



Table S1

Distribution of school types in the current sample

School type	Measurement time		
	t ₁	t ₂	t ₃
Elementary school	46.7	3.3	0.2
Lower secondary school	0.5	0.8	1.2
Intermediate secondary school	5.8	11.3	11.8
Integrated lower and intermediate school	3.6	5.0	6.1
Comprehensive school	10.7	24.0	20.6
Waldorf school	1.4	1.5	1.7
Upper secondary school	27.5	51.7	54.8
School for special needs	1.4	1.7	2.4
Other type of school	2.4	0.8	1.2

Note. Percentages are depicted.

Table S2*Results of Latent Change Models for Grades (Math)*

Parameters	Est.	[95% CI]	<i>p</i>
Latent means			
μ_{Baseline}	-.004	[-.075; .067]	.911
μ_{Change}	-.037	[-.088; .014]	.154
Variances			
$\sigma^2_{\text{Baseline}}$.478	[.366; .590]	<.001
σ^2_{Change}	.057	[-.001; .114]	.054
Covariances			
$\sigma^2_{\text{Baseline, Change}}$	-.019	[-.088; .014]	.563
Model fit			
$\chi^2(\text{df})$	1.148 (3), $p = .765$		
CFI	>.999		
RMSEA [90% CI]	<.001 [.000, .041]		
SRMR	.005		

Note. Unstandardized solution from the constant change model. Grades corrected for school type and inverted for better interpretability. Est. = estimate.

Table S3*Results of Latent Change Models for Grades (German)*

Parameters	Est.	[95% CI]	<i>p</i>
Latent means			
μ_{Baseline}	.005	[-.075; .067]	.869
μ_{Change}	-.031	[-.088; .014]	.198
Variances			
$\sigma^2_{\text{Baseline}}$.365	[.366; .590]	<.001
σ^2_{Change}	.052	[-.001; .114]	.040
Covariances			
$\sigma^2_{\text{Baseline, Change}}$	-.018	[-.088; .014]	.514
Model fit			
$\chi^2(\text{df})$	20.658 (3), $p = .765$		
CFI	<.001		
RMSEA [90% CI]	<.001 [.000, .041]		
SRMR	.060		

Note. Unstandardized solution from the constant change model. Grades corrected for school type and inverted for better interpretability. Est. = estimate.

Table S4*Latent change models predicting baseline level and change of grades (math)*

	DV: Baseline		DV: Growth	
	β	p	β	p
Conditional models without latent interaction				
C	.241	<.001	-.031	.810
Gf	.606	<.001	-.095	.501
(Sex)	-.050	.290	.094	.366
(SES)	.114	.070	-.171	.214
$X^2(48) 76.868, p = .006; CFI = .981, RMSEA = .024; SRMR = .031$ $AIC = 35266.456; nBIC = 35464.451$				
Latent interaction model				
C	.246	<.001	-.047	.717
Gf	.600	<.001	-.085	.547
C x Gf	-.104	.043	.227	.098
(Sex)	-.047	.321	.086	.409
(SES)	.119	.056	-.181	.179
$AIC = 35266.840; nBIC = 35474.734$				

Note. Standardized solution from the constant change model. DV = dependent variable; C= conscientiousness; Gf = fluid intelligence;

C x Gf = latent interaction between conscientiousness and fluid intelligence; SES = socioeconomic status (composite measure); CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation;

SRMR = standardized root mean squared residual; AIC = Akaike information criterion; nBIC = Bayesian information criterion corrected for sample size. Grades were corrected for school type and inverted for interpretability.

Table S5*Latent change models predicting baseline level and change of grades (German)*

	DV: Baseline		DV: Change	
	β	p	β	p
Baseline model				
C	.188	.002	.158	.258
Gf	-.391	<.001	-.200	.186
(Sex)	.254	<.001	.133	.231
(SES)	.282	<.001	-.270	.060
$X^2(48 = 92.473, p < .001; CFI = .969, RMSEA = .030; SRMR = .038$ $AIC = 35013.914; nBIC = 35211.908$				
Latent interaction model				
C	.191	.002	.160	.241
Gf	.400	<.001	-.209	.169
C x Gf	.088	.181	-.082	.539
(Sex)	.252	<.001	.135	.222
(SES)	.276	<.001	-.265	.064
$AIC = 35016.273; nBIC = 35224.167$				

Note. Standardized solution from the constant change model. DV = dependent variable; C= conscientiousness; Gf = fluid intelligence;

C x Gf = latent interaction between conscientiousness and fluid intelligence; SES = socioeconomic status (composite measure); CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation;

SRMR = standardized root mean squared residual; AIC = Akaike information criterion; nBIC = Bayesian information criterion corrected for sample size. Grades were corrected for school type and inverted for interpretability.