

### Supplemental Materials

*Supplemental Figure S1.* Affective visual analog scale completed after the peer evaluation task.

Circle the face which best describes how you feel right now:



1



2



3



4



5

Supplemental Table S1. Results with CAUG as the reference group

	Simple mediation		Moderated mediation	
	$\beta$	$b$ (95% CI)	$\beta$	$b$ (95% CI)
<b>Effect on mediator: PEP age 12</b>				
FCG vs CAUG	-0.10	-.75 (-1.83, .32)	-.10	-.75 (-1.83, .32)
NIG vs CAUG	-.32**	-2.31 (-3.88, -.90)	-.33**	-2.32 (-3.91, -.89)
Sex (male)	.05	.37 (-.80, 1.48)	.05	.37 (-.80, 1.48)
<b>Effect on outcome: peer problems age 16</b>				
PEP age 12	.13*	.02 (.01, .04)	.16*	.02 (.01, .04)
FCG vs CAUG	-.03	-.04 (-.27, .19)	-.03	-.03 (-.25, .20)
NIG vs CAUG	-.19**	-.21 (-.42, -.01)	-.16	-.17 (-.39, .04)
Peer problems age 12	.24**	.22 (.07, .38)	.24**	.21(.07, .38)
Sex (male)	.23**	.25 (.09, .42)	.21*	.23 (.05, .42)
FQ age 12			-.07	-.06 (-.20, .09)
FQ X PEP			-.17*	-.04 (-.09, -.01)

Note.  $N=271$ . NIG= Never-institutionalized group. CAUG= Care as usual group. FCG= Foster care group. PEP= Pre-ejection period. FQ= Friendship quality. \*\* $p \leq .01$ . \* $p \leq .05$ .

*Supplemental Table S2.* Estimates of indirect effects comparing FCG to CAUG with bias-corrected confidence intervals derived from bootstrapping distributions.

	<i>b</i> (95% Confidence Intervals)	
<b>Indirect effects</b>		
FCG vs CAUG	-.015 (-.056, .003)	
<b>Conditional indirect effects</b>	<u>at low FQ (-1 <i>SD</i>)</u>	<u>at high FQ (+1 <i>SD</i>)</u>
FCG vs CAUG	-.034 (-.109, .014)	.000 (-.019, .040)

*Note.* CAUG= Care as usual group. FCG= Foster care group. FQ= Friendship quality.

*Supplemental Table S3.* Estimates of standardized indirect effects using a Bayesian estimator with two-tailed credibility intervals and one-tailed p-values derived from posterior probability distributions.

<b>(A) Indirect effects</b>	$\beta$	95% CI	P			
CAUG vs NIG	.11	(.006, .253)	.019			
FCG vs NIG	.08	(.001, .191)	.022			
FCG vs CAUG	-.04	(-.123, .013)	.084			
<b>(B) Conditional indirect effects:</b>	<u>at low FQ (-1 SD)</u>			<u>at high FQ (+1 SD)</u>		
	$\beta$	95% CI	P	$\beta$	95% CI	P
CAUG vs NIG	.21	(.057, .410)	.002	.05	(-.069, .188)	.202
FCG vs NIG	.14	(.023, .310)	.006	.04	(-.047, .139)	.204
FCG vs CAUG	-.07	(-.205, .023)	.070	-.02	(-.086, .030)	.247

*Note.* CAUG= Care as usual group. FCG= Foster care group. FQ= Friendship quality.