

Emotion

Use of Linguistic Distancing and Cognitive Reappraisal Strategies During Emotion Regulation in Children, Adolescents, and Young Adults

Erik C. Nook, Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante, Hyun Young Cho, and Leah H. Somerville

Online First Publication, March 21, 2019. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000570>

CITATION

Nook, E. C., Vidal Bustamante, C. M., Cho, H. Y., & Somerville, L. H. (2019, March 21). Use of Linguistic Distancing and Cognitive Reappraisal Strategies During Emotion Regulation in Children, Adolescents, and Young Adults . *Emotion*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000570>

Use of Linguistic Distancing and Cognitive Reappraisal Strategies During Emotion Regulation in Children, Adolescents, and Young Adults

Erik C. Nook, Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante, Hyun Young Cho, and Leah H. Somerville
Harvard University

Regulating one's emotions is an important psychological skill at all ages. Cognitive reappraisal—changing the meaning of a stimulus to alter its emotional impact—is an effective emotion regulation technique. Prior work shows that adults spontaneously reduce their use of present tense verbs and first-person singular pronouns (e.g., *I, me, mine*) when engaging in cognitive reappraisal, a linguistic shift that is thought to track increased psychological distance. Here, we investigated whether such *linguistic distancing* during emotion regulation varied across age. Participants aged 10 to 23 ($N = 112$) spoke aloud their thoughts and feelings while completing a classic cognitive reappraisal task. Participants' verbal responses were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed for linguistic distancing, compliance with reappraisal instructions, and use of 8 different reappraisal strategies identified by prior researchers. Results replicated prior work in a developmental sample: Reappraisal decreased negative affect and increased linguistic distancing, and stronger linguistic distancing during reappraisal was associated with more successful emotion regulation. Contrary to hypotheses, we found no age differences in linguistic distancing or reappraisal success, even after excluding trials on which participants did not comply with reappraisal instructions. However, reappraisal strategy use varied across age. Use of the *changing circumstances* and *separating oneself* (i.e., *distancing*) strategies increased across age whereas *changing consequences* use decreased across age. Additionally, in adolescence, *challenging reality* use was elevated and *problem-solving* use was reduced compared to other ages. Results suggest that linguistic distancing during emotion regulation is stable from age 10 to 23 but use of cognitive reappraisal strategies differs.

Keywords: emotion regulation, psychological distancing, linguistic distancing, development, reappraisal strategies

Supplemental materials: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000570.supp>

Emotions play crucial roles in guiding behavior across all stages of human development. However, emotions can also impair functioning when too intense, too long-lasting, or poorly matched to the events that spur them (Gross & Jazaieri, 2014). Thus people must develop skills for regulating their emotions by learning to guide how their emotional experiences unfold (Gross, 1998b, 2015). One effective technique for regulating emotions—called *cognitive reappraisal*—involves changing the meaning of a stimulus to alter its emotional impact. For example, critical feedback from a parent or peer can be interpreted as helpful guidance for improvement rather than an indication that one is flawed. Substan-

tial evidence demonstrates that cognitive reappraisal is an effective method for regulating emotions (Buhle et al., 2014; Gross, 1998a, 2015) and that greater use of cognitive reappraisal is associated with the absence of several forms of psychopathology (Aldao, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Schweizer, 2010). As such, both basic and applied psychologists are interested in understanding how to facilitate successful cognitive reappraisal. Insight into age-related changes in the use of factors that facilitate effective emotion regulation could be especially valuable given that certain periods of development (e.g., adolescence) are characterized by increased risk for the onset of mental illness (Kessler et al., 2005).

Erik C. Nook, Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante, Hyun Young Cho, and Leah H. Somerville, Department of Psychology, Harvard University.

Erik C. Nook and Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante contributed equally to this work. Erik C. Nook and Leah H. Somerville developed the study design; Erik C. Nook programmed the computer task; Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante and Hyun Young Cho collected data; Hyun Young Cho oversaw reappraisal-coding process; Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante and Erik C. Nook analyzed data; authors collaboratively interpreted results; Erik C. Nook and Constanza M. Vidal Bustamante drafted the manuscript, and all other authors provided critical revisions. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission. Authors declare no conflicts of interest. Portions of these results have been shared via posters at

conferences of the Social and Affective Neuroscience Society (May, 2018) and the Society for Research in Psychopathology (September, 2018). This project was supported by a Harvard University startup grant to Leah H. Somerville and a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE1144152) to Erik C. Nook. The authors thank Amanda Brandt, Elisa Hornung, Jessica Hsu, Laurel Kordyban, Sandy Li, and Sadhana Ponnaluri for assistance with transcribing audio recordings; Katya Kabotyanski and Laurel Kordyban for assistance with recruitment; Michael Mayer for assistance with coding; Catherine Sebastian for the reappraisal coding system; and Patrick Mair for advice on statistical analysis.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Erik C. Nook, Department of Psychology, Harvard University, William James Hall, 33 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. E-mail: enook@g.harvard.edu

Robust evidence shows that one psychological skill that can facilitate self-regulation is a strategy called *psychological distancing* (Ayduk & Kross, 2010; Kross & Ayduk, 2011; Travers-Hill, Dunn, Hoppitt, Hitchcock, & Dalgleish, 2017; White, Kross, & Duckworth, 2015). Psychological distancing involves focusing on ways to separate oneself from sources of distress by increasing the psychological distance between oneself and a distressing cue. These distancing strategies can operate along physical (Silvers et al., 2012), social (Kross, Gard, Deldin, Clifton, & Ayduk, 2012), or temporal (Ahmed, Somerville, & Sebastian, 2018; Bruehlman-Senecal & Ayduk, 2015) dimensions. For example, one could distance oneself from a negative memory of critical feedback by seeing that moment from a third-person rather than first-person perspective (increasing social distance) and by focusing on how long ago that feedback was given (increasing temporal distance). Subtle interventions like these have been shown to increase one's psychological distance from the memory and consequently reduce its emotional impact (Kross, Davidson, Weber, & Ochsner, 2009). Creative designs have shown that even very young children (4–6 years of age) can successfully engage in psychological distancing and that doing so improves their performance on cognitively demanding or frustrating tasks (Grenell et al., 2018; White et al., 2017; White & Carlson, 2016).

Interestingly, the degree to which one has adopted a psychologically distanced perspective can be measured through psycholinguistics (Pennebaker & King, 1999). Use of words that refer to oneself (i.e., first-person singular pronouns; e.g., *I, me, mine*) and words that refer to the present moment (i.e., present-tense verbs; e.g., *feel, chase, lose*) indicate that a person is focused on the “here-and-now,” whereas less use of these word classes indicates a more distanced perspective. These linguistic markers are thought to arise because the mind scaffolds representations of spatial, social, and temporal distance onto a common neural and linguistic code (Casasanto & Boroditsky, 2008; Maglio, Trope, & Liberman, 2013; Parkinson, Liu, & Wheatley, 2014; Parkinson & Wheatley, 2013). Thus not only can people modulate psychological distance by reimagining situations in a distanced perspective, they can also engage in *linguistic distancing* to increase psychological distance merely by reducing use of first-person singular pronouns and present-tense verbs.

In fact, recent research demonstrates that cognitive reappraisal and linguistic distancing share a bidirectional relationship (Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017). When adults regulate their emotions by cognitively reappraising the meaning of negative images, they spontaneously distance their language, and participants who more strongly distance their language when reappraising are more successful at reducing their negative affect. Likewise, instructing participants to distance their language by writing about aversive images as if they are physically far away (physical distancing), without using the word *I* (social distancing), or without using present-tense verbs (temporal distancing) spontaneously reduces negative affect. These findings converge with other work on psychological distancing showing that subtle shifts in distancing one's language can reduce distress and even facilitate coping with stressful or traumatic experiences (Kaplow et al., 2018; Kross et al., 2014; Moser et al., 2017; Orvell, Kross, & Gelman, 2017).

From a developmental perspective, might the ability to regulate one's emotions vary across age? Indeed, evidence from several studies demonstrates that broad emotion regulation abilities im-

prove with age (Campos, Campos, & Barrett, 1989; Cole, Martin, & Dennis, 2004; Eisenberg, 2000; Gullone, Hughes, King, & Tonge, 2010; Tottenham, Hare, & Casey, 2011). Additionally, cognitive reappraisal success increases from childhood to young adulthood, especially in response to social scenes involving negative interactions between people (McRae, Gross, et al., 2012; Silvers et al., 2012, 2017b; Silvers, Shu, Hubbard, Weber, & Ochsner, 2015). Furthermore, fMRI data demonstrate that developments in the regulatory roles of ventrolateral and ventromedial prefrontal cortex activity explain age-related differences in cognitive reappraisal ability (Silvers et al., 2017b). These findings converge with neurodevelopmental evidence that these prefrontal regions undergo protracted development through this age window (Ahmed, Bittencourt-Hewitt, & Sebastian, 2015; Gogtay et al., 2004; Shaw et al., 2008). However, not all studies have found age-related improvements in cognitive reappraisal success across childhood and adolescence, either when down-regulating negative affect in response to aversive stimuli (Ahmed et al., 2018; Van Cauwenberge, Van Leeuwen, Hoppenbrouwers, & Wiersma, 2017) or when down-regulating craving in response to appetizing foods (Giuliani & Pfeifer, 2015; Silvers et al., 2014). Instead, these studies found no relations between reappraisal success and age.

However, the potential role of linguistic distancing in the development of emotion regulation remains unexplored. Studies have found age-related differences from childhood to young adulthood in the ability to “project” oneself into past or future autobiographical scenes (Abram, Picard, Navarro, & Piolino, 2014; Gott & Lah, 2014). To the extent that this psychological skill overlaps with psychological distancing, these data support the notion that increased spontaneous psychological distancing might underlie developmental differences in emotion regulation success. Thus we hypothesized that the tendency to spontaneously distance one's language during cognitive reappraisal would mediate increased emotion regulation success from childhood to young adulthood (see <https://osf.io/vcnry/> for preregistration of methods, hypotheses, and analysis plan). We administered a classic cognitive reappraisal paradigm that included a verbal assessment of participants' thoughts during reappraisal to participants aged 10 to 23. As such, this task assessed participants' reappraisal success and linguistic distancing. We hypothesized that both reappraisal success and linguistic distancing would increase across this age window and that increased linguistic distancing during reappraisal would mediate increased reappraisal success.

In addition to changes in emotion regulation success, the strategies that people use to reappraise a stimulus may also change across development. Emotion regulation is an umbrella term for several techniques that people can use to change how they feel, and developmental researchers have found that regulatory habits shift from more behavior-focused strategies (e.g., escaping a situation) to more cognitive-focused strategies (e.g., distracting oneself; Altschuler, Genevaro, Ruble, & Bonstein, 1995; Brown, Covell, & Abramovitch, 1991) across childhood. However, scholars have proposed that there is a taxonomy of strategies within cognitive reappraisal that differ from each other in important ways (Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2013; McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012; Sheppes et al., 2014). For example, people can reappraise the meaning of an aversive stimulus by pretending it is fake (*challenging reality*) or by reinterpreting the details of the stimulus to make it less negative (*changing circumstances*; McRae, Ciesielski, &

Gross, 2012). Few studies have assessed use of different reappraisal strategies in developmental samples, and these studies largely ask participants to retrospectively report which strategies they tend to use rather than assessing their actual strategy use in experimental tasks (Cracco, Goossens, & Braet, 2017; Zimmermann & Iwanski, 2014; though see Lennarz, Hollenstein, Lichtwarck-Aschoff, Kuntsche, & Granic, 2018, who took an experience-sampling approach). As such, age-related differences in reappraisal strategy use remain unclear.

To address the scientific gaps outlined above, this study investigated three research questions using a classic cognitive reappraisal task in which participants' thoughts and feelings were audio recorded, transcribed, and coded. First, do relations between linguistic distancing and cognitive reappraisal found in adults replicate in a developmental sample? Second, do indices of reappraisal success and/or linguistic distancing change from childhood to young adulthood? Third, are there age-related differences in the strategies people use when reappraising their emotions? This study was originally designed to address the first two of these questions (as noted in the preregistration, <https://osf.io/vcnyr/>). The decision to investigate the third question concerning age-related differences in reappraisal strategy use was added after data collection was complete. Hence, analyses concerning reappraisal strategy use should be considered as exploratory both because the analyses were defined following preregistration and because the study design was not optimized to address this question. In particular, the instructions used in this study mentioned specific reappraisal strategies as examples and thus may have biased participants' strategy choices (see the online supplemental materials for task instructions). Even though patterns observed in this study can provide initial insight into how reappraisal strategy choice might differ across age, these methodological limitations should be kept in mind.

Method and Materials

Participants

One hundred 24 participants aged 10–23 recruited from our laboratory's participant database completed the study. Adult participants and guardians of minor participants provided informed consent prior to participation, and minor participants assented to participation. We excluded three participants due to missing or unintelligible audio recordings, eight participants who failed to meet an a priori compliance threshold (i.e., \geq two thirds of all reappraisal trials must have been verified as using reappraisal instructions), and one participant who failed to understand task instructions. Thus, 112 participants were included in final analyses (50.89% male, one did not disclose sex; 65.18% Caucasian, 14.29% Black, 9.82% Asian, 10.71% Other; 8.93% Hispanic; age range = 10.02–23.87, $M_{\text{age}} = 17.07$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 3.95$). Age was not a significant predictor of sex (logistic regression $\beta = -.01$, $p = .974$) nor of any of the race or ethnicity markers ($ps > .05$), suggesting that the sex and race distributions of the sample were not systematically related to age. The Committee for Use of Human Subjects at Harvard University approved all methods for this study (IRB15-4030: "Developmental brain predictors of subsequent emotion change"). Participants received \$20 for their time. Although this study adapted methods from Nook, Schleider, and

Somerville (2017), the current study reports on a nonoverlapping sample.

Preregistration for this study was filed on Open Science Framework following the completion of a pilot phase with 53 participants (<https://osf.io/vcnyr/>). As described in the preregistration, we used a power analysis to select a target sample size that would allow us to test three hypothesized relations between (a) age and linguistic distancing, (b) linguistic distancing and reappraisal success, and (c) age and reappraisal success. To our knowledge, there were no previous studies examining age-related effects in the relationship between linguistic distancing and reappraisal success (i.e., path a). Prior work suggested that the effect size for the b path (i.e., a correlation between linguistic distancing and reappraisal success, $r = .28$; Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017) was smaller than the effect size for the c path (i.e., the increase in reappraisal success across age, $\beta = .446$; McRae, Gross, et al., 2012). To ensure we had sufficient power to detect the smaller of these effects, we conducted a power analysis based on the weakest hypothesized relationship (i.e., path b: a correlation between linguistic distancing and emotion regulation success). This power analysis indicated that we required at least 98 participants to reproduce at 80% power. We increased the target sample size to 112 to provide additional power to detect smaller effects and to allow us to collect an even number of participants (i.e., 8, allowing for a target of 4 girls and 4 boys of each age) across the 14 ages in the 10–23 age window. This final target sample size was preregistered and subsequently collected.

Stimuli and Procedure

The paradigm for this study was an abbreviated version of Study 1 reported in Nook, Schleider, and Somerville (2017). On each trial, participants saw the cue word *LOOK* or the cue word *CHANGE* above an image for 30 seconds (Figure 1). Participants were instructed that the cue word *LOOK* meant that they should "just look at the picture and let yourself feel whatever that image makes you feel." The cue word *CHANGE* indicated that they should regulate their emotions by reappraising the meaning of the image (see online supplemental materials for task instructions). Participants were instructed to reinterpret the meaning of the image to make it less negative (e.g., imagine that the objects are fake or that something good is about to happen; Gross, 1998b, 2015). Piloting revealed that children were slower at typing than adults; thus to avoid this potential confound, participants were asked to say out loud (rather than type) what they were thinking and feeling about each image, and their answers were audio recorded. The image automatically advanced after 30 seconds. Participants were instructed not to advance the screen before the requisite time had elapsed, and compliance with this instruction was near perfect (99.8% of total trials). After responding to each image according to trial instructions, participants rated how they were feeling on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not bad at all* to 7 = *Extremely bad*). Negative affect ratings were self-paced.

Trials were divided into three conditions: (a) look negative, (b) reappraise negative, and (c) look neutral. Participants completed 12 trials of each condition. We assembled three lists of 12 child-friendly images from the Open Affective Standardized Image Set (OASIS; Kurdi, Lozano, & Banaji, 2017). These image lists were subsets of those used in Nook, Schleider, and Somerville (2017);




Figure 1. Task schematic. Participants said aloud their thoughts and feelings about an image for 30 seconds before rating how bad they felt. *LOOK* or *CHANGE* cues were presented above images to sort trials into look negative, reappraise negative, and look neutral conditions. In look negative and look neutral trials, participants said aloud their natural thoughts and feelings in response to negative and neutral images, respectively. In reappraise negative trials, participants talked about their thoughts and feelings while reappraising the meaning of the image to make it less negative. Photos are from the OASIS image set (Kurdi, Lozano, & Banaji, 2017). See the online article for the color version of this figure.

see Table S1 in the online supplemental materials for stimuli details). One list included only neutral images (e.g., paper clips, mugs, rocks; normed valence ratings between 4 and 5 on a 1–9 scale where lower scores are more negative; valence: $M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.26$; arousal: $M = 2.44$, $SD = 0.33$). Neutral images were always paired with the *LOOK* instruction. The other two lists both included negative images only, and they were matched for valence (List A: $M = 2.39$, $SD = 0.49$; List B: $M = 2.42$, $SD = 0.41$; comparison between lists: $t(22) = 0.13$, $p = .899$) and arousal (List A: $M = 4.39$, $SD = 0.51$; List B: $M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.53$; comparison between lists: $t(22) = 0.32$, $p = .750$). Negative images included a wide variety of emotional scenes (e.g., a baby crying, frightening animals, a woman at a cemetery, natural disasters, polluted beaches, abandoned animals, people expressing anger), and the two lists were well matched on image content (see Table S1 in the online supplemental materials). Mapping of each negative image list to look negative or reappraise negative conditions was counterbalanced across participants to ensure that differences between the look negative and reappraise negative conditions were not due to stimulus differences. Participants reported their date of birth, sex, and race at the beginning of the survey. We produced unrounded measures of participants' ages by calculating the number of days between their date of birth and the date they completed the study and dividing this number by 365.25. This ensured that all statistical analyses and figures used a continuous measure of age (e.g., 15.091 rather than 15).

Data Processing

Following data collection, audio recordings of participants' thoughts and feelings during each trial—amounting to a total of 45 hr of recordings—were transcribed into text files by trained research assistants. Transcribing each participant's audio data required approximately 1 hour, meaning transcriptions required about 123 hr in total. Transcribers were instructed to mark any segments where they were uncertain of what was said by the

participant, and these segments were checked by at least one other transcriber. If the segment remained unintelligible after a final check by the first author, it was excluded from linguistic analyses. Of the 1,275 trials included in final analyses, 17 trials (i.e., 1%) contained unintelligible segments, suggesting that almost all vocalizations were readily understood and transcribed. In addition to the cross checking of unintelligible segments among the transcribers, transcriptions were spot checked for quality by the first author.

To ensure that participants complied with task instructions, three trained coders reviewed participants' transcribed responses to all reappraisal trials and coded each of them for compliance (i.e., that they did indeed use a cognitive reappraisal strategy when instructed to do so). Coders also coded which reappraisal strategy or strategies participants used on each trial. The third author acted as the master coder (i.e., she coded all reappraisal trials) and the other two coders provided second codings for approximately half of the reappraisal trials each. In this initial coding process, discrepancies between coders on strategies used for each trial were rare (93% agreement in initial codings) across all trials included in final analyses. These discrepancies were resolved through discussion, and coders came to full (i.e., 100%) agreement for all codings.

Across all subjects who understood task instructions and had usable audio responses ($N = 120$), 11.46% of all trials were found to be noncompliant. Participants who failed to meet the a priori compliance threshold (that is, over one third of reappraisal trials [≥ 5 trials] were noncompliant) were excluded from all analyses. Noncompliant trials from included participants (i.e., 7.81% of trials) were also excluded from analyses to ensure dependent measures only included compliant trials. Although the mean age of participants excluded due to noncompliance (14.18 years) was slightly lower than the full sample's mean age, robust regressions revealed no significant relations between age and a participant's number of noncompliant trials neither in the full dataset of 120 participants who provided usable data, $\beta = -.06$, $p = .327$, nor the final dataset of 112 participants after excluding those who failed to meet the compliance

threshold, $\beta = -.02$, $p = .843$. Additionally, significance of results did not change when including all usable data including noncompliant participants and trials (with three minor exceptions noted in the online supplemental materials).

Following prior research (McRae, Gross, et al., 2012; Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017; Silvers et al., 2012; Wager, Davidson, Hughes, Lindquist, & Ochsner, 2008), we computed each participant's average negative affect rating for trials in each condition (look negative, reappraise negative, and look neutral). We then created measures of (a) *emotional reactivity* (i.e., average look negative affect rating – average look neutral affect rating) and (b) *reappraisal success* (i.e., average look negative affect rating – average reappraise negative affect rating) for each participant. In addition to this self-report measure of affect, we used Pennebaker's Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) program to produce a set of linguistic measures from participants' verbal responses to each trial type (Pennebaker, Chung, Ireland, Gonzales, & Booth, 2007). LIWC computes the percentage of words that fall within grammatical categories (e.g., verbs, first-person singular pronouns) and content categories (e.g., body-related words, affect related words). Qualitative and empirical investigations have related these categories to psychological phenomena of interest, such as affective state, temporal focus, and certain cognitive processes (Doré, Ort, Braverman, & Ochsner, 2015; Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017; Pennebaker et al., 2007; Tackman et al., 2018).

We focused linguistic analyses on (a) negative affect words (e.g., *hurt, nasty, worried, sad, crying, annoyed*), (b) positive affect words (e.g., *love, nice, sweet, happy, laughing, cute*), and (c) a composite linguistic measure of psychological distancing (following Mehl, Robbins, & Holleran, 2012). This composite measure combined use of first-person singular pronouns (e.g., *I, me, my*), present-tense verbs, articles (*the, a, an*), discrepancy words (e.g., *would, could, should*), and words of more than six letters across trials (see Mehl et al., 2012 and Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017 for more detailed descriptions of how this composite measure was computed). We averaged this measure of linguistic distancing across trials within each condition for each participant. Low linguistic distancing scores indicated that participants used language that was personal, experiential, and focused on the here-and-now, whereas high linguistic distancing scores indicated that language was impersonal, abstract, and not focused on the here-and-now.

Analogous to the measure of reappraisal success, we then computed measures of how much each participant modulated their affective and distancing language when regulating their emotions by subtracting each participant's average frequency of negative affect words, positive affect words, and linguistic distancing words in the look negative condition from their average use in the reappraise negative condition. More positive values for these variables indicated that participants showed a larger increase in their use of each word type when reappraising relative to responding naturally.

The trained coders also coded the use of eight strategies used in each reappraisal trial, following the system developed by McRae and colleagues (McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012). Each reappraisal was coded as fitting one or more of these strategies (mean number of strategies used per trial = 1.31, $SD = 0.21$): (a) *changing circumstances* (i.e., reinterpreting the current circum-

stances of the event so that the event is less negative than initially thought; e.g., "the boy is crying out of happiness"¹); (b) *challenging reality* (i.e., the event might not be real; e.g., "it's from a movie" or "it's just a photo"); (c) *changing consequences* (i.e., the future outcome of the negative event will be less negative than initially thought; e.g., "someone will see this stray dog and feel sorry for him, so they will adopt him and he will have a much better life"); (d) *acceptance* (i.e., accepting or simply "being ok with" the negative situation; e.g., "it's alright because death is part of the circle of life, that is just how nature works"); (e) *introducing agency* (i.e., someone with necessary skills will be able to change the negative event; e.g., "firefighters will come and stop the fire"); (f) *making positive* (i.e., reinterpreting the situation to make it better than if the negative event had never happened; e.g., "he seems very sad and frustrated like he just broke up with his girlfriend, but perhaps it was a very toxic relationship and it is good he got out of it"); (g) *separating oneself*² (i.e., the reappraisal invokes a sense of physical or psychological distance from the negative event; e.g., "the snake is at the zoo, behind glass, and it cannot get to me"); and (h) *problem-solving* (i.e., specific steps can be taken to improve or solve the negative event; e.g., "the neighbors can get organized in groups and clean all the litter on the beach so that the sea is not polluted"). See McRae, Ciesielski, and Gross (2012) for further details of this coding system. We also included *Other* as a category to capture reappraisals that did not clearly fall under any of the categories outlined above.

Analyses

Replicating cognitive reappraisal and linguistic distancing effects in a developmental sample. Our first research question concerned whether the results we found in a previous adult sample (Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017) would replicate in a non-overlapping developmental sample of children, adolescents and adults. We evaluated how cognitive emotion regulation affected (a) negative affect ratings, (b) affect word use, and (c) linguistic signatures of psychological distance. Repeated-measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs) tested for significant differences across the three conditions in four dependent variables (i.e., negative affect ratings, negative affect word use, positive affect word use, and linguistic distancing). When significant main effects emerged, follow-up paired-samples *t* tests assessed for differences between the reappraise negative condition and the other two conditions. We hypothesized that regulating negative emotions would be associated with reduced negative affect (i.e., reduced self-reported negative affect ratings, reduced use of negative affect words, and increased use of positive affect words) and increased linguistic distancing. To confirm that emotion regulation was associated with increases in specific aspects of social and temporal distancing, we present analyses of each subcomponent of the linguistic distancing measure in the online supplemental materials. Note that 90% confidence intervals (CIs) are reported for ANOVA statistics be-

¹ Example reappraisals provided here are taken from participants' actual responses to the task.

² The *separating oneself* strategy is typically referred to simply as *distancing* (see McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012). However, we decided to rename it throughout this paper to avoid it being confused with *psychological distancing* or *linguistic distancing*.

cause the ANOVA F test is technically a one-sided test (Lakens, 2013).

We then investigated whether the tendency to use more psychologically distant language when regulating was associated with more successful emotion regulation. We used robust regressions to test the hypothesis that higher reappraisal success scores would be associated with stronger reductions in use of negative affect words when regulating, stronger increases in use of positive affect words when regulating, and increased linguistic distancing when regulating.

Relations between cognitive reappraisal, linguistic distancing, and age. Our second research question concerned how age was related to reappraisal success, linguistic distancing, emotion reactivity, raw negative affect ratings in each condition, and changes in negative and positive affect word use when regulating. Following prior work (McRae, Gross, et al., 2012; Silvers et al., 2012, 2017b), we hypothesized that emotion reactivity would remain constant across age but reappraisal success would increase across age. Because some previous work had found that emotion regulation success increases linearly with age but others report both linear and quadratic effects (McRae, Gross, et al., 2012; Silvers et al., 2012), we tested both linear and nonlinear age models. We also hypothesized that linguistic distancing when regulating emotions would increase with age. To ensure that age-related differences in overall affect ratings (i.e., even to neutral images; Silvers et al., 2017a) did not mask developmental differences in other dependent variables, we also subjected raw average negative affect ratings in each condition to these analyses. Finally, we tested whether age was related to changes in the use of negative and positive affect words when regulating to assess relations between age and linguistic measures of affect.

To allow for the possibility of nonlinear relationships between age and these dependent variables, we followed recent methods (Nook et al., 2018; Rodman, Powers, & Somerville, 2017) and subjected each dependent variable to a set of robust regression models that tested for both linear and nonlinear age trajectories. Adjudicating between different age-related patterns is important to accurately characterize the shape of relations between age and dependent variables, as simple linear regressions may miss more complex curvilinear trajectories. For instance, a quadratic relationship with age would suggest that the middle of the age range (i.e., late adolescence) differed from other ages. A cubic relationship with age would suggest a more complex nonlinear pattern such that the dependent variable rose, fell, and rose again (or vice versa) across the age range of the sample.

Thus three robust regression models were tested for each dependent variable, corresponding to (a) linear, (b) quadratic, or (c) cubic relationships with age. Quadratic and cubic age models included the respective lower order polynomial transformations of age as regressors within the model (i.e., the quadratic age model also included a linear term for age, and the cubic age model also included linear and quadratic terms for age). We compared these three models to each other, as well as to a simple null model. The best fitting age model was the model that had (a) the lowest Akaike's information criterion (AIC, a common metric for model fit), and (b) a significant p value (i.e., $p < .05$, indicating a significant improvement over the null model). When the null model provided the lowest AIC or when no model produced a significant fit, it was concluded that no significant age effect

existed for that dependent variable. However, when the linear model provided the best fit as determined by lowest AIC and a significant linear effect (i.e., $p < .05$), we tested whether this model provided a significantly better fit relative to the null model using a likelihood ratio test (LRT). When a nonlinear model (i.e., a cubic or quadratic model) produced the lowest AIC and had a significant cubic or quadratic regressor (i.e., $p < .05$), we used LRTs to compare it to the model with the second-lowest AIC to ensure it provided a significantly better fit than all other models.

Reappraisal strategy use across age. Our third research question concerned potential differences in what reappraisal strategies participants used across age. Following preregistration, we determined the importance of verifying that participants complied with reappraisal instructions during reappraisal trials, and therefore we added methods to code reappraisal compliance as well as the strategies participants used in each reappraisal. These extra analyses are thus exploratory in nature. We present them as descriptive characterizations of age-related differences in spontaneous use of reappraisal strategies that may prompt questions for future research. It is important to note that task instructions included example reappraisal strategies that fell within three of the categories we coded (i.e., changing circumstances, changing consequences, and challenging reality, see the online supplemental materials), and this may have affected participants' reappraisal strategy choices.

The use of each reappraisal strategy for each subject was quantified as the proportion of compliant reappraisal trials in which they employed each strategy. To investigate whether the average number of reappraisal strategies used in each trial varied across age, and how the frequency of use of each reappraisal strategy varied across age, the same three age models outlined in the previous section (i.e., linear, quadratic, and cubic) as well as a simple null model were fit to the average number of strategies used per trial and to the use of each reappraisal strategy. We used the same criteria to determine the best fitting model as described in the previous section (that is, lowest AIC, significant age regressor, and [when needed] a significant LRT confirming it provided a significantly better fit than less complicated models).

Linguistic complexity control analyses. Finally, we conducted a set of post hoc analyses testing whether age-related variation in linguistic complexity (i.e., the sophistication with which an individual can express information via language; Lust, Foley, & Dye, 2009; Pallotti, 2015; Ravid, 2005) could explain age-related differences in the cognitive reappraisal strategies verbalized in this task. Although the study did not include independent measures of verbal ability or verbal fluency, prior research has used measures ascertained by LIWC to assess linguistic complexity (Pennebaker & King, 1999; Saslow et al., 2014). This approach hinges on the notion that more complex language involves expressing information with more nuance (i.e., making more distinctions and qualifications). As such, linguistic complexity scores can be formed by combining the LIWC categories of exclusive words (e.g., *but*, *except*, *however*, *unless*), tentative words (e.g., *maybe*, *perhaps*, *guess*), negations (e.g., *neither*, *never*, *cannot*), discrepancies (e.g., *should*, *would*), and the reverse-scored use of inclusive words (e.g., *with*, *also*, *plus*). We report details of these analyses and their results in the online supplemental materials.

Analytic software and data availability. All analyses were conducted in RStudio (RStudio Team, 2016). We conducted polynomial age analyses using the *poly* function in the core stats package (R Core Team, 2018), robust regressions using the *rlm* function in the MASS package (Venables & Ripley, 2002), and likelihood ratio tests using the *lrtest* function in the *lme4* package (Zeileis & Hothorn, 2002). Data for this study can be downloaded from <https://osf.io/ex5gy/>.

Results

Replicating Cognitive Reappraisal and Linguistic Distancing Effects in a Developmental Sample

All results reported in Study 1 of Nook, Schleider, and Somerville (2017) are replicated in this developmental sample. Details of these results are reported below.

Self-reported negative affect ratings. Self-reported negative affect ratings differed significantly across conditions, $F(2, 222) = 401.06$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .78$, 90% CI = [.74, .81] (Figure 2A).

Participants reported feeling less negative affect in response to images in the reappraise negative condition ($M = 2.90$, $SD = .99$) than in response to images in the look negative condition ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.05$), $t(111) = 11.52$, $p < .001$, 95% CI of mean difference = [0.68, 0.96], Cohen's $d = 1.09$. Unsurprisingly, ratings for images in the reappraise negative condition were higher than ratings for images in the look neutral condition ($M = 1.52$, $SD = 0.55$), $t(111) = 17.38$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.23, 1.54], $d = 1.64$.

Affect words. Reappraisal affected the use of negative and positive affect words. The prevalence of negative affect words differed significantly across conditions, $F(2, 222) = 273.62$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .71$, 90% CI [.66, .75]. Participants used fewer negative affect words in the reappraise negative condition ($M = 3.19\%$, $SD = 1.06$) than in the look negative condition ($M = 5.51\%$, $SD = 1.84$), $t(111) = 13.66$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.98, 2.65], $d = 1.29$. Participants used more negative affect words in the reappraise negative condition than the look neutral condition ($M = 1.63\%$, $SD = 1.12$), $t(111) = 11.38$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.28, 1.82], $d = 1.08$. Similarly, the frequency of positive affect words differed




Figure 2. Linguistic distancing results. (A) Average negative affect ratings for each condition. Participants reported feeling less negative affect in response to images after regulating their emotions compared to passively looking at them. (B) Average linguistic distancing (mean z-scored frequencies of word types tracking psychological distance) in each condition. Participants used significantly more distant language in the reappraise negative condition than the other conditions. (C) Scatterplot showing the relation between reappraisal success (the extent to which participants reduced their negative affect when regulating their emotions) and the extent to which participants increased their use of words encoding psychological distance when regulating. Participants who showed stronger linguistic distancing when regulating were more successful at regulating their emotions. Panels A and B error bars are 95% confidence intervals adjusted for within-subjects comparisons following Morey (2008). The black line in panel C shows a robust linear regression fit, and the gray shading represents 95% confidence interval of the linear regression. *** $p < .001$.

significantly across conditions, $F(2, 222) = 60.01, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .35$, 90% CI [.27, .42]. Participants used more positive affect words in the reappraise negative condition ($M = 3.44\%$, $SD = 1.29$) than the look negative condition ($M = 2.94\%$, $SD = 1.37$), $t(111) = 3.71, p < .001$, 95% CI [0.24, 0.77], $d = 0.35$. Participants used fewer positive affect words in the reappraise negative condition than the look neutral condition ($M = 4.77\%$, $SD = 2.15$), $t(111) = 6.82, p < .001$, 95% CI [0.94, 1.71], $d = 0.64$.

Linguistic distancing. Critically, participants spontaneously increased their use of words coding psychological distance when regulating their emotional responses to negative images. The composite measure of linguistic distance differed significantly across conditions, $F(2, 222) = 24.73, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .18$, 90% CI [.11, .25] (Figure 2B). Participants' verbal responses were more distanced in the reappraise negative condition ($M = 0.11, SD = 0.27$) than in the look negative condition ($M = -0.08, SD = 0.31$), $t(111) = 6.03, p < .001$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.26], $d = 0.57$. Additionally, verbal responses were more distanced in the reappraise negative condition than in the look neutral condition ($M = 0.02, SD = 0.28$), $t(111) = 3.39, p < .001$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.14], $d = 0.32$. This pattern existed for all components of the linguistic distancing variable except for words of more than six letters (Table S2 in the online supplemental materials).

Relations between linguistic measures and reappraisal success. As in the adult sample, a robust regression showed that participants in this developmental sample who more strongly distanced their language when regulating were more successful at regulating their emotions, $\beta = .24, p = .010$ (Figure 2C). Significant regressions emerged between reappraisal success and two components of the linguistic distancing measure (i.e., first-person singular pronouns and present-tense verbs), but this relationship was not significant for discrepancy words, articles, or words of greater than six letters (Table S3 in the online supplemental

materials). Greater reappraisal success was also associated with reduced use of negative affect words when regulating as compared with when responding naturally, $\beta = -.23, p = .011$, and it was also associated with increased use of positive affect words when regulating, $\beta = .26, p = .003$.

Relations Between Cognitive Reappraisal, Linguistic Distancing, and Age

Comparisons between null, linear, quadratic, and cubic age models were used to assess whether behavior in the cognitive reappraisal task differed across age. Contrary to hypotheses, age was not significantly related to any of the emotion regulation variables of interest, as the null model produced the best fit for each dependent variable (Table S4 in online supplemental materials). We did not find any significant age-related differences in emotional reactivity, reappraisal success, or linguistic distancing when regulating. To ensure that this lack of effect was not due to overall differences in emotional responding, we analyzed raw negative affect ratings in each condition and confirmed that age was not significantly related to reported affect in the reappraise negative, look negative, or look neutral conditions (Figure 3). Similarly, there were no significant age-related differences in how strongly participants changed their use of negative or positive affect words when reappraising. In the preregistration of this project (<https://osf.io/vcn9r/>) we planned to conduct a robust mediation testing whether increased linguistic distancing when regulating mediated increased reappraisal success across age. However, because we found no relations between age and reappraisal success or linguistic distancing (the a and b paths of the mediation model), a mediation analysis was not justified.




Figure 3. Robust regressions of mean self-reported negative affect ratings in each condition suggest no age-related differences in negative affect when participants regulated their emotions, nor when they passively looked at negative images or at neutral images. Lines display robust linear regression fits, and gray shaded regions represent 95% CIs.

Reappraisal Strategy Use Across Age

Overall use of each strategy. The overall use of each of the nine reappraisal strategies was first calculated at the subject level (as the percentage of usable trials that used each strategy). These participant-level proportions were then averaged across the sample (see Figure 4). Overall use of each of the nine reappraisal strategies differed significantly, $F(8, 888) = 269.15, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .71, 90\% \text{ CI} = [.68, .73]$. *Changing circumstances* was the most frequently used strategy ($M = 69.39\%, SD = 19.96$), followed by *challenging reality* ($M = 25.18\%, SD = 24.99$) and *changing consequences* ($M = 8.74\%, SD = 13.52$). These were followed by *acceptance* ($M = 7.78\%, SD = 11.99$), *introducing agency* ($M = 7.13\%, SD = 10.37$), *making positive* ($M = 5.14\%, SD = 8.98$), *separating oneself* ($M = 3.88\%, SD = 6.78$), and *problem-solving* ($M = 3.36\%, SD = 6.56$). The *Other* category was needed for only one trial (0.08%) across all subjects. On this trial, the subject reminded himself he had already overcome a similar situation and used this personal experience to keep negative feelings in perspective.

Reappraisal strategy use across age. We used model comparisons to assess whether the number of reappraisal strategies used per trial and the average use of each reappraisal strategy were best explained by a null, linear, quadratic, or cubic age model (Table 1). We did not find significant age-related differences in the number of strategies used for each reappraisal trial. Figure 5 shows the best fitting models of age for the five reappraisal strategies for which age was a significant predictor of strategy use. Model comparisons revealed that the linear age model was the best fit for *changing circumstances* (Figure 5A, LRT comparing linear and null models: $\chi^2 = 4.86, \text{degrees of freedom (DF)} = 1, p = .027$); the cubic age model was the best fit for *challenging reality* (Figure 5B, LRT comparison to null model, the next best

fitting model: $\chi^2 = 7.98, \text{DF} = 3, p = .046$); the linear age model was the best fit for *changing consequences* (Figure 5C, LRT comparing linear and null models: $\chi^2 = 6.65, \text{DF} = 1, p = .010$); the null model was the best fit for the use of *acceptance*, for *introducing agency*, and for *making positive*; the linear age model was the best fit for *separating oneself* (Figure 5D, LRT comparing linear and null models: $\chi^2 = 28.05, \text{DF} = 1, p < .001$); and the cubic age model was the best fit for *problem-solving* (Figure 5E, LRT comparison to linear model, the next best fitting model: $\chi^2 = 25.11, \text{DF} = 2, p < .001$). Note that relations between age and use of *changing circumstances*, *challenging reality*, and *problem-solving* strategies were reduced to statistical trends when including noncompliant participants and trials (see online supplemental materials).

Linguistic complexity control analyses. Analyses revealed no significant linear, quadratic, or cubic relations between age and the linguistic complexity measure produced by LIWC (see Pennebaker & King, 1999; Saslow et al., 2014; online supplemental materials). Null models were the best fit both for overall average linguistic complexity scores and also the extent to which participants increased their linguistic complexity while regulating. Although this was a post hoc analysis using a somewhat crude measure of linguistic complexity, this result provides initial evidence that age-related differences in linguistic complexity could not mediate or confound age-related differences in other dependent variables.

Discussion

This study investigated age-related differences in cognitive reappraisal from childhood to young adulthood. Participants' verbally expressed thoughts and feelings were recorded during a classic cognitive reappraisal task and analyzed to test how linguis-




Figure 4. Average use of each reappraisal strategy. The percentage of compliant trials that used each reappraisal strategy was first computed for each participant, and then averaged across all subjects for each reappraisal strategy. Error bars represent 95% CIs adjusted for within-subjects comparisons following Morey (2008). Note that the *separating oneself* strategy is typically referred to as *distancing* (see McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012), and was renamed in this paper to avoid confusion with the broader concept of *psychological distancing* or the measure of *linguistic distancing*.

Table 1
Results of Polynomial Models for the Use of Each
Reappraisal Strategy

Reappraisal strategy	Model	β	p	AIC
Average number of strategies used	Null			321.53
	Linear	-.11	.268	321.68
	Quadratic	.02	.517	323.72
	Cubic	.04	.693	325.56
Changing circumstances	Null			320.95
	Linear	.20	.040*	318.09
	Quadratic	-.06	.100	319.79
	Cubic	.05	.190	321.29
Challenging reality	Null			320.88
	Linear	-.10	.301	321.37
	Quadratic	.009	.586	323.35
	Cubic	.26	.040*	318.90
Changing consequences	Null			324.31
	Linear	-.15	.010*	319.67
	Quadratic	.04	.040*	322.26
	Cubic	-.08	.024*	320.54
Acceptance	Null			323.51
	Linear	.01	.831	325.77
	Quadratic	.04	.813	328.06
	Cubic	.04	.889	329.72
Introducing agency	Null			324.72
	Linear	.05	.452	327.38
	Quadratic	-.02	.740	328.91
	Cubic	-.14	.194	326.65
Making positive	Null			325.25
	Linear	-.07	.291	323.70
	Quadratic	.03	.521	325.28
	Cubic	.05	.605	327.50
Separating oneself	Null			344.72
	Linear	.15	.034*	318.67
	Quadratic	-.08	.048*	318.94
	Cubic	-.03	.099	320.04
Problem-solving	Null			347.05
	Linear	.01	.110	346.97
	Quadratic	.001	.255	350.57
	Cubic	-.14	.038*	325.86

Note. Bold text indicates best fitting model for each dependent variable, as determined by AIC, p -value, and LRT. β = standardized beta, AIC = Akaike Information Criterion. Note that the *separating oneself* strategy is typically referred to as *distancing* (see McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012), and was renamed in this paper to avoid confusion with the broader concept of *psychological distancing* or the measure of *linguistic distancing*.

* $p < .05$.

tic distancing and the use of reappraisal strategies differed across age. Consistent with hypotheses and prior work, we found that participants reduced their negative affect when reappraising negative images and spontaneously increased their linguistic distance when reappraising. Additionally, stronger linguistic distancing during reappraisal was associated with more successful down-regulation of negative affect, an effect that was evident in both self-report and linguistic measures. Contrary to hypotheses, we found no age-related differences in reappraisal success, linguistic distancing, or any other affective or linguistic measure from this task. However, use of five reappraisal strategies showed significant relations with age. Participants' tendency to reappraise images by changing circumstances or psychologically distancing themselves showed linear increases across age, their tendency to change the consequences of the situation decreased linearly with age, and their tendency to challenge reality or problem solve showed non-

linear relations with age. However, reappraisal strategy results should be interpreted with caution given that task instructions likely primed participants to use a specific subset of strategies. Nonetheless, together these findings extend understanding of the psychological and linguistic processes underlying the development of successful emotion regulation.

In addition to replicating prior work showing that adults distance their language when regulating their emotions and that stronger linguistic distancing is associated with more successful regulation (Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017), we also found that participants' tendency to spontaneously distance their language when regulating emotions remained stable across this developmental window. This result suggests that by late childhood, people spontaneously increase psychological and linguistic distance from aversive stimuli during emotion regulation. This reveals an unexplored feature of children and adolescents' emotion regulation abilities. Additionally, because linguistic distancing tracked successful reappraisal for children and adolescents (as well as adults), it is possible that encouraging children and adolescents to distance their language during cognitive reappraisal could increase the efficacy of this regulatory strategy. This implies that future research should investigate the clinical utility of linguistic distancing in childhood, adolescent, and adult samples.

However, based on evidence that the ability to project into past or future autobiographical scenes becomes more rich (Gott & Lah, 2014) and more specific (Abram et al., 2014) from childhood to young adulthood, we initially hypothesized that linguistic distancing might increase across this developmental window. Thus, finding that linguistic distancing did not vary across age was unexpected. Nonetheless, this result converges with prior work showing no age differences in the efficacy of emotion regulation when participants were specifically instructed to engage in temporal distancing (Ahmed et al., 2018), as well as recent work showing that children much younger than our age range (i.e., 4–6 years of age) are able to improve their performance on cognitively demanding and frustrating tasks through psychological distancing (Grenell et al., 2018; White et al., 2017; White & Carlson, 2016). Thus when taken together with prior work, the current results suggest that relations between the developmental trajectories of (a) emotion regulation via distancing and (b) at least some psychological projection abilities (at least as measured by Abram et al., 2014; Gott & Lah, 2014) may not be as straightforward as one might assume. These patterns raise several questions that could be investigated in future work, including (a) what facets of psychological distancing undergo development, (b) what facets of psychological distancing are important to emotion regulation, and (c) whether children might only experience difficulty performing difficult projection/distancing tasks but show adult levels on easier distancing tasks. Understanding the nuanced relationships between developments in the ability to project oneself beyond the here-and-now and emotion regulation could provide much needed insight into how the basic processes underlying emotion regulation vary across age.

Similarly, the lack of developmental differences in reappraisal success in this study is inconsistent with some prior studies (McRae, Gross, et al., 2012; Silvers et al., 2012, 2015, 2017b) and consistent with others (Ahmed et al., 2018; Van Cauwenberge et al., 2017). These discrepancies suggest that there may be important conceptual factors that moderate whether or not a study will find




Figure 5. Reappraisal strategy use by age. Best fitting models of age for the five reappraisal strategies for which age was a significant predictor of strategy use. The y-axis represents the percentage of usable reappraise negative trials for which each strategy was used. (A) *Changing circumstances* was best described by a linear age effect. (B) *Challenging reality* was best described by a cubic age effect. (C) *Changing consequences* was best described by a linear age effect. (D) *Separating oneself* was best described by a linear age effect. (E) *Problem-solving* was best described by a cubic age effect. The black lines show robust linear regression fits, and the gray shaded regions represent 95% CIs. Note that the *separating oneself* strategy is typically referred to as *distancing* (see McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012), and was renamed in this paper to avoid confusion with the broader concept of *psychological distancing* or the measure of *linguistic distancing*.

developmental differences in reappraisal success. One potential moderating variable is the type of reappraisal strategy under investigation. Lack of developmental effects have been found when reinterpretations were provided by the task and when participants were instructed to project themselves temporally into the future (Ahmed et al., 2018; Van Cauwenberge et al., 2017), and increased cognitive reappraisal success across age has been found when participants were instructed to psychologically distance themselves from the content of images (Silvers et al., 2012, 2015, 2017b). However, two studies found increased reappraisal success across age when participants were given general instructions to reinterpret the meaning of aversive images, similar to the prompt used in this study (McRae, Gross, et al., 2012; Silvers et al., 2012). Thus if reappraisal type does indeed moderate developmental effects, the differences in instructions that produce these effects must be subtle.

The target of reappraisal (i.e., the types of situations and stimuli that generate emotions participants must regulate) could also moderate developmental differences in reappraisal success. Specifically, one study found age differences in reappraisal success only for images that included social (i.e., interpersonal) content (Silvers et al., 2012). The current study included a mix of social and nonsocial stimuli, but fewer social stimuli were used than nonsocial stimuli, potentially clouding age differences. Emerging research also indicates that both the intensity of negative affect induced by a stimulus (Lennarz et al., 2018; Sheppes et al., 2014) and its reappraisal “affordances” (i.e., how easy it is for participants to generate alternative appraisals; Suri et al., 2018) both affect what regulatory strategies people choose to implement. Given that we found age differences in participants’ spontaneous use of regulatory strategies, these factors could likewise moderate relations between age and reappraisal success. Future research

could specifically manipulate reappraisal affordances and image intensity to examine whether these factors do indeed impact reappraisal success differently for children and adolescents compared to adults, as these factors could also explain divergent results across studies. As a broader point, the current study included too few trials to examine how image-level variables (e.g., intensity, emotional content, social content, etc.) impacted reappraisal success and strategy choice. Future research should intentionally manipulate these variables to investigate how these factors influence regulation.

A final potential moderator relevant to the current study involves the fact that participants were asked to say aloud the content of their reappraisals. This design feature could have impacted any number of psychological processes (e.g., depth of elaboration or sense of interpersonal support; Schacter & Graf, 1986; Zaki & Williams, 2013) that might have affected participants' regulatory success. Thus, the context of reappraisal—a facet of emotion regulation that has gained increased interest in recent years (Aldao, 2013; Schirda, Valentine, Aldao, & Prakash, 2016)—could also impact developmental differences in emotion regulation. In particular, Park, Ayduk, and Kross (2016) found that an intervention in which participants verbalized their thoughts and feelings through writing—but not silently thought about them—increased psychological distance and reduced negative reactivity in response to an emotional challenge months after the intervention. Although there is not an obvious reason why this effect would be stronger at younger ages, it is nonetheless possible that having participants specifically verbalize their approach to regulating their emotions may contribute to discrepancies between the current results and prior work. We encourage future researchers to specifically examine which of the factors listed above (or other factors) moderate measures of cognitive reappraisal across development. Meta-analytic approaches might be especially helpful in clarifying the relative influence of these contextual factors on reappraisal success across age.

As an advance beyond prior work, the current study ensured that participants did indeed engage in cognitive reappraisal on trials when they were instructed to do so. This verification provided several points of additional insight. First, it ensured that any age-related differences in reappraisal success were not driven by (or masked by) age-related differences in compliance. Indeed, we found no relationships between age and compliance, and all results (except for age trajectories for the use of 3 reappraisal strategies) remained significant regardless of whether noncompliant trials and participants were excluded. Second, we were able to estimate the number of noncompliant trials across a developmental sample of participants. Across all 120 participants for whom we had usable behavioral and audio data, we found that approximately 10% of trials did not involve a reappraisal. Although full compliance would be ideal, the fact that most results do not differ when noncompliant participants and trials are included suggests that this proportion of noncompliant trials does not significantly interfere with estimates of reappraisal success. This result implies that developmental results in other studies are not likely due to differential compliance across age, but given that our methods differed, this is an empirical question that should be verified in future work.

Our third research question concerned age differences in the reappraisal strategies people use to regulate their affect. Although reappraisal strategy use has been of great interest to both basic

(McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012; Sheppes et al., 2014) and applied (Aldao et al., 2010) researchers, standard methods of assessing reappraisal do not permit insight into what strategies participants use at the trial level. We found that the vast majority of reappraisal trials involved either changing circumstances or challenging reality, and each of the other strategies were used on fewer than 10% of trials on average. Again, the generalizability of this pattern should be considered in light of the fact that the study's instructions provided example reappraisal strategies that fell within these categories (see the online supplemental materials). Hence, participants may have been "primed" to use these strategies when reappraising images. Interestingly, however, patterns of average strategy use observed in the current study are similar to the rates reported by McRae and colleagues in an adult sample (McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012), although results from the current study show less use of the making positive and changing consequences strategies. This consistency with prior work might imply that participants' predilection for changing circumstances and challenging reality may reflect their general behavior in cognitive reappraisal tasks, but future studies that use more neutral instructions should replicate this finding before taking it as definitive.

Although prior researchers have found that adolescents report that they would use a smaller set of reappraisal strategies in emotional situations compared to children and adults (Zimmermann & Iwanski, 2014), we found that the average number of reappraisal strategies participants used on each trial did not vary across age. Thus, when adolescents are faced with the challenge of reappraising images, they tend to use just as many strategies concurrently as children and young adults. By contrast, the types of strategies participants used differed across age, with use of five strategies showing linear or cubic relations with age. However, the facts that (a) there was a large imbalance in overall strategy use, (b) analyses of strategy use were not preregistered, and (c) the instructions introduced example strategies that may have biased participants' behavior in the task should be kept in mind when interpreting these results. Thus, we present these results as exploratory characterizations of participants' spontaneous reappraisal strategies that could generate future questions for research. That said, three key patterns can be observed in these data.

First, use of the changing circumstances strategy (the most frequently used strategy) increased linearly across age. Several processes could produce this result. For example, adults may select this strategy because they believe it is easier or more effective than other strategies, whereas its perceived ease or effectiveness may vary for other ages. Hence, this result calls for future work on age-related differences in perceptions of reappraisal strategies and how these perceptions relate to reappraisal strategy selection (see Troy, Shallcross, Brunner, Friedman, & Jones, 2018 for an example study in adults).

Second, the two cubic patterns we observed were inverses of each other: Adolescents showed elevated challenging reality use and reduced problem-solving use compared to other ages. A similar trend appeared at the highest end of our age window. Although denying reality may be a helpful strategy for down-regulating negative affect in many situations, it can also be problematic, as merely pretending stressors aren't real will not solve underlying problems causing those stressors. As such, these results converge with prior work showing that adolescents self-report a general shift

away from optimal regulatory strategies and toward potentially maladaptive strategies compared to children and adults (Cracco et al., 2017). Future research could examine whether adolescents do indeed tend to “avoid” real-world stressors by denying their reality and whether this has negative downstream consequences. However, an assumption of this interpretation is that emotion regulation strategies may differ in their impact across time (e.g., challenging reality might reduce distress in the short term but increase distress in the long term). Because the current study used a paradigm that tightly constrains the time window in which participants select and deploy emotion regulation strategies, it is not an ideal method for testing this question. Hence, although the current study provides a close analysis of how people choose to regulate their emotions in short timespans, future research could benefit from methods that examine more long-term consequences of these regulatory strategies.

Third, we found that participants’ tendency to change the consequences of stimuli decreased with age, whereas their use of the separating oneself (i.e., psychological distancing) strategy increased with age. This pattern might shed light on why overall linguistic distancing is stable across age. Reappraising by changing the consequences of a stimulus requires reimagining how the scene will play out in the future, and psychological distancing involves reimagining the scene so that its contents are separated from oneself. Thus there may be a developmental shift in how participants distance themselves from aversive stimuli as they age: Whereas children might tell themselves a new story about how the event will play out, young adults instead take a more general psychologically distanced perspective. Adolescence, then, may be a period of crossover between these tendencies. Future work should seek to replicate and extend these patterns to further investigate if and why styles of psychological distancing vary across development.

Although the current study addressed the three research questions discussed above, limitations of the study’s design merit discussion and should be addressed through future research. First, although we found that spontaneous linguistic distancing in cognitive reappraisal was stable from age 10 to 23, it is possible that this capacity emerges at earlier ages. Hence, future research on these phenomena could recruit younger ages to assess whether age-related differences in spontaneous linguistic distancing arise earlier in development. Second, the current work adopts a cross-sectional design, which prevents any causal conclusions regarding development. Use of longitudinal methods would provide greater certainty about the age-related differences observed here. Third, asking participants to verbalize their regulatory approach may have influenced participants’ psychological distance and regulatory success (Park et al., 2016). It’s also possible that participants may have been using several reappraisal strategies but only verbally describing some of them. Although linguistic measures require that participants verbalize their thoughts through speaking or writing, future research could manipulate whether or not reappraisals are verbalized to see if this manipulation affects reappraisal success. Participants could then be thoroughly questioned about their use of reappraisal strategies after each trial to ensure that the measure of reappraisal strategy isn’t biased by which strategies are easiest to describe.

Fourth, although analyses of a linguistic complexity measure provided by LIWC provided initial evidence that linguistic com-

plexity did not significantly differ across age (and thus did not confound primary results), the current study could have more specifically investigated how general verbal and linguistic development might relate to developments in linguistic distancing, reappraisal success, and/or the reappraisal strategies that participants verbalized. The general ability to represent and communicate about emotional and nonemotional information changes across age (Baron-Cohen, Golan, Wheelwright, Granader, & Hill, 2010; Farkas & Beron, 2004; Nook et al., 2018), and these developments could relate in very interesting ways to the phenomena central to the current study. For example, prior work shows that increased verbal knowledge mediates the development of multidimensional emotion concepts, which could be related to one’s ability to regulate emotions (Nook, Sasse, Lambert, McLaughlin, & Somerville, 2017). Thus future research on the development of emotion regulation—and linguistic components of emotion regulation, in particular—should (a) include gold-standard measures of general verbal ability (e.g., Wechsler, 1991) and (b) examine more sophisticated measures of linguistic complexity (Pallotti, 2015; Ravid, 2005) to test for relations between these constructs. Targeting these constructs in future studies is important given the possibility that children may have used complex reappraisal strategies cognitively but struggled to express them through language.

Fifth, because the current study examined spontaneous reappraisal strategy use when instructed to reappraise aversive images—which could differ from people’s regulatory choices in real-world settings where reappraisal is not explicitly instructed—future work should examine participants’ reappraisal strategy use outside of controlled laboratory environments. For example, experience-sampling methods that have been used to examine how broad emotion regulation strategies and other aspects of emotion dynamics relate to adolescent well-being (e.g., Lennarz et al., 2018; Lennarz, Lichtwarck-Aschoff, Timmerman, & Granic, 2018) could be adapted to investigate how these phenomena vary across development. Sixth and finally, because use of each strategy differed greatly across participants, this study was not well designed to test how effectively each reappraisal strategy down-regulated negative affect. A more controlled study in which participants are instructed to use different strategies could better assess the efficacy of each strategy across age (e.g., Gross, 1998a; Troy et al., 2018). A combination of these final two future directions could contribute to the notion that there may be gaps between developmental patterns in people’s capacity and their tendency to regulate their emotions (Silvers & Guassi Moreira, 2017). In other words, researchers could both explore what strategies people of different ages select to regulate their emotions in naturalistic settings as well as how effective those strategies are.

In all, this study revealed that children and adolescents spontaneously distance their language when regulating emotions to the same extent as adults and that greater linguistic distancing is associated with more successful cognitive reappraisal regardless of one’s age. This result suggests that increasing linguistic distancing tracks—and might even facilitate—successful emotion regulation even in childhood and adolescence. Additionally, the results provide initial evidence that the strategies people spontaneously use to reappraise stimuli vary across development. Specifically, the tendency to change the circumstances of a situation increases with age, adolescents may be more likely to deny reality and avoid problem-solving than

other ages, and there may be a crossover in how people distance their perspective on aversive stimuli across age. These results provide greater insight into the cognitive and linguistic underpinnings of successful emotion regulation across development and generate new research questions on how the tendency and efficacy of different reappraisal strategies might vary from childhood to adulthood.

References

- Abram, M., Picard, L., Navarro, B., & Piolino, P. (2014). Mechanisms of remembering the past and imagining the future—New data from autobiographical memory tasks in a lifespan approach. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 29, 76–89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2014.07.011>
- Ahmed, S. P., Bittencourt-Hewitt, A., & Sebastian, C. L. (2015). Neurocognitive bases of emotion regulation development in adolescence. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15, 11–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2015.07.006>
- Ahmed, S. P., Somerville, L. H., & Sebastian, C. L. (2018). Using temporal distancing to regulate emotion in adolescence: Modulation by reactive aggression. *Cognition and Emotion*, 32, 812–826. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1358698>
- Aldao, A. (2013). The future of emotion regulation research: Capturing context. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8, 155–172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459518>
- Aldao, A., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2013). One versus many: Capturing the use of multiple emotion regulation strategies in response to an emotion-eliciting stimulus. *Cognition and Emotion*, 27, 753–760. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.739998>
- Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 217–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.11.004>
- Altshuler, J. L., Genevare, J. L., Ruble, D. N., & Bonstein, M. H. (1995). Children's knowledge and use of coping strategies during hospitalization for elective surgery. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 16, 53–76. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973\(95\)90016-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973(95)90016-0)
- Ayduk, O., & Kross, E. (2010). From a distance: Implications of spontaneous self-distancing for adaptive self-reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 809–829. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019205>
- Baron-Cohen, S., Golan, O., Wheelwright, S., Granader, Y., & Hill, J. (2010). Emotion word comprehension from 4 to 16 years old: A developmental survey. *Frontiers in Evolutionary Neuroscience*, 2, 109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnevo.2010.00109>
- Brown, K., Covell, K., & Abramovitch, R. (1991). Time course and control of emotion: Age differences in understanding and recognition. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 37, 273–287.
- Bruehlman-Senecal, E., & Ayduk, O. (2015). This too shall pass: Temporal distance and the regulation of emotional distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108, 356–375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038324>
- Buhle, J. T., Silvers, J. A., Wager, T. D., Lopez, R., Onyemekwu, C., Kober, H., . . . Ochsner, K. N. (2014). Cognitive reappraisal of emotion: A meta-analysis of human neuroimaging studies. *Cerebral Cortex*, 24, 2981–2990. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bht154>
- Campos, J. J., Campos, R. G., & Barrett, K. C. (1989). Emergent themes in the study of emotional development and emotion regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 394–402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.25.3.394>
- Casasanto, D., & Boroditsky, L. (2008). Time in the mind: Using space to think about time. *Cognition*, 106, 579–593. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.03.004>
- Cole, P. M., Martin, S. E., & Dennis, T. A. (2004). Emotion regulation as a scientific construct: Methodological challenges and directions for child development research. *Child Development*, 75, 317–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00673.x>
- Cracco, E., Goossens, L., & Braet, C. (2017). Emotion regulation across childhood and adolescence: Evidence for a maladaptive shift in adolescence. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 26, 909–921. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-017-0952-8>
- Doré, B., Ort, L., Braverman, O., & Ochsner, K. N. (2015). Sadness shifts to anxiety over time and distance from the national tragedy in Newtown, CT. *Psychological Science*, 26, 363–373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797614562218>
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 665–697. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.665>
- Farkas, G., & Beron, K. (2004). The detailed age trajectory of oral vocabulary knowledge: Differences by class and race. *Social Science Research*, 33, 464–497. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2003.08.001>
- Giuliani, N. R., & Pfeifer, J. H. (2015). Age-related changes in reappraisal of appetitive cravings during adolescence. *NeuroImage*, 108, 173–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.12.037>
- Gogtay, N., Giedd, J. N., Lusk, L., Hayashi, K. M., Greenstein, D., Vaituzis, A. C., . . . Thompson, P. M. (2004). Dynamic mapping of human cortical development during childhood through early adulthood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101, 8174–8179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0402680101>
- Gott, C., & Lah, S. (2014). Episodic future thinking in children compared to adolescents. *Child Neuropsychology*, 20, 625–640. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09297049.2013.840362>
- Grenell, A., Prager, E. O., Schaefer, C., Kross, E., Duckworth, A. L., & Carlson, S. M. (2018). Individual differences in the effectiveness of self-distancing for young children's emotion regulation. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12259>
- Gross, J. J. (1998a). Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 224–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.224>
- Gross, J. J. (1998b). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 271–299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271>
- Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26, 1–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781>
- Gross, J. J., & Jazaieri, H. (2014). Emotion, emotion regulation, and psychopathology: An affective science perspective. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 2, 387–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2167702614536164>
- Gullone, E., Hughes, E. K., King, N. J., & Tonge, B. (2010). The normative development of emotion regulation strategy use in children and adolescents: A 2-year follow-up study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51, 567–574. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02183.x>
- Kaplow, J. B., Wardecker, B. M., Layne, C. M., Kross, E., Burnside, A., Edelstein, R. S., & Prossin, A. R. (2018). Out of the mouths of babes: Links between linguistic structure of loss narratives and psychosocial functioning in parentally bereaved children. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 31, 342–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jts.22293>
- Kessler, R. C., Berglund, P., Demler, O., Jin, R., Merikangas, K. R., & Walters, E. E. (2005). Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62, 593–602. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.62.6.593>

- Kross, E., & Ayduk, O. (2011). Making meaning out of negative experiences by self-distancing. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 187–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411408883>
- Kross, E., Bruehlman-Senecal, E., Park, J., Burson, A., Dougherty, A., Shablack, H., . . . Ayduk, O. (2014). Self-talk as a regulatory mechanism: How you do it matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 304–324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035173>
- Kross, E., Davidson, M., Weber, J., & Ochsner, K. (2009). Coping with emotions past: The neural bases of regulating affect associated with negative autobiographical memories. *Biological Psychiatry*, 65, 361–366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2008.10.019>
- Kross, E., Gard, D., Deldin, P., Clifton, J., & Ayduk, O. (2012). “Asking why” from a distance: Its cognitive and emotional consequences for people with major depressive disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121, 559–569. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028808>
- Kurdi, B., Lozano, S., & Banaji, M. R. (2017). Introducing the Open Affective Standardized Image Set (OASIS). *Behavior Research Methods*, 49, 457–470. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0715-3>
- Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for *t*-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 863. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863>
- Lennarz, H. K., Hollenstein, T., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Kuntsche, E., & Granic, I. (2018). Emotion regulation in action: Use, selection, and success of emotion regulation in adolescents’ daily lives. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165025418755540>
- Lennarz, H. K., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Timmerman, M. E., & Granic, I. (2018). Emotion differentiation and its relation with emotional well-being in adolescents. *Cognition and Emotion*, 32, 651–657. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1338177>
- Lust, B., Foley, C., & Dye, C. (2009). The first language acquisition of complex sentences. In E. Bavin (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of child language* (pp. 237–258). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511576164.014>
- Maglio, S. J., Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2013). The common currency of psychological distance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22, 278–282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721413480172>
- McRae, K., Ciesielski, B., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Unpacking cognitive reappraisal: Goals, tactics, and outcomes. *Emotion*, 12, 250–255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026351>
- McRae, K., Gross, J. J., Weber, J., Robertson, E. R., Sokol-Hessner, P., Ray, R. D., . . . Ochsner, K. N. (2012). The development of emotion regulation: An fMRI study of cognitive reappraisal in children, adolescents and young adults. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 7, 11–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsr093>
- Mehl, M. R., Robbins, M. L., & Holleran, S. E. (2012). How taking a word for a word can be problematic: Context-dependent linguistic markers of extraversion and neuroticism. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences*, 3, 30–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2458/jmm.v3i2.16477>
- Morey, R. D. (2008). Confidence intervals from normalized data: A correction to Cousineau (2005). *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 4, 61–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.04.2.p061>
- Moser, J. S., Dougherty, A., Mattson, W. I., Katz, B., Moran, T. P., Guevarra, D., . . . Kross, E. (2017). Third-person self-talk facilitates emotion regulation without engaging cognitive control: Converging evidence from ERP and fMRI. *Scientific Reports*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-04047-3>
- Nook, E. C., Sasse, S. F., Lambert, H. K., McLaughlin, K. A., & Somerville, L. H. (2017). Increasing verbal knowledge mediates development of multidimensional emotion representations. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, 881–889. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0238-7>
- Nook, E. C., Schleider, J. L., & Somerville, L. H. (2017). A linguistic signature of psychological distancing in emotion regulation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 146, 337–346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xge0000263>
- Nook, E. C., Stavish, C. M., Sasse, S. F., Lambert, H. K., Mair, P., McLaughlin, K. A., & Somerville, L. H. (2018). *Charting the development of emotion comprehension and abstraction using observer-rated and linguistic measures*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Orvell, A., Kross, E., & Gelman, S. A. (2017). How “you” makes meaning. *Science*, 355, 1299–1302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aaj2014>
- Pallotti, G. (2015). A simple view of linguistic complexity. *Second Language Research*, 31, 117–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0267658314536435>
- Park, J., Ayduk, Ö., & Kross, E. (2016). Stepping back to move forward: Expressive writing promotes self-distancing. *Emotion*, 16, 349–364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000121>
- Parkinson, C., Liu, S., & Wheatley, T. (2014). A common cortical metric for spatial, temporal, and social distance. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 34, 1979–1987. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2159-13.2014>
- Parkinson, C., & Wheatley, T. (2013). Old cortex, new contexts: Repurposing spatial perception for social cognition. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, 645. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00645>
- Pennebaker, J. W., Chung, C. K., Ireland, M., Gonzales, A., & Booth, R. J. (2007). *The development and psychometric properties of LIWC2007*. Austin, TX: LIWC.net. Retrieved from <http://www.liwc.net/LIWC2007LanguageManual.pdf>
- Pennebaker, J. W., & King, L. A. (1999). Linguistic styles: Language use as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1296–1312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1296>
- Ravid, D. (2005). Emergence of linguistic complexity in later language development: Evidence from expository text construction. In D. Ravid & H. B. Z. Shyldkrot (Eds.), *Perspectives on language and language development* (pp. 337–355). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-7911-7_25
- R Core Team. (2018). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Rodman, A. M., Powers, K. E., & Somerville, L. H. (2017). Development of self-protective biases in response to social evaluative feedback. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114, 13158–13163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1712398114>
- RStudio Team. (2016). *RStudio: Integrated development for R*. Boston, MA: RStudio, Inc.
- Saslow, L. R., McCoy, S., van der Löwe, I., Cosley, B., Vartan, A., Oveis, C., . . . Epel, E. S. (2014). Speaking under pressure: Low linguistic complexity is linked to high physiological and emotional stress reactivity. *Psychophysiology*, 51, 257–266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12171>
- Schacter, D. L., & Graf, P. (1986). Effects of elaborative processing on implicit and explicit memory for new associations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 12, 432–444. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.12.3.432>
- Schirda, B., Valentine, T. R., Aldao, A., & Prakash, R. S. (2016). Age-related differences in emotion regulation strategies: Examining the role of contextual factors. *Developmental Psychology*, 52, 1370–1380. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dev0000194>
- Shaw, P., Kabani, N. J., Lerch, J. P., Eckstrand, K., Lenroot, R., Gogtay, N., . . . Wise, S. P. (2008). Neurodevelopmental trajectories of the human cerebral cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 28, 3586–3594. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5309-07.2008>
- Sheppes, G., Scheibe, S., Suri, G., Radu, P., Blechert, J., & Gross, J. J. (2014). Emotion regulation choice: A conceptual framework and supporting evidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143, 163–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030831>
- Silvers, J. A., & Guassi Moreira, J. F. (2017). Capacity and tendency: A neuroscientific framework for the study of emotion regulation. *Neuro-*

- science Letters*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2017.09.017>
- Silvers, J. A., Insel, C., Powers, A., Franz, P., Helion, C., Martin, R., . . . Ochsner, K. N. (2017a). The transition from childhood to adolescence is marked by a general decrease in amygdala reactivity and an affect-specific ventral-to-dorsal shift in medial prefrontal recruitment. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25, 128–137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2016.06.005>
- Silvers, J. A., Insel, C., Powers, A., Franz, P., Helion, C., Martin, R. E., . . . Ochsner, K. N. (2017b). vPFC–vmPFC–amygdala interactions underlie age-related differences in cognitive regulation of emotion. *Cerebral Cortex*, 27, 3502–3514. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhw073>
- Silvers, J. A., Insel, C., Powers, A., Franz, P., Weber, J., Mischel, W., . . . Ochsner, K. N. (2014). Curbing craving: Behavioral and brain evidence that children regulate craving when instructed to do so but have higher baseline craving than adults. *Psychological Science*, 25, 1932–1942. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797614546001>
- Silvers, J. A., McRae, K., Gabrieli, J. D. E., Gross, J. J., Remy, K. A., & Ochsner, K. N. (2012). Age-related differences in emotional reactivity, regulation, and rejection sensitivity in adolescence. *Emotion*, 12, 1235–1247. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028297>
- Silvers, J. A., Shu, J., Hubbard, A. D., Weber, J., & Ochsner, K. N. (2015). Concurrent and lasting effects of emotion regulation on amygdala response in adolescence and young adulthood. *Developmental Science*, 18, 771–784. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/desc.12260>
- Suri, G., Sheppes, G., Young, G., Abraham, D., McRae, K., & Gross, J. J. (2018). Emotion regulation choice: The role of environmental affordances. *Cognition and Emotion*, 32, 963–971. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1371003>
- Tackman, A. M., Sbarra, D. A., Carey, A. L., Donnellan, M. B., Horn, A. B., Holtzman, N. S., . . . Mehl, M. R. (2018). Depression, negative emotionality, and self-referential language: A multi-lab, multi-measure, and multi-language-task research synthesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000187>
- Tottenham, N., Hare, T. A., & Casey, B. J. (2011). Behavioral assessment of emotion discrimination, emotion regulation, and cognitive control in childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00039>
- Travers-Hill, E., Dunn, B. D., Hoppitt, L., Hitchcock, C., & Dalgleish, T. (2017). Beneficial effects of training in self-distancing and perspective broadening for people with a history of recurrent depression. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 95, 19–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2017.05.008>
- Troy, A. S., Shallcross, A. J., Brunner, A., Friedman, R., & Jones, M. C. (2018). Cognitive reappraisal and acceptance: Effects on emotion, physiology, and perceived cognitive costs. *Emotion*, 18, 58–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000371>
- Van Cauwenberge, V., Van Leeuwen, K., Hoppenbrouwers, K., & Wiersema, J. R. (2017). Developmental changes in neural correlates of cognitive reappraisal: An ERP study using the late positive potential. *Neuropsychologia*, 95, 94–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.12.015>
- Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with R* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Wager, T. D., Davidson, M. L., Hughes, B. L., Lindquist, M. A., & Ochsner, K. N. (2008). Prefrontal-subcortical pathways mediating successful emotion regulation. *Neuron*, 59, 1037–1050. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.09.006>
- Wechsler, D. (1991). *The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children* (3rd ed.). San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- White, R. E., & Carlson, S. M. (2016). What would Batman do? Self-distancing improves executive function in young children. *Developmental Science*, 19, 419–426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/desc.12314>
- White, R. E., Kross, E., & Duckworth, A. L. (2015). Spontaneous self-distancing and adaptive self-reflection across adolescence. *Child Development*, 86, 1272–1281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12370>
- White, R. E., Prager, E. O., Schaefer, C., Kross, E., Duckworth, A. L., & Carlson, S. M. (2017). The “Batman effect”: Improving perseverance in young children. *Child Development*, 88, 1563–1571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12695>
- Zaki, J., & Williams, W. C. (2013). Interpersonal emotion regulation. *Emotion*, 13, 803–810. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033839>
- Zeileis, A., & Hothorn, T. (2002). Diagnostic checking in regression relationships. *R News*, 2, 7–10.
- Zimmermann, P., & Iwanski, A. (2014). Emotion regulation from early adolescence to emerging adulthood and middle adulthood: Age differences, gender differences, and emotion-specific developmental variations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 38, 182–194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165025413515405>

Received July 16, 2018

Revision received December 9, 2018

Accepted December 11, 2018 ■