

Stage 2 Registered Report

A multi-country test of brief reappraisal interventions on emotions during the COVID-19 pandemic

Names

Ke Wang¹, Amit Goldenberg², Charles A. Dorison³, Jeremy K. Miller^{4*} (millerj@willamette.edu), Andero Uusberg⁵, Jennifer S. Lerner⁶, James Gross⁷, Bamikole Bamikole Agesin⁸, Kafeel Ashraf⁹, Olatz Campos¹⁰, Luis Eudave¹¹, Karolina Grzech¹², Daphna Hausman Ozery¹³, Emily A. Jackson¹⁴, William Jimenez-Leal¹⁵, Valerija Križanić¹⁶, Elkin Oswaldo Luis Garcia¹⁷, Shira Meir Drexler¹⁸, Anita Penić Jurković¹⁹, John Paul Wilson²⁰, Maria Antoniadí²¹, Kermeka Desai²², Zoi Gialitaki²³, Elizaveta Kushnir²⁴, Khaoula Nadif²⁵, Olalla Niño Bravo²⁶, Rafia Nauman²⁷, Marlies Oosterlinck²⁸, Myrto Pantazi²⁹, Natalia Pilecka³⁰, Anna Szabelska³¹, I. M. M. van Steenkiste³², Katarzyna Filip³³, Andreea Ioana Bozdoc³⁴, Gabriela Mariana Marcu³⁵, Elena Agadullina³⁶, Matúš Adamkovič³⁷, Marta Roczniewska³⁸, Cecilia Reyna³⁹, Angelos P. Kassianos⁴⁰, Minja Westerlund⁴¹, Lina Ahlgren⁴², Sara Pöntinen⁴³, Gabriel Agboola Adetula⁴⁴, Pinar Dursun⁴⁵, Azuka Ikechukwu Arinze⁴⁶, Nwadiogo Chisom Arinze⁴⁷, Chisom Esther Ogbonnaya⁴⁸, Izuchukwu L. G. Ndukaihe⁴⁹, Ilker Dalgac⁵⁰, Handan Akkas⁵¹, Paulo Manuel Macapagal⁵², Savannah Lewis⁵³, Irem Metin-Orta⁵⁴, Francesco Foroni⁵⁵, Megan Willis⁵⁶, Anabela Caetano Santos⁵⁷, Aviv Mokady⁵⁸, Niv Reggev⁵⁹, Merve A. Kurfali⁶⁰, Martin R. Vasilev⁶¹, Nora L. Nock⁶², Michal Parzuchowski⁶³, Mauricio F. Espinoza Barría⁶⁴, Marek Vranka⁶⁵, Markéta Braun Kohlová⁶⁶, Ivan Ropovik⁶⁷, Mikayel Harutyunyan⁶⁸, Chunhui Wang⁶⁹, Elvin Yao⁷⁰, Maja Becker⁷¹, Efisio Manunta⁷², Gwenael Kaminski⁷³, Dafne Marko⁷⁴, Andrej Findor⁷⁵, Anais Thibault Landry⁷⁶, David M. G. Lewis⁷⁷, John Jamir Benzon Aruta⁷⁸, Julio E. Cruz Vásquez⁷⁹, Manuel S. Ortiz⁸⁰, Ekaterina Pronizius⁸¹, Martin Voracek⁸², Claus Lamm⁸³, Maurice Grinberg⁸⁴, Ranran Li⁸⁵, Jaroslava Varella Valentova⁸⁶, Giovanna Mioni⁸⁷, Nicola Cellini⁸⁸, Sau-Chin Chen⁸⁹, Janis Zickfeld⁹⁰, Karis Moon⁹¹, Habiba Azab⁹², Neil Levy⁹³, Alper Karababa⁹⁴, Jennifer L. Beaudry⁹⁵, Anna Louise Todsén⁹⁶, Kevin van Schie⁹⁷, Jáchym Vintř⁹⁸, Jozef Bavolar⁹⁹, Lada Kaliska¹⁰⁰, Lara Samojlenko¹⁰¹, Razieh Pourafshari¹⁰², Sandra J. Geiger¹⁰³, Julia Beitner¹⁰⁴, Lara Warmelink¹⁰⁵, Robert M. Ross¹⁰⁶, Ian D. Stephen¹⁰⁷, Thomas J. Hostler¹⁰⁸, Soufian Azouaghe¹⁰⁹, Randy McCarthy¹¹⁰, Anna Szala¹¹¹, Caterina Grano¹¹², Claudio Singh Solorzano¹¹³, Gulnaz Anjum¹¹⁴, Ondřej Kácha¹¹⁵, Alexios Arvanitis¹¹⁶, Qinyu Xiao¹¹⁷, Rodrigo Cárcamo¹¹⁸, Saša Zorjan¹¹⁹, Zuzanna Tajchman¹²⁰, Iris Vilares¹²¹, Jeffrey M. Pavlacic¹²², Jonas R. Kunst¹²³, Christian K. Tamnes¹²⁴, Claudia C. von Bastian¹²⁵, Mohammad Atari¹²⁶, MohammadHasan Sharifian¹²⁷, Monika Hricova¹²⁸, Pavol Kačmár¹²⁹, Jana Schrötter¹³⁰, Rima-Maria Rahal¹³¹, Noga Cohen¹³², Saiedeh Fatah Modarres¹³³, Miha Zrimsek¹³⁴, Ilya Zakharov¹³⁵, Monica A Koehn¹³⁶, Celia Esteban-Serna¹³⁷, Robert J. Calin-Jageman¹³⁸, Anthony J Krafnick¹³⁹, Meetu Khosla¹⁴⁰, Eva Štrukelj¹⁴¹, Peder Mortvedt Isager¹⁴², Jan Urban¹⁴³, Jaime R. Silva¹⁴⁴, Marcel Martončík¹⁴⁵, Dušana Šakan¹⁴⁶, Sanja Batić Očovaj¹⁴⁷, Anna O. Kuzminska¹⁴⁸, Jasna Milosevic Djordjevic¹⁴⁹, Inês A. T. Almeida¹⁵⁰, Ana Ferreira¹⁵¹, Ljiljana Lazarevic¹⁵², Harry Manley¹⁵³, Danilo Zambrano Ricaurte¹⁵⁴, Renan P. Monteiro¹⁵⁵, Erica Musser¹⁵⁶, Daniel Dunleavy¹⁵⁷, Weilun Chou¹⁵⁸, Hendrik Godbersen¹⁵⁹, Susana Ruiz-Fernández¹⁶⁰, Crystal

Reeck¹⁶¹, Carlota Batres¹⁶², Komil Kirgizova¹⁶³, Abdumalik Muminov¹⁶⁴, Flavio Azevedo¹⁶⁵, Daniela Serrato Alvarez¹⁶⁶, Muhammad Mussaffa Butt¹⁶⁷, Jeong Min Lee¹⁶⁸, Zhang Chen¹⁶⁹, Frederick Verbruggen¹⁷⁰, Ignazio Ziano¹⁷¹, Murat Tümer¹⁷², Abdelilah C. A. Charyate¹⁷³, Dmitrii Dubrov¹⁷⁴, María del Carmen M. C. Tejada Rivera¹⁷⁵, Christopher Aberson¹⁷⁶, Barbora Hubena¹⁷⁷, Asli Sacakli¹⁷⁸, Bence Pálfi¹⁷⁹, Chris D. Ceary¹⁸⁰, Karley L. Richard¹⁸¹, Gage Singer¹⁸², Jennifer T. Perillo¹⁸³, Tonia Ballantyne¹⁸⁴, Wilson Cyrus-Lai¹⁸⁵, Maksim Fedotov¹⁸⁶, Hongfei Du¹⁸⁷, Magdalena Wielgus¹⁸⁸, Ilse L. Pit¹⁸⁹, Matej Hruška¹⁹⁰, Daniela Sousa¹⁹¹, Balazs Aczel¹⁹², Barnabas Szaszi¹⁹³, Sylwia Adamus¹⁹⁴, Krystian Barzykowski¹⁹⁵, Leticia Micheli¹⁹⁶, Nadya-Daniela Schmidt¹⁹⁷, Andras N. Zsido¹⁹⁸, Mariola Paruzel-Czachura¹⁹⁹, Michal Bialek²⁰⁰, Marta Kowal²⁰¹, Agnieszka Sorokowska²⁰², Michal Misiak²⁰³, Débora Mola²⁰⁴, María Victoria Ortiz²⁰⁵, Pablo Sebastián Correa²⁰⁶, Anabel Belaus²⁰⁷, Fany Muchembled²⁰⁸, Rafael R. Ribeiro²⁰⁹, Patricia Arriaga²¹⁰, Raquel Oliveira²¹¹, Leigh Ann Vaughn²¹², Paulina Szwed²¹³, Małgorzata Kossowska²¹⁴, Gabriela Czarnek²¹⁵, Julita Kiełińska²¹⁶, Benedict Antazo²¹⁷, Stefan Stieger²¹⁸, Gustav Nilsson²¹⁹, Nicolle Simonovic²²⁰, Jennifer Taber²²¹, Amélie Gourdon-Kanhukamwe²²², Artur Domurat²²³, Keiko Ihaya²²⁴, Yuki Yamada²²⁵, Anum Urooj²²⁶, Tripat Gill²²⁷, Martin Čadek²²⁸, Lisa Bylinina²²⁹, Johanna Messerschmidt²³⁰, Adeyemi Adetula²³¹, Ekaterina Baklanova²³², Nihan Albayrak-Aydemir²³³, Heather Barry Kappes²³⁴, Biljana Gjoneska²³⁵, Thea House²³⁶, Marc V. Jones²³⁷, Jana B. Berkessel²³⁸, William J. Chopik²³⁹, Sami Çoksan²⁴⁰, Martin Seehuus²⁴¹, Ahmed Khaoudi²⁴², Ahmed Bokkour²⁴³, Kanza Ait El Arabi²⁴⁴, Ikhtlas Djamaï²⁴⁵, Aishwarya Iyer²⁴⁶, Neha Parashar²⁴⁷, Arca Adiguzel²⁴⁸, Halil Emre Kocalar²⁴⁹, Carsten Bundt²⁵⁰, James O. Norton²⁵¹, Marietta Papadatou-Pastou²⁵², Anabel De la Rosa-Gomez²⁵³, Vladislav Ankushev²⁵⁴, Natalia Bogatyreva²⁵⁵, Dmitry Grigoryev²⁵⁶, Aleksandr Ivanov²⁵⁷, Irina Prusova²⁵⁸, Marina Romanova²⁵⁹, Irena Sarieva²⁶⁰, Maria Terskova²⁶¹, Evgeniya Hristova²⁶², Veselina Hristova Kadreva²⁶³, Allison Janak²⁶⁴, Vidar Schei²⁶⁵, Therese E. Sverdrup²⁶⁶, Adrian Dahl Askelund²⁶⁷, Lina Maria Sanabria Pineda²⁶⁸, Dajana Krupić²⁶⁹, W. Matthew Collins²⁷⁰, Leanne Boucher²⁷¹, Carmel A. Levitan²⁷², Niklas Johannes²⁷³, Nihal ouherrou²⁷⁴, Nicolas Say²⁷⁵, Sladjana Sinkolova²⁷⁶, Kristina Janjić²⁷⁷, Marija Stojanovska²⁷⁸, Dragana Stojanovska²⁷⁹, Andrew G. Thomas²⁸⁰, Franki Y. H. Kung²⁸¹, Gijsbert Bijlstra²⁸², Farnaz Mosannenzadeh²⁸³, Busra Bahar Balci²⁸⁴, Ulf-Dietrich Reips²⁸⁵, Ernest Baskin²⁸⁶, Byurakn Ishkhanyan²⁸⁷, Johanna Czamanski-Cohen²⁸⁸, Barnaby James Wyld Dixon²⁸⁹, David Moreau²⁹⁰, Clare A. M. Sutherland²⁹¹, Hu Chuan-Peng²⁹², Chris Noone²⁹³, Heather Flowe²⁹⁴, Michele Anne²⁹⁵, Steve M. J. Janssen²⁹⁶, Marta Topor²⁹⁷, Cynthia H. Y. Fu²⁹⁸, Nadyanna M Majeed²⁹⁹, Yoshihiko Kunisato³⁰⁰, Karen Yu³⁰¹, Shimrit Daches³⁰², Andree Hartanto³⁰³, Milica Vdovic³⁰⁴, Lisa Anton-Boicuk³⁰⁵, Paul A. G. Forbes³⁰⁶, Julia Kamburidis³⁰⁷, Mina Nedelcheva-Datsova³⁰⁸, Nikolay R. Rachev³⁰⁹, Alina Stoyanova³¹⁰, Evelina Marinova³¹¹, Kathleen Schmidt³¹², Jordan W Suchow³¹³, Murathan Kurfali³¹⁴, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm³¹⁵, Teodor Jernsäter³¹⁶, Jonas K. Olofsson³¹⁷, Olga Bialobrzaska³¹⁸, Magdalena Marszalek³¹⁹, Srinivasan Tatachari³²⁰, Reza Afhami³²¹, Wilbert Law³²², Jan Antfolk³²³, Barbara Žuro³²⁴, Natalia Van Doren³²⁵, Jose A Soto³²⁶, Rachel Searston³²⁷, Jacob Miranda³²⁸, Kaja Damnjanović³²⁹, Siu Kit Yeung³³⁰, Dino Krupić³³¹, Karlijn Hoyer³³², Bastian Jaeger³³³, Dongning Ren³³⁴, Gerit Pfuhl³³⁵, Kristoffer Klevjer³³⁶, Zahir Vally³³⁷, Juan Camilo Vargas-Nieto³³⁸, Oscar J. Galindo-Caballero³³⁹, Laura Calderón Pérez³⁴⁰, Nadia S. Corral-Frías³⁴¹, Martha Frias-Armenta³⁴², Marc Y. Lucas³⁴³, Adriana Olaya Torres³⁴⁴, Mónica Toro³⁴⁵, Lady Grey Javela Delgado³⁴⁶, Diego Vega³⁴⁷, Sara Álvarez Solas³⁴⁸, Roosevelt Vilar³⁴⁹, Sébastien Massoni³⁵⁰, Thomas Frizzo³⁵¹, Alexandre Bran³⁵², David C. Vaidis³⁵³, Luc Vieira³⁵⁴, Bastien Paris³⁵⁵, Mariagrazia Capizzi³⁵⁶, Gabriel Lins de Holanda Coelho³⁵⁷, Anna Greenburgh³⁵⁸, Cassie M. Whitt³⁵⁹, Alexa M. Tullett³⁶⁰, Xinkai Du³⁶¹, Leonhard Volz³⁶², Minke Jasmijn Bosma³⁶³, Cemre Karaarslan³⁶⁴, Eylül Sarioğuz³⁶⁵, Tara Bulut Allred³⁶⁶, Max Korbmacher³⁶⁷, Melissa F. Colloff³⁶⁸, Tiago J. S. Lima³⁶⁹, Matheus Fernando Felix Ribeiro³⁷⁰, Jeroen P. H. Verharen³⁷¹, Maria Karekla³⁷², Christiana Karashiali³⁷³, Naoyuki Sunami³⁷⁴, Lisa M. Jaremka³⁷⁵, Daniel Storage³⁷⁶, Sumaiya Habib³⁷⁷, Widad Hassan³⁷⁸, Anna Studzinska³⁷⁹, Paul H. P. Hanel³⁸⁰, Dawn Liu Holford³⁸¹, Miroslav Sirota³⁸², Kelly Wolfe³⁸³, Faith Chiu³⁸⁴, Andriana Theodoropoulou³⁸⁵, El Rim Ahn³⁸⁶, Yijun Lin³⁸⁷, Erin C. Westgate³⁸⁸, Hilmar Brohmer³⁸⁹, Gabriela Hofer³⁹⁰, Olivier Dujols³⁹¹, Kevin Vezirian³⁹², Gilad Feldman³⁹³, Giovanni A. Travaglino³⁹⁴, Afroja Ahmed³⁹⁵, Manyu Li³⁹⁶, Jasmijn Bosch³⁹⁷, Nathan Torunsky³⁹⁸, Hui Bai³⁹⁹,

Mathi Manavalan⁴⁰⁰, Xin Song⁴⁰¹, Radoslaw B. Walczak⁴⁰², Przemysław Zdybek⁴⁰³, Maja Friedemann⁴⁰⁴, Anna Dalla Rosa⁴⁰⁵, Luca Kozma⁴⁰⁶, Sara G. Alves⁴⁰⁷, Rita C. Correia⁴⁰⁸, Peter Babinčák⁴⁰⁹, Gabriel Banik⁴¹⁰, Luis Miguel F. Rojas-Berscia⁴¹¹, Marco A. C. Varella⁴¹², Jim Uttley⁴¹³, Julie E. Beshears⁴¹⁴, Katrine Krabbe Thommesen⁴¹⁵, Behzad Behzadnia⁴¹⁶, Maria Bradford⁴¹⁷, Shawn Geniole⁴¹⁸, Miguel A. Silan⁴¹⁹, Princess Lovella G. Maturan⁴²⁰, Johannes K. Vilsmeier⁴²¹, Ulrich S. Tran⁴²², Sara Morales Izquierdo⁴²³, Lukasz Walasek⁴²⁴, Michael C. Mensink⁴²⁵, Piotr Sorokowski⁴²⁶, Agata Groyecka-Bernard⁴²⁷, Theda Radtke⁴²⁸, Vera Cubela Adoric⁴²⁹, Joelle Carpentier⁴³⁰, Asil Ali Özdoğru⁴³¹, Jennifer A. Joy-Gaba⁴³², Tatsunori Ishii⁴³³, Aaron L. Wichman⁴³⁴, Jan Philipp Röer⁴³⁵, Thomas Ostermann⁴³⁶, William E. Davis⁴³⁷, Lilian Suter⁴³⁸, Charles R. Ebersole⁴³⁹, Christopher R. Chartier⁴⁴⁰, Peter R. Mallik⁴⁴¹, Heather L. Urry⁴⁴², Erin M. Buchanan⁴⁴³, Nicholas A. Coles⁴⁴⁴, Maximilian A. Primbs⁴⁴⁵, Dana M. Basnight-Brown⁴⁴⁶, Hans IJzerman⁴⁴⁷, Patrick S. Forscher⁴⁴⁸, Hannah Moshontz⁴⁴⁹

Institutions

¹Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University, Cambridge, United States. ²Harvard University, Cambridge, United States. ³Kellogg School of Management, Management & Organizations Department, Northwestern University, Evanston, United States. ⁴Department of Psychology, Willamette University, Salem, United States. ⁵University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia. ⁶Harvard Kennedy School and Department of Psychology, Harvard University, Cambridge, United States. ⁷Stanford University, Stanford, United States. ⁸Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba, Nigeria. ⁹GC University Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan. ¹⁰University of Deusto, Barakaldo, Spain. ¹¹University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ¹²University of Valencia; Stockholm University, Valencia, Spain. ¹³California State University, Northridge, Los Angeles, United States. ¹⁴Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ¹⁵Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. ¹⁶Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Osijek, Croatia. ¹⁷Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ¹⁸Department of Cognitive Psychology, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum, Germany. ¹⁹Kindergarten Kustošija, Zagreb, Croatia. ²⁰Montclair State University, Montclair, United States. ²¹European University of Cyprus, Engomi, Cyprus. ²²Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ²³Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands. ²⁴Unaffiliated, Unknown. ²⁵Unaffiliated, Unknown. ²⁶Unaffiliated, Unknown. ²⁷Unaffiliated, Unknown. ²⁸Unaffiliated, Unknown. ²⁹Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom. ³⁰University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland. ³¹Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland. ³²Universiteit Leiden, Leiden, Netherlands. ³³Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland. ³⁴Department of Psychology, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, Sibiu, Romania. ³⁵Department of Psychology, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu; Carol Davila University of Medicine and Pharmacy Bucharest, Sibiu, Romania. ³⁶National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ³⁷Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, University of Presov; Institute of Social Sciences, CSPA Slovak Academy of Sciences, Prešov, Slovakia. ³⁸Department of Psychology, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities; Department of Learning, Informatics, Management, and Ethics, Karolinska Institutet, Sopot, Poland. ³⁹Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (UNC); Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas (IIPSI), Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET)-UNC, Córdoba, Argentina. ⁴⁰Department of Psychology, University of Cyprus; Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, Nicosia, Cyprus. ⁴¹Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland. ⁴²Faculty of Arts, Psychology, and Theology, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland. ⁴³Faculty of Arts, Psychology, and Theology, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland. ⁴⁴Department of Pure and Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences,

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba, Nigeria. ⁴⁵Department of Psychology, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey. ⁴⁶Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu-Alike, Ndufu-Alike, Nigeria. ⁴⁷Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu-Alike, Ndufu-Alike, Nigeria. ⁴⁸Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu-Alike, Ndufu-Alike, Nigeria. ⁴⁹Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu-Alike, Ndufu-Alike, Nigeria. ⁵⁰Department of Psychology, Ankara Medipol University, Ankara, Turkey. ⁵¹MIS Department, Ankara Science University, Ankara, Turkey. ⁵²School of Psychology, Arellano University, Manila, Philippines. ⁵³Ashland University, Ashland, Ohio. ⁵⁴Department of Psychology, Atilim University, Ankara, Turkey. ⁵⁵Australian Catholic University, North Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. ⁵⁶School of Behavioural and Health Sciences, Australian Catholic University, North Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. ⁵⁷Aventura Social and DESSH, Faculty of Human Kinetics, University of Lisbon; Institute of Environmental Health, Medicine Faculty, University of Lisbon; ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal. ⁵⁸Department of Psychology, Ben Gurion University, Beersheba, Israel. ⁵⁹Department of Psychology and Zlotowski Center for Neuroscience, Ben Gurion University, Beersheba, Israel. ⁶⁰Department of Political Science, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. ⁶¹Department of Psychology, Bournemouth University, Poole, United Kingdom. ⁶²Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, United States. ⁶³Center for Research on Cognition and Behavior, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities in Sopot, Sopot, Poland. ⁶⁴Universidad del Desarrollo, Centre of Attachment and Emotional Regulation (CARE), Las Condes, Chile. ⁶⁵Charles University, Prague, Czechia. ⁶⁶Environment Center, Charles University, Prague, Czechia. ⁶⁷Institute for Research and Development of Education, Faculty of Education, Charles University; Faculty of Education, University of Presov, Prague, Czechia. ⁶⁸Institute of Economic Studies, Charles University, Prague, Czechia. ⁶⁹Chinese Center of Disease Prevention and Control, Beijing, China. ⁷⁰Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, United States. ⁷¹CLLE, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France. ⁷²CLLE, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France. ⁷³CLLE, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France. ⁷⁴Cognitive Science, Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia. ⁷⁵Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia. ⁷⁶Concordia University, Montréal, Canada. ⁷⁷College of Science, Health, Engineering and Education, Murdoch University, Perth, Australia. ⁷⁸De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines. ⁷⁹Departamento de Psicología, Universidad de Los Andes; Estudios en Ciencias del Comportamiento, Bogotá, Colombia. ⁸⁰Departamento de Psicología, Laboratorio de Estrés y Salud, Universidad de La Frontera, Temuco, Chile. ⁸¹Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁸²Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁸³Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁸⁴Department of Cognitive Science and Psychology, Research Center for Cognitive Science, New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria. ⁸⁵Department of Experimental and Applied Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands. ⁸⁶Department of Experimental Psychology, Institute of Psychology, University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil. ⁸⁷Department of General Psychology, University of Padova, Padua, Italy. ⁸⁸Department of General Psychology, University of Padova; Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Padova; Padua Neuroscience Center, University of Padova; Human Inspired Technology Center, University of Padova, Padua, Italy. ⁸⁹Department of Human Development and Psychology, Tzu-Chi University, Hualien, Taiwan. ⁹⁰Department of Management, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark. ⁹¹Department of Management, Kingston University London, Kingston, England. ⁹²Department of Neurosurgery, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, United States. ⁹³Department of Philosophy, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. ⁹⁴Department of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Faculty of Education, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla, Turkey. ⁹⁵Department of Psychological Sciences, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia. ⁹⁶Department of Psychology and Neuroscience,

University of St Andrews, St Andrews, United Kingdom. ⁹⁷Department of Psychology, Education & Child Studies, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam; MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. ⁹⁸Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czechia. ⁹⁹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Košice, Slovakia. ¹⁰⁰Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education, Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia. ¹⁰¹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Information Technologies, University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia. ¹⁰²Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Education, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. ¹⁰³Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. ¹⁰⁴Department of Psychology, Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany. ¹⁰⁵Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom. ¹⁰⁶Department of Psychology, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. ¹⁰⁷Department of Psychology, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. ¹⁰⁸Department of Psychology, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United States. ¹⁰⁹Department of Psychology, Mohammed V University in Rabat; LIP/PC2S, Université Grenoble Alpes, Rabat, Morocco. ¹¹⁰Department of Psychology, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, United States. ¹¹¹Department of Psychology, Oakland University, Oakland County, United States. ¹¹²Department of Psychology, Sapienza University, Rome, Italy. ¹¹³Department of Psychology, Sapienza University, Rome, Italy. ¹¹⁴Department of Psychology, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia. ¹¹⁵Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom. ¹¹⁶Department of Psychology, University of Crete, Heraklion, Greece. ¹¹⁷Department of Psychology, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. ¹¹⁸Department of Psychology, University of Magallanes, Punta Arenas, Chile. ¹¹⁹Department of Psychology, University of Maribor, Maribor, Slovenia. ¹²⁰Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, United States. ¹²¹Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, United States. ¹²²Department of Psychology, University of Mississippi, Oxford, United States. ¹²³Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway. ¹²⁴Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway. ¹²⁵Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom. ¹²⁶Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, United States. ¹²⁷Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. ¹²⁸Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Košice, Slovakia. ¹²⁹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Košice, Slovakia. ¹³⁰Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Košice, Slovakia. ¹³¹Department of Social Psychology, Tilburg University, Tilburg, the Netherlands. ¹³²Department of Special Education and The Edmond J. Safra Brain Research Center for the Study of Learning Disabilities, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel. ¹³³Department of Sport Management, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Science, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran. ¹³⁴Department of Translation Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia. ¹³⁵Developmental Behavioral Genetics Laboratory, Psychological Institute of the Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia. ¹³⁶Discipline of Psychology, Faculty of Health, University of Canberra, Canberra, Australia. ¹³⁷Division of Psychology & Language Sciences, University College London, London, United Kingdom. ¹³⁸Psychology Department, Dominican University, River Forest, United States. ¹³⁹Psychology Department, Dominican University, River Forest, United States. ¹⁴⁰Psychology Department, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India. ¹⁴¹Dynamic and Clinical Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy. ¹⁴²Department of Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, the Netherlands. ¹⁴³Environment Center, Charles University, Prague, Czechia. ¹⁴⁴Facultad de Psicología, Universidad del Desarrollo; Clínica Alemana de Santiago; Sociedad Chilena de Desarrollo Emocional, Concepción, Chile. ¹⁴⁵Faculty of Arts, University of Presov, Prešov, Slovakia. ¹⁴⁶Faculty of Legal and Business Studies Dr Lazar Vrkatic, Department of

Psychology, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad, Serbia. ¹⁴⁷Faculty of Legal and Business Studies Dr Lazar Vrkatic, Department of Psychology, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad, Serbia. ¹⁴⁸Faculty of Management, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland. ¹⁴⁹Faculty of Media and Communication, Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia. ¹⁵⁰Faculty of Medicine FMUC, Institute of Nuclear Sciences Applied to Health ICS, Coimbra Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Translational Research CIBIT, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. ¹⁵¹Faculty of Medicine FMUC, Institute of Nuclear Sciences Applied to Health ICS, Coimbra Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Translational Research CIBIT, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. ¹⁵²Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia. ¹⁵³Faculty of Psychology, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. ¹⁵⁴Faculty of Psychology, Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz, Bogotá, Colombia. ¹⁵⁵Department of Psychology, Federal University of Mato Grosso, Cuiabá, Brazil. ¹⁵⁶Center for Children and Families, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, United States. ¹⁵⁷Center for Translational Behavioral Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, United States. ¹⁵⁸Department of Psychology, Fo Guang University, Jiaoxi, Yilan, Taiwan. ¹⁵⁹FOM University of Applied Sciences, Essen, Germany. ¹⁶⁰FOM University of Applied Sciences; Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien; LEAD Research Network, Eberhard Karls University, Essen, Germany. ¹⁶¹Fox School of Business, Temple University, Philadelphia, United States. ¹⁶²Department of Psychology, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, United States. ¹⁶³Unaffiliated, Unknown. ¹⁶⁴Unaffiliated, Unknown. ¹⁶⁵Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena, Germany. ¹⁶⁶Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz, Bogotá, Colombia. ¹⁶⁷GC University, Lahore, Pakistan. ¹⁶⁸Department of Psychology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, United States. ¹⁶⁹Department of Experimental Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium. ¹⁷⁰Department of Experimental Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium. ¹⁷¹Ecole de Management, Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France. ¹⁷²Department of Anesthesiology and Reanimation, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. ¹⁷³Higher College of Education & Training, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco. ¹⁷⁴National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ¹⁷⁵Universidad del Desarrollo, Concepción, Chile. ¹⁷⁶Humboldt State University, Arcata, United States. ¹⁷⁷Charles University, Prague, Czechia. ¹⁷⁸Unaffiliated, Unknown. ¹⁷⁹Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom. ¹⁸⁰Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ¹⁸¹Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ¹⁸²Department of Psychology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ¹⁸³Department of Psychology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ¹⁸⁴Indiana University Pennsylvania, Indiana, United States. ¹⁸⁵INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France. ¹⁸⁶Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia. ¹⁸⁷Institute of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences, Beijing Normal University at Zhuhai, Zhuhai, China. ¹⁸⁸Institute of Applied Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland. ¹⁸⁹Institute of Cognitive and Evolutionary Anthropology, University of Oxford; Calvea Research Centre for Evolution and Human Sciences, Magdalen College, Oxford, United Kingdom. ¹⁹⁰Institute of European Studies and International Relations, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia. ¹⁹¹Institute of Nuclear Sciences Applied to Health ICS, Coimbra Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Translational Research CIBIT, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal. ¹⁹²Institute of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary. ¹⁹³Institute of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary. ¹⁹⁴Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland. ¹⁹⁵Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland. ¹⁹⁶Institute of Psychology, University of Hildesheim, Hannover, Germany. ¹⁹⁷Institute of Psychology, University of Hildesheim, Hildesheim, Germany. ¹⁹⁸Institute of Psychology, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary. ¹⁹⁹Institute of Psychology, University of Silesia in Katowice, Katowice, Poland. ²⁰⁰Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland. ²⁰¹Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland. ²⁰²Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland. ²⁰³Institute of Psychology, University of

Wroclaw; School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography, University of Oxford, Wrocław, Poland. ²⁰⁴Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas (IIPsi), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba - Conicet, Córdoba, Argentina. ²⁰⁵Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas (IIPsi), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba - Conicet; Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba., Córdoba, Argentina. ²⁰⁶Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas (IIPsi), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba - Conicet, Córdoba, Argentina. ²⁰⁷Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas (IIPsi), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba - Conicet, Córdoba, Argentina. ²⁰⁸Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Monterrey, Mexico. ²⁰⁹CIS-IUL, Iscte-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal. ²¹⁰CIS-IUL, Iscte-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal. ²¹¹CIS-IUL, Iscte-University Institute of Lisbon; Intelligent Agents and Synthetic Characters Group (GAIPS), INESC-ID, Lisbon, Portugal. ²¹²Ithaca College, Ithaca, United States. ²¹³Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland. ²¹⁴Department of Philosophy, Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Kraków, Poland. ²¹⁵Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland. ²¹⁶Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland. ²¹⁷Department of Psychology, Jose Rizal University, Mandaluyong, Philippines. ²¹⁸Department of Psychology and Psychodynamics, Karl Landsteiner University of Health Sciences, Krems an der Donau, Austria. ²¹⁹Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet; Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. ²²⁰Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University, Kent, United States. ²²¹Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University, Kent, United States. ²²²Kingston University; Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education (IGDORE), London, United Kingdom. ²²³Centre for Economic Psychology and Decision Sciences, Kozminski University, Warsaw, Poland. ²²⁴Admission Center, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan. ²²⁵Faculty of Arts and Science, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan. ²²⁶La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. ²²⁷Lazaridis School of Business and Economics, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario. ²²⁸Carnegie School of Sport, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, United Kingdom. ²²⁹Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands. ²³⁰Leipzig University, Institute of Psychology, Leipzig, Germany. ²³¹LIP/PC2S, Université Grenoble Alpes; Department of Psychology, Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Grenoble, France. ²³²Institute of Asian and African Studies, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia. ²³³London School of Economics and Political Science, London, England. ²³⁴Department of Management, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, England. ²³⁵Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje, North Macedonia. ²³⁶Macquarie University; University of Bristol, Sydney, Australia. ²³⁷Department of Psychology, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom. ²³⁸Mannheim Centre for European Social Research, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany. ²³⁹Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. ²⁴⁰Department of Psychology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. ²⁴¹Department of Psychology, Middlebury College; Vermont Psychological Services, University of Vermont, Middlebury, United States. ²⁴²Mohammed V University in Rabat, Rabat, Morocco. ²⁴³Mohammed V University in Rabat, Rabat, Morocco. ²⁴⁴Department of Psychology, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Rabat, Morocco. ²⁴⁵Department of Psychology, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Rabat, Morocco. ²⁴⁶Sampurna Montfort College, Bengaluru, India. ²⁴⁷Sampurna Montfort College, Bengaluru, India. ²⁴⁸Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla, Turkey. ²⁴⁹Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla, Turkey. ²⁵⁰Multimodal Imaging and Cognitive Control Lab, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo; Cognitive and Translational Neuroscience Cluster, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway. ²⁵¹College of Science, Health, Engineering & Education, Murdoch University, Perth, Australia. ²⁵²National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece. ²⁵³Faculty of Higher Studies "Iztacala", National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico. ²⁵⁴National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁵⁵National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia.

²⁵⁶National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁵⁷National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁵⁸National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁵⁹National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁶⁰National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁶¹National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. ²⁶²Department of Cognitive Science and Psychology, New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria. ²⁶³Department of Cognitive Science and Psychology, New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria. ²⁶⁴Department of Applied Psychology, New York University, New York City, United States. ²⁶⁵NHH Norwegian School of Economics, Department of Strategy and Management, Bergen, Norway. ²⁶⁶NHH Norwegian School of Economics, Department of Strategy and Management, Bergen, Norway. ²⁶⁷Nic Waals Institute, Lovisenberg Diaconal Hospital, Oslo, Norway. ²⁶⁸Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. ²⁶⁹Norvel - Psychological Centre for Counselling and Research, Osijek, Croatia. ²⁷⁰Nova Southeastern University, Broward County, United States. ²⁷¹Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Nova Southeastern University, Broward County, United States. ²⁷²Department of Cognitive Science, Occidental College, Los Angeles, United States. ²⁷³Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, England. ²⁷⁴Paul Valery Montpellier University, Montpellier, France. ²⁷⁵Prague University of Economics and Business, Prague, Czechia. ²⁷⁶PSA Psihesko, Skopje, Macedonia. ²⁷⁷PSA Psihesko, Skopje, Macedonia. ²⁷⁸PSA Psihesko, Skopje, Macedonia. ²⁷⁹PSA Psihesko, Skopje, Macedonia. ²⁸⁰Psychology Department, Swansea University, Swansea, United Kingdom. ²⁸¹Purdue University, West Lafayette, United States. ²⁸²Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands. ²⁸³Behavioural Science Institute, Faculty of Social Sciences, Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands. ²⁸⁴Department of Psychology, Samsun University, Samsun; Department of Psychology, Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir, Turkey. ²⁸⁵Research Methods, Assessment, and iScience, Department of Psychology, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany. ²⁸⁶Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia, United States. ²⁸⁷School of Communication and Culture, Aarhus University; Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, Aarhus, Denmark. ²⁸⁸School of Creative Arts Therapies, University of Haifa; Emili Sagol creative arts therapies research center, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel. ²⁸⁹School of Health and Behavioural Sciences, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sunshine Coast, Australia. ²⁹⁰School of Psychology and Centre for Brain Research, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. ²⁹¹School of Psychology, King's College, University of Aberdeen; School of Psychological Science, University of Western Australia, Aberdeen, United Kingdom. ²⁹²School of Psychology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China. ²⁹³School of Psychology, National University of Ireland, Galway, Galway, Ireland. ²⁹⁴School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United States. ²⁹⁵School of Psychology, University of Nottingham Malaysia, Semenyih, Malaysia. ²⁹⁶School of Psychology, University of Nottingham Malaysia, Semenyih, Malaysia. ²⁹⁷School of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guildford, England. ²⁹⁸School of Psychology. University of East London; Centre for Affective Disorders, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom. ²⁹⁹School of Social Sciences, Singapore Management University, Singapore, Singapore. ³⁰⁰Department of Psychology, Senshu University, Tokyo, Japan. ³⁰¹Sewanee: The University of the South, Sewanee, United States. ³⁰²Department of Psychology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel. ³⁰³School of Social Sciences, Singapore Management University, Singapore, Singapore. ³⁰⁴Department of Psychology, Faculty of Media and Communications, Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia. ³⁰⁵Social, Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience Unit, Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ³⁰⁶Social, Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience Unit, Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ³⁰⁷Department of General, Experimental, and Health Psychology, Sofia Universtiy St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria. ³⁰⁸Department of General, Experimental, and Health Psychology, Sofia

Universtiy St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria. ³⁰⁹Department of General, Experimental, and Health Psychology, Sofia Universtiy St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria. ³¹⁰Department of General, Experimental, and Health Psychology, Sofia Universtiy St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria. ³¹¹Department of General, Experimental, and Health Psychology, Sofia Universtiy St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria. ³¹²School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, United States. ³¹³School of Business, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, United States. ³¹⁴Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. ³¹⁵Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. ³¹⁶Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. ³¹⁷Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden. ³¹⁸SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland. ³¹⁹SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland. ³²⁰T. A. Pai Management Institute, Manipal, India. ³²¹Department of Art Studies, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran. ³²²Department of Psychology, The Education University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. ³²³The Faculty of Humanities, Psychology and Theology, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland. ³²⁴The Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Osijek, Osijek, Croatia. ³²⁵Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, United States. ³²⁶Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, United States. ³²⁷The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia. ³²⁸Department of Psychology, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, United States. ³²⁹Laboratory for Experimental Psychology, Institute of Philosophy, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, The University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia. ³³⁰The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. ³³¹Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, The University of Osijek, Osijek, Croatia. ³³²Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands. ³³³Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands. ³³⁴Department of Social Psychology, Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands. ³³⁵Department of Psychology, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway. ³³⁶Department of Psychology, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway. ³³⁷Department of Clinical Psychology, United Arab Emirates University; Wolfson College, University of Oxford, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates. ³³⁸Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. ³³⁹Departamento de Psicología, Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. ³⁴⁰Departamento de Psicología, Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. ³⁴¹Universidad de Sonora, Sonora, México. ³⁴²Universidad de Sonora, Sonora, México. ³⁴³Department of Psychology, Universidad de Sonora, Sonora, México. ³⁴⁴Universidad del Desarrollo, Concepción, Chile. ³⁴⁵Centro de Apego y Regulación Emocional, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Del Desarrollo, Concepción, Chile. ³⁴⁶Programa de Psicología, Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia. ³⁴⁷Universidad Latina de Costa Rica, San Pedro, Costa Rica. ³⁴⁸Grupo de investigación en Biogeografía y Ecología Espacial (BioGeoE²), Universidad Regional Amazónica Ikiam, Tena, Ecuador. ³⁴⁹Universidade Cruzeiro do Sul, São Paulo Brazil. ³⁵⁰Université de Lorraine; Université de Strasbourg, Nancy, France. ³⁵¹Université de Lorraine; Université de Strasbourg, Nancy, France. ³⁵²Université de Paris, Paris, France. ³⁵³Université de Paris, Paris, France. ³⁵⁴Université de Paris, Paris, France. ³⁵⁵Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France. ³⁵⁶Université Paul Valéry Montpellier, Montpellier, France. ³⁵⁷University College Cork, Cork, Ireland. ³⁵⁸Department of Experimental Psychology, University College London, London, United Kingdom. ³⁵⁹University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, United States. ³⁶⁰Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, United States. ³⁶¹University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. ³⁶²University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. ³⁶³Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. ³⁶⁴Department of Psychology, Institute of Social Sciences, University of Başkent, Ankara, Turkey. ³⁶⁵Department of Psychology, Institute of Social Sciences, University of Başkent, Ankara, Turkey. ³⁶⁶Laboratory for Research of Individual Differences, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia. ³⁶⁷Department of Biological and Medical Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway. ³⁶⁸University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom. ³⁶⁹Department of Social and Work Psychology.,

University of Brasília, Brasília, Brazil. ³⁷⁰Institute of Psychology, University of Brasilia, Brasília, Brazil. ³⁷¹Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, United States. ³⁷²University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus. ³⁷³Department of Psychology, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus. ³⁷⁴University of Delaware, Newark, United States. ³⁷⁵Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, United States. ³⁷⁶Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado. ³⁷⁷Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh. ³⁷⁸Department of Psychology, University of East London, London, United Kingdom. ³⁷⁹University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland. ³⁸⁰University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom. ³⁸¹University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom. ³⁸²University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom. ³⁸³University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom. ³⁸⁴Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom. ³⁸⁵Department of Psychology, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom. ³⁸⁶Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, United States. ³⁸⁷Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, United States. ³⁸⁸Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, United States. ³⁸⁹Institute of Psychology, University of Graz, Graz, Austria. ³⁹⁰Institute of Psychology, University of Graz, Graz, Austria. ³⁹¹LIP/PC2S, Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France. ³⁹²LIP/PC2S, Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France. ³⁹³University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. ³⁹⁴University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom. ³⁹⁵Department of Psychology, Global MINDS, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland. ³⁹⁶University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana. ³⁹⁷University of Milan-Bicocca, Milan, Italy. ³⁹⁸Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, United Kingdom. ³⁹⁹University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, United Kingdom. ⁴⁰⁰Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, United Kingdom. ⁴⁰¹Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, United Kingdom. ⁴⁰²Institute of Psychology, University of Opole, Opole, Poland. ⁴⁰³Institute of Psychology, University of Opole, Opole, Poland. ⁴⁰⁴University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom. ⁴⁰⁵Department of Philosophy, Sociology, Education and Applied Psychology, University of Padova, Padua, Italy. ⁴⁰⁶Institute of Psychology, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary. ⁴⁰⁷Center for Psychology, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal. ⁴⁰⁸Center for Psychology, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal. ⁴⁰⁹Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, University of Presov, Prešov, Slovakia. ⁴¹⁰Institute of Psychology, University of Presov, Prešov, Slovakia. ⁴¹¹School of Languages and Cultures, University of Queensland; Centro de Estudios Orientales, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Brisbane, Australia. ⁴¹²Department of Experimental Psychology, Institute of Psychology, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil. ⁴¹³School of Architecture, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom. ⁴¹⁴University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, United States. ⁴¹⁵School of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, United Kingdom. ⁴¹⁶University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran. ⁴¹⁷University of the Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. ⁴¹⁸Department of Psychology, University of the Fraser Valley, Abbotsford, British Columbia. ⁴¹⁹University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. ⁴²⁰Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, Philippines. ⁴²¹Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁴²²Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, School of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ⁴²³University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom. ⁴²⁴University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom. ⁴²⁵Department of Psychology; University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, United States. ⁴²⁶Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland. ⁴²⁷Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław; Social and Legal Psychology, Johannes Gutenberg University, Wrocław, Poland. ⁴²⁸Department of Psychology, University of Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany. ⁴²⁹Department of Psychology, University of Zadar, Zadar, Croatia. ⁴³⁰Department of Organization and Human Resources, School of Management, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal, Canada. ⁴³¹Department of Psychology, Üsküdar University, Istanbul, Turkey. ⁴³²Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, United States.

⁴³³Faculty of Science and Engineering, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan. ⁴³⁴Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, United States. ⁴³⁵Department of Psychology and Psychotherapy, Witten/Herdecke University, Witten, Germany. ⁴³⁶Department of Psychology and Psychotherapy, Witten/Herdecke University, Witten, Germany. ⁴³⁷Department of Psychology, Wittenberg University, Springfield, United States. ⁴³⁸School of Applied Psychology, ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Winterthur, Switzerland. ⁴³⁹University of Virginia, Charlottesville, United States. ⁴⁴⁰Department of Psychology, Ashland University, Ashland, United States. ⁴⁴¹Department of Psychology, Ashland University, Ashland, United States. ⁴⁴²Department of Psychology, Tufts University, Middlesex County, United States. ⁴⁴³Harrisburg University of Science and Technology, Harrisburg, United States. ⁴⁴⁴Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University, Cambridge, United States. ⁴⁴⁵Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands. ⁴⁴⁶United States International University - Africa, Nairobi, Kenya. ⁴⁴⁷Université Grenoble Alpes; Institut Universitaire de France, Grenoble, France. ⁴⁴⁸LIP/PC2S, Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France. ⁴⁴⁹Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, United States.

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has increased negative emotions and decreased positive emotions globally. Left unchecked, these emotional changes might have a wide array of adverse impacts. To reduce negative emotions and increase positive emotions, we tested the effectiveness of reappraisal, an emotion regulation strategy which modifies how one thinks about a situation. Participants from 87 countries/regions ($n = 21,644$) were randomly assigned to one of two brief reappraisal interventions (reconstrual or repurposing) or one of two control conditions (active or passive). Results revealed that both reappraisal interventions (vs. both control conditions) consistently reduced negative emotions and increased positive emotions across different measures. Reconstrual and repurposing had similar effects. Importantly, planned exploratory analyses indicated that reappraisal interventions did not reduce intentions to practice preventive health behaviours. The findings demonstrate the viability of creating scalable, low-cost interventions for use around the world to build resilience during the pandemic and beyond.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is increasing negative emotions and decreasing positive emotions around the globe¹⁻¹⁰. Concurrently, individuals are reporting that COVID-19 is having a negative impact on their psychological functioning and mental health^{4, 11, 12}. For example, individuals report sleeping less, consuming more alcohol or other drugs/substances, having trouble concentrating because their mind is occupied by COVID-19, and having more fights with their partner or loved ones, some escalating to domestic violence^{1, 9, 13}.

These disturbing trends are partly caused by heightened levels of negative emotion and diminished levels of positive emotion, which have been found to contribute to a number of negative psychological, behavioural, and health consequences. These include increased risk for anxiety and depressive disorders, as well as other forms of psychopathology¹⁴; impaired social connections¹⁵; increased substance use^{16, 17, 18}; compromised immune system functioning^{19, 20, 21}; disturbed sleep²²; increased maladaptive eating^{23, 24}; increased aggressive behaviour^{25, 26}; impaired learning²⁷; worse job performance^{28, 29}; and impaired economic decision-making^{30, 31}.

As the COVID-19 pandemic unfolds around the world, we believe it is crucial to mitigate expected adverse outcomes by reducing negative emotions and increasing positive emotions. Such a change in emotions is central to increasing psychological resilience, a multifaceted concept that involves adaptive emotional responses in the face of adversity^{32, 33, 34}. Reappraisal, an emotion regulation strategy that involves changing how one thinks about a situation with the goal of influencing one's emotional response³⁵, is a promising candidate as an intervention to increase psychological resilience, due to its adaptability, simplicity, and efficiency^{34, 36, 37, 38}. In contrast to less effective emotion regulation strategies such as suppression, reappraisal generally leads to more successful regulation ($d = 0.45$, 95% Confidence Interval (CI) = [0.35, 0.56] in changing emotion experience in a meta-analysis³⁹; see caveats about interpreting effect sizes in past research in the "Sampling plan" section below). In particular, over the short term, reappraisal leads to decreased reports of negative emotion and increased reports of positive

emotion^{40, 41, 42}, as well as corresponding changes both in peripheral physiological responses^{43, 44, 45} and central physiological responses⁴⁶⁻⁵³. Over the longer term, reappraisal is associated with stronger social connections⁵⁴; higher academic achievement^{55, 56}; enhanced psychological well-being⁵⁷; fewer psychopathological symptoms^{58, 59}; better cardiovascular health^{60, 61}, and greater resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic⁶².

Despite these shorter-term and longer-term benefits, most people do not reappraise consistently⁶³, which has motivated efforts to teach people to use reappraisal (see reviews^{65, 66}). For example, in the context of anxiety, reappraisal training led to reduced intrusive memories⁶⁷ and increased emotion regulation self-efficacy^{68, 69}. Reappraisal training also led to long-lasting changes in the neural representation of unpleasant events⁷⁰.

Although demand characteristics are always a concern when examining the effects of reappraisal (given that one is teaching people to change their thinking in order to change how they're feeling, and then asking them how they feel)⁷¹, the wide array of self-report and non-self-report outcomes³⁹⁻⁵³ that show reappraisal effects across studies increases confidence that these effects are real. It is also encouraging to note that reappraisal generally out-performs other types of emotion regulation such as suppression, even though demand characteristics appear comparable across regulation conditions³⁹. In addition, evidence indicates that reappraisal interventions can influence emotional outcomes even in intensely challenging contexts in which people are often unmotivated to regulate their emotions⁷². For example, a brief reappraisal training conducted in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and replicated in the context of the Colombian conflict⁷³, has been found to contribute to reduced intergroup anger and increased support for conciliatory political policies⁷⁴.

As part of the Psychological Science Accelerator's (PSA) attempt to address pressing questions related to the psychological impact of COVID-19, the current study aimed to use reappraisal interventions to enhance psychological resilience in response to the pandemic. To maximize the impact of these interventions, this project had a global reach of large, diverse samples via the PSA's network⁷⁵, and employed highly scalable methods that were translated for use around the world. In order to make

stronger and clearer inferences, our design included two reappraisal interventions that were compared to two control conditions, an active control and a passive control.

For our reappraisal interventions, we examined two theoretically defined forms of reappraisal⁷⁶ -- namely reconstrual and repurposing. Reconstrual involves changing how a situation was construed or mentally represented in a way that changes the emotional responses related to the situation. Examples of reconstrual in response to COVID-19 include: “Washing hands, avoiding touching my face, keeping a safe distance...There are simple and effective things I can do to protect myself and my loved ones from getting sick and to stop the spread of the virus” and “I know from world history that keeping calm and carrying on gets us through tough times.” Repurposing involves focusing on a potentially positive outcome that could come from the current situation in a way that changes the emotional response to it. Examples of repurposing in response to COVID-19 include: “This situation is helping us realize the importance of meaningful social connections, and helping us understand who the most important people in our lives are” and “Medical systems are now learning to deal with amazing challenges, which will make them much more resilient in the future.” For our active control condition, we asked participants to reflect on their thoughts and feelings as they unfolded. Meta-analyses have revealed that reflecting on one’s thoughts and feelings produces small but reliable salutary effects ($d = 0.07$, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.17] in improving psychological health that includes emotional responses^{77, 78}). Examples of reflecting in response to COVID-19 are: “I really wish we could find a vaccine soon” and “This situation is changing so fast, and I don’t know how the future will develop.” By asking participants in this condition to actively use a strategy that is likely to have a positive effect, we sought to match expectancy and demand across reappraisal and active control conditions. For our passive control condition, we asked participants to respond as they naturally do, which is a commonly used passive control condition in prior research on emotion regulation (for a meta-analysis, see³⁹).

In comparing conditions, we chose to distinguish between negative and positive emotional responses, as previous evidence suggests that the two are clearly separable^{79, 80}. Specifically, we hypothesized that our reappraisal interventions would lead to reduced negative emotional responses

(hypothesis 1) and increased positive emotional responses (hypothesis 2) compared to both control conditions combined. While both reconstrual and repurposing strategies involve changing thinking, we hypothesised that reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative emotional responses than repurposing (hypothesis 3) and that repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive emotional responses than reconstrual (hypothesis 4). We theorized that reconstruing one's situation should primarily decrease negative emotions because it typically focuses on ameliorating the problem at hand. Reconstrual is most similar to a previously studied subtype of reappraisal called reappraising emotional stimulus, which has been mainly investigated on negative emotions and has a $d = 0.38$, 95% CI = [0.21, 0.55] in changing emotion experience³⁹. Repurposing one's situation, by contrast, should primarily increase positive emotions because it usually calls to mind positive experiences. Repurposing is similar to a few previously examined types of reappraisals such as benefit finding and positive reappraisal, both of which are primarily associated with positive outcomes^{81, 82} (the "Sampling plan" section below provides further detail).

In testing these hypotheses, we planned to employ orthogonal contrasts that make two primary comparisons, while keeping all other comparisons exploratory (Table 1 provides further detail). The first comparison contrasted both the reappraisal conditions combined with both the active control condition and the passive control condition combined for negative (hypothesis 1) and positive (hypothesis 2) emotions. The second comparison contrasted the reconstrual and repurposing interventions for negative (hypothesis 3) and positive (hypothesis 4) emotions. One attractive feature of comparisons between reappraisal conditions is that there is no reason to assume that demand or expectancies would differ across these reappraisal conditions.

One potential concern about the current design was that the emotion regulation interventions might reduce preventive health behaviours (e.g., keeping social distance and washing hands) that could potentially be motivated by negative emotions. Some research on the connection between emotions and health behaviour suggests that increased negative emotions such as fear do not seem to be a strong motivator to change one's health behaviour⁸³. Furthermore, positive emotions augmented by the

reappraisal interventions may contribute to a greater tendency to undertake health behaviours^{84, 85}. For example, positive emotions can lead to higher medication adherence⁸⁶. To ensure that our interventions would not adversely impact any relevant health behaviours, we took two steps. First, during the instructions, we clarified that, in some cases, negative emotions such as fear and sadness may be helpful, and that it is up to each person to determine when an emotion is unhelpful or not and to downregulate only those emotions that are unhelpful. Second, in order to assess whether our training would lead to reduced vigilance, we specifically measured and examined intentions to follow stay-at-home orders and wash hands in exploratory analyses.

In addition, we conducted other exploratory analyses. Among other things, these analyses tested the impact of our reappraisal interventions on negative and positive anticipated emotions and intentions to enact potentially harmful versus beneficial behaviours associated with these emotions (details described in the measure section below), and assessed whether the effects of our reappraisal interventions, if any, were moderated by motivation to use the given strategy⁷¹, belief in the effectiveness of the given strategy⁸⁷, or demographics (gender³⁹; socioeconomic status^{88, 89}; or country/region⁹⁰ [particularly in light of the differing levels of impact of COVID-19 in any given country/region at any given point in time]).

Results

Final sample size and demographics. We collected 27,989 responses from May 2020 to October 2020. After implementing preregistered exclusions (see details at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.4878591.v1>) and an additional exclusion of nine duplicate IDs, our final sample included 21,644 participants from 87 countries/regions (63.41% female, 35.34% male, 0.45% other genders, 0.56% preferred not to say, and 0.24% missing responses to the gender question; M age = 31.91, SD age = 14.52; see Supplementary Table 1 for sample size per country/region and Supplementary Table 2 for sample size per month). Of the 87 countries/regions represented, 37 had over

200 participants, surpassing our 95% power criterion based on simulations in our power analysis (see the “Power analysis” section below).

We preregistered two exclusion criteria. First, as planned, we excluded participants who answered both multiple choice manipulation check questions incorrectly, and found that conditions had similar proportions of such participants (0.55%), Holm’s adjusted P s > 0.999 . Second, as planned, we excluded participants who completed fewer than 50% of the questions in the study, and found that the passive control condition had fewer such participants (16.17%) than the other three conditions (23.86% in the active control condition, 24.41% in the reconstrual condition, and 23.90% in the repurposing condition), Holm’s adjusted P s < 0.001 . One possible explanation for this difference is that the instructions given to participants in the passive control condition were shorter than those given in the other conditions, requiring less cognitive effort to read and less time to complete the study. Applying both exclusion criteria, the overall exclusion rate was significantly lower in the passive control condition (16.71%) than in the other three conditions (24.47% in the active control condition, 24.99% in the reconstrual condition, and 24.37% in the repurposing condition), Holm’s adjusted P s < 0.001 . To rule out concerns related to differences in exclusion rates, we repeated all preregistered analyses on the full sample. Reassuringly, all patterns, statistical significance, and conclusions remained unchanged when analyses were repeated on the full sample (see Supplementary Table 3 for details).

Preregistered analyses. We included all 87 countries/regions in all analyses regardless of their sample sizes, except for Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 1, and Supplementary Fig. 2 where the 37 countries/regions with $n \geq 200$ were analyzed separately by country/region. Effect sizes, frequentist statistics, and Bayes factors for each of our hypotheses are presented in Table 2. Raw means and standard deviations for each relevant measure are provided in Table 3. Details of analytical models are described in the Methods section.

Hypotheses regarding the shared effects of two brief reappraisal interventions. Consistent with the study's main hypotheses, both reappraisal interventions combined (vs. both control conditions combined) significantly decreased negative emotional responses (hypothesis 1) and significantly increased positive emotional responses (hypothesis 2) across all primary outcome measures (emotions in response to the photos, state emotions after viewing all the photos, and emotions about the COVID-19 situation; see Table 2, rows 2-7). As shown in Fig. 1, this finding was consistent across the 37 countries/regions where we had over 200 participants (although all 87 countries/regions were included in the analysis testing hypotheses regardless of their sample size, only the 37 countries/regions with $n \geq 200$ were analyzed separately by country/region for Fig. 1). For example, in comparing participants' immediate negative emotional responses to the photos about the COVID-19 situation, data from 33 out of the 37 (89%) countries/regions showed significant effects of the reappraisal interventions in the hypothesised direction. None of the 37 countries/regions' data revealed a statistically significant result in the opposite direction.

Hypotheses regarding the unique effects of the two reappraisal interventions. Results revealed little to no support for our hypotheses regarding the differences between reconstrual and repurposing, as neither was reliably better than the other at reducing negative emotions or increasing positive emotions across outcomes (see Table 2, rows 8-13; Supplementary Fig. 2). We hypothesised that reconstrual would produce greater decreases in negative emotional responses than repurposing (hypothesis 3), and data revealed supportive evidence for only one outcome (negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation; see Table 2, row 10) out of the three measures of negative emotions. The other two negative emotion outcome measures did not support that hypothesis. One outcome (negative emotions in response to the photos; see Table 2, row 8) revealed that repurposing had significantly stronger effects in decreasing negative emotional responses than reconstrual, whereas the Bayes factor indicated inconclusive evidence.

Another outcome (negative state emotions; see Table 2, row 9) revealed no significant difference between types of reappraisal, and the Bayes factor indicated strong evidence in favour of the null hypothesis.

We also hypothesised that repurposing would produce greater increases in positive emotional responses than reconstrual (hypothesis 4), and data revealed supportive evidence for only one outcome (positive emotions in response to the photos; see Table 2, row 11) out of the three measures of positive emotions. The other two outcome measures of positive emotions revealed no significant differences between the two reappraisal conditions. The Bayes factors indicated strong evidence in favour of the null hypothesis for one outcome (positive state emotions; see Table 2, row 12) and inconclusive evidence for another outcome (positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation; see Table 2, row 13). Overall, there were no consistent differences across outcomes between reconstrual and repurposing in reducing negative emotions or increasing positive emotions in the current experimental context. We examined potential reasons for these findings in the exploratory analyses and in the discussion section.

Exploratory analyses. In order to better understand the impact of the reappraisal interventions, we conducted four sets of exploratory analyses. First, we examined pairwise comparisons between conditions (each of the reappraisal conditions vs. each of the control conditions, and the active control condition vs. the passive control condition) for our primary outcomes (emotions in response to the photos, state emotions after viewing all the photos, and emotions about the COVID-19 situation). Second, we assessed the effect of reappraisal interventions on four exploratory outcomes (behavioural intentions to practice preventive health behaviours, participants' engagement with emotion regulation strategies, global change in emotions, and anticipated emotions). Third, we assessed four sets of potential moderators of reappraisal interventions' effects (motivation to use the given strategy⁷¹, belief in the effectiveness of the given strategy⁸⁷, demographics^{39, 88, 89, 90}, and lockdown status). Lastly, we contextualised reappraisal interventions' effect sizes on negative emotions by comparing them to effect sizes of lockdown status and self-isolation due to symptoms. Details of analytical models are reported in Supplementary Information (Supplementary Tables 4, 5).

Pairwise comparisons of conditions on primary outcomes. In the first set of exploratory analyses, we examined the extent to which each of the reappraisal conditions differed from each of the control conditions for our primary outcomes (emotions in response to the photos, state emotions after viewing all the photos, and emotions about the COVID-19 situation). Pairwise comparisons for all primary outcomes produced results consistent with the pattern of evidence for hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2. Each of the repurposing and reconstrual conditions (vs. each of the control conditions) significantly decreased negative emotional responses and significantly increased positive emotional responses (P s < 0.001; see Table 3).

We also examined whether the active and passive control conditions differed from each other at the level of pairwise comparisons. Among the three primary outcome measures of negative emotional responses, one was significantly higher in the active control condition than in the passive control condition (negative emotions in response to the photos: $B = 0.091$, $SE = 0.015$, $t(20,740) = 6.192$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.070$, 95% CI = [0.048, 0.093]), while the other two showed no significant differences (negative state emotions: $B = 0.022$, $SE = 0.011$, $t(20,400) = 1.933$, $P = 0.053$, $d = 0.037$, 95% CI = [-0.001, 0.075]; negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation: $B = 0.005$, $SE = 0.022$, $t(26.01) = 0.221$, $P = 0.827$, $d = 0.005$, 95% CI = [-0.040, 0.047]). Among the three primary outcome measures of positive emotional responses, two were significantly higher in the active control condition than in the passive control condition (positive emotions in response to the photos: $B = 0.039$, $SE = 0.013$, $t(20,740) = 2.918$, $P = 0.004$, $d = 0.033$, 95% CI = [0.011, 0.054]; positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation: $B = 0.053$, $SE = 0.019$, $t(233.7) = 2.805$, $P = 0.005$, $d = 0.053$, 95% CI = [0.015, 0.091]), while one showed no significant differences (positive state emotions: $B = 0.009$, $SE = 0.010$, $t(20,350) = 0.858$, $P = 0.391$, $d = 0.017$, 95% CI = [-0.021, 0.054]). Thus, effects produced by the active control condition versus the passive control condition differed infrequently. When they did differ, differences were small in magnitude, inconsistent in direction, and slightly smaller in effect size than was suggested by previous meta-analyses ($d = 0.07$, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.17]⁷⁷).

Reappraisal interventions' effects on four exploratory outcomes. Descriptive statistics and pairwise comparisons for exploratory outcomes can be found in Table 3. Below we focus on the contrast between the two reappraisal interventions combined and the two control conditions combined.

Behavioural intentions to practice preventive health behaviours. To address the concern that reappraisal interventions might reduce preventive health behaviours (by reducing negative emotions such as fear), we asked about participants' behavioural intentions to follow stay-at-home orders stringently and to wash their hands regularly for at least 20 seconds the following week. We found that reappraisal interventions (vs. both control conditions combined) did not significantly change intentions to follow stay-at-home orders ($B = 0.009$, $SE = 0.024$, $t(15.04) = 0.38$, $P = 0.709$, $d = 0.005$, 95% CI = [-0.023, 0.032]) or to wash hands ($B = 0.034$, $SE = 0.020$, $t(20,740) = 1.69$, $P = 0.091$, $d = 0.022$, 95% CI = [-0.004, 0.048]). Pairwise comparisons revealed that the only significant difference was that participants in the reconstrual condition reported higher intentions to wash their hands than those in the passive control condition ($B = 0.077$, $SE = 0.028$, $t(20,740) = 2.714$, Holm's adjusted $P = 0.040$, $d = 0.051$, 95% CI = [0.014, 0.087]). These results thus provide preliminary evidence that reappraisal interventions did not significantly reduce intentions to practice preventive health behaviours.

Participants' engagement with emotion regulation strategies. To better understand participants' engagement with emotion regulation strategies when viewing the photos related to COVID-19, we examined participants' self-reported frequency of using different strategies when viewing the photos, motivation to use their given strategy, and belief in the effectiveness of their given strategy.

Providing confidence in the effectiveness of the manipulation, we found that participants in each of the four conditions reported using the strategy instructed in their condition more frequently than using the other strategies (see Table 3). It is noteworthy that participants in the two reappraisal conditions reported using both reconstrual and repurposing more frequently than those in either control conditions

rather than primarily using only the form of reappraisal instructed in their condition. This finding may help explain the lack of differences between the two reappraisal conditions on our primary outcomes.

Next, we examined participants' motivation to follow the given instructions, as well as participants' belief that the given strategy could influence their emotions. We found that participants in the two reappraisal interventions (vs. both control conditions combined) reported being significantly less motivated to follow their given instructions while viewing the photos ($B = -0.192$, $SE = 0.016$, $t(20.87) = -11.62$, $P < 0.001$, $d = -0.183$, 95% CI = [-0.215, -0.152]), but reported significantly greater belief in the effectiveness of their given strategy ($B = 0.420$, $SE = 0.053$, $t(52.05) = 7.97$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.233$, 95% CI = [0.175, 0.290]). Thus, the reappraisal conditions were effective in changing emotions despite the fact that participants in reappraisal conditions reported being less motivated to follow the instructions than participants in the control conditions.

Global change of emotions. At the end of the study, we asked participants how they felt compared to the beginning of the study. We found that reappraisal interventions (vs. both control conditions combined) significantly reduced global negative feelings ($B = -0.397$, $SE = 0.026$, $t(45.29) = 15.30$, $P < 0.001$, $d = -0.432$, 95% CI = [-0.489, -0.377]) and significantly increased global positive feelings ($B = 0.378$, $SE = 0.023$, $t(45.49) = 16.75$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.423$, 95% CI = [0.373, 0.473]). These findings suggest that the effects are not specific to items in the immediate proximity of the manipulations.

Anticipated emotions. To gain insight into the potential longer-term effects of reappraisal interventions, we asked participants how they anticipated they would feel the following week. We found that reappraisal interventions (vs. both control conditions combined) significantly reduced negative anticipated emotions ($B = -0.125$, $SE = 0.012$, $t(41.99) = -10.27$, $P < 0.001$, $d = -0.205$, 95% CI = [-0.245, -0.166]) and significantly increased positive anticipated emotions ($B = 0.125$, $SE = 0.008$, $t(13.07) = 15.58$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.227$, 95% CI = [0.197, 0.256]). These findings suggest that participants anticipated that reappraisal strategies would be useful in improving their emotional well-being in the future.

Exploratory moderators of intervention effects. Prior research suggests that emotion regulation interventions lead to better results when the participants are: motivated to regulate their emotions⁷¹, led to believe in the effectiveness of regulation⁸⁷, female (vs. male)³⁹, from lower (vs. higher) socioeconomic status^{88, 89}, and from Western (vs. Eastern) cultures⁹⁰. We examined these as well as lockdown status (as a proxy for differing levels of impact of COVID-19) as potential moderators on our primary outcomes (emotions in response to the photos, state emotions after viewing all the photos, and emotions about the COVID-19 situation).

Controlling for baseline emotions, results of multilevel models revealed that two of the variables moderated intervention effects across all six primary outcomes. Specifically, the higher the scores on motivation to use the given strategy and on belief in the effectiveness of the given strategy were, the more effective the interventions were (Supplementary Fig. 3, 4, Supplementary Tables 6, 7). Two variables (gender and employment status) moderated intervention effects on four of the six primary outcomes: Females (versus males) and individuals who had no employment/no income (versus employment/with income or versus no employment/with income) showed stronger effects of the intervention (Supplementary Tables 9, 10). One variable moderated intervention effects on two of the six outcomes: the higher a country/region scored on Hofstede's⁹¹ index of individualism, the more effective the intervention was in increasing positive emotions in response to the photos and increasing positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation among participants from that country/region (Supplementary Table 8). Subjective socioeconomic status, education level, and lockdown status significantly moderated no more than one of the six outcomes, which would unlikely hold after correction for multiple comparisons (Supplementary Tables 11-13). We report full, detailed results in Supplementary Information.

Contextualising reappraisal interventions' effect sizes. To facilitate interpretation of reappraisal effect sizes, it is helpful to compare them to effect sizes of other factors that may have also contributed to

differences in participants' emotions. One such candidate for comparison is differences in emotional experience as a function of lockdown status and of self-isolation due to symptoms. Assuming that lockdown or self-isolation due to symptoms impacted participants' emotions, emotional changes caused by these factors could be compared to the ones caused by our interventions in order to get a sense of the impact of our intervention.

With negative state emotions as the outcome variable, we examined lockdown status and self-isolation due to symptoms, respectively, as a fixed variable in two separate multilevel models with random by-country slopes and random by-country intercepts to estimate the pure effect size of each variable (as lockdown status and self-isolation due to symptoms were correlated, entering both variables simultaneously in the same model may generate biased estimates). We found that participants whose areas were in full lockdown reported more negative state emotions than participants whose areas were not in lockdown ($B = 0.154$, $SE = 0.040$, $t(37.56) = 3.812$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.159$, 95% CI = [0.075, 0.243]), and participants whose areas were in partial lockdown reported more negative state emotions than participants whose areas were not in lockdown ($B = 0.094$, $SE = 0.027$, $t(27.25) = 3.531$, $P = 0.001$, $d = 0.097$, 95% CI = [0.041, 0.155]). We also found that participants who were self-isolating due to flu-like or cold-like symptoms reported more negative state emotions than participants who were not self-isolating due to flu-like or cold-like symptoms ($B = 0.175$, $SE = 0.044$, $t(25.83) = 3.981$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.183$, 95% CI = [0.092, 0.283]). As shown in Table 2 for hypothesis 1b, participants who were in the two reappraisal conditions reported less negative state emotions than participants who were in the two control conditions ($B = 0.185$, $SE = 0.013$, $t(36.39) = 14.401$, $P < 0.001$, $d = 0.313$, 95% CI = [0.270, 0.357]). In addition, the amount of variance explained by fixed effects in a model with only lockdown status as a fixed variable is marginal $R^2 = 0.003^{92}$. The amount of variance explained by fixed effects in a model with only self-isolation due to symptoms as a fixed variable is marginal $R^2 = 0.001^{92}$. The amount of variance explained by fixed effects in a model with only the contrast between the two reappraisal conditions and the two control conditions as the fixed variable is marginal $R^2 = 0.013^{92}$. Across different measures of effect size, it is notable that the effects of reappraisal interventions on state negative emotions were of similar or even

larger magnitude than the effects of lockdown status or self-isolation due to symptoms. This comparison suggests that reappraisal interventions could help to alleviate the emotional toll caused by lockdown and self-isolation. Thus, we believe that the effects of reappraisal interventions are not only statistically significant but also practically meaningful.

Discussion

The current study had two main goals. The first was to examine the shared effects of two brief reappraisal interventions (vs. both passive and active control conditions) on negative and positive emotions in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and to determine whether these effects were similar or different across countries/regions and COVID-19 situations. The second goal was to examine the potentially unique effects of the two reappraisal interventions—reconstrual and repurposing—on negative and positive emotions.

Regarding the first goal, we predicted and found that both reappraisal interventions (vs. both control conditions combined) consistently decreased negative emotional responses (hypothesis 1) and consistently increased positive emotional responses (hypothesis 2) across all primary outcome measures: immediate emotions in response to each photo about the COVID-19 situation, state emotions after viewing all the photos about the COVID-19 situation, and overall emotions about the COVID-19 situation. Exploratory analyses suggested that both reappraisal interventions also improved participants' reported emotions compared to the beginning of the study and the emotions they anticipated feeling in the future.

Further exploratory analyses suggested that despite substantial local variations in how severe the pandemic was at the time data were collected and cultural differences in how people understand and respond to emotions^{90, 93}, the intervention effects appeared in almost all of the countries/regions we studied. For example, in comparing participants' immediate negative emotional responses to the photos about the COVID-19 situation, 33 out of the 37 (89%) countries/regions with high statistical power (over

200 participants) showed statistically significant effects of reappraisal interventions. Although reappraisal interventions tended to have larger effects among females (versus males), and among unemployed individuals without income, the effects were largely unqualified by education level, subjective socioeconomic status, and whether a participant's country/region was under lockdown.

Regarding the second goal, we predicted that reconstrual would be more effective at reducing negative emotions than repurposing (hypothesis 3), but repurposing would be more effective at increasing positive emotions than reconstrual (hypothesis 4). We found little to no support for these hypotheses, as neither was reliably better than the other at reducing negative emotions or increasing positive emotions across outcomes. The finding that the two forms of reappraisal were similarly effective at regulating emotions in the context of COVID-19 is consistent with the idea that the pandemic offers a wide array of affordances both for construing emotional situations in different ways, thus enabling reconstrual, and for evaluating these situations in light of different goals, thus enabling repurposing⁷⁶. This implies that it may be beneficial to combine both strategies, a hypothesis that future studies can be designed to test. It also remains to be investigated whether reconstrual and repurposing offer similarly comparable benefits in other contexts.

The comparable effectiveness of reconstrual and repurposing in this context raises interesting questions about these two forms of reappraisal. We found that even though participants learned only one form of reappraisal, they reported using both strategies more often than in either control condition. This overlap might have stemmed from insufficient differentiation between the reappraisal instructions used in this study. It may also mean that the distinction between repurposing and reconstrual, although useful theoretically, is not readily accessible to lay people. Alternatively, this overlap may have stemmed from reconstrual and repurposing being mutually associated to a degree that being instructed to use one strategy primes the other strategy. Future research is needed to more directly investigate these possibilities.

After assessing results related to the primary goals, an important question was whether reducing negative emotions and increasing positive emotions in response to the pandemic might inadvertently

come at the cost of decreasing intentions to engage in preventive health behaviour (for review, see⁹⁴). Reassuringly, the reappraisal interventions improved emotions without significantly reducing intentions to practice preventive health behaviours. This is consistent with recent findings that there are many paths to motivate preventive health behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic without inducing negative emotions⁹⁵⁻⁹⁸.

Our results highlight the benefits of applying reappraisal interventions at scale to increase psychological resilience and to mitigate the adverse impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic—benefits that could potentially be applied in other contexts that elicit negative emotions. Importantly, the effects of the intervention were not meager: The extent to which emotions were changed by our reappraisal interventions was comparable in magnitude to the extent to which emotions differed between people who faced extreme hardships (lockdowns or symptom-induced isolations) and people who experienced neither of these hardships. Thus, contextualising the effect sizes of reappraisal interventions in this manner suggests that the interventions are practically meaningful. This practical meaning matters in light of findings that people on average do not appear to fully recover their emotional well-being even after six months into the COVID-19 pandemic⁹⁹, that stress and depression can impair vaccine efficacy¹⁰⁰, and that negative emotions predispose morbidity and mortality via increases in substance use and other risky behaviours¹⁰¹. Essential workers, nurses and doctors, students, patients, and many other populations whose work and life are highly affected by the pandemic could potentially benefit from reappraisal interventions, although more research is needed to establish the effectiveness of reappraisal for groups facing distinct challenges. Because these interventions are inexpensive, brief, and scalable, they could be implemented through a variety of media and communication mechanisms, such as advertising campaigns¹⁰², speeches, courses, apps, and mobile games¹⁰³.

Our results also have important implications for the science of emotion (for review, see¹⁰⁴) and for emotion regulation (for review, see^{35,39}), in particular. Despite the fact that reappraisal is one of the most researched topics in psychology³⁵, this study is the largest cross-cultural investigation of reappraisal that has been conducted to date, drawing diverse samples from well beyond the Western, Educated,

Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) societies¹⁰⁵ that have been heavily represented to date in social science. Thus, the findings reveal the generalizability of reappraisal effects across many countries/regions even in the context of significant, protracted stressors. The present study also extends understanding of how contextual moderators influence reappraisal processes (e.g., individualism, lockdown status, and demographics) while deepening understanding of distinct forms of reappraisal (i.e., comparing them vis-à-vis multiple outcomes). Finally, our study provides a rich dataset for examining many other questions related to emotions, emotion regulation, and cultural differences. We look forward to seeing what other insights can be generated from this dataset.

Despite the encouraging findings, several limitations should be noted. One limitation is the use of convenience sampling and a limited set of photos. Our sample was not nationally representative within each country/region, and it appeared to over-represent females, younger people, and people with internet access. The photos used in the study, although carefully chosen, might not represent local situations for different groups of participants. Future research is needed to assess generalizability using nationally representative samples and more personally emotionally evocative stimuli. A second limitation is that we cannot fully rule out the influence of demand characteristics and expectancies. Although we attempted to match demand characteristics and expectancies in the reappraisal conditions using our active control condition, we did not quantify the extent to which they were comparable, and we measured perceived strategy effectiveness after participants had used the strategies, which is different from expectancies formed upon reading the instructions but before using the strategies. Future research should assess the influence of demand characteristics and expectancies. A third limitation relates to the fact that the current study examined only the immediate and proximal effects of the interventions. Future research employing longitudinal designs is needed to examine whether the effects persist over time and at what intervals individuals might optimally engage in reappraisal. A fourth limitation is that the current study examined only a limited number of outcomes via self-report measures. More comprehensive evaluations, including assessments of actual behaviours (rather than intentions) and health outcomes, are necessary to determine whether there are any additional benefits or unintended consequences of the interventions. Lastly, before

implementing reappraisal interventions for practice, more research is needed to better evaluate the intervention (e.g., via formal cost-benefit analysis and/or using the Reach, Efficacy, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance framework^{106, 107}).

In conclusion, our findings demonstrated that two brief reappraisal interventions had robust and generalizable effects in reducing negative emotions and increasing positive emotions during the COVID-19 pandemic across countries/regions, without reducing intentions to practice preventive health behaviours. We hope this study will inform efforts to create scalable interventions for use around the world to build resilience during the pandemic and beyond.

Methods

Ethics information and participants

This study is one of three studies in the PSA COVID-19 Rapid Project. The other two studies investigated the effects of loss and gain message framing and self-determination theory-guided message framing, respectively. The other two studies are reported elsewhere. The study was conducted online, and participants clicked a single data collection link that led to either the current study or the other two studies in the COVID-19 Rapid Project. A comprehensive summary of the PSA COVID-19 Rapid Project—including descriptions of the study selection procedure, the other selected studies, the internal peer review process, and implementation plans—can be found at <https://psyarxiv.com/x976j/>.

Participants were recruited by the PSA network. The PSA recruited 186 member labs from 55 countries/regions speaking 42 languages. Of the 27,989 participants recruited to complete the current study (not counting participants for the other two studies in the PSA COVID-19 Rapid Project), 4,050 of them were recruited through semi-representative paneling (based on sex, age, and sometimes ethnicity) from the following countries/regions: Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Mexico, United States, Austria, Romania, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, China, Japan, and South Korea (270

participants per country/region). The remaining participants were recruited through the research groups by convenience sampling. Each research group obtained approval from their local Ethics Committee or IRB to conduct the study, explicitly indicated that their institution did not require approval for the researchers to conduct this type of task, or explicitly indicated that the current study was covered by a pre-existing approval. Although the specifics of the consent procedure differed across research groups, all participants provided informed consent. The style and the amount of compensation varied with local conventions (a common practice in PSA). More information regarding participant compensation and sample size can be found at <https://psyarxiv.com/x976j/>.

Procedure

An overview of the experiment is depicted in Fig. 2.

Pre-measure. Before reading the instructions, participants reported emotions they felt in the moment (details for all study measures are described in the next section). These ratings constituted a baseline emotional measure.

Randomization to condition. Following the pre-measure, participants were randomly assigned to one of four between-subjects experimental conditions: two reappraisal intervention conditions (reconstrual and repurposing), one active control condition, and one passive control condition. Because the study was conducted online, data collection was performed blind to the conditions of the participants. The content of the instructions in each condition differed, but the lengths were matched except for the passive control condition, which had a shorter set of instructions.

Participants in the two reappraisal intervention conditions (reconstrual and repurposing) and the active control condition received the following instructions: “In this study, we will show you photographs related to COVID-19 from various news sources. Our goal is to better understand how people respond to such photos, which may include feelings of fear, anger, and sadness. Sometimes emotions like these are

helpful. At other times, however, these emotions can be unhelpful to us. Researchers have found that when people think their emotions are unhelpful, they can take steps to influence their emotions.”

In the reconstrual condition, participants were told that (emphasis in original) “One strategy that some people find helpful for influencing their emotions is *rethinking*. This strategy involves changing one’s thinking in order to change one’s emotions. This strategy is based on the insight that **different ways of interpreting or thinking about any situation can lead to different emotions**. This means that finding new ways of thinking about a situation can change how you feel about the situation. For example, consider someone who stays at home under lockdown due to COVID-19 and is feeling anxious, sad, or angry. In this case, *rethinking* might involve realizing that the situation is only temporary because dedicated people across the world are working hard to find a vaccine.” Participants were then given four examples of how rethinking might be employed for the COVID-19 situation (Example 1: “I know from world history that keeping calm and carrying on gets us through tough times.” Example 2: “Scientists across the world are working hard to find treatment and vaccines. Throughout history, humans have been resourceful in finding solutions to new challenges.” Example 3: “Washing hands, avoiding touching my face, keeping a safe distance...There are simple and effective things I can do to protect myself and my loved ones from getting sick and to stop the spread of the virus.” Example 4: “In the past, people have overcome many challenges that seemed overwhelming at the time, and we will overcome COVID-19 related challenges too.”).

In the repurposing condition, participants were told that (emphasis in original) “One strategy that some people find helpful for influencing their emotions is *refocusing*. This strategy involves changing one’s thinking in order to change one’s emotions. This strategy is based on the insight that **finding something good in even the most challenging situations can lead to different emotional responses**. This means that refocusing on whatever good aspects may be found in a situation can change how you feel about the situation. For example, consider someone who stays at home under lockdown due to COVID-19 and is feeling anxious, sad, or angry. In this case, *refocusing* might involve realizing that staying at home gives them time to do things that they may not have been able to do before, like reading,

painting, and spending time with family.” Participants were then given four examples of how refocusing might be employed for the COVID-19 situation (Example 1: “This situation is helping us realize the importance of meaningful social connections, and helping us understand who the most important people in our lives are.” Example 2: “Medical systems are now learning to deal with amazing challenges, which will make them much more resilient in the future.” Example 3: “Even though we are physically apart, we are finding creative ways to stay connected and our hearts are more connected than ever.” Example 4: “I have been inspired by the way that frontline health care workers have responded with resilience, generosity, determination, and deep commitment.”).

In the active control condition, participants were asked to reflect on their emotions as they unfold. This condition is inspired by the literature on expressive writing and experimental disclosure, which shows that asking people to reflect about their very deepest thoughts and feelings can improve psychological health^{77, 78}. By having an active control condition, which was likely to lead to some benefit to participants, we can make stronger inferences regarding the impact of reappraisal interventions relative to a potentially useful strategy designed to equate demand characteristics and expectancies. In the instructions, participants were told that (emphasis in original) “One strategy that some people find helpful for influencing their emotions is *reflecting*. This strategy involves allowing oneself to freely experience and reflect on one’s thoughts and feelings. This strategy is based on the insight that **reflecting on your thoughts and feelings about any situation can lead to different emotional responses**. This means that exploring your thoughts and emotions can change how you feel about the situation. For example, consider someone who stays at home under lockdown due to COVID-19 and is feeling anxious, sad, or angry. In this case, *reflecting* might involve allowing oneself to experience these feelings and be fully immersed in the lockdown experience, reflecting on the meaning this situation has for the person and their loved ones.” Participants were then given four examples of how reflecting might be employed for the COVID-19 situation (Example 1: “This situation is changing so fast, and I don’t know how the future will develop.” Example 2: “People are struggling to cope with these unprecedented and overwhelming challenges.”

Example 3: “Someone I love might get sick and there might not even be ventilators to help them.”

Example 4: “I really wish we could find a vaccine soon.”).

To reinforce what they had learned, participants in the two reappraisal conditions and the active control condition were then asked to summarize, in 1-2 sentences, the strategy they had just learned. This text response was collected only for exploratory purposes and was not used in confirmatory analysis.

In the passive control condition, participants received the following instructions: “In this study, we will show you photographs related to COVID-19 from various news sources. Our goal is to better understand how people respond to such photos, which may include feelings of fear, anger, and sadness. As you view these photographs, please respond as you naturally would.” Having a passive control condition allowed us to have clear interpretations in the case that we found no significant difference in our contrast between both the reappraisal conditions combined and both the control conditions combined. If this was the case, we would have compared each reappraisal condition against the passive control condition and compared the active control condition against the passive control condition in the exploratory analysis to determine whether each strategy had a non-zero impact relative to individuals' natural responses.

Practice trials. After receiving instructions by condition, participants were asked to practice the strategy in two trials designed to facilitate their understanding of the strategy. The practice trials included providing ratings and written responses to two photographs (per prior research¹⁰⁸). The photographs in this study were selected by our research team from major media news sources (CNN, New York Times, The Guardian, and Reuters) and present situations in Asia, Europe, and North America. They were rated by our team to evoke either sadness or anxiety above the midpoint on a 7-point scale ranging from “not at all” to “very” and to score close to or above the midpoint on a 7-point scale ranging from “not at all” to “very” on the question “How much do you recommend using this picture?” (photographs available at <https://osf.io/8bjnz/>). In each practice trial, participants saw a negative photo related to the COVID-19 situation (e.g., an exhausted doctor, medical workers in hazmat suits) and a reminder above the photo to use the strategy that was presented to them. In the reconstrual condition, the reminder was “As you view

the photo, draw on the examples we gave you earlier in order to **interpret the situation in a new way.**” In the repurposing condition, the reminder was “As you view the photo, draw on the examples we gave you earlier in order to **focus on any good you can find in the situation.**” In the active control condition, the reminder was “As you view the photo, draw on the examples we gave you earlier in order to **reflect on your thoughts and feelings.**” In the passive control condition, the reminder was “As you view the photo, **respond as you naturally would.**” After ten seconds, participants were asked to rate their emotions in response to the photo using two corresponding unipolar 5-point Likert scales, one for negative emotion and one for positive emotion. These ratings were designed to familiarize participants with the task, and were not used in the confirmatory analyses. After each photo, participants in the two reappraisal conditions and the active control condition were asked to write (in text) how they applied the strategy while observing the photo. Participants in the passive control condition were asked to write (in text) anything that comes naturally to their mind about the photo. The text response was also collected only for exploratory purposes and was not used in the confirmatory analysis. Participants in the two reappraisal conditions and the active control condition were then given one example of how the photo might be viewed (examples varied by condition). Note that the two reappraisal conditions and the active control condition were designed to be matched for demand characteristics and expectancy.

Experimental trials. Following the two practice trials, participants viewed additional photos related to the COVID-19 situation in ten experimental trials. Participants in the two reappraisal conditions and the active control condition were asked to use the strategy that they practiced, and participants in the passive control condition were asked to respond naturally. All participants saw exactly the same ten photos, but the order of the presentation was randomized across the ten experimental trials. Each photo was presented to participants with the same reminder used in the practice trials. After observing each photo for ten seconds, participants were asked to rate both their negative and positive emotions in response to the photo using the same 5-point Likert scales from the practice trials.

Post-measures. In the final section of the study, participants completed several measures, including (1) negative and positive state emotions, (2) negative and positive emotions about the COVID-

19 situation, (3) negative and positive anticipated emotions, (4) behavioural intentions, (5) motivation/beliefs, and (6) manipulation check.

Measures

Demographics. At the beginning of the study, participants completed a general survey that included demographic questions and some questions related to COVID-19 shared by all three studies in the PSA COVID-19 Rapid Project. Details about the general survey can be found at <https://osf.io/7axc4/>. While we originally planned for the general survey to appear at the end of the study, it was necessary for recruitment purposes (selecting representative panels) that it appear at the beginning of the study.

Baseline emotions. To assess baseline emotion, we asked participants how they were feeling right now at the beginning of the session on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely) (All response options were labelled and numbers were not displayed to participants for clarity). For negative baseline emotions, we measured five items on fear, anger, sadness, distrust, and stress from the modified Differential Emotions Scale¹⁰⁹. For positive baseline emotions, we measured five items on hope, gratitude, love, inspiration, and serenity from the modified Differential Emotions Scale¹⁰⁹ (details for all scoring rules described in the Analysis Plan section). We also measured three items on loneliness¹¹⁰ and three items on social connectedness¹¹¹. These six items also were included in the assessment of post-photo state emotions and in the assessment of anticipated emotions (at each assessment point, these six items were used in exploratory analyses).

Negative emotional responses. In order to capture descriptively rich, nuanced data, we measured negative emotional responses in four ways. The first way is to measure negative emotions in response to the photos. For each photo, we asked participants how negative the photo made them feel using a unipolar scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). The second way is to measure negative state emotions after viewing all ten photos. We asked participants “how you are feeling right now” with the same set of items used to measure baseline emotions, which included five negative state emotions of fear, anger,

sadness, distrust, and stress. The third way is to measure negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation. We asked participants how negative/hopeless they were feeling about the COVID-19 situation right now on a unipolar scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). The fourth way is to measure negative anticipated emotions, which were an exploratory outcome. We asked participants “In the next week, to what extent, if at all, do you think you will feel each of the following?” with the same set of items used to measure baseline emotions, which included five negative anticipated emotions of fear, anger, sadness, distrust, and stress.

Positive emotional responses. Following a parallel procedure, we measured positive emotional responses in four ways. The first way is to measure positive emotions in response to the photos. For each photo, we asked participants how positive the photo made them feel using a unipolar scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). The second way is to measure positive state emotions after viewing all ten photos. We asked participants “how you are feeling right now” with the same set of items used to measure baseline emotions, which included five positive state emotions of hope, gratitude, love, inspiration, and serenity. The third way is to measure positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation. We asked participants how positive/hopeful they were feeling about the COVID-19 situation right now on a unipolar scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). The fourth way is to measure positive anticipated emotions, which were an exploratory outcome. We asked participants “In the next week, to what extent, if at all, do you think you will feel each of the following?” with the same set of items used to measure baseline emotions, which included five positive anticipated emotions of hope, gratitude, love, inspiration, and serenity.

Behavioural intentions. In addition to the emotional responses that are central to our four confirmatory hypotheses in this study, we also examined exploratory outcomes concerning behavioural intentions. Such intentions matter because they have been shown to predict actual behaviours^{112,113}. Following protocols from Fishbein and Ajzen¹¹⁴, we asked participants to indicate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 7 (extremely likely) their intentions to engage in each of 10 different behaviours within the next week. Five of the items concern potentially harmful behaviour, which

we chose based on documented links between negative emotions and substance use, aggressive behaviour, and excessive information seeking^{17, 25, 115}. Items included: drinking too much alcohol, using too much tobacco (e.g., smoking/vaping) or other recreational drugs, yelling at someone, taking anger out online, and spending too much time on media. The other five items concerned beneficial behaviour, which we chose based on evidence that positive emotions contribute to more health behaviours^{84, 85}. Items include: eating healthy food, getting enough physical activity, practicing healthy sleep habits (*for example, going to bed and waking at regular hours*), washing hands regularly for at least 20 seconds, and following a stay-at-home order stringently (*if there isn't an order in your region now, assume that one is imposed*).

Motivation/beliefs. We measured both the motivation to use the emotion regulatory strategy and the belief in the effectiveness of the emotion regulatory strategy as exploratory moderators^{71, 87}. We asked “Recall the instructions we gave you for viewing the photos. To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?” Motivation to use the emotion regulatory strategy was measured with the item: “I tried my hardest to follow the instructions I was given while viewing the photos.” Belief in the effectiveness of the emotion regulatory strategy employed by participants was measured with the item “I believed that following the instructions would influence my emotions.” Participants rated their answers using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Manipulation check. We planned to evaluate participants’ attention to our instructions and photos using two multiple-choice questions. The first question asked participants to choose the instructions they had at the beginning of the survey from among four options. The second question asked participants to choose the photo that was not shown to them in the survey from among three options.

For exploratory purposes, we also asked how often participants actually used each approach when viewing the photographs and their global change of emotions compared to the beginning of the study. Participants were asked, “When viewing the ten photographs related to COVID-19 earlier, how often did you use each of the following approaches?” and rated four approaches: “responding as I naturally would,” “reflecting on my thoughts and feelings,” “interpreting the situation in a new way,” and “focusing on any

good I could find in the situation.” Participants rated their answers using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). To measure global change of emotion, participants were asked, “Overall, compared to the beginning of this study, how negative do you feel right now?” using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (much more negative) to 5 (much less negative) and “Overall, compared to the beginning of this study, how positive do you feel right now?” using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (much more positive) to 5 (much less positive).

Order of items. For measures above, items belonging to the negative category (i.e., negative emotional responses and intentions for harmful behaviour) and to the positive category (i.e., positive emotional responses and intentions for beneficial behaviour) were presented in a counterbalanced order within each measure across participants. In other words, half of the participants always rated an item from the negative category first and then an item from the positive category, whereas the other half always rated an item from the positive category first and then an item from the negative category. For measures that have multiple items, items belonging to the negative category were randomized within the negative category, and items belonging to the positive category were randomized within the positive category. When the same set of items used to measure baseline emotions was repeated, the set had the same order for every given participant.

Analysis plan

Pre-processing

Exclusion. We planned to exclude (1) participants who answered both multiple choice manipulation check questions incorrectly, and (2) participants who completed fewer than 50% of the questions in the study.

Reliability of measures. For items from the modified Differential Emotions Scale¹⁰⁹, we planned to create overall negative emotion scores at each time point by averaging the five negative emotions (fear,

anger, sadness, distrust, and stress) and overall positive emotion scores at each time point by averaging the five positive emotions (hope, gratitude, love, inspiration, and serenity) if the average inter-item correlation was above .40 for negative emotions and for positive emotions, respectively. If the average inter-item correlation was below .40, we would conduct an exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotation and maintain factors with an eigenvalue above 1.00. If no factors had an eigenvalue above 1, we would report results by item rather than as a composite. The actual average inter-item correlation was .50 for negative baseline emotions and .48 for positive baseline emotions, respectively. Therefore, we created overall negative emotion scores at each time point by averaging the five negative emotions and overall positive emotion scores at each time point by averaging the five positive emotions.

Missing data. We dropped incomplete cases on an analysis-by-analysis basis. Given our sampling plan described below, we should have power of 0.95 or above.

Outliers. In order to be maximally conservative, we did not define or identify outliers.

Analytic plan for hypotheses

Since negative emotional responses and positive emotional responses are separable^{79, 80}, we examined negative emotional responses and positive emotional responses separately. To control family-wise error rates in multiple comparisons, we used the Holm-Bonferroni method within each of the four hypotheses separately. For all analyses testing negative emotional responses (hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 3), we planned to control for the participants' negative baseline emotions. As originally intended by the scale¹⁰⁹, we planned to create an overall negative baseline emotion score by averaging the five negative emotions (fear, anger, sadness, distrust, and stress). For all analyses testing positive emotional responses (hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 4), we planned to control for the participants' positive baseline emotions. As originally intended by the scale¹⁰⁹, we planned to create an overall positive baseline emotion score by averaging the five positive emotions (hope, gratitude, love, inspiration, and serenity). To account for the

nested structure in our data (e.g., participant nested by country/region), we fitted multilevel models with the condition using the contrast in Table 1, random by-country/region slopes, and random by-country/region intercepts. If a model failed to converge, we planned to explore other reasonable models¹¹³ and report results of all explored models in an appendix. We visually assessed assumptions of heteroscedasticity and normality of residuals and found no severe deviations. All tests were two-tailed.

Although we used the frequentist approach for confirmatory analyses, we also reported Bayes factors (BF) for every result to gain information about the strength of evidence provided by the data comparing the null and alternative hypotheses¹¹⁷. If we got non-significant results from the frequentist approach, we used BF to help us interpret non-significant results and differentiate between insensitive results and those that reveal good enough evidence supporting the null-hypothesis. We set these evidence thresholds to BF_{10} to > 10 for H_1 and $< 1/10$ for H_0 . If BFs did not cross the evidence thresholds, we think our sample size is sufficiently large that inconclusive results at this sample size would be an important message for the field. We used informed priors for the alternative model: a one-tailed Cauchy distribution with a mode of zero and a scale $r = 0.18$ (hypotheses 1 and 2), $r = 0.17$ (hypothesis 3), and $r = 0.25$ (hypothesis 4) on the standardized effect size. These priors were based on the lowest available estimates of effect sizes in past research (See the “Sampling plan” section for more information). At Stage 1, we wrote the code for the Bayesian part of our analysis plan using the BayesFactor package¹¹⁸ in R. We also planned to investigate the sensitivity of our conclusions to priors using Robustness Regions¹¹⁹, which involves calculating a Bayes factor under a large number of different priors to see how the Bayes factor changes. After we collected our data, we made the following adjustments to our plans for our Bayesian analysis. First, to estimate the Bayesian models, we switched from the BayesFactor package to the brms package¹²⁰ because of the brms package’s superior handling of random effects. Our brms models used four chains, each with 1,000 warmup samples, 10,000 post-warmup samples, and a thinning rate of 1. To calculate Bayes factors, we used bridge sampling, as implemented in the bayestestR¹²¹ and bridgesampling¹²² packages, to compare the marginal likelihoods of the full model versus a null model that does not contain one of our two focal contrasts. Second, we discovered that the Bayesian versions of

our models involving emotional responses to the photos had high computational requirements due to the inclusion of two sources of random effect (country/region and participant) rather than one. To make these models more computationally manageable we simplified the dataset by computing the average emotional response to each photo for each participant and using this as the outcome variable. This allowed us to omit the by-participant random effect in these models and drastically reduce the resource requirements and compute time. Although these simplified models do not separate participant-specific variance from error variance, our analysis plan had no plans to interpret these sources of variation separately, so we reasoned this simplification was a fair way to obtain the same mathematical results as required by our analysis plan at a lower computational cost. Finally, we simplified the robustness analyses by only investigating how the Bayes factors change with one very large prior ($r = 1.0$) rather than computing full robustness regions. We made this last change to once again reduce the compute time to manageable levels. If the Bayes factors under the large prior are in line with those generated by the pre-registered priors (which are already very small), the results should be robust to other reasonable priors.

Tests for hypotheses 1 and 3

Overall, we expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative emotional responses (hypothesis 1), and that reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative emotional responses than repurposing (hypothesis 3). We tested hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 3 using two orthogonal contrasts (Table 1). The first contrast is between both reappraisal conditions combined and both control conditions combined for hypothesis 1. The second contrast is between the reconstrual condition and the repurposing condition for hypothesis 3. Negative emotional responses were measured in four ways (negative emotions in response to the photos, negative state emotions after viewing the photos, negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation, and negative anticipated emotions). We had confirmatory hypotheses regarding the first three outcomes and examined negative anticipated emotions in the exploratory analysis. Therefore, hypothesis 1 can be subdivided into hypotheses 1a to 1c, and hypothesis 3 can be subdivided into hypotheses 3a to 3c. We planned to consider a hypothesis to be supported if at least 1 of the 3 sub-hypotheses is significant after Holm-Bonferroni correction (controlling for 3

comparisons within each hypothesis). If we found non-significant results for any sub-hypothesis, we compared each reappraisal condition against the passive control condition and compared the active control condition against the passive control condition in the exploratory analysis to determine whether each strategy had a non-zero impact relative to individuals' natural responses.

Testing effects on negative emotions in response to the photos: We expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative emotions in response to the photos (hypothesis 1a), and reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative emotional responses in response to the photos than repurposing (hypothesis 3a). We modeled ratings of negativity in response to each photo in the experimental trials as a function of the fixed effects of condition using our contrast. We included by-participant random intercepts, by-country/region random intercepts, as well as by-country/region random slopes for each contrast.

Testing effects on negative state emotions: We expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative state emotions (hypothesis 1b), and reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative state emotions than repurposing (hypothesis 3b). Similar to creating the overall negative baseline emotion score, we planned to create an overall negative state emotion score by averaging the five negative emotions (fear, anger, sadness, distrust, and stress). We modeled the overall negative state emotion score as a function of the fixed effects of condition using our contrast. We included by-country/region random intercepts, as well as by-country/region random slopes for each contrast.

Testing effects on negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation: We expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation (hypothesis 1c), and reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation than repurposing (hypothesis 3c). We modeled negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation as a function of the fixed effects of condition using our contrast. We included by-country/region random intercepts, as well as by-country/region random slopes for each contrast.

Tests for hypotheses 2 and 4

Overall, we expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive emotional responses (hypothesis 2), and repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive emotional responses than reconstrual (hypothesis 4). We tested hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 4 using two orthogonal contrasts (Table 1). The first contrast is between both reappraisal conditions combined and both control conditions combined for hypothesis 2. The second contrast is between the reconstrual condition and the repurposing condition for hypothesis 4. Positive emotional responses were measured in four ways (positive emotions in response to the photos, positive state emotions after viewing the photos, positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation, and positive anticipated emotions). We had confirmatory hypotheses regarding the first three outcomes and examined positive anticipated emotions in an exploratory analysis. Therefore, hypothesis 2 can be subdivided into hypotheses 2a to 2c, and hypothesis 4 can be subdivided into hypotheses 4a to 4c. We planned to consider a hypothesis to be supported if at least 1 of the 3 sub-hypotheses is significant after Holm-Bonferroni correction (controlling for 3 comparisons within each hypothesis). If we found non-significant results for any sub-hypothesis, we would compare each reappraisal condition against the passive control condition and compare the active control condition against the passive control condition in the exploratory analysis to determine whether each strategy had a non-zero impact relative to individuals' natural responses.

Testing effects on positive emotions in response to the photos: We expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive emotions in response to the photos (hypothesis 2a), and repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive emotions in response to the photos than reconstrual (hypothesis 4a). We modeled ratings of positivity in response to each photo in the experimental trials as a function of the fixed effects of condition using our contrast. We included by-participant random intercepts, by-country/region random intercepts, as well as by-country/region random slopes for each contrast.

Testing effects on positive state emotions: We expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive state emotions (hypothesis 2b), and repurposing would lead to greater increases in

positive state emotions in response to the photos than reconstrual (hypothesis 4b). Similar to creating the overall positive baseline emotion score, we planned to create an overall positive state emotion score by averaging the five positive emotions (hope, gratitude, love, inspiration, and serenity). We modeled the overall positive state emotion score as a function of the fixed effects of condition using our contrast. We planned to include by-country/region random intercepts, as well as by-country/region random slopes for each contrast. However, the model could not converge when we included by-country/region random slopes for contrast 2. To make the model converge, we did not include by-country/region random slopes for contrast 2.

Testing effects on positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation: We expected that reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation (hypothesis 2c), and repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation than reconstrual (hypothesis 4c). We modeled positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation as a function of the fixed effects of condition using our contrast. We included by-country/region random intercepts, as well as by-country/region random slopes for each contrast.

Exploratory analyses

We conducted a series of exploratory analyses to address supplemental questions regarding our hypotheses, including, but not limited to: (1) Were there any differences in other pairwise comparisons in testing hypotheses 1 - 2? (2) Were there emotion-specific effects of reappraisal¹²³? (3) Were the effects on emotions subjectively detectable by participants¹²⁴? Did the effects of strategy use vary by (4) motivation to use the strategy⁷¹; (5) beliefs in the strategy's effectiveness⁸⁷; or (6) the participant's country of residence⁹⁰?

We investigated the impacts of strategy use on other outcomes, including, but not limited to: (1) positive and negative anticipated emotions; (2) intentions to enact potentially harmful versus beneficial behaviours (see results in Supplementary Table 14); and (3) loneliness and social connectedness (see results in Supplementary Table 15).

Sampling plan

Expected effect sizes. In order to compare effect sizes across studies, below we report Cohen's d s, which in some cases were transformed or calculated from the results reported in the original studies (see Supplementary Table 16 for details). Several caveats are in order regarding the effect sizes that follow. First, meta-analyses tend to overestimate effect sizes, although the size of overestimation varies considerably across studies and sometimes shows no overestimation¹²⁵. Second, most prior studies were conducted in the lab, whereas the current study was conducted online. Third, the current crisis is likely to lead to strong emotional responses, especially for participants who are facing financial or health-related setbacks, although strong negative emotions also motivate people to regulate emotions more⁶⁴. These caveats suggest uncertainty in effect sizes.

In general, reappraisal has an average effect size of $d = 0.45$, 95% CI = [0.35, 0.56] in changing emotion experience relative to passive control conditions (i.e., no instruction, instructions to experience naturally, instructions to not regulate in a certain manner, or instructions to enhance or maintain the focal emotion) (meta-analysis³⁹; it finds no evidence of publication bias). Experimental disclosure and expressive writing, which inspired the instruction in the active control condition, have an average effect size of $d = 0.07$, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.17] in improving psychological health (including emotional responses), relative to engaging in non-treatment neutral activities (e.g., describing what they have done in the past 24 hours) or no activities (meta-analysis⁷⁷; it finds evidence of publication bias). These works suggest the lowest available estimate of the effect size to be $d = 0.18$ (subtracting the upper bound of 95% CI $d = 0.17$ for experimental disclosure and expressive writing from the lower bound of 95% CI of $d = 0.35$ for the reappraisal interventions) between our reappraisal interventions and the control conditions for hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2.

In relation to the comparison between reconstrual and repurposing, although prior research has not used the same theoretical framework⁷⁶ to empirically contrast reconstrual and repurposing as we did in the current study, research on closely related constructs can provide estimates of effect sizes.

Reconstrual is most similar to a previously studied subtype of reappraisal called “reappraising emotional stimulus” in Webb, Miles, & Sheeran’s meta-analysis³⁹, which has a $d = 0.38$, 95% CI = [0.21, 0.55] in changing emotion experience (this effect size is primarily for negative emotions, as all but one study examined negative emotions). Repurposing is similar to the construct “benefit finding” (perceiving positive consequences that resulted from a traumatic event), which is associated with positive well-being, $d = 0.45$, 95% CI = [0.37, 0.52], but not global distress, $d = 0.00$, 95% CI = [-0.04, 0.04] (meta-analysis⁸¹). Repurposing is also similar to the subtype of reappraisal called “positive reappraisal,” which is more effective in increasing positive thoughts than other types of reappraisals, $d = 0.49$, 95% CI = [0.25, 0.72] relative to detached reappraisal¹²⁶. These works suggest the lowest available estimate of the effect size to be $d = 0.17$ (subtracting the upper bound of 95% CI $d = 0.04$ for the association between benefit finding and global distress from the lower bound of 95% CI of $d = 0.21$ for “reappraising emotional stimulus” in Webb, Miles, & Sheeran³⁹) between reconstrual and repurposing in changing negative emotions for hypothesis 3, and $d = 0.25$ (the lower bound of 95% CI of positive reappraisal in increasing positive thoughts than detached reappraisal in Shiota & Levenson¹²⁶) between reconstrual and repurposing in changing positive emotions for hypothesis 4.

Sample size. For practical reasons, sample size was primarily decided based on the availability of resources among members of the PSA.

Adjusted alpha levels. The tests of each hypothesis involved three comparisons, with α for the smallest p -value = 0.017 (0.05/3), α for the second-smallest p -value = 0.025 (0.05/2), and α for the largest p -value = 0.05 (Holm-Bonferroni corrections).

Power analysis. We conducted a simulation study to estimate power for a variety of potential effect sizes ($|d| = 0.05$ to 0.29, separated by increments of 0.02), number of countries/regions ($N_{\text{country/region}} = 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60$), within-country/region sample sizes ($N = 200, 400, 600, 800$), by-country/region intercept variances ($\sigma^2_{\text{intercept}} = 0.05, 0.30, 0.55, 0.80$), and by-country/region slope variances ($\sigma^2_{\text{slope}} = 0.0, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04$) at $\alpha = .017$. The lowest level of intercept variances in our

simulation was chosen on the basis of an ongoing multi-country/region project tracking rates of depression ($\sigma^2_{\text{intercept}} = 0.04$) and worries about the COVID-19 ($\sigma^2_{\text{intercept}} = 0.06$) across countries/regions during the COVID-19 outbreak¹²⁴ (See Supplementary Table 16 for details). The lowest level of slope variances in our simulation was chosen on the basis of the average slope variance ($\sigma^2_{\text{slope}} < 0.01$) in a large multi-site, multi-country/region project involving 28 psychological manipulations¹²⁵. The slope variances capture the variability of the effect of psychological manipulations, and there is no apparent reason to expect that the effect of reappraisal interventions on emotions is more variable than most other psychological manipulations in Klein et al.¹²⁸. In fact, appraisal theories of emotion argue that the relationship between appraisals and emotions is culturally universal¹²⁹, suggesting low variability. As one example to show that similar appraisals associate with similar emotional experiences, we found the associations varied little across countries/regions between perceived insufficient government response and depression ($\sigma^2_{\text{slope}} = 0.003$) and between perceived insufficient government response and worries ($\sigma^2_{\text{slope}} = 0.003$) during the COVID-19 pandemic¹²⁴ (See Supplementary Table 16 for details), consistent with the observation of low slope variances ($\sigma^2_{\text{slope}} < 0.01$) in Klein et al.¹²⁸. Despite expecting low variability from empirical findings and theories, we tested a variety of intercept variances and slope variances in our power simulation, some of which were much higher than those in the Klein et al.¹²⁸ and Fetzter et al.¹²⁷ to be maximally conservative. We conducted 1000 simulations for each set of simulation parameters using the *simr* package¹³⁰ using computing power harnessed through the Open Science Grid^{131, 132}.

We show comprehensive results for our simulation study at <https://osf.io/mf5z4/>. In our final sample after pre-registered exclusion, 37 countries/regions had over 200 participants, surpassing the 95% power criterion based on simulations.

Protocol registration. The stage 1 protocol for this Registered Report was accepted in principle on 12 May 2020. The protocol, as accepted by the journal, can be found at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.4878591.v1>

Data availability

The full materials for the Psychological Science Accelerator's Rapid-Response COVID-19 Projects (including the materials for the current project) are at <https://osf.io/s4hj2/> and all data are at <https://osf.io/gvw56/>. The analytical datasets for the current project is at <https://osf.io/jeu73/>.

Code availability

All analysis codes (completed in R) are available at <https://osf.io/jeu73/>.

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. New poll: COVID-19 impacting mental well-being: Americans feeling anxious, especially for loved ones; older adults are less anxious. *American Psychiatric Association* <https://www.psychiatry.org/newsroom/news-releases/new-poll-covid-19-impacting-mental-well-being-americans-feeling-anxious-especially-for-loved-ones-older-adults-are-less-anxious> (5 May 2020).
2. Barari, S. *et al.* Evaluating COVID-19 public health messaging in Italy: self-reported compliance and growing mental health concerns. Preprint at *medRxiv* <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.27.20042820v2> (2020).
3. Hou, Z., Du, F., Jiang, H., Zhou, X. & Lin, L. Assessment of public attention, risk perception, emotional and behavioural responses to the COVID-19 outbreak: social media surveillance in China. Preprint at *SSRN* <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3551338> (2020).
4. Kirzinger, A., Kearney, A., Hamel, L. & Brodie, M. KFF health tracking poll – early April 2020: the impact of coronavirus on life in America. *The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation* <https://www.kff.org/health-reform/report/kff-health-tracking-poll-early-april-2020/> (5 May 2020).

5. Langer, G. Coronavirus impacts: disrupted lives, elevated stress, and soaring worry: Poll. *ABC News* <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/coronavirus-impacts-disrupted-lives-elevated-stress-soaring-worry/story?id=69812058> (5 May 2020).
6. Li, S., Wang, Y., Xue, J., Zhao, N. & Zhu, T. The impact of COVID-19 epidemic declaration on psychological consequences: a study on active Weibo users. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **17**, 2032 (2020).
7. McCarthy, J. Three in four Americans worry about COVID-19 exposure. *Gallup.com* <https://news.gallup.com/poll/307646/three-four-americans-worry-covid-exposure.aspx> (5 May 2020).
8. Pinnington, B. Britain's view of COVID-19 as 'high threat' to their business jumps 19 points in a week. *Ipsos MORI* <https://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/britains-view-covid-19-high-threat-their-business-jumps-19-points-week> (5 May 2020).
9. Smith, M. How is COVID-19 affecting British opinions, jobs and wellbeing? | YouGov. *YouGov* <https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2020/03/24/how-covid-19-affecting-british-opinions-jobs-and-w> (5 May 2020).
10. Zhao, Y. & Xu, H. Chinese public attention to COVID-19 epidemic: based on social media. Preprint at *medRxiv* <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038026v1> (2020).
11. Jackson, C. & Newall, M. Partisanship reemerging in American views of coronavirus. *Ipsos* <https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/news-polls/axios-ipsos-coronavirus-index> (5 May 2020).
12. Stremikis, K. In COVID-19 Tracking poll, Californians report worsening mental health, cost worries. *California Health Care Foundation* <https://www.chcf.org/blog/covid-19-tracking-poll-californians-report-worsening-mental-health-cost-worries/> (5 May 2020).
13. UN Women Headquarters. Issue brief: COVID-19 and ending violence against women and girls | Digital library: Publications. *UN Women* <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/04/issue-brief-covid-19-and-ending-violence-against-women-and-girls> (5 May 2020).

14. Sheppes, G., Suri, G. & Gross, J. J. Emotion regulation and psychopathology. *Annu. Rev. Clin. Psychol.* **11**, 379–405 (2015).
15. Cacioppo, J. T. & Cacioppo, S. The growing problem of loneliness. *The Lancet* **391**, 426 (2018).
16. Cooper, M. L., Frone, M. R., Russell, M. & Mudar, P. Drinking to regulate positive and negative emotions: a motivational model of alcohol use. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **69**, 990–1005 (1995).
17. Dorison, C. A. *et al.* Sadness, but not all negative emotions, heightens addictive substance use. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 943–949 (2020).
18. Kassel, J. D., Stroud, L. R. & Paronis, C. A. Smoking, stress, and negative affect: correlation, causation, and context across stages of smoking. *Psychol. Bull.* **129**, 270–304 (2003).
19. Brod, S., Rattazzi, L., Piras, G. & D'Acquisto, F. 'As above, so below' examining the interplay between emotion and the immune system. *Immunology* **143**, 311–318 (2014).
20. Denson, T. F., Spanovic, M. & Miller, N. Cognitive appraisals and emotions predict cortisol and immune responses: a meta-analysis of acute laboratory social stressors and emotion inductions. *Psychol. Bull.* **135**, 823–853 (2009).
21. Moons, W. G. & Shields, G. S. Anxiety, not anger, induces inflammatory activity: an avoidance/approach model of immune system activation. *Emotion* **15**, 463–476 (2015).
22. Alvaro, P. K., Roberts, R. M. & Harris, J. K. A Systematic review assessing bidirectionality between sleep disturbances, anxiety, and depression. *Sleep* **36**, 1059–1068 (2013).
23. Adam, T. C. & Epel, E. S. Stress, eating and the reward system. *Physiol. Behav.* **91**, 449–458 (2007).
24. Groesz, L. M. *et al.* What is eating you? Stress and the drive to eat. *Appetite* **58**, 717–721 (2012).
25. Birkley, E. L. & Eckhardt, C. I. Anger, hostility, internalizing negative emotions, and intimate partner violence perpetration: a meta-analytic review. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **37**, 40–56 (2015).
26. Robertson, T., Daffern, M. & Bucks, R. S. Emotion regulation and aggression. *Aggress. Violent Behav.* **17**, 72–82 (2012).

27. Foley, A. E. *et al.* The math anxiety-performance link: a global phenomenon. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* (2017).
28. Diener, E., Thapa, S. & Tay, L. Positive emotions at work. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.* **7**, 451–477 (2020).
29. Shockley, K. M., Ispas, D., Rossi, M. E. & Levine, E. L. A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between state affect, discrete emotions, and job performance. *Hum. Perform.* **25**, 377–411 (2012).
30. Haushofer, J. & Fehr, E. On the psychology of poverty. *Science* **344**, 862–867 (2014).
31. Lerner, J. S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P. & Kassam, K. S. Emotion and decision making. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **66**, 799–823 (2015).
32. Bonanno, G. A. Loss, Trauma, and human resilience: have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *Am. Psychol.* **59**, 20–28 (2004).
33. Fletcher, D. & Sarkar, M. Psychological resilience. *Eur. Psychol.* **18**, 12–23 (2013).
34. Southwick, S. M. & Charney, D. S. The science of resilience: implications for the prevention and treatment of depression. *Science* **338**, 79–82 (2012).
35. McRae, K. & Gross, J. J. Emotion regulation. *Emotion* **20**, 1 (2020).
36. Kalisch, R., Müller, M. B. & Tüschler, O. A conceptual framework for the neurobiological study of resilience. *Behav. Brain Sci.* (2014).
37. McRae, K. & Mauss, I. B. *Increasing Positive Emotion in Negative Contexts: Emotional Consequences, Neural Correlates, and Implications for Resilience. Positive Neuroscience* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2016).
38. Tugade, M. M. & Fredrickson, B. L. Regulation of positive emotions: emotion regulation strategies that promote resilience. *J. Happiness Stud.* **8**, 311–333 (2007).
39. Webb, T. L., Miles, E. & Sheeran, P. Dealing with feeling: a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of strategies derived from the process model of emotion regulation. *Psychol. Bull.* **138**, 775–808 (2012).

40. Denny, B. T. & Ochsner, K. N. Behavioral effects of longitudinal training in cognitive reappraisal. *Emotion* **14**, 425–433 (2014).
41. Gross, J. J. Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **74**, 224–237 (1998).
42. Jackson, D. C., Malmstadt, J. R., Larson, C. L. & Davidson, R. J. Suppression and enhancement of emotional responses to unpleasant pictures. *Psychophysiology* **37**, 515–522 (2000).
43. Denson, T. F., Grisham, J. R. & Moulds, M. L. Cognitive reappraisal increases heart rate variability in response to an anger provocation. *Motiv. Emot.* **35**, 14–22 (2011).
44. Dillon, D. G. & LaBar, K. S. Startle modulation during conscious emotion regulation is arousal-dependent. *Behav. Neurosci.* **119**, 1118–1124 (2005).
45. Ray, R. D., McRae, K., Ochsner, K. N. & Gross, J. J. Cognitive reappraisal of negative affect: converging evidence from EMG and self-report. *Emotion* **10**, 587–592 (2010).
46. Chang, L. J., Gianaros, P. J., Manuck, S. B., Krishnan, A. & Wager, T. D. A sensitive and specific neural signature for picture-induced negative affect. *PLOS Biol.* **13**, e1002180 (2015).
47. Dörfel, D. *et al.* Common and differential neural networks of emotion regulation by detachment, reinterpretation, distraction, and expressive suppression: a comparative fMRI investigation. *NeuroImage* **101**, 298–309 (2014).
48. Hajcak, G. & Nieuwenhuis, S. Reappraisal modulates the electrocortical response to unpleasant pictures. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* **6**, 291–297 (2006).
49. Kalisch, R. *et al.* Anxiety reduction through detachment: subjective, physiological, and neural effects. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **17**, 874–883 (2005).
50. Lohani, M. & Isaacowitz, D. M. Age differences in managing response to sadness elicitors using attentional deployment, positive reappraisal and suppression. *Cogn. Emot.* **28**, 678–697 (2014).
51. Ochsner, K. N., Bunge, S. A., Gross, J. J. & Gabrieli, J. D. E. Rethinking feelings: an fmri study of the cognitive regulation of emotion. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **14**, 1215–1229 (2002).

52. Schaefer, S. M. *et al.* Modulation of amygdalar activity by the conscious regulation of negative emotion. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **14**, 913–921 (2002).
53. Shahane, A. D., Lopez, R. B. & Denny, B. T. Implicit reappraisal as an emotional buffer: reappraisal-related neural activity moderates the relationship between inattention and perceived stress during exposure to negative stimuli. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* **19**, 355–365 (2019).
54. English, T., John, O. P., Srivastava, S. & Gross, J. J. Emotion regulation and peer-rated social functioning: a 4-year longitudinal study. *J. Res. Personal.* **46**, 780–784 (2012).
55. Davis, E. L. & Levine, L. J. Emotion regulation strategies that promote learning: reappraisal enhances children’s memory for educational information. *Child Dev.* **84**, 361–374 (2013).
56. Ivcevic, Z. & Brackett, M. Predicting school success: comparing conscientiousness, grit, and emotion regulation ability. *J. Res. Personal.* **52**, 29–36 (2014).
57. Gross, J. J. & John, O. P. Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **85**, 348–362 (2003).
58. Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S. & Schweizer, S. Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: a meta-analytic review. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **30**, 217–237 (2010).
59. Cludius, B., Mennin, D. & Ehring, T. Emotion regulation as a transdiagnostic process. *Emotion* **20**, 37–42 (2020).
60. Appleton, A. A., Buka, S. L., Loucks, E. B., Gilman, S. E. & Kubzansky, L. D. Divergent associations of adaptive and maladaptive emotion regulation strategies with inflammation. *Health Psychol.* **32**, 748–756 (2013).
61. Appleton, A. A., Loucks, E. B., Buka, S. L. & Kubzansky, L. D. Divergent associations of antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation strategies with midlife cardiovascular disease risk. *Ann. Behav. Med.* **48**, 246–255 (2014).
62. Veer, I. M. *et al.* *Mental resilience in the Corona lockdown: first empirical insights from Europe.* Preprint at *PsyArXiv* <https://psyarxiv.com/4z62t/> (2020).

63. Suri, G., Whittaker, K. & Gross, J. J. Launching reappraisal: it's less common than you might think. *Emotion* **15**, 73–77 (2015).
64. Milyavsky, M. *et al.* To reappraise or not to reappraise? Emotion regulation choice and cognitive energetics. *Emotion* **19**, 964–981 (2019).
65. Cohen, N. & Ochsner, K. N. From surviving to thriving in the face of threats: the emerging science of emotion regulation training. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **24**, 143–155 (2018).
66. Denny, B. T. Getting better over time: a framework for examining the impact of emotion regulation training. *Emotion* **20**, 110–114 (2020).
67. Woud, M. L., Holmes, E. A., Postma, P., Dalgleish, T. & Mackintosh, B. Ameliorating intrusive memories of distressing experiences using computerized reappraisal training. *Emotion* **12**, 778–784 (2012).
68. Goldin, P. R. *et al.* Cognitive reappraisal self-efficacy mediates the effects of individual cognitive-behavioral therapy for social anxiety disorder. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **80**, 1034–1040 (2012).
69. Kivity, Y. & Huppert, J. D. Does cognitive reappraisal reduce anxiety? A daily diary study of a micro-intervention with individuals with high social anxiety. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **84**, 269–283 (2016).
70. Denny, B. T., Inhoff, M. C., Zerubavel, N., Davachi, L. & Ochsner, K. N. Getting over it: long-lasting effects of emotion regulation on amygdala response. *Psychol. Sci.* (2015).
71. Tamir, M., Halperin, E., Porat, R., Bigman, Y. E. & Hasson, Y. When there's a will, there's a way: disentangling the effects of goals and means in emotion regulation. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **116**, 795–816 (2019).
72. Porat, R., Halperin, E. & Tamir, M. What we want is what we get: group-based emotional preferences and conflict resolution. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **110**, 167–190 (2016).
73. Hurtado-Parrado, C. *et al.* Emotion regulation and attitudes toward conflict in Colombia: effects of reappraisal training on negative emotions and support for conciliatory and aggressive statements. *Front. Psychol.* **10**, (2019).

74. Halperin, E., Porat, R., Tamir, M. & Gross, J. J. Can emotion regulation change political attitudes in intractable conflicts? from the laboratory to the field. *Psychol. Sci.* (2012).
75. Moshontz, H. *et al.* The Psychological Science Accelerator: advancing psychology through a distributed collaborative network. *Adv. Methods Pract. Psychol. Sci.* **1**, 501–515 (2018).
76. Uusberg, A., Taxer, J. L., Yih, J., Uusberg, H. & Gross, J. J. Reappraising reappraisal. *Emot. Rev.* (2019).
77. Frattaroli, J. Experimental disclosure and its moderators: a meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.* **132**, 823–865 (2006).
78. Pennebaker, J. W. & Smyth, J. M. *Opening Up by Writing It Down, Third Edition: How Expressive Writing Improves Health and Eases Emotional Pain.* (Guilford Publications, 2016).
79. Kreibig, S. D. & Gross, J. J. Understanding mixed emotions: paradigms and measures. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **15**, 62–71 (2017).
80. Larsen, J. T. & McGraw, A. P. Further evidence for mixed emotions. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **100**, 1095–1110 (2011).
81. Helgeson, V. S., Reynolds, K. A. & Tomich, P. L. A meta-analytic review of benefit finding and growth. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **74**, 797–816 (2006).
82. Shiota, M. N. Silver linings and candles in the dark: differences among positive coping strategies in predicting subjective well-being. *Emotion* **6**, 335–339 (2006).
83. Kok, G., Peters, G.-J. Y., Kessels, L. T. E., ten Hoor, G. A. & Ruiter, R. A. C. Ignoring theory and misinterpreting evidence: the false belief in fear appeals. *Health Psychol. Rev.* **12**, 111–125 (2018).
84. Fredrickson, B. L. & Joiner, T. Reflections on positive emotions and upward spirals. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* (2018).
85. Pressman, S. D., Jenkins, B. N. & Moskowitz, J. T. Positive affect and health: what do we know and where next should we go? *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **70**, 627–650 (2019).
86. Ogedegbe, G. O. *et al.* A randomized controlled trial of positive-affect intervention and medication adherence in hypertensive African Americans. *Arch. Intern. Med.* **172**, 322–326 (2012).

87. Bigman, Y. E., Mauss, I. B., Gross, J. J. & Tamir, M. Yes I can: expected success promotes actual success in emotion regulation. *Cogn. Emot.* **30**, 1380–1387 (2016).
88. Hittner, E. F., Rim, K. L. & Haase, C. M. Socioeconomic status as a moderator of the link between reappraisal and anxiety: laboratory-based and longitudinal evidence. *Emotion* **19**, 1478–1489 (2019).
89. Troy, A. S., Ford, B. Q., McRae, K., Zorolia, P. & Mauss, I. Change the things you can: emotion regulation is more beneficial for people from lower than from higher socioeconomic status. *Emot. Wash. DC* **17**, 141–154 (2017).
90. Miyamoto, Y., Ma, X. & Petermann, A. G. Cultural differences in hedonic emotion regulation after a negative event. *Emotion* **14**, 804–815 (2014).
91. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. 3rd edn, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 2010).
92. Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. A general and simple method for obtaining R² from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 133–142 (2013).
93. Eid, M. & Diener, E. Norms for experiencing emotions in different cultures: inter- and intranational differences. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **81**, 869–885 (2001).
94. Ferrer, R., Klein, W., Lerner, J. S., Reyna, V. F., & Keltner, D. Emotions and Health Decision-Making: Extending the Appraisal Tendency Framework to Improve Health and Healthcare. In C. Roberto & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Behavioral Economics and Public Health*. (Harvard Univ. Press, 2016).
95. Smith, A. M., *et al.* Coping with health threats: the costs and benefits of managing emotions. Preprint at *PsyArXiv* <https://psyarxiv.com/dn957/> (2020).
96. Pfattheicher, S., Nockur, L., Böhm, R., Sassenrath, C. & Petersen, M. B. The emotional path to action: empathy promotes physical distancing and wearing of face masks during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol. Sci.* **31**, 1363-1373 (2020).

97. Jørgensen, F., Bor, A. & Petersen, M. B. Compliance without fear: predictors of protective behavior during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. Preprint at *PsyArXiv* <https://psyarxiv.com/uzwgf/> (2020).
98. Jordan, J., Yoeli, E. & Rand, D. Don't get it or don't spread it? Comparing self-interested versus prosocially framed COVID-19 prevention messaging. Preprint at *PsyArXiv* <https://psyarxiv.com/yuq7x/> (2020).
99. Willroth, E. C., *et al.* A test of resilience theory in the context of a global crisis. Preprint at *PsyArXiv* <https://psyarxiv.com/g3jr7/> (2021).
100. Madison, A. A., Shrout, M. R., Renna, M. E. & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. Psychological and behavioral predictors of vaccine efficacy: considerations for COVID-19. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* 1-13 (2021).
101. Ferrer, R. A., *et al.* The role of incidental affective states in appetitive risk behavior: a meta-analysis. *Health Psychol.* **39**, 1109–1124 (2020).
102. Kemp, E., Cowart, K. & Bui, M. Promoting consumer well-being: examining emotion regulation strategies in social advertising messages. *J. of Bus. Res.* **112**, 200–209 (2020).
103. Porat, R., Erel, L., Pnueli, V. & Halperin, E. Developing ReApp: an emotion regulation mobile intervention for intergroup conflict. *Cogn. Emot.* **34**, 1326–1342 (2020).
104. Keltner, D., & Lerner, J. S. Emotion. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010).
105. Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. The weirdest people in the world. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **33(2-3)**, 61-83 (2010).
106. Glasgow, R. E., Vogt, T. M. & Boles, S. M. Evaluating the public health impact of health promotion interventions: the RE-AIM framework. *Am. J. Public Health* **89**, 1322–1327 (1999).
107. Premachandra, B. & Lewis, N. A. J. Do we report the information that is necessary to give psychology away? A scoping review of the psychological intervention literature 2000-2018. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* 1-13 (2021).

108. Goldin, P. R. & Gross, J. J. Effects of mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) on emotion regulation in social anxiety disorder. *Emotion* **10**, 83–91 (2010).
109. Fredrickson, B. L. Positive Emotions Broaden and Build. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology: Volume 47* (eds. Devine, P. & Plant, A.) 1–53 (Academic Press, 2013).
110. Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Hawkey, L. C. & Cacioppo, J. T. A short scale for measuring loneliness in large surveys: results from two population-based studies. *Res. Aging* (2016).
111. Lytle, M. C., Blossnich, J. R., Luca, S. M. D. & Brownson, C. Association of religiosity with sexual minority suicide ideation and attempt. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* **54**, 644–651 (2018).
112. Ajzen, I. & Madden, T. J. Prediction of goal-directed behavior: attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioral control. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* **22**, 453–474 (1986).
113. Webb, T. L. & Sheeran, P. Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychol. Bull.* **132**, 249–268 (2006).
114. Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. (Psychology Press, 2011).
115. Thompson, R. R., Jones, N. M., Holman, E. A. & Silver, R. C. Media exposure to mass violence events can fuel a cycle of distress. *Sci. Adv.* **5**, eaav3502 (2019).
116. Brauer, M. & Curtin, J. J. Linear mixed-effects models and the analysis of nonindependent data: a unified framework to analyze categorical and continuous independent variables that vary within-subjects and/or within-items. *Psychol. Methods* **23**, 389–411 (2018).
117. Dienes, Z. Using Bayes to get the most out of non-significant results. *Front. Psychol.* **5**, (2014).
118. Morey, R. D. & Rouder, J. N. Bayesfactor: Computation of Bayes Factors for common designs. R package version 0.9.12-4.2 <https://cran.r-project.org/package=BayesFactor> (2018).
119. Dienes, Z. How do i know what my theory predicts?: *Adv. Methods Pract. Psychol. Sci.* **4**, 364–377 (2019).
120. Bürkner, P-C. brms: an R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *J. Stat. Softw.*, **80**, 1-28. (2017).

121. Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M. & Lüdtke, D. bayestestR: describing effects and their uncertainty, existence and significance within the Bayesian framework. *JOSS* **4**, 1541 (2019).
122. Gronau, Q. F., Singmann, H. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. bridgesampling: an R package for estimating normalizing constants. *J. Stat. Soft.* **92**, 1-29. (2020).
123. Vishkin, A., Hasson, Y., Millgram, Y. & Tamir, M. One size does not fit all: tailoring cognitive reappraisal to different emotions. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, **46**, 469-484. (2019).
124. Anvari, F. & Lakens, D. Using anchor-based methods to determine the smallest effect size of interest. Preprint at *PsyArXiv* <https://psyarxiv.com/syp5a> (2019).
125. Kvarven, A., Strömland, E. & Johannesson, M. Comparing meta-analyses and preregistered multiple-laboratory replication projects. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **4**, 423–434 (2020).
126. Shiota, M. N. & Levenson, R. W. Turn down the volume or change the channel? Emotional effects of detached versus positive reappraisal. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **103**, 416–429 (2012).
127. Fetzer, T. *et al.* Global behaviors and perceptions at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Preprint at *SSRN* <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3594262> (2020).
128. Klein, R. A. *et al.* Many Labs 2: investigating variation in replicability across samples and settings. *Adv. Methods Pract. Psychol. Sci.* (2018).
129. Ellsworth, P. C. & Scherer, K. R. Appraisal processes in emotion. In *Handbook of affective sciences* 572–595 (Oxford Univ. Press, 2003).
130. Green, P. & MacLeod, C. J. SIMR: an R package for power analysis of generalized linear mixed models by simulation. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 493–498 (2016).
131. Pordes, R. *et al.* The open science grid. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **78**, 012057 (2007).
132. Sfiligoi, I. *et al.* The pilot way to grid resources using glideinWMS. In *2009 WRI World Congress on Computer Science and Information Engineering* vol. 2 428–432 (2009).
133. Jeffreys, H. *Theory of Probability*. (Oxford Univ. Press, 1961).

Acknowledgements

This project was supported by funds from: the Amazon Web Services (AWS) Imagine Grant; the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (JSPS KAKENHI; 16h03079, 17h00875, 18k12015, and 20h04581 to YY); the research program “Dipartimenti di Eccellenza” from the Ministry of Education University and Research (MIUR to NC and GM and the Department of General Psychology of the University of Padua); statutory funds of the University of Wroclaw (to AS); the Charles University Research Programme "PROGRES" (Q18 to MV); the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation (2016:0229 to JKO); the Rubicon Grant (019.183sg.007 to KVS) from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research; the Australian Research Council (dp180102384 to RMR); the US National Institutes of Health (NIMH111640 to MN), the Huo Family Foundation to NJ; the NSF Directorate for Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences, Division of Social and Economic Sciences (1559511 to JSL); the US National Institutes of Health (RO1-CA-224545 to JSL); Eesti Teadusagentuur - Estonian Research Council (PSG525 to AU); the J. William Fulbright Program (to FA); the HSE Basic Research Program (to DD); Dominican University (a Faculty Development Grant to AK); and the French National Research Agency “Investissements d’avenir” supporting PSF (ANR-15-IDEX-02 to HI).

Computation for this research was assisted by: the Harvard Business School compute cluster (HBSGrid); and the Open Science Grid. The Open Science Grid is supported by the National Science Foundation award 1148698 and the US Department of Energy’s Office of Science. As well as by: the compute resources and assistance of the UW-Madison Center For High Throughput Computing (CHTC) in the Department of Computer Sciences. The CHTC is supported by UW-Madison, the Advanced Computing Initiative, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, the Wisconsin Institutes for Discovery, and the National Science Foundation, and is an active member of the Open Science Grid, which is supported by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Science.

Our semi-representative panels were made possible by: an in-kind purchase from the Leibniz Institute for Psychology (protocol doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.3012>); a special grant from the Association for Psychological Science; and a fee waiver from Prolific.

Author Contributions

Contribution Statement

Conceptualization: K. Wang, J.S. Lerner, C.A. Dorison

Data curation: E.M. Buchanan, P.S. Forscher

Formal analysis: K. Wang, P.S. Forscher

Funding Acquisition: C. Chartier, E.M. Buchanan, P.S. Forscher

Investigation: J.K. Miller, L. Eudave, D. Hausman Ozery, E.A. Jackson, W. JIMENEZ-LEAL, E. Luis Garcia, J. Wilson, K. Desai, E. Kushnir, M. Pantazi, N. Pilecka, G. Marcu, E. Agadullina, M. Adamkovič, M. Roczniowska, C. Reyna, A.P. Kassianos, M. Westerlund, L. Ahlgren, S. Pöntinen, A. Arinze, N. Arinze,

C. Ogbonnaya, I.L. Ndukaihe, I. Dalgar, A.A. Özdoğru, P. Macapagal, F. Foroni, M. Willis, A.C. Santos, A. Mokady, N. Reggev, M.R. Vasilev, N. Nock, M. Parzuchowski, M.F. Espinoza Barría, M. Vranka, M. Braun Kohlová, I. Ropovik, M. Harutyunyan, E. Yao, M. Becker, E. Manunta, G. Kaminski, D. Marko, A. Findor, A. Thibault Landry, D. Lewis, J. Aruta, J.E. Cruz Vásquez, M.S. Ortiz, E. Pronizius, M. Voracek, C. Lamm, M. Grinberg, J.V. Valentova, G. Mioni, N. Cellini, S. Chen, J. Zickfeld, K. Moon, N. Levy, A. Karababa, J. Bavolar, R.M. Ross, I.D. Stephen, T.J. Hostler, S. Azouaghe, R. McCarthy, C. Grano, C. Singh Solorzano, G. Anjum, A. Arvanitis, Q. Xiao, R. Cárcamo, S. Zorjan, Z. Tajchman, I. Vilares, J.M. Pavlacic, J.R. Kunst, M. Atari, M. Hricova, P. Kačmár, J. Schrötter, R. Rahal, I. Zakharov, M.A. Koehn, C. Esteban-Serna, R.J. Calin-Jageman, A.J. Krafnick, m. khosla, E. Štrukelj, J. Urban, J.R. Silva, M. Martončik, D. Šakan, S. Batić Očovaj, A.O. Kuzminska, J. Milosevic Djordjevic, I.A. Almeida, A. Ferreira, L. Lazarevic, H. Manley, D. Zambrano Ricaurte, R.P. Monteiro, E. Musser, W. Chou, H. Godbersen, S. Ruiz-Fernández, C. Reeck, C. Batres, D. Serrato Alvarez, M.M. Butt, Z. Chen, F. Verbruggen, I. Ziano, M. Tümer, A.C. CHARYATE, D. Dubrov, M.M. Tejada Rivera, C. Aberson, A. Sacakli, C.D. Ceary, K.L. Richard, G. Singer, J.T. Perillo, T. Ballantyne, H. Du, M. Hruška, D. Sousa, K. Barzykowski, A.N. Zsido, M. Paruzel-Czachura, M. Bialek, M. Kowal, A. Sorokowska, M. Misiak, M. Ortiz, P.S. Correa, A. Belaus, D. Mola, P. Arriaga, R. Oliveira, L. Vaughn, P. Szwed, M. Kossowska, J. Kielińska, B. Antazo, G. Nilsonne, N. Simonovic, J. Taber, A. Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, A. Domurat, K. Ihaya, A. Urooj, T. Gill, A. Adetula, N. Albayrak-Aydemir, H.B. Kappes, B. Gjoneska, T. House, M.V. Jones, J. Berkessel, W.J. Chopik, S. Çoksan, M. Seehuus, A. Khaoudi, A. BOKKOUR, K. AIT EL ARABI, I. Djamai, A. Iyer, N. Parashar, A. Adiguzel, H. Kocalar, C. Bundt, J.O. Norton, M. Papadatou-Pastou, A. De la Rosa-Gomez, V. Ankushev, N. Bogatyreva, D. Grigoryev, A. Ivanov, I. Prusova, M. Romanova, I. Sarieva, M. Terskova, E. Hristova, A. Janak, V. Schei, T.E. Sverdrup, A. Askelund, W. Collins, L. Boucher, N. ouherrou, N. Say, A. Thomas, F.Y. Kung, G. Bijlstra, F. Mosannenzadeh, B. Balci, U. Reips, E. Baskin, J. Czamanski-Cohen, B.J. Dixson, D. Moreau, C.A. Sutherland, C. Noone, H. Flowe, M. Anne, S.M. Janssen, C.H. Fu, N.M. Majeed, Y. Kunisato, K. Yu, s. daches, A. Hartanto, M. Vdovic, P.A. Forbes, J. Kamburidis, M. Nedelcheva-Datsova, N.R. Rachev, A. Stoyanova, E. Marinova, K. Schmidt, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, T. Jernsäther, J.K. Olofsson, O. Bialobrzaska, M. Marszalek, S. Tatachari, R. Afhami, W. Law, J. Antfolk, N. Van Doren, J.A. Soto, R. Searston, J. Miranda, K. Damnjanović, S. Yeung, B. Jaeger, D. Ren, G. Pfuhl, K. Klevjer, Z. Vally, J. Vargas-Nieto, L. Calderón Pérez, N.S. Corral-Frías, M. Frias-Armenta, M.Y. Lucas, A. Olaya Torres, M. Toro, L. Javela Delgado, D. Vega, S. Álvarez Solas, R. Vilar, S. Massoni, T. Frizzo, A. Bran, D.C. Vaidis, L. Vieira, G. Lins de Holanda Coelho, A. Greenburgh, C.M. Whitt, A.M. Tullett, L. Volz, C. Karaarslan, E. Sarioğuz, T. Bulut Allred, M.F. Colloff, T.J. Lima, M.F. Ribeiro, M. Karekla, C. Karashiali, N. Sunami, L.M. Jaremka, D. Storage, W. Hassan, A. Studzinska, P. Hanel, D. Holford, M. Sirota, K. Wolfe, F. Chiu, A. Theodoropoulou, E. Ahn, Y. Lin, E.C. Westgate, H. Brohmer, G. Hofer, O. Dujols, K. Vezirian, G. Feldman, G. Travaglino, A. Ahmed, M. Li, M. Manavalan, N. Torunsky, H. Bai, X. SONG, R.B. Walczak, P. Zdybek, L. Kozma, A. Dalla Rosa, P. Babinčák, G. Banik, M.A. Varella, J. Uttley, B. Behzadnia, M. Bradford, S. Geniole, J.K. Vilsmeier, U.S. Tran, M.C. Mensink, P. Sorokowski, A. Groyecka-Bernard, T. Radtke, J. Carpentier, J.A. Joy-Gaba, T. Ishii, A.L. Wichman, J. Röer, T. Ostermann, W.E. Davis, H. Urry, E.M. Buchanan, M.A. Primbs, H. IJzerman, P.S. Forscher

Methodology: K. Wang, J.S. Lerner, C.A. Dorison, I. Ropovik, F. Azevedo, B. Palfi, B. Aczel, P. Arriaga, A. Thomas, M.A. Silan, M.C. Mensink, H. Urry, D.M. Basnigh-Brown, P.S. Forscher

Project Administration: J.K. Miller, V. Križanić, S. Meir Drexler, M. Oosterlinck, A. Szabelska, G. Marcu, A.P. Kassianos, I. Dalgar, S. Lewis, N. Reggev, M.R. Vasilev, M. Vranka, M. Becker, G. Kaminski, E. Pronizius, N. Cellini, H. Azab, J.L. Beaudry, A. Todsén, M. Sharifian, E. Štrukelj, M. Martončik, D. Dunleavy, K. Kirgizova, F. Azevedo, B. Palfi, I.L. Pit, B. Aczel, P. Arriaga, A. Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, Y. Yamada, A. Urooj, L. Bylinina, A. Adetula, B. Gjoneska, A. Askelund, C.A. Levitan, B. Ishkhanyan, H. Chuan-Peng, J.W. Suchow, J. Antfolk, B. Paris, L. Volz, T. Bulut Allred, P. Hanel, F. Chiu, A. Ahmed, L. Kozma, J.E. Beshears, K. Thommesen, M.A. Silan, S. Morales Izquierdo, C.R. Ebersole, C. Chartier, P.R. Mallik, H. Urry, E.M. Buchanan, N.A. Coles, M.A. Primbs, D.M. Basnigh-Brown, H. IJzerman, P.S. Forscher, H. Moshontz

Resources: B.B. Agesin, K. Ashraf, O. Campos, K. Grzech, V. Križanić, S. Meir Drexler, A. Penić Jurković, M. Antoniadi, Z. Gialitaki, E. Kushnir, K. Nadif, O. Niño Bravo, M. Oosterlinck, M. Pantazi, N.

Pilecka, A. Szabelska, I. van Steenkiste, K. Filip, A. Bozdoc, G. Marcu, M. Adamkovič, M. Roczniowska, A.P. Kassianos, M. Westerlund, L. Ahlgren, S. Pöntinen, G.A. Adetula, P. Dursun, I. Dalgar, H. Akkas, S. Lewis, I. Metin-Orta, A.C. Santos, A. Mokady, N. Reggev, M. A. Kurfali, M.R. Vasilev, M. Parzuchowski, M. Vranka, I. Ropovik, M. Harutyunyan, C. Wang, E. Yao, M. Becker, E. Manunta, G. Kaminski, D. Marko, A. Findor, A. Thibault Landry, J. Aruta, E. Pronizius, R. Li, G. Mioni, N. Cellini, S. Chen, J. Zickfeld, H. Azab, A. Karababa, J.L. Beaudry, A. Todsens, K. van Schie, J. VINTR, J. Bavolar, L. Kaliska, L. Samojlenko, R. Pourafshari, S.J. Geiger, J. Beitner, L. Warmelink, S. Azouaghe, A. Szala, C. Grano, C. Singh Solorzano, O. Kácha, J.R. Kunst, C. Tamnes, C.C. von Bastian, M. Sharifian, P. Kačmár, J. Schrötter, N. Cohen, M. Zrimsek, I. Zakharov, E. Štrukelj, D. Šakan, J. Milosevic Djordjevic, D. Zambrano Ricaurte, D. Dunleavy, S. Ruiz-Fernández, K. Kirgizova, A. Muminov, F. Azevedo, D. Serrato Alvarez, J. Lee, Z. Chen, M. Tümer, D. Dubrov, B. Hubena, A. Sacakli, W. Cyrus-Lai, M. Fedotov, M. Wielgus, I.L. Pit, M. Hruška, B. Aczel, B. Szaszi, S. Adamus, K. Barzykowski, L. Micheli, N. Schmidt, A.N. Zsido, M. Paruzel-Czachura, M. Bialek, M. Kowal, F. Muchembled, P. Arriaga, R. Oliveira, R.R. Ribeiro, M. Kossowska, G. Czarnek, J. Kiełńska, B. Antazo, S. Stieger, G. Nilsonne, A. Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, A. Domurat, K. Ihaya, Y. Yamada, M. Čadek, J. Messerschmidt, A. Adetula, E. Baklanova, B. Gjoneska, J. Berkessel, S. Çoksan, A. Khaoudi, A. BOKKOUR, K. AIT EL ARABI, I. Djamai, A. Adiguzel, H. Kocalar, N. Bogatyreva, E. Hristova, V.H. Kadreva, V. Schei, T.E. Sverdrup, A. Askelund, L. Sanabria Pineda, D. Krupić, C.A. Levitan, N. Johannes, N. Say, S. Sinkolova, K. Janjić, M. Stojanovska, D. Stojanovska, F. Mosannenzadeh, U. Reips, B. Ishkhanyan, J. Czamanski-Cohen, H. Chuan-Peng, M. Topor, Y. Kunisato, M. Vdovic, L. Anton-Boicuk, J. Kamburidis, M. Nedelcheva-Datsova, N.R. Rachev, A. Stoyanova, E. Marinova, M. Kurfali, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, T. Jernsäter, O. Bialobrzeska, M. Marszalek, W. Law, J. Antfolk, B. Žuro, D. Krupić, K. Hoyer, K. Klevjer, J. Vargas-Nieto, O.J. Galindo-Caballero, D. Vega, S. Massoni, A. Bran, L. Vieira, B. Paris, M. Capizzi, X. Du, L. Volz, M.J. Bosma, C. Karaarslan, E. Sarıoğuz, T. Bulut Allred, M. Korbmacher, J.P. Verharen, N. Sunami, S. Habib, A. Studzinska, F. Chiu, O. Dujols, K. Vezirian, G. Travaglino, A. Ahmed, J. Bosch, M. Friedemann, L. Kozma, A. Dalla Rosa, S.G. Alves, R.C. Correia, G. Banik, L.F. Rojas-Berscia, J.E. Beshears, K. Thommesen, M.A. Silan, P.G. Maturan, S. Morales Izquierdo, A. Groyecka-Bernard, V. Cubela Adoric, T. Ishii, L. Suter, E.M. Buchanan

Supervision: J.K. Miller, A. Todsens, M. Sharifian, J.W. Suchow, K. Thommesen, C.R. Ebersole, C. Chartier, P.R. Mallik, H. Urry, E.M. Buchanan, N.A. Coles, M.A. Primbs, D.M. Basnight-Brown, H. IJerman, P.S. Forscher, H. Moshontz

Visualization: K. Wang

Writing - original draft: K. Wang

Writing - review and editing: K. Wang, J.S. Lerner, C.A. Dorison, J.K. Miller, B.B. Agesin, K. Ashraf, O. Campos, L. Eudave, K. Grzech, D. Hausman Ozery, E.A. Jackson, W. JIMENEZ-LEAL, V. Križanić, E. Luis Garcia, S. Meir Drexler, A. Penić Jurković, J. Wilson, M. Antoniadi, K. Desai, Z. Gialitaki, E. Kushnir, K. Nadif, O. Niño Bravo, M. Oosterlinck, M. Pantazi, N. Pilecka, A. Szabelska, I. van Steenkiste, K. Filip, A. Bozdoc, G. Marcu, E. Agadullina, M. Adamkovič, M. Roczniowska, C. Reyna, A.P. Kassianos, M. Westerlund, L. Ahlgren, S. Pöntinen, G.A. Adetula, P. Dursun, A. Arinze, N. Arinze, C. Ogbonnaya, I.L. Ndukaihe, I. Dalgar, H. Akkas, A.A. Özdoğru, P. Macapagal, S. Lewis, I. Metin-Orta, F. Foroni, M. Willis, A.C. Santos, A. Mokady, N. Reggev, M. A. Kurfali, M.R. Vasilev, N. Nock, M. Parzuchowski, M.F. Espinoza Barría, M. Vranka, M. Braun Kohlová, I. Ropovik, M. Harutyunyan, C. Wang, E. Yao, M. Becker, E. Manunta, G. Kaminski, D. Marko, A. Findor, A. Thibault Landry, D. Lewis, J. Aruta, J.E. Cruz Vásquez, M.S. Ortiz, E. Pronizius, M. Voracek, C. Lamm, M. Grinberg, R. Li, J.V. Valentova, G. Mioni, N. Cellini, S. Chen, J. Zickfeld, K. Moon, H. Azab, N. Levy, A. Karababa, J.L. Beaudry, A. Todsens, K. van Schie, J. VINTR, J. Bavolar, L. Kaliska, L. Samojlenko, R. Pourafshari, S.J. Geiger, J. Beitner, L. Warmelink, R.M. Ross, I.D. Stephen, T.J. Hostler, S. Azouaghe, R. McCarthy, A. Szala, C. Grano, C. Singh Solorzano, G. Anjum, O. Kácha, A. Arvanitis, Q. Xiao, R. Cárcamo, S. Zorjan, Z. Tajchman, I. Vilares, J.M. Pavlacic, J.R. Kunst, C. Tamnes, C.C. von Bastian, M. Atari, M. Sharifian, M. Hricova, P. Kačmár, J. Schrötter, R. Rahal, N. Cohen, M. Zrimsek, I. Zakharov, M.A. Koehn, C. Esteban-Serna, R.J. Calin-Jageman, A.J. Krafnick, m. khosla, E. Štrukelj, P.M. Isager, J. Urban, J.R. Silva, M. Martončík, D. Šakan, S. Batić Očovaj, A.O. Kuzminska, J. Milosevic Djordjevic, I.A. Almeida, A. Ferreira, L. Lazarevic, H. Manley, D.

Zambrano Ricaurte, R.P. Monteiro, E. Musser, D. Dunleavy, W. Chou, H. Godbersen, S. Ruiz-Fernández, C. Reeck, C. Batres, K. Kirgizova, A. Muminov, F. Azevedo, D. Serrato Alvarez, M.M. Butt, J. Lee, Z. Chen, F. Verbruggen, I. Ziano, M. Tümer, A.C. CHARYATE, D. Dubrov, M.M. Tejada Rivera, C. Aberson, B. Palfi, B. Hubena, A. Sacakli, C.D. Ceary, K.L. Richard, G. Singer, J.T. Perillo, T. Ballantyne, W. Cyrus-Lai, M. Fedotov, H. Du, M. Wielgus, I.L. Pit, M. Hruška, D. Sousa, B. Aczel, B. Szaszi, S. Adamus, K. Barzykowski, L. Micheli, N. Schmidt, A.N. Zsido, M. Paruzel-Czachura, M. Bialek, M. Kowal, A. Sorokowska, M. Misiak, M. Ortiz, P.S. Correa, A. Belaus, D. Mola, F. Muchembled, P. Arriaga, R. Oliveira, R.R. Ribeiro, L. Vaughn, P. Szwed, M. Kossowska, G. Czarnek, J. Kiełńska, B. Antazo, S. Stieger, G. Nilsonne, N. Simonovic, J. Taber, A. Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, A. Domurat, K. Ihaya, Y. Yamada, A. Urooj, T. Gill, M. Čadek, L. Bylinina, J. Messerschmidt, A. Adetula, E. Baklanova, N. Albayrak-Aydemir, H.B. Kappes, B. Gjoneska, T. House, M.V. Jones, J. Berkessel, W.J. Chopik, S. Çöksan, M. Seehuus, A. Khaoudi, A. BOKKOUR, K. AIT EL ARABI, I. Djamai, A. Iyer, N. Parashar, A. Adiguzel, H. Kocalar, C. Bundt, J.O. Norton, M. Papadatou-Pastou, A. De la Rosa-Gomez, V. Ankushev, N. Bogatyreva, D. Grigoryev, A. Ivanov, I. Prusova, M. Romanova, I. Sarieva, M. Terskova, E. Hristova, V.H. Kadreva, A. Janak, V. Schei, T.E. Sverdrup, A. Askelund, L. Sanabria Pineda, D. Krupić, W. Collins, L. Boucher, C.A. Levitan, N. Johannes, N. ouherrou, N. Say, S. Sinkolova, K. Janjić, M. Stojanovska, D. Stojanovska, A. Thomas, F.Y. Kung, G. Bijlstra, F. Mosannenzadeh, B. Balci, U. Reips, E. Baskin, B. Ishkhanyan, J. Czamanski-Cohen, B.J. Dixon, D. Moreau, C.A. Sutherland, H. Chuan-Peng, C. Noone, H. Flowe, M. Anne, S.M. Janssen, M. Topor, C.H. Fu, N.M. Majeed, Y. Kunisato, K. Yu, s. daches, A. Hartanto, M. Vdovic, L. Anton-Boicuk, P.A. Forbes, J. Kamburidis, M. Nedelcheva-Datsova, N.R. Rachev, A. Stoyanova, E. Marinova, K. Schmidt, J.W. Suchow, M. Kurfali, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, T. Jernsäter, J.K. Olofsson, O. Bialobrzeska, M. Marszalek, S. Tatachari, R. Afhami, W. Law, J. Antfolk, B. Žuro, N. Van Doren, J.A. Soto, R. Searston, J. Miranda, K. Damnjanović, S. Yeung, D. Krupić, K. Hoyer, B. Jaeger, D. Ren, G. Pfuhl, K. Klevjer, Z. Vally, J. Vargas-Nieto, O.J. Galindo-Caballero, L. Calderón Pérez, N.S. Corral-Frías, M. Frias-Armenta, M.Y. Lucas, A. Olaya Torres, M. Toro, L. Javela Delgado, D. Vega, S. Álvarez Solas, R. Vilar, S. Massoni, T. Frizzo, A. Bran, D.C. Vaidis, L. Vieira, B. Paris, M. Capizzi, G. Lins de Holanda Coelho, A. Greenburgh, C.M. Whitt, A.M. Tullett, X. Du, L. Volz, M.J. Bosma, C. Karaarslan, E. Sarıoğuz, T. Bulut Allred, M. Korbmacher, M.F. Colloff, T.J. Lima, M.F. Ribeiro, J.P. Verharen, M. Karekla, C. Karashiali, N. Sunami, L.M. Jaremka, D. Storage, S. Habib, W. Hassan, A. Studzinska, P. Hanel, D. Holford, M. Sirota, K. Wolfe, F. Chiu, A. Theodoropoulou, E. Ahn, Y. Lin, E.C. Westgate, H. Brohmer, G. Hofer, O. Dujols, K. Vezirian, G. Feldman, G. Travaglino, A. Ahmed, M. Li, J. Bosch, M. Manavalan, N. Torunsky, H. Bai, X. SONG, R.B. Walczak, P. Zdybek, M. Friedemann, L. Kozma, A. Dalla Rosa, S.G. Alves, R.C. Correia, P. Babinčák, G. Banik, L.F. Rojas-Berscia, M.A. Varella, J. Uttley, J.E. Beshears, K. Thommesen, B. Behzadnia, M. Bradford, S. Geniole, M.A. Silan, P.G. Maturan, J.K. Vilsmeier, U.S. Tran, S. Morales Izquierdo, M.C. Mensink, P. Sorokowski, A. Groyecka-Bernard, T. Radtke, V. Cubela Adoric, J. Carpentier, J.A. Joy-Gaba, T. Ishii, A.L. Wichman, J. Röer, T. Ostermann, W.E. Davis, L. Suter, C.R. Ebersole, C. Chartier, P.R. Mallik, H. Urry, E.M. Buchanan, N.A. Coles, M.A. Primbs, D.M. Basnight-Brown, H. IJerman, P.S. Forscher, H. Moshontz

A number of project contributors could not be reached for inclusion in the review and editing process and to approve the final manuscript for submission. They are not listed as authors on this version of the manuscript. All the listed authors approved the final manuscript for submission.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure legends

Fig. 1 | Effect sizes of both reappraisal interventions combined (vs. both control conditions combined) on primary outcomes by country/region. In almost all of the 37 countries/regions where we had over 200 participants, both reappraisal interventions combined (vs. both control conditions combined) decreased negative emotional responses and increased positive emotional responses for primary outcome measures (emotions in response to the photos, state emotions after viewing all the photos, and emotions about the COVID-19 situation). Effect sizes are raw mean differences on 5-point scales without adjusting for covariates. Confidence intervals are based on the t distribution. Countries/regions are ordered by decreasing effect sizes of negative emotions in response to the photos, and larger dots reflect larger samples. (Supplementary Fig. 1 presents the countries/regions in alphabetical order.)

Fig. 2 | Overview of the experiment. *Participants in the passive control condition did not have the fourth step in the practice trials.

Tables

Table 1 | Contrast structure of testing hypotheses 1 - 4 (with unit-weighting)

	Active Control	Passive Control	Reconstrual	Repurposing
Contrast 1 (Hypotheses 1-2)	1/2	1/2	-1/2	-1/2
Contrast 2 (Hypotheses 3-4)	0	0	1/2	-1/2

Table 2 | Effect sizes, frequentist statistics, and Bayes factors for each preregistered hypothesis

Row number	Hypothesis	B (SE)	by-country/region standard deviation of B	t statistic (df)	Holm's adjusted P value	Cohen's d [95% CI]	$\log(BF_{10})$ [under robustness check]	verbal interpretation of $\log(BF_{10})$ ¹³³
2	Reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative emotions in response to the photos (hypothesis 1a).	0.513 (0.021)	0.129	23.973 (52.36)	< 0.001	0.392 [0.360, 0.425]	29.41 [29.47]	$\log(BF) > 2$ represents “extreme evidence in favour of H_A ” $2 > \log(BF) > 1.5$ represents “very strong evidence in favour of H_A ”
3	Reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative state emotions (hypothesis 1b)	0.185 (0.013)	0.064	14.401 (36.39)	< 0.001	0.313 [0.270, 0.357]	15.61 [15.15]	
4	Reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would reduce negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation (hypothesis 1c)	0.241 (0.019)	0.082	12.570 (30.67)	< 0.001	0.239 [0.201, 0.277]	13.26 [12.92]	

5	Reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive emotions in response to the photos (hypothesis 2a)	0.711 (0.025)	0.166	28.301 (59.18)	< 0.001	0.590 [0.549, 0.631]	34.65 [34.80]	1.5 > log(BF) > 1 represents “strong evidence in favour of H _A ” 1 > log(BF) > 0.5 represents “moderate evidence in favour of H _A ” 0.5 > log(BF) > -0.5 represents “inconclusive evidence”
6	Reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive state emotions (hypothesis 2b)	0.178 (0.012)	0.064	14.263 (42.69)	< 0.001	0.326 [0.281, 0.372]	15.90 [15.42]	
7	Reappraisal interventions (vs. control) would increase positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation (hypothesis 2c)	0.263 (0.018)	0.070	14.809 (31.21)	< 0.001	0.266 [0.230, 0.301]	15.48 [15.23]	
8	Reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative emotional responses in response to the photos than repurposing (hypothesis 3a).	-0.056 (0.023)	0.107	-2.438 (33.48)	0.041	-0.043 [-0.078, -0.008]	0.25 [-0.47]	
9	Reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative state emotions than repurposing (hypothesis 3b)	-0.005 (0.016)	0.069	-0.321 (29.67)	0.751	-0.008 [-0.063, 0.046]	-1.09 [-1.87]	

10	Reconstrual would lead to greater decreases in negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation than repurposing (hypothesis 3c)	0.068 (0.022)	0.045	3.139 (30.61)	0.011	0.067 [0.024, 0.112]	1.02 [0.32]	-0.5 > log(BF) > -1 represents “moderate evidence in favour of H ₀ ”
11	Repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive emotions in response to the photos than reconstrual (hypothesis 4a)	0.137 (0.022)	0.113	6.176 (46.79)	< 0.001	0.114 [0.077, 0.151]	5.37 [4.84]	-1 > log(BF) > -1.5 represents “strong evidence in favour of H ₀ ”
12	Repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive state emotions than reconstrual (hypothesis 4b)	-0.006 (0.011)	Random slopes by country/region were not included for the model to converge	-0.526 (20,340)	0.599	-0.011 [-0.049, 0.028]	-1.39 [-2.00]	-1.5 > log(BF) > -2 represents “very strong evidence in favour of H ₀ ”
13	Repurposing would lead to greater increases in positive emotions about the	-0.047 (0.026)	0.109	-1.781 (37.46)	0.166	-0.047 [-0.100, 0.005]	-0.41 [-0.93]	-2 > log(BF) represents

	COVID-19 situation than reconstrual (hypothesis 4c)							“extreme evidence in favour of H ₀ ”
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: We included all 87 countries/regions in the preregistered analyses regardless of their sample sizes. The signs of B , t statistic, and Cohen’s d are adjusted such that positive (negative) values indicate being consistent (inconsistent) with the direction specified in a hypothesis. For hypotheses 1-2, B reflects the difference on the original 5-point scales between the average of the means of the two control conditions and the average of the means of the two reappraisal intervention conditions. For hypotheses 3-4, B reflects the difference on the original 5-point scales between the mean of the reconstrual condition and the mean of the repurposing condition. Degrees of freedom vary due to random slopes¹¹⁶. Cohen’s d is calculated as the raw mean difference divided by the square root of the pooled variance of all the random components.

Table 3 | Raw means and standard deviations (in parentheses) for outcomes

Outcome	Reappraisal interventions		Control conditions	
	Reconstrual (<i>n</i> = 5,078)	Repurposing (<i>n</i> = 5,421)	Active control (<i>n</i> = 5,349)	Passive control (<i>n</i> = 5,796)
Primary outcomes				
Negative emotions in response to the photos	2.77 ^a (0.80)	2.71 ^b (0.77)	3.29 ^c (0.83)	3.19 ^d (0.84)
Positive emotions in response to the photos	2.47 ^a (0.81)	2.62 ^b (0.79)	1.86 ^c (0.72)	1.84 ^d (0.73)
Negative state emotions	2.32 ^a (0.90)	2.31 ^a (0.90)	2.52 ^b (0.95)	2.48 ^b (0.95)
Positive state emotions	3.17 ^a (0.88)	3.18 ^a (0.87)	2.99 ^b (0.88)	2.98 ^b (0.90)
Negative emotions about the COVID-19 situation	2.71 ^a (1.08)	2.77 ^b (1.07)	2.99 ^c (1.10)	2.97 ^c (1.10)
Positive emotions about the COVID-19 situation	2.91 ^a (1.05)	2.88 ^a (1.04)	2.65 ^b (1.06)	2.59 ^c (1.06)
Exploratory outcomes				
Intention to follow stay-at-home orders stringently	5.42 ^a (1.79)	5.44 ^a (1.77)	5.41 ^a (1.80)	5.45 ^a (1.77)

Intention to wash hands regularly for at least 20 seconds	5.82 ^a (1.53)	5.82 ^{ab} (1.50)	5.82 ^{ab} (1.51)	5.76 ^b (1.56)
Frequency of natural response	3.49 ^a (1.35)	3.53 ^b (1.35)	4.00 ^c (1.17)	4.56 ^d (0.79)
Frequency of using reflecting	3.92 ^a (1.11)	3.90 ^a (1.14)	4.25 ^b (0.97)	3.91 ^a (1.20)
Frequency of using reconstrual	3.80 ^a (1.09)	3.73 ^b (1.14)	3.06 ^c (1.27)	2.75 ^d (1.34)
Frequency of using repurposing	3.89 ^a (1.13)	4.15 ^b (1.01)	3.21 ^c (1.31)	3.12 ^d (1.34)
Motivation to use the given strategy	6.14 ^a (1.12)	6.17 ^a (1.12)	6.26 ^b (1.04)	6.43 ^c (1.00)
Belief in the effectiveness of the given strategy	5.00 ^a (1.68)	5.03 ^a (1.69)	4.80 ^b (1.76)	4.44 ^c (1.90)
Global change in negative feelings	2.82 ^a (0.94)	2.75 ^b (0.93)	3.19 ^c (0.92)	3.17 ^c (0.88)
Global change in positive feelings	3.28 ^a (0.91)	3.33 ^a (0.91)	2.92 ^b (0.92)	2.92 ^b (0.89)
Anticipated negative emotions	2.31 ^a (0.90)	2.30 ^a (0.89)	2.45 ^b (0.92)	2.44 ^b (0.94)
Anticipated positive emotions	3.26 ^a (0.88)	3.26 ^a (0.87)	3.13 ^b (0.86)	3.11 ^b (0.89)

Note: Values are displayed as raw mean (standard deviation). Sample sizes (*n*) presented in the second row reflect the numbers of participants after preregistered exclusion. Sample sizes vary by outcome because we dropped incomplete cases on an analysis-by-analysis basis. All primary outcomes were assessed on 5-point scales. The following four exploratory outcomes were assessed on 7-point scales: intention to follow stay-at-

home orders stringently, intention to wash hands regularly for at least 20 seconds, motivation to use the given strategy, and belief in the effectiveness of the given strategy. The rest of the exploratory outcomes were assessed on 5-point scales. Within each row, means that do not share a superscript differ at $P < 0.05$, two-tailed, Holm's method for adjustment. For instance, means both marked with ^a do not differ significantly, but means marked with ^a and ^b differ significantly from each other.