

Supplementary Results

We have elected to include all additional results in comma separated value (csv) format rather than as tables in a document, on the basis that this makes the data easier to work with in future reporting or analyses.

Measurement invariance

Full results of each test of measurement invariance can be found in “supplementary_results_measurement_invariance_full_results.csv”.

Effect sizes for measurement invariance

Continuous effect sizes for tests of measurement invariance can be found in “supplementary_results_effect_sizes_cfa_fits.csv”. For each group comparison (e.g., median age and gender), Cohen’s d was calculated to estimate the between-groups effect size. This was done using both the observed sum scores as well as the latent scores. Difference scores between these two Cohen’s d values were then computed. This method therefore quantifies the impact of failing to meet measurement invariance on the magnitude of between-groups comparisons.

Effect sizes for CFA fit

Continuous effect sizes for the CFA fits, which can be found in “supplementary_results_effect_sizes_measurement_invariance.csv”. Two different metrics were calculated. First, we estimated the correlation between observed sum scores and latent scores for each scale. These typically produce correlations of $r > .95$, which are easy to misinterpret as representing almost perfect fit. In order to explicate that even high correlations can have substantive implications, we also calculated a misclassification rate. For each scale, participants were split into low and high groups based on the mean score for both the observed sum score and the latent score. This cut-off value was merely for convenience and illustration. We then calculated the proportion of participants who received incongruent classifications between observed and latent scores. This number therefore represents the proportion of participants who one would have classified differently had one used the latent score over the observed or vice versa.