To ensure the quality of the data, several steps were taken to determine whom to include in the final sample at W1. First, six respondents were removed from the sample who were deemed to have inaccurate or implausible information (e.g., indicated biological mother whose age suggested giving birth before age 10). Next, consistent with practices employed when using online data collection procedures (Curran, 2016; Huang et al., 2012), several steps were undertaken to screen for potential participants who had provided invalid and/or careless responses. Based on recommendations of expecting participants to take 2 seconds per item (Huang et al., 2012), participants who took less than 30 minutes to complete the survey were excluded (n = 24). Next, potential participants who responded incorrectly to 50% of the eight instructional attention checks (i.e., "items/measures" directing participants to respond in a specific manner; Curran, 2016) were deemed ineligible for inclusion in the final sample (n = 10).

Next, two approaches were employed to screen for random and inconsistent responses to measures. Using the first approach, 30 respondents were excluded from the final sample who provided three or more inconsistent responses to the same or highly similar items across measures in the screening and W1 surveys (e.g., responding with a "1" for an item in one measure and responding with a "7" to the same/similar item in a different measure; Huang et al., 2012). The second screening approach considered random and inconsistent responses within measures by considering very high or very low inter-item variability (see Lee & Ashton, 2018 who employed a similar approach, and Curran, 2016 for discussion). Specifically, four measures were selected that were conducive to these approaches (e.g., measures that are relatively longer, have reverse scored items, and/or have multiple subscales). Respondents (n = 16) who were flagged as responding randomly/inconsistently on two or more of these measures were excluded from the final sample.