**Supplementary Materials**

Table S1. Multilevel modeling regression results detailing the relationships between DERS subscales and dependent variables of interest.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Dependent Variable* | *Independent Variable* | *Statistical Test of the Partially Standardised Regression Coefficient* | *FDR corrected p-values* |
| Desire to change emotions | **Non-acceptance**AwarenessClarity**Goals****Impulsivity**Strategies | *βp* = -.02, *SE* = .09, *t* = -.18, *p* = .86*βp* = .04, *SE* = .08, *t* = .52, *p* = .61*βp* = .03, *SE* = .07, *t* = .47, *p* = .64*βp* = .17, *SE* = .09, *t* = 1.85, *p* = .07*βp* = .0001, *SE* = .08, *t* = .002, *p >* .99*βp* = .09, *SE* = .10, *t* = .92, *p* = .36 | >.99.83.83.25>.99.63 |
| Any vs. No ER strategy \* | **Non-acceptance**AwarenessClarityGoals**Impulsivity****Strategies** | *βp* = -.19, *SE* = .11, *Z* = -1.69, *p* = .09*βp* = -.004, *SE* = .09, *Z* = -.04, *p* = .97*βp* = -.07, *SE* = .09, *Z* = -.77, *p* = .44*βp* = -.27, *SE* = .12, *Z* = -2.31, *p* = .02*βp* = .63, *SE* = .10, *Z* = 6.11, *p* < .001*βp* = .34, *SE* = .12, *Z* = 2.74, *p* = .006 | .30>.99.66.10< .001.046 |
| Avoidant vs. Engagement ER \* | Non-acceptanceAwarenessClarity**Goals****Impulsivity****Strategies** | *βp* = .50, *SE* = .15, *Z* = 3.35, *p =* .0008*βp* = .19, *SE* = .13, *Z* = 1.50, *p* = .13*βp* = .17, *SE* = .12, *Z* = 1.40, *p* = .16*βp* = .21, *SE* = .15, *Z* = 1.42, *p* = .16*βp* = -.28, *SE* = .13, *Z* = -2.15, *p =* .03*βp* = -.12, *SE* = .15, *Z* = -.76, *p* = .45 | .012.40.40.40.14.66 |
| Effectiveness in changing emotions  | Non-acceptance**Awareness****Clarity**GoalsImpulsivity**Strategies** | *βp* = -.01, *SE* = .01, *t* = -.09, *p =* .93*βp* = -.08, *SE* = .08, *t* = -.97, *p* = .33*βp* = -.08, *SE* = .07, *t* = -1.04, *p* = .30*βp* = -.22, *SE* = .10, *t* = -2.35, *p* = .02*βp* = .03, *SE* = .09, *t* = .40, *p =* .69*βp* = -.01, *SE* = .11, *t* = -.14, *p* = .89 | >.99.63.63.11.86>.99 |
| Ability to identify emotions | Non-acceptance**Awareness****Clarity**GoalsImpulsivityStrategies | *βp* = .07, *SE* = .10, *t* = .74, *p* = .46*βp* = -.07, *SE* = .08, *t* = -.89, *p =* .38*βp* = -.22, *SE* = .07, *t* = -3.03, *p* = .003*βp* = -.01, *SE* = .10, *t* = -.05, *p* = .96*βp* = .11, *SE* = .09, *t* = 1.24, *p =* .22*βp* = -.10, *SE* = .11, *t* = -.92, *p* = .36 | .66.63.031>.99.50.63 |

*Note:* DERS = Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale; ER = Emotion Regulation; *βp* = partial standardised regression coefficient (which can be interpreted as a partial correlation coefficient); *SE* = standard error; *FDR* = False Discovery Rate; Bolded independent variables indicate subscales that were hypothesised during preregistration. \*Positive coefficient values indicate greater Any ER versus No ER endorsements (and greater Avoidant versus Engagement ER endorsements) as facets of trait emotion dysregulation increase.

**Supplementary Analyses**

 **Negative Affect Threshold.** There were concerns about whether our results would be consistent at other cutoff points using our negative affect variable. Accordingly, we provide new analyses that demonstrate the robustness of our findings across two additional cut-points (using the top 80% of negative affect observations: *n* = 2340, and the top 20% of negative affect observations: *n* = 828 observations). As seen below in Table S2, even after applying the Holm correction for multiple comparisons, these tests are still significant and in the same direction as our main text analyses, supporting the robustness of our results.

**Controlling for Mean Negative Affect.** There were questions about whether our results would remain significant if we controlled for person-level mean negative affect. We were able to complete additional analyses by adding the person-level (Level 2) variable of mean negative affect to our analyses as a fixed effect control along with our original trait emotion dysregulation predictor variable. As seen in Table S3, when the person-level mean negative affect variable is considered within the same models, many of the effects for trait emotion dysregulation are no longer statistically significant. However, one effect pertaining to the likelihood of selecting avoidant ER versus engagement ER remained, even after controlling for multiple tests. Given that 75% of DERS items are phrased in a way that appears to assess emotion dysregulation of negative affect (moreso than positive affect), we feel that the DERS measure is tied to (or at least overlaps with) the assessment of negative affective states and reaction to those states. Thus, we suggest caution in interpreting these results, as it remains difficult to know what the remaining variance explained by the DERS variable is measuring (once variance explained by mean negative affect is removed) given how the scale is constructed. It may be that other facets of emotion dysregulation beyond those closely related to negative affect, such as impulsivity or non-acceptance, are related to selection of avoidant ER versus engagement ER.

**Specific ER Strategies.** Our primary analyses left open the question of whether certain specific ER strategies could be driving the observed effects. We therefore added supplementary analyses testing four individual strategies, representing the two most frequently endorsed ER strategies from each category: Distraction (*n* = 301 endorsements) and Emotion Suppression (*n* = 218) from the avoidant category, and Rumination/Introspection (*n* = 415) and Problem Solving (*n* = 430) from the engagement category. In these analyses, single ER strategies (dichotomous Level 1 variables) were entered as dependent variables, which were predicted by trait emotion dysregulation (Level 2 variable) in our subset of top 40% negative affect observations (*n* = 1646 total observations). Trait emotion dysregulation was positively associated with the use of distraction and emotion suppression, but not problem solving or rumination/introspection (see below Table S4). Results suggest that our main trait emotion dysregulation effects may be driven more by the selection of strategies in the avoidant ER category than in the engagement ER category.

Table S2. Analyses of the relationship between trait emotion dysregulation and five dependent variables at two additional thresholds of negative affect.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable(IV = Trait Emotion Dysregulation) | Subset(Negative Affect) | *β*p | *SE* | *Test Statistic* | *95% CI* | *p-*value | Holm corrected *p-*value |
| Momentary negative affect | Top 80%Top 20% | .29.29 | .06.07 | *t* = 4.90*t* = 4.34 | .17, .41.16, .42 | < .0001< .0001 | < .001< .001 |
| Desire to change emotions | Top 80%Top 20% | .23.22 | .05.06 | *t* = 4.52*t* = 3.42 | .13, .34.16, .42 | < .0001.0009 | < .001.001 |
| Any ER vs. No ER strategy | Top 80%Top 20% | .27\*.49\* | .06.10 | *Z* = 4.61Z = 4.84 | .16, .39.29, .69 |  4.00e-6­1.33e-6 | < .001< .001 |
| Avoidant ER vs. Engagement ER | Top 80%Top 20% | .43\*.49\* | .08.12 | *Z* = 5.15Z = 3.93 | .27, .59.25, .74 | 2.56e-78.43e-5 | < .001< .001 |
| Effectiveness in changing emotions | Top 80%Top 20% | -.21-.25 | .06.06 | *t* = -3.59*t* = -4.19 | -.32, -.09-.37, -.13 | ­.0005.0001 | .001< .001 |

*Note*: ER = Emotion Regulation; *β*p = partial standardised regression coefficient (which can be interpreted as a partial correlation coefficient); IV = Independent variable; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval. Holm correction applied at the family-wise level pertaining to threshold. \*Positive values indicate that as trait emotion dysregulation increases, the relative endorsement of Any ER (vs. no ER) and Avoidant ER (vs. Engagement ER) also increases, respectively.

Table S3. Analyses of the relationship between trait emotion dysregulation and five dependent variables at two additional thresholds of negative affect.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DV | IV(both Level 2 variables)  | *β*p | *SE* | *Test Statistic* | *95% CI* | *p-*value | Holm corrected *p-*value |
| Desire to change emotions | Trait emotion dysregulationMean negative emotion | .09.37 | .05.06 | *t* = 1.66*t* = 6.15 | -.02, .20.24, .48 | .099< .0001 | > .99.001 |
| Any ER vs. No ER strategy | Trait emotion dysregulationMean negative emotion | .05.50 | .08.09 | *Z* = .58*Z* = 5.84 | -.12, .21.33, .67 |  .56< .0001 | > .99.001 |
| Avoidant ER vs. Engagement ER | Trait emotion dysregulationMean negative emotion | .35.15 | .10.11 | *Z* = 3.29*Z* = 1.34 | .14, .55-.07, .37 | .001­­.18 | .005.68 |
| Effectiveness in changing emotions | Trait emotion dysregulationMean negative emotion | -.08-.42 | .06.06 | *t* = -1.38*t* = -6.73 | -.19, .03-.55, -.30 | ­.17< .0001 | .68.001 |

*Note*: ER = Emotion Regulation; *β*p = partial standardised regression coefficient (which can be interpreted as a partial correlation coefficient); DV = Dependent variable; IV = Independent variable; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval.

Table S4. Analyses of the relationship between trait emotion dysregulation and the four most common specific emotion regulation strategies in our dataset.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DV (Specific ER Strategy) | IV  | *β*p | *SE* | *Test Statistic* | *95% CI* | *p-*value | Holm corrected *p-*value |
| Problem Solving | Trait emotion dysregulation | .06 | .14 | *Z* = .46 | -.21, .34 | .64 | > .99 |
| Rumination/Introspection | Trait emotion dysregulation | .03 | .19 | *Z* = .17 | -.34, .41 |  .87 | > .99 |
| Distraction | Trait emotion dysregulation | .37 | .13 | *Z* = 2.89 | .12, .62 | .004 | .012 |
| Emotion Suppression | Trait emotion dysregulation | .52 | .17 | *Z* = 3.04 | .18, .85 | .002 | .008 |

*Note*: *β*p = partial standardised regression coefficient (which can be interpreted as a partial correlation coefficient); DV = Dependent variable; IV = Independent variable; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval.