

University of Groningen

## Effect of self-monitoring through experience sampling on emotion differentiation in depression

Widdershoven, Raf L A; Wichers, Marieke; Kuppens, Peter; Hartmann, Jessica A; Menne-Lothmann, Claudia; Simons, Claudia J P; Bastiaansen, Jojanneke A

*Published in:*  
Journal of Affective Disorders

*DOI:*  
[10.1016/j.jad.2018.10.092](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.10.092)

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*  
Final author's version (accepted by publisher, after peer review)

*Publication date:*  
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Widdershoven, R. L. A., Wichers, M., Kuppens, P., Hartmann, J. A., Menne-Lothmann, C., Simons, C. J. P., & Bastiaansen, J. A. (2019). Effect of self-monitoring through experience sampling on emotion differentiation in depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 244, 71-77.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.10.092>

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

**The Effect of Self-Monitoring Through Experience Sampling on Emotion  
Differentiation in Depression**

Raf L. A. Widdershoven<sup>a</sup>, Marieke Wichers<sup>b</sup>, Peter Kuppens<sup>c</sup>, Jessica A. Hartmann<sup>d</sup>, Claudia Menne-Lothmann<sup>e</sup>, Claudia J. P. Simons<sup>e, f</sup>, Jojanneke A. Bastiaansen<sup>b, g\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University

<sup>b</sup> University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Psychiatry, Interdisciplinary Center Psychopathology and Emotion regulation

<sup>c</sup> Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven-University of Leuven

<sup>d</sup> Orygen, The National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health, University of Melbourne

<sup>e</sup> Department of Psychiatry and Psychology, Maastricht University Medical Centre

<sup>f</sup> GGzE, Institute of Mental Health Care Eindhoven and De Kempen

<sup>g</sup> Department of Education and Research, Friesland Mental Health Care Services

\* Corresponding author: Department of Psychiatry, UMCG, Hanzeplein 1, 9700 RB Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: [j.bastiaansen@umcg.nl](mailto:j.bastiaansen@umcg.nl), Tel: 0031503611169, Fax: 0031503619722

Declarations of interest: none

### Abstract

**Background:** Major depressive disorder has been linked to an inability to differentiate between negative emotions. The current study investigates whether emotion differentiation improves when individuals with major depressive disorder are required to report on specific emotions multiple times a day through the experience sampling method (ESM) – a structured self-report diary technique. **Methods:** Seventy-nine patients diagnosed with major depressive disorder participated in this study, of whom 55 used ESM for 6 weeks (3 days a week, 10 times a day). Changes from baseline to post assessment in positive and negative emotion differentiation were compared between the participants who did and those who did not use ESM. **Results:** Engaging in ESM related to an improvement in both positive and negative emotion differentiation, but only the latter reached statistical significance. The relationship between the number of ESM measurements (dose) and emotion differentiation change (response) was not significant. **Limitations:** The sample size for the dose-response analysis was relatively small (N=55). It is unknown whether emotion differentiation improvements generalize beyond the emotions (N=12) we probed in this study. Other factors could also have contributed to the change (e.g. meetings with the researchers). **Conclusions:** The present study suggests that patients with depression using ESM for 3 days a week for 6 weeks can improve their negative emotion differentiation. Future studies should assess after what period of ESM changes in emotion differentiation become apparent, and whether these changes are persistent and relate to actual improvement in depressive symptoms.

*Keywords:* emotion differentiation, emotion, experience sampling, depression

## The Effect of Self-Monitoring through Experience Sampling on Emotion Differentiation in Depression

### **Introduction**

People can experience a vast range of emotions and oftentimes even feel multiple emotions at the same time. As some of these emotions can be quite similar, it can sometimes be difficult to discriminate between them. The ability to make nuanced distinctions and differentiate between emotions is called emotion differentiation (e.g. Barrett et al., 2001). Emotions can influence cognitive processes, which then help to regulate and shape behaviors (Baumeister et al., 2007). Barrett and colleagues (2001) showed that participants who were better in differentiating their negative emotions more often employed adaptive emotion regulation strategies. This was especially the case when emotions were experienced at a higher intensity. Similarly, it has been found that people who differentiate their emotions better are less likely to use alcohol to cope with negative emotions (Kashdan et al., 2010) and respond to anger in a less aggressive way (Pond et al., 2012). This suggests that negative emotion differentiation can be linked to more adaptive emotion regulation, that is, people who are better in differentiating their emotions may be more likely to make use of this knowledge to fit their response to a specific situation.

The research mentioned above mainly focused on negative emotion differentiation, but there are also multiple positive emotions that can be differentiated. Boden and colleagues (2013) found that negative and positive emotion differentiation are positively correlated. The research on positive emotion differentiation in relation to emotion regulation styles is, however, not as conclusive. Although there is some evidence suggesting that better differentiation of positive emotions is linked to a more future-oriented and proactive coping

style (Tugade et al., 2004), there are also studies that report no effect of greater positive differentiation on emotion regulation (Barrett et al., 2001; Pond et al., 2012).

If better emotion differentiation leads to more adaptive coping, impairments in emotion differentiation can be expected to be related to worse emotion regulation. Indeed, Edwards and Wupperman (2016) showed that low overall emotion differentiation was associated with poorer emotion regulation, which in turn has been associated with more psychopathology (Aldao et al., 2010). Impairments in emotion differentiation can be seen in many different psychopathologies such as schizophrenia (Kimhy et al., 2014), autism (Erbas et al., 2013), borderline personality disorder (Zaki et al., 2013), anorexia nervosa (Selby et al., 2014), and major depressive disorder (Demiralp et al., 2012).

Given the important role of emotions and emotion regulation in the onset and maintenance of depression, research into emotion differentiation in this disorder is highly relevant (Joormann & Vanderlind, 2014). Demiralp and colleagues (2012) asked patients with depression and healthy controls to rate four positive and seven negative emotions eight times a day for seven days. They showed that people with depression showed less negative emotion differentiation than the healthy controls.

Furthermore, it was found that in non-clinical samples less negative emotion differentiation was related to elevated levels of depressive symptoms (Erbas et al., 2014; Plonsker et al., 2016; Starr et al., 2017). Lennarz and colleagues (2017) found that more negative emotion differentiation was correlated with less intense negative emotions, but they did not find significant correlations between emotion differentiation and depressive symptoms. However, this may be due to the relatively low depressive symptoms in their sample of adolescents. There are few studies that look at positive emotion differentiation in depression. The study that did look into this found no difference in positive emotion differentiation between patients with depression and healthy controls (Demiralp et al., 2012).

The main technique used to measure emotion differentiation is the experience sampling method (ESM; Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983). When using ESM people are asked to rate the intensity of different emotions at several time-points during the day (Kashdan et al., 2015). The intraclass correlations between the self-reported emotions over time are then used to estimate emotion differentiation; more specifically, if the temporal fluctuations between different emotions are highly correlated it can be assumed that the person sees them as the same emotion and does not differentiate well (e.g. Tugade et al., 2004). Many emotion differentiation studies used this procedure only for a couple of days without looking at changes in emotion differentiation over time. It can be reasoned, though, that being asked to rate different emotions for an extended period multiple times a day can help to differentiate between emotions, because people are directed to think about the intensity of separate emotions rather than negative or positive affect in general. Given the literature on negative emotion differentiation impairments, this could be especially beneficial for people suffering from depression. The present study will be the first to investigate the effect of an extended period of self-monitoring through ESM on emotion differentiation in depression.

The aim of the current study is to investigate the influence of self-monitoring through ESM on emotion differentiation in depression. It is hypothesized that participants suffering from depression who use ESM for six weeks will be better at differentiating negative emotions than participants with depression who do not use ESM during this period. A similar effect is expected regarding positive emotion differentiation. However, since depression has not been as clearly associated with an impairment in positive emotion differentiation, it is expected that this effect will be of a smaller size. Furthermore, it is expected that the effect of ESM on emotion differentiation will be proportional to the number of times participants

complete the ESM reports (i.e. a dose-response relationship), which is a proxy for the time spent reflecting on specific emotions.

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

The sample comprised 79 patients with a diagnosis of major depressive disorder according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed., text rev.; DSM-IV-TR; American Psychiatric Association, 2000). The sample was derived from a larger sample of outpatients (n = 102), who were recruited by Kramer and colleagues (2014) between January 2010 and February 2012 at mental health care institutions in the cities of Maastricht and Eindhoven and through advertisements in local media. Patients were included if they were between the ages of 18 to 65. Further inclusion criteria were: a total score of at least 8 on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale – 17 (HDRS; Hamilton, 1960); treatment with antidepressants or mood stabilizers; sufficient knowledge of the Dutch language; and adequate vision. Patients who met the criteria for a current or lifetime diagnosis of non-affective psychotic disorder or reported a (hypo-) manic or mixed episode within the past month were excluded. All participants provided written informed consent before their enrolment. For the purpose of this study, only those participants who filled out the 5-day ESM assessment before and after the 6-week intervention period were included.

### **Procedure**

The original study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Maastricht University Medical Centre. Potential participants were called by a psychologist or psychiatrist to see whether they were eligible for inclusion in the study. If potentially eligible, they were invited for a full screening on site during which the HDRS and the Structural Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders (SCID-I; First et al., 1995) were administered. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (i.e. an ESM group, an ESM-

with-feedback group and a control group). See Figure 1 for an overview of the three study conditions. Randomization was stratified based on current psychotherapy (yes or no) and duration of pharmacological treatment (shorter or longer than 8 weeks prior to study entry). A more detailed description of the full procedure of the trial can be found in the paper by Kramer and colleagues (2014).

All participants were invited to do a 5-day baseline ESM assessment (Figure 1). During this time they were notified by a beep on a palmtop (i.e. PsyMate; Myin-Germeys et al., 2011) to fill in a short questionnaire 10 times a day at random intervals in 90-minute time blocks between 7:30 and 22:30. Participants were instructed to fill in the questionnaire as quickly as possible after the beep; after 10 minutes it was no longer possible to fill in the questionnaire. The ESM questionnaires contained questions about the participant's current context, stress appraisals of this context, and current mood by asking participants to rate positive and negative affect items.

After this baseline period, participants in the ESM-with-feedback group and ESM group received 10 ESM questionnaires a day on 3 consecutive days a week for 6 weeks (Figure 1). The ESM-with-feedback group (n=25) received weekly ESM-derived feedback with a focus on positive affect in face-to-face sessions with the researcher. The first two feedback sessions focused on daily life-activities, the following two sessions focused on daily life events and the way the patient dealt with these events, and the last two sessions concerned social interactions in daily life. The ESM group (n=30) did not receive ESM-related feedback, but did have structured weekly contacts with the researcher during which the HDRS interview was repeated. In addition, there was a control group (n=24), which did not participate in any

ESM measurements during the 6-week intervention period. After this period, all participants were enrolled once again in a 5-day ESM period identical to the one at baseline (Figure 1).<sup>1</sup>

The feedback received by the ESM-with-feedback group concerned overall negative and positive affect without differentiating between specific emotions. Therefore, it was not expected that the presence of feedback would influence emotion differentiation, and the ESM-with-feedback and ESM groups, who both engaged in ESM for 6 weeks, were combined into one ESM group for the main analyses.

<u>ESM-with-feedback group</u>	<u>ESM group</u>	<u>Control group</u>
<b>Baseline</b> ESM: 5 days, 10/day	<b>Baseline</b> ESM: 5 days, 10/day	<b>Baseline</b> ESM: 5 days, 10/day
<b>Intervention</b> ESM: 3 days, 10/day, across 6 weeks Meetings: weekly (i.e., 6 times) discussion of ESM-based feedback on positive affect	<b>Intervention</b> ESM: 3 days, 10/day, across 6 weeks Meetings: weekly (i.e., 6 times) semi-structured interview on symptoms of depression (HDRS)	<b>Intervention</b> ESM: no measurements Meetings with researcher: none
<b>Post assessment</b> ESM: 5 days, 10/day	<b>Post assessment</b> ESM: 5 days, 10/day	<b>Post assessment</b> ESM: 5 days, 10/day

ESM = experience sampling method, HDRS = Hamilton Depression Rating Scale

*Figure 1.* Overview of study conditions.

## Measures

We used participants' ratings on emotional adjectives during the 5-day baseline and post-assessment ESM periods to calculate emotion differentiation measures. Similar to previous studies (e.g. Demiralp et al., 2012; Lennarz et al., 2018), our set of emotional adjectives covered both the valence dimension (i.e., positive and negative) and arousal

---

<sup>1</sup> There were some small deviations in the number of days people engaged in the ESM baseline and ESM post assessment ( $M = 5.64$ ,  $SD = 1.24$ ).

dimension of emotional experience (e.g., down and relaxed for low arousal, anxious and enthusiastic for high arousal).

*Negative Emotion differentiation:* During the 5-day baseline and post-assessment ESM period, participants were asked to describe their emotions by rating negative emotional adjectives (i.e. down, irritated, lonely, restless, agitated, suspicious, guilty and anxious) on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 0 = “not at all” to 7 = “very”). All these adjectives except for “restless” and “agitated” were also included in the 6-week ESM period. Emotion differentiation variables were created by computing average intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) with consistency of agreement between the emotion adjectives (e.g. Erbas et al., 2014). The ICC indicates how strongly (negative) emotions are correlated across time. Thus, a high ICC indicates low differentiation. In order to ease interpretation, ICC scores were subtracted from 1. In this way, higher values represent better emotion differentiation. In this study, two negative emotion differentiation variables were created for each participant: one for the baseline ESM period and one for the post-assessment ESM period.

*Positive Emotion differentiation:* The pre- and post-assessment positive emotion differentiation variables were created in the same way using the specific positive emotion adjectives (i.e. cheerful, satisfied, enthusiastic and relaxed). All these adjectives were also included in the 6-week ESM period.

## **Analysis**

All the analyses were conducted in Stata 14. The emotion differentiation variables were created by computing the ICCs<sup>2</sup> using mixed-effect models based on consistency of agreement. The mixed effect model was chosen as this study treated the different emotions as

---

<sup>2</sup> In line with previous research, negative intraclass correlation coefficients were set to zero (e.g. Boden et al., 2013). The interpretation of the results did not change when the participants with a negative intraclass correlation coefficient (n = 11) were completely removed from analysis.

fixed effects. In line with Erbas and colleagues (2014) the ICC measuring consistency of agreement was used as only the correlations among emotions were of interest. Then, the ICCs were normalized by a Fisher's Z transformation (e.g. Boden et al., 2013). Finally, the ICCs were subtracted from 1 for ease of interpretation. In this manner, four final emotion differentiation variables were created for each participant: a negative and a positive emotion differentiation score for both the baseline ESM period and the post-assessment ESM period.

First, the influence of ESM on emotion differentiation while taking into account emotion differentiation differences at baseline was investigated. In a randomized controlled study such as ours, including the baseline measure as a covariate has more power to detect a difference between two groups from baseline to post assessment than an analysis of variance of change (Van Breukelen, 2006). Therefore, two separate hierarchical regressions (for both negative and positive emotion differentiation) with emotion differentiation at post assessment as dependent variable were conducted. Baseline emotion differentiation was added to the model, followed by the variable Group (ESM or control) in order to analyze the influence of having had 6 weeks of ESM on the dependent variable.

Second, the dose-response relationship between the number of ESM questionnaires that were filled in during the 6-week ESM period and (change in) emotion differentiation at post assessment was investigated. To this end, two hierarchical regressions were conducted within the ESM group (for both negative and positive emotion differentiation). These models included emotion differentiation at post-test as the dependent variable, and emotion differentiation at baseline and the number of filled in questionnaires as predictors.

For all analyses, the assumptions of a hierarchical multiple regression (i.e. normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and no multicollinearity) were not violated.

## Results

### Sample Characteristics

The baseline sample characteristics are reported in Table 1. There were no significant group differences in terms of mean levels of the affect items and positive and negative emotion differentiation ICCs.

**Table 1.** Baseline Sample Characteristics

Characteristics	ESM	Control	Test		
	<i>n</i> = 55	<i>n</i> = 24	<i>F</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Age [ <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )]	48.13 (9.91)	50.33 (10.56)			
Sex, (female, %)	52.17	54.17			
Negative emotions [ <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )]					
Lonely	2.60 (1.75)	2.37 (1.59)		0.68	.496
Down	2.86 (1.64)	3.08 (1.67)		-0.78	.435
Irritated	2.69 (1.79)	2.81 (1.72)		-0.28	.776
Anxious	1.97 (1.52)	1.89 (1.32)		0.51	.610
Suspicious	2.00 (1.44)	2.15 (1.41)		-0.45	.650
Guilty	2.14 (1.57)	2.34 (1.53)		-0.38	.706
Restless	3.37 (1.84)	3.55 (1.84)		-0.61	.542
Agitated	3.03 (1.97)	3.14 (1.84)		-0.29	.771
Positive emotions [ <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )]					
Relaxed	4.06 (1.60)	3.94 (1.43)		0.70	.481
Satisfied	3.67 (1.50)	3.48 (1.28)		0.90	.366
Enthusiastic	2.91 (1.54)	2.74 (1.33)		0.76	.447
Cheerful	3.14 (1.56)	2.88 (1.30)		1.07	.284
Negative ED [ <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )]	0.17 (0.37)	0.04 (0.27)	2.22		.141
Positive ED [ <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )]	0.12 (0.35)	0.06 (0.36)	0.47		.496

Note. ED = emotion differentiation

### The Effect of ESM on Negative Emotion Differentiation

To test the hypothesis that the ESM group would show an increase in negative emotion differentiation from pre- to post-assessment in comparison with the control group, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. In the first step, negative emotion differentiation at baseline was found to be a significant predictor of post-assessment negative emotion differentiation,  $F(1, 77) = 8.47, p = .005$ . This model accounted for 9.9% of the variation in the dependent variable. When Group was added in the second step, this model

was significant and explained an additional 6.7% of the variation in negative emotion differentiation at post assessment,  $F(1, 76) = 6.14, p = .015$ . See Table 2 for the regression statistics. A post-hoc paired samples t-test was conducted to compare negative emotion differentiation within the ESM group between baseline ( $M = 0.17, SD = 0.37$ ) and post assessment ( $M = 0.37, SD = 0.43$ ), and showed that the ESM group improved significantly in their ability to differentiate their negative emotions,  $t(54) = -3.17, p = .003, d = 0.43, 95\% CI [-0.33, -0.07]$ , whereas the control group did not,  $t(23) = -0.41, p = .683, d = 0.08, 95\% CI [-0.22, 0.14]$ . See Figure 2 for a graphic representation.

The present study combined the ESM-with-feedback and ESM groups of the original study into one ESM group, because both involved 6 weeks of ESM and it was not expected that the general feedback in the experimental condition would additionally influence emotion differentiation. To verify this assumption, a post-hoc hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with negative emotion differentiation at post-test as dependent variable, baseline negative emotion differentiation as predictor in the first model, and group (the ESM-with-feedback group versus ESM group) as an additional predictor in the second model, and no significant group difference,  $F(1, 52) = 0.00, p = .963$  was found.

### **The Effect of ESM on Positive Emotion Differentiation**

When this procedure was repeated for positive emotion differentiation (see Table 2), the first step in which positive emotion differentiation at baseline was added was significant,  $F(1, 77) = 14.98, p < .001$ , explaining 16.3% of the variation in positive emotion differentiation at post assessment, adding the group variable in the second step lead to 3.6% more explained variation but this was not a significant improvement in prediction,  $F(1, 76) = 3.40, p = .069$ . The ESM group did show some (nonsignificant) improvement in positive emotion differentiation,  $t(54) = -1.52, p = .136, d = 0.20, 95\% CI [-0.21, 0.03]$ . The control

group did not significantly improve from pre to post-test,  $t(23) = 0.60, p = .558, d = 0.12$ , 95% CI [-0.08, 0.15]. See Figure 2 for a graphic representation.

Similar to the results for negative emotion differentiation, a post-hoc hierarchical multiple regression including group as a second predictor in addition to baseline emotion differentiation, showed that there was no significant difference between the ESM-with-feedback and ESM-group,  $F(1, 52) = 0.27, p = .603$ .




Figure 2. Emotion differentiation change from pre- to post-assessment

### The Effect of Number of Filled in Questionnaires on Negative Emotion Differentiation

On average, participants in the ESM group responded to 149.76 beeps ( $SD = 21.33$ ) ranging from 87 to 224. To investigate whether there was a (positive) relationship between the number of filled in questionnaires (beeps) on emotion differentiation within the ESM group,

another hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Table 2) was conducted. Baseline negative emotion differentiation predicted post-assessment negative emotion differentiation,  $F(1, 53) = 5.03, p = .029$ . This model could explain 8.7% of the variation in the dependent variable.

Adding the number of filled in questionnaires as a second predictor did not significantly increase the explained variance,  $\Delta R^2 = .04, F(1, 52) = 2.54, p = .117$ .

**Table 2.** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Post-Assessment Negative and Positive Emotion Differentiation from Baseline Positive and Negative Emotion Differentiation, Group Status and Number of Beeps

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI
<b>Model 1</b>				
Step 1				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.40	2.91	.005	[0.13, 0.67]
Step 2				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.34	2.55	.013	[0.08, 0.61]
Group	0.25	2.48	.015	[0.05, 0.45]
<b>Model 2</b>				
Step 1				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.44	3.87	<.001	[0.21, 0.67]
Step 2				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.43	3.78	<.001	[0.20, 0.65]
Group	0.16	1.84	.069	[-0.01, 0.33]
<b>Model 3</b>				
Step 1				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.34	2.24	.029	[0.04, 0.64]
Step 2				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.27	1.76	.084	[-0.04, 0.58]
Beeps	0.00	1.59	.117	[0.00, 0.10]
<b>Model 4</b>				
Step 1				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.33	2.20	.032	[0.03, 0.63]
Step 2				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.33	2.12	.039	[0.02, 0.63]
Beeps	0.00	0.25	.801	[0.00, 0.01]

Note. CI = confidence interval

### **The Effect of Number of Filled in Questionnaires on Positive Emotion Differentiation**

To see if positive emotion differentiation at post assessment was influenced by the number of filled in questionnaires, a fourth hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted (Table 2). The first step in which baseline positive emotion differentiation was added was significant,  $F(53, 1) = 4.86, p = .032$ , and explained 8.4% of the variance. When the number of filled in questionnaires was introduced in the second step, there was no significant change in the percentage of explained variance,  $\Delta R^2 = .00, F(1, 52) = .06, p = .801$ .

### **Discussion**

The aim of the present study was to investigate whether partaking in ESM measurements, which involves repeatedly thinking about and reporting on distinct emotional states, influences emotion differentiation in individuals with depression. The results of the study confirm the hypothesis that individuals suffering from depression who fill in ESM questionnaires 3 days a week for 6 consecutive weeks improve in their ability to differentiate between their negative emotions in comparison to a control group not partaking in a prolonged period of ESM measurements. The study also shows a similar effect for positive emotion differentiation, but this effect did not reach statistical significance. The study did not find evidence for a dose-response relationship between the number of filled in ESM questionnaires and improvement in positive or negative emotion differentiation.

This is the first study to suggest that self-monitoring of different specific negative emotions with ESM can help to improve negative emotion differentiation in patients suffering from depression. Recently, research into using ESM as an intervention method has been accumulating (Myin-Germeys et al., 2016). Improving negative emotion differentiation skills by frequently filling in questionnaires might be one of the mechanisms through which ESM could ameliorate depressive symptoms. It is known that patients with depression have a

deficit in their negative emotion differentiation skills in comparison to healthy controls (Demiralp et al., 2012). Furthermore, it has been suggested that better negative emotion differentiation can be linked to more adaptive emotion regulation (Barrett et al., 2001), which, in turn has been linked to recovery of depression (Arditte & Joormann, 2011). It could thus be the case that the improvement in negative emotion differentiation found in this study enables individuals suffering from depression to better attribute their negative emotions to a specific situation and with that provide them with the means to pick the best emotion regulation strategy. Further research is needed to indicate what part of the ESM period triggered the change in emotion differentiation and whether the improvement in negative emotion differentiation can be linked to improvement of depressive symptoms and if ESM could thus be an effective intervention for depression.

In the present study, patients with depression filling in ESM 3 days a week for 6 weeks improved in positive emotion differentiation when compared to the control group, but this effect was small and not significant. The smaller effect of continuously monitoring emotions on positive emotion differentiation compared to negative emotion differentiation was in line with the hypotheses. Based on the findings by Demiralp and colleagues (2012) that positive emotion differentiation did not differ between individuals suffering from depression and healthy controls, this could be due to less room for improvement in positive differentiation in depression. Alternatively, given that there were more negative ( $n = 8$ ) than positive ( $n = 4$ ) affect items in the ESM measurements, the present study might have enabled participants to train negative emotion differentiation more. All things considered, it cannot be discarded that focusing on positive emotions multiple times a day might have an effect on emotion differentiation. However, given the meagre evidence linking positive emotion differentiation to better emotion regulation (e.g. Barrett et al., 2001), a focus on negative

emotions seems most suited when considering using ESM as an emotion differentiation intervention.

Although the present study found that patients with depression who filled in ESM measurements for 6 weeks showed a small improvement in (negative) emotion differentiation, no statistical evidence was found for a dose-response relationship with the actual number of filled in ESM measurements. However, this result should be interpreted with caution. There might not have been sufficient variance in the number of filled in ESM questionnaires across the ESM group to be able to detect a dose-response relationship; all participants filled out at least 87 measurements with a median of 151 measurements. Possibly, thinking about specific emotions for 87 times is already sufficient to improve emotion differentiation with only a very small additional effect of filling in more measurements beyond that point. The sample size of the ESM group ( $n = 55$ ) might not have been sufficiently large to detect such a small effect. Future studies should use a larger sample size to determine whether there is a dose-response relationship between filled in ESM measurements and change in emotion differentiation, and to investigate at what point a change in emotion differentiation becomes apparent.

Although the results of this study could indicate that it is possible to train negative emotion differentiation with ESM, it is important to consider some alternative explanations as well. One of the things that should be considered is that apart from filling in ESM questionnaires for 6 weeks another difference between the ESM group and the control group were the weekly meetings with the researcher. These meetings could have enhanced participants' attention to their emotional states. However, specific emotions and emotion differentiation were neither the focus of the weekly meetings in the ESM group nor the ESM-with-feedback group. It seems unlikely that HDRS interviews (ESM group) and feedback on general positive affect (ESM-with-feedback group) could explain the changes we found in the differentiation of negative emotions. That said, the design of our study does not allow

drawing firm conclusions on which part of the ESM-intervention caused the change in emotion differentiation.

Another thing that should be considered is that the intervention was directed at reducing emotional intensity, and that may have influenced results. Likewise, changes in depression could have potentially mediated results, given depression's established relationships with negative emotion differentiation (e.g. Demiralp et al., 2012). However, in our study changes in emotional intensity or depression were not related to negative or positive emotion differentiation. Moreover, the results for the effect of prolonged ESM on differentiation remained the same when changes in emotional intensity or depression were taken into account (see Supplement 1).

The present study has some other limitations as well. One of them being that even though it can be reasoned that the participants in this study trained negative emotion differentiation as a skill, it is not certain that improvement in negative emotion differentiation can be generalized beyond the eight adjectives used in this study. It should be noted, however, that the affect items that were measured are the ones often used in ESM research. Furthermore, it is important that an ESM questionnaire does not contain too many items. Another limitation is the sample size of this study, which may not have been large enough to detect some effects, particularly the dose-response relationships, which may have been underpowered due to the size of the ESM group (n=55).

Further research is needed to investigate whether the effect of filling in ESM questionnaires on negative emotion differentiation improvement is large enough to cause a clinically relevant improvement in depressive symptoms. In the present study, this could not be tested as the most substantial improvements in depressive symptoms in the sample occurred after post assessment (Kramer et al., 2014), when there were no more ESM measurements to be able to determine whether improvements in emotion differentiation were

sustained. Future studies should follow an ESM and a control group (not enrolled in prolonged ESM-measurements) as was done in the present study but with additional brief ESM periods and emotion regulation questionnaires at the follow-up measurements to investigate whether the change in negative emotion differentiation sustains over time and can be linked to better emotion regulation strategies and improvements in depression. In sum, further research is needed to address stability of emotion differentiation, persistence of changes in emotion differentiation and how changes in emotion differentiation relate to follow-up behaviors or outcomes. Future research should also examine whether patients themselves report on change in emotion differentiation and to what elements of the ESM-intervention they attribute this change, for instance through interviews with patients after the ESM period. More insight into the patient perspective on the ESM intervention would be very valuable, because it could contribute to a better understanding of what mechanisms might underlie changes in emotion differentiation and depression outcomes (Bastiaansen et al., 2018).

The results of this study also indicate that when used for an extended period of time, the use of ESM to study emotion differentiation can have an effect on emotion differentiation. This could have implications for all studies using ESM as a measurement tool. The phenomenon that merely filling in measurements such as ESM questionnaires can have an effect on the actual responses that are being recorded is called measurement reactivity. It is recognized that measurement reactivity in ESM is an important phenomenon that demands attention (Myin-Germeys et al., 2018), and the results of the present research give more insight into measurement reactivity. Reactivity can be reduced by decreasing an individual's continuous self-awareness. This can be achieved by randomizing the time-sampling procedure and using non-intrusive devices (Delespaul, 1995). Conversely, when using ESM to modify

behaviors, for example to train emotion differentiation, reactivity might be of use, and the ESM procedure should be adapted accordingly.

In sum, the present study suggests that patients with depression using ESM 3 days a week for 6 weeks can improve their negative emotion differentiation. In light of the recent attention to ESM as an intervention, the results of the present study are promising and give more insight into a possible mechanism through which ESM can ameliorate depressive symptoms. More research is needed, to replicate these results and see what part of the prolonged ESM period caused the change in negative emotion differentiation. Furthermore, future studies should investigate if the improvement in negative emotion differentiation is actually accompanied by a decrease in depressive symptoms and an increase in the use of adaptive emotion regulation strategies. Furthermore, the results of this study indicate that measurement reactivity is important to consider when ESM is used for an extended period of time.

### References

- Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*, 217-237.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed., text rev.)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arditte, K. A., & Joormann, J. (2011). Emotion regulation in depression: Reflection predicts recovery from a major depressive episode. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 35*, 536-543.
- Barrett, L. F., Gross, J., Christensen, T. C., & Benvenuto, M. (2001). Knowing what you're feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. *Cognition and Emotion, 15*, 713-724.
- Bastiaansen, J., Meurs, M., Stelwagen, R., Wunderink, L., Schoevers, R. A., Wichers, M., & Oldehinkel, A. (2018). Self-monitoring and personalized feedback based on the experiencing sampling method as a tool to boost depression treatment: a protocol of a pragmatic randomized controlled trial (ZELF-i). *BMC Psychiatry, 18*(276).
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., DeWall, C. N., & Zhang, L. (2007). How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection, rather than direct causation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 167-203.
- Boden, M. T., Thompson, R. J., Dizén, M., Berenbaum, H., & Baker, J. P. (2013). Are emotional clarity and emotion differentiation related? *Cognition and Emotion, 27*, 961-978.
- Delespaul, P. (1995). *Assessing schizophrenia in daily life: The experience sampling method*. Maastricht, the Netherlands: Maastricht University Press

Demiralp, E., Thompson, R. J., Mata, J., Jaeggi, S. M., Buschkuhl, M., Barrett, L. F., . . .

Deldin, P. J. (2012). Feeling blue or turquoise? Emotional differentiation in major depressive disorder. *Psychological Science, 23*, 1410-1416.

Edwards, E. R., & Wupperman, P. (2016). Emotion Regulation Mediates Effects of Alexithymia and Emotion Differentiation on Impulsive Aggressive Behavior. *Deviant Behavior, 1-12*.

Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., Boonen, J., Noens, I., & Kuppens, P. (2013). Emotion differentiation in autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 7*, 1221-1227.

Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., Lee Pe, M., Koval, P., & Kuppens, P. (2014). Negative emotion differentiation: Its personality and well-being correlates and a comparison of different assessment methods. *Cognition and Emotion, 28*, 1196-1213.

First, M. B., Spitzer, R. L., Gibbon, M., & Williams, J. B. (1995). Structured clinical interview for DSM-IV axis I disorders. *New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute*.

French, D. P., & Sutton, S. (2010). Reactivity of measurement in health psychology: how much of a problem is it? What can be done about it?. *British journal of health psychology, 15*, 453-468.

Hamilton, M. (1960). A rating scale for depression. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 23*, 56-62.

Joormann, J., & Vanderlind, W. M. (2014). Emotion regulation in depression the role of biased cognition and reduced cognitive control. *Clinical Psychological Science, 2*, 402-421.

- Kashdan, T. B., Barrett, L. F., & McKnight, P. E. (2015). Unpacking emotion differentiation transforming unpleasant experience by perceiving distinctions in negativity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*, 10-16.
- Kashdan, T. B., Ferrisizidis, P., Collins, R. L., & Muraven, M. (2010). Emotion differentiation as resilience against excessive alcohol use an ecological momentary assessment in underage social drinkers. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1341-1347.
- Kimhy, D., Vakhrusheva, J., Khan, S., Chang, R. W., Hansen, M. C., Ballon, J. S., . . . Gross, J. J. (2014). Emotional granularity and social functioning in individuals with schizophrenia: An experience sampling study. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 53*, 141-148.
- Kramer, I., Simons, C. J., Hartmann, J. A., Menne-Lothmann, C., Viechtbauer, W., Peeters, F., . . . Delespaul, P. (2014). A therapeutic application of the experience sampling method in the treatment of depression: A randomized controlled trial. *World Psychiatry, 13*, 68-77.
- Larson, R., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1983). "The experience sampling method". *New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science, 15*, 41-56.
- Lennarz, H. K., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Timmerman, M. E., & Granic, I. (2017). Emotion differentiation and its relation with emotional well-being in adolescents. *Cognition and Emotion, 1-7*.
- Myin-Germeys, I., Birchwood, M., & Kwapil, T. (2011). From environment to therapy in psychosis: A real-world momentary assessment approach. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 37*, 244-247.
- Myin-Germeys, I., Kasanova, Z., Vaessen, T., Vachon, H., Kirtley, O., Viechtbauer, W., & Reininghaus, U. (2018). Experience sampling methodology in mental health research: new insights and technical developments. *World Psychiatry, 17*, 123-132.

- Myin-Germeys, I., Klippel, A., Steinhart, H., & Reininghaus, U. (2016). Ecological momentary interventions in psychiatry. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 29*, 258-263.
- Plonsker, R., Gavish Biran, D., Zvielli, A., & Bernstein, A. (2016). Cognitive fusion and emotion differentiation: Does getting entangled with our thoughts dysregulate the generation, experience and regulation of emotion? *Cognition and Emotion, 31*, 1-8.
- Pond, R. S., Kashdan, T. B., DeWall, C. N., Savostyanova, A., Lambert, N. M., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Emotion differentiation moderates aggressive tendencies in angry people: A daily diary analysis. *Emotion, 12*, 326-337.
- Selby, E. A., Wonderlich, S. A., Crosby, R. D., Engel, S. G., Panza, E., Mitchell, J. E., . . . Le Grange, D. (2014). Nothing tastes as good as thin feels: Low positive emotion differentiation and weight-loss activities in anorexia nervosa. *Clinical Psychological Science, 2*, 514-531.
- Starr, L. R., Hershenberg, R., Li, Y. I., & Shaw, Z. A. (2017). When Feelings Lack Precision: Low Positive and Negative Emotion Differentiation and Depressive Symptoms in Daily Life. *Clinical Psychological Science, 5*, 613-631.
- Tugade, M. M., Fredrickson, B. L., & Feldman Barrett, L. (2004). Psychological resilience and positive emotional granularity: Examining the benefits of positive emotions on coping and health. *Journal of Personality, 72*, 1161-1190.
- Van Breukelen, G. J. (2006). ANCOVA versus change from baseline had more power in randomized studies and more bias in nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 59*, 920-925.
- Zaki, L. F., Coifman, K. G., Rafaeli, E., Berenson, K. R., & Downey, G. (2013). Emotion differentiation as a protective factor against nonsuicidal self-injury in borderline personality disorder. *Behavior Therapy, 44*, 529-540.

## **Supplement 1: Effect of Change in Emotional Intensity and Depression on Emotion Differentiation.**

In order to address change in emotional intensity and change in depression in relation to emotion differentiation we performed four more analyses.

### **Measures**

*Emotional Intensity:* The emotional intensity score was created using the same method as Demiralp and colleagues (2012). For the negative emotions we averaged the rating of each adjective at every measurement separately for the baseline and post assessment. We then created the emotional intensity score by taking the average of the negative emotion ratings over the baseline and over the post-assessment, the change score was created by subtracting the baseline emotional intensity score from the post-assessment score. The same was done for the positive emotions.

*Depression:* Depression was measured using the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale – 17 (HDRS; Hamilton, 1960). The semi-structured interview took place at baseline and post assessment and was used to assess the severity of depressive symptoms. The change score for depression was created by subtracting the post assessment HDRS score from the baseline HDRS score.

### **Analysis**

To look at the effect of emotional intensity, two separate hierarchical regressions (for both negative and positive emotion differentiation) with emotion differentiation at post assessment as dependent variable were conducted. Baseline emotion differentiation was added

to the model, followed by the variable Group (ESM or control). Then the emotional intensity change score was added.

To test for the effect of depression the above mentioned analysis were repeated, but instead of adding emotional intensity change score in the last step, HDRS change score was added.

## Results

### **The effect of emotional intensity**

We repeated the hierarchical multiple regression that we conducted to test the effect of ESM on negative emotion differentiation (Model 1). We used a third step to introduce the negative emotional intensity change score as one of the predictors. This model was not significant, it explained an additional 0.7% of the variation in negative emotion differentiation at post assessment,  $F(1, 75) = 0.66, p = .421$ . In this third step Group remained a significant predictor, see Table 3 for the regression statistics.

We repeated the hierarchical multiple regression that we conducted to test the effect of ESM on positive emotion differentiation (Model 2). We used a third step to introduce the positive emotional intensity change score as one of the predictors. This model was not significant, it explained an additional 3.7% of the variation in negative emotion differentiation at post assessment,  $F(1, 75) = 3.64, p = .06$ . Group was a significant predictor in this third step, see Table 3 for the regression statistics.

### **The effect of depression**

We repeated the hierarchical multiple regression that we conducted to test the effect of ESM on negative emotion differentiation (Model 1). We used a third step to introduce the HDRS change score as one of the predictors. This model was not significant, it explained an

additional 3.3% of the variation in negative emotion differentiation at post assessment,  $F(1, 75) = 3.05, p = .085$ . In this third step Group remained a significant predictor, see Table 4 for the regression statistics.

To see the effect of HDRS score change on positive emotion differentiation we repeated the hierarchical multiple regression that we conducted to test the effect of ESM on positive emotion differentiation (Model 2). We used a third step to the HDRS change score as one of the predictors. This model was not significant, it explained an additional 3.5% of the variation in negative emotion differentiation at post assessment,  $F(1, 75) = 3.44, p = .068$ . Group was still not significant in this third step, see Table 4 for the regression statistics.

**Table 3.** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Post-Assessment Negative and Positive Emotion Differentiation from Baseline Positive and Negative Emotion Differentiation, Group Status and Emotional Intensity Change.

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI
<b>Model 1</b>				
Step 1				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.40	2.91	.005	[0.13, 0.67]
Step 2				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.34	2.55	.013	[0.08, 0.61]
Group	0.25	2.48	.015	[0.05, 0.45]
Step 3				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.35	2.60	.011	[0.08, 0.62]
Group	0.26	2.53	.014	[0.05, 0.46]
Emotional intensity change	-0.06	-0.81	.421	[-0.21, 0.09]
<b>Model 2</b>				
Step 1				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.44	3.87	<.001	[0.21, 0.67]
Step 2				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.43	3.78	<.001	[0.20, 0.65]
Group	0.16	1.84	.069	[-0.01, 0.33]
Step 3				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.44	3.95	<.001	[0.22, 0.66]
Group	0.17	2.04	.045	[0.00, 0.34]
Emotional intensity change	0.09	1.91	.060	[0.00, 0.19]

Note. CI = confidence interval

**Table 4.** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Post-Assessment Negative and Positive Emotion Differentiation from Baseline Positive and Negative Emotion Differentiation, Group Status and Depression Change.

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI
<b>Model 1</b>				
Step 3				
Baseline negative differentiation	0.32	2.43	.018	[0.06, 0.59]
Group	0.24	2.38	.020	[0.04, 0.44]
Depression change	-0.01	-1.75	.085	[-0.03, 0.00]
<b>Model 2</b>				
Step 3				
Baseline positive differentiation	0.43	3.86	<.001	[0.21, 0.65]
Group	0.14	1.70	.093	[-0.03, 0.31]
Depression change	-0.01	-1.85	.068	[-0.02, 0.00]

*Note.* CI = confidence interval