				χ^2			Cohen's d				
	%	п	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Female	46	119	-	-	-	.24	.13	.11	.01	.16	.04
2. Racial/ethnic minority	61	158	0	-	-	.14	78*	.23	.62*	.40*	.37*
3. Violence Exposure	60	155	0	24.2*	-	.17	-1.32*	.59*	1.62*	.92*	.30*
							Correlations				
		N	М	SD		4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Age		259	12.6	2.59		-					
5. Income-to-needs		242	3.26	2.69		01	-				
6. Emotional awareness		250	17.4	7.58		.18*	13*	-			
7. P-factor (baseline)		259	0	0.89		.14*	36*	.52*	-		
8. P-factor (follow up)		196	0	0.88		.31*	22*	.46*	.67*	-	
9. Time elapsed (years)		196	1.82	0.65		.13	24*	.12	.06	.12	-

Table S1: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Study 2

Note: * p < .05, N = number of participants with valid data on that measure, High scores on Emotional awareness indicate lower

emotional awareness.

Supplemental Analyses with CBCL/YSR Internalizing and Externalizing

We conducted supplementary analyses using youth-reported Internalizing problems on the YSR and the higher of parent and youth-reported Externalizing problems on the CBCL and YSR respectively as outcome variables. The results of those analyses are summarized in Tables S2-S6.

	Externalizing Problems					
Predictors	В	SE	β	р		
Female	-7.48	5.56	-0.57	0.182		
Age	0.22	0.33	0.10	0.509		
Income-to-needs ratio	-0.25	0.29	-0.09	0.388		
Racial/ethnic minority	-0.56	1.46	-0.04	0.704		
Emotional Awareness	0.23	0.06	0.35	0.001		
Age x Female	0.39	0.44	0.39	0.376		
Observations	92			-		
R ² / adjusted R ²	0.190 / 0.133					

Table S2: Study 1 Relation between Emotional Awareness and CBCL/YSR Externalizing Problems

	Internalizing Problems					
Predictors	В	SE	β	р		
Female	-10.46	5.88	-0.63	0.079		
Age	0.23	0.35	0.08	0.512		
Income-to-needs ratio	0.31	0.31	0.09	0.312		
Racial/ethnic minority	3.00	1.54	0.17	0.055		
Emotional Awareness	0.49	0.07	0.60	<0.001		
Age x Female	0.74	0.47	0.59	0.116		
Observations	92					
R^2 / adjusted R^2	0.434 / 0.394	Ļ				

Table S3: Study 1 Relation between Emotional Awareness and YSR Internalizing Problems

	Externalizing Problems (baseline)						
Predictors	В	SE	β	р			
Emotional Awareness	0.32	0.08	0.23	<0.001			
Age	-0.15	0.29	-0.04	0.609			
Female	4.26	5.53	0.20	0.442			
Racial/ethnic minority	2.54	1.19	0.12	0.035			
Income-to-needs ratio	0.19	0.25	0.05	0.441			
Violence Exposure	11.18	1.38	0.52	<0.001			
Age x Female	-0.40	0.43	-0.26	0.350			
Observations	234						
R ² / adjusted R ²	0.401 / 0.382						

 Table S4: Study 2 Relation between Emotional Awareness and CBCL/YSR Externalizing

 Problems (baseline)

Table S5: Study 2 Relation between Emotional Awareness and YSR Internalizing Problems

	Internalizing Problems (baseline)				
Predictors	В	SE	β	р	
Emotional Awareness	0.89	0.09	0.56	<0.001	
Age	0.06	0.33	0.01	0.864	
Female	-7.75	6.26	-0.32	0.218	
Racial/ethnic minority	0.74	1.34	0.03	0.585	
Income-to-needs ratio	-0.29	0.28	-0.07	0.306	
Violence Exposure	1.96	1.55	0.08	0.208	
Age x Female	0.59	0.48	0.33	0.227	
Observations	233				
R ² / adjusted R ²	0.411 / 0.39	3			

	Externalizing Problems (Follow-up)					
Predictors	В	SE	β	р		
Externalizing Problems (baseline)	0.75	0.08	0.70	<0.001		
Emotional Awareness	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.972		
Age	0.28	0.25	0.06	0.256		
Female	0.47	1.29	0.02	0.713		
Racial/ethnic minority	-3.29	1.41	-0.14	0.021		
Income-to-needs ratio	-0.11	0.30	-0.03	0.702		
Violence Exposure	1.37	1.81	0.06	0.452		
Time Elapsed (Years)	0.68	1.00	0.04	0.499		
Age x Female	-0.88	0.50	-0.10	0.079		
Observations	174					
R^2 / adjusted R^2	0.514 / 0.488					

Table S5: Study 2 Relation between Emotional Awareness and CBCL/YSR ExternalizingProblems (Follow-up)

	Internalizing Problems (Follow-up)						
Predictors	В	SE	β	р			
Internalizing Problems (baseline)	0.41	0.07	0.42	<0.001			
Emotional Awareness	0.31	0.11	0.21	0.008			
Age	0.83	0.27	0.19	0.003			
Female	-1.87	1.39	-0.08	0.180			
Racial/ethnic minority	-0.83	1.49	-0.04	0.581			
Income-to-needs ratio	-0.21	0.32	-0.05	0.507			
Violence Exposure	1.66	1.72	0.07	0.335			
Time Elapsed (Years)	-0.77	1.09	-0.05	0.478			
Age x Female	-1.12	0.54	-0.13	0.039			
Observations	170						
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.434 / 0.402						

 Table S6: Study 2 Relation between Emotional Awareness and YSR Internalizing Problems (Follow-up)

Supplemental Analyses with binning psychopathology into quartiles when calculating the p-factor

Study 1:

PTSD symptoms did not load significantly onto the general factor in the bifactor model or to the internalizing factor in the correlated-factors model. Therefore, PTSD symptoms were excluded from final models. The bifactor and correlated-factors model provided similar fit to the data. However, the correlated-factors model was not positive definite. Fit indices for the bi-factor model were: AIC = 1400.07, BIC = 1487.08, Sample adjusted BIC = 1407.84. Standardized factor loadings for the latent p-factor ranged from 0.48 to 0.95 (all p's < .001). Fit indices for the correlated-factors model were: AIC = 1405.00, BIC = 1463.54, Sample adjusted BIC = 1397.15.

The p-factor scores computed from quartiles of the psychopathology measures correlated with the p-factor scores computed from deciles at r = .95. Consequentially, the results of all analyses did not meaningfully change using this alternative quantification.

Study 2:

The bifactor and correlated-factors model provided similar fit to the data, with the bifactor model demonstrating better fit on all indices. Fit indices for the bi-factor model were: AIC = 3784.45, BIC = 3912.29, Sample adjusted BIC = 3817.064. Standardized factor loadings for the latent p-factor ranged from 0.44 to 0.86 (all p's < .001). Fit indices for the correlated-factors model were: AIC = 3830.29, BIC = 3916.64, Sample adjusted BIC = 3831.04. Standardized factor loadings for the latent internalizing factor ranged from 0.67 to 0.78 (all p's < .001). Standardized factor loadings for the latent externalizing factor ranged from 0.75 to 0.88 (all p's < .001).

The baseline p-factor scores computed from quartiles of the psychopathology measures correlated with the baseline p-factor scores computed from deciles at r = .97. The p-factor scores computed from quartiles at follow-up correlated with the follow-up p-factor scores computed from deciles at r = .95. Consequentially, the results of all analyses did not meaningfully change using this alternative quantification.