

**Is Timing Everything? The Effects of Measurement Timing on
the Performance of Nonlinear Longitudinal Models**

by

Sebastian L.V. Sciarra

A Thesis

presented to

The University of Guelph

In partial fulfilment of requirements
for the degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

in

Psychology

in the field of Industrial-Organizational Psychology

Guelph, Ontario, Canada

© Sebastian L.V. Sciarra, February, 2023

ABSTRACT

IS TIMING EVERYTHING? THE EFFECTS OF MEASUREMENT TIMING ON THE PERFORMANCE OF NONLINEAR LONGITUDINAL MODELS

Sebastian L.V. Sciarra
University of Guelph, 2023

Advisor(s):
David Stanley

Despite the value that longitudinal research offers for understanding psychological processes, studies in organizational research rarely use longitudinal designs. One reason for the paucity of longitudinal designs may be the challenges they present for researchers. Three challenges of particular importance are that researchers have to determine 1) how many measurements to take, 2) how to space measurements, and 3) how to design studies when participants provide data with different response schedules (time unstructuredness). In systematically reviewing the simulation literature, I found that few studies comprehensively investigated the effects of measurement number, measurement spacing, and time structuredness (in addition to sample size) on model performance. As a consequence, researchers have little guidance when trying to conduct longitudinal research. To address these gaps in the literature, I conducted a series of simulation experiments. I found poor model performance across all measurement number/sample size pairings. That is, bias and precision were never concurrently optimized under any combination of manipulated variables. Bias was often low, however, with moderate measurement numbers and sample sizes. Although precision was frequently low, the greatest improvements in precision resulted from using either seven measurements with $N \geq 200$ or nine measurements with $N \leq 100$. With time-unstructured data, model performance systematically

decreased across all measurement number/sample size pairings when the model incorrectly assumed an identical response pattern across all participants (i.e., time-structured data). Fortunately, when models were equipped to handle heterogeneous response patterns using definition variables, the poor model performance observed across all measurement number/sample size pairings no longer appeared. Altogether, the results of the current simulation experiments provide guidelines for researchers interested in modelling nonlinear change.

DEDICATION

[To be completed after defence]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[To be completed after defence]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables.....	xii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Appendices	xv
1 If you are creating a PDF you'll need to write your preliminary content	1
1.1 The Need to Conduct Longitudinal Research	2
1.2 Understanding Patterns of Change That Emerge Over Time	2
1.3 Challenges Involved in Conducting Longitudinal Research.....	2
1.3.1 Number of Measurements	2
1.3.2 Spacing of Measurements	2
1.3.3 Time Structuredness	2
1.3.3.1 Time-Structured Data	2
1.3.3.2 Time-Unstructured Data	2
1.3.4 Summary.....	2
1.4 Using Simulations To Assess Modelling Accuracy	2
1.5 Systematic Review of Simulation Literature	2
1.5.1 Systematic Review Methodology	2
1.5.2 Systematic Review Results.....	2
1.6 Methods of Modelling Nonlinear Patterns of Change Over Time	2
1.7 Multilevel and Latent Variable Approach	2
1.7.1 Next Steps.....	2
1.8 Overview of Simulation Experiments.....	2
2 Experiment 1	2
2.1 Methods	4
2.1.1 Overview of Data Generation.....	4
2.1.1.1 Function Used to Generate Each Data Set	4

2.1.1.2	Population Values Used for Function Parameters	4
2.1.2	Modelling of Each Generated Data Set	4
2.1.3	Variables Used in Simulation Experiment.....	4
2.1.3.1	Independent Variables	4
2.1.3.1.1	Spacing of Measurements	4
2.1.3.1.2	Number of Measurements.....	4
2.1.3.1.3	Population Values Set for The Fixed-Effect Days-to-Halfway Elevation Parameter β_{fixed} (Nature of Change)	4
2.1.3.2	Constants	4
2.1.3.3	Dependent Variables.....	4
2.1.3.3.1	Convergence Success Rate	4
2.1.3.3.2	Model Performance	4
2.1.3.3.2.1	Bias.....	4
2.1.3.3.2.2	Precision.....	4
2.1.4	Analysis of Data Modelling Output and Accompanying Visualizations	4
2.1.4.1	Analysis of Convergence Success Rate.....	4
2.1.4.2	Analysis and Visualization of Bias	4
2.1.4.3	Analysis and Visualization of Precision	4
2.1.4.3.1	Effect Size Computation for Precision	4
2.2	Results and Discussion.....	4
2.2.1	Framework for Interpreting Results.....	4
2.2.2	Pre-Processing of Data and Model Convergence	4
2.2.3	Equal Spacing.....	4
2.2.3.1	Nature of Change That Leads to Highest Model Performance	4
2.2.3.2	Bias.....	4
2.2.3.3	Precision	4
2.2.3.4	Qualitative Description.....	4
2.2.3.5	Summary of Results With Equal Spacing.....	4
2.2.4	Time-Interval Increasing Spacing	4
2.2.4.1	Nature of Change That Leads to Highest Model Performance	4
2.2.4.2	Bias.....	4
2.2.4.3	Precision	4

2.2.4.4	Qualitative Description.....	4
2.2.4.5	Summary of Results With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing .	4
2.2.5	Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing	4
2.2.5.1	Nature of Change That Leads to Highest Model Performance	4
2.2.5.2	Bias.....	4
2.2.5.3	Precision	4
2.2.5.4	Qualitative Description.....	4
2.2.5.5	Summary of Results Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing	4
2.2.6	Middle-and-Extreme Spacing	4
2.2.6.1	Nature of Change That Leads to Highest Model Performance	4
2.2.6.2	Bias.....	4
2.2.6.3	Precision	4
2.2.6.4	Qualitative Description.....	4
2.2.6.5	Summary of Results With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing	4
2.2.7	Addressing My Research Questions	4
2.2.7.1	Does Placing Measurements Near Periods of Change In- crease Model Performance?.....	4
2.2.7.2	When the Nature of Change is Unknown, How Should Measurements be Spaced?	4
2.3	Summary of Experiment 1	4
3	Experiment 2.....	4
3.1	Methods	6
3.1.1	Overview of Data Generation.....	6
3.1.2	Modelling of Each Generated Data Set	6
3.1.3	Variables Used in Simulation Experiment.....	6
3.1.3.1	Independent Variables	6
3.1.3.1.1	Spacing of Measurements	6
3.1.3.1.2	Number of Measurements.....	6
3.1.3.1.3	Sample Size.....	6
3.1.3.2	Constants	6
3.1.3.3	Dependent Variables.....	6
3.1.3.3.1	Convergence Success Rate	6
3.1.3.3.2	Model Performance	6

3.1.3.3.2.1	Bias.....	6
3.1.3.3.2.2	Precision.....	6
3.1.4	Analysis of Data Modelling Output and Accompanying Visualizations	6
3.2	Results and Discussion.....	6
3.2.1	Framework for Interpreting Results.....	6
3.2.2	Pre-Processing of Data and Model Convergence.....	6
3.2.3	Equal Spacing.....	6
3.2.3.1	Bias.....	6
3.2.3.2	Precision	6
3.2.3.3	Qualitative Description.....	6
3.2.3.4	Summary of Results With Equal Spacing.....	6
3.2.4	Time-Interval Increasing Spacing	6
3.2.4.1	Bias.....	6
3.2.4.2	Precision	6
3.2.4.3	Qualitative Description.....	6
3.2.4.4	Summary of Results With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing .	6
3.2.5	Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing	6
3.2.5.1	Bias.....	6
3.2.5.2	Precision	6
3.2.5.3	Qualitative Description.....	6
3.2.5.4	Summary of Results Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing	6
3.2.6	Middle-and-Extreme Spacing	6
3.2.6.1	Bias.....	6
3.2.6.2	Precision	6
3.2.6.3	Qualitative Description.....	6
3.2.6.4	Summary of Results with Middle-and-Extreme Spacing	6
3.3	What Measurement Number/Sample Size Pairings Should be Used With Each Spacing Schedule?	6
3.4	Summary of Experiment 2	6
4	Experiment 3.....	6
4.1	Methods	8
4.1.1	Variables Used in Simulation Experiment.....	8
4.1.1.1	Independent Variables	8

4.1.1.1.1	Number of Measurements.....	8
4.1.1.1.2	Sample Size.....	8
4.1.1.1.3	Time Structuredness	8
4.1.1.2	Constants.....	8
4.1.1.3	Dependent Variables.....	8
4.1.1.3.1	Convergence Success Rate	8
4.1.1.3.2	Model Performance	8
4.1.1.3.2.1	Bias.....	8
4.1.1.3.2.2	Precision.....	8
4.1.2	Overview of Data Generation.....	8
4.1.2.0.1	Simulation Procedure for Time Structuredness	8
4.1.3	Modelling of Each Generated Data Set	8
4.1.4	Analysis of Data Modelling Output and Accompanying Visualizations	8
4.2	Results and Discussion.....	8
4.2.1	Framework for Interpreting Results.....	8
4.2.2	Pre-Processing of Data and Model Convergence	8
4.2.3	Time-Structured Data.....	8
4.2.3.0.1	Bias	8
4.2.3.0.2	Precision	8
4.2.3.0.3	Qualitative Description	8
4.2.3.1	Summary of Results for Time-Structured Data	8
4.2.4	Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Fast Response Rate.....	8
4.2.4.1	Bias.....	8
4.2.4.2	Precision	8
4.2.4.3	Qualitative Description.....	8
4.2.4.4	Summary of Results for Time-Unstructured Character- ized by a Fast Response Rate	8
4.2.5	Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate	8
4.2.5.1	Bias.....	8
4.2.5.2	Precision	8
4.2.5.3	Qualitative Description.....	8
4.2.5.4	Summary of Results Time-Unstructured Characterized by a Slow Response Rate.....	8

4.2.6	How Does Time Structuredness Affect Model Performance?	8
4.2.7	Eliminating the Bias Caused by Time Unstructuredness: Using Def- inition Variables	8
4.3	Summary of Experiment 3	8
5	General Discussion.....	8
5.1	Limitations and Future Directions.....	9
5.1.1	Cutoff Values for Bias and Precision	9
5.1.2	External Validity of Simulation Experiments.....	9
5.1.3	Simulations With Other Longitudinal Analyses.....	9
5.2	Nonlinear Patterns and Longitudinal Research	9
5.2.1	A New Perspective on Longitudinal Designs for Modelling Change	9
5.2.2	Why is it Important to Model Nonlinear Patterns of Change?	9
5.2.3	Suggestions for Modelling Nonlinear Change	9
5.3	Conclusion.....	9
	References.....	10

LIST OF TABLES

G.1	Convergence Success Rates in Experiment 1.....	89
G.2	Convergence Success Rates in Experiment 2.....	90
G.3	Convergence Success Rates in Experiment 3.....	91
G.4	Convergence Success in Experiment 3 With Definition Variables	91
H.1	Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Ex- periment 1	93
H.2	Parameter Values Estimated in Experiment 2	96
H.3	Parameter Values Estimated in Experiment 3	102

LIST OF FIGURES

C.1	Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Equal Spacing	23
C.2	Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing	26
C.3	Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing	28
C.4	Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing.....	31
D.1	Estimation Accuracy of Taylor Series Approximation of Nonlinear Function ($\cos(x)$)	41
F.1	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Equal Spacing in Experiment 1	54
F.2	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing in Experiment 1.....	57
F.3	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing in Experiment 1.....	60
F.4	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing in Experiment 1	63
F.5	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Equal Spacing in Experiment 2.....	66
F.6	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing in Experiment 2.....	69
F.7	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing in Experiment 2.....	72
F.8	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing in Experiment 2	75
F.9	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Structured Data in Experiment 3.....	78
F.10	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Fast Response Rate in Experiment 3.....	81
F.11	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate in Experiment 3.....	84
F.12	Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters When Using Definition Variables To Model Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate	87

F.12 Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters When Using Definition Variables To Model Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate (continued).....	88
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ergodicity and the Need to Conduct Longitudinal Research.....	15
Appendix B: Code Used to Run Monte Carlo Simulations for all Experiments.....	19
Appendix C: Procedure for Generating Measurement Schedules Measurement Sched- ules	21
C.1 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Equal Spacing....	22
C.2 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing.....	22
C.3 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing.....	25
C.4 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Middle-and- Extreme Spacing	27
Appendix D: Using Nonlinear Function in the Structural Equation Modelling Frame- work	33
D.1 Nonlinear Latent Growth Curve Model Used to Analyze Each Generated Data Set	33
D.1.1 Brief Review of the Latent Growth Curve Model.....	33
D.1.2 Fitting a Nonlinear Function in the Structural Equation Modelling Framework	35
D.1.2.1 Taylor Series’: Approximations of Linear Functions	36
D.1.2.2 Taylor Series of the Logistic Function.....	41
D.1.2.3 Fitting the Logistic Taylor Series Into the Structural Equation Modelling Framework.....	44
D.1.2.4 Estimating Parameters in the Structured Latent Curve Mod- elling Approach.....	49
Appendix E: OpenMx Code for Structured Latent Growth Curve Model Used in Simulation Experiments	51
Appendix F: Complete Versions of Bias/Precision Plots (Day- and Likert-Unit Pa- rameters)	54
F.1 Experiment 1	54
F.1.1 Equal Spacing	54
F.1.2 Time-Interval Increasing Spacing	57
F.1.3 Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing.....	60
F.1.4 Middle-and-Extreme Spacing.....	63
F.2 Experiment 2	66

F.2.5	Equal Spacing	66
F.2.6	Time-Interval Increasing Spacing	69
F.2.7	Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing	72
F.2.8	Middle-and-Extreme Spacing	75
F.3	Experiment 3	78
F.3.9	Time-Structured Data	78
F.3.10	Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Fast Response Rate.....	81
F.3.11	Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate	84
F.3.12	Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate and Modelled with Definition Variables	87
Appendix G:	Convergence Success Rates	89
G.1	Experiment 1	89
G.2	Experiment 2	90
G.3	Experiment 3	91
Appendix H:	Parameter Estimate Tables	92
H.1	Experiment 1	92
H.2	Experiment 2	95
H.3	Experiment 3	101
Appendix I:	OpenMx Code for Structured Latent Growth Curve Model With Def- inition Variables	108

1 1 If you are creating a PDF you'll need to write your
2 preliminary content

3 Placeholder

4	1.1 The Need to Conduct Longitudinal Research
5	1.2 Understanding Patterns of Change That Emerge Over Time
6	1.3 Challenges Involved in Conducting Longitudinal Research
7	1.3.1 Number of Measurements
8	1.3.2 Spacing of Measurements
9	1.3.3 Time Structuredness
10	1.3.3.1 Time-Structured Data
11	1.3.3.2 Time-Unstructured Data
12	1.3.4 Summary
13	1.4 Using Simulations To Assess Modelling Accuracy
14	1.5 Systematic Review of Simulation Literature
15	1.5.1 Systematic Review Methodology
16	1.5.2 Systematic Review Results
17	1.6 Methods of Modelling Nonlinear Patterns of Change Over
18	Time
19	1.7 Multilevel and Latent Variable Approach
20	1.7.1 Next Steps
21	1.8 Overview of Simulation Experiments
22	2 Experiment 1
23	Placeholder

24	2.1 Methods
25	2.1.1 Overview of Data Generation
26	2.1.1.1 Function Used to Generate Each Data Set
27	2.1.1.2 Population Values Used for Function Parameters
28	2.1.2 Modelling of Each Generated Data Set
29	2.1.3 Variables Used in Simulation Experiment
30	2.1.3.1 Independent Variables
31	2.1.3.1.1 Spacing of Measurements
32	2.1.3.1.2 Number of Measurements
33	2.1.3.1.3 Population Values Set for The Fixed-Effect Days-to-Halfway Eleva-
34	tion Parameter β_{fixed} (Nature of Change)
35	2.1.3.2 Constants
36	2.1.3.3 Dependent Variables
37	2.1.3.3.1 Convergence Success Rate
38	2.1.3.3.2 Model Performance
39	2.1.3.3.2.1 Bias
40	2.1.3.3.2.2 Precision
41	2.1.4 Analysis of Data Modelling Output and Accompanying Visualizations
42	2.1.4.1 Analysis of Convergence Success Rate
43	2.1.4.2 Analysis and Visualization of Bias
44	2.1.4.3 Analysis and Visualization of Precision
45	2.1.4.3.1 Effect Size Computation for Precision
46	2.2 Results and Discussion
47	2.2.1 Framework for Interpreting Results
48	2.2.2 Pre-Processing of Data and Model Convergence

81	3.1 Methods
82	3.1.1 Overview of Data Generation
83	3.1.2 Modelling of Each Generated Data Set
84	3.1.3 Variables Used in Simulation Experiment
85	3.1.3.1 Independent Variables
86	3.1.3.1.1 Spacing of Measurements
87	3.1.3.1.2 Number of Measurements
88	3.1.3.1.3 Sample Size
89	3.1.3.2 Constants
90	3.1.3.3 Dependent Variables
91	3.1.3.3.1 Convergence Success Rate
92	3.1.3.3.2 Model Performance
93	3.1.3.3.2.1 Bias
94	3.1.3.3.2.2 Precision
95	3.1.4 Analysis of Data Modelling Output and Accompanying Visualizations
96	3.2 Results and Discussion
97	3.2.1 Framework for Interpreting Results
98	3.2.2 Pre-Processing of Data and Model Convergence
99	3.2.3 Equal Spacing
100	3.2.3.1 Bias
101	3.2.3.2 Precision
102	3.2.3.3 Qualitative Description
103	3.2.3.4 Summary of Results With Equal Spacing
104	3.2.4 Time-Interval Increasing Spacing
105	3.2.4.1 Bias

124	4.1 Methods
125	4.1.1 Variables Used in Simulation Experiment
126	4.1.1.1 Independent Variables
127	4.1.1.1.1 Number of Measurements
128	4.1.1.1.2 Sample Size
129	4.1.1.1.3 Time Structuredness
130	4.1.1.2 Constants
131	4.1.1.3 Dependent Variables
132	4.1.1.3.1 Convergence Success Rate
133	4.1.1.3.2 Model Performance
134	4.1.1.3.2.1 Bias
135	4.1.1.3.2.2 Precision
136	4.1.2 Overview of Data Generation
137	4.1.2.0.1 Simulation Procedure for Time Structuredness
138	4.1.3 Modelling of Each Generated Data Set
139	4.1.4 Analysis of Data Modelling Output and Accompanying Visualizations
140	4.2 Results and Discussion
141	4.2.1 Framework for Interpreting Results
142	4.2.2 Pre-Processing of Data and Model Convergence
143	4.2.3 Time-Structured Data
144	4.2.3.0.1 Bias
145	4.2.3.0.2 Precision
146	4.2.3.0.3 Qualitative Description
147	4.2.3.1 Summary of Results for Time-Structured Data
148	4.2.4 Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Fast Response Rate

166	5.1 Limitations and Future Directions
167	5.1.1 Cutoff Values for Bias and Precision
168	5.1.2 External Validity of Simulation Experiments
169	5.1.3 Simulations With Other Longitudinal Analyses
170	5.2 Nonlinear Patterns and Longitudinal Research
171	5.2.1 A New Perspective on Longitudinal Designs for Modelling Change
172	5.2.2 Why is it Important to Model Nonlinear Patterns of Change?
173	5.2.3 Suggestions for Modelling Nonlinear Change
174	5.3 Conclusion

References

- Adolf, J. K., & Fried, E. I. (2019). Ergodicity is sufficient but not necessary for group-to-individual generalizability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(14), 6540–6541. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1818675116> (cited on p. 18).
- Birkhoff, G. D. (1931). Proof of the ergodic theorem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 17(12), 656–660. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.17.2.656> (cited on p. 16).
- Blozis, S. A. (2004). Structured latent curve models for the study of change in multivariate repeated measures. *Psychological Methods*, 9(3), 334–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989x.9.3.334> (cited on pp. 34, 46).
- Boker, S. M., Neale, M. C., Maes, H. H., Wilde, M. J., Spiegel, M., Brick, T. R., Estabrook, R., Bates, T. C., Mehta, P., von Oertzen, T., Gore, R. J., Hunter, M. D., Hackett, D. C., Karch, J., Brandmaier, A., Pritikin, J. N., Zahery, M., & Kirkpatrick, R. M. (2020, August). *Openmx user guide release 2.18.1*. (Cited on p. 49).
- Browne, M. W. (1993). Structured latent curve models. In C. M. Cuadras & C. R. Rao (Eds.), *Multivariate analysis: Future directions 2* (1st ed., pp. 171–197). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-81531-6.50016-7> (cited on pp. 34, 35, 41, 46).
- Browne, M. W., & du Toit, S. H. C. (1991). Models for learning data. In L. M. Collins & J. L. Horn (Eds.), *Best methods for the analysis of change: Recent advances, unanswered questions, future directions* (pp. 47–68). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10099-004> (cited on pp. 35, 41).

- Choe, C. H. (2005). *Computational ergodic theory*. Springer-Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/b138894> (cited on p. 16).
- Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2011). The disaggregation of within-person and between-person effects in longitudinal models of change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62(1), 583–619. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100356> (cited on p. 19).
- Day, D. V., & Sin, H.-P. (2011). Longitudinal tests of an integrative model of leader development: Charting and understanding developmental trajectories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 545–560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.011> (cited on p. 19).
- Fisher, A. J., Medaglia, J. D., & Jeronimus, B. F. (2018). Lack of group-to-individual generalizability is a threat to human subjects research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(27). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1711978115> (cited on pp. 18, 19).
- Hamaker, E. L. (2012). Why researchers should think “within-person”: A paradigmatic rationale. In M. R. Mehl & T. S. Conner (Eds.), *Handbook of studying research methods for daily life* (pp. 43–61). The Guilford Press. <https://bit.ly/3jxfq14> (cited on p. 19).
- Igic, I., Keller, A. C., Elfering, A., Tschan, F., Kálin, W., & Semmer, N. K. (2017). Ten-year trajectories of stressors and resources at work: Cumulative and chronic effects on health and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(9), 1317–1343. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000225> (cited on p. 19).

- Kraft, D. (1994). Algorithm 733: Tomp–fortran modules for optimal control calculations. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 20(3), 262–281. <https://doi.org/10.1145/192115.192124> (cited on p. 50).
- Magee, C. A., Caputi, P., & Lee, J. K. (2016). Distinct longitudinal patterns of absenteeism and their antecedents in full-time australian employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(1), 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039138> (cited on p. 19).
- Medaglia, J. D., Jeronimus, B. F., & Fisher, A. J. (2019). Reply to adolf and fried: Conditional equivalence and imperatives for person-level science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(14), 6542–6543. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1820221116> (cited on p. 18).
- Meredith, W., & Tisak, J. (1990). Latent curve analysis. *Psychometrika*, 55(1), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02294746> (cited on pp. 33, 34).
- Miraglia, M., Alessandri, G., & Borgogni, L. (2015). Trajectory classes of job performance. *Career Development International*, 20(4), 424–442. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cdi-03-2015-0032> (cited on p. 19).
- Molenaar, P. C. M. (2004). A manifesto on psychology as idiographic science: Bringing the person back into scientific psychology, this time forever. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective*, 2(4), 201–218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15366359mea0204_1 (cited on pp. 16, 18, 19).
- Molenaar, P. C. M. (2008). Consequences of the ergodic theorems for classical test theory, factor analysis, and the analysis of developmental processes. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976589.n5> (cited on p. 19).

- Molenaar, P. C., & Campbell, C. G. (2009). The new person-specific paradigm in psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(2), 112–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01619.x> (cited on pp. 16, 19).
- Petersen, K. E. (1983, May 12). *Ergodic theory*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511608728> (cited on p. 16).
- Preacher, K., Wichman, A., MacCallum, R., & Briggs, N. (2008). *Latent growth curve modeling*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984737> (cited on p. 33).
- Preacher, K. J., & Hancock, G. R. (2015). Meaningful aspects of change as novel random coefficients: A general method for reparameterizing longitudinal models. *Psychological Methods*, 20(1), 84–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000028> (cited on pp. 35, 46).
- Shapiro, A., & Browne, M. W. (1987). Analysis of covariance structures under elliptical distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(400), 1092–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1987.10478544> (cited on p. 46).
- Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(2), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8> (cited on p. 18).
- Voelkle, M. C., Brose, A., Schmiedek, F., & Lindenberger, U. (2014). Toward a unified framework for the study of between-person and within-person structures: Building a bridge between two research paradigms. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 49(3), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2014.889593> (cited on p. 18).

264 Wang, L., & Maxwell, S. E. (2015). On disaggregating between-person and within-person
265 effects with longitudinal data using multilevel models. *Psychological Methods*,
266 20(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000030> (cited on p. 19).

Appendix A: Ergodicity and the Need to Conduct Longitudinal Research

To understand why cross-sectional results are unlikely to agree with longitudinal results for any given analysis, a discussion of data structures is apropos. Consider an example where a researcher obtains data from 50 people measured over 100 time points such that each row contains a p person's data over the 100 time points and each column contains data from 50 people at a t time point. For didactic purposes, all data are assumed to be sampled from a normal distribution. To understand whether findings in any given cross-sectional data set yield the same findings in any given longitudinal data set, the researcher randomly samples one cross-sectional and one longitudinal data set and computes the mean and variance in each set. To conduct a cross-sectional analysis, the researcher randomly samples the data across the 50 people at a given time point and computes a mean of the scores at the sampled time point (\bar{X}_t) using Equation A.1 shown below:

$$\bar{X}_t = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=1}^P x_p, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the scores of all P people are summed (x_p) and then divided by the number of people (P). To compute the variance of the scores at the sampled time point (S_t^2), the researcher uses Equation A.2 shown below:

$$S_t^2 = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=1}^P (x_p - \bar{X}_t)^2, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the sum of the squared differences between each person's score (x_p) and the average value at the given t time point (\bar{X}_t) is computed and then divided by the number of people (P). To conduct a longitudinal analysis, the researcher randomly samples one person's data across the 100 time points and also computes a mean and variance of the scores. To compute the mean across the t time points of the longitudinal data set (\bar{X}_p), the researcher uses Equation A.3 shown below:

$$\bar{X}_p = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the scores at each t time point are summed (x_t) and then divided by the number of time points (T). The researcher also computes a variance of the sampled person's scores across all time points (S_p^2) using Equation A.4 shown below:

$$S_p^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (x_t - \bar{X}_p)^2, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the sum of squared differences between the score at each time point (x_t) and the average value of the p person's scores (\bar{X}_p) is computed and then divided by the number of time points (T).

If the researcher wants treat the mean and variance from the cross-sectional and longitudinal data sets as interchangeable, then two conditions outlined by ergodic theory must be satisfied (Molenaar, 2004; Molenaar & Campbell, 2009).¹ First, a given cross-sectional mean and variance can only closely estimate the mean and variance of any given

¹Note that ergodic theory is an entire mathematical discipline (for an introduction, see Petersen, 1983). In the current context, the most important ergodic theorems are those proven by Birkhoff (1931, for a review, see Choe, 2005, Chapter 3)

person's data (i.e., a longitudinal data set) to the extent that each person's data originate from a normal distribution with the same mean and variance. If each person's data originate from a different normal distribution, then computing the mean and variance at a given time point would, at best, describe the values of one person. When each person's data are generated from the same normal distribution, the condition of *homogeneity* is met. Importantly, satisfying the condition of homogeneity does not guarantee that the mean and variance obtained from another cross-sectional data set will closely estimate the mean and variance of any given person (i.e., any given longitudinal data set). The mean and variance values computed from any given cross-sectional data set can only closely estimate the values of any given person to the extent that the cross-sectional mean and variance remain constant over time. If the mean and variance of observations remain constant over time, then the second condition of *stationarity* is satisfied. Therefore, the researcher can only treat means and variances from cross-sectional and longitudinal data sets as interchangeable if each person's data are generated from the same normal distribution (homogeneity) and if the mean and variance remain constant over time (stationarity). When the conditions of homogeneity and stationarity are satisfied, a process is said to be *ergodic*: Analyses of cross-sectional data sets will return the same values as analyses on longitudinal data sets.

Given that psychological studies almost never collect data from only one person, one potential reservation may be that the conditions required for ergodicity only hold when a longitudinal data set contains the data of one person. That is, if the researcher uses the full data set containing the data of 100 people sampled over 100 time points and computes 100 cross-sectional means and variances (Equation A.1 and Equation A.2,

respectively) and 100 longitudinal means and variances (Equation A.3 and Equation A.4, respectively), wouldn't the average of the cross-sectional means and variances be the same as the average of the longitudinal means and variances? Although averaging the cross-sectional means returns the same value as averaging the longitudinal means, the average longitudinal variance remains different from the average cross-sectional variance (for several empirical examples, see Fisher et al., 2018). Therefore, the conditions of ergodicity apply even with larger longitudinal and cross-sectional sample sizes.

The guaranteed differences in cross-sectional and longitudinal variance values that result from non-ergodic processes have far-reaching implications. Almost every analysis employed in organizational research—whether it be correlation, regression, factor analysis, mediation, etc.—analyzes variability, and so, when a process is non-ergodic, cross-sectional variability will differ from longitudinal variability, and the results obtained from applying any given analysis on each of the variabilities will differ as a consequence. Because variability is central to so many analyses, the non-equivalence of longitudinal and cross-sectional variances that results from a non-ergodic process explains why discussions of ergodicity often point out that “for non-ergodic processes, an analysis of the structure of IEV [interindividual variability] will yield results that differ from results obtained in an analogous analysis of IAV [intraindividual variability]” (Molenaar, 2004, p. 202).²

²It is important to note that a violation of one or both ergodic conditions (homogeneity and stationarity) does not mean that an analysis of cross-sectional variability yields results that have no relation to the results gained from applying the analysis on longitudinal variability (i.e., the causes of cross-sectional variability are independent from the causes of longitudinal variability). An analysis of cross-sectional variability can still give insight into temporal dynamics if the causes of non-ergodicity can be identified (Voelkle et al., 2014; for similar discussion, see Spector, 2019). Thus, conceptualizing ergodicity on a continuum with non-ergodicity and ergodicity on opposite ends provides a more accurate perspective for understanding ergodicity (Adolf & Fried, 2019; Medaglia et al., 2019).

With an understanding of the conditions required for ergodicity, a brief review of organizational phenomena finds that these conditions are regularly violated. Focusing only on homogeneity (each person's data are generated from the same distribution), several instances in organizational research violate this condition. As examples of homogeneity violations, employees show different patterns of absenteeism over five years (Magee et al., 2016), leadership development over the course of a seminar (Day & Sin, 2011), career stress over the course of 10 years (Igic et al., 2017), and job performance in response to organizational restructuring (Miraglia et al., 2015). With respect to stationarity (constant values for statistical parameters across people over time), several examples can be generated by realizing how calendar events affect psychological processes and behaviours throughout the year. As examples of stationarity violations, consider how salespeople, on average, undoubtedly sell more products during holidays, how employees, on average, take more sick days during the winter months, and how accountants, on average, experience more stress during tax season. With violations of ergodic conditions commonly occurring in organizational psychology, it becomes fitting to echo the commonly held sentiment that few, if any, psychological processes are ergodic (Curran & Bauer, 2011; Fisher et al., 2018; Hamaker, 2012; Molenaar, 2004, 2008; Molenaar & Campbell, 2009; Wang & Maxwell, 2015). As a result, longitudinal research is necessary for understanding psychological processes.

Appendix B: Code Used to Run Monte Carlo Simulations for all Experiments

The code used to compute the simulations of each experiment are shown in Code Block B.1. Note that the cell size is 1000 (i.e., `num_iterations = 1000`).

Code Block B.1

Code Use to Run Monte Carlo Simulations for Each Simulation Experiment

```
1 devtools::install_github(repo = 'sciarraseb/nonlinSims', force=T)
2
3 library(easypackages)
4 packages <- c('devtools', 'nonlinSims', 'parallel', 'tidyverse', "OpenMx",
5 "data.table", 'progress', 'tictoc')
6 libraries(packages)
7
8 time_period <- 360
9
10 #Population values for parameters
11 #fixed effects
12 sd_scale <- 1
13 common_effect_size <- 0.32
14 theta_fixed <- 3
15 alpha_fixed <- theta_fixed + common_effect_size
16 beta_fixed <- 180
17 gamma_fixed <- 20
18
19 #random effects
20 sd_theta <- 0.05
21 sd_alpha <- 0.05
22 sd_beta <- 10
23 sd_gamma <- 4
24 sd_error <- 0.05
25
26 #List containing population parameter values
27 pop_params_4l <- generate_four_param_pop_curve(
28   theta_fixed = theta_fixed, alpha_fixed = alpha_fixed,
29   beta_fixed = beta_fixed, gamma_fixed = gamma_fixed,
30   sd_theta = sd_theta, sd_alpha = sd_alpha,
31   sd_beta = sd_beta, sd_gamma = sd_gamma, sd_error = sd_error
32 )
33
34 num.iterations <- 1e3 #n=1000 (cell size)
35 seed <- 27 #ensures replicability
36
37 # Experiment 1 (number measurements, spacing, midpoint) -----
38 factor_list_exp_1 <- list('num.measurements' = seq(from = 5, to = 11, by = 2),
39   'time_structuredness' = c('time_structured'),
40   'spacing' = c('equal', 'time_inc', 'time_dec', 'mid_ext'),
41   'midpoint' = c(80, 180, 280),
42   'sample_size' = c(225))
43
44 tic()
45 exp_1_data <- run_exp_simulation(factor_list = factor_list_exp_1, num.iterations =
46   num.iterations, pop_params = pop_params_4l,
47   num.cores = detectCores()-1, seed = seed)
48 toc()
49
50 #Average computation time is 1 iteration per second. As an example, Experiment has 48
51 #cells x 1000 iterations/cell = 48 000 iterations and seconds/3600s/hour ~ 13.33 hours
52 #(simulations computed with 15 cores)
53 write_csv(x = exp_1_data, file = '~/Desktop/exp_1_data.csv')
54
55 # Experiment 2 (number measurements, spacing, sample size) ---
56 factor_list_exp_2 <- list('num.measurements' = seq(from = 5, to = 11, by = 2),
57   'time_structuredness' = c('time_structured'),
58   'spacing' = c('equal', 'time_inc', 'time_dec', 'mid_ext'),
59   'midpoint' = 180,
60   'sample_size' = c(30, 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000))
61
62 tic()
63 exp_2_data <- run_exp_simulation(factor_list = factor_list_exp_2, num.iterations =
64   num.iterations, pop_params = pop_params_4l,
```

```

61                                     num_cores = detectCores(), seed = seed)
62 tic()
63
64 write_csv(x = exp_2_data, file = 'Desktop/exp_2_data.csv')
65
66 # Experiment 3 (number measurements, sample size, time structuredness) -----
67 factor_list_exp_3 <- list('num_measurements' = seq(from = 5, to = 11, by = 2),
68                          'time_structuredness' = c('time_structured', 'fast_response',
69                                                     'slow_response'),
70                          'spacing' = c('equal'),
71                          'midpoint' = 180,
72                          'sample_size' = c(30, 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000))
73 tic()
74 exp_3_data <- run_exp_simulation(factor_list = factor_list_exp_3, num_iterations =
75                                num_iterations, pop_params = pop_params_4l,
76                                num_cores = detectCores(), seed = seed)
77
78 write_csv(x = exp_3_data, file = '~/Desktop/exp_3_data.csv')
79
80
81 # Experiment 3 (definition variables with slow response rate ) -----
82 factor_list_exp_def <- list('num_measurements' = seq(from = 5, to = 11, by = 2),
83                            'time_structuredness' = c('slow_response'),
84                            'spacing' = c('equal'),
85                            'midpoint' = 180,
86                            'sample_size' = c(30, 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000))
87 tic()
88 exp_3_def_data <- run_exp_simulation(factor_list = factor_list_exp_def, num_iterations =
89                                    num_iterations, pop_params = pop_params_4l,
90                                    num_cores = detectCores() - 1, seed = seed,
91                                    definition = T)
92
93 tic()
94 #240734.993 sec elapsed (7 cores used; simulation time increased by roughly a
95 magnitude of 8).
96 write_csv(x = exp_3_def_data, file = 'exp_3_def.csv')

```

Appendix C: Procedure for Generating Measurement Schedules

Given that no procedure existed (to my knowledge) for creating measurement schedules, I devised a method for generating measurement schedules for the four spacing conditions (equal, time-interval increasing, time-interval decreasing, and middle-and-extreme spacing). The code I used to automate the generation of these schedules can be found within the code for the `compute_measurement_schedules()` function for the `nonlinSims` package (see <https://github.com/sciarraseb/nonlinSims>). For each measurement spacing conditions across all measurement number levels, a two-step procedure was employed to

generate measurement schedules in Experiments 1 and 2. At a broad level, the first step computes values for setup variables and the second step computes the interval lengths.

C.1 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Equal Spacing

Figure C.1 shows how the two-step procedure is implemented to construct a measurement schedule with equal spacing and five measurements. In the first step, the number of intervals (NI) is computed by subtracting one from the number of measurements (NM). With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals ($NI = 4$). In the second step, interval lengths are calculated by dividing the length of the measurement period (MP) by the number of intervals (NI), yielding an interval length of 90 days ($\frac{MP}{NI} = \frac{360}{4} = 90$) for each interval and the following measurement days:


- $m_1 = \text{day } 0$
- $m_2 = \text{day } 90$
- $m_3 = \text{day } 180$
- $m_4 = \text{day } 270$
- $m_5 = \text{day } 360$.

C.2 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing

Figure C.2 shows how the two-step procedure is implemented to construct a measurement schedule with time-interval increasing spacing and five measurements. In the first step, the number of intervals (NI) is computed by subtracting one from the number of measurements (NM). With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals

Figure C.1

Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Equal Spacing



Step 1: Setup Variables

I = number of measurements (NM) = 5 measurements

□ = number of intervals (NI) = $NM - 1 = 5 - 1 = \underline{4}$ intervals

Step 2: Interval Calculations

$$\text{Interval length}(x) = \frac{MP}{NI} = 90 \text{ days}$$

395 *Note.* In Step 1, setup variables are calculated. With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals ($NI = 4$). In Step 2, interval lengths are calculated by
396 dividing the length of the measurement period (MP) by the number of intervals (NI), yielding an interval length of 90 days ($\frac{MP}{NI} = \frac{360}{4} = 90$) for each interval.

397 ($NI = 4$). Because interval lengths increase over time, I decided that intervals would
 398 increase by an integer multiple of a constant length (c) after each measurement day (m_i)
 399 according to the function shown below in Equation C.1:

$$\text{Constant-length increment} = \sum_{x=0}^{NI-1} xc, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

400 where x represents the integer multiple that increases by 1 after each measurement day.
 401 Importantly, to calculate the constant-length increment (c) by which interval lengths
 402 increase over time, it is important to realize that two terms contribute to the length
 403 of any interval: A shortest-interval length (s) and a constant-length value (c), as shown
 404 below in Equation C.2:

$$\text{Interval length} = s + \sum_{x=0}^{NI-1} xc. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

405 Because the shortest-interval length (s) contributes to the length of each interval—in
 406 this example, four intervals—then the sum of these lengths can be subtracted from the
 407 measurement period length of 360 days ($MP = 360$). In the current example with five
 408 measurements, 240 days remain ($r = 240$) after subtracting the days needed for the
 409 shortest-interval lengths (see Equation C.3).

$$\text{Remaining days } (r) = MP - (NI)s = 360 - (30)4 = 240 \text{ days} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

410 Having computed the number of remaining days, the constant-length value (c) can then
 411 be obtained by dividing the number of remaining days by the number of constant-value

interval lengths (c_i), as shown below in Equation C.4:

$$\text{Constant-value interval length}(c) = \frac{r}{\sum_{i=0}^{NI-2} i} = \frac{240}{3 + 2 + 1} = 40 \text{ days} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Therefore, having computed the value for c , the following interval lengths are obtained:

- $i_1 = s + 0(c) = 30 + 0(30) = 30 \text{ days}$
- $i_2 = s + 1(c) = 30 + 1(40) = 70 \text{ days}$
- $i_3 = s + 0(c) = 30 + 2(40) = 110 \text{ days}$
- $i_4 = s + 0(c) = 30 + 3(40) = 150 \text{ days}$

and the following measurement days are obtained:


- $m_1 = \text{day } 0$
- $m_2 = \text{day } 30$
- $m_3 = \text{day } 100$
- $m_4 = \text{day } 210$
- $m_5 = \text{day } 360.$

C.3 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing

Figure C.3 shows how the two-step procedure is implemented to construct a measurement schedule with time-interval decreasing spacing and five measurements. Because the procedure for calculating time-decreasing intervals simply requires that the order of time-interval increasing intervals are reversed, the procedure is, thus, essentially identical to the procedure shown in the [previous section](#). Therefore, with five measurements, time-interval decreasing spacing produces the following intervals:

Figure C.2

Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing



Step 1: Setup Variables

I = number of measurements (NM) = 5 measurements

I = number of intervals (NI) = $NM - 1 = 5 - 1 = \underline{4}$ intervals

Step 2: Interval Calculations

s = shortest-interval length = 30 days

Remaining days(r) = $MP - (NI)s = 360 - 4(30) = \underline{240 \text{ days}}$

Constant length(c) = $\frac{r}{\sum_{i=0}^{NI-1} c_i} = \frac{240}{0+1+2+3} = \underline{40 \text{ days}}$

Note. In Step 1, setup variables are calculated. With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals ($NI = 4$). In Step 2, two components contribute to each interval length: A shortest-interval length (s) and a constant-length value (c), as shown in Equation C.2. Because the shortest-interval length (s) contributes to each interval, the sum of these lengths can be subtracted from the measurement period length of 360 days ($MP = 360$). In the current example with five measurements, 240 days remain ($r = 240$) after subtracting the days needed for the shortest-interval lengths (see Equation C.3). To calculate the constant-length value (c), the remaining days (r) are divided by the number of constant-value interval lengths (c_i), as shown in Equation C.4.

$$\bullet i_1 = s + 0(c) = 30 + 3(40) = 150 \text{ days}$$

$$\bullet i_2 = s + 0(c) = 30 + 2(40) = 110 \text{ days}$$

$$\bullet i_3 = s + 1(c) = 30 + 1(40) = 70 \text{ days}$$

$$\bullet i_4 = s + 0(c) = 30 + 0(30) = 30 \text{ days}$$

and the following measurement days are obtained:

$$\bullet m_1 = \text{day } 0$$

$$\bullet m_2 = \text{day } 150$$

$$\bullet m_3 = \text{day } 260$$

$$\bullet m_4 = \text{day } 330$$


$$\bullet m_5 = \text{day } 360.$$

C.4 Procedure for Constructing Measurement Schedules With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing

Figure C.4 shows how the two-step procedure is implemented to construct a measurement schedule with middle-and-extreme spacing and five measurements. In the first step, the number of intervals (NI) is computed by subtracting one from the number of measurements (NM). With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals ($NI = 4$). Importantly, because middle-and-extreme spacing places measurements near the extremities and the middle of the measurement window, the number of measurements in both these sections must also be calculated. The number of extreme measurements is first calculated by dividing the number of measurements by 3 and taking the floor (i.e., rounded-down value $\lfloor x \rfloor$) of this value and multiplying it by 2, as shown below in Equation C.5:

Figure C.3

Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing



Step 1: Setup Variables

I = number of measurements (NM) = 5 measurements

NI = number of intervals (NI) = $NM - 1 = 5 - 1 = \underline{4}$ intervals

Step 2: Interval Calculations

s = shortest-interval length = 30 days

Remaining days(r) = $MP - (NI)s = 360 - 4(30) = \underline{240 \text{ days}}$

Constant length(c) = $\frac{r}{\sum_{i=0}^{NI-1} c_i} = \frac{240}{0+1+2+3} = \underline{40 \text{ days}}$

Note. In Step 1, setup variables are calculated. With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals ($NI = 4$). In Step 2, two components contribute to each interval length: A shortest-interval length (s) and a constant-length value (c), as shown in Equation C.2. Because the shortest-interval length (s) contributes to each interval, the sum of these lengths can be subtracted from the measurement period length of 360 days ($MP = 360$). In the current example with five measurements, 240 days remain ($r = 240$) after subtracting the days needed for the shortest-interval lengths (see Equation C.3). To calculate the constant-length value (c), the remaining days (r) are divided by the number of constant-value interval lengths (c_i), as shown in Equation C.4.

$$\text{Number of extreme measurements}(ex) = 2\lfloor \frac{NM}{3} \rfloor = 2\lfloor \frac{5}{3} \rfloor = 2. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

464 The number of middle measurements can then be calculated by subtracting the number
 465 of extreme measurements (ex) from the number of measurements (NM), as shown below
 466 in Equation C.7:

$$\text{Number of middle measurements}(mi) = NM - ex = 5 - 2 = 3. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

467 In Step 2, interval lengths are calculated. For middle-and-extreme spacing, there are
 468 two types of interval lengths: 1) Intervals separating either two middle or two extreme
 469 measurements and 2) intervals separating one middle and one extreme measurement.
 470 Intervals separating two middle or two extreme measurements (w_i) are set to the shortest-
 471 interval length (s), which I set to be 30 days ($w_i = s = 30$). Intervals separating one
 472 middle and one extreme measurement (b_i) are set to the sum of two components: 1) A
 473 shortest-interval length (s) and a 2) constant-value interval length (c), as shown below
 474 in Equation C.7:

$$b_i = s + c. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

475 To obtain the constant-value interval length (c), the sum of shortest-value interval lengths
 476 (s) is subtracted from the measurement period of 360 days ($MP = 360$). In the current
 477 example with five measurements, 240 days remain ($r = 240$) after subtracting the days

478 needed for the shortest-interval lengths (see Equation C.8).

$$\text{Remaining days } (r) = MP - (NI)s = 360 - (30)4 = 240 \text{ days} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

479 Having computed the number of remaining days, the constant-length value (c) can then be
480 obtained by dividing the number of remaining days by the number of intervals separating
481 middle and extreme measurements, which will always be 2, as shown below in Equation
482 C.9:

$$\text{Constant-value interval length}(c) = \frac{r}{2} = \frac{240}{2} = 120 \text{ days} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

483 Therefore, having computed the value for c , the following interval lengths are obtained:


- 484 • $b_1 = s + c = 30 + 120 = 150$ days
- 485 • $w_1 = s = 30 = 30$ days
- 486 • $w_2 = s = 30 = 30$ days
- 487 • $b_2 = s + c = 30 + 120 = 150$ days

488 and the following measurement days are obtained:

- 489 • $m_1 = \text{day } 0$
- 490 • $m_2 = \text{day } 150$
- 491 • $m_3 = \text{day } 180$
- 492 • $m_4 = \text{day } 21$
- 493 • $m_5 = \text{day } 360$.

Figure C.4

Procedure for Computing Measurement Schedules With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing



Step 1: Setup Variables

I = number of measurements (NM) = 5 measurements

\square = number of intervals (NI) = $NM - 1 = 5 - 1 = \underline{4}$ intervals

Number of extreme measurements (ex) = $2(\lfloor \frac{NM}{3} \rfloor) = \underline{2}$ extreme measurements

Number of middle measurements (mi) = $NM - ex = \underline{3}$ middle measurements

Step 2: Interval Calculations

s = shortest-interval length = 30 days

Constant length(c) = $\frac{r}{2} = \frac{240}{2} = \underline{120 \text{ days}}$

Remaining days(r) = $MP - (NI)s = 360 - 4(30) = \underline{240 \text{ days}}$

494 *Note.* In Step 1, setup variables are calculated. With five measurements ($NM = 5$), there are four intervals ($NI = 4$). Importantly, because middle-and-extreme
495 spacing places measurements near the extremities and the middle of the measurement window, the number of measurements in both these sections must also
496 be calculated. The number of extreme measurements is first calculated by dividing the number of measurements by 3 and taking the taking the floor (i.e.,
497 rounded-down value $\lfloor \frac{x}{3} \rfloor$) of this value and multiplying it by 2 (see Equation C.5). The number of middle measurements can then be calculated by subtracting

498 the number of extreme measurements (ex) from the number of measurements (NM ; see Equation C.7). In Step 2, interval lengths are calculated. For
499 middle-and-extreme spacing, there are two types of interval lengths: 1) Intervals separating either two middle or two extreme measurements and 2) intervals
500 separating one middle and one extreme measurement. Intervals separating two middle or two extreme measurements are set to the shortest-interval length (s),
501 which I set to be 30 days ($w_i = s = 30$). Intervals separating one middle and one extreme measurement are set to the sum of two components: 1) A
502 shortest-interval length (s) and a 2) constant-value interval length (c ; see Equation C.9). To obtain the constant-value interval length (c), the sum of
503 shortest-value interval lengths (s) is subtracted from the measurement period of 360 days ($MP = 360$). In the current example with five measurements, 240 days
504 remain ($r = 240$) after subtracting the days needed for the shortest-interval lengths (see Equation C.8). Having computed the number of remaining days, the
505 constant-length value (c) can then be obtained by dividing the number of remaining days by the number of intervals separating middle and extreme
506 measurements, which will always be 2 (see Equation C.9).

Appendix D: Using Nonlinear Function in the Structural Equation Modelling Framework

D.1 Nonlinear Latent Growth Curve Model Used to Analyze Each Generated Data Set

The sections that follow will first review the framework used to build latent growth curve models and then explain how nonlinear functions can be modified to fit into this framework.

D.1.1 Brief Review of the Latent Growth Curve Model

The latent growth curve model proposed by Meredith and Tisak (1990) is briefly reviewed here (for a review, see K. Preacher et al., 2008). Consider an example where data are collected at five time points ($T = 5$) from p people ($\mathbf{y}_p = [y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5]$). A simple model to fit is one where change over time is defined by a straight line and each person's pattern of change is some variation of this straight line. In modelling parlance, an intercept-slope model is fit where both the intercept and slope are random effects whose values are allowed to vary for each person.

To fit a random-effect intercept-slope model, a general linear pattern can first be specified in the Λ matrix shown below in Equation D.1:

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

524 In each column of Λ , the effect a parameter is specified over the five time points; that is,
525 Λ is a matrix with two columns (one for the intercept and one for the slope parameter)
526 and five rows (one for each time point).³ The first column of Λ specifies the intercept
527 parameter. Because the effect of the intercept parameter is constant over time, a column
528 of 1s is used to represent its effect. The second column of Λ specifies the slope parameter.
529 Because a linear pattern of growth is assumed, the second column contains a series of
530 monotonically increasing integer numbers across the time points and begins with 0.⁴

531 To specify the intercept and slope parameters as random effects that vary across
532 people, a weight can be applied to each column of Λ and each weight can vary across
533 people. That is, a p person's pattern of change can be reproduced with a unique set of
534 weights in \mathbf{t}_p that determines the extent to which each basis column of Λ contributes to
535 the person's observed change over time. By allowing the weights for the intercept and
536 slope parameters to vary across people, variability can be estimated in these parameters.
537 Discrepancies between the values predicted by $\Lambda\mathbf{t}_p$ and a person's observed scores across
538 all five time points are stored in an error vector \mathcal{E}_p . Thus, a person's observed data (\mathbf{y}_p)
539 is reproduced using the function shown below in Equation D.2:

$$y_p = \Lambda\mathbf{t}_p + \mathcal{E}_p. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

540 Note that Equation D.2 defines the general structural equation modelling framework.

³The columns of Λ are often called basis curves (Blozis, 2004) or basis functions (Meredith & Tisak, 1990; Browne, 1993) because each column specifies a particular component of change.

⁴The set of numbers specified for the slope starts at zero because there is presumably no effect of any variable at the first time point.

D.1.2 Fitting a Nonlinear Function in the Structural Equation Modelling Framework

Unfortunately, the logistic function of Equation ??—where each parameter is estimated as a fixed- and random-effect—cannot be directly used in a latent growth curve model because it violates the linear nature of the structural equation modelling framework (Equation D.2). Structural equation models only permit linear combinations—specifically, the products of matrix-vector and/or matrix-matrix multiplication—and so directly fitting a nonlinear function such as the logistic function in Equation ?? is not possible.

One solution to fitting the logistic function within the structural equation modelling framework is to implement the structured latent curve modelling approach (Browne, 1993; Browne & du Toit, 1991; for an excellent review, see K. J. Preacher & Hancock, 2015). Briefly, the structured latent curve modelling approach constructs a Taylor series approximation of a nonlinear function so that the nonlinear function can be fit into the structural equation modelling framework (Equation D.2). The sections that follow will present the structured latent curve modelling approach in four parts such that 1) Taylor series approximations will first be reviewed, 2) a Taylor series approximation will then be constructed for the logistic function, 3) the logistic Taylor series approximation will be modified and fit into the structural equation modelling framework, and 4) the process of parameter estimation will be reviewed.

D.1.2.1 Taylor Series': Approximations of Linear Functions

A Taylor series uses derivative information of a nonlinear function to construct a linear function that is an approximation of the nonlinear function.⁵ Equation D.3 shows the general formula for a Taylor series such that

$$P^N(f(x), a) = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{f^n a}{n!} (x - a)^n, \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where N is the highest derivative order of the function $f(a)$ that is taken beginning from a zero-value derivative order ($n = 0$), a is the point where the Taylor series is derived (i.e., the point of derivation), and x is the point where the Taylor series is evaluated (i.e., the point of evaluation). As an example of a Taylor series, consider the second-order Taylor series of $f(x) = \cos(x)$. Note that, across the continuum of x values (i.e., from $-\infty$ to ∞), $\cos(x)$ returns values between -1 and 1 in an oscillatory manner. Computing the second-order Taylor series of $f(x) = \cos(x)$ yields the following function shown in

⁵Linear functions are defined as functions where no parameter exists within its own partial derivative (at any order). For example, none of the parameters in the polynomial equation of $y = a + bt + ct^2 + dt^3$ exist within their own partial derivative: $\frac{\partial y}{\partial a} = 1$, $\frac{\partial y}{\partial b} = t$, $\frac{\partial y}{\partial c} = t^2$, and $\frac{\partial y}{\partial d} = t^3$. Conversely, the logistic function is nonlinear because β and γ exist in their own partial derivatives. For example, the derivative of the logistic function $y = \theta + \frac{\alpha - \theta}{1 + e^{\frac{\beta - t}{\gamma}}}$ with respect to β is $\frac{(\theta - \alpha)(e^{\frac{\beta - t}{\gamma}})(\frac{1}{\gamma})}{1 + (e^{\frac{\beta - t}{\gamma}})^2}$ and so is nonlinear because it contains β .

571 Equation D.4:

$$\begin{aligned}
P^2(\cos(x), a) &= \frac{\frac{\partial^0 \cos(a)}{\partial a^0}}{0!} (x - a)^0 + \frac{\frac{\partial^1 \cos(a)}{\partial a^1}}{1!} (x - a)^1 + \frac{\frac{\partial^2 \cos(a)}{\partial a^2}}{2!} (x - a)^2 \\
&= \frac{\cos(0)}{0!} (x - 0)^0 - \frac{\sin(0)}{1!} (x - 0)^1 - \frac{\cos(0)}{2!} (x - 0)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{1} 1 - \frac{0}{1} x - \frac{1}{2} x^2 \\
P^2(\cos(x), 0) &= 1 - \frac{1}{2} x^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.4}$$

572 Importantly, the second-order Taylor series of $\cos(x)$ shown in Equation D.4 is linear,
573 whereas the function $\cos(x)$ is not linear. To show that the second-order Taylor series of
574 $1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2$ is linear, we can reformulate it by adding placeholder parameters in front of each
575 term (b and c), resulting in the following modified equation of Equation D.5:

$$P_{reform}^2(\cos(x), a) = b1 - c\frac{1}{2}x^2. \tag{D.5}$$

576 If the partial derivative of $P^2(\cos(x), a)$ is taken with respect to b and c , no parameter
577 exists within its own partial derivative, meaning the function is linear (see Equations
578 D.6–D.7 below).

$$\frac{\partial P_{reform}^2(\cos(x), a)}{\partial b} = 1 \text{ and} \tag{D.6}$$

$$\frac{\partial P_{reform}^2(\cos(x), c)}{\partial c} = -\frac{1}{2}x^2. \tag{D.7}$$

579 Conversely, the fourth-order partial derivative of $\cos(x)$ contains itself (see Equation D.8),
580 and so is a nonlinear function.

$$\frac{\partial^4 \cos(x)}{\partial x^4} = \cos(x). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

581 Therefore, Taylor series' can generate linear versions of nonlinear functions by using local
582 derivative information.

583 Although Taylor series' provide linear versions of nonlinear functions, it is important
584 to emphasize that the linear versions are approximations. More specifically, the second-
585 order Taylor series of $\cos(x)$ perfectly estimates $\cos(x)$ when the point of evaluation x is
586 set equal to the point of derivation a , but estimates $\cos(x)$ with an increasing amount
587 of error as the difference between x and a increases (see Example D.1). Thus, Taylor
588 series are approximations because they are only locally accurate (i.e., near the point of
589 derivation).

590 **Example D.1.** *Estimates of Taylor series approximation of $f(x) = \cos(x)$ as the differ-*
591 *ence between the point of evaluation x and the point of derivation a increases.*

592 Taylor series approximation of $\cos(x)$ (specifically, the second-order Taylor series;
593 $P^2[\cos(x), a]$) estimates values that are exactly equal to the values returned by $\cos(x)$
594 when the point of evaluation (x) is set to the point of derivation (a). The example below
595 computes the value predicted by the Taylor series approximation of $P^2[\cos(x), a]$ and by

596 $\cos(x)$ when $x = a = 0$.

$$P^2(\cos(x = 0), a = 0) = \cos(x = 0)$$

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 = \cos(0)$$

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}0^2 = 1$$

$$1 - 0 = 1$$

$$1 = 1$$

598 Taylor series approximation of $\cos(x)$ (specifically, the second-order Taylor series;
599 $P^2[\cos(x), a]$) estimates a value that is approximately equal (\approx) to the value returned by
597 $f \cos(x)$ when the difference between the point of evaluation x and the point of deriva-
601 tion a is small. The example below computes the value predicted by the Taylor series
602 approximation of $P^2[\cos(x), a]$ and by $\cos(x)$ when $x = 1$ and $a = 0$.

$$P^2(\cos(x = 1), 0) \approx \cos(x = 1)$$

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 \approx \cos(1)$$

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}1^2 \approx 0.54$$

$$1 - 0.5 \approx 0.54$$

$$0.5 \approx 0.54$$

604 Taylor series approximation of $f \cos(x)$ (specifically, the second-order Taylor series;
605 $P^2[\cos(x), a]$) estimates a a value that is clearly not equal (\neq) to the value returned by
603 $f \cos(x)$ when the difference between the point of evaluation x and the point of deriva-
606 tion a is large. The example below computes the value predicted by the Taylor series

608 approximation of $P^2[\cos(x), a]$ and by $\cos(x)$ when $x = 4$ and $a = 0$.

$$P^2(\cos(x = 4), 0) \neq \cos(x = 4)$$

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2 \neq \cos(4)$$

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}4^2 \neq -0.65$$

$$1 - 16 \neq -0.65$$


$$0.5 \neq -0.65$$

610

609 Figure D.1 provides a comprehensive visualization of the of the point conveyed in
612 Example D.1 about the accuracy of Taylor series approximations. In Figure D.1, the
613 values returned by the nonlinear function of $\cos(x)$ and its second-order Taylor series
614 $P^2[\cos(x)] = 1 - \frac{1}{2}x^2$ are shown. The second order Taylor series perfectly estimates $\cos(x)$
615 when the point of evaluation (x) equals the point of derivation ($a; x = a = 0$), but incurs
616 an increasingly large amount of error as the difference between the point of evaluation
617 and the point of derivation increases. For example, at $x = 10$, $\cos(10) = -0.84$, but the
618 Taylor series outputs a value of -49.50 ($P^2[\cos(50)] = 1 - \frac{1}{2}10^2 = -49.50$).

Figure D.1

Estimation Accuracy of Taylor Series Approximation of Nonlinear Function ($\cos(x)$)



619 *Note.* The second order Taylor series perfectly estimates $\cos(x)$ when the point of evaluation (x) equals the
620 point of derivation (a ; $x = a = 0$), but incurs an increasingly large amount of error as the difference between
621 the point of evaluation and the point of derivation increases. For example, at $x = 10$, $\cos(x) = -0.84$, but the
622 Taylor series outputs a value of -49.50 ($P^2[\cos(50)] = 1 - \frac{1}{2}10^2 = -49.50$).

623 D.1.2.2 Taylor Series of the Logistic Function

624 Given that the Taylor series provides a linear version of a nonlinear function, the
625 structured latent curve modelling approach uses Taylor series' to fit nonlinear functions
626 into the linear nature of the structural equation modelling framework (Browne, 1993;
627 Browne & du Toit, 1991). In the current simulations, the logistic function was used to
628 generate data (see Equation D.10), and so a Taylor series approximation was constructed
629 for the logistic function in the analysis. Note that, because the logistic function had four
630 parameters ($\theta, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$), partial derivatives were computed with respect to each of the

parameters. Using a derivative order set to one ($n = 1$), the following Taylor series was constructed for the logistic function (Equation D.9):

$$P^1(L(\Theta, t)) = L + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta}(x_\theta - a_\theta)^1 + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \alpha}(x_\alpha - a_\alpha)^1 + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta}(x_\beta - a_\beta)^1 + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \gamma_\gamma}(x_\gamma - a_\gamma)^1, \quad (\text{D.9})$$

where $\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t})$ represents the logistic function shown below in Equation D.10:

$$\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t}) = \theta + \frac{\alpha - \theta}{1 + e^{\frac{\beta - t}{\gamma}}} + \epsilon, \quad (\text{D.10})$$

with $\Theta = [\theta, \alpha, \beta, \gamma]$ and $\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t})$ being a vector of scores across all \mathbf{t} time points. Because each parameter of the logistic function has a unique meaning (see section on [data generation](#)), they are unlikely to have the same population value, and so the derivation (a) will, therefore, differ for each parameter. To set the derivation values (a), the mean values estimated by the structured latent growth curve model for each parameter (i.e., fixed-effect values) are used, meaning that each derivation value in Equation D.9 is replaced with a model estimate as shown below:

- $a_\theta = \hat{\theta}$
- $a_\alpha = \hat{\alpha}$
- $a_\beta = \hat{\beta}$
- $a_\gamma = \hat{\gamma}$

where a caret ($\hat{}$) denotes a parameter value that is estimated by the analysis. In order to compute curves for each p person, evaluation points for each parameter ($x_\theta, x_\alpha, x_\beta, x_\gamma$) are set to the value computed for a given person ($\theta_p, \alpha_p, \beta_p, \gamma_p$). Thus, each evaluation

value in Equation D.9 is replaced with a person-specific value as shown below:

- $x_\theta = \theta_p$
- $x_\alpha = \alpha_p$
- $x_\beta = \beta_p$
- $x_\gamma = \gamma_p$.

Substituting the above values for the derivation and evaluation values of x and a in the initial logistic Taylor series (Equation D.9) yields the following function (Equation D.11):

$$P^1(L(\Theta, t)) = L(\Theta, t) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta}(\theta_p - \hat{\theta})^1 + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \alpha}(\alpha_p - \hat{\alpha})^1 + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta}(\beta_p - \hat{\beta})^1 + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \gamma}(\gamma_p - \hat{\gamma})^1. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Two important points about Equation D.9 deserve mentioning. First, the average population logistic curve (i.e., the fixed-effect parameter values) will have a perfect logistic function shape. In estimating the average population logistic curve, the evaluation values (x) are set equal to the derivation value counterparts (a); that is, each mean value estimated for a parameter ($\hat{\theta}$, $\hat{\alpha}$, $\hat{\beta}$, $\hat{\gamma}$) replaces the corresponding derivation-evaluation pair in Equation D.9. Second, it is possible that estimates of random-effect parameters (i.e., variability observed in a parameter's value across people) may be misleading. To compute the values for the random-effect parameters, the evaluation values (a) are set to the logistic function values needed to compute each p person's observed curve (θ_p , α_p , β_p , γ_p). Because Taylor series approximations are only locally accurate, the curves computed for individuals can accommodate shapes that do not resemble a logistic (i.e., s-shaped) pattern (see Example D.1). Thus, estimates of random-effect parameters (i.e., variability observed in a parameter's value across people) can be influenced by curves that do not

668 have a logistic shape and, therefore, may be misleading.

669 **D.1.2.3 Fitting the Logistic Taylor Series Into the Structural Equation Mod-** 670 **elling Framework**

671 With the logistic Taylor series computed in Equation D.11, it can be fit into the
672 structural equation modelling framework by transforming it from its scalar form (Equa-
673 tion D.11) into its matrix form (see Equation D.16). In transforming the scalar form of
674 the logistic Taylor series into a matrix form, three steps will be completed, with each step
675 transforming a component of the scalar form into a matrix representation. The paragraphs
676 that follow detail each of these three steps.

677 First, the partial derivative information must be transformed into their matrix form.
678 The matrix Λ shown below contains the partial derivative information presented in the
679 scalar Taylor series function (see Equation D.11):⁶

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_1)}{\partial \theta} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_1)}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_1)}{\partial \beta} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_1)}{\partial \gamma} \\ \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_2)}{\partial \theta} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_2)}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_2)}{\partial \beta} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_2)}{\partial \gamma} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_n)}{\partial \theta} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_n)}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_n)}{\partial \beta} & \frac{\partial L(\Theta, t_n)}{\partial \gamma} \end{bmatrix}.$$

680 As in the structural equation modelling framework (see Equation D.2) where each column
681 of Λ specifies a basis curve (i.e., loadings of a growth parameter onto all time points that
682 specify the effect of the parameter over time), each column of Λ in the structured latent
683 curve modelling approach similarly contains the loadings of a logistic function parameter
684 across all the n time points, but the loading values are now determined by the partial

⁶This is also known as a Jacobian matrix.

685 derivative of the logistic function with respect to that parameter.

686 Second, the difference between the evaluation and derivation values ($x - a$) must be
 687 transformed into their matrix form. As a reminder, the difference between the evaluation
 688 and derivation values is needed so that person-specific curves can be computed. Thus, the
 689 difference between the evaluation and derivation values can be conceptualized as person-
 690 specific deviation. The vector \mathbf{t}_p contains the person-specific deviations (e.g., $\hat{\theta} - \theta_p$) from
 691 each mean estimated parameter value as shown below:

$$\mathbf{t}_p = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\theta} - \theta_p \\ \hat{\alpha} - \alpha_p \\ \hat{\beta} - \beta_p \\ \hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_p \end{bmatrix},$$

692 where a caret ($\hat{}$) denotes the mean value estimated for a given parameter and a subscript
 693 p indicates a parameter value computed for a person.

694 With a matrix of logistic function loadings (Λ) and the vector of person-specific
 695 deviations (\mathbf{t}_p), person-specific weights can be computed for each parameter. Specifically,
 696 person-specific weights can be computed by post-multiplying the matrix of loadings (Λ)
 697 by the vector of person-specific deviations (\mathbf{t}_p), as shown below in Equation D.12:

$$\text{Person-specific weights} = \Lambda \mathbf{t}_p. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

698 Importantly, to compute person-specific curves (\mathbf{y}_p), the average logistic curve must be

699 added to Equation D.12, as shown below in Equation D.13:

$$\mathbf{y}_p = \mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t}) + \Lambda \iota_p + \mathcal{E}_p. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

700 Unfortunately, the logistic function ($\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t})$) in the above expression (Equation D.13) is
701 simply the original logistic function (see Equation D.10), and so Equation D.13 above
702 is nonlinear. Because Equation D.13 is nonlinear, it cannot be inserted in the structural
703 equation modelling framework, which requires a linear function (see Equation D.2). Thus,
704 the logistic function term in Equation D.13 ($\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t})$) must be linearized so that the logistic
705 Taylor series can be used in the structural equation modelling framework.

706 Third, and last, the logistic function component ($\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t})$) must be linearized. By
707 taking advantage of some clever linear algebra, the logistic function component can be
708 rewritten as the product of the partial derivative matrix (Λ) and a mean vector (τ ;
709 Browne, 1993; Shapiro & Browne, 1987) as shown below in Equation D.14:

$$\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t}) = \Lambda \tau. \quad (\text{D.14})$$

710 Importantly, the values of the mean vector τ need to be determined so that a linear
711 representation of the logistic function can be created. Example D.2 below solves for the
712 mean vector (τ) and shows that the values obtained for the linear parameters (i.e., θ and
713 α) constitute the mean values estimated by the analysis (i.e., the fixed-effect values) and
714 zeroes are obtained for the nonlinear parameters (i.e., θ and α). Given that the vector
715 τ contains mean estimated values, it is often called the mean vector (Blozis, 2004; K. J.
716 Preacher & Hancock, 2015).

717 **Example D.2.** *Computation of mean vector τ .*

718 Given the parameter estimates of $\hat{\theta} = 3.00$, $\hat{\alpha} = 3.32$, $\hat{\beta} = 180.00$, and $\hat{\gamma} = 20.00$ and \mathbf{t}
 719 $= [0, 1, 2, 3]$, $\tau = [3.00, 3.32, 0, 0]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t}) &= \mathbf{\Lambda}\tau \\ [3.00, 3.02, 3.30, 3.32] &= \begin{bmatrix} 1.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.95 & 0.05 & -0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.05 & 0.95 & -0.00 & -0.00 \\ 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \end{bmatrix} \tau \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.95 & 0.05 & -0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.05 & 0.95 & -0.00 & -0.00 \\ 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 3.00 \\ 3.02 \\ 3.30 \\ 3.32 \end{bmatrix} &= \mathbf{\Lambda}\tau \\ \tau &= [3.00, 3.32, 0, 0] \end{aligned}$$

721

722 With $\mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{\Lambda}\tau$, Equation D.13 can be rewritten in a linear equation as shown
 723 below in Equation D.15:

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{\Lambda}\tau + \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{p}}. \quad (\text{D.15})$$

724 Two important points should be made about Equation D.15. First, with some algebraic

725 modification, it can be shown to have the exact same form as the general structural equa-
 726 tion modelling framework (see Equation D.2) that expresses a person's score (y_p) as the
 727 sum of a loading matrix (Λ) post-multiplied by a vector of person-specific deviations (\mathbf{u}_p)
 728 and an error vector (\mathcal{E}_p). To show the equivalence between Equation D.15 and Equation
 729 D.2, the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and vector of person-specific deviations \mathbf{u}_p can be combined into
 730 a new vector \mathbf{s}_p that, like the product of $\Lambda\boldsymbol{\tau}$ (see Equation D.14), also represents the
 731 person-specific weights applied to the basis curves in Λ such that

$$\mathbf{s}_p = \boldsymbol{\tau} + \mathbf{u}_p = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\theta} + \hat{\theta} - \theta_p \\ \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\alpha} - \alpha_p \\ 0 + \hat{\beta} - \beta_p \\ 0 + \hat{\gamma} - \gamma_p \end{bmatrix},$$

732 which allows Equation D.15 to be reexpressed in Equation D.16 below and, thus, take
 733 on the exact same form as the general structural equation modelling framework (see
 734 Equation D.2)

$$\mathbf{y}_p = \Lambda\mathbf{s}_p + \mathcal{E}_p. \quad (\text{D.16})$$

735 Second, the logistic Taylor series shown in Equation D.15 reproduces the nonlinear logistic
 736 function. Because the expected value of the person-specific weights (\mathbf{s}_p) is the mean vector
 737 ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$; $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{s}_p] = \boldsymbol{\tau}$), the expected set of scores predicted across all people ($\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_p]$) gives back
 738 the original expression for the logistic function matrix-vector product in Equation D.14

as shown below in Equation D.17:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{p}}] = \Lambda\tau = \mathbf{L}(\Theta, \mathbf{t}). \quad (\text{D.17})$$

Therefore, the structured latent curve modelling approach successfully reproduces the output of the nonlinear logistic function (Equation D.10) with the linear function of Equation D.16. Note that that no error term exists in Equation D.17 because the expected value of the error values is zero ($\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{p}}] = 0$).

D.1.2.4 Estimating Parameters in the Structured Latent Curve Modelling Approach

To estimate the parameter values, the full-information maximum likelihood shown in Equation D.18 is computed for each person (i.e., likelihood of observing a p person's data given the estimated parameter values):

$$\mathcal{L}_p = k_p \ln(2\pi) + \ln(|\Sigma_{\mathbf{p}}| + (\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{p}} - \mu_{\mathbf{p}})^{\top} \Sigma_{\mathbf{p}}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{p}} - \mu_{\mathbf{p}})), \quad (\text{D.18})$$

where k_p is the number of non-missing values for a given p person, $\Sigma_{\mathbf{p}}$ is the model-implied covariance matrix with rows and columns filtered at time points where person p has missing data, $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{p}}$ is a vector containing the data points collected for a p person (i.e., filtered data), and $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ is the model-implied mean vector that is filtered at time points where person p has missing data. Note that, because all my simulations assumed complete data across all times points, no filtering procedures were executed (for a review of the filtering procedure, see Boker et al., 2020, Chapter 5). Thus, computing the above full-information maximum likelihood in Equation D.18 is equivalent to computing the

below likelihood function in Equation D.19:

$$\mathcal{L}_p = k_p \ln(2\pi) + \ln(|\Sigma|) + (\mathbf{y}_p - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_p - \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (\text{D.19})$$

where Σ is the model-implied covariance matrix, \mathbf{y}_p contains the data collected from a p person, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the model-implied mean vector. The model-implied covariance matrix Σ is computed using Equation D.20 below:

$$\Sigma = \Lambda \Psi \Lambda + \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}, \quad (\text{D.20})$$

where Ψ is the random-effect covariance matrix and $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}$ contains the error variances at each time point. The mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is computed using Equation D.21 shown below:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = \Lambda \boldsymbol{\tau}. \quad (\text{D.21})$$

Parameter estimation is conducted by finding values for the model-implied covariance matrix Σ and the model-implied mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ that maximizes the sum of log-likelihoods across all P people (see Equation D.22 below):

$$\mathcal{L} = \arg \max_{\Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \sum_{p=1}^P \mathcal{L}_p. \quad (\text{D.22})$$

In OpenMx, the above problem is solved using the sequential least squares quadratic program (for a review, see Kraft, 1994).

Appendix E: OpenMx Code for Structured Latent Growth Curve Model Used in Simulation Experiments

The code that I used to model logistic pattern of change (see [data generation](#)) is shown in Code Block E.1. Note that, the code is largely excerpted from the `run_exp_simulations()` and `create_logistic_model_ns()` functions from the `nonlinSims` package, and so readers interested in obtaining more information should consult the source code of this package. One important point to mention is that the model specified in Code Block E.1 assumes time-structured data.

Code Block E.1

OpenMx Code for Structured Latent Growth Curve Model That Assumes Time-Structured Data

```
1 #Days on which measurements are assumed to be taken (note that model assumes
  time-structured data; that is, at each time point, participants provide data at the
  exact same moment). The measurement days obtained by finding the unique values in the
  `measurement.day` column of the generated data set.
2 measurement_days <- unique(data$measurement.day)
3
4 #Manifest variable names (i.e., names of columns containing data at each time point,
5 manifest_vars <- nonlinSims::extract_manifest_var_names(data_wide = data_wide)
6
7 #Now convert data to wide format (needed for OpenMx)
8 data_wide <- data[, c(1:3, 5)] %>%
9   pivot_wider(names_from = measurement.day, values_from = c(obs_score,
10     actual_measurement_day))
11
12 #Remove . from column names so that OpenMx does not run into error (this occurs
  because, with some spacing schedules, measurement days are not integer values.)
13 names(data_wide) <- str_replace(string = names(data_wide), pattern = '\\\\.', replacement
14   = '_')
15
16 #Latent variable names (theta = baseline, alpha = maximal elevation, beta =
  days-to-halfway elevation, gamma = triquarter-halfway elevation)
17 latent_vars <- c('theta', 'alpha', 'beta', 'gamma')
18
19 latent_growth_curve_model <- mxModel(
20   model = model_name,
21   type = 'RAM', independent = T,
22   mxData(observed = data_wide, type = 'raw'),
23
24   manifestVars = manifest_vars,
25   latentVars = latent_vars,
26
27   #Residual variances; by using one label, they are assumed to all be equal
  (homogeneity of variance). That is, there is no complex error structure.
28   mxPath(from = manifest_vars,
29     arrows=2, free=TRUE, labels='epsilon', values = 1, lbound = 0),
30
31   #Latent variable covariances and variances (note that only the variances are
  estimated. )
```

```

30 mxPath(from = latent_vars,
31        connect='unique.pairs', arrows=2,
32        free = c(TRUE,FALSE, FALSE, FALSE,
33                 TRUE, FALSE, FALSE,
34                 TRUE, FALSE,
35                 TRUE),
36        values=c(1, NA, NA, NA,
37                 1, NA, NA,
38                 1, NA,
39                 1),
40        labels=c('theta_rand', 'NA(cov_theta_alpha)', 'NA(cov_theta_beta)',
41                 'NA(cov_theta_gamma)',
42                 'alpha_rand', 'NA(cov_alpha_beta)', 'NA(cov_alpha_gamma)',
43                 'beta_rand', 'NA(cov_beta_gamma)',
44                 'gamma_rand'),
45        lbound = c(1e-3, NA, NA, NA,
46                  1e-3, NA, NA,
47                  1, NA,
48                  1),
49        ubound = c(2, NA, NA, NA,
50                   2, NA, NA,
51                   90^2, NA,
52                   45^2)),
53
54 # Latent variable means (linear parameters). Note that the parameters of beta and
55 # gamma do not have estimated means because they are nonlinear parameters (i.e., the
56 # logistic function's first-order partial derivative with respect to each of those two
57 # parameters contains those two parameters. )
58 mxPath(from = 'one', to = c('theta', 'alpha'), free = c(TRUE, TRUE), arrows = 1,
59        labels = c('theta_fixed', 'alpha_fixed'), lbound = 0, ubound = 7,
60        values = c(1, 1)),
61
62 #Functional constraints (needed to estimate mean values of fixed-effect parameters)
63 mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
64        labels = 'theta_fixed', name = 't', values = 1, lbound = 0, ubound = 7),
65 mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
66        labels = 'alpha_fixed', name = 'a', values = 1, lbound = 0, ubound = 7),
67 mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
68        labels = 'beta_fixed', name = 'b', values = 1, lbound = 1, ubound = 360),
69 mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
70        labels = 'gamma_fixed', name = 'g', values = 1, lbound = 1, ubound = 360),
71
72 mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = FALSE,
73        values = measurement_days, name = 'time'),
74
75 #Algebra specifying first-order partial derivatives;
76 mxAlgebra(expression = 1 - 1/(1 + exp((b - time)/g)), name="T1"),
77 mxAlgebra(expression = 1/(1 + exp((b - time)/g)), name = 'A1'),
78
79 mxAlgebra(expression = -((a - t) * (exp((b - time)/g) * (1/g))/(1 + exp((b -
80 time)/g))^2), name = 'B1'),
81 mxAlgebra(expression = (a - t) * (exp((b - time)/g) * ((b - time)/g^2))/(1 + exp((b
82 -time)/g))^2, name = 'G1'),
83
84 #Factor loadings; all fixed and, importantly, constrained to change according to
85 #their partial derivatives (i.e., nonlinear functions)
86 mxPath(from = 'theta', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
87        labels = sprintf(fmt = 'T1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
88 mxPath(from = 'alpha', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
89        labels = sprintf(fmt = 'A1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
90 mxPath(from='beta', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
91        labels = sprintf(fmt = 'B1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
92 mxPath(from='gamma', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
93        labels = sprintf(fmt = 'G1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
94
95 #Fit function used to estimate free parameter values.

```

```
90     mxFitFunctionML(vector = FALSE)
91 )
92
93 #Use starting value function from OpenMx to generate good starting values (uses
94 #weighted least squares)
95 latent_growth_model <- mxAutoStart(model = latent_growth_model)
96
97 #Fit model using mxTryHard(). Increases probability of convergence by attempting model
98 #convergence by randomly shifting starting values.
99 model_results <- mxTryHard(latent_growth_model)
```

Appendix F: Complete Versions of Bias/Precision Plots (Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters)

F.1 Experiment 1

F.1.1 Equal Spacing

Figure F.1
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Equal Spacing in Experiment 1





Figure F.1

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Equal Spacing in Experiment 1 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. Importantly, across all nature-of-change
 values (i.e., population values used for β_{fixed}), the acceptable amount of bias and precision was based on a
 population value of 180. See Table H.1 for specific values estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.2
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing in Experiment 1





Figure F.2

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing in Experiment 1 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

801 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 802 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 803 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 804 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 805 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 806 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 807 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 808 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 809 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 810 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. Importantly, across all nature-of-change
 811 values (i.e., population values used for β_{fixed}), the acceptable amount of bias and precision was based on a
 812 population value of 180. See Table H.1 for specific values estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.3
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing in Experiment 1





Figure F.3

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing in Experiment 1 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

818 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 819 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 820 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 821 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 822 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 823 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 824 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 825 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 826 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 827 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. Importantly, across all nature-of-change
 828 values (i.e., population values used for β_{fixed}), the acceptable amount of bias and precision was based on a
 829 population value of 180. See Table [H.1](#) for specific values estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.4
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing in Experiment 1





Figure F.4

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing in Experiment 1 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

835 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 836 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 837 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 838 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 839 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 840 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 841 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 842 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 843 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 844 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. Importantly, across all nature-of-change
 845 values (i.e., population values used for β_{fixed}), the acceptable amount of bias and precision was based on a
 846 population value of 180. See Table H.1 for specific values estimated for each parameter.

847 **F.2 Experiment 2**

848 **F.2.5 Equal Spacing**

Figure F.5
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Equal Spacing in Experiment 2





Figure F.5

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Equal Spacing in Experiment 2 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

853 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 854 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 855 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 856 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 857 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 858 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 859 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 860 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 861 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 862 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.2 for specific values
 863 estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.6
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing in Experiment 2





Figure F.6

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Increasing Spacing in Experiment 2 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

869 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 870 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 871 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 872 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 873 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 874 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 875 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 876 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 877 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 878 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.2 for specific values
 879 estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.7
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing in Experiment 2





Figure F.7

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Interval Decreasing Spacing in Experiment 2 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

885 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 886 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 887 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 888 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 889 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 890 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 891 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 892 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 893 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 894 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.2 for specific values
 895 estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.8
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing in Experiment 2





Figure F.8

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Middle-and-Extreme Spacing in Experiment 2 (continued)



897 *Note.* Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation
 898 parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and
 899 random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F:
 900 Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

901 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 902 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 903 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 904 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 905 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 906 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 907 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 908 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 909 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 910 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.2 for specific values
 911 estimated for each parameter.

F.3 Experiment 3

F.3.9 Time-Structured Data

Figure F.9
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Structured Data in Experiment 3





Figure F.9

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Structured Data in Experiment 3 (continued)



914 *Note.* Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation
 915 parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and
 916 random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F:
 917 Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

918 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 919 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 920 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 921 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 922 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 923 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 924 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 925 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 926 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 927 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.3 for specific values
 928 estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.10
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Fast Response Rate in Experiment 3





Figure F.10

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Fast Response Rate in Experiment 3 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

934 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 935 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 936 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 937 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 938 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 939 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 940 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 941 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 942 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 943 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.3 for specific values
 944 estimated for each parameter.

Figure F.11
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate in Experiment 3





Figure F.11

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters With Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate in Experiment 3 (continued)



Note. Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

950 Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters,
 951 respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for
 952 each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$,
 953 $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} =$
 954 0.05 , $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate
 955 cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the
 956 middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots
 957 that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding
 958 the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note
 959 that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.3 for specific values
 960 estimated for each parameter.

961 **F.3.12 Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate and**
962 **Modelled with Definition Variables**

Figure F.12
Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters When Using Definition Variables To Model Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate





Figure F.12

Bias/Precision Plots for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters When Using Definition Variables To Model Time-Unstructured Data Characterized by a Slow Response Rate (continued)



963 *Note.* Panels A–B: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect days-to-halfway elevation
 964 parameters, respectively (β_{fixed} and β_{random}). Panels C–D: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and
 965 random-effect triquarter-halfway elevation parameters, respectively (γ_{fixed} and γ_{random}). Panels E–F:
 966 Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect baseline parameters, respectively (θ_{fixed} and θ_{random}).

Panels G–H: Bias/precision plots for the fixed- and random-effect maximal elevation parameters, respectively (α_{fixed} and α_{random}). Blue horizontal lines in each panel represent the population value for each parameter. Population values for each day-unit parameter are as follows: $\beta_{fixed} \in 80, 180, 280$, $\beta_{random} = 10.00$, $\gamma_{fixed} = 20.00$, $\gamma_{random} = 4.00$, $\theta_{fixed} = 3.00$, $\theta_{random} = 0.05$, $\alpha_{fixed} = 3.32$, $\alpha_{random} = 0.05$, $\epsilon = 0.05$. Gray bands indicate the $\pm 10\%$ margin of error for each parameter and unfilled dots indicate cells with average parameter estimates outside of the margin or biased estimates. Error bars represent the middle 95% of estimated values, with light blue error bars indicating imprecise estimation. I considered dots that fell outside the gray bands as biased and error bar lengths with at least one whisker length exceeding the 10% cutoff (i.e., or longer than the portion of the gray band underlying the whisker) as imprecise. Note that random-effect parameter units are in standard deviation units. See Table H.3 for specific values estimated for each parameter.

Appendix G: Convergence Success Rates

G.1 Experiment 1

Table G.1
Convergence Success Rates in Experiment 1

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	Days to Halfway Elevation		
		80	180	280
Equal	5	1.00	0.98	0.95
	7	1.00	1.00	0.99
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time-interval increasing	5	1.00	1.00	1.00
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time-interval decreasing	5	1.00	0.96	0.82
	7	1.00	0.99	0.98
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00

	5	1.00	0.96	0.86
Middle-and-	7	1.00	1.00	1.00
extreme	9	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00

Note. Cells shaded in gray indicate conditions where less than 90% of models converged.

980 G.2 Experiment 2

Table G.2
Convergence Success Rates in Experiment 2

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	Sample Size (<i>N</i>)					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000
Equal	5	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.95	0.92
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time-interval increasing	5	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time-interval decreasing	5	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.95	0.93	0.88
	7	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.95
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Middle-and-extreme	5	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.90	0.81
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Note. Cells shaded in gray indicate conditions where less than 90% of models converged.

G.3 Experiment 3

Table G.3

Convergence Success Rates in Experiment 3

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	Sample Size (<i>N</i>)					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000
Time structured	5	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.90
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time unstructured (fast response)	5	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.99	0.96	0.90
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.99
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time unstructured (slow response)	5	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.95	0.92
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Time unstructured (slow response) with definition variables	5	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98
	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99
	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Note. Cells shaded in gray indicate conditions where less than 90% of models converged.

Table G.4

Convergence Success in Experiment 3 With Definition Variables

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	Sample size (<i>N</i>)					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000

Time unstructured	5	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98
(slow response)	7	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99
with definition	9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
variables	11	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Note. Cells shaded in gray indicate conditions where less than 90% of models converged.

982 Appendix H: Parameter Estimate Tables

983 H.1 Experiment 1

Table H.1*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 1*

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	β_{fixed} (Days to halfway elevation)			β_{random} (Days to halfway elevation) Pop value = 10.00			γ_{fixed} (Triquarter-halfway delta) Pop value = 20.00			γ_{random} (Triquarter-halfway delta) Pop value = 4.00		
		80	180	280	80	180	280	80	180	280	80	180	280
Equal spacing	5	79.73	179.78	279.81 [□]	10.14	10.40	10.08	19.37	19.49	19.71	7.41 [□]	14.53 [□]	8.11 [□]
	7	80.21	178.99	279.55 [□]	10.16	10.55	10.13	20.67	20.83	20.60	4.37	5.14 [□]	4.41 [□]
	9	80.00	179.94	279.99 [□]	10.29	10.37	10.34	20.77	20.76	20.67	4.24	4.14	4.30
	11	80.03	180.01	279.88 [□]	10.27	10.29	10.32	20.64	20.70	20.64	4.13	4.08	4.18
Time-interval increasing	5	79.88	180.10	274.37 [□]	10.32	9.73	13.04 [□]	20.71	20.39	18.32	4.57 [□]	4.99 [□]	6.20 [□]
	7	80.19	179.82	279.86 [□]	10.42	10.47	10.14	20.66	20.79	19.78	4.29	4.87 [□]	7.03 [□]
	9	79.59	179.06	279.70 [□]	10.07	10.22	10.20	20.33	20.66	20.72	4.17	4.25	4.32
	11	79.89	179.84	279.62 [□]	10.38	10.30	10.47	20.78	20.75	20.68	4.23	4.18	4.13
Time-interval decreasing	5	70.67	179.92	279.63 [□]	15.28 [□]	9.80	10.22	16.63	20.07	20.55	5.48 [□]	5.17 [□]	4.59 [□]
	7	78.23	178.22	279.84 [□]	10.08	10.46	10.39	19.38	20.59	20.69	6.80 [□]	5.09 [□]	4.24
	9	79.95	179.34	278.98 [□]	10.03	10.20	10.05	20.42	20.54	20.28	4.37	4.32	4.19
	11	79.42	179.70	279.52 [□]	10.38	10.13	10.06	20.75	20.45	20.31	4.17	4.16	4.17
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	71.95	179.61	287.73 [□]	16.78 [□]	10.26	16.74 [□]	15.59	20.61	17.09	6.54 [□]	4.24	8.61 [□]
	7	80.45	180.00	279.15 [□]	13.93 [□]	10.25	13.69 [□]	20.71	20.58	20.61	5.21 [□]	4.16	4.98 [□]
	9	80.28	180.05	279.63 [□]	10.42	10.24	10.24	20.91	20.65	20.85	4.74 [□]	4.26	4.72 [□]
	11	80.19	179.96	279.86 [□]	10.27	10.28	10.15	20.71	20.70	20.71	4.14	4.08	4.16

Table H.1*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 1 (continued)*

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	θ_{fixed} (Baseline) Pop value = 3.00			θ_{random} (Baseline) Pop value = 0.05			α_{fixed} (Maximal elevation) Pop value = 3.32			α_{random} (Maximal elevation) Pop value = 0.05			ϵ (error) Pop value = 0.03		
		80	180	280	80	180	280	80	180	280	80	180	280	80	180	280
Equal spacing	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval increasing	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.33	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval decreasing	5	2.99	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	2.99	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.33	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Note. Cells shaded in light blue indicate cells where estimation is imprecise (i.e., lower and/or upper whisker lengths exceeding 10% of the parameter's population value. Empty superscript squares (\square) indicate biased estimates (i.e., bias exceeding 10% of parameter's population value). Importantly, bias and precision cutoff values for the days-to-halfway elevation parameter (β_{fixed}) are based on a value of 180.00.

984 H.2 Experiment 2

Table H.2

Parameter Values Estimated in Experiment 2

		β_{fixed} (Days to halfway elevation) Pop value = 180.00						β_{random} (Days to halfway elevation) Pop value = 10.00					
Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Equal spacing	5	179.71	179.82	179.53	180.00	179.99	179.64	10.40	10.36	10.04	10.51	10.65	10.74
	7	180.05	179.65	179.53	179.75	179.76	179.99	10.18	10.59	10.49	10.54	10.60	10.58
	9	179.84	180.07	179.94	180.00	180.02	180.03	10.28	10.20	10.30	10.40	10.39	10.36
	11	180.11	180.11	180.01	180.03	179.98	179.98	10.08	10.04	10.28	10.29	10.38	10.29
Time-interval increasing	5	181.81	181.16	181.14	180.27	179.78	179.57	11.24 [□]	10.24	9.93	9.59	9.91	10.22
	7	179.99	179.96	179.73	179.77	179.79	179.83	10.26	10.43	10.50	10.43	10.47	10.47
	9	179.33	179.18	178.99	179.07	179.11	179.13	10.15	10.10	10.17	10.18	10.21	10.29
	11	179.81	179.79	179.86	179.88	179.81	179.82	9.99	10.19	10.32	10.27	10.30	10.30
Time-interval decreasing	5	177.01	178.48	179.13	179.23	179.86	180.37	10.95	11.38 [□]	9.97	9.55	10.36	10.11
	7	178.98	179.68	179.12	179.53	180.07	179.75	10.07	10.31	10.48	10.37	10.46	10.51
	9	179.65	179.01	178.46	179.47	179.64	179.75	10.11	10.16	10.20	10.17	10.28	10.26
	11	179.48	179.68	179.70	179.65	179.64	179.68	9.85	9.98	10.03	10.12	10.13	10.11
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	177.99	179.65	179.15	179.83	179.61	178.74	10.30	10.24	10.40	10.24	10.28	10.26
	7	179.96	179.82	179.97	179.98	180.02	179.98	10.25	10.20	10.32	10.26	10.29	10.27
	9	179.88	180.07	179.89	179.98	179.98	179.99	10.12	10.16	10.24	10.30	10.24	10.29
	11	180.02	179.96	180.01	179.98	180.01	179.99	10.08	10.35	10.15	10.35	10.30	10.28

Table H.2*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 2 (continued)*

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	γ_{fixed} (Triquarter-halfway delta) Pop value = 20.00						γ_{random} (Triquarter-halfway delta) Pop value = 4.00					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Equal spacing	5	18.25	18.11	18.27	19.59	20.27	20.60	17.69 [□]	16.95 [□]	16.41 [□]	15.19 [□]	12.19 [□]	8.51 [□]
	7	20.25	20.53	20.66	20.75	20.81	20.74	9.22 [□]	7.70 [□]	5.77 [□]	4.89 [□]	4.98 [□]	4.34
	9	20.88	20.72	20.73	20.76	20.75	20.73	5.30 [□]	4.99 [□]	4.44 [□]	4.27	4.03	4.00
	11	20.65	20.66	20.73	20.70	20.69	20.71	4.86 [□]	4.49 [□]	4.20	4.10	4.02	4.07
Time-interval increasing	5	18.81	19.11	19.56	20.25	20.80	20.92	6.18 [□]	5.88 [□]	5.25 [□]	4.94 [□]	4.68 [□]	4.42 [□]
	7	20.74	20.74	20.94	20.83	20.83	20.82	7.38 [□]	6.31 [□]	5.45 [□]	5.06 [□]	4.66 [□]	4.45 [□]
	9	20.72	20.65	20.69	20.65	20.63	20.65	5.15 [□]	4.83 [□]	4.44 [□]	4.26	4.16	4.23
	11	20.80	20.69	20.84	20.76	20.78	20.76	4.84 [□]	4.43 [□]	4.25	4.26	4.17	4.14
Time-interval decreasing	5	19.21	18.50	19.21	19.90	20.50	20.79	7.17 [□]	6.01 [□]	5.18 [□]	5.12 [□]	4.91 [□]	4.66 [□]
	7	20.36	20.49	20.57	20.69	21.03	20.76	6.98 [□]	6.18 [□]	5.43 [□]	5.20 [□]	4.67 [□]	4.68 [□]
	9	20.69	20.60	20.55	20.62	20.70	20.63	5.48 [□]	5.12 [□]	4.72 [□]	4.52 [□]	4.72 [□]	4.83 [□]
	11	20.49	20.53	20.38	20.41	20.47	20.41	4.66 [□]	4.57 [□]	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.17
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	20.80	20.69	20.65	20.67	20.64	20.59	5.21 [□]	4.68 [□]	4.43 [□]	4.18	4.15	4.11
	7	20.76	20.55	20.70	20.63	20.60	20.63	5.07 [□]	4.60 [□]	4.39	4.23	4.19	4.15
	9	20.68	20.71	20.67	20.63	20.58	20.63	4.99 [□]	4.67 [□]	4.49 [□]	4.17	4.13	4.15
	11	20.64	20.74	20.67	20.70	20.66	20.68	4.57 [□]	4.47 [□]	4.22	4.19	4.09	4.07

Table H.2*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 2 (continued)*

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	θ_{fixed} (Baseline) Pop value = 3.00						θ_{random} (Baseline) Pop value = 0.05					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Equal spacing	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval increasing	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval decreasing	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Table H.2*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 2 (continued)*

Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	α_{fixed} (Maximal elevation) Pop value = 3.32						α_{random} (Maximal elevation) Pop value = 0.05					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Equal spacing	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval increasing	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval decreasing	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Table H.2
Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 2 (continued)

		$\epsilon(\text{error})$					
		Pop value = 0.03					
Measurement Spacing	Number of Measurements	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Equal spacing	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval increasing	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time-interval decreasing	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Middle-and-extreme spacing	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Note. Cells shaded in light blue indicate cells where estimation is imprecise (i.e., lower and/or upper whisker lengths exceeding 10% of the parameter's population value. Empty superscript squares (\square) indicate biased estimates (i.e., bias exceeding 10% of parameter's population value).

985 **H.3 Experiment 3**

Table H.3
Parameter Values Estimated in Experiment 3

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	β_{fixed} (Days to halfway elevation) Pop value = 180.00						β_{random} (Days to halfway elevation) Pop value = 10.00					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Time structured	5	179.71	179.67	179.75	179.98	180.00	179.66	10.40	10.27	10.37	10.56	10.73	10.69
	7	180.05	179.59	179.02	179.66	180.03	179.63	10.18	10.42	10.65	10.52	10.76	10.60
	9	179.84	180.01	180.01	179.97	180.01	180.00	10.28	10.28	10.37	10.46	10.42	10.41
	11	180.11	179.91	179.94	180.00	180.00	180.00	10.08	10.32	10.21	10.29	10.36	10.31
Time unstructured (fast response)	5	177.48	177.24	176.74	177.50	177.42	177.06	10.65	10.36	10.38	10.65	10.85	10.96
	7	176.89	177.03	176.37	175.92	177.20	176.95	10.53	10.60	10.88	10.83	10.84	10.84
	9	177.54	177.28	177.27	177.31	177.34	177.33	10.66	10.43	10.44	10.61	10.65	10.59
	11	177.25	177.35	177.27	177.37	177.35	177.30	10.41	10.37	10.37	10.45	10.52	10.51
Time unstructured (slow response)	5	174.13	174.02	173.65	173.85	173.41	173.63	11.23 [□]	10.93	11.22 [□]	11.80 [□]	12.10 [□]	12.07 [□]
	7	173.31	173.63	173.01	173.06	173.55	173.55	11.71 [□]	11.67 [□]	11.88 [□]	11.97 [□]	11.91 [□]	11.94 [□]
	9	173.37	173.37	173.54	173.52	173.50	173.49	11.26 [□]	11.38 [□]	11.42 [□]	11.40 [□]	11.47 [□]	11.46 [□]
	11	173.58	173.56	173.50	173.51	173.49	173.47	10.87	10.98	11.12 [□]	11.18 [□]	11.14 [□]	11.16 [□]
Time unstructured (slow response) with definition variables	5	179.92	179.87	179.97	179.92	179.87	179.88	10.70	10.40	10.35	10.50	10.66	10.61
	7	180.07	179.96	179.96	179.92	179.91	179.94	10.32	10.32	10.33	10.52	10.53	10.50
	9	180.17	179.86	179.88	179.97	179.95	179.98	10.12	10.26	10.43	10.32	10.40	10.38
	11	179.93	180.20	179.94	179.97	179.99	179.99	10.11	10.20	10.34	10.31	10.27	10.32

Table H.3*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 3 (continued)*

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	γ_{fixed} (Triquarter-halfway delta) Pop value = 20.00						γ_{random} (Triquarter-halfway delta) Pop value = 4.00					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Time structured	5	18.25	18.11	18.46	19.67	20.55	20.65	17.69 [□]	17.05 [□]	16.38 [□]	15.03 [□]	11.63 [□]	9.02 [□]
	7	20.25	20.79	20.67	20.77	20.98	20.93	9.22 [□]	7.32 [□]	6.12 [□]	4.99 [□]	4.45 [□]	4.69 [□]
	9	20.88	20.79	20.84	20.69	20.74	20.71	5.30 [□]	4.95 [□]	4.34	4.13	4.05	3.96
	11	20.65	20.74	20.73	20.69	20.71	20.67	4.86 [□]	4.41 [□]	4.17	4.13	4.09	4.03
Time unstructured (fast response)	5	18.57	18.16	18.59	19.45	20.15	20.58	16.85 [□]	16.21 [□]	14.96 [□]	13.48 [□]	9.94 [□]	7.72 [□]
	7	20.39	20.44	20.67	20.73	20.77	20.77	9.65 [□]	7.07 [□]	6.25 [□]	5.47 [□]	4.61 [□]	4.34
	9	20.54	20.66	20.75	20.71	20.72	20.74	5.27 [□]	4.68 [□]	4.59 [□]	4.08	4.06	4.05
	11	20.77	20.70	20.72	20.70	20.71	20.73	4.85 [□]	4.68 [□]	4.29	4.14	4.16	4.14
Time unstructured (slow response)	5	18.66	17.88	18.34	19.83	20.57	20.67	14.54 [□]	13.26 [□]	11.51 [□]	10.05 [□]	7.89 [□]	6.65 [□]
	7	20.51	20.73	20.75	20.89	20.89	20.86	7.62 [□]	6.65 [□]	5.61 [□]	5.21 [□]	4.83 [□]	4.67 [□]
	9	20.91	20.82	20.82	20.89	20.94	20.89	6.00 [□]	5.32 [□]	4.97 [□]	4.67 [□]	4.74 [□]	4.70 [□]
	11	20.98	20.85	20.90	20.92	20.90	20.90	5.26 [□]	4.92 [□]	4.83 [□]	4.69 [□]	4.75 [□]	4.71 [□]
Time unstructured (slow response) with definition variables	5	20.58	20.64	20.76	20.86	20.90	20.94	11.12 [□]	9.82 [□]	8.51 [□]	6.86 [□]	5.78 [□]	5.17 [□]
	7	20.55	20.68	20.73	20.87	20.81	20.78	6.68 [□]	5.93 [□]	5.14 [□]	4.74 [□]	4.11	4.12
	9	20.69	20.68	20.69	20.74	20.70	20.73	5.22 [□]	4.77 [□]	4.53 [□]	4.24	4.05	4.05
	11	20.66	20.77	20.69	20.69	20.67	20.69	4.79 [□]	4.72 [□]	4.32	4.01	4.14	4.11

Table H.3

Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 3 (continued)

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	θ_{fixed} (Baseline) Pop value = 3.00						θ_{random} (Baseline) Pop value = 0.05					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Time structured	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (fast response)	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (slow response)	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (slow response) with definition variables	5	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Table H.3*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 3 (continued)*

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	α_{fixed} (Maximal elevation) Pop value = 3.32						α_{random} (Maximal elevation) Pop value = 0.05					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000	30	50	100	200	500	1000
Time structured	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (fast response)	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (slow response)	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (slow response) with definition variables	5	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Table H.3*Parameter Values Estimated for Day- and Likert-Unit Parameters in Experiment 3 (continued)*

Time Structuredness	Number of Measurements	$\epsilon(\text{error})$					
		Pop value = 0.03					
		30	50	100	200	500	1000
Time structured	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (fast response)	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (slow response)	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Time unstructured (slow response) with definition variables	5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	7	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	9	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	11	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05

Note. Cells shaded in light blue indicate cells where estimation is imprecise (i.e., lower and/or upper whisker lengths exceeding 10% of the parameter's population value. Empty superscript squares (\square) indicate biased estimates (i.e., bias exceeding 10% of parameter's population value).

Appendix I: OpenMx Code for Structured Latent Growth Curve Model With Definition Variables

The code that I used to model logistic pattern of change using definition variables (see [definition variables](#)) is shown in Code Block I.1. Note that, the code is largely excerpted from the `run_exp_simulations()` and `create_definition_model()` functions from the `nonlinSims` package, and so readers interested in obtaining more information should consult the source code of this package. One important point to mention is that the model specified in Code Block I.1 can accurately model time-unstructured data because it uses definition variables.

Code Block I.1

OpenMx Code for Structured Latent Growth Curve Model With Definition Variables

```
1 #Now convert data to wide format (needed for OpenMx)
2 data_wide <- data[ , c(1:3, 5)] %>%
3   pivot_wider(names_from = measurement_day, values_from = c(obs_score,
4     actual_measurement_day))
5 #Definition variable (data. prefix tells OpenMx to use recorded time of observation
6   for each person's data)
7 obs_score_days <- paste('data.', extract_obs_score_days(data = data_wide), sep = '')
8 #Remove . from column names so that OpenMx does not run into error (this occurs
9   because, with some spacing schedules, measurement days are not integer values.)
10 names(data_wide) <- str_replace(string = names(data_wide), pattern = '\\.', replacement
11   = '_')
12 #Latent variable names (theta = baseline, alpha = maximal elevation, beta =
13   days-to-halfway elevation, gamma = triquarter-halfway elevation)
14 latent_vars <- c('theta', 'alpha', 'beta', 'gamma')
15
16 def_growth_curve_model <- mxModel(
17   model = model_name,
18   type = 'RAM', independent = T,
19   mxData(observed = data_wide, type = 'raw'),
20
21   manifestVars = manifest_vars,
22   latentVars = latent_vars,
23
24   #Residual variances; by using one label, they are assumed to all be equal
25   (homogeneity of variance). That is, there is no complex error structure.
26   mxPath(from = manifest_vars,
27     arrows=2, free=TRUE, labels='epsilon', values = 1, lbound = 0),
28
29   #Latent variable covariances and variances (note that only the variances are
30   estimated. )
31   mxPath(from = latent_vars,
32     connect='unique.pairs', arrows=2,
33     free = c(TRUE,FALSE, FALSE, FALSE,
```

```

30         TRUE, FALSE, FALSE,
31         TRUE, FALSE,
32         TRUE),
33     values=c(1, NA, NA, NA,
34             1, NA, NA,
35             1, NA,
36             1),
37     labels=c('theta_rand', 'NA(cov_theta_alpha)', 'NA(cov_theta_beta)',
38             'NA(cov_theta_gamma)',
39             'alpha_rand', 'NA(cov_alpha_beta)', 'NA(cov_alpha_gamma)',
40             'beta_rand', 'NA(cov_beta_gamma)',
41             'gamma_rand'),
42     lbound = c(1e-3, NA, NA, NA,
43             1e-3, NA, NA,
44             1, NA,
45             1),
46     ubound = c(2, NA, NA, NA,
47             2, NA, NA,
48             90^2, NA,
49             45^2)),
50
51     # Latent variable means (linear parameters). Note that the parameters of beta and
52     # gamma do not have estimated means because they are nonlinear parameters (i.e., the
53     # logistic function's first-order partial derivative with respect to each of those two
54     # parameters contains those two parameters)
55     mxPath(from = 'one', to = c('theta', 'alpha'), free = c(TRUE, TRUE), arrows = 1,
56           labels = c('theta_fixed', 'alpha_fixed'), lbound = 0, ubound = 7,
57           values = c(1, 1)),
58
59     #Functional constraints (needed to estimate mean values of fixed-effect parameters)
60     mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
61           labels = 'theta_fixed', name = 't', values = 1, lbound = 0, ubound = 7),
62     mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
63           labels = 'alpha_fixed', name = 'a', values = 1, lbound = 0, ubound = 7),
64     mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
65           labels = 'beta_fixed', name = 'b', values = 1, lbound = 1, ubound = 360),
66     mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(manifest_vars), ncol = 1, free = TRUE,
67           labels = 'gamma_fixed', name = 'g', values = 1, lbound = 1, ubound = 360),
68
69     #Definition variables set for loadings (accounts for time-unstructured data)
70     mxMatrix(type = 'Full', nrow = length(obs_score_days), ncol = 1, free = FALSE,
71           labels = obs_score_days, name = 'time'),
72
73     #Algebra specifying first-order partial derivatives;
74     mxAlgebra(expression = 1 - 1/(1 + exp((b - time)/g)), name="T1"),
75     mxAlgebra(expression = 1/(1 + exp((b - time)/g)), name = 'A1'),
76     mxAlgebra(expression = -((a - t) * (exp((b - time)/g) * (1/g)))/(1 + exp((b -
77     time)/g))^2), name = 'B1'),
78     mxAlgebra(expression = (a - t) * (exp((b - time)/g) * ((b - time)/g^2))/(1 + exp((b
79     -time)/g))^2, name = 'G1'),
80
81     #Factor loadings; all fixed and, importantly, constrained to change according to
82     #their partial derivatives (i.e., nonlinear functions)
83     mxPath(from = 'theta', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
84           labels = sprintf(fmt = 'T1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
85     mxPath(from = 'alpha', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
86           labels = sprintf(fmt = 'A1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
87     mxPath(from='beta', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
88           labels = sprintf(fmt = 'B1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
89     mxPath(from='gamma', to = manifest_vars, arrows=1, free=FALSE,
90           labels = sprintf(fmt = 'G1[%d,1]', 1:length(manifest_vars))),
91
92     #Fit function used to estimate free parameter values.
93     mxFitFunctionML(vector = FALSE)
94 )

```

```
90 #Fit model using mxTryHard(). Increases probability of convergence by attempting model  
convergence by randomly shifting starting values.  
91 model_results <- mxTryHard(def_growth_curve_model)
```