**Supplementary Tables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 1  *Sample Sizes, Means, and Standard Deviations for Unused Variables in the Exploratory Study* | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | *n* | | Mean | | *SD* | | Scale |
| Time 1: Single Item SE | | | 1553 | | 3.00 | | 1.29 | | 1 to 5 |
| Time 2: Single Item SE | | | 1320 | | 3.12 | | 1.25 | | 1 to 5 |
| Time 1: SWLS | | | 1553 | | 4.49 | | 1.40 | | 1 to 7 |
| Time 2: SWLS | | | 1321 | | 4.66 | | 1.44 | | 1 to 7 |
| Time 1: RSES | | | 1553 | | 2.78 | | 0.59 | | 1 to 4 |
| Time 2: RSES | | | 1320 | | 2.83 | | 0.59 | | 1 to 4 |
| CBFI-2 Extraversion | | | 551 | | 0.61 | | 0.44 | | -2 to 2 |
| CBFI-2 Agreeableness | | | 551 | | 0.59 | | 0.48 | | -2 to 2 |
| CBFI-2 Conscientiousness | | | 552 | | 0.78 | | 0.50 | | -2 to 2 |
| CBFI-2 Negative Emotionality | | | 551 | | -0.95 | | 0.52 | | -2 to 2 |
| CBFI-2 Open-Mindedness | | | 552 | | 0.54 | | 0.48 | | -2 to 2 |
| Mindset: General Personality | | | 1547 | | 4.02 | | 1.08 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Extraversion | | | 1546 | | 3.85 | | 1.16 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Sociable | | | 1551 | | 4.33 | | 1.00 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Assertive | | | 1549 | | 4.44 | | 0.96 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Energetic | | | 1551 | | 4.14 | | 1.12 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Agreeableness | | | 1549 | | 4.43 | | 0.95 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Compassionate | | | 1552 | | 4.54 | | 1.05 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Respectful | | | 1550 | | 5.09 | | 0.90 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Trusting | | | 1547 | | 4.15 | | 1.15 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Conscientiousness | | | 1551 | | 4.57 | | 0.97 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Organized | | | 1548 | | 4.95 | | 0.90 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Productive | | | 1548 | | 4.97 | | 0.86 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Responsible | | | 1548 | | 4.93 | | 0.88 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Negative Emotionality | | | 1550 | | 4.25 | | 1.11 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Anxious | | | 1550 | | 3.41 | | 1.30 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Depressed | | | 1550 | | 3.29 | | 1.37 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Emotional | | | 1548 | | 3.95 | | 1.13 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Open-Mindedness | | | 1549 | | 4.68 | | 1.04 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Curious | | | 1549 | | 4.22 | | 1.10 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Aesthetic | | | 1549 | | 4.00 | | 1.15 | | 1 to 6 |
| Mindset: Imaginative | | | 1551 | | 3.83 | | 1.19 | | 1 to 6 |
| BCIS: Reflectiveness | | | 1289 | | 2.54 | | 0.46 | | 1 to 4 |
| BCIS: Self Certainty | | | 1289 | | 2.13 | | 0.49 | | 1 to 4 |
| BIPM: Interest | | | 1289 | | 3.30 | | 0.77 | | 1 to 5 |
| BIPM: Insight | | | 1289 | | 2.03 | | 0.83 | | 1 to 5 |
| *Note*. SE = Self-esteem; SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale; RSES = Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale; CBFI-2 = Change Big Five Inventory – 2; BCIS = Beck Cognitive Insight Scale; BPIM = Balanced Index of Psychological Mindedness; The Mindsets for each Big Five had their own items and were not averages of the facets | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary Table 2  *Anticipated and Retrospective Change for General Personality, the Big Five, and Each Big Five Facets for the Exploratory Study* | | | | | | | |
|  | Anticipated Change | | | Retrospective Change | | | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | | Mean | | *SD* | |
| Extraversion | 0.59 | 0.86 | | 0.32 | | 0.91 | |
| Sociability | 0.68 | 0.85 | | 0.39 | | 0.95 | |
| Assertiveness | 0.54 | 0.76 | | 0.33 | | 0.76 | |
| Energetic | 0.39 | 0.93 | | 0.10 | | 0.93 | |
| Agreeableness | 0.48 | 0.73 | | 0.31 | | 0.71 | |
| Compassion | 0.48 | 0.75 | | 0.31 | | 0.72 | |
| Respectfulness | 0.45 | 0.74 | | 0.28 | | 0.64 | |
| Trusting | 0.20 | 0.77 | | -0.01 | | 0.80 | |
| Conscientiousness | 0.72 | 0.84 | | 0.33 | | 0.85 | |
| Organized | 0.61 | 0.85 | | 0.25 | | 0.84 | |
| Productiveness | 0.80 | 0.91 | | 0.24 | | 0.99 | |
| Responsibility | 0.81 | 0.80 | | 0.47 | | 0.78 | |
| Negative Emo | -0.16 | 0.99 | | 0.13 | | 0.99 | |
| Anxiousness | 0.21 | 1.09 | | 0.42 | | 1.04 | |
| Depressiveness | -0.20 | 1.05 | | 0.11 | | 1.10 | |
| Emotional | -0.06 | 0.88 | | 0.18 | | 0.89 | |
| Open-mindedness | 0.88 | 0.76 | | 0.56 | | 0.76 | |
| Curiosity | 0.75 | 0.83 | | 0.42 | | 0.76 | |
| Aesthetic | 0.32 | 0.75 | | 0.23 | | 0.65 | |
| Creative | 0.53 | 0.77 | | 0.27 | | 0.70 | |
| Gen Personality | 0.79 | 0.64 | | 0.75 | | 0.64 | |
| *Note*. Items range from -2 (*Will decrease / decreased*) to +2 (*Will increase / decreased*); Gen personality = general personality; Gen personality item ranged from 0 (*Will stay pretty much the same*), 1 (*Will change a little*), 2 (*Will change a good deal*); Anticipated Change was reported at Time 1 and Retrospective Change was reported at Time 2. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 3  *Personality Change and Stability Mechanism Checklist Frequencies for Each Big Five Traits for the Third and Fourth Cohorts in the Exploratory Study* | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | | | Time 2 | | | | |
|  | E | A | C | N | O | E | A | C | N | O |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 641 (63.97%) | 321 (32.04%) | 435 (43.41%) | 391 (39.02%) | 515 (51.40%) | 492 (58.22%) | 239 (28.28%) | 312 (36.92%) | 354 (41.89%) | 317 (37.51%) |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 91 (9.08%) | 104 (10.38%) | 136 (13.57%) | 333 (33.23%) | 71 (7.09%) | 85 (10.06%) | 69 (8.17%) | 125 (14.79%) | 227 (26.86%) | 47 (5.56%) |
| Essentialism | 133 (13.27%) | 353 (35.23%) | 198 (19.76%) | 134 (13.37%) | 221 (22.06%) | 172 (20.36%) | 388 (45.92%) | 229 (27.10%) | 124 (14.67%) | 340 (40.24%) |
| New Role | 211 (21.06%) | 152 (15.17%) | 251 (25.05%) | 167 (16.67%) | 178 (17.76%) | 143 (16.92%) | 101 (11.95%) | 146 (17.28%) | 123 (14.56%) | 101 (11.95%) |
| Volitional | 287 (28.64%) | 389 (38.82%) | 440 (43.91%) | 272 (27.15%) | 359 (35.83%) | 182 (21.54%) | 224 (26.51%) | 289 (34.20%) | 187 (22.13%) | 211 (24.97%) |
| Maturity | 230 (22.95%) | 220 (21.96%) | 187 (18.66%) | 151 (15.07%) | 237 (23.65%) | 118 (13.96%) | 121 (14.32%) | 109 (12.90%) | 92 (10.89%) | 145 (17.16%) |
| Repeated Enactment | 365 (36.43%) | 197 (19.66%) | 297 (29.64%) | 275 (27.44%) | 295 (29.44%) | 290 (34.32%) | 119 (14.08%) | 207 (24.50%) | 238 (28.17%) | 170 (20.12%) |
| Biology | 68 (6.79%) | 64 (6.39%) | 48 (4.79%) | 274 (27.35%) | 53 (5.29%) | 49 (5.80%) | 30 (3.55%) | 56 (6.63%) | 202 (23.91%) | 26 (3.08%) |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 237 (23.65%) | 204 (20.36%) | 218 (21.76%) | 234 (23.35%) | 185 (18.46%) | 131 (15.50%) | 102 (12.07%) | 136 (16.09%) | 157 (18.58%) | 108 (12.78%) |
| *Note*. E = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; N = Negative Emotionality; O = Open-mindedness; To calculate the proportions, each cell in Time 1 was divided by 1002 (the valid *n* of Cohorts 3 and 4 at Time 1) and each cell in Time 2 was divided by 845 (the valid *n* of Cohorts 3 and 4 at Time 2); this was done because the items were presented in checklist form with either “1” or “NA” values as opposed to “1”, “0”, and “NA”; Summed percentages go over 100% because participants could mark all that apply | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 4  *“Average” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Extraversion at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Extraversion* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 251) | | T2 (*n =* 141) | | T1 (*n =* 219) | | T2 (*n =* 204) | | T1 (*n =* 77) | | T2 (*n =* 93) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.79 | 0.28 | 0.78 | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.92 | 0.11 | 0.95 | 0.11 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.60 | 0.36 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| Volitional | 0.28 | 0.33 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Biology | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| *Note*. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 5  *“Average” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Agreeableness at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Agreeableness* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 210) | | T2 (*n =* 119) | | T1 (*n =* 311) | | T2 (*n =* 290) | | T1 (*n =* 23) | | T2 (*n =* 23) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.66 | 0.33 | 0.72 | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.86 | 0.23 | 0.88 | 0.25 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.28 | 0.31 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 0.29 | 0.65 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| Volitional | 0.32 | 0.34 | 0.23 | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.12 |
| Maturity | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.08 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.13 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 6  *“Average” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Conscientiousness at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Conscientiousness* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 306) | | T2 (*n =* 143) | | T1 (*n =* 189) | | T2 (*n =* 219) | | T1 (*n =* 52) | | T2 (*n =* 70) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.67 | 0.34 | 0.75 | 0.31 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.95 | 0.11 | 0.90 | 0.20 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.75 | 0.30 | 0.58 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Volitional | 0.47 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.09 | 018 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.08 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.12 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.09 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.07 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.15 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 7  *“Average” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Negative Emotionality at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Negative Emotionality* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 160) | | T2 (*n =* 168) | | T1 (*n =* 176) | | T2 (*n =* 147) | | T1 (*n =* 209) | | T2 (*n =* 116) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.91 | 0.17 | 0.94 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.54 | 0.36 | 0.62 | 0.36 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.38 | 0.34 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.64 | 0.32 | 0.53 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| New Role | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Volitional | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.48 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.39 |
| Maturity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Biology | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.18 | 0.07 | 0.20 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.08 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 8  *“Average” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Open-mindedness at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Open-mindedness* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 342) | | T2 (*n =* 183) | | T1 (*n =* 195) | | T2 (*n =* 226) | | T1 (*n =* 7) | | T2 (*n =* 19) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.71 | 0.30 | 0.76 | 0.31 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.34 | 0.83 | 0.21 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.74 | 0.30 | 0.59 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Volitional | 0.32 | 0.34 | 0.24 | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.10 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.11 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.26 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 0.13 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 9  *“Any” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Extraversion at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Extraversion* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 251) | | T2 (*n =* 141) | | T1 (*n =* 219) | | T2 (*n =* 204) | | T1 (*n =* 77) | | T2 (*n =* 93) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.97 | 0.18 | 0.96 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.09 | 0.28 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.70 | 0.46 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 0.29 | 0.45 | 0.16 | 0.37 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.33 | 0.75 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.34 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.15 |
| Volitional | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.23 |
| Maturity | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.32 | 0.47 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| Biology | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.05 | 0.23 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.17 | 0.38 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.18 | 0.39 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.10 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 10  *“Any” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Agreeableness at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Agreeableness* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 210) | | T2 (*n =* 119) | | T1 (*n =* 311) | | T2 (*n =* 290) | | T1 (*n =* 23) | | T2 (*n =* 23) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.93 | 0.25 | 0.91 | 0.29 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.21 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.38 | 0.49 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Essentialism | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.20 | 0.93 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.21 |
| Volitional | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0.13 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 0.34 | 0.17 | 0.39 |
| Maturity | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 0.13 | 0.34 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.17 | 0.39 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.17 | 0.39 | 0.13 | 0.34 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 11  *“Any” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Conscientiousness at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Conscientiousness* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 306) | | T2 (*n =* 143) | | T1 (*n =* 189) | | T2 (*n =* 219) | | T1 (*n =* 52) | | T2 (*n =* 70) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.90 | 0.30 | 0.94 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.28 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.12 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 0.50 | 0.61 | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.17 |
| Essentialism | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.97 | 0.18 | 0.95 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.08 | 0.26 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Volitional | 0.79 | 0.41 | 0.69 | 0.46 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.27 | 0.45 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 0.28 |
| Maturity | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.12 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.40 | 0.04 | 0.20 |
| Biology | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.23 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0.13 | 0.34 | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.34 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 12  *“Any” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Negative Emotionality at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Negative Emotionality* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 160) | | T2 (*n =* 168) | | T1 (*n =* 176) | | T2 (*n =* 147) | | T1 (*n =* 209) | | T2 (*n =* 116) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.99 | 0.08 | 0.99 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.86 | 0.35 | 0.91 | 0.28 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.65 | 0.48 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.16 |
| Essentialism | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.94 | 0.23 | 0.89 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.13 |
| New Role | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Volitional | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.67 | 0.47 | 0.66 | 0.48 |
| Maturity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.09 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.12 | 0.33 |
| Biology | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.35 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 0.31 | 0.12 | 0.33 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 13  *“Any” Final Code Approach Means and Standard Deviations for Open-mindedness at each Time Point Separated by whether the Participant Anticipated or Retrospectively Reported Increasing, Staying the Same, or Decreasing in Open-mindedness* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Increase | | | | Stay | | | | Decrease | | | |
|  | T1 (*n =* 342) | | T2 (*n =* 183) | | T1 (*n =* 195) | | T2 (*n =* 226) | | T1 (*n =* 7) | | T2 (*n =* 19) | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.96 | 0.19 | 0.95 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.86 | 0.38 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.41 | 0.49 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.14 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.32 |
| Essentialism | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.94 | 0.23 | 0.92 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| New Role | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Volitional | 0.62 | 0.49 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.17 | 0.38 | 0.29 | 0.49 | 0.11 | 0.32 |
| Maturity | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.29 | 0.49 | 0.11 | 0.32 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.32 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.11 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.23 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.48 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.26 | 0.45 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 14  *Exploratory Study Cohorts 1 and 2 Extraversion Means and Standard Deviations for Each “Final Coding” Procedure at Each Time Point* | | | | | | | | |
|  | T1 Average | | T1 Any | | T2 Average | | T2 Any | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.50 | 0.45 | 0.61 | 0.49 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.56 | 0.50 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.49 |
| Essentialism | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.48 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.48 |
| New Role | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.21 |
| Volitional | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0.10 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.42 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Biology | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.13 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.26 |
| *Note. n*T1 = 547; *n*T2 = 438; T1 Average = the average final coding approach for Time 1; T1 Any = the any final coding approach for Time 1; T2 Average = the average final coding approach for Time 2; T2 Any = the any final coding approach for Time 2. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 15  *Exploratory Study Cohorts 1 and 2 Agreeableness Means and Standard Deviations for Each “Final Coding” Procedure at Each Time Point* | | | | | | | | |
|  | T1 Average | | T1 Any | | T2 Average | | T2 Any | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.29 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.25 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.47 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.11 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.37 | 0.48 |
| Essentialism | 0.44 | 0.43 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 0.41 | 0.63 | 0.49 |
| New Role | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.16 |
| Volitional | 0.14 | 0.26 | 0.32 | 0.47 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.43 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.28 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.37 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.37 |
| *Note. n*T1 = 544; *n*T2 = 432 | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 16  *Exploratory Study Cohorts 1 and 2 Conscientiousness Means and Standard Deviations for Each “Final Coding” Procedure at Each Time Point* | | | | | | | | |
|  | T1 Average | | T1 Any | | T2 Average | | T2 Any | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.50 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.16 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 0.47 |
| Essentialism | 0.26 | 0.40 | 0.34 | 0.47 | 0.30 | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0.50 |
| New Role | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.17 |
| Volitional | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.53 | 0.50 | 0.17 | 0.27 | 0.38 | 0.49 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.31 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.14 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.32 |
| *Note. n*T1 = 547; *n*T2 = 432 | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 17  *Exploratory Study Cohorts 1 and 2 Negative-emotionality Means and Standard Deviations for Each “Final Coding” Procedure at Each Time Point* | | | | | | | | |
|  | T1 Average | | T1 Any | | T2 Average | | T2 Any | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.65 | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.65 | 0.48 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.43 |
| Essentialism | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.46 | 0.19 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.47 |
| New Role | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| Volitional | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.47 | 0.13 | 0.29 | 0.21 | 0.41 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.21 |
| Biology | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.28 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.31 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.33 |
| *Note. n*T1 = 545; *n*T2 = 431 | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 18  *Exploratory Study Cohorts 1 and 2 Open-mindedness Means and Standard Deviations for Each “Final Coding” Procedure at Each Time Point* | | | | | | | | |
|  | T1 Average | | T1 Any | | T2 Average | | T2 Any | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.46 | 0.41 | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0.37 | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.50 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.17 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.46 |
| Essentialism | 0.27 | 0.40 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| New Role | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.14 |
| Volitional | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.43 | 0.50 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.47 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.13 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.13 | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.47 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.40 |
| Biology | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.26 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.35 |
| *Note. n*T1 = 544; *n*T2 = 428 | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 19  *Exploratory Study Cohorts 3 and 4 Means and Standard Deviations for Each “Final Coding” Procedure at Each Time Point* | | | | | | | | |
|  | T1 Average | | T1 Any | | T2 Average | | T2 Any | |
|  | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* | Mean | *SD* |
| Self-acceptance | 0.06 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.31 |
| No Explanation | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.63 | 0.48 | 0.15 | 0.21 | 0.47 | 0.50 |
| Not Personality | 0.26 | 0.28 | 0.60 | 0.49 | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.58 | 0.49 |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 0.53 | 0.35 | 0.82 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 0.35 | 0.80 | 0.40 |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.34 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| Essentialism | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.53 | 0.50 |
| New Role | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| Volitional | 0.17 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.50 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.48 |
| Maturity | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.22 |
| Repeated Enactment | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.33 | 0.47 |
| Biology | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| Hard to Rate | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.43 |
| *Note. n*T1 = 979; *n*T2 = 858 | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 20  *Fixed Effect Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Environment Facilitates Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.42\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.25\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.19\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.23\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.27\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.16\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.27\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.19\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.23\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.27\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.16\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.03\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.72\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.02 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.07\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.03\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.01 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.03\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -0.75\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.02 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 21  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Environment Hinders Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.15\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.16\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.05\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.08\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.05\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.04\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.12\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.05\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.08\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.05\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.04\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.08\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -0.08\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.02 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.15\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.05\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.02 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.05\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 0.33\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.01 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 22  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Essentialism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.29\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.46\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.17\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.26\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.26\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.15\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.46\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.17\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.26\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.26\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.15\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.01 |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.11\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.04\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.13\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.07\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.04\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.06\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 0.59\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | -0.02 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 23  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average New Role Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.01\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.01 | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.00 | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.00 | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 0.00 |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.02\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 24  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Volitional Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.15\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.11\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.11\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.05\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.05\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.14\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.11\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.05\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.05\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.06\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.23\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.07\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.03 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.01 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.01 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.04\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -0.17\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.03\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 25  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Maturity Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.01\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.01\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.01\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.01\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.01 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -0.01\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.00 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 26  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Repeated Enactment Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.05\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.03\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.01 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.07\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.05\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.01 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.07\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.03\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.05\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.06\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.02\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -0.03\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.05\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 27  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Biology Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.01\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.00 | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.04\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.00 | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.04\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.02\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.00 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.03\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -0.02\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | -0.01\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 28  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Accentuation / Interactionism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.03\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.05\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.02\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.06\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.02\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.02\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 0.06\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.02\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.02\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.02\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 0.01 |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | -0.01 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 29  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Environment Facilitates Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.21\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.79\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 1.15\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.22\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 1.64\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.01\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -0.61\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 1.16\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.23\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 1.65\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.01\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.37\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | 2.88\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.82\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.28\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.97\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.63 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.11 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -7.33\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.50 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 30  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Environment Hinders Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.14\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.95\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.46\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.33\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.51\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.49\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -1.28\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.46\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.34\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.52\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.50\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.63\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -4.06\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.16 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.52\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.64\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.05 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.60\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 3.64\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | -1.39\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 31  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Essentialism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.36\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | 0.60\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -1.05\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.35\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.57\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.94\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | 0.45\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -1.05\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.35\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.58\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.95\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.32\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -5.49\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.17 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.80\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.05 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.24 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.67\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 9.82\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.66 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 32  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any New Role Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -4.56\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -5.09\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.73 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.08\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.81 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.47 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -5.05\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.74\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.08\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.81\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.48\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.14\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -5.67\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.39 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.96\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.23 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.02 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.17 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -2.43\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 1.83\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 33  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Volitional Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.86\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.13\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.87\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.03 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.12 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.50\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -0.93\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.88\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.03 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.13 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.50\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.43\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -0.43\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.59\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.39\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.57\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.13 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.28\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -1.40\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.62\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 34  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Maturity Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -7.40\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -7.27\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.09 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.81 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.98 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -7.04\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.09 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.83 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.00 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.90\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -6.44\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.52 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.58\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.66\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.73 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.67 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -3.59\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.50 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 35  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Repeated Enactment Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.94\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -2.46\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.54\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.26 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.20 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.35\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -2.13\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.56\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.27 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.21 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.40\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.83\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -1.87\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.17 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.05 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.59\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.05\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.65\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -1.77\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | 0.93\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 36  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Biology Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -5.44\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -11.28\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 2.50 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 3.09\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 5.27\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.90 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -11.38\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 2.50 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 3.09\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 5.27\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 1.91 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.17 |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -7.46\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 1.26 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.70 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 3.46\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.75 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.17 |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | -2.64\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | -0.93\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 37  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Accentuation / Interactionism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Trait (Model 2), Time (Model 3), and Predicted Direction of Change (Model 4) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.99\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.41\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.66\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.79\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.81\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.85\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -1.11\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.67\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.80\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.83\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.87\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.67\* |
| Model 4: Intercept + Trait + Time + Predicted Change Direction | Intercept | -1.05\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.59\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.75\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.78\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.76\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.73\* |
| Decrease (0) vs Stay the Same (+1) | 0.13 |
| Decrease (0) vs Increase (+1) | -0.44\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. A (0) vs C (+1) = agreeableness dummy coded to 0 compared to conscientiousness dummy coded to 1; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 38  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Environment Facilitates Change Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.34\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.01\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.53\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.45\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.56\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.71\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -0.85\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.53\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.46\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.57\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.72\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.33\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 39  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Environment Hinders Change Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.10\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -2.65\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.50\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.02 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 1.60\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.48\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -2.57\* | No |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.50\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.02 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 1.60\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.48\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.17 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |
| Supplementary Table 40  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Essentialism Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.25\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.47\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.91\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.38\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.68\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.47\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -0.72\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.92\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.40\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.70\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.48\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.49\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 41  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the New Role Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.10\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -2.40\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.62\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.45\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.19 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.13 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -2.19\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.63\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.45\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.19 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.13 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.47\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |
| Supplementary Table 42  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Volitional Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.01\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.88\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.32\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.47\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.45\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.15 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -0.60\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.33\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.48\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.46\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.15 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.60\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 43  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Maturity Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.02\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.92\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.27\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.46\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.14 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -1.64\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.27\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.01 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.47\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.14 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.63\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |
| Supplementary Table 44  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Repeated Enactment Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.26\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.93\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.70\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.18\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.74\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.55\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -1.77\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.70\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.19\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.75\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.55\* |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.33\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 45  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Biology Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.88\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -3.96\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.10 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.30 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 2.38\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.25 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -3.85\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.10 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.30 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 2.38\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.25 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.23 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |
| Supplementary Table 46  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Accentuation / Interactionism Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) and Time (Model 3) Using Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.92\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -2.10\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.25 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.28\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.39\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.08 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Trait + Time | Intercept | -1.83\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.25 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.28\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.40\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.08 |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.64\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 47  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2) for Global Personality Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | | |
| Model | Dependent Variable | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better Model? |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Environment Facilitates Change | Intercept | 0.52\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Environment Facilitates Change | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.54\*  -0.04\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Environment Hinders Change | Intercept | 0.05\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Environment Hinders Change | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.04\*  0.03\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Essentialism | Intercept | 0.36\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Essentialism | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.36\*  0.00 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for New Role | Intercept | 0.04\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for New Role | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.03\*  0.02\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Volitional | Intercept | 0.14\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Volitional | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.16\*  -0.04\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Maturity | Intercept | 0.02\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Maturity | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.02\*  0.00 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Repeated Enactment | Intercept | 0.08\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Repeated Enactment | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.09\*  -0.01 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Biology | Intercept | 0.03\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Biology | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.03\*  0.00 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Accentuation / Interactionism | Intercept | 0.03\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Accentuation / Interactionism | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.04\*  -0.03\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Self-acceptance | Intercept | 0.04\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Self-acceptance | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.06\*  -0.03\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for No Explanation | Intercept | 0.22\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for No Explanation | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.29\*  -0.13\* | Yes |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Time was coded as T1 (0) vs T2 (+1); Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 48  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Any Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2) for Global Personality Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | | |
| Model | Dependent Variable | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better Model? |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Environment Facilitates Change | Intercept | 2.02\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Environment Facilitates Change | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 2.22\*  -0.34 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Environment Hinders Change | Intercept | -1.91\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Environment Hinders Change | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -2.18\*  0.47\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Essentialism | Intercept | 0.25\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Essentialism | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.37\*  -0.23 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for New Role | Intercept | -2.00\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for New Role | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -2.23\*  0.41\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Volitional | Intercept | -0.47\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Volitional | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.26\*  -0.44\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Maturity | Intercept | -8.09\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Maturity | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -8.30  0.35 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Repeated Enactment | Intercept | -0.76\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Repeated Enactment | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.76\*  0.01 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Biology | Intercept | -7.30\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Biology | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -7.40\*  0.18 | No |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Accentuation / Interactionism | Intercept | -1.96\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Accentuation / Interactionism | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -1.64\*  -0.93\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for Self-acceptance | Intercept | -2.03\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for Self-acceptance | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -1.75\*  -0.75\* | Yes |
| Base: Intercept | Avg Code for No Explanation | Intercept | 0.21\* |  |
| Intercept + Time | Avg Code for No Explanation | Intercept  T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.58\*  -0.72\* | Yes |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Time was coded as T1 (0) vs T2 (+1); Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 49  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Environment Facilitates Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.47\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.49\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.04\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.54\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.04\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.27\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.08\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.04 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.11\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept; G = Global personality; Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test; \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 50  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Environment Hinders Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.11\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.08\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.06\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.02\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.06\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.11\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.06\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 0.20\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.06\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 0.07\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 51  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Essentialism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.32\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.32\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.36\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.10\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.08\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.16\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.16\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.06\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 52  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average New Role Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.03\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.02\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.01\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.04\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.01\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.04\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.03\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.02\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.04\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.03\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 53  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Volitional Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.15\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.17\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.05\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.17\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.05\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.03 |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.08\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.02 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.02 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 0.02 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 54  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Maturity Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.01\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.01\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.02\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.01\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.01\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.01\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.01\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.01\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 55  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Repeated Enactment Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.06\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.07\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.03\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.10\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.03\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.06\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.04\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.05\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.07\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 0.02\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 56  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Biology Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.02\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.02\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.03\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.03\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.03\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.02\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.01 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.03\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 57  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Models Predicting the Average Accentuation / Interactionism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 1) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.03\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.04\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.02\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.04\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.02\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.02\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.00 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 0.00 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 58  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Environment Facilitates Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | 0.98\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 1.16\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.34\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 2.09\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.36\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -2.72\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -1.55\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -1.48\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -1.06\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -1.70\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 59  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Environment Hinders Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.45\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.77\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.58\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -2.26\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.60\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.99\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.53\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 1.33\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.47\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 0.49\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 60  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Essentialism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.05 | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -0.12 | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.14 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.20\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.15 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.32\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.72\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -1.01\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -1.23\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.61\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 61  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any New Role Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -4.00\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -4.17\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.26 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -2.29\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.23 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -2.62\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -1.90\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -1.56\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -3.42\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -2.16\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 62  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Volitional Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.70\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -0.50\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.43\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -0.29\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.44\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.62\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.25 |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.65\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.75\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.12 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 63  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Maturity Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -8.55\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -8.39\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.40 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -7.38\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.40 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -1.26 |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -1.16 |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -2.10\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -2.28\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -1.26 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 64  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Repeated Enactment Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.45\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.24\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.46\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -0.59\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.47\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -1.62\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -1.07\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -1.35\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -1.82\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.27 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 65  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Biology Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -7.51\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -7.59\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.14 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -6.98\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.17 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -5.39\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -2.87\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -2.27\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.03 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -3.47\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 66  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Accentuation / Interactionism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative Data from Cohorts 1 & 2 and Qualitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.00\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.69\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.74\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -1.72\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.75\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.64\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.03 |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.16 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.19 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.23 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 67  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Environment Facilitates Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.06 | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | 0.09 | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.29\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 1.83\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.34\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -2.69\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -2.16\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -1.25\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -2.11\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -1.97\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 68  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Environment Hinders Change Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.97\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.95\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.04 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -1.80\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.04 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.70\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.20 |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.68\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.85\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -1.17\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 69  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Essentialism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.95\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.09\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.28\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | 0.09 | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | 0.33\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.73\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -1.64\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -2.09\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -2.43\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -1.19\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 70  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any New Role Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.99\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.85\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.30\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -1.84\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.31\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.31\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.31\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 0.13 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.14 |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.17 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 71  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Volitional Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.89\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -0.63\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.54\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -0.24\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.56\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.34\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.02 |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.82\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.77\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.48\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 72  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Maturity Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.14\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.91\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.50\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -3.30\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.52\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 1.67\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 1.38\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 1.62\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 1.19\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 1.79\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 73  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Repeated Enactment Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.14\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.02\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.24\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -0.71\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.25\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -1.03\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.35\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 0.10 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | -0.31\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.50\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 74  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Biology Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.82\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -2.74\* | No |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.17 |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -3.10\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.19 |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | -0.61\* |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | -0.44\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | -0.29 |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 1.73\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | -0.75\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 75  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Any Accentuation / Interactionism Code (Final Qualitative Coding Approach 2) from Time (Model 2), and Personality Conceptualization (Model 3) Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data from Cohorts 3 & 4* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.86\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Time | Intercept | -1.58\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.64\* |
| Model 3: Intercept + Time + Personality Conceptualization | Intercept | -1.88\* | Yes |
| T1 (0) vs T2 (+1) | -0.65\* |
| G (0) vs A (+1) | 0.20 |
| G (0) vs C (+1) | 0.41\* |
| G (0) vs E (+1) | 0.44\* |
| G (0) vs N (+1) | 0.56\* |
| G (0) vs O (+1) | 0.10 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 76  *Measurement Invariance for Times 1 and 2 Calculated Separately for Each Trait in the Exploratory Study* | | | | | | |
| Trait | Model | χ2 (df) | RMSEA | CFI | TLI | SRMR |
| Extraversion | Configural | 18.03 (5) | .040 | .998 | .993 | .010 |
| Metric | 19.91 (7) | .034 | .998 | .995 | .012 |
| Scalar | 31.81 (9) | .040 | .996 | .993 | .013 |
| Strict | 37.28 (12) | .036 | .995 | .994 | .018 |
| Agreeableness | Configural | 7.03 (5) | .016 | .999 | .998 | .008 |
| Metric | 9.11 (7) | .014 | .999 | .999 | .015 |
| Scalar | 19.76 (9) | .027 | .997 | .995 | .021 |
| Strict | 22.95 (12) | .024 | .997 | .996 | .032 |
| Conscientiousness | Configural | 7.16 (5) | .016 | 1.00 | .999 | .007 |
| Metric | 8.08 (7) | .010 | 1.00 | 1.00 | .009 |
| Scalar | 12.75 (9) | .016 | .999 | .999 | .008 |
| Strict | 17.72 (12) | .017 | .999 | .999 | .018 |
| Negative Emotionality | Configural | 6.75 (5) | .015 | 1.00 | .999 | .009 |
| Metric | 10.34 (7) | .017 | .999 | .999 | .015 |
| Scalar | 18.09 (9) | .025 | .998 | .997 | .018 |
| Strict | 25.04 (12) | .026 | .998 | .997 | .027 |
| Open-Mindedness | Configural | 11.76 (5) | .029 | .999 | .996 | .011 |
| Metric | 19.91 (7) | .034 | .997 | .994 | .019 |
| Scalar | 26.24 (9) | .034 | .996 | .994 | .017 |
| Strict | 27.95 (12) | .039 | .997 | .996 | .019 |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 77  *Latent Change Score Models for Extraversion Measured at Two Time Points Using Three Facet Indicators. Each Cell is the Correlation between the Mechanism Variable and the Latent Change Score in Extraversion* | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | Time 2 | | |
|  | Quant | Avg | Any | Quant | Avg | Any |
| Environment Facilitates Change | .01 | -.03 | -.03 | .04\* | -.03 | -.02 |
| Environment Hinders Change | -.01 | .02 | .01 | -.02\* | .01 | -.01 |
| Essentialism | .00 | -.02 | -.01 | .00 | -.01 | -.02 |
| New Role | .01 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .00 |
| Volitional | .01 | -.01 | -.02 | .01 | .01 | .01 |
| Maturity | -.01 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .00 |
| Repeated Enactment | .02 | .00 | .00 | .02 | .01 | .02 |
| Biology | -.01 | .00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .00 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .00 | -.01 |
| *Note*. \* = *p* < .01; correlations in the range of -.004 to +.004 are reported as .00; Each of these extended models was identical to the strict invariance model but with a covariate added and “auto.var” (i.e., error variances free to vary) set to TRUE to help with convergence; Some models had a variance / covariance matrix that was not positive definite. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 78  *Latent Change Score Models for Extraversion Measured at Two Time Points Using Three Facet Indicators. Each Cell is the Correlation between the Mechanism Variable and the Latent Change Score in Agreeableness* | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | Time 2 | | |
|  | Quant | Avg | Any | Quant | Avg | Any |
| Environment Facilitates Change | .01 | -.03 | -.03 | .00 | -.02 | -.02 |
| Environment Hinders Change | -.01 | .00 | .01 | -.01 | -.01 | -.02 |
| Essentialism | .00 | .03 | .02 | .00 | .02 | .01 |
| New Role | .00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .00 | .01 |
| Volitional | .03 | .01 | .01 | .03 | .01 | .01 |
| Maturity | .01 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 |
| Repeated Enactment | -.01 | .00 | -.01 | .01 | .00 | .01 |
| Biology | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | NA | NA |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | -.01 | .00 | -.01 | .01 | .00 | .02 |
| *Note*. Correlations in the range of -.004 to +.004 are reported as .00; Each of these extended models was identical to the strict invariance model but with a covariate added and “auto.var” set to TRUE (i.e., error variances free to vary) to help with convergence; Some models had a variance / covariance matrix that was not positive definite; NA = these codes had zero variance so the models were not run. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 79  *Latent Change Score Models for Extraversion Measured at Two Time Points Using Three Facet Indicators. Each Cell is the Correlation between the Mechanism Variable and the Latent Change Score in Conscientiousness* | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | Time 2 | | |
|  | Quant | Avg | Any | Quant | Avg | Any |
| Environment Facilitates Change | .03 | -.04 | -.03 | .04\* | -.04 | -.03 |
| Environment Hinders Change | -.01 | .01 | .01 | -.04\* | -.01 | -.02 |
| Essentialism | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .02 | .00 | -.01 |
| New Role | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .01 |
| Volitional | .02 | .01 | .01 | .05\* | .01 | .02 |
| Maturity | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Repeated Enactment | .00 | .00 | -.02 | .02 | .00 | .01 |
| Biology | -.01 | .00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .00 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | .00 | .00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .00 |
| *Note*. \* = *p* < .01; correlations in the range of -.004 to +.004 are reported as .00; Each of these extended models was identical to the strict invariance model but with a covariate added and “auto.var” set to TRUE (i.e., error variances free to vary) to help with convergence; Some models had a variance / covariance matrix that was not positive definite. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 80  *Latent Change Score Models for Extraversion Measured at Two Time Points Using Three Facet Indicators. Each Cell is the Correlation between the Mechanism Variable and the Latent Change Score in Negative Emotionality* | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | Time 2 | | |
|  | Quant | Avg | Any | Quant | Avg | Any |
| Environment Facilitates Change | -.02 | .02 | .00 | .01 | .05\* | .03 |
| Environment Hinders Change | .02 | -.01 | -.02 | .03 | -.01 | -.01 |
| Essentialism | .01 | .02 | .01 | -.02 | .00 | .00 |
| New Role | .00 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .00 |
| Volitional | .00 | -.01 | -.01 | -.03\* | -.02 | -.05\* |
| Maturity | .01 | .00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .00 |
| Repeated Enactment | -.01 | .00 | .00 | .00 | -.003\* | -.02 |
| Biology | .02 | .00 | .01 | .05\* | .00 | -.01 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | .01 | .00 | .00 | .03 | .00 | .00 |
| *Note*. \* = *p* < .01; correlations in the range of -.004 to +.004 are reported as .00; Each of these extended models was identical to the strict invariance model but with a covariate added and “auto.var” set to (i.e., error variances free to vary) TRUE to help with convergence; Some models had a variance / covariance matrix that was not positive definite. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 81  *Latent Change Score Models for Extraversion Measured at Two Time Points Using Three Facet Indicators. Each Cell is the Correlation between the Mechanism Variable and the Latent Change Score in Open-mindedness* | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | Time 2 | | |
|  | Quant | Avg | Any | Quant | Avg | Any |
| Environment Facilitates Change | .02 | .01 | .04 | .02 | .01 | .02 |
| Environment Hinders Change | .00 | -.01 | -.01 | .00 | -.03\* | -.04 |
| Essentialism | -.02 | -.01 | -.02 | -.03 | .00 | -.01 |
| New Role | .00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Volitional | .03 | .04 | .06 | .02 | .02 | .04 |
| Maturity | -.01 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | -.01 |
| Repeated Enactment | .01 | .01 | .02 | .02 | .01 | .02 |
| Biology | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | .01 | .01 | .03 | .01 | .00 | .01 |
| *Note*. \* = *p* < .01; correlations in the range of -.004 to +.004 are reported as .00; Each of these extended models was identical to the strict invariance model but with a covariate for added and “auto.var” set to (i.e., error variances free to vary) TRUE to help with convergence. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 82  *Sample Sizes, Means, and Standard Deviations for Unused Variables in the Follow-up Study* | | | | | | |
|  | T1  (*n*s 507 to 513) | | T2  (*n*s 428 to 431) | | T3  (*n*s 342 to 345) | |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Single Item Self-esteem | 3.02 | 1.20 | 3.08 | 1.17 | 3.18 | 1.17 |
| Satisfaction with Life Scale | 4.58 | 1.33 | 4.74 | 1.23 | 4.89 | 1.27 |
| Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale | 2.80 | 0.57 | 2.80 | 0.54 | 2.83 | 0.54 |
| Mindset: General | 3.96 | 1.07 | 3.84 | 1.03 | 3.80 | 1.06 |
| Mindset: Extraversion | 3.84 | 1.23 | 3.73 | 1.17 | 3.77 | 1.21 |
| Mindset: Sociability | 4.38 | 1.04 | 4.25 | 1.02 | 4.37 | 0.99 |
| Mindset: Assertiveness | 4.46 | 1.02 | 4.34 | 1.02 | 4.32 | 1.02 |
| Mindset: Energy Level | 4.05 | 1.15 | 4.06 | 1.09 | 4.04 | 1.10 |
| Mindset: Agreeableness | 4.44 | 1.05 | 4.33 | 0.97 | 4.40 | 0.97 |
| Mindset: Compassionate | 4.55 | 1.08 | 4.42 | 1.06 | 4.39 | 1.07 |
| Mindset: Respectfulness | 5.17 | 0.91 | 5.02 | 0.94 | 5.05 | 0.88 |
| Mindset: Trust | 4.20 | 1.12 | 4.10 | 1.05 | 4.04 | 1.07 |
| Mindset: Conscientiousness | 4.47 | 0.97 | 4.25 | 1.01 | 4.40 | 1.01 |
| Mindset: Organization | 4.92 | 0.97 | 4.77 | 0.97 | 4.86 | 0.94 |
| Mindset: Productiveness | 5.04 | 0.87 | 4.90 | 0.86 | 4.89 | 0.85 |
| Mindset: Responsibility | 4.90 | 0.88 | 4.83 | 0.92 | 4.84 | 0.94 |
| Mindset: Negative Emotionality | 4.28 | 1.15 | 4.38 | 0.96 | 4.33 | 1.09 |
| Mindset: Anxiety | 3.36 | 1.32 | 3.32 | 1.22 | 3.32 | 1.20 |
| Mindset: Depression | 3.41 | 1.36 | 3.28 | 1.29 | 3.32 | 1.29 |
| Mindset: Emotional Volatility | 4.03 | 1.15 | 3.93 | 1.06 | 3.93 | 1.12 |
| Mindset: Open-mindedness | 4.69 | 1.04 | 4.55 | 1.00 | 4.57 | 1.08 |
| Mindset: Intellectual Curiosity | 4.21 | 1.16 | 4.05 | 1.14 | 4.12 | 1.16 |
| Mindset: Aesthetic Sensitivity | 4.04 | 1.15 | 3.94 | 1.12 | 3.91 | 1.11 |
| Mindset: Creative Imagination | 3.76 | 1.22 | 3.69 | 1.14 | 3.58 | 1.19 |
| BCIS: Self-reflectiveness | 2.51 | 0.44 | 2.55 | 0.44 | 2.50 | 0.46 |
| BCIS: Self-certainty | 2.14 | 0.48 | 2.16 | 0.48 | 2.12 | 0.48 |
| BIPM: Interest | 3.24 | 0.75 | 3.31 | 0.76 | 3.38 | 0.79 |
| BIPM: Insight | 1.91 | 0.74 | 1.97 | 0.80 | 1.90 | 0.77 |
| *Note*. BCIS = Beck Cognitive Insight Scale; BPIM = Balanced Index of Psychological Mindedness; The Mindsets for each Big Five had their own items and were not averages of the facets | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 83  *Anticipated and Retrospective Change for General Personality, the Big Five, and Each Big Five Facet for the Follow-up Study* | | | | |
|  | Anticipated Change | | Retrospective Change | |
|  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Extraversion | 0.55 | 0.79 | 0.35 | 0.82 |
| Sociability | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.47 | 0.81 |
| Assertiveness | 0.45 | 0.75 | 0.27 | 0.64 |
| Energetic | 0.41 | 0.90 | 0.09 | 0.82 |
| Agreeableness | 0.41 | 0.70 | 0.25 | 0.60 |
| Compassion | 0.43 | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.64 |
| Respectfulness | 0.41 | 0.71 | 0.24 | 0.60 |
| Trusting | 0.16 | 0.73 | 0.04 | 0.70 |
| Conscientiousness | 0.60 | 0.84 | 0.31 | 0.80 |
| Organized | 0.54 | 0.83 | 0.21 | 0.81 |
| Productiveness | 0.76 | 0.91 | 0.29 | 0.99 |
| Responsibility | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.46 | 0.74 |
| Negative Emo | -0.18 | 0.93 | 0.01 | 0.84 |
| Anxiousness | 0.22 | 1.05 | 0.30 | 0.98 |
| Depressiveness | -0.30 | 1.01 | -0.03 | 0.97 |
| Emotional | -0.09 | 0.83 | -0.01 | 0.79 |
| Open-mindedness | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.47 | 0.73 |
| Curiosity | 0.56 | 0.81 | 0.37 | 0.69 |
| Aesthetic | 0.26 | 0.77 | 0.21 | 0.56 |
| Creative | 0.44 | 0.75 | 0.24 | 0.60 |
| Gen Personality | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.62 | 0.62 |
| *Note*. Items range from -2 (Will decrease / decreased) to +2 (Will increase / decreased); Gen personality = general personality; Gen personality item ranged from 0 (Will stay pretty much the same), 1 (Will change a little), 2 (Will change a good deal); Time 1 *n*s range from 509 to 513; Time 2 *n*s range from 344 to 345. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 84  *Personality Change and Stability Mechanism Checklist Frequencies for Each Big Five Traits for Times 1 and 3 in the Follow-up Study* | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Time 1 | | | | | Time 3 | | | | |
|  | E | A | C | N | O | E | A | C | N | O |
| Environment Facilitates Change | 344  (67.06%) | 186  (36.26%) | 232  (45.22%) | 195  (38.01%) | 244  (47.56%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environment  Hinders Change | 68  (13.26%) | 60  (11.70%) | 95  (18.52%) | 191  (37.23%) | 54  (10.53%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Essentialism | 76  (14.81%) | 185  (36.06%) | 113  (22.03%) | 68  (13.26%) | 139  (27.10%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Role | 161  (31.38%) | 85  (16.57%) | 112  (21.83%) | 80  (15.59%) | 93  (18.13%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volitional | 207  (40.35%) | 236  (46.00%) | 294  (57.31%) | 172  (33.53%) | 218  (42.50%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maturity | 147  (28.65%) | 142  (27.68%) | 101  (19.69%) | 79  (15.40%) | 136  (26.51%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Repeated Enactment | 243  (47.37%) | 141  (27.49%) | 174  (33.92%) | 157  (30.60%) | 168  (32.75%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biology | 50  (9.75%) | 37  (7.21%) | 36  (7.02%) | 147  (28.65%) | 27  (5.26%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accentuation / Interactionism | 161  (31.38%) | 135  (26.32%) | 124  (24.17%) | 131  (25.54%) | 110  (21.44%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Note*. To calculate the proportions, each cell in Time 1 was divided by 513 (the valid n at Time 1); this was done because the items were presented in checklist form with either “1” or “NA” values as opposed to “1”, “0”, and “NA”; Summed percentages go over 100% because participants could mark all that apply; Due to a programming error, data for Time 3 are missing. | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 85  *Frequencies and Sample Proportions for the Response Options for Each Recall (What Each Participant Remembered Entering for Anticipated Change at Time 1) and Anticipated Change Item in the Follow-up Study* | | | | | | |
|  | Will Decrease | Will Decrease Slightly | Will Stay the Same | Will Increase Slightly | Will Increase | I don’t recall being asked about this |
| R\_Extraversion | 2 (0.6%) | 11 (3.2%) | 135 (39.1%) | 160 (46.4%) | 30 (8.7%) | 7 (2.0%) |
| A\_Extraversion | 1 (0.2%) | 37 (7.2%) | 210 (41.0%) | 208 (40.6%) | 56 (10.9%) | - |
| R\_Agreeableness | 3 (0.9%) | 8 (2.3%) | 199 (57.7%) | 98 (28.4%) | 29 (8.4%) | 8 (2.3%) |
| A\_Agreeableness | 2 (0.4%) | 16 (3.1%) | 306 (59.8%) | 148 (28.9%) | 40 (7.8%) | - |
| R\_Conscientiousness | 2 (0.6%) | 21 (6.1%) | 151 (43.9%) | 116 (33.7%) | 44 (12.8%) | 10 (2.9%) |
| A\_Conscientiousness | 2 (0.4%) | 34 (6.6%) | 209 (40.7%) | 188 (36.6%) | 80 (15.6%) | - |
| R\_Negative Emotionality | 21 (6.1%) | 116 (33.6%) | 136 (39.4%) | 53 (15.4%) | 8 (2.3%) | 11 (3.2%) |
| A\_Negative Emotionality | 34 (6.6%) | 159 (31.1%) | 199 (38.9%) | 106 (20.7%) | 14 (2.7%) | - |
| R\_Open-mindedness | 1 (0.3%) | 5 (1.5%) | 151 (43.9%) | 135 (39.2%) | 45 (13.1%) | 7 (2.0%) |
| A\_Open-mindedness | 1 (0.2%) | 9 (1.8%) | 195 (38.0%) | 234 (45.6%) | 74 (14.4%) | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R\_Psychopathy | 29 (8.4%) | 47 (13.6%) | 144 (41.7%) | 10 (2.9%) | 8 (2.3%) | 107 (31.0%) |
| R\_Narcissism | 26 (7.5%) | 50 (14.5%) | 150 (43.5%) | 12 (3.5%) | 7 (2.0%) | 100 (29.0%) |
| R\_Machiavellianism | 34 (9.9%) | 49 (14.2%) | 126 (36.5%) | 4 (1.2%) | 3 (0.9%) | 129 (37.4%) |
| R\_Self-esteem | 1 (0.3%) | 22 (6.4%) | 140 (40.6%) | 133 (38.6%) | 42 (12.2%) | 7 (2.0%) |
| R\_Well-being | 1 (0.3%) | 19 (5.5%) | 120 (34.8%) | 133 (38.6%) | 55 (15.9%) | 17 (4.9%) |
| *Note*. R = recalled items; A = anticipated change items | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 86  *Recall “Accuracy” for Anticipated Change in Each of the Big Five and Whether Recall Confidence Moderated the Association* | | |
|  | Correlation | Moderation by Recall Confidence |
| Ant\_E and Recall\_E | .26 | No |
| Ant\_A and Recall\_A | .38 | No |
| Ant\_C and Recall\_C | .25 | No |
| Ant\_N and Recall\_N | .35 | No |
| Ant\_O and Recall\_O | .29 | No |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 87  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Environment Facilitates Change Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.14\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.66\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.44\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.50\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.09 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.55\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 88  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Environment Hinders Change Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.74\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -2.43\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.62\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.16 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 1.78\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.13 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 89  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Essentialism Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.45\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.71\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.84\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -1.40\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -1.55\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.51\* |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 90  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the New Role Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.82\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -2.23\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.44 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.11\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.09 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.14 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 91  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Volitional Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.30\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -0.20 | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.57\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | -0.29 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.65\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.18 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 92  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Maturity Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.48\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.23\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.55\* |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.06 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.91\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.07 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 93  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Repeated Enactment Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -0.78\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.19\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | 0.37 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 1.07\* |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 0.18 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | 0.30 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 94  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Biology Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -2.63\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -3.63\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.04 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.41 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | 2.20\* |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.41 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 95  *Fixed Effects Results of Stepwise Multilevel Logistic Models Predicting the Checklist Endorsements of the Accentuation / Interactionism Mechanism from Trait (Model 2) Using Checklist Data from the Follow-up Study* | | | |
| Model | Independent Variable | Fixed Effect Coefficient | Better model? |
| Base: Intercept | Intercept | -1.40\* | - |
| Model 2: Intercept + Trait | Intercept | -1.37\* | Yes |
| A (0) vs C (+1) | -0.15 |
| A (0) vs E (+1) | 0.33 |
| A (0) vs N (+1) | -0.05 |
| A (0) vs O (+1) | -0.35 |
| *Note*. All models included a random effect for the Intercept. Better model = Does the model fit better than the preceding model according to a Chi-square difference test. \* = significant at *p* < .01 | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplementary Table 96  *Measurement Invariance for Times 1 and 3 Calculated Separately for Each Trait in the Follow-up Study* | | | | | | |
| Trait | Model | χ2 (df) | RMSEA | CFI | TLI | SRMR |
| Extraversion | Configural | 3.95 (5) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | .009 |
| Metric | 6.23 (7) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | .019 |
| Scalar | 7.89 (9) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | .021 |
| Strict | 10.13 (12) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | .030 |
| Agreeableness | Configural | 2.91 (5) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .012 |
| Metric | 3.62 (7) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .014 |
| Scalar | 12.35 (9) | .027 | .997 | .995 | .024 |
| Strict | 14.59 (12) | .020 | .997 | .997 | .040 |
| Conscientiousness | Configural | 0.93 (5) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .005 |
| Metric | 1.30 (7) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .009 |
| Scalar | 1.50 (9) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .010 |
| Strict | 2.10 (12) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .016 |
| Negative Emotionality | Configural | 12.18 (5) | .052 | .995 | .986 | .015 |
| Metric | 12.57 (7) | .039 | .996 | .992 | .016 |
| Scalar | 23.66 (9) | .055 | .991 | .984 | .021 |
| Strict | 32.93 (12) | .057 | .987 | .983 | .041 |
| Open-Mindedness | Configural | 2.67 (5) | .000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | .008 |
| Metric | 7.88 (7) | 015 | .999 | .999 | .029 |
| Scalar | 17.99 (9) | .043 | .993 | .989 | .026 |
| Strict | 20.87 (12) | .037 | .993 | .992 | .027 |
|  | | | | | | |