Electronic Supplementary Material 1 for Ćepulić, D.-B. (2023). Too mild, too harsh, or just about right? The relationship between personality and perception of COVID-19 measures. *Journal of Individual Differences.*

BFI-S reliability

The reliability of the personality scales was estimated via the omega coefficient (reliability() function from the semTools package; Jorgensen et al., 2021). Table E1 shows that reliabilities of neuroticism, extraversion and openness are somewhat higher than reliabilities of conscientiousness and agreeableness.

Table E1
Omega reliabilities for BFI-S personality scales in different countries

Country	N	E	O	C	A
Bosnia and Herzegovina	.648	.764	.604	.638	.569
Bulgaria	.663	.747	.620	.545	.531
Croatia	.713	.784	.651	.642	.588
Czech Republic	.744	.823	.623	.526	.552
Finland	.724	.836	.678	.610	.601
France	.776	.849	.664	.569	.573
Germany	.761	.796	.669	.602	.545
Japan	.787	.724	.733	.509	.592
Mexico	.710	.786	.651	.581	.538
Poland	.649	.743	.643	.571	.551
Sweden	.802	.807	.659	.601	.589
Switzerland	.750	.806	.600	.575	.554
Turkey	.684	.786	.761	.541	.555
United Kingdom	.720	.778	.646	.567	.552
United States	.770*	.849	.667	.558	.585
Total	**.729**	**.807**	**.701**	**.628**	**.601**

Note. N = neuroticism, E = extraversion, O = openness, C = conscientiousness, A = agreeableness. All countries from the original COVIDiSTRESS dataset with $\omega<.50$ were excluded from further analyses (see Data preparation section in the main article)

* For the US, a negative residual variance of item 2 was estimated in the CFA model using the DWLS estimator for ordinal variables. Thus, omega reliability for Neuroticism scale was additionally estimated via the MLR estimator - it was .765

Software

The data were analyzed in R (R Core Team, 2021). It was examined, cleaned, and visualized with *tidyverse* (Wickham et al., 2019) and *janitor* (Firke, 2021) packages; the CFA models were estimated, reliabilities were estimated and measurement invariance was tested with *lavaan* (Rosseel, 2012) and *semTools* (Jorgensen et al., 2021) packages, and package *sirt* (Robitzsch, 2021) was used to test the approximate measurement invariance via alignment approach. Linear mixed models analyses were done with *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015), *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) and *emmeans* (Lenth, 2021) packages.

Measurement invariance testing

Multigroup CFA

To compare personality differences between people with distinct perceptions of strictness of COVID-19 measures (PSM) across countries, measurement invariance was evaluated. This was first done via the multigroup CFA with DWLS estimator and by treating scale items as ordinal. The criteria for establishing invariance were adopted from Rutkowski and Swetina (Rutkowski & Svetina, 2017; ΔCFI $\geq$ -.004 and ΔRMSEA $\leq$.05 for metric invariance, and ΔCFI $\geq$ -.004 and ΔRMSEA $\leq$ .01 for scalar, i.e. threshold invariance).

Table E2

Testing measurement invariance of personality dimensions with robust/scaled fit indices

	Model	χ^2 scaled (df scaled)	p	CFI	RMSEA	ΔCFI	ΔRMSEA
Neuroticism							
	Configural	-	-	1.000	.000	-	-
	Metric	1731.558 (28)	< .001	.983	.121	-.017	.121
	Scalar	18567.799 (182)	< .001	.813	.156	-.170	.035
Extraversion							
	Configural	-	-	1.000	.000	-	-
	Metric	2243.846 (28)	< .001	.990	.138	-.010	.138
	Scalar	21619.261 (182)	< .001	.899	.169	-.091	.031
Openness							
	Configural	-	-	1.000	.000	-	-
	Metric	302.453 (28)	< .001	.996	.049	-.004	.049
	Scalar	7284.551 (182)	< .001	.885	.097	-.111	.048
Agreeableness							
	Configural	-	-	1.000	.000	-	-
	Metric	1035.838 (28)	< .001	.972	.093	-.028	.093
	Scalar	6701.283 (182)	< .001	.816	.093	-.156	.000
Conscientiousness (MLR estimator)							
	Configural	-	-	1.000	.000	-	-
	Metric	360.868 (28)	< .001	.976	.054	-.024	.054
	Scalar	4189.228 (56*)	< .001	.702	.133	-.274	.079

Note. * these degrees of freedom are different from those in other scalar models because models for conscientiousness were estimated with MLR instead of DWLS estimator (also, indicators were treated as interval, and not ordinal variables)

Table E2 shows the results of measurement invariance tests for different personality dimensions. In the case of neuroticism, the configural model estimated a negative residual variance of one item in the United States sample (-0.075). However, because the estimated value was close to zero, and there were no negative residual variances when estimating the model with the MLR estimator, the configural model obtained using the DWLS estimator was accepted. Also, because some categories of an item in the subsample of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the conscientiousness dimension were empty, measurement invariance was tested using the MLR estimator. When looking simultaneously at ΔCFI and ΔRMSEA (Table E2), metric invariance

was observed only for openness, and scalar invariance was not observed for any personality scale[1].

Approximate invariance test

Because multigroup CFA may be too sensitive to small deviations when measurement invariance is evaluated across large number of groups, the alignment method was proposed for evaluation whether approximate (instead of exact) invariance holds (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014; Byrne & van de Vijver, 2017; Fischer & Karl, 2019). R^2 values indicate how similar the aligned parameters (item loadings and intercepts) are across groups – estimates close to 1 suggest high invariance (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014; Fischer & Karl, 2019; Robitzsch, 2021). Also, Muthén and Asparouhov (2014) suggest a cut-off of 25% non-invariance to regard the results of the alignment to be credible. The tolerance for declaring an aligned item parameter for a certain group non-invariant was 0.2 for loadings, and 0.4 for intercepts, as suggested by Robitzsch (2021). For those who are interested, Fischer and Karl (2019) offer a helpful tutorial for testing approximate measurement invariance in R.

---

[1] Metric invariance for conscientiousness was also not achieved when using more liberal criteria by Rutkowski and Svetina (2014)

Table E3

Approximate invariance test for personality dimensions via the alignment method

	Estimator	R^2		% noninvariant items	
		Loadings	Intercepts	Loadings	Intercepts
Neuroticism	DWLS	.979	-	6.667	-
	MLR	.968	.996	13.333	8.889
Extraversion	DWLS	.989	-	4.444	-
	MLR	.979	.996	13.333	24.444
Openness	DWLS	.995	-	0	-
	MLR	.989	.998	0	4.444
Agreeableness	DWLS	.987	-	4.444	-
	MLR	.981	.998	2.222	4.444
Conscientiousness	DWLS	.968	-	8.889	-
	MLR	.965	.998	6.667	4.444

Alignment was performed for item parameters using both DWLS and MLR estimators because package *sirt* (Robitzsch, 2021) does not align thresholds estimated by DWLS. However, the conclusions regarding loadings for both estimators are similar. All R^2 values in Table E3 are greater than .96, and the percentages of non-invariant items are below 25% for both item loadings and intercepts of all personality dimensions. This indicated adequate absorption of non-invariance via alignment for all personality dimensions across 15 countries. Next, aligned personality scores for each participant were estimated with the factor.scores() function from the package *psych* (Revelle, 2022) using the country-specific aligned lambdas and "components" method of factor score estimation (analogous to the aligned factor score estimation by Han, 2021). The aligned personality scores were then rescaled to range from 1 to 6 (to reflect the original scale) and used in the following linear mixed model analyses.

The correlation between the composite scores and aligned personality factor scores ranged between .91 and .96.

Linear mixed models

The initial linear mixed models estimated correlated random intercepts and random slopes for the PSM and health-risk dummy predictors, and their interaction, as these were the associations of interest. However, overparameterization may result in singular variance-covariance matrices of random effects (Bates et al., 2018). If the initial model fit was singular, the random effect structure was reduced by removing the random slopes of the dummy variables, starting with the more complex ones (interaction of PSM and health-risk). The fit of each reduced model was compared to the fit of the initial model via the likelihood ratio test. The initial model was reduced by the random effects whose removal showed insignificant (or the lowest) detriment of fit. This was repeated until the fit of the reduced model estimated by both the maximum likelihood and the restricted maximum likelihood estimator was not singular. That model, estimated by restricted maximum likelihood estimator, was accepted as the final model.

Descriptive statistics

Tables E4a, E4b and E5 show the descriptive statistics for the categorical and numerical variables used in the study.

Table E4a

Descriptive statistics (percentages) of analyzed categorical variables across different countries

Country	n	Gender (%)			Education (%)						
		Male	Female	Other	None	< 6 years school	< 9 years school	< 12 years school	Some college	College degree	PhD
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1003	24.13	75.27	0.60	0.20	0.10	0.20	15.65	18.15	60.42	5.28
Bulgaria	3647	17.00	81.41	1.59	0.11	0.00	0.16	9.46	22.92	62.22	5.13
Croatia	2397	20.48	79.27	0.25	0.21	0.21	0.38	15.64	16.10	62.16	5.30
Czech Republic	1600	20.81	78.62	0.56	0.50	0.12	0.38	13.81	28.19	52.50	4.50
Finland	19448	16.78	81.41	1.81	2.15	6.56	3.10	13.24	20.62	50.03	4.30
France	11226	46.71	51.75	1.54	0.94	1.23	0.68	7.82	21.21	58.15	9.98
Germany	1192	29.28	69.30	1.43	0.08	0.08	0.59	11.41	19.30	57.30	11.24
Japan	4457	54.70	44.04	1.26	7.70	0.29	3.32	23.98	12.25	49.85	2.60
Mexico	7268	26.87	72.56	0.56	0.32	0.04	0.51	5.10	9.36	53.80	30.88
Poland	2433	12.45	86.93	0.62	0.33	0.00	0.66	15.37	23.10	55.61	4.93
Sweden	2574	22.92	76.07	1.01	0.12	0.12	1.79	17.17	16.94	55.63	8.24
Switzerland	981	37.82	61.77	0.41	0.51	0.20	2.96	12.84	16.62	58.00	8.87
Turkey	888	23.65	75.34	1.01	0.11	0.00	0.11	3.49	4.62	57.66	34.01
United Kingdom	1191	22.67	76.66	0.67	0.00	0.08	0.42	5.54	17.04	63.22	13.69
United States	1924	21.52	76.56	1.92	0.16	0.00	0.21	3.22	18.19	57.59	20.63
Total	**62229**	**27.46**	**71.22**	**1.31**	**1.49**	**2.32**	**1.60**	**11.62**	**18.41**	**54.64**	**9.92**

Table E4b

Descriptive statistics (percentages) of analysed categorical variables across different countries

Country	Health-risk (%)			Isolation status (%)				Perception of strictness of COVID-19 measures (%)		
	No	Not sure	Yes	Life carries on as usual	Life carries on with minimal changes	Isolated	Isolated in a medical facility	Appropriate	Too mild/Too little	Too harsh/Too much
Bosnia and Herzegovina	63.71	8.67	27.62	3.59	59.52	36.69	0.20	51.05	17.05	31.90
Bulgaria	64.08	11.76	24.16	2.55	40.50	56.87	0.08	47.68	23.75	28.57
Croatia	71.71	7.55	20.73	1.71	68.59	29.66	0.04	70.21	4.63	25.16
Czech Republic	70.44	6.69	22.88	2.19	78.31	19.50	0.00	66.56	8.50	24.94
Finland	78.68	5.71	15.61	3.09	60.31	36.48	0.12	71.39	12.81	15.80
France	66.83	8.59	24.59	4.48	64.75	30.70	0.07	42.13	51.61	6.25
Germany	67.53	7.80	24.66	2.94	60.32	36.74	0.00	66.86	14.51	18.62
Japan	35.18	9.94	54.88	47.12	51.78	1.03	0.07	34.46	61.52	4.02
Mexico	78.08	4.79	17.13	2.00	31.80	66.03	0.18	37.99	46.27	15.74
Poland	86.97	2.38	10.65	0.99	45.58	53.39	0.04	46.77	44.80	8.43
Sweden	75.37	4.35	20.28	2.41	74.59	23.00	0.00	68.30	19.00	12.70
Switzerland	66.87	7.65	25.48	2.24	65.04	32.62	0.10	65.44	12.54	22.02
Turkey	77.70	6.64	15.65	1.01	26.24	72.52	0.23	38.29	47.97	13.74
United Kingdom	63.39	6.38	30.23	2.10	40.72	57.18	0.00	43.24	47.10	9.66
United States	76.04	3.90	20.06	1.35	37.68	60.86	0.10	21.36	73.02	5.61
Total	**71.18**	**6.78**	**22.04**	**6.04**	**55.31**	**38.56**	**0.09**	**53.85**	**32.05**	**14.10**

Note. Health-risk – indicates whether the participants or any of their close relations (family, close friends) are in a high-risk group for Coronavirus (e.g., pregnant, elderly or due to a pre-existing medical condition)*;* Isolation status - indicates whether the participants are in some form of isolation or their life continued as usual or with minimal changes (in the main analyses "isolated" and "isolated in a medical facility" were collapsed into "isolated", while the other two answer were collapsed into "not isolated"

Table E5

Means and standard deviations (in brackets) for the numerical variables used in the study across 15 countries

Country	Age	Compliance	N	E	O	C	A	SI
Bosnia and Herzegovina	36.61 (11.28)	5.30 (0.78)	3.11 (0.96)	4.46 (0.97)	4.67 (0.79)	4.72 (0.77)	4.56 (0.76)	88.90 (3.73)
Bulgaria	41.02 (13.39)	5.12 (0.88)	3.05 (0.98)	4.50 (0.96)	4.72 (0.79)	4.88 (0.72)	4.38 (0.83)	71.05 (2.57)
Croatia	35.59 (12.26)	5.29 (0.70)	3.21 (0.99)	4.35 (1.01)	4.65 (0.81)	4.59 (0.80)	4.49 (0.75)	96.23 (1.13)
Czech Republic	33.25 (11.65)	4.95 (0.87)	3.60 (0.98)	3.85 (1.09)	4.42 (0.80)	3.82 (0.79)	4.05 (0.81)	71.01 (10.20)
Finland	43.50 (14.03)	5.00 (0.88)	3.09 (1.03)	4.15 (1.12)	4.67 (0.87)	4.37 (0.83)	4.52 (0.76)	70.66 (1.43)
France	33.01 (12.49)	5.23 (0.84)	3.54 (1.11)	3.80 (1.19)	4.43 (0.93)	4.05 (0.92)	4.42 (0.86)	87.88 (0.92)
Germany	36.71 (12.02)	5.00 (0.86)	3.16 (1.03)	4.01 (1.11)	4.65 (0.85)	4.34 (0.85)	4.34 (0.79)	75.76 (3.67)
Japan	44.57 (11.24)	4.12 (1.01)	3.79 (0.96)	3.12 (0.88)	3.37 (0.91)	3.54 (0.75)	3.63 (0.73)	43.60 (0.80)
Mexico	37.23 (13.56)	5.33 (0.78)	3.58 (0.97)	3.70 (1.14)	4.89 (0.74)	4.79 (0.78)	4.61 (0.82)	82.41 (0.00)
Poland	30.99 (7.23)	5.08 (0.85)	3.51 (0.95)	3.91 (0.99)	4.43 (0.85)	4.22 (0.80)	4.30 (0.73)	80.29 (5.66)
Sweden	46.45 (12.19)	4.96 (0.87)	2.91 (1.02)	4.21 (1.01)	4.45 (0.90)	4.53 (0.77)	4.72 (0.71)	64.71 (0.75)
Switzerland	43.26 (17.57)	5.05 (0.80)	2.94 (1.00)	4.20 (1.04)	4.52 (0.83)	4.53 (0.79)	4.39 (0.78)	72.86 (1.78)
Turkey	32.50 (10.94)	5.28 (0.74)	3.42 (1.02)	4.49 (1.00)	4.72 (0.80)	4.50 (0.80)	4.40 (0.82)	75.94 (0.14)
United Kingdom	39.79 (12.65)	5.21 (0.81)	3.35 (1.01)	3.86 (1.08)	4.56 (0.84)	4.39 (0.81)	4.49 (0.78)	79.40 (1.37)
United States	42.91 (14.83)	5.15 (0.89)	3.43 (1.02)	3.82 (1.20)	4.65 (0.84)	4.52 (0.79)	4.57 (0.79)	72.69 (0.00)
Total	**39.38 (13.87)**	**5.05 (0.90)**	**3.32 (1.05)**	**3.96 (1.14)**	**4.53 (0.93)**	**4.34 (0.89)**	**4.42 (0.83)**	**75.08 (12.11)**

Note. The table shows means and standard deviations for the original composite personality scale scores (not for the aligned personality scale scores). N = neuroticism, E = extraversion, O = openness, C = conscientiousness, A = agreeableness, SI = stringency index

Linear mixed models - Tables

Tables E6-E10 show the estimated parameters of the study's linear mixed models.

Table E6

Fixed and random effects of the linear mixed model predicting aligned neuroticism scores

Parameter	β	β CI 95%	b	b CI 95%	b SE	t	df	p
Intercept	-0.297	[-0.541, -0.053]	4.696	[4.469, 4.922]	0.108	43.553	18.078	<.001
PSM-TM	0.075	[0.030, 0.119]	0.068	[0.027, 0.108]	0.019	3.621	13.454	.003
PSM-TH	-0.039	[-0.062, -0.016]	-0.035	[-0.056, -0.014]	0.011	-3.292	61830.816	.001
SI	-0.047	[-0.080, -0.014]	-0.043	[-0.073, -0.013]	0.015	-2.826	3134.668	.005
PSM-TM × SI	-0.002	[-0.039, 0.035]	-0.002	[-0.035, 0.031]	0.016	-0.123	14.922	.904
PSM-TH × SI	0.005	[-0.018, 0.028]	0.005	[-0.016, 0.025]	0.011	0.437	59785.749	.662
Health-risk - Not sure	0.091	[0.055, 0.126]	0.082	[0.050, 0.114]	0.016	5.047	62135.394	<.001
Health-risk - No	-0.074	[-0.096, -0.051]	-0.067	[-0.087, -0.047]	0.010	-6.525	60261.696	<.001
PSM-TM × Health-risk - Not sure	-0.081	[-0.138, -0.024]	-0.073	[-0.125, -0.021]	0.026	-2.768	60891.121	.006
PSM-TH × Health-risk - Not sure	-0.032	[-0.109, 0.046]	-0.029	[-0.099, 0.042]	0.036	-0.799	62184.076	.424
PSM-TM × Health-risk - No	-0.055	[-0.091, -0.019]	-0.050	[-0.082, -0.017]	0.017	-3.000	48897.202	.003
PSM-TH × Health-risk - No	0.007	[-0.038, 0.053]	0.006	[-0.035, 0.048]	0.021	0.306	62187.073	.760
Gender - Female	0.383	[0.367, 0.398]	0.347	[0.333, 0.361]	0.007	48.984	62183.386	<.001
Gender - Other/would rather not say	0.358	[0.301, 0.415]	0.324	[0.273, 0.376]	0.026	12.264	62187.957	<.001
Age	-0.172	[-0.179, -0.165]	-0.011	[-0.012, -0.011]	0.000	-47.341	61969.144	<.001
Education – up to 6 years of school	0.011	[-0.057, 0.078]	0.010	[-0.051, 0.071]	0.031	0.312	62179.862	.755
Education – up to 9 years of school	0.051	[-0.022, 0.123]	0.046	[-0.020, 0.112]	0.034	1.364	62178.400	.173
Education – up to 12 years of school	0.017	[-0.038, 0.073]	0.016	[-0.035, 0.066]	0.026	0.609	62181.921	.542
Education - Some college	-0.062	[-0.117, -0.007]	-0.056	[-0.106, -0.006]	0.025	-2.215	62186.286	.027
Education - College degree	-0.068	[-0.121, -0.014]	-0.061	[-0.110, -0.013]	0.025	-2.479	62188.148	.013
Education - PhD	-0.082	[-0.140, -0.025]	-0.075	[-0.127, -0.023]	0.027	-2.808	62192.259	.005
Isolation - Isolated	0.102	[0.088, 0.117]	0.093	[0.080, 0.106]	0.007	14.144	62140.383	<.001
Compliance	0.008	[0.001, 0.015]	0.008	[0.001, 0.015]	0.004	2.273	62129.958	.023
Extraversion	-0.116	[-0.124, -0.109]	-0.106	[-0.112, -0.099]	0.003	-31.722	62194.848	<.001
Openness	0.020	[0.013, 0.027]	0.021	[0.013, 0.029]	0.004	5.392	62194.260	<.001
Conscientiousness	-0.113	[-0.120, -0.105]	-0.139	[-0.148, -0.129]	0.005	-29.130	62157.851	<.001
Agreeableness	-0.114	[-0.121, -0.107]	-0.145	[-0.154, -0.136]	0.005	-31.715	62196.153	<.001
SD (Intercept)	0.431		0.391					
SD (PSM-TM)	0.063		0.057					
Cor (Intercept - PSM-TM)	0.367		0.367					
SD (Residual)	0.809		0.734					

Note. PSM-TM – regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too mild/too little and appropriate groups, PSM-TH - regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too harsh/too much and appropriate groups, SI - stringency index, SD – standard deviation, Cor - correlation. The reference group for Gender - male, for Education - no education, for Health-risk - yes (i.e., the person or their close relations are in a high-risk group for coronavirus), and for Isolation - not isolated

Table E7

Fixed and random effects of the linear mixed model predicting aligned extraversion scores

Parameter	β	β CI 95%	b	b CI 95%	b SE	t	df	p
Intercept	-0.147	[-0.301, 0.008]	1.813	[1.643, 1.984]	0.084	21.669	33.000	<.001
PSM-TM	-0.026	[-0.046, -0.006]	-0.026	[-0.046, -0.006]	0.010	-2.556	8736.134	.011
PSM-TH	0.058	[0.018, 0.098]	0.058	[0.018, 0.098]	0.019	3.043	20.152	.006
SI	0.004	[-0.031, 0.039]	0.004	[-0.031, 0.039]	0.018	0.208	1947.704	.835
PSM-TM × SI	-0.005	[-0.021, 0.011]	-0.005	[-0.021, 0.011]	0.008	-0.604	31521.729	.546
PSM-TH × SI	0.005	[-0.028, 0.038]	0.005	[-0.028, 0.038]	0.016	0.291	21.714	.774
Health-risk - Not sure	-0.053	[-0.091, -0.015]	-0.053	[-0.091, -0.015]	0.019	-2.729	61534.723	.006
Health-risk - No	0.053	[0.014, 0.092]	0.053	[0.014, 0.092]	0.018	2.904	14.776	.011
PSM-TM × Health-risk - Not sure	0.072	[0.011, 0.134]	0.072	[0.011, 0.134]	0.031	2.298	62059.379	.022
PSM-TH × Health-risk - Not sure	0.044	[-0.041, 0.128]	0.044	[-0.041, 0.128]	0.043	1.016	50584.828	.310
PSM-TM × Health-risk - No	0.042	[0.002, 0.083]	0.042	[0.002, 0.083]	0.021	2.048	2241.051	.041
PSM-TH × Health-risk - No	-0.039	[-0.089, 0.012]	-0.039	[-0.089, 0.012]	0.026	-1.505	11805.841	.132
Gender - Female	0.215	[0.198, 0.232]	0.215	[0.198, 0.232]	0.009	25.076	62016.709	<.001
Gender - Other/would rather not say	-0.185	[-0.247, -0.123]	-0.185	[-0.247, -0.123]	0.032	-5.847	62181.041	<.001
Age	0.045	[0.037, 0.053]	0.003	[0.003, 0.004]	0.000	11.297	60467.515	<.001
Education – up to 6 years of school	0.077	[0.004, 0.150]	0.077	[0.004, 0.150]	0.037	2.070	62177.502	.038
Education – up to 9 years of school	0.095	[0.017, 0.174]	0.095	[0.017, 0.174]	0.040	2.372	62174.000	.018
Education – up to 12 years of school	0.070	[0.010, 0.130]	0.070	[0.010, 0.130]	0.031	2.273	62179.258	.023
Education - Some college	0.044	[-0.015, 0.104]	0.044	[-0.015, 0.104]	0.030	1.453	62181.218	.146
Education - College degree	0.057	[-0.001, 0.115]	0.057	[-0.001, 0.115]	0.030	1.932	62185.715	.053
Education - PhD	-0.010	[-0.072, 0.052]	-0.010	[-0.072, 0.052]	0.032	-0.320	62179.308	.749
Isolation - Isolated	0.055	[0.040, 0.071]	0.055	[0.040, 0.071]	0.008	7.031	62107.494	<.001
Compliance	-0.021	[-0.029, -0.014]	-0.024	[-0.032, -0.015]	0.004	-5.408	62062.254	<.001
Neuroticism	-0.137	[-0.146, -0.129]	-0.151	[-0.161, -0.142]	0.005	-31.850	61960.774	<.001
Openness	0.150	[0.142, 0.158]	0.177	[0.168, 0.186]	0.005	38.175	62085.973	<.001
Conscientiousness	0.108	[0.100, 0.116]	0.147	[0.136, 0.158]	0.006	25.840	61917.602	<.001
Agreeableness	0.173	[0.165, 0.180]	0.243	[0.232, 0.253]	0.005	44.685	62094.298	<.001
SD (Intercept)	0.260		0.260					
SD (PSM-TH)	0.045		0.045					
SD (Health-risk - No)	0.044		0.044					
Cor (Intercept - PSM-TH)	-0.633		-0.633					
Cor (Intercept - Health-risk - No)	0.239		0.240					
Cor (PSM-TH - Health-risk - No)	-0.468		-0.468					
SD (Residual)	0.877		0.877					

Note. PSM-TM – regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too mild/too little and appropriate groups, PSM-TH - regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too harsh/too much and appropriate groups, SI - stringency index, SD – standard deviation, Cor - correlation. The reference group for Gender - male, for Education - no education, for Health-risk - yes (i.e., the person or their close relations are in a high-risk group for coronavirus), and for Isolation - not isolated

Table E8

Fixed and random effects of the linear mixed model predicting aligned openness scores

Parameter	β	β CI 95%	b	b CI 95%	b SE	t	df	p
Intercept	-0.160	[-0.399, 0.079]	2.317	[2.107, 2.527]	0.101	22.962	20.238	<.001
PSM-TM	0.073	[0.028, 0.118]	0.062	[0.024, 0.100]	0.018	3.479	14.010	.004
PSM-TH	0.001	[-0.024, 0.026]	0.001	[-0.020, 0.022]	0.011	0.093	58676.016	.926
SI	-0.017	[-0.053, 0.019]	-0.014	[-0.045, 0.016]	0.016	-0.912	3059.976	.362
PSM-TM × SI	0.026	[-0.012, 0.065]	0.022	[-0.010, 0.055]	0.015	1.485	13.037	.161
PSM-TH × SI	0.028	[0.003, 0.053]	0.024	[0.003, 0.045]	0.011	2.211	59988.271	.027
Health-risk - Not sure	-0.017	[-0.056, 0.021]	-0.014	[-0.047, 0.018]	0.017	-0.873	61435.854	.382
Health-risk - No	-0.058	[-0.097, -0.018]	-0.049	[-0.082, -0.015]	0.016	-3.067	16.600	.007
PSM-TM × Health-risk - Not sure	-0.006	[-0.069, 0.056]	-0.005	[-0.058, 0.047]	0.027	-0.204	60468.577	.839
PSM-TH × Health-risk - Not sure	0.070	[-0.015, 0.154]	0.059	[-0.013, 0.131]	0.037	1.606	62175.907	.108
PSM-TM × Health-risk - No	-0.021	[-0.063, 0.021]	-0.018	[-0.053, 0.018]	0.018	-0.986	1776.853	.324
PSM-TH × Health-risk - No	0.012	[-0.039, 0.062]	0.010	[-0.033, 0.052]	0.022	0.449	37854.611	.653
Gender - Female	-0.101	[-0.118, -0.084]	-0.086	[-0.100, -0.071]	0.007	-11.655	62185.746	<.001
Gender - Other/would rather not say	0.301	[0.239, 0.364]	0.255	[0.202, 0.308]	0.027	9.454	62184.312	<.001
Age	0.005	[-0.003, 0.013]	0.000	[-0.000, 0.001]	0.000	1.211	61949.966	.226
Education – up to 6 years of school	-0.011	[-0.084, 0.063]	-0.009	[-0.072, 0.053]	0.032	-0.286	62171.435	.775
Education – up to 9 years of school	-0.030	[-0.109, 0.050]	-0.025	[-0.092, 0.042]	0.034	-0.731	62165.682	.465
Education – up to 12 years of school	0.020	[-0.041, 0.080]	0.017	[-0.035, 0.068]	0.026	0.633	62172.435	.527
Education - Some college	0.181	[0.121, 0.240]	0.153	[0.102, 0.204]	0.026	5.906	62178.724	<.001
Education - College degree	0.167	[0.109, 0.225]	0.141	[0.092, 0.191]	0.025	5.598	62182.827	<.001
Education - PhD	0.256	[0.193, 0.319]	0.217	[0.163, 0.270]	0.027	7.995	62192.884	<.001
Isolation - Isolated	0.073	[0.057, 0.088]	0.062	[0.049, 0.075]	0.007	9.201	62046.926	<.001
Compliance	0.092	[0.084, 0.100]	0.086	[0.079, 0.093]	0.004	23.260	62136.276	<.001
Neuroticism	0.024	[0.015, 0.032]	0.022	[0.014, 0.030]	0.004	5.379	62149.482	<.001
Extraversion	0.152	[0.145, 0.160]	0.129	[0.122, 0.136]	0.003	38.169	62192.251	<.001
Conscientiousness	0.088	[0.080, 0.096]	0.101	[0.092, 0.111]	0.005	20.809	62182.056	<.001
Agreeableness	0.056	[0.048, 0.063]	0.066	[0.057, 0.075]	0.005	14.068	62183.083	<.001
SD (Intercept)	0.420		0.355					
SD (PSM-TM)	0.062		0.053					
SD (Health-risk - No)	0.046		0.039					
Cor (Intercept - PSM-TM)	-0.366		-0.366					
Cor (Intercept - Health-risk - No)	0.186		0.186					
Cor (PSM-TM - Health-risk - No)	-0.197		-0.197					
SD (Residual)	0.884		0.748					

Note. PSM-TM – regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too mild/too little and appropriate groups, PSM-TH - regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too harsh/too much and appropriate groups, SI - stringency index, SD – standard deviation, Cor - correlation. The reference group for Gender - male, for Education - no education, for Health-risk - yes (i.e., the person or their close relations are in a high-risk group for coronavirus), and for Isolation - not isolated

Table E9

Fixed and random effects of the linear mixed model predicting aligned conscientiousness scores

Parameter	β	β CI 95%	b	b CI 95%	b SE	t	df	p
Intercept	-0.181	[-0.480, 0.119]	2.175	[1.950, 2.400]	0.107	20.351	17.302	<.001
PSM-TM	0.020	[-0.039, 0.079]	0.015	[-0.029, 0.058]	0.020	0.737	12.253	.475
PSM-TH	0.091	[0.067, 0.115]	0.067	[0.049, 0.084]	0.009	7.462	62085.311	<.001
SI	0.024	[-0.011, 0.059]	0.018	[-0.008, 0.043]	0.013	1.340	4170.164	.180
PSM-TM × SI	-0.006	[-0.047, 0.034]	-0.005	[-0.035, 0.025]	0.014	-0.333	18.741	.743
PSM-TH × SI	-0.014	[-0.038, 0.010]	-0.010	[-0.028, 0.007]	0.009	-1.168	61178.754	.243
Health-risk - Not sure	-0.090	[-0.126, -0.053]	-0.066	[-0.093, -0.039]	0.014	-4.848	62177.087	<.001
Health-risk - No	0.036	[0.013, 0.058]	0.026	[0.009, 0.043]	0.009	3.065	61525.262	.002
PSM-TM × Health-risk - Not sure	0.008	[-0.051, 0.066]	0.006	[-0.038, 0.049]	0.022	0.254	61488.588	.799
PSM-TH × Health-risk - Not sure	-0.032	[-0.112, 0.048]	-0.023	[-0.082, 0.035]	0.030	-0.780	62181.924	.435
PSM-TM × Health-risk - No	0.015	[-0.023, 0.052]	0.011	[-0.017, 0.038]	0.014	0.770	54405.957	.441
PSM-TH × Health-risk - No	0.070	[0.023, 0.117]	0.051	[0.017, 0.086]	0.018	2.903	62188.046	.004
Gender - Female	0.235	[0.219, 0.251]	0.173	[0.161, 0.185]	0.006	28.851	62193.696	<.001
Gender - Other/would rather not say	-0.003	[-0.062, 0.056]	-0.002	[-0.045, 0.041]	0.022	-0.091	62186.107	.928
Age	0.109	[0.102, 0.117]	0.006	[0.005, 0.006]	0.000	28.787	62123.204	<.001
Education – up to 6 years of school	0.061	[-0.009, 0.130]	0.045	[-0.007, 0.096]	0.026	1.709	62180.727	.087
Education – up to 9 years of school	0.046	[-0.029, 0.121]	0.034	[-0.021, 0.089]	0.028	1.201	62178.517	.230
Education – up to 12 years of school	0.013	[-0.044, 0.070]	0.010	[-0.033, 0.052]	0.022	0.445	62181.667	.656
Education - Some college	-0.057	[-0.114, -0.001]	-0.042	[-0.084, -0.001]	0.021	-1.985	62184.316	.047
Education - College degree	0.081	[0.026, 0.136]	0.060	[0.019, 0.100]	0.021	2.878	62186.152	.004
Education - PhD	0.220	[0.160, 0.279]	0.162	[0.118, 0.205]	0.022	7.273	62190.009	<.001
Isolation - Isolated	-0.075	[-0.090, -0.060]	-0.055	[-0.066, -0.044]	0.006	-10.023	62131.290	<.001
Compliance	0.140	[0.132, 0.147]	0.114	[0.108, 0.120]	0.003	37.674	62169.828	<.001
Neuroticism	-0.120	[-0.128, -0.112]	-0.097	[-0.104, -0.091]	0.003	-29.136	62159.003	<.001
Extraversion	0.098	[0.091, 0.106]	0.072	[0.067, 0.078]	0.003	25.892	62191.373	<.001
Openness	0.079	[0.071, 0.086]	0.068	[0.062, 0.075]	0.003	20.815	62197.133	<.001
Agreeableness	0.111	[0.104, 0.118]	0.115	[0.107, 0.122]	0.004	29.875	62183.478	<.001
SD (Intercept)	0.533		0.392					
SD (PSM-TM)	0.092		0.067					
Cor (Intercept - PSM-TM)	-0.674		-0.674					
SD (Residual)	0.834		0.614					

Note. PSM-TM – regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too mild/too little and appropriate groups, PSM-TH - regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too harsh/too much and appropriate groups, SI - stringency index, SD – standard deviation, Cor - correlation. The reference group for Gender - male, for Education - no education, for Health-risk - yes (i.e., the person or their close relations are in a high-risk group for coronavirus), and for Isolation - not isolated

Table E10

Fixed and random effects of the linear mixed model predicting aligned agreeableness scores

Parameter	β	β CI 95%	b	b CI 95%	b SE	t	df	p
Intercept	-0.132	[-0.361, 0.097]	2.936	[2.766, 3.106]	0.082	35.991	20.676	<.001
PSM-TM	-0.064	[-0.085, -0.044]	-0.046	[-0.060, -0.031]	0.007	-6.244	62201.858	<.001
PSM-TH	-0.018	[-0.044, 0.008]	-0.013	[-0.031, 0.005]	0.009	-1.382	62192.987	.167
SI	-0.019	[-0.055, 0.017]	-0.014	[-0.039, 0.012]	0.013	-1.048	15317.747	.295
PSM-TM × SI	0.008	[-0.009, 0.024]	0.005	[-0.006, 0.017]	0.006	0.921	62193.838	.357
PSM-TH × SI	0.006	[-0.019, 0.031]	0.004	[-0.014, 0.022]	0.009	0.475	62200.516	.635
Health-risk - Not sure	-0.007	[-0.046, 0.032]	-0.005	[-0.033, 0.023]	0.014	-0.350	62188.899	.726
Health-risk - No	-0.008	[-0.033, 0.016]	-0.006	[-0.023, 0.011]	0.009	-0.668	62191.933	.504
PSM-TM × Health-risk - Not sure	-0.052	[-0.115, 0.011]	-0.037	[-0.082, 0.008]	0.023	-1.622	62188.409	.105
PSM-TH × Health-risk - Not sure	0.023	[-0.063, 0.109]	0.016	[-0.045, 0.077]	0.031	0.524	62188.268	.601
PSM-TM × Health-risk - No	-0.023	[-0.062, 0.016]	-0.016	[-0.044, 0.012]	0.014	-1.147	62188.735	.251
PSM-TH × Health-risk - No	0.013	[-0.037, 0.064]	0.009	[-0.026, 0.045]	0.018	0.518	62189.110	.604
Gender - Female	0.132	[0.115, 0.150]	0.094	[0.082, 0.107]	0.006	15.088	62197.373	<.001
Gender - Other/would rather not say	-0.002	[-0.065, 0.062]	-0.001	[-0.046, 0.044]	0.023	-0.050	62188.875	.960
Age	-0.050	[-0.058, -0.042]	-0.003	[-0.003, -0.002]	0.000	-12.212	62201.612	<.001
Education – up to 6 years of school	0.020	[-0.055, 0.095]	0.014	[-0.039, 0.067]	0.027	0.527	62189.692	.598
Education – up to 9 years of school	-0.054	[-0.135, 0.026]	-0.039	[-0.096, 0.018]	0.029	-1.326	62188.934	.185
Education – up to 12 years of school	-0.032	[-0.094, 0.030]	-0.023	[-0.067, 0.021]	0.022	-1.019	62191.594	.308
Education - Some college	-0.024	[-0.085, 0.036]	-0.017	[-0.060, 0.026]	0.022	-0.782	62190.753	.434
Education - College degree	-0.064	[-0.123, -0.005]	-0.046	[-0.088, -0.003]	0.022	-2.121	62190.985	.034
Education - PhD	-0.084	[-0.147, -0.020]	-0.060	[-0.105, -0.014]	0.023	-2.582	62194.282	.010
Isolation - Isolated	0.002	[-0.013, 0.018]	0.002	[-0.010, 0.013]	0.006	0.285	62200.355	.776
Compliance	0.114	[0.106, 0.122]	0.090	[0.084, 0.096]	0.003	28.669	62195.871	<.001
Neuroticism	-0.139	[-0.148, -0.131]	-0.109	[-0.116, -0.103]	0.003	-31.677	62200.883	<.001
Extraversion	0.180	[0.172, 0.188]	0.128	[0.123, 0.134]	0.003	44.707	62195.591	<.001
Openness	0.057	[0.049, 0.065]	0.048	[0.041, 0.055]	0.003	14.113	62201.970	<.001
Conscientiousness	0.127	[0.119, 0.136]	0.123	[0.115, 0.131]	0.004	29.842	62189.570	<.001
SD (Intercept)	0.402		0.286					
SD (Residual)	0.895		0.637					

Note. PSM-TM – regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too mild/too little and appropriate groups, PSM-TH - regression coefficient illustrating the difference between too harsh/too much and appropriate groups, SI - stringency index, SD – standard deviation, Cor - correlation. The reference group for Gender - male, for Education - no education, for Health-risk - yes (i.e., the person or their close relations are in a high-risk group for coronavirus), and for Isolation - not isolated

Table E11 shows the estimated marginal means of aligned personality scores and post-hoc tests

between groups of PSM for significant interactions (PSM and health-risk for neuroticism,

extraversion, and conscientiousness, and PSM and stringency index for openness).

Table E11

*Estimated marginal means (unstandardized) of aligned personality scores, their standard errors,
and post-hoc tests for significant interactions with PSM*

			Perception of strictness of COVID-19 measures						
			Appropriate (1)		Too mild (2)		Too harsh (3)		
	Interaction with	Levels	M	SE	M	SE	M	SE	Significant differences
Neuroticism	Health-risk	Yes	3.087	0.102	3.155	0.108	3.052	0.102	1-2**, 1-3**, 2-3**
		Not sure	3.169	0.103	3.164	0.110	3.106	0.106	-
		No	3.021	0.102	3.038	0.109	2.992	0.103	-
Extraversion	Health-risk	Yes	3.758	0.069	3.732	0.069	3.816	0.063	1-2*, 1-3**, 2-3**
		Not sure	3.705	0.071	3.751	0.072	3.807	0.072	1-3*
		No	3.811	0.073	3.827	0.074	3.831	0.068	-
Openness	Stringency Index	Low (SI=63)	4.144	0.095	4.176	0.091	4.144	0.096	-
		Mid (SI=75)	4.130	0.093	4.184	0.090	4.153	0.094	1-2*
		High (SI=87)	4.116	0.094	4.192	0.091	4.163	0.095	1-2**, 1-3*
Conscientiousness	Health-risk	Yes	3.784	0.102	3.798	0.091	3.850	0.102	1-3**, 2-3*
		Not sure	3.718	0.102	3.738	0.092	3.761	0.105	-
		No	3.810	0.102	3.835	0.092	3.928	0.102	1-3**, 2-3**

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; marginal means were estimated across all levels of categorical covariates while keeping the numerical covariates fixed at their mean values; p-values were adjusted via the Tukey post-hoc test

Tables E12-16 show estimated random PSM-TM and PSM-TH effects across countries.

Table E12

Estimated random intercepts, PSM-TM and PSM-TH coefficients for different countries when predicting aligned neuroticism scores (unstandardized)

Country	Intercept	PSM-TM	PSM-TH
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4.282	0.041	-0.035
Bulgaria	4.441	-0.020	-0.035
Croatia	4.363	0.026	-0.035
Czech Republic	4.579	0.065	-0.035
Finland	4.295	0.042	-0.035
France	5.051	0.126	-0.035
Germany	4.666	0.046	-0.035
Japan	5.106	0.093	-0.035
Mexico	5.500	0.064	-0.035
Poland	4.342	0.041	-0.035
Sweden	4.587	0.073	-0.035
Switzerland	4.736	0.092	-0.035
Turkey	4.372	0.060	-0.035
United Kingdom	4.777	0.181	-0.035
United States	5.344	0.084	-0.035

Note. The random coefficients were calculated by summing the fixed effects and their respective random effects. A constant fixed effect is shown across countries when random effects were not significant.

Table E13

Estimated random intercepts, PSM-TM and PSM-TH coefficients for different countries when predicting aligned extraversion scores (unstandardized)

Country	Intercept	PSM-TM	PSM-TH
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.205	-0.026	0.012
Bulgaria	1.748	-0.026	0.055
Croatia	2.113	-0.026	0.042
Czech Republic	2.068	-0.026	0.039
Finland	1.739	-0.026	0.101
France	1.290	-0.026	0.112
Germany	1.569	-0.026	0.101
Japan	1.706	-0.026	0.070
Mexico	1.964	-0.026	-0.015
Poland	2.064	-0.026	0.027
Sweden	1.976	-0.026	0.067
Switzerland	1.528	-0.026	0.081
Turkey	1.945	-0.026	0.039
United Kingdom	1.597	-0.026	0.077
United States	1.691	-0.026	0.068

Note. The random coefficients were calculated by summing the fixed effects and their respective random effects. A constant fixed effect is shown across countries when random effects were not significant.

Table E14

Estimated random intercepts, PSM-TM and PSM-TH coefficients for different countries when predicting aligned openness scores (unstandardized)

Country	Intercept	PSM-TM	PSM-TH
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.509	0.084	0.001
Bulgaria	2.666	0.106	0.001
Croatia	2.352	0.087	0.001
Czech Republic	2.567	0.066	0.001
Finland	2.557	0.013	0.001
France	2.003	0.101	0.001
Germany	2.918	0.009	0.001
Japan	1.822	0.058	0.001
Mexico	2.632	-0.012	0.001
Poland	2.133	0.069	0.001
Sweden	2.322	0.078	0.001
Switzerland	2.571	0.029	0.001
Turkey	1.733	0.061	0.001
United Kingdom	2.062	0.039	0.001
United States	1.907	0.143	0.001

Note. The random coefficients were calculated by summing the fixed effects and their respective random effects. A constant fixed effect is shown across countries when random effects were not significant.

Table E15

Estimated random intercepts, PSM-TM and PSM-TH coefficients for different countries when predicting aligned conscientiousness scores (unstandardized)

Country	Intercept	PSM-TM	PSM-TH
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.293	0.003	0.067
Bulgaria	1.893	0.072	0.067
Croatia	2.227	0.034	0.067
Czech Republic	1.108	0.147	0.067
Finland	2.168	0.080	0.067
France	1.901	-0.028	0.067
Germany	2.203	-0.007	0.067
Japan	2.421	-0.004	0.067
Mexico	2.456	0.037	0.067
Poland	2.331	-0.007	0.067
Sweden	1.983	0.076	0.067
Switzerland	2.231	-0.051	0.067
Turkey	2.963	-0.085	0.067
United Kingdom	2.265	-0.011	0.067
United States	2.178	-0.037	0.067

Note. The random coefficients were calculated by summing the fixed effects and their respective random effects. A constant fixed effect is shown across countries when random effects were not significant.

Table E16

Estimated random intercepts, PSM-TM and PSM-TH coefficients for different countries when predicting aligned agreeableness scores (unstandardized)

Country	Intercept	PSM-TM	PSM-TH
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.823	-0.046	-0.013
Bulgaria	2.715	-0.046	-0.013
Croatia	2.515	-0.046	-0.013
Czech Republic	2.658	-0.046	-0.013
Finland	2.832	-0.046	-0.013
France	3.528	-0.046	-0.013
Germany	2.835	-0.046	-0.013
Japan	3.228	-0.046	-0.013
Mexico	3.112	-0.046	-0.013
Poland	2.624	-0.046	-0.013
Sweden	3.257	-0.046	-0.013
Switzerland	3.103	-0.046	-0.013
Turkey	2.681	-0.046	-0.013
United Kingdom	3.009	-0.046	-0.013
United States	3.124	-0.046	-0.013

Note. The random coefficients were calculated by summing the fixed effects and their respective random effects. A constant fixed effect is shown across countries when random effects were not significant.

References

Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2014). Multiple-Group Factor Analysis Alignment. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *21*(4), 495–508. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.919210

Bates, D., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., & Baayen, H. (2018). Parsimonious Mixed Models. *ArXiv:1506.04967 [Stat]*. http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.04967

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using **lme4**. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

Byrne, B. M., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2017). The maximum likelihood alignment approach to testing for approximate measurement invariance: A paradigmatic cross-cultural application. *Psicothema*, *29*(4), 539–551. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2017.178

Firke, S. (2021). *janitor: Simple tools for examining and cleaning dirty data* (R package version 2.1.0). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=janitor

Fischer, R., & Karl, J. A. (2019). A Primer to (Cross-Cultural) Multi-Group Invariance Testing Possibilities in R. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1507. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01507

Han, H. (2021). Exploring the association between compliance with measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and big five traits with Bayesian generalized linear model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *176*, 110787. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110787

Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2021). *semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling* (R package version 0.5-5.912). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). **lmerTest** Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *82*(13). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13

Lenth, R. V. (2021). *emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means* (R package

    version 1.7.0). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans

Muthén, B., & Asparouhov, T. (2014). IRT studies of many groups: The alignment method.

    Frontiers in Psychology, *5*, 978. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00978

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for

    Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

Revelle, W. (2022). *psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*

    (R package version 2.2.9). Northwestern University. https://CRAN.R-

    project.org/package=psych

Robitzsch, A. (2021). *sirt: Supplementary item response theory models* (R package version 3.10-

    118). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sirt

Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical*

    Software, *48*(2), 1–36.

Rutkowski, L., & Svetina, D. (2014). Assessing the Hypothesis of Measurement Invariance in the

    Context of Large-Scale International Surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*,

    74(1), 31–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413498257

Rutkowski, L., & Svetina, D. (2017). Measurement Invariance in International Surveys: Categorical

    Indicators and Fit Measure Performance. *Applied Measurement in Education*, *30*(1), 39–51.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2016.1243540

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., Grolemund, G.,

    Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T. L., Miller, E., Bache, S. M., Müller,

    K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D. P., Spinu, V., … Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the

    tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *4*(43), 1686.

    https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686