiety across ages (10 and 13 years) together in one factor, we examined if the results differed when examining each age separately. As in the main manuscript and shown in Tables S6 and S7, results revealed the relation between BI and ER strategy was moderated by parenting behaviors in both ages (age 10 and 13 years). Importantly, the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was also conditional on parenting behaviors as indicated by a significant interaction indirect effect in both models (age 10 and 13 years). For age 10, the estimates were: $b = 0.25$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = 0.031$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [0.057, 0.547]. For age 13, the estimates were: $b = 0.25$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = 0.035$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [0.052, 0.555]. Probing these interactions also revealed the same patterns of results for both ages.

These findings are similar across ages and to the ones presented in the main manuscript, leading to the same conclusions. These sensitivity analyses provide support for our decision to examine social anxiety across ages (10 and 13 years) together as one outcome, as shown in the main manuscript.

Table S6. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety at age 10 only rather than a composite across 10 and 13 years.*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.24	-0.90	0.000	-1.396	-0.401
Maternal Ethnicity	0.02	0.06	0.827	-0.508	0.635
Maternal Education	0.02	0.06	0.738	-0.301	0.424
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.09	0.29	0.374	-0.352	0.937
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.24	-0.58	0.000	-0.896	-0.257
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.11	-0.95	0.296	-2.719	0.827
BI x OP	-0.19	-2.28	0.001	-3.620	-0.935
Dismissive Parenting	-0.06	-0.11	0.426	-0.395	0.167
Task Directive Parenting	-0.07	-0.13	0.371	-0.403	0.150
BI x DP	-0.12	-0.31	0.075	-0.642	0.031
BI x TDP	-0.07	-0.17	0.318	-0.496	0.161
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Gender	0.13	0.20	0.036	0.014	0.396
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.10	-0.16	0.130	-0.370	0.047
Maternal Education	-0.15	-0.16	0.023	-0.301	-0.022
Emotion Regulation	-0.26	-0.11	0.001	-0.170	-0.044
Behavioral Inhibition	0.16	0.16	0.011	0.036	0.285

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting. Gender was coded as females = 1 and males = 0. Maternal Ethnicity was coded as Non-Hispanic Caucasian = 1 and Other = 0. Maternal Education was coded as High school graduate = 0, College Graduate = 1, Graduate school graduate = 2, and Other = missing.

Table S7. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety at age 13 only rather than a composite across 10 and 13 years.*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.24	-0.89	0.000	-1.392	-0.397
Maternal Ethnicity	0.02	0.07	0.811	-0.502	0.642
Maternal Education	0.02	0.06	0.731	-0.299	0.426
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.09	0.29	0.371	-0.351	0.940
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.24	-0.58	0.000	-0.895	-0.256
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.11	-0.95	0.294	-2.723	0.824
BI x OP	-0.19	-2.29	0.001	-3.636	-0.951
Dismissive Parenting	-0.06	-0.12	0.407	-0.400	0.162
Task Directive Parenting	-0.07	-0.12	0.378	-0.401	0.152
BI x DP	-0.12	-0.30	0.076	-0.640	0.032
BI x TDP	-0.08	-0.17	0.307	-0.501	0.158
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Gender	0.16	0.26	0.009	0.065	0.453
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.10	-0.18	0.106	-0.402	0.039
Maternal Education	-0.15	-0.17	0.024	-0.313	-0.023
Emotion Regulation	-0.25	-0.11	0.001	-0.173	-0.042
Behavioral Inhibition	0.15	0.16	0.022	0.022	0.291

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting. Gender was coded as females = 1 and males = 0. Maternal Ethnicity was coded as Non-Hispanic Caucasian = 1 and Other = 0. Maternal Education was coded as High school graduate = 0, College Graduate = 1, Graduate school graduate = 2, and Other = missing.

Results using average composite of parent and child reports rather than multi-method social anxiety factor

In order to examine the robustness of our results based on the main outcome measure, we examined if the results differed if we used an average composite of the anxiety measure of the parent and child reports of social anxiety on the SCARED at ages 10 and 13 years. As in the main manuscript and shown in Table S8, results revealed the relation between BI and ER strategy was moderated by parenting behaviors. BI predicted less engaged ER strategy use at high levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = -1.07, p < 0.001$, but not at low levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = -0.10, p = 0.688$. In turn, more engaged ER strategies predicted less social anxiety in childhood and adolescence (Table S8). Importantly, the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was also conditional on parenting behaviors as indicated by a significant interaction indirect effect, $b = 0.68, SE = 0.35, p = 0.052, 95\% \text{ Bootstrapped CI } [0.095, 1.588]$. Probing this interaction revealed that for children receiving high levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, engaged ER strategies mediated the relation between BI and social anxiety symptoms, $b = 0.31, p = 0.013, 95\% \text{ Bootstrapped CI } [0.083, 0.612]$. This indirect effect was not significant at low levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = 0.03, p = 0.679, 95\% \text{ Bootstrapped CI } [-0.120, 0.198]$.

These findings are similar to the ones presented in the main manuscript, leading to the same conclusions. The findings are also very similar if examined separately for each age (10 or 13 years; not shown). This suggests that our findings are robust to the measure of anxiety used in the current study. As such, we decided to present the results that utilized the most comprehensive measure of anxiety.

Table S8. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety using an average of child and parent report rather than the more comprehensive factor including observed anxiety and clinical diagnoses.*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.24	-0.90	0.000	-1.404	-0.404
Maternal Ethnicity	0.02	0.08	0.793	-0.497	0.651
Maternal Education	0.02	0.06	0.752	-0.305	0.422
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.09	0.30	0.365	-0.348	0.946
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.24	-0.58	0.000	-0.901	-0.262
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.11	-0.95	0.297	-2.725	0.831
BI x OP	-0.19	-2.31	0.001	-3.655	-0.958
Dismissive Parenting	-0.06	-0.12	0.403	-0.400	0.161
Task Directive Parenting	-0.07	-0.12	0.383	-0.401	0.154
BI x DP	-0.12	-0.31	0.074	-0.642	0.030
BI x TDP	-0.08	-0.17	0.314	-0.502	0.161
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Gender	0.18	0.91	0.006	0.261	1.550
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.09	-0.50	0.185	-1.230	0.237
Maternal Education	-0.16	-0.59	0.019	-1.078	-0.097
Emotion Regulation	-0.21	-0.29	0.005	-0.499	-0.089
Behavioral Inhibition	0.17	0.58	0.011	0.133	1.021

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting.

Results using only participants with complete data

In order to examine the robustness to the method for handling missing data, we examined if the results differed if we only included participants with complete data (i.e., listwise deletion). As in the main manuscript and shown in Table S9, results revealed the relation between BI and ER strategy was moderated by parenting behaviors. Probing the interaction revealed the same pattern of results, such that BI predicted less engaged ER strategy use at high levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = -1.03$, $p < 0.001$, but not at low levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = -0.17$, $p = 0.550$. In turn, more engaged ER strategies predicted less social anxiety in childhood and adolescence (Table S9). Importantly, the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was also conditional on parenting behaviors as indicated by a significant interaction indirect effect, $b = 0.60$, $SE = 0.32$, $p = 0.059$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [0.063, 1.544]. Probing this interaction revealed that for children receiving high levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, engaged ER strategies mediated the relation between BI and social anxiety symptoms, $b = 0.30$, $p = 0.007$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [0.097, 0.612]. This indirect effect was not significant at low levels of affectionate/oversolicitous parenting behavior, $b = 0.05$, $p = 0.537$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [-0.140, 0.249].

These findings are similar to the ones presented in the main manuscript, leading to the same conclusions. Although the delta method was a non-significant trend, the delta method is known to be a conservative and biased test of indirect effects, leading to low power (MacKinnon et al., 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). As such, we relied on the bootstrapped confidence intervals to determine significance (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). This sensitivity analysis suggests that our findings are robust to the method used to handle missing data. As such, we decided to present the results that utilized FIML, as that is currently the recommended approach to handle missing data (Enders & Bandalos, 2001).

Table S9. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety using only participants with complete data*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.33	-1.25	0.000	-1.863	-0.628
Maternal Ethnicity	0.11	0.46	0.236	-0.302	1.224
Maternal Education	0.01	0.02	0.919	-0.406	0.450
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.12	0.41	0.224	-0.251	1.072
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.23	-0.60	0.002	-0.982	-0.218
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.09	-0.84	0.397	-2.789	1.107
BI x OP	-0.17	-2.06	0.005	-3.504	-0.614
Dismissive Parenting	-0.01	-0.02	0.901	-0.364	0.321
Task Directive Parenting	-0.06	-0.12	0.443	-0.409	0.179
BI x DP	-0.10	-0.29	0.186	-0.711	0.138
BI x TDP	-0.05	-0.12	0.522	-0.474	0.241
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Gender	0.16	0.59	0.037	0.037	1.140
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.09	-0.35	0.317	-1.032	0.335
Maternal Education	-0.17	-0.45	0.024	-0.837	-0.058
Emotion Regulation	-0.31	-0.29	0.002	-0.474	-0.110
Behavioral Inhibition	0.12	0.29	0.102	-0.058	0.644

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting. Gender was coded as females = 1 and males = 0. Maternal Ethnicity was coded as Non-Hispanic Caucasian = 1 and Other = 0. Maternal Education was coded as High school graduate = 0, College Graduate = 1, Graduate school graduate = 2, and Other = missing.

Results while controlling for previous anxiety levels

In order to examine if results changed while controlling for previous levels of anxiety, we used parent reports in the Anxiety Scale of the Child Behavior Checklist at age 5, when emotion regulation was measured. As in the main manuscript and shown in Table S10, results revealed the relation between BI and ER strategy was moderated by parenting behaviors. In turn, more engaged ER strategies predicted less social anxiety in childhood and adolescence (Table S10). Importantly, the indirect pathway linking BI to social anxiety via engaged ER strategies was also conditional on parenting behaviors as indicated by a significant interaction indirect effect, $b = 0.52$, $SE = 0.24$, $p = 0.033$, 95% Bootstrapped CI [0.117, 1.157]. Probing this interaction revealed the same patterns of results as shown in the paper.

These findings are similar to the ones presented in the main manuscript, leading to the same conclusions. These sensitivity analyses suggest that our results are robust to previous levels of anxiety, when emotion regulation was measured. We hesitate to interpret these results as suggesting increases in anxiety because our measure of anxiety at age 5 is not the same as our measure of social anxiety at ages 10 and 13.

Table S10. *Path Results for the Moderated Mediation Model for Social Anxiety while controlling for previous anxiety levels.*

Predictors	β	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>	LL	UL
<u>Emotion Regulation</u>					
Gender	-0.24	-0.90	0.000	-1.394	-0.399
Maternal Ethnicity	0.02	0.07	0.822	-0.506	0.637
Maternal Education	0.03	0.06	0.726	-0.298	0.427
Child Fear/Sad Affect	0.09	0.29	0.378	-0.357	0.940
Behavioral Inhibition	-0.24	-0.57	0.000	-0.895	-0.255
Oversolicitous Parenting	-0.11	-0.94	0.300	-2.720	0.839
BI x OP	-0.19	-2.29	0.001	-3.623	-0.957
Dismissive Parenting	-0.06	-0.12	0.421	-0.396	0.165
Task Directive Parenting	-0.07	-0.13	0.376	-0.403	0.152
BI x DP	-0.12	-0.31	0.070	-0.642	0.026
BI x TDP	-0.07	-0.16	0.335	-0.489	0.167
<u>Social Anxiety</u>					
Anxiety (age 5)	0.06	0.05	0.327	-0.048	0.144
Gender	0.14	0.46	0.028	0.049	0.874
Maternal Ethnicity	-0.11	-0.39	0.090	-0.845	0.061
Maternal Education	-0.15	-0.35	0.025	-0.651	-0.045
Emotion Regulation	-0.25	-0.23	0.001	-0.362	-0.089
Behavioral Inhibition	0.15	0.32	0.025	0.040	0.591

Note: β = standardized estimates. *b* = unstandardized estimates. LL = lower limit of 95% confidence interval. UL = upper limit of 95% confidence interval. Bold = $p < .05$. BI = Behavioral Inhibition. OP = Overprotective Parenting. DP = Dismissive Parenting. TDP = Task Directive Parenting. Gender was coded as females = 1 and males = 0. Maternal Ethnicity was coded as Non-Hispanic Caucasian = 1 and Other = 0. Maternal Education was coded as High school graduate = 0, College Graduate = 1, Graduate school graduate = 2, and Other = missing.