**Supplemental Materials**

Participants were recruited from both a national sample online (*n* = 388) and a college sample (*n* = 33). To ensure that our sampling strategy did not affect the SEM analysis, we ran all models without the 33 university-recruited participants. Results from models without these participants suggest the same results as the models that include all participants.

**Models with Only the Online Sample**

With the 33 university sample participants removed, the measurement model continued to adequately fit the data, χ2 (8) = 17.38, *p* = .026; RMSEA = .05, 90% CI [.02, .09]; SRMR = .01; CFI = 1.00; TLI = 0.99. Good fit was also indicated in Structural model 0, χ2 (24) = 50.92, *p* = .001; RMSEA = .05, 90% CI [.03, .07]; SRMR = .01; CFI = .991; TLI = .985. For the structural model 1, the log-likelihood ratio test yielded a difference value of *D* = 17.6. It was significant, indicating that the null model (Model 0, no interaction) represented a significant loss of fit relative to the alternative model (Model 1, includes interaction). In summary, results that excluded the university sample are in line with results that included all participants.