**Measurement Invariance Analyses for Five Factor Model Outcomes**

 *Neuroticism*. In a test of configural invariance, we estimated a longitudinal measurement model in which Neuroticism was represented by a single latent factor at each assessment wave. Factor loadings were freely estimated across waves, and cross-wave error covariances for the same indicator were freely estimated. This unconstrained confirmatory factor model fit the data well, *χ*2(335) = 526.86, *p* < .001; CFI = .98; TLI = .98; RMSEA = 0.03; SRMR = 0.04. Factor loadings were all moderate-to-strong (λ range: .44-.87) and statistically significant at a .001 alpha threshold. Next, in a model imposing weak measurement invariance, we constrained loadings of the same indicators to equality across time. In this constrained model, the restrictions on factor loadings over time did not produce a significant decrement in model fit, *χ*2diff(20) = 26.17, *p* = .16. We concluded that weak measurement invariance was present.

 *Conscientiousness*. The unconstrained model provided evidence of configural invariance, *χ*2(335) = 538.83, *p* < .001; CFI = .98; TLI = .98; RMSEA = 0.03; SRMR = 0.04. Factor loadings were all strong (λ range: .50-.85) and statistically significant at a .001 alpha threshold. Constraining factor loadings to equality over time did not significantly diminish model fit, *χ*2diff(20) = 18.23, *p* = .57, consistent with weak measurement invariance.

 *Extraversion*. The unconstrained model without loading constraints fit acceptably, *χ*2(335) = 599.32, *p* < .001; CFI = .97; TLI = .97; RMSEA = 0.03; SRMR = 0.05. Factor loadings were generally large (λ range: .31-.80) and all statistically significant at a .001 alpha threshold. Constraining factor loadings to equality over time led to a decrement in model fit that was statistically significant at the .05 alpha level, *χ*2diff(20) = 33.55, *p* = .03. Inspection of the modification indices suggested that releasing the constraint on one loading (the 5th Extraversion item on the NEO-PI-R) mitigated this problem, such that the revised constrained model fit no worse than the unconstrained model, *χ*2diff(16) = 21.14, *p* = .17.

 *Agreeableness*. As was the case for Extraversion, the unconstrained model fit adequately, *χ*2(335) = 746.70, *p* < .001; CFI = .96; TLI = .95; RMSEA = 0.04; SRMR = 0.07, but the cross-wave loading constraints significantly diminished model fit, *χ*2diff(20) = 38.48, *p* = .01. The modification indices highlighted one item (the 3rd Agreeableness item on the NEO-PI-R) that exhibited different loadings across time. We relaxed the restriction on that factor loading, and the resulting model fit as well as the unconstrained model, *χ*2diff(16) = 15.29, *p* = .50.

 *Openness*. The unconstrained model provided a good fit to the data, *χ*2(335) = 522.38, *p* < .001; CFI = .98; TLI = .98; RMSEA = 0.03; SRMR = 0.05. Factor loadings were all moderate-to-strong (λ range: .42-.80) and statistically significant at a .001 alpha threshold. The constrained model did not fit significantly worse, *χ*2diff(20) = 17.47, *p* = .62, consistent with measurement invariance.

 *Five Factor Model Borderline Personality Composite*. In a final set of analyses, we examined measurement invariance in the Five Factor Model trait composite of borderline personality. The initial model—composed of 5 Neuroticism facets and 1 Conscientiousness facet—fit the data well, *χ*2(335) = 690.76, *p* < .001; CFI = .97; TLI = .96; RMSEA = 0.04; SRMR = 0.07. The constrained model was a significantly worse fit to the data, *χ*2diff(20) = 38.10, *p* = .01. However, releasing the constraint on the 3rd Neuroticism item restored adequate fit, relative to the baseline model, *χ*2diff(16) = 21.34, *p* = .16. Overall, then, we concluded that there was sufficient evidence for weak measurement invariance for all 6 of these personality constructs, and proceeded to test out trait-state-occasion models.