I don't fit, so I blame you? - Influence of Regulatory Focus and Fit on Emotion Generation and
Regulation in Single- and Group-Context

Christopher M. Jones^{1,2} & Daniel Memmert²

¹ Institute of Public Health and Nursing Research, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

² Institute of Exercise Training and Sport Informatics, German Sport University Cologne,
Cologne, Germany

Author note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christopher M. Jones,
Institute of Public Health and Nursing Research, University of Bremen, Grazer Str. 4, 28359
Bremen, Germany. E-mail: jones@uni-bremen.de

Abstract

Person-environment-interactions play a main role in the process of emotional experience. While Regulatory Focus Theory has been adopted to illustrate how some goal-oriented parts of this process might shape by proposing a regulatory fit between individual and environmental characteristics, whether this fit not only implies feeling “right” but feeling “good” or at least cope better, has not been tested empirically. In this study, we extend earlier research on the influence of regulatory fit to the generation and regulation of emotions. We additionally emphasize the role of the context, by integrating current work on group-based emotion regulation in comparing single- and group-environments. We used a within-subjects design, with 2 (situational focus) x 2 (single/group environment) levels. Thirty-two male football players participated in one football-specific task per level. Emotional experience and cognitive regulation strategies were measured after each. Multilevel regression showed, that a regulatory fit predicted more passive-negative emotions in both and more active-negative emotions in the group-environments. The Regulatory fit predicted stronger use of functional regulation strategies in the single- but less in the group-environment. Group-membership predicted stronger use of group-based regulation strategies and weaker use of other strategies – thus indicating further constraints and new ways to cope. We discuss the counter-intuitive results regarding emotional experience in the light of the athletic context as well as theoretical accounts of regulatory fit and its role in moderating motivational intensity and value assignment. Results regarding influence of group-membership are integrated into current research and we highlight directions for future research.

Keywords: group-based emotion, emotion regulation, self-regulation, regulatory focus

I don't fit, so I blame you? - Influence of Regulatory Focus and Fit on Emotion Generation and Regulation in Single- and Group-Context

While being the focal part of a highly favoured but hugely underperforming Argentinian team during their deciding World Cup qualifier against Chile, Lionel Messi did not adapt too well to the demands and constraints of the situation as he severely insulted the referee, ultimately receiving not only a red card but also a ten-thousand dollar fine and four-game ban. As this scene encapsulated, even when fight, flight, laughter, or tears are provoked as first action-oriented response to an emotional experience, they do not necessarily lead to the best adaption to a given situation. This becomes all the more obvious when looking at today's highly complex interpersonal relationships and goal attainment processes that leave individuals with only a restricted range of ways to act and cope, thus making a dynamic and adaptive regulation process inevitable (Gross, 2014).

Regulatory focus theory (RFT) proposes a framework to describe the relationship of goal-related environmental and individual characteristics and assesses a degree of fit between both. Fitting with one's individual mode of self-regulation into a situation with corresponding features is assumed to make an individual "feel right", increase the subjective value of the action and, according to recent research, facilitate better performance (Keller & Bless, 2006; Spiegel, Grant-Pillow, & Higgins, 2004). The subjective experience of "fit" has been shown to influence information processing, motivational intensity and different aspects of evaluations of decisions and assigned values (Higgins, 2000). What has been lacking to date, is an answer to the question if feeling "right" also leads to feeling "good" - or at least the higher ability to cope and thus feel "good". While many aspects and effects of the subjective experience of a regulatory fit have

57 been examined, a possible connection on an individual's emotional experience remains to be
58 tested empirically.

59 However, as our introduction shows, many situations offer additional constraints to an
60 individual's adaption as it is framed within RFT. These restrictions are especially important
61 when teams in general and team sports in particular are considered. Concerned with both goal
62 directed self- and emotion regulation, the individual is not only faced with personal but team
63 aims, obligations and resources as well as further situational characteristics. We thus additionally
64 assume, that connecting RFT and regulatory fit with the process of emotion regulation falls well
65 short without further extending this connection to group-based emotions and their regulation.
66 Only this extension may shed light on the specific adaptive functioning. By integrating recently
67 introduced approaches of group-based emotion regulation theory (Goldenberg, Halperin, van
68 Zomeren, & Gross, 2016), we add to existing work that neglects group-membership as an
69 important factor in emotion generation as well as regulation.

71 **Group-based emotion regulation**

72 To date, work in the emerging field of emotion regulation has mostly focused on the role
73 of either hedonistic (i.e. feeling better in a given situation) or instrumental goals as well as
74 different types of regulation strategies and their effectiveness in different situations (Koole,
75 2009). However, as in Messi's case, group-membership based on one's self-categorization and
76 perceived relevance for the group play a key role in emotion generation as well as regulation.
77 Goldenberg et al. (2016) propose the process model of group-based emotion regulation by
78 integrating self-categorization- (Tajfel & Turner, 2004) and inter-group emotion theory (Mackie,
79 Maimor, & Smith, 2009) into Gross' (2014) process model. This allows them to broaden the

framework of regulation processes, as strategies for regulating non-group-based emotions (e.g. situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, cognitive change, response modulation) are adapted for group-based emotions (i.e. appraising “anthems do not belong to sports events”) and extended by the possibility of changing the state of self-categorization and perceived importance to the group. Because of the aforementioned constraints in many group-related situations (i.e. difficulties in avoiding emotion arousing situations) or potentially higher resource-costs to do so (Khawaja, 1993), special emphasis is put on cognitive strategies (Halperin, Porat, Tamir, & Gross, 2012).

Regulatory focus theory

RFT proposes two modes of an individual’s self-regulation as an interplay of personal and environmental factors, framing dimensions such as information processing and emotional experience (Higgins et al., 1997). Individuals with a chronic promotion focus are attributed a tendency to orientate towards positive outcomes, accomplishments and aspirations, whereas a prevention focus is attributed to an orientation towards possible negative outcomes, safety and responsibilities. Looking back at Lionel Messi’s tricky situation, one can easily adopt the given distinction in order to understand why regulatory focus theory also proposes a situational focus. In this case, the Argentinian team was trying to prevent a crushing blow to their World Cup hopes and their compatriots’ expectations (situational prevention focus), whereas the Chileans were chasing high hopes and aspirations of beating the favorite (situational promotion focus). There is no superior mode per se, but based on the assumption of higher performance- and goal attainment motivation as well as positive affect, several works have shown a positive effect on cognitive (Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Keller & Bless, 2006; Shah, Higgins, & Friedman,

1998; Spiegel, Grant-Pillow, & Higgins, 2004) and athletic (Memmert, Hüttermann, & Orliczek, 2013; Plessner, Unkelbach, Memmert, Baltes, & Kolb, 2009; Vogel & Genschow, 2013) performance measures when situational and chronic focus match – the so-called regulatory fit between individual and environmental characteristics. It has been theorized, that a regulatory fit not only influences the nature of one's emotional experience (e.g. positive feedback raises cheerfulness, negative feedback raises disappointment in case of chronic promotion focus and calmness opposed to agitation in case of chronic prevention focus), but its degree as well (Brockner & Higgins, 2001). Research on emotion regulation within an RFT-framework is lacking to date.

Aims of the Present Research

The connection between RFT, conceptualizing the link between person and environment, and an individual's emotional experience is well-established theoretically. Yet, the nature and degree have been only brought into focus and not been tested empirically yet. As regulatory fit has been shown to improve different aspects of (cognitive) performance, we also include cognitive emotion regulation as a main feature of an individual's adaption to situation specific demands and the subjective, transactional experience. We further distinguish between single- and group-environments to accommodate different constraints and possibilities this might bring for an individual.

We thus assume that (a) the emotional experience and (b) the use of cognitive emotion regulation strategies as part of the transactional process are influenced by the interaction of chronic and situational focus and a potential regulatory fit – resulting in a cross-over interaction effect. To broaden the understanding and accommodate specific constraints and resources of a

given situation, we integrate the substantial work of Goldenberg et al. (2016). We (c) consistently assume that being part of a group not only changes emotion generation but also the strategies used to regulate these emotions accordingly. Thus, in the present study we examine the influence of chronic regulatory focus, situational regulatory focus and their interaction in single as well as group-context. As our introduction shows, the many different facets of team-sports offer a unique setup to probe complex relationships between different theoretical constructs. For the present research we therefore utilize individual- and group-tasks in football, to change the respective environmental characteristics according to the underlying theoretical assumptions.

Method

Participants

Thirty-two male football players with a mean age of 17.12 years ($SD = 1.03$) participated in the present study. Another two players had to be omitted from all analysis as they only completed questionnaires for three of the four experimental conditions. No incentives were offered. Players actively played in the third and second tier of the German youth football system and accordingly had several years of expertise ($M = 8.75$, $SD = 2.22$). Several players had been training in a football academy setting before joining their respective teams. Both teams trained three or four times a week on a regular basis. Written consent was obtained from all participants and parents prior to testing according to the Declaration of Helsinki in 1975.

Football tasks

The four (two for each context) football-specific tasks we used as experimental conditions had been adopted from the coaches' monthly journal of the German Football

Federation (DFB) as part of a set of twelve different exercises (set up as 1 v 1-drills or small-sided games)(Höner & Votteler, 2016). The first selection was based on our assumptions about the respective task's inherent focus (i.e. not losing the ball as a team vs. scoring a goal while being outnumbered), the chance of success for each player / team, and each task's set of rules. We then cast the experts' vote, asking six highly qualified coaches from the DFB ($M = 36.00$) by showing them a graphic illustration and rule-set for each of the twelve exercises. The experts were asked to rate each exercise presented in randomized order on a 100-point scale, resembling the work of Plessner et al. (2009), as either "focused on maximal gains" or "focused on safety and preventing losses". Two-way ANOVA showed a significant main effect regarding the situational regulatory focus ($F(1,69) = 455.39, MSE = 69.72, p < .001, \hat{\eta}_p^2 = .868$), but no effect regarding context ($F(1,69) = 2.07, MSE = 69.72, p = .155, \hat{\eta}_p^2 = .029$). In accordance with our assumptions, the exercises could be separated into two different sets (one promotion oriented, the other one prevention oriented). Within each set, no significant mean differences were found. Thus, we were able to select exercises containing two types of situational focus, one for each team or opponent, streamlining procedures and promoting compliance.

Measures

Before the first trial, all participants a priori completed an adapted German seven-point scale version of the regulatory focus questionnaire (Keller & Bless, 2006; Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002), adjusted to the study's specific context by changing the items description of "academic goals" to more appropriate "athletic goals". The questionnaire contained nine promotion and nine prevention related items. After each trial participants completed two more questionnaires. First, they answered an adjectively worded 13-item scale regarding their

emotional experience taken from the EER (Benecke, Vogt, Bock, Koschier, & Peham, 2008). Based on the authors' factorial analysis, results were merged into three main factors ("passive-negative", "active-negative", "positive" emotional experience). In accordance with the assumptions stated above, we excluded the EER's part focusing on emotion regulation. Instead participants completed an adapted German version of the cognitive emotion regulation questionnaire (CERQ) based on Gross and Thompson's (2014) conceptualization of emotion regulation (Garnefski & Kraaij, 2006) that focuses strongly on the cognitive parts of the regulative process more accessible to self-report measures. Based on guidelines by Goldenberg et al. (2016), we added four similarly phrased questions, regarding the use of group-based regulation strategies (e.g. weaker and stronger self-categorization, up- and devaluing teammates). Instructions on both questionnaires put the focus upon the respective given task participants had just accomplished. No further demographic variables were collected.

Design and Procedure

The present study follows a two-factor within-subjects design, yielding 2 (situational prevention focus / situational promotion focus, experimental) x 2 (single or group context, experimental) factor levels. The whole study was conducted as part of one regular training session per team. All participants were informed by their respective coach that a study on motivation and emotion in football would be part of the next training session, so players not willing to participate were allowed to stay at home. On arrival, players were handed the regulatory focus questionnaire and a randomly assigned identification number by a researcher. After getting dressed and going through their usual warm-up routines, all players gathered to receive basic organizational guidelines from their coaches, who had been instructed beforehand.

195 Players were then randomly assigned into two groups and order for the first trial. Players first
196 completed both single-environment tasks (the order if a promotion or prevention oriented task
197 was to be completed first, was randomly assigned beforehand), before completing the two group-
198 environment tasks. Because of the above described choice of football tasks no further framing
199 was needed and each trial connected a situational prevention focus for one player with a
200 situational promotion focus for the other. All tasks were introduced to the players by the coaches
201 focusing only on organization and rules. During the trials no further instructions or comments -
202 except for remaining game time - were given. After each trial the players were handed the two
203 questionnaires on emotional experience and cognitive emotion regulation during the task, both to
204 be tagged with their identification number. Once all players had done their first single-context
205 trial (e.g. 1v1 setup), the earlier assigned groups switched (e.g. regarding experimental factor
206 situational focus) and players were again randomly ordered within, so they would not face the
207 same opponent again. After completing the second single-context trial and both questionnaires,
208 the same principles of random assignment and group switch were used again for the two group-
209 context trials (e.g. small-sided games). All players and coaches gathered once the last sequence
210 of trials had finished and were debriefed and thanked by the researcher as the training session
211 continued right after.

213 **Analysis**

214 To be able to explicitly model the interaction between continuous chronic focus and
215 categorical design factors situational focus and single-/group environment, we used a multilevel
216 modelling approach (Hoffman & Rovine, 2007). Thus, we treated observations (level-1) as
217 crossed within participants (level-2), with chronic regulatory focus as a level-2 variable and

situational focus, single- or group-environment as well as emotional experience and used regulation strategies as level-1 variables. Using this approach also made it possible to accommodate the non-independent nature of observations. Prior to analysis, chronic regulatory focus was centered at the grand mean, while situational focus (prevention focus as -1 , promotion focus as $+1$) as well as single- or group-context (single context as -1 , group context as $+1$) were effect-coded. As the main question of this study can only be answered by the inclusion of a combined (three-way) interaction-term, we used the following modelling approach. Instead of building models stepwise and adding random effects as well as interaction terms separately, we started each procedure with a nearly full model (Model 1) (Barr et al., 2013). Model 1 included all main fixed effects as well as two- and three-way interaction terms. As observations were treated as nested within participants, we allowed intercepts to vary between participants. In order to be able to test interactions and still yield an acceptable Type I-error performance, we conformed to the approach suggested by Barr (2013) and allowed slopes to vary for the interaction of single- / group-environment and situational regulatory focus. We compared this Model 1 to two reduced versions. Model 2 allowed intercepts to vary as the full model and slopes for single- / group-environment and situational regulatory focus to vary each but did not include any interaction terms. Model 3 allowed only intercepts to vary between participants and did not include interaction terms either. We compared respective model fit by using likelihood ratio tests and used an unstructured covariance matrix as well as the between-within method of estimating degrees of freedom. Explained variance and effect sizes were estimated with Conditional R^2 (Nakagawa & Schielzeth, 2013) and semipartial R^2 (Edwards, Muller, Wolfinger, Qaqish, & Schabenberger, 2008). To further explore interactions between single-/group-environment and a possible regulatory fit of chronic and situational regulatory

focus, we used simple slopes analysis. To account for risks of multiple comparisons only values below significance levels of $\alpha = .0045$ were deemed significant (Bonferroni correction).

For all analysis and production of this reproducible manuscript, we used R (Version 3.5.1; R Core Team, 2018) and the R-packages *lme4* (Version 1.1.19; Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015), *multilevel* (Version 2.6; Bliese, 2016), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9842; Aust & Barth, 2018), *psych* (Version 1.8.10; Revelle, 2018).

Results

Scales

Internal consistencies were checked before any further analysis, yielding questionable results for both regulatory focus subscales (prevention subscale: $M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.84$, $\alpha = .61$, promotion subscale: $M = 5.68$, $SD = 0.66$, $\alpha = .67$). In spite of their orthogonal theoretical nature (Haws, Dholakia, & Bearden, 2010) both scales correlated moderately ($r = .54$, $p < .001$) with one another. Following the proposed procedures by Keller and Bless (2006) as well as Plessner et al. (2009), we thus computed a difference score ($M = 0.00$, $SD = 0.96$), subtracting the z-standardized prevention score from the z-standardized promotion score, representing relative focus strength - also avoiding a possible loss of power. Two of the three subscales of the EER yielded good results regarding their internal consistency (passive-negative: $M = 1.40$, $SD = 1.22$, $\alpha = .89$, active-negative: $M = 1.80$, $SD = 1.31$, $\alpha = .77$), replicating the findings of Benecke et al. (2008). The subscale spanning all parts of one's positive emotional experience had to be adjusted because of negative correlations between one specific item and the others, which resulted in this item being deleted and therefore an increased alpha ($M = 3.11$, $SD =$

0.78, $\alpha = .65$). As the CERQ-items range from 1 to 5, we subtracted 1 from each answer, in order to give intercepts a meaningful zero.

Emotion generation

To verify whether the hypothesized change in emotion generation needed for any further analysis, was de facto induced by the experimental conditions, we used the modelling procedure described above for each subscale of the EER. Intraclass correlation ('active negative': $ICC = 0.16$, 'passive negative': $ICC = 0.18$, 'positive': $ICC = 0.07$) was higher than .1 in two of the three cases, so we used the described modelling approach. Conditional R^2 ranged from .25 ('positive') to .27 ('passive negative') and .45 ('active negative'). As Table 3 shows, players generally reported a more positive than active or passive negative emotional experience. However, conforming to the lower level of significance, this stronger positive experience was not predicted by any of the factors we included into our model (Context: $b = -.81$, $SE = .40$, $t(87) = -2.05$, $p = .04$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.05$). In contrast, looking at the fixed effects regarding passive-negative emotional experience, there was a significant small interaction effect of situational regulatory focus and chronic regulatory focus ($b = 0.28$, $SE = .13$, $t(84) = 2.11$, $p = .04$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.11$). Simple slopes analysis (Figure 1) reveal a cross-over interaction effect suggesting, that participants experience stronger passive-negative emotions in case of a situational and chronic regulatory focus fit. A possible three-way interaction including single- / group-environment did not predict passive-negative experience significantly and thus did not influence this interaction. On the other hand, there was a significant small three-way interaction effect of situational regulatory focus, chronic regulatory focus and context for the active-negative subscale ($b = 0.93$, $SE = .37$, $t(76) = 2.55$, $p = .01$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.08$).

Simple slopes analysis (Figure 2), illustrating the interaction of situational and chronic regulatory focus for single- / and group-environment, show that participants only report marginal differences regarding active-negative experience during the single-tasks, but a cross-over interaction with major differences during group-tasks. When in a promotion focused situation, participants in a regulatory fit experienced far stronger active-negative emotions than their counterparts. None of the three factors alone, nor any of their two-way interactions significantly predicted active-negative emotional experience.

Use of Regulation Strategies

Intraclass correlation ranged from 0.01 ('stronger self-categorization') to 0.46 ('acceptance') and was higher than .1 in most cases, thus showing additional support for the use of multilevel models. Conditional R^2 for the model including all interaction terms varied widely and ranged from medium ('upvalue teammates' Cond. $R^2 = .23$) to large ('refocus on planning' Cond. $R^2 = .71$) (Tables 4-15). As Tables 4 to 15 show, players in general used a variety of emotion regulation strategies to cope with the given situation. Conforming to the adjusted level of significance, several fixed main effects of environmental factors situational focus ('self-blame') and single-/group-context ('refocus on planning') as well as individual level chronic regulatory focus ('refocus on planning', 'positive reappraisal', 'blaming others') cannot be deemed significant. In addition, several two-way (Sit. Focus $\times$ Chronic Focus on 'refocus on planning', Sit. Focus $\times$ Chronic Focus on 'positive reappraisal', Context $\times$ Sit. Focus on 'putting into perspective', Context $\times$ Chronic Focus on 'blaming others', Context $\times$ Chronic Focus and Sit. Focus $\times$ Chronic Focus on 'stronger self-categorization', Context $\times$ Chronic Focus on 'devalue teammates') and three-way interaction effects ('devalue teammates', 'stronger self-

categorization') fell between α -levels of $p < 0.05$ and the corrected threshold of $p < 0.0045$ (Tables 4-15). Most effect sizes were smaller than semi-partial $R^2 = .10$ and thus appeared to be practicably irrelevant. In some cases, estimation yielded effect sizes that might be of practical relevance and should be reported within the exploratory focus of this research. Of the fixed main effects, Situational Focus predicted 'self-blame' ($b = .66$, $SE = .27$, $t(63) = -2.42$, $p = .02$, semi-partial $R^2 = .11$), while the interaction of Context $\times$ Chronic Focus predicted 'blaming others' ($b = 1.04$, $SE = .39$, $t(60) = 2.69$, $p = .009$, semi-partial $R^2 = .11$) and 'stronger self-categorization' ($b = -0.99$, $SE = .39$, $t(60) = 6.46$, $p = .01$, semi-partial $R^2 = .10$). Simple slopes analysis show, that while participants blamed others less in their respective single-environment fit, they all blamed others more in a promotion-oriented situation when being part of a group (Figure 3). Figure 4 ('stronger self-categorization') depicts another type of change as group-membership not only cancels out the cross-over interaction seen in the single-environment, but also increases the general frequency of strategy use. Below the adjusted level of significance, single-/group-environment predicted 'putting into perspective' ($b = -1.31$, $SE = .45$, $t(59) = -2.92$, $p = .005$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.13$) and 'stronger self-categorization' ($b = 1.56$, $SE = .39$, $t(60) = 4.01$, $p < .001$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.21$), as participants relativized less but categorized themselves as more important parts of the team when in a group-environment. Analysis showed no significant fixed main effects for situational or chronic regulatory focus. However, single-/group-environment interacted with participants' chronic foci to predict 'refocus on planning' ($b = 1.21$, $SE = .36$, $t(58) = 3.37$, $p = .001$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.16$) and 'positive reappraisal' ($b = 1.57$, $SE = .46$, $t(60) = 3.39$, $p = .001$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.16$). In both cases a three-way interaction, now also including situational regulatory focus, predicted 'refocus on planning' ($b = -0.71$, $SE = .24$, $t(82) = -2.96$, $p =$

.004, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.10$) and ‘positive reappraisal’ ($b = -1.11$, $SE = .29$, $t(69) = -3.80$, $p < .001$, semi-partial $R^2 = 0.17$). Simple slopes analysis revealed, that while performing on their own, participants refocused on planning more in case of a fit scenario – although no cross-over interaction can be reported. When they became part of a group, participants instead showed a cross-over interaction with less use of this strategy in case of a regulatory fit (Figure 5). Analysis depicted in Figure 6 (‘positive reappraisal’) show a cross-over interaction effect going in the exact opposite direction. While participants reappraised more positively when in a single-environment regulatory fit compared to a non-fit, they did way less compared to their respective non-fit scenario when being part of a group. Effect sizes suggested practical relevance for all of the reported fixed effects.

Discussion

Earlier, we assumed that (a) emotional experience and (b) also the use of emotion regulation strategies as part of the transactional process are influenced by the interaction of chronic and situational focus, thus a potential regulatory fit. Additionally, we assumed that (c) being part of a group not only changes emotion generation but also the strategies used to regulate these emotions accordingly.

Our results support the hypothesized influence of regulatory fit on emotional experience. While neither an individual’s chronic focus nor a situational focus show a direct influence on emotional experience, their interaction well does. But as reported above, there are several necessary differentiations to be made. On the one hand, only active- and passive-negative parts of participants’ emotional experience changed in case of a regulatory fit, but not the positive aspects. This finding is especially surprising as participants in general showed a stronger positive

than negative experience (i.e. more potential variance could be expected) and all theoretical accounts of regulatory focus include positively valenced parts of one's emotional experience. A potentially fundamental problem might have resulted from a measurement choice, as the scale we used to measure the positive experience of participants yielded a considerably worse performance as the two scales measuring negative experience did - additionally to the much smaller and less differentiated number of items representing positively as opposed to negatively valenced experience. This adds to the difficulties arising from the transfer of items from one context to another - an approach Turner and Haslam (2001) have already criticized and which needs to be addressed in future research. Results also indicate the notion of a more active emotional experience for participants with a higher promotional focus as well as a more passive experience for participants with a higher prevention focus. These observations resemble the distinction made by Werth and Foerster (2007). They describe affective experience as between joy and disappointment, thus more active and externalizing, in case of a promotion focus and between ease and tenseness, thus more passive and internalizing, in case of a prevention focus.

On the other hand, regulatory fit exclusively predicted passive-negative experience, while this relationship was only significant when also including single- / group-environment in case of active-negative experience. As simple slopes analysis revealed, this three-way interaction resulted from participants only reporting the hypothesized cross-over interaction for promotion and prevention regulatory fit when being part of a group. For the two single-tasks, this cross-over interaction cannot be deemed significant. To add to this finding, being in a group-environment also exhibits a main fixed effect on positive emotional experience, with players reporting fewer positive emotions. These effects may, although team-sports are often associated with societal motives (Recours, Souville, & Griffet, 2004), have resulted from the added pressures when

competing within a team and its specific goals. Players may also have experienced more constraints regarding their freedom to express emotions as well as reduced opportunities to cope with them, consequently resulting in a less positive experience and influencing the role regulatory fit might play. Combining these two results, we support the important role we had hypothesized a group-environment might play the generation of one's emotional experience. Results suggest, that this role might be important in different aspects of the transactional process, as not only nature and degree of emotional experience change with being part of a group, but it may also enhance or attenuate the influence a potential regulatory fit plays. This connection seems to justify the complex experimental approach we used to empirically test our assumptions and adds further support for the integration of theoretical accounts of group-based emotion generation (Goldenberg et al., 2016).

What is most surprising about the influence regulatory fit (and its interaction with single- / group environment) exhibits on emotion generation, is the counter-intuitive direction of the associated change in experience. While participants in a fit-scenario experience more negative emotions, their respective counterparts in a non-fit-scenario experience quite the opposite. At first glance, these findings do not fit the hypothesized cross-over interaction effect of a regulatory fit, as feeling "right" might have resulted in feeling "good", too (Cesario et al., 2004). However, one might look at the different aspects a regulatory fit is associated with, before making any further conclusions. As described above, a regulatory fit is associated with higher motivational intensity and higher value assigned to the task at hand (Higgins, 2000). As we did not control for success within the tasks or the players' subjective evaluations, it can be hypothesized, that the added value and importance might have resulted in negative emotional experience, when not being successful. But even without the players' evaluations of success,

there remain two important points, influencing the valence of experience. A higher value of the task and higher motivational intensity might themselves result in more negative experiences because of the added pressure to succeed and importance in relation to players' self-concepts in a given fit-scenario. This relation might be emphasized, when players become part of a group, as this adds additional importance to both aspects as well as further constraints to ways of coping. To further add to this line of thought, negative emotional experience has played an important part as a driver to success in many aspects of goal-striving, especially in sports, where athletes use negative feeling such as anger to fuel their competitive fire (Lazarus, 2000). This is in line with the inevitable ambiguity when trying to rate emotional experience as good or bad: As several authors have pointed out (Robazza, Pellizzari, & Hanin, 2004; Tamir & Ford, 2009), instrumentally using negative emotional experience to reach a goal might make sense in many cases - even when going against the hedonic principle. Recapitulating these different aspects that might play a role in deciding whether players experience stronger positive or negative emotions, it might be less of a surprise to see regulatory fit predict emotional experience, but not in the hypothesized direction.

Goldenberg et al. (2016) suggest, that being part of a group changes the ways an individual can regulate their emotions as constraints and new opportunities arise. Our results support both of these assumptions. On the one hand, participants used 'putting into perspective' less, when part of group, which might be due to added constraints as relativizing can be limited by group-based evaluations as well as norms and thus not as flexible as when on one's own. Turner and Haslam (2001) have questioned the transferability of strategies used in individual contexts to those with group-membership, a notion Goldenberg et al. (2016) have rejected and we can do so, too, based on the reported findings. On the other hand, not only constraints

become apparent. Being part of a group may also add new ways to cope. Our results support this suggestion as participants emphasized their self-categorization as members of a group when part of one. However, single- / group-environment showed no further main effects on use of group-based regulation strategies. While it has to be emphasized, that the items we created for group-based emotion regulation were heavily based on the work of Goldenberg et al. (2016), but not at all further validated, this not significant influence might also be due to a more complex connection between the factors we tested. When leaving out all interaction terms, single- / group-environment strongly predicts ‘self-blame’, ‘devalue teammates’ and ‘weaker self-categorization’. This influence appears much more complex, when interaction terms are added. While in the case of ‘weaker self-categorization’ no effects remain significant, for both other strategies Context $\times$ Chronic Focus as well as Context $\times$ Situational Focus $\times$ Chronic Focus are significant fixed effects with effect sizes ranging from semi-partial $R^2 = 0.10$ to 0.17 . Regulatory fit yields only significant results above the corrected α -level. The complex three-way-interaction becomes all the more interesting, when looking at the simple slope plots (Figures 5 and 6). For ‘refocus on planning’ as well as ‘positive reappraisal’, participants used these potentially functional regulation strategies more when in a regulatory fit and on their own. However, this relationship was inverted when participants became part of a group. As the overall strategy use did not diminish, these effects cannot be interpreted as group-membership constraining participants’ ways to regulate their emotions but inverting the role a regulatory fit might play. So, while participants were able to emphasize their belonging and importance to the group - whether to distribute the load to more shoulders or to stake a claim in the case of success goes beyond the scope of this research – group-membership also changed the way regulatory fit could work. As this change resulted in less use of functional strategies, we have to not only point

out a counter-intuitive emotional experience in a regulatory fit but also in some cases a less functional regulation of the experiences. This makes differentiating the type of environment an individual is in all the more important, as the expected functionality of feeling “right” and a person-environment-fit – based on a regulatory fit – seems to work in single-context but not in group-context. This becomes especially troubling as the stronger negative experiences and the reduced positive experiences participants reported, called for a better and more functional use of regulation strategies. In this case it appears to be crucial, that besides adding further pressures and constraints, being part of a group also adds new opportunities to cope.

On a cautionary note, we have to point out, that the scale we used to assess participants' chronic regulatory focus (Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002) has not shown acceptable or better reliability ratings in several studies (e.g. Plessner et al., 2009; Vogel & Genschow, 2013). Hence, effects based on this measure and its interactions might be over- or underestimated. Still, on the one hand we found this measure to be the most adoptable to the given situation within the training setup of the teams as the more reliable and implicit Regulatory Strength Measure (Shah, Higgins, & Friedman, 1998) can only be used in an extremely controlled environment and administered via computer. On the other hand the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins et al., 2001) does relate way less to current attitudes, actions and habits which might have made it much more difficult for the young participants to complete and additionally reduced its potential specification to the athletic environment and its specific aims and ambitions. Based on these considerations, we decided to use the approach advocated by Plessner et al. (2009) and used an adopted version of the scale developed by Lockwood et al. (2002), thus making it comparable to other studies in the context of sports.

Future research might aim to address generalizability and replicability of the findings in different contexts and with different measures, especially of chronic regulatory focus. Higher ratings of internal consistency could add credibility to the findings and help evaluate the strength of the effects. Another aspect future research should address is, whether the reported interaction effects can be shown to work in explicitly induced situational foci, thus making comparisons with past research more viable.

Nonetheless, the findings reported above support the hypothesized complex dynamics and interplay between a possible regulatory fit and a single- or group-environment regarding not only emotional experience but also its regulation. We can thus add further evidence for the explanatory role both theories play within stages of the transactional process of emotion generation and regulation, implicating a broader integrating view of underlying processes in not only individuals, but groups – making sympathizing with poor Lionel Messi all the more easy.

References

- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2018). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*. Retrieved December 8, 2018, from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Barr, D.J. (2013). Random effects structure for testing interactions in linear mixed-effects models. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4(328). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00328
- Barr, D. J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 68(3), 255-278. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01
- Benecke, C., Vogt, T., Bock, A., Koschier, A., & Peham, D. (2008). A Self Report Questionnaire for the Assessment of Emotional Experience and Emotion Regulation. *Psychotherapie Psychosomatik Medizinische Psychologie*, 58(09/10), 366–370. doi:10.1055/s-2007-986319
- Bliese, P. (2016). *Multilevel: Multilevel functions*. Retrieved December 8, 2018, from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=multilevel>
- Brockner, J., & Higgins, E. (2001). Regulatory Focus Theory: Implications for the Study of Emotions at Work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), 35–66. doi:10.1006/obhd.2001.2972
- Cesario, J., Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Transfer from "feeling right.". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(3), 388. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.3.388

- 503 Edwards, L. J., Muller, K. E., Wolfinger, R. D., Qaqish, B. F., & Schabenberger, O. (2008). An
504 R2 statistic for fixed effects in the linear mixed model. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(29),
505 6137–6157. doi:10.1002/sim.3429
- 506 Förster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Idson, L. C. (1998). Approach and avoidance strength during goal
507 attainment: Regulatory focus and the "goal looms larger" effect. *Journal of Personality and*
508 *Social Psychology*, 75(5), 1115–1131. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.5.1115
- 509 Garnefski, N., & Kraaij, V. (2006). Cognitive emotion regulation questionnaire development of a
510 short 18-item version (CERQ-short). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(6), 1045–
511 1053. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.010
- 512 Goldenberg, A., Halperin, E., van Zomeren, M., & Gross, J. J. (2016). The Process Model of
513 Group-Based Emotion: Integrating Intergroup Emotion and Emotion Regulation
514 Perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 20(2), 118–141.
515 doi:10.1177/1088868315581263
- 516 Gross, J. J. (2014). Emotion regulation: Conceptual and empirical foundations. In J. J. Gross
517 (Ed.) *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3–20). New York: Guilford Press.
- 518 Halperin, E., Porat, R., Tamir, M., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Can Emotion Regulation Change
519 Political Attitudes in Intractable Conflicts? From the Laboratory to the Field.
520 *Psychological Science*, 24(1), 106–111. doi:10.1177/0956797612452572
- 521 Haws, K. L., Dholakia, U. M., & Bearden, W. O. (2010). An Assessment of Chronic Regulatory
522 Focus Measures. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(5), 967–982.
523 doi:10.1509/jmkr.47.5.967

- 524 Higgins, E. T., Shah, J., & Friedman, R. (1997). Emotional responses to goal attainment:
525 Strength of regulatory focus as moderator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
526 72(3), 515–525. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.515
- 527 Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist*, 55(11),
528 1217-1230. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.11.1217
- 529 Höner, O., & Votteler, A. (2016). Prognostic relevance of motor talent predictors in early
530 adolescence: A group- and individual-based evaluation considering different levels of
531 achievement in youth football. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 34(24), 2269–2278.
532 doi:10.1080/02640414.2016.1177658
- 533 Keller, J., & Bless, H. (2006). Regulatory fit and cognitive performance: The interactive effect of
534 chronic and situationally induced self-regulatory mechanisms on test performance.
535 *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(3), 393–405. doi:10.1002/ejsp.307
- 536 Khawaja, M. (1993). Repression and popular collective action: Evidence from the West Bank.
537 *Sociological Forum*, 8(1), 47–71. doi:10.1007/BF01112330
- 538 Koole, S. L. (2009). The psychology of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Cognition and*
539 *Emotion*, 23(1), 4–41. doi:10.1080/02699930802619031
- 540 Lazarus, R. S. (2000). How emotions influence performance in competitive sports. *The Sport*
541 *Psychologist*, 14(3), 229-252.
- 542 Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role
543 models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and*
544 *Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854–864. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.854

- 545 Mackie, D. M., Maimer, A. T., & Smith, E. R. (2009). Intergroup emotions theory. In T.D. (Ed.),
546 *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 285–307). New York:
547 Psychology Press.
- 548 Memmert, D., Hüttermann, S., & Orliczek, J. (2013). Decide like Lionel Messi! The impact of
549 regulatory focus on divergent thinking in sports. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,
550 43(10), 2163–2167. doi:10.1111/jasp.12159
- 551 Nakagawa, S., & Schielzeth, H. (2013). A general and simple method for obtaining R² from
552 generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4(2), 133–
553 142. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x
- 554 Plessner, H., Unkelbach, C., Memmert, D., Baltes, A., & Kolb, A. (2009). Regulatory fit as a
555 determinant of sport performance: How to succeed in a soccer penalty-shooting.
556 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10(1), 108–115. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.02.001
- 557 R Core Team. (2018). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria:
558 R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved December 8, 2018, from [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
559 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)
- 560 Recours, R. A., Souville, M., & Griffet, J. (2004). Expressed Motives for Informal and
561 Club/Association-based Sports Participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36(1), 1-22.
562 doi:10.1080/00222216.2004.11950008
- 563 Revelle, W. (2018). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality*
564 *research*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University. Retrieved December 8, 2018, from
565 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>

- 566 Robazza, C., Pellizzari, M., & Hanin, Y. (2004). Emotion self-regulation and athletic
567 performance: An application of the IZOF model. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 5(4),
568 379–404. doi:10.1016/S1469-0292(03)00034-7
- 569 Shah, J., Higgins, E., & Friedman, R. (1998). Performance incentives and means: How
570 regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
571 74(2), 285–293. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.74.2.285
- 572 Spiegel, S., Grant-Pillow, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). How regulatory fit enhances motivational
573 strength during goal pursuit. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(1), 39–54.
574 doi:10.1002/ejsp.180
- 575 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). *The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior*. New York:
576 Psychology Press.
- 577 Tamir, M., & Ford, B. Q. (2009). Choosing to be afraid: Preferences for fear as a function of goal
578 pursuit. *Emotion*, 9(4), 488–497. doi:10.1037/a0015882
- 579 Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (2001). Social identity, organizations, and leadership. In M.E.
580 Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 25–65). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence
581 Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- 582 Vogel, T., & Genschow, O. (2013). When Do Chronic Differences in Self-Regulation Count?:
583 Regulatory Focus Effects in Easy and Difficult Soccer Tasks. *Journal of Sport and*
584 *Exercise Psychology*, 35(2), 216–220. doi:10.1123/jsep.35.2.216
- 585 Werth, L., & Foerster, J. (2007). How regulatory focus influences consumer behavior. *European*
586 *Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(1), 33–51. doi:10.1002/ejsp.343

Tables

Table 1

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Passive-Negative Emotional Experience

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.40*** (0.17)	1.41*** (0.21)	1.41*** (0.17)
Context	-0.01 (0.19)	-0.02 (0.24)	-0.03 (0.20)
Situational Focus	0.04 (0.14)	-0.05 (0.10)	-0.05 (0.10)
Chronic Focus	-0.14 (0.17)	0.12 (0.13)	-0.02 (0.14)
Context × Situational Focus	-0.19 (0.19)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.20 (0.19)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.28* (0.13)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	0.07 (0.19)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	1.14	0.83	1.25
Intercept	0.30	1.04	0.29
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.00		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.00		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	0.01		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.01		
Context Slope		0.94	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.08	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.87	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.03	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.15	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.27 (15)	0.47 (11)	0.19 (6)
AIC; BIC	422.47; 464.53	409.12; 439.96	410.09; 426.92
Log Likelihood	-196.23	-193.56	-199.05

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit.

Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.017$

Table 2

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Active-Negative Emotional Experience

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.92*** (0.42)	1.71*** (0.41)	1.72*** (0.37)
Context	-0.32 (0.56)	0.09 (0.24)	0.08 (0.22)
Situational Focus	-0.11 (0.25)	0.03 (0.21)	0.02 (0.22)
Chronic Focus	-0.49 (0.41)	0.22 (0.14)	0.16 (0.14)
Context × Situational Focus	0.27 (0.37)		
Context × Chronic Focus	-0.95 (0.56)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.29 (0.25)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	0.93* (0.37)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	1.00	1.22	1.49
Intercept	0.39	1.81	0.26
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.03		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.09		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	0.04		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.05		
Context Slope		0.61	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.19	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-1.02	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.51	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.33	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.45 (15)	0.32 (11)	0.16 (6)
AIC; BIC	433.27; 475.81	445.10; 476.30	438.90; 455.92
Log Likelihood	-201.63	-211.55	-213.45

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.017$

Table 3

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Positive Emotional Experience

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	3.49*** (0.26)	3.29*** (0.20)	3.29*** (0.22)
Context	-0.81* (0.40)	-0.40** (0.15)	-0.40** (0.13)
Situational Focus	-0.13 (0.18)	0.01 (0.12)	0.01 (0.13)
Chronic Focus	0.38 (0.28)	0.00 (0.08)	-0.05 (0.08)
Context × Situational Focus	0.27 (0.25)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.11 (0.40)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	-0.25 (0.18)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.15 (0.25)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.49	0.41	0.53
Intercept	0.00	0.17	0.06
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.04		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.03		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	0.00		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	0.00		
Context Slope		0.27	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.07	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.21	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.06	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.06	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.25 (15)	0.35 (11)	0.16 (6)
AIC; BIC	318.25; 360.56	309.33; 340.35	303.70; 320.62
Log Likelihood	-144.13	-143.66	-145.85

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.017$

Table 4

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Self-Blame

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.88*** (0.42)	2.20*** (0.31)	2.20*** (0.34)
Context	-0.13 (0.56)	-0.78** (0.24)	-0.78** (0.20)
Situational Focus	0.66* (0.27)	0.44* (0.18)	0.44* (0.20)
Chronic Focus	-0.54 (0.42)	-0.18 (0.12)	-0.16 (0.12)
Context × Situational Focus	-0.43 (0.36)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.31 (0.56)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.33 (0.27)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.36 (0.37)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.98	0.88	1.26
Intercept	0.61	0.64	0.15
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.40		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.05		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.32		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.18		
Context Slope		0.97	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.18	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.17	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.11	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.36	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.41 (15)	0.47 (11)	0.23 (6)
AIC; BIC	429.77; 472.43	418.82; 450.10	417.83; 434.90
Log Likelihood	-199.88	-198.41	-202.92

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 5

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Rumination

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	2.19*** (0.27)	2.12*** (0.24)	2.12*** (0.23)
Context	-0.34 (0.33)	-0.20 (0.17)	-0.20 (0.13)
Situational Focus	0.06 (0.16)	0.11 (0.11)	0.11 (0.13)
Chronic Focus	-0.25 (0.27)	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.02 (0.11)
Context × Situational Focus	0.09 (0.22)		
Context × Chronic Focus	-0.14 (0.33)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.20 (0.16)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.01 (0.22)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.35	0.29	0.53
Intercept	0.61	1.00	0.28
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.15		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.07		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.07		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.21		
Context Slope		0.63	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.11	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.42	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.15	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.14	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.58 (15)	0.65 (11)	0.35 (6)
AIC; BIC	338.38; 381.16	320.29; 351.67	336.04; 353.15
Log Likelihood	-154.19	-149.15	-162.02

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 6

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Refocus on Planning

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	3.22*** (0.31)	3.39*** (0.29)	3.42*** (0.27)
Context	0.74* (0.35)	0.36* (0.17)	0.35* (0.14)
Situational Focus	-0.17 (0.17)	-0.29* (0.13)	-0.31* (0.14)
Chronic Focus	-0.79* (0.32)	-0.16 (0.15)	-0.19 (0.15)
Context × Situational Focus	-0.26 (0.24)		
Context × Chronic Focus	1.21** (0.36)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.36* (0.18)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.72** (0.24)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.39	0.50	0.65
Intercept	1.02	1.20	0.58
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.17		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.04		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.15		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.17		
Context Slope		0.45	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.01	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.48	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.09	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.04	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.71 (15)	0.62 (11)	0.51 (6)
AIC; BIC	369.90; 412.45	370.73; 401.93	367.14; 384.16
Log Likelihood	-169.95	-174.37	-177.57

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 7

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Positive Reappraisal

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	3.00*** (0.38)	3.01*** (0.33)	3.00*** (0.29)
Context	-0.00 (0.46)	0.02 (0.16)	0.02 (0.16)
Situational Focus	-0.02 (0.21)	-0.01 (0.16)	-0.01 (0.16)
Chronic Focus	-0.96* (0.39)	-0.30 (0.15)	-0.27 (0.16)
Context × Situational Focus	0.02 (0.29)		
Context × Chronic Focus	1.57** (0.46)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.49* (0.21)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-1.11*** (0.29)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.66	0.75	0.77
Intercept	1.20	1.31	0.61
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.02		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.07		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.15		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.29		
Context Slope		0.02	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.04	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.16	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.22	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.03	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.55 (15)	0.49 (11)	0.47 (6)
AIC; BIC	393.83; 436.50	395.84; 427.12	387.70; 404.76
Log Likelihood	-181.92	-186.92	-187.85

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 8

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Putting into Perspective

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	3.38*** (0.37)	2.83*** (0.33)	2.83*** (0.30)
Context	-1.31** (0.45)	-0.20 (0.18)	-0.21 (0.16)
Situational Focus	-0.38 (0.20)	-0.01 (0.15)	-0.01 (0.16)
Chronic Focus	-0.18 (0.37)	-0.16 (0.15)	-0.08 (0.16)
Context × Situational Focus	0.73* (0.29)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.44 (0.46)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.14 (0.20)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.44 (0.29)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.63	0.64	0.77
Intercept	1.20	1.74	0.64
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.00		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.13		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.06		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.35		
Context Slope		0.35	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.04	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.62	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.25	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.09	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.57 (15)	0.56 (11)	0.46 (6)
AIC; BIC	396.31; 438.97	393.05; 424.34	389.69; 406.75
Log Likelihood	-183.16	-185.53	-188.84

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 9

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Catastrophizing

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.81*** (0.29)	1.72*** (0.24)	1.72*** (0.24)
Context	-0.31 (0.35)	-0.12 (0.16)	-0.12 (0.13)
Situational Focus	-0.03 (0.19)	0.03 (0.13)	0.03 (0.13)
Chronic Focus	-0.13 (0.29)	-0.06 (0.10)	-0.10 (0.12)
Context × Situational Focus	0.13 (0.23)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.17 (0.35)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	-0.02 (0.18)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.04 (0.2)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.38	0.29	0.54
Intercept	0.80	1.03	0.32
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.30		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.14		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.25		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.32		
Context Slope		0.50	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.26	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.18	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.27	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.25	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.57 (15)	0.66 (11)	0.38 (6)
AIC; BIC	347.13; 389.79	324.79; 356.08	338.45; 355.51
Log Likelihood	-158.56	-151.40	-163.22

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 10

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Blaming Others

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	2.03*** (0.28)	1.73*** (0.24)	1.73*** (0.24)
Context	-0.59 (0.38)	0.02 (0.18)	0.02 (0.14)
Situational Focus	-0.06 (0.18)	0.14 (0.12)	0.14 (0.14)
Chronic Focus	-0.61* (0.29)	0.16* (0.08)	0.07 (0.09)
Context × Situational Focus	0.41 (0.25)		
Context × Chronic Focus	1.04** (0.39)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.29 (0.18)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.38 (0.25)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.47	0.45	0.64
Intercept	0.22	0.54	0.08
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.08		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.02		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.04		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.07		
Context Slope		0.58	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.02	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.43	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.04	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.03	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.37 (15)	0.42 (11)	0.12 (6)
AIC; BIC	341.09; 383.87	336.60; 367.97	338.03; 355.15
Log Likelihood	-155.54	-157.30	-163.02

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 11

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Acceptance

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	2.95*** (0.38)	3.16*** (0.31)	3.17*** (0.27)
Context	0.52 (0.44)	0.08 (0.14)	0.08 (0.15)
Situational Focus	0.23 (0.22)	0.09 (0.16)	0.08 (0.15)
Chronic Focus	-0.31 (0.37)	-0.40** (0.13)	-0.38** (0.14)
Context × Situational Focus	-0.29 (0.28)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.20 (0.44)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	-0.06 (0.22)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.11 (0.28)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.60	0.59	0.68
Intercept	1.39	1.38	0.43
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.29		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.19		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.52		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.47		
Context Slope		0.02	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.24	
Intercept - Context Covariance		0.02	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.48	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.03	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.53 (15)	0.53 (11)	0.46 (6)
AIC; BIC	383.28; 425.83	372.10; 403.30	364.53; 381.55
Log Likelihood	-176.64	-175.05	-176.27

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 12

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Upvalue Teammates

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.59*** (0.30)	1.36*** (0.24)	1.36*** (0.24)
Context	-0.56 (0.42)	-0.09 (0.17)	-0.09 (0.15)
Situational Focus	-0.00 (0.19)	0.16 (0.13)	0.16 (0.15)
Chronic Focus	-0.05 (0.30)	-0.04 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.08)
Context × Situational Focus	0.31 (0.28)		
Context × Chronic Focus	0.40 (0.43)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	-0.01 (0.19)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.25 (0.28)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.58	0.54	0.68
Intercept	0.05	0.32	0.03
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.03		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.05		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	0.04		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.04		
Context Slope		0.42	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.00	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.33	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.02	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.02	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.23 (15)	0.25 (11)	0.06 (6)
AIC; BIC	355.21; 397.99	343.08; 374.45	338.23; 355.34
Log Likelihood	-162.61	-160.54	-163.11

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 13

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Devalue Teammates

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.66*** (0.31)	1.47*** (0.24)	1.47*** (0.28)
Context	0.44 (0.43)	0.81*** (0.21)	0.81*** (0.16)
Situational Focus	0.03 (0.20)	0.16 (0.14)	0.16 (0.16)
Chronic Focus	-0.36 (0.31)	0.00 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.11)
Context × Situational Focus	0.25 (0.29)		
Context × Chronic Focus	1.00* (0.44)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.22 (0.20)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	-0.65* (0.29)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.60	0.55	0.87
Intercept	0.07	0.34	0.17
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.10		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.17		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	0.07		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.05		
Context Slope		0.92	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.06	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.52	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.05	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.05	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.51 (15)	0.55 (11)	0.29 (6)
AIC; BIC	389.96; 432.74	378.07; 409.44	380.65; 397.76
Log Likelihood	-179.98	-178.03	-184.32

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 14

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Stronger Self-Categorization

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.97*** (0.29)	2.02*** (0.24)	2.02*** (0.26)
Context	1.56*** (0.39)	1.47*** (0.20)	1.47*** (0.15)
Situational Focus	-0.09 (0.17)	-0.12 (0.13)	-0.13 (0.15)
Chronic Focus	0.44 (0.29)	-0.15 (0.10)	-0.16 (0.11)
Context × Situational Focus	-0.06 (0.26)		
Context × Chronic Focus	-0.99* (0.39)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	-0.34* (0.18)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	0.53* (0.26)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.49	0.39	0.74
Intercept	0.22	0.83	0.17
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.00		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.23		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	0.03		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.09		
Context Slope		0.95	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.13	
Intercept - Context Covariance		-0.64	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.23	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		0.16	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.68 (15)	0.74 (11)	0.50 (6)
AIC; BIC	371.36; 414.14	357.92; 389.29	363.31; 380.43
Log Likelihood	-170.68	-167.96	-175.66

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Table 15

Multilevel Model Parameters and Standard Errors for Weaker Self-Categorization

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Fixed Effects Coefficients Estimates (SE)</i>			
Intercept	1.40*** (0.33)	1.17*** (0.25)	1.16*** (0.28)
Context	-0.06 (0.43)	0.40* (0.20)	0.39* (0.17)
Situational Focus	0.16 (0.22)	0.32* (0.16)	0.33* (0.17)
Chronic Focus	-0.22 (0.33)	-0.02 (0.09)	-0.00 (0.10)
Context × Situational Focus	0.31 (0.29)		
Context × Chronic Focus	-0.14 (0.43)		
Situational Focus × Chronic Focus	0.11 (0.22)		
Context × Sit. Focus × Chron. Focus	0.17 (0.29)		
<i>Random Effects</i>			
Residual	0.58	0.63	0.88
Intercept	0.63	0.26	0.08
Sit. Focus x Single Context Slope	0.42		
Sit. Focus x Group Context Slope	0.17		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Single Covariance	-0.45		
Intercept – Sit. F. × Group Covariance	-0.20		
Context Slope		0.61	
Sit. Focus Slope		0.17	
Intercept - Context Covariance		0.09	
Intercept - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.16	
Context - Sit. Focus Covariance		-0.18	
<i>Fit Statistics</i>			
Conditional R^2 (number of parameters)	0.45 (15)	0.38 (11)	0.14 (6)
AIC; BIC	384.07; 426.73	375.44; 406.72	371.36; 388.42
Log Likelihood	-177.03	-176.72	-179.68

Note – AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; Contrast Coded: Sit. Prevention Focus ‘-1’, Sit. Promotion Focus ‘+1’; Single Context ‘-1’, Group Context ‘+1’.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, bold: $p < 0.0045$

Figures

Figure 1. Simple slopes analysis of cross-level interaction of Chronic Regulatory Focus (Level 2) and Situational Focus (Level 1) in predicting Passive-negative Emotional Experience. Note – Chronic Regulatory Focus is z-standardized.

Figure 2. Simple slopes analysis of cross-level interaction of Chronic Regulatory Focus (Level 2), Situational Focus (Level 1) and Single- or Group-Context (Level 1) in predicting Active-negative Emotional Experience. *Note* – Chronic Regulatory Focus is z-standardized.

Figure 3. Simple slopes analysis of cross-level interaction of Chronic Regulatory Focus (Level 2), Situational Focus (Level 1) and Single- or Group-Context (Level 1) in predicting Blaming Others. *Note* – Chronic Regulatory Focus is z-standardized.

Figure 4. Simple slopes analysis of cross-level interaction of Chronic Regulatory Focus (Level 2), Situational Focus (Level 1) and Single- or Group-Context (Level 1) in predicting Stronger Self-Categorization. *Note* – Chronic Regulatory Focus is z-standardized.

Figure 5. Simple slopes analysis of cross-level interaction of Chronic Regulatory Focus (Level 2), Situational Focus (Level 1) and Single- or Group-Context (Level 1) in predicting Refocus on Planning. Note – Chronic Regulatory Focus is z-standardized.

1216

1217 *Figure 6. Simple slopes analysis of cross-level interaction of Chronic Regulatory Focus (Level*1218 *2), Situational Focus (Level 1) and Single- or Group-Context (Level 1) in predicting Positive*1219 *Reappraisal. Note – Chronic Regulatory Focus is z-standardized.*