**Supplemental Materials**

**S1**. Descriptive summary of ASQ-SE Z scores by sociodemographic factors.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Self-regulation** | **Adaptive-functioning** | **Affect** | **Social-communication** | **Interaction** | **Social-emotional total score** |
|  | **M ± (SD)****(Min-Max)** | **M ± (SD)****(Min-Max)** | **M ± (SD)****(Min-Max)** | **M ± (SD)****(Min-Max)** | **M ± (SD)****(Min-Max)** | **M ± (SD)****(Min-Max)** |
| **Childcare support** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Childcare support provided | -.07±.98(-1.37− 2.54) | .00±1.02(-1.17− 3.07) | -.11±.96(-1.37− 1.70) | -.01±.95(-.87− 3.07) | -.02±.96(-1.24− 2.56) | -.06±.95(-1.52− 2.75) |
| Childcare support not provided | .25±.99(-1.37− 2.29) | -.02±.85(-1.04− 2.14) | .31±.96(-1.14− 1.70) | .05±1.15(-.87− 2.43) | .10±1.09(-1.24− 3.12) | .22±1.13(-2.14− 2.59) |
| Statistical test (effect size) | t = 1.17(d=.32) | t = -.08 (d=.02) | t = 1.63 (d=.44) | t = .25 (d=.06) | t = .46 (d=.13) | t = 1.06 (d=.23) |
| **Mother’s marital status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single | -.02±1.14(-1.37− 2.54) | .02±1.03(-1.17− 3.07) | .05±1.03(-1.37− 1.70) | .27±1.14(-.87− 3.07) | -.06±.98(-1.24− 2.56) | -.06±1.08(-2.14− 2.75) |
| Boyfriend | .15±.86(-.96− 1.74) | -.01±1.08(-1.17− 2.14) | -.26±1.06(-1.37− 1.69) | -.13±.82(-.87− 1.61) | -.01±1.03(-1.24− 2.56) | -.02±.82(-1.22− 1.64) |
| Co-habiting with a partner | -.11±.88(-1.37− 2.29) | -.02±.87(-1.04− 2.14) | .10±.76(-1.16− 1.70) | -.27±.81(-.87− 2.43) | .10±.99(-1.13− 3.12) | -.06±1.02(-1.52− 2.59) |
| Statistical test (effect size) | F = .41(η2 = .01) | F = .01(η2 = .00) | F = .94(η2 = .02) | F = 2.39(η2 =.05) | F = .18(η2 = .01) | F = .12(η2 =.00) |
| **Mother’s employment**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed | -.11±.80(-1.35− 1.38) | .10±.66(-1.04− 1.12) | .22±1.05(-1.37− 1.70) | .10±1.02(-.87− 2.36) | -.12±1.01(-1.24− 1.89) | -.01±.89(-1.45− 1.85) |
| Unemployed  | .03±1.03(-1.37− 2.54) | -.02±1.05(-1.17− 3.07) | -.08±.95(-1.37− 1.70) | -.02±.98(-.87− 3.07) | .03±.99(-1.13− 3.12) | .00±1.02(-2.14− 2.75) |
| Statistical test (effect size) |  t = .49(d=.15) | t = -.55 (d=.03) | t = -1.09 (d=.30) | t = -.45 (d=.13) | t = .52 (d=.15) | t = .03 (d=.00) |
| **Mother`s level of education** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dropped out of school  | .08±.95(-1.35− 1.93) | -.03±.97(-1.17− 1.87) | .04±.86(-1.37− 1.70) | .09±1.12(-.87− 2.36) | -.07±.90(-.79− 1.73) | .00±.88(-1.49− 1.85) |
| Elementary/high school student  | -.00±1.10(-1.37− 2.29) | .21±1.16(-1.17− 3.07) | .00±1.11(-1.16− 1.70) | -.05±.73(-.87− .81) | -.03±.91(-1.13− 2.56) | .07±.97(-1.22− 2.15) |
| Completed high school | -.02±.97(-1.37− 2.54) | -.09±.92(-1.17− 2.14) | -.04±.95(-1.37− 1.70) | -.00±1.06(-.87− 3.07) | .03±1.05(-1.24− 3.12) | -.03±1.03(-2.14− 2.75) |
| Statistical test (effect size) | F = .42(η2 = .00) | F = .64(η2 = .02) | F = .04(η2 = .00) | F = .07(η2 =.00) | F = .06(η2 = .00) | F = .07(η2 =.00) |
| **Child gender** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | -.05±.99(-1.37− 2.54) | -.00±.99(-1.17− 2.14) | -.08±1.04(-1.37− 1.70) | .21±1.07(-.87− 3.07) | -.10±.88(-1.24− 2.56) | -.01±1.05(-2.14− 2.75) |
| Female | -.06±.99(-1.37− 2.29) | -.00±1.00(-1.17− 3.07) | .04±.90(-1.37− 1.70) | -.24±.83(-.87− 2.36) | .12±1.10(-1.13− 3.12) | .02±.93(-1.45− 2.59) |
| Statistical test (effect size) |  t = -.47(d=.11) | t = -.01 (d=.00) | t = -.54 (d=.13) | t = 2.05 (d=.47) \* | t = -.98 (d=.22) | t = -.13 (d=.03) |
| **Preschool center** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attends | -.05±.96(-1.37− 2.54) | -.11±1.12(-1.17− 3.07) | -.40±.77(-1.37− 1.60) | .09±1.09(-.87− 3.07) | .07±.98(-1.13− 2.56) | -.08±1.01(-1.49− 2.75) |
| Does not attend | .03±1.01(-1.37− 2.29) | .06±.91(-1.17− 2.14) | .19±1.01(-1.37− 1.70) | -.05±.93(-.87− 2.43) | -.04±1.00(-1.24− 3.12) | .04±.98(-2.14− 2.59) |
| Statistical test (effect size) |  t = .31(d=.07) | t = .72 (d=.17) | t = 2.70 (d=.66) \*\* | t = -.58 (d=.14) | t = -.50 (d=.12) | t = .52 (d=.12) |
| **Relatives who live with the child** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother and father | .41±1.21(-.96− 2.29) | -.01±.89(-1.04− 1.34) | .12±.98(-1.14− 1.69) | -.69±.32(-.87− .04) | .66±1.52(-.77− 3.12) | .26±1.50(-1.52− 2.59) |
| Mother and grandparents | .07±1.01(-1.37− 2.54) | .02±1.04(-1.17− 3.07) | -.04±1.07(-1.37− 1.70) | .11±1.03(-.87− 3.07) | -.06±.99(-1.24− 2.56) | .05±.98(-2.14− 2.75) |
| Mother, father, and grandparents | -.36±.73(-1.37− 1.38) | -.07±.88(-1.04− 2.14) | -.02±.57(-1.16− .75) | -.12±.88(-.87− 2.43) | -.05±.71(-1.13− 1.00) | -.26±.80(-1.22− 2.46) |
| Statistical test (effect size) | F = 1.82(η2 = .05) | F = .06(η2 = .00) | F = .07(η2 = .00) | F = 2.01(η2 =.05) | F = 1.45(η2 = .04) | F = .85(η2 =.02) |

\**p* < .05 \*\**p* < .01

The relationship between each of the factors included in the sociodemographic questionnaire and children’s social-emotional development (ASQ-SE Z scores) was analyzed. The results showed that girls performed significantly better than boys in social-communication (t (77) = 2.05; p = .043 d = 0.47), and children that attended preschool demonstrated better affect (t (69) = 2.92; p = .005 d = 0.66).

**S2**. Multiple mediation model for Maternal self-efficacy on children’s adaptive functioning



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Children’s adaptive functioning |
|  | Coeff. | SE | *p* |
| Maternal self-efficacy | -.01 | .11 | .91 |
| Mother’s anxiety | -.01 | .04 | .79 |
| Mother’s depression | .03 | .05 | .62 |
| Maternal stress | 0 | .02 | .91 |
| Intercept  | -.03 | 1.25 | .98 |
|  | R2=.01 |
|  | *F* (4, 74) = .14, *p* =.97 |

The direct effect between maternal self-efficacy and children’s adaptive functioning was nonsignificant (c’= -0.01, p= .91; 95% CI = [-0.23 – 0.20]). As for the indirect effects on children’s adaptive functioning, neither mediated via mother’s anxiety (a1b1= 0.01; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.08– 0.12]), via mother’s depression (a2b2= -0.03; 95% BCa-CI =[-0.12 – 0.06]), nor via maternal stress (a1b1= -0.01; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.17– 0.14] allowed concluding effects significantly different from zero. Finally, the total effect yielded a non-significant result (c = -0.03; 95% CI = [-0.17– 0.11]). This model presented a low predictive capacity and globally cannot be considered useful for predicting children’s adaptive functioning (R2= .01; F (4, 74) = 0.14, p=.97).

**S3**. Multiple mediation model for Maternal self-efficacy on children’s affect



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Children’s affect |
|  | Coeff. | SE | *p* |
| Maternal self-efficacy |  .09 | .11 | .38 |
| Mother’s anxiety | .01 | .04 | .86 |
| Mother’s depression |  .03 | .05 | .52 |
| Maternal stress |  .02 | .02 | .47 |
| Intercept  | -1.30 | 1.22 | .29 |
|  | R2=.02 |
| *F* (4, 74) = .45, *p* =.77 |

The direct effect between maternal self-efficacy and children’s affect was nonsignificant (c’= 0.09, p= .38; 95% CI = [-0.12 – 0.30]). As for the indirect effects on children’s affect, neither mediated via mother’s anxiety (a1b1= -0.01; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.12– 0.08]), via mother’s depression (a2b2= -0.03; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.15 – 0.08]), nor via maternal stress (a1b1= -0.06; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.23– 0.09] allowed concluding effects significantly different from zero. Finally, the total effect yielded a non-significant result (c = -0.002; 95% CI = [-0.14– 0.14]). This model presented a low predictive capacity and globally cannot be considered useful for predicting children’s affect (R2= .02; F (4, 74) = 0.45, p=.77).

**S4**. Multiple mediation model for Maternal self-efficacy on children’s social communication

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Children’s social communication |
|  | Coeff. | SE | *p* |
| Maternal self-efficacy | -.01 | .10 | .94 |
| Mother’s anxiety |  -.07 | .04 | .06 |
| Mother’s depression |  .03 | .05 | .49 |
| Maternal stress |  .04 | .02 | .10 |
| Intercept  | -.46 | 1.20 | .70 |
|  | R2=.10 |
| *F* (4, 74) = 1.95,*p* =.11 |

The direct effect between maternal self-efficacy and children’s social communication was nonsignificant (c’= -0.01, p= .94; 95% CI = [-0.21 – 0.20]). As for the indirect effects on children’s social communication, neither mediated via mother’s anxiety (a1b1= 0.09; 95% BCa-CI = [0.002– 0.18]), via mother’s depression (a2b2= -0.03; 95% BCa-CI =[-0.13 – 0.08]), nor via maternal stress (a1b1= -0.12; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.34– 0.04] allowed concluding effects significantly different from zero. Finally, the total effect yielded a non-significant result (c = -0.08; 95% CI = [-0.22– 0.06]). This model presented a low-medium predictive capacity and globally cannot be considered useful for predicting children’s social communication (R2= .10; F (4, 74) = 1.95, p=.11).

**S5**. Multiple mediation model for Maternal self-efficacy on children’s interaction 

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Children’s interaction |
|  | Coeff. | SE | *p* |
| Maternal self-efficacy | .12 | .11 | .26 |
| Mother’s anxiety | 0 | .04 | .99 |
| Mother’s depression | -.06 | .05 | .26 |
| Maternal stress | .04 | .02 | .07 |
| Intercept | -1.53 | 1.22 | .22 |
|  | R2=.05 |
| *F* (4, 74) = 1.05, *p* =.39 |

The direct effect between maternal self-efficacy and children’s interaction was nonsignificant (c’= 0.12, p= .26; 95% CI = [-0.09 – 0.33]). As for the indirect effects on children’s interaction, neither mediated via mother’s anxiety (a1b1= 0.001; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.10– 0.09]), via mother’s depression (a2b2= 0.06; 95% BCa-CI =[-0.05 – 0.17]), nor via maternal stress (a1b1= -0.14; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.30– 0.01] allowed concluding effects significantly different from zero. Finally, the total effect yielded a non-significant result (c = 0.04; 95% CI = [-0.10– 0.18]). This model presented a low predictive capacity and globally cannot be considered useful for predicting children’s interaction (R2= .05; F (4, 74) = 1.05, p=.39).

**S6**. Multiple mediation model for Maternal self-efficacy on children’s social-emotional development

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Children’s social-emotional development, |
|  | Coeff. | SE | *p* |
| Maternal self-efficacy | 0 | .10 | 1.0 |
| Mother’s anxiety | 0 | .04 | .98 |
| Mother’s depression | 0 | .05 | .95 |
| Maternal stress |  .04 | .02 | .06 |
| Intercept  |  -0.9 | 1.19 | .46 |
|  | R2=.10 |
| *F* (4, 74) = 2.06, *p* =.09 |



The direct effect between maternal self-efficacy and children’s socioemotional development was nonsignificant (c’= -0.001, p=.10; 95% CI = [-0.21 – 0.21]). As for the indirect effects on children’s socioemotional development, neither mediated via mother’s anxiety (a1b1= 0.001; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.12– 0.10]), via mother’s depression (a2b2= 0.003; 95% BCa-CI =[-0.10 – 0.12]), nor via maternal stress (a1b1= -0.14; 95% BCa-CI = [-0.37– 0.05] allowed concluding effects significantly different from zero. Finally, the total effect yielded a significant result (c = -0.14; 95% CI = [-0.28– -0.0024]). This model presented a low-medium predictive capacity and but globally it cannot be considered useful for predicting children’s socioemotional development (R2= .10; F (4, 74) = 2.06, p=.09). Additionally, note that the total effect is contrary to the conjectured one, since a higher mother’s self-efficacy score would be associated with a lower socioemotional development in her child.