

Supplemental Report Comparing Time 1 and Time 2 Participants

1602 participants selected the survey in MTurk and attempted to complete Survey 1. Participants had to first meet the study criteria before completing the survey. Of the original 1602 participants who logged into the survey, 1113 (or 69.4%) met the screening criteria and were allowed to access the full survey.

Of the 1113 who met the study's screening criteria and began the survey, only 976 (87.7%) completed the entire survey. As such, our final sample of participants for Survey 1 was 976. Four months later, 718 participants remained who 1) met the study criteria, 2) consented to be contacted, 3) who provided valid email addresses, and 4) were still on mTurk. Each of these individuals were sent an email asking them to complete the follow-up survey. Non-respondents were sent a reminder email as well as an individual message via their mTurk accounts. 458 participants returned for the second survey; however 53 did not complete the entire survey and 9 did not provide any information that allowed us to correctly match them to their first survey. Thus, our final sample consisted of 396 participants who completed both surveys.

T-tests were conducted to examine whether there were any differences between those who returned and those who did not return for the second survey. Individuals who returned were slightly older than those who did not ($M = 31.6$ years old versus $M = 29.7$ years old, $p < .01$). The age difference is perhaps due in part to problems with our invitation emails getting through spam filters at Universities. A number of .edu email addresses bounced back. Only 26 respondents had .edu email addresses in Time 2 compared to 119 in Time 1. However, individuals who completed both surveys were significantly more educated than those who did not ($p < .01$). Across racial groups, African-Americans and American Indians were less likely to complete the second survey than Caucasians, Asian Americans, and individuals of mixed-race. All effect sizes for the significant comparisons were small (all *Cohen's d* < .20). There were no differences in household income as a function of whether an individual completed both surveys.

Note, also during Time 2, Yahoo mail experienced a significant outage. Accordingly, only 32.5% of yahoo users returned for Part 2 (compared to 43.6% of gmail users). Invitations were sent through email and via mTurk, but mTurk messages can be filtered to email addresses.

Despite the demographic differences, when examining potential romantic relationship differences (i.e., relationship status, relationship length, cohabitation, and children) between those who returned and those who did not relationship length was the only significant difference between the two groups. Individuals who returned for the second survey were more likely to have been in a longer relationship than those who did not ($p = .01$; *Cohen's d* = .17). However, this difference was largely driven by 8 individuals who completed the second survey and reported being with their romantic partners for over 40 years. When these individuals were removed from the sample, there were no relationship differences among the groups.

Upon further examination of the data, we found significant differences between those who returned and those who did not on some of the variables of interest in the study. Specifically, those who

returned to complete Survey 2 were significantly more trusting ($M = 5.0$ versus $M= 4.8$, $p<.01$ on Driscoll and colleagues' scale and $M = 7.2$ versus $M = 7.0$, $p<.01$ on Rempel's scale) and committed to their partners ($M = 5.2$ versus $M= 4.9$, $p<.01$ on Driscoll and colleagues' scale and $M = 7.7$ versus $M = 7.4$, $p<.01$ on Lund's scale) and were significantly less critical of their partners ($M = 2.3$ versus $M= 2.5$, $p<.01$). There was a significant difference in feelings of romantic but not passionate love between the two groups ($M = 5.1$ versus $M= 5.0$, $p = .03$ on Driscoll and colleagues' scale and $M = 7.3$ versus $M = 7.2$, $p=.12$ on the Passionate Love Scale). With regards to social network opinion, individuals who returned were significantly more likely to report that their friends were less interfering/more approving of their relationship ($M = 1.5$ versus $M= 1.7$, $p<.01$ on Driscoll and colleagues' scale and $M = 4.2$ versus $M = 4.0$, $p < .01$ on the SNOS), but there were no differences in parent opinion ($M = 1.6$ versus $M= 1.7$, $p=.13$ on Driscoll and colleagues' scale and $M = 4.2$ versus $M = 4.1$, $p = .32$ on the SNOS). Similar to the analyses in the above sections, all effect sizes for the differences noted were small (*Cohen's d*'s $< .22$ with the exception of friend interference).