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Collaborators from 32 academic institutions primarily in the United States collected data from emerging adults \( N_{\text{raw}} = 4220, N_{\text{processed}} = 3134 \). Participants completed self-report measures assessing markers of adulthood, IDEA inventory of dimensions of emerging adulthood, subjective well-being, mindfulness, belonging, self-efficacy, disability identity, somatic health, perceived stress, perceived social support, social media use, political affiliation, beliefs about the American dream, interpersonal transgressions, narcissism, interpersonal exploitativeness, beliefs about marriage, and demographics. The data are available at (https://osf.io/qtqpb/) with details about the study and contributors at our main EAMMi2 page (https://osf.io/te54b/). These data may be used to examine new research questions, provide authentic research experiences for students, and provide demonstrations for research and statistics courses.
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(1) Overview

Collection Date(s)
2016–2017

Background

The Emerging Adulthood Measured at Multiple Institutions 2: The Next Generation project (EAMMi2; [1]) replicated and extended the original EAMMi project [2]. The project sought to generate a rich data set for use in answering many psychological questions addressing Emerging Adulthood. Emerging Adulthood [3], [4], is a term associated with the period between ages 18 and 29 when individuals in more economically developed societies are transitioning from adolescence to adulthood. Details about the various measures can be learned at our EAMMi2 project page [1].

(2) Methods

Project organizers recruited contributors through social media (Facebook & Twitter) and listserv invitations (Society of Personality and Social Psychology, Society of Teaching Psychology). Recruitment was open, but all collaborators were from English speaking institutions. They followed protocols to demonstrate Institutional Review Board approval following the original approval of Primary Investigator from Pacific Lutheran University – IRB# HPRB SP16-13. These approvals were publicly recorded here [5], then contributors received a link to the Qualtrics survey shown here as a .pdf – [6] with a site specific identifier. Contributors then collected data locally following their own procedures. These various procedures are reported on the EAMMi2 Development and Recruitment Plan document on the Samples and Procedures Component [7]. These procedures included sending email invitations to friends, emailing students in certain classes or the department, or by completing the survey in a research laboratory. We also completed an open-ended preregistration of the project with our recruitment strategies and survey before the data collection phase began [8].

Sample

Collaborators from 32 institutions recruited 4,220 respondents who started the survey. Following preregistered data cleaning criteria, EAMMi2 data team removed
respondents who: (a) completed the survey in less than 10 minutes \( (n_{under10min} = 610) \), (b) failed the attention check \( (n_{attention} = 195) \), (c) completed less than 80% of the survey \( (n_{under80} = 258) \), or (d) demonstrated response bias by having identical answers on at least 8 survey pages \( (n_{double} = 4) \). Though not in pre registered screening procedures, 19 respondents were identified as submitting double entries and the 2nd entry for each was removed from the final data set. This yielded a combined data set for all project contributors to access \( (N = 3,134) \). Also due to a programming error, age data were not initially collected resulting in a large group of respondents missing this information \( (N_{agemissing} = 1047) \).

Among this sample \( (N = 3,134) \), 72.8% of respondents were women \( (N_{women} = 2280; N_{men} = 771) \), with an age range between 18 and 61 \( (M_{age} = 21.10, SD = 4.83) \), though 96% were 29 or younger. The sample was relatively diverse in racial and ethnic identities, including White/European American respondents \( (63.5\%) \), Black/African-American \( (7.6\%) \), Hispanic/Latino/Latina \( (8.7\%) \), Asian/Pacific Islander \( (6.5\%) \), Native American \( (0.4\%) \), “Other” Race \( (2.2\%) \), and many participants who indicated more than one racial category \( (two categories: 8.6\%; three or more: 1.4\%) \) with a small portion not responding \( (1.0\%) \).

Recruitment procedures varied between institutions and are detailed on the EAMMi2 Development and Recruitment Plan document on the Samples and Procedures Component [5]. Contributors recruited either through the local institutional participant pool, through email invitations to social network contacts, or posting links to the survey on their social media pages directly. The survey could still be accessed and was used by some contributors after the initial data collection stop date. Data after December 12th, 2016 are from late respondents and have not been examined by any authors to date.

Materials
Study Materials are documented on our EAMMi2 Materials Component which includes the survey [9] as well as a list of all the various scales employed and their intended scoring procedures. We also recorded the process for data cleaning and scale construction on our data component [10] so readers can review exact scoring for all scales and variables. Here we provide scale names and minimal information because there are documents on the public data component recording the variable names, labels, descriptions and scoring keys. Scales included on this survey were: Markers of Adulthood \( (MOA; items derived from [11], [12]; importance, 20 items; achieve, 20 items; adulthood, 1 item) \), IDEA-8 [13] \( (8 items) \), Political Affiliation \( (party identification, 1 item; political ideology, 1 item; Presidential Preference, 1 item) \), Subjective Well-Being [14] \( (6 items) \), Mindfulness [15] \( (15 items) \), Need to Belong [16] \( (10 items) \), Efficacy [17] \( (8 items) \), Perceived Social Support [18] \( (12 items) \), Social Media Use Scale \( (adapted from [19], [20], maintaining existing connections, 5 items; making new connections, 4 items; information, 2 items) \), American Dream \( (importance of achieving, 1 item; ability to achieve; 1 item) \), Interpersonal Transgressions \( (exploratory items adapted from [21], 12 items) \), Narcissistic Personality Inventory-13 \( (NPI-13; [22], 13 items) \), Interpersonal Exploitativeness Scale [23], (3 items), Disability Identity \( (one dichotomous item assessing participants’ self-perception as “disabled” and six dichotomous items assessing the presence or absence of a disability in a variety of areas; including physical, sensory, learning, psychiatric, chronic health, and other; Personal Opinions Questionnaire, POQ; [24], 15 items), Patient Health Questionnaire [25], (13 items), Perceived Stress Questionnaire [26], (10 items), Marriage Opinions \( (Central identity, Marital Salience, Marital Timing, Marital Permanence, adapted from [27], [28], (5 items), then demographics (school attended, sex, age, education, sibling, race, armed services (2 items), income, and Residency (3 items)).

Procedures
Respondents received a link to the EAMMi2 survey either via email invitation or through campus specific recruiting procedures (such as SONA systems). When they completed the EAMMi2 survey online, they were instructed to do so in private and received informed consent and debriefing via the survey itself. When completed in a laboratory, they were provided privacy and could receive further debriefing from the researcher. Local data collection procedures are reported on the EAMMi2 Development and Recruitment Plan document on the Samples and Procedures Component [7].

Quality Control
As demonstrated in our methods above there was little effort to control test taking conditions. However, we did complete a series of exclusion criteria to reduce error in the data set. These included four preregistered criteria (less than 10 minutes to complete survey, less than 80% of survey completed, failed attention check, demonstrated response bias on 8 or more survey pages) and the subsequent removal of 19 responses resulting from double entries.

Ethical issues
The project organizer obtained approval from his Institutional Review board [6; see HPRB SP16-13 Exempt Grahe], then provided that approval publicly for other contributors to use for their own applications. Contributors did not receive a link to the survey for data collection until they provided evidence of approval to proceed at their own institution. These files were uploaded to our IRB Applications and Approval Component [5]. Participants indicated their informed consent on the first page of the survey and could stop the anonymous survey at any time without risk or penalty.

To further anonymize the data, we deleted the variables that collected the respondents’ IP address, Longitude, and Latitude.

Dataset description
We provide both the raw data (EAMMi2-CombinedRawData-1.0.xlsx) and cleaned data. (EAMMi2-cleandata.sav, N = 3134) is the SPSS data file described in this paper and includes all variables and scales including recoded variables and some coding of open ended questions. (EAMMi2-Data-1.2.xlsx, N = 3182) is Excel data file that includes participants that completed the survey.
after initial data collection ended and all planned exclusion criteria are applied, but no scales are scored or computed. We also provide EAMMi2-Data1.2-Codebook with all question prompts and responses.

**Object name**
EAMMi2-CleanData.sav – from Original data collection period, scales computed.
EAMMi2-CombinedRawData-1.0.xlsx – combined raw data including responses after original ended.
EAMMi2-Data-1.2-Codebook.xlsx – codebook for the cleaned data, with not scales created.
EAMMi2-Data-1.2.xlsx – combined raw data cleaned with exclusion criteria, but no scales created.

**Data type**
Raw and Processed data with details regarding the processing reported in detail (https://osf.io/qtqpb/).

**Format names and versions**
SPSS, version 24
Microsoft Excel 2010

**Data Collectors**
Each location included a primary contact who oversaw data collection. Because instructors might have used this as a class exercise, it is possible that there are student data collectors or assistants that are not recorded in this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Cramblet Alvarez</td>
<td>Adams State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleni Vousoura</td>
<td>American College of Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Hall</td>
<td>Ball State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Hermann</td>
<td>Bradley University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Richards</td>
<td>College of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Biehle</td>
<td>DeFauw University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Schmolesky</td>
<td>Georgia Gwinnett College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Barlett</td>
<td>Gettysburg College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Westcott</td>
<td>Juniata College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly M. Chalk</td>
<td>McDaniel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Sharon</td>
<td>Mercer University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Chopik</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley M Skulborstad</td>
<td>Mount Ida College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin Faas</td>
<td>Mount St. Mary’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Adams</td>
<td>Norco College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth List</td>
<td>Northwest Nazarene University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki DiLillo</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Brunell</td>
<td>OSU Mansfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Grahe</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lazzara</td>
<td>Paradise Valley Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna Sylaska</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Wolpoff</td>
<td>Riverside City College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana C. Leighton</td>
<td>Southern Arkansas University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hauhart</td>
<td>St Martin’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Landon</td>
<td>St. George’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph McFall</td>
<td>State University of New York at Fredonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Shobe</td>
<td>Stockton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Kemp</td>
<td>Swansea University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Harris-O’Brien</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chia-chen Yang</td>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerika Norona</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Noflje</td>
<td>Willamette University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**
English

**License**
CC0 1.0 Universal

**Embargo**
The data were under embargo from 1/9/2017 until 1/9/2018. This enabled any data collectors to preregister and test hypotheses on the combined data set before public access.

**Repository location**
DOI with registered page – DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/X7MP2

**Publication date**
January 9, 2018

(4) **Reuse potential**
There are currently 10 manuscripts planned from the subset of the data collected before December 12th, 2016, which we are tracking on our Manuscripts and Presentations component (https://osf.io/3kch4/). However, with 19 different psychological measures and a series of demographic measures, there are many unanswered research questions that could be explored with these data.

Some other uses of these data include testing effects that were previously demonstrated on more homogenous or limited data samples. Additionally, this dataset is particularly appropriate for teaching and conducting research with students who may not have time to collect data and conduct meaningful analysis within one academic term. Undergraduate students who are also emerging adults are often interested in the questions asked in EAMMi2 and this data gives them the opportunity to explore data beyond their one institution. These data could also be used in teaching research methods or statistics courses to provide realistic demonstrations of analyses. In addition to offering opportunities to create aggregate scores and explore missing data patterns, there are so many variables in the data set that each student can analyze unique variables. The EAMMi2 project has developed some teaching exercises (https://osf.io/627qk/) and invites others to help further expand those resources.
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