**Supplementary Material**

**Transparency and Open Science Statements**

*Preregistration statement.* The hypotheses in this paper were not preregistered.

*Sampling statement.* The link below provides a table that shows which combination of responses on The Life history Calendar and the separate question on participants’ attendance in educational programs at Time 3 would lead to assignment to either the transition group, the semi-transition group or the non-transition group. Link: <https://osf.io/5vk3n/?view_only=85823f9e3c1a4a79bea638d13a01df35>.

*Open material statement.* The data used in this paper comes from a large dataset on CONflict And Management Of Relationships (CONAMORE;(Meeus et al., 2006). This dataset appears in many papers. The papers from Klimstra, Akse, Hale III, Raaijmakers, and Meeus (2010), Klimstra, Hale III, Raaijmakers, Branje, and Meeus (2009) are most similar to the research questions and variables used in the current paper.

*Open data statement.* The data is available on request by the corresponding author. The dataset is not openly accessible to reduce the risk of double publishing of the data.

*Reproducible script statement.* All output files for this study can be found on the website of Open Science Framework with the following link: <https://osf.io/5vk3n/?view_only=85823f9e3c1a4a79bea638d13a01df35>.

**Preliminary analyses**

*Control for covariates*. We selected cohort, age, sex, ethnicity, religion, and the educational level of the participant, their fathers, and their mothers as possible confounding variables. We conducted chi-square tests of independence to examine whether there was a significant difference between the different transition groups on cohort, educational level of the participant, ethnicity, religion, and educational level of the parents. These analyses revealed that there were significant differences between the groups for cohort (*X*2(3)=151.325, *p*< .001), education (*X*2(8)=150.880, *p*< .001), education level father (*X*2(16)=63.801, *p*< .001), and education level mother (*X*2(16)=52.885, *p*< .001). For age, we conducted a one-way ANOVA. This analysis indicated significant group differences on age (F(2,890)=88.050, *p*< .001). The other variables did not differ significantly between the groups (ethnicity: *X*2(12)=12.168, *p*= .432, religion: *X*2(18)=24.551, *p*= .138, sex: *X*2(3)=3.836, *p*= .280). For ethnicity the assumption of chi-square tests that no more than 20% of all cells should have an expected frequency < 5, was violated. Therefore, the likelihood ratio was interpreted and not the Pearson chi-square. Based on these results we only included cohort, educational level of the participant, age and educational level of the parents into the analysis as covariates.

*Cohort effects.* To test for differences between cohorts on the outcome measures we ran Independent Sample T-tests. Table 1 shows the results. After controlling for multiple testing, five out of the 17 dimensions (i.e., agreeableness and openness on Time 1 and Time 2 and commitment and reconsideration on Time 3) show significant differences between the two cohorts. We also ran an Independent Sample T-test to test for age differences between the two cohorts. The results in Table 1 show that there is a significant age difference between the two cohorts. We conducted Chi-Square Tests of Independence to examine whether there was a significant difference between the different cohorts on sex. This analysis revealed there was not a significant difference between cohorts on sex (*X*2(1)=1.689, *p*= .194).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1**  *Independent Sample T-test for Differences between Cohorts* | | | |
|  | t | *df* | *p* |
| Age | -76.597 | 325.367 | <.001 |
| Time 1 | | | |
| Extraversion | -0.184 | 886 | .854 |
| Conscientiousness | -2.465 | 887 | .014 |
| Agreeableness | -4.595 | 566.971 | <.001 |
| Emotional Stability | 0.577 | 887 | .564 |
| Openness | -3.606 | 886 | <.001 |
| Time 2 | | | |
| Extraversion | 0.746 | 888 | .456 |
| Conscientiousness | -2.848 | 888 | .004 |
| Agreeableness | -4.962 | 537.287 | <.001 |
| Emotional Stability | 1.085 | 888 | .278 |
| Openness | -3.440 | 888 | .001 |
| Time 3 | | | |
| Extraversion | 1.410 | 885 | .159 |
| Conscientiousness | -1.696 | 885 | .090 |
| Agreeableness | -0.245 | 885 | .807 |
| Emotional Stability | -0.702 | 885 | .483 |
| Openness | -0.278 | 885 | .781 |
| Commitment | 3.802 | 556.335 | <.001 |
| Reconsideration | 3.046 | 422.566 | .002 |
| *Note.* t= test statistic; *df* =degrees of freedom; *p*= p-value; Test for differences between cohort 1 and cohort 2. Levene’s Test for Equality of variance was significant. Therefore, the *p*-values for tests in which equal variances are not assumed were used. | | | |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2**  *Fit Indices for Latent Growth Curve Models by Group* | | | | | | | |
|  | *X*² | *p* | *df* | CFI | TLI | SRMR | RMSEA (90% CI) |
| Transition (N=287) | | | | | | | |
| Extraversion | 0.757 | .3843 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.004 | .011 | .000 (.000, .167) |
| Conscientiousness | 1.132 | .2873 | 1 | 0.999 | 0.997 | .013 | .024 (.000, .180) |
| Agreeableness | 0.524 | .4693 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.043 | .012 | .000 (.000, .157) |
| Emotional Stability | 0.008 | .9270 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.008 | .001 | .000 (.000, .044) |
| Openness | 0.303 | .5820 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.023 | .007 | .000 (.000, .144) |
| Semi-transition (N=387) | | | | | | | |
| Extraversion | 6.938 | .0084 | 1 | 0.978 | 0.934 | .023 | .124 (.050 , .218) |
| Conscientiousness | 0.129 | .7194 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.006 | .003 | .000 (.000, .096) |
| Agreeableness | 0.518 | .4716 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.013 | .008 | .000 (.000, .120) |
| Emotional Stability | 0.948 | .3301 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.001 | .013 | .000 (.000, .174) |
| Openness | 0.216 | .6421 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.008 | .004 | .000 (.000, .104) |
| None-transition 2 (N=226) | | | | | | | |
| Extraversion | 1.114 | .2913 | 1 | 1.000 | 0.999 | .012 | .020 (.000, .159) |
| Conscientiousness | 0.355 | .5510 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.008 | .006 | .000 (.000, .131) |
| Agreeableness | 0.463 | .4963 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.014 | .008 | .000 (.000, .136) |
| Emotional Stability | 0.750 | .3864 | 1 | 1.000 | 1.004 | .010 | .000 (.000, .148) |
| Openness | 1.156 | .2822 | 1 | 0.999 | 0.998 | .010 | .023 (.000, .161) |
| *Note.*  *X*² = chi-square; *p*= p-value; *df* =degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI= Tucker-Lewis index; SRMR= Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; Fulfilment of two of the three following conditions: X² is significantly larger than zero, ∆ CFI is > .010 and, ∆ RMSEA >.015, compared to ideal fit (i.e., X²=0, CFI=1.000 and RMSEA=.000), indicate that a linear model cannot be used to analyze the data. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3**  *Growth Parameters for Unconstrained Multigroup Latent Growth Curve Models (N=900)* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Growth parameters | | | | | | | |
|  | Intercept | | | | Slope | | | |
|  | M | *p* | σ² | *p* | M | *p* | σ² | *p* |
| Transition |  | | | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | 3.878 | <.001 | 0.927 | <.001 | 0.267 | .058 | 0.020 | .179 |
| Agreeableness | 5.217 | <.001 | 0.223 | <.001 | 0.225 | .002 | 0.001 | - |
| Emotional Stability | 3.762 | <.001 | 0.780 | <.001 | -0.277 | .044 | 0.001 | - |
| Openness | 4.054 | <.001 | 0.612 | <.001 | 0.069 | .588 | 0.014 | .224 |
| Extraversion T1-T2 | 4.690 | <.001 | 0.964 | <.001 | 0.580 | .333 | 0.354 | <.001 |
| Extraversion T2-T3 | 5.159 | <.001 | 1.079 | <.001 | -1.065 | .143 | 0.660 | <.001 |
| Semi-transition |  | | | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | 5.412 | <.001 | 1.155 | <.001 | -0.024 | .854 | 0.011 | .278 |
| Agreeableness | 4.817 | <.001 | 0.246 | <.001 | 0.112 | .143 | 0.000 | <.001 |
| Emotional Stability | 2.887 | <.001 | 0.742 | <.001 | 0.016 | .914 | 0.023 | .009 |
| Openness | 3.485 | <.001 | 0.670 | <.001 | 0.056 | .629 | 0.011 | .109 |
| Extraversion T1-T2 | 3.386 | <.001 | 0.987 | <.001 | 0.334 | .612 | 0.374 | <.001 |
| Extraversion T2-T3 | 3.501 | <.001 | 0.975 | <.001 | 0.437 | .615 | 0.664 | <.001 |
| None-transition | | | | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | 5.444 | <.001 | 1.243 | <.001 | -0.116 | .409 | 0.008 | .469 |
| Agreeableness | 5.085 | <.001 | 0.337 | <.001 | 0.299 | .007 | 0.008 | .066 |
| Emotional Stability | 4.895 | <.001 | 0.813 | <.001 | -0.211 | .262 | 0.028 | .010 |
| Openness | 5.021 | <.001 | 0.621 | <.001 | 0.186 | .195 | 0.017 | <.001 |
| Extraversion T1-T2 | 5.604 | <.001 | 0.900 | <.001 | -0.679 | .367 | 0.407 | <.001 |
| Extraversion T2-T3 | 4.897 | <.001 | 0.791 | <.001 | 2.848 | .008 | 0.753 | <.001 |
| *Note.* Change in extraversion is analyzed with Latent Difference Score Models; T1= Time 1; T2= Time 2; T3= Time 3; M= mean; *p*= p-value; σ² = variance; slope σ² of agreeableness and emotional stability was fixed at .001 because of modelling issues. Therefore, the *p*-value could not be estimated; models are corrected for cohort, education level participant, age and parents’ education level. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4**  *Fit Indices for Latent Growth Curve Models for the Combined Semi- and Transition Group (N=613)* | | | | | | |
|  | *X*² | *df* | CFI | TLI | SRMR | RMSEA (90% CI) |
| Conscientiousness | 3.790 | 6 | 1.000 | 1.008 | .005 | .000 (.000, .040) |
| Agreeableness | 3.709 | 7 | 1.000 | 1.030 | .012 | .000 (.000, .031) |
| Emotional Stability | 6.824 | 6 | 0.999 | 0.996 | .010 | .015 (.000, .056) |
| Openness | 3.252 | 6 | 1.000 | 1.014 | .007 | .000 (.000, .035) |
| Extraversion T1-T2 | 389.178 | 106 | 0.914 | 0.898 | .128 | .066 (.059, .073) |
| Extraversion T2-T3 | 486.643 | 106 | 0.893 | 0.873 | .135 | .077 (.070, .083) |
| *Note.*  Extraversion is analyzed with Latent Difference Score Models; T1= Time 1; T2= Time 2; T3= Time 3; *X²* = chi-square; *df*=degrees of freedom; CFI= Comparative Fit Index; TLI= Tucker-Lewis index; SRMR= Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA= Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; Models are corrected for cohort, education level participant, age and parents’ education level. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5**  *Growth Parameters for Latent Growth Curve Models for the Combined Semi- and Transition Group (N=613)* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Growth parameters | | | | | | | |
|  | Intercept | | | | Slope | | | |
|  | M | *p* | σ² | *p* | M | *p* | σ² | *p* |
| Conscientiousness | 4.754 | <.001 | 1.102 | <.001 | 0.113 | .229 | 0.015 | .082 |
| Agreeableness | 4.981 | <.001 | 0.242 | <.001 | 0.160 | .002 | 0.001 | - |
| Emotional Stability | 3.386 | <.001 | 0.762 | <.001 | -0.136 | .172 | 0.013 | .082 |
| Openness | 3.725 | <.001 | 0.661 | <.001 | 0.065 | .444 | 0.014 | .023 |
| Extraversion T1-T2 | 4.051 | <.001 | 0.994 | <.001 | 0.358 | .444 | 0.379 | <.001 |
| Extraversion T2-T3 | 4.288 | <.001 | 1.044 | <.001 | -0.289 | .608 | 0.691 | <.001 |
| *Note.* Extraversion is analyzed with Latent Difference Score Models; T1= Time 1; T2= Time 2; T3= Time 3; M= mean; *p*= p-value; σ² = variance; slope σ² of agreeableness was fixed at .001, therefore the p-value could not be estimated; Models are corrected for cohort, education level participant, age and parents’ education level. | | | | | | | | |