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Inventory of Psychosocial Development (Constantinople, 1969)

The Inventory of Psychosocial Development includes ten items for each of Erikson's eight psychosocial stages. This includes five items assessing the positive pole of each stage (i.e., Trust, Autonomy, Initiative, Industry, Identity, Intimacy, Generativity, Ego Integrity) and five items assessing the negative pole of each construct (i.e., Mistrust, Shame and Doubt, Guilt, Inferiority, Diffusion, Isolation, Stagnation, Despair).

The original version of the scale, developed by Constantinople (1969), assessed the first six stages only. Subsequently, Whitbourne and Waterman (1979) items to assess the remaining two stages, Generativity and Ego Integrity.

Participants respond to the items below using the following scale:

7 = definitely most characteristic of you

6 = very characteristic of you

5 = somewhat characteristic of you

4 = neither characteristic nor *un* characteristic of you

3 = somewhat *un* characteristic of you

2 = very *un* characteristic of you

1 = definitely most *un* characteristic of you

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item: |  | Subscale: |
| IPD1 | Placid and untroubled | Trust |
| IPD2 | An automatic response to all situations | Shame and doubt |
| IPD3 | Adventuresome | Initiative |
| IPD4 | Can’t fulfill my ambitions | Inferiority |
| IPD5 | Confidence is brimming over | Identity |
| IPD6 | Little regard for the rest of the world | Isolation |
| IPD7 | Incapable of absorbing frustration and everything frustrates me | Mistrust |
| IPD8 | Value independence above security | Autonomy |
| IPD9 | Sexually blunted | Guilt |
| IPD10 | Conscientious and hardworking | Industry |
| IPD11 | A poseur, all façade and pretense | Diffusion |
| IPD12 | Candid, not afraid to expose myself | Intimacy |
| IPD13 | Accessible to new ideas | Trust |
| IPD14 | Meticulous and over-organized | Shame and doubt |
| IPD15 | Dynamic | Initiative |
| IPD16 | Don’t apply myself fully | Inferiority |
| IPD17 | Natural and genuine | Identity |
| IPD18 | Preoccupied with myself | Isolation |
| IPD19 | Can’t share anything | Mistrust |
| IPD20 | Free and spontaneous | Autonomy |
| IPD21 | Afraid of impotence | Guilt |
| IPD22 | Interested in learning and like to study | Industry |
| IPD23 | Spread myself thin | Diffusion |
| IPD24 | Warm and friendly | Intimacy |
| IPD25 | Imperturbable optimist | Trust |
| IPD26 | Cautious, hesitant, doubting | Shame and doubt |
| IPD27 | Ambitious | Initiative |
| IPD28 | Fritter away my time | Inferiority |
| IPD29 | Poised | Identity |
| IPD30 | Very lonely | Isolation |
| IPD31 | Pessimistic, little hope | Mistrust |
| IPD32 | Stand on own my own two feet | Autonomy |
| IPD33 | Think too much about the wrong things | Guilt |
| IPD34 | Serious, have high standards | Industry |
| IPD35 | Attempt to appear at ease | Diffusion |
| IPD36 | Have sympathetic concern for others | Intimacy |
| IPD37 | Able to take things as they come | Trust |
| IPD38 | Feel as if i were being followed | Shame and doubt |
| IPD39 | Inventive, delight in finding new solutions to new problems | Initiative |
| IPD40 | Ineffective, don’t amount to much | Inferiority |
| IPD41 | Know who I am and what I want out of life | Identity |
| IPD42 | Cold and remote | Isolation |
| IPD43 | Dim nostalgia for lost paradise | Mistrust |
| IPD44 | Quietly go my own way | Autonomy |
| IPD45 | Big smoke but no fire | Guilt |
| IPD46 | Accomplish much, truly productive | Industry |
| IPD47 | Never know how I feel | Diffusion |
| IPD48 | Tactful in personal relations | Intimacy |
| IPD49 | Deep, unshakable faith in myself | Trust |
| IPD50 | Always in the wrong, apologetic | Shame and doubt |
| IPD51 | Sexually aware | Initiative |
| IPD52 | A playboy, always “hacking around” | Inferiority |
| IPD53 | Pride in my own character and values | Identity |
| IPD54 | Secretly oblivious to the opinions of others | Isolation |
| IPD55 | Never get what I really want | Mistrust |
| IPD56 | Good judge of when to comply and when to assert myself | Autonomy |
| IPD57 | Inhibited and self-restricted | Guilt |
| IPD58 | Excel in my work | Industry |
| IPD59 | Afraid of commitment | Diffusion |
| IPD60 | Comfortable in intimate relationships | Intimacy |
| IPD61 | Want to be remembered | Generativity |
| IPD62 | Think about my failures | Despair |
| IPD63 | Concerned about my health | Stagnation |
| IPD64 | Reached my goals | Ego integrity |
| IPD65 | Like to care for others | Generativity |
| IPD66 | Afraid of getting old | Despair |
| IPD67 | Enjoy spending time by myself | Stagnation |
| IPD68 | Proud of what I’ve done | Ego integrity |
| IPD69 | Feel productive in my work | Generativity |
| IPD70 | Regret the mistakes I’ve made | Despair |
| IPD71 | Bored by work | Stagnation |
| IPD72 | Satisfied with my life so far | Ego integrity |
| IPD73 | Creative | Generativity |
| IPD74 | Don’t have enough time to do what I want to | Despair |
| IPD75 | Have little interest in family affairs | Stagnation |
| IPD76 | Take responsibility for my actions | Ego integrity |
| IPD77 | Enjoy making plans for the future | Generativity |
| IPD78 | Wish I could change myself | Despair |
| IPD79 | More concerned about myself than about others | Stagnation |
| IPD80 | Wouldn’t change my life if I lived it over | Ego integrity |

Supplemental Figure S1. *Matrix Interpretation of Erikson's Model*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Outcome | | | | | | | |
| Predictor |  | Trust | Autonomy | Initiative | Industry | Identity | Intimacy | Generativity | Integrity |
| Trust |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Autonomy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identity |  |  |  |  |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Intimacy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generativity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Integrity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Note.* Supplemental Figure 1 depicts the 56 possible pathways linking eight psychosocial constructs represented within the matrix interpretation of Erikson's model. Assuming that each construct can only inform the constructs in subsequent stages (e.g., autonomy does not precede trust) reduces the number of possible paths to 28, depicted by the gray cells. The dark gray cells depict the links from one stage to the subsequent stage. The cells with an asterisk represent the links addressed by the primary research questions and hypotheses of the present study.

Supplemental Table S1. *Correlations between Psychosocial Constructs and Completion at Each Wave*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Completed T2 | Completed T3 | Completed T4 | Completed T5 |
| T1 Identity | .02 | .05 | .00 | .03 |
| T1 Intimacy | .03 | .06\* | .01 | -.02 |
| T2 Intimacy | - | .09 | .02 | -.03 |
| T3 Intimacy | -.07 | - | -.04 | -.13\* |
| T4 Intimacy | -.02 | .03 | - | -.09 |
| T5 Intimacy | .02 | .01 | .10 | - |
| T1 Generativity | .05 | .05 | .06 | - |
| T2 Generativity | - | .08 | .09 | .03 |
| T3 Generativity | .05 | - | .10 | .03 |
| T4 Generativity | .03 | .11 | - | .02 |
| T5 Generativity | .03 | .06 | .11 | - |
| T1 Integrity | -.05 | .05 | .13\*\*\* | - |
| T2 Integrity | - | .13\*\* | .13\*\* | .17\*\*\* |
| T3 Integrity | -.01 | - | .04 | .01 |
| T4 Integrity | -.02 | .04 | - | -.02 |
| T5 Integrity | .06 | .10 | -.01 | - |

*Note*. \*\*\**p* < .001; \*\**p* < .01; \**p* < .05. No correlation could be calculated for the association between T1 Generativity and Completed T5, or between T1 Integrity and Completed T5, because participants in Cohort 1 did not receive the Generativity and Integrity subscales at T1, and this is the only cohort to have reached T5 at present.

Supplemental Table S2. *Cronbach's Alpha for IPD Subscales*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Identity | Intimacy | Generativity | Generativity\* | Integrity |
| Cohort 1, T3 | - | .72 | .57 | .61 | .77 |
| Cohort 1, T4 | - | .76 | .55 | .62 | .78 |
| Cohort 1, T5 | - | .75 | .61 | .66 | .78 |
| Cohort 2, T2 | - | .76 | .39 | .59 | .77 |
| Cohort 2, T3 | - | .76 | .57 | .69 | .72 |
| Cohort 2, T4 | - | .73 | .50 | .56 | .76 |
| Cohort 3, T1 | .64 | .74 | .36 | .55 | .69 |
| Cohort 3, T2 | - | .67 | .47 | .55 | .76 |
| Cohort 3, T3 | - | .72 | .54 | .65 | .69 |
| Cohort 4, T1 | .64 | .72 | .45 | .61 | .74 |
| Cohort 4, T2 | - | .66 | .56 | .62 | .77 |

*Note.* \*Alternative coding for Generativity, removing item 63 ("enjoy spending time by myself") and 67 ("concerned about my health")

Supplemental Table S3. *Test-Retest Reliability for Intimacy*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Cohort 1* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Intimacy | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Intimacy | .47\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Intimacy | .52\*\*\* | .65\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| 4. T4 Intimacy | .45\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* | .72\*\*\* | - |  |
| 5. T5 Intimacy | .41\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .66\*\*\* | .64\*\*\* | - |
| *Cohort 2* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Intimacy | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Intimacy | .63\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Intimacy | .24\* | .69\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| 4. T4 Intimacy | .39\*\*\* | .75\*\*\* | .78\*\*\* | - |  |
| *Cohort 3* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Intimacy | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Intimacy | .41\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Intimacy | .39\*\*\* | .62\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| *Cohort 4* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Intimacy | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Intimacy | .45\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |

*Note.* \*\*\**p*<.001, \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05

Supplemental Table S4. *Test-Retest Reliability for Generativity*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Cohort 1* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Generativity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Generativity | - | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Generativity | - | .53\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| 4. T4 Generativity | - | .56\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | - |  |
| 5. T5 Generativity | - | .42\*\*\* | .54\*\*\* | .71\*\*\* | - |
| *Cohort 2* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Generativity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Generativity | .48\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Generativity | .40\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| 4. T4 Generativity | .28\*\* | .59\*\*\* | .65\*\*\* | - |  |
| *Cohort 3* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Generativity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Generativity | .50\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Generativity | .46\*\*\* | .40\*\* | - |  |  |
| *Cohort 4* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Generativity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Generativity | .46\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |

*Note.* Generativity was not assessed at T1 for Cohort 1. \*\*\**p*<.001, \*\**p*<.01

Supplemental Table S5. *Test-Retest Reliability for Integrity*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Cohort 1* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Integrity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Integrity | - | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Integrity | - | .64\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| 4. T4 Integrity | - | .65\*\*\* | .73\*\*\* | - |  |
| 5. T5 Integrity | - | .56\*\*\* | .70\*\*\* | .81\*\*\* | - |
| *Cohort 2* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Integrity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Integrity | .38\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Integrity | .35\*\* | .45\* | - |  |  |
| 4. T4 Integrity | .37\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* | .56\*\*\* | - |  |
| *Cohort 3* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Integrity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Integrity | .51\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |
| 3. T3 Integrity | .45\*\*\* | .64\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| *Cohort 4* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. T1 Integrity | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. T2 Integrity | .47\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |

*Note.* Integrity was not assessed at T1 for Cohort 1. \*\*\**p*<.001, \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05

Supplemental Table S6. *Latent Growth Curve Model Predicting Generativity on Identity, with Alternative Generativity Scoring*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Generativity | | | |
|  | Coefficient | | SE | |
| *Fixed Effects* | |  | |  | |
| For intercept | |  | |  | |
| Intercept | | 12.56\*\*\* | | .99 | |
| Identity | | .43\*\*\* | | .04 | |
| Cohort | | -.51 | | .29 | |
| Female | | 2.52\*\*\* | | .46 | |
| For linear slope | |  | |  | |
| Intercept | | .11 | | .37 | |
| Identity | | -.05\* | | .02 | |
| Cohort | | .36\* | | .15 | |
| Female | | -.28 | | .24 | |
| *Random Effects* | |  | |  | |
| Intercept | | 12.23\*\*\* | | 2.23 | |
| Slope | | 1.74\*\* | | .53 | |

Note. All coefficients are unstandardized. \*\*\**p* < .001; \*\**p* < .01; \**p* < .05.

Supplemental Table S7. *Latent Growth Curve Models Predicting Psychosocial Outcomes, Including Graduate Education as a Covariate*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intimacy | | | Generativity | |
|  | Coefficient | | SE | Coefficient | SE |
| *Fixed Effects* |  | |  |  |  |
| For intercept | |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 7.80\*\*\* | 1.25 | 7.41\*\*\* | 1.38 |
| Identity | | .50\*\*\* | .05 | .28\*\*\* | .05 |
| Cohort | | 1.95\* | .83 | .06 | .77 |
| Female | | 1.98\*\* | .70 | 1.27 | .71 |
| Graduate education | | .47 | .70 | .58 | .80 |
| For linear slope | |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 1.26\*\* | .47 | .04 | .52 |
| Identity | | -.07\*\*\* | .02 | .01 | .02 |
| Cohort | | -.24 | .32 | .15 | .32 |
| Female | | .38 | .26 | .10 | .28 |
| Graduate education | | .23 | .26 | .16 | .31 |
| *Random Effects* | |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 18.90\*\*\* | 3.42 | 14.05\*\*\* | 3.54 |
| Slope | | 1.25\* | .51 | 1.32\* | .52 |

Note. All coefficients are unstandardized. \*\*\**p* < .001; \*\**p* < .01; \**p* < .05.

These exploratory analyses examine whether attaining a graduate degree is associated with increases in intimacy or generativity across adulthood. Only Cohorts 1 and 2 had educational data available, so these analyses only include participants in those cohorts who were not missing on all education status indicators (N = 306). Attempts to fit a model for integrity were unsuccessful, perhaps because of the smaller sample size and greater complexity in the functional form for integrity (a basis model, rather than the simpler linear functional form for intimacy and generativity). Attaining a graduate degree does not appear to be significantly associated with trajectories for intimacy or generativity.

Supplemental Table S8. *Latent Growth Curve Models Excluding Participants with Ages Outside Intended Range*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intimacy | | | Generativity | | Integrity | |
|  | Coefficient | | SE | Coefficient | SE | Coefficient | SE |
| *Fixed Effects* | | | | | | | |
| For intercept | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 10.48\*\*\* | .44 | 7.49\*\*\* | .53 | - | - |
| EA Identity | | .56\*\*\* | .03 | .34\*\*\* | .02 | - | - |
| Cohort | | .12 | .15 | -.23 | .17 | - | - |
| Female | | 1.63\*\*\* | .35 | 1.26\*\*\* | .32 | - | - |
| For linear slope | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 1.07\*\*\* | .25 | .28 | .25 | - | - |
| EA Identity | | -.11\*\*\* | .02 | -.03\* | .01 | - | - |
| Cohort | | .14 | .13 | .16 | .12 | - | - |
| Female | | .13 | .19 | .08 | .18 | - | - |
| For basis intercept | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | - | - | - | - | 4.57\*\*\* | 1.00 |
| EA Identity | | - | - | - | - | .63\*\*\* | .05 |
| Cohort | | - | - | - | - | -.60\* | .30 |
| Female | | - | - | - | - | 1.23\*\* | .45 |
| For basis shape factor | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | - | - | - | - | 5.22\* | 2.62 |
| EA Identity | | - | - | - | - | -.40\*\* | .12 |
| Cohort | | - | - | - | - | -1.15 | .68 |
| Female | | - | - | - | - | -.44 | 1.15 |
| Basis factor loadings | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wave 2 | | - | - | - | - | .50\*\*\* | .09 |
| Wave 3 | | - | - | - | - | .39 | .25 |
| Wave 4 | | - | - | - | - | .57\*\*\* | .13 |
| *Random Effects* | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 15.98\*\*\* | 2.50 | 11.95\*\*\* | 2.21 | - | - |
| Slope | | 1.20\* | .50 | 1.69\*\* | .52 | - | - |
| Basis intercept | | - | - | - | - | 23.09 | 16.52 |
| Basis slope | | - | - | - | - | 64.93 | 60.63 |

Note. All coefficients are unstandardized. \*\*\**p* < .001; \*\**p* < .01; \**p* < .05. EA = Emerging adulthood. Fixed effects represent the average trajectory across all participants, and random effects represent the variance of individual participants' trajectories around the average trajectory.

These models are identical to the main models reported in the manuscript, but exclude two participants whose ages were reported as 55 and 58 within Wave 3, when participants were supposed to be in their forties. Results are largely unchanged.

Supplemental Table S9. *Latent Growth Curve Models Controlling for Mean-Imputed Age*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intimacy | | | Generativity | | Integrity | |
|  | Coefficient | | SE | Coefficient | SE | Coefficient | SE |
| *Fixed Effects* | | | | | | | |
| For intercept | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 10.48\*\*\* | .44 | 7.63\*\*\* | .54 | - | - |
| EA Identity | | .56\*\*\* | .03 | .34\*\*\* | .02 | - | - |
| Cohort | | .13 | .15 | -.27 | .17 | - | - |
| Female | | 1.63\*\*\* | .35 | 1.27\*\*\* | .32 | - | - |
| For linear slope | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 1.16\*\*\* | .25 | .27 | .25 | - | - |
| EA Identity | | -.11\*\*\* | .02 | -.03\* | .01 | - | - |
| Cohort | | .07 | .14 | .16 | .12 | - | - |
| Female | | .12 | .19 | .05 | .18 | - | - |
| For basis intercept | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | - | - | - | - | 5.10\*\*\* | 1.31 |
| EA Identity | | - | - | - | - | .64\*\*\* | .04 |
| Cohort | | - | - | - | - | -.76\* | .39 |
| Female | | - | - | - | - | 1.21\*\* | .47 |
| For basis shape factor | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | - | - | - | - | 4.17 | 2.90 |
| EA Identity | | - | - | - | - | -.42\*\*\* | .08 |
| Cohort | | - | - | - | - | -.97 | .82 |
| Female | | - | - | - | - | -.41 | 1.07 |
| Basis factor loadings | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wave 2 | | - | - | - | - | .54\*\*\* | .10 |
| Wave 3 | | - | - | - | - | .49\* | .21 |
| Wave 4 | | - | - | - | - | .66\*\*\* | .10 |
| *Random Effects* | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 16.14\*\*\* | 2.49 | 11.95\*\*\* | 2.18 | - | - |
| Slope | | 1.23\* | .49 | 1.71\*\* | .51 | - | - |
| Basis intercept | | - | - | - | - | 34.32 | 32.39 |
| Basis slope | | - | - | - | - | 96.88 | 80.05 |

Note. All coefficients are unstandardized. \*\*\**p* < .001; \*\**p* < .01; \**p* < .05. EA = Emerging adulthood. Fixed effects represent the average trajectory across all participants, and random effects represent the variance of individual participants' trajectories around the average trajectory.

These models control for age as a time-varying covariate. The two participants whose ages were outside the intended W3 age range are excluded. Because cases that are missing data on predictors are listwise deleted in the process of fitting a latent growth curve model, we needed a strategy for handling instances where participants were missing age data in one or more waves. This table reports the findings for our first approach: replacing missing age values with the mean age for that wave. Results are largely unchanged from the main findings reported in the manuscript.

Supplemental Table S10. *Latent Growth Curve Models Controlling for Age, with Missing Ages Computed*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intimacy | | | Generativity | | Integrity | |
|  | Coefficient | | SE | Coefficient | SE | Coefficient | SE |
| *Fixed Effects* | | | | | | | |
| For intercept | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 10.36\*\*\* | .49 | 7.77\*\*\* | .60 | - | - |
| EA Identity | | .54\*\*\* | .03 | .34\*\*\* | .03 | - | - |
| Cohort | | .22 | .19 | -.35 | .21 | - | - |
| Female | | 1.60\*\*\* | .38 | 1.24\*\*\* | .35 | - | - |
| For linear slope | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 1.11\*\*\* | .27 | .15 | .27 | - | - |
| EA Identity | | -.10\*\*\* | .02 | -.03\* | .01 | - | - |
| Cohort | | .07 | .17 | .21 | .14 | - | - |
| Female | | .14 | .20 | .05 | .19 | - | - |
| For basis intercept | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | - | - | - | - | 5.89 | 21.78 |
| EA Identity | | - | - | - | - | .62\* | .31 |
| Cohort | | - | - | - | - | -1.08 | 7.08 |
| Female | | - | - | - | - | 1.13 | 2.40 |
| For basis shape factor | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | - | - | - | - | 2.82 | 42.44 |
| EA Identity | | - | - | - | - | -.39\* | .17 |
| Cohort | | - | - | - | - | -.57 | 12.27 |
| Female | | - | - | - | - | -.16 | 5.57 |
| Basis factor loadings | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wave 2 | | - | - | - | - | .57 | 1.90 |
| Wave 3 | | - | - | - | - | .56 | 2.88 |
| Wave 4 | | - | - | - | - | .66 | 1.38 |
| *Random Effects* | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | | 16.08\*\*\* | 2.62 | 11.01\*\*\* | 2.32 | - | - |
| Slope | | 1.23\* | .50 | 1.64\*\* | .51 | - | - |
| Basis intercept | | - | - | - | - | 47.43 | 785.69 |
| Basis slope | | - | - | - | - | 127.39 | 1557.56 |

Note. All coefficients are unstandardized. \*\*\**p* < .001; \*\**p* < .01; \**p* < .05. EA = Emerging adulthood. Fixed effects represent the average trajectory across all participants, and random effects represent the variance of individual participants' trajectories around the average trajectory.

These models control for age as a time-varying covariate. The two participants whose ages were outside the intended W3 age range are excluded. Because cases that are missing data on predictors are listwise deleted in the process of fitting a latent growth curve model, we needed a strategy for handling instances where participants were missing age data in one or more waves. This table reports the findings for our second approach: replacing missing age values with an estimate based on participants' ages reported in previous or subsequent waves, and calculated using the approximate time in years between waves. Results are largely unchanged from the main findings reported in the manuscript, except for the findings for integrity: cohort is no longer significantly associated with baseline integrity.

*Comparison to Sneed et al. (2012)*

Our findings on the relationship between identity and intimacy may seem inconsistent with those of Sneed et al. (2012). Using cross-lagged panel modeling, Sneed et al. found few instances across four waves where one assessment of identity predicted a change in intimacy for the subsequent wave. We found that baseline identity predicted change in intimacy over time, and argue that emerging adulthood identity does indeed predict subsequent levels of intimacy, which may seem to contradict Sneed et al.'s conclusion that identity does not predict future intimacy. Importantly, however, Sneed et al. (2012) controlled for the stability in identity and intimacy over time in their models – they tested whether change in identity from, for instance, T1 to T2, would predict change in intimacy from T1 to T2, not whether the initial level of identity would predict subsequent change in intimacy. In contrast, our study is explicitly interested in whether the initial level of identity (including any stable component of identity) predicts long-term change in intimacy, which may be subtle from wave to wave, but may add up to a significant effect over the course of several decades, as we found. It is possible that the stable portion of identity predicts trajectories of intimacy over time, even if wave-to-wave fluctuations in identity do not predict wave-to-wave fluctuations in intimacy over time for most waves. Taken together, the findings of both studies suggest that individuals with lower identity resolution increase in their level of intimacy over time, but it may not be change in identity resolution itself that is driving the change in intimacy.