

Negative Emotion and Nonacceptance of Emotion in Daily Life

Natasha H. Bailen
Washington University in St. Louis

Peter Koval
University of Melbourne and KU Leuven

Michael Strube
Washington University in St. Louis

Nick Haslam
University of Melbourne

Renee J. Thompson
Washington University in St. Louis

Nonacceptance of emotion is consistently linked with increased levels of psychopathology and diminished well-being. Research has found that negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion are positively associated cross-sectionally but has yet to directly investigate temporal associations between these constructs. Given that negative emotions are frequently the target of negative thoughts and other emotions, and that acceptance of emotion is associated with prospective decreases in negative emotion, we hypothesized that the temporal relation between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion is bidirectional. The present study examined the association between these variables during people's daily lives using an experience sampling methodology. Multilevel modeling was used for all analyses, including hierarchical generalized linear modeling and log-normal hurdle modeling. A total of 187 women from the United States and Australia reported negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion 14 times a day for 5 days. Negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion were positively associated contemporaneously. Across time, nonacceptance of emotion was prospectively and positively associated with the intensity of negative emotion independent of immediately prior negative emotion, and negative emotion intensity was prospectively and positively associated with nonacceptance of emotion independent of immediately prior nonacceptance. Results support a bidirectional model of negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion wherein each variable predicts increases in the other across time. Our findings elucidate how individuals fall into maladaptive emotional patterns that are difficult to break and could possibly pave the way to the development and maintenance of psychopathology.






Keywords: emotion, negative affect, experience sampling, acceptance

For centuries, people seeking insight, fulfillment, and inner peace have engaged in the practice of mindfulness, taking time to intentionally bring their complete and undivided attention to the experiences of the present moment (Kabat-Zinn, 1990; Linehan, 1993). Research has found that mindfulness confers many health benefits, including improvements in medical symptoms and coping; reductions in depression, anxiety, and physical pain; and increases in quality of life (Grossman, Niemann, Schmidt, &

Walach, 2004). A core component of mindfulness is the acceptance and nonjudgment of one's own emotional states (Dimidjian & Linehan, 2003), particularly emotional states that might otherwise be judged to be undesirable or unpleasant (Blackledge & Hayes, 2001).

Just as internal states can be accepted, they also can be rejected. The opposite of emotional acceptance, nonacceptance of emotion, involves the cognitive judgment of emotional experiences as un-

This article was published Online First September 10, 2020.

 Natasha H. Bailen, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis;  Peter Koval, Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, and Research Group of Quantitative Psychology and Individual Differences, KU Leuven;  Michael Strube, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis;  Nick Haslam, Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne;  Renee J. Thompson, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis.

This research was supported by a Discovery Project Grant awarded by the Australian Research Council (DP150103053) to Nick Haslam, funding from

the Australian Catholic University awarded to Peter Koval, and a Graduate Student Research Grant awarded by the Washington University in St. Louis Psychological and Brain Sciences Department to Natasha H. Bailen. We thank Elise Holland for her contributions to this project. On behalf of all authors, Natasha H. Bailen states that there is no conflict of interest. Data and materials have been made publicly available via Open Science Framework and can be accessed at <https://osf.io/cv8sj/>. The study was not preregistered.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Natasha H. Bailen, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis, 1 Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130. E-mail: nbailen@wustl.edu

desirable (e.g., Gratz & Roemer, 2004; Mayer & Stevens, 1994; Mennin, Holaway, Fresco, Moore, & Heimberg, 2007).¹ Nonacceptance of emotion is conceptualized as a key aspect of emotion dysregulation (Gratz & Roemer, 2004; Mennin et al., 2007), and just as mindfulness and acceptance are associated with myriad positive outcomes, high levels of nonacceptance of emotion are consistently associated with poor mental health and diminished well-being. This includes associations with psychopathology, such as depression (Ehring, Tuschen-Caffier, Schnulle, Fischer, & Gross, 2010; Flynn, Hollenstein, & Mackey, 2010; Gratz & Roemer, 2004; Neumann, van Lier, Gratz, & Koot, 2010; Saxena, Dubey, & Pandey, 2011), anxiety (Campbell-Sills, Barlow, Brown, & Hofmann, 2006; Salters-Pedneault, Roemer, Tull, Rucker, & Mennin, 2006; Sauer-Zavala et al., 2012), eating disorders (Brockmeyer et al., 2014; Gianini, White, & Masheb, 2013; Harrison, Sullivan, Tchanturia, & Treasure, 2010; Harrison, Tchanturia, & Treasure, 2010; Svaldi, Griepstroh, Tuschen-Caffier, & Ehring, 2012), and self-injurious behavior (Emery, Heath, & Mills, 2016). Further, individuals who endorse greater trait levels of nonacceptance of emotion often have higher levels of social dysfunction (Saxena et al., 2011) and are more prone to social isolation (Mayer & Stevens, 1994). Although acceptance and nonacceptance could theoretically be considered part of the same continuum (Williams & Lynn, 2010), we focused in the present study on nonacceptance of emotion, as is more common in the clinical literature on emotion dysregulation (e.g., Gratz & Roemer, 2004).

In earlier research, nonacceptance of emotion has almost always been conceptualized as a trait phenomenon that characterizes how individuals typically relate to their emotions (e.g., Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietemeyer, & Toney, 2006; Gratz & Roemer, 2004). For example, the Non-Acceptance of Emotion subscale of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2004) asks participants to indicate how often they react negatively to their emotions. Similarly, the Nonjudge subscale of the Five-Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire asks participants to indicate whether they are generally judgmental of their internal experiences (Baer et al., 2006). However, many theories and treatments involving nonacceptance of emotion and similar constructs conceptualize them as context-dependent states that fluctuate over time. By definition, mindfulness is the state of being attuned to the present moment, implying a momentary construct that can vary from one moment to the next (Hayes, Follette, & Linehan, 2004). Indeed, mindfulness during daily events has been found to be correlated with event-related judgments of stressfulness, importance, and positivity (Nezlek, Holas, Rusanowska, & Krejtz, 2016). Although the nonacceptance of emotions and other similar constructs (e.g., experiential avoidance; Hayes, Wilson, Gifford, Follette, & Strosahl, 1996) are almost exclusively assessed as trait phenomena in research studies, it is critical that research examine their state forms to inform theory and treatment.

Negative Emotion and Nonacceptance of Emotion

Negative emotion is often central to the experience of nonacceptance of emotion and related constructs. In a recent study of metaemotion, we found that people experience negative emotions about negative emotions more frequently than negative emotions about positive emotions (Bailey, Wu, & Thompson, 2018), possi-

bly due to people's inherent motivation to maximize pleasure and minimize displeasure, leading to the desire to avoid or dampen negative emotions. Empirical trait associations between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion (Lavender, Tull, DiLillo, Messman-Moore, & Gratz, 2017; Mayer & Stevens, 1994; Saxena et al., 2011) support the idea that negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion are closely and positively related. Indeed, although nonacceptance can be directed toward positive or negative emotions, the idea of negative emotion as the most likely target of nonacceptance is so widely assumed that some commonly used nonacceptance measures (e.g., DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2004) limit their scope to assessing (nonacceptance of) negative emotion.

Researchers still have not elucidated the directionality of the association between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion. However, we hypothesized that the relation is bidirectional. Supporting the longitudinal association between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion, people report efforts to avoid or decrease negative emotions more frequently than any other types of emotion regulation goals, indicating some degree of emotional nonacceptance (e.g., Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994; English, Lee, John, & Gross, 2017). In line with these findings, Bailen et al. (2018) found that individuals reported feeling negatively about other negative emotions more frequently than they reported feeling negatively about positive emotions.

The other direction of association—nonacceptance of emotion predicting subsequent negative emotion—is also plausible. Research suggests that constructs that are highly related to nonacceptance of emotion are associated with higher negative emotion over time. For example, experiential avoidance in response to negative stimuli is associated with prospective within-person increases in negative emotion (Hershenberg, Mavandadi, Wright, & Thase, 2017; Machell, Goodman, & Kashdan, 2015; Wenzel, Gaugler, Sheets, & DeCicco, 2018). Many other studies have shown that acceptance of emotion is prospectively associated with lower negative emotion both within and between person (e.g., Dunn, Billotti, Murphy, & Dalgleish, 2009; Ford, Lam, John, & Mauss, 2018; Heij & Cheavens, 2014; Levitt, Brown, Orsillo, & Barlow, 2004; Shallcross, Troy, Boland, & Mauss, 2010).

Prior to the present study, there have been no studies directly examining the bidirectional association between momentary acceptance (or nonacceptance) of emotion and negative emotion in daily life. That is, previous studies have either (a) manipulated acceptance in the lab (e.g., Dunn et al., 2009), (b) measured acceptance using global/trait questionnaires (e.g., Ford et al., 2018), or (c) only examined unidirectional associations between acceptance and negative emotion (Shallcross et al., 2010). Thus, our study tested a more complex bidirectional model in which acceptance and negative emotion mutually reinforce each other over time.

¹ There are several other constructs that, like nonacceptance of emotion, also capture nuances of negative reactivity to internal experiences. For instance, negative metaemotional experiences occur when people have negative emotional reactions to their own negative emotions (e.g., Bailen et al., 2018; Jäger & Bänninger-Huber, 2015; Norman & Furnes, 2016), and experiential avoidance describes efforts to escape or avoid a wide range of internal experiences (e.g., Hayes et al., 1996). In this article, although we narrowed our focus to nonacceptance of emotion, we reviewed literature on experiential avoidance and negative metaemotions when evidence regarding nonacceptance of emotion was lacking.

We suggest, in line with the theory behind experiential avoidance (Hayes et al., 1996), that nonacceptance of negative emotion could hypothetically (and paradoxically) serve to amplify the experience of negative emotion, leading to an increase in negative emotion. In this theorized pathway, the act of avoiding unwanted (i.e., unaccepted) internal experiences involves thinking about the experience one is attempting to avoid, causing the unwanted experience to become more salient and accessible (Wenzlaff & Wegner, 2000). In this case, the nonacceptance of, and subsequent attempt to avoid, a preexisting negative emotional state generates a downward spiral of increasing negative emotion. This cycle could be at the root of common psychological disorders that are associated with both high negative emotion and high nonacceptance of emotion, including mood and anxiety disorders (Hayes et al., 1996). If so, this would provide indirect evidence as to why acceptance-based treatments contribute to the reduction of mood symptoms in such disorders. For example, emotion-focused therapy (EFT; Greenberg & Watson, 2006), which involves training in awareness and acceptance of one's emotions, is empirically supported for the treatment of depression (e.g., Goldman, Greenberg, & Angus, 2006). Treatments such as EFT might serve to break the cycle of negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion by decreasing nonacceptance of emotion. In view of the mixed evidence for temporal links between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion, further research is needed to investigate the temporal directionality of this association.

The Current Study

The goal of this study was to examine the associations between state negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion in daily life. We did this by assessing participants' momentary experiences of negative emotion and nonacceptance over several days using experience sampling methodology (ESM). The use of ESM is key because the majority of existing research examining negative reactivity to negative emotion has been laboratory based or used single-occasion survey designs. Not only does ESM have high ecological validity, but it also allows for the investigation of temporal associations between variables.

The present study aimed to clarify the directionality of the association between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion. First, we examined whether negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion were positively associated contemporaneously, in accordance with prior literature. Second, we examined whether nonacceptance of emotion prospectively predicted increases in negative emotion over time. Third, we examined whether negative emotion prospectively predicted increases in the likelihood of experiencing nonacceptance of emotion over time. Fourth, we examined the associations between positive emotion and nonacceptance of emotion contemporaneously and prospectively. We hypothesized that nonacceptance of emotion would prospectively predict negative emotion and that negative emotion would also prospectively predict nonacceptance of emotion—that is, that the temporal relation between nonacceptance of emotion and negative emotion intensity would be bidirectional. We hypothesized that significant associations between nonacceptance and emotion would be specific to negative, as opposed to positive, emotion—that is, that positive emotion would have no association with

nonacceptance of emotion either contemporaneously or prospectively.

Method

Participants

A total of 187 women between the ages of 18 and 40 ($M = 25.1$ years, $SD = 5.5$) were recruited for participation in a large project on emotion and sexual objectification in daily life (Koval et al., 2019). To be eligible, individuals needed to be women, be 18 to 40 years old, speak English as their primary language, and own a smartphone with an up-to-date iOS or Android operating system. Individuals were recruited from the communities of Melbourne, Australia ($n = 90$) and St. Louis, Missouri, United States ($n = 100$) through advertisements posted online and at local agencies and businesses. Three participants from the Melbourne site (none from the St. Louis site) were excluded from the final sample of 187 due to low ecological momentary assessment (EMA) compliance (<35% of scheduled EMA surveys; $n = 1$) or because they had already participated in a study with similar methodology conducted a year earlier ($n = 2$). We combined samples to increase the reliability and generalizability of the results. Ethnic breakdown was 49.7% White/Caucasian, 25.7% Asian, and 24.6% Multiracial/Other. A total of 77.5% of the sample self-identified as heterosexual, 13.4% as bisexual, 4.8% as gay or lesbian, and 4.3% as other. To account for any site differences in samples, we included site (i.e., Melbourne or St. Louis) as a variable in all models.

Procedure

Participants completed one laboratory session followed by 5 days of ESM. Baseline sessions were conducted in small groups of up to five (St. Louis site) and 10 (Melbourne site) participants. At baseline sessions, participants provided informed consent, completed a series of self-report measures administered on a computer via Qualtrics, and underwent an ESM tutorial given via a PowerPoint presentation. Before the tutorial, experimenters, who were undergraduate research assistants, helped participants download the survey app, SEMA, which was designed to collect data offline throughout the sampling period so that it did not require Wi-Fi or a data plan. Then, for the tutorial, the experimenter reviewed each ESM item, providing instruction and answering participants' questions.

Participants' devices were programmed to randomly prompt them every 60 ± 30 min from 10 a.m. to 12 a.m. (or during a corresponding 14-hr window, e.g., 9 a.m. to 11 p.m.; i.e., approximately 14 ESM surveys daily) for 5 days and were asked to respond to roughly 70 surveys over the course of the week. We wanted to have a sampling frequency that allowed us to look at changes in emotion over relatively short periods of time. We chose a rate of 14 surveys per day for 5 days in order to maximize the amount of emotion data we collected while also minimizing participant burden. Emotional changes similar to the ones we examined have been observed in past research using EMA survey schedules and time frames similar to ours (e.g., Koval, Kuppens, Allen, & Sheeber, 2012). Participants were given 15 min to respond to each survey before it expired, in which case data were recorded as missing. Surveys were excluded if the interval between

the index survey and the previous survey was abnormally short (i.e., less than 30 min) or long (i.e., more than 90 min) due to technical issues. A total of 456 surveys (6.2%) were excluded for this reason. The mean (within-day) interval between prompts was 59.2 min ($SD = 17.2$, range = 30–90). Compliance with the ESM protocol was high, with participants completing an average of 80.4% ($SD = 13.4\%$, range = 38–100%) of scheduled surveys. This is comparable with ESM compliance rates in prior emotion research (e.g., Flueckiger, Lieb, Meyer, Witthauer, & Mata, 2016; Hill & Updegraff, 2012).

A day after participants completed their last ESM survey, they were e-mailed a hyperlink to a series of self-report measures, which ended with a page debriefing them on the nature of the study. Finally, participants were compensated for their participation, with an extra incentive for responding to more than 50% of the prompts. The research protocol at each site was approved by its respective university institutional review board.

ESM Measures

Emotion. Emotions were assessed with a series of questions: “Right now, how [emotion] do you feel?” Negative emotions included sad, anxious, angry, afraid, ashamed, embarrassed, and guilty. Positive emotions included happy and confident. The order of emotions presented at each survey was randomized. Participants moved a slider along a slider scale with anchors of *not at all* and *very much so* to indicate how strongly they felt a particular emotion. During the in-person tutorial, the experimenters emphasized that participants should indicate how they were feeling at the moment they were prompted to complete the survey. A negative emotion composite was computed by averaging ratings of negative emotions at each survey, and a positive emotion composite was computed by averaging ratings of positive emotions at each survey.

Nonacceptance of emotion. After participants rated their emotions, nonacceptance of both positive and negative emotion was assessed with a single question: “Do you think your current emotions are bad or inappropriate?” This item was adapted from the highest-loading item on the Nonjudge subscale of the trait Five-Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (“I think some of my emotions are bad or inappropriate and I shouldn’t feel them”; Baer et al., 2006). Participants moved a slider along a visual analog scale with anchors of *not at all* and *very much so* to indicate the degree of nonacceptance they felt toward their emotions. SEMA automatically quantified the final position of the slider on a scale of 0 to 100, with 0 indicating the lowest and 100 indicating the highest possible degree of nonacceptance. During the in-person tutorial, participants were prompted to generate their own example of a time they thought their emotions were bad or inappropriate. If they were unable to generate their own example, the experimenter provided the following example:

Imagine you get angry at someone for interrupting you when you are talking. You might then tell yourself that you should not be angry about something seemingly small. In this case, you might think your anger was bad or inappropriate, and you would move the indicator to the right.

Participants were also told, “Of course, there are times when you think your feelings are just as they should be. If that is the case,

you would want to move the slider all the way to the left (i.e., ‘not at all’).”

Data Analytic Plan

We used multilevel modeling (MLM) to account for the hierarchical structure of the data (i.e., surveys nested within individuals; Nezlek, 2012; Schnijder & Bosker, 2012). MLM is an appropriate choice for these analyses because it does not assume independence of responses, can accommodate missing surveys, and allows the spacing of surveys to vary across individuals (Nezlek, 2012). All analyses were run in the program R 3.6.0 (R Core Team, 2019). MLM regression analyses generally require at least 15–30 clusters at Level 2, with at least 5–30 Level 1 observations per cluster (Kreft, 1996; McNeish & Stapleton, 2016). Given these guidelines, our sample of 187 participants (i.e., Level 2 clusters), each with an average of 56.3 completed surveys (i.e., Level 1 observations), gives us more than adequate power to detect meaningful statistical effects.

Examination of Distributions and Modeling Choices

The distributions of both negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion were zero-inflated. The nonacceptance of emotion data contained a very high number of zeros (68% across all measurement occasions); the remaining reported values had multiple modes (including one at a response value of 100) and did not follow a discernible underlying distribution. Accordingly, we treated this measure as a binary variable that indicated the presence versus absence of nonacceptance of emotion (i.e., a response of 0 on the scale indicated no presence of nonacceptance of emotion, while all other responses from 1–100 indicated the presence of nonacceptance of emotion). This binary variable was used in place of the original continuous variable in all analyses. For all models with nonacceptance of emotion as an outcome, we used hierarchical generalized linear modeling with the binomial distribution as the sampling model at Level 1. These analyses were run using the lme4 package (Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015).

Across all participants and surveys, 24.6% of negative emotion reports were zeros with the nonzero responses exhibiting positive skew. Consequently, we used a log-normal hurdle model as the sampling model at Level 1 for all multilevel models with negative emotion (i.e., the composite variable) as an outcome. This model assumes that the response has two parts. One part reflects the decision to not report any negative emotion at all (a zero vs. a report of negative emotion), and a second part reflects the magnitude of negative emotion reported given that any negative emotion is reported. These two parts are estimated simultaneously, each with its own set of predictors. A binomial model estimates the binary part of the outcome, with the outcomes on the logit scale, meaning they represent the natural log of the odds of not experiencing negative emotion. A log-normal model estimates the nonzero continuous part of the outcome, with outcomes represented by the log of the nonzero negative emotion. These analyses were conducted using the GLMMadaptive package (Rizopoulos, 2019). To further justify our decision to treat nonacceptance of emotion as binary and negative emotion as zero-inflated continuous, we (a) examined the ability of each model to reconstruct the zeros in the data (the most problematic part of each measure), (b) compared

models using the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) in which nonacceptance of emotion and negative emotion were treated as either binary or continuous predictors and comparing models with the same outcome variable (either continuous or binary), and (c) examined the distribution of the residuals from the chosen models relative to simulated residuals from the assumed underlying sampling distributions (using the DHARMA package; Hartig, 2019).

Preliminary Analyses

Before conducting full multilevel models, we tested unconditional models (i.e., with negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion as outcome variables and no predictors) to calculate the intraclass correlations (ICCs). The ICC is the proportion of total variance that exists at Level 2 (between-person level) of the models. We then conducted multilevel models to examine whether demographic variables including race, age, and location (United States vs. Australia) were associated with our outcome variables. Those demographic variables found to be related to the outcomes were retained in subsequent models. We also conducted multilevel models to examine whether survey prompt was associated with our outcome variables to examine linear time trends in the data.

Tests of Hypotheses

Next, we examined the between- and within-person correlations for our two primary outcome variables. The between-person correlation between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion was based on person-means for each measure, aggregated across ESM surveys. A within-person correlation for negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion was calculated for each person across the profile of responses for that person. We report the central tendency and variability of this distribution.

To test whether negative emotion prospectively predicts nonacceptance of emotion, we tested a model with lagged (time $t-1$) negative emotion and lagged (time $t-1$) nonacceptance of emotion as Level 1 predictors of current (time t) nonacceptance of emotion. Similarly, to test whether nonacceptance of emotion prospectively predicts negative emotion, we tested a model with lagged negative emotion and lagged nonacceptance of emotion as Level 1 predictors of current negative emotion. In these analyses, the inclusion of a lagged version of the outcome as a predictor isolates the unique contribution of the other lagged predictor by accounting for the contemporaneous correlation between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion. That unique contribution also can be thought of as indicating partialled change in the outcome. In the equations for the MLM models below, subscript i represents individual participants and subscript t represents ESM surveys (at time t). When used as predictors, lagged negative emotion (i.e., negative emotion at time point $t-1$) and lagged nonacceptance of emotion were person-mean centered (i.e., each person i 's mean across all occasions was subtracted from that person's score at each time point). Thus, these measures reflect magnitude relative to the particular person. Of note, the first value of the lagged predictors for each day was replaced with a missing value to remove previous-day effects when modeling using these variables.

We then conducted analyses that examined the relation between positive emotion and nonacceptance. These include contemporaneous between- and within-person correlations. They also include

a model that includes both lagged negative and lagged positive emotion as predictors of nonacceptance of emotion, as well as a model in which positive emotion is the outcome and lagged nonacceptance of emotion and lagged positive emotion act as Level 1 predictors. Positive emotion did not show zero inflation and so was modeled using a simple mixed model, assuming normally distributed residuals. Finally, we report several additional analyses. These include (a) diagnostics to address model assumptions, (b) resampling statistics to verify inferences in the event assumptions are not met (i.e., bootstrapping), (c) analyses to justify our use of nonacceptance of emotion as a binary variable and negative emotion as a continuous variable, and (d) analyses that include person-means for the Level 1 predictors as Level 2 predictors (i.e., model extensions).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptive analyses. Negative emotion (based on person-means across surveys) had a mean of 11.27 (between-person range = 0.20–54.91) and a between-person standard deviation of 11.56; the median within-person standard deviation was 7.05. Some negative emotion (i.e., above zero) was reported on 75.4% of completed survey prompts. One hundred percent of participants reported experiencing negative emotion at least once. Nonacceptance of emotion had a mean of 9.53 (median = 4.00, range = 0–72.10) and a between-person standard deviation of 13.91; the median within-person standard deviation was 12.02. Some degree of nonacceptance of emotion (i.e., above zero) was reported for 32.1% of completed survey prompts (for individual participants, range = 0–100%; 96.3% of participants reported nonacceptance of emotion at least once). Subsequent reference to nonacceptance of emotion refers to the binary form of the measure.

Unconditional models. The ICC from the unconditional model revealed that 59.8% of the variance for nonacceptance of emotion was at the between-person level. For negative emotion, 63.1% of the variance for the binary part of the model and 47.7% of the variance for the continuous nonzero part of the model were at the between-person level. Importantly, as our research questions concern within-person (lagged) associations between negative emotion and nonacceptance, there was considerable variance at the within-person level for both variables.

Demographic models. Race did not significantly predict nonacceptance of emotion, $\chi^2(df = 2) = 1.05, p = .59$, or negative emotion, $\chi^2(df = 4) = 7.20, p = .13$ (likelihood ratio tests comparing model with race to an unconditional model).² Age did not significantly predict nonacceptance of emotion, $\chi^2(df = 1) = 2.48, p = .12$, or negative emotion, $\chi^2(df = 2) = 0.61, p = .74$. Consequently, we did not include race or age in subsequent models. Location, however, was a significant predictor for nonacceptance of emotion $\chi^2(df = 1) = 4.46, p = .035$, with U.S. participants being more likely than Australian participants to report nonacceptance with an odds ratio (OR) of 2.02. Similarly, location was a significant predictor of negative emotion, $\chi^2(df = 2) =$

² For the purpose of these analyses, racial categories were consolidated into three groups: White/Caucasian, Asian, and Other.

10.06, $p = .007$. This effect was isolated in the binary part of the model and indicated that U.S. participants were more likely than Australian participants to report negative emotion ($OR = 2.69$). Location was included in subsequent models.

Time trends. Survey prompt number did not predict magnitude of negative emotion, $\beta_{(1)10} = -0.07$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .26$. Prompt number also did not predict the likelihood of nonacceptance of emotion, $\beta_{10} = -0.15$, $SE = 0.13$, $p = .25$.

Tests of Hypotheses

Contemporaneous association between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion. At the between-person level, the person-means for negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion were positively and significantly correlated, $r(185) = .65$, $p < .001$. At the within-person level, negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion had an average correlation of .24 ($SD = .23$), $t(175) = 13.35$, $p < .001$.

Negative emotion predicting change in nonacceptance of emotion over time. We next examined lagged negative emotion ($NegE_{t-1}$) and lagged nonacceptance of emotion ($NonA_{t-1}$) as Level 1 predictors of nonacceptance of emotion ($NonA_t$) with location (Loc) included as a Level 2 predictor of the intercept.³

Model 1

Level 1 (ESM surveys):

$$NonA_{it} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i}NegE_{i,t-1} + \pi_{2i}NonA_{i,t-1} \quad (1a)$$

Level 2 (individuals):

$$\pi_{0i} = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01}Loc_i + \mu_{0i} \quad (1b)$$

$$\pi_{1i} = \beta_{10} + \mu_{1i} \quad (1c)$$

$$\pi_{2i} = \beta_{20} + \mu_{2i} \quad (1d)$$

This model examines the impact of negative emotion at the immediately prior time point (denoted by the term $NegE_{i,t-1}$) on current emotional nonacceptance using a random intercept and slopes model. The within-person equation for this analysis is shown in Equation 1a. Here, person i 's level of nonacceptance of emotion at time t is modeled as a function of an intercept (π_{0i}) and a slope representing negative emotion at time $t-1$ (π_{1i}), while controlling for person i 's level of nonacceptance of emotion at time $t-1$ (captured by the slope π_{2i}). By including the lagged predictor ($NonA_{i,t-1}$) in the model, the slope of negative emotion (π_{1i}) can be interpreted as the association of negative emotion from $t-1$ with the outcome that is independent of immediately prior nonacceptance of emotion.

The between-person equation for this analysis can be seen in Equations 1b, 1c, and 1d. The fixed intercept, β_{00} , represents the expected log-odds of reporting nonacceptance of emotion among Australian participants; the slope, β_{01} , represents the amount by which the log-odds of U.S. participants differ from Australian participants. The fixed intercepts, β_{10} and β_{20} , are the mean associations of prior negative emotion and prior nonacceptance of emotion, respectively, with the outcome. Random effects (μ_{0i} , μ_{1i} , μ_{2i}) also were included to reflect each person i 's deviation from the location mean (for β_{00}) or grand mean (β_{10} , β_{20}). Random effect variances were, respectively, 5.08, 0.00049, and 0.41. The corresponding 95% confidence intervals are [4.02, 6.52], [0.00018, 0.0011], and [0.15, 0.82]. These confidence intervals all exclude 0,

indicating that additional variation in the intercepts and slopes is potentially accountable by other Level 2 predictors.

Consistent with our hypothesis, we found that both lagged negative emotion ($\beta_{10} = 0.028$, $SE = 0.0045$, 95% CI [0.020, 0.037], $p < .001$) and lagged nonacceptance of emotion ($\beta_{20} = 0.53$, $SE = 0.11$, [0.31, 0.75], $p < .001$) were significant positive predictors of nonacceptance of emotion. That is, greater than usual negative emotion (relative to a person's mean) prospectively and independently predicted a greater than usual likelihood of reporting nonacceptance of emotion. Each 10-point increment in negative emotion multiplies the odds of reporting nonacceptance of emotion by 1.32.

Nonacceptance of emotion predicting change in negative emotion over time. We then ran a model similar to Model 1, using negative emotion as the outcome variable in place of nonacceptance of emotion (Model 2). This model had two parts. One part reflected the binary choice to not report negative emotion (a logit model). The other part reflected the amount of negative emotion reported when the choice was to report negative emotion. This model is defined by the following equations.

Model 2

Binary part

Level 1 (ESM surveys):

$$NegE_{(b)it} = \pi_{(b)0i} + \pi_{(b)1i}NegE_{i,t-1} + \pi_{(b)2i}NonA_{i,t-1} \quad (2a)$$

Level 2 (individuals):

$$\pi_{(b)0i} = \beta_{(b)00} + \beta_{(b)01}Loc_i + \mu_{0i} \quad (2b)$$

$$\pi_{(b)1i} = \beta_{(b)10} \quad (2c)$$

$$\pi_{(b)2i} = \beta_{(b)20} \quad (2d)$$

Continuous part

Level 1 (ESM surveys):

$$NegE_{(c)it} = \pi_{(c)0i} + \pi_{(c)1i}NegE_{i,t-1} + \pi_{(c)2i}NonA_{i,t-1} + \tau_{i,t-1} \quad (2e)$$

Level 2 (individuals):

$$\pi_{(c)0i} = \beta_{(c)00} + \beta_{(c)01}Loc_i + \mu_{0i} \quad (2f)$$

$$\pi_{(c)1i} = \beta_{(c)10} + \mu_{1i} \quad (2g)$$

$$\pi_{(c)2i} = \beta_{(c)20} + \mu_{2i} \quad (2h)$$

Each part of the model has the same form (which mimics Model 1) and differ only in the nature of the outcome variable. Each part used a random intercept, and these intercepts were allowed to correlate. More complex random-effect models encountered convergence problems. The intercept variances for the binary and continuous parts were 2.44 and 1.03, respectively. The intercepts

³ Preliminary analyses indicated that location influenced only the intercept. For nonacceptance of emotion, a model with location as a predictor of the intercept was indistinguishable from a model that included location as a moderator of the slopes, $\chi^2(df = 2) = 0.86$, $p = .65$. For negative emotion, a model with location as a predictor of the intercept was likewise indistinguishable from a model that included location as a moderator of the slopes, $\chi^2(df = 4) = 2.28$, $p = .68$. Preliminary analyses also determined the random-effects portion of the models based on (a) likelihood ratio tests comparing models with different random-effect structures and (b) ability of the estimation algorithm to converge on a solution.

had a correlation of $-.80$. Random-effect variances were 5.94 and 1.06 for the continuous and binary parts of the model, respectively. The corresponding confidence intervals are [4.40, 7.75] and [0.85, 1.29]. These confidence intervals all exclude 0, indicating that additional variation in the intercepts and slopes is potentially accountable by other Level 2 predictors.

Results of both parts of the model were consistent with our hypothesis. In the zero-part of the model, we found that both lagged negative emotion ($\beta_{(b)10} = 0.060$, $SE = 0.0056$, $p < .001$) and lagged nonacceptance of emotion ($\beta_{(b)20} = 0.38$, $SE = 0.11$, $p < .001$) were significant positive predictors of reporting any negative emotion at all (note that we have reversed the signs for the binary part for interpretational ease). This suggests that greater than usual previous nonacceptance of emotion predicts a higher than usual likelihood of experiencing subsequent negative emotion. Previously reporting nonacceptance of emotion multiplies the odds of reporting negative emotion by 1.47. In the nonzero part of the model, we found that both lagged negative emotion ($\beta_{(c)10} = 0.025$, $SE = 0.0012$, $p < .001$) and lagged nonacceptance of emotion ($\beta_{(c)20} = 0.16$, $SE = 0.037$, $p < .001$) were significant positive predictors of the level of negative emotion reported. This suggests that nonacceptance of emotion predicts a tendency to subsequently experience more intense negative emotion than usual (accounting for prior negative emotion).

Nonacceptance of emotion and positive emotion. At the between-person level, the person-means for positive emotion and nonacceptance of emotion were significantly correlated, $r(187) = -.29$, $p < .001$. The between-person correlation of negative emotion with nonacceptance (.65) and the between-person correlation of positive emotion with nonacceptance ($-.29$) were significantly different from each other using the Williams (1959) method (see also Hittner, May, & Silver, 2003), $t(184) = -9.31$, $p < .001$, as estimated by the cocor package (Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015), suggesting the former association was strongest. This finding was supported by a simulation-based method recommended by Wilcox and Tian (2008), $p < .001$. At the within-person level, the average correlation between positive emotion and nonacceptance of emotion was significant, $r = -.15$, $SD = .20$, $t(175) = -9.80$, $p < .001$. The within-person correlation of negative emotion with nonacceptance (.24) and the within-person correlation of positive emotion with nonacceptance ($-.15$) were significantly different from each other, $t(175) = 12.74$, $p < .001$, suggesting the former association was strongest.

We tested two additional longitudinal models to examine the relation between nonacceptance of emotion and positive emotion. In one longitudinal model, we augmented Model 1 by including lagged positive emotion as an additional predictor. It did not contribute significantly to the prediction of nonacceptance of emotion ($p = .34$). In a second longitudinal model, we used positive emotion as the outcome with Level 1 predictors of lagged nonacceptance of emotion and lagged positive emotion. In this model, lagged nonacceptance of emotion did not contribute significantly ($p = .72$).

Additional Analyses

Diagnostics. Follow-up diagnostic analyses examined the residuals for each model. Level 2 residuals are expected to be normally distributed; they were found to be reasonably symmet-

rical, with no influential outliers, but with mild departures from normality. The Level 1 residuals are expected to follow the underlying sampling models. This was examined using the DHARMA package, which is based on a simulation methodology. These analyses indicated mild departures from expectation and low numbers of outliers (some are expected due to the very number of data points). Although the departures of residuals from model assumptions was minor, we followed up the main analyses with bootstrapping analyses to verify our inferences.

Bootstrapping. Bootstrapping is a resampling method that builds empirical sampling distributions for model coefficients that can be used for inference when the theory-based sampling distributions may not hold due to assumption violation. We used Level 2 case resampling with 1,000 bootstrap samples to generate the bootstrap distributions. Confidence intervals were constructed using the bias-corrected and accelerated method. The inferences about coefficient statistical significance based on these bootstrap distributions matched the inferences from the original analyses.

Model justification. We treated nonacceptance of emotion as a binary variable and treated negative emotion as a continuous variable. That decision is partly verified by the previously described Level 1 residual analyses. In addition, we (a) examined the ability of each model to reconstruct the zeros in the data (the most problematic part of each measure) and (b) compared models using BIC in which nonacceptance of emotion and negative emotion were treated as either binary or continuous predictors, comparing models with the same outcome variable (either continuous or binary). The chosen models reconstructed the zeros in the data well. In the original negative emotion data, the proportion of zeros was .254; the model-based estimated proportion of zeros was .254. For nonacceptance of emotion, the proportion of zeros in the original data was .688; the model-based estimated proportion of zeros was .662.

The model comparisons produced the following results. When continuous negative emotion was the outcome, the model with binary nonacceptance as a predictor was a better fit ($BIC = 25,743$) than the model with continuous nonacceptance as a predictor ($BIC = 25,770$). When binary negative emotion was the outcome, the model with binary nonacceptance as a predictor ($BIC = 6,930$) and the model with continuous nonacceptance as a predictor ($BIC = 6,930$) were indistinguishable. When continuous nonacceptance of emotion was the outcome, the model with continuous negative emotion as a predictor ($BIC = 14,303$) was a better fit than the model with binary negative emotion as a predictor ($BIC = 14,318$). When binary nonacceptance of emotion was the outcome, the model with continuous negative emotion as a predictor ($BIC = 6,713$) was a better fit than the model with binary negative emotion as a predictor ($BIC = 6,760$). Collectively, these analyses support the way we have treated the nonacceptance and negative emotion variables.

Model extensions. When data are person-mean centered, individual differences for the centered variables are lost to the model unless the person-means are included as Level 2 predictors. Although our primary interest was in the Level 1 model, we conducted additional analyses that added the person-means for nonacceptance of emotion and for negative emotion as predictors in the Level 2 equations. Prior to inclusion, the person-means were standardized.

In the model with nonacceptance of emotion as the outcome, person-level negative emotion significantly influenced the intercept as well as the slope for negative emotion. Participants who reported more average negative emotion were more likely to report nonacceptance of emotion, $\beta = 1.45$, $SE = .14$, 95% CI [1.18, 1.72]. A one-standard-deviation increase in mean negative emotion multiplies the odds of reporting nonacceptance of emotion by 4.26. Mean negative emotion also moderated the Level 1 slope for lagged negative emotion, $\beta = -0.0082$, $SE = .0041$, $[-0.016, -0.00023]$. A one-standard-deviation increase in mean negative emotion is associated with a -0.0082 decrease in the Level 1 association between lagged negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion.

The model with negative emotion as the outcome included person-means for lagged nonacceptance of emotion as predictors in both parts (binary and continuous). In the binary part of the model, the person-means for nonacceptance of emotion influenced the intercept but not the slopes. Participants who reported higher mean levels of nonacceptance of emotion were more likely to report negative emotion, $\beta = 1.82$, $SE = 0.17$, 95% CI [1.49, 2.15]. A one-standard-deviation increase in mean nonacceptance of emotion multiplies the odds of reporting negative emotion by 6.17. In the continuous part of the model, the person-means for nonacceptance of emotion influenced the intercept and slope for Level 1 lagged negative emotion. Participants who reported higher mean levels of nonacceptance of emotion were more likely to report negative emotion, $\beta = 0.62$, $SE = 0.063$, [0.49, 0.74]. Mean nonacceptance of emotion also moderated the Level 1 slope for lagged negative emotion, $\beta = -0.0073$, $SE = 0.0012$, $[-0.0097, -0.0050]$. A one-standard-deviation increase in mean nonacceptance of emotion is associated with a decrease of -0.0073 in the Level 1 association between lagged negative emotion and current negative emotion.

Discussion

Nonacceptance of emotion is strongly associated with poor psychological and social outcomes. Prior literature has found a positive cross-sectional association between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion (e.g., Lavender et al., 2017; Mayer & Stevens, 1994; Saxena et al., 2011). The present study examined the association between these variables both contemporaneously and over time. We used ESM to assess people's momentary experiences of negative emotion and nonacceptance during daily life in naturalistic settings, adding incrementally to existing cross-sectional and laboratory research.

First, we found that momentary negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion were positively associated contemporaneously. These results build upon prior research reporting positive associations between trait negative emotion and trait nonacceptance of emotion (Lavender et al., 2017; Mayer & Stevens, 1994; Saxena et al., 2011) by demonstrating that, on average, when individuals experience higher negative emotion than usual, they are also more likely than usual to experience greater nonacceptance of emotion *at the same time*. Thus, our findings indicate that these variables tend to co-occur in daily life within individuals, building on past between-person findings. Although we did not directly assess the target of nonacceptance (i.e., which emotion[s] participants were nonaccepting of), the target of the contempora-

neously reported nonacceptance reasonably could be the negative emotion participants also reported via the survey. In those instances, our results would suggest that nonacceptance of emotion tends to increase as the intensity of the target negative emotion increases. Individuals would be more likely to experience nonacceptance of their sadness, for example, during moments when their sadness is more intense. However, it is possible that the seven negative emotion items did not always capture the target emotion of participants' nonacceptance. For example, we did not assess disgust, so if a participant reported being nonaccepting of her emotions and she was being nonaccepting of her feelings of disgust, the target of nonacceptance in this instance would not be captured by her report of negative emotion. To further illuminate the contemporaneous association between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion, future research could ask participants to name specific emotional states as targets of reported nonacceptance. This methodology also could allow for the comparison of the nonacceptance of different target emotions: whether, say, nonacceptance of anger is more predictive than nonacceptance of sadness of subsequent increases in negative emotion.

When we examined the temporal associations between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion in separate models, each significantly predicted increases in the other across time (controlling for immediately prior levels of the outcome). Negative emotion prospectively predicted increases in the likelihood of nonacceptance of emotion from survey to survey, providing the first direct evidence of this temporal relation. Further, consistent with existing theoretical and extant literature (e.g., Ford et al., 2018; Hershenberg et al., 2017), in the current study, nonacceptance of emotion also prospectively predicted within-person increases in the magnitude of negative emotion over time. This is the first work to show that the temporal relation between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion is bidirectional in the same sample.⁴ Findings imply a cycle wherein negative emotion leads to increased nonacceptance of emotions, which leads to increased negative emotion. Future studies could use a longer data collection framework—one that takes place over the course of months or even years—to more thoroughly explore the extent of such a cycle. Given that chronically elevated negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion are each independently linked to negative psychological and social outcomes (e.g., Clark, Watson, & Mineka, 1994; Gratz & Roemer, 2004; Mayer & Stevens, 1994; Saxena et al., 2011), it is plausible that such a cycle could amplify and prolong those negative effects.

We also examined how nonacceptance of emotion was related to positive emotion contemporaneously and prospectively. Although we had hypothesized that they would not be significantly associated, positive emotion was significantly, inversely related to nonacceptance of emotion contemporaneously. That is, higher levels of positive emotion were associated with lower likelihood of nonacceptance of emotion. Although our contemporaneous findings show that both positive and negative emotion were significantly associated with nonacceptance, albeit in opposite directions,

⁴ Of note, given the nature of the data, we had to fit different types of models to different types of measures, and that prevented any direct test of bidirectional influence in one model. We can, however, infer separate unidirectional influence in each direction, which we refer to here as bidirectional.

negative emotion was more strongly associated with nonacceptance of emotion than was positive emotion. In terms of prospective findings, consistent with our hypotheses, nonacceptance of emotion did not significantly predict changes in positive emotion, and positive emotion did not significantly predict changes in nonacceptance. Taken together, these findings suggest that negative emotion is more strongly implicated in nonacceptance of emotion both concurrently and over time than is positive emotion, supporting a continued emphasis on future studies on negative emotion. They also suggest that positive emotion could be a protective factor for experiencing nonacceptance at any given time, which might elucidate one mechanism behind treatments for major depressive disorder that aim to increase positive affect, such as behavioral activation (e.g., Spates, Pagoto, & Kalata, 2006).

Our study's findings have substantial implications for emotion dynamics in both healthy and clinical samples. Even among healthy individuals, momentary negative emotion can be exacerbated or ameliorated in a variety of ways—for example, through changes in attention or the employment of emotion regulation strategies (Gross & Jazaieri, 2014). Our study suggests that nonacceptance of emotion is another such factor that influences negative emotionality in the moment. When individuals reject, suppress, or avoid their negative emotion, those responses actually could cause the negative emotion to linger or worsen. The resulting negative emotion could then lead to more nonacceptance, which could lead to further negative emotion, and so on.

It is important to keep in mind that the observed temporal changes in emotion variables occurred over a 30-min interval or longer. Thus, the finding that negative emotion predicts prospective increases in nonacceptance of emotion, for example, indicates that emotional nonacceptance affects emotional functioning later in the day. Similarly, the intensity of negative emotion can have implications for nonacceptance of emotions felt over 30 min later. In interventions, it could be important to provide psychoeducation about the long-lasting effects of nonacceptance of emotion: that even if it seems like rejecting one's emotions should allow one to minimize or avoid them, it often backfires and has the opposite effect. Interventions should help individuals build awareness that heightened negative emotion might increase vulnerability to engaging in nonacceptance of emotion later on and that nonacceptance of emotion might exacerbate negative emotion even after minutes or hours have passed.

The chronic perpetuation of this cycle could even contribute to the development of psychological disorders that entail chronically high levels of negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion, including major depressive disorder (Beblo et al., 2012), generalized anxiety disorder (Salters-Pedneault et al., 2006), panic disorder (Tull, 2006), and borderline personality disorder (Salsman & Linehan, 2012). Individuals with major depressive disorder, in particular, have been shown to have a denser emotion network for negative emotions, indicating their emotion systems are more resistant to change (Pe et al., 2015); we speculate that part of the tendency for negative emotions to be more resistant to change in depressive disorder may be accounted for by a tighter coupling between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion over time, perhaps via underlying risk factors such as neuroticism (e.g., Hirschfeld et al., 1983).

Established treatments for the above disorders, such as EFT, often target nonacceptance of emotion as a point of intervention.

Some treatments target negative emotion more directly, as well: In dialectical behavior therapy, for example (Linehan, 1993), clients are taught to nonjudgmentally experience negative emotion, but they are also taught skills to decrease negative emotion with distress tolerance and emotion regulation skills. Our findings could elucidate a mechanism by which these treatments work to reduce symptoms: They suggest that targeting both negative emotion itself and targeting nonacceptance of emotions could help weaken the mutually reinforcing cycle as both help to reduce negative emotion, which ensures that subsequent increases in nonacceptance of emotions are less likely.

Future research with clinical samples, such as those with major depressive disorder (Gratz & Roemer, 2004), is needed to obtain greater variability and to examine whether the same pattern of findings holds. If so, it could help explain the development and maintenance of several common forms of psychopathology. Further, to capture how people's emotional reactions play out over seconds or a few minutes, future research could either examine these relations over more frequent sampling periods or examine them in the lab using experimental designs. We expect that positive associations also would be found over a shorter time frame. This would be consistent with laboratory research using constructs related to nonacceptance of emotion—for example, research shows that acceptance of negative emotions is associated with decreased negative emotions over a period of minutes (Shallcross et al., 2010). Future studies also should explore negative emotion in relation to other constructs that, like nonacceptance of emotion, capture nuances of negative reactivity to internal experiences, such as negative metaemotions (e.g., Bailen et al., 2018; Jäger & Bänninger-Huber, 2015; Norman & Furnes, 2016) and experiential avoidance (e.g., Hayes et al., 1996). These constructs differ as to whether, and in what way, they are defined by cognition, emotion, and behavior and could potentially have differential associations with negative emotion. Similarly, it would be useful to examine whether the same results are obtained when using a measure of acceptance as when using a measure of nonacceptance. Of note, the zero point on our scale did not necessarily represent acceptance, but a lack of nonacceptance. Empirical evidence is needed to assert whether acceptance and nonacceptance are two ends of a bipolar scale or whether acceptance and the lack of nonacceptance have differential associations with negative emotion.

We want to note a few limitations to our study. First, we included only women as participants, which limits the generalizability of our study with regard to gender. Given that some studies have found that women report higher levels of nonacceptance than men (e.g., Flynn et al., 2010; Osborne, Michonski, Sayrs, Welch, & Anderson, 2017), it will be important to see if the present findings also characterize men's experiences. Having said this, we expect that the results will be similar among men given that positive associations between negative emotion and constructs similar to nonacceptance of emotion have been shown in samples composed mostly or entirely of men both cross-sectionally (Saxena et al., 2011) and temporally (e.g., Hershenberg et al., 2017). Second, similarly, given that we limited our sample to individuals between the ages of 18 and 40, it will be important to replicate this study in a sample that includes older adults. Since older adults experience less negative emotion than younger adults in general (e.g., Bruine de Bruin, van Putten, van Emden, & Strough, 2018),

they also might experience less nonacceptance of emotion and might be less likely to fall into the temporally predictive pattern we found. Indeed, one study showed that greater acceptance of negative emotion mediates the negative association between age and negative emotion (Shallcross, Ford, Floerke, & Mauss, 2013). Third, we did not assess trait nonacceptance in the current sample. It will be important that future studies assess trait and state nonacceptance to better understand how closely the two are related—that is, whether trait nonacceptance of emotion predicts the frequency of nonacceptance of emotion in daily life. Finally, although some might consider the high number of zero values in our nonacceptance of emotion data a limitation of our study, we think it reflects the actual experience of this community sample. This interpretation is supported by evidence showing that nonacceptance of emotion is higher in currently depressed than nondepressed individuals (e.g., Gratz & Roemer, 2004). We addressed the high number of zero values by dichotomizing the nonacceptance variable and by using analyses that were appropriate for use with binary data. Of note, if we had used a multiple-item measure of nonacceptance of emotion instead of a single-item measure, it is possible we would have obtained a sufficient distribution of responses to treat the data as continuous. The high number of zero values in our negative emotion data similarly could be attributable to having a healthy community sample, although it was not statistically necessary to dichotomize these data.

Using intensive longitudinal data from a nonclinical sample of women, this study highlights bidirectional associations between negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion over time in daily life. Given that negative emotion and nonacceptance of emotion have each been implicated in psychological distress and impairments in functioning, it is important to continue to explore how they influence each other and how their combined influence can contribute to negative outcomes. In the present study, we built on previous research that has reported positive cross-sectional associations among trait nonacceptance and negative emotion by examining their contemporaneous association at the within-person (i.e., state) level. Furthermore, we also took the important next step of demonstrating bidirectional associations among negative emotion and nonacceptance over time. In this manner, we showed that nonacceptance of emotion has implications for emotional functioning that transcend the present moment and continue to have ramifications later in the day. These findings are critical to elucidating how individuals fall into maladaptive emotional patterns such that even one episode of nonacceptance of emotion can increase later negative emotion and make individuals vulnerable to future nonacceptance of emotion and negative emotion.

References

- Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment, 13*, 27–45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504>
- Bailen, N. H., Wu, H., & Thompson, R. J. (2018). Meta-emotions in daily life: Associations with emotional awareness and depression. *Emotion, 19*, 776–787. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000488>
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software, 67*, 1–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1994). *Losing control: How and why people fail at self-regulation*. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Beblo, T., Fernando, S., Klocke, S., Gripenstroh, J., Aschenbrenner, S., & Driessen, M. (2012). Increased suppression of negative and positive emotions in major depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 141*(2–3), 474–479. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.03.019>
- Blackledge, J. T., & Hayes, S. C. (2001). Emotion regulation in acceptance and commitment therapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 57*, 243–255. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(200102\)57:2<243::AID-JCLP9>3.0.CO;2-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(200102)57:2<243::AID-JCLP9>3.0.CO;2-X)
- Brockmeyer, T., Skunde, M., Wu, M., Bresslein, E., Rudofsky, G., Herzog, W., & Friederich, H. C. (2014). Difficulties in emotion regulation across the spectrum of eating disorders. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 55*, 565–571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2013.12.001>
- Bruin de Bruin, W., van Putten, M., van Emden, R., & Strough, J. (2018). Age differences in emotional responses to monetary losses and gains. *Psychology and Aging, 33*, 413–418. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pag0000219>
- Campbell-Sills, L., Barlow, D. H., Brown, T. A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2006). Acceptability and suppression of negative emotion in anxiety and mood disorders. *Emotion, 6*, 587–595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.6.4.587>
- Clark, L. A., Watson, D., & Mineka, S. (1994). Temperament, personality, and the mood and anxiety disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103*, 103–116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.103.1.103>
- Diedenhofen, B., & Musch, J. (2015). cocor: A comprehensive solution for the statistical comparison of correlations. *PLoS ONE, 10*(3), e0121945. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121945>
- Dimidjian, S., & Linehan, M. M. (2003). Defining an agenda for future research on the clinical application of mindfulness practice. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 10*, 166–171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bpg019>
- Dunn, B. D., Billotti, D., Murphy, V., & Dalgleish, T. (2009). The consequences of effortful emotion regulation when processing distressing material: A comparison of suppression and acceptance. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 47*, 761–773. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.05.007>
- Ehring, T., Tuschen-Caffier, B., Schnülle, J., Fischer, S., & Gross, J. J. (2010). Emotion regulation and vulnerability to depression: Spontaneous versus instructed use of emotion suppression and reappraisal. *Emotion, 10*, 563–572. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019010>
- Emery, A. A., Heath, N. L., & Mills, D. J. (2016). Basic psychological need satisfaction, emotion dysregulation, and non-suicidal self-injury engagement in young adults: An application of self-determination theory. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*, 612–623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0405-y>
- English, T., Lee, I. A., John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2017). Emotion regulation strategy selection in daily life: The role of social context and goals. *Motivation and Emotion, 41*, 230–242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9597-z>
- Flueckiger, L., Lieb, R., Meyer, A. H., Witthauer, C., & Mata, J. (2016). The importance of physical activity and sleep for affect on stressful days: Two intensive longitudinal studies. *Emotion, 16*, 488–497. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000143>
- Flynn, J. J., Hollenstein, T., & Mackey, A. (2010). The effect of suppressing and not accepting emotions on depressive symptoms: Is suppression different for men and women? *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*, 582–586. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.05.022>
- Ford, B. Q., Lam, P., John, O. P., & Mauss, I. B. (2018). The psychological health benefits of accepting negative emotions and thoughts: Laboratory, diary, and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 115*, 1075–1092. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000157>

- Gianini, L. M., White, M. A., & Masheb, R. M. (2013). Eating pathology, emotion regulation, and emotional overeating in obese adults with binge eating disorder. *Eating Behaviors, 14*, 309–313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2013.05.008>
- Goldman, R. N., Greenberg, L. S., & Angus, L. (2006). The effects of adding emotion-focused interventions to the client-centered relationship conditions in the treatment of depression. *Psychotherapy Research, 16*, 537–549. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10503300600589456>
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 26*, 41–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBA.0000007455.08539.94>
- Greenberg, L. S., & Watson, J. C. (2006). *Emotion-focused therapy for depression*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11286-000>
- Gross, J. J., & Jazaieri, H. (2014). Emotion, emotion regulation, and psychopathology: An affective science perspective. *Clinical Psychological Science, 2*, 387–401.
- Grossman, P., Niemann, L., Schmidt, S., & Walach, H. (2004). Mindfulness-based stress reduction and health benefits: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 57*, 35–43. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3999\(03\)00573-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3999(03)00573-7)
- Harrison, A., Sullivan, S., Tchanturia, K., & Treasure, J. (2010). Emotional functioning in eating disorders: Attentional bias, emotion recognition and emotion regulation. *Psychological Medicine, 40*, 1887–1897. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291710000036>
- Harrison, A., Tchanturia, K., & Treasure, J. (2010). Attentional bias, emotion recognition, and emotion regulation in anorexia: State or trait? *Biological Psychiatry, 68*, 755–761. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.04.037>
- Hartig, F. (2019). DHARMA: Residual diagnostics for hierarchical (multi-level/mixed) regression models (R Package Version 0.2.6) [Computer software]. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMA>
- Hayes, S. C., Follette, V. M., & Linehan, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Mindfulness and acceptance: Expanding the cognitive-behavioral tradition*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hayes, S. C., Wilson, K. G., Gifford, E. V., Follette, V. M., & Strosahl, K. (1996). Experimental avoidance and behavioral disorders: A functional dimensional approach to diagnosis and treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 1152–1168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.64.6.1152>
- Heij, J. E., & Cheavens, J. S. (2014). Back to basics: A naturalistic assessment of the experience and regulation of emotion. *Emotion, 14*, 878–891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037231>
- Hershenberg, R., Mavandadi, S., Wright, E., & Thase, M. E. (2017). Anhedonia in the daily lives of depressed veterans: A pilot report on experiential avoidance as a moderator of emotional reactivity. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 208*, 414–417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.10.011>
- Hill, C. L., & Updegraff, J. A. (2012). Mindfulness and its relationship to emotional regulation. *Emotion, 12*, 81–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026355>
- Hirschfeld, R. M., Klerman, G. L., Clayton, P. J., Keller, M. B., McDonald-Scott, P., & Larkin, B. H. (1983). Assessing personality: Effects of the depressive state on trait measurement. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 140*, 695–699. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ajp.140.6.695>
- Hittner, J. B., May, K., & Silver, N. C. (2003). A Monte Carlo evaluation of tests for comparing dependent correlations. *Journal of General Psychology, 130*, 149–168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221300309601282>
- Jäger, C., & Bänninger-Huber, E. (2015). Looking into meta-emotions. *Synthese, 192*, 787–811. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11229-014-0588-x>
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophic living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, anxiety and depression*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Koval, P., Holland, E., Zyphur, M. J., Stratemeyer, M., Knight, J. M., Bailen, N. H., . . . Haslam, N. (2019). How does it feel to be treated like an object? Direct and indirect effects of exposure to sexual objectification on women's emotions in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 116*, 885–898. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000161>
- Koval, P., Kuppens, P., Allen, N. B., & Sheeber, L. (2012). Getting stuck in depression: The roles of rumination and emotional inertia. *Cognition and Emotion, 26*, 1412–1427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.667392>
- Kreft, I. G. (1996). *Are multilevel techniques necessary? An overview, including simulation studies*. Unpublished manuscript, California State University, Los Angeles, CA.
- Lavender, J. M., Tull, M. T., DiLillo, D., Messman-Moore, T., & Gratz, K. L. (2017). Development and validation of a state-based measure of emotion dysregulation: The State Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (S-DERS). *Assessment, 24*, 197–209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191115601218>
- Levitt, J. T., Brown, T. A., Orsillo, S. M., & Barlow, D. H. (2004). The effects of acceptance versus suppression of emotion on subjective and psychophysiological response to carbon dioxide challenge in patients with panic disorder. *Behavior Therapy, 35*, 747–766. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(04\)80018-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80018-2)
- Linehan, M. (1993). *Cognitive-behavioral treatment of borderline personality disorder*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Machell, K. A., Goodman, F. R., & Kashdan, T. B. (2015). Experiential avoidance and well-being: A daily diary analysis. *Cognition and Emotion, 29*, 351–359. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.911143>
- Mayer, J. D., & Stevens, A. A. (1994). An emerging understanding of the reflective (meta-) experience of mood. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*, 351–373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1994.1025>
- McNeish, D. M., & Stapleton, L. M. (2016). The effect of small sample size on two-level model estimates: A review and illustration. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*, 295–314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-014-9287-x>
- Mennin, D. S., Holaway, R. M., Fresco, D. M., Moore, M. T., & Heimberg, R. G. (2007). Delineating components of emotion and its dysregulation in anxiety and mood psychopathology. *Behavior Therapy, 38*, 284–302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2006.09.001>
- Neumann, A., van Lier, P. A., Gratz, K. L., & Koot, H. M. (2010). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation difficulties in adolescents using the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Assessment, 17*, 138–149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191109349579>
- Nezlek, J. B. (2012). Multilevel modeling analyses of diary-style data. In M. R. Mehl & T. S. Conner (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 357–383). New York, NY: Guilford Press. Retrieved from <https://jbnzsl.people.wm.edu/Reprints/2012-MLM-Chapter-Daily-Life-Handbook.pdf>
- Nezlek, J. B., Holas, P., Rusanowska, M., & Krejtz, I. (2016). Being present in the moment: Event-level relationships between mindfulness and stress, positivity, and importance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 93*, 1–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.031>
- Norman, E., & Furnes, B. (2016). The concept of “metaemotion”: What is there to learn from research on metacognition? *Emotion Review, 8*, 187–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1754073914552913>
- Osborne, T. L., Michonski, J., Sayrs, J., Welch, S. S., & Anderson, L. K. (2017). Factor structure of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale (DERS) in adult outpatients receiving dialectical behavior therapy (DBT). *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 39*, 355–371.

- Pe, M. L., Kircanski, K., Thompson, R. J., Bringmann, L. F., Tuerlinckx, F., Mestdagh, M., . . . Gotlib, I. H. (2015). Emotion-network density in major depressive disorder. *Clinical Psychological Science, 3*, 292–300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2167702614540645>
- R Core Team. (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Computer software]. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <http://www.R-project.org/>
- Rizopoulos, D. (2019). GLMMadaptive: Generalized linear mixed models using adaptive gaussian quadrature (R Package Version 0.6–0) [Computer software]. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=GLMMadaptive/>
- Salsman, N. L., & Linehan, M. M. (2012). An investigation of the relationships among negative affect, difficulties in emotion regulation, and features of borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 34*, 260–267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10862-012-9275-8>
- Salters-Pedneault, K., Roemer, L., Tull, M. T., Rucker, L., & Mennin, D. S. (2006). Evidence of broad deficits in emotion regulation associated with chronic worry and generalized anxiety disorder. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 30*, 469–480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10608-006-9055-4>
- Sauer-Zavala, S., Boswell, J. F., Gallagher, M. W., Bentley, K. H., Ametaj, A., & Barlow, D. H. (2012). The role of negative affectivity and negative reactivity to emotions in predicting outcomes in the unified protocol for the transdiagnostic treatment of emotional disorders. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 50*, 551–557. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2012.05.005>
- Saxena, P., Dubey, A., & Pandey, R. (2011). Role of emotion regulation difficulties in predicting mental health and well-being. *Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 18*, 147–155. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2011-21803-003>
- Schnijder, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (2012). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shallcross, A. J., Ford, B. Q., Floerke, V. A., & Mauss, I. B. (2013). Getting better with age: The relationship between age, acceptance, and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 734–749. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031180>
- Shallcross, A. J., Troy, A. S., Boland, M., & Mauss, I. B. (2010). Let it be: Accepting negative emotional experiences predicts decreased negative affect and depressive symptoms. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 48*, 921–929. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2010.05.025>
- Spates, C. R., Pagoto, S. L., & Kalata, A. (2006). A qualitative and quantitative review of behavioral activation treatment of major depressive disorder. *The Behavior Analyst Today, 7*, 508–521.
- Svaldi, J., Griepstroh, J., Tuschen-Caffier, B., & Ehring, T. (2012). Emotion regulation deficits in eating disorders: A marker of eating pathology or general psychopathology? *Psychiatry Research, 197*(1–2), 103–111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2011.11.009>
- Tull, M. T. (2006). Extending an anxiety sensitivity model of uncued panic attack frequency and symptom severity: The role of emotion dysregulation. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 30*, 177–184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10608-006-9036-7>
- Wenze, S. J., Gaugler, T. L., Sheets, E. S., & DeCicco, J. M. (2018). Momentary experiential avoidance: Within-person correlates, antecedents, and consequences and between-person moderators. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 107*, 42–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2018.05.011>
- Wenzlaff, R. M., & Wegner, D. M. (2000). Thought suppression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 59–91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.59>
- Wilcox, R. R., & Tian, T. (2008). Comparing dependent correlations. *Journal of General Psychology, 135*, 105–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/GENP.135.1.105-112>
- Williams, E. J. (1959). The comparison of regression variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Methodological, 21*, 396–399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1959.tb00346.x>
- Williams, J. C., & Lynn, S. J. (2010). Acceptance: An historical and conceptual review. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 30*, 5–56.

Received August 28, 2019

Revision received June 4, 2020

Accepted June 11, 2020 ■