

**The Transition to Grandparenthood: No Consistent Evidence for Change in  
the Big Five Personality Traits and Life Satisfaction**

Michael D. Krämer<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Manon A. van Scheppingen<sup>4</sup>, William J. Chopik<sup>5</sup>, and David  
Richter<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>German Institute for Economic Research, Germany


<sup>2</sup>International Max Planck Research School on the Life Course (LIFE), Germany


<sup>3</sup>Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

<sup>4</sup>Tilburg University, Netherlands


<sup>5</sup>Michigan State University, USA

### Author Note

Michael D. Krämer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9883-5676>, Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin); International Max Planck Research School on the Life Course (LIFE), Max Planck Institute for Human Development; Department of Education and Psychology, Freie Universität Berlin.

Manon A. van Scheppingen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0133-2069>, Department of Developmental Psychology, Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Tilburg University.

William J. Chopik  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1748-8738>, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University.

David Richter  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2811-8652>, Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin); International Max Planck Research School on the Life Course (LIFE), Max Planck Institute for Human Development; Survey Research Division, Department of Education and Psychology, Freie Universität Berlin.

The authors made the following contributions. Michael D. Krämer: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Visualization, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing; Manon A. van Scheppingen: Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing; William J. Chopik: Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing; David Richter: Supervision, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Michael D. Krämer, German Institute for Economic Research, Mohrenstr. 58, 10117 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: [mkraemer@diw.de](mailto:mkraemer@diw.de)

**Abstract**

Intergenerational relations have received close attention in the context of population aging and increased childcare provision by grandparents. However, few studies have investigated the psychological consequences of becoming a grandparent. In a preregistered test of grandparenthood as a developmental task in middle and older adulthood, we used representative panel data from the Netherlands ( $N = 563$ ) and the United States ( $N = 2,210$ ) to analyze first-time grandparents' personality and life satisfaction development. We tested gender, employment, and grandchild care as moderators. To address confounding, we employed propensity score matching using two procedures: matching grandparents with parents and nonparents to achieve balance in different sets of carefully selected covariates. Multilevel models demonstrated mean-level stability of the Big Five personality traits and life satisfaction over the transition to grandparenthood, and no consistent moderation effects—contrary to the social investment principle. The few small effects of grandparenthood on personality development did not replicate across samples. We found no evidence of larger interindividual differences in change in grandparents compared to the controls or of lower rank-order stability. Our findings add to recent critical re-examinations of the social investment principle and are discussed in light of characteristics that might moderate grandparents' personality development.

*Keywords:* grandparenthood, Big Five, life satisfaction, personality development, propensity score matching

## **The Transition to Grandparenthood: No Consistent Evidence for Change in the Big Five Personality Traits and Life Satisfaction**

Becoming a grandparent is an important life event for many people in midlife or old age (Infurna et al., 2020). In an era of population aging, the time that grandparents are alive and in good health is prolonged compared to previous generations (Bengtson, 2001; Leopold & Skopek, 2015; Margolis & Wright, 2017). In addition, grandparents fulfill an increased share of childcare responsibilities (Hayslip et al., 2019; Pilkauskas et al., 2020). In recent years, intergenerational relations have received heightened attention from psychological and sociological research (Bengtson, 2001; Coall & Hertwig, 2011; Fingerma et al., 2020). In research on personality development, the transition to grandparenthood has been proposed as an important developmental task arising in old age (Hutteman et al., 2014). However, empirical research on the psychological consequences of grandparenthood remains sparse. Using data from two nationally representative panel studies, we investigate whether the transition to grandparenthood affects the Big Five personality traits and life satisfaction. We test hypotheses derived from neo-socioanalytic theory (Roberts & Wood, 2006) in a prospective quasi-experimental case-control design (see Luhmann et al., 2014).

### **Personality Development in Middle and Older Adulthood**

The life span perspective conceptualizes aging as a lifelong process of development and adaptation (Baltes et al., 2006). Research embedded in this perspective has found personality traits to be subject to change across the entire life span (Costa et al., 2019; Graham et al., 2020; Specht, 2017; Specht et al., 2014; for recent reviews, see Bleidorn et al., 2021; Roberts & Yoon, 2021). Although a majority of personality development takes place in adolescence and emerging adulthood (Bleidorn & Schwaba, 2017; Pusch et al., 2019; Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2018), personality traits also change in middle and older adulthood (e.g., Allemand et al., 2008; Damian et al., 2019; Kandler et al., 2015; Lucas & Donnellan, 2011; Möttus et al., 2012; S. Mueller et al., 2016; Seifert et al., 2021; Wagner et

al., 2016; for a review, see Specht, 2017).

Here, we examine the Big Five personality traits—agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience—which constitute a broad categorization of universal patterns of thought, affect, and behavior (John et al., 2008; John & Srivastava, 1999). Changes over time in the Big Five occur both in mean trait levels (i.e., mean-level change, Roberts et al., 2006) and in the ordering of people relative to each other on trait dimensions (i.e., rank-order stability, Anusic & Schimmack, 2016; Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000). A lack of observed changes in mean trait levels does not necessarily mean that individual trait levels are stable over time, and perfect rank-order stability does not preclude mean-level changes. Mean-level changes in early to middle adulthood (circa 30–60 years old, Hutteman et al., 2014) are typically characterized by greater maturity, as evidenced by increased agreeableness and conscientiousness and decreased neuroticism (Damian et al., 2019; Roberts et al., 2006). In old age (circa 60 years and older, Hutteman et al., 2014), research is generally more sparse. But there is some evidence of a *reversal* of the maturity effect following retirement (sometimes termed *la dolce vita* effect, Asselmann & Specht, 2021; Marsh et al., 2013; cf. Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2019) and at the end of life when health problems arise (Wagner et al., 2016).

In terms of rank-order stability, most prior studies have shown support for an inverted U-shape trajectory (Ardelt, 2000; Lucas & Donnellan, 2011; Seifert et al., 2021; Specht et al., 2011; Wortman et al., 2012): Rank-order stability rises until it reaches a plateau in midlife, and decreases in old age. However, evidence is mixed on whether rank-order stability decreases again in old age (see Costa et al., 2019; Wagner et al., 2019). We are not aware of any study investigating trait rank-order stability over the transition to grandparenthood. Other life events are associated with rank-order stability of personality and well-being, although only certain events and traits (e.g., Denissen et al., 2019; Hentschel et al., 2017; Specht et al., 2011). Still, the previously held view that personality is stable or “set like plaster” (Specht, 2017, p. 64) after one reaches adulthood (or leaves

emerging adulthood behind, Bleidorn & Schwaba, 2017) has been largely abandoned (Specht et al., 2014).

Theories explaining the mechanisms of personality development in middle and older adulthood emphasize genetic influences and life experiences as interdependent sources of stability and change (Bleidorn et al., 2021; Specht et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2020). We conceptualize the transition to grandparenthood as adopting a new social role according to the social investment principle of neo-socioanalytic theory (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007; Roberts & Wood, 2006). The social investment principle states that normative life events or transitions such as entering the work force or becoming a parent lead to personality maturation through adopting new social roles (Roberts et al., 2005). These new roles encourage or compel people to act in a more agreeable, conscientious, and emotionally stable (i.e., less neurotic) way. People's experiences in these roles as well as societal expectations towards them are hypothesized to drive long-term personality development (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007; Wrzus & Roberts, 2017).

Empirical research on life events entailing new social roles has focused on young adulthood: A first romantic relationship (Wagner et al., 2015), the transition from high school to university, or a first job (Asselmann & Specht, 2021; Golle et al., 2019; Lüdtke et al., 2011) co-occur with mean-level changes that are (partly) consistent with the social investment principle (for a review, see Bleidorn et al., 2018). However, recent findings on the transition to parenthood fail to support the social investment principle (Asselmann & Specht, 2020a; van Scheppingen et al., 2016). An analysis of trajectories of the Big Five before and after different life events produced limited support for the social investment principle: Small increases in emotional stability occurred following the transition to employment but not in the other traits or following marriage or childbirth (Denissen et al., 2019).

Age-graded, normative role transitions may drive personality development across the entire lifespan but they are understudied in middle and older adulthood. Recent

research indicates that retirement contributes to personality change following a period of relative stability in midlife (Bleidorn & Schwaba, 2018; Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2019). These results are only partly in line with the social investment principle regarding mean-level changes and display substantial interindividual differences in change trajectories. Schwaba and Bleidorn described retirement as a “divestment” of social roles (2019, p. 660; *personality relaxation*, see Asselmann & Specht, 2021) that functions differently than *social investment*, which adds a role. The grandparent role is one of only a few new normative roles available in middle and older adulthood. It is perceived as highly important and represents a psychologically meaningful role investment (Mahne & Motel-Klingebiel, 2012; Thiele & Whelan, 2006)—given that grandparents have regular contact with grandchildren and take part in childcare (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007). Mechanisms of grandparents’ personality change remain unexplored. However, grandparental role investment may not be linearly related to changes in well-being and health (see section *Life Satisfaction and Grandparenthood*). Instead, moderate levels of grandchild care and contact appear most beneficial. At the same time, even if grandparents do not provide substantial grandchild care, grandparenthood might alter their everyday lives and activities considerably by changing the social structure imposed by kinship bonds (M. Mueller & Elder, 2003; Tanskanen, 2017). For example, grandchildren might bring about frequent family gatherings, which eventually contribute to grandparents’ personality development in a bottom-up fashion.

## Grandparenthood

The transition to grandparenthood is a time-discrete life event—the beginning of one’s status as a grandparent (Luhmann et al., 2012). In terms of characteristics of major life events (Luhmann et al., 2020), the transition to grandparenthood stands out in that it is externally caused (by one’s children, see also Arpino, Gumà, et al., 2018; Margolis & Verdery, 2019), but also predictable as soon as children reveal their family planning or

pregnancy. The transition to grandparenthood has been labeled a countertransition due to this lack of direct control over its timing (Hagestad & Neugarten, 1985; as cited in Arpino, Gumà, et al., 2018). Grandparenthood is also generally positive in valence and emotionally significant if the grandparent maintains a good relationship with their child. Grandparents' investments in their grandchildren are beneficial in terms of the evolutionary, economic, and sociological advantages they provide (Coall et al., 2018; Coall & Hertwig, 2011).

Grandparenthood is a developmental task (Hutteman et al., 2014) that generally takes place in (early) old age, although this varies considerably both within and between cultures (Leopold & Skopek, 2015; Skopek & Leopold, 2017). Still, the period in which parents experience the birth of their first grandchild coincides with the end of (relative) personality stability in midlife (Specht, 2017), when retirement, shifting social roles, and initial cognitive and health declines can disrupt life circumstances, setting processes of personality development in motion (e.g., S. Mueller et al., 2016; Stephan et al., 2014). As a developmental task, grandparenthood is considered part of a normative sequence of aging that is subject to societal expectations and values that differ across cultures and historical time (Baltes et al., 2006; Hutteman et al., 2014). Mastering developmental tasks (i.e., fulfilling roles and expectations) is hypothesized to drive positive personality development similarly to propositions of the social investment principle, that is, leading to higher levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness, and lower levels of neuroticism (Roberts et al., 2005; Roberts & Wood, 2006).

In comparison to the transition to parenthood, which is ambivalent in terms of both personality maturation and changes in life satisfaction (Aassve et al., 2021; Johnson & Rodgers, 2006; Krämer & Rodgers, 2020; van Scheppingen et al., 2016), Hutteman et al. (2014) hypothesized that the transition to grandparenthood is positive because it (usually) does not impose the stressful demands of daily childcare on grandparents. However, societal expectations about how grandparents should behave are less clearly defined than expectations around parenthood. There is considerable heterogeneity in how intensely



grandparents are involved in their grandchildren's lives and care (Meyer & Kandic, 2017). The degree of possible grandparental investment differs depending on a variety of factors: how close grandparents live to their children, the quality of their relationship, and sociodemographic factors that create conflicting role demands such as paid work or other caregiving responsibilities (Arpino & Bellani, 2022; Arpino & Gómez-León, 2020; Lumsdaine & Vermeer, 2015; Silverstein & Marenco, 2001). In the entire population of first-time grandparents, this diversity of possible and desired role investments could generate role conflicts for some grandparents (according to role strain theory, Goode, 1960). Subsequently, pronounced interindividual differences in intraindividual personality change might then emerge.

### *Life Satisfaction and Grandparenthood*

Although few studies on the Big Five and grandparenthood exist, there is some evidence for life satisfaction, which we define as the general, cognitive appraisal of one's well-being in life based on subjective criteria (Eid & Larsen, 2008). Life satisfaction is generally considered less stable than the Big Five and more prone to changes due to environmental influences but still trait-like in its characteristics (Anusic & Schimmack, 2016; Kandler et al., 2014; Luhmann et al., 2012), and robustly related to the Big Five (Anglim et al., 2020).

Longitudinal studies on grandparents' life satisfaction have produced conflicting conclusions: Studies using data from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) showed that the birth of a grandchild was followed by improvements in quality of life and life satisfaction, but only among women (Tanskanen et al., 2019) and only in first-time grandmothers via their daughters (Di Gessa et al., 2019). Several studies demonstrated that grandparents who were actively involved in childcare experienced larger increases in life satisfaction (Arpino, Bordone, et al., 2018; Danielsbacka et al., 2019;

Danielsbacka & Tanskanen, 2016). On the other hand, fixed effects regression models<sup>1</sup> using SHARE data did not find any effects of first-time grandparenthood on life satisfaction regardless of grandparental investment and only minor decreases in depressive symptoms in grandmothers Ates (2017).

Studies of grandparents' life satisfaction, and well-being and health more generally, have often contrasted role strain theory and role enhancement theory (e.g., Di Gessa et al., 2016a; Xu et al., 2017; see also Kim et al., 2017). Role strain theory (Goode, 1960) predicts that investing in grandparenthood alongside other existing roles can produce role conflicts and psychological demands exceeding one's resources. Altogether, these factors prevent adaptive development and lower life satisfaction. Role enhancement theory (Sieber, 1974), conversely, anticipates adaptive development and well-being benefits because the added social role provides grandparents with status security, social support, and psychological meaning. Empirically, providing grandchild care is, on the one hand, associated with decreased marital satisfaction (Wang & Mutchler, 2020) and increased depressive symptoms if grandparents perceive caregiving as burdensome (Xu et al., 2017). On the other hand, it is associated with increased social contact (Quirke et al., 2021; Tanskanen, 2017; cf. Arpino & Bordone, 2017) and a higher quantity (but not quality) of leisure activities (Ates et al., 2021), whereby social engagement serves as a buffer for mental health decreases (Notter, 2021).

Research on well-being and health has found evidence for both role strain theory and role enhancement theory depending on the degree of grandparental role investment (Danielsbacka et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2017). Whereas no investment or being a grandchild's primary caregiver are associated with adverse effects in most studies, there is evidence that moderate levels of grandchild care have beneficial life satisfaction and health effects for non-coresiding grandparents. This provides preliminary support for the inverted

---

<sup>1</sup> Fixed effects regression models rely exclusively on within-person variance (see Brüderl & Ludwig, 2015; McNeish & Kelley, 2019).

U-shape between investment and utility proposed by Coall and Hertwig (2011). However, multiple authors have recently emphasized that the literature is still at an early stage and that prior studies often lack representativeness, longitudinal data, and appropriate control for selection effects (Coall et al., 2018; Danielsbacka et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2017).

In summary, evidence is lacking on the Big Five and inconclusive on life satisfaction (and related measures) which is partly due to different methodological approaches that do not account for confounding (i.e., selection effects).

### Methodological Considerations

Effects of life events on psychological traits tend to be small and need to be analyzed using robust, prospective designs and appropriate control groups (Bleidorn et al., 2018; Luhmann et al., 2014). This is necessary because pre-existing differences between prospective grandparents and non-grandparents in variables related to the development of the Big Five or life satisfaction introduce confounding bias when estimating the effects of the transition to grandparenthood (VanderWeele et al., 2020). The impact of adjusting for pre-existing differences was recently emphasized in predicting life outcomes from personality (Beck & Jackson, 2021). Propensity score matching is one technique to account for confounding bias by equating groups in their estimated propensity to experience the event (Thoemmes & Kim, 2011). This propensity is calculated from regressing the so-called treatment variable (whether someone experienced the event) on covariates related to the likelihood of experiencing the event and to the outcomes. This approach addresses confounding bias by creating balance between groups in the covariates used to calculate the propensity score (Stuart, 2010).

We adopt a prospective design that tests the effects of becoming first-time grandparents against two propensity-score-matched control groups separately: first, parents (but not grandparents) with at least one child, and, second, nonparents. This allows us to disentangle potential effects of becoming a grandparent from effects of already being a

parent (i.e., parents who eventually become grandparents might share additional similarities with parents who do not). Thus, we can address selection effects into grandparenthood more comprehensively than previous research. We cover the first two of three causal pathways to not experiencing grandparenthood pointed out in demographic research (Margolis & Verdery, 2019): childlessness, childlessness of one's children, and not living long enough to become a grandparent. Our comparative design controls for average age-related and historical trends in the Big Five traits and life satisfaction (Luhmann et al., 2014). The design also enables us to report effects of the transition to grandparenthood unconfounded by instrumentation effects, which describe the tendency of reporting lower well-being scores with each repeated measurement (Baird et al., 2010).

We match at a specific time point before the transition to grandparenthood (i.e., at least two years beforehand) and not based on individual survey years. This design choice ensures that the covariates involved in the matching procedure are not already influenced by the event or anticipation of it (Greenland, 2003; Rosenbaum, 1984; VanderWeele, 2019; VanderWeele et al., 2020), thereby reducing the risk of introducing confounding through collider bias (Elwert & Winship, 2014). Similar approaches in the study of life events have been adopted recently (Balbo & Arpino, 2016; Krämer & Rodgers, 2020; van Scheppingen & Leopold, 2020).

## Current Study

In the current study, we examine the development of the Big Five personality traits across the transition to grandparenthood in a prospective, quasi-experimental design, thereby extending previous research on the effects of this transition on well-being to psychological development in a more general sense. We also revisit life satisfaction development, which allows us to anchor our model results. With the literature on grandparenthood and well-being in mind, the current results for life satisfaction constitute a benchmark for the Big Five outcomes. Three research questions motivate the current

study which—to our knowledge—is the first to analyze Big Five personality development over the transition to grandparenthood:

1. What are the effects of the transition to grandparenthood on mean-level trajectories of the Big Five traits and life satisfaction?
2. How large are interindividual differences in intraindividual change for the Big Five traits and life satisfaction over the transition to grandparenthood?
3. How does the transition to grandparenthood affect rank-order stability of the Big Five traits and life satisfaction?

To address these questions, we used two nationally representative panel data sets and compared grandparents' development over the transition to grandparenthood with that of matched respondents who did not become grandparents during the study period (Luhmann et al., 2014). Informed by the social investment principle, previous research on personality development in middle and older adulthood, and the literature on grandparenthood and well-being, we preregistered the following hypotheses (see <https://osf.io/a9zpc>):

- H1a: Following the birth of their first grandchild, grandparents increase in agreeableness and conscientiousness, and decrease in neuroticism compared to the matched control groups of parents (but not grandparents) and nonparents. We do not expect the groups to differ in their trajectories of extraversion and openness to experience.
- H1b: Grandparents' post-transition increases in agreeableness and conscientiousness, and decreases in neuroticism are more pronounced among those who provide substantial grandchild care.
- H1c: Grandmothers increase in life satisfaction following the transition to grandparenthood compared to the matched control groups but grandfathers do not.

The heterogeneity in the degree of possible and desired grandparental investment in our samples leads us to expect pronounced interindividual differences in intraindividual change (i.e., deviations from the average trajectories).

- H2: Individual differences in intraindividual change in the Big Five and life satisfaction are larger in the grandparent group than the control groups.

Consequently, assuming that grandparents' personality is rearranged through the experience of the event, we also expect decreases in rank-order stability over the transition to grandparenthood.

- H3: Compared to the matched control groups, grandparents' rank-order stability of the Big Five and life satisfaction over the transition to grandparenthood is smaller.

Finally, commitments to other institutions and roles possibly constrain the amount of possible grandparental investment in line with role strain theory. Alternatively, the added grandparental role could complement existing roles inducing positive psychological development according to role enhancement theory. Thus, exploratorily, we probe the moderator *performing paid work*, which could constitute a role conflict among grandparents. In another exploratory analysis, suggested by an anonymous reviewer, we examine *ethnicity* as a moderator, which is associated with differences in the demography of grandparenthood (Hayslip et al., 2019; Margolis & Verdery, 2019) and in grandparents' well-being (Goodman & Silverstein, 2006).

## Methods

### Samples

We used data from two population-representative panel studies: the Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) panel from the Netherlands, and the Health and Retirement Study (HRS) from the United States.

The LISS panel is a representative sample of the Dutch population initiated in 2008 with data collection still ongoing (Scherpenzeel, 2011; van der Laan, 2009). It is administered by Centerdata (Tilburg University). The survey population is a true probability sample of households drawn from the population register (Scherpenzeel & Das, 2010). Data collection was carried out online, and respondents were provided technical equipment if needed. We included yearly assessments from 2008 to 2021 as well as basic demographics assessed monthly. For later coding of covariates from these monthly demographic data we used the first available assessment each year.

The HRS is an ongoing population-representative study of older adults in the United States (Sonnega et al., 2014) administered by the Survey Research Center (University of Michigan). Initiated in 1992 with a first cohort of individuals aged 51-61 and their spouses, the study has since been expanded through additional cohorts (see <https://hrs.isr.umich.edu/documentation/survey-design/>). In addition to the biennial in-person or telephone interview, since 2006 the study has included a leave-behind questionnaire covering psychosocial topics including personality traits. These topics, however, were only administered every four years starting in 2006 for one half of the sample and in 2008 for the other half. We included personality data from 2006 to 2018, all available data for the coding of the transition to grandparenthood from 1996 to 2018, as well as covariate data from 2006 to 2018 including variables drawn from the Imputations File and the Family Data (only available up to 2014).

These two panel studies provided the advantage that they contained several waves of personality data as well as information on grandparent status and a broad range of covariates. While the HRS provided a large sample with a wider age range, the LISS was smaller and younger but provided more frequent personality assessments spaced every one to two years. Included grandparents from the LISS were younger because grandparenthood questions were part of the Work and Schooling module and—for reasons unknown to us—filtered to respondents performing paid work. Thus, older, retired first-time

grandparents from the LISS could not be identified. Even though we have published using the LISS and HRS data before (see <https://osf.io/a9zpc>), these publications do not overlap with the current study on grandparenthood. The present study used de-identified archival data available in the public domain, which meant that it was not necessary to obtain ethical approval from an IRB.

## Measures

### *Personality*

In the LISS, the Big Five personality traits were assessed using the 50-item version of the IPIP Big Five Inventory scales (Goldberg, 1992). For each trait, respondents answered ten 5-point Likert-scale items (1 = *very inaccurate*, 2 = *moderately inaccurate*, 3 = *neither inaccurate nor accurate*, 4 = *moderately accurate*, 5 = *very accurate*). Example items included “like order” (conscientiousness), “sympathize with others’ feelings” (agreeableness), “worry about things” (neuroticism), “have a vivid imagination” (openness), and “start conversations” (extraversion). In each wave, we took a respondent’s mean of each subscale as their trait score. Internal consistencies at the time of matching, as indicated by  $\omega_h$  (McNeish, 2018), averaged  $\omega_h = 0.70$  over all traits ( $\omega_t = 0.89$ ;  $\alpha = 0.83$ ; see Table S1). Other studies have shown measurement invariance for these scales across time and age groups, and convergent validity with the Big Five Inventory (Denissen et al., 2020; BFI-2, Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2018). The Big Five and life satisfaction were administered yearly but with planned missingness in some years for certain cohorts (see Denissen et al., 2019).

In the HRS, the Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI) scales measured the Big Five (Lachman & Weaver, 1997) with 26 adjectives (five each for conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion; four for neuroticism; seven for openness). Respondents were asked to rate on a 4-point scale how well each item described them (1 = *a lot*, 2 = *some*, 3 = *a little*, 4 = *not at all*). Example adjectives included “organized”



(conscientiousness), “sympathetic” (agreeableness), “worrying” (neuroticism), “imaginative” (openness), and “talkative” (extraversion). For better comparability with the LISS panel, we reverse-scored all items so that higher values corresponded to higher trait levels and, in each wave, took the mean of each subscale as the trait score. Big Five trait scores showed satisfactory internal consistencies at the time of matching that averaged  $\omega_h = 0.63$  over all traits ( $\omega_t = 0.80$ ;  $\alpha = 0.72$ ; see Table S1).

### ***Life Satisfaction***

In both samples, life satisfaction was assessed using the 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS, Diener et al., 1985) which respondents answered on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *somewhat disagree*, 3 = *slightly disagree*, 4 = *neither agree or disagree*, 5 = *slightly agree*, 6 = *somewhat agree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). An example item was “I am satisfied with my life”. Internal consistency at the time of matching was between  $\alpha = 0.88$  and  $\alpha = 0.91$  in the four analysis samples (see Table S1).

### ***Transition to Grandparenthood***

The procedure to obtain information on the transition to grandparenthood generally followed the same steps in both samples. This coding was based on items that differed slightly, however: In the LISS, respondents performing paid work were asked “Do you have children and/or grandchildren?” and were offered the answer categories “children”, “grandchildren”, and “no children or grandchildren”. In the HRS, all respondents were asked to state their total number of grandchildren: “Altogether, how many grandchildren do you (or your husband / wife / partner, or your late husband / wife / partner) have? Include as grandchildren any children of your (or your [late] husband’s / wife’s / partner’s) biological, step- or adopted children”.

In both samples, we tracked grandparenthood status over time using all available longitudinal information (including HRS waves 1996-2018). Due to longitudinally inconsistent data in some cases, we included in the grandparent group only respondents

with one transition from 0 (*no grandchildren*) to 1 (*at least one grandchild*) in this status variable, and no transitions backwards (see Figure 1). We marked respondents who consistently indicated that they had no grandchildren as potential members of the control groups.

### Participant Flowchart

#### Grandparents:

**Step 1** Respondents who had grandchildren for the first time during study participation. Includes all HRS waves (1996-2018).

**Step 2** Respondents with at least one valid personality assessment (since 2006 in HRS).

**Step 3** Respondents with a valid personality assessment both before and one after the transition to grandparenthood.

**Step 4** Respondents with non-missing and consistent information regarding their children.

$N_{LISS} = 380$

$N_{HRS} = 3273$

$N_{LISS} = 378$

$N_{HRS} = 1703$

$N_{LISS} = 283$

$N_{HRS} = 860$

$N_{LISS} = 282$

$N_{HRS} = 847$

Matched Samples	LISS	HRS
Parents	282 grandparents (1591 obs.) & 1128 controls (6288 obs.)	847 grandparents (2264 obs.) & 3388 controls (8326 obs.)
Nonparents	282 grandparents (1591 obs.) & 1128 controls (6290 obs.)	847 grandparents (2264 obs.) & 3388 controls (8229 obs.)

#### Potential Control Respondents:

**Parents** Respondents with at least one child aged between 15 and 65 but no grandchildren throughout the observation period. Filtered to observations with valid personality assessments.

**Nonparents** Respondents with no children or grandchildren throughout the observation period. Filtered to observations with valid personality assessments.

$N_{LISS} = 853$   
(3846 obs.)

$N_{HRS} = 1485$   
(2703 obs.)

$N_{LISS} = 986$   
(4906 obs.)

$N_{HRS} = 1340$   
(2346 obs.)

**Figure 1**

Participant flowchart demonstrating the composition of the four analysis samples via matching (1:4 matching ratio with replacement). obs. = longitudinal observations.

## *Moderators*

We tested four variables as potential moderators of the mean-level trajectories of the Big Five and life satisfaction over the transition to grandparenthood: First, we analyzed whether female gender (0 = *male*, 1 = *female*) acted as a moderator as indicated by research on life satisfaction (Di Gessa et al., 2019; Tanskanen et al., 2019).

Second, we tested whether performing paid work (0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*) was associated with divergent trajectories of the Big Five and life satisfaction (Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2019). Since the LISS subsample consisted solely of respondents performing paid work, we performed these analyses only in the HRS. This served two purposes. On the one hand, it allowed us to test how respondents in the workforce differed from those not working, which might shed light on role conflict and have implications for social investment mechanisms. On the other hand, these moderation analyses allowed us to assess whether potential differences in results between the LISS and HRS samples could be accounted for by including performing paid work as a moderator in HRS analyses. In other words, perhaps HRS respondents performing paid work were similar to those in the LISS sample—those conditioned on this variable through questionnaire filtering.

Third, we examined how involvement in grandchild care moderated trajectories of the Big Five and life satisfaction (Arpino, Bordone, et al., 2018; Danielsbacka et al., 2019; Danielsbacka & Tanskanen, 2016). We coded a moderator variable (0 = *provided less than 100 hours of grandchild care*, 1 = *provided 100 or more hours of grandchild care*) based on the question “Did you (or your [late] husband / wife / partner) spend 100 or more hours in total since the last interview / in the last two years taking care of grand- or great grandchildren?”.<sup>2</sup> This information was only available for grandparents in the HRS (43% *yes*); in the LISS, too few respondents answered respective follow-up questions to be included in analyses.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dichotomization of a continuous construct (hours of care) is not ideal for moderation analysis (MacCallum et al., 2002). However, there were too many missing values in the variable assessing hours of care continuously (variables \*E063).

Fourth, in the HRS, we compared Black/African American respondents with White respondents.

## Procedure

Drawing on all available data, three main restrictions defined the analysis samples of grandparents (see Figure 1): First, we identified respondents who indicated having grandchildren for the first time during study participation ( $N_{LISS} = 380$ ;  $N_{HRS} = 3273$ , including HRS waves 1996-2004 before personality assessments were introduced). Second, we restricted the sample to respondents with at least one valid personality assessment (valid in the sense that at least one of the six outcomes was non-missing;  $N_{LISS} = 378$ ;  $N_{HRS} = 1703$ ).<sup>3</sup> Third, we included only respondents with both one valid personality assessment before and one after the transition to grandparenthood ( $N_{LISS} = 283$ ;  $N_{HRS} = 860$ ). Finally, a few respondents were excluded because of inconsistent or missing information regarding their children resulting in the final analysis samples of first-time grandparents,  $N_{LISS} = 282$  (54.61% female; age at transition to grandparenthood  $M = 58.29$ ,  $SD = 4.87$ ) and  $N_{HRS} = 847$  (54.90% female; age at transition to grandparenthood  $M = 61.80$ ,  $SD = 6.87$ ).

We defined two mutually exclusive pools of potential control subjects for matching: The first comprised parents who had at least one child (given that  $15 \leq age_{firstborn} \leq 65$ ) but no grandchildren during the observation period ( $N_{LISS} = 853$  with 3846 longitudinal observations;  $N_{HRS} = 1485$  with 2703 longitudinal observations). The second comprised respondents who reported being childless throughout the observation period ( $N_{LISS} = 986$  with 4906 longitudinal observations;  $N_{HRS} = 1340$  with 2346 longitudinal observations).

---

<sup>3</sup> We also excluded  $N = 30$  HRS grandparents in a previous step who reported unrealistically high numbers of grandchildren ( $> 10$ ) in their first assessment following the transition to grandparenthood.

## *Covariates*

We used propensity score matching to match each grandparent with a control respondent from each pool of potential controls who was most similar in terms of the included covariates.

Although critical to the design, covariate selection is seldom explicitly discussed in studies estimating effects of life events (e.g., in matching designs). We see two (in part conflicting) traditions that address covariate selection: First, classic recommendations from psychology are to include all available variables that are associated with both the treatment assignment process (i.e., selection into treatment) and the outcome (e.g., Steiner et al., 2010; Stuart, 2010). Second, recommendations from a structural causal modeling perspective (Elwert & Winship, 2014; Rohrer, 2018) are more cautious, aiming to avoid pitfalls such as conditioning on a pre-treatment collider (collider bias) or a mediator (overcontrol bias). However, structural causal modeling requires advanced knowledge of the causal structures underlying the involved variables (Pearl, 2009).

In selecting covariates, we followed the guidelines of VanderWeele et al. (2019; 2020), which reconcile both views and offer practical guidance when the underlying causal structures are not completely understood and when using large archival datasets. The “modified disjunctive cause criterion” (VanderWeele, 2019, p. 218) recommends selecting all available covariates which are assumed to be causes of the outcomes, treatment exposure (i.e., the transition to grandparenthood), or both, as well as any proxies for an unmeasured common cause of the outcomes and treatment exposure. Variables that are assumed to be instrumental variables (i.e., assumed causes of treatment exposure that are unrelated to the outcomes except through the exposure) and collider variables (Elwert & Winship, 2014) should be excluded from this selection. Because all covariates we used for matching were measured at least two years before the first grandchild’s birth, we judge the risk of introducing collider bias or overcontrol bias to be relatively small. In addition, as mentioned above, the transition to grandparenthood is not planned by or under the direct

control of the grandparents, which further reduces the risk of these biases.

Following these guidelines, we selected covariates covering respondents' demographics (e.g., age, education), economic situation (e.g., income), and health (e.g., mobility difficulties). We also included the pre-transition outcome variables as covariates—as recommended in the literature (Cook et al., 2020; Hallberg et al., 2018; Steiner et al., 2010; VanderWeele et al., 2020), as well as wave participation count and assessment year in order to control for instrumentation effects and historical trends (e.g., 2008/2009 financial crisis, Baird et al., 2010; Luhmann et al., 2014). To match grandparents with the parent control group, we additionally selected covariates containing information on fertility and family history (e.g., number of children, age of first three children) which were causally related to the timing of the transition to grandparenthood (Arpino, Gumà, et al., 2018; Margolis & Verdery, 2019).

An overview of all covariates can be found in the supplemental materials (see Tables S2 & S3). Importantly, as part of our preregistration we justified each covariate, explaining whether we assumed it to be related to the treatment assignment, the outcomes, or both (see *gp-covariates-overview.xlsx* on <https://osf.io/75a4r/>). In this document, we provided references supporting our assumptions on whether a specific covariate is related to these causal processes. For example, we justified the inclusion of *religion* as a covariate with its relation to fertility (Hayford & Morgan, 2008; L. Zhang, 2008), which is often passed down to the child's family (Götmark & Andersson, 2020), and its relation to the Big Five and life satisfaction (Diener et al., 2018; Gebauer et al., 2014). We tried to find substantively equivalent covariates in both samples but had to compromise in a few cases.

Estimating propensity scores required complete covariate data. Therefore, we performed multiple imputations to address missingness in the covariates (Greenland & Finkle, 1995). Using five imputed data sets computed by classification and regression trees (CART, Burgette & Reiter, 2010) in the *mice* R package (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011), we predicted treatment assignment (i.e., the transition to

grandparenthood) five times per observation in logistic regressions with a logit link function.<sup>4</sup> We averaged these five scores per observation to compute the final propensity score used for matching (Mitra & Reiter, 2016). We used imputed data only for propensity score computation and not in later analyses because nonresponse in the outcome variables was negligible.

### *Propensity Score Matching*

The time of matching preceded the survey year in which the transition to grandparenthood was first reported by at least two years (aside from that choosing the smallest available gap between matching and transition). This ensured that the covariates were not affected by the event itself or anticipation thereof (i.e., matching occurred well before children would have announced that they were expecting their first child, Greenland, 2003; Rosenbaum, 1984; VanderWeele et al., 2020). Propensity score matching was performed using the *MatchIt* R package (Ho et al., 2011) with exact matching on gender combined with Mahalanobis distance matching on the propensity score. Four matchings were performed; two per sample (LISS; HRS) and two per control group (parents; nonparents). We matched 1:4 with replacement because of the relatively small pools of available controls.<sup>5</sup> We did not specify a caliper because our goal was to find matches for all grandparents, and because we achieved good covariate balance this way.

We evaluated the matching procedure in terms of covariate balance and graphically (Stuart, 2010). Covariate balance as indicated by the standardized difference in means

---

<sup>4</sup> In these logistic regressions, we included all covariates listed above as predictors except for *female*, which was later used for exact matching, and health-related covariates in LISS wave 2014, which were not assessed in that wave.

<sup>5</sup> In the LISS, 282 grandparent observations were matched with 1128 control observations; these control observations corresponded to 561 unique person-year observations stemming from 281 unique respondents for the parent control group, and to 523 unique person-year observations stemming from 194 unique respondents for the nonparent control group. In the HRS, 847 grandparent observations were matched with 3388 control observations; these control observations corresponded to 1363 unique person-year observations stemming from 978 unique respondents for the parent control group, and to 1039 unique person-year observations stemming from 712 unique respondents for the nonparent control group.

between grandparents and controls after matching was good (see Tables S2 & S3), lying below 0.25 as recommended in the literature (Stuart, 2010), and below 0.10 with few exceptions (Austin, 2011). Graphically, group differences in the propensity score distributions were small and indicated no substantial missing overlap (see Figure S1).

After matching, each matched control observation was assigned the same value as the matched grandparent in the *time* variable describing the temporal relation to treatment, and the control respondent's other longitudinal observations were centered around this matched observation. We thus coded a counterfactual transition time frame for each control respondent. Due to left- and right-censored longitudinal data (i.e., panel entry or attrition), we restricted the final analysis samples to six years before and six years after the transition, as shown in Table 1.

The final LISS analysis samples (see Figure 1) contained 282 grandparents with 1591 longitudinal observations, matched with 1128 control respondents with either 6288 (parent control group) or 6290 longitudinal observations (nonparent control group). The final HRS analysis samples contained 847 grandparents with 2264 longitudinal observations, matched with 3388 control respondents with either 8326 (parent control group) or 8229 longitudinal observations (nonparent control group). In the HRS, there were a few additional missing values in the outcomes ranging from 19 to 99 longitudinal observations, which were listwise deleted in the respective analyses.



Table 1

*Longitudinal Sample Size in the Analysis Samples and Coding Scheme for the Piecewise Regression Coefficients.*

	Pre-transition years						Post-transition years						
	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
LISS: Analysis samples													
Grandparents: obs.	105	99	122	137	171	155	170	149	130	117	91	74	71
Grandparents: % women	50.48	52.53	54.92	51.09	57.89	60.00	48.82	53.69	53.08	52.99	50.55	62.16	59.15
Parent controls: obs.	337	469	465	675	838	486	483	532	452	446	457	331	317
Parent controls: % women	57.57	52.88	56.99	51.26	56.56	55.56	53.42	55.26	53.54	50.45	52.30	57.40	58.04
Nonparent controls: obs.	313	445	456	699	863	470	495	558	400	522	470	307	292
Nonparent controls: % women	42.81	55.73	55.04	53.36	56.43	54.68	51.72	54.12	52.25	57.09	50.21	46.91	56.51
LISS: Coding scheme													
Before-slope	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
After-slope	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shift	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
HRS: Analysis samples													
Grandparents: obs.	162		389		461		381		444		195		232
Grandparents: % women	57.41		54.24		55.53		54.07		55.41		56.41		53.45
Parent controls: obs.	647		1544		1844		1230		1492		703		866
Parent controls: % women	51.62		54.15		55.53		54.55		56.90		52.77		58.08
Nonparent controls: obs.	666		1545		1845		1203		1464		687		819
Nonparent controls: % women	56.61		54.17		55.50		56.36		58.13		57.21		61.66
HRS: Coding scheme													
Before-slope	0		1		2		2		2		2		2
After-slope	0		0		0		1		2		3		4
Shift	0		0		0		1		1		1		1

*Note.* obs. = observations. *time* = 0 marks the first year where the transition to grandparenthood has been reported. The number of grandparent respondents included in the final samples is  $N_{LJSS} = 282$  and  $N_{HRS} = 847$ .

## Transparency and Openness

We used R (Version 4.0.4; R Core Team, 2021) and the R-packages *lme4* (Version 1.1.27.1; Bates et al., 2015), and *lmerTest* (Version 3.1.3; Kuznetsova et al., 2017) for multilevel modeling, as well as *tidyverse* (Wickham et al., 2019a) for data wrangling, and *papaja* (Aust & Barth, 2020) for reproducible manuscript production (see supplement for complete package information). The preregistration and scripts for data wrangling, analyses, and to reproduce this manuscript<sup>6</sup> can be found on the OSF (<https://osf.io/75a4r/>) and GitHub (<https://github.com/mdkraemer/gp-personality>). LISS and HRS data are available after registering accounts. We deviate from the preregistration in using new waves of data released in the meantime (2020/2021 LISS) as well as updated datasets (HRS). Following Benjamin et al. (2018), we set the  $\alpha$ -level for confirmatory analyses to .005.

## Analytical Strategy

Our design can be referred to as an interrupted time series with a “nonequivalent no-treatment control group” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 182) where treatment, that is, the transition to grandparenthood, is not deliberately manipulated. First, to analyze mean-level changes (research question 1), we used linear piecewise regression coefficients in multilevel models with person-year observations nested within respondents and households (Hoffman, 2015). To model change over time in relation to the transition to grandparenthood, we coded three piecewise regression coefficients: a *before-slope* representing linear change in the years leading up to the transition to grandparenthood, an *after-slope* representing linear change in the years after the transition, and a *shift* coefficient, shifting the intercept directly after the transition was first reported, thus representing sudden changes that go beyond changes already modeled by the *after-slope*

---

<sup>6</sup> We also provide instructions to aid reproducing the manuscript.

(see Table 1 for the coding scheme of these coefficients).<sup>7</sup> Other studies of personality development have recently adopted similar piecewise coefficients (Krämer & Rodgers, 2020; e.g., Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2019; van Scheppingen & Leopold, 2020).

All effects of the transition to grandparenthood on the Big Five and life satisfaction were modeled as deviations from the matched control groups by interacting the three piecewise coefficients with the treatment variable ( $0 = \text{control}$ ,  $1 = \text{grandparent}$ ). In additional models, we interacted these coefficients with the moderator variables, resulting in two- and three-way interactions. To test differences in the growth parameters between two groups in cases where these differences were represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients, we defined linear contrasts using the *linearHypothesis* command from the *car* package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a). All models of mean-level changes were estimated using maximum likelihood and included random intercepts but no random slopes. Simultaneous random slopes of change parameters frequently lead to convergence issues. Fixed slopes models are appropriate to model average trajectories, which vary systematically with the person-level treatment variable (Hoffman & Walters, 2022). We included the propensity score as a level-2 covariate for a double-robust approach (Austin, 2017). The equation for the basic (i.e., unmoderated) model reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{ti} &= \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} \text{before}_{ti} + \beta_{2i} \text{after}_{ti} + \beta_{3i} \text{shift}_{ti} + e_{ti} \\
 \beta_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} \text{grandparent}_i + \gamma_{02} \text{pscore}_i + v_{0i} \\
 \beta_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11} \text{grandparent}_i \\
 \beta_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21} \text{grandparent}_i \\
 \beta_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31} \text{grandparent}_i ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

---

<sup>7</sup> As a robustness check, we re-estimated the mean-level trajectories after further restricting the time frame by excluding time points earlier than two years before the transition (i.e., before the latest time of matching). This served the purpose of assessing whether including time points from before matching (as preregistered) would distort the trajectories in any way. However, results were highly similar (see *gp\_restricted\_models.pdf* on <https://osf.io/75a4r/>).

where at time  $t$  for person  $i$   $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  and  $v_{0i} \sim N(0, \tau_{00})$  (ignoring the additional nesting in households applied to the majority of models).  $y_{ti}$  represented one of the Big Five or life satisfaction. Separate models were computed for each analysis sample. The other model equations can be found in the supplemental materials.

Second, to assess interindividual differences in change (research question 2), we added random slopes. In other words, we allowed for differences between individuals in their trajectories of change to be modeled, that is, differences in the *before-slope*, *after-slope*, and *shift* coefficients. Because simultaneous random slopes are often not computationally feasible, we added random slopes one at a time and used likelihood ratio tests to determine whether the addition of the respective random slope led to a significant improvement in model fit. To test differences in the random slope variance between the grandparent group and each control group, we respecified the models as heterogeneous variance models using the *nlme* R package (Pinheiro et al., 2021). This allowed for separate random slope variances to be estimated in the grandparent group and the control group within the same model. We compared the fit of these heterogeneous variance models to corresponding models with a homogeneous (single) random slope variance using likelihood ratio tests.

Third, to examine rank-order stability in the Big Five and life satisfaction over the transition to grandparenthood (research question 3), we computed the test-retest correlation of measurements prior to the transition to grandparenthood (at the time of matching) and the first available measurement afterward. To test differences in test-retest correlations between grandparents and either of the control groups, we entered the pre-treatment measure, the treatment variable ( $0 = \textit{control}$ ,  $1 = \textit{grandparent}$ ), and their interaction into regression models predicting the Big Five and life satisfaction. The interaction tests for significant differences in the rank-order stability between those who experienced the transition to grandparenthood and those who did not (see Denissen et al., 2019; McCrae, 1993).

## Results

Throughout the results section, we referred to statistical tests with  $.005 < p < .05$  as *suggestive evidence* as stated in our preregistration.

### Descriptive Results


Means and standard deviations of the Big Five and life satisfaction over the analyzed time points are presented in Tables S4 and S5. Visually represented (see Figures S2-S7), all six outcomes display marked stability over time in both LISS and HRS. Intra-class correlations (see Table S6) show that large portions of the total variance in the Big Five could be explained by nesting in respondents ( $median = 0.75$ ), while nesting in households only accounted for minor portions of the total variance ( $ICC_{hid}$ ,  $median = 0.03$ ). For outcome-subsample combinations with  $ICC_{hid}$  below 0.05 we omitted the household nesting factor from all models to bypass computational errors—a small deviation from our preregistration. For life satisfaction, the nesting in households accounted for slightly larger portions of the total variance ( $median = 0.37$ ) than nesting in respondents ( $median = 0.30$ ). Across all outcomes, the proportion of variance due to within-person factors was relatively low ( $median = 0.23$ ).

### Mean-Level Changes

Figures 2 and 3 summarize the effects of the basic models and those including the gender interaction for all outcomes and across the four analysis samples.

### *Agreeableness*


In the basic models, we found no evidence that grandparents increased in agreeableness as compared to the controls (see Tables S7 & S8 and Figure 4). The models including the gender interaction (see Tables 2 & S9 and Figure 4) indicated that grandfathers increased slightly in agreeableness after the transition to grandparenthood as compared to the parent controls (LISS:  $\hat{\gamma}_{21} = 0.02$ , 95% CI [0.01, 0.04],  $p = .002$ ; suggestive

**Figure 2**



*Unstandardized Effect Sizes of the Basic Models Across Analysis Samples (Regression Coefficients  $\hat{\gamma}$  or Linear Contrasts  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  From Multilevel Models, see Tables S7, S8, S16, S17, S24, S25, S34, S35, S44, S45, S54, S55). Error Bars Represent 95% Confidence Intervals.*

evidence in the HRS:  $\hat{\gamma}_{21} = 0.03$ , 95% CI [0.01, 0.05],  $p = .008$ ), whereas grandmothers did not differ from the female controls.

There was no consistent evidence for moderation by paid work (see Tables S10 & S11 and Figure S8), providing grandchild care (see Tables S12 & S13 and Figure S9), or ethnicity (see Tables S14 & S15 and Figure S10).

**Figure 3**



*Unstandardized Effect Sizes of the Models Including the Gender Interaction Across Analysis Samples (Regression Coefficients  $\hat{\gamma}$  or Linear Contrasts  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  From Multilevel Models, see Tables 2, S9, S18, S19, S26, S27, S36, S37, S46, S47, S56, S57). Error Bars Represent 95% Confidence Intervals.*

**LISS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

— Grandparents  
— Parent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**

— Grandparents  
— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

— Grandparents  
— Parent Controls

**Gender**

— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**

— Grandparents  
— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**

— Women  
- - Men

**Figure 4**

Change trajectories of agreeableness based on the basic models (left column) and the models including the gender interaction (right column). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood.



Table 2

*Fixed Effects of Agreeableness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Gender.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p
<b>LISS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.65	[3.58, 3.73]	93.57	< .001	3.65	[3.56, 3.74]	79.53	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.07	[0.01, 0.12]	2.37	.018	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	1.37	.172
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-0.97	.333	0.00	[0.00, 0.01]	0.91	.364
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.02, -0.01]	-5.09	< .001	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.49	.625
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.02	[-0.01, 0.06]	1.37	.172	0.01	[-0.02, 0.05]	0.81	.417
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.04	[-0.07, 0.16]	0.72	.473	0.05	[-0.07, 0.17]	0.78	.434
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.37	[0.27, 0.47]	7.09	< .001	0.44	[0.32, 0.56]	7.24	< .001
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.52	.602	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.22	.221
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.02	[0.01, 0.04]	3.11	.002	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	1.03	.301
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.03	[-0.10, 0.05]	-0.71	.475	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.06]	-0.48	.635
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.54	.592	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-2.82	.005
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	2.94	.003	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.51	.132
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.02]	-0.88	.377	-0.03	[-0.08, 0.02]	-1.16	.244
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	0.00	[-0.15, 0.16]	0.03	.977	-0.07	[-0.23, 0.10]	-0.78	.436
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.32	.751	0.02	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.20	.231
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.24	.025	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-1.51	.130
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.06	[-0.04, 0.16]	1.21	.227	0.07	[-0.04, 0.18]	1.26	.209
<b>HRS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.29	[3.24, 3.34]	135.53	< .001	3.39	[3.34, 3.44]	124.23	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.09	[0.03, 0.15]	2.97	.003	0.06	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.77	.076
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.22	.223	-0.02	[-0.04, -0.01]	-2.86	.004
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.20	.001	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.99	.320
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.04	[0.01, 0.08]	2.83	.005	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.39	.700
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.06	[-0.02, 0.14]	1.57	.116	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.05]	-0.65	.514
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.32	[0.26, 0.38]	10.44	< .001	0.21	[0.14, 0.27]	6.08	< .001
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.03	[-0.06, 0.01]	-1.42	.157	0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.29	.772
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.65	.008	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.71	.087
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.05	[-0.12, 0.01]	-1.53	.126	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.05]	-0.46	.648
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.01	.044	0.02	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.46	.145
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	2.05	.040	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.35	.178
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	-0.07	[-0.11, -0.03]	-3.16	.002	0.03	[-0.01, 0.07]	1.50	.135

Table 2 continued

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	-0.09	[-0.19, 0.02]	-1.66	.098	0.03	[-0.08, 0.13]	0.48	.632
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.05	[0.00, 0.10]	1.84	.067	0.01	[-0.04, 0.06]	0.37	.713
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.00]	-2.14	.033	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	-0.66	.512
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.08	[-0.01, 0.17]	1.74	.082	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.07]	-0.34	.737

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

### Conscientiousness

We found no differences between grandparents and both parent and nonparent controls in their trajectories of conscientiousness (see Tables S16 & S17 and Figure S11). There was only inconsistent evidence for gender moderation (see Tables S18 & S19 and Figure S11): Grandfathers' conscientiousness decreased immediately following the transition to grandparenthood as compared to male nonparents in the HRS,  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.07$ , 95% CI  $[-0.11, -0.02]$ ,  $p = .004$ , but not in any of the other three analysis samples.

There were significant differences in conscientiousness trajectories depending on grandparents' work status (see Tables 3 & S20 and Figure 5): non-working grandparents saw more pronounced increases in conscientiousness in the years before the transition to grandparenthood compared to non-working parents,  $\hat{\gamma}_{21} = 0.08$ , 95% CI  $[0.03, 0.13]$ ,  $p < .001$ , and nonparent controls,  $\hat{\gamma}_{21} = 0.06$ , 95% CI  $[0.02, 0.11]$ ,  $p = .004$ , and compared to working grandparents (difference in *before* parameter; parents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.08$ , 95% CI  $[-0.13, -0.03]$ ,  $p = .002$ ; nonparents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.08$ , 95% CI  $[-0.12, -0.03]$ ,  $p = .001$ ). Grandparents providing grandchild care increased in conscientiousness to a greater degree than the matched controls (difference in *after* parameter; parents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.04$ , 95% CI  $[0.02, 0.06]$ ,  $p < .001$ ; nonparents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.04$ , 95% CI  $[0.02, 0.06]$ ,  $p < .001$ ; see Tables 4 & S21 and Figure 6). There was only suggestive evidence that grandparents who provided grandchild care increased more strongly in conscientiousness after the transition than grandparents who did not (difference in *after* parameter; parents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.03$ , 95% CI  $[0.00, 0.06]$ ,  $p = .029$ ; nonparents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.03$ , 95% CI  $[0.01, 0.06]$ ,  $p = .020$ ). Conscientiousness trajectories were not moderated by ethnicity (see Tables S22 & S23 and Figure S12).

### Extraversion



The trajectories of grandparents' extraversion closely followed those of the matched controls. There were no significant effects indicating differences between grandparents and

Table 3

*Fixed Effects of Conscientiousness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Performing Paid Work.*



Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.40	[3.36, 3.44]	169.21	< .001	3.39	[3.34, 3.43]
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.06	[0.01, 0.12]	2.17	.030	0.13	[0.07, 0.19]
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.24	.215	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.07	.284	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	-0.07	.943	-0.05	[-0.08, -0.02]
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.09	[-0.17, 0.00]	-2.04	.042	-0.10	[-0.19, -0.02]
Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	-0.52	.600	-0.04	[-0.08, -0.01]
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.08	[0.03, 0.13]	3.41	.001	0.06	[0.02, 0.11]
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.54	.124	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.07	[-0.14, 0.00]	-1.96	.050	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.05]
Before-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	3.13	.002	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]
After-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.80	.422	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]
Shift * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	-0.80	.422	0.07	[0.03, 0.11]
Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.16	[0.07, 0.25]	3.57	< .001	0.19	[0.10, 0.27]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.11	[-0.16, -0.06]	-4.04	< .001	-0.08	[-0.13, -0.03]
After-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	-0.27	.784	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]
Shift * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	0.07	[-0.02, 0.16]	1.48	.140	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.07]

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *working* = 1 indicates being employed in paid work.

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure 5**

*Change trajectories of conscientiousness based on the models of moderation by paid work (see Table 3). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S11 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*



**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure 6**

*Change trajectories of conscientiousness based on the models of moderation by grandchild care (see Table 4). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S11 (basic models) but restricted to the post-transition period for better comparability.*

controls in the basic models (see Tables S24 & S25 and Figure S13) or the models including the gender interaction (see Tables S26 & S27 and Figure S13). We also found no evidence for moderation by paid work (see Tables S28 & S29 and Figure S14), grandchild care (see Tables S30 & S31 and Figure S15), or ethnicity (see Tables S32 & S33 and Figure S16).

## Neuroticism

The basic models for neuroticism (see Tables S34 & S35 and Figure S17) showed only minor differences between grandparents and matched controls: Compared to HRS parent controls, HRS grandparents shifted slightly downward in their neuroticism immediately after the transition to grandparenthood (difference in *shift* parameter:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.07$ , 95% CI  $[-0.11, -0.02]$ ,  $p = .003$ ; suggestive evidence in the nonparent sample:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.05$ , 95% CI  $[-0.09, 0.00]$ ,  $p = .042$ ), which was not the case in the LISS samples. The models including the gender interaction (see Tables S36 & S37 and Figure S17) showed one significant effect in the comparison of grandparents and controls: In the HRS, grandfathers, compared to male parent controls, shifted downward in neuroticism directly after the transition to grandparenthood (difference in *shift* parameter:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.15$ , 95% CI  $[-0.21, -0.08]$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Thus, the effect present in the basic models seemed to be mostly due to differences in the grandfathers (vs. male controls).

Grandparents' trajectories of neuroticism as compared to the controls were significantly moderated by paid work in one instance (see Tables S38 & S39 and Figure S18): Compared to working controls, working grandparents increased more strongly in neuroticism in the years before the transition to grandparenthood (difference in *before* parameter; parents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.06$ , 95% CI  $[0.02, 0.10]$ ,  $p = .001$ ; nonparents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.06$ , 95% CI  $[0.02, 0.09]$ ,  $p = .002$ ). There was no evidence that grandparents providing grandchild care differed in neuroticism from grandparents who did not (see Tables S40 & S41 and Figure S19). Neuroticism trajectories were not moderated by ethnicity (see Tables S42 & S43 and Figure S20).

## Openness

For openness, we found a high degree of similarity between grandparents and matched control respondents in their trajectories based on the basic models (see Tables S44 & S45 and Figure S21) and models including the gender interaction (see Tables S46 & S47



and Figure S21). Grandfathers in the HRS shifted downward in openness in the first assessment after the transition to grandparenthood to a greater extent than the male parent controls (difference in *shift* parameter:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = -0.09$ , 95% CI  $[-0.14, -0.03]$ ,  $p = .002$ ). However, this was not the case in the other three analysis samples.

The analysis of moderation by performing paid work revealed only one significant effect for openness trajectories (see Tables S48 & S49 and Figure S22): Non-working grandparents increased more strongly in openness post-transition than non-working parent controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} = 0.04$ , 95% CI  $[0.02, 0.06]$ ,  $p < .001$ ; suggestive evidence in the nonparent sample:  $\hat{\gamma}_{41} = 0.03$ , 95% CI  $[0.01, 0.05]$ ,  $p = .015$ ). We found that grandparents providing grandchild care increased more strongly in openness than matched parent controls (difference in *after* parameter:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.04$ , 95% CI  $[0.01, 0.06]$ ,  $p = .005$ ; suggestive evidence in the nonparent sample:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}] = 0.03$ , 95% CI  $[0.00, 0.05]$ ,  $p = .025$ ). However, grandparents who provided grandchild care did not differ significantly from grandparents who did not (see Tables S50 & S51 and Figure S23). We found no evidence for moderation of openness by ethnicity (see Tables S52 & S53 and Figure S24).

### ***Life Satisfaction***

We found no consistent evidence that grandparents' life satisfaction trajectories differed significantly from those of the controls in either the basic models (see Tables S54 & S55 and Figure S25) or the models including the gender interaction (see Tables S56 & S57 and Figure S25). There was also no evidence of a moderation of life satisfaction by performing paid work (see Tables S58 & S59 and Figure S26) or grandchild care (see Tables S60 & S61 and Figure S27).

Black/African American grandparents increased to a higher degree in life satisfaction after the transition to grandparenthood than Black/African American nonparent controls (difference in *after* parameter:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}] = 0.37$ , 95% CI  $[0.14, 0.59]$ ,  $p = .001$ ; suggestive evidence in the parent sample:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}] = 0.28$ , 95% CI  $[0.06, 0.50]$ ,  $p$

= .013; see Tables S62 & S63 and Figure S28). In addition, there was suggestive evidence that Black/African American grandparents' post-transition increases were more pronounced than those of White grandparents (difference in *after* parameter; parents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}] = 0.28$ , 95% CI [0.07, 0.49],  $p = .009$ ; nonparents:  $[\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}] = 0.29$ , 95% CI [0.08, 0.49],  $p = .006$ ). However, the model uncertainty regarding these effects was comparatively high.

### Interindividual Differences in Change

First, we conducted model fit comparisons between the random intercept models reported previously and models where a random slope variance was estimated, separately for each change parameter because joint random effects modeling frequently led to model nonconvergence. These comparisons showed a substantial amount of interindividual differences in change for all random slopes in all models, as indicated by increases in model fit significant at  $p < .001$ .

Second, we estimated models with heterogeneous random slope variances of the grandparents and each control group to test whether interindividual differences in change were significantly larger in the grandparents. Contrary to hypothesis H2, for agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and neuroticism, interindividual differences in intraindividual change were greater in the control group for all tested effects (see Tables S64, S65, S66, & S67). In the two HRS samples, assuming group heterogeneity in the random slope variances led to significant improvements in model fit in all model comparisons. In the two LISS samples, this was the case for around half the tests.

For openness, interindividual differences in change before the transition to grandparenthood were significantly greater in the HRS grandparents than the nonparent controls (random slope variances of the *before* parameter), *likelihood ratio* = 57.57,  $p < .001$ . This result could not be replicated in the other three samples. The other parameters of change either did not differ between groups in their random slope variances or had significantly larger random slope variances in the respective control group (see Table S68).

We found larger interindividual differences in grandparents' changes in life satisfaction before the transition to grandparenthood compared to the nonparent controls in the HRS (random slope variances of the *before* parameter), *likelihood ratio* = 115.87,  $p < .001$  (see Table S69). This was not corroborated in the other three analysis samples. Overall, most tests for heterogeneous random slope variances in life satisfaction indicated either non-significant differences or significantly larger random slope variances in the control sample.

### Rank-Order Stability

We computed test-retest correlations for the Big Five and life satisfaction for the matched sample and separately for grandparents only and controls only (see Table 5). In 5 out of 24 comparisons, grandparents' test-retest correlation was lower than the respective control group's. However, differences in rank-order stability between grandparents and control respondents did not reach significance in any of these comparisons. Overall, we found no confirmatory evidence in support of hypothesis H3.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> In addition to the preregistered retest interval, we computed a maximally large interval between the first available assessment before and the last assessment after the transition. Here, 3 out of 24 comparisons indicated that rank-order stability was lower in the grandparents. There was only one significant difference supporting our hypothesis: HRS grandparents' rank-order stability in openness was lower than that of the nonparents,  $p < .001$  (see Table S70). Another analysis also failed to provide convincing evidence that grandparents' rank-order stability was lower: We excluded duplicate control respondents resulting from matching with replacement who might bias results towards greater stability in the controls. Descriptively, 10 out of 24 comparisons showed lower rank-order stability in the grandparents (see Table S71). However, group differences were small and nonsignificant.

**Table 5**  
*Rank-Order Stability.*

Outcome	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	<i>Cor<sub>all</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>GP</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>con</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>all</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>GP</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>con</sub></i>
LISS						
Agreeableness	0.78	0.81	0.77	0.73	0.81	0.71
Conscientiousness	0.79	0.80	0.79	0.79	0.80	0.78
Extraversion	0.80	0.87	0.78	0.85	0.87	0.84
Neuroticism	0.73	0.77	0.71	0.72	0.77	0.70
Openness	0.73	0.80	0.71	0.79	0.80	0.79
Life Satisfaction	0.70	0.66	0.71	0.61	0.66	0.60
HRS						
Agreeableness	0.67	0.70	0.67	0.71	0.70	0.72
Conscientiousness	0.70	0.69	0.70	0.70	0.69	0.70
Extraversion	0.71	0.75	0.70	0.73	0.75	0.73
Neuroticism	0.66	0.71	0.65	0.69	0.71	0.68
Openness	0.70	0.73	0.69	0.76	0.73	0.77
Life Satisfaction	0.49	0.55	0.48	0.54	0.55	0.54

*Note.* Test-retest correlations as indicators of rank-order stability, and p-values indicating significant group differences therein between grandparents and each control group. The average retest intervals in years are 3.06 ( $SD = 0.89$ ) for the LISS parent sample, 3.05 ( $SD = 0.94$ ) for the LISS nonparent sample, 4.15 ( $SD = 0.77$ ) for the HRS parent sample, and 4.11 ( $SD = 0.67$ ) for the HRS nonparent sample. *Cor* = correlation; *GP* = grandparents; *con* = controls.

## Discussion

In an analysis of first-time grandparents compared to both parent and nonparent matched control respondents, we found pronounced stability in the Big Five and life satisfaction over the transition to grandparenthood. There were a few isolated effects in line with our hypotheses on mean-level increases in agreeableness and conscientiousness, and decreases in neuroticism (H1a). However, they were very small in size, only present in grandfathers, and not consistent over the two analyzed panel studies (LISS and HRS) or the two matched control groups (parents and nonparents). We found no robust evidence that grandparents providing grandchild care experienced more pronounced positive personality development than those who did not (H1b). Evidence for moderation of mean-level trajectories by performing paid work was inconsistent. There was no evidence that grandmothers (or grandfathers) reached higher levels of life satisfaction following the transition to grandparenthood (H1c). Although interindividual differences in change were present for all change parameters, they were only greater in the grandparents than the controls in a small minority of model comparisons (H2). Finally, rank-order stability did not differ between grandparents and either control group, or it was lower in the control group—contrary to expectations (H3).

### Social Investment Principle

We conducted a preregistered, cross-study, and multi-comparison test of the social investment principle (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007; Roberts & Wood, 2006) with grandparenthood as a candidate catalyst of personality change (Hutteman et al., 2014). We found more evidence of trait stability than of change.

The direction of the few effects we found generally supported the social investment principle, that is, increases to agreeableness and conscientiousness and decreases to neuroticism—in contrast to development following parenthood (Asselmann & Specht, 2020a; van Scheppingen et al., 2016). However, even though small psychological effects

may be meaningful and involve real-world consequences (Götz et al., 2021), the effects we found were not only small but also inconsistent across analysis samples.

Past research—mostly in the domains of well-being and health—found more pronounced effects of the transition to grandparenthood for grandmothers (Di Gessa et al., 2016b, 2019; Sheppard & Monden, 2019; Tanskanen et al., 2019). This has been discussed in the context of grandmothers spending more time with their grandchildren than grandfathers and providing more hours of care (Condon et al., 2013; Di Gessa et al., 2020), thus making a higher social investment.<sup>9</sup> Our results for the Big Five were not in agreement with this line of thought. One possible explanation is that (future) grandfathers were previously more invested in their work lives than in child rearing, and at the end of their career or after retirement, found investments in grandchild care to be a more novel and meaningful transition than grandmothers (StGeorge & Fletcher, 2014; Tanskanen et al., 2021). Currently, however, empirical research specifically on the grandfather role is sparse (for a qualitative approach, see Mann & Leeson, 2010), while the demography of grandparenthood is undergoing sweeping changes, with rising proportions of grandfathers actively involved in grandchild care (see Coall et al., 2016; Mann, 2007). Thus, more research into grandfathers' experience of the transition to grandparenthood is needed.

We tested paid work and grandchild care as moderators to gain more insight into social investment mechanisms. For conscientiousness, we found that grandparents who were not employed increased in anticipation of the transition to grandparenthood compared to working grandparents (and matched nonworking controls). This could imply that working grandparents did not find as much time for social investment because of the role conflict with the employee/worker role (Goode, 1960; see also, Arpino & Bellani, 2022; Tanskanen et al., 2021). Worth noting, we expected these moderation effects after the transition, when grandparents were able to spend time with their grandchild. However,

---

<sup>9</sup> In the HRS, a higher proportion of first-time grandmothers ( $M = 0.45$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ) than grandfathers ( $M = 0.41$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ) reported that they provided at least 100 hours of grandchild care since the last assessment.

such post-transition differences did not surface. Results for neuroticism were even less in line with the social investment principle: Working grandparents increased in neuroticism in anticipation of the transition to grandparenthood compared to the matched controls. Regarding moderation by grandchild care, our results suggested that grandparents who provided grandchild care increased slightly more in conscientiousness than grandparents who did not. However, the strength of the evidence was weak and indicates a need for temporally more fine-grained assessments with more extensive instruments of grandchild care (e.g., Vermote et al., 2021; see also Fingerman et al., 2020).

In total, evidence in favor of the social investment principle was very thin, and our analyses do not support the view that becoming a grandparent, in and of itself, changes personality in any meaningful way. This adds to other recent empirical tests in the context of parenthood and romantic relationships (Asselmann & Specht, 2020a, 2020b; Spikic et al., 2021; van Scheppingen et al., 2016) that have challenged the original core assumption of personality maturation through age-graded social role transitions. It now seems likely that distinct (or additional) theoretical assumptions and mechanisms are required to explain empirical findings of personality development in middle and older adulthood. First steps in that direction include the recent distinction between social investment and divestment (Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2019) in the context of retirement (for the related distinction between personality maturation and relaxation, see Asselmann & Specht, 2021). Further, personality development may be more closely tied to subjective perceptions of role competency and mastery than to transitions per se (Roberts & Davis, 2016; Roberts & Nickel, 2017).

Nonetheless, the possibility remains that preconditions we have not considered have to be met for grandparents to undergo personality development. For example, grandparents might need to live near their grandchild, see them regularly, and provide care above a certain quantity and quality. To our knowledge, however, there are presently no datasets with such detailed information regarding the grandparent role in conjunction with

multiple waves of Big Five personality data. Studies on well-being have provided initial evidence that more frequent contact with grandchildren is associated with higher grandparental well-being (Arpino, Bordone, et al., 2018; Danielsbacka et al., 2019; Danielsbacka & Tanskanen, 2016; Dunifon et al., 2020). However, Danielsbacka et al. (2019) noted that this effect is due to between-person differences in grandparents, thus limiting a causal interpretation of frequency of grandchild care as a mechanism of development in psychological characteristics like life satisfaction and personality.

### Life Satisfaction

Similar to the Big Five personality traits, we did not find convincing evidence that life satisfaction changed due to grandparenthood. A study of the effects of the transition on first-time grandparents' life satisfaction that used fixed effects regressions also did not discover any positive within-person effects of the transition (Sheppard & Monden, 2019; see also Ates, 2019). Further, in line with this study, we did not find evidence that grandparents who provided grandchild care increased more strongly in life satisfaction than those who did not, and grandparents' life satisfaction trajectories were also not moderated by employment status (Sheppard & Monden, 2019).

Overall, evidence has accumulated that there is an association between having grandchildren and higher life satisfaction on the between-person level—especially for (maternal) non-coresiding grandmothers who provide grandchild care (Danielsbacka et al., 2011, 2022; Danielsbacka & Tanskanen, 2016)—but no within-person effect of the transition. The main reason for this divergence is the presence of *selection* effects. Specifically, through propensity score matching we controlled for confounding (Luhmann et al., 2014; Thoemmes & Kim, 2011; VanderWeele et al., 2020), but its influence was present in previous studies. We carefully deliberated the inclusion of each covariate on the basis of its assumed causal relations to treatment assignment and the outcomes and made these underlying assumptions transparent within the preregistration.



In an exploratory analysis, Black/African American grandparents—usually lower in life satisfaction compared to White HRS respondents (e.g., W. Zhang et al., 2017)—increased in life satisfaction following the transition to grandparenthood bringing them up on par with White respondents. This is in line with cross-sectional data indicating no ethnic differences in life satisfaction between African American and White grandmothers (Goodman & Silverstein, 2006). Corroboration of this tentative finding in other samples should be awaited, though.

### **Interindividual Differences in Change**

All parameters of change exhibited considerable interindividual differences. Similar to Denissen et al. (2019), who found model fit improvements with random slopes in most models (see also Doré & Bolger, 2018), respondents—both grandparents and matched controls—deviated to a considerable extent from mean-level change trajectories.

We expected larger interindividual differences in grandparents because life events differ in their impact on daily life and in the degree to which they are perceived as meaningful or emotionally significant (Doré & Bolger, 2018; Luhmann et al., 2020). Another reason for expecting heterogeneity in the individual trajectories were the considerable differences between grandparents in the amount of grandparental investment (e.g., Danielsbacka et al., 2022) and competing role demands (e.g., Arpino & Bellani, 2022) present in our samples. Our results, however, indicated that interindividual differences were larger in the controls than the grandparents for many models, or not significantly different between groups. Only in a small minority of tests were interindividual differences significantly larger in grandparents (concerning the linear slope in anticipation of grandparenthood for openness and life satisfaction).

Importantly, most previous studies do not compare interindividual differences in personality change between an event group and a comparison group (even if they use comparison groups for the main analyses, Denissen et al., 2019; Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2019;

cf. Jackson & Beck, 2021). Interindividual differences in personality change are substantial up until around 70 years of age (Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2018). Regarding the substantive question of how the transition to grandparenthood affects interindividual differences in change, we propose that it is more informative to test grandparents' variability in change against well-matched control groups than against no groups.

Recently, Jackson and Beck (2021) presented evidence that the experience of sixteen commonly analyzed life events was mostly associated with decreases in interindividual variation in the Big Five compared to those not experiencing the respective event. They used a comparable approach to ours but in a SEM latent growth curve framework and without accounting for pre-existing group differences (i.e., without matching). Their results based on the German SOEP data suggested—contrary to their expectations—that most life events made people *more* similar to each other (Jackson & Beck, 2021). Thus, taken together with our results, it seems that the assumption that life events and transitions ostensibly produce increased heterogeneity between people needs to be scrutinized in future studies. It is possible that normative social demands of events such as grandparenthood increase homogeneity of personality development trajectories.

### Rank-Order Stability

We expected lower rank-order stability over the transition to grandparenthood in grandparents compared to the matched controls based on the assumption that grandparents' personality is reorganized through the experience of the event and the addition of the new social role. Conceptually, rank-order stability represents to which extent individual differences endure over time and it can be low even in the absence of mean-level changes if traits change nonsystematically. Empirically, though, we did not find evidence supporting our hypothesis (H3): Rank-order stability was highly similar in most comparisons of grandparents and controls, and it was not significantly lower in these comparisons. In a recent study of the effects of eight different life events on the

development of the Big Five personality traits and life satisfaction (Denissen et al., 2019), comparably high rank-order stability was reported in the event groups. Only particularly adverse events such as widowhood and disability significantly lowered rank-order stability (Chopik, 2018; Denissen et al., 2019).

Regarding the Big Five's general age trajectories of rank-order stability, support for inverted U-shape trajectories was recently strengthened in a study of two panel data sets (Seifert et al., 2021). This study also explored that health deterioration accounted for parts of the decline of personality stability in old age. Therefore, it is possible that in later developmental phases (see also Hutteman et al., 2014) rank-order stability of personality is largely influenced by health status and less by normative life events. In the context of grandparenthood, this relates to research into health benefits (Chung & Park, 2018; Condon et al., 2018; Di Gessa et al., 2016a, 2016b; cf. Ates, 2017) and decreases to mortality risk associated with grandparenthood or grandchild care (Choi, 2020; Christiansen, 2014; Hilbrand et al., 2017; cf. Ellwardt et al., 2021). Grandparenthood might therefore have a time-lagged effect on personality stability through protective effects on health. However, with the currently available data, such a mediating effect cannot be reliably recovered (under realistic assumptions, Rohrer et al., 2022).

## Limitations and Future Directions

A number of limitations need to be addressed: First, there remains some doubt whether we were able to follow truly socially invested grandparents over time. The moderator variable on grandchild care only reflects whether a respondent (or their spouse/partner) provides a minimal level of care. More detailed information regarding a grandparent's relationship with their first and later grandchildren<sup>10</sup> and the level of care a grandparent provides would be a valuable source of information on social investment, as would information on constraining factors such as length and cost of travel between

---

<sup>10</sup> It is also possible that effects of grandparental role investment accumulate with successive grandchildren (as shown for parental sleep deficits, Richter et al., 2019).

grandparent and grandchild. One way to obtain comprehensive information on mechanisms of grandparental development would be a measurement burst design in a sample of grandparents with diverse social backgrounds (see Crawford et al., 2022; Springstein et al., 2022). This would allow differentiating contexts of social investment while also providing insight into daily-life social activities (e.g., Dunifon et al., 2020) and their medium- to long-term influence on personality development (Wrzus & Roberts, 2017). On a similar note, we did not examine grandparents' subjective perception of the transition to grandparenthood in terms of the emotional significance, meaningfulness, and impact on daily lives, which might be responsible for differential individual change trajectories (Haehner et al., 2022; Kritzler et al., 2022; Luhmann et al., 2020). Grandparents' perception of potential role conflicts (Goode, 1960), and whether they perceive caregiving as a burden or obligation (Xu et al., 2017), could also uncover mechanisms of personality development.

Second, a causal interpretation of our results rests on a number of assumptions that are not directly testable with the data (Li, 2013; Stuart, 2010): We assumed that we picked the right sets of covariates, that our model to estimate the propensity score was correctly specified, and that there was no substantial remaining bias due to unmeasured confounding. Importantly, we selected covariates following state-of-the-art recommendations and substantiated each covariate's selection explicitly within our preregistration. Regarding the propensity score estimation, we computed grandparents' propensity scores at a specific time point at least two years before the transition to grandparenthood, which had the advantages that (1) the covariates were uncontaminated by anticipation of the transition, and (2) the matched controls had a clear counterfactual timeline of transition (for similar approaches, see Balbo & Arpino, 2016; Krämer & Rodgers, 2020; van Scheppingen & Leopold, 2020). It also has to be emphasized that the timing of measurements might have missed more short-term effects of grandparenthood playing out over months instead of years.

Third, our results only pertain to the countries for which our data are representative on a population level: the Netherlands and the United States. Personality development has been examined cross-culturally (e.g., Bleidorn et al., 2013; Chopik & Kitayama, 2018): On the one hand, these studies showed universal average patterns of positive personality development over the life span. On the other hand, they emphasized cultural differences regarding norms and values and the temporal onset of social roles (see Arshad & Chung, 2022). For grandparenthood, there are demographic differences between countries (Leopold & Skopek, 2015), as well as differences in public child care systems that may demand different levels of grandparental involvement (Bordone et al., 2017; Hank & Buber, 2009). In the Netherlands, people become grandparents six years later on average than in the United States (Leopold & Skopek, 2015). Furthermore, although both countries have largely market-based systems for early child care, parents in the Netherlands on average have access to more extensive childcare services through (capped) governmental benefits (OECD, 2020). Despite these differences, our results from the Dutch and US samples did not indicate systematic discrepancies.

## Conclusion

Do personality traits change over the transition to grandparenthood? In two nationally representative panel studies in a preregistered propensity score matching design, Big Five personality traits and life satisfaction remained predominantly stable in first-time grandparents over this transition compared to matched parents and nonparents. We found slight post-transition increases to grandparents' agreeableness and conscientiousness in line with the social investment principle. However, these effects were minuscule and inconsistent across analysis samples. In addition, our analyses revealed (1) a lack of consistent moderators of personality development, (2) interindividual differences in change that were mostly smaller in grandparents than in matched respondents, and (3) comparable rank-order stability in grandparents and matched respondents. Thus, we

conclude that the transition to grandparenthood did not act as a straightforwardly important developmental task driving personality development (as previously proposed, see Hutteman et al., 2014). With more detailed assessment of the grandparent role, future research can investigate whether personality development occurs in grandparents with specific degrees of role investment.

### Acknowledgements

We thank Joe Rodgers, Jaap Denissen, Oliver Huxhold, and Julia Rohrer for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

## References

- Aassve, A., Luppi, F., & Mencarini, L. (2021). A first glance into the black box of life satisfaction surrounding childbearing. *Journal of Population Research*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12546-021-09267-z>
- Allemand, M., Zimprich, D., & Martin, M. (2008). Long-term correlated change in personality traits in old age. *Psychology and Aging, 23*(3), 545–557.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013239>
- Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(4), 279–323. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226>
- Anusic, I., & Schimmack, U. (2016). Stability and change of personality traits, self-esteem, and well-being: Introducing the meta-analytic stability and change model of retest correlations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*(5), 766–781.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000066>
- Ardelt, M. (2000). Still stable after all these years? Personality stability theory revisited. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*(4), 392–405. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695848>
- Arpino, B., & Bellani, D. (2022). Juggling Grandchild Care and Labor Force Participation: The Effect on Psychological Wellbeing of Older Women. *Frontiers in Sociology, 6*.
- Arpino, B., & Bordone, V. (2017). Regular provision of grandchild care and participation in social activities. *Review of Economics of the Household, 15*(1), 135–174.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-016-9322-4>
- Arpino, B., Bordone, V., & Balbo, N. (2018). Grandparenting, education and subjective well-being of older Europeans. *European Journal of Ageing, 15*(3), 251–263.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-018-0467-2>
- Arpino, B., & Gómez-León, M. (2020). Consequences on depression of combining grandparental childcare with other caregiving roles. *Aging & Mental Health, 24*(8), 1263–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2019.1584788>

- Arpino, B., Gumà, J., & Julià, A. (2018). Family histories and the demography of grandparenthood. *Demographic Research*, 39(42), 1105–1150.  
<https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2018.39.42>
- Arshad, M., & Chung, J. (2022). Practical recommendations for considering culture, race, and ethnicity in personality psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12656>
- Asselmann, E., & Specht, J. (2021). Personality maturation and personality relaxation: Differences of the Big Five personality traits in the years around the beginning and ending of working life. *Journal of Personality*, Advance Online Publication.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12640>
- Asselmann, E., & Specht, J. (2020a). Testing the Social Investment Principle Around Childbirth: Little Evidence for Personality Maturation Before and After Becoming a Parent. *European Journal of Personality*, Advance Online Publication.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2269>
- Asselmann, E., & Specht, J. (2020b). Taking the ups and downs at the rollercoaster of love: Associations between major life events in the domain of romantic relationships and the Big Five personality traits. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(9), 1803–1816.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001047>
- Ates, M. (2017). Does grandchild care influence grandparents' self-rated health? Evidence from a fixed effects approach. *Social Science & Medicine*, 190, 67–74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.08.021>
- Ates, M. (2019). *Well-Being of Grandparents in Germany* [PhD thesis]. Universität zu Köln.
- Ates, M., Bordone, V., & Arpino, B. (2021). Does grandparental child-care provision affect number, satisfaction and with whom leisure activities are done? *Ageing and Society*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X2100009X>
- Aust, F. (2019). *Citr: 'RStudio' add-in to insert markdown citations*.



1081 <https://github.com/crsh/citr>

1082 Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles with R*  
1083 *Markdown*. <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>

1084 Austin, P. C. (2017). Double propensity-score adjustment: A solution to design bias or bias  
1085 due to incomplete matching. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 26(1), 201–222.  
1086 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280214543508>

1087 Austin, P. C. (2011). An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects  
1088 of confounding in observational studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 46(3),  
1089 399–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.568786>

1090 Baird, B. M., Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2010). Life satisfaction across the lifespan:  
1091 Findings from two nationally representative panel studies. *Social Indicators Research*,  
1092 99(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9584-9>

1093 Balbo, N., & Arpino, B. (2016). The role of family orientations in shaping the effect of  
1094 fertility on subjective well-being: A propensity score matching approach. *Demography*,  
1095 53(4), 955–978. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-016-0480-z>

1096 Baltes, P. B., Lindenberger, U., & Staudinger, U. M. (2006). Life Span Theory in  
1097 Developmental Psychology. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child*  
1098 *psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 569–664). John Wiley &  
1099 Sons Inc.

1100 Barth, M. (2021). *tinylabels: Lightweight variable labels*.  
1101 <https://cran.r-project.org/package=tinylabels>

1102 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects  
1103 models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48.  
1104 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>

1105 Bates, D., & Maechler, M. (2021). *Matrix: Sparse and dense matrix classes and methods*.  
1106 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Matrix>

1107 Beck, E. D., & Jackson, J. J. (2021). A Mega-Analysis of Personality Prediction:

- 1108 Robustness and Boundary Conditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, In*  
1109 *Press*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/7pg9b>
- 1110 Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the Nuclear Family: The Increasing Importance of  
1111 Multigenerational Bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(1), 1–16.  
1112 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00001.x>
- 1113 Benjamin, D. J., Berger, J. O., Clyde, M., Wolpert, R. L., Johnson, V. E., Johannesson,  
1114 M., Dreber, A., Nosek, B. A., Wagenmakers, E. J., Berk, R., & Brems, B. (2018).  
1115 Redefine statistical significance. *Nature Human Behavior, 2*, 6–10.  
1116 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0189-z>
- 1117 Bernaards, C. A., & I.Jennrich, R. (2005). Gradient projection algorithms and software for  
1118 arbitrary rotation criteria in factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological*  
1119 *Measurement, 65*, 676–696.
- 1120 Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., Back, M. D., Denissen, J. J. A., Hennecke, M., Hill, P. L.,  
1121 Jokela, M., Kandler, C., Lucas, R. E., Luhmann, M., Orth, U., Roberts, B. W.,  
1122 Wagner, J., Wrzus, C., & Zimmermann, J. (2021). Personality Trait Stability and  
1123 Change. *Personality Science, 2*(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ps.6009>
- 1124 Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., & Lucas, R. E. (2018). Life events and personality trait  
1125 change. *Journal of Personality, 86*(1), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12286>
- 1126 Bleidorn, W., Klimstra, T. A., Denissen, J. J. A., Rentfrow, P. J., Potter, J., & Gosling, S.  
1127 D. (2013). Personality Maturation Around the World: A Cross-Cultural Examination  
1128 of Social-Investment Theory. *Psychological Science, 24*(12), 2530–2540.  
1129 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613498396>
- 1130 Bleidorn, W., & Schwaba, T. (2017). Personality development in emerging adulthood. In  
1131 J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality Development Across the Lifespan* (pp. 39–51). Academic  
1132 Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-804674-6.00004-1>
- 1133 Bleidorn, W., & Schwaba, T. (2018). Retirement is associated with change in self-esteem.  
1134 *Psychology and Aging, 33*(4), 586–594. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000253>

- 1135 Bordone, V., Arpino, B., & Aassve, A. (2017). Patterns of grandparental child care across  
1136 Europe: The role of the policy context and working mothers' need. *Ageing and Society*,  
1137 37(4), 845–873. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X1600009X>
- 1138 Brüderl, J., & Ludwig, V. (2015). *Fixed-Effects Panel Regression* (H. Best & C. Wolf,  
1139 Eds.). SAGE.
- 1140 Burgette, L. F., & Reiter, J. P. (2010). Multiple Imputation for Missing Data via  
1141 Sequential Regression Trees. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 172(9), 1070–1076.  
1142 <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwq260>
- 1143 Chang, W., Cheng, J., Allaire, J., Sievert, C., Schloerke, B., Xie, Y., Allen, J., McPherson,  
1144 J., Dipert, A., & Borges, B. (2021). *Shiny: Web application framework for r*.  
1145 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny>
- 1146 Choi, S. E. (2020). Grandparenting and Mortality: How Does Race-Ethnicity Matter?  
1147 *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 61(1), 96–112.  
1148 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146520903282>
- 1149 Chopik, W. J. (2018). Does personality change following spousal bereavement? *Journal of*  
1150 *Research in Personality*, 72, 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.08.010>
- 1151 Chopik, W. J., & Kitayama, S. (2018). Personality change across the life span: Insights  
1152 from a cross-cultural, longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality*, 86(3), 508–521.  
1153 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12332>
- 1154 Christiansen, S. G. (2014). The association between grandparenthood and mortality. *Social*  
1155 *Science & Medicine*, 118, 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.07.061>
- 1156 Chung, S., & Park, A. (2018). The longitudinal effects of grandchild care on depressive  
1157 symptoms and physical health of grandmothers in South Korea: A latent growth  
1158 approach. *Aging & Mental Health*, 22(12), 1556–1563.  
1159 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2017.1376312>
- 1160 Coall, D. A., & Hertwig, R. (2011). Grandparental Investment: A Relic of the Past or a  
1161 Resource for the Future? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(2), 93–98.

1162 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411403269>

1163 Coall, D. A., Hilbrand, S., Sear, R., & Hertwig, R. (2018). Interdisciplinary perspectives on  
1164 grandparental investment: A journey towards causality. *Contemporary Social Science*,  
1165 *13*(2), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2018.1433317>

1166 Coall, D. A., Hilbrand, S., Sear, R., & Hertwig, R. (2016). A New Niche? The Theory of  
1167 Grandfather Involvement. In A. Buchanan & A. Rotkirch (Eds.), *Grandfathers: Global*  
1168 *Perspectives* (pp. 21–44). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

1169 [https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56338-5\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56338-5_2)

1170 Condon, J., Corkindale, C., Luszcz, M., & Gamble, E. (2013). The Australian First-time  
1171 Grandparents Study: Time spent with the grandchild and its predictors. *Australasian*  
1172 *Journal on Ageing*, *32*(1), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6612.2011.00588.x>

1173 Condon, J., Luszcz, M., & McKee, I. (2018). The transition to grandparenthood: A  
1174 prospective study of mental health implications. *Aging & Mental Health*, *22*(3),  
1175 336–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2016.1248897>

1176 Cook, T. D., Zhu, N., Klein, A., Starkey, P., & Thomas, J. (2020). How much bias results  
1177 if a quasi-experimental design combines local comparison groups, a pretest outcome  
1178 measure and other covariates?: A within study comparison of preschool effects.  
1179 *Psychological Methods*, Advance Online Publication.

1180 <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000260>

1181 Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Löckenhoff, C. E. (2019). Personality Across the Life Span.  
1182 *Annual Review of Psychology*, *70*(1), 423–448.

1183 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103244>

1184 Crawford, J. L., English, T., & Braver, T. S. (2022). Incorporating ecological momentary  
1185 assessment into multimethod investigations of cognitive aging: Promise and practical  
1186 considerations. *Psychology and Aging*, *37*(1), 84–96.

1187 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000646>

1188 Damian, R. I., Spengler, M., Sutu, A., & Roberts, B. W. (2019). Sixteen going on sixty-six:

- 1189 A longitudinal study of personality stability and change across 50 years. *Journal of*  
1190 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 117(3), 674–695.  
1191 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000210>
- 1192 Danielsbacka, M., Křenková, L., & Tanskanen, A. O. (2022). Grandparenting, health, and  
1193 well-being: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Ageing*.  
1194 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-021-00674-y>
- 1195 Danielsbacka, M., & Tanskanen, A. O. (2016). The association between grandparental  
1196 investment and grandparents' happiness in Finland. *Personal Relationships*, 23(4),  
1197 787–800. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12160>
- 1198 Danielsbacka, M., Tanskanen, A. O., Coall, D. A., & Jokela, M. (2019). Grandparental  
1199 childcare, health and well-being in Europe: A within-individual investigation of  
1200 longitudinal data. *Social Science & Medicine*, 230, 194–203.  
1201 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.03.031>
- 1202 Danielsbacka, M., Tanskanen, A. O., Jokela, M., & Rotkirch, A. (2011). Grandparental  
1203 Child Care in Europe: Evidence for Preferential Investment in More Certain Kin.  
1204 *Evolutionary Psychology*, 9(1), 147470491100900102.  
1205 <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491100900102>
- 1206 Denissen, J. J. A., Geenen, R., Soto, C. J., John, O. P., & van Aken, M. A. G. (2020). The  
1207 Big Five Inventory–2: Replication of Psychometric Properties in a Dutch Adaptation  
1208 and First Evidence for the Discriminant Predictive Validity of the Facet Scales. *Journal*  
1209 *of Personality Assessment*, 102(3), 309–324.  
1210 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1539004>
- 1211 Denissen, J. J. A., Luhmann, M., Chung, J. M., & Bleidorn, W. (2019). Transactions  
1212 between life events and personality traits across the adult lifespan. *Journal of*  
1213 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 116(4), 612–633.  
1214 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000196>
- 1215 Di Gessa, G., Bordone, V., & Arpino, B. (2019). Becoming a Grandparent and Its Effect

- 1216 on Well-Being: The Role of Order of Transitions, Time, and Gender. *The Journals of*  
 1217 *Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, Advance Online  
 1218 Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbz135>
- 1219 Di Gessa, G., Glaser, K., & Tinker, A. (2016a). The Health Impact of Intensive and  
 1220 Nonintensive Grandchild Care in Europe: New Evidence From SHARE. *The Journals*  
 1221 *of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 71(5), 867–879.  
 1222 <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbv055>
- 1223 Di Gessa, G., Glaser, K., & Tinker, A. (2016b). The impact of caring for grandchildren on  
 1224 the health of grandparents in Europe: A lifecourse approach. *Social Science &*  
 1225 *Medicine*, 152, 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.01.041>
- 1226 Di Gessa, G., Zaninotto, P., & Glaser, K. (2020). Looking after grandchildren: Gender  
 1227 differences in “when,” “what,” and “why”: Evidence from the English Longitudinal  
 1228 Study of Ageing. *Demographic Research*, 43(53), 1545–1562.  
 1229 <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2020.43.53>
- 1230 Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life  
 1231 Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.  
 1232 [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13)
- 1233 Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature*  
 1234 *Human Behaviour*, 2(4), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
- 1235 Doré, B., & Bolger, N. (2018). Population- and individual-level changes in life satisfaction  
 1236 surrounding major life stressors. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(7),  
 1237 875–884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617727589>
- 1238 Dunifon, R. E., Musick, K. A., & Near, C. E. (2020). Time with Grandchildren: Subjective  
 1239 Well-Being Among Grandparents Living with Their Grandchildren. *Social Indicators*  
 1240 *Research*, 148(2), 681–702. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02206-9>
- 1241 Eid, M., & Larsen, R. J. (2008). *The science of subjective well-being*. Guilford Press.
- 1242 Ellwardt, L., Hank, K., & Mendes de Leon, C. F. (2021). Grandparenthood and risk of

- 1243 mortality: Findings from the Health and Retirement Study. *Social Science & Medicine*,  
1244 268, 113371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113371>
- 1245 Elwert, F., & Winship, C. (2014). Endogenous Selection Bias: The Problem of  
1246 Conditioning on a Collider Variable. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40(1), 31–53.  
1247 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043455>
- 1248 Fingerman, K. L., Huo, M., & Birditt, K. S. (2020). A Decade of Research on  
1249 Intergenerational Ties: Technological, Economic, Political, and Demographic Changes.  
1250 *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 383–403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12604>
- 1251 Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019a). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third). Sage.
- 1252 Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019b). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third). Sage.  
1253 <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/>
- 1254 Fox, J., Weisberg, S., & Price, B. (2020). *carData: Companion to applied regression data*  
1255 *sets*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=carData>
- 1256 Gebauer, J. E., Bleidorn, W., Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., Lamb, M. E., & Potter, J.  
1257 (2014). Cross-cultural variations in Big Five relationships with religiosity: A  
1258 sociocultural motives perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
1259 107(6), 1064–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037683>
- 1260 Genz, A., & Bretz, F. (2009). *Computation of multivariate normal and t probabilities*.  
1261 Springer-Verlag.
- 1262 Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure.  
1263 *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1), 26–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26>
- 1264 Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory  
1265 measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. *Personality Psychology in*  
1266 *Europe*, 7(1), 7–28.
- 1267 Golle, J., Rose, N., Göllner, R., Spengler, M., Stoll, G., Hübner, N., Rieger, S., Trautwein,  
1268 U., Lüdtke, O., Roberts, B. W., & Nagengast, B. (2019). School or Work? The Choice  
1269 May Change Your Personality. *Psychological Science*, 30(1), 32–42.

1270 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618806298>

1271 Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483–496.

1272 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092933>

1273 Goodman, C. C., & Silverstein, M. (2006). Grandmothers Raising Grandchildren: Ethnic  
1274 and Racial Differences in Well-Being Among Custodial and Coparenting Families.  
1275 *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(11), 1605–1626.

1276 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06291435>

1277 Götmark, F., & Andersson, M. (2020). Human fertility in relation to education, economy,  
1278 religion, contraception, and family planning programs. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 265.

1279 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8331-7>

1280 Götz, F. M., Gosling, S. D., & Rentfrow, P. J. (2021). Small Effects: The Indispensable  
1281 Foundation for a Cumulative Psychological Science. *Perspectives on Psychological*  
1282 *Science*, Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620984483>

1283 Graham, E. K., Weston, S. J., Gerstorf, D., Yoneda, T. B., Booth, T., Beam, C. R.,  
1284 Petkus, A. J., Drewelies, J., Hall, A. N., Bastarache, E. D., Estabrook, R., Katz, M. J.,  
1285 Turiano, N. A., Lindenberger, U., Smith, J., Wagner, G. G., Pedersen, N. L., Allemand,  
1286 M., Spiro Iii, A., . . . Mroczek, D. K. (2020). Trajectories of Big Five Personality Traits:  
1287 A Coordinated Analysis of 16 Longitudinal Samples. *European Journal of Personality*,  
1288 Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2259>

1289 Greenland, S. (2003). Quantifying biases in causal models: Classical confounding vs  
1290 collider-stratification bias. *Epidemiology*, 14(3), 300–306.

1291 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.EDE.0000042804.12056.6C>

1292 Greenland, S., & Finkle, W. D. (1995). A Critical Look at Methods for Handling Missing  
1293 Covariates in Epidemiologic Regression Analyses. *American Journal of Epidemiology*,  
1294 142(12), 1255–1264. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a117592>

1295 Haehner, P., Rakhshani, A., Fassbender, I., Lucas, R. E., Donnellan, M. B., & Luhmann,  
1296 M. (2022). Perception of major life events and personality trait change. *European*



1297 *Journal of Personality*, Advance Online Publication.

1298 <https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070221107973>

1299 Hagestad, G. O., & Neugarten, B. L. (1985). Age and the life course. In E. Shanas & R.

1300 Binstock (Eds.), *Handbook of aging and the social sciences*. Van Nostrand and Reinhold.

1301 Hallberg, K., Cook, T. D., Steiner, P. M., & Clark, M. H. (2018). Pretest Measures of the

1302 Study Outcome and the Elimination of Selection Bias: Evidence from Three Within

1303 Study Comparisons. *Prevention Science*, 19(3), 274–283.

1304 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-016-0732-6>

1305 Hank, K., & Buber, I. (2009). Grandparents Caring for their Grandchildren: Findings

1306 From the 2004 Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe. *Journal of Family*

1307 *Issues*, 30(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X08322627>

1308 Harrell Jr, F. E. (2021). *Hmisc: Harrell miscellaneous*.

1309 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc>

1310 Hayford, S. R., & Morgan, S. P. (2008). Religiosity and Fertility in the United States: The

1311 Role of Fertility Intentions. *Social Forces*, 86(3), 1163–1188.

1312 <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.0.0000>

1313 Hayslip, B., Fruhauf, C. A., & Dolbin-MacNab, M. L. (2019). Grandparents Raising

1314 Grandchildren: What Have We Learned Over the Past Decade? *The Gerontologist*,

1315 59(3), e152–e163. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnx106>

1316 Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*.

1317 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr>

1318 Hentschel, S., Eid, M., & Kutscher, T. (2017). The Influence of Major Life Events and

1319 Personality Traits on the Stability of Affective Well-Being. *Journal of Happiness*

1320 *Studies*, 18(3), 719–741. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9744-y>

1321 Hilbrand, S., Coall, D. A., Gerstorf, D., & Hertwig, R. (2017). Caregiving within and

1322 beyond the family is associated with lower mortality for the caregiver: A prospective

1323 study. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 38(3), 397–403.

1324 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2016.11.010>

1325 Ho, D. E., Imai, K., King, G., & Stuart, E. A. (2011). MatchIt: Nonparametric  
1326 preprocessing for parametric causal inference. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 42(8),  
1327 1–28.

1328 Hoffman, L. (2015). *Longitudinal analysis: Modeling within-person fluctuation and change*.  
1329 Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

1330 Hoffman, L., & Walters, R. W. (2022). Catching Up on Multilevel Modeling. *Annual*  
1331 *Review of Psychology*, 73. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/j8x9k>

1332 Hothorn, T. (2019). *TH.data: TH's data archive*.

1333 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=TH.data>

1334 Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., & Westfall, P. (2008). Simultaneous inference in general parametric  
1335 models. *Biometrical Journal*, 50(3), 346–363.

1336 Hutteman, R., Hennecke, M., Orth, U., Reitz, A. K., & Specht, J. (2014). Developmental  
1337 Tasks as a Framework to Study Personality Development in Adulthood and Old Age.  
1338 *European Journal of Personality*, 28(3), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1959>

1339 Infurna, F. J., Gerstorf, D., & Lachman, M. E. (2020). Midlife in the 2020s: Opportunities  
1340 and challenges. *American Psychologist*, 75(4), 470–485.  
1341 <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000591>

1342 Jackson, J. J., & Beck, E. D. (2021). Personality Development Beyond the Mean: Do Life  
1343 Events Shape Personality Variability, Structure, and Ipsative Continuity? *The Journals*  
1344 *of Gerontology: Series B*, 76(1), 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa093>

1345 John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big  
1346 Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R.  
1347 W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp.  
1348 114–158). The Guilford Press.

1349 John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five Trait taxonomy: History, measurement,  
1350 and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of*

1351 *personality: Theory and research, 2nd ed.* (pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.

1352 Johnson, A. B., & Rodgers, J. L. (2006). The impact of having children on the lives of  
1353 women: The Effects of Children Questionnaire. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,  
1354 36(11), 2685–2714. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00123.x>

1355 Kandler, C., Kornadt, A. E., Hagemeyer, B., & Neyer, F. J. (2015). Patterns and sources  
1356 of personality development in old age. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
1357 109(1), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000028>

1358 Kandler, C., Zimmermann, J., & Mcadams, D. (2014). Core and Surface Characteristics  
1359 for the Description and Theory of Personality Differences and Development. *European*  
1360 *Journal of Personality*, 28(3), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1952>

1361 Kim, H.-J., Kang, H., & Johnson-Motoyama, M. (2017). The psychological well-being of  
1362 grandparents who provide supplementary grandchild care: A systematic review. *Journal*  
1363 *of Family Studies*, 23(1), 118–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2016.1194306>

1364 Krämer, M. D., & Rodgers, J. L. (2020). The impact of having children on domain-specific  
1365 life satisfaction: A quasi-experimental longitudinal investigation using the  
1366 Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) data. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
1367 119(6), 1497–1514. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000279>

1368 Kritzler, S., Rakhshani, A., Terwiel, S., Fassbender, I., Donnellan, M. B., Lucas, R. E., &  
1369 Luhmann, M. (2022). How are common major life events perceived? Exploring  
1370 differences between and variability of different typical event profiles and raters.  
1371 *European Journal of Personality*, Advance Online Publication.  
1372 <https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070221076586>

1373 Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest package: Tests  
1374 in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(13), 1–26.  
1375 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>

1376 Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1997). *The Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI)*  
1377 *personality scales: Scale construction and scoring*. Brandeis University.

- 1378 Leopold, T., & Skopek, J. (2015). The Demography of Grandparenthood: An International  
1379 Profile. *Social Forces*, 94(2), 801–832. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sov066>
- 1380 Li, M. (2013). Using the Propensity Score Method to Estimate Causal Effects: A Review  
1381 and Practical Guide. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(2), 188–226.  
1382 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112447816>
- 1383 Lodi-Smith, J., & Roberts, B. W. (2007). Social Investment and Personality: A  
1384 Meta-Analysis of the Relationship of Personality Traits to Investment in Work, Family,  
1385 Religion, and Volunteerism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(1), 68–86.  
1386 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294590>
- 1387 Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2011). Personality development across the life span:  
1388 Longitudinal analyses with a national sample from Germany. *Journal of Personality*  
1389 *and Social Psychology*, 101(4), 847–861. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024298>
- 1390 Lüdtke, O., Roberts, B. W., Trautwein, U., & Nagy, G. (2011). A random walk down  
1391 university avenue: Life paths, life events, and personality trait change at the transition  
1392 to university life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(3), 620–637.  
1393 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023743>
- 1394 Luhmann, M., Fassbender, I., Alcock, M., & Haehner, P. (2020). A dimensional taxonomy  
1395 of perceived characteristics of major life events. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
1396 *Psychology*, Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000291>
- 1397 Luhmann, M., Hofmann, W., Eid, M., & Lucas, R. E. (2012). Subjective well-being and  
1398 adaptation to life events: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
1399 *Psychology*, 102(3), 592–615. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025948>
- 1400 Luhmann, M., Orth, U., Specht, J., Kandler, C., & Lucas, R. E. (2014). Studying changes  
1401 in life circumstances and personality: It's about time. *European Journal of Personality*,  
1402 28(3), 256–266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1951>
- 1403 Lumsdaine, R. L., & Vermeer, S. J. C. (2015). Retirement timing of women and the role of  
1404 care responsibilities for grandchildren. *Demography*, 52(2), 433–454.

1405 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-015-0382-5>

1406 MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the practice of  
1407 dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods*, 7(1), 19–40.

1408 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.19>

1409 Mahne, K., & Motel-Klingebiel, A. (2012). The importance of the grandparent role—A  
1410 class specific phenomenon? Evidence from Germany. *Advances in Life Course*  
1411 *Research*, 17(3), 145–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2012.06.001>

1412 Mann, R. (2007). Out of the shadows?: Grandfatherhood, age and masculinities.

1413 *Masculinity and Aging*, 21(4), 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2007.05.008>

1414 Mann, R., & Leeson, G. (2010). Grandfathers in Contemporary Families in Britain:

1415 Evidence from Qualitative Research. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 8(3),  
1416 234–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2010.498774>

1417 Margolis, R., & Verdery, A. M. (2019). A Cohort Perspective on the Demography of  
1418 Grandparenthood: Past, Present, and Future Changes in Race and Sex Disparities in  
1419 the United States. *Demography*, 56(4), 1495–1518.

1420 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00795-1>

1421 Margolis, R., & Wright, L. (2017). Healthy Grandparenthood: How Long Is It, and How  
1422 Has It Changed? *Demography*, 54(6), 2073–2099.

1423 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0620-0>

1424 Marsh, H. W., Nagengast, B., & Morin, A. J. S. (2013). Measurement invariance of big-five  
1425 factors over the life span: ESEM tests of gender, age, plasticity, maturity, and la dolce  
1426 vita effects. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(6), 1194–1218.

1427 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026913>

1428 McCrae, R. R. (1993). Moderated analyses of longitudinal personality stability. *Journal of*  
1429 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(3), 577–585.

1430 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.3.577>

1431 McNeish, D. (2018). Thanks coefficient alpha, we'll take it from here. *Psychological*

- 1432 *Methods*, 23(3), 412–433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000144>
- 1433 McNeish, D., & Kelley, K. (2019). Fixed effects models versus mixed effects models for  
1434 clustered data: Reviewing the approaches, disentangling the differences, and making  
1435 recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 24(1), 20–35.  
1436 <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000182>
- 1437 Meyer, M. H., & Kandic, A. (2017). Grandparenting in the United States. *Innovation in*  
1438 *Aging*, 1(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igx023>
- 1439 Mitra, R., & Reiter, J. P. (2016). A comparison of two methods of estimating propensity  
1440 scores after multiple imputation. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 25(1),  
1441 188–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280212445945>
- 1442 Möttus, R., Johnson, W., & Deary, I. J. (2012). Personality traits in old age: Measurement  
1443 and rank-order stability and some mean-level change. *Psychology and Aging*, 27(1),  
1444 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023690>
- 1445 Mueller, M., & Elder, G. (2003). Family Contingencies Across the Generations:  
1446 Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships in Holistic Perspective. *Journal of Marriage and*  
1447 *Family*, 65, 404–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00404.x>
- 1448 Mueller, S., Wagner, J., Drewelies, J., Duezel, S., Eibich, P., Specht, J., Demuth, I.,  
1449 Steinhagen-Thiessen, E., Wagner, G. G., & Gerstorf, D. (2016). Personality  
1450 development in old age relates to physical health and cognitive performance: Evidence  
1451 from the Berlin Aging Study II. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 65, 94–108.  
1452 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.08.007>
- 1453 Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames*.  
1454 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble>
- 1455 Notter, I. R. (2021). Grandchild Care and Well-Being: Gender Differences in Mental  
1456 Health Effects of Caregiving Grandparents. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*,  
1457 gbab164. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbab164>
- 1458 OECD. (2020). *Is Childcare Affordable? Policy Brief On Employment, Labour And Social*

*Affairs.*

Ooms, J. (2021). *Magick: Advanced graphics and image-processing in R.*

<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=magick>

Pearl, J. (2009). Causal inference in statistics: An overview. *Statistics Surveys*, 3, 96–146.

<https://doi.org/10.1214/09-SS057>

Pilkauskas, N. V., Amorim, M., & Dunifon, R. E. (2020). Historical Trends in Children

Living in Multigenerational Households in the United States: 1870–2018. *Demography*,

57(6), 2269–2296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-020-00920-5>

Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., & R Core Team. (2021). *nlme: Linear and*

*nonlinear mixed effects models*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>

Pusch, S., Mund, M., Hagemeyer, B., & Finn, C. (2019). Personality Development in

Emerging and Young Adulthood: A Study of Age Differences. *European Journal of*

*Personality*, 33(3), 245–263. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2181>

Quirke, E., König, H.-H., & Hajek, A. (2021). What are the social consequences of

beginning or ceasing to care for grandchildren? Evidence from an asymmetric fixed

effects analysis of community dwelling adults in Germany. *Aging & Mental Health*,

25(5), 969–975. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2020.1727846>

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R

Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>

Revelle, W. (2021). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality*

*research*. Northwestern University. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>

Richter, D., Krämer, M. D., Tang, N. K. Y., Montgomery-Downs, H. E., & Lemola, S.

(2019). Long-term effects of pregnancy and childbirth on sleep satisfaction and duration

of first-time and experienced mothers and fathers. *Sleep*, 42(4), 1–10.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/zsz015>

Roberts, B. W., & Davis, J. P. (2016). Young Adulthood Is the Crucible of Personality

Development. *Emerging Adulthood*, 4(5), 318–326.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696816653052>

Roberts, B. W., & DelVecchio, W. F. (2000). The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: A quantitative review of longitudinal studies.

*Psychological Bulletin*, 126(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.1.3>

Roberts, B. W., & Nickel, L. B. (2017). A critical evaluation of the Neo-Socioanalytic Model of personality. In J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality Development Across the Lifespan* (pp. 157–177). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-804674-6.00011-9>

Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies.

*Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.1>

Roberts, B. W., & Wood, D. (2006). Personality Development in the Context of the Neo-Socioanalytic Model of Personality. In D. K. Mroczek & T. D. Little (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality Development*. Routledge.

Roberts, B. W., Wood, D., & Smith, J. L. (2005). Evaluating Five Factor Theory and social investment perspectives on personality trait development. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39(1), 166–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.08.002>

Roberts, B. W., & Yoon, H. J. (2021). Personality Psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Advance Online Publication.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-020821-114927>

Rohrer, J. M. (2018). Thinking Clearly About Correlations and Causation: Graphical Causal Models for Observational Data. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245917745629>

Rohrer, J. M., Hünermund, P., Arslan, R. C., & Elson, M. (2022). That’s a Lot to Process! Pitfalls of Popular Path Models. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 5(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459221095827>

Rosenbaum, P. (1984). The consequences of adjustment for a concomitant variable that has been affected by the treatment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A*



- 1513       (*General*), 147(5), 656–666. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2981697>
- 1514   Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r*. Springer.
- 1515       <http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org>
- 1516   Scherpenzeel, A. C. (2011). Data Collection in a Probability-Based Internet Panel: How
- 1517       the LISS Panel Was Built and How It Can Be Used. *Bulletin of Sociological*
- 1518       *Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 109(1), 56–61.
- 1519       <https://doi.org/10.1177/0759106310387713>
- 1520   Scherpenzeel, A. C., & Das, M. (2010). True” longitudinal and probability-based internet
- 1521       panels: Evidence from the Netherlands. In M. Das, P. Ester, & L. Kaczmirek (Eds.),
- 1522       *Social and behavioral research and the internet: Advances in applied methods and*
- 1523       *research strategies* (pp. 77–104). Taylor & Francis.
- 1524   Schwaba, T., & Bleidorn, W. (2018). Individual differences in personality change across the
- 1525       adult life span. *Journal of Personality*, 86(3), 450–464.
- 1526       <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12327>
- 1527   Schwaba, T., & Bleidorn, W. (2019). Personality trait development across the transition to
- 1528       retirement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 116(4), 651–665.
- 1529       <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000179>
- 1530   Seifert, I. S., Rohrer, J. M., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2021). The Development of the
- 1531       Rank-Order Stability of the Big Five Across the Life Span. *Journal of Personality and*
- 1532       *Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000398>
- 1533   Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and*
- 1534       *quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton, Mifflin and
- 1535       Company.
- 1536   Sheppard, P., & Monden, C. (2019). Becoming a First-Time Grandparent and Subjective
- 1537       Well-Being: A Fixed Effects Approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(4),
- 1538       1016–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12584>
- 1539   Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*,

39(4), 567–578. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094422>

Silverstein, M., & Marengo, A. (2001). How Americans Enact the Grandparent Role Across the Family Life Course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 493–522.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/019251301022004006>

Skopek, J., & Leopold, T. (2017). Who becomes a grandparent – and when? Educational differences in the chances and timing of grandparenthood. *Demographic Research*, 37(29), 917–928. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2017.37.29>

Sonnega, A., Faul, J. D., Ofstedal, M. B., Langa, K. M., Phillips, J. W., & Weir, D. R. (2014). Cohort Profile: The Health and Retirement Study (HRS). *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 43(2), 576–585. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyu067>

Specht, J. (2017). Personality development in adulthood and old age. In J. Specht (Ed.), *Personality Development Across the Lifespan* (pp. 53–67). Academic Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-804674-6.00005-3>

Specht, J., Bleidorn, W., Denissen, J. J. A., Hennecke, M., Hutteman, R., Kandler, C., Luhmann, M., Orth, U., Reitz, A. K., & Zimmermann, J. (2014). What Drives Adult Personality Development? A Comparison of Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Evidence. *European Journal of Personality*, 28(3), 216–230.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1966>

Specht, J., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2011). Stability and change of personality across the life course: The impact of age and major life events on mean-level and rank-order stability of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(4),

862–882. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024950>

Spikic, S., Mortelmans, D., & Pasteels, I. (2021). Does divorce change your personality? Examining the effect of divorce occurrence on the Big Five personality traits using panel surveys from three countries. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 171, 110428.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110428>

Springstein, T., Growney, C. M., & English, T. (2022). Supporting robust research on

adult emotional development by considering context. *Psychology and Aging*, 37(1), 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000669>

Steiner, P., Cook, T., Shadish, W., & Clark, M. (2010). The Importance of Covariate Selection in Controlling for Selection Bias in Observational Studies. *Psychological Methods*, 15, 250–267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018719>

Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R., & Terracciano, A. (2014). Physical activity and personality development across adulthood and old age: Evidence from two longitudinal studies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 49, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.12.003>

StGeorge, J. M., & Fletcher, R. J. (2014). Men’s experiences of grandfatherhood: A welcome surprise. *The International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 78(4), 351–378. <https://doi.org/10.2190/AG.78.4.c>

Stuart, E. A. (2010). Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical Science: A Review Journal Of The Institute Of Mathematical Statistics*, 25(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-STS313>

Tanskanen, A. O. (2017). Intergenerational relations before and after offspring arrive: A within-person investigation. *Social Science Research*, 67, 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.08.001>

Tanskanen, A. O., Danielsbacka, M., Coall, D. A., & Jokela, M. (2019). Transition to Grandparenthood and Subjective Well-Being in Older Europeans: A Within-Person Investigation Using Longitudinal Data. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 17(3), 1474704919875948. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704919875948>

Tanskanen, A. O., Danielsbacka, M., Hämäläinen, H., & Solé-Auró, A. (2021). Does Transition to Retirement Promote Grandchild Care? Evidence From Europe. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.

Terry M. Therneau, & Patricia M. Grambsch. (2000). *Modeling survival data: Extending the Cox model*. Springer.

Thiele, D. M., & Whelan, T. A. (2006). The Nature and Dimensions of the Grandparent

1594 Role. *Marriage & Family Review*, 40(1), 93–108.

1595 [https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v40n01\\_06](https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v40n01_06)

1596 Thoemmes, F. J., & Kim, E. S. (2011). A Systematic Review of Propensity Score Methods  
1597 in the Social Sciences. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 46(1), 90–118.

1598 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.540475>

1599 Urbanek, S. (2013). *Png: Read and write PNG images*.

1600 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=png>

1601 Ushey, K. (2022). *Renv: Project environments* [R Package Version 0.15.2].

1602 van Buuren, S., & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011). mice: Multivariate imputation by  
1603 chained equations in r. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 45(3), 1–67.

1604 van der Laan, J. (2009). *Representativity of the LISS panel (Discussion Paper 09041)*.  
1605 Statistics Netherlands.

1606 van Scheppingen, M. A., Jackson, J. J., Specht, J., Hutteman, R., Denissen, J. J. A., &  
1607 Bleidorn, W. (2016). Personality Trait Development During the Transition to  
1608 Parenthood: A Test of Social Investment Theory. *Social Psychological and Personality*  
1609 *Science*, 7(5), 452–462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616630032>

1610 van Scheppingen, M. A., & Leopold, T. (2020). Trajectories of life satisfaction before, upon,  
1611 and after divorce: Evidence from a new matching approach. *Journal of Personality and*  
1612 *Social Psychology*, 119(6), 1444–1458. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000270>

1613 VanderWeele, T. J. (2019). Principles of confounder selection. *European Journal of*  
1614 *Epidemiology*, 34(3), 211–219. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-019-00494-6>

1615 VanderWeele, T. J., Mathur, M. B., & Chen, Y. (2020). Outcome-Wide Longitudinal  
1616 Designs for Causal Inference: A New Template for Empirical Studies. *Statistical*  
1617 *Science*, 35(3), 437–466. <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-STS728>

1618 Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with s* (Fourth).  
1619 Springer. <http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4/>

1620 Vermote, M., Deliens, T., Deforche, B., & D'Hondt, E. (2021). The impact of

- non-residential grandchild care on physical activity and sedentary behavior in people aged 50 years and over: Study protocol of the Healthy Grandparenting Project. *BMC Public Health*, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-10024-9>
- Wagner, J., Becker, M., Lüdtke, O., & Trautwein, U. (2015). The First Partnership Experience and Personality Development: A Propensity Score Matching Study in Young Adulthood. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(4), 455–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614566092>
- Wagner, J., Lüdtke, O., & Robitzsch, A. (2019). Does personality become more stable with age? Disentangling state and trait effects for the big five across the life span using local structural equation modeling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 116(4), 666–680. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000203>
- Wagner, J., Orth, U., Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., & Kandler, C. (2020). Toward an Integrative Model of Sources of Personality Stability and Change. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(5), 438–444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420924751>
- Wagner, J., Ram, N., Smith, J., & Gerstorf, D. (2016). Personality trait development at the end of life: Antecedents and correlates of mean-level trajectories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111(3), 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000071>
- Wang, S., & Mutchler, J. E. (2020). The Implications of Providing Grandchild Care for Grandparents' Marital Quality. *Journal of Family Issues*, 41(12), 2476–2501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X20934845>
- Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>
- Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors)*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>
- Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*.

1648 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>

1649 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R.,  
1650 Grolemund, G., Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T. L., Miller, E.,  
1651 Bache, S. M., Müller, K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D. P., Spinu, V., . . . Yutani,  
1652 H. (2019a). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43), 1686.  
1653 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>

1654 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R.,  
1655 Grolemund, G., Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T. L., Miller, E.,  
1656 Bache, S. M., Müller, K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D. P., Spinu, V., . . . Yutani,  
1657 H. (2019b). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43), 1686.  
1658 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>

1659 Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of data*  
1660 *manipulation*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>

1661 Wickham, H., Hester, J., & Bryan, J. (2021). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*.  
1662 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>

1663 Wickham, H., & Seidel, D. (2020). *Scales: Scale functions for visualization*.  
1664 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=scales>

1665 Wilke, C. O. (2020). *Cowplot: Streamlined plot theme and plot annotations for 'ggplot2'*.  
1666 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cowplot>

1667 Wortman, J., Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2012). Stability and change in the Big  
1668 Five personality domains: Evidence from a longitudinal study of Australians.  
1669 *Psychology and Aging*, 27(4), 867–874. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029322>

1670 Wrzus, C., & Roberts, B. W. (2017). Processes of personality development in adulthood:  
1671 The TESSERA framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21(3), 253–277.  
1672 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316652279>

1673 Xu, L., Tang, F., Li, L. W., & Dong, X. Q. (2017). Grandparent Caregiving and  
1674 Psychological Well-Being Among Chinese American Older Adults—The Roles of

- 1675        Caregiving Burden and Pressure. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A*, 72(suppl\_1),  
1676        S56–S62. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glw186>
- 1677    Zeileis, A., & Croissant, Y. (2010). Extended model formulas in R: Multiple parts and  
1678        multiple responses. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 34(1), 1–13.  
1679        <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v034.i01>
- 1680    Zhang, L. (2008). Religious affiliation, religiosity, and male and female fertility.  
1681        *Demographic Research*, 18, 233–262. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2008.18.8>
- 1682    Zhang, W., Braun, K. L., & Wu, Y. Y. (2017). The educational, racial and gender  
1683        crossovers in life satisfaction: Findings from the longitudinal Health and Retirement  
1684        Study. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 73, 60–68.  
1685        <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2017.07.014>

## Supplemental Material

### Model Equations

#### *Mean-Level Changes (RQ1)*

Model equation for the basic (i.e., unmoderated) models (ignoring the additional nesting in households applied to the majority of models):

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{ti} &= \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}before_{ti} + \beta_{2i}after_{ti} + \beta_{3i}shift_{ti} + e_{ti} \\
 \beta_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}grandparent_i + \gamma_{02}pscore_i + v_{0i} \\
 \beta_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}grandparent_i ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

where at time  $t$  for person  $i$   $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  and  $v_{0i} \sim N(0, \tau_{00})$ .  $y_{ti}$  represented one of the Big Five or life satisfaction. Separate models were computed for LISS and HRS samples, and for parent and nonparent matched controls.

Model equation for the models including the gender interaction (moderator variable *female<sub>i</sub>*):

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{ti} &= \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}before_{ti} + \beta_{2i}after_{ti} + \beta_{3i}shift_{ti} + e_{ti} \\
 \beta_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}grandparent_i + \gamma_{02}female_i + \gamma_{03}grandparent_i female_i \\
 &\quad + \gamma_{04}pscore_i + v_{0i} \\
 \beta_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}grandparent_i + \gamma_{12}female_i + \gamma_{13}grandparent_i female_i \\
 \beta_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}grandparent_i + \gamma_{22}female_i + \gamma_{23}grandparent_i female_i \\
 \beta_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}grandparent_i + \gamma_{32}female_i + \gamma_{33}grandparent_i female_i ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

where  $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  and  $v_{0i} \sim N(0, \tau_{00})$ . Again, we estimated separate models for each



1696 sample (LISS, HRS) and each comparison group (parents, nonparents).

1697 Model equation for the models including the interaction by paid work (moderator  
1698 variable  $working_{ti}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{ti} &= \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}working_{ti} + \beta_{2i}before_{ti} + \beta_{3i}before_{ti}working_{ti} + \beta_{4i}after_{ti} \\
 &\quad + \beta_{5i}after_{ti}working_{ti} + \beta_{6i}shift_{ti} + \beta_{7i}shift_{ti}working_{ti} + e_{ti} \\
 \beta_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}grandparent_i + \gamma_{02}pscore_i + v_{0i} \\
 \beta_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{4i} &= \gamma_{40} + \gamma_{41}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{5i} &= \gamma_{50} + \gamma_{51}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{6i} &= \gamma_{60} + \gamma_{61}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{7i} &= \gamma_{70} + \gamma_{71}grandparent_i ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

1699 where  $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  and  $v_{0i} \sim N(0, \tau_{00})$ . We estimated separate models for each  
1700 comparison group (parents, nonparents) in the HRS.

1701 Model equation for the models including the interaction by grandchild care  
1702 (moderator variable  $caring_{ti}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{ti} &= \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}caring_{ti} + \beta_{2i}after_{ti} + \beta_{3i}after_{ti}caring_{ti} + e_{ti} \\
 \beta_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}grandparent_i + \gamma_{02}pscore_i + v_{0i} \\
 \beta_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}grandparent_i \\
 \beta_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}grandparent_i ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

1703 where  $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  and  $v_{0i} \sim N(0, \tau_{00})$ . Restricted to the HRS post-transition period, we

estimated separate models for each comparison group (parents, nonparents).

### *Interindividual Differences in Change (RQ2)*

The equations for the models testing interindividual differences in change differ only in the random effects from those in (A1). For models with a homogeneous (single) random slope (but heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and the control

group, respectively), the random effects are now represented by  $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  and

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_{0i} \\ v_{1i} \end{bmatrix} \sim MVN \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_{00g} & \\ & \tau_{11} \end{bmatrix} \right), \text{ with } T_{00g} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{00g=0} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{00g=1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $g$  represents the grouping variable.  $\tau_{00g=0}$  refers to the random intercept variance of

the control group and  $\tau_{00g=1}$  to that of the grandparents. This type of baseline model is

compared via likelihood ratio test with one that features both heterogeneous random

intercept variances and heterogeneous random slope variances. For models with

heterogeneous random slopes for the grandparent and control groups, the random effects

$$\text{are represented by } e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2) \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} v_{0i} \\ v_{1i} \end{bmatrix} \sim MVN \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_{00g} & \\ T_{10g} & T_{11g} \end{bmatrix} \right), \text{ with}$$

$$T_{00g} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{00g=0} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{00g=1} \end{bmatrix}, T_{11g} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{11g=0} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{11g=1} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } T_{10g} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{10g=0} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{10g=1} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } g$$

represents the grouping variable.  $\tau_{00g=0}$ ,  $\tau_{11g=0}$  and  $\tau_{10g=0}$  refer to the random intercept

variance, random slope variance, and random intercept/slope covariance of the control

group, respectively, and  $\tau_{00g=1}$ ,  $\tau_{11g=1}$ , and  $\tau_{10g=1}$  to those of the grandparents. In addition

to the two random slope variances (instead of one,  $\tau_{11}$ ), the heterogeneous variance models

estimate two random intercept/slope covariances. In Tables S64-S69 we report  $\tau_{11}$ ,  $\tau_{11g=0}$ ,

and  $\tau_{11g=1}$  for each change parameter as well as the results of the likelihood ratio tests.

Please note that the notation for heterogeneous models used here is not found in standard

multilevel modeling textbooks and is partly based on *this tutorial* by Nilam Ram. See also

*this blogpost* by Jonas Lang for syntax examples in *nlme* and *lme4* syntax.

1727 **Supplemental Tables****Table S1***Internal Consistency Measures in the Four Analysis Samples at the Time of Matching.*

	A	C	E	N	O	LS
LISS: Parent controls						
$\omega_t$	0.88	0.83	0.88	0.91	0.88	0.93
$\omega_h$	0.75	0.57	0.71	0.72	0.63	0.78
$\alpha$	0.83	0.78	0.84	0.87	0.78	0.91
LISS: Nonparent controls						
$\omega_t$	0.89	0.88	0.93	0.92	0.88	0.89
$\omega_h$	0.73	0.68	0.79	0.79	0.66	0.75
$\alpha$	0.81	0.79	0.90	0.90	0.79	0.88
HRS: Parent controls						
$\omega_t$	0.78	0.82	0.80	0.76	0.86	0.93
$\omega_h$	0.67	0.48	0.68	0.59	0.61	0.88
$\alpha$	0.78	0.59	0.75	0.71	0.77	0.90
HRS: Nonparent controls						
$\omega_t$	0.84	0.77	0.81	0.76	0.85	0.92
$\omega_h$	0.64	0.63	0.71	0.62	0.65	0.82
$\alpha$	0.80	0.57	0.77	0.72	0.79	0.90

*Note.* A = agreeableness, C = conscientiousness, E = extraversion, N = neuroticism, O = openness, LS = life satisfaction. Omega total,  $\omega_t$ , is based on ‘omega.tot’ from the *psych::omega()* function, and omega hierarchical,  $\omega_h$ , on ‘omega\_h’ (Revelle, 2021). For the LISS, we based the number of lower-order factors specified in ‘nfactors’ on information supplied in Goldberg (1999). For the HRS, we could not find comparable information and used the default value.  $\alpha$  is based on ‘raw\_alpha’ from the *psych::alpha()* function (Revelle, 2021).

Table S2

*Standardized Difference in Means for Covariates Used in Propensity Score Matching and the Propensity Score in the LISS.*

Covariate	Description	Raw variables	Parent control group		Nonparent control group	
			Before PSM	After PSM	Before PSM	After PSM
pscore	Propensity score	/	1.13	0.02	1.32	0.03
female	Gender (f.=1, m.=0)	geslacht	0.08	0.00	0.07	0.00
age	Age	gebjaar	0.76	0.03	3.86	-0.11
degreehighersec	Higher secondary/preparatory university education	oplnet	0.04	-0.08	-0.08	0.10
degreevocational	Intermediate vocational education	oplnet	-0.20	0.01	0.01	0.06
degreecollege	Higher vocational education	oplnet	0.03	0.05	0.02	-0.02
degreedegree	University degree	oplnet	-0.06	0.06	-0.15	-0.03
religion	Member of religion/church	cr*012	0.19	0.01	0.38	0.11
speakdutch	Dutch spoken at home (primarily)	cr*089	-0.01	0.11	-0.01	0.05
divorced	Divorced (marital status)	burgstat	0.01	-0.01	0.29	0.06
widowed	Widowed (marital status)	burgstat	0.09	-0.13	0.14	-0.13
livetogether	Live together with partner	cf*025	-0.03	0.00	1.04	0.05
rooms	Rooms in dwelling	cd*034	0.05	-0.03	0.68	-0.04
logincome	Personal net monthly income in Euros (logarithm)	nettoink	-0.07	-0.03	0.46	-0.09
rental	Live for rent (vs. self-owned dwelling)	woning	-0.10	0.01	-0.48	-0.03
financialsit	Financial situation of household (scale from 1-5)	ci*252	0.01	0.08	-0.05	0.03
jobhours	Average work hours per week	cw*127	0.03	0.08	0.10	0.03
mobility	Mobility problems (walking, staircase, shopping)	ch*023/027/041	0.05	-0.03	0.06	-0.06
dep	Depression items from Mental Health Inventory	ch*011 - ch*015	0.01	0.02	-0.21	-0.09
betterhealth	Poor/moderate health status (ref.: good)	ch*004	-0.03	0.07	-0.28	0.08
worsehealth	Very good/excellent health status (ref.: good)	ch*004	-0.01	0.00	0.05	-0.12
totalchildren	Number living children	cf*455 / cf*036	0.29	0.06	NA	NA
totalresidentkids	Number of living-at-home children in household	aaantalki	-0.63	0.01	NA	NA
secondkid	Has two or more children	cf*455 / cf*036	0.23	0.05	NA	NA
thirdkid	Has three or more children	cf*455 / cf*036	0.27	0.06	NA	NA
kid1female	Gender of first child (f.=1, m.=0)	cf*068	0.04	0.02	NA	NA
kid2female	Gender of second child (f.=1, m.=0)	cf*069	0.08	-0.03	NA	NA
kid3female	Gender of third child (f.=1, m.=0)	cf*070	0.14	0.06	NA	NA
kid1age	Age of first child	cf*456 / cf*037	1.58	-0.09	NA	NA
kid2age	Age of second child	cf*457 / cf*038	0.84	0.03	NA	NA
kid3age	Age of third child	cf*458 / cf*039	0.41	0.06	NA	NA
kid1home	First child living at home	cf*083	-1.46	0.00	NA	NA

Table S2 continued

Covariate	Description	Raw variables	Parent control group		Nonparent control group	
			Before PSM	After PSM	Before PSM	After PSM
kid2home	Second child living at home	cf*084	-0.94	0.01	NA	NA
kid3home	Third child living at home	cf*085	-0.03	-0.01	NA	NA
swls	Satisfaction with Life Scale	cp*014 - cp*018	0.06	0.03	0.22	0.02
agree	Agreeableness	cp*021 - cp*066	0.05	0.05	0.12	-0.12
con	Conscientiousness	cp*022 - cp*067	-0.04	0.08	0.14	0.06
extra	Extraversion	cp*020 - cp*065	0.05	0.08	0.04	-0.01
neur	Neuroticism	cp*023 - cp*068	0.05	-0.04	-0.22	-0.06
open	Openness	cp*024 - cp*069	0.03	0.13	-0.16	0.00
participation	Waves participated	/	-0.71	-0.07	-0.18	-0.04
year	Year of assessment	wave	-0.63	-0.02	-0.16	-0.02

*Note.* PSM = propensity score matching, ref. = reference category, f. = female, m. = male, NA = covariate not used in this sample. The standardized difference in means between the grandparent and the two control groups (parent and nonparent) was computed by  $(\bar{x}_{gp} - \bar{x}_c)/(\hat{\sigma}_{gp})$ . Rules of thumb say that this measure should ideally be below .25 (Stuart, 2010) or below .10 (Austin, 2011).

Table S3

Standardized Difference in Means for Covariates Used in Propensity Score Matching and the Propensity Score in the HRS.

Covariate	Description	Raw variables	Parent control group		Nonparent control group	
			Before PSM	After PSM	Before PSM	After PSM
pscore	Propensity score	/	0.92	0.01	1.45	0.00
female	Gender (f.=1, m.=0)	RAGENDER	-0.06	0.00	0.01	0.00
age	Age	RABYEAR	-0.46	-0.03	-1.02	0.10
schlyrs	Years of education	RAEDYRS	0.11	0.05	0.24	-0.01
religyear	Religious attendance: yearly	*B082	0.04	0.01	0.13	0.02
religmonth	Religious attendance: monthly	*B082	0.01	-0.03	0.10	0.05
religweek	Religious attendance: weekly	*B082	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.03
religmore	Religious attendance: more	*B082	0.09	-0.04	0.06	-0.06
notusaborn	Not born in the US	*Z230	-0.05	0.02	0.13	0.01
black	Race: black/african american (ref.: white)	RARACEM	-0.12	-0.03	-0.20	0.00
raceother	Race: other (ref.: white)	RARACEM	-0.09	-0.01	0.01	-0.01
divorced	Divorced (marital status)	R*MSTAT	-0.06	-0.02	0.01	0.00
widowed	Widowed (marital status)	R*MSTAT	-0.31	0.01	-0.41	0.04
livetogether	Live together with partner	*A030 / *XF065_R	0.25	0.00	1.05	-0.01
roomslessthree	Number of rooms (in housing unit)	*H147 / *066	-0.15	-0.01	-0.59	-0.06
roomsfourfive	Number of rooms (in housing unit)	*H147 / *066	0.00	0.01	-0.23	-0.02
roomsmoreeight	Number of rooms (in housing unit)	*H147 / *066	0.07	-0.03	0.25	0.03
loghhincome	Household income (logarithm)	*ITOT	0.03	0.00	0.41	0.04
loghhwealth	Household wealth (logarithm)	*ATOTB	0.07	0.00	0.34	0.03
renter	Live for rent (vs. self-owned dwelling)	*H004	-0.09	-0.02	-0.50	-0.08
jobhours	Hours worked/week main job	R*JHOURS	0.25	0.06	0.59	-0.03
paidwork	Working for pay	*J020	0.28	0.08	0.62	-0.04
mobilitydiff	Difficulty in mobility rated from 0-5	R*MOBILA	-0.16	-0.02	-0.52	-0.01
cesd	CESD score (depression)	R*CESD	-0.13	-0.01	-0.26	-0.04
conde	Sum of health conditions	R*CONDE	-0.23	-0.01	-0.51	0.03
healthexcellent	Self-report of health - excellent (ref: good)	R*SHLT	0.06	0.01	0.15	0.00
healthverygood	Self-report of health - very good (ref: good)	R*SHLT	0.23	-0.01	0.31	-0.02
healthfair	Self-report of health - fair (ref: good)	R*SHLT	-0.16	0.00	-0.29	-0.01
healthpoor	Self-report of health - poor (ref: good)	R*SHLT	-0.07	-0.03	-0.24	0.02
totalnonresidentkids	Number of nonresident kids	*A100	0.66	-0.06	NA	NA
totalresidentkids	Number of resident children	*A099	-0.22	0.03	NA	NA
secondkid	Has two or more children	KIDID	0.52	0.01	NA	NA

Table S3 continued

Covariate	Description	Raw variables	Parent control group		Nonparent control group	
			Before PSM	After PSM	Before PSM	After PSM
thirdkid	Has three or more children	KIDID	0.38	-0.02	NA	NA
kid1female	Gender of first child (f.=1, m.=0)	KAGENDERBG	0.11	0.04	NA	NA
kid2female	Gender of second child (f.=1, m.=0)	KAGENDERBG	0.17	0.02	NA	NA
kid3female	Gender of third child (f.=1, m.=0)	KAGENDERBG	0.23	0.05	NA	NA
kid1age	Age of first child	KABYEARBG	-0.35	-0.06	NA	NA
kid2age	Age of second child	KABYEARBG	0.36	-0.01	NA	NA
kid3age	Age of third child	KABYEARBG	0.35	-0.02	NA	NA
kid1educ	Education of first child (years)	KAEDUC	0.30	0.03	NA	NA
kid2educ	Education of second child (years)	KAEDUC	0.57	0.03	NA	NA
kid3educ	Education of third child (years)	KAEDUC	0.40	-0.01	NA	NA
childrenclose	Children live within 10 miles	*E012	0.13	0.00	NA	NA
siblings	Number of living siblings	R*LIVSIB	0.05	-0.02	0.22	0.03
swls	Satisfaction with Life Scale	*LB003*	0.17	0.05	0.30	0.00
agree	Agreeableness	*LB033*	0.06	0.01	0.11	0.02
con	Conscientiousness	*LB033*	0.14	0.03	0.26	-0.03
extra	Extraversion	*LB033*	0.04	0.03	0.18	-0.04
neur	Neuroticism	*LB033*	-0.07	0.01	-0.04	-0.01
open	Openness	*LB033*	0.04	0.07	0.05	-0.05
participation	Waves participated (2006-2018)	/	-0.36	-0.02	-0.26	-0.04
interviewyear	Date of interview - year	*A501	-0.33	-0.04	-0.18	-0.07

*Note.* PSM = propensity score matching, ref. = reference category, f. = female, m. = male, NA = covariate not used in this sample. The standardized difference in means between the grandparent and the two control groups (parent and nonparent) was computed by  $(\bar{x}_{gp} - \bar{x}_c)/(\hat{\sigma}_{gp})$ . Rules of thumb say that this measure should ideally be below .25 (Stuart, 2010) or below .10 (Austin, 2011).

**Table S4***Means and Standard Deviations of the Big Five and Life Satisfaction over Time in the LISS Panel.*

	Pre-transition years						Post-transition years						
	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Agreeableness													
Grandparents	3.84 (0.50)	3.88 (0.50)	3.94 (0.45)	3.84 (0.50)	3.91 (0.53)	3.91 (0.48)	3.85 (0.51)	3.90 (0.55)	3.89 (0.52)	3.96 (0.49)	3.89 (0.51)	3.96 (0.51)	3.98 (0.40)
Parent controls	3.90 (0.51)	3.87 (0.50)	3.89 (0.45)	3.87 (0.51)	3.85 (0.49)	3.90 (0.46)	3.84 (0.45)	3.86 (0.50)	3.89 (0.52)	3.82 (0.48)	3.84 (0.49)	3.87 (0.48)	3.81 (0.48)
Nonparent controls	3.89 (0.53)	3.95 (0.53)	3.96 (0.49)	3.97 (0.49)	3.95 (0.49)	3.93 (0.48)	3.90 (0.46)	3.95 (0.44)	3.94 (0.46)	3.94 (0.48)	3.95 (0.44)	3.92 (0.43)	3.90 (0.42)
Conscientiousness													
Grandparents	3.79 (0.52)	3.85 (0.45)	3.75 (0.48)	3.76 (0.47)	3.77 (0.52)	3.78 (0.49)	3.80 (0.51)	3.80 (0.51)	3.79 (0.49)	3.81 (0.50)	3.81 (0.45)	3.77 (0.47)	3.75 (0.44)
Parent controls	3.75 (0.56)	3.75 (0.47)	3.73 (0.53)	3.73 (0.48)	3.72 (0.47)	3.76 (0.49)	3.73 (0.47)	3.76 (0.46)	3.74 (0.49)	3.74 (0.49)	3.71 (0.50)	3.76 (0.51)	3.65 (0.48)
Nonparent controls	3.72 (0.54)	3.76 (0.55)	3.77 (0.54)	3.73 (0.50)	3.76 (0.52)	3.75 (0.50)	3.73 (0.52)	3.74 (0.51)	3.72 (0.53)	3.77 (0.49)	3.74 (0.51)	3.71 (0.53)	3.76 (0.53)
Extraversion													
Grandparents	3.21 (0.65)	3.18 (0.73)	3.31 (0.56)	3.31 (0.58)	3.29 (0.66)	3.29 (0.60)	3.21 (0.63)	3.21 (0.68)	3.16 (0.68)	3.22 (0.62)	3.26 (0.59)	3.32 (0.62)	3.20 (0.54)
Parent controls	3.30 (0.59)	3.22 (0.61)	3.22 (0.57)	3.23 (0.58)	3.25 (0.55)	3.23 (0.55)	3.19 (0.57)	3.20 (0.58)	3.24 (0.57)	3.18 (0.57)	3.20 (0.57)	3.17 (0.55)	3.19 (0.50)
Nonparent controls	3.29 (0.72)	3.28 (0.70)	3.24 (0.78)	3.28 (0.74)	3.29 (0.68)	3.31 (0.66)	3.27 (0.70)	3.24 (0.68)	3.30 (0.71)	3.22 (0.73)	3.27 (0.72)	3.25 (0.66)	3.26 (0.71)
Neuroticism													
Grandparents	2.39 (0.70)	2.33 (0.64)	2.32 (0.59)	2.41 (0.63)	2.48 (0.64)	2.42 (0.70)	2.32 (0.67)	2.38 (0.78)	2.28 (0.68)	2.35 (0.65)	2.29 (0.64)	2.45 (0.79)	2.41 (0.68)
Parent controls	2.50 (0.58)	2.44 (0.60)	2.47 (0.62)	2.42 (0.55)	2.46 (0.58)	2.43 (0.60)	2.40 (0.60)	2.41 (0.60)	2.34 (0.62)	2.36 (0.60)	2.37 (0.61)	2.33 (0.64)	2.40 (0.59)
Nonparent controls	2.51 (0.58)	2.47 (0.61)	2.51 (0.68)	2.45 (0.64)	2.46 (0.66)	2.41 (0.65)	2.44 (0.69)	2.42 (0.71)	2.49 (0.76)	2.50 (0.74)	2.48 (0.77)	2.52 (0.80)	2.49 (0.83)



Table S4 continued

	Pre-transition years						Post-transition years						
	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Openness													
Grandparents	3.48 (0.52)	3.48 (0.51)	3.48 (0.51)	3.51 (0.45)	3.47 (0.53)	3.47 (0.52)	3.46 (0.50)	3.49 (0.54)	3.50 (0.44)	3.48 (0.46)	3.47 (0.47)	3.46 (0.53)	3.39 (0.53)
Parent controls	3.47 (0.58)	3.41 (0.50)	3.42 (0.51)	3.44 (0.52)	3.41 (0.49)	3.38 (0.49)	3.41 (0.52)	3.40 (0.50)	3.37 (0.49)	3.37 (0.48)	3.38 (0.48)	3.36 (0.45)	3.36 (0.48)
Nonparent controls	3.54 (0.48)	3.52 (0.53)	3.50 (0.51)	3.50 (0.53)	3.51 (0.53)	3.46 (0.53)	3.49 (0.52)	3.48 (0.52)	3.52 (0.52)	3.52 (0.53)	3.51 (0.51)	3.48 (0.49)	3.49 (0.52)
Life satisfaction													
Grandparents	5.17 (1.07)	5.24 (0.91)	5.21 (1.11)	5.14 (0.98)	5.29 (0.92)	5.28 (1.08)	5.34 (0.91)	5.23 (0.99)	5.36 (1.06)	5.44 (0.88)	5.39 (1.10)	5.27 (1.10)	5.32 (1.08)
Parent controls	5.10 (1.29)	5.14 (1.11)	5.17 (1.17)	5.21 (1.01)	5.20 (1.06)	5.31 (1.12)	5.27 (1.10)	5.26 (1.12)	5.26 (1.10)	5.30 (1.09)	5.21 (1.12)	5.30 (1.17)	5.18 (1.12)
Nonparent controls	5.06 (0.92)	5.17 (0.85)	5.07 (0.92)	5.10 (0.92)	5.21 (0.88)	5.22 (0.88)	5.12 (0.96)	5.00 (1.00)	5.02 (1.15)	4.96 (1.21)	5.04 (1.13)	5.05 (1.16)	5.02 (1.14)

*Note.* Standard deviations shown in parentheses; *time* = 0 marks the first year where the transition to grandparenthood was reported.

**Table S5***Means and Standard Deviations of the Big Five and Life Satisfaction over Time in the HRS.*

	Pre-transition years						Post-transition years						
	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Agreeableness													
Grandparents	3.46 (0.47)	3.51 (0.48)	3.51 (0.49)	3.51 (0.49)	3.51 (0.47)	3.51 (0.48)	3.51 (0.49)	3.52 (0.48)	3.50 (0.53)	3.50 (0.50)	3.50 (0.50)	3.56 (0.44)	3.56 (0.44)
Parent controls	3.47 (0.50)	3.51 (0.46)	3.51 (0.47)	3.51 (0.47)	3.51 (0.48)	3.51 (0.48)	3.51 (0.49)	3.50 (0.49)	3.50 (0.49)	3.50 (0.50)	3.50 (0.50)	3.48 (0.52)	3.48 (0.52)
Nonparent controls	3.53 (0.48)	3.48 (0.51)	3.51 (0.49)	3.51 (0.49)	3.51 (0.49)	3.48 (0.51)	3.48 (0.51)	3.52 (0.49)	3.44 (0.54)	3.44 (0.54)	3.44 (0.54)	3.47 (0.54)	3.47 (0.54)
Conscientiousness													
Grandparents	3.47 (0.46)	3.47 (0.45)	3.47 (0.44)	3.47 (0.44)	3.47 (0.44)	3.46 (0.45)	3.46 (0.45)	3.45 (0.44)	3.44 (0.43)	3.44 (0.43)	3.44 (0.43)	3.49 (0.44)	3.49 (0.44)
Parent controls	3.45 (0.44)	3.44 (0.45)	3.46 (0.45)	3.46 (0.45)	3.46 (0.45)	3.46 (0.45)	3.46 (0.45)	3.46 (0.47)	3.44 (0.48)	3.44 (0.48)	3.44 (0.48)	3.46 (0.50)	3.46 (0.50)
Nonparent controls	3.50 (0.43)	3.47 (0.45)	3.49 (0.43)	3.49 (0.43)	3.49 (0.43)	3.49 (0.44)	3.49 (0.44)	3.50 (0.44)	3.47 (0.45)	3.47 (0.45)	3.47 (0.45)	3.49 (0.44)	3.49 (0.44)
Extraversion													
Grandparents	3.15 (0.56)	3.22 (0.56)	3.20 (0.54)	3.20 (0.54)	3.20 (0.54)	3.21 (0.56)	3.21 (0.56)	3.19 (0.58)	3.22 (0.59)	3.22 (0.59)	3.22 (0.59)	3.22 (0.58)	3.22 (0.58)
Parent controls	3.18 (0.54)	3.19 (0.54)	3.19 (0.55)	3.19 (0.55)	3.19 (0.55)	3.22 (0.54)	3.22 (0.54)	3.21 (0.56)	3.22 (0.52)	3.22 (0.52)	3.22 (0.52)	3.22 (0.54)	3.22 (0.54)
Nonparent controls	3.23 (0.54)	3.21 (0.54)	3.24 (0.55)	3.24 (0.55)	3.24 (0.55)	3.22 (0.53)	3.22 (0.53)	3.25 (0.52)	3.24 (0.56)	3.24 (0.56)	3.24 (0.56)	3.27 (0.55)	3.27 (0.55)
Neuroticism													
Grandparents	2.00 (0.56)	1.98 (0.63)	2.06 (0.62)	2.06 (0.62)	2.06 (0.62)	1.91 (0.60)	1.91 (0.60)	1.96 (0.58)	1.91 (0.59)	1.91 (0.59)	1.91 (0.59)	1.91 (0.61)	1.91 (0.61)
Parent controls	2.07 (0.59)	2.02 (0.59)	2.02 (0.60)	2.02 (0.60)	2.02 (0.60)	1.98 (0.61)	1.98 (0.61)	1.99 (0.62)	1.96 (0.59)	1.96 (0.59)	1.96 (0.59)	1.95 (0.59)	1.95 (0.59)
Nonparent controls	2.08 (0.59)	2.04 (0.61)	2.03 (0.60)	2.03 (0.60)	2.03 (0.60)	1.96 (0.60)	1.96 (0.60)	1.97 (0.60)	1.88 (0.56)	1.88 (0.56)	1.88 (0.56)	1.93 (0.58)	1.93 (0.58)

Table S5 continued

	Pre-transition years						Post-transition years						
	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Openness													
Grandparents	3.00 (0.51)	3.02 (0.53)	3.04 (0.51)	3.04 (0.51)	3.01 (0.52)	3.00 (0.52)	2.99 (0.53)	3.00 (0.52)	2.96 (0.59)	3.04 (0.51)			
Parent controls	3.01 (0.51)	2.99 (0.54)	2.99 (0.54)	2.99 (0.54)	3.00 (0.53)	2.99 (0.53)	3.00 (0.53)	2.97 (0.56)	2.96 (0.56)				
Nonparent controls	3.08 (0.56)	3.04 (0.53)	3.07 (0.54)	3.04 (0.53)	3.06 (0.55)	3.02 (0.55)	3.04 (0.57)						
Life satisfaction													
Grandparents	5.14 (1.44)	5.08 (1.45)	5.15 (1.46)	5.17 (1.40)	5.16 (1.44)	5.28 (1.50)							
Parent controls	5.08 (1.60)	5.03 (1.56)	5.05 (1.58)	5.16 (1.50)	5.13 (1.52)	5.18 (1.49)							
Nonparent controls	5.16 (1.45)	5.07 (1.54)	5.15 (1.47)	5.21 (1.44)	5.26 (1.37)	5.46 (1.31)							

*Note.* Standard deviations shown in parentheses; *time* = 0 marks the first year where the transition to grandparenthood was reported. To aid comparability with the LISS panel measures, we reverse scored all Big Five items so that higher values corresponded to higher trait levels.

**Table S6***Intra-Class Correlations of Grandparents and Matched Controls in the Four Analysis Samples.*

	A	C	E	N	O	LS
LISS: Parent controls						
$ICC_{pid}$	0.76	0.76	0.83	0.67	0.76	0.28
$ICC_{hid}$	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.40
$ICC_{pid/hid}$	0.80	0.78	0.84	0.78	0.79	0.68
LISS: Nonparent controls						
$ICC_{pid}$	0.75	0.74	0.85	0.65	0.80	0.31
$ICC_{hid}$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.34
$ICC_{pid/hid}$	0.75	0.75	0.85	0.74	0.81	0.65
HRS: Parent controls						
$ICC_{pid}$	0.75	0.73	0.76	0.71	0.58	0.28
$ICC_{hid}$	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.20	0.38
$ICC_{pid/hid}$	0.76	0.76	0.79	0.74	0.78	0.66
HRS: Nonparent controls						
$ICC_{pid}$	0.69	0.74	0.75	0.74	0.60	0.33
$ICC_{hid}$	0.08	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.22	0.37
$ICC_{pid/hid}$	0.77	0.79	0.80	0.75	0.83	0.70

*Note.* A = agreeableness, C = conscientiousness, E = extraversion, N = neuroticism, O = openness, LS = life satisfaction. Intra-class correlations are the proportion of total variation that is explained by the respective nesting factor.  $ICC_{pid}$  is the proportion of total variance explained by nesting in respondents which corresponds to the correlation between two randomly selected observations from the same respondent.  $ICC_{hid}$  is the proportion of total variance explained by nesting in households which corresponds to the correlation between two randomly selected observations from the same household.  $ICC_{pid/hid}$  is the proportion of total variance explained by nesting in respondents and in households which corresponds to the correlation between two randomly selected observations from the same respondent and the same household.

Table S7

*Fixed Effects of Agreeableness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
<b>LISS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.86	[3.80, 3.91]	135.36	3.90	[3.83, 3.96]	116.54
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.06	[0.01, 0.12]	2.18	0.02	[-0.04, 0.08]	0.71
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-0.90	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.52
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.01, -0.01]	-4.30	0.00	[0.00, 0.01]	0.88
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.05	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.10
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.04	[-0.04, 0.12]	0.93	0.01	[-0.08, 0.10]	0.27
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-1.07	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.57
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	2.17	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.07
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.00	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.19	0.02	[-0.04, 0.07]	0.60
<b>HRS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.47	[3.44, 3.51]	198.85	3.49	[3.45, 3.54]	167.64
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.08	[0.02, 0.14]	2.51	0.07	[0.01, 0.14]	2.23
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.21	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.77
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.50	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-3.16
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.67	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	2.39
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.01	[-0.04, 0.07]	0.49	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	-0.38
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.19	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.89
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.57	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.91
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.04]	-0.36	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.02]	-1.15

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S8

Linear Contrasts for Agreeableness.

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.00	0.07	.792	0.00	0.01	.932
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	0.90	.343	0.02	0.63	.428
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	0.52	.471	0.02	0.44	.506
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	-0.01	2.75	.097	-0.01	2.02	.155
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.00	0.10	.748	0.00	0.12	.726
HRS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.00	0.06	.806	0.01	2.86	.091
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.02	.890	0.00	0.02	.896
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.05	.815	-0.01	0.42	.517
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.00	0.09	.759	0.00	0.10	.746
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.00	0.27	.607	0.00	0.30	.581

Note. The linear contrasts are needed in cases where estimates of interest are represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients and are computed using the *linearHypothesis* function from the *car* R package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a) based on the models from Table S7.  $\hat{\gamma}_c =$  combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S9

*Linear Contrasts for Agreeableness (Moderated by Gender).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.01	0.20	.657	0.01	0.67	.413
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.00	0.00	.959	-0.01	0.34	.559
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.02	.901	0.00	0.01	.939
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.03	1.69	.194	0.03	1.30	.255
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.01	.924	-0.01	0.09	.762
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	-0.01	1.10	.295	0.00	0.19	.659
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.01	.927	-0.01	1.23	.267
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.03	1.38	.239	0.04	1.64	.201
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.01	0.13	.716	-0.02	0.99	.319
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.00	0.01	.932	0.00	0.01	.921
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.01	1.13	.288	-0.01	0.90	.342
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.03	0.61	.434	0.03	0.50	.478
HRS						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.03	5.09	.024	0.00	0.00	.959
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.02	5.24	.022	0.02	4.44	.035
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.01	0.05	.819	0.01	0.05	.828
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.00	0.00	.971	0.00	0.00	.976
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	0.67	.413	0.00	0.03	.865
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.02	1.37	.242	0.01	0.79	.374
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.07	.791	0.01	0.84	.358
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.03	1.13	.288	-0.02	0.84	.359
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.05	10.29	.001	0.02	1.80	.180
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.02	1.17	.280	0.02	1.19	.276
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.02	1.87	.171	-0.02	2.01	.157
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.00	0.02	.884	0.00	0.02	.887

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table 2.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S10

Fixed Effects of Agreeableness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Performing Paid Work.

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.51	[3.47, 3.56]	161.90	3.51	[3.46, 3.55]	142.65
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.09	[0.03, 0.15]	2.82	0.06	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.69
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.57	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-1.95
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.42	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-2.94
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	-0.56	0.03	[-0.01, 0.06]	1.58
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.12	[-0.21, -0.03]	-2.65	-0.11	[-0.20, -0.02]	-2.31
Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.06	[-0.10, -0.02]	-3.06	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	-0.37
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.05	[0.00, 0.10]	2.14	0.07	[0.02, 0.12]	2.76
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.63	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.54
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	0.00	[-0.08, 0.07]	-0.06	-0.04	[-0.11, 0.03]	-1.06
Before-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.52	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.70
After-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]	2.46	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.66
Shift * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	0.02	[-0.03, 0.06]	0.71	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	-0.37
Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.18	[0.09, 0.28]	3.79	0.13	[0.04, 0.22]	2.76
Before-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.07	[-0.13, -0.02]	-2.49	-0.08	[-0.13, -0.02]	-2.63
After-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	-0.75	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.40
Shift * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.09]	-0.11	0.02	[-0.08, 0.11]	0.36

Note. Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *working* = 1 indicates being employed in paid work.



Table S11

*Linear Contrasts for Agreeableness (Moderated by Paid Work; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of not-working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	-0.03	4.00	.045	0.01	0.68	.411
Shift of working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.01	0.40	.528	0.02	2.65	.103
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.01	0.14	.712	-0.01	0.15	.700
Shift of working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.01	0.07	.795	0.00	0.06	.812
Shift of not-working controls vs. not-working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	0.02	0.29	.589	-0.02	0.53	.466
Before-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	1.75	.186	-0.01	0.28	.597
After-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.01	0.32	.571	0.01	1.05	.305
Shift of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.00	0.00	.958	-0.01	0.24	.621
Shift of not-working controls vs. working controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.03	3.81	.051	0.00	0.05	.825
Before-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.07	6.16	.013	-0.07	6.59	.010
After-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.01	0.14	.710	0.01	0.15	.694
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.02	0.20	.658	0.01	0.20	.659

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S10.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.



**Table S13**  
*Linear Contrasts for Agreeableness (Moderated by Grandchild Care; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
After-slope of caring controls vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	4.66	.031	4.93
After-slope of not-caring grandparents vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.01	0.61	.434	0.70

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S12.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S14

*Fixed Effects of Agreeableness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Ethnicity.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.49	[3.46, 3.53]	185.58	< .001	3.48	[3.44, 3.53]	152.86	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.08	[0.02, 0.14]	2.62	.009	0.06	[0.00, 0.13]	1.87	.061
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.08	.037	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.87	.062
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.56	.574	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.44	.015
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.90	.368	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.65	.008
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	-0.27	.790	0.00	[-0.06, 0.07]	0.15	.884
Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.07	[-0.18, 0.04]	-1.27	.203	0.13	[0.01, 0.24]	2.16	.031
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.42	.674	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.31	.755
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.39	.695	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.25	.211
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.04]	-0.27	.788	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.02]	-1.07	.286
Before-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.05	[0.01, 0.10]	2.55	.011	-0.04	[-0.08, 0.00]	-1.98	.047
After-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	-0.06	[-0.08, -0.03]	-4.67	< .001	-0.04	[-0.08, -0.01]	-2.88	.004
Shift * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.41	.679	0.01	[-0.07, 0.09]	0.18	.856
Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.07	[-0.14, 0.27]	0.63	.532	-0.13	[-0.35, 0.08]	-1.24	.214
Before-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.02	[-0.12, 0.09]	-0.28	.781	0.08	[-0.02, 0.18]	1.51	.130
After-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	0.07	[0.01, 0.13]	2.12	.034	0.06	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.67	.095
Shift * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	0.01	[-0.16, 0.19]	0.14	.891	-0.01	[-0.19, 0.17]	-0.13	.893

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity.

Table S15

*Linear Contrasts for Agreeableness (Moderated by Ethnicity; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of White controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	0.01	0.85	.358	0.02	5.58	.018
Shift of Black controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.07	5.38	.020	-0.02	0.34	.559
Shift of White grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	0.00	0.07	.791	0.00	0.06	.806
Shift of Black grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.01	0.04	.840	0.01	0.03	.854
Shift of White controls vs. White grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	0.00	0.03	.858	-0.02	0.71	.400
Before-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.01	0.03	.854	0.08	2.68	.102
After-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.07	5.26	.022	0.07	4.17	.041
Shift of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.08	1.43	.232	0.03	0.19	.665
Shift of White controls vs. Black controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.07	6.18	.013	-0.04	1.41	.235
Before-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.04	0.64	.424	0.04	0.69	.406
After-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.01	0.14	.713	0.01	0.14	.705
Shift of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.01	0.02	.903	0.01	0.01	.912

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S14.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S16

*Fixed Effects of Conscientiousness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
LISS						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.77	[3.71, 3.82]	134.94	< .001	3.83	[3.76, 3.90]
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.08	[0.02, 0.13]	2.59	.009	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-2.43	.015	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-2.96	.003	0.01	[0.00, 0.01]
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.21	.225	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.06]	-0.46	.644	-0.05	[-0.14, 0.04]
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.38	.168	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.46	.646	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.00	[-0.05, 0.05]	0.14	.887	0.01	[-0.04, 0.07]
HRS						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.39	[3.36, 3.42]	208.49	< .001	3.35	[3.32, 3.39]
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.08	[0.02, 0.13]	2.75	.006	0.15	[0.09, 0.21]
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	2.35	.019	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.53	.125	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.17	.242	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.03	[-0.02, 0.09]	1.34	.181	0.03	[-0.02, 0.08]
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.32	.752	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.90	.058	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	-0.97	.333	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.01]

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

**Table S17**  
*Linear Contrasts for Conscientiousness.*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.01	0.54	.461	0.01	0.80	.371
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.01	0.47	.493	0.01	0.39	.532
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.01	0.07	.789	0.00	0.02	.884
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.00	0.10	.751	0.00	0.08	.773
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.00	0.86	.353	0.00	0.69	.406
HRS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.02	4.85	.028	-0.01	1.62	.202
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	2.50	.114	-0.02	2.87	.091
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.01	0.17	.678	-0.01	0.87	.351
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.01	0.59	.441	0.01	0.70	.403
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.01	1.85	.174	0.01	2.16	.142

*Note.* The linear contrasts are needed in cases where estimates of interest are represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients and are computed using the *linearHypothesis* function from the *car* R package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a) based on the models from Table S16.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S18

*Fixed Effects of Conscientiousness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Gender.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p
<b>LISS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.72	[3.64, 3.80]	89.52	< .001	3.77	[3.67, 3.87]	75.55	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.08	[0.02, 0.13]	2.61	.009	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	-0.33	.745
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.08	.037	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.26	.024
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.96	.050	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-0.56	.577
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.02	[-0.01, 0.06]	1.44	.150	0.00	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.08	.936
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.01	[-0.14, 0.11]	-0.23	.820	-0.04	[-0.17, 0.10]	-0.56	.575
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.09	[-0.02, 0.20]	1.60	.110	0.10	[-0.03, 0.23]	1.48	.139
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.00	.318	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.06	.291
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	1.12	.261	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.48	.634
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.00	[-0.08, 0.07]	-0.08	.936	0.02	[-0.06, 0.10]	0.51	.613
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.62	.537	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.29	.198
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.02	.986	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	2.90	.004
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.03]	-0.84	.401	0.00	[-0.05, 0.05]	0.11	.912
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	-0.01	[-0.17, 0.16]	-0.08	.939	-0.02	[-0.20, 0.16]	-0.20	.841
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.17	.867	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.49	.623
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.06	.290	-0.03	[-0.05, 0.00]	-2.22	.026
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.01	[-0.09, 0.11]	0.26	.792	-0.01	[-0.12, 0.10]	-0.17	.866
<b>HRS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.31	[3.27, 3.36]	142.75	< .001	3.27	[3.22, 3.32]	126.71	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.08	[0.03, 0.14]	2.97	.003	0.14	[0.09, 0.20]	4.83	< .001
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.03	[0.01, 0.04]	3.61	< .001	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.71	.477
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.92	.360	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-0.98	.328
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.01]	-1.46	.143	0.02	[-0.01, 0.05]	1.51	.131
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.01	[-0.07, 0.08]	0.15	.879	0.01	[-0.06, 0.09]	0.38	.707
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.14	[0.08, 0.20]	4.73	< .001	0.16	[0.10, 0.22]	4.88	< .001
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.24	.807	0.02	[-0.01, 0.05]	1.06	.287
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.96	.050	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	2.13	.033
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.04	[-0.11, 0.02]	-1.39	.164	-0.09	[-0.15, -0.03]	-2.90	.004
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	-0.03	[-0.05, -0.01]	-2.78	.006	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.17	.861
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.16	.874	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.53	.593
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	0.02	[-0.02, 0.06]	0.94	.346	-0.04	[-0.08, -0.01]	-2.27	.023



Table S18 continued

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	0.05	[-0.05, 0.15]	1.00	.318	0.03	[-0.07, 0.13]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.00	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.12	.903	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.02]
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	-0.92	.356	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.04	[-0.04, 0.13]	1.00	.315	0.10	[0.02, 0.18]

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S19

*Linear Contrasts for Conscientiousness (Moderated by Gender).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
<b>LISS</b>						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.02	1.46	.226	0.00	0.00	.976
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.00	0.01	.923	0.02	1.18	.277
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	0.67	.413	0.02	0.57	.452
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.01	0.06	.800	0.01	0.05	.816
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.01	0.03	.867	0.02	0.47	.494
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.01	0.72	.395	0.00	0.17	.677
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.11	.737	-0.02	7.66	.006
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	0.07	.787	-0.01	0.09	.766
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.02	0.93	.335	0.02	0.59	.444
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.00	0.02	.901	0.00	0.01	.915
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.01	1.40	.236	-0.01	1.13	.287
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.02	0.19	.664	-0.02	0.16	.689
<b>HRS</b>						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.03	5.34	.021	0.02	2.33	.127
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.01	0.74	.388	-0.03	9.62	.002
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.05	5.02	.025	-0.05	5.82	.016
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.00	0.01	.923	0.00	0.01	.912
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	0.89	.345	-0.07	8.09	.004
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.00	0.01	.926	-0.01	0.17	.680
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	0.61	.436	0.01	1.23	.266
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.01	0.09	.764	0.03	1.65	.199
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.02	1.33	.248	-0.05	10.13	.001
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	-0.02	1.38	.240	-0.03	1.60	.205
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.01	1.23	.268	-0.02	1.46	.227
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.05	2.55	.110	0.05	2.95	.086

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S18.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

**Table S20***Linear Contrasts for Conscientiousness (Moderated by Paid Work; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of not-working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	-0.01	0.25	.620	-0.07	26.57	< .001
Shift of working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.02	3.07	.080	0.02	4.47	.035
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.06	5.21	.022	-0.06	6.00	.014
Shift of working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.01	0.08	.778	-0.01	0.13	.718
Shift of not-working controls vs. not-working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.05	3.38	.066	0.01	0.08	.778
Before-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.03	5.06	.024	-0.01	1.02	.313
After-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.01	1.32	.250	0.01	1.11	.293
Shift of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.01	0.29	.590	-0.02	1.55	.213
Shift of not-working controls vs. working controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.01	0.47	.495	0.08	29.16	< .001
Before-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.08	9.33	.002	-0.08	10.57	.001
After-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.00	0.01	.930	0.00	0.02	.885
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.05	2.65	.103	0.05	2.93	.087

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table 3.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S21

Linear Contrasts for Conscientiousness (Moderated by Grandchild Care; only HRS).

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
After-slope of caring controls vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.04	11.65	0.04	11.81
After-slope of not-caring grandparents vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	4.75	0.03	5.45

Note. The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table 4.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S22

*Fixed Effects of Conscientiousness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Ethnicity.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.42	[3.38, 3.45]	194.05	3.36	[3.32, 3.40]	160.53
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.07	[0.01, 0.13]	2.38	0.15	[0.09, 0.21]	4.83
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.42	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.59
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.35	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.77
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.37	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.43
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.01	[-0.05, 0.06]	0.24	0.02	[-0.04, 0.08]	0.70
Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.21	[-0.31, -0.11]	-4.05	0.00	[-0.10, 0.11]	0.02
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.47	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.50
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.53	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]	2.27
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.03	[-0.08, 0.01]	-1.52	-0.04	[-0.08, 0.01]	-1.62
Before-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.09	[0.05, 0.13]	4.31	-0.04	[-0.07, 0.00]	-2.15
After-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-1.78	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.00]	-1.78
Shift * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.13	[-0.20, -0.06]	-3.50	0.04	[-0.04, 0.11]	0.99
Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.29	[0.10, 0.49]	2.96	0.09	[-0.10, 0.28]	0.94
Before-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.12	[-0.22, -0.02]	-2.29	0.01	[-0.09, 0.10]	0.15
After-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	1.38	0.05	[-0.01, 0.10]	1.51
Shift * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	0.08	[-0.09, 0.24]	0.91	-0.08	[-0.24, 0.08]	-1.02

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity.

**Table S23***Linear Contrasts for Conscientiousness (Moderated by Ethnicity; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of White controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	0.00	0.40	.529	-0.01	1.78	.182
Shift of Black controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.15	32.53	< .001	0.00	0.01	.923
Shift of White grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.03	3.20	.074	-0.03	3.69	.055
Shift of Black grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.05	0.98	.321	-0.05	1.06	.304
Shift of White controls vs. White grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.02	1.72	.189	-0.02	1.25	.264
Before-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.11	5.04	.025	0.01	0.08	.783
After-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.05	3.35	.067	0.06	4.52	.033
Shift of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.10	2.51	.113	-0.06	0.91	.339
Shift of White controls vs. Black controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.15	27.97	< .001	0.01	0.20	.656
Before-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.03	0.40	.527	-0.03	0.48	.489
After-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.02	0.58	.445	0.02	0.60	.439
Shift of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.03	0.22	.641	-0.03	0.22	.642

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S22.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S24

*Fixed Effects of Extraversion Over the Transition to Grandparenthood.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
<b>LISS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.25	[3.17, 3.32]	89.33	3.29	[3.20, 3.38]	73.28
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.08	[0.01, 0.14]	2.32	0.03	[-0.03, 0.09]	0.89
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.59	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-0.91
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.75	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.01]	-4.79
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.01]	-1.41	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.37
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.04	[-0.07, 0.14]	0.66	0.00	[-0.12, 0.12]	0.04
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.70	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-1.00
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.41	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.74
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.05]	-0.34	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.02]	-1.15
<b>HRS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.19	[3.15, 3.22]	160.27	3.14	[3.10, 3.19]	136.03
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.05	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.53	0.05	[-0.02, 0.12]	1.50
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-1.03	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.40
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.01]	1.57	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.45
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.34	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.34
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]	0.07	0.04	[-0.03, 0.10]	1.17
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.51	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.51
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.45	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	1.00
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.03]	-0.92	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.03]	-0.66

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

**Table S25**  
*Linear Contrasts for Extraversion.*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.02	3.95	.047	-0.01	0.40	.527
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.03	1.87	.172	-0.03	1.85	.174
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.01	0.09	.765	-0.02	0.84	.358
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	-0.01	2.51	.113	-0.01	2.52	.112
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.00	0.16	.692	0.00	0.16	.693
HRS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.01	1.28	.259	0.00	0.06	.812
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.01	0.31	.576	-0.01	0.35	.556
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	1.02	.313	-0.01	0.17	.676
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.00	0.01	.939	0.00	0.01	.931
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.01	1.63	.202	0.01	1.80	.180

*Note.* The linear contrasts are needed in cases where estimates of interest are represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients and are computed using the *linearHypothesis* function from the *car* R package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a) based on the models from Table S24.  $\hat{\gamma}_c =$  combined fixed-effects estimate.



*Fixed Effects of Extraversion Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Gender.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$
<b>LISS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.21	[3.11, 3.32]	59.28	< .001	3.23	[3.09, 3.36]	47.76	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.08	[0.01, 0.14]	2.35	.019	0.03	[-0.03, 0.09]	0.99	.322
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-0.91	.363	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.77	.077
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.05	.964	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.01]	-3.61	< .001
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.08	[-0.12, -0.05]	-4.40	< .001	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.29	.773
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.06	[-0.10, 0.22]	0.76	.449	0.06	[-0.12, 0.23]	0.65	.517
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.06	[-0.08, 0.20]	0.80	.426	0.12	[-0.05, 0.30]	1.36	.174
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.40	.690	-0.02	[-0.03, 0.00]	-1.61	.108
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.38	.700	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.15	.252
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.05	[-0.03, 0.13]	1.18	.236	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.05]	-0.72	.474
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.14	.889	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.39	.001
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.59	.112	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.42	.673
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	0.12	[0.07, 0.17]	4.70	< .001	0.02	[-0.03, 0.07]	0.77	.441
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	-0.04	[-0.25, 0.17]	-0.40	.687	-0.11	[-0.34, 0.13]	-0.89	.376
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.10	.917	0.02	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.38	.167
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.89	.371	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.01	.989
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	-0.11	[-0.22, 0.00]	-1.92	.055	-0.01	[-0.12, 0.10]	-0.11	.909
<b>HRS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.13	[3.08, 3.19]	109.26	< .001	3.12	[3.06, 3.19]	98.59	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.06	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.69	.091	0.05	[-0.02, 0.12]	1.32	.188
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.43	.152	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-1.01	.314
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	2.51	.012	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	1.04	.299
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.02]	-1.05	.293	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	0.06	.953
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.08]	-0.15	.879	0.00	[-0.09, 0.09]	0.02	.980
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.10	[0.02, 0.17]	2.64	.008	0.05	[-0.04, 0.13]	1.10	.270
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	-1.15	.249	0.00	[-0.04, 0.04]	-0.14	.891
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.12	.901	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.83	.409
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.00	[-0.07, 0.08]	0.13	.895	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.39	.694
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	-0.03	[-0.06, -0.01]	-2.98	.003	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.60	.009
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	-0.02	[-0.03, 0.00]	-1.97	.049	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.95	.340
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	0.04	[-0.01, 0.08]	1.72	.086	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	-0.41	.681

Table S26 continued

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	0.02	[-0.11, 0.14]	0.24	.808	0.07	[-0.06, 0.19]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.06	[0.00, 0.11]	2.07	.039	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.04]
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.20	.844	0.00	[-0.04, 0.03]
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	-0.05	[-0.15, 0.05]	-0.98	.328	0.00	[-0.10, 0.09]

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S27

*Linear Contrasts for Extraversion (Moderated by Gender).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.08	25.26	< .001	-0.02	1.25	.264
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.03	3.67	.055	0.00	0.05	.819
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.04	1.43	.231	-0.04	1.40	.236
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.02	0.60	.438	-0.02	0.60	.440
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.05	1.58	.209	-0.02	0.30	.582
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	-0.01	0.35	.552	0.00	0.09	.767
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	0.82	.365	0.01	1.60	.206
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.05	2.46	.117	-0.03	0.62	.429
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.11	25.15	< .001	0.02	0.95	.331
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.00	0.04	.851	0.00	0.03	.857
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.05	.825	0.00	0.05	.826
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.02	0.13	.716	0.02	0.13	.721
HRS						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.00	0.06	.802	0.01	0.30	.584
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.02	3.12	.077	-0.01	0.69	.406
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.02	.897	0.00	0.01	.904
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.02	0.69	.405	-0.02	0.76	.384
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.01	0.05	.819	0.00	0.02	.884
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.03	3.30	.069	-0.01	0.33	.568
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	0.18	.668	0.01	0.26	.613
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.04	2.36	.124	-0.01	0.17	.683
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.02	1.85	.173	-0.02	0.92	.338
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.02	0.78	.377	0.02	0.83	.363
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.01	0.57	.452	-0.01	0.62	.432
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.02	0.43	.513	-0.02	0.45	.502

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S26.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S28

*Fixed Effects of Extraversion Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Performing Paid Work.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.19	[3.14, 3.24]	131.67	3.16	[3.11, 3.21]	117.06
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.11]	1.28	0.02	[-0.05, 0.09]	0.46
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.34	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.22
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.45	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.55
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.00]	-1.89	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.43
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.08	[-0.18, 0.02]	-1.62	-0.04	[-0.14, 0.05]	-0.88
Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.00	[-0.05, 0.04]	-0.21	0.00	[-0.04, 0.04]	-0.10
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.04	[-0.01, 0.09]	1.50	0.04	[-0.01, 0.09]	1.51
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.05	0.02	[0.00, 0.05]	1.99
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.05]	-0.73	-0.06	[-0.13, 0.02]	-1.38
Before-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.27	0.02	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.18
After-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.10	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]	1.98
Shift * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	0.06	[0.01, 0.10]	2.43	0.00	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.13
Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.11	[0.01, 0.21]	2.10	0.11	[0.01, 0.21]	2.13
Before-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.04	[-0.10, 0.02]	-1.28	-0.06	[-0.12, 0.00]	-1.92
After-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.02]	-0.92	-0.03	[-0.06, 0.00]	-1.79
Shift * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	0.02	[-0.09, 0.12]	0.29	0.07	[-0.03, 0.17]	1.32

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and withnonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *working* = 1 indicates being employed in paid work.

**Table S29***Linear Contrasts for Extraversion (Moderated by Paid Work; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of not-working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	-0.03	3.19	.074	-0.01	0.53	.465
Shift of working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.03	8.11	.004	0.01	0.44	.505
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.04	2.00	.157	-0.04	2.17	.141
Shift of working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.01	0.42	.518	0.01	0.43	.514
Shift of not-working controls vs. not-working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.02	0.25	.618	-0.03	0.91	.341
Before-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.00	.998	-0.02	1.62	.204
After-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.00	0.07	.793	-0.01	0.29	.592
Shift of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.02	0.50	.479	0.01	0.09	.766
Shift of not-working controls vs. working controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.06	9.85	.002	0.02	0.94	.333
Before-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.04	2.27	.131	-0.04	2.47	.116
After-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	-0.02	0.96	.326	-0.02	1.03	.311
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.06	2.22	.136	0.06	2.37	.124

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S28.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S30

*Fixed Effects of Extraversion Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Grandchild Care.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.18	[3.13, 3.23]	127.99	3.16	[3.10, 3.22]	107.75
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.07	[-0.01, 0.16]	1.72	0.07	[-0.02, 0.16]	1.45
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.54	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.61
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.01	[-0.08, 0.06]	-0.26	0.01	[-0.07, 0.09]	0.27
Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.03	[-0.01, 0.07]	1.63	0.00	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.09
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.20	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.25
After-slope * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.04	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.23
Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.06	[-0.16, 0.03]	-1.30	-0.04	[-0.13, 0.06]	-0.81
After-slope * Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.04	[0.00, 0.07]	1.99	0.03	[0.00, 0.07]	1.79

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *caring* = 1 indicates more than 100 hours of grandchild care since the last assessment.

**Table S31**  
*Linear Contrasts for Extraversion (Moderated by Grandchild Care; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
After-slope of caring controls vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	6.30	0.03	4.85
After-slope of not-caring grandparents vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	2.91	0.03	3.56

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S30.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S32

*Fixed Effects of Extraversion Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Ethnicity.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.20	[3.16, 3.24]	148.85	3.13	[3.08, 3.18]	123.56
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.03	[-0.03, 0.10]	1.00	0.05	[-0.03, 0.12]	1.28
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.00]	-2.24	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.97
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.01]	1.77	0.00	[0.00, 0.01]	1.13
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.25	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.23
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.04]	-0.78	0.04	[-0.03, 0.11]	1.03
Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.07	[-0.19, 0.06]	-1.04	0.15	[0.02, 0.28]	2.32
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.02	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.20	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	-0.62
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.27	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.58
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.03	[-0.08, 0.02]	-1.12	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.04]	-0.47
Before-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.08	[0.03, 0.12]	3.35	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.00]	-2.12
After-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.01]	-1.03	-0.06	[-0.09, -0.02]	-3.32
Shift * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.05	[-0.13, 0.03]	-1.19	0.06	[-0.03, 0.15]	1.30
Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.28	[0.05, 0.52]	2.38	0.07	[-0.16, 0.30]	0.58
Before-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.10	[-0.22, 0.01]	-1.73	0.02	[-0.09, 0.13]	0.37
After-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	0.02	[-0.05, 0.09]	0.50	0.06	[-0.01, 0.13]	1.64
Shift * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	0.02	[-0.17, 0.21]	0.19	-0.09	[-0.28, 0.10]	-0.91
						.362

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity.



**Table S33***Linear Contrasts for Extraversion (Moderated by Ethnicity; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of White controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	0.02	5.77	.016	0.00	0.04	.843
Shift of Black controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.04	1.83	.176	0.00	0.02	.879
Shift of White grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.01	0.09	.765	-0.01	0.10	.758
Shift of Black grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.03	0.26	.608	-0.03	0.27	.603
Shift of White controls vs. White grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.03	1.82	.177	-0.01	0.13	.716
Before-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.08	2.20	.138	0.01	0.05	.818
After-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.02	0.34	.557	0.06	3.38	.066
Shift of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.01	0.02	.902	-0.04	0.28	.595
Shift of White controls vs. Black controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.06	3.93	.047	0.00	0.01	.925
Before-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	0.19	.664	-0.02	0.19	.662
After-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.00	0.01	.905	0.00	0.01	.904
Shift of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.03	0.17	.680	-0.03	0.17	.677

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S32.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S34

*Fixed Effects of Neuroticism Over the Transition to Grandparenthood.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$
<b>LISS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	2.48	[2.41, 2.56]	67.36	< .001	2.43	[2.34, 2.52]	53.46	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.06	[-0.01, 0.14]	1.66	.096	0.17	[0.09, 0.25]	4.15	< .001
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.73	.084	-0.02	[-0.02, -0.01]	-4.27	< .001
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-2.66	.008	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	2.79	.005
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	-0.21	.831	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.38	.703
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.09	[-0.20, 0.02]	-1.63	.103	-0.08	[-0.20, 0.05]	-1.24	.217
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.61	.541	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]	1.82	.069
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.97	.334	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.00]	-1.40	.163
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.05	[-0.11, 0.02]	-1.41	.158	-0.05	[-0.12, 0.03]	-1.21	.227
<b>HRS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	2.07	[2.03, 2.12]	94.88	< .001	2.07	[2.02, 2.12]	79.40	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.46	.649	0.13	[0.05, 0.21]	3.07	.002
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.02	[-0.04, -0.01]	-3.16	.002	-0.04	[-0.05, -0.02]	-5.33	< .001
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.07	.947	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-3.02	.003
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.01]	-0.96	.337	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.01]	-1.45	.146
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.05	[-0.12, 0.02]	-1.47	.141	-0.11	[-0.18, -0.04]	-2.99	.003
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.03	[0.00, 0.06]	1.82	.069	0.04	[0.01, 0.07]	2.67	.008
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.00	.045	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-0.78	.437
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.05	[-0.10, 0.01]	-1.54	.125	-0.04	[-0.10, 0.02]	-1.28	.200

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S35

Linear Contrasts for Neuroticism.

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
LISS				
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.01	0.68	.410	0.03
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.05	3.97	.046	3.33
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.04	1.93	.165	2.90
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.00	0.03	.853	0.02
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.00	0.05	.828	0.04
HRS				
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.01	1.64	.201	10.46
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.08	15.39	< .001	15.42
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.07	8.55	.003	4.15
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.01	0.25	.615	0.19
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	-0.02	5.12	.024	5.64

Note. The linear contrasts are needed in cases where estimates of interest are represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients and are computed using the *linearHypothesis* function from the *car* R package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a) based on the models from Table S34.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S36

*Fixed Effects of Neuroticism Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Gender.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p
<b>LISS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	2.41	[2.31, 2.52]	45.01	< .001	2.29	[2.16, 2.42]	34.73	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.07	[-0.01, 0.14]	1.74	.082	0.18	[0.10, 0.26]	4.42	< .001
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.31	.190	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.42	.016
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.29	.770	0.02	[0.01, 0.03]	4.98	< .001
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.02]	-1.01	.315	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]	-1.52	.129
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.15	[-0.30, 0.01]	-1.85	.065	-0.08	[-0.25, 0.10]	-0.85	.394
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.12	[-0.02, 0.26]	1.72	.086	0.24	[0.07, 0.41]	2.80	.005
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.38	.703	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	0.87	.382
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.08	.939	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.00]	-2.17	.030
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.05	[-0.15, 0.04]	-1.10	.271	-0.04	[-0.15, 0.07]	-0.74	.456
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.21	.836	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.89	.376
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.01	.045	-0.03	[-0.04, -0.01]	-4.22	< .001
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	1.17	.241	0.06	[-0.01, 0.13]	1.81	.070
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	0.10	[-0.11, 0.31]	0.96	.337	0.00	[-0.24, 0.23]	-0.03	.972
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	0.09	.925	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.60	.548
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.70	.487	0.03	[0.00, 0.05]	1.66	.097
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.02	[-0.12, 0.15]	0.25	.800	-0.01	[-0.15, 0.14]	-0.11	.913
<b>HRS</b>								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	1.98	[1.92, 2.04]	63.31	< .001	2.02	[1.95, 2.09]	56.79	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.31	.759	0.13	[0.04, 0.21]	2.96	.003
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.03	[-0.05, -0.01]	-3.13	.002	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.29	.022
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.54	.124	-0.02	[-0.04, -0.01]	-3.03	.002
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.06	[0.03, 0.10]	3.23	.001	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	-0.85	.396
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.05	[-0.15, 0.05]	-1.01	.311	-0.15	[-0.26, -0.04]	-2.77	.006
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.17	[0.09, 0.25]	4.20	< .001	0.09	[0.00, 0.18]	2.05	.041
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.06	[0.02, 0.11]	2.68	.007	0.06	[0.01, 0.10]	2.31	.021
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	-0.08	.939	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.59	.557
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.15	[-0.23, -0.06]	-3.25	.001	-0.06	[-0.15, 0.03]	-1.38	.167
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.02	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.15	.250	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.00]	-1.64	.102
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	2.04	.041	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.41	.157
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	-0.14	[-0.19, -0.09]	-5.18	< .001	0.00	[-0.06, 0.05]	-0.11	.909

Table S36 continued

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	0.00	[-0.13, 0.14]	0.01	.996	0.07	[-0.07, 0.21]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	-0.06	[-0.12, 0.00]	-1.90	.057	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.04]
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.04	[-0.08, 0.01]	-1.71	.087	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.01]
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.18	[0.06, 0.29]	2.95	.003	0.04	[-0.08, 0.16]

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S37

*Linear Contrasts for Neuroticism (Moderated by Gender).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.02	1.47	.226	-0.01	0.41	.520
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.00	0.00	.998	0.02	0.95	.328
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.08	4.09	.043	-0.08	3.37	.066
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.03	0.60	.439	-0.03	0.51	.474
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.05	1.53	.217	-0.07	1.81	.178
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.01	0.31	.577	0.02	3.32	.068
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	1.24	.265	0.00	0.01	.927
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.03	0.47	.491	-0.05	1.18	.278
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.02	0.81	.368	0.03	1.29	.255
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.00	0.04	.833	0.00	0.05	.825
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.04	.840	0.00	0.04	.840
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.05	0.95	.331	0.05	0.76	.382
HRS						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.05	12.37	< .001	-0.04	6.17	.013
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.07	23.28	< .001	-0.03	4.52	.033
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.09	9.16	.002	-0.09	9.17	.002
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.07	6.71	.010	-0.07	6.70	.010
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.15	18.41	< .001	-0.05	2.40	.122
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.00	0.03	.873	0.03	2.33	.127
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.04	6.89	.009	-0.02	2.28	.131
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.00	0.02	.888	-0.04	1.86	.173
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.12	34.07	< .001	0.01	0.23	.629
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	-0.05	2.44	.118	-0.05	2.49	.115
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.02	0.81	.369	-0.02	0.83	.364
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.02	0.28	.599	0.02	0.28	.597

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S36.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S38

Fixed Effects of Neuroticism Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Performing Paid Work.

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	2.02	[1.96, 2.07]	73.54	2.09	[2.03, 2.15]	67.21
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.06]	-0.47	0.15	[0.07, 0.24]	3.52
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.62	-0.05	[-0.08, -0.02]	-3.81
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.48	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.15
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.02	[-0.02, 0.06]	0.95	-0.03	[-0.08, 0.01]	-1.34
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.15	[0.03, 0.26]	2.48	0.00	[-0.11, 0.12]	0.07
Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.09	[0.04, 0.14]	3.45	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]	-1.65
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	-0.07	[-0.14, -0.01]	-2.20	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.05]	-0.48
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.01]	-1.26	-0.03	[-0.06, 0.00]	-1.91
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.03	[-0.12, 0.07]	-0.60	0.02	[-0.07, 0.12]	0.47
Before-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.04	[-0.07, -0.01]	-2.86	0.02	[-0.01, 0.05]	1.25
After-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.87	-0.02	[-0.04, -0.01]	-2.66
Shift * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.06	[-0.11, 0.00]	-2.13	0.03	[-0.03, 0.08]	0.98
Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.26	[-0.39, -0.14]	-4.25	-0.14	[-0.26, -0.02]	-2.33
Before-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.13	[0.06, 0.21]	3.50	0.07	[0.00, 0.15]	1.90
After-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	-0.40	0.03	[-0.01, 0.08]	1.64
Shift * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	-0.02	[-0.14, 0.11]	-0.26	-0.10	[-0.23, 0.02]	-1.63

Note. Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *working* = 1 indicates being employed in paid work.

**Table S39***Linear Contrasts for Neuroticism (Moderated by Paid Work; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of not-working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	0.01	0.37	.543	-0.03	2.93	.087
Shift of working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.03	5.61	.018	-0.03	5.27	.022
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.04	1.12	.290	-0.04	1.17	.280
Shift of working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.10	15.73	< .001	-0.10	15.86	< .001
Shift of not-working controls vs. not-working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.05	1.48	.223	-0.01	0.02	.888
Before-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.06	10.60	.001	0.06	9.30	.002
After-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	-0.03	3.38	.066	0.01	0.16	.694
Shift of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.07	6.11	.013	-0.07	6.69	.010
Shift of not-working controls vs. working controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.04	3.70	.054	0.00	0.02	.886
Before-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.09	6.67	.010	0.09	7.01	.008
After-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.01	0.22	.639	0.01	0.25	.618
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.07	2.21	.137	-0.07	2.19	.139

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S38.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.



**Table S40***Fixed Effects of Neuroticism Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Grandchild Care.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	2.00	[1.95, 2.05]	73.94	1.97	[1.90, 2.03]	59.60
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.03	[-0.06, 0.13]	0.70	0.02	[-0.09, 0.12]	0.29
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]	-1.03	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.49
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.08	[-0.16, 0.00]	-2.01	-0.05	[-0.13, 0.04]	-1.05
Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.02	[-0.02, 0.06]	0.86	0.05	[0.00, 0.09]	2.12
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.27	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.54
After-slope * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.21	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.05
Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.08	[-0.03, 0.18]	1.36	0.04	[-0.07, 0.16]	0.73
After-slope * Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.01]	-1.25	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.03]	-0.73

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *caring* = 1 indicates more than 100 hours of grandchild care since the last assessment.

Table S41

*Linear Contrasts for Neuroticism (Moderated by Grandchild Care; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
After-slope of caring controls vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	2.09	.148	0.28
After-slope of not-caring grandparents vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.04	4.06	.044	3.52

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S40.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S42

*Fixed Effects of Neuroticism Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Ethnicity.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	2.08	[2.04, 2.13]	88.55	2.07	[2.01, 2.13]	72.73
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.40	0.13	[0.04, 0.21]	2.96
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-2.79	-0.03	[-0.05, -0.02]	-4.44
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.24	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.53
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	-0.03	[-0.06, 0.00]	-2.21	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.01]	-1.03
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.45	-0.07	[-0.15, 0.01]	-1.81
Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.15, 0.13]	-0.15	-0.09	[-0.23, 0.05]	-1.24
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.02	[-0.02, 0.05]	0.99	0.03	[0.00, 0.06]	1.67
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.23	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-0.73
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.04]	-0.78	-0.04	[-0.10, 0.02]	-1.24
Before-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.09	[-0.15, -0.04]	-3.41	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]	-1.56
After-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.04	[0.01, 0.07]	2.55	0.05	[0.01, 0.09]	2.65
Shift * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	0.12	[0.02, 0.21]	2.42	-0.02	[-0.12, 0.09]	-0.28
Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.29	[-0.55, -0.03]	-2.21	-0.20	[-0.47, 0.07]	-1.44
Before-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.11	[-0.02, 0.24]	1.62	0.06	[-0.08, 0.19]	0.83
After-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.07]	-0.32	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.06]	-0.63
Shift * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	-0.08	[-0.30, 0.14]	-0.72	0.05	[-0.18, 0.28]	0.43

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and withnonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1

indicates Black/African American ethnicity.

**Table S43***Linear Contrasts for Neuroticism (Moderated by Ethnicity; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of White controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	-0.03	8.87	.003	-0.03	8.31	.004
Shift of Black controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.12	12.30	< .001	0.01	0.03	.858
Shift of White grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.08	14.19	< .001	-0.08	13.24	< .001
Shift of Black grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.02	0.06	.812	-0.02	0.05	.824
Shift of White controls vs. White grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.05	4.10	.043	-0.05	3.82	.051
Before-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.13	3.64	.056	0.09	1.62	.203
After-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	-0.04	0.85	.355	-0.04	0.70	.404
Shift of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.14	3.04	.081	-0.02	0.08	.780
Shift of White controls vs. Black controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.16	17.71	< .001	0.04	0.87	.350
Before-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	0.08	.774	0.02	0.07	.789
After-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.03	0.49	.485	0.03	0.46	.499
Shift of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.06	0.64	.423	0.06	0.61	.435

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S42.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S44

*Fixed Effects of Openness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
<b>LISS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.48	[3.42, 3.53]	121.02	3.52	[3.46, 3.59]	104.78
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	1.40	0.01	[-0.04, 0.06]	0.47
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.01, 0.00]	-3.00	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.98
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.00]	-1.82	0.00	[0.00, 0.01]	0.78
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-0.72	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.25
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.07]	-0.31	-0.05	[-0.14, 0.04]	-1.10
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.53	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	1.11
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.23	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.42
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.00	[-0.05, 0.05]	0.16	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.03]	-0.77
<b>HRS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.05	[3.01, 3.09]	152.61	3.04	[2.99, 3.09]	131.12
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.11]	1.28	-0.01	[-0.08, 0.06]	-0.31
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.90	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.54
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.01]	-3.38	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.76
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.62	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.56
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.03]	-1.01	0.00	[-0.06, 0.07]	0.08
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.05]	1.60	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.12
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.12	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.80
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.00]	-1.81	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.02]	-0.95

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S45

Linear Contrasts for Openness.

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.01	1.50	.221	0.02	2.55	.110
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.01	0.24	.627	-0.01	0.28	.595
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.00	0.02	.895	-0.02	1.45	.229
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.00	0.04	.842	0.00	0.05	.820
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	-0.01	1.28	.257	-0.01	1.45	.229
HRS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.02	3.66	.056	0.00	0.25	.621
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	1.29	.256	-0.02	1.55	.214
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.04	3.52	.061	-0.01	0.78	.376
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.00	0.01	.935	0.00	0.01	.903
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.00	0.17	.679	0.00	0.22	.638

Note. The linear contrasts are needed in cases where estimates of interest are represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients and are computed using the *linearHypothesis* function from the *car* R package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a) based on the models from Table S44.  $\hat{\gamma}_c =$  combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S46

*Fixed Effects of Openness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Gender.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
<b>LISS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.55	[3.46, 3.63]	83.49	3.58	[3.48, 3.67]	71.70
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	1.37	0.01	[-0.04, 0.06]	0.32
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-2.26	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	-0.38
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[0.00, 0.01]	1.28	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.30
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.05	[-0.08, -0.02]	-2.92	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.86
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.03	[-0.09, 0.15]	0.48	0.01	[-0.12, 0.14]	0.13
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.12	[-0.23, -0.01]	-2.16	-0.09	[-0.22, 0.04]	-1.38
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.77	0.00	[-0.02, 0.01]	-0.10
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.00]	-1.62	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.26
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.04	[-0.03, 0.12]	1.12	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.05]	-0.64
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.36	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.43
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	-0.02	[-0.02, -0.01]	-3.38	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.33
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	0.08	[0.03, 0.12]	3.31	0.00	[-0.04, 0.04]	0.02
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	-0.08	[-0.25, 0.08]	-1.00	-0.12	[-0.29, 0.06]	-1.29
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.44	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.29
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.94	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.35
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	-0.07	[-0.17, 0.03]	-1.39	0.01	[-0.09, 0.10]	0.14
<b>HRS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.07	[3.01, 3.12]	110.76	3.05	[2.99, 3.11]	98.96
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.04	[-0.02, 0.11]	1.33	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.05]	-0.45
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.49	-0.02	[-0.03, 0.00]	-2.46
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.51	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.99
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.07	[0.03, 0.10]	4.03	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	0.12
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.04	[-0.13, 0.05]	-0.92	0.00	[-0.09, 0.09]	0.02
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.04]	-0.68	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.32
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[-0.03, 0.05]	0.37	0.00	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.26
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.62	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.92
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.11	[-0.18, -0.03]	-2.89	-0.04	[-0.10, 0.03]	-1.19
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.33	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.83
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	1.72	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.25
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	-0.07	[-0.11, -0.02]	-3.05	0.01	[-0.03, 0.05]	0.35
						.726

Table S46 continued

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	0.01	[-0.10, 0.13]	0.25	.804	0.00	[-0.11, 0.12]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.03	[-0.03, 0.08]	0.95	.341	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.04]
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.01]	-1.17	.240	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.11	[0.01, 0.21]	2.26	.024	0.03	[-0.05, 0.12]

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.



**Table S47***Linear Contrasts for Openness (Moderated by Gender).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
<b>LISS</b>						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.05	9.28	.002	0.01	1.08	.298
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.02	1.34	.247	0.02	1.55	.213
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	0.32	.569	-0.02	0.38	.539
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.00	0.03	.853	-0.01	0.04	.839
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	0.81	.368	-0.03	1.04	.308
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.01	2.27	.132	0.01	3.22	.073
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	1.23	.268	-0.01	0.72	.396
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.02	0.48	.487	-0.02	0.57	.450
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.06	9.22	.002	0.00	0.01	.928
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.01	0.46	.499	0.01	0.52	.469
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.27	.605	0.00	0.30	.583
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.01	0.09	.766	0.01	0.10	.751
<b>HRS</b>						
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.05	13.53	< .001	-0.01	0.56	.455
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.01	0.48	.489	0.00	0.00	.998
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.04	2.45	.118	-0.04	2.84	.092
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.00	0.01	.939	0.00	0.01	.915
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.09	9.39	.002	-0.03	1.33	.249
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.03	3.45	.063	0.00	0.01	.923
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.00	.973	0.00	0.07	.796
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.01	0.06	.808	0.00	0.01	.923
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.05	10.30	.001	0.01	0.32	.571
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.02	0.80	.370	0.02	1.08	.299
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.01	0.21	.646	-0.01	0.20	.654
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.04	1.23	.266	0.04	1.40	.237

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S46.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S48

Fixed Effects of Openness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Performing Paid Work.

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.04	[2.99, 3.09]	126.17	3.07	[3.02, 3.12]	116.43
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.03	[-0.03, 0.10]	0.92	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.04]	-0.81
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-1.85	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-1.18
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-4.08	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.67
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.04	[0.00, 0.07]	2.12	-0.02	[-0.06, 0.01]	-1.45
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.09	[-0.19, 0.01]	-1.73	-0.09	[-0.19, 0.00]	-1.94
Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.02	[-0.02, 0.06]	1.05	-0.04	[-0.07, 0.00]	-1.91
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.04	[-0.01, 0.10]	1.61	0.04	[-0.01, 0.08]	1.48
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.04	[0.02, 0.06]	3.31	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.44
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.12	[-0.19, -0.04]	-2.91	-0.05	[-0.12, 0.02]	-1.44
Before-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.36	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.11
After-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.02	[0.01, 0.04]	3.01	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.38
Shift * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.02]	-0.99	0.04	[0.00, 0.08]	2.01
Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.07	[-0.03, 0.17]	1.34	0.13	[0.04, 0.22]	2.79
Before-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.04]	-0.77	-0.04	[-0.10, 0.01]	-1.47
After-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	-0.06	[-0.10, -0.03]	-3.53	-0.04	[-0.07, -0.01]	-2.61
Shift * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	0.14	[0.04, 0.24]	2.66	0.07	[-0.02, 0.16]	1.51

Note. Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *working* = 1 indicates being employed in paid work.

Table S49

*Linear Contrasts for Openness (Moderated by Paid Work; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of not-working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	0.01	1.13	.288	-0.03	5.76	.016
Shift of working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.02	1.97	.160	0.01	1.68	.194
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.06	4.32	.038	-0.06	5.11	.024
Shift of working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.02	0.68	.408	0.02	0.81	.367
Shift of not-working controls vs. not-working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.07	5.45	.020	-0.03	0.73	.392
Before-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	1.47	.226	-0.01	0.17	.684
After-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	-0.02	2.93	.087	-0.01	1.57	.210
Shift of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.00	0.01	.916	0.01	0.06	.804
Shift of not-working controls vs. working controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.00	0.00	.980	0.05	7.22	.007
Before-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.03	0.99	.320	-0.03	1.25	.263
After-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	-0.04	6.04	.014	-0.04	7.42	.006
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.08	4.49	.034	0.08	5.31	.021

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S48.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S50

*Fixed Effects of Openness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Grandchild Care.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.04	[2.99, 3.09]	122.72	< .001	2.97	[2.91, 3.03]	101.44	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.05	[-0.03, 0.14]	1.26	.207	0.23	[0.14, 0.32]	5.21	< .001
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-4.38	< .001	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.16	.002
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.04]	-0.92	.358	-0.05	[-0.12, 0.03]	-1.15	.248
Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.01	[-0.03, 0.05]	0.62	.536	0.00	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.26	.794
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	0.87	.385	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	0.05	.960
After-slope * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.09	.929	0.00	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.30	.762
Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.04	[-0.13, 0.06]	-0.75	.454	-0.03	[-0.12, 0.06]	-0.67	.505
After-slope * Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.03	[-0.01, 0.06]	1.55	.122	0.03	[-0.01, 0.06]	1.63	.103

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *caring* = 1 indicates more than 100 hours of grandchild care since the last assessment.

**Table S51**  
*Linear Contrasts for Openness (Moderated by Grandchild Care; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	
After-slope of caring controls vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.04	7.93	.005	0.03
After-slope of not-caring grandparents vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	2.84	.092	0.03
				$\chi^2$
				$p$
				5.03
				3.87
				.025
				.049

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S50.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S52

*Fixed Effects of Openness Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Ethnicity.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	3.06	[3.02, 3.10]	142.11	3.04	[2.99, 3.08]	120.08
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.05	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.57	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.04]	-0.80
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.02	[-0.03, -0.01]	-3.53	0.00	[-0.01, 0.01]	0.35
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.01]	-3.55	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-3.06
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	1.82	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.28
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.04	[-0.11, 0.02]	-1.31	0.01	[-0.06, 0.08]	0.39
Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.04	[-0.16, 0.08]	-0.65	0.06	[-0.06, 0.19]	0.96
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.05]	1.65	0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]	-0.03
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	1.14	0.01	[-0.01, 0.02]	0.86
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]	-1.55	-0.03	[-0.08, 0.01]	-1.39
Before-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.02	[-0.03, 0.06]	0.69	-0.03	[-0.06, 0.01]	-1.46
After-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.79	0.03	[0.00, 0.06]	1.93
Shift * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	0.09	[0.01, 0.17]	2.19	-0.07	[-0.15, 0.01]	-1.64
Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.12	[-0.11, 0.35]	1.01	0.01	[-0.22, 0.23]	0.05
Before-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.05	[-0.16, 0.07]	-0.80	0.00	[-0.10, 0.10]	-0.01
After-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	0.02	[-0.05, 0.09]	0.55	0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]	0.04
Shift * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	-0.08	[-0.26, 0.11]	-0.80	0.08	[-0.10, 0.25]	0.85
						.393

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and withnonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1

indicates Black/African American ethnicity.

**Table S53***Linear Contrasts for Openness (Moderated by Ethnicity; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of White controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	0.01	0.62	.431	0.00	0.10	.750
Shift of Black controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.11	12.63	< .001	-0.03	1.43	.231
Shift of White grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.02	1.72	.190	-0.02	2.09	.148
Shift of Black grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.02	0.08	.773	0.02	0.09	.770
Shift of White controls vs. White grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.03	2.33	.127	-0.03	2.06	.151
Before-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.02	0.17	.678	0.00	0.00	.987
After-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.03	0.76	.383	0.01	0.07	.797
Shift of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.09	1.63	.201	0.05	0.66	.418
Shift of White controls vs. Black controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.10	10.12	.001	-0.04	1.53	.216
Before-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.03	0.33	.568	-0.03	0.34	.558
After-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.03	0.84	.360	0.03	1.09	.297
Shift of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	0.04	0.40	.526	0.04	0.46	.500

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S52.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S54

*Fixed Effects of Life Satisfaction Over the Transition to Grandparenthood.*

Parameter	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$
LISS								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	5.04	[4.93, 5.15]	90.40	< .001	5.15	[5.02, 5.28]	78.22	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.08	[-0.22, 0.05]	-1.18	.239	0.01	[-0.12, 0.15]	0.20	.843
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.03	[0.02, 0.04]	5.02	< .001	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	2.03	.042
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.02]	2.10	.036	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.00]	-1.53	.126
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.02]	-1.20	.230	-0.11	[-0.16, -0.05]	-3.64	< .001
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.14	[-0.03, 0.30]	1.58	.115	0.00	[-0.18, 0.18]	0.01	.995
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	-0.55	.583	0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.68	.494
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.01]	-1.53	.125	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]	0.09	.928
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.08	[-0.04, 0.20]	1.24	.215	0.15	[0.02, 0.28]	2.34	.019
HRS								
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	4.79	[4.67, 4.90]	81.69	< .001	4.58	[4.45, 4.72]	67.28	< .001
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.42	[0.21, 0.63]	3.87	< .001	0.43	[0.21, 0.65]	3.87	< .001
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.27	.790	0.04	[0.00, 0.07]	1.95	.051
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	0.91	.361	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	2.37	.018
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.01	[-0.06, 0.09]	0.28	.783	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.06]	-0.40	.690
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.01	[-0.20, 0.18]	-0.11	.911	0.15	[-0.04, 0.35]	1.51	.130
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.08	[-0.01, 0.17]	1.76	.079	0.06	[-0.03, 0.14]	1.26	.207
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.03	[-0.02, 0.09]	1.11	.266	0.02	[-0.04, 0.07]	0.61	.539
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.07	[-0.24, 0.10]	-0.78	.436	-0.05	[-0.21, 0.11]	-0.59	.553

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.



**Table S55**  
*Linear Contrasts for Life Satisfaction.*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
LISS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.02	0.83	.363	-0.12	20.17	< .001
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	0.53	.468	0.04	0.51	.476
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.06	1.13	.288	0.15	7.24	.007
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.02	3.68	.055	0.02	3.28	.070
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	-0.01	0.46	.496	-0.01	0.42	.519
HRS						
Shift of the controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.02	0.58	.445	0.01	0.28	.595
Shift of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.01	0.04	.844	-0.02	0.09	.771
Shift of the controls vs. shift of the grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.03	0.27	.602	-0.03	0.25	.616
Before-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{10} + \hat{\gamma}_{11}$ )	0.09	4.29	.038	0.09	5.35	.021
After-slope of the grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{21}$ )	0.04	2.88	.090	0.05	3.50	.061

*Note.* The linear contrasts are needed in cases where estimates of interest are represented by multiple fixed-effects coefficients and are computed using the *linearHypothesis* function from the *car* R package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019a) based on the models from Table S54.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S56

*Fixed Effects of Life Satisfaction Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Gender.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
<b>LISS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	4.96	[4.81, 5.11]	63.49	5.12	[4.94, 5.30]	55.20
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	-0.08	[-0.21, 0.05]	-1.17	0.01	[-0.12, 0.14]	0.15
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.05	[0.03, 0.06]	4.76	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]	1.57
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.02	[0.00, 0.03]	1.91	-0.02	[-0.04, 0.00]	-2.50
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.08	[-0.17, 0.00]	-2.00	-0.04	[-0.12, 0.04]	-0.93
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.27	[0.04, 0.51]	2.29	0.09	[-0.17, 0.34]	0.67
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.14	[-0.05, 0.33]	1.43	0.05	[-0.17, 0.28]	0.47
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.02]	-1.19	0.01	[-0.04, 0.05]	0.24
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	-0.03	[-0.07, 0.00]	-1.73	0.00	[-0.03, 0.04]	0.23
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.13	[-0.05, 0.30]	1.38	0.08	[-0.10, 0.27]	0.86
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	-0.02	[-0.05, 0.00]	-1.90	0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]	-0.26
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	-0.69	0.02	[0.00, 0.04]	2.00
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	0.09	[-0.02, 0.20]	1.60	-0.13	[-0.24, -0.01]	-2.13
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	-0.26	[-0.56, 0.04]	-1.67	-0.16	[-0.49, 0.17]	-0.97
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.03	[-0.02, 0.09]	1.15	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]	0.38
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	0.02	[-0.03, 0.07]	0.91	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.04]	-0.30
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	-0.09	[-0.33, 0.15]	-0.73	0.13	[-0.12, 0.38]	0.99
<b>HRS</b>						
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	4.68	[4.53, 4.82]	61.35	4.49	[4.32, 4.66]	51.99
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{04}$	0.43	[0.22, 0.64]	3.95	0.40	[0.18, 0.62]	3.61
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]	0.28	0.06	[0.01, 0.12]	2.27
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	-0.55	0.06	[0.02, 0.10]	3.05
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.18	[0.07, 0.29]	3.13	-0.21	[-0.32, -0.10]	-3.75
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	0.09	[-0.17, 0.35]	0.71	0.25	[-0.01, 0.52]	1.85
Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.20	[0.03, 0.37]	2.36	0.18	[-0.01, 0.38]	1.88
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.01	[-0.13, 0.14]	0.10	-0.04	[-0.17, 0.09]	-0.62
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.06	[-0.03, 0.14]	1.32	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.07]	-0.23
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.19	[-0.44, 0.06]	-1.51	0.19	[-0.05, 0.43]	1.57
Before-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{12}$	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.07]	-0.27	-0.05	[-0.12, 0.03]	-1.23
After-slope * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{22}$	0.04	[-0.01, 0.09]	1.58	-0.05	[-0.10, 0.00]	-2.07
Shift * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{32}$	-0.31	[-0.46, -0.15]	-3.95	0.34	[0.20, 0.48]	4.63

Table S56 continued

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{03}$	-0.19	[-0.51, 0.13]	-1.19	.234	-0.17	[-0.50, 0.15]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{13}$	0.14	[-0.04, 0.32]	1.48	.139	0.17	[0.00, 0.34]
After-slope * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{23}$	-0.05	[-0.16, 0.07]	-0.79	.432	0.05	[-0.06, 0.15]
Shift * Grandparent * Female, $\hat{\gamma}_{33}$	0.23	[-0.11, 0.56]	1.34	.180	-0.41	[-0.73, -0.10]

*Note.* Two models were computed for each of the two samples (LISS, HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval.

Table S57

*Linear Contrasts for Life Satisfaction (Moderated by Gender).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
LISS				
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	-0.07	3.48	-0.06	2.59
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.01	0.19	-0.16	21.48
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.03	0.13	0.03	0.12
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.04	0.41	0.04	0.40
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.09	1.38	0.09	1.07
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.01	0.16	0.02	0.67
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	-0.01	0.30	0.00	0.03
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.03	0.13	0.21	7.28
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	0.08	2.81	-0.10	3.97
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.09
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.02	0.45	0.02	0.41
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03
HRS				
Shift of male controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30}$ )	0.17	14.63	-0.15	12.35
Shift of female controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.09	5.59	0.14	13.77
Shift of grandfathers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.04	0.17	0.03	0.12
Shift of grandmothers vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{20} + \hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.05	0.35	-0.05	0.45
Shift of male controls vs. grandfathers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.13	1.92	0.18	3.79
Before-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{11} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.14	5.47	0.13	4.79
After-slope of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.01	0.09	0.04	0.92
Shift of female controls vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	0.05	0.29	-0.19	5.13
Shift of male vs. female controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32}$ )	-0.26	19.63	0.29	25.88
Before-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{12} + \hat{\gamma}_{13}$ )	0.13	2.28	0.12	2.36
After-slope of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{23}$ )	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.02
Shift of grandfathers vs. grandmothers ( $\hat{\gamma}_{22} + \hat{\gamma}_{32} + \hat{\gamma}_{23} + \hat{\gamma}_{33}$ )	-0.08	0.50	-0.08	0.50

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S56.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S58

*Fixed Effects of Life Satisfaction Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Performing Paid Work.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	$t$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	4.78	[4.63, 4.93]	63.55	< .001	4.62	[4.46, 4.78]
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.40	[0.18, 0.61]	3.64	< .001	0.37	[0.15, 0.59]
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.00	[-0.07, 0.07]	0.11	.912	-0.08	[-0.16, -0.01]
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.00	[-0.04, 0.03]	-0.25	.800	0.05	[0.01, 0.09]
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	-0.02	[-0.14, 0.10]	-0.30	.761	0.18	[0.06, 0.30]
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.04	[-0.36, 0.29]	-0.22	.826	0.11	[-0.20, 0.43]
Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	0.02	[-0.12, 0.16]	0.27	.787	0.02	[-0.12, 0.15]
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.07	[-0.11, 0.25]	0.74	.458	0.16	[-0.01, 0.33]
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.04	[-0.05, 0.12]	0.87	.385	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.06]
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	0.11	[-0.16, 0.38]	0.77	.440	-0.10	[-0.36, 0.16]
Before-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.00	[-0.08, 0.09]	0.06	.950	0.16	[0.08, 0.25]
After-slope * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.05	[0.00, 0.10]	1.88	.060	-0.04	[-0.09, 0.01]
Shift * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	0.02	[-0.13, 0.18]	0.28	.778	-0.26	[-0.41, -0.11]
Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.03	[-0.31, 0.38]	0.19	.848	0.03	[-0.30, 0.35]
Before-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	0.02	[-0.19, 0.23]	0.19	.853	-0.14	[-0.34, 0.06]
After-slope * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	-0.03	[-0.15, 0.09]	-0.51	.611	0.06	[-0.05, 0.17]
Shift * Grandparent * Working, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	-0.25	[-0.61, 0.10]	-1.41	.160	0.03	[-0.31, 0.36]

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *working* = 1 indicates being employed in paid work.

**Table S59***Linear Contrasts for Life Satisfaction (Moderated by Paid Work; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of not-working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	-0.02	0.22	.636	0.23	21.09	< .001
Shift of working controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.05	1.67	.197	-0.07	3.91	.048
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	0.12	1.43	.232	0.12	1.55	.213
Shift of working grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.09	1.49	.223	-0.10	1.99	.159
Shift of not-working controls vs. not-working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	0.14	1.65	.200	-0.12	1.21	.272
Before-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.09	2.65	.104	0.02	0.15	.697
After-slope of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.01	0.02	.886	0.04	1.06	.303
Shift of working controls vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.14	2.80	.094	-0.03	0.16	.689
Shift of not-working controls vs. working controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.07	1.35	.246	-0.30	23.66	< .001
Before-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	0.05	.819	0.02	0.05	.823
After-slope of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.02	0.13	.716	0.02	0.16	.693
Shift of not-working grandparents vs. working grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.21	2.77	.096	-0.22	3.28	.070

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S58.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

**Table S60**

*Fixed Effects of Life Satisfaction Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Grandchild Care.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	p	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	4.99	[4.85, 5.13]	69.26	< .001	4.82	[4.66, 4.99]
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	-0.05	[-0.30, 0.21]	-0.37	.712	0.24	[-0.02, 0.51]
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	0.02	[-0.01, 0.06]	1.43	.153	0.02	[-0.02, 0.05]
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.02	[-0.24, 0.20]	-0.17	.863	0.02	[-0.21, 0.25]
Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.02	[-0.14, 0.10]	-0.33	.739	-0.12	[-0.24, 0.00]
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.04	[-0.03, 0.12]	1.25	.212	0.05	[-0.02, 0.12]
After-slope * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.04]	-0.30	.762	0.05	[0.00, 0.10]
Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.23	[-0.06, 0.53]	1.54	.124	0.34	[0.05, 0.64]
After-slope * Grandparent * Caring, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.03	[-0.14, 0.08]	-0.50	.620	-0.08	[-0.19, 0.03]

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and with nonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *caring* = 1 indicates more than 100 hours of grandchild care since the last assessment.

**Table S61**  
*Linear Contrasts for Life Satisfaction (Moderated by Grandchild Care; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls		Nonparent controls	
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$
After-slope of caring controls vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	0.02	0.15	-.03	0.63
After-slope of not-caring grandparents vs. caring grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-.04	0.51	-.04	0.56

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S60.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.



Table S62

*Fixed Effects of Life Satisfaction Over the Transition to Grandparenthood Moderated by Ethnicity.*

Parameter	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t	$\hat{\gamma}$	95% CI	t
Intercept, $\hat{\gamma}_{00}$	4.91	[4.79, 5.04]	78.04	4.62	[4.48, 4.77]	62.14
Propensity score, $\hat{\gamma}_{02}$	0.40	[0.19, 0.62]	3.65	0.35	[0.13, 0.58]	3.06
Before-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.04]	-0.24	0.05	[0.01, 0.09]	2.34
After-slope, $\hat{\gamma}_{40}$	0.01	[-0.01, 0.04]	1.00	0.03	[0.01, 0.06]	2.41
Shift, $\hat{\gamma}_{60}$	-0.02	[-0.10, 0.06]	-0.47	0.00	[-0.08, 0.08]	0.00
Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{01}$	-0.06	[-0.26, 0.14]	-0.59	0.22	[0.01, 0.43]	2.01
Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{10}$	-0.89	[-1.25, -0.53]	-4.86	0.10	[-0.26, 0.47]	0.56
Before-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$	0.10	[0.00, 0.19]	2.04	0.05	[-0.04, 0.14]	1.11
After-slope * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{41}$	0.02	[-0.04, 0.08]	0.69	0.01	[-0.05, 0.06]	0.19
Shift * Grandparent, $\hat{\gamma}_{61}$	-0.04	[-0.22, 0.14]	-0.43	-0.06	[-0.23, 0.11]	-0.74
Before-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{30}$	0.09	[-0.06, 0.25]	1.15	-0.18	[-0.31, -0.04]	-2.52
After-slope * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{50}$	0.02	[-0.06, 0.11]	0.55	-0.08	[-0.19, 0.03]	-1.37
Shift * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{70}$	-0.03	[-0.31, 0.25]	-0.20	0.06	[-0.24, 0.35]	0.37
Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{11}$	0.42	[-0.30, 1.13]	1.15	-0.57	[-1.28, 0.14]	-1.57
Before-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{31}$	-0.23	[-0.62, 0.16]	-1.17	0.03	[-0.34, 0.40]	0.17
After-slope * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{51}$	0.26	[0.03, 0.49]	2.20	0.36	[0.13, 0.59]	3.07
Shift * Grandparent * Black, $\hat{\gamma}_{71}$	-0.34	[-0.98, 0.31]	-1.02	-0.43	[-1.06, 0.21]	-1.32

*Note.* Two models were computed (only HRS): grandparents matched with parent controls and withnonparent controls. CI = confidence interval. *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1

indicates Black/African American ethnicity.

**Table S63***Linear Contrasts for Life Satisfaction (Moderated by Ethnicity; only HRS).*

Linear Contrast	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$	$\hat{\gamma}_c$	$\chi^2$	$p$
Shift of White controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60}$ )	-0.01	0.03	.864	0.03	1.09	.296
Shift of Black controls vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	-0.01	0.01	.930	0.01	0.01	.923
Shift of White grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.02	0.14	.709	-0.03	0.21	.644
Shift of Black grandparents vs. 0 ( $\hat{\gamma}_{40} + \hat{\gamma}_{60} + \hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.10	0.24	.625	-0.11	0.30	.583
Shift of White controls vs. White grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61}$ )	-0.02	0.06	.799	-0.06	0.78	.376
Before-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{21} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.14	0.49	.482	0.08	0.21	.648
After-slope of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.28	6.12	.013	0.37	10.37	.001
Shift of Black controls vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{41} + \hat{\gamma}_{61} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.10	0.16	.689	-0.12	0.28	.596
Shift of White controls vs. Black controls ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70}$ )	0.00	0.00	.971	-0.02	0.03	.854
Before-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{30} + \hat{\gamma}_{31}$ )	-0.14	0.60	.437	-0.14	0.66	.418
After-slope of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{51}$ )	0.28	6.90	.009	0.29	7.56	.006
Shift of White grandparents vs. Black grandparents ( $\hat{\gamma}_{50} + \hat{\gamma}_{70} + \hat{\gamma}_{51} + \hat{\gamma}_{71}$ )	-0.08	0.14	.713	-0.09	0.16	.689

*Note.* The linear contrasts are based on the models from Table S62.  $\hat{\gamma}_c$  = combined fixed-effects estimate.

Table S64

*Tests of Heterogeneous Random Slope Variance Models for Agreeableness Against Comparison Models*

*With a Uniform Random Slope Variance.*

	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>
LISS								
Before-slope: uniform	0.00	0.04			0.00	0.04		
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.05			0.00	0.05		
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.04	15.22	.002	no		37.53	< .001
After-slope: uniform	0.00	0.03			0.00	0.03		
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.04			0.00	0.04		
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.03	4.88	.181	no		14.49	.002
Shift: uniform	0.02	0.15			0.02	0.15		
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.15			0.03	0.16		
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.02	0.13	1.57	.666	no		15.97	.001
HRS								
Before-slope: uniform	0.01	0.11			0.01	0.12		
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.14			0.02	0.15		
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.12	57.65	< .001	no		81.45	< .001
After-slope: uniform	0.01	0.09			0.01	0.11		
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.01	0.10			0.01	0.12		
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.08	35.76	< .001	no		68.22	< .001
Shift: uniform	0.06	0.25			0.07	0.26		
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.08	0.28			0.09	0.30		
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.05	0.22	68.90	< .001	no		92.11	< .001

*Note.* The heterogeneous variance models ( $df = 16$ ) differ only in the random effects from the comparison models ( $df = 13$ ). In addition to two random slope variances (instead of one), the heterogeneous variance models estimate two additional random intercept/slope covariances. Both models estimate heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and control groups. *Var.* = random slope variance; *SD* = standard deviation; *LR* = likelihood ratio; *p* = *p*-value (of the LR test); *GP greater* = indicating if the random slope variance of the grandparents is larger than that of either control group.

Table S65

*Tests of Heterogeneous Random Slope Variance Models for Conscientiousness Against Comparison Models*

*With a Uniform Random Slope Variance.*

	Parent controls				Nonparent controls					
	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GP greater</i>	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GP greater</i>
LISS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.04			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.05				0.00	0.04			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.03	16.78	< .001	no	0.00	0.01	31.44	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.04			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.04			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.03	8.02	.046	no	0.00	0.03	17.47	< .001	no
Shift: uniform	0.02	0.14				0.02	0.14			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.15				0.02	0.16			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.12	2.58	.461	no	0.01	0.08	14.58	.002	no
HRS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.01	0.11				0.01	0.11			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.14				0.02	0.14			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.11	79.31	< .001	no	0.02	0.13	105.76	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.01	0.09				0.01	0.10			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.01	0.11				0.01	0.11			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.08	57.77	< .001	no	0.01	0.09	59.64	< .001	no
Shift: uniform	0.06	0.24				0.06	0.25			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.07	0.27				0.08	0.27			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.05	0.23	83.80	< .001	no	0.06	0.25	91.50	< .001	no

*Note.* The heterogeneous variance models ( $df = 16$ ) differ only in the random effects from the comparison models ( $df = 13$ ). In addition to two random slope variances (instead of one), the heterogeneous variance models estimate two additional random intercept/slope covariances. Both models estimate heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and control groups. *Var.* = random slope variance; *SD* = standard deviation; *LR* = likelihood ratio; *p* = *p*-value (of the LR test); *GP greater* = indicating if the random slope variance of the grandparents is larger than that of either control group.

Table S66

Tests of Heterogeneous Random Slope Variance Models for Extraversion Against Comparison Models With a Uniform Random Slope Variance.

	Parent controls				Nonparent controls					
	Var.	SD	LR	p	GP greater	Var.	SD	LR	p	GP greater
LISS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.00	0.05				0.00	0.05			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.06				0.00	0.06			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.05	25.93	< .001	no	0.00	0.05	16.88	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.04			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.05			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.03	4.61	.203	no	0.00	0.03	8.97	.030	no
Shift: uniform	0.03	0.17				0.03	0.18			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.03	0.18				0.04	0.20			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.02	0.13	6.66	.084	no	0.02	0.13	8.05	.045	no
HRS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.01	0.12				0.02	0.13			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.14				0.03	0.16			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.11	50.21	< .001	no	0.02	0.13	88.69	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.01	0.10				0.01	0.11			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.01	0.11				0.02	0.12			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.09	40.23	< .001	no	0.01	0.10	48.76	< .001	no
Shift: uniform	0.07	0.27				0.08	0.28			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.09	0.29				0.09	0.31			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.06	0.25	60.29	< .001	no	0.07	0.26	67.55	< .001	no

Note. The heterogeneous variance models ( $df = 16$ ) differ only in the random effects from the comparison models ( $df = 13$ ). In addition to two random slope variances (instead of one), the heterogeneous variance models estimate two additional random intercept/slope covariances. Both models estimate heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and control groups.  $Var.$  = random slope variance;  $SD$  = standard deviation;  $LR$  = likelihood ratio;  $p$  =  $p$ -value (of the LR test);  $GP$  greater = indicating if the random slope variance of the grandparents is larger than that of either control group.

Table S67

*Tests of Heterogeneous Random Slope Variance Models for Neuroticism Against Comparison Models With a Uniform Random Slope Variance.*

	Parent controls				Nonparent controls					
	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GP greater</i>	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GP greater</i>
LISS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.00	0.06				0.01	0.07			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.07				0.01	0.09			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.06	13.44	.004	no	0.00	0.06	27.16	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.00	0.05				0.00	0.06			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.05				0.00	0.06			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.04	4.07	.254	no	0.00	0.04	12.76	.005	no
Shift: uniform	0.04	0.21				0.06	0.25			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.04	0.21				0.08	0.29			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.04	0.20	1.74	.628	no	0.03	0.18	13.84	.003	no
HRS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.02	0.15				0.02	0.15			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.04	0.19				0.04	0.20			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.03	0.17	83.87	< .001	no	0.03	0.18	96.92	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.01	0.12				0.01	0.12			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.14				0.02	0.14			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.10	73.89	< .001	no	0.01	0.10	87.94	< .001	no
Shift: uniform	0.10	0.32				0.09	0.30			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.13	0.36				0.12	0.34			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.09	0.30	103.35	< .001	no	0.08	0.29	99.32	< .001	no

*Note.* The heterogeneous variance models ( $df = 16$ ) differ only in the random effects from the comparison models ( $df = 13$ ). In addition to two random slope variances (instead of one), the heterogeneous variance models estimate two additional random intercept/slope covariances. Both models estimate heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and control groups. *Var.* = random slope variance; *SD* = standard deviation; *LR* = likelihood ratio; *p* = *p*-value (of the LR test); *GP greater* = indicating if the random slope variance of the grandparents is larger than that of either control group.

Table S68

Tests of Heterogeneous Random Slope Variance Models for Openness Against Comparison Models With a

Uniform Random Slope Variance.

	Parent controls				Nonparent controls					
	Var.	SD	LR	p	GP greater	Var.	SD	LR	p	GP greater
LISS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.04			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.05				0.00	0.04			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.04	32.73	< .001	no	0.00	0.04	20.42	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.00	0.03				0.00	0.03			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.00	0.04				0.00	0.03			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.00	0.02	20.08	< .001	no	0.00	0.02	9.55	.023	no
Shift: uniform	0.02	0.14				0.02	0.13			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.16				0.02	0.13			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.10	16.70	< .001	no	0.01	0.12	8.33	.040	no
HRS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.01	0.12				0.01	0.12			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.15				0.02	0.14			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.10	66.09	< .001	no	0.02	0.14	57.57	< .001	yes
After-slope: uniform	0.01	0.10				0.01	0.10			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.01	0.11				0.01	0.11			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.01	0.09	31.95	< .001	no	0.01	0.10	31.36	< .001	no
Shift: uniform	0.07	0.26				0.07	0.26			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.08	0.28				0.08	0.28			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.06	0.24	61.83	< .001	no	0.07	0.26	52.06	< .001	no

Note. The heterogeneous variance models ( $df = 16$ ) differ only in the random effects from the comparison models ( $df = 13$ ). In addition to two random slope variances (instead of one), the heterogeneous variance models estimate two additional random intercept/slope covariances. Both models estimate heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and control groups.  $Var.$  = random slope variance;  $SD$  = standard deviation;  $LR$  = likelihood ratio;  $p$  =  $p$ -value (of the LR test);  $GP$  greater = indicating if the random slope variance of the grandparents is larger than that of either control group.

Table S69

*Tests of Heterogeneous Random Slope Variance Models for Life Satisfaction Against Comparison Models*

*With a Uniform Random Slope Variance.*

	Parent controls				Nonparent controls					
	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GP greater</i>	<i>Var.</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>LR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>GP greater</i>
LISS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.01	0.11				0.01	0.11			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.02	0.14				0.02	0.14			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.02	0.13	56.24	< .001	no	0.01	0.12	34.59	< .001	no
After-slope: uniform	0.01	0.10				0.01	0.10			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.01	0.09				0.01	0.10			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.02	0.12	11.91	.008	yes	0.01	0.12	10.88	.012	yes
Shift: uniform	0.20	0.45				0.19	0.44			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	0.21	0.45				0.19	0.44			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.23	0.48	8.96	.030	yes	0.21	0.46	8.43	.038	yes
HRS										
Before-slope: uniform	0.12	0.34				0.14	0.38			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.22	0.47				0.22	0.47			
Before-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.22	0.47	116.02	< .001	no	0.32	0.57	115.87	< .001	yes
After-slope: uniform	0.10	0.32				0.11	0.33			
After-slope: heterogeneous (controls)	0.14	0.38				0.15	0.39			
After-slope: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.07	0.27	96.08	< .001	no	0.09	0.30	80.01	< .001	no
Shift: uniform	0.84	0.91				0.78	0.88			
Shift: heterogeneous (controls)	1.11	1.05				1.00	1.00			
Shift: heterogeneous (grandparents)	0.76	0.87	171.58	< .001	no	0.85	0.92	125.52	< .001	no

*Note.* The heterogeneous variance models ( $df = 16$ ) differ only in the random effects from the comparison models ( $df = 13$ ). In addition to two random slope variances (instead of one), the heterogeneous variance models estimate two additional random intercept/slope covariances. Both models estimate heterogeneous random intercept variances for the grandparent and control groups. *Var.* = random slope variance; *SD* = standard deviation; *LR* = likelihood ratio; *p* = *p*-value (of the LR test); *GP greater* = indicating if the random slope variance of the grandparents is larger than that of either control group.



Table S70

Rank-Order Stability With Maximal Retest Interval.

Outcome	Parent controls			Nonparent controls		
	<i>Cor<sub>all</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>GP</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>con</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>all</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>GP</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>con</sub></i>
LISS						
Agreeableness	0.74	0.77	0.74	0.67	0.77	0.64
Conscientiousness	0.68	0.77	0.66	0.69	0.77	0.67
Extraversion	0.74	0.82	0.71	0.80	0.82	0.80
Neuroticism	0.70	0.76	0.68	0.68	0.76	0.65
Openness	0.74	0.79	0.73	0.78	0.79	0.78
Life Satisfaction	0.67	0.54	0.70	0.51	0.54	0.51
HRS						
Agreeableness	0.67	0.68	0.67	0.69	0.68	0.69
Conscientiousness	0.66	0.68	0.66	0.65	0.68	0.64
Extraversion	0.70	0.73	0.69	0.69	0.73	0.68
Neuroticism	0.64	0.67	0.64	0.63	0.67	0.62
Openness	0.70	0.71	0.70	0.76	0.71	0.77
Life Satisfaction	0.51	0.54	0.50	0.48	0.54	0.46

*Note.* Test-retest correlations as indicators of rank-order stability, and p-values indicating significant group differences therein between grandparents and each control group. The average retest intervals in years are 8.45 ( $SD = 2.24$ ) for the LISS parent sample, 8.31 ( $SD = 2.28$ ) for the LISS nonparent sample, 6.91 ( $SD = 2.21$ ) for the HRS parent sample, and 6.96 ( $SD = 2.27$ ) for the HRS nonparent sample. *Cor* = correlation; *GP* = grandparents; *con* = controls.


Table S71

Rank-Order Stability Excluding Duplicate Control Observations.



Outcome	Parent controls				Nonparent controls			
	<i>Cor<sub>all</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>GP</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>con</sub></i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cor<sub>all</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>GP</sub></i>	<i>Cor<sub>con</sub></i>	<i>p</i>
LISS								
Agreeableness	0.79	0.81	0.77	.410	0.77	0.81	0.71	.007
Conscientiousness	0.80	0.80	0.79	.428	0.78	0.80	0.75	.395
Extraversion	0.86	0.87	0.85	.751	0.86	0.87	0.86	.709
Neuroticism	0.77	0.77	0.78	.925	0.76	0.77	0.75	.545
Openness	0.76	0.80	0.72	.111	0.81	0.80	0.82	.826
Life Satisfaction	0.65	0.66	0.63	.853	0.64	0.66	0.63	.252
HRS								
Agreeableness	0.69	0.70	0.68	.990	0.70	0.70	0.70	.943
Conscientiousness	0.70	0.69	0.70	.219	0.69	0.69	0.70	.513
Extraversion	0.74	0.75	0.73	.228	0.75	0.75	0.74	.159
Neuroticism	0.68	0.71	0.66	.599	0.72	0.71	0.74	.028
Openness	0.73	0.73	0.74	.887	0.74	0.73	0.76	.639
Life Satisfaction	0.56	0.55	0.57	.515	0.58	0.55	0.62	.031

*Note.* Test-retest correlations as indicators of rank-order stability, and p-values indicating significant group differences therein between grandparents and each control group. The average retest intervals in years are 2.90 ( $SD = 0.90$ ) for the LISS parent sample, 2.90 ( $SD = 0.92$ ) for the LISS nonparent sample, 3.91 ( $SD = 0.96$ ) for the HRS parent sample, and 3.89 ( $SD = 0.94$ ) for the HRS nonparent sample. *Cor* = correlation; *GP* = grandparents; *con* = controls.



## 1797 Supplemental Figures

**Figure S1**



*Distributional Overlap of the Propensity Score in the Four Analysis Samples at the Time of Matching.*

**LISS****HRS****Figure S2**



*Violin Plots for Agreeableness Including Means Over Time and LOESS Line.*

**LISS****HRS****Figure S3**



*Violin Plots for Conscientiousness Including Means Over Time and LOESS Line.*

**LISS****HRS****Figure S4**

*Violin Plots for Extraversion Including Means Over Time and LOESS Line.*



**LISS****HRS****Figure S5**

*Violin Plots for Neuroticism Including Means Over Time and LOESS Line.*



**LISS****HRS****Figure S6**

*Violin Plots for Openness Including Means Over Time and LOESS Line.*





**LISS****HRS****Figure S7**



*Violin Plots for Life Satisfaction Including Means Over Time and LOESS Line.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S8**



*Change trajectories of agreeableness based on the models of moderation by paid work (see Table S10). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure 4 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S9**

*Change trajectories of agreeableness based on the models of moderation by grandchild care (see Table S12). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure 4 (basic models) but restricted to the post-transition period for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S10**



*Change trajectories of agreeableness based on the models of moderation by ethnicity (see Table S14). black = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, black = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure 4 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

**LISS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Parent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Parent Controls

**Gender**

— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**



—●— Grandparents  
—●— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**

















— Women  
- - Men

**Figure S11**



*Change trajectories of conscientiousness based on the basic models (left column) and the models including the gender interaction (right column). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S12**

*Change trajectories of conscientiousness based on the models of moderation by ethnicity (see Table S22). black = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, black = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S11 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*



**LISS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group****Gender****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group****Gender****HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group****Gender****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group****Gender****Figure S13**

Change trajectories of extraversion based on the basic models (left column) and the models including the gender interaction (right column). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood.



**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S14**

*Change trajectories of extraversion based on the models of moderation by paid work (see Table S28). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S13 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*



















**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S15**



*Change trajectories of extraversion based on the models of moderation by grandchild care (see Table S30). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S13 (basic models) but restricted to the post-transition period for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S16**



Change trajectories of extraversion based on the models of moderation by ethnicity (see Table S32). *black* = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, *black* = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S13 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.

**LISS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group****Gender****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group****Gender****HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group****Gender****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group****Gender****Figure S17**



Change trajectories of neuroticism based on the basic models (left column) and the models including the gender interaction (right column). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood.

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S18**



*Change trajectories of neuroticism based on the models of moderation by paid work (see Table S38). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S17 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S19**

*Change trajectories of neuroticism based on the models of moderation by grandchild care (see Table S40). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S17 (basic models) but restricted to the post-transition period for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S20**



*Change trajectories of neuroticism based on the models of moderation by ethnicity (see Table S42). black = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, black = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S17 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

**LISS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Parent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Parent Controls

**Gender**

— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**



—●— Grandparents  
—●— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**

— Women  
- - Men



**Figure S21**

*Change trajectories of openness based on the basic models (left column) and the models including the gender interaction (right column). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood.*



**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S22**

*Change trajectories of openness based on the models of moderation by paid work (see Table S48). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S21 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*





**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S23**

*Change trajectories of openness based on the models of moderation by grandchild care (see Table S50). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S21 (basic models) but restricted to the post-transition period for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S24**



*Change trajectories of openness based on the models of moderation by ethnicity (see Table S52). black = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, black = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S21 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

**LISS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Parent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Group**

—●— Grandparents  
—●— Parent Controls

**Gender**

— Women  
- - Men

**Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Group**



—●— Grandparents  
—●— Nonparent Controls

**Gender**



— Women  
- - Men

**Figure S25**



Change trajectories of life satisfaction based on the basic models (left column) and the models including the gender interaction (right column). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood.

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S26**

*Change trajectories of life satisfaction based on the models of moderation by paid work (see Table S58). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S25 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S27**

*Change trajectories of life satisfaction based on the models of moderation by grandchild care (see Table S60). The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S25 (basic models) but restricted to the post-transition period for better comparability.*

**HRS****Grandparents vs. Parent Controls****Grandparents vs. Nonparent Controls****Figure S28**

*Change trajectories of life satisfaction based on the models of moderation by ethnicity (see Table S62). black = 0 indicates White/Caucasian ethnicity, black = 1 indicates Black/African American ethnicity. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals of the predicted values, which only account for the fixed-effects portion of the model. The vertical line indicates the approximate time of the transition to grandparenthood. The plots in the left column are the same as in Figure S25 (basic models) and added here for better comparability.*

## Complete Software and Session Information

We used R (Version 4.0.4; R Core Team, 2021) and the R-packages *car* (Fox et al., 2020; Version 3.0.12; Fox & Weisberg, 2019b), *carData* (Version 3.0.4; Fox et al., 2020), *citr* (Version 0.3.2; Aust, 2019), *cowplot* (Version 1.1.1; Wilke, 2020), *dplyr* (Version 1.0.7; Wickham, François, et al., 2021), *forcats* (Version 0.5.1; Wickham, 2021a), *Formula* (Version 1.2.4; Zeileis & Croissant, 2010), *ggplot2* (Version 3.3.5; Wickham, 2016), *GPArotation* (Version 2014.11.1; Bernaards & I.Jennrich, 2005), *Hmisc* (Version 4.6.0; Harrell Jr, 2021), *lattice* (Version 0.20.41; Sarkar, 2008), *lme4* (Version 1.1.27.1; Bates et al., 2015), *lmerTest* (Version 3.1.3; Kuznetsova et al., 2017), *magick* (Version 2.7.3; Ooms, 2021), *MASS* (Version 7.3.53; Venables & Ripley, 2002), *Matrix* (Version 1.3.2; Bates & Maechler, 2021), *multcomp* (Version 1.4.18; Hothorn et al., 2008), *mvtnorm* (Version 1.1.1; Genz & Bretz, 2009), *nlme* (Version 3.1.152; Pinheiro et al., 2021), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust & Barth, 2020), *png* (Version 0.1.7; Urbanek, 2013), *psych* (Version 2.1.9; Revelle, 2021), *purrr* (Version 0.3.4; Henry & Wickham, 2020), *readr* (Version 2.1.1; Wickham, Hester, et al., 2021), *scales* (Version 1.1.1; Wickham & Seidel, 2020), *shiny* (Version 1.7.1; Chang et al., 2021), *stringr* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham, 2019), *survival* (Version 3.2.7; Terry M. Therneau & Patricia M. Grambsch, 2000), *TH.data* (Version 1.0.10; Hothorn, 2019), *tibble* (Version 3.1.6; Müller & Wickham, 2021), *tidyr* (Version 1.1.4; Wickham, 2021b), *tidyverse* (Version 1.3.1; Wickham et al., 2019b), and *tinylabels* (Version 0.2.2; Barth, 2021) for data wrangling, analyses, and plots. We used *renv* to create a reproducible environment for this R-project (Version 0.15.2, Ushey, 2022).

The following is the output of R's *sessionInfo()* command, which shows information to aid analytic reproducibility of the analyses.

R version 4.0.4 (2021-02-15) Platform: x86\_64-apple-darwin17.0 (64-bit) Running under: macOS Big Sur 10.16

Matrix products: default BLAS:

```
1824 /Library/Frameworks/R.framework/Versions/4.0/Resources/lib/libRblas.dylib LAPACK:
1825 /Library/Frameworks/R.framework/Versions/4.0/Resources/lib/libRlapack.dylib
1826 locale: [1]
1827 en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8/C/en_US.UTF-8/en_US.UTF-8
1828 attached base packages: [1] grid stats graphics grDevices datasets utils methods
1829 [8] base
1830 other attached packages: [1] png_0.1-7 magick_2.7.3 car_3.0-12
1831 [4] carData_3.0-4 scales_1.1.1 cowplot_1.1.1
1832 [7] nlme_3.1-152 lmerTest_3.1-3 lme4_1.1-27.1
1833 [10] Matrix_1.3-2 GPArotation_2014.11-1 psych_2.1.9
1834 [13] forcats_0.5.1 stringr_1.4.0 dplyr_1.0.7
1835 [16] purrr_0.3.4 readr_2.1.1 tidyr_1.1.4
1836 [19] tibble_3.1.6 tidyverse_1.3.1 Hmisc_4.6-0
1837 [22] ggplot2_3.3.5 Formula_1.2-4 lattice_0.20-41
1838 [25] multcomp_1.4-18 TH.data_1.0-10 MASS_7.3-53
1839 [28] survival_3.2-7 mvtnorm_1.1-1 citr_0.3.2
1840 [31] papaja_0.1.0.9997 tinylab_0.2.2
1841 loaded via a namespace (and not attached): [1] minqa_1.2.4 colorspace_2.0-2
1842 ellipsis_0.3.2
1843 [4] htmlTable_2.4.0 base64enc_0.1-3 fs_1.5.2
1844 [7] rstudioapi_0.13 fansi_1.0.2 lubridate_1.8.0
1845 [10] xml2_1.3.3 codetools_0.2-18 splines_4.0.4
1846 [13] mnormt_2.0.2 knitr_1.37 jsonlite_1.7.3
1847 [16] nloptr_1.2.2.2 broom_0.7.11.9000 cluster_2.1.0
1848 [19] dbplyr_2.1.1 shiny_1.7.1 compiler_4.0.4
1849 [22] httr_1.4.2 backports_1.4.1 assertthat_0.2.1
```



- 1850 [25] fastmap\_1.1.0 cli\_3.1.1 later\_1.3.0
- 1851 [28] htmltools\_0.5.2 tools\_4.0.4 gtable\_0.3.0
- 1852 [31] glue\_1.6.1 Rcpp\_1.0.7 cellranger\_1.1.0
- 1853 [34] vctrs\_0.3.8 xfun\_0.29 rvest\_1.0.2
- 1854 [37] mime\_0.12 miniUI\_0.1.1.1 lifecycle\_1.0.1
- 1855 [40] renv\_0.15.2 zoo\_1.8-8 hms\_1.1.1
- 1856 [43] promises\_1.2.0.1 parallel\_4.0.4 sandwich\_3.0-0
- 1857 [46] RColorBrewer\_1.1-2 yaml\_2.2.2 gridExtra\_2.3
- 1858 [49] rpart\_4.1-15 latticeExtra\_0.6-29 stringi\_1.7.6
- 1859 [52] checkmate\_2.0.0 boot\_1.3-26 rlang\_1.0.0
- 1860 [55] pkgconfig\_2.0.3 evaluate\_0.14 htmlwidgets\_1.5.2
- 1861 [58] tidysselect\_1.1.1 magrittr\_2.0.2 bookdown\_0.24
- 1862 [61] R6\_2.5.1 generics\_0.1.1 DBI\_1.1.0
- 1863 [64] pillar\_1.6.5 haven\_2.4.3 foreign\_0.8-81
- 1864 [67] withr\_2.4.3 abind\_1.4-5 nnet\_7.3-15
- 1865 [70] modelr\_0.1.8 crayon\_1.4.2 utf8\_1.2.2
- 1866 [73] tmvnsim\_1.0-2 tzdb\_0.2.0 rmarkdown\_2.11
- 1867 [76] jpeg\_0.1-8.1 readxl\_1.3.1 data.table\_1.13.2
- 1868 [79] reprex\_2.0.1 digest\_0.6.29 xtable\_1.8-4
- 1869 [82] httpuv\_1.6.5 numDeriv\_2016.8-1.1 munsell\_0.5.0