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**Full Survey**

*Wave 1* (11/10/16; *N* = 202)

1. [T1intensity] Please rate the intensity of negative emotion you felt when you first heard the news of Donald Trump’s election. (1 – 9)
2. Please select and rank the emotions you felt in response to the election results.

(Disgust – Anger – Fear – Sadness – Other: Please specify)

1. Did you have trouble falling asleep the night you learned of the election result? (yes/no)
2. Which option best describes how you dealt with your negative emotion when you first heard the election result?
   1. I cut myself off from election news and engaged in other thoughts and activities to take my mind off of the results. (Distraction)
   2. I looked for the bright side of things and tried to think of ways in which it might not be so bad. (Reappraisal)
   3. I focused on accepting the negative emotion instead of struggling against it with the intention of moving on. (Acceptance)
   4. Other: Please describe
3. [T2intensity] Please rate the intensity of negative emotion you feel right now in regard to the election result. (1 – 9)

*Wave 2* (11/11/16; *N* = 152) [T3intensity]

Wave 2 consisted of a survey with the same questions as Survey 1 with the following additions:

1. On the night of the election result, did you reach out to family or friends to discuss the events?
2. How many of such interactions did you have in the first 12 hours of the news breaking? (1-2, 3-4, 5-10, 10+)
3. Did discussing events help you to reduce your negative emotion? (yes/no)
4. (If yes) Please briefly describe the ways in which discussing the events of the election helped to reduce your negative emotion.

The following questions had one additional choice response added. These additional choices were included due to their prevalence in the “Other” free-response sections of Survey 1.

1. Please select and rank the emotions you felt in the last 24 hours, in response to the election results.

Disgust – Anger – Fear – Sadness – Surprise – Other: Please specify

1. Which option best describes how you have dealt with your negative emotion over the last 24 hours?
   1. I cut myself off from election news and engaged in other thoughts and activities to take my mind off of the results. (Distraction)
   2. I looked for the bright side of things and tried to think of ways in which it might not be so bad. (Reappraisal)
   3. I focused on accepting the negative emotion instead of struggling against it with the intention of moving on. (Acceptance)
   4. I have not made attempts to reduce my negative emotion
   5. Other: Please describe

*Wave 3* (11/13/16 – 11/14/16; *N* = 139) [T4intensity]

Identical to Survey 2*.*

*Wave 4* (11/16/16 – 11/18/16; *N* = 131) [T5intensity]

Survey 4 contained the same questions as Survey 3 with the following additions.

1. Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985)
2. Short Form Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (EPQR-S) Neuroticism Segment (Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985).

**Data and Analyses**

We conducted all analyses in Mplus 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). For data and analysis scripts, please see our Open Science Framework repository at <https://osf.io/vcfb8/>.

**Model fitting procedure**

The repeated measures of emotion intensity were used as factor loadings to the two latent variables representing the intercept and the slope. In the first step, adjacent time points were contrasted against each other (one fixed at 0, the other one at 1 with all other time points freed). This approach indicated that there are two significant drops in emotion intensity: the first between T1 and T2 and the second between T3 and T4. The comparison between T2 and T3 and between T4 and T5 resulted in non-significant means and variances of the slope indicated no apparent change between those measurement points.

This initial analysis, as well as the observed mean pattern, indicated that the growth curve of the emotion intensity did not follow the linear trend. Indeed, when the linear trend was fitted, it resulted in poor model fit (*X*2(10) = 136.16, *p* < .001; CFI = 0.75, RMSEA = 0.25). We had no predictions for the type of decrease in the emotion intensity, so as an alternative, we decided to explicitly model the change between T1 and T5 (by fixing T1 to 0 and T5 to 1 and freeing all other time scores). Additionally, we fixed one non-significant residual variance (T1) to 0. This approach resulted in a very good model fit *X*2(8) = 10.16, *p* = .25; CFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.04. The intercept mean is equivalent to the mean emotion intensity for the first measurement, which not surprisingly was significantly different from 0 (*M*INTERCEPT = 7.45; *SE*INTERCEPT = 0.10, *p* < .001). The significant variance of the intercept (*V*INTERCEPT = 2.19; *SE*INTERCEPT = 0.22, *p* < .001) indicates that there was a significant variability in the emotion intensity at T1. The mean of slope was also significant (*M*SLOPE = -2.89; *SE*SLOPE = 0.18, *p* < .001) which indicates that on average, participants decreased their emotion intensity between T1 and T5 (fixed time scores used in this analysis). The significant variance of the slope (*V*SLOPE = 3.85; *SE*SLOPE = 0.53, *p* < .001) indicates that there was a significant variability in slope values among individuals.

After the intercept and slope were regressed on to the covariates, the model resulted in a good fit *X*2(20) = 23.35, *p* = .27; CFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.04. When the two insignificant paths were fixed to 0 the model fit remained very good *X*2(22) = 23.39, *p* = .38; CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0.02 and the difference test between the two models was not significant *ΔX*2(2) = 0.04, *p =* .98 suggesting that both models fit equally well.

**Emotion regulation strategy choice additional analyses**

In a primary analysis of emotion regulation strategy choice reported in the main manuscript, we used ER strategy choice in Wave 2 as a dependent variable and the preceding emotion intensity measurement (T2) was used as a predictor. In addition to this analysis, we conducted an analysis in which, ER strategy in Wave 2 was used as a dependent variable, the prior emotion intensity (T2) was used a predictor while controlling for the prior ER strategy choice in Wave 1. This was done by using reappraisal as a reference category and distraction and acceptance as two dummy variables. The role of the preceding emotion intensity for the log odds of choosing acceptance versus reappraisal remained significant even when controlling for the ER strategy choice at Wave 1 (point estimate of 0.30, *SE* = 0.15, *p* = .04, OR = 1.35). For distraction versus reappraisal, however, the role of the preceding emotion intensity was not significantly different from trend level when controlling for the ER strategy in Wave 1, (point estimate of 0.23, *SE* = 0.14, *p* = .11, OR = 1.26).

One likely explanation for the non-significant result for distraction at T2 is the reduction in power due to an increase in the choice of ‘other’ responses for ER strategy, as well as the rate of drop out. Although the directionality of the odds ratio was preserved after adding in the autoregressive covariate, the N’s in each cell became too small to garner a significant *p*-value, see Table SM1.

Table SM1

*Number of participants selecting reappraisal or distraction in Waves 1 and 2*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Reappraisal Wave 2 | Distraction Wave 2 |
| Reappraisal Wave 1 | 22 | 10 |
| Distraction Wave 1 | 13 | 26 |

**Additional measures**

Sleep trouble was recorded at each survey during Waves 1-4, see Table SM2 for details. Participants that predominantly used reappraisal experienced, on average, fewer nights of troubled sleep than participants that predominantly used distraction (*t*(91) = 3.53, *p* < .001, *d* = .65) or acceptance (*t*(63) = 3.20, *p* = .002, *d* = .69). The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) was administered in Wave 4 (Diener et al., 1985). Predominant reappraisal-users did not differ significantly from predominant distraction-users or predominant acceptance-users on the SWLS (*p*’s > .24) or the EPQR-S Neuroticism (*p*’s > .09).

Table SM2

*Additional measures by different regulation patterns*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Dominant strategy | | | | | |
|  | Reappraisal | | Acceptance | | Distraction | |
| Nights of sleep trouble | 0.61 | [.43, .78] | 1.25 | [.88, 1.62] | 1.22 | [.92, 1.53] |
| SWLS | 23.58 | [21.42, 25.73] | 21.26 | [18.79, 23.73] | 21.81 | [19.72, 23.89] |
| EPQR-S Neuroticism | 3.47 | [2.45, 4.50] | 4.71 | [3.47, 5.95] | 5.06 | [3.96, 6.15] |
|  | | | | | | |

*Note.* Brackets indicate 95% CIs.

Four major discrete emotions were reported in Waves 1-4. “Surprise” was added in Wave 2 due to its prevalence as a free-response answer. As expected, reports of discrete emotions declined over time, see Table SM3 for details.

Table SM3

*Proportion of participants that reported discrete emotions*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Wave 1 | | Wave 2 | | Wave 3 | | Wave 4 | |
| Sadness | .75 | [.69, .81] | .66 | [.59, .74] | .61 | [.53, .69] | .56 | [.47, .64] |
| Disgust | .74 | [.68, 80] | .63 | [.54, .70] | .49 | [.41, .58] | .46 | [.37, .54] |
| Fear | .71 | [.65, .78] | .59 | [.51, .66] | .48 | [.40, .56] | .44 | [.36, .53] |
| Anger | .61 | [.54, .68] | .48 | [.40, .56] | .33 | [.25, .41] | .34 | [.25, .42] |
| Surprise | - | - | .39 | [.47, 47] | .20 | [.13, .27] | .20 | [.13, .27] |

*Note.* Brackets indicate 95% CIs.
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