Social Support Predicts Differential Use, But Not Differential Effectiveness,
of Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing in Daily Life

Lisanne S. Pauw¹, Hayley Medland², Sarah J. Paling², Ella Moeck², Katharine H.
Greenaway², Elise K. Kalokerinos², Jordan D. X. Hinton^{2,3}, Tom Hollenstein⁴,
and Peter Koval^{*2,5}

¹ University of Münster, Germany

² University of Melbourne, Australia

³ Australian Catholic University, Australia

⁴ Queen's University, Canada

⁵ KU Leuven, Belgium

Word Count: 2000

Author Note

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Peter Koval, Melbourne
School of Psychological Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3010,
Australia; email: p.koval@unimelb.edu.au

Abstract

While emotion regulation often happens in the presence of others, little is known about how social context shapes regulatory efforts and outcomes. One key element of the social context is social support. In two experience sampling studies ($Ns = 179$ and 123), we examined how the use and affective consequences of two fundamentally social emotion regulation strategies—social sharing and expressive suppression—vary as a function of perceived social support. Across both studies, we found evidence that perceived social support predicted variation in people's use of these strategies, such that higher levels of social support predicted more sharing and less suppression. However, we found only limited and inconsistent support for context-dependent affective outcomes of suppression and sharing: suppression was associated with better affective consequences in the context of higher perceived social support in Study 1, but this effect did not replicate in Study 2. Taken together, these findings suggest that the *use* of social emotion regulation strategies appears to depend on contextual variability in social support, whereas their *effectiveness* does not. Future research is needed to better understand the circumstances in which context-dependent use of emotion regulation may have emotional benefits, accounting for personal, situational, and cultural factors.

Key words: *Emotion Regulation, Context, Wellbeing, Social Support, Psychological Flexibility*

Social Support Predicts Differential Use, But Not Differential Effectiveness,
of Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing in Daily Life

People regulate their emotions in myriad ways, some of which can be done alone, such as when people distract themselves or change their thoughts about an emotional situation. However, other emotion-regulation strategies, such as talking about emotions (*social sharing*) or hiding one's emotional expressions (*expressive suppression*), are fundamentally social. That is, they involve communicating or concealing emotions to and from others. Despite these social emotion-regulation strategies being studied extensively (Cameron & Overall, 2018; English & Eldesouky, 2020; Rimé et al., 2020), there are two gaps in the literature. First, because research has relied predominantly on global self-reports and lab experiments, we know surprisingly little about the *use* and *efficacy* of social emotion-regulation strategies in everyday situations (Colombo et al., 2020; Koval et al., 2020). Second, little is known about how social context influences social emotion-regulation strategies. To address this gap, we investigated how perceived social support, a key socio-contextual factor, predicts the use and short-term affective consequences of sharing and suppression in daily life across two experience sampling studies.

Sharing and Suppression in Daily Life

Experience sampling and daily diary studies have shown that suppression and sharing are both used commonly in daily life (Cameron & Overall, 2018; Heij & Cheavens, 2014). However, few studies have explored how these strategies vary as a function of changes in social context (Greenaway et al., 2018). This blind spot is surprising, given the fundamentally social nature of these strategies: social sharing requires a partner to share with, and suppressing the outward expression of emotions generally functions to conceal one's emotions from another person.

One key element of the social context is social support. Prior research and theory suggests that the social context, and in particular the availability of social support, should influence the degree to which people share or hide their emotions from others (English et al., 2017; Reis, 2008). For example, people tend to share their emotions more with people who are perceived as more responsive and supportive (Clark & Finkel, 2005; Pentina & Zhang, 2017; Ruan et al., 2020; Von Culin et al., 2018). Conversely, people tend to suppress their emotional expressions more in the company of non-close others (English et al., 2017), perhaps because they perceive them as less supportive than close others. Taken together, these findings suggest that greater perceived social support will predict more sharing and less suppression of emotions.

The affective consequences of suppression and sharing may also vary by context. Overall, daily life studies of suppression show that it predicts worse emotional outcomes in the form of greater negative affect (NA) and less positive affect (PA), although the size of these effects varies across studies (Brans, Koval, et al., 2013; Brockman et al., 2017; Farmer & Kashdan, 2012; Impett et al., 2012; Nezlek & Kuppens, 2008; but see Heiy & Cheavens, 2014). The short-term affective consequences of social sharing are more mixed (Brans, Koval, et al., 2013; Cameron & Overall, 2018; Heiy & Cheavens, 2014). Theoretical work on regulatory flexibility suggests that the outcomes of emotion regulation may be context-dependent (e.g., Aldao, 2013; Bonanno & Burton, 2013), which could help to explain these mixed findings. Specifically, we argue that perceived social support may influence the short-term affective consequences of sharing and suppressing emotions.

We see two contrasting ways that social support could affect the consequences of suppression. One possibility is that the generally harmful affective consequences of suppression may be reduced in contexts of high (compared to low) social support. This would align with research on social support as a buffer for other emotionally harmful

psychological states, such as stress (e.g., Cohen & Wills, 1985). Another possibility, however, is that hiding emotions from others may be less harmful—or even beneficial—in contexts lacking social support, where emotional disclosure may be met with disapproval. Consistent with this view, suppression appears to be less harmful in cultures that discourage emotional expression (Soto et al., 2011); and at times when people perceive their social status as being low (Catterson et al., 2017)—contexts in which social support may be lacking. Thus, although previous theory and research suggest that social support is likely to influence the affective consequences of suppression, the direction of this moderating effect remains unclear.

A clearer argument can be made about the context-dependent consequences of social sharing: Lab studies have consistently shown that social sharing is perceived as more helpful when the listener acts supportively (Rimé et al., 2020). Furthermore, daily experiences of negative emotion tend to be shorter when they are shared with a supportive partner (Brans, Van Mechelen, et al., 2013). Thus, we propose that sharing should have greater affective benefits when used in everyday contexts with high (vs. low) perceived social support.

The Present Research

We sought to test theorizing on regulatory flexibility (e.g., Bonanno & Burton, 2013) by investigating how the use and efficacy of social sharing and suppression vary as a function of perceived social support in daily life. First, we investigated how social support predicts the use of each strategy, hypothesizing that higher levels of social support would be associated with decreased suppression (H1a) and increased sharing (H1b). Second, we investigated the affective consequences of each strategy, predicting that suppression would be associated with decreases in PA and increases in NA (H2a). In contrast, given previous mixed findings, we made no predictions regarding the overall affective consequences of sharing (H2b). Finally, we investigated the moderating effect of social support on the

efficacy of each strategy. We made no predictions regarding how social support would moderate the affective consequences of suppression (H3a), but we expected social support to be associated with increased emotional benefits of social sharing (H3b). We tested our hypotheses in an existing experience-sampling dataset ($N = 179$) and sought to replicate our findings in a second, independent experience-sampling dataset ($N = 123$).

Study 1

Method

Below we report only methodological details relevant to the current report. For more information, including participant eligibility criteria and data cleaning procedure, see Grommisch et al. (2020). A list of all measured constructs can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

Participants

We recruited an adult community sample in Melbourne, Australia ($N = 186$), using online and printed advertisements. After the initial lab session, one participant was deemed ineligible and six others withdrew voluntarily, leaving a final sample of $N = 179$ (65% female) aged 18 to 69 years ($M = 27.02$, $SD = 8.98$).

Procedure

Participants attended an introductory lab session during which they completed several questionnaires and downloaded *SEMA2*, a custom-built experience-sampling smartphone application (Harrison et al., 2017).¹ Over the next 21 days, participants were prompted to complete an experience-sampling survey every 80 (± 30) minutes between 10:00am and 10:00pm, resulting in approximately nine surveys per day. Compliance with the experience-sampling protocol ranged between 35% and 100% ($M = 84\%$, $SD = 13\%$). At

¹ SEMA2 is now obsolete and has been replaced by an updated version of the platform, called SEMA3 available at <https://sema3.com/>

the end of the 21 days, participants were thanked and reimbursed on a pro-rata basis, up to \$150 AUD, contingent upon their completion of the experience-sampling protocol and other study components.

Measures

Each experience-sampling survey began by asking participants to rate their current feelings on three positive affect items (PA; "happy", "confident", "relaxed") and three negative affect items (NA; "sad", "angry", "stressed"), presented in random order at each survey. Momentary PA and NA scores were computed by averaging the positive and negative items, respectively. Multilevel composite reliability (ω), estimated with the *multilevelTools* package (Wiley, 2020) following Geldhof et al. (2014), was good for PA ($\omega_{\text{within}} = .73$, $\omega_{\text{between}} = .93$) and NA ($\omega_{\text{within}} = .62$, $\omega_{\text{between}} = .89$).

After rating their affect, participants responded to 10 items, presented in a random order, measuring their use of emotion-regulation strategies² "since the last survey", including expressive suppression ("I was careful not to express my emotions to others") and social sharing ("I talked with someone about my emotions"), similar to items used in other experience-sampling studies of emotion-regulation in daily life (e.g., Brans, Koval, et al., 2013). Finally, participants were asked to rate several items measuring appraisals of "the situation/environment [they had] been in since last survey", including an item assessing the extent to which they felt "supported by others in the situation" to measure perceived social support. All experience-sampling items were rated on a scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 100 (*very much*).

² We focus exclusively on social sharing and expressive suppression as these were the only fundamentally "social" regulation strategies, which we predicted to vary as a function of social support. The other regulation strategies assessed were: (i) situation selection; (ii) situation modification; (iii) distraction; (iv) rumination; (v) ignoring; (vi) two forms of cognitive reappraisal; and (vii) acceptance.

Data-Analytic Approach

To account for the two-level structure (experience-sampling surveys nested within participants) we analyzed data using multilevel regression using the *lme4* package (Bates et al., 2015) in R (version 4.1.0), with p-values calculated using *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova et al., 2017). Our models included random intercepts and slopes for all Level-1 predictors, which were allowed to correlate freely at Level-2. All Level-1 predictors were within-person standardized to ensure that they represented purely within-person effects and to facilitate model convergence (Wang et al., 2019). However, when specific models did not converge using the *lme4* default settings, we re-ran these models using the “bobyqa” optimizer allowing for a maximum of 200,000 iterations (Bates et al., 2015). All models included the lagged outcome (excluding overnight lags) as a Level-1 covariate to model change in the outcome as a function of the key predictors over and above persistence in the outcome across successive measurement occasions. We followed-up statistically significant interactions by plotting simple slopes at $\pm 1 SD$ around the mean level of the moderator.

Results

Descriptive statistics and within- and between-person correlations are shown in Table 1. Key model estimates related to our hypotheses are shown in Table 2. Estimates of all fixed effects for the main analyses can be found in Tables S1-S5 in the online supplemental materials.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Study 1: Between-Person Means (*M*), Within-Person (*SD_w*) and Between-Person Standard Deviations (*SD_b*), Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICC) and Between-Person and Within-Person Correlations.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD_w</i>	<i>SD_b</i>	ICC	Sharing	Suppression	Support	NA	PA
Sharing	35.37	25.84	19.82	.35	–	.50	.57	.22	.34
Suppression	38.54	22.73	22.75	.46	-.07	–	.20	.43	.04
Social Support	56.36	23.98	16.20	.29	.34	-.08	–	-.16	.58
Negative Affect (NA)	22.10	13.33	13.38	.47	.00	.12	-.19	–	-.46
Positive Affect (PA)	62.88	14.77	13.32	.42	.10	-.09	.27	-.63	–

Note. Between-person correlations are shown above the diagonal; average within-person correlations are below the diagonal.

First, we examined whether momentary use of suppression and social sharing varied as a function of perceived social support. Supporting Hypotheses 1a and 1b, we found that greater perceived social support predicted decreased use of suppression, and increased use of social sharing.

Next, we examined the affective consequences of the two regulatory strategies. Supporting Hypothesis 2a, momentary suppression predicted higher NA and lower PA. Social sharing, on the other hand, predicted an increase in PA, but had no effect on NA.

Finally, we examined whether the affective consequences of suppression and sharing were moderated by perceived levels of support. Regarding Hypothesis 3a, perceived social support did not moderate the effect of suppression on PA. However, we found a small, yet statistically significant interaction among perceived social support and suppression for NA. As displayed in Figure 1 (Panel A), suppression predicted smaller increases in NA in contexts with higher (vs. lower) levels of perceived social support. Thus, perceived social support appeared to buffer the harmful consequences of suppression on negative affect. Contrary to Hypothesis 3b, there was no significant interaction between social sharing and perceived social support predicting NA or PA.

Table 2. Fixed effect estimates for hypothesized effects in Study 1

Hypothesis	Outcome	Predictor	Estimate (SE)	95% CI	<i>p</i>
H1a	Expressive Suppression	Social Support	-1.48 (0.42)	[-2.30, -0.65]	.001
H1b	Social Sharing	Social Support	8.27 (0.45)	[7.38, 9.16]	< .001
H2a	Positive Affect (PA)	Suppression	-0.81 (0.19)	[-1.19, -0.43]	< .001
	Negative Affect (NA)	Suppression	1.28 (0.17)	[0.96, 1.61]	< .001
H2b	Positive Affect (PA)	Sharing	1.26 (0.18)	[0.92, 1.61]	< .001
	Negative Affect (NA)	Sharing	-0.05 (0.16)	[-0.37, 0.26]	.733
H3a	Positive Affect (PA)	Suppression * Social Support	0.17 (0.11)	[-0.06 – 0.39]	.142
	Negative Affect (NA)	Suppression * Social Support	-0.24 (0.11)	[-0.45 – -0.02]	.032
H3b	Positive Affect (PA)	Sharing * Social Support	0.22 (0.13)	[-0.04 – 0.47]	.100
	Negative Affect (NA)	Sharing * Social Support	-0.19 (0.12)	[-0.43 – 0.05]	.132

Figure 1. Simple slope plots illustrating the moderating effect of perceived social support on the short-term affective consequences of expressive suppression and social sharing on negative affect and positive affect in Study 1. Simple slopes are plotted at ± 1 *SD* around the mean level of perceived social support. Panel A (interaction between social support and suppression predicting negative affect) was statistically significant at $p < .05$. No other interactions were statistically significant.

Supplemental Analyses

To test the robustness of the key findings from our main analyses, we ran a series of additional analyses reported in the online supplemental materials. First, to establish whether the effects we observed for each strategy (i.e., suppression or sharing) were independent of the other strategy, we repeated our main analyses controlling for the effect of the other regulation strategy in each model. That is, in each model including suppression as an outcome (H1) or a focal predictor (H2 and H3), we added social sharing as a Level-1 covariate, whereas in models including sharing as an outcome (H1) or a focal predictor (H2

and H3) we controlled for the effect of suppression at Level-1 (see Tables S6-S8). Our key findings were robust in these models, except for the interaction between social support and suppression predicting NA, which was no longer statistically significant when controlling for sharing (see Table S8 in Supplement 2.1).

Second, we ran an additional set of analyses to test the temporal nature and directionality of our findings regarding the influence of social support on suppression and sharing. Specifically, we reran our main analyses for H1 without including lagged suppression or sharing use as covariates. These analyses yield identical findings compared to our main analyses (see Supplement 2.2 and Table S9). Furthermore, given the correlational nature of our main analyses, they do not speak to the direction of the effect. Therefore, we repeated our analyses testing H1 using lagged social support as a predictor. We also investigated the possibility that the effect may flow in the opposite direction by modeling how lagged suppression and sharing predict future social support. These analyses support bidirectional lagged relationships among social support and sharing, but no lagged associations between social support and suppression (see Tables S10 and S11 in Supplement 2.2).

Study 2

To replicate our Study 1 findings, we ran similar analyses using another experience-sampling dataset. This dataset, previously published by Medland et al. (2020), was collected with similar methods to Study 1, except (i) a shorter experience-sampling protocol of 7 days; (ii) suppression and social sharing were measured with two items each, and reported in response to the most intense negative emotional experience in the past hour; (iii) perceived social support was measured using a categorical and a continuous item, which we combined into an overall social support score; and (iv) momentary affect was measured on a single bipolar scale, rather than positive and negative affect scales.

Method

Below we report only methodological details relevant to the current report. For more information, including participant eligibility criteria, data cleaning procedure and an overview all of measured constructs, see Medland et al. (2020).

Participants

We recruited 132 participants via online advertisements, and through an undergraduate research pool at a university in Melbourne, Australia. Four participants voluntarily withdrew and five were excluded due to technical problems, leaving a final sample of $N = 123$ (66.7% female) aged 18 to 34 years ($M = 21.2$, $SD = 3.5$). Participants were reimbursed pro-rata, depending on their experience-sampling compliance. Undergraduate participants received course credit and community participants were reimbursed up to \$45 AUD.

Procedure

Similar to Study 1, participants attended an introductory lab session during which they completed several questionnaires and downloaded the SEMA2 app onto their smartphones. Over the next 7 days, participants were prompted to complete an experience-sampling survey every 90 (± 20) minutes between 9:00 am and 9:00 pm (i.e., 8-9 surveys per day). Compliance ranged between 7.9% and 100% ($M = 79.6\%$, $SD = 17.5\%$).

Measures

Each experience-sampling survey began by asking participants to rate their current affect (“how are you feeling right now?”) using a bipolar *valence* scale from -10 (*very negative*) to $+10$ (*very positive*). Next, after participants selected their “strongest negative emotion...in the last hour”, they rated “how intense” this emotion was (*negative emotion intensity*) on a slider scale ranging from 0 (*not at all, I barely noticed*) to 100 (*very intense*).

Social emotion regulation in daily life

All remaining experience-sampling questions were framed in relation to this recent negative emotional experience.

Perceived social support was measured with two items. First, participants responded to a categorical *support* item (“Did you feel supported by the other person(s) present?”) with response options of “yes”, “no”, or “I was alone”. Next, if participants answered “yes” to the categorical support item ($n = 1,725$), they completed a continuous measure of *support intensity* (“To what extent did you feel supported by the other person(s) present?”) on 0 (*not at all*) to 100 (*very much*) scale. For comparability with Study 1, which included a continuous measure of social support presented at all experience-sampling surveys without asking whether people were alone, we used the continuous support intensity item for our main analyses. However, we replaced missing values for support intensity with 0s when participants responded “no” ($n = 1,394$) or “I was alone” ($n = 2,843$) to the categorical support item. We acknowledge that being alone is not the same as having an unsupportive interaction. Therefore, we repeated our analyses excluding “I was alone” responses in the supplemental materials (see Tables S24 and S25). These analyses replicate our main findings.

Next, participants responded to 12 items (presented in random order) measuring their use of emotion-regulation strategies, which began with the stem “In response to my emotion”, referring to their most intense negative emotion in the past hour. These items were adapted from the Regulating Emotion Systems Survey (RESS; De France & Hollenstein, 2017) to suit experience-sampling (Medland et al., 2020). Social sharing, also referred to as *engagement* (De France & Hollenstein, 2017), was measured with the items “I showed my feelings” and “I expressed my feelings”, whereas suppression was measured with the items “I made an effort to hide my feelings” and “I pretended I wasn’t upset”, all rated on a scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 100 (*very much*). We calculated momentary sharing

Social emotion regulation in daily life

and suppression composites by averaging scores on the two items assessing each strategy at each experience-sampling survey. Multilevel correlations, estimated using the *psych* package (Revelle, 2021), were adequate for both social sharing ($r_{\text{within}} = .64$, $r_{\text{between}} = .97$) and suppression ($r_{\text{within}} = .54$, $r_{\text{between}} = .96$). Finally, participants rated their perceived emotion regulation success with the following question: “Overall, how successful were you in regulating your emotions?”, on a scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 100 (*very much*).

Data-Analytic Approach

Study 2 did not include PA and NA measures equivalent to those in Study 1. Therefore, the data analytic approach was identical to Study 1, except we tested Hypotheses 2 and 3 using bipolar valence as an outcome.

Results

Descriptive statistics as well as within- and between-person correlations are shown in Table 3. Model estimates for all hypothesized effects are shown in Table 4. Estimates of all fixed effects can be found in Table S12-14 in the Supplemental Materials available online.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics Study 2: Between-Person Means (*M*), Within-Person (*SD_w*) and Between-Person Standard Deviations (*SD_b*), Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICC) and Between-Person and Within-Person Correlations

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD_w</i>	<i>SD_b</i>	ICC	Valence	Sharing	Suppression	Support
Valence	2.95	3.58	2.94	.36	-	.12	-.20	.09
Sharing	41.51	20.91	18.05	.38	-.02	-	.24	.25
Suppression	37.42	20.15	18.74	.43	-.02	-.15	-	.05
Social Support	19.86	27.18	16.98	0.24	.17	.19	-.05	-

Note. Between-person correlations are shown above the diagonal; average within-person correlations are below the diagonal. Valence was measured on a scale from -10 (very negative) to +10 (very positive).

Supporting Hypotheses 1a and 1b, and replicating our findings in Study 1, higher levels of perceived social support predicted decreased use of suppression and increased use of social sharing. Contrary to Hypothesis 2a and our findings in Study 1, suppression and social sharing were not associated with changes in momentary valence. Finally, contrary to Hypotheses 3a and 3b, and partly inconsistent with Study 1 findings, perceived social support did not moderate the affective consequences of suppression or social sharing (see Figure 2).

Table 4. Fixed effect estimates for hypothesized effects in Study 2

Hypothesis	Outcome	Predictor	Estimate (SE)	95% CI	<i>p</i>
H1a	Suppression	Social Support	-1.13 (0.47)	-2.05 – -0.21	.017
H1b	Sharing	Social Support	3.97 (0.50)	3.00 – 4.94	<.001
H2a	Valence	Suppression	-0.16 (0.09)	-0.34 – 0.02	.086
H2b	Valence	Sharing	-0.01 (0.10)	-0.19 – 0.18	.941
		Suppression *	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.13 – 0.11	.905
H3a	Valence	Social Support			
		Sharing * Social	0.03 (0.07)	-0.11 – 0.16	.683
H3b	Valence	Support

Figure 2. Simple slope plots illustrating the moderating effect of perceived social support on the short-term affective consequences of expressive suppression and social sharing on valence in Study 2. Simple slopes are plotted at ± 1 *SD* around the mean level of perceived social support. None of the interactions were statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Supplemental Analyses

To test the robustness of the key findings from our main analyses, we ran a series of additional analyses, the results of which we report in the supplemental online materials.

First, to establish whether the effects we observed for suppression and sharing were independent of the other strategy, we again repeated our main analyses controlling for the effect of the other regulation strategy in each model (see Tables S15-S17). These analyses largely replicate our key findings (see Supplement 2.1 for a more elaborate description of the findings).

Second, to test the temporal nature and causal directionality of our findings regarding the influence of social support on suppression and sharing, we ran an additional set of analyses. See Study 1 and Supplement 2.2 for a more elaborate description of how and why we performed these analyses. In short, we re-ran our analyses testing H1 *without* lagged ER strategies as covariates. These analyses replicated our main findings (see Table S18). Furthermore, we repeated our analyses testing H1 using lagged social support as a predictor of the two regulatory strategies, and vice versa. Overall, we found no significant lagged effects, suggesting that the effect of social support on the use of suppression and sharing unfolds on a relatively short timescale (see Tables S19 and S20 for the parameter estimates).

Third, we repeated our main analyses with two alternative dependent measures (see Supplement 2.3). Whereas Study 1 included measures of both PA and NA, our analyses of Study 2 were limited to valence. Therefore, we re-ran our analyses testing Hypothesis 2 and 3 using participants' intensity ratings of their most negative emotional experience in the last hour as an outcome, as an additional test of the (context-dependent) affective consequences of both regulatory strategies (see Tables S21 and S22). These analyses replicated our main analyses, except that both suppression and sharing were associated with an increase in negative emotional intensity. Note, however, that negative intensity was measured in

response to the emotional experience that was regulated, suggesting that higher negative emotional intensity may have been the antecedent, rather than consequence, of greater suppression and sharing. Furthermore, we explored whether context-dependent emotional benefits may be reflected in *perceived* efficacy of emotion-regulation strategies, rather than in the actual affective consequences. To this end, we re-ran our analyses testing Hypothesis 3, replacing affect with perceived emotion regulation success as a dependent measure. These analyses replicated our main findings, except for a significant interaction indicating that participants experienced expressive suppression as more effective in the context of lower perceived support (see Table S23).

Finally, we repeated all our main analyses with an alternative operationalization of social support, in which social support was coded as missing when participants reported being alone on the categorical social support item. As mentioned above, these analyses replicate our main analyses (see Supplement 2.3). Parameter estimates from these models can be found in Supplemental Tables S24 and S25.

Discussion

We sought to test theoretical accounts of flexible emotion regulation (Aldao et al., 2015; Bonanno & Burton, 2013; Sheppes, 2020) by investigating the context-dependent use and efficacy of social sharing and suppression in daily life. As sharing and suppression are fundamentally social emotion-regulation strategies, we reasoned the use and affective consequences of these strategies should depend on a salient feature of the social context, namely perceived social support. Across two experience-sampling studies, we found that use of sharing and suppression indeed vary by social context: when people perceived their environments as being higher (vs. lower) in social support, they engaged in more sharing and less suppression.

The finding that perceived social support predicted increased sharing and decreased suppression resonates with a wealth of literature on the importance of perceived partner responsiveness. Perceived responsiveness refers to the confidence that the other will understand, accept, and be responsive to one's needs, and lies at the core of emotional and relational wellbeing (for overviews, see Reis et al., 2017; Reis & Gable, 2015). Prior work shows that social sharing brings about feelings of relief and strengthens interpersonal relationships when listeners respond supportively (Brans, Van Mechelen, et al., 2013; Graham et al., 2008). Our findings suggest that by selectively sharing or hiding emotions in line with perceived social resources, people may be strategically seeking to increase their chances of obtaining positive outcomes. However, as we discuss below, our findings in relation to the context-dependent affective outcomes of sharing and suppression do not bear this out.

Overall, the affective consequences of sharing and suppression were partially in line with our hypotheses. In Study 1, social sharing showed some benefits (increased PA, no change in NA) and suppression had emotional costs (reduced PA, increased NA). Yet, in Study 2, neither strategy predicted short-term changes in affect. Our findings for sharing are consistent with past research that has found an overall mixed or null effect of sharing on emotional outcomes (Brans, Van Mechelen, et al., 2013; Heij & Cheavens, 2014). Our findings for suppression are consistent with previous daily life studies (e.g., Brans, Koval, et al., 2013), but contrast with experimental work suggesting suppression does not influence experience (Kaloerinos et al., 2015).

Contrary to predictions, we found no consistent evidence that social support moderated the affective outcomes of either suppression or sharing. A significant interaction between social support and sharing predicting NA, observed in Study 1, suggested that perceived social support may buffer the harmful consequences of suppression (cf. Cohen &

Wills, 1985). However, this effect did not replicate in Study 2 and we found no corresponding moderation for the impact of suppression on PA in either study. Furthermore, our supplemental Study 2 analyses suggested the opposite pattern when predicting *perceived* regulation success, such that expressive suppression was perceived as more effective in the context of lower perceived support. Thus, overall, our findings do not support the context-dependent affective consequences of either strategy.

Our difficulty in detecting robust context-dependent affective consequences speaks to several challenges faced by the field. So far, most work on emotion regulation flexibility has been theoretical (Kobylińska & Kusev, 2019), featuring large heterogeneity in conceptualizations and operationalizations of flexibility (Aldao et al., 2015). While research examining individual differences in flexibility speaks to a wide variety of psychological health benefits (Bonanno & Burton, 2013; Kashdan & Rottenberg, 2010), a clear mapping of which strategies are best for particular people in particular situations is still lacking (Doré et al., 2016). A challenge for future research will thus be to examine these various factors across multiple studies to contribute to a more sophisticated and comprehensive understanding of emotion-regulation flexibility. Importantly, understanding when strategies are not helpful (or not harmful) constitutes an important part of this puzzle. Null findings should therefore not be neglected (Aldao et al., 2015).

We note several limitations of the current studies. First, our studies relied on self-report. While experience-sampling reduces recall biases, it may still be difficult for participants to accurately report on contextual factors, such as social support, or even their own emotion regulation efforts, which may sometimes be implicit or automatic (Braunstein et al., 2017; Gyurak et al., 2011). Second, in Study 1, emotion regulation and perceived support were assessed retrospectively (i.e., since the last survey). As such, we cannot be certain that ratings of social support referred to the same context as the emotion-regulation

episode. This limitation was mitigated, to an extent, in Study 2 where participants reported their use of regulation strategies and perceived support in relation to the same (most intense) recent negative emotional episode. Finally, given the correlational nature of our data, we cannot rule out that our findings regarding context-dependent use of suppression and sharing reflect the opposite causal direction to what we proposed, such that sharing increases perceived support and suppression decreases perceived support. Importantly, however, these two interpretations need not be mutually exclusive, but instead may represent a bidirectional loop. Future experimental studies are needed to clarify the directionality of these associations.

Conclusion

The present research examined how social context in the form of perceived support shapes the use and short-term affective consequences of two common social emotion-regulation strategies across two experience-sampling studies. Across both studies, we found that higher perceived social support was associated with greater sharing and reduced suppression. However, we did not find robust evidence for context-dependent affective consequences of these regulation strategies. Future research is warranted to better understand the circumstances in which context-dependent emotion regulation benefits wellbeing, ideally taking into account personal, situational and cultural factors (Doré et al., 2016; Greenaway et al., 2018).

Declarations

Funding

This research was supported by a Discovery Project grant (DP160102252) and a Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DE190100203) from the Australian Research Council.

Competing Interests

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Ethics Approval

Approval was obtained from the ethics committee of Australian Catholic University (Ethics ID: 2015-10H) for Study 1 and from the University of Melbourne (Ethics ID: 1851354.1) for Study 2. The procedures used in this study adhere to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Data, Material and/or Code Availability

The studies were not preregistered. Data and code are publicly available on OSF (<https://osf.io/735eg/>).

Authors' Contribution

Peter Koval, Tom Hollenstein, Hayley Medland, and Jordan Hinton designed the studies.

Jordan Hinton, Hayley Medland, and Peter Koval collected the data.

Peter Koval, Sarah Paling, and Lisanne Pauw formulated the hypotheses and analysis plan.

Social emotion regulation in daily life

Peter Koval, Lisanne Pauw, Hayley Medland, and Sarah Paling analyzed the data.

Lisanne Pauw, Sarah Paling, and Peter Koval wrote the manuscript and supplementary material.

Ella Moeck, Katie Greenaway, Elise Kalokerinos, Jordan Hinton, and Tom Hollenstein provided critical feedback on all sections of the manuscript.

References

- Aldao, A. (2013). The future of emotion regulation research: Capturing context. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(2), 155–172.
- Aldao, A., Sheppes, G., & Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation flexibility. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 39(3), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-014-9662-4>
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Bonanno, G. A., & Burton, C. L. (2013). Regulatory flexibility: An individual differences perspective on coping and emotion regulation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(6), 591–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613504116>
- Brans, K., Koval, P., Verduyn, P., Lim, Y. L., & Kuppens, P. (2013). The regulation of negative and positive affect in daily life. *Emotion*, 13(5), 926–939. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032400>
- Brans, K., Van Mechelen, I., Rimé, B., & Verduyn, P. (2013). The relation between social sharing and the duration of emotional experience. *Cognition and Emotion*, 27(6), 1023–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.762758>
- Braunstein, L. M., Gross, J. J., & Ochsner, K. N. (2017). Explicit and implicit emotion regulation: A multi-level framework. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12(10), 1545–1557. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx096>
- Brockman, R., Ciarrochi, J., Parker, P., & Kashdan, T. (2017). Emotion regulation strategies in daily life: Mindfulness, cognitive reappraisal and emotion suppression. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 46(2), 91–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2016.1218926>

- Cameron, L. D., & Overall, N. C. (2018). Suppression and expression as distinct emotion-regulation processes in daily interactions: Longitudinal and meta-analyses. *Emotion, 18*(4), 465–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000334>
- Catterson, A. D., Eldesouky, L., & John, O. P. (2017). An experience sampling approach to emotion regulation: Situational suppression use and social hierarchy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 69*, 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.04.004>
- Clark, M. S., & Finkel, E. J. (2005). Willingness to express emotion: The impact of relationship type, communal orientation, and their interaction. *Personal Relationships, 12*(2), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00109.x>
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*(2), 310–357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
- Colombo, D., Fernández-Álvarez, J., Suso-Ribera, C., Cipresso, P., Valev, H., Leufkens, T., Sas, C., Garcia-Palacios, A., Riva, G., & Botella, C. (2020). The need for change: Understanding emotion regulation antecedents and consequences using ecological momentary assessment. *Emotion, 20*(1), 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000671>
- De France, K., & Hollenstein, T. (2017). Assessing emotion regulation repertoires: The regulation of emotion systems survey. *Personality and Individual Differences, 119*, 204–215.
- Doré, B. P., Silvers, J. A., & Ochsner, K. N. (2016). Toward a personalized science of emotion regulation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10*(4), 171–187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12240>
- English, T., & Eldesouky, L. (2020). We're not alone: Understanding the social consequences of intrinsic emotion regulation. *Emotion, 20*(1), 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000661>

- 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(2), 230–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9597-z>
- Farmer, A. S., & Kashdan, T. B. (2012). Social anxiety and emotion regulation in daily life: Spillover effects on positive and negative social events. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 41(2), 152–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2012.666561>
- Geldhof, G. J., Preacher, K. J., & Zyphur, M. J. (2014). Reliability estimation in a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis framework. *Psychological Methods*, 19(1), 72–91. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032138>
- Graham, S. M., Huang, J. Y., Clark, M. S., & Helgeson, V. S. (2008). The positives of negative emotions: Willingness to express negative emotions promotes relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(3), 394–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207311281>
- Greenaway, K. H., Kalokerinos, E. K., & Williams, L. A. (2018). Context is everything (in emotion research). *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 12(6), e12393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12393>
- Grommisch, G., Koval, P., Hinton, J. D. X., Gleeson, J., Hollenstein, T., Kuppens, P., & Lischetzke, T. (2020). Modeling individual differences in emotion regulation repertoire in daily life with multilevel latent profile analysis. *Emotion*, 20(8), 1462–1474. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000669>
- Gyurak, A., Gross, J. J., & Etkin, A. (2011). Explicit and implicit emotion regulation: A dual-process framework. *Cognition & Emotion*, 25(3), 400–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2010.544160>

- Harrison, A., Harrsion, S., Koval, P., Gleeson, J., & Alvarez, M. (2017). SEMA: Smartphone ecological momentary assessment (version 2). [*Computer Software*]. <https://github.com/eorygen>
- Heiy, J. E., & Cheavens, J. S. (2014). Back to basics: A naturalistic assessment of the experience and regulation of emotion. *Emotion, 14*(5), 878–891. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037231>
- Impett, E. A., Kogan, A., English, T., John, O., Oveis, C., Gordon, A. M., & Keltner, D. (2012). Suppression sours sacrifice: Emotional and relational costs of suppressing emotions in romantic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(6), 707–720. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212437249>
- Kalokerinos, E. K., Greenaway, K. H., & Denson, T. F. (2015). Reappraisal but not suppression downregulates the experience of positive and negative emotion. *Emotion, 15*(3), 271–275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000025>
- Kashdan, T. B., & Rottenberg, J. (2010). Psychological flexibility as a fundamental aspect of health. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*(7), 865–878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.03.001>
- Kobylińska, D., & Kusev, P. (2019). Flexible emotion regulation: How situational demands and individual differences influence the effectiveness of regulatory strategies. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 72. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00072>
- Koval, P., Kalokerinos, E. K., Greenaway, K. H., Medland, H., Kuppens, P., Nezlek, J. B., Hinton, J., & Gross, J. (2020). *Emotion regulation in everyday life: Mapping global self-reports to daily processes* [Preprint]. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/cav54>

- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(13).
<https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
- Medland, H., De France, K., Hollenstein, T., Mussoff, D., & Koval, P. (2020). Regulating emotion systems in everyday life. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 36(3), 437–446. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000595>
- Nezlek, J. B., & Kuppens, P. (2008). Regulating positive and negative emotions in daily life. *Journal of Personality*, 76(3), 561–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00496.x>
- Pentina, I., & Zhang, L. (2017). Effects of social support and personality on emotional disclosure on facebook and in real life. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 36(5), 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2016.1258086>
- Reis, H. T. (2008). Reinvigorating the concept of situation in social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(4), 311–329.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308321721>
- Reis, H. T., & Gable, S. L. (2015). Responsiveness. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 67–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.01.001>
- Reis, H. T., Lemay Jr., E. P., & Finkenauer, C. (2017). Toward understanding understanding: The importance of feeling understood in relationships. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11(3), e12308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12308>
- Revelle, W. (2021). *psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- Rimé, B., Bouchat, P., Paquot, L., & Giglio, L. (2020). Intrapersonal, interpersonal, and social outcomes of the social sharing of emotion. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 31, 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.024>

- Ruan, Y., Reis, H. T., Clark, M. S., Hirsch, J. L., & Bink, B. D. (2020). Can I tell you how I feel? Perceived partner responsiveness encourages emotional expression. *Emotion*, 20(3), 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000650>
- Sheppes, G. (2020). Transcending the “good & bad” and “here & now” in emotion regulation: Costs and benefits of strategies across regulatory stages. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 61, pp. 185–236). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2019.09.003>
- Soto, J. A., Perez, C. R., Kim, Y.-H., Lee, E. A., & Minnick, M. R. (2011). Is expressive suppression always associated with poorer psychological functioning? A cross-cultural comparison between European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese. *Emotion*, 11(6), 1450–1455. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023340>
- Von Culin, K. R., Hirsch, J. L., & Clark, M. S. (2018). Willingness to express emotion depends upon perceiving partner care. *Cognition and Emotion*, 32(3), 641–650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1331906>
- Wang, L., Zhang, Q., Maxwell, S. E., & Bergeman, C. S. (2019). On Standardizing Within-Person Effects: Potential Problems of Global Standardization. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 54(3), 382–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2018.1532280>
- Wiley, J. F. (2020). *multilevelTools: Multilevel and mixed effects model diagnostics and effect sizes*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=multilevelTools>

Supplemental Materials

Supplement 1: Overview Measures Included in Study 1

Below, we report all constructs that were additionally measured in Study 1, as part of a larger research project.

Experience Sampling:

- Social interaction (person they spent most time with)
- Emotion regulation strategies (expressive suppression, social sharing, distraction, situation selection, situation modification, reappraisal, acceptance, rumination, avoidance)
- Context appraisals (control, importance, coping self-efficacy)
- Emotion regulation goals (happy, relaxed, confident, sad, stressed, angry)

Traits:

- Demographics
- Social Isolation
- Depression, Anxiety and Stress
- Perceived Stress
- Self-Esteem
- Personality
- Fear of Negative Evaluation
- Actual and Ideal Affect
- Emotion Regulation
- Self-Control

Social emotion regulation in daily life

- Loneliness
- Self-Efficacy
- Self-Compassion
- Implicit Theories and Expectations of Emotion
- Satisfaction with Life
- Interpersonal Support
- Social Desirability

Supplement 2: Additional Analyses

Supplement 2.1: Controlling for the Other ER Strategy (Studies 1 and 2)

To establish whether the effects we observed for suppression and sharing were independent of the other strategy, we repeated our main analyses controlling for the effect of the other regulation strategy in each model. That is, in each model including suppression as an outcome (H1) or a focal predictor (H2 and H3), we added social sharing as a Level-1 covariate, whereas in models including sharing as an outcome (H1) or a focal predictor (H2 and H3) we controlled for the effect of suppression at Level-1 (see Tables S6-S8 for Study 1 and Tables S15-17 for Study 2).

In Study 1, the findings remain largely the same. More specifically, findings for Hypothesis 1 and 2 remain identical. The only difference observed was for the analyses testing Hypothesis 3. As can be seen in Table S8, the interaction effect between Suppression and Social Support predicting NA was no longer significant. Instead, a significant interaction emerged between Social Sharing and Support, indicating that high support buffered the negative effect of sharing on NA.

In Study 2, some small differences emerged. When testing Hypothesis 1 while controlling for the other ER strategy, perceived support remained a significant predictor of increased sharing, but the negative effect of perceived support on suppression disappeared. In the analyses testing Hypothesis 2, suppression emerged as a significant negative predictor of valence, in line with our hypothesis. Social sharing remained a non-significant predictor of valence. Finally, no significant interaction effects emerged, replicating our main analyses.

Supplement 2.2: Probing Causality: Concurrent, Reversed and Lagged Analyses

(Studies 1 and 2)

We ran an additional set of analyses to test the temporal nature and directionality of our findings regarding the influence of social support on suppression and sharing. Our main analyses for H1 modelled social support as a predictor of suppression or sharing measured contemporaneously, controlling for lagged suppression or sharing. Given that both social support and sharing/suppression were measured “since the last survey”, we included lagged suppression or sharing as covariates to rule out the possibility that potential associations between social support and these two regulation strategies were, in fact, due to the strategies causing changes in social support.

However, this approach comes with two shortcomings. First, it measures *change* in regulation-strategy use as a function of social support, while we are interested in ER use as a function of the contemporaneous social context, which may be independent of ER use in the previous context. Therefore, we reran our main analyses for Hypothesis 1, examining the use of suppression and sharing as a function of concurrent social support, *without* including lagged ER use as a predictor. These analyses yielded identical findings compared to our main analyses (see Table S9). Together, our findings show that greater perceived social support in one particular context is associated with less suppression and more social sharing in that same context.

Second, given that the predictor and outcome variables in our main analyses testing H1 were measured concurrently, we cannot be sure that our findings reflect a causal effect of variation in perceived social support predicting differential use of each regulation strategy, as hypothesized. To test the robustness of this interpretation, we ran additional “lagged” models probing the directionality of the associations of social support, on one hand, and suppression and sharing, on the other.

First, we ran lagged analyses to examine whether perceived support at one occasion (T1) would also predict the use of social sharing and suppression reported at the following measurement occasion (T2). In Study 1, we found that perceived support at T1 positively predicted social sharing at T2, but not suppression at T2 (see Table S10). In Study 2, we found no significant lagged effects for both emotion regulation strategies (see Table S19).

Second, we ran reversed-lagged models, examining whether suppression and social sharing at T1 would predict changes in perceived support at T2. In both studies, suppression at T1 did not predict perceived support at T2 (see Table S11 and S20). In Study 1, social sharing at T1 positively predicted perceived support at T2 (see Table S11), but this effect was not replicated in Study 2 (see Table S20).

Together, these findings suggest that the effect of social support on the use of suppression and sharing may unfold on a relatively short timescale: Our original analyses show that when perceiving high levels of support, participants engaged in more social sharing and less expressive suppression (Table S1 and S12). However, lagged analyses indicated that higher perceived social support did not consistently predict future use of sharing and suppression across both studies. Moreover, although we did find some evidence that higher perceived support predicted future increases in sharing (in Study 1), there appeared to be a reciprocal effect in the opposite direction, such that greater sharing also predicted future increases in perceived social support. Thus, although we have interpreted our main findings as supporting H1, we cannot rule out the possibility of bidirectional associations among social support, on one hand, and expressive suppression and social sharing, on the other.

Supplement 2.3: Robustness Checks (Study 2)

Negative Emotional Intensity as an Outcome (Study 2). In addition to our main analyses with bipolar valence (i.e., current affect) as the outcome, we re-ran our analyses using negative emotional intensity ratings of participants' most negative emotional experience since the last beep. Contrary to our main findings predicting valence, both expressive suppression and social sharing predicted significant increases in negative emotional intensity, meaning that the use of both regulatory strategies was associated with greater negative affect (see Table S21). It should be noted that participants rated the intensity of their most negative emotional experience in the past hour, after which they reported on how they regulated their emotions in response to this emotional experience. These findings may thus indicate that higher negative emotional intensity is an antecedent, rather than consequence, of greater suppression and sharing. In line with our main findings predicting valence, perceived social support did not moderate the effect of either of the two emotion regulation strategies on negative emotional intensity (see Table S22).

Perceived Regulation Success as an Outcome. Given that our findings did not lend strong support for context-dependent affective consequences, we exploratorily examined whether such context-dependent benefits may be primarily reflected in perceptions of effective emotion regulation rather than in actual affective consequences. To this end, we re-ran our analyses testing Hypothesis 3, replacing affect with perceived regulation success as a dependent measure. As can be seen in Table S23, suppression and social sharing did not predict perceived regulation success. We did find a small but significant interaction effect between perceived social support and suppression, but not social sharing. These findings suggest that while people did not experience social sharing as more effective in the context of higher perceived support (contrary to Hypothesis 3b), they did experience expressive suppression as more effective in the context of *lower* perceived support. Finally, replicating

Study 1 and 2, and in line with a wealth of literature speaking to the importance of perceived responsiveness (see Reis et al., 2017; Reis & Gable, 2015), perceived social support emerged as a significant positive predictor of perceived emotion regulation success.

Alternative Operationalization of Social Support. In our main analyses, perceived social support was operationalized such that support was coded as zero when participants indicated to have received no support *and* when they reported being alone. To examine the robustness of our findings, we repeated our analyses excluding “I was alone” responses, such that social support reflected the support participants experienced to have received when in the presence of others. Replicating our main analyses and in line with Hypothesis 1, social support was associated with increased Social Sharing, and decreased Expressive Suppression (see Table S24). Further replicating our main analyses, though inconsistent with Hypothesis 3, social support did not moderate the relationship between either of the two emotion regulation strategies and valence (see Table S25).

Supplement 4: Supplemental Tables

Please find below all supplemental tables as referred to in the main paper or in the Supplemental Materials above.

Table Overview

Study 1

- S1: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1a and 1b
- S2: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2a
- S3: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2b
- S4: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3a
- S5: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3b
- S6: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 while controlling for the other ER strategy (i.e., Predicting Suppression from Social Support, Controlling for Sharing and Predicting Sharing from Social Support, Controlling for Suppression)
- S7: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2 with Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing as Simultaneous Predictors of PA and NA
- S8: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing as Simultaneous Predictors of PA and NA
- S9: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 without Lagged ER Use as a Predictor
- S10: Parameter Estimates Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1
- S11: Parameter Estimates Reversed Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1

Study 2

- S12: Parameter estimates Hypothesis 1
- S13: Parameter estimates Hypothesis 2

Social emotion regulation in daily life

- S14: Parameter estimates Hypothesis 3
- S15: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 while controlling for the other ER strategy (i.e., Predicting Suppression from Social Support, Controlling for Sharing and Predicting Sharing from Social Support, Controlling for Suppression)
- S16: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2 with Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing as Simultaneous Predictors
- S17: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing as Simultaneous Predictors
- S18 Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 without Lagged ER Use as a Predictor
- S19: Parameter Estimates Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1
- S20: Parameter Estimates Reversed Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1
- S21: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2a and 2b with Negative Emotional Intensity with as the Dependent Variable
- S22: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3a and 3b with Negative Emotional Intensity with as the Dependent Variable
- S23: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Perceived Regulation Success as the Dependent Variable
- S24: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 with Alternative Operationalization of Social Support (i.e., Excluding Cases when Participants were Alone)
- S25: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Alternative Operationalization of Social Support (i.e., Excluding Cases when Participants were Alone)

Table S1. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1a and 1b – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Expressive Suppression			Social Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	38.56 (1.71)	35.21 – 41.92	<0.001	35.28 (1.49)	32.37 – 38.19	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	4.45 (0.38)	3.71 – 5.19	<0.001			
Social Support	-1.48 (0.42)	-2.30 – -0.65	0.001	8.27 (0.45)	7.38 – 9.16	<0.001
Lagged Sharing				4.34 (0.31)	3.74 – 4.95	<0.001
N	179 <small>SEMA_ID</small>			178 <small>SEMA_ID</small>		
Observations	22514			22345		

Table S2. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2a – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Affect			Positive Affect		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	22.11 (1.00)	20.14 – 24.08	<0.001	63.03 (1.00)	61.08 – 64.99	<0.001
Lagged Negative Affect	4.84 (0.26)	4.32 – 5.35	<0.001			
Suppression	1.28 (0.17)	0.96 – 1.61	<0.001	-0.81 (0.19)	-1.19 – -0.43	<0.001
Lagged Positive Affect				5.79 (0.29)	5.23 – 6.36	<0.001
N	179 SEMA_ID			179 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22838			22855		

Table S3. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2b – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Affect			Positive Affect		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	22.19 (1.00)	20.23 – 24.16	<0.001	63.04 (1.00)	61.08 – 65.00	<0.001
Lagged Negative Affect	5.01 (0.27)	4.49 – 5.53	<0.001			
Sharing	-0.05 (0.16)	-0.37 – 0.26	0.733	1.26 (0.18)	0.92 – 1.61	<0.001
Lagged Positive Affect				5.84 (0.29)	5.27 – 6.42	<0.001
N	178 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22671			22691		

Table S4. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3a – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Affect			Positive Affect		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	22.05 (1.01)	20.08 – 24.02	<0.001	63.07 (0.99)	61.12 – 65.02	<0.001
Lagged Negative Affect	4.56 (0.25)	4.06 – 5.06	<0.001			
Suppression	1.08 (0.14)	0.80 – 1.36	<0.001	-0.65 (0.16)	-0.96 – -0.33	<0.001
Social Support	-2.05 (0.18)	-2.41 – -1.69	<0.001	3.24 (0.19)	2.87 – 3.61	<0.001
Suppression*Social Support	-0.24 (0.11)	-0.45 – -0.02	0.032	0.17 (0.11)	-0.06 – 0.39	0.142
Lagged Positive Affect				5.30 (0.27)	4.77 – 5.82	<0.001
N	179 SEMA_ID			179 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22664			22678		

Table S5. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3b – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Affect			Positive Affect		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	22.23 (1.00)	20.26 – 24.19	<0.001	62.96 (1.00)	61.00 – 64.92	<0.001
Lagged Negative Affect	4.66 (0.25)	4.17 – 5.16	<0.001			
Sharing	0.85 (0.14)	0.58 – 1.13	<0.001	0.09 (0.16)	-0.22 – 0.40	0.584
Social Support	-2.35 (0.20)	-2.74 – -1.96	<0.001	3.33 (0.20)	2.93 – 3.72	<0.001
Sharing*Social Support	-0.19 (0.12)	-0.43 – 0.05	0.132	0.22 (0.13)	-0.04 – 0.47	0.100
Lagged Positive Affect				5.36 (0.27)	4.83 – 5.89	<0.001
N	178 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22501			22518		

Table S6. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 while controlling for the other ER strategy (i.e., Social Support predicting Expressive Suppression while controlling for Social Sharing, and Social Support predicting Social Sharing while controlling for Expressive Suppression) – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	38.76 (1.71)	35.42 – 42.11	<0.001	35.29 (1.48)	32.38 – 38.20	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	4.19 (0.36)	3.48 – 4.89	<0.001			
Sharing	-0.91 (0.43)	-1.76 – -0.06	0.038			
Social Support	-1.17 (0.34)	-1.83 – -0.52	0.001	7.73 (0.43)	6.89 – 8.58	<0.001
Lagged Sharing				4.07 (0.30)	3.49 – 4.65	<0.001
Suppression				-0.74 (0.42)	-1.55 – 0.08	0.079
N	178 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22308			22304		

Table S7. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2 with Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing as Simultaneous Predictors of PA and NA – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Affect			Positive Affect		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	22.20 (1.00)	20.24 – 24.17	<0.001	63.03 (1.00)	61.07 – 64.99	<0.001
Lagged Negative Affect	4.83 (0.26)	4.31 – 5.34	<0.001			
Sharing	-0.02 (0.15)	-0.31 – 0.27	0.887	1.11 (0.17)	0.78 – 1.43	<0.001
Suppression	1.32 (0.15)	1.02 – 1.62	<0.001	-0.92 (0.17)	-1.26 – -0.58	<0.001
Lagged Positive Affect				5.68 (0.29)	5.12 – 6.25	<0.001
N	178 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22585			22601		

Table S8. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Expressive Suppression, Social Sharing and Social Support as Simultaneous Predictors of PA and NA – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Affect			Positive Affect		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	22.21 (1.00)	20.25 – 24.18	<0.001	62.97 (1.00)	61.01 – 64.93	<0.001
Lagged Negative Affect	4.52 (0.25)	4.03 – 5.01	<0.001			
Suppression	0.82 (0.14)	0.54 – 1.10	<0.001	0.04 (0.16)	-0.26 – 0.35	0.796
Sharing	-2.28 (0.19)	-2.65 – -1.91	<0.001	3.26 (0.20)	2.88 – 3.64	<0.001
Social Support	1.14 (0.14)	0.87 – 1.40	<0.001	-0.72 (0.16)	-1.03 – -0.42	<0.001
Suppression*Social Support	-0.15 (0.12)	-0.39 – 0.08	0.199	0.18 (0.13)	-0.07 – 0.44	0.161
Sharing*Social Support	-0.24 (0.12)	-0.46 – -0.01	0.044	0.18 (0.11)	-0.05 – 0.40	0.124
Lagged Positive Affect				5.24 (0.27)	4.72 – 5.77	<0.001
N	178 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22458			22472		

Table S9. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 without Lagged ER Use as a Predictor – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	38.52 (1.70)	35.19 – 41.85	<0.001	35.35 (1.48)	32.45 – 38.25	<0.001
Social Support	-1.55 (0.45)	-2.43 – -0.68	0.001	8.97 (0.47)	8.05 – 9.89	<0.001
N	179 SEMA_ID			179 SEMA_ID		
Observations	28868			28872		

Table S10. Parameter Estimates for Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1 – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	38.59 (1.71)	35.24 – 41.95	<0.001	35.21 (1.49)	32.30 – 38.13	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	4.69 (0.40)	3.92 – 5.47	<0.001			
Lagged Social Support	-0.26 (0.22)	-0.70 – 0.17	0.233	1.66 (0.22)	1.23 – 2.08	<0.001
Lagged Sharing				5.21 (0.35)	4.53 – 5.88	<0.001
N	179 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22502			22335		

Table S11. Parameter Estimates Reversed Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1 – Study 1

<i>Predictors</i>	Social Support			Social Support		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	56.08 (1.23)	53.68 – 58.49	<0.001	56.03 (1.23)	53.62 – 58.43	<0.001
Lagged Social Support	6.65 (0.35)	5.96 – 7.34	<0.001	6.25 (0.35)	5.55 – 6.95	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	-0.11 (0.22)	-0.54 – 0.31	0.597			
Lagged Sharing				1.26 (0.23)	0.81 – 1.70	<0.001
N	179 SEMA_ID			178 SEMA_ID		
Observations	22402			22243		

Table S12: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1a and 1b – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	37.24 (1.74)	33.83 – 40.64	<0.001	41.45 (1.66)	38.20 – 44.70	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	2.97 (0.47)	2.05 – 3.89	<0.001			
Social Support	-1.13 (0.47)	-2.05 – -0.21	0.017	3.97 (0.50)	3.00 – 4.94	<0.001
Lagged Sharing				2.66 (0.49)	1.70 – 3.61	<0.001
N	120 _{sema_id}			120 _{sema_id}		
Observations	4272			4264		

Table S13: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2a and 2b – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Valence			Valence		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.05 (0.27)	2.52 – 3.57	<0.001	3.05 (0.27)	2.53 – 3.57	<0.001
Lagged valence	0.82 (0.09)	0.66 – 0.99	<0.001	0.81 (0.09)	0.64 – 0.99	<0.001
Suppression	-0.16 (0.09)	- 0.34 – 0.02	0.086			
Sharing				-0.01 (0.10)	-0.19 – 0.18	0.941
N	122 <small>sema_id</small>			122 <small>sema_id</small>		
Observations	4421			4416		

Table S14: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3a and 3b – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Valence			Valence		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.03 (0.27)	2.49 – 3.56	<0.001	3.03 (0.27)	2.50 – 3.56	<0.001
Lagged Valence	0.78 (0.08)	0.61 – 0.94	<0.001	0.77 (0.09)	0.60 – 0.94	<0.001
Suppression	-0.13 (0.09)	-0.31 – 0.05	0.151			
Social Support	0.62 (0.07)	0.48 – 0.77	<0.001	0.66 (0.08)	0.50 – 0.83	<0.001
Suppression* Social Support	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.13 – 0.11	0.905			
Sharing				-0.15 (0.10)	-0.34 – 0.04	0.118
Sharing*Social Support				0.03 (0.07)	-0.11 – 0.16	0.683
N	120 sema_id			120 sema_id		
Observations	4334			4331		

Table S15: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 while controlling for the other ER strategy (i.e., Social Support predicting Expressive Suppression while controlling for Social Sharing, and Social Support predicting Social Sharing while controlling for Expressive Suppression) – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	37.27 (1.74)	33.87 – 40.68	<0.001	41.55 (1.66)	38.30 – 44.79	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	2.46 (0.46)	1.56 – 3.36	<0.001			
Sharing	-2.52 (0.79)	-4.07 – -0.98	0.002			
Social Support	-0.57 (0.44)	-1.44 – 0.29	0.198	3.63 (0.47)	2.71 – 4.54	<0.001
Lagged Sharing				2.19 (0.49)	1.24 – 3.14	<0.001
Suppression				-2.60 (0.79)	-4.14 – -1.06	0.001
N	120 <small>sema_id</small>			120 <small>sema_id</small>		
Observations	4261			4257		

Table S16. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2 with Expressive Suppression and Social Sharing as Simultaneous Predictors of Valence – Study 2

Valence			
<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.07 (0.27)	2.55 – 3.59	<0.001
Lagged Valence	0.79 (0.08)	0.63 – 0.95	<0.001
Sharing	-0.02 (0.09)	-0.21 – 0.16	0.795
Suppression	-0.18 (0.09)	-0.35 – -0.01	0.041
N _{sema_id}	122		
Observations	4405		

Table S17. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Expressive Suppression, Social Sharing and Social Support as Simultaneous Predictors of Valence – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Valence		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.04 (0.27)	2.50 – 3.57	<0.001
Lagged Valence	0.83 (0.06)	0.72 – 0.94	<0.001
Sharing	-0.18 (0.06)	-0.29 – -0.06	0.003
Social Support	0.65 (0.06)	0.53 – 0.77	<0.001
Suppression	-0.17 (0.06)	-0.28 – -0.06	0.003
Sharing*Social Support	0.01 (0.05)	-0.09 – 0.12	0.778
Suppression*Social Support	0.01 (0.05)	-0.09 – 0.11	0.864
N _{sema_id}	120		
Observations	4320		

Note. Due to convergence issues, this model only included fixed slopes.

Table S18. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1 without Lagged ER Use as a Predictor – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	37.20 (1.69)	33.89 – 40.50	<0.001	41.66 (1.62)	38.48 – 44.84	<0.001
Social Support	-0.90 (0.40)	-1.69 – -0.11	0.028	4.15 (0.46)	3.25 – 5.04	<0.001
N	120 <small>sema_id</small>			120 <small>sema_id</small>		
Observations	5767			5766		

Table S19. Parameter Estimates for Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1 – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Suppression			Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	37.18 (1.72)	33.80 – 40.56	<0.001	41.36 (1.66)	38.11 – 44.61	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	3.06 (0.48)	2.13 – 4.00	<0.001			
Lagged Social Support	0.21 (0.35)	-0.47 – 0.89	0.541	0.31 (0.37)	-0.41 – 1.03	0.399
Lagged Sharing				2.97 (0.51)	1.98 – 3.96	<0.001
N	120 _{sema_id}			120 _{sema_id}		
Observations	4271			4264		

Table S20. Parameter Estimates for Reverse Lagged Analyses Hypothesis 1 – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Social Support			Social Support		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	19.94 (1.57)	16.86 – 23.03	<0.001	20.08 (1.57)	17.00 – 23.16	<0.001
Lagged Social Support	4.25 (0.67)	2.94 – 5.56	<0.001	4.16 (0.68)	2.83 – 5.49	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	0.16 (0.48)	-0.77 – 1.09	0.738			
Lagged Sharing				0.48 (0.46)	-0.43 – 1.39	0.301
N	120 _{sema_id}			120 _{sema_id}		
Observations	4311			4311		

Table S21: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 2a and 2b with Negative Emotional Intensity with as the Dependent Variable – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Emotion			Negative Emotion		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	39.29 (1.33)	36.68 – 41.90	<0.001	39.26 (1.33)	36.66 – 41.86	<0.001
Lagged Negative Emotion	4.35 (0.51)	3.35 – 5.35	<0.001	4.19 (0.49)	3.23 – 5.15	<0.001
Suppression	3.75 (0.55)	2.66 – 4.83	<0.001			
Sharing				2.94 (0.61)	1.74 – 4.13	<0.001
N	122 _{sema_id}			122 _{sema_id}		
Observations	4401			4395		

Table S22: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3a and 3b with Negative Emotional Intensity with as the Dependent Variable – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Negative Emotion			Negative Emotion		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	39.13 (1.35)	36.48 – 41.77	<0.001	39.15 (1.34)	36.51 – 41.78	<0.001
Lagged Negative Emotion	4.15 (0.50)	3.17 – 5.13	<0.001	3.93 (0.46)	3.02 – 4.84	<0.001
Suppression	3.54 (0.55)	2.46 – 4.63	<0.001			
Social Support	-2.19 (0.50)	-3.17 – -1.21	<0.001	-2.98 (0.54)	-4.05 – -1.91	<0.001
Support*Social Support	-0.06 (0.35)	-0.75 – 0.63	0.858			
Sharing				3.62 (0.62)	2.41 – 4.83	<0.001
Sharing*Social Support				-0.37 (0.42)	-1.20 – 0.45	0.377
N	120 <small>sema_id</small>			120 <small>sema_id</small>		
Observations	4315			4311		

Table S23. Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3 with Perceived Regulation Success as the Dependent Variable – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Perceived Regulation Success			Perceived Regulation Success		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	65.58 (1.34)	62.94 – 68.21	<0.001	65.50 (1.33)	62.89 – 68.10	<0.001
Lagged Success	3.49 (0.46)	2.58 – 4.40	<0.001	3.33 (0.42)	2.51 – 4.16	<0.001
Suppression	0.06 (0.51)	-0.93 – 1.06	0.902			
Social Support	2.62 (0.38)	1.89 – 3.36	<0.001	2.82 (0.41)	2.02 – 3.63	<0.001
Suppression*Social Support	-0.63 (0.31)	-1.25 – -0.02	0.048			
Sharing				-0.46 (0.62)	-1.67 – 0.76	0.463
Sharing*Social Support				0.21 (0.33)	-0.43 – 0.85	0.516
N	120 _{sema_id}			120 _{sema_id}		
Observations	4249			4250		

Table S24: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 1a and 1b with Alternative Operationalization of Social Support (i.e., Excluding Cases when Participants were Alone) – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Expressive Suppression			Social Sharing		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	39.13 (1.72)	35.76 – 42.50	<0.001	44.77 (1.67)	41.50 – 48.04	<0.001
Lagged Suppression	3.09 (0.63)	1.85 – 4.33	<0.001			
Social Support	-3.14 (0.63)	-4.38 – -1.90	<0.001	4.13 (0.63)	2.89 – 5.36	<0.001
Lagged Social Sharing				2.38 (0.69)	1.03 – 3.74	0.001
N	120 <small>sema_id</small>			120 <small>sema_id</small>		
Observations	2264			2261		

Table S25: Parameter Estimates for Hypothesis 3a and 3b with Alternative Operationalization of Social Support (i.e., Excluding Cases when Participants were Alone) – Study 2

<i>Predictors</i>	Valence			Valence		
	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Estimate (SE)</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.21 (0.28)	2.67 – 3.75	<0.001	3.24 (0.27)	2.71 – 3.78	<0.001
Lagged Valence	0.67 (0.11)	0.46 – 0.88	<0.001	0.67 (0.11)	0.45 – 0.89	<0.001
Suppression	-0.08 (0.10)	- 0.28 – 0.11	0.404			
Social Support	0.96 (0.10)	0.77 – 1.16	<0.001	1.04 (0.12)	0.82 – 1.27	<0.001
Suppression*Social Support	-0.04 (0.08)	- 0.19 – 0.12	0.630			
Sharing				-0.27 (0.12)	-0.50 – - 0.03	0.028
Sharing*Social Support				0.11 (0.10)	- 0.09 – 0.31	0.297
N	120 <small>sema_id</small>			120 <small>sema_id</small>		
Observations	2294			2295		