

Supplement

Description of Developmental Task Score

The developmental task scores range from 0 through 14, and were generated through a composite of rank scores (0 through 2) on seven domains of functioning. Participants were ranked in one of three categories for each domain based on their success on the developmental task relative to other participants in the study. This approach was taken to emulate work by Schulenberg et al (2004). Information from each domain was drawn from the Adult Self Report measure (ASR; Achenbach, 2003) and a demographics questionnaire. Thereby, this score includes both objectively verifiable components (e.g., education attainment, annual income) and subjective components (e.g., friendship quality, family involvement).

For the education domain, 29 individuals did not finish high school (however 16 of those received their GED) and were categorized as lower, 19 graduated from high school and were categorized as middle, and 40 pursued further education (24 earned a vocational technical diploma or completed part of a collegiate program, 11 earned an associate's degree, 4 earned a bachelor's degree, and 1 earned a master's degree) and were categorized as upper.

Success in work was based on occupational standing according to the Hauser and Warren Socioeconomic Index (SEI) score that considers earnings, education, and prestige associated with occupations (1997), and the job satisfaction and confidence scores on the ASR. Scores for the participants' current work and usual work were averaged to create one score. Twenty people were categorized as lower in this domain, including individuals who were currently unemployed or disabled. Individuals who reported that they were keeping house or in school, or held a job of mediocre occupational standing (e.g., maid, janitor, construction laborer, kitchen worker), or an adaptive functioning job score of < 1.5 (low job satisfaction and confidence) were considered

middle rank in this domain. This group contained 49 individuals. Finally, 19 participants who had a relatively high SEI score (e.g., health aide, teacher or teacher's aide, general office clerk, sales worker) and an average ASR job score greater than 1.5 (medium-high job satisfaction and confidence) were considered in the upper rank.

Financial autonomy was based on total family income rank within this sample. The range of family income levels were divided into approximate thirds. Twenty-eight individuals were in the lower rank category, which included those earning less than \$20k/year. Thirty-six individuals' family income was between \$20-40k and were in the middle rank category. Lastly, 24 individuals were in the upper rank category with family earnings of \$40-120k. Based on the 2013 Federal Poverty Guidelines, the poverty line is defined as household income of less than \$23.5k/year for a family of four (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2013).

Ranking of success in the romantic involvement domain differed from rankings by Schulenberg and colleagues (2004) to reflect the average age of marriage in New York State (28 years of age, as opposed to 26 years, which was used in Schulenberg's ranking). Unmarried and non-cohabiting individuals who were 28 years old or younger were classified as in the middle category. Otherwise, rankings were based on marital status, divorce history, and relationship ratings given on the ASR. To be classified as lower, individuals had to have been divorced more than twice, single and not cohabiting, or in a low-quality marriage (ASR adaptive functioning Spouse/Partner score < 1). This group contained 28 individuals. The middle rank group, which contained 41 individuals, included divorced but remarried participants, unmarried but cohabiting participants, and married but unsatisfied participants (ASR adaptive functioning spouse/partner score = 1-1.5). Nineteen individuals were classified as high rank in the romantic involvement

domain, which included individuals who had never been divorced and were currently in a high-quality marriage (ASR average Spouse/Partner satisfaction-related score > 1.5).

For the peer involvement domain, ranking was based on the ASR adaptive functioning friends scale. This scale encompasses quantity of friendships and contact as well as quality of friendships. Twenty-eight participants were low (ASR score < 1.75), 28 participants were middle (score = $1.75 - 2.25$), and 32 participants were high (score > 2.25) in this domain.

Family involvement rankings were also based on the ASR report, using the adaptive functioning family scale, which indexes how well one gets along with family members. These scores were averaged across family members that participants reported having contact with (including parents, siblings, and children), as it may actually be adaptive to not have contact with some family members, particularly if maltreatment was perpetrated by a family member. Thirty participants were categorized as low (score < 1.25), while 25 were middle (score = $1.25 - 1.75$) and 33 were high (score > 1.75).

The last developmental task domain indexed in this sample was related to substance abuse. Rankings were based on ASR Substance Use Scales for tobacco, alcohol, and drugs. Scores on these three subscales (ranging from 50 to 100) were averaged. The sample was nearly evenly divided into thirds, with 29 individuals ranked as low (score > 66.67), 31 ranked as middle (score = $50 - 66.67$), and 28 ranked as high (score = 50).

Demographic and sample characteristic between group contrasts

Group differences between demographic and sample characteristics were tested by ANOVA or two-tailed t -test, as appropriate for the number of levels. The CM group ($M = 30.71$ years, $SD = 3.07$ years) is older on average than the comparison group ($M = 29.10$ years, $SD = 3.53$ years; $t(86) = -2.29$, $p = .03$). There was not a difference in the proportion of males between

groups ($F(1,86) = .15, p = .70$). There was not a difference in proportion of Black, White, and Other/Multiracial participants between groups ($F(1,86) = .06, p = .80$). There was not a group difference in total annual family income ($t(86) = .57, p = .57$) or in marital status ($F(1,86) = .44, p = .51$). There was not a difference in proportion of individuals working full time, working part time, or not working between groups ($F(2,85) = .66, p = .52$). There was also no group difference in proportion of individuals who completed some high school, completed high school or earned a GED, went to technical school, an associates program, or completed some college, or earned a bachelor's or master's degree ($F(1,83) = 1.04, p = .31$). Adolescent Self Report Maternal Relationship Quality did not differ by group ($t(86) = -.08, p = .94$). Internalizing symptoms in adolescence ($t(86) = -.59, p = .56$) and adulthood ($t(86) = .91, p = .91$) also did not differ by group. Similarly, externalizing symptoms in adolescence ($t(86) = -1.30, p = .20$) and adulthood ($t(86) = -.62, p = .54$) also did not differ by group. Adult adaptive functioning was also comparable across groups ($t(86) = 1.68, p = .10$). Both frontal lobe volume ($t(86) = -.91, p = .36$) and estimated total intracranial volume ($t(86) = .06, p = .95$) were not significantly different by group.

1. Schulenberg JE, Bryant AL, O'malley PM (2004): Taking hold of some kind of life: How developmental tasks relate to trajectories of well-being during the transition to adulthood. *Dev Psychopathol.* 16:1119-1140.
2. Achenbach TM, Rescorla LA (2003): *Manual for ASEBA adult forms and profiles.* Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, and Families.
3. Hauser, R. M., & Warren, J. R. (1997). Socioeconomic indexes for occupations: A review, update, and critique. *Sociological methodology*, 27(1), 177-298.
4. US Department of Health and Human Services (2013): Poverty guidelines. *Federal Register* 78: 5182-5183.