Developmental pathways of physical aggression

from infancy to early school age

Ane Nærde [1*], Harald Tage Janson[1], Mike Stoolmiller[1,2]

[1]The Norwegian Center for Child Behavioral Development, Oslo, Norway

[2]Oregon Research Institute, Eugene, Oregon, USA

*Corresponding author

E-mail: ane.narde@nubu.no (AN)

Abstract

This study identified latent trajectories of physical aggression from infancy to preschool age and tested for (a) early parent, parenting and child predictor effects on trajectory membership and (b) trajectory-effects net of parent, parenting, and child predictor effects on Grade 2 social, behavioral and academic functioning. We used data from the Behavior Outlook Norwegian Developmental Study (BONDS), comprising 1,159 children (559 girls). Parents reported on risk and protective factors, and on physical aggression from 1 to 5 years; teachers reported on Grade 2 outcomes. We employed latent class growth curve analyses to identify nine aggression trajectories. In fully adjusted models testing simultaneously all associations among predictors, trajectories, and outcomes, maternal and paternal harsh parenting, child gender, and sibling presence predicted trajectory membership, which significantly predicted Grade 2 externalizing. Child gender had a pervasive influence on all outcomes as well as on trajectory membership. This is the first trajectory study that attempts to sort out which predictors are most proximal, more distal, or just confounded, with their relative direct effect sizes, and to link early paternal as well as maternal harsh parenting with children's development of physical aggression from infancy to preschool age. Our findings underscore the need to include fathers in developmental research and early prevention and intervention efforts.

Introduction

In this study, we take a deep dive into the developmental patterns of physical aggression during early childhood and explore how these longitudinal patterns influence children's social, behavioral and academic functioning in school age when simultaneously considering early individual and contextual risk and protective factors. During the past few decades, it has become increasingly evident that children's use of physical aggression is predictable, normative, and close to ubiquitous during certain developmental periods. Indeed, behaviors such as kicking, hitting, and pushing have their origins in early childhood and serve developmentally salient and adaptive functions. At the same time, physical aggression may be highly problematic and is in fact considered as the most serious and socially unacceptable form of aggression, being ontogenetically antecedent to less "serious" forms such as verbal aggression or indirect aggression [1].

The systematic study of how physical aggression develops already from early childhood onwards is still recent [2], as most existing research focuses on aggression beginning in toddlerhood or preschool age [but see e.g., 3, 4]. Still, theoretical and empirical research efforts together with advances in quantitative theory and practice have moved the field forward. In short, there is compelling evidence that: (a) children start to physically aggress at an early age [5-7]; (b) such behavior typically peaks around 2-3 years of age followed by a steep decline [3, 8-10]; and (c) a small proportion of children, more often boys, maintain a high and stable frequency of physical aggression during middle childhood that is associated with a range of negative outcomes [11-17]. Yet, existing longitudinal research is limited by mainly starting out from the second year of life, comprising relatively few observations of aggressive behavior, relying solely on assessments from mothers, and

primarily *about* mothers, and not testing simultaneously all associations among predictors,

trajectories, and outcomes. We add to the existing literature by identifying trajectories of

physical aggression from infancy to preschool age (i.e., 1 to 5 years) in a large population-

based sample using data from multiple informants and examining social, behavioral and

academic adjustment in second grade as a function of these trajectories as well as of

empirically driven early predictors. Following previous research [7, 18], we use the term

physical aggression to denote physical acts directed against others in the form of observable

child behaviors such as kicking and hitting, without any consideration of intentionality.

Developmental trajectories of physical aggression across early

childhood

In a seminal paper at the turn of the century, Tremblay [1] reviewed the state of

knowledge regarding the origins of aggressive behavior and highlighted the need to focus on

the first few years of development if we are to understand physical aggression and prevent

chronic cases. He argued that infants' physical aggression typically had not been deemed

developmentally significant and stated that "the exciting work that needs to be done is to

study the developmental trajectories of these aggressive behaviors at the intra-individual

level during infancy and toddlerhood, and their relationship with later development" [1, p.

134]. Some twenty years later, this task seems well underway, with published results from

several longitudinal studies mapping the development of aggression utilizing state-of-the-

art analytic techniques. Among other things, empirical evidence shows that there is

heterogeneity in the early development of physical aggression [2, 13, 14, 17, 19-21]. In the

following, we provide an overview of research applying a developmental trajectory

approach, that is, the identification of prototypic subgroup curves that represent different

developmental patterns of aggression [e.g., 16]. We focus on summarizing key results from

large-scale longitudinal studies specifically exploring developmental pathways of physical

aggression starting in toddlerhood, which is in accord with the focus of the current study.

Research addressing the course of aggression has found varying numbers of

developmental trajectories. This is likely related to sample variations like age range, size,

and risk factor composition, the number of repeated assessments and variation in the

targeted constructs that measurements are able to capture, as well as model specification

and model selection criteria [8, 22]. Several studies focusing on the course of physical

aggression through early childhood have identified either 3 [8, 10, 17, 20], 4 [19, 23-27], or 5

trajectories of aggression [13, 21]. Some have also reported differing numbers of trajectory

groups for girls and boys (i.e., 3 for girls and 5 for boys [2]. Results from two studies [13, 21]

utilizing a sample of over 1,100 children identified 5 distinct aggression trajectories from age

2 through 9 years including a "very low" group characterized by low frequency in early

childhood followed by a rapid decline (~45% of the sample), a "low-aggression" group

(~25%), also quite low in aggression throughout, although higher than the lowest group, a

"moderate-decline" group, showing a marked decline over time (~12%), a "moderate" group

being moderately stable, albeit slightly declining (~15%), and a "high" group showing the

highest level of aggression (~3%).

There are several similarities across findings. Groups of children who display high

physical aggression at young ages tend to continue to display high aggression over time.

Moreover, studies have typically identified at least one trajectory group showing low levels

of aggression across time, as well as one characterized by a high and stable level. Whereas

several, but not all, studies have identified trajectories characterized by declining physical

aggression [21, 24, 27], no late onset high physical aggression groups tend to be identified.

Given empirical evidence that children start to physically aggress already at 6 to 8

months of age [5, 6], it is noteworthy that only a small minority of longitudinal studies

addressing developmental trajectories of aggression have started out before the second

year of life. Urges for researchers conducting longitudinal developmental research to start

up in early childhood and conduct multiple observations across a host of data sources have

been expressed, including by Jennings and Reingle [22] in their comprehensive meta-review

of latent group-based trajectories of violence, aggression, and delinquency across the life

span. Examples of longitudinal studies starting out this early include the Quebec

Longitudinal Study of Child Development [QLSCD; see e.g., 2, 20, 28], the National

Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth in Canada [NLSCY; see e.g., 19], the NICHD Study

of Early Child Care and Youth Development in the US [SECCYD; see e.g., 14, 21], and studies

by Lorber et al., [4, 7] and Tremblay et al. [10]. Finally, it should be mentioned that despite

the call from Tremblay [1] for longitudinal studies to include repeated measurements of

aggressive behavior at least every two to three months from birth to 36 months, and ideally

every 6 months from 36 months onward, existing evidence is typically based on data

collected about yearly [2, 3, 27], every other year [8, 19], or a mix (17, 21). [But see e.g., 4,

7, 29].

Predictors of physical aggression trajectories

One implicit assumption when identifying population heterogeneity is that groups of

children exhibiting atypical developmental patterns have specific risk characteristics [2, 8,

21]. Considerable efforts have thus been devoted to identifying early predictors of trajectory

group membership. Results from twin research [30, 31] suggest that individual differences in

the frequency of physical aggression may be substantially driven by genetically based

factors, and recent evidence [32, 33] indicate that epigenetic mechanisms could be involved

in the development of chronic aggression, highlighting the need to identify early bio-psycho-

social mechanisms [33, 34]. Longitudinal patterns of aggression have also been linked to

several environmental predictors (including gene-environment correlations), comprising *risk*

as well as *protective* factors. Protective factors contribute to positive outcomes especially in

the context of increased risk, but also regardless of risk level (the latter is sometimes

distinguished as *promotive* factors; a distinction which is meaningful but empirically not so

clear-cut [see e.g., 21, 35]. These risk and protective factors fit within Bronfenbrenner's [36]

socio-ecological model addressing the ecology of human development. In line with this,

Labella and Mason [37] recently discussed the most salient family-based risk and protective

factors for the development of aggression and violence including those relating to children's

proximal developmental contexts, which can be grouped into *parent/family factors* (i.e.,

sociodemographic risk, parental psychopathology), *parenting factors* (i.e., parenting style),

and *child factors* (i.e., gender, temperament).

Parent/family factors

Sociodemographic risk and parental psychopathology represent two of the strongest

and most persistent predictors of multiple types of child maladjustment, including

physical aggression [37- 40]. For instance, results from the SECCYD NICHD ECCRN [21]

indicated that family poverty, low maternal education, and single parenthood predicted

higher and more stable maternal reported physical aggression trajectories among more

than 1,100 children from 2 years to third grade. Relatedly, Côté et al. explored maternal

reported trajectories of physical aggression from 2 to 8 years [19] and from 2 to 11 years [8]

among 1,183 children participating in the NLSCY and found that those in the high aggression

group were more likely than the ones following lower aggression groups to come from low-

income families, with mothers who had not completed high school. Similar findings were

also reported by Tremblay et al. [10] in that low income, early maternal childbearing,

smoking during pregnancy, the presence of similarly aged siblings, maternal antisocial

behavior in high school, and family dysfunction predicted the high aggression group at ages

17, 30, and 42 months among 572 Canadian families. Finally, Teymoori et al. [2] addressed

predictors of maternal reported physical aggression trajectories separately for boys and girls

among 2,223 Canadian children participating in the QLSCD from 1.5 to 13 years of age. The

girls in the high trajectory group were significantly different from those in the low on 9 out

of 12 family risk factors, including parent's education, depression, and antisocial behavior in

adolescence, household income, socioeconomic status, and number of siblings at birth and

at 17 months. The boys in the highest group furthermore had parents with lower education

and socioeconomic status, higher depression, and mothers who were younger at first

childbirth. According to the much-studied family stress model [41-44], poverty and financial

instability undermine parents' psychological well-being and lead to persistently elevated

levels of stress, which in turn predict their parenting practices and subsequent child

functioning.

Having siblings (younger or older) furthermore constitutes a major risk factor for

aggressive behavior [45-50]. Siblings represent easily accessible targets for and sources of

aggression, and physical aggression amongst siblings is the most prevalent, albeit often

overlooked form of family violence, for which the lack of a comprehensive theory has long

been noted [51, 52]. Relevant theoretical perspectives mainly include family systems theory,

evolutionary psychology, and social learning theories (49-52). For instance, Patterson [49,

50] suggested a sibling-training hypothesis wherein coercive sibling interactions set the

stage for the development and escalation of aggressive behavior through direct practice,

modeling, and reinforcement. In accord with Patterson's coercion theory [53], parental

reactions and handling of their children's conflicts and aggressive behaviors further

contribute to exacerbate or diminish such sibling behavior [48].

Parenting factors

There is much evidence to support that parenting style is predictive of children's

externalizing behavior. For example, results from the SECCYD NICHD ECCRN [21] indicated

that less sensitive and involved maternal parenting predicted higher and more stable

aggression trajectories from 2 years to third grade. Moreover, Tremblay et al. [10] found

that maternal coercive parenting behavior predicted membership in the high aggression

group from 17 to 42 months, which was also reported by Côté et al. [19] across 2 to 8 years.

Among the most well-established theories of development of aggression and externalizing

problem behavior is Patterson's [53] coercion theory, wherein child externalizing develops

from transactional reinforcement processes between the child and important others in the

early developmental period. Parenting behaviors characterized by lack of skills, warmth and

positive affect in a discipline encounter can lead the child to react with (even more) negative

and challenging behaviors, which may make the parents feel overwhelmed and frustrated

and possibly giving in to the child just to restore peace. This parental negative

reinforcement for child acting out behavior is what perpetuates an adverse parent-child

cycle [53, 54]. Such suboptimal parenting behaviors are typically associated with parental

psychopathology and depression (in research mainly focusing on mothers; [55-56] but see

also Cheung and Theule [57]), which illustrates how these risk factors tend to appear and

operate in tandem.

The recurring failure to integrate fathers into empirical research addressing child

development in general, and development of physical aggression in particular (although see

a recent exception by Yang et al. [58]), is serious and unfortunate as it might bring about

erroneous conclusions, such as misattributing influences of fathers to mothers or leaving

important sources of variation unexplained. Cabrera et al. [59] and Cabrera [60] recently

discussed the puzzling fact that fathers are still mostly absent from parenting research,

despite strong suggestions that traditional mother-focused models of developmental

influences are outdated. Father involvement is particularly high in societies where this is

facilitated by social policies [61]. In Norway, both parents have the right to a lengthy paid

leave in connection with childbirth, of which a particular quota (6 weeks in 2006, when the

current sample was recruited) is reserved for the father. Indeed, Norwegian fathers started

spending significantly more time with their children following the introduction of this quota

[62], and time-use data show that they tend to be highly involved in caregiving [63],

providing a unique opportunity to assess the importance of factors relating to mothers and

fathers alike (e.g., parenting behavior and psychopathology) for the development of

aggression. Finally, the dearth of research examining paternal sensitivity in conjunction with

maternal within developmental psychopathology more generally was highlighted in a recent

meta-analytic review [64] addressing (observed) paternal sensitivity and children's cognitive

and socioemotional outcomes.

Child factors

It is well established that boys use direct forms of aggression (i.e., physical or verbal)

more often than girls. In line with this, Côté et al. [19] reported that children in the high

aggression trajectory group from 2 to 8 years (amongst other things) were more likely to be

boys. Researchers has frequently addressed various aspects of these gender differences,

including *when* they emerge, the *types* of aggressive behaviors boys and girls generally

engage in, and *alternative hypotheses* for such differences [5, 19, 23, 65-67]. Empirical

evidence suggests that boys and girls use physical force against others (e.g., pulling peoples

hair, hitting, biting) at similar rates in infancy and early toddlerhood [5, 66, 68], whereas

boys show significantly more physical aggression in the next few years [3, 5, 25, 69].

According to Hay [5], no single factor explains the widening gender gap, but rather a

developmental cascade of biological and social factors. One important contribution of

trajectory- or group-based approaches is the finding that emerging gender differences

primarily may be accounted for by more boys than girls making up the small group of

children who continue to deploy aggression at high rates [11].

Finally, the contribution of child temperament to the early development of

externalizing problem behaviors is well documented, including high negative emotionality,

activity level and reactivity, along with low effortful control, inadaptability, persistence, and

negative mood - sometimes subsumed under the broad construct difficult temperament [5,

25, 29, 70, 71]. Several theoretical models (see Slagt et al. [72] for overview) postulate

individual differences among children in their general susceptibility to parenting and

environmental influences based on their temperamental characteristics. A meta-analysis

[72] on parenting-by-temperament interactions reported partly support for Belsky's [73]

differential susceptibility hypothesis wherein young children with difficult temperament are

more likely to develop externalizing problems in the presence of negative parenting

compared with those having an easier temperament [47, 70, 74-76].

Outcomes of physical aggression trajectories

A key question when mapping the developmental course of aggression across early

childhood is the degree to which the trajectories predict subsequent behavior and

adjustment, and whether moderate versus elevated levels of aggression predict different

patterns of outcomes [12, 13, 65, 76, 77]. Much research exploring outcomes of aggression

trajectories has focused on more serious delinquency and antisocial behavior in adolescence

and emerging adulthood [12, 15, 16, 78, 79], as well as in adulthood [80-82], whereas less

has addressed a broader range of social and academic outcomes that may also confer risk

[but see e.g., 13, 17, 21, 24, 83]. Results from two studies using data from the SECCYD [13,

21] show that both level and stability of aggression from age 2 to 9 predict middle childhood

academic achievement and social functioning at home, school, and in the peer group. In the

first study [21], the five identified trajectories were compared on age 9 measures of

academic competence and cognitive functioning, teacher reported behavior problems and

social competence, self-reported peer relationships, friendships, and hostile attribution

biases, observed behavior in school, and mother-reported discipline and mother-child

conflict. Relatedly, in a second study, Campbell et al. [13] explored age 9 to 12 adjustment

(i.e., teacher reported behavior problems, social competence, and academic achievement,

child self-reported peer relations, depression, and risk taking, observed classroom behavior

and friendship interaction) as a function of the same 5 trajectories. Overall, the results

indicated that outcomes varied by trajectory group. As expected, children in the high- and

moderate-stable groups showed continuing behavioral and social problems relative to those

very low in aggression; the high-stable group evidenced signs of significant antisocial

behavior, whereas the moderate-stable showed symptoms of ADHD and more minor peer

problems [13, 21]. The researchers suggested that the two groups seemed to be on

different developmental pathways. Moreover, children in the moderate decreasing group

displaying transient and age-related aggression that disappeared before school age, showed

good adjustment both at age 9 [21], and across the transition to adolescence [13]. A more

surprising finding was the differences between the two low aggression groups (i.e., low-

stable, and very-low), given that the aggression in the low-stable group initially seemed

trivial. Still, relative to the very-low group, children in the low-stable group had elevated

scores on several measures of internalizing and externalizing problems and poor social skills

in elementary school [13]. Consequently, moderate, or low-level physical aggression that

persists from toddlerhood through school entry may signal that adjustment problems will

continue or emerge by middle childhood, albeit not at the level of the high-stable trajectory

group.

The present study

In the present study, we extend previous research by scrutinizing developmental

pathways of physical aggression spanning the age range during which it emerges among

most children, when it is particularly prevalent and viewed as normative, as well as the

period when such behavior usually declines. The study follows up on previous work [9]

utilizing the same sample, which addressed the developmental course of physical aggression

from infancy to age 2 applying growth curve modeling rather than a developmental

trajectory approach and comprising early predictors but no outcomes. We include a

comprehensive set of 20 early predictors and several school-age outcomes, enabling us to

disentangle the relative importance of children's longitudinal patterns of physical aggression

for their subsequent social, behavioral, and academic functioning, while simultaneously

considering the direct and indirect impact of early risk and protective factors. As far as we

know, this is the first study to examine trajectories of physical aggression across the

developmental period from 1 year until pre-school age including frequent parental reports

of child aggression (up to 21 reports with 90% of the sample having at least ten) and to test

in the same model the effects of a comprehensive set of early risk and protective factors on

trajectory membership, as well as those of trajectory membership on teacher-reported

school-age outcomes net of early predictors. In contrast, most prior research has either

focused on effects of precursors on trajectories, or of trajectories on outcomes, or has

included a somewhat restricted set of covariates. Finally, we take advantage of very recent

advances in statistical methods for trajectory analysis, so called 3-step procedures [84], that

were not available for many prior studies, when incorporating multiple predictors and

multiple outcomes in the trajectory model to obtain the best possible estimates of both

effect sizes and their associated standard errors.

Research issues

We employed state-of-the-art analytic techniques to:

1. Model trajectories of physical aggression from infancy (i.e., 1 year) to preschool age (i.e.,

5 years);

2. Predict aggression-trajectory membership from empirically driven parent, parenting,

and child predictors measured at child age 0.5 or 1 year both unadjusted and adjusted

for all other predictors; and

3. Predict children's teacher-rated Grade 2 adjustment (externalizing and internalizing,

social skills, and academic competence) as a function of aggression-trajectory

membership as well as the early predictors, both unadjusted and adjusted for all other

predictors and for trajectory membership.

Materials and methods

Sample and procedures

311 We utilized data from the Behavior Outlook Norwegian Developmental Study

312 (BONDS), a population-based longitudinal study of 1,159 children (559 girls and 600 boys)

from five municipalities in southeast Norway conducted by the Norwegian Center for Child

Behavioral Development. The BONDS is approved by the Regional Committee for Medical

and Health Research Ethics and the Norwegian Social Sciences Data Services (approval

numbers S-06067; 2009/224a), and all parents provided informed written consent.

Participants were recruited from September 13, 2006, until December 31, 2008, by nurses

at the 5-month visit at child health clinics, which are attended almost universally. Inclusion

criteria were the child being of the appropriate age and one parent being able to participate

without an interpreter. Families of 1,931 eligible children were informed about the project.

Of the 1,465 (76%) who agreed to be contacted, 1,159 (79%, or 60% of the eligible group)

opted to participate. The sample was fairly representative of the general population,

however, somewhat biased toward mothers with higher education, fewer immigrant

parents, more firstborns, and fewer single mothers [85]. Personal interviews, which

included a computerized questionnaire, were conducted when children were aged 6

months, 1, 2, 3, and 4 years, and in the child's first school year. Whereas both parents were

invited to participate in the first interview, fathers were primarily targeted in the 1- and 3-

year waves, and mothers in the 2- and 4-year waves. At 1, 2, and 3 years, the assessment

included videotaped structured parent-child interaction tasks, in which more fathers thus

participated at ages 1 and 3 years, and more mothers at age 2. The parental interviews

(including the interaction tasks) were conducted by trained assistants in local offices (or in

the home setting if parents preferred). At two occasions (i.e., 5 years as well as in the child's

second school year), lengthier telephone interviews including many of the study's variables

were conducted instead of a personal interview. In addition to the yearly main data

collections, brief telephone interviews comprising a small selection of items relevant to the

study's key outcomes were conducted at about 8 months, 10 months, 1 year and 3 months,

1 year and 6 months, 1 year and 9 months, 2 years and 4 months, 2 years and 8 months, and

3½ years. Brief telephone interviews were also added 2 and 1 months prior to and 1-, 2-,

and 3-months following entry into center-based childcare when the child's date of entry was

known to the project and these ages were not covered by another interview. At age four,

which was the endpoint for the original participation consent, 1,121 children (96.7%)

remained in the study. Parents of 1,027 children (88.6%) renewed their informed written

consent for participation in a continuation of the study until second grade. At the Grade 2

data collection, 996 children (85.9% of the original sample) remained in the study. Teachers

of 901 children contributed reports on the child in Grade 2.

Child physical aggression measure

Our measurement design for physical aggression included repeated measurements

per child across time and as many items on physical aggression as thought to be relevant

and feasible at each wave of data collection. Thus, from 10 months onward, each

questionnaire (i.e., at 1, 2, 3, and 4 years in the current dataset) and each telephone

interview (i.e., in the current dataset including 7 target ages from 1 year and 3 months up to

5 years, and in addition prior to and after entry into center-based childcare as described

above) included 2 to 9 items on child physical aggression. We used an original instrument

developed for the BONDS, with idiomatic wordings and a selection of items widely

acceptable to parents of small children, including exclusively physical behavior directed at

others covering also the lower range of intensity (Supporting information A). In telephone

interviews, respondents were asked if the behavior was true now or in the past two weeks,

with a dichotomous (*yes/no*) response format. In the questionnaire format, respondents

were asked how often the child engaged in the behavior, with responses given on a seven-

point frequency scale ranging from 1 (*never/not in the past year*) to 7 (*three times daily or*

more). The present set of analyses used physical aggression data starting with the 1-year

interview and including up to the 5-year telephone interview. The number of regularly

scheduled interviews from 1 to 5 years was eleven; a smaller number of interviews occurred

when families discontinued participation or declined to participate in specific interviews; a

greater number of interviews occurred when additional telephone interviews were added

prior to and after entry in center-based day care, and when both father and mother

contributed with an interview at the same age. Reports on 1,141 children were available.

Table 1 shows item inclusion and frequencies for telephone interviews from around 1 year 3

months to around 5 years, as well as for the 1- to 4-year questionnaires. The number of

reports per child ranged from one (7 cases) to 21 (1 case) with a mean of 12.0 (*SD*=2.5), with

90% having at least ten reports and 43% having at least thirteen. In total, 26% of the reports

were by fathers.

Table 1. Item inclusion and frequencies for telephone interviews from around 15 to around 60 months and 1- to 4-year questionnaires.

	Telephone-interview responses (% Yes for past two weeks)							Questionnaire responses (M [SD] for frequency)[a]			
Target age (months)	15	18	21	28	32	42	60	12	24	36	48
Age range (months)	14-16[b]	17-19[b]	20-22[b]	27-29[b]	31-33[b]	41-44[b]	59-61[b]	10-15[c]	22-29[c]	34-39[c]	46-51[c]
Hits you	44 %	59 %	60 %	63 %	56 %	41 %	27 %	1.8 (0.8)	2.2 (0.6)	2.0 (0.5)	1.8 (0.6)
Hits siblings[d]	37 %	57 %	62 %	66 %	61 %	50 %	53 %	1.7 (0.7)	2.3 (0.7)	2.1 (0.7)	2.0 (0.6)
Hits other adults	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.7 (0.6)	--	--
Pushes someone to get his/her will	38 %	48 %	54 %	59 %	54 %	44 %	32 %	1.6 (0.7)	2.1 (0.7)	2.0 (0.6)	1.9 (0.6)
Pulls someone's hair	--	-- [e]	-- [e]	19 %	17 %	7 %	4 %	--	1.6 (0.7)	1.4 (0.6)	1.3 (0.5)
Pinches someone	--	--	--	--	--	--	14 %	--	1.6 (0.7)	1.5 (0.6)	1.4 (0.5)
Throws things at others	-- [e]	31 %	37 %	35 %	34 %	23 %	18 %	--	1.9 (0.7)	1.8 (0.5)	1.6 (0.5)
Bites someone[f]	--[f]	29 %	25 %	19 %	15 %	6 %	--	--[f]	1.6 (0.6)	1.4 (0.5)	1.2 (0.4)
Kicks someone	-- [e]	8 %	10 %	17 %	18 %	18 %	18 %	--	1.4 (0.5)	1.5 (0.5)	1.5 (0.6)
N responses[g]	1603	1391	1211	1127	1098	1034	919	1215	1141	1091	1127
Father responses	23 %	21 %	22 %	23 %	19 %	18 %	7 %	69 %	8 %	70 %	9 %

	Telephone-interview responses (% Yes for past two weeks)							Questionnaire responses (*M* [*SD*] for frequency)[a]			
Target age (months)	**15**	**18**	**21**	**28**	**32**	**42**	**60**	**12**	**24**	**36**	**48**
Age range (months)	**14-16[b]**	**17-19[b]**	**20-22[b]**	**27-29[b]**	**31-33[b]**	**41-44[b]**	**59-61[b]**	**10-15[c]**	**22-29[c]**	**34-39[c]**	**46-51[c]**
N children	1096	1086	1068	1057	1058	1015	880	1101	1075	1024	1059

[a] Means and standard deviations are based on the reduced 4-point frequency scale: 1 (never/not in the past year), 2 (on single occasions/1-3 times per

month/once per week), 3 (2-3 times per week/1-2 times per day), and 4 (3 times per day or more). [b]Children's age in whole months, i.e., from -1.0 to +2.0

months from target age. Mostly due to telephone interviews around entry in center-based childcare, there were 716 (7.9%) telephone-interview responses

from 526 different children outside of these age ranges; while those responses were included in the data set, percentages tabulated here include only

responses within the indicated age ranges. [c]Age range in whole months for all questionnaire responses. [d]Administered only to children with a similar-aged

sibling in the family (who ranged from 39% at age 1 to 82% at age 5). [e]According to study design, this question should not have been included at this age.

However, due to interviewer choice, the data set included 10 or fewer responses for this age; a percentage out of this small number is not tabulated here.

[f]Excluding during breastfeeding. Data prior to 18 months excluded. [g]Multiple telephone-interviews responses per child up to 42 months occurred as a result

of frequent interviews around center-based day care entry. Two questionnaire responses per child, or two 60-month telephone interviews, occurred when

both parents participated in the yearly parental interview.

We employed Rasch scaling [86] to equate response formats, link response patterns

with varying sets of completed items, and address measurement invariance. The following is

a summary; a fuller account is given in Supporting information B. We first performed Rasch

scaling in two calibration subsamples – one of questionnaire responses, and one of

telephone-interview responses – each consisting of responses covering the age span

sampled such that each child contributed only one response. Rasch rating scale analyses

suggested that a reduction of the scale from seven to four categories (1 [*never/not in the*

past year], 2 [*on single occasions/1-3 times per month/once per week*], 3 [*2-3 times per*

week/1-2 times per day], and 4 [*three times daily or more*]) gave a more optimally

functioning rating scale. There was almost perfect correlation (*r*=.986) between item scale

value estimates from questionnaires and the corresponding estimates from telephone

interviews. In both calibration subsamples, we tested and found reasonable measurement

invariance of the Rasch model with respect to item scale value estimates for respondent

(mother vs. father) and child gender (boy vs. girl) by means of Rasch-model differential item

functioning (DIF) analyses. For child age, six items' scale values were allowed to vary as a

function of age based on the DIF analyses in the calibration subsamples and further analyses

of item displacement in eleven age-specific subsamples. The arbitrary average difference in

person locations that was a result of the two data types (questionnaire vs. telephone

interview) was addressed by adding a constant of about 2 to questionnaire data. We

obtained person location estimates for all measurements in the sample according to the

estimation procedure presented by Linacre [87].

In the final data set after recoding of extreme values and equivalating for forms, the

13,673 person location estimates from the Rasch analyses that we used as our physical

aggression measurements ranged from -5.30 to 5.02 with a mean of -1.86 and standard

deviation of 1.87 (variance 3.49; skewness 0.28; kurtosis -0.23). The estimates of the

measures' standard error averaged 1.22, and the average squared standard error estimate

was 1.67. Thus, Rasch-model based person reliability estimated in the entire sample by

means of these terms equaled .52, suggesting modest overall reliability of an individual

measurement. On the other hand, from a standard (i.e., 1-class) growth model

parameterized the same way as our latent class growth models (4th order polynomial

trajectories, see below), the average reliability of the child level aggression was estimated

at .88 at age 2.2 years, the growth curve intercept (.82 at 1.2 years; .81 at 4.4 years), and the

growth curves accounted for about 55 percent of the total outcome variance. Thus,

although an individual aggression measurement at one point in time has only modest

reliability, sets of repeated aggression measurements over time are substantially more

reliable and suitable for growth curve or latent class growth curve analysis.

421   The average time-to-time correlation of physical aggression measurements for 2- to

12-month intervals between study design target ages was .46. A simple, non-parametric

regression (Loess) plot of the repeated measures of physical aggression vs child age is

shown in Figure 1. The developmental trend shows a rapid increase from 10 months to a

peak at about 2 years and 2 months, and a slower decrease thereafter.

Fig 1. Loess plot of average child physical aggression by child age

Predictor measures

Parent/family measures

Parental education and age. Information about parental age, education, and family

composition was obtained from the interviews at child ages 6 months and 1 year. Parental

age at child age 6 months was dichotomized into 1 (young, i.e., ≤25 years) and 0 (not

young). Mothers and fathers reported on their educational level in six categories: 1 (*9-year*

elementary school or shorter), 2 (*1-2 years of high school*), 3 (*Higher vocational*), 4 (*3 years*

of high school, upper secondary school), 5 (*College, university up to 4 years [Bachelor, Nurse,*

Teacher, Engineer]), or 6 (*University, college, more than 4 years [Master's degree]*). The

reports were recoded to represent the total years of education, the six categories taken to

represent 9, 10.5, 12, 12, 15.5, and 18 years of education, respectively.

Family composition. Single parent status, from child age 1 year if a report existed,

and from 6 months otherwise, was coded 1 and not being single was coded 0.

Financial stress. Parents' reports at child age 1 year of having more long-standing

financial difficulties in the past year (rent, mortgage, obligations, etc.) We obtained reports

from at least one parent for 1096 children, coded 1 if at least one parent reported the

presence of such difficulties, and 0 otherwise.

Couple relationship. We used mothers' questionnaire reports at child age 6 months

of the relationship between her and her husband/partner on a shortened and modified 10-

item version of the Relationship satisfaction scale [88], answered on a 6-point Likert scale

from 1 (*very much agree*) to 6 (*very much disagree*). Cronbach's alpha was .90 for 1084

mothers.

Parental depression and anxiety. A 12-item version of the Hopkins Symptom Check

List [89] from the 6-month interview was used as a measure of symptoms of depression and

anxiety. The 12 items are a subset of those in the 25-item version, a widely used self-report

symptom inventory tapping the most common forms of psychopathology in non-psychiatric

populations (i.e., anxiety and depression; [90]). The response format is a Likert-type scale

from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*). We computed a mean score of the 12 items. Cronbach's

alpha was .88 for 1130 mothers and .87 for 677 fathers who contributed reports.

Parenting predictor measures

Parent sensitivity. Parent sensitivity was measured based on ratings of videotaped

parent-child structured interaction tasks at age 1 year. Fathers were the primarily targeted

participants at this age, and more fathers took part in the assessment than mothers, but

when fathers were not able or willing to come, the mother took part instead. We thus

obtained videotapes of father-child interaction for the greater part of the sample, but for

mother-child interaction for a smaller part. The interaction tasks were selected based on

their capacity to elicit parent and child behaviors associated with subsequent child

adjustment [91, 92] following literature reviews and discussions with international experts.

The tasks strived at being gender non-stereotypic and included *free-play*, where parents

were asked to play with their child as they liked with a provided set of toys (4 min.); *clean

up*, where parents were asked to put the toys away and told that the child could help but

was not required to (2 min.); *structured play*, where two sets of toys were presented, a

shape sorter box and a set of stacking rings (selected to be too difficult for most 1-year-olds

to manage on their own), and parents were asked to help the child as much as they thought

necessary with one toy at a time (2 × 3 min.; the assistant informed the dyad when it was

time to switch toys). They were also told that there was no need to complete the tasks (e.g.,

put all stacking rings in the correct order). Prior to the observations, parents were informed

that they could choose to discontinue the tasks at any time.

We used the mean of three global ratings - Sensitivity/responsiveness, Detachment/

disengagement (reversed), and Positive regard for the child – from the Norwegian

adaptation of the Qualitative Ratings for Parent Child Interaction at 3-15 Months in the

NICHD SECCYD study [93, 94] to form a composite index of parent sensitivity. The mean was

aggregated across two separately rated interaction segments, one being free-play and clean

up, and the other structured play. Each variable was rated on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5 by

trained judges; interrater reliability (single rating, absolute agreement, two-way, random

intraclass correlation) ranged from .65 to .74 in the full set of all rating variables [94]. The

average was computed if at least three out of six ratings were present, which occurred in

717 fathers and 244 mothers. Internal consistency (alpha) for the composite was .88 for

fathers and .86 for mothers in 708 fathers and 242 mothers with complete sets of six

ratings.

Harsh and positive parenting. Those mothers and fathers who took part in the 1-

year assessment contributed self-reports of parenting practices on a subset of items of the

Parenting scale from the Fast Track Project adapted from the Parental Discipline Scale and

Parent Praise scales from the Pittsburgh Youth Study [95, 96]. For the same reasons as for

parent sensitivity, these self-reports were obtained for a larger proportion of fathers and a

smaller proportion of mothers. Items were answered on a frequency scale from 1 (*never*) to

5 (*almost always*). We used the mean of three items on parent positive behavior (giving the

child a smile, saying something nice about the child to the child, and giving the child a hug,

pat on the back, or a kiss) in response to desirable child behavior as the measure of positive

parenting practices. We used the mean of two parent negative items (yelling or screaming

and slapping or hitting) in response to undesirable child behavior as the measure of harsh

parenting practices. Alpha was .60 and .25, respectively, for positive and harsh parenting,

for 377 mothers, and alpha was .71 and .24, respectively, for positive and harsh parenting,

for 835 fathers. However, one issue with these reliability estimates is that Cronbach's alpha

– a correlational measure – provides an overly pessimistic view of the reliability of these

measures considering attenuation due to ceiling and floor effects. We thus in addition

conducted supplemental measurement models appropriate for ordered categorical

variables. We fit separate confirmatory factor models to the respective items sets for harsh

and positive parenting. Because of the floor and ceiling effects, we tested models that

specified the items as ordered categorical indicators of their underlying latent constructs

using in one case, a logit link function and robust, full-information, maximum likelihood

(FIML) estimation and in the second case, a probit link function and WLSMV (weighted least

squares mean and variance adjusted) estimation. The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

model for the harsh parenting with only 2 indicators per latent construct was specified with

fixed factor loadings of 1, making it a random intercept model. With 3 items per latent

construct for positive parenting, we estimated 2 factor loadings and the factor variance for

each latent construct. In the FIML models, the test for the missing completely at random

(MCAR) assumption could not be rejected for both constructs, suggesting that the subsets of

the sample, father only, mother only and mother and father were random samples from the

same underlying population. The latent models indicated that the items functioned as

intended, and that the latent factors were well defined: In the FIML models, the test of the

underlying model for the ordered categorical indicators (a continuous latent indicator with

thresholds) could not be rejected, suggesting that ordered categorical indicator model

assumptions were reasonable. For the WLSMV models, the overall chi-square tests of model

fit were non-significant (smallest p value was .21), RMSEAs were well under .05 (biggest

RMSEA was .020), and CFI/TLI were well above .9, (smallest value was .948). In the fully

standardized CFA results, all items loaded significantly (all $p < .001$) and moderately to

strongly on their intended constructs, with FIML estimated single-indicator reliabilities for

the harsh parenting items for fathers and mothers of .43 and .41, respectively, and

estimated single-indicator reliabilities for the positive parenting items for fathers and

mothers ranging from .30 to .98, suggesting that equivalent reliabilities for latent construct

scores would be .60 for father's harsh parenting, .58 for mother's harsh parenting, .86 for

fathers' positive parenting, and .81 for mothers' positive parenting. Correlations of

estimated factor scores from latent models with the transformed raw scores we used in the

latent class growth models were very high at .95, suggesting that little would be gained by

using factor scores rather than the trimmed mean of the items that we had used.

Child predictor measures

Child age. The child's age was calculated as the time difference between the

interview date and the child's approximate (±5 days) birth date.

Child gender. The child's gender was a sampling variable recorded at study inclusion

and was coded 0 (*girl*) or 1 (*boy*).

Presence of similar-aged sibling. Presence of a similar-aged sibling (age difference

up to 5 years, thus for the greater part indicating the presence of older siblings) was coded

1, absence was coded 0.

Child temperament. To measure temperament, we included the scales Activity level

and Distress to limitations from Rothbart's Infant Behavior Questionnaire-Revised [97] as

well as the Soothability scale from the Infant Behavior Questionnaire [98], completed at the

6-month interview with a modified three-point response format: 1 (*most of the time*), 2

(*sometimes*), or 3 (*rarely or never*), in addition to a *does not apply* option. The mean score of

items was used as the scale score. Cronbach's alpha was .71, .76, and .77, respectively, for

the three scales.

Outcome variables

Teachers completed questionnaires in the middle of the second school year. With

few exceptions, children were in their 8th year around the time of data collection. We

selected the following variables:

Externalizing. We used the sum of the 12 Externalizing problem behavior items from

the Social Skills Improvement System-Rating Scales (SSIS-RS; [99]). Frequency is rated on a

four-point scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 3 (*almost always*). We allowed one item to be

missing when calculating the sum; if so, the sum was adjusted as 12 times the item mean

and rounded up to the next integer. This sum could be calculated for 901 children (893

children had complete data whereas 8 had one missing item). No children had more than

one missing item. Cronbach's alpha based on 893 children with complete data was .92 for

the scale of 12 items.

Internalizing. We used the sum of the seven Internalizing behavior items from the

SSIS-RS [99]. Frequency is rated on a four-point scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 3 (*almost*

always). We allowed one item to be missing when calculating the sum; if so, the sum was

adjusted as 7 times the item mean and rounded to the next integer. This sum could be

calculated for 901 children (892 children had complete data whereas 9 had one missing

item). No children had more than one missing item. Cronbach's alpha based on 892 children

with complete data was .83 for the scale of 7 items.

Academic competence. We used the sum of the ratings for the seven Academic

Competence items from the SSIS-RS [99], which are rated on a five-point scale ranging from

1 (*lowest 10%*) to 5 (*highest 10%*). We allowed one item to be missing when calculating the

sum; if so, the sum was adjusted as 7 times the item mean and rounded to the next integer.

This sum could be calculated for 896 children (889 children had complete data whereas 7

had one missing item). Data for one child with four items completed were excluded.

Cronbach's alpha based on 889 children with complete data was .96 for the scale of 7 items.

Social skills. We used the sum of the frequency ratings for the 46 Social Skill items of

the SSIS-RS [99]. Frequency is rated on a four-point scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 3 (*almost*

always). We allowed up to four items to be missing when calculating the sum; when items

were missing, the sum was adjusted as 46 times the item mean and rounded to the next

integer. This sum could be calculated for 887 children (839 children had complete data, 38

had one missing item, and 10 children had 2, 3, or 4 missing items). Data for fourteen

children with 41 or fewer items completed was excluded. Cronbach's alpha based on 839

children with complete data was .96 for the scale of 46 items.

Statistical analyses

Software

586 Basic data operations were performed in SPSS, versions 20.0 through 28.0. Rasch

587 analyses of child physical aggression were performed in Winsteps, version 3.90.0 through

588 4.7.1.0. Standard regression and latent class analyses were carried out using R, version 4.1

589 and Mplus, versions 8.6 and 8.7, respectively.

Analytic subsample and missing data

The present study used an analytic subsample of 1141 children with reports of

physical aggression. Among predictor variables from 6 months representing demography

and child temperament, 1.3% missing observations were imputed prior to the main analyses

using a single imputation of missing values by means of the Estimation Maximization (EM)

algorithm in SPSS) as described in more detail in Nærde et al. [9].

For the remaining early predictor variables and Grade 2 outcomes, missingness was

addressed using multiple imputation in R [100] for standard regression analyses. The

imputation model included all early predictors and grade 2 outcomes. For all analyses

involving latent classes, missingness was handled within the latent-variable framework in

Mplus as described below under Statistical Methods.

Attrition analyses revealed that the analytic subsample resembled the entire original

study sample very closely with respect to all early predictors (Supporting information C).

Analyses also revealed very great similarity between the entire original sample and the

subsample of 901 children who had Grade 2 teacher reports with respect to early

predictors; a multivariate binomial logistic regression on early predictors of presence of

Grade 2 teacher reports, which made up our distal outcomes, suggested that maternal

education, single parent, and sibling presence together significantly predicted missingness in

Grade 2 teacher reports. These three early predictors were included in the fully adjusted

models, including in the modeling of missingness, thus reducing or eliminating the

possibility of bias in the fully adjusted models due to any missingness explained by early

predictors.

Data transformations

Continuous predictors were centered at their sample means. To prevent potential

distortions due to outliers, we trimmed non-binary predictors at about the 2nd and 98th

percentiles of their respective distributions. Some of the non-binary predictors as well as

the Grade 2 outcomes of externalizing and internalizing were highly skewed, as would be

expected in this population, and were square root transformed to make the assumption of

within-class normality more reasonable. Descriptive statistics for predictors and outcomes,

before and after transformations, are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for predictors and outcomes

	N	M	SD	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max	M	SD	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max
		Raw data						**Transformed data**					
							Early predictors						
Maternal education[a]	1141	14.29	2.57	-0.14	-1.06	9	18	0.00	2.57	-0.14	-1.06	-5.29	3.71
Paternal education[a]	1141	13.84	2.59	0.23	-1.09	9	18	0.01	2.59	0.23	-1.09	-4.84	4.17
Young mother	1141	0.14	0.34	2.12	2.49	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Young father	1141	0.06	0.23	3.86	12.95	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Financial stress	1096	0.12	0.33	2.34	3.46	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Couple relationship[b]	1072	5.33	0.65	-1.70	4.18	1.20	6.00	0.70	0.39	-0.15	-0.70	0.00	1.38
Single parent	1141	0.05	0.21	4.32	16.66	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mat'l depression & anxiety[c]	1116	1.33	0.37	1.95	5.98	1.00	3.75	0.47	0.32	0.07	-0.82	0.00	1.15
Pat'l depression & anxiety[c]	671	1.27	0.33	2.59	13.12	1.00	4.00	0.40	0.31	0.10	-1.11	0.00	1.00
Maternal sensitivity[d]	244	3.90	0.61	-0.79	0.36	1.83	5.00	0.01	0.59	-0.63	-0.31	-1.43	0.93
Paternal sensitivity[d]	717	3.74	0.69	-0.45	-0.17	1.17	5.00	0.00	0.66	-0.32	-0.75	-1.41	1.09

		Raw data						Transformed data					
	N	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max
Maternal harsh parenting[d]	377	1.42	0.50	1.96	7.73	1.00	5.00	-0.01	0.47	1.28	1.70	-0.42	1.58
Paternal harsh parenting[d]	835	1.40	0.47	1.23	1.77	1.00	4.00	-0.01	0.44	0.82	-0.28	-0.41	1.10
Mat'l positive parenting[d]	377	4.71	0.45	-2.82	13.90	1.00	5.00	0.01	0.40	-1.61	2.25	-1.38	0.29
Pat'l positive parenting[d]	835	4.53	0.54	-2.10	8.50	1.00	5.00	0.02	0.47	-0.86	-0.18	-1.19	0.47
Child gender	1141	0.52	0.50	-0.06	-2.00	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Similar-aged sibling	1141	0.38	0.49	0.47	-1.78	0	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Child activity level[d]	1141	2.07	0.28	0.07	0.00	1.09	2.83	0.00	0.27	0.11	-0.42	-0.54	0.60
Child distress to limitations[d]	1141	1.69	0.31	0.40	0.13	1.00	2.82	0.00	0.30	0.30	-0.31	-0.56	0.70
Child soothability[d]	1141	2.63	0.29	-0.46	-0.35	1.56	3.00	0.00	0.28	-0.30	-0.89	-0.63	0.37
					Grade 2 outcomes								
Externalizing[e]	901	4.81	5.26	1.68	3.22	0	35	1.83	1.21	0.34	-0.36	0.00	5.92
Internalizing[e]	901	3.01	2.97	1.17	1.49	0	18	1.42	1.00	-0.04	-0.94	0.00	4.24
Academic competence	896	25.03	7.12	-0.40	-0.50	7	35	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Raw data						Transformed data					
	N	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max
Social skills	887	103.79	19.56	-0.43	-0.45	32	137	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note. Some variables were transformed as marked by letter subscripts. Descriptive statistics for transformed variables are displayed in the right part of the

table. Reversing and recentering are linear transformations that do not change the shape of a distribution, the rank order of observations, or the linear

relations with other variables. Trimming and square root transformations are non-linear transformations that change the shape of a distribution (make it

less skewed and heavy-tailed), the rank order of a few of the observations (only trimming and this is because it produces ties among extremes) and thus

potentially alter linear relations with other variables.

[a]Centered. [b]Trimmed (values smaller than the 2nd percentile or larger than the 98th percentile recoded back to the 2nd or 98th percentile values),

reversed, recentered to have a minimum score of zero and square root transformed. [c]Trimmed, recentered to have a minimum score of zero and square

root transformed. [d]Centered and trimmed. [e]Square root transformed.

Statistical methods

Growth model and latent class (trajectory) analysis (LCGA). Because of the large number and irregular timing of the repeated growth measures within children, we found it simplest to use a 2-level specification for the LCGA with the child's age in years, centered at 2.2, as the time variable. Prior research clearly indicates that the pattern of growth requires at least a 2nd degree polynomial (i.e., quadratic) model to capture the rise to a peak and subsequent decline. Preliminary analyses indicated that a 4th order model fit significantly and substantially better than 2nd or 3rd order models in our sample with up to 21 repeated measures, so we adopted the 4th order model for all analyses (i.e., included terms up to the 4th power of time). The basic 2-level LCGA-growth model specification included 5 child-level growth components with freely estimated means for the 5 growth components in each class, no within-class variability on growth components, and time-specific variability constrained to be equal across both time and classes. The specification of no within class variability in growth is what locates our model in the category of LCGA (latent class growth analysis; [16], which is considered the simplest longitudinal mixture model [101]). Most prominent trajectory studies to date, [including e.g., 8, 16, 21, 25] have employed LCGA models. LCGA models in common circumstances extract more classes than growth mixture models (GMM), which do allow for some variation of trajectories within classes [102].

3-Step approach. For models that included latent classes and either predictors, outcomes, or both, we used the manual 3-step procedure as recommended by Asparouhov and Muthen [84]. In addition to the advantages given by Asparouhov and Muthen, the 3-step approach allows us to use a much simpler way of dealing with missing data in child level predictors because Step 3 eliminates all the repeated growth measurements for a particular child and replaces them with one child level nominal predictor of latent class –

pseudo-class – which enables us to switch to a 1-level model. We had several important

predictors with substantial amounts of missing data. Mplus requires the use of a

computationally intensive approach based on Monte Carlo numerical integration to deal

with missing data in the predictors and this is much simpler in a 1-level model.

Prediction of trajectory (class) membership. To evaluate the overall effect of each

predictor on class membership, whether unadjusted and considered singly or fully adjusted

for all competing predictors on class membership, we used likelihood ratio tests (LRT)

comparing the model with all possible predictor effects to the model that included the

predictor but had all predictor effects constrained to zero. We used a pseudo-R statistic

[103] as the indicator of the strength of association between predictor and class

membership.

We investigated predictor effects on membership in any class versus another in

multinomial logistic regressions in the context of the 3-step approach. The multinomial

logistic model is a collection of individual logistic regressions, one less than the number of

classes, where one class serves as the reference class and predictors compete to

discriminate each of the other classes against the reference class in the individual,

simultaneous logistic regressions. The multinomial logistic regression model is estimated on

the log odds scale; a contrast coefficient of ±0.69 on the log odds scale corresponds to an

odds ratio of 2 or 0.5, thus expressing double the odds of membership in one of the

compared classes over the reference class conditional on the predictor. Contrast coefficients

express the change in log odds of the outcome for a 1-unit change in the predictor. For

interpretability, we standardized predictor coefficients by the predictors' sample standard

deviations.

In our case with 9 latent classes, the multinomial logistic regression produces 8

effects for each class vs the reference class for each predictor. The choice of the reference

class is arbitrary and Mplus uses the "last" class by default. The 8 effects can be recombined

in simple linear combinations to derive any contrast between any 2 classes, and it is very

helpful to examine these alternative contrasts to understand the nature of the effects of a

predictor on class membership. With 9 classes, there are 36 non-redundant, pairwise

contrasts.

Prediction of Grade 2 outcomes from class (trajectory). To evaluate the overall

effect of class membership on the distal outcomes considered singly, similarly to our

approach for comparing predictor effects, we adopted an LRT approach comparing the

model with distal outcome means freely estimated in each class to the null hypothesis

model with distal outcome means forced to be equal in each class. To summarize the overall

effect of latent class on outcomes we computed R as the square root of R^2 by computing the

proportional reduction of total outcome variance represented by the residual, within class

outcome variance, that is, R^2 = proportion explained variance = 1 - (residual variance/total

variance). For means comparisons of outcomes among latent classes, we used standardized

mean differences and examined all pairwise contrasts among classes.

Prediction of Grade 2 outcomes from early predictors. We used a standardized

regression weight as the indicator of the strength of association between each early

predictor and Grade 2 outcomes. These standard regression analyses were carried out in R

using multiple imputations to account for missing data.

Unadjusted versus fully adjusted prediction models. Comparing unadjusted vs

adjusted effects is useful because we gain insight into which predictors are the most

proximal and which are more distal. The former remains significant even after full

adjustment and the latter becomes nonsignificant, whether overall or just a few class

contrasts. We first examined all prediction effects unadjusted for other influences.

For each distal outcome, we went on to build fully adjusted models for the influence

of early predictors on trajectory, as well as the influence of trajectory and early predictors

on the outcome. For these analyses, we retained those early predictors that either had a

significant unadjusted effect on trajectory membership or had a significant effect on any of

the four distal outcomes after adjusting for all other predictors in separate multi-predictor

models. The full models included all possible predictor effects on latent class, all latent class

effects on the distal outcome, and all possible direct paths from the predictors to the distal

outcome.

Results

Number and shape of trajectories

We considered two- to ten trajectory solutions. We relied on information criteria,

the parametric bootstrap likelihood ratio test (BLRT), and substantive considerations to

select the number of trajectories that seemed optimal with respect to parsimony, model fit,

and the distinctions that the trajectory model made in the data. Table 3 shows information

criteria for the sequence of models. Test statistics for the BLRT are given in table SD2 in

Supporting information D. Nine trajectories minimized the Bayesian information criterion

(BIC), whereas ten trajectories (or possibly more) minimized the sample size adjusted BIC

and the Akaike information criterion (AIC). A less often reported criterion, the consistent

Akaike information criterion (CAIC; [104]) was minimized by the eight-trajectory solution.

The BLRT consistently rejected simpler models with less than 8 trajectories, although due to

the heavy computational burden we did not attempt to test 9 or more trajectories against

simpler models.

Table 3. Information criteria, entropy, and parameters for 2 to 10 trajectory models.

Trajectories	-2log*L*	Parameters	BIC	adjBIC	AIC	CAIC	Entropy
2	51385	12	51499	51461	51408	51511	.83
3	50609	18	50781	50723	50645	50799	.82
4	50212	24	50441	50364	50260	50465	.80
5	50009	30	50294	50199	50069	50324	.77
6	49827	36	50170	50055	49899	50206	.77
7	49680	42	50080	49946	49764	50122	.79
8	49575	48	50032	49880	49671	**50080**	.76
9	49515	54	**50030**	49858	49623	50084	.76
10	49470	60	50041	**49850**	**49590**	50101	.77

Note. -2log*L*: -2 times the H0 loglikelihood. BIC: Bayesian information criterion. adjBIC: Sample-size adjusted Bayesian criterion. AIC: Akaike information
criterion. CAIC: Consistent Akaike information criterion [104]. Numbers in bold indicate minima or maxima that suggest the optimal solution according to
each information criterion.

The assembled statistical evidence clearly suggested to us that at least 7 trajectories

were necessary. Visual inspection of graphs of the two- to ten-trajectory solutions

(reproduced in Supporting information D) revealed, among other things, (a) that at least one

declining trajectory appeared in all solutions starting with the four-trajectory solution; (b)

that the small high-stable trajectory appeared from the seven-trajectory solution and

persisted virtually unchanged in shape and proportion through to the ten-trajectory

solution; (c) that starting with the eight-trajectory solution, there were two rather than one

no- or low-aggression trajectories; and (d) that in going from eight to nine trajectories two

declining trajectories appeared rather than one.

In considering 7, 8, or 9 trajectories, we eliminated the 7-trajectory model from

consideration because it was clearly and strongly rejected by the BLRT, the test that has the

best support mathematically [105, 106] and in simulations [104]. We selected the nine-

trajectory solution over the eight because it was suggested by the BIC, which is strongly

recommended by methodologists as being accurate, or at worst somewhat conservative, in

this context [104].

Figure 2 shows the 9-class model estimated trajectories, which seem to represent:

(1) one *high-stable* trajectory that rises to a very high peak of physical aggression

around 2 years, and stays at a high level (Trajectory 9, model-based trajectory

proportion 3%);

(2) three *variable-start, high-endpoint* trajectories that end up at an intermediately

elevated level of physical aggression, but with different early developments: one

starting high and declining after a rather high peak (Trajectory 8, 7%), one

starting low and quickly attaining the peak and decline levels of the

beforementioned (Trajectory 7, 9%), and one starting low with a late and flat

peak (Trajectory 6, 17%);

(3) two *high-start, low-endpoint* trajectories that decline from their initial highest

level, with a late and flat peak followed by another decline to a low level, one

following a slightly higher-level path (Trajectory 5, 5%) than the other (Trajectory

4, 7%);

(4) two *medium-peak, low-endpoint* trajectories that start and end up with a low

level of physical aggression, one reaching an early peak of a somewhat high level

(Trajectory 3, 16%), and one with a flatter peak at a lower level (Trajectory 2,

22%); and

(5) one *low-stable* or "*no aggression*" trajectory that starts out and stays at a low

level of aggression with just a minor rise to a very low, flat peak, and a decline

back to a low level (Trajectory 1, 14%).

Details of the 9-class model are given in Supporting information E.

Fig 2. Model predicted child physical aggression by trajectory in nine-trajectory solution

(fourth-grade polynomial growth function)

The curls toward the end of the developmental period for many of the trajectories

are most likely an artefact of fitting a 4th degree polynomial function to a data set with no

planned data collections between 4 and 5 years. The conclusion that levels of physical

aggression in Trajectories 4 and 5 rebound at or after 5 years is not well supported or

justified due to the lack of observed data between ages 4 and 5 years.

Table 4 shows model-estimated and pseudo-class assigned (i.e., by children's highest

estimated trajectory membership probability) proportions of trajectories, and the

distribution of boys and girls within trajectories. The estimated and assigned proportions

were overall very similar, supporting the model's fit to the empirical distinctions present in

the data set. Gender differences in development were clear in that more boys than girls

were described by the high-endpoint and high-stable Trajectories 6-9 (from 60% to a

maximum of 69% pseudo-class assignments for Trajectory 9), and more girls than boys were

described by the no-aggression Trajectory 1 (28% boys by pseudo-class assignments). It is

noteworthy that there were no trajectories that exclusively described only one gender; the

low-endpoint Trajectories 2-5 described more or less even proportions of boys and girls, and

each trajectory, including those with the most uneven gender distribution, described a fair

proportion of the less represented gender (1 boy per 2.5 girls in Trajectory 1, and 1 girl per

2.2 boys in Trajectory 9).

Table 4. Trajectory proportions and gender proportions within trajectory.

Trajectory	Model estimates		Pseudo-class assignments			
	Trajectory proportion	Proportion boys within trajectory[a]	Girls	Boys	Trajectory proportion	Proportion boys within trajectory
1 No aggression	.137	.24	111	44	.136	.28
2 Medium-peak, low-endpoint – flatter	.219	.51	130	126	.224	.49
3 Medium-peak, low-endpoint – early peak	.160	.51	89	98	.164	.52
4 High-start, low-endpoint – lower	.069	.45	39	34	.064	.47
5 High-start, low-endpoint – higher	.054	.58	24	32	.049	.57
6 High-endpoint – late flat peak	.168	.62	80	119	.174	.60
7 High-endpoint – low start	.092	.66	35	64	.087	.65
8 High-endpoint – high start, high peak	.075	.59	35	52	.076	.60
9 High-stable	.027	.70	9	20	.025	.69

788   [a]The model estimated proportion of boys was derived from the set of unstandardized and unadjusted trajectory prediction contrast coefficients for child

789   gender as trajectory-membership predictor (Table 6 displays the corresponding standardized set) and the model estimated trajectory proportions (pseudo-

790   class proportions yielded the same result).

Unadjusted predictor effects on trajectory membership

792   Overall effects of each predictor in isolation on trajectory membership are shown in

793   the first three data column of Table 5 including an overall, 8-degree-of-freedom chi-square

794   test and the strength of the overall effect as pseudo-*R*.

Table 5. Unadjusted overall prediction effects of early predictors on trajectory and outcomes, and of trajectory on outcomes.

Predictor	Prediction to trajectory[a]			Prediction to Grade 2 outcomes[b]			
						Academic	
	χ^2	*p*	Pseudo R[a]	Externalizing	Internalizing	competence	Social skills
Maternal education	17.1	.029	.12*	-.13***	-.12***	.22***	.18***
Paternal education	14.5	.070	.11	-.12***	-.09**	.17***	.15***
Young mother	13.7	.090	.11	.09**	.11**	-.01	-.09*
Young father	5.9	.660	.07	.09*	.13***	-.05	-.08*
Financial stress	12.2	.144	.10	.16***	.15***	-.13***	-.18***
Couple relationship (reversed)	23.3	.003	.14**	.09*	.12***	-.08*	-.06
Single parent	13.9	.086	.11	.16***	.13***	-.14***	-.15***
Maternal depression & anxiety	40.8	<.001	.19***	.07*	.09**	-.09**	-.06
Paternal depression & anxiety	16.1	.041	.12*	.13**	.08	.00	-.17***
Maternal sensitivity	4.4	.818	.06	-.12	-.13*	.11	.09
Paternal sensitivity	11.4	.179	.10	-.12**	-.07	.10*	.11**
Maternal harsh parenting	46.5	<.001	.20***	.13*	.04	-.09	-.09

Predictor	Prediction to trajectory[a]			Prediction to Grade 2 outcomes[b]			
						Academic	
	χ^2	p	Pseudo R[a]	Externalizing	Internalizing	competence	Social skills
Paternal harsh parenting	31.7	<.001	.17***	.06	.01	-.11**	-.09*
Maternal positive parenting	6.5	.594	.08	.02	-.02	-.06	-.03
Paternal positive parenting	7.5	.485	.08	.03	.04	.04	-.02
Child gender	54.7	<.001	.22***	.30***	.13***	-.13***	-.30***
Similar-aged sibling	66.6	<.001	.24***	-.02	-.07*	-.02	.04
Child activity level	32.3	<.001	.17***	.09**	.09**	-.03	-.08*
Child distress to limitations	38.0	<.001	.18***	-.04	.00	.02	.04
Child soothability	29.5	<.001	.16***	.09**	.03	-.07*	-.11**
Trajectory[c]	--	--	--	.27***	.11	.19***	.19**

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001.

[a]Overall prediction to trajectory was assessed by comparing a model with all class discrimination effects of each single predictor freely estimated to a

reduced model where all the class discrimination effects are zeroed out in an 8 degrees of freedom chi-square test; the effect size is given as pseudo-R

estimated as the square root of Nagelkerke's pseudo R^2 derived from robust chi-square, which was identical to the effect measure w derived from robust

chi square. [b]Predictor-to-outcome associations are given as fully standardized regression coefficients. Coefficients were standardized by sample means

(Table 2). [c]Prediction of outcomes from trajectory membership is given as R, the square root of R^2 computed as the proportional reduction in total outcome

variance represented by the residual within class variance, that is, R^2 = proportion explained variance = 1 - (residual variance/total variance).

Eleven out of the 20 predictors had significant overall effects on trajectory

membership with pseudo-R ranging from .12 to .24. Similar-aged sibling and child gender

were the two strongest predictors, and also significant at this level were maternal

education, couple relationship, both parents' depression and anxiety, both parents' harsh

parenting, and all three child-temperament variables. Trajectory predictor coefficients (with

Trajectory 1 [no aggression], as the reference trajectory) with all possible pairwise contrast

tests are shown in the upper part of Table 6. Pairwise contrasts were not corrected for mass

significance; at $p<.05$, 1.8 pairwise contrasts (i.e., 3.6 superscripts as each pair of trajectories

are superscripted for a contrast) would be expected to be significant by chance in the case

of a null association between a predictor and the 9-trajectory solution. In the presence of a

significant overall effect, the pairwise contrast tests are offered as a guide to interpret the

predictor-trajectory effect direction. In the absence of a significant overall effect, significant

uncorrected pairwise contrasts do not suggest an effect unless clearly exceeding the chance

expected number (i.e., at least 3 significant contrasts) and suggesting a difference involving

one – or possibly a few – categories in isolation against other classes, which is an effect

pattern that may be present even in the case of an insignificant overall test. This ability to

detect effects that are limited to only a few groups but still may be large enough to be

important represents a strength of the latent class approach.

Table 6. Trajectory predictor coefficient contrasts for unadjusted effects of early predictors on trajectory and means comparison contrasts for

<u>unadjusted </u>**effects of trajectory on outcomes.**

Variable	Overall effect[a]	Trajectory								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Trajectory prediction coefficients with pairwise contrasts for effects of early predictors on trajectory[b]								
Maternal education	.12*	0.00	0.15[489]	0.00	-0.27[267]	0.12	0.13[489]	0.21[489]	-0.24[267]	-0.40[267]
Paternal education	.11	0.00[9]	-0.04	-0.10	-0.17	-0.02	-0.03[9]	0.21[89]	-0.31[7]	-0.60[167]
Young mother	.11	0.00	-0.02	0.03	0.23[67]	-0.04	-0.29[48]	-0.30[4]	0.12[6]	-0.03
Young father	.07	0.00	-0.03	-0.07	-0.08	-0.07	-0.23[9]	-0.17	-0.06	0.18[6]
Financial stress	.10	0.00[9]	0.04[9]	0.20	0.29	0.23	0.09[9]	0.26	0.29	0.46[126]
Couple relationship (reversed)	.14**	0.00[6]	-0.13[35689]	0.21[24]	-0.22[3689]	0.23[2]	0.28[124]	0.17	0.24[24]	0.45[24]
Single parent	.11	0.00	-0.50	0.02	0.06	-0.12	-0.05	0.12	0.15	0.06
Maternal depression & anxiety	.19***	0.00[36789]	0.09[3789]	0.45[12]	0.30[9]	0.33	0.32[19]	0.57[12]	0.63[12]	0.84[1246]
Paternal depression & anxiety	.12*	0.00[8]	-0.35[48]	0.05	0.29[2]	0.04	0.15	0.10	0.47[12]	0.18
Maternal sensitivity	.06	0.00	0.09	-0.11[5]	-0.09[5]	0.68[34678]	-0.07[5]	-0.10[5]	-0.08[5]	0.22
Paternal sensitivity	.10	0.00	-0.03	-0.13[4]	0.57[3569]	-0.22[4]	-0.24[4]	0.08	0.03	-0.22[4]

Variable	Overall effect[a]	Trajectory								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Maternal harsh parenting	.20***	0.00^{38}	$-0.64^{3456789}$	0.88^{12}	0.68^{2}	0.72^{2}	0.65^{28}	0.64^{2}	1.15^{1269}	0.47^{28}
Paternal harsh parenting	.17***	0.00^{3679}	0.23^{79}	0.51^{19}	0.45^{9}	0.48^{9}	0.54^{19}	0.75^{12}	0.47^{9}	$1.00^{1234568}$
Maternal positive parenting	.08	0.00	-0.19	-0.43	-0.10	-0.46	-0.13	-0.38	-0.39	0.00
Paternal positive parenting	.08	0.00^{28}	-0.43^{1}	-0.29	-0.35	-0.25	-0.22	-0.21	-0.43^{1}	-0.46
Child gender	.22***	$0.00^{23456789}$	0.59^{1}	0.59^{1}	0.47^{17}	0.73^{1}	0.80^{1}	0.90^{14}	0.76^{1}	0.98^{1}
Similar-aged sibling	.24***	0.00^{356789}	0.33^{789}	0.37^{1789}	0.07^{6789}	0.55^{1}	0.53^{1479}	0.90^{12346}	0.80^{1234}	1.00^{12346}
Child activity level	.17***	0.00^{4589}	-0.04^{4589}	0.06^{48}	0.45^{1236}	0.35^{126}	-0.09^{4589}	0.18	0.50^{1236}	0.37^{126}
Child distress to limitations	.18***	$0.00^{3456789}$	0.32^{58}	0.56^{1}	0.63^{1}	0.75^{12}	0.53^{1}	0.54^{1}	0.68^{12}	0.67^{1}
Child soothability	.16***	0.00^{23568}	-0.34^{18}	-0.39^{18}	-0.17^{8}	-0.58^{1}	-0.45^{18}	-0.20^{8}	$-0.76^{1234679}$	-0.29^{8}
Standardized means comparisons with pairwise contrasts for effects of trajectory on distal outcomes[c]										
Externalizing	.27***	$0.00^{23456789}$	0.32^{167}	0.37^{17}	0.47^{17}	0.48^{17}	0.71^{12}	0.99^{12345}	0.63^{1}	0.75^{1}
Internalizing	.11	0.00	0.06	0.19	0.25	-0.03	0.16	0.17	0.31	0.46
Academic competence	.19***	0.00^{9}	-0.19^{9}	-0.24^{9}	-0.11^{9}	0.08^{79}	-0.19^{9}	-0.34^{59}	-0.38^{9}	$-1.09^{12345678}$

Variable	Overall effect[a]	Trajectory								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Social skills	.19**	0.00^{679}	-0.06^{679}	-0.15^{9}	-0.43	-0.35	-0.42^{12}	-0.45^{12}	-0.33	-0.80^{123}

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 for overall effects.

[a]Pseudo-*R/R* estimate with overall significance test from Table 5. [b]Trajectory prediction contrast coefficients are fully standardized logistic regression effects

on the log odds scale (the effect on the log odds of the class contrast for a change in the predictor of one standard deviation) given relative to membership

in Trajectory 1 (the "no aggression" trajectory). Coefficients were standardized by sample means (Table 2). Contrast coefficients between any pair of

trajectories can be derived by subtraction (i.e., for maternal education between Trajectories 2 and 4: 0.15- [-0.27]=0.42, which is significant at *p*<.05 as

indicated by superscripts). A contrast coefficient of 0.69 is equivalent to an odds ratio of 2.0, and a coefficient of -0.69 is equivalent to an odds ratio of 0.5.

[c]The entries are standardized mean differences relative to Trajectory 1. Contrast coefficients between any pair of trajectories can be derived by subtraction.

[123456789]Number superscripts indicate pairwise contrast tests significant at *p*<.05 between the indexed trajectory and the trajectory with the superscripts'

number; significant contrasts are superscripted for both involved trajectories. Contrast tests are not adjusted for mass significance; the chance expected

number out of 36 pairwise contrasts at *p*<.05 would be 1.8 per variable, or 3.6 numbered subscripts per table row, in the case of a null association between

a predictor/outcome and the 9-trajectory solution. In the presence of a significant overall effect, contrast tests are offered as a guide to effect direction

interpretation; in the absence of a significant overall effect, significant contrast tests should not be taken as implying an effect unless clearly exceeding the

chance expected number (i.e., at least 3 significant contrasts) and suggesting a difference involving one or possibly a few isolated trajectories.

The contrast tests for predictors with a significant overall effect on trajectory

membership generally indicated effects in the expected direction, with risk factors

predicting trajectories with higher overall level, peak, or endpoints, and protective factors

predicting in the opposite direction. Out of the nine predictors without a significant overall

effect, there were four for which the number of significant pairwise contrast tests clearly

exceeded the chance expected number and suggested a difference involving one or a few

categories in isolation; these were *paternal education* (as education went up, a child was

less likely to be in Trajectory 9 vs. Trajectories 1, 6, or 7, and more likely to be in Trajectory 7

vs. Trajectory 8), *financial stress* (as stress went up, a child was more likely to be in

Trajectory 9 compared to Trajectories 1, 2, and 6), *maternal sensitivity* (as sensitivity went

up, a child was more likely to be in Trajectory 5 compared to five other trajectories) and

paternal sensitivity (as sensitivity went up, a child was more likely to be in Trajectory 4

compared to four other trajectories). (For young mothers, the number of significant

contrasts exceeded chance expectations, but suggested no clear effect pattern.)

Unadjusted effects of trajectory membership on grade 2 outcomes

Overall effects of physical-aggression trajectory on outcomes in isolation tested with

a likelihood ratio chi-square with 8 degrees of freedom are shown in the lowermost row of

Table 5. Trajectory significantly predicted externalizing (R^2 = 7.4%), academic competence

(R^2 = 3.6%), and social skills (R^2 = 3.7%). Uncorrected for mass significance, pairwise means

comparisons among outcomes by trajectory with contrast tests are shown in the lower part

of Table 6, and should be interpreted analogous to the predictor-trajectory contrasts tests,

That is, in the presence of a significant overall effect as a guide to effect direction

interpretation, and in the absence of a significant overall effect suggesting no effect unless

clearly exceeding the chance expected number (i.e., at least 3) and revealing a difference

involving one or possibly a few isolated trajectories. Regarding externalizing, the no-

aggression trajectory (1) had the lowest mean, contrasting to all other trajectories, of which

Trajectory 7 had the highest mean level. For academic competence, however, it was the

high-stable trajectory (9) that contrasted to all other trajectories.

864   Unadjusted predictor effects on grade 2 outcomes

When considering the effects of predictors in isolation on any of the four outcomes,

17 predictors—all except maternal and paternal positive parenting and child distress to

limitations—influenced one or more of the outcomes. The effects of the significant

predictors on each outcome are shown in the rightmost four data columns of Table 5. The

significant predictor-outcome associations were in the expected direction, with risk factors

predicting poorer Grade 2 outcomes and protective factors predicting in the opposite

direction, with the following exceptions: Soothability predicted slightly to (a) more

externalizing, (b) less academic competence, and (c) lower social skills; having a similar-aged

sibling predicted to less internalizing. The consistent prediction to all four Grade 2 outcomes

from the parent and family variables of parental educational level, financial stress, single

parent, and maternal depression and anxiety is noteworthy, as well as the finding that child

gender (but not the other child variables) predicted strongly and consistently to each

outcome.

878   Fully adjusted models predicting each distal outcome from early

879   predictors and trajectory

For each distal outcome, we went on to build fully adjusted models for the influence

of early predictors on trajectory, as well as the influence of trajectory and early predictors

on the outcome. For these analyses, we retained those 14 early predictors that either had a

significant unadjusted effect on trajectory membership (Table 5) or had a significant effect

on any of the four distal outcomes after adjusting for all other predictors in separate multi-

predictor models. Paternal education, young father, maternal and paternal sensitivity, and

maternal and paternal positive parenting did not have a significant overall effect on

trajectory (unadjusted) or any of the Grade 2 outcomes (adjusted for other predictors) and

were not included in the fully adjusted models. We did not allow significant predictor effects

to be in the opposite direction of effects in the unadjusted results. This occurred for the

effect of paternal depression and anxiety on academic competence (unadjusted

standardized regression coefficient -0.002 [N.S.]; freely estimated fully adjusted

standardized regression coefficient 0.139 [p=.018]); the final fully adjusted model for this

outcome was thus re-estimated with the effect of this predictor fixed to zero. The findings

are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Fully adjusted overall prediction effects of early predictors on trajectory and outcomes, and of trajectory on outcomes.

Predictor	Prediction to trajectory[a]			Prediction to Grade 2 outcomes[b]			
						Academic	
	χ^2	*p*	Pseudo *R*[a]	Externalizing	Internalizing	competence	Social skills
Maternal education	8.2	.417	.08	-.07	-.04	.18***	.10**
Young mother	5.2	.732	.07	.04	.04	.08	-.01
Financial stress	5.5	.704	.07	.09*	.10*	-.07	-.09*
Couple relationship (reversed)	7.8	.453	.08	.03	.08*	-.02	.00
Single parent	12.4	.135	.10	.09*	.07	-.09*	-.07
Maternal depression & anxiety	10.9	.205	.10	.00	.02	-.02	.00
Paternal depression & anxiety	4.2	.834	.06	.03	.00	.00[c]	-.09
Maternal harsh parenting	27.8	.001	.16***	.06	.00	-.10	-.05
Paternal harsh parenting	20.1	.010	.13**	.02	-.01	-.09	-.05
Child gender	49.2	<.001	.21***	.25***	.11**	-.10**	-.27***
Similar-aged sibling	90.3	<.001	.28***	-.06	-.06	.02	.06
Child activity level	15.2	.055	.12	.05	.06	.03	-.02

Predictor	Prediction to trajectory[a]			Prediction to Grade 2 outcomes[b]			
						Academic	
	χ^2	p	Pseudo R[a]	Externalizing	Internalizing	competence	Social skills
Child distress to limitations	10.7	.222	.10	-.10*	-.05	.01	.08*
Child soothability	11.5	.174	.10	.10*	.04	-.08*	-.10**
Trajectory[d]	--	--	--	.22***	.09	.16	.12

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001.

[a]Comparisons are of a baseline model where all class discrimination effects of all early predictors are included to a reduced model where all the class

discrimination effects for a single early predictor are zeroed out completely; prediction to trajectory membership is given as pseudo–R as the effect

measure w derived from robust chi square. [b]Predictor-to-outcome associations are given as fully standardized regression coefficients. [c]The effect of

paternal depression and anxiety changed signs from the unadjusted results and was fixed at 0. [d]Prediction of outcomes from trajectory membership is given

as R, the square root of R^2 computed as the proportional reduction in total outcome variance represented by the residual within class variance, that is, R^2 =

proportion explained variance = 1 - (residual variance/total variance).

In these adjusted models, the number and magnitude of significant effects, as

expected, generally shrank relative to the unadjusted effects (Table 5), highlighting that

these adjusted models identify the most proximal predictors of the trajectories and

outcomes. Important but more distal influences that primarily work through the most

proximal predictors will generally not be significant, except possibly in very large samples.

Significant adjusted overall predictors of trajectory included similar-aged sibling

presence (the effect of which was stronger in the fully adjusted model than in unadjusted

models, but which did not have a direct effect on any Grade 2 outcome), child gender

(which also had direct effects on all Grade 2 outcomes), and maternal and paternal harsh

parenting (with no direct effects on Grade 2 outcomes). The upper part of Table 8 displays

fully adjusted trajectory prediction contrast coefficients. For the predictors with significant

effects, the contrast patterns resembled those in the unadjusted results, although fewer

contrasts reached significance. Out of the nine predictors without a significant overall effect,

there were three for which the number of significant pairwise contrast tests clearly

exceeded the chance expected number and suggested a difference involving one or a few

categories in isolation after adjustment for competing predictors; these included maternal

perceptions of poor relationship quality, child distress to limitations, and child soothability.

As maternal perceptions of poor relationship quality went up, a child was significantly more

likely to be in Trajectories 1, 3, or 6 compared to Trajectory 4. As distress to limitations went

up, a child was significantly more likely to be in Trajectories 3, 5, or 6 compared to

Trajectory 1. As soothability went up, a child was significantly more likely to be in

Trajectories 1, 3, and 4 compared to Trajectory 8.

Table 8. Trajectory predictor coefficient contrasts for fully adjusted effects of early predictors on trajectory and means comparison contrasts for fully

adjusted effects of trajectory on outcomes.

Variable	Overall effect[a]	Trajectory								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Trajectory prediction coefficients with pairwise contrasts for effects of early predictors on trajectory[b]								
Maternal education	.08	0.00	0.09	0.10	-0.14	0.18	0.12	0.36	-0.13	-0.24
Young mother	.07	0.00	-0.05	0.16	0.18	0.08	-0.17	-0.14	0.18	-0.10
Financial stress	.07	0.00	-0.07	0.12	0.11	0.17	0.07	0.25	0.10	0.27
Couple relationship (reversed)	.08	0.00[4]	-0.21	0.06[4]	-0.40[136]	0.05	0.17[4]	-0.03	-0.13	0.07
Single parent	.10	0.00	-0.29[7]	0.24	0.14	0.07	0.15	0.34[2]	0.27	0.15
Maternal depression & anxiety	.10	0.00[79]	0.27	0.34	0.24	0.15	0.19	0.51[1]	0.41	0.71[1]
Paternal depression & anxiety	.06	0.00	-0.10	-0.26	0.06	-0.13	-0.14	-0.17	0.03	-0.03
Maternal harsh parenting	.16***	0.00[38]	-0.66[38]	1.18[129]	0.62	0.66	0.72	0.57	1.16[129]	0.34[38]
Paternal harsh parenting	.13**	0.00[3679]	0.20[7]	0.68[1]	0.51	0.55	0.62[1]	0.76[12]	0.53	0.80[1]
Child gender	.21***	0.00[2356789]	0.64[1]	0.53[1]	0.39[79]	0.70[1]	0.80[1]	1.04[14]	0.69[1]	1.04[14]
Similar-aged sibling	.28***	0.00[356789]	0.36[789]	0.38[1789]	0.25[789]	0.59[1]	0.49[1789]	1.03[12346]	0.97[12346]	1.03[12346]
Child activity level	.12	0.00	0.03	-0.26[8]	0.12	0.12	-0.33[8]	0.00	0.20[36]	0.10

Variable	Overall effect[a]	Trajectory								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Child distress to limitations	.10	0.00[356]	0.17	0.48[1]	0.54	0.53[1]	0.45[1]	0.42	0.32	0.46
Child soothability	.10	0.00[8]	-0.28	-0.05[8]	0.02[8]	-0.28	-0.21	0.03	-0.49[134]	-0.07
		Standardized means comparisons with pairwise contrasts for effects of trajectory on distal outcomes[c]								
Externalizing	.22***	0.00[23456789]	0.33[17]	0.35[17]	0.40[1]	0.47[1]	0.62[1]	0.88[123]	0.52[1]	0.53[1]
Internalizing	.09	0.00	0.17	0.19	0.23	-0.02	0.14	0.16	0.29	0.35
Academic competence	.16	0.00[9]	-0.31	-0.20[9]	-0.02[9]	0.07[9]	-0.09[9]	-0.22	-0.27	-0.84[13456]
Social skills	.12	0.00	-0.12	-0.13	-0.36	-0.32	-0.31	-0.27	-0.22	-0.55

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 for overall effects.

[a]Pseudo-R/R estimate with overall significance test from Table 7. [b]Trajectory prediction contrast coefficients are fully standardized logistic regression effects

on the log odds scale (the effect on the log odds of the class contrast for a change in the predictor of one standard deviation) given relative to membership

in Trajectory 1 (the "no aggression" trajectory). Coefficients were standardized by sample means (Table 2). Contrast coefficients between any pair of

trajectories can be derived by subtraction (i.e., for couple relationship [reversed] between Trajectories 6 and 4: 0.17- [-0.40]=0.57, which is significant at

*p<.05 as indicated by superscripts). A contrast coefficient of 0.69 is equivalent to an odds ratio of 2.0, and a coefficient of -0.69 is equivalent to an odds

ratio of 0.5. [c]The entries are standardized mean differences relative to Trajectory 1. Contrast coefficients between any pair of trajectories can be derived by

subtraction.

[123456789] Number superscripts indicate pairwise contrast tests significant at $p<.05$ between the indexed trajectory and the trajectory with the superscripts'

number; significant contrasts are superscripted for both involved trajectories. Contrast tests are not adjusted for mass significance; the chance expected

number out of 36 pairwise contrasts at $p<.05$ would be 1.8 per variable, or 3.6 numbered subscripts per table row, in the case of a null association between

a predictor/outcome and the 9-trajectory solution. In the presence of a significant overall effect, contrast tests are offered as a guide to effect direction

interpretation; in the absence of a significant overall effect, significant contrast tests should not be taken as implying an effect unless clearly exceeding the

chance expected number (i.e., at least 3 significant contrasts) and suggesting a difference involving one or possibly a few isolated trajectories.

We can thus infer that the set of predictors that were significantly related to trajectory

membership (either overall or for some trajectory contrasts) prior to adjustment, but not

after, potentially have important *indirect* or *mediated effects* on trajectory membership.

These predictors include paternal depression and anxiety, maternal education, financial

stress, and young mother status. It is beyond this work's scope, however, to identify and

quantify specific mediational pathways.

In the adjusted models, trajectory had a significant overall effect on externalizing (R^2

= 5.0%), but not on academic competence (R^2 = 2.6%), social skills (R^2 = 1.5%) or internalizing

(R^2 = 0.8%). Adjustment for competing predictors eliminated the significant unadjusted

overall effect of trajectory on academic competence and social skills. Out of the outcomes

with no significant overall effect, the number of pairwise contrast tests exceeded the chance

expected number for academic competence, suggesting a difference involving specifically

Trajectory 9 (high-stable), which had the lowest mean, contrasting with Trajectories 1, 3, 4,

5, and 6. Thus, after adjustment for early predictors, trajectory effects remained significant

and important for externalizing (overall) and for academic competence (high-stable in

isolation contrasting with five other trajectories), were eliminated for social skills, and

remained unrelated to internalizing.

There were direct effects on one or more Grade 2 outcomes of several early

predictors including child gender (effects on all 4 outcomes), financial stress (externalizing,

internalizing, and social skills), maternal education (academic competence and social skills),

single parent status (externalizing and academic competence), couple relationship

(internalizing), child distress to limitations (three outcomes, all in unexpected direction), and

soothability (two outcomes, both in unexpected direction).

Discussion

The current study extends previous research about the variation in normative

development of physical aggression from infancy to preschool age, how this development

matters for social, behavioral, and academic functioning in early school age, and the relative

importance of early characteristics related to the child, the parents, and the family on the

course and outcomes of aggression development. This is one of few studies extensively

testing these longitudinal trajectories in comprehensive models unraveling the relative

importance of children's developmental patterns of physical aggression for their subsequent

behavior and functioning, and the only one to simultaneously considering the direct and

indirect impact of a range of early risk and protective factors.

We found that nine latent trajectories represented the development of child physical

aggression from 1 to 5 years in a Norwegian population-based sample. The developmental

patterns could be characterized as *high-stable*, *variable-start and high endpoint*, *high-start*

and low-endpoint, *medium-peak and low-endpoint*, and *low stable* (*no aggression*),

respectively (Figure 2). Before adjustment for competing early risk and protective factors,

these trajectories had significant and moderate overall effects on externalizing, social skills,

and academic competence in Grade 2, but not on internalizing (R^2 of 7.4%, 3.7%, 3.6% and

1.2%, respectively). Despite the moderate overall effect size, significant individual mean

contrasts on outcomes among trajectory groups ranged from medium to very large effects.

The presence of a similar-aged sibling and child gender showed the strongest

unadjusted association with trajectory membership. Whereas each trajectory described

both boys and girls, gender differences manifested themselves in a larger proportion of girls

in the no-aggression trajectory, and a larger proportion of boys in the high-stable and high-

endpoint trajectories. In this respect, our findings are in accordance with earlier trajectory-

or group-based approaches [11] in suggesting that gender differences may result from more

boys than girls making up the small group of children who continues to deploy aggression at

high rates. The strongest and most consistent unadjusted predictors of Grade 2 outcomes

were child gender, maternal and paternal educational level, single parent status, and

financial stress.

In the fully adjusted model, which represents the most rigorous empirical test of

these influences to date, the effects of the aggression trajectories on the outcomes

simultaneously competed with those early predictors identified as having significant

unadjusted effects on trajectory membership or significant adjusted effects on any

outcome. While the significant direct effects were fewer and smaller, the ones remaining

represent the most proximal predictors of physical aggression development and Grade 2

functioning. Trajectory membership had significant and important effects on teacher rated

externalizing problems as well as on academic competence when the children were in their

8th year. Significant adjusted overall predictors of trajectory membership included the

presence of a similar-aged sibling, child gender, and early maternal and paternal harsh

parenting. Five other predictors (i.e., child temperament, maternal depression and anxiety,

maternal perceptions of poor relationship quality, and single parent status) that fell short of

an overall significant effect still had at least one significant class contrast. In addition to

indirect effects through trajectory membership, child gender also had direct effects on all

Grade 2 outcomes. Finally, paternal depression, maternal education, financial stress, and

young motherhood all had potential indirect or mediated effects on class membership, as

these predictors were significantly related to class membership *before* adjustment, but not

after. In the following, we discuss the findings and the empirical contributions from our

study in more detail, focusing mainly on the adjusted results.

In contrast to our 9 trajectories, the most comparable extant latent trajectory studies

have typically found three to five trajectories [2, 8, 10, 13, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25]. Compared to

existing studies, our study started early encompassing the period of peak change (at about 2

years), had frequent assessment (up to 21), used a vertically (age) scaled measurement

instrument, and utilized 4th order polynomial growth curves, all qualities that would tend to

increase significant distinctions among trajectories. The present study is indeed the only one

getting close to the recommendation made by Tremblay [1] of assessments at least every

two to three months from birth to 3 years, and ideally every 6 months from 3 years onward.

Overall, these differences provided the power to make finer distinctions and detect more

fine-grained developmental patterns of physical aggression.

Even with the dissimilarities between our sample and findings and those from

previous studies, there are also important similarities. Like other research [15, 17, 21, 24,

25, 27], we identified one high-stable trajectory group (Trajectory 9) with the lowest

prevalence (3%) and poor outcomes (the most severe on academic competence and social

skills; but not on externalizing, although the difference between Trajectory 9 and the one

with the poorest externalizing outcome was not significant). The proportion of children

belonging to the typically identified high-stable trajectory, however, tends to vary across

studies. For instance, in accord with our findings, the SECCYD study [21] found a high-stable

trajectory group from 2 to 9 years constituting 3% of their sample (N=1195), having the

poorest academic and social functioning through age 12 [13]. Also, Wildeboer et al. [17]

found a high-increasing trajectory across 1.5, 3, and 6 years consisting of 3.2% of their

sample (N=4781). Moreover, Joussemet et al. [25] reported about a high trajectory group

from kindergarten to sixth grade consisting of 6% of their sample (N=1508), whereas

Tremblay et al. [10] found that 13.9% of the sample (N=572), followed a rising trajectory of

high physical aggression from 17 to 42 months. Finally, Côté et al. [8] found that as much as

16.6% of their large sample (N=10658) followed a high stable trajectory between 2 and 11

years.

With respect to the lower end of the physical aggression spectrum, the SECCYD study

[21], found a very low trajectory describing 45% of the study children, and another 25%

described by a low group. In our sample, the *low-stable or no aggression* (1), *medium-peak*

and low endpoint (2,3), and *high-start and low-endpoint* (4,5), all with low aggression

endpoints at age 5, albeit with differing developmental patterns up to then, may

quantitatively (in all 64%) correspond to a couple of larger very-low or low aggression

trajectories like those identified in the SECCYD [21]. Such a comparison may be even more

reasonable considering that the SECCYD, like most previous research, did not start until 2

years, when physical aggression probably has begun to diminish among most children and

particularly those engaging in low levels or frequency of aggression.

Our set of nine trajectories revealed more diversity in predictor-trajectory patterns

than a less fine-grained classification into fewer developmental patterns might have

enabled. That is, the somewhat complex solution offered a perspective that was

differentiated enough to view not only a few main developmental trends, but also to

identify some more subtle distinctions in developmental patterns and their relation to

predictors that supplemented and nuanced the main findings. Overall, all child

characteristics (gender and three temperament dimensions) predicted trajectory

membership in the unadjusted results, along with similar-aged siblings, maternal education,

couple relationship, both parents' depression and anxiety, and both parents' harsh

parenting practices, generally in the expected direction (Table 6). These effects were most

clearly seen in significant predictor-coefficient contrasts between, on the one hand, the *low-*

stable or no aggression trajectory (1) and to a lesser extent the *medium-peak and low-*

endpoint trajectory (2), and on the other hand, the *high-stable* trajectory (9) and to a lesser

extent the *variable-start and high-endpoint* trajectories (6, 7, 8).

Exploration of the finer distinctions in predictor-trajectory effect patterns may

provide some clues for what make children follow an intermediate-endpoint rather than a

stable-high trajectory. While the intermediate- and high endpoint Trajectories 6-9 shared

many predictors – notably, there were no significant trajectory prediction contrasts among

them for child gender, child distress to limitation, couple relationship, paternal depression

and anxiety, or paternal or maternal sensitivity – the predictor-trajectory contrasts seemed

to suggest some possibly important effect-pattern differences. High maternal, but low

paternal, harsh parenting (compared to Trajectory 9), low child soothability (compared to

Trajectories 9, 6, and 7) and high child activity level (like Trajectory 9 but unlike Trajectory 6)

was associated with a child being in Trajectory 8. This could suggest that Trajectory 8 was

somewhat more driven by child temperament and heated mother-child interactions, which

is in line with the established knowledge that children's temperamental characteristics are

associated with the development of externalizing problems [72], and with the mentioned

differential susceptibility model postulating that children with difficult temperament are

more vulnerable to negative parenting behavior than those with easy temperament [47, 70,

73-75]. Moreover, the suggestion of a possible compensatory effect of father's low harsh

parenting in a context with high maternal harsh parenting underscores the importance of

including fathers in developmental research. This is in accord with the family systems

perspective [107, 108] highlighting the need to consider how the behavior of both parents

jointly impact children's socioemotional development. Also, higher maternal and paternal

education (compared to Trajectories 9 and 8), and higher child soothability (compared to

Trajectory 8), was associated with membership in Trajectories 6 and 7. This may indicate

that parent resourcefulness and child self-regulation can function as protective factors

against the high-stable aggression pattern even in the presence of many other shared risk

factors. The association between self-regulation and externalizing is well-documented in the

literature [109-111], as is the link between socioeconomic status and parenting [112, 113].

Again, the results indicate that both maternal and paternal level of education matters for

development. In addition, Trajectory 6 membership was associated with low financial stress,

sibling absence, low infant activity level, and low maternal depression and anxiety

(compared to Trajectory 9 and for child activity also to Trajectory 8), suggesting several

other possible contributing factors that might elevate physical aggression.

As regards the trajectory-outcome effect patterns, results from the unadjusted

models consistently suggested poorer outcomes on externalizing, social skills, and academic

competence associated with the higher level and endpoint Trajectories 6-9. Still, there was a

mean difference among these trajectories for academic competence only. In particular,

Trajectory 9 had significantly worse outcomes than Trajectories 6-8 (except for

externalizing, for which Trajectory 7 had the highest level), higher parental education

predicting Trajectory 6 and 7 memberships compared to 9 and 8 possibly suggesting a

contributing explanation.

The prediction patterns for the two declining-aggression trajectories 4 and 5 may be

particularly interesting to note. More difficult child temperament (i.e., higher activity level,

more distress to limitations, and less soothability) compared to Trajectory 1, and one

parent's high sensitivity (mother's for Trajectory 5 and father's for Trajectory 4,

underscoring the importance of including both parents), predicted membership in these

trajectories. This might suggest that parental sensitivity (and perhaps a good couple

relationship, in the case of the lower declining Trajectory 4) moderates or mitigates

physical-aggression development in children displaying difficult infant temperament, which

is in accord with the differential susceptibility model [47, 70, 73-75]. In line with this, high

infant activity level in combination with parental sensitivity to infant behavior may also

hypothetically be elements explaining the high starting point of parent-reported child

aggression in these trajectories.

Of interest in an opposite manner might be pairs of trajectories for which the

prediction pattern seemingly had less to offer in terms of possible explanations for

differences in physical-aggression development. For instance, Trajectory 3 (low aggression,

with an early rise and moderate peak) shared some predictors with trajectories with

consistently higher aggression over time and was in fact indistinguishable from Trajectory 6

on any predictor and contrasted with Trajectory 7 only with respect to sibling absence. It is

tempting to hypothesize that groups of children whose development were described by

Trajectories 3, 6, and possibly 7, did not differ dramatically on critical predictors at the

outset, and that explanations outside the present set of predictors – perhaps involving time-

varying or intervening influences – must be sought for what differentiated these

developmental paths.

Among predictors identified by previous research, neither being a single parent nor a

young mother was significantly related to trajectory. This is probably due to the low

proportion of single parents in our sample when the children were 1 year old, as well as the

low proportion of young mothers (≤ 25 years), given the low prevalence of teenage mothers

in Norway and the high mean age for primiparous women (i.e., 30.1 years in 2021 [114]).

There were notably fewer statistically significant predictor-trajectory, trajectory-outcome,

and predictor-outcome relationships in the *fully adjusted* set of results than in the

unadjusted. While the differences between these sets of results may seem dramatic, it is

crucial to acknowledge that the fully adjusted model, which is the benchmark test for

identifying the most proximal predictors, constituted a rigorous test of all possible

simultaneous effects. Importantly, net of all other effects, trajectory still predicted Grade 2

externalizing problems and academic competence. Within this context, it may be worth

noting that the high-stable trajectory specifically predicted to poor academic competence,

while the no-aggression trajectory was the one that contrasted most starkly to all other

groups with respect to externalizing problems.

Our results both support and extend previous research in strongly suggesting that

early maternal and paternal harsh parenting practices, in addition to child gender and

similar-aged sibling presence, consistently predict physical-aggression development from 1

to 5 years. This is the first study applying a trajectory approach addressing developmental

patterns of physical aggression from infancy to preschool age to link early *paternal* harsh

parenting, as well as that of *maternal*, with this development. Previous research [8, 10, 14,

25] has not been able to explore this association due to lack of data on fathers parenting

behavior. The results from the current study underscore the significance of fathers' harsh

parenting behavior in infancy for children's subsequent development of physical aggression

and is in line with a limited but growing literature highlighting the significance of fathering

for children's and adolescents' development [58, 59, 64, 115].

The importance of harsh parenting in predicting the development of children's

physical aggression corresponds with findings from previous research that has included this

process-oriented predictor albeit with mothers only [8, 10, 14, 25], and generally with the

mentioned theories of development of aggression and externalizing problems, particularly

Patterson's [53] coercion theory. In line with the established knowledge that parenting

behaviors typically associated with the development of externalizing behaviors tend to co-

appear with parental psychopathology [55-57], it is theoretically and empirically sound to

view the pattern of predictor-trajectory influences in our unadjusted and adjusted results in

a perspective where factors like parental depression and anxiety, couple relationship

troubles, and difficult child temperament do not in *themselves* produce an effect on

physical-aggression development, unless they are associated with an increase in harsh

maternal and paternal parenting behavior. At the same time, we would like to add that this

is in fact a bit of an over-simplification of all the predictor-trajectory results. As mentioned

earlier, there were some significant contrast patterns in the fully adjusted models for

predictors that did not have a significant overall adjusted effect (i.e., child distress to

limitations and soothability and maternal perceptions of poor relationship quality). These

effects tend to be notable in magnitude but limited in scope, that is, they affect only a few

classes or small classes.

All in all, the fully adjusted findings add importantly to previous findings. The few

studies that have examined trajectory outcomes as well as predictors [14, 17, 21, 24]

included a more limited number of social risk variables as covariates in their final set of

analyses, and thus did not consider competing effects on trajectory and outcomes of the

complete set of predictors, as was done in the present study.

As regards *predictor-outcome effects* in both sets of findings, it is noteworthy that

early financial stress had a consistent impact on three Grade 2 teacher-rated outcomes

(externalizing, internalizing, and social skills) in the fully adjusted model. This is even more

notable considering the crude measure we used (i.e., parents' dichotomous reports of

having more long-standing financial difficulties in the past year [rent, mortgage, obligations,

etc.]). Family financial stress when the child is about one year old may thus have long-lasting

(or continuing) effects on child social, behavioral, and academic functioning. Importantly

though, this effect may not relate specifically to the development of children's physical

aggression (the predictor had no significant effect on *trajectory* in any set of findings). This

result highlights the well-established finding linking socioeconomic conditions to a range of

child behavioral outcomes [40, 42, 116, 117]. At the same time, some previous research has

found low family income to act as a risk factor for more frequent and stable use of physical

aggression across early childhood and adolescence [2, 8, 10]. We have no clear opinion as to

why our results do not replicate earlier findings on this point, but possible explanations

could be differences between countries/cultures with a smaller income range and a smaller

proportion of families in serious financial hardship in Scandinavia than in North America and

Canada, variations in age span, the use of financial stress as opposed to low family income

as an indicator of financial risk, and the crude nature of our measure.

Another note concerning predictor-outcome effects concerns the two child

temperament variables of distress to limitations and soothability. While predicting

aggression trajectories as expected in the unadjusted results, these also predicted three

outcomes in the *unexpected direction* in the unadjusted and adjusted findings. We have no

strong and plausible hypothesis concerning these findings. Possible explanations include

interactional or transactional associations among child temperament, child behavior, and

parenting [72]. For example, that difficult temperament in a population-based and for some

part resourceful sample like the present might elicit child-parent behavior transactions

bolstering or mitigating the temperamental risk, which could eventually lead to better

outcomes for some children having difficult infant temperament, to the extent of producing

a paradoxical overall mean effect.

Finally, the weak associations between observed parental sensitivity and aggression

trajectory, and the lack of association with Grade 2 outcomes, merit some attention, not

least considering that self-reported harsh parenting practices in response to undesirable

child behavior for mothers and fathers alike was one of the strongest predictors of

trajectory membership. As previously noted by Nordahl [94], null findings in the current

sample may partly relate to the fact that the parents overall displayed low levels of aversive

or negative parenting behaviors with their 1-year-olds during the interaction session. Thus,

limited variability in the observed parenting behavior may have contributed to the finding of

weak associations. For one thing, fathers from a population based (versus clinical) sample

may essentially engage in positive behavior during interaction with their infants, and

particularly when being observed. Moreover, the observed interactions were relatively short

in duration and the tasks were not designed to induce conflict or elicit negative or harsh

parenting behaviors. This made it less likely that parents would experience the session as

very challenging and/or that it would trigger much undesirable child behavior. Whereas

results from the NICHD SECCYD [21] indicated that less observed sensitive and involved

maternal parenting was associated with higher and more stable trajectories of physical

aggression from toddlerhood to middle childhood, that study had access to more

comprehensive observational data at several ages across infancy and third grade.

This study has some notable strengths. We apply rigorous statistical tests using very

recent advances in latent class methodology of the early predictors and distal outcomes of

developmental trajectories of physical aggression, using a rich longitudinal data set. The

latent trajectory approach, among other things, also allows us to detect important effects

that are limited to only a few groups. The sample is relatively large and resembles the

general Norwegian population fairly well. The participation rate is furthermore high and the

attrition for the most part low. We also include frequent reports on a relevant measure of

child physical aggression from both mothers and fathers, covering the developmental

periods when such behavior typically emerges, peaks, and decreases. Teachers, being

independent informants from a different setting, report the Grade 2 outcomes. Moreover,

our data set contains a comprehensive number of early predictors and all of those used in

previous research, including some with reports from both parents. The only relevant

predictor from other research that we were not able to include was parents' antisocial

behavior in their own youth, which was not measured in our sample. We also test all

possible predictor-outcome influences simultaneously. The strength of the fully adjusted set

of findings is that it highlights effects that stand out as proximal, strong and consistent

enough to withstand the competition with other possibly relevant associations. Particularly,

in contrast to previous sets of findings in which all links between the included early

predictors, the trajectories as well as the outcomes were not considered simultaneously,

trajectory-outcome associations are not overstated.

The study is also limited in a few ways. Some of our predictors were quite

imperfectly measured. In particular, the estimated reliability of self-reported harsh and

positive parenting was less than desirable even when estimated by latent-variable models

that were not attenuated by floor and ceiling effects. Also, due to study design, only subsets

of fathers and mothers provided such self-reports at 1 year. Under such circumstances, null

findings (e.g., no trajectory or outcome prediction from positive parenting practices) are

uninformative, whereas significant results (e.g., significant prediction to trajectory and distal

outcomes from harsh parenting) signal true effects that are large enough to be detected

with the given sample, although attenuated and less precisely estimated. The findings from

sensitivity analyses showing that latent-variable constructs predicted trajectory just in the

same way as the manifest variables further supported the unlikeliness that low predictor

reliability artefactually distorted these effects.

As mentioned, there is evidence that individual differences in the early use of

physical aggression is associated with both social and genetic factors [33]; however, our

design did not permit the disentangling of genetic predispositions toward aggressive

behavior in children and parents. Moreover, in line with most others, we use parents as

informants about children's aggressive behavior. Our design and analytical strategy, with a

range of predictors and outcomes and nine distinct developmental trajectories of physical

aggression, furthermore, reduced the possibility for investigating interaction effects among

predictors, or among predictors and trajectories in predicting outcomes. Possible interaction

effects worth studying include moderating effects of gender on predictor-trajectory,

trajectory-outcome, or predictor-outcome patterns, as well as interactions between

parenting and child gender and sibling status. For example, it is easy to imagine that sibling

squabbling could amplify harsh parenting. The choice to study a nine-trajectory model (in

the normative absence of a known true number of groups) also has consequences for what

results emerge as significant: A model with fewer trajectories, all other things being equal,

would have greater statistical power to detect predictor-trajectory or trajectory-outcome

associations. Of course, this holds only to the degree that the fewer trajectories still

captured the critical differences in development that mattered for those relationships.

Otherwise, fewer groups could obscure associations to the degree that the broader

trajectories encompassed subgroups with differing predictor or outcome patterns.

Also related to analytical strategy, the merits of testing all influences in fully adjusted

models are obvious, but this approach also brings with it the limitation that the results are

dependent on the particular variable universe of the present study. The included predictors

were all time-invariant in the analyses, measured only *prior to* or *at* the starting point for

the trajectory model. This precluded us from investigating the importance of time-varying

predictors or intermediate-timepoint predictors such as parental harsh parenting and

financial stress at later child ages for the subsequent development of physical aggression

and school-age outcomes. Then again, including such variables would have brought with it

even more complexity and have warranted more interpretive caution with respect to cause-

effect directions.

Sibling presence merits a special note. We measured the presence of a similar-aged

sibling only at study start. This predictor, which constitutes one of the strongest and most

consistent predictors of physical aggression, is thus of having an *older* sibling. Our finding is

in line with those from other studies [10] exploring the links between older siblings and

aggression trajectories (but not with outcomes). A fair proportion of the children we

studied, however, acquired younger siblings as the study progressed, and any influences of

the presence of younger siblings is unmeasured in our study. The overall predictive effect of

sibling presence may thus potentially have been underestimated.

As regards outcomes, we studied each outcome in isolation, not addressing possible

comorbidity or overlap. However, physical aggression trajectories may well predict

specifically to certain multivariate outcome configurations or profiles (e.g., predictors of a

multi-problem outcome profile might be different from what precedes isolated problematic

outcomes).

Future research should focus on the potentially intricate interplay of predictors,

including gender-moderating effects and relevant interaction effects among predictors (e.g.,

of parental depression, harsh parenting, child gender and number of siblings). This should

also include the study of time-varying predictors (e.g., of financial or other stress across the

developmental period, or of language and motor development in tandem with aggressive-

behavior development), and predictors that may have an influence at a particular time or

age (e.g., transition to day-care or to school). Research should also address trajectory and

predictor effects on profiles of outcomes rather than single outcomes in isolation.

Understanding common and less common developmental patterns of physical

aggression, the link with subsequent social, behavioral, and academic functioning, and

markers for the various patterns, is crucial for early prevention and intervention efforts. The

results from our study confirm and expand previous research in underscoring the

importance of addressing harsh parenting behavior to influence the developmental

pathways of physical aggression during infancy and toddlerhood. Our findings also support

the notion that fathers matter and must be included both in research and early prevention

and intervention efforts.

1311

1312   **Acknowledgements**

1313   We are very grateful to the participating families and to the research assistants who

1314   contributed to the data collection. We thank Elisabeth Askeland and Anett Apeland for their

1315   contribution to the development of the physical aggression measure.

References

1316

1. Tremblay RE. The development of aggressive behavior during childhood: What have

1317

we learned in the past century? International Journal of Behavioral Development.

1318

2000;24(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/016502500383232

1319

2. Teymoori A, Côté S, Jones B, Nagin, D, Boivin, M, Vitaro F, et al. Risk factors

1320

associated with boys' and girls' developmental trajectories of physical aggression

1321

from early childhood through early adolescence. JAMA network open. 2018;1(8),

1322

Article e186364. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jamanetworkopen. 2018.6364

1323

3. Alink LRA, Mesman J, Van Zeijl J, Stolk MN, Juffer F, Koot, HM, et al. The early

1324

childhood aggression curve: Development of physical aggression in 10- to 50-month-

1325

old children. Child Development. 2006;77(4), 954–966. https://doi.org/10.1111 /

1326

j.1467-8624.2006.00912.x

1327

4. Lorber MF, Del Vecchio T, Slep AMS. The development of individual physically

1328

aggressive behaviors from infancy to toddlerhood. Developmental Psychology. 2018;

1329

54(4), 601-612. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000450

1330

5. Hay DF. The early development of human aggression. Child Development

1331

Perspectives. 2017;11(2), 102-106. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12220

1332

6. Lorber MF, Del Vecchio T, Slep AMS. The emergence and evolution of infant

1333

externalizing behavior. Development and Psychopathology. 2015;27(3), 663-680.

1334

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579414000923

1335

7. Lorber MF, Del Vecchio T, Slep AM, Scholer SJ. Normative trends in physically

1336

aggressive behavior: Age-aggression curves from 6 to 24 months. The Journal of

1337

Pediatrics. 2019;206, 197-203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.10.025

1338

8.   Côté SM, Vaillancourt T, LeBlanc JC, Nagin DS, Tremblay RE. The development of

physical aggression from toddlerhood to pre-adolescence: A nationwide longitudinal

study of Canadian children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 2006;34(1), 68–

82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-005-9001-z

9.   Nærde A, Ogden T, Janson H, Zachrisson HD. Normative development of physical

aggression from 8 to 26 months. Developmental Psychology. 2014;50(6), 1710–1720.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036324

10.   Tremblay RE, Nagin DS, Séguin JR, Zoccolillo M, Zelazo PD, Boivin M, et al. Physical

aggression during early childhood: Trajectories and predictors. Pediatrics. 2004;

114(1), 43–50. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.114.1.e4

11.   Baillargeon RH, Zoccolillo M, Keenan K, Côté S, Pérusse D, Wu HX, et al. Gender

differences in physical aggression: A prospective population-based survey of children

before and after 2 years of age. Developmental Psychology. 2007;43(1), 13-26.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.1.13

12.   Broidy LM, Nagin DS, Tremblay RE, Bates J, Brame B, Dodge KA, et al. Developmental

trajectories of childhood disruptive behaviors and adolescent delinquency: A six-site,

cross-national study. Developmental Psychology. 2003;39(2), 222–245.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.2.222

13.   Campbell SB, Spieker S, Burchinal M, Poe MD, The NICHD Early Child Care Research

Network. Trajectories of aggression from toddlerhood to age 9 predict academic and

social functioning through age 12. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 2006;

47(8), 791–800. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01636.x

14.   Campbell SB, Spieker S, Vandergrift N, Belsky J, Burchinal M, The NICHD Early Child

Care Research Network. Predictors and sequelae of trajectories of physical

aggression in school-age boys and girls. Development and Psychopathology. 2010;

22(1), 133–150. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579409990319

15. Fontaine N, Carbonnea R, Barker ED, Vitaro F, Hébert M, Côté SM, et al. Girls'

hyperactivity and physical aggression during childhood and adjustment problems in

early adulthood: A 15-year longitudinal study. Archives of General Psychiatry.

2008;65(3), 320-328. https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2007.41

16. Nagin D, Tremblay RE. Trajectories of boys' physical aggression, opposition, and

hyperactivity on the path to physically violent and nonviolent juvenile delinquency.

Child Development. 1999;70(5), 1181–1196. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-

8624.00086

17. Wildeboer A, Thijssen S, Van IJzendoorn MH, Van Der Ende J, Jaddoe VW, Verhulst

FC, et al. Early childhood aggression trajectories: Associations with teacher-reported

problem behaviour. International Journal of Behavioral Development. 2015;39(3),

221-234. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 0165025414562239

18. Tremblay RE, Japel CJ, Perusse D, Mcduff P, Boivin M, Zoccolillo M, et al. The search

for the age of "onset" of physical aggression: Rousseau and Bandura revisited.

Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health. 1999;9(1), 8–23.

https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.288

19. Côté SM, Vaillancourt T, Barker ED, Nagin D, Tremblay RE. The joint development of

physical and indirect aggression: Predictors of continuity and change during

childhood. Development and psychopathology. 2007;19(1), 37-55. https://doi.org/

10.1017/S0954579407070034

20. Côté SM, Boivin M, Nagin DS, Japel C, Xu Q, Zoccolillo M, et al. The role of maternal

education and nonmaternal care services in the prevention of children's physical

aggression problems. Archives of General Psychiatry. 2007;64(11), 1305-1312.

doi:10.1001/archpsyc.64.11.1305

21.   NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. Trajectories of physical aggression from

toddlerhood to middle childhood: Predictors, correlates and outcomes. Monographs

of the Society for Research in Child Development. 2004;69(4), vii-129.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0037-976x.2004.00312.x

22.   Jennings WG, Reingle JM. On the number and shape of developmental/life-course

violence, aggression, and delinquency trajectories: A state-of-the-art review. Journal

of Criminal Justice. 2012; 40(6), 472-489. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jcrimjus.

2012.07.001

23.   Archer J, Côté S. Sex differences in aggressive behavior: a developmental and

evolutionary perspective. In: Tremblay RE, Hartup WW, Archer J, editors.

Developmental Origins of Aggression. New York: Guilford Press; 2005. p. 425–43.

24.   Jambon M, Madigan S, Plamondon A, Jenkins J. Developmental trajectories of

physical aggression and prosocial behavior in early childhood: Family antecedents

and psychological correlates. Developmental Psychology. 2019;55(6), 1211-1225.

https://doi.org /10.1037/dev0000714

25.   Joussemet M, Vitaro F, Barker ED, Côté S, Nagin DS, Zoccolillo M, Tremblay RE.

Controlling parenting and physical aggression during elementary school. Child

Development. 2008; 79(2), 411-425. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

8624.2007.01133.x

26.   Nagin DS, Tremblay RE. Parental and early childhood predictors of persistent physical

aggression in boys from kindergarten to high school. Archives of General psychiatry.

2001; 58(4), 389-394. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.58.4.389

27.   van Adrichem DS, Huijbregts SC, van der Heijden KB, Van Goozen SH, Swaab H. The

role of inhibitory control, attention and vocabulary in physical aggression trajectories

from infancy to toddlerhood. Frontiers in Psychology. 2020; 11, 1079. https://doi.org

/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01079

28.   Orri M, Boivin M, Chen C, Ahun MN, Geoffroy MC, Ouellet-Morin I, et al. Cohort

profile: Quebec longitudinal study of child development (QLSCD). Social Psychiatry

and Psychiatric Epidemiology. 2021; 56(5), 883-894. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-

020-01972-z

29.   Hay DF, Waters CS, Perra O, Swift N, Jones R, Jones I, et al. Precursors to aggressive

conduct problems are evident by six months of age. Developmental Science. 2014;

17(3), 471–480. doi:10.1111/desc.12133

30.   Brendgen M, Dionne G, Girard A, Boivin M, Vitaro F, Pérusse D. Examining genetic

and environmental effects on social aggression: A study of 6-year-old twins. Child

Development. 2005; 76(4), 930-946. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

8624.2005.00887.x

31.   Dionne G, Tremblay R, Boivin M, Laplante D, Pérusse D. Physical aggression and

expressive vocabulary in 19-month-old twins. Developmental Psychology. 2003;

39(2), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.2.261

32.   Provençal N, Booij L, Tremblay RE. The developmental origins of chronic physical

aggression: biological pathways triggered by early life adversity. Journal of

Experimental Biology. 2015;218(1), 123-133. doi:10.1242/jeb.111401

33.   Tremblay RE, Vitaro F, Côté SM. Developmental origins of chronic physical

aggression: a bio-psycho-social model for the next generation of preventive

interventions. Annual Review of Psychology. 2018;69(1), 383-407.

https://doi.org/10.1111/ j.1469-7610.2010.02211.x

34. Tremblay RE. Developmental origins of chronic physical aggression: An international

perspective on using singletons, twins and epigenetics. European Journal of

Criminology. 2015;12(5), 551-561. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370815600617

35. Brumley LD, Jaffee SR. Defining and distinguishing promotive and protective effects

for childhood externalizing psychopathology: a systematic review. Social Psychiatry

and Psychiatric Epidemiology. 2016;51(6), 803-815. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00127-

016-1228-1

36. Bronfenbrenner U. The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and

design. Harvard university press, 1979

37. Labella MH, Masten AS. Family influences on the development of aggression and

violence. Current Opinion in Psychology. 2018;19, 11-16. https://doi.org/10.1016

/j.copsyc.2017.03.028

38. Huijbregts SC, Seguin JR, Zoccolillo M, Boivin M, Tremblay RE. Maternal prenatal

smoking, parental antisocial behavior, and early childhood physical aggression.

Development and Psychopathology. 2008;20(2), 437-453. DOI: https://doi.org

/10.1017/S0954579408000217

39. Kinge JM, Øverland S, Flatø M, Dieleman J, Røgeberg O, Magnus MC, et al. Parental

income and mental disorders in children and adolescents: prospective register-based

study. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2021;50(5), 1615-1627. doi: 10.1093/ije

/dyab066

40. Peverill M, Dirks MA, Narvaja T, Herts KL, Comer JS, McLaughlin KA. Socioeconomic

status and child psychopathology in the United States: A meta-analysis of

population-based studies. Clinical Psychology Review. 2021;83, 101933.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101933

41.   Conger RD, Ge X, Elder Jr GH, Lorenz FO, Simons RL. Economic stress, coercive family

process, and developmental problems of adolescents. Child Development. 1994;

65(2), 541-561. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00768.x

42.   Conger RD, Conger KJ, Martin MJ. Socioeconomic status, family processes, and

individual development. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2010;72(3), 685-704.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x

43.   Masarik AS, Conger RD. Stress and child development: A review of the Family Stress

Model. Current Opinion in Psychology. 2017;13, 85-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/

j.copsyc.2016.05.008

44.   Mazza JR, Pingault JB, Booij L, Boivin M, Tremblay R, Lambert J, et al. Poverty and

behavior problems during early childhood: The mediating role of maternal

depression symptoms and parenting. International Journal of Behavioral

Development. 2017;41(6), 670-680. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025416657615

45.   Dunn J, Munn P. Sibling quarrels and maternal intervention: Individual differences in

understanding and aggression. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 1986;

27(5), 583-595. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1986.tb00184.x

46.   Garcia MM, Shaw DS, Winslow EB, Yaggi KE. Destructive sibling conflict and the

development of conduct problems in young boys. Developmental Psychology. 2000;

36(1), 44–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.36.1.44

47.   Mesman J, Stoel R, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, van IJzendoorn MH, Juffer F, Koot

HM, et al. Predicting growth curves of early childhood externalizing problems:

Differential susceptibility of children with difficult temperament. Journal of

Abnormal Child Psychology. 2009;37(5), 625-636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-

009-9298-0

48.   Olson SL, Ip KI, Gonzalez R, Beyers-Carlson EE, Volling, BL. Development of

externalizing symptoms across the toddler period: The critical role of older siblings.

Journal of Family Psychology. 2020;34(2), 165-174. https://doi.org/10.1037/

fam0000581

49.   Patterson GR. Siblings: Fellow travelers in coercive family processes. In: Blanchard RJ,

editor. Advances in the study of aggression New York: Academic Press; 1984. p. 174-

213.

50.   Patterson G. R. The contribution of siblings to training for fighting: A microsocial

analysis. In: Olweus D, Block J, Radke-Yarrow M, editors. Development of antisocial

and prosocial behavior: Research, theories, and issues. Orlando, Florida: Academic;

1986, p. 235–261.

51.   Caspi, J. Sibling aggression: Assessment and treatment. New York, NY: Springer;

2012.

52.   Eriksen S, Jensen V. A push or a punch: Distinguishing the severity of sibling violence.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2009; 24(1), 183-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/

0886260508316298

53.   Patterson GR. The early development of coercive family processes. In: Reid JB,

Patterson GR, Snyder J, editors. Antisocial behavior in children and adolescents: A

developmental analysis and model for intervention. American Psychological

Association; 2002. p. 25–44.

54.   Shaw DS, Winslow EB, Owens EB, Vondra JI, Cohn JF, Bell RQ. The development of

early externalizing problems among children from low-income families: A

transformational perspective. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 1998;26(2), 95-

107. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022665704584

55. Goodman SH, Rouse MH, Connell AM, Broth MR, Hall CM, Heyward D. Maternal

depression and child psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. Clinical Child and

Family Psychology Review. 2011;14(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-010-

0080-1

56. Wilson S, Durbin CE. Effects of paternal depression on fathers' parenting behaviors:

A meta-analytic review. Clinical Psychology Review. 2010;30(2), 167-180.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.10.007

57. Cheung K, Theule J. Paternal depressive symptoms and parenting behaviors: An

updated meta-analysis. Journal of Child and Family Studies. 2019;28(3), 613-626.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-01316-1

58. Yang, P, Schlomer GL, Lippold MA. Mothering versus fathering? Positive parenting

versus negative parenting? Their relative importance in predicting adolescent

aggressive behavior: A longitudinal comparison. Developmental psychology. 2022;

59(1), 69-83. https://doi.org/10.1037 /dev0001442.

59. Cabrera NJ, Volling BL, Barr R. Fathers are parents, too! Widening the lens on

parenting for children's development. Child Development Perspectives. 2018;12(3),

152-157. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12275

60. Cabrera NJ. Father involvement, father-child relationship, and attachment in the

early years. Attachment & Human development. 2020;22(1), 134-138. https://doi.

org /10.1080/14616734.2019.1589070

1528

1529   61.   Haas LL, Hwang CP. Fatherhood and social policy in Scandinavia. In: Shwalb DW,

1530   Shwalb BJ, Lamb ME, editors. Fathers in cultural contexts. New York, NY: Routledge;

1531   2013. p. 303–331.

1532   62.   Rege M, Solli IF. The impact of paternity leave on long-term father involvement.

1533   CESifo Working Paper Series No. 3130. 2010. Available at SSRN:

1534   https://ssrn.com/abstract =1649344

1535   63.   Sullivan O, Coltrane S, McAnnally L, Altintas E. Father-friendly policies and time-use

1536   data in a cross-national context: Potential and prospects for future research. The

1537   Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2009; 624(1), 234–

1538   254. https:// doi.org/10.1177/0002716209335138

1539   64.   Rodrigues M, Sokolovic N, Madigan S, Luo Y, Silva V, Misra S. et al. Paternal

1540   sensitivity and children's cognitive and socioemotional outcomes: A meta-analytic

1541   review. Child Development. 2021;92(2), 554-577. https://doi.org/10.1111/

1542   cdev.13545

1543   65.   Card NA, Stucky BD, Sawalani GM, Little TD. Direct and indirect aggression during

1544   childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences,

1545   intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. Child Development 2008;79(5),

1546   1185–1229. https://doi.org/10.1111 /j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x

1547   66.   Hay DF. The gradual emergence of sex differences in aggression: alternative

1548   hypotheses. Psychological Medicine. 2007;37(11), 1527-1537. DOI: https://doi.org

1549   /10.1017/S0033291707000165

1550   67.   Hay DF, Nash A, Caplan M, Swartzentruber J, Ishikawa F, Vespo JE. The emergence of

1551   gender differences in physical aggression in the context of conflict between young

peers. British Journal of Developmental Psychology. 2011;29(2), 158–175.

doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02028.x

68.   Hay DF. The beginnings of aggression in infancy. In: Tremblay RE, Hartup WW, Archer

J, editors. Developmental origins of aggression. New York: Guilford Press; 2005. p.

107–132.

69.   Côté SM. Sex differences in physical and indirect aggression: A developmental

perspective. European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research. 2007;13(3), 183-200.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-007-9046-3

70.   van Zeijl J, Mesman J, Stolk MN, Alink LR, Van IJzendoorn MH, Bakermans-

Kranenburg MJ, et al. Differential susceptibility to discipline: the moderating effect of

child temperament on the association between maternal discipline and early

childhood externalizing problems. Journal of Family Psychology. 2007;21(4), 626-636.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.626

71.   Vitaro F, Barker ED, Boivin M, Brendgen M, Tremblay RE. Do early difficult

temperament and harsh parenting differentially predict reactive and proactive

aggression? Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 2006;34(5), 681–691.

https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10802-006-9055-6

72.   Slagt M, Dubas JS, Deković M, van Aken, MA. Differences in sensitivity to parenting

depending on child temperament: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin. 2016;

142(10), 1068-1110. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000061

73.   Belsky J. Variation in susceptibility to environmental influence: An evolutionary

argument. Psychological Inquiry. 1997;8(3), 182-186. DOI:

10.1207/s15327965pli0803_3

74.   Belsky J. Theory testing, effect-size evaluation, and differential susceptibility to

1576   rearing influence: The case of mothering and attachment. Child Development. 1997;

1577   68(4), 598-600. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1997.tb04221.x

1578   75.   Belsky J, Hsieh KH, Crnic K. Mothering, fathering, and infant negativity as

1579   antecedents of boys' externalizing problems and inhibition at age 3 years:

1580   Differential susceptibility to rearing experience? Development and Psychopathology.

1581   1998;10(2), 301-319. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S095457949800162X

1582   76.   Campbell SB, Shaw DS, Gilliom M. Early externalizing behavior problems: Toddlers

1583   and preschoolers at risk for later maladjustment. Development and Psychopathology

1584   2000; 12(3), 467– 488. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/ S0954579400003114

1585   77.   Brame B, Nagin DS, Tremblay RE. Developmental trajectories of physical aggression

1586   from school entry to late adolescence. The Journal of Child Psychology and

1587   Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines. 2001;42(4), 503-512. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/

1588   S0021963001007120

1589   78.   Cleverley K, Szatmari P, Vaillancourt T, Boyle M, Lipman E. Developmental

1590   trajectories of physical and indirect aggression from late childhood to adolescence:

1591   Sex differences and outcomes in emerging adulthood. Journal of the American

1592   Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry. 2012;51(10), 1037-1051. https://doi.org/

1593   10.1016/j.jaac.2012.07.010

1594   79.   Kokko K, Tremblay RE, Lacours, E, Nagin DS, Vitaro F. Trajectories of prosocial

1595   behavior and physical aggression in middle childhood: Links to adolescent school

1596   dropout and physical violence. Journal of Research on Adolescence. 2006;16(3), 403-

1597   428. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00500.x

1598   80.   Kokko K, Pulkkinen L, Huesmann LR, Dubow EF, Boxer P. Intensity of aggression in

1599   childhood as a predictor of different forms of adult aggression: A two-country

1600   (Finland and the United States) analysis. Journal of Research on Adolescence. 2009;

1601   19(1), 9-34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2009.00579.x

1602   81.   Reef J, Diamantopoulou S, van Meurs I, Verhulst F, van der Ende J. Predicting adult

1603   emotional and behavioral problems from externalizing problem trajectories in a 24-

1604   year longitudinal study. European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry. 2010;19(7), 577-

1605   585. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-010-0088-6

1606   82.   Temcheff CE, Serbin LA, Martin-Storey A, Stack DM, Hodgins S, Ledingham J, et al.

1607   Continuity and pathways from aggression in childhood to family violence in

1608   adulthood: A 30-year longitudinal study. Journal of Family Violence. 2008;23(4), 231-

1609   242. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-007-9147-2

1610   83.   Carbonneau R, Boivin M, Brendgen M, Nagin D, Tremblay RE. Comorbid development

1611   of disruptive behaviors from age 1½ to 5 years in a population birth-cohort and

1612   association with school adjustment in first grade. Journal of Abnormal Child

1613   Psychology. 2016;44(4), 677-690. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-015-0072-1

1614   84.   Asparouhov T, Muthén B. Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: Three-step

1615   approaches using Mplus. Structural Equation Modeling. 2014;21(3), 329-341.

1616   https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.915181

1617   85.   Nærde A, Janson H, Ogden T. BONDS (The Behavior Outlook Norwegian

1618   Developmental Study): A prospective longitudinal study of early development of

1619   social competence and behavior problems. Oslo: The Norwegian Center for Child

1620   Behavioral Development; 2014. Report. ISBN 978-82-93406-00-6.

1621   86.   Bond TG, Fox CM. Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in the

1622   human sciences (3rd ed.). Routledge; 2015.

1623   87.   Linacre JM. Estimating Rasch measures with known polytomous (or rating scale) item

1624   difficulties: Anchored Maximum Likelihood Estimation (AMLE). Rasch Measurement

1625   Transactions. 1998;12(2), 638. https://www.rasch.org/rmt/rmt122q.htm

1626   88.   Blum JS, Mehrabian A. Personality and temperament correlates of marital

1627   satisfaction. Journal of Personality. 1999; 67(1), 93–125.

1628   89.   Winokur A, Winokur DF, Rickels K, Cox DS. Symptoms of emotional distress in a

1629   family planning service: Stability over a four-week period. British Journal of

1630   Psychiatry. 1984;144(4), 395-399. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.144.4.395

1631   90.   Tambs K, Moum T. How well can a few questionnaire items indicate anxiety and

1632   depression? Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 1993;87(5), 364–367.

1633   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1993.tb03388.x

1634   91.   Aspland H, Gardner F. Observational measures of parent-child interaction: An

1635   introductory review. Child and Adolescent Mental Health. 2003;8(3),136–143.

1636   http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1475-3588.00061

1637   92.   Snyder J, Stoolmiller M, Wilson M, Yamamoto M. Child anger regulation, parental

1638   responses to children's anger displays, and early child antisocial behavior. Social

1639   Development. 2003;12(3), 335–360. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00237

1640   93.   Cox MJ, Crnic K. Qualitative ratings for parent–child interaction at 3–12 months of

1641   age. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Psychology, University of North

1642   Carolina at Chapel Hill; 2003.

94.   Nordahl KB. Early father-child interaction in a father-friendly context: Gender

differences, child outcomes, and predictive factors related to fathers' parenting

behaviors with one-year-olds [dissertation]. University of Bergen, Norway; 2014.

95.   Loeber R, Stouthamer-Loeber M, Van Kammen W, Farrington D. Initiation, escalation

and desistance in juvenile offending and their correlates. Journal of Criminal Law and

Criminology. 1991;82(1), 36-82.

96.   Thornberry T, Huizinga D, Loeber R. The prevention of serious delinquency and

violence: Implications from the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of

Delinquency. In: Howell J, Krisberg B, Hawking D, Wilson JD, editors. Sourcebook on

serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders Sage; 1995. p. 213-327.

97.   Gartstein MA, Rothbart MK. Studying infant temperament via the Revised Infant

Behavior Questionnaire. Infant Behavior & Development. 2003;26(1), 64–86.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(02)00169-8

98.   Rothbart MK. Measurement of temperament in infancy. Child Development. 1981;

52(2), 569-578. https://doi.org/10.2307/1129176

99.   Gresham FM, Elliott SN. Social Skills Improvement System: Rating scales.

Bloomington, MN: Pearson Assessments 2008.

100.   van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate imputation by chained

equations in R. Journal of Statistical Software. 2011;45(3), 1-67.

https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v045.i03

101.   Muthén B. Latent variable hybrids: Overview of old and new models. In: Hancock GR,

Samuelsen KM, editors. Advances in latent variable mixture models. Charlotte, NC:

Information Age Publishing, Inc; 2008. p. 1-24.

1666

1667   102.   Tofighi D, Enders CK. Identifying the correct number of classes in growth mixture

1668   models. In: Hancock GR, Samuelsen KM, editors. Advances in latent variable mixture

1669   models. Information Age Publishing 2008, pp. 317-341.

1670   103.   Nagelkerke NJ. A note on a general definition of the coefficient of determination.

1671   Biometrika. 1991;78(3), 691-692.

1672   104.   Nylund K, Asparouhov T, Muthen BO. Deciding on the number of classes in latent

1673   class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study.

1674   Structural Equation Modeling. 2007;14(4), 535–569. https://doi.org/10.1080/

1675   10705510701575396

1676   105.   Dziak JJ, Lanza ST, Tan X. Effect size, statistical power and sample size requirements

1677   for the bootstrap likelihood ratio test in latent class analysis. Structural Equation

1678   Modeling. 2014; 21(4): 534–552. doi:10.1080/10705511.2014.919819.

1679   106.   McLachlan G, Peel D. Finite Mixture Models. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons Inc

1680   2000.

1681   107.   Cox MJ, Paley B. Families as systems. Annual Review of Psychology. 1997;48*(1)*, 243–

1682   267. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.243

1683   108.   Kerr ME, Bowen M. Family evaluation: An approach based on Bowen theory. WW

1684   Norton & Co 1988.

1685   109.   Olson S, Lopez-Duran N, Lunkenheimer E, Chang H, Sameroff A. Individual differences

1686   in the development of early peer aggression: Integrating contributions of self-

1687   regulation, theory of mind, and parenting. Development and Psychopathology.

1688   2011;23(1), 253-266. doi:10.1017/S095457941000077

1689   110.   Spinrad TL, Eisenberg N, Gaertner B, Popp T, Smith CL, Kupfer A, et al. Relations of

1690   maternal socialization and toddlers' effortful control to children's adjustment and

1691   social competence. Developmental psychology. 2007; 43(5), 1170.

1692   111.   Sulik MJ, Blair C, Mills-Koonce R, Berry D, Greenberg M. Early parenting and the

1693   development of externalizing behavior problems: Longitudinal mediation through

1694   children's executive function. Child Development. 2015;86(5), 1588–1603.

1695   https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12386

1696   112.   Hoff E, Laursen B. Socioeconomic status and parenting. In: Bornstein MH, editor.

1697   Handbook of parenting. Volume 2: Biology and Ecology of Parenting. Routledge

1698   2019, pp. 421-447.

1699   113.   Shaw DS, Shelleby EC. Early-onset conduct problems: Intersection of conduct

1700   problems and poverty. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology. 2014;10(503), 503-528.

1701   doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153650

1702   114.   Andersen E. Økt fruktbarhet for første gang på 12 år (Increased fertility for the first

1703   time in 12 years). Statistics Norway 2022, March 9. Available from:

1704   https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/fodte-og-dode/statistikk/fodte /artikler/okt-

1705   fruktbarhet-for-forste-gang-pa-12-ar

1706   115.   Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, Lotz A, Alyousefi-van Dijk K, van IJzendoorn M. Birth of a

1707   father: Fathering in the first 1,000 days. Child Development Perspectives. 2019;

1708   13(4), 247-253. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12347

1709   116.   Leventhal T, Brooks-Gunn J. The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of

1710   neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. Psychological Bulletin.

1711   2000;126(2), 309. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.2.309

1712   117.   Poulain T, Vogel M, Kiess W. Review on the role of socioeconomic status in child

1713   health and development. Current Opinion in Pediatrics. 2020; 32(2), 308-314.

1714   https://doi.org/ 10.1097/mop.0000000000000876

1715   118.   Karlberg P, Taranger J, Engström I, Klackenberg-Larsson I, Lichtenstein H, Stensson J

1716   et al. The development of children in a Swedish urban community: A prospective,

1717   longitudinal study. Acta Paediatrica. 1968; 57(S187), 48-66. https://doi.org/10.1111

1718   /j.1651-2227.1968.tb06040.x

1719   119.   Patterson GR, Chamberlain P, Reid JB. A comparative evaluation of a parent-training

1720   program. Behavior Therapy. 1982; 13(5), 638-650. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-

1721   7894(82)80021-X

1722   120.   Singer JD, Willett JB. Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event

1723   occurrence. Oxford University Press; 2003. https://doi.org/10.1093/ acprof:oso/

1724   9780195152968.001.0001

1725   121.   Andrich D. Rasch models for measurement. Sage; 1988. https://dx.doi.org/ 10.4135/

1726   9781412985598.

1727   122.   Olsen R, Garratt A, Iversen H, Bjertnaes O. Rasch analysis of the Psychiatric Out-

1728   Patient Experiences Questionnaire (POPEQ). BMC Health Services Research. 2010;

1729   10, Article 282. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-10-282

1730   123.   Janson H, Bringedal, GE, Nærde A. A flowchart of participation and collected data

1731   across 15 years of The Behavior Outlook Norwegian Developmental Study (BONDS).

1732   Oslo, Norway: The Norwegian Center for Child Behavioral Development; 2023.

1733   Report. https://www.nubu.no/getfile.php /1323354-1687432522/ Filer/nubu.no

1734   /Intranett/Dokumenter/Rapporter/2023%20Report%20BONDS%20Participation.pdf

1735

Supporting information

Supporting information A: Physical aggression measure

SA1 Table. Physical aggression measure developed for the Behavior Outlook Norwegian Developmental Study.

SA2 Table. Physical aggression item inclusion in data collections at ages 1-5 years in the Behavior Outlook Norwegian Developmental Study.

Supporting information B: Scaling of the physical aggression measure

SB1 Table. Final Rasch-model item scale value estimates at target ages.

Supporting information C: Attrition

SC1 Table. Descriptive data for predictors in the original sample, for children with any physical aggression data, and for children with Grade 2 outcome data.

Supporting information D: Additional comparisons of 2-10 trajectory solutions.

SD1 Table. Initial and final starts, replications of best loglikelihood, and final starts replications and converged for 2 to 10 trajectory models.

SD2 Table. Bootstrap likelihood ratio tests for 2- to 9-trajectory solutions.

SD Fig. Trajectory Plots for 2-9 Trajectory Solutions.

Supporting information E: Details of the 9-trajectory solution.

SE1 Table. Class counts and proportions for latent classes based on estimated posterior probabilities.

SE2 Table. Estimated parameters with associated standard errors of trajectory parameters for the 9-trajectory solution.

SE3 Table. Average latent class probabilities for the most likely latent class membership (row) by latent class (column).

1759   **SE4 Table. Classification probabilities for the most likely latent class membership (column)**

1760   **by latent class (row).**

Figure 1

Figure 2