20 **S3 Table. Summary of model fit and model comparison statistics for nested longitudinal mediation analysis models (N=751).**

| Model | $\chi^2$ (df) | CFI | SRMR | RMSEA [90% CI] | Model Comparison (Pass?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Full forward cross-lagged panel model + contemporaneous mediation paths; all paths freely estimated. | 212.67 (104)*** | .982 | .043 | .037 [.030, .044] | n/a |
| 2. Only first-order stability and cross-lagged panel + contemporaneous mediation; all paths freely estimated. | 827.29 (296)*** | .914 | .084 | .049 [.045, .053] | 1 vs 2 (No) |
| 3. First- and higher-order stability, but first-order cross-lagged + contemporaneous mediation; all paths freely estimated. | 418.88 (260)*** | .974 | .052 | .029 [.023, .033] | 1 vs 3 (Yes) |
| 4. First-order stability, but first- and higher-order cross-lagged + contemporaneous mediation; all paths freely estimated. | 563.51 (140)*** | .931 | .056 | .063 [.058, .069] | 1 vs 4 (No) |
| 5. Full forward cross-lagged panel model + no contemporaneous mediation; all paths freely estimated. | 698.22 (158)*** | .912 | .074 | .067 [.062, .073] | 1 vs 5 (No) |
| 6. First- and higher-order stability, but first-order cross-lagged + contemporaneous mediation; invariance of cross-lagged paths across time (developmental equilibrium). | 521.75 (342)*** | .971 | .056 | .026 [.022, .031] | 3 vs 6 (Yes) |
| 7. First- and higher-order stability, but first-order cross-lagged + contemporaneous mediation; invariance of cross-lagged and stability paths across time (developmental + stability equilibrium). | 675.61 (378)*** | .952 | .068 | .032 [.028, .036] | 6 vs 7 (No) |
| 8. First- and higher-order stability, but first-order cross-lagged + contemporaneous mediation; invariance of cross-lagged and contemporaneous paths across time (developmental + contemporaneous equilibrium). | 608.65 (387)*** | .964 | .060 | .028 [.023, .032] | 6 vs 8 (Yes) |

21 S3 Table Notes: Model 1 T-size results for equivalent testing were as follows (*a*) CFI = .970 and (*b*) RMSEA = .045; Model 1 T-size
22 results relative to descriptive cutoff values were as follows for CFI (*a*) Excellent = .989, (*b*) Close = .950, (*c*) Fair = .920 and for
23 RMSEA (*a*) Excellent = .022, (*b*) Close = .057, (*c*) Fair = .087; Model 8 T-Size results for equivalent testing were as follows (*a*) CFI =
24 .946 and (*b*) RMSEA = .032; Model 8 T-size results relative to descriptive cutoff values were as follows for CFI (*a*) Excellent = .985,
25 (*b*) Close = .942, (*c*) Fair = .909 and for RMSEA (*a*) Excellent = .017, (*b*) Close = .055, (*c*) Fair = .088.
26 ***$p \leq .001$
27