

Electronic Supplementary Material 3 to the article *Civic identity in emerging adulthood: Validation of the Civic Identity Status Scale*

Results for the alternative Civic Identity Status Scale structure (without one of the items)

Structure validity

Table S2. *Model fit for the Civic Identity Status Scale*

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	RMSEA [95% CI]	CFI	SRMR	gamma hat
1F	603.13	44	.182 [.169, .195]	.51	.134	.790
2F (commitment)	458.27	43	.161 [.148, .175]	.63	.125	.830
2F (exploration)	502.16	43	.169 [.156, .183]	.59	.131	.815
4F	100.65	38	.067 [.051, .083]	.94	.055	.968

Notes. 1F – single factor solution, 2F – two factor solutions based on the presence of commitment or exploration (present/absent), 4F – four factor solution (achievement, moratorium, diffusion, and foreclosure)

Criterion validity

Table S3. Correlation and regression coefficients of the CISS factor scores on types of civic engagement, political interest, trust, and self-efficacy

	Achieved			Diffused			Moratorium			Foreclosed		
	<i>r/b</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	<i>r/b</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	<i>r/b</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	<i>r/b</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Correlation												
overall eng.	.38	< .001	[.23, .45]	-.30	< .001	[-.37, -.17]	.06	.43	[-.07, .17]	.19	< .001	[.05, .29]
political	.34	< .001	[.18, .39]	-.21	< .001	[-.27, -.08]	.09	.16	[-.03, .19]	.29	< .001	[.13, .37]
civic	.37	< .001	[.29, .54]	-.35	< .001	[-.51, -.26]	.04	.60	[-.11, .20]	.12	.07	[-.01, .27]
online	.30	< .001	[.16, .40]	-.18	< .001	[-.27, -.07]	.03	.63	[-.09, .15]	.21	< .001	[.06, .34]
offline	.37	< .001	[.24, .46]	-.31	< .001	[-.40, -.18]	.07	.33	[-.07, .19]	.18	< .001	[.05, .30]
interest	.09	.17	[-.07, .41]	-.29	< .001	[-.75, -.31]	.03	.67	[-.21, .32]	-.16	< .001	[-.49, -.08]
trust	.20	< .001	[.13, .44]	-.01	.89	[-.18, .15]	.01	.89	[-.17, .19]	.22	< .001	[.14, .50]
self-efficacy	.25	< .001	[.17, .55]	-.23	< .001	[-.50, -.17]	-.12	.12	[-.38, .04]	.00	.95	[-.18, .17]
Regression												
overall eng.	.37	< .001	[.11, .55]	-.20	.04	[-.34, -.01]	.16	.03	[.02, .27]	-.01	.89	[-.17, .15]
political	.30	.03	[.03, .48]	-.14	.18	[-.29, .05]	.14	.05	[.00, .24]	.13	.18	[-.05, .27]
civic	.35	< .001	[.12, .66]	-.25	.01	[-.48, -.07]	.18	.01	[.04, .35]	-.09	.31	[-.30, .09]
online	.31	.02	[.04, .55]	-.06	.55	[-.25, .13]	.08	.31	[-.07, .21]	.07	.44	[-.11, .24]
offline	.34	< .001	[.09, .55]	-.23	.02	[-.39, -.04]	.19	.01	[.04, .31]	-.03	.75	[-.19, .14]
interest	.12	.36	[-.26, .71]	-.35	< .001	[-1.03, -.26]	.21	< .001	[.10, .66]	-.17	.06	[-.64, .02]
trust	.25	.05	[-.01, .73]	.09	.40	[-.17, .43]	.00	.98	[-.19, .20]	.16	.11	[-.05, .50]
self-efficacy	.34	< .001	[.12, .85]	-.10	.32	[-.43, .14]	.02	.80	[-.18, .24]	-.06	.51	[-.34, .17]

Note. CISS - Civic Identity Status Scale, $N = 415$

Measurement invariance between sociodemographic groupsTable S4. *Measurement invariance for gender*

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	Change (Δ)		
						CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Configural	173.64	76	.918	.084	.067	-	-	-
Weak (vs. configural)	184.06	83	.915	.082	.072	.003	.002	.005
Strong (vs. weak)	191.73	90	.914	.079	.074	.001	.003	.002
Strict (vs. strong)	211.40	101	.907	.077	.074	.007	.001	.001
Equal means (vs. strict)	233.88	105	.891	.082	.083	.016	.005	.009

Note. 200 female vs. 169 male. All χ^2 s significant at $p < .001$.

Table S5. *Measurement invariance for living arrangement*

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	Change (Δ)		
						CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Configural	146.49	76	.940	.071	.066	-	-	-
Weak (vs. configural)	155.48	83	.939	.069	.069	.002	.002	.003
Strong (vs. weak)	163.94	90	.937	.067	.070	.001	.002	.001
Strict (vs. strong)	183.01	101	.930	.067	.070	.007	.000	.001
Equal means (vs. strict)	191.16	105	.927	.067	.073	.004	.000	.003

Note. 228 living with parents vs. 141 living alone. All χ^2 s significant at $p < .001$.

Table S6. *Measurement invariance for educational status*

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	Change (Δ)		
						CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Configural	168.37	76	.923	.082	.062	-	-	-
Weak (vs. configural)	179.13	83	.920	.080	.067	.003	.002	.004
Strong (vs. weak)	186.11	90	.920	.076	.068	.000	.003	.001
Strict (vs. strong)	215.61	101	.905	.079	.068	.015	.002	.000
Equal means (vs. strict)	219.79	105	.905	.077	.069	.000	.001	.001

Note. 317 students vs. 51 non-students. All χ^2 s significant at $p < .001$.

Generalizability across sociodemographic groupsTable S7. *Standardized latent mean differences (Hedge's g) between demographic groups*

	Achieved	Diffused	Moratorium	Foreclosed
Male (vs. female)	-.253*	-.009	.493***	-.135
Living outside the parental home (vs. living with parents)	.037	-.013	.011	-.310**
Students (vs. non-students)	.038	-.285	.256	.038

Note. The latent mean of the first labeled group was subtracted from the latent mean of the second group (in parentheses). Negative g values thus indicate lower means of the first than the second group.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < .001$

Internal consistency

Achieved: $\omega = .728, \alpha = .727$

Diffused: $\omega = .773, \alpha = .766$

Moratorium: $\omega = .706, \alpha = .704$

Foreclosed: $\omega = .735, \alpha = .731$