Heterogeneity and heterotypic continuity of emotional and behavioral profiles across development

Running head: Behavioral profiles across development

João Picoito, MD, Constança Santos, MD, Carla Nunes, PhD

Dr. João Picoito is with the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Hospital Pediátrico, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Portugal.

Drs. João Picoito and Constança Santos and Carla Nunes are with the Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, and with the Public Health Research Center, Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugal.

Dr. Constança Santos is also with the Department of Pediatrics, Centro Hospitalar Universitário Cova da Beira, Portugal.

Correspondence to João Picoito, MD, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Hospital Pediátrico, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Portugal, 3000-602; e-mail: joao.picoito@chuc.min-saude.pt; +351 92 508 03 95

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to the Centre for Longitudinal Studies (CLS), UCL Institute of Education, for the use of these data and to the UK Data Service for making them available. However, neither CLS nor the UK Data Service bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of these data.

Funding: The authors have no funding to report.

Disclosure: Drs. Picoito, Santos, and Nunes report no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

Keywords: emotional, behavioral, heterotypic, homotypic, transition

Abstract

Objective: To identify profiles of emotional and behavioral symptoms from early childhood to adolescence, their stability across development and associated factors.

Method: Our sample included 17,216 children assessed at ages 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. We used latent profile and latent transition analysis to study their emotional and behavioral profiles from early childhood to adolescence. We included sociodemographic, family, and parenting variables to study the effect on the latent profile's membership and transitions.

Results: The number and specific profiles of emotional and behavioral symptoms change with the developmental stage. We found a higher number of profiles for ages 3, 5, and 14, which suggests greater heterogeneity in the presentation of emotional and behavioral symptoms for early childhood and adolescence compared to late childhood. There was greater heterotypic continuity between ages 3 and 5, particularly in transitions from higher to lower severity profiles. Children exposed to socioeconomic disadvantages were more likely to belong or transition to any moderate or high emotional and behavioral symptoms profiles. Maternal psychological distress and harsh parenting were associated with internalizing and externalizing profiles, respectively. Adolescents with high externalizing and internalizing symptoms had the greatest likelihood of reporting substance use, self-harm, and lower mental wellbeing.

Conclusion: Emotional and behavioral symptoms develop early in life, with levels of heterogeneity and heterotypic stability that change throughout development. These results call for interventions for the prevention and treatment of pediatric mental illness that can account for the heterogeneity and stability of symptoms across development.

Introduction

Emotional and behavioral (EB) symptoms develop early in life and have a lasting impact across development.[1] Children and adolescents with EB symptoms have higher odds of developing psychiatric disorders, poor academic achievement, and risk behaviors.[2] These enduring effects on the lives of young children have motivated research on the specific manifestations of early psychopathology. Identifying specific profiles of EB symptoms, and their transitions and associated factors is crucial for effective interventions in childhood and adolescence mental health.

Traditionally, research on EB profiles in childhood and adolescence has focused on internalizing (such as depression and anxiety) and externalizing symptoms (such as hyperactivity, aggression, and oppositional behavior). Internalizing symptoms in childhood are associated with mood and anxiety disorders in adolescence and young adulthood[3]. In turn, externalizing symptoms in childhood are, in turn, associated with conduct disorder and antisocial behaviors in adolescence.[4] Although internalizing and externalizing symptoms are indeed distinct in terms of phenomenology, they tend to cluster together.[5] This warrants the need to study these manifestations with person-centered methods such as latent class or latent profile analysis to capture different patterns of expression for internalizing and externalizing symptomatology instead of studying these manifestations separately. Additionally, the different patterns of internalizing and externalizing symptoms may change from early childhood to adolescence as EB regulation skills develop, and new challenges and difficulties arise in their lives.

EB symptoms can have a variable course across development.[3] Some children will develop similar problems (homotypic continuity), while others will develop different types of symptomatology (heterotypic continuity). The degree of homotypic or heterotypic stability, and the factors that influence these transitions have been a topic of much research.[6–8] While homotypic stability has been reported as the norm,[6] other studies have reported similar degrees of homotypic and heterotypic continuity.[8] It remains elusive whether some developmental periods are more prone to heterotypic or homotypic transitions, and which contextual and individual factors are associated with specific transitions.

In the current study, we wanted to know whether different developmental stages were associated with different degrees of heterogeneity in the expression of EB symptoms, and different degrees of homotypic and heterotypic continuity. Additionally, we wanted to explore which contextual and ecological factors had a greater influence on specific EB symptoms profiles and developmental stages. Thus, our main objectives were 1) to identify profiles of EB symptoms from early childhood to adolescence, and to study their transitions across development; 2) to assess the effect of socioeconomic, family and parenting factors on membership and transition to specific profiles; and 3) to explore the influence of adolescence mental well-being, self-harm and substance use on membership to specific EB symptoms profiles in adolescence. To achieve these objectives, we used person-centered statistical methods, namely latent profile analysis and latent transition analysis, on a large general population sample.

Method

Participants

Data for this study was drawn from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS; http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/mcs) which is an ongoing longitudinal study, held in the United Kingdom, which has followed a sample of children since their infancy.[9] A stratified random sampling approach was used to overrepresent areas of high child poverty, and areas with high proportions of ethnic minorities. From the two initial sweeps (at age nine months and three years, respectively), 19,243 families in total were enrolled in MCS. Subsequent sweeps were conducted at ages 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 that included 15,590, 15,246, 13,857, 13,287, and 11,726 families, respectively. Additional details on study design, sampling, attrition, and ethics can be found elsewhere.[10] For the analysis, we included cohort members (singletons and first-born twins or triplets) with valid data for socio-emotional behavioral symptoms in at least one of sweeps 2–6, comprising 17,216, from 19,243 participants. Children excluded from the analysis (n=2,027) were more likely to be male, and from ethnic minorities, to live in a monoparental family, and to be from lower-income households (supplementary material Table S1). Table 1 reports sample characteristics.

Measures

The cohort members' *EB profiles* were measured at ages 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 with the parent-reported Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), a brief behavioral screening questionnaire for children aged 3–16 years.[11] It is composed of 25 items, scored 0–2 (not true, somewhat true, and certainly true), and divided into five subscales: emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity and inattention, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior. Scores for each subscale were in the range 0–10 with higher scores indicating more problems or difficulties. We assessed the reliability of the SDQ subscales by computing ordinal coefficient alpha, which is considered a suitable alternative to Cronbach's alpha for ordinal scales, particularly for scales with few response items.[12,13] The reliability was good for all SDQ subscales with ordinal alpha ranging across sweeps at 0.76–0.82 for emotional symptoms, 0.65–0.8 for peer relationship problems, 0.78–0.86 for hyperactivity and inattention, 0.77–0.85 for conduct problems, and 0.77–0.86 for prosocial behavior. Each subscale was used in the analysis as continuous variables. To interpret the severity, we used proposed cut-off points (5 for emotional problems, 4 for conduct and peer problems, 7 for hyperactivity/inattention, and 4 for prosocial behavior).[14] At age 3, the cut-off point was lower for emotional problems (4) and higher for conduct problems (5) and prosocial behavior (7).[15]

The sociodemographic and family variables included gender, ethnicity (white vs. other), living in a monoparental family, family income poverty (equivalized income <60% of the national median), and maternal professional qualification at nine months of age for cohort member (higher degree vs. other). Maternal psychological distress was measured with the self-reported Kessler K6[16] (Cronbach's alpha 0.87–0.89). Harsh parenting was assessed with the sum of three items from Straus's Conflict Tactics Scale[17], (Cronbach's alpha 0.66–0.67). These items measure how often a parent uses violent physical or verbal discipline practices such as smacks, shouts and "telling off," with higher values indicating a higher frequency.[18] Living in a monoparental family, family income poverty, maternal psychological distress, and harsh parenting were measured at each sweep (except for harsh parenting, which was only measured in sweeps 2, 3,

and 4), entering the model as time-varying covariates. These covariates were chosen based on the existing literature.[5,19,20]

We also assessed functional outcomes measured at age 14, namely mental wellbeing, self-harm, and lifetime substance use, including alcohol, binge drinking, tobacco, and cannabis. Mental wellbeing was measured using a six-item questionnaire (Cronbach's alpha = 0.86) in which adolescents reported their level of happiness with various aspects of their lives, namely family, school, appearance, and life overall. For self-harm, adolescents were asked "Have you hurt yourself on purpose in any way in the past year?"

Data analysis

To assess EB profiles from early childhood to adolescence, we conducted the analysis in several steps.

First, we performed a cross-sectional latent profile analysis (LPA) on the SDQ subscale scores and determined for each time-point the number of profiles. LPA is a type of finite mixture modeling that identifies discrete groups of individuals within a population, in which the latent variable is categorical, and the indicators are treated as continuous.[21] To select the optimal number of latent profiles we used different criteria, namely Bayesian information criterion (BIC), with lower values indicating better fit; Lo-Mendell-Rubin test (LMRT), which tests if an additional profile improves model fit; and Entropy for each model, measured on a 0 to 1 scale, with values approaching 1 indicating less classification error; as well as interpretability and parsimony. More details on these fit indices can be found elsewhere.[22]

Second, to study the transitions between profiles from early childhood to adolescence we performed latent transition analysis (LTA), which is a longitudinal extension of LPA that allowed us to calculate the transition probability from a profile at time t to another profile at time t+1.[21] It is common in latent transition analysis to test for measurement invariance, i.e. whether profiles are equal across time, because it allows for a straightforward interpretation of latent profiles across time.[22] However, as we were interested in capturing developmental changes in EB profiles from childhood to adolescence, full measurement non-invariance was conceptually more appropriate for the present study than full or partial measurement invariance. Examining the resultant profiles and the different number of optimal profiles from childhood to adolescence further attested this. Additionally, full measurement invariance could mask significant developmental differences from childhood to adolescence.[23]

Third, we included covariates in the LTA model to assess the effect of socioeconomic, family and parenting factors on membership and transition to specific EB symptoms profiles, and to explore the relationship between adolescence mental well-being, self-harm and substance use and EB profiles in adolescence. To avoid measurement parameter shifts with the inclusion of covariates in the LTA model, we used the manual three-step specification[24]. This involved the estimation of the unconditional mixture model (latent profile analysis), the assignment of each participant to latent profiles using modal class assignment, and then estimating the models with measurement parameters that were fixed at values that accounted for the measurement error in the class assignment. A final LTA model was estimated using the three-step variables obtained earlier for each model combined.

Missing values for the SDQ subscales were dealt with full-information maximum likelihood (FIML) procedures incorporated in LPA and LTA, assuming to be missing at random. However, missingness on the covariates cannot be treated with FIML approaches. Therefore, we multiply

imputed by chained equations 25 datasets, using a model comprised of all covariates and the SDQ subscale scores, and other variables related to the missing covariates. All analyses accounted for the stratified clustered sample design of the MCS. Data analysis was performed with Mplus version 8.3[25], and the package MplusAutomation[26] for R version 3.5.1.

Results

Latent profile analysis of EB symptoms

A series of LPA models were fit separately for each age, with models ranging from one to six classes. At ages 3 and 5, a five-profile solution was considered the best fitting model, with the LMRT supporting the better fit of a five-profile compared to a four-profile solution, and with good entropy values (0.78 and 0.85 for ages 3 and 5, respectively). Although the six-profile solution presented better information criteria for ages 3 and 5, the LMRT p-value was not significant and entropy was lower at both ages compared to the five-profile solutions. At ages 7 and 11, solutions with six profiles also provided the lowest information criteria. However, the LMRT did not support a five- or six-profile solution, so we chose a four-profile solution for ages 7 and 11. Additionally, the entropy for the four-profile solutions was better than the nearest profiles for both ages 7 and 11. At age 14, the LMRT supported a five-profile solution with good entropy (0.85). Examining the resulting models for interpretability, clinical and developmental meaningfulness, and parsimony, we chose five-profile solutions for ages 3, 5, and 14, and four-profile solutions for ages 7 and 11. More details about model selection can be found in supplementary file Tables S2–6.

Figure 1 shows the different latent profiles from early childhood to adolescence. Examining the plots, we can see a marked difference in the shape of the profiles between ages 3 and 5. This difference is attenuated between ages 7 and 11 and changes again at age 14 at the start of adolescence. Across all time points, we found a profile characterized by average scores for each SDQ subscale (*low symptoms*) comprising the majority of the sample (57.1% at age 3 peaking at 72.6% at age 11). The second most common profile was *moderate externalizing*, characterized by borderline scores on conduct problems and hyperactivity/inattention, with a stable shape from childhood to adolescence. From ages 3 through to 7, we found a profile of slightly raised peer relationship problems with average scores in the remaining subscales comprising 13.8, 8.3, and 9.1%, at ages 3, 5, and 7, respectively. A similar profile develops at ages 11 and 14, but with borderline scores on emotional problems and peer relationship problems named *moderate internalizing.* In the last sweep, additional to the *moderate internalizing* profile, we found a profile with higher scores for emotional and peer relationship problems (*high internalizing*), with a prevalence of 5.1%. At age 3, we found a *high emotional and conduct* profile (3.9%) that was not found at age 5, a *moderate emotional* profile appeared at that age instead (6.4%). A profile of high externalizing symptoms (conduct problems and hyperactivity/inattention) emerged from childhood to adolescence, albeit with some distinct nuances. At age 3, this latter profile was associated with low prosocial behaviors (*high externalizing and low prosocial*, 3.8%), and at ages 5 and 7 it was instead associated with borderline emotional problems (*high externalizing and moderate emotional*, 3.4, 4.2, and 3.1%, respectively). At age 11, this high externalizing profile was associated with higher emotional problems (*high externalizing and high emotional*, 3.8%).

Latent transition analysis of EB symptoms from childhood to adolescence

We studied the stability of EB profiles from childhood to adolescence by performing latent transition analysis (Figure 2). Children in the *low symptoms* profile had a high probability of remaining in the same profile at a later time-point, with transition probabilities of 93.2% (age 3 to 5) to 83.4% (age 11 to 14). Children in the *moderate externalizing* profile at age 3 were most likely to remain in the same profile at age 5 (48.4%) but also to transition to the *low symptoms* profile (31.1%). From age 5 onwards, the probability of staying in the *moderate externalizing*

profile were higher, ranging 58.0–74.3%, while the probability of transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile decreased (10.4–26.4%). The *moderate peer problems* profile, from ages 3 to 5, had a higher probability of transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile (50.5%) than staying in the same profile (27.5%). This pattern of a higher probability of transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile then changes in later transitions with slightly higher probability of remaining in the same profile, and from ages 7–11 and 11–14 moving to the closely related *moderate internalizing* profile (44.4 and 35.7%, respectively). Children in the *high emotional and conduct problems* profile (specific to age 3) were likely to transition to the lower severity *moderate emotional* profile (38.4%), but also to others such as the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (17.5%) or the *low symptoms* profiles (14.5%). At age 3, those in the *high externalizing and low prosocial* profile had a slightly higher probability of transitioning to the related *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (38.3%) or *moderate externalizing* profiles (36.6%). From ages 5 to 7, children in the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile had a 65.3% probability of remaining in the same profile. This changed from age 7 to 11 with a lower probability of transitioning by age 11 to the closely related *high externalizing and high emotional* (47.5%) or the *moderate externalizing* profiles (34.7%). Children in the *high externalizing and high emotional* profile had a similar probability of transitioning to the related *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (38.4%) or the *high internalizing* profiles (33.2%).

Socioeconomic and contextual differences

Figure 3 presents the results of the LTA with covariates. Boys were more likely to be in high and moderate externalizing profiles (except at ages 11 and 14) than girls, with higher odds for the age 3 *high externalizing and low prosocial* (odds ratio [OR] = 3.01, 95% confidence interval (CI) 2.43–3.74). White children were consistently less likely to belong to the *moderate peer problems* profile from ages 3 to 7 (age 3 OR: 0.49 CI: 0.41–0.6; age 5 OR: 0.53 CI: 0.42–0.67; age 7 OR 0.54 CI 0.42–0.69). Children from monoparental families and households with income below the poverty line were more likely to belong to any EB profile than to the *low symptoms* profile from ages 3 to 11, particularly at age 3 *high externalizing and low prosocial* (monoparental family OR: 3.68 CI: 3.01–4.5; poverty OR: 5.33 CI: 4.32–6.57), and *high emotional and conduct* (monoparental family OR: 2.81 CI: 2.31–3.41; poverty OR: 5.49 CI: 4.54–6.64). Similarly, adolescents living in households with income below the poverty line were more likely to belong to the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 6.95 CI: 4.85–9.95). Children from mothers with a high professional qualification were more likely to belong to the *low symptoms* profile. This association is true for ages 3–7, for all moderate and high EB profiles, and at age 11 for the *high externalizing and emotional* profile (OR: 0.53 CI: 0.38–0.73). Higher maternal distress was consistently associated with a higher risk of inclusion in any EB symptoms profile, compared to the *low symptoms* profile at any age. Harsh parenting was associated with higher odds of membership in any externalizing profile at any age, but particularly at age 7 (*high externalizing and moderate emotional* OR: 1.75 CI: 1.61–1.9; *moderate externalizing* OR: 1.62 CI: 1.54–1.71).

Influence of covariates on the transition probabilities

We additionally tested if contextual covariates modified the probability of a child transitioning among profiles (Supplementary tables S16–29). Children from monoparental families and households with income poverty were more likely to transition to higher severity profiles, internalizing or externalizing, at any developmental stage (for example, age 3 *moderate externalizing* to age 5 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile: poverty OR: 1.79 CI: 1.15–2.77, monoparental family OR: 2.49 CI: 1.44–4.31). Harsh parenting was associated with

maintenance of or transition to moderate externalizing profiles such as age 5 *moderate externalizing* to age 7 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 1.23 CI: 1.07–1.43), or age 5 *moderate peer problems* to age 7 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 1.41 CI: 1.19–1.68). Maternal distress was consistently associated with higher odds of transitioning to moderate or high internalizing profiles, namely from age 3 *low symptoms* to age 5 *moderate emotional* (OR: 1.11 CI: 1.04–1.19), age 7 *low symptoms* to age 11 *moderate internalizing* (OR: 1.19 CI: 1.08–1.16), age 11 *moderate internalizing* to age 14 *high internalizing* (OR: 1.13 CI: 1.08–1.19). High maternal professional qualification was associated with a lower risk of transitioning to moderate or high severity profiles, as from age 5 *low symptoms* to age 7 *moderate externalizing* (OR: 0.6 CI: 0.42–0.84), from age 7 *low symptoms* to age 11 *moderate internalizing* (OR: 0.57 CI: 0.41–0.80) or from age 11 *low symptoms* to age 14 *moderate externalizing* (OR: 0.60 CI: 0.56–0.79).

Profiles at adolescence and association with mental well-being, self-harm and substance use

Adolescents from any EB profile were more likely to report lower mental wellbeing and increased self-harm compared to adolescents in the *low symptoms* profile. For self-harm, the odds were higher for the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 7.48 CI: 5.13–10.9) and *high internalizing* profiles (OR: 6.15 CI: 4.45–8.5). Adolescents in the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile had the highest probabilities of reporting positive alcohol (OR: 3.18 CI: 2.3–4.4), binge drinking (OR: 7.47 CI: 4.82–11.57), smoking (OR: 15.61 CI: 10.75–22.68), and cannabis lifetime use (OR: 21.7 CI: 13.55–34.76).

Discussion

We used latent profile and latent transition analysis to capture developmental changes in EB profiles from childhood to adolescence. We found that the number and specific profiles of EB symptoms that could best explain heterogeneity in the data changed with the developmental stage. Early childhood was characterized by profiles with higher internalizing and externalizing symptoms, compared with later stages, with two unique profiles found at age 3, namely *high externalizing and low prosocial*, and *high emotional and conduct.* At age 5, we found the emergence of a profile with mixed externalizing and internalizing symptomatology (*high externalizing and moderate emotional*), that persisted until adolescence. At ages 11 and 14, we found increased levels of internalizing symptoms. The higher number of profiles for ages 3, 5, and 14 suggests increased heterogeneity in the presentation of EB difficulties for early childhood and adolescence when compared with late childhood (ages 7 and 11).

Using data from the MCS, a recent study found five different groups of EB symptoms for ages 3–11 based on the conduct problems and emotional problems subscale of the SDQ.[5] The five subgroups were similar to our results, namely low symptoms (57% of the sample), moderate behavioral (21%), moderate emotional (12.5%), high emotional and moderate behavioral (5.5%), and high behavioral and moderate emotional classes (4%).[5] Our study further builds on these findings by applying latent profile analysis separately at each age and including additional SDQ subscales, which allows for the assessment of developmental differences on EB symptoms. We assumed full measurement non-invariance and allowed for the profiles to change across time. This was also the case for a recent latent transition analysis study on problematic behavior across the preschool years using items from the Child Behavior Checklist.[7] The authors described four profiles of problem behavior at age 1.5, 3, and 6, including an internalizing and externalizing profile, that displays higher scores for aggressive behavior and dysregulation at age 6.[7]

Compared to later developmental stages, there was more heterotypic continuity between ages 3 and 5, particularly transitions from high to moderate profiles and transitions to the *low symptoms* profile. The decline in externalizing symptoms from age 3 to 5 has been reported in the literature and is explained by the typical maturation and development of cognition and affect regulation processes.[27,28] In contrast, homotypic transition was the rule from age 5 to 11 with a consistently high probability of remaining in the same profile. A community study of childhood psychiatric disorders in Norway found higher homotypic continuity between 8 and 10 years than between 4 and 6 years.[6] Another previous study on childhood psychiatric disorders between ages 3 and 6, reported a similar magnitude of homotypic and heterotypic stability in this age range.[8] It appears that past early childhood, emotional and behavioral problems tend to crystallize and stabilize, with fewer children transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile. Indeed, early childhood is considered a developmentally sensitive period that is particularly permeable to protective and risk factors.[29,30] The transition to adolescence was also associated with a higher degree of heterotypic continuity, particularly to internalizing profiles and to lower prevalence in the *low symptoms* profile. Accordingly, adolescence has been associated with increased rates of internalizing disorders[31] with homotypic and heterotypic pathways to these disorders.[32]

Our analysis includes a set of socioeconomic and contextual covariates to study the effects of these factors on membership to specific EB profiles, and to assess the effect on the transition probabilities. Living in a monoparental family and household poverty were associated with a higher probability of membership and transition to any moderate or high EB profile. These odds were particularly high in early childhood. A systematic review on socioeconomic inequalities and mental health among children and adolescents reported that socioeconomic hardship was more

strongly associated with mental health problems among younger children than among adolescents.[33] Single parenthood has been linked with a range of functional and mental health problems in both children and adolescents.[34,35] This association may stem from the higher probability of economic hardship, mental illness in parents, and adverse life events in single-parent families.[36] Maternal distress was associated with membership in any moderate or high EB problems profile compared to the *low symptoms* profile and was consistently associated with higher odds of transition to an internalizing profile. Maternal psychological distress and mental illness have been considered strong predictors of children's mental ill-health and adjustment, being this way an important focus for treatment and prevention of pediatric mental illness.[37] Children exposed to harsh parenting practices were more likely to belong or transition to externalizing profiles (including mixed internalizing and externalizing). The association between externalizing symptoms and harsh parenting has been consistently replicated in the literature, particularly within a transactional theoretical framework.[38] A recent study that used data from the MCS found that harsh parenting measured at age 3 was associated with fewer conduct problems but higher emotional problems at age 11.[39] The methodological differences with our study could explain the apparently contrasting results, namely that we used a person-centric approach and included harsh parenting as a time-varying covariate (measured at ages 3, 5, and 7). However, the common co-occurrence of internalizing and externalizing symptoms (also evidenced in our results for the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile, for example) could also explain these differences. Children from mothers with high maternal professional qualification had higher odds of belonging to the low symptoms profile, particularly from age 3 to 7. Low paternal education has been associated with both mental illness in children and adolescents and its persistence and severity,[40] with higher effects for younger children.[41]

We studied the association between EB profiles in adolescence and mental well-being, self-harm and substance use. These associations helped validate the profiles' clinical meaningfulness. Adolescents in the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profiles had the highest likelihood of reporting positive lifetime use of alcohol, binge drinking, smoking, and cannabis, as well as self-harm and lower mental wellbeing. The link between internalizing and externalizing symptoms, mental well-being, and risk behaviors in adolescence may stem from the behavioral and emotional self-control and regulation that develops early in life.[42]

To our best knowledge, this is the first study to assess EB profiles from early childhood to adolescence within a latent transition analysis framework that includes five time points. We have included both time-invariant and time-varying covariates and studied the effect of these covariates on the transition probabilities. Although computationally heavy, these models allowed us to capture developmental changes from childhood to adolescence. We used the five subscales of the SDQ and allowed for more nuanced EB profiles that could not have been achieved using just a subset of the subscales. The additional strengths are the large sample provided by the MCS and its national representativeness. One limitation is the use of parent-report for only the SDQ subscales and covariates, which can produce some bias in the results.[43] The EB profiles do not represent clinical disorders. However, the SDQ has shown good predictive power for clinical diagnoses.[11] Another limitation is the higher attrition rate for socioeconomically disadvantaged families and from ethnic minorities in each sweep of the MCS.

In conclusion, EB symptoms tend to develop early in life, with levels of heterogeneity, as well as heterotypic stability that change with the developmental stage. Socioeconomic disadvantage was positively associated with any moderate or high internalizing profiles while maternal education was protective, particularly for younger children. Higher levels of internalizing and

externalizing symptoms were associated with worse functional outcomes in adolescence. These results highlight the need to implement developmentally sensitive interventions on the prevention and treatment of mental disorders in children and adolescents that can account for the heterogeneity and stability of symptoms across development.

Clinical Guidance

- Identifying specific profiles of emotional and behavioral symptoms, as well as their transitions and associated factors, is crucial for effective interventions on childhood and adolescence mental health.
- There is more heterogeneity in the presentation of emotional and behavioral difficulties in early childhood and adolescence, compared with late childhood.
- Past early childhood, emotional and behavioral problems tend to crystallize and stabilize, with fewer children transitioning to the low symptoms profile.
- Children from socioeconomically disadvantaged families were more likely to belong to any moderate or high internalizing or externalizing profile, while high maternal professional qualification was protective, particularly for younger children.
- Higher levels of internalizing and externalizing symptoms were associated with lower mental wellbeing and higher rates of self-harm and substance use.
- Within an ecological framework, earlier Intervention on emotional and behavioral symptoms is crucial for better mental health in children and adolescents.

References

1. Angold A, Egger HL. Preschool psychopathology: lessons for the lifespan. *J Child Psychol & Psychiat*. 2007;48(10):961-966. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01832.x

2. Luby JL, Gaffrey MS, Tillman R, April LM, Belden AC. Trajectories of preschool disorders to full DSM depression at school age and early adolescence: continuity of preschool depression. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2014;171(7):768-776. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13091198

3. Roza SJ, Hofstra MB, van der Ende J, Verhulst FC. Stable prediction of mood and anxiety disorders based on behavioral and emotional problems in childhood: a 14-year follow-up during childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2003;160(12):2116-2121. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.160.12.2116

4. Pardini DA, Fite PJ. Symptoms of conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and callous-unemotional traits as unique predictors of psychosocial maladjustment in boys: advancing an evidence base for DSM-V. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2010;49(11):1134-1144. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2010.07.010

5. Patalay P, Moulton V, Goodman A, Ploubidis GB. Cross-Domain Symptom Development Typologies and Their Antecedents: Results From the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2017;56(9):765-776.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2017.06.009

6. Wichstrøm L, Belsky J, Steinsbekk S. Homotypic and heterotypic continuity of symptoms of psychiatric disorders from age 4 to 10 years: a dynamic panel model. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2017;58(11):1239-1247. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12754

7. Basten M, Tiemeier H, Althoff RR, et al. The stability of problem behavior across the preschool years: an empirical approach in the general population. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2016;44(2):393-404. doi:10.1007/s10802-015-9993-y

8. Bufferd SJ, Dougherty LR, Carlson GA, Rose S, Klein DN. Psychiatric disorders in preschoolers: continuity from ages 3 to 6. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2012;169(11):1157-1164. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12020268

9. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Sixth Survey, 2015. *UK Data Service*. 2019. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-8156-4

10. Joshi H, Fitzsimons E. The Millennium Cohort Study: the making of a multi-purpose resource for social science and policy. *Longit Life Course Stud*. 2016;7(4). doi:10.14301/llcs.v7i4.410

11. Goodman A, Goodman R. Strengths and difficulties questionnaire as a dimensional measure of child mental health. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2009;48(4):400-403. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181985068

12. Zumbo BD, Gadermann AM, Zeisser C. Ordinal versions of coefficients alpha and theta for likert rating scales. *J Mod App Stat Meth*. 2007;6(1):21-29. doi:10.22237/jmasm/1177992180

13. Sulik MJ, Blair C, Greenberg M. Child Conduct Problems across Home and School Contexts: A Person-Centered Approach. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess*. 2017;39(1):46-57. doi:10.1007/s10862-016-9564-8

14. Youthinmind Ltd. Scoring the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire for age 4-17. https://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/b3.py?language=Englishqz(UK). Published 2015. Accessed October 30, 2019.

15. Youthinmind Ltd. Scoring the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire for age 2-4. https://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/b3.py?language=Englishqz(UK). Published 2016. Accessed October 30, 2019.

16. Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ, et al. Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2003;60(2):184-189. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.60.2.184

17. Straus MA, Hamby SL. Measuring Physical & Psychological Maltreatment of Children with the Conflict Tactics Scales. 1997.

18. Flouri E, Midouhas E. Environmental adversity and children's early trajectories of problem behavior: The role of harsh parental discipline. *J Fam Psychol*. 2017;31(2):234-243. doi:10.1037/fam0000258

19. Patalay P, Fitzsimons E. Correlates of mental illness and wellbeing in children: are they the same? results from the UK millennium cohort study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2016;55(9):771-783. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2016.05.019

20. Mazza JRSE, Lambert J, Zunzunegui MV, Tremblay RE, Boivin M, Côté SM. Early adolescence behavior problems and timing of poverty during childhood: A comparison of lifecourse models. *Soc Sci Med*. 2017;177:35-42. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.01.039

21. Collins LM, Lanza ST. *Latent class and latent transition analysis: With applications in the social, behavioral, and health sciences*. Vol 718. John Wiley & Sons; 2010.

22. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the Number of Classes in Latent Class Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo Simulation Study. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2007;14(4):535-569. doi:10.1080/10705510701575396

23. Nylund KL. Latent transition analysis: Modeling extensions and an application to peer victimization. 2007.

24. Nylund-Gibson K, Grimm R, Quirk M, Furlong M. A Latent Transition Mixture Model Using the Three-Step Specification. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2014;21(3):439-454. doi:10.1080/10705511.2014.915375

25. Muthen LK, Muthén BO. *Mplus Version 8 User's Guide*. Muthen & Muthen; 2017:944.

26. Hallquist MN, Wiley JF. MplusAutomation: An R Package for Facilitating Large-Scale Latent Variable Analyses in Mplus. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 2018;25(4):621-638. doi:10.1080/10705511.2017.1402334

27. Montroy JJ, Bowles RP, Skibbe LE, McClelland MM, Morrison FJ. The development of self-regulation across early childhood. *Dev Psychol*. 2016;52(11):1744-1762. doi:10.1037/dev0000159

28. Wakschlag LS, Tolan PH, Leventhal BL. Research Review: "Ain"t misbehavin': Towards a developmentally-specified nosology for preschool disruptive behavior. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2010;51(1):3-22. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02184.x

29. Conway AM, McDonough SC. Emotional resilience in early childhood: developmental antecedents and relations to behavior problems. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2006;1094:272-277. doi:10.1196/annals.1376.033

30. Khan A, McCormack HC, Bolger EA, et al. Childhood Maltreatment, Depression, and Suicidal Ideation: Critical Importance of Parental and Peer Emotional Abuse during Developmental Sensitive Periods in Males and Females. *Front Psychiatry*. 2015;6:42. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2015.00042

31. Adkins DE, Wang V, Elder GH. Structure and Stress: Trajectories of Depressive Symptoms across Adolescence and Young Adulthood. *Soc Forces*. 2009;88(1):31. doi:10.1353/sof.0.0238

32. Shevlin M, McElroy E, Murphy J. Homotypic and heterotypic psychopathological continuity: a child cohort study. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2017;52(9):1135-1145. doi:10.1007/s00127-017-1396-7

33. Reiss F. Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and adolescents: a systematic review. *Soc Sci Med*. 2013;90:24-31. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026

34. Fergusson DM, Boden JM, Horwood LJ. Exposure to single parenthood in childhood and later mental health, educational, economic, and criminal behavior outcomes. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;64(9):1089-1095. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.64.9.1089

35. Sieh DS, Visser-Meily JMA, Meijer AM. The relationship between parental depressive symptoms, family type, and adolescent functioning. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(11):e80699. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080699

36. Hoffmann JP. Family structure and adolescent substance use: an international perspective. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2017;52(13):1667-1683. doi:10.1080/10826084.2017.1305413

37. O'Connor TG, Monk C, Burke AS. Maternal affective illness in the perinatal period and child development: findings on developmental timing, mechanisms, and intervention. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2016;18(3):24. doi:10.1007/s11920-016-0660-y

38. Wiggins JL, Mitchell C, Hyde LW, Monk CS. Identifying early pathways of risk and resilience: The codevelopment of internalizing and externalizing symptoms and the role of harsh parenting. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2015;27(4 Pt 1):1295-1312. doi:10.1017/S0954579414001412

39. Rajyaguru P, Moran P, Cordero M, Pearson R. Disciplinary parenting practice and child mental health: evidence from the UK millennium cohort study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2019;58(1):108-116.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2018.06.033

40. McLaughlin KA, Breslau J, Green JG, et al. Childhood socio-economic status and the onset, persistence, and severity of DSM-IV mental disorders in a US national sample. *Soc Sci Med*. 2011;73(7):1088-1096. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.06.011

41. Meyrose A-K, Klasen F, Otto C, Gniewosz G, Lampert T, Ravens-Sieberer U. Benefits of maternal education for mental health trajectories across childhood and adolescence. *Soc Sci Med*. 2018;202:170-178. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.02.026

42. Wills TA, Simons JS, Sussman S, Knight R. Emotional self-control and dysregulation: A dual-process analysis of pathways to externalizing/internalizing symptomatology and positive well-being in younger adolescents. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2016;163 Suppl 1:S37-45. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.08.039

43. Curhan AL, Rabinowitz JA, Pas ET, Bradshaw CP. Informant Discrepancies in Internalizing and Externalizing Symptoms in an At-Risk Sample: The Role of Parenting and School Engagement. *J Youth Adolesc*. August 2019. doi:10.1007/s10964-019-01107-x

Data References

1. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Longitudinal Family File, 2001-2015. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-8172-2
2. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: First Survey, 2001-2003. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-4683-4
3. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Second Survey, 2003-2005. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-5350-4
4. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Third Survey, 2006. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-5795-4

5. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Fourth Survey, 2008. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-6411-7
6. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Fifth Survey, 2012. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-7464-4
7. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Sixth Survey, 2015. UK Data Service. 2019. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-8156-4

Table 1 Weighted descriptive statistics (n= 17216)			
		n (%) / mean (standard error)	Missing n (%)
Gender (male)		8804 (51.1)	-
Ethnicity (white)		14138 (87.8)	100 (0.6)
Mother's professional qualification (high)		4963 (34.6)	702 (4.1)
Family income poverty			
	Age 3	5053 (26.1)	1880 (10.9)
	Age 5	5115 (27.1)	2118 (12.3)
	Age 7	4155 (23.2)	3396 (19.7)
	Age 11	3298 (17.6)	3949 (22.9)
	Age 14	3457 (21.3)	5511 (32)
Monoparental family			
	Age 3	2691 (15.3)	1817 (10.6)
	Age 5	3014 (17.9)	2028 (11.8)
	Age 7	2912 (19.2)	3378 (19.6)
	Age 11	3129 (22.2)	3949 (22.9)
	Age 14	2881 (23.5)	5511 (32.0)
SDQ Emotional problems			
	Age 3	1.31 (0.17)	2473 (14.4)
	Age 5	1.35 (0.02)	2490 (14.5)
	Age 7	1.49 (0.02)	3773 (21.9)
	Age 11	1.82 (0.03)	4421 (25.7)
	Age 14	1.97 (0.03)	5889 (34.2)
SDQ Conduct problems			
	Age 3	2.75 (0.03)	2446 (14.2)
	Age 5	1.46 (0.02)	2471 (14.4)
	Age 7	1.34 (0.02)	3744 (21.7)
	Age 11	1.34 (0.02)	4418 (25.7)
	Age 14	1.35 (0.02)	5887 (34.2)
SDQ Hyperactivity/inattention score			
	Age 3	3.86 (0.03)	2584 (15)
	Age 5	3.23 (0.03)	2557 (14.9)
	Age 7	3.30 (0.04)	3794 (22.0)
	Age 11	3.05 (0.04)	4445 (25.8)
	Age 14	2.90 (0.04)	5894 (34.2)
SDQ Peer problems score			
	Age 3	1.48 (0.02)	2570 (14.9)
	Age 5	1.09 (0.02)	2500 (14.5)
	Age 7	1.17 (0.02)	3764 (21.9)
	Age 11	1.32 (0.02)	4414 (25.6)
	Age 14	1.68 (0.03)	5884 (34.2)
SDQ Prosocial score			
	Age 3	7.34 (0.02)	2549 (14.8)
	Age 5	8.39 (0.02)	2472 (14.4)
	Age 7	8.60 (0.02)	3740 (21.7)
	Age 11	8.78 (0.02)	4411 (25.6)
	Age 14	8.32 (0.02)	5886 (34.2)
Maternal distress (Kessler-6)			
	Age 3	3.14 (0.04)	3627 (21.1)
	Age 5	3.07 (0.04)	2885 (16.8)
	Age 7	3.03 (0.05)	4053 (23.5)
	Age 11	3.87 (0.06)	5511 (32)
	Age 14	4.16 (0.07)	6849 (39.8)
Harsh parenting			
	Age 3	9.39 (0.03)	4220 (24.5)
	Age 5	8.37 (0.02)	3073 (17.8)
	Age 7	8.11 (0.02)	4203 (24.4)

Results are presented as n (%) for categorical variables, and as mean (standard error) for continuous variables. n – unweighted frequency. % - weighted percentage. SDQ – Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire



Figure 1 – Latent profiles of emotional and behavioral symptoms



LS = Low symptoms; He+C = High emotional + conduct; MPP = Moderate peer problems; ME = Moderate externalizing; HE+LP = High externalizing + low prosocial; Me = Moderate emotional; HE+Me = High externalizing + moderate emotional; MI = moderate internalizing; HE+He = High externalizing + high emotional; HI = High internalizing

Thickness of nodes represents the proportion of cases most likely assigned to that profile. Thicker and darker edges represent greater probability of transitioning from a time t profile to a time t+1 profile.

Figure 2 – Latent transition probabilities and classification probabilities



Figure 3 – Results of the latent transition analysis with covariates. Monoparental family, poverty, high maternal professional qualification, maternal distress and harsh parenting odds ratios are adjusted for gender and ethnicity. Reference class = low symptoms.



Figure 3 (continued) – Results of the latent transition analysis with covariates. Monoparental family, poverty, high maternal professional qualification, maternal distress and harsh parenting odds ratios are adjusted for gender and ethnicity. Reference class = low symptoms.



Figure 4 – Profiles at adolescence and association with mental well-being, self-harm and substance use. Odds ratios adjusted for gender and ethnicity. Reference class = low symptoms.