

Table S4. Spearman correlations between all study and control variables

1

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Postures & gazes	-												
2 Turn-taking	.313**	-											
3 Mutual respect for coparenting roles	-.163	.169	-										
4 Conflict resolution	.240*	.516**	.125	-									
5 Affective climate	.367**	.532**	.046	.714**	-								
6 Mentalization	.260*	.502**	.029	.630**	.691**	-							
7 Role reversal	.160	.494**	.451**	.548**	.437**	.513**	-						
8 coparenting support	.171	.542**	.408**	.517**	.442**	.449**	.601**	-					
9 Autonomy promotion	.237*	.614**	.133	.685**	.723**	.747**	.505**	.445**	-				
10 Adolescent autonomy	.270*	.323**	-.120	.463**	.550**	.520**	.275*	.165	.419**	-			
11 Adolescent age	-.049	.053	.007	.062	.038	.086	.217	.005	.014	.250*	-		
12 Adolescent gender	.069	.182	-.030	.290**	.187	.145	.089	.207	.261*	.134	-.058	-	
13 Family situation	.073	-.178	-.131	-.097	-.064	-.044	-.188	-.082	-.089	-.110	.010	.105	-
14 Family socioeconomic status	.258*	.180	-.084	.102	.188	.261*	.243*	.046	.120	.305**	.179	.017	-.028
15 LTP-CDT scenario	.012	.128	-.195	-.072	-.055	.062	-.052	-.045	.075	.060	-.064	.075	-.051
16 M RAS	.019	-.031	.147	.224*	.200	.117	.185	.296**	.069	.142	-.138	.099	.013
17 F RAS	.209	.169	.121	.197	.276*	.323**	.240*	.244*	.287*	.187	-.010	.221	-.158
18 M CIPA cooperation	.174	.190	.173	.237*	.241*	.266*	.232*	.283*	.182	.313**	-.009	-.084	-.022
19 M CIPA conflict	-.106	-.151	-.178	-.294**	-.386**	-.236*	-.199	-.158	-.179	-.290**	-.192	.042	.110
20 M CIPA triangulation	-.149	-.147	-.184	-.189	-.119	-.132	-.261*	-.261*	-.074	-.104	.170	.008	-.040
21 F CIPA cooperation	.033	.209	.263*	.363**	.350**	.317**	.329**	.364**	.305**	.290**	.125	.179	-.169
22 F CIPA conflict	-.167	-.086	-.309**	-.234*	-.299**	-.098	-.198	-.155	-.179	-.275*	-.279*	.012	.180
23 F CIPA triangulation	-.288**	-.217	-.152	-.194	-.335**	-.278**	-.135	-.317**	-.197	-.292**	.030	.038	-.055
24 A perception of typicality	.010	-.036	-.016	.084	-.065	.018	.100	-.055	-.004	-.068	.053	.010	-.051
25 M perception of typicality	-.075	.049	.011	.235*	.181	.147	.118	-.058	.071	.295**	.199	.025	.145
26 F perception of typicality	.168	.234*	-.088	.299**	.364**	.324**	.112	.103	.235*	.470**	.037	.056	-.003

2

Table S4 (continued)

Variables	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
14 Family socioeconomic status	-												
15 LTP-CDT scenario	.042	-											
16 M RAS	-.089	-.138	-										
17 F RAS	.050	-.147	.277*	-									
18 M CIPA cooperation	.127	-.058	.261*	.035	-								
19 M CIPA conflict	-.019	.075	-.235	-.203	-.486**	-							
20 M CIPA triangulation	.051	.128	-.433**	-.213	-.468**	.469**	-						
21 F CIPA cooperation	.041	-.281*	.141	.341**	.308**	-.437**	-.359**	-					
22 F CIPA conflict	-.019	.162	-.103	-.232*	-.090	.577**	.268*	-.475**	-				
23 F CIPA triangulation	.023	.210	-.212	-.355**	-.326**	.469**	.356**	-.307**	.446**	-			
24 A perception of typicality	-.007	.033	.135	-.125	.049	.077	-.061	-.121	-.116	.106	-		
25 M perception of typicality	-.005	-.205	.256*	.299**	.201	-.338**	-.236*	.169	-.204	-.144	.005	-	
26 F perception of typicality	.109	-.165	.190	.252*	.298**	-.336**	-.238*	.273*	-.267*	-.276*	-.005	.443**	-

Notes. N = 78-82. Adolescent gender: 0 = girls and 1 = boys. Family situation: 1 = parents together and 2 = parents not together. LTP-CDT scenario: 1 = mother starts; 2 = father starts M = mothers; F = fathers; A = adolescents; RAS = Relationship Assessment Scale; CIPA = Coparenting Inventory for Parents and Adolescents. * < .05; ** < .01.