



**HAL**  
open science

## **CERSA: How does emotion regulation vary according to context?**

Yoann Fombouchet, Lyda Lannegrand, Joanna Lucenet

### ► **To cite this version:**

Yoann Fombouchet, Lyda Lannegrand, Joanna Lucenet. CERSA: How does emotion regulation vary according to context?. *Developmental Psychology*, 2023, 41 (3), pp.306-323. <10.1111/bjdp.12450>. <hal-04164272>

**HAL Id: hal-04164272**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04164272v1>**

Submitted on 28 Aug 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Yoann FOMBOUCHET, Lyda LANNEGRAND, Joanna LUCENCET

## 1 **Introduction**

2 Emotion regulation (ER) has mostly been studied in children and adults, underscoring its  
3 importance to various psychological outcomes such as well-being or quality of social interactions  
4 (Lopes et al., 2005; McRae, Jacobs, et al., 2012; Nelis et al., 2011). Yet, few studies have focused on  
5 how adolescents regulate their emotions and the effectiveness of this regulation. ER may be  
6 particularly important in this period of life, which is characterised by many developmental changes  
7 (e.g., biological, cognitive, social) and many new emotional experiences (e.g., in parents, peers and  
8 with romantic relationships) that often elicit negative emotions (e.g., Silk et al., 2003).

9 ER is defined as “the extrinsic and intrinsic processes responsible for monitoring, evaluating  
10 and modifying emotional reactions, especially their intensive and temporal features, to accomplish  
11 one’s goals” (Thompson, 1994, pp. 27-28). Most research has studied ER independently of  
12 individuals’ goals and the situations in which they find themselves. However, recent advances have  
13 suggested that ER might be context-dependent, and that individuals’ flexible use of different ER  
14 strategies depending on the situation should be investigated (Aldao et al., 2015). Based on these new  
15 insights, our aim was to develop a questionnaire assessing adolescents’ ER strategies and abilities in  
16 different situations: the Contextualised Emotion Regulation Survey for Adolescents (CERSA).

### 17 **From general to contextualised ER approaches**

18 ER studies are largely based on the theoretical process model Gross proposed in 1998,  
19 defining different families of ER strategies (i.e., situation selection, situation modification,  
20 attentional deployment, cognitive change and response modulation). In particular, many of them  
21 have focused on two different ER strategies, comparing the general use of reappraisal and expressive  
22 suppression. Reappraisal is a form of cognitive strategy consisting in changing the interpretation of a

23 situation to decrease its emotional impact, whereas expressive suppression is a type of response  
24 modulation strategy which involves inhibiting emotional expression (Gross & John, 2003). Studies  
25 have shown that reappraisal is an adaptive strategy, whereas expressive suppression is maladaptive  
26 (e.g., Dryman & Heimberg, 2018; Pepping et al., 2016). However, in Gross's process model (1998),  
27 little attention was paid to what leads individuals to use one strategy rather than another, and how  
28 these strategies are actually started or stopped. These limitations have been addressed by the author  
29 in his extended process model (Gross, 2015), with an emphasis on valuation systems that take into  
30 account the contextual aspects of ER.

31         In contrast with the idea of a general adaptiveness of ER strategies, recent models stress the  
32 need to consider the context when determining the adaptiveness of such strategies (Aldao, 2013). For  
33 instance, expressive suppression can sometimes be adaptive, especially when multiple strategies are  
34 used to deal with an event (e.g., suppressing anger expression when receiving a bad grade from a  
35 teacher and reappraising the event later) (Ford et al., 2019). The adaptiveness of ER can be related to  
36 ER flexibility (Aldao et al., 2015), defined as the ability to effectively regulate emotions by selecting  
37 different ER strategies from a broader repertoire, depending on the characteristics of a particular  
38 situation (Bonanno & Burton, 2013; Kobylńska & Kusev, 2019). ER flexibility relies on  
39 individuals' ability to understand, regard, and respond to their emotional experience (Tull & Aldao,  
40 2015). Thus, when examining the use of ER strategies in a given situation, ER abilities - which refer  
41 to one's beliefs about one's effectiveness at regulating emotions - should be taken into account.  
42 Despite the dearth of studies on these abilities in adolescence, there is evidence of a link between  
43 difficulties in ER abilities and mental health problems such as anxiety, depression or aggressive  
44 behaviours (Herts et al., 2012; McLaughlin et al., 2011). Even though ER abilities and strategies are

45 distinguishable processes, theoretical frameworks suggest that they share bidirectional relationships  
46 (e.g., Tull & Aldao, 2015).

#### 47 **Development of ER in adolescence and gender differences**

48 Few studies have been conducted on ER in adolescence, and even fewer within the  
49 framework of recent theories. Developmental studies reveal changes in the use of several ER  
50 strategies during adolescence, with an overall increase during late adolescence in strategies that were  
51 considered as adaptive in previous studies, such as distraction or reappraisal (e.g., McRae, Gross, et  
52 al., 2012). In addition, gender-specific preferences in the use of ER strategies seem to emerge from  
53 this period (Chaplin & Aldao, 2013). For instance, rumination (i.e., repetitive focusing on one's  
54 emotions and their causes and consequences) and support seeking (i.e., looking for support when  
55 experiencing emotions to regulate them) have been shown to be mostly used by girls (Nolen-  
56 Hoeksema et al., 2008; Williams et al., 2018), whereas distraction (diverting one's attention away  
57 from an emotional stimulus and towards other content) is mostly used by boys (Sheppes & Gross,  
58 2011). Less clear is the evidence for gender differences in the use of reappraisal and expressive  
59 suppression which may be linked to the different methodologies and age ranges used: while some  
60 studies fail to demonstrate gender differences in the use of these strategies, others reveal a greater  
61 use of expressive suppression in boys and of reappraisal in girls (Gullone et al., 2010; Nolen-  
62 Hoeksema & Aldao, 2011).

63 Regulatory abilities are thought to increase with age, due to a greater awareness of  
64 motivation, emotion-type or contextual factors (Zeman et al., 2006). As with ER strategies, gender  
65 differences in ER abilities exist: while girls report difficulties controlling the behavioural  
66 manifestation of their emotions (i.e., more dysregulated expression of their emotions), boys are more

67 likely to feel in control of their emotional experience (Bender et al., 2012; Zimmermann & Iwanski,  
68 2014).

### 69 **Current limitations of existing self-report measures of ER in adolescence**

70 ER in childhood and adolescence is generally measured using strategy-based or ability-based  
71 questionnaires in general negative contexts. However, most of these questionnaires were constructed  
72 within the framework of early models of ER, and thus suffer from several limitations. Regarding  
73 ability-based questionnaires, the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS, Gratz & Roemer,  
74 2004) comprises six subscales (strategies, goals, impulse, non-acceptance, awareness and clarity)  
75 that can be summed to obtain a general marker of ER difficulties. However, as some authors have  
76 pointed out (e.g., Preece et al., 2018), the awareness and clarity subscales do not fit with recent  
77 definitions of ER but rather refer to components of alexithymia. Regarding strategy-based  
78 questionnaires, most have focused on a small number of strategies. For example, the Emotion  
79 Regulation Questionnaire for Children and Adolescents (ERQ-CA, Gullone & Taffe, 2012) is only  
80 focused on two strategies, reappraisal and expressive suppression. Yet a broad repertoire of strategies  
81 appears to be mobilised by adolescents (Lougheed & Hollenstein, 2012). Few other questionnaires  
82 were constructed in order to measure a larger number of strategies. For instance, the Cognitive  
83 Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ, Garnefski et al., 2001) enables to measure 9 strategies.  
84 Nevertheless, because most of these strategies belong to the same family, namely cognitive change,  
85 and are highly correlated, they classically fall into two broad categories (i.e., adapted and  
86 maladaptive strategies). Therefore, the adaptiveness of ER should be measured by evaluating  
87 multiple and distinct ER strategies in a given situation.

88 The development of ER strategies may also be emotion-specific (e.g., Brenning & Braet,  
89 2013). Indeed, specific emotions may activate different strategies to be regulated. In that sense,

90 adolescents' use of specific ER strategies and their effectiveness vary in response to anger, fear and  
91 sadness (e.g., Silk et al., 2003). Within this approach, the Children's Emotion Management Scale  
92 (CEMS) is often referred to as a strategy-based questionnaire for evaluating sadness and anger  
93 regulation in children (Zeman et al., 2002). Given the theoretical advances since the CEMS was  
94 published, we consider this questionnaire as a mix between ER strategies and abilities (i.e., with the  
95 dysregulated-expression subscale considered as an ability and inhibition as a strategy).

96         As regards the definition of ER flexibility, differentiating specific emotions and concluding  
97 upon the adaptiveness of strategies without contextualisation can be misleading. For instance, a  
98 negative emotion like sadness may stem from thinking about the death of a close relative or from an  
99 argument with one's parents. These different situations may not trigger the use of the same ER  
100 strategies, some of them being more or less adapted to the specific context (e.g., using expressive  
101 suppression might be more helpful in the case of an argument than the death of a relative). In this  
102 respect, the Negative Emotion Regulation Inventory (NERI, Zimmermann & Iwanski, 2014) is one  
103 of the few contextualised questionnaires of ER, with seven strategies (adaptive ER, social support  
104 seeking, avoidance, passivity, expressive suppression, dysfunctional rumination and dysregulation)  
105 in six situations, each one evoking a specific negative emotion of sadness, fear or anger (i.e., two  
106 situations per emotion). However, some subscales described as strategies comprise items which  
107 could be viewed as abilities. For example, dysregulation can be described as being part of an ER  
108 ability, but also comprises items that refer to the strategies of blaming others (e.g., "I blame others,  
109 even if they are not responsible"). Besides, the situations proposed in this questionnaire address  
110 highly diverse contexts (e.g., interpersonal relations with "renege on a promise" for anger, threatful  
111 to the individual with "being alone in a dark place" for fear), making interpretation of the results  
112 difficult. This issue is raised by studies that focus on ER repertoires in specific contexts, such as that

113 of Dixon-Gordon et al. (2015). In this study, participants reported their use of ER strategies across  
114 achievement-related (e.g., failing a class) or social-related situations (e.g., arguing with a friend) for  
115 the emotions of sadness, anxiety and anger. Interestingly, interpersonal variability in ER was higher  
116 for social-related stressors than for achievement-related stressors. This finding highlights the need  
117 for contextualised measures of ER, especially in adolescence, which is characterised by changes in  
118 social relations, with instability in peer relations and decreased perceived support from parents  
119 (Furman & Buhrmester, 2009).

### 120 **Aims of the present study**

121 ER in adolescence has been insufficiently investigated, especially regarding how it develops  
122 and whether gender differences exist. Moreover, the few self-reported measures assessing ER in  
123 adolescence such as the ERQ-CA or the CERQ do not include recent advances in the ER field (e.g.,  
124 distinction between strategies and abilities, the influence of context in ER, measuring different  
125 families of strategies). There is thus a need to create new measures that can assess a diversity of  
126 situations eliciting different emotions and demands to capture ER flexibility. In order to address the  
127 limitations existing in the literature, we developed the CERSA. This questionnaire has been  
128 constructed in response to contemporary challenges in ER self-report measurement in adolescence.  
129 To this end, it assesses five ER strategies (reappraisal, expressive suppression, distraction, support  
130 seeking and rumination) and two abilities (controlling experience and dysregulation) in three  
131 interpersonal situations that elicit specific negative emotions (sadness, fear and anger).

132 The present study had four main objectives. First, we aimed to examine the factor structure,  
133 the internal consistency, as well as the construct and external validity of the CERSA. In line with the  
134 number of dimensions in this questionnaire (i.e., five strategies and two abilities), a seven-factor  
135 structure was expected for the three situations. To evaluate the construct validity of the CERSA, we

136 investigated its relation with the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ, Garnefski et  
137 al., 2001). We expected that ER strategies and abilities evaluated in the CERSA would be related to  
138 ER strategies measured in the CERQ (e.g., rumination subscales of questionnaires, reappraisal of the  
139 CERSA with positive reappraisal of the CERQ). To evaluate the external validity of the CERSA, we  
140 investigated its relation with the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS, Diener et al., 1985) as one of  
141 the components of the construct of well-being. Second, as we were attempting to clearly distinguish  
142 ER strategies and abilities, we wanted to explore the links between them. Third, we assessed gender  
143 differences for both ER strategies and abilities. For ER strategies, we expected boys to report a  
144 greater use of distraction and expressive suppression, and girls to use more support seeking and  
145 rumination. For ER abilities, we expected boys to report higher levels of control of emotional  
146 experiences (Lougheed & Hollenstein, 2012) and girls to report higher levels of dysregulation.  
147 However, we wanted to check whether these assumptions based on results obtained in a general  
148 context, would be confirmed or balanced using a contextualised measure. In other words, we tested  
149 the variability of gender differences between situations. Finally, we studied the variability of strategy  
150 uses and of the abilities reported by adolescents, depending on the situation. Based on the recent  
151 theoretical models on ER flexibility (e.g., Aldao et al., 2015), we expected the levels of all strategies  
152 and abilities to vary according to situations.

153

## Method

154

### Participants

155

156

157

158

This study consisted of two samples. The first sample was composed of 852 middle and high schoolers who only completed the CERSA. Twelve participants were excluded because at least 10% of their questionnaire data were missing or because they did not follow the instructions given in the questionnaire (e.g., straight liners). This resulted in a dataset of 840 adolescents ( $M_{\text{age}} = 14.75$ ;  $SD_{\text{age}}$

159 = 1.61, range<sub>age</sub> = 12-19 years, 431 males, 406 females, 3 not reported). Participants were  
160 representative of the French population, with most of them Caucasian and from a middle-class  
161 socioeconomic background. All participants were recruited in five French public middle and high  
162 schools (63.7% middle schoolers). Data collected within this sample were used to test all hypotheses  
163 except those on construct and external validity, which were tested using data collected from the  
164 second sample of 318 middle schoolers who completed the CERSA, the CERQ and the SWLS. Five  
165 adolescents were excluded for the same reasons stated above. This resulted in a dataset of 313  
166 adolescents from two French middle schools ( $M_{\text{age}} = 13.63$ ;  $SD_{\text{age}} = 0.85$ , range<sub>age</sub> = 12-15 years, 156  
167 males, 156 females, 1 not reported).

## 168 **Measures and Procedure**

169         The CERSA is an 84-item French self-report measurement of both ER strategies and abilities  
170 in different negative situations that may occur in adolescence. Each of the situations was created to  
171 evoke a particular negative emotion (sadness, fear and anger). Compared to other questionnaires that  
172 specify an emotion to adolescents, we chose to use scenarios because they (1) better reflect what  
173 happens in daily life (i.e., ecological validity), (2) are widely used to activate emotions (Siedlecka &  
174 Denson, 2019), and (3) allow for better comparability of adolescents' responses (i.e., participants can  
175 remember very different situations when asked about a specific emotion). We focused on negative  
176 emotional situations because there is a perceived increase in negative emotions in adolescence and  
177 thus a higher need to regulate them (Silk et al., 2003). These situations were generated based on  
178 existing contextualized measures such as the NERI (Zimmermann & Iwanski, 2014). We also asked  
179 adolescents (N= 37) to describe situations inducing emotions of sadness, fear and anger. Due to  
180 heterogeneity in responses, we selected the situations that (1) were the most frequently experienced  
181 by the adolescents and (2) induced the intended negative emotions. These situations were written in a

182 person-directed manner and were designed to assess ER in an interpersonal context at school. We  
183 focused on this context because adolescents spend most of their lives in schools where they have to  
184 face negative emotions (26 hours on average in France). The sadness situation refers to the departure  
185 of a close friend who will not be in the adolescent's class or school next year. The fear situation  
186 concerns an important talk in front of comrades when the adolescent has forgotten everything they  
187 wanted to say. Finally, the anger situation is the divulgation of a secret by a close friend to peers.  
188 After the presentation of a situation, the adolescents were asked whether they had already  
189 experienced it on a three-point Likert scale (i.e., with the answers being never, once and multiple  
190 times). The validity of the situations to elicit the expected emotion was measured by asking them for  
191 the intensity rating of experienced sadness, fear and anger for each situation presented on a seven-  
192 point Likert-type scale (from 1 "not at all" to 7 "really intense"). In the questionnaire and during its  
193 presentation, the adolescents were asked to respond according to their emotions and reactions to the  
194 situation presented, as soon as this situation occurs.

195 For every situation, five strategies (i.e., distraction, reappraisal, expressive suppression,  
196 support seeking and rumination) and two abilities (i.e., controlling experience and dysregulation)  
197 were measured with four items each, specifically designed for adolescents. According to the  
198 extended process model (Gross, 2015), these strategies refer to different families of strategies (i.e.,  
199 attentional deployment, cognitive change and response modulation). In their study, Lennarz et al.,  
200 (2019) highlighted that these strategies are among the most used by adolescents when facing  
201 negative emotions. Furthermore, two of these strategies are usually considered as adaptive  
202 (reappraisal, distraction), two as maladaptive (expressive suppression, rumination) and the last one is  
203 usually not classified (support seeking). The strategies and abilities were measured with different  
204 instructions but the formulation of the items was similar in each situation. The questionnaire asked

205 how adolescents would react in order to measure the strategies, whereas for the abilities it asked how  
206 they would describe themselves in the situation. The five strategies were reappraisal (e.g., “I change  
207 the way I think about this situation”), expressive suppression (e.g., “I don’t show how I feel”),  
208 distraction (e.g., “I do something else to distract myself”), support seeking (e.g., “I look for someone  
209 who makes me feel good”) and rumination (e.g., “I can’t stop myself thinking about this situation”).  
210 Each item was measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (from 1 “Not at all like that” to 7 “Totally  
211 like that”). The two abilities were controlling experience (e.g., “I’m able to control my feelings”) and  
212 dysregulation (e.g., “I can’t control what I say or do because of my feelings”). Each item was  
213 measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (from 1 “Not like me at all” to 7 “Totally like me”).

214         The CERQ is a 36-item questionnaire measuring cognitive ER strategies used by adolescents  
215 in a general negative context (Garnefski et al., 2001). Even if this questionnaire mainly refers to one  
216 family of strategies (cognitive change), we used it because it is one of the few to measure multiple  
217 ER strategies, it has been proven to be valid with an adolescent sample, and it is available in French  
218 (d’Acremont & Van der Linden, 2007). The nine strategies measured in the CERQ are usually  
219 classified as either adaptive with Acceptance (e.g., “I think that I have to accept the situation”),  
220 Putting into Perspective (e.g., “I think that it hasn’t been too bad compared to other things”), Positive  
221 Reappraisal (e.g., “I think that the situation also has its positive sides”), Refocus on Planning (e.g., “I  
222 think of what I can do best”), and Positive Refocusing (e.g., “I think of nicer things than what I have  
223 experienced”); or non-adaptive with Catastrophizing (e.g., “I keep thinking about how terrible it is  
224 what I have experienced”), Rumination (e.g., “I often think about how I feel about what I have  
225 experienced”), Self-Blame (e.g., “I feel that I am the one to blame for it”), and Blaming Others  
226 strategies (e.g., “I feel that others are to blame for it”). Participants were asked what they usually

227 think when experiencing negative or unpleasant events, with each item being evaluated on a 5-point  
228 Likert-type scale (from 1 “almost never” to 5 “almost always”).

229         The SLSW is a short 5-item questionnaire that measures satisfaction with life (Diener et al.,  
230 1985). This questionnaire is available in French and has been validated with adolescent samples  
231 (Blais et al., 1989; Neto, 1993). Participants were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the  
232 items (e.g., “I am satisfied with my life”, “In most ways my life is close to my ideal”) and responded  
233 on a 7-point Likert-type scale (from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree”).

234         The participants from the two samples filled out the CERSA or all questionnaires during  
235 school time. Written informed consent was obtained from all adolescents and their parents.  
236 Participation was voluntary, not rewarded, and the adolescents were informed that they could stop  
237 participating in the study at any time. Participants were told that there were no right or wrong  
238 answers, and that they had to give the answer that was truest for them.

### 239 **Data analysis**

240         All analyses were performed using R 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020). The proportion of missing  
241 data for the 84 items of the questionnaire in the first sample was 0.582%. In order to deal with the  
242 missing data, we performed multiple imputations using the missMDA package which have the  
243 advantage of having little to no weight in factor analyses (Josse & Husson, 2016). Power analyses  
244 were conducted separately to estimate both samples required for (1) factor analyses (structural  
245 equation models being the most demanding of our analyses in terms of number of participants) and  
246 (2) correlations between the dimensions of the CERSA, the CERQ and the SLWS.

247         For the internal validity of the CERSA, linear mixed models were performed for the emotions  
248 induced by each situation using the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015). Confirmatory factor analyses

249 (CFA) were performed to assess the 7-factor structure of five strategies and two abilities, for each  
250 emotion scenario, using the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012). The goodness-of-fit of these models  
251 was judged based on several fit indices: the robust  $\chi^2/df$ , robust comparative fit index (robust CFI),  
252 robust Tucker Lewis index (robust TLI), robust root mean square error of approximation (robust  
253 RMSEA) and standardised root mean residual (SRMR). Robust  $\chi^2/df$  values  $< 3$  were judged as an  
254 acceptable parsimonious fit, robust CFI and TLI values  $> .90$  were judged to indicate an acceptable  
255 incremental fit and robust RMSEA and SRMR values  $< .08$  were judged as an acceptable absolute fit  
256 (Bentler & Bonnet, 1980; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Marsh et al., 2004). To calculate the number of  
257 participants for these analyses, we followed two rules of thumbs: (1) N:q ratio being superior to 5,  
258 where N is the number of cases and q the number of estimates parameters, and (2) obtaining 20  
259 participants per measured variable (Bentler & Chou, 1987; Shumacker & Lomax, 2016). According  
260 to our models, with 105 parameters and 28 items for 7 factors each, 525 participants were required  
261 for the N:q ratio and 480 for the 20 per measured variable ratio. Data collection resulted in a higher  
262 number of 840 participants which was sufficient to test our hypotheses.

263 For the construct and external validity, Pearson's correlations were performed on the manifest  
264 dimensions of the CERSA, CERQ and SLWS using Hmisc package (Harrell Jr, 2019). Using  
265 G\*Power 3.1.9.7 (Faul et al., 2009), detecting small effects  $> .15$  with a statistical power of .80 and  $\alpha$   
266 = .05 required 301 participants. Thus, the obtained sample size of  $N = 313$  is more than adequate to  
267 test the study hypothesis.

268 For the links between ER strategies and abilities, latent correlations between factors were  
269 calculated through the CFA step. However, because meaningless correlations can become significant  
270 in large samples, only significant correlations with a coefficient  $\geq 0.10$  were interpreted.

271 Multigroup comparisons for measurement invariance across gender were conducted using the  
272 semTools and lavaan packages (Jorgensen et al., 2021; Rosseel, 2012). Given the large number of  
273 parameters in our models, the approach selected to reject a more constrained solution was to check  
274 differences in alternative fit indices ( $\Delta$ AFIs). Specifically, a model was rejected when the decrease in  
275 the comparative fit index criterion ( $\Delta$ CFI) was higher than .01, or when an increase in the root mean  
276 square error of approximation ( $\Delta$ RMSEA) was higher than .015, indicating non-invariant loadings,  
277 intercepts or residuals (Chen, 2007). In order to test gender differences in the three situations, latent  
278 means comparisons were performed.

279 Finally, linear mixed models and Tukey post-hoc tests were performed on the manifest  
280 dimensions to compare the levels of ER strategies and abilities between the three situations, using the  
281 lme4 and multcomp packages (Bates et al., 2015; Hothorn et al., 2008).

## 282 **Results**

### 283 **Internal validity of the CERSA**

284 Descriptive statistics for the reported intensity of sadness, fear and anger for each situation as  
285 well as the percentage of adolescents who had experienced them at least once are presented in Table  
286 1. Orthogonal contrasts were used in linear mixed models in order to test whether each situation  
287 correctly induced the expected emotion (coded as 2 and the other two emotions as -1). Intercepts of  
288 the participants were set as random factors to control the variance due to individual differences. The  
289 hypothesis contrast was significant for the situation of sadness,  $t(1658) = 38.99, p < .001, d = 1.92,$   
290 fear,  $t(1658) = 42.24, p < .001, d = 2.07$  and anger,  $t(1658) = 51.06, p < .001, d = 2.51.$

291 <Insert Table 1 about here>

292 Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were performed on each situation in order to test the  
293 expected seven factor structure, using maximum likelihood robust (MLR) estimator. The first 7-  
294 factor model tested for the sadness situation showed an acceptable fit:  $\chi^2(329) = 861.330, p < .001,$   
295  $\chi^2/df = 2.618, CFI = .949, RMSEA = .048[.044-.052], TLI = .941,$  and SRMR = .056. However, one  
296 item of the distraction factor showed low standardized factor loading (i.e., .367) (Matsunaga, 2010)  
297 and was then removed from further analyses. The 7-factor models tested without this item provided a  
298 good fit for the three situations; sadness:  $\chi^2(303) = 764.865, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.524, CFI = .955,$   
299 RMSEA = .047[.042-.051], TLI = .950, and SRMR = .049; fear:  $\chi^2(303) = 778.494, p < .001, \chi^2/df =$   
300 2.569, CFI = .952, RMSEA = .048[.044-.052], TLI = .947, and SRMR = .049; and anger:  $\chi^2(303) =$   
301 684.902,  $p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.260, CFI = .962, RMSEA = .044[.040-.048], TLI = .957,$  and SRMR =  
302 .046. Standardised factor loadings are reported in Table 2.

303 <Insert Table 2 about here>

### 304 **Internal consistency of the CERSA and latent correlations between strategies and abilities** 305 **factors**

306 The internal consistency of the seven factors and latent correlations between them are  
307 reported in Table 3. The internal consistency was good to excellent for the sadness ( $\omega$  from .827 to  
308 .916), fear ( $\omega$  from .830 to .892) and anger situations ( $\omega$  from .830 to .908). Significant factor  
309 correlations had little to high effect sizes, with notable variations between situations. While some  
310 strategy factors were positively associated in all situations like *support seeking* with *ruminating* or  
311 *distraction* with *reappraisal*, other strategies factors were only associated in certain situations (i.e.,  
312 *expressive suppression* was positively linked to *reappraisal* only in the fear and anger situations).  
313 Similarly, for the links between strategies and abilities, while *dysregulation* was positively linked to  
314 *ruminating* in all situations, it was negatively linked to *reappraisal* in the sadness and anger

315 situations, and to *distraction* and *expressive suppression* in the anger situation. Nevertheless,  
316 *controlling of emotional experience* was positively or negatively linked to each strategy in all  
317 situations, with one exception, namely *support seeking* in the anger situation. Finally, the links  
318 between the ability factors *controlling of emotional experience* and *dysregulation* were negative in  
319 all situations.

320 <Insert Table 3 about here>

### 321 **Construct and external validity of the CERSA**

322 CERSA strategies and abilities were related CERQ strategies in all situations with some  
323 variations, especially in the effect sizes. As expected, the CERSA *reappraisal* subscale was  
324 positively correlated with the CERQ positive refocusing, refocusing on planning, positive reappraisal  
325 and putting into perspective subscales in all situations. The CERSA *rumination* subscale was  
326 positively associated with the CERQ rumination, self-blame and catastrophising subscales in all  
327 situations, as well as with the blaming others subscale in the sadness and anger situations. The  
328 CERSA *controlling experience* subscale was positively associated with the CERQ acceptance  
329 subscale in the sadness and anger situations.

330 Similarly, most dimensions of the CERSA were related to the SLWS dimension in all  
331 situations. As expected, while *distraction*, *reappraisal* and *controlling experience* were positively  
332 correlated with satisfaction with life, *rumination* and *dysregulation* were negatively correlated.  
333 Expressive suppression was negatively associated with satisfaction with life in the sadness and fear  
334 situations. Detailed results as well as the internal consistency of the CERQ and SLWS dimensions  
335 are reported in Table 4.

336 <Insert Table 4 about here>



359 <Insert Table 6 about here>

### 360 **Variability in ER strategies and abilities across situations**

361 We conducted linear mixed models to check whether the mean levels of these dimensions  
362 varied across the three situations. Intercepts of the participants were set as random factors to control  
363 the variance due to individual differences. Tukey post-hoc tests were run to test differences between  
364 each situation. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the dimensions of the  
365 CERSA, the fixed effects of the linear mixed models and the order of the situations determined by  
366 Tukey post-hoc tests are reported in Table 7. All mean levels of strategies and abilities varied  
367 according to the situations. For example, adolescents reported that they looked more for *social*  
368 *support* and demonstrated higher *dysregulation* in the anger situation while they reported a higher  
369 use of *reappraisal* and presented a higher *control of emotional experience* for the sadness situation.

370 <Insert Table 7 about here>

### 371 **Discussion**

372 Adolescence is a period characterised by the exploration of new contexts or roles. The  
373 numerous changes that occur in this period are often accompanied by negative emotions that  
374 adolescents have to regulate. Although investigation into ER in adolescence is growing, there is a  
375 need to develop reliable tools for research on both ER strategies and abilities in context, based on  
376 situations that are meaningful to adolescents. In this article, we documented a new French self-report  
377 measure of ER for adolescents, the Contextualised Emotion Regulation Survey for Adolescents  
378 (CERSA), developed within the framework of the latest theoretical models on ER. All situations  
379 presented in this questionnaire were written in an interpersonal context and induced the intended  
380 emotions of sadness, fear or anger. We evaluated its internal structure, its construct and its external

381 validity, and we investigated relationships between strategies and abilities, gender differences as well  
382 as differences in the mean levels of strategies and abilities between situations, across two samples of  
383 adolescents. The CERSA demonstrated an excellent factorial structure, confirming the theoretical  
384 construction of a seven-factor structure composed of five strategies and two abilities that were  
385 replicated in the three situations presented. Furthermore, the dimensions evaluated in the CERSA  
386 were related to the dimensions of another measure of ER, the CERQ, as well as to a measure of  
387 satisfaction with life, thereby demonstrating the validity of this new questionnaire. ER strategies and  
388 abilities, as well as their links showed stability and variability in the three tested situations, as did  
389 gender effects. These are promising results for the study of ER flexibility in adolescence and  
390 highlight the need to construct measures that take into account the contextual aspect of ER.

391 This study provides support for the hypothesis that ER strategies and abilities are  
392 distinguishable processes (i.e., they did not overlap in the factor analysis) that can be assessed in the  
393 same questionnaire. Furthermore, ER strategies were also associated with ER abilities, demonstrating  
394 that these two aspects of ER are interrelated, as theoretically assumed (Tull & Aldao, 2015). As  
395 studies on both ER strategies and abilities are scarce, this article provides new insights for further  
396 studies that aim to better understand the nature of these links (i.e., with both shared and separable  
397 mechanisms) and their evolution during adolescence.

398 Moreover, adolescents' use of more than one strategy to regulate the emotions driven by a  
399 single event and the level of use of each strategy they mobilise depending on the situation provide  
400 empirical support for studying adolescents' emotion regulation in context. Indeed, the links between  
401 ER strategies varied according to the situation, indicating that the combination of strategies used by  
402 adolescents may be different depending on the context they are in. These findings reinforce the  
403 recent theoretical proposition of polyregulation (Ford et al., 2019). In addition, the mean level of ER

404 strategies and abilities varied according to the situation, showing that adolescents regulate their  
405 emotions differently and feel more or less effective at doing so depending on the characteristics of a  
406 given situation. Together, these findings highlight the need to capture ER flexibility by focusing on  
407 the repertoires of strategies that adolescents can mobilise in different contexts, rather than studying  
408 the separate outcomes of each strategy (Bonanno & Burton, 2013; Loughheed & Hollenstein, 2012).  
409 Thus, the CERSA seems particularly adapted to implementation of the recent emerging hypotheses  
410 in the ER research field.

411         Variability in the use of ER strategies was also observed in the results on gender differences.  
412 In line with previous studies, some strategies were used more by boys, such as distraction or  
413 reappraisal, while others, such as support seeking or rumination, were used more by girls  
414 (Eschenbeck et al., 2007; Hampel & Petermann, 2005; Zimmermann & Iwanski, 2014). Surprisingly,  
415 there was no gender difference in the use of expressive suppression. However, it is important to note  
416 that most gender differences found in this study were dependent on the situation, indicating that  
417 gender roles in ER may or may not be activated according to the situation. These results also  
418 highlight the importance of measuring ER in a contextualised way to gain a better understanding of  
419 how gender socialisation can lead adolescents to regulate their emotions differently. Consistent with  
420 gender role theories that men's role involves being active and agentic (Tamres et al., 2002), greater  
421 use of reappraisal may be made in attempts to control or change certain situations. Our results are  
422 also congruent with studies showing that girls share their emotions more but ruminate more  
423 (Garnefski et al., 2005; Nolen-Hoeksema, 2012), although this is not verified in every situation. This  
424 point should be further investigated across different situations, for example by referring to  
425 achievement-related and social-related situations (Dixon-Gordon et al., 2015). Finally, our results  
426 also indicate that gender differences in ER abilities are more stable than in strategies across the

427 situations presented, further highlighting the need to differentiate and evaluate these two aspects of  
428 ER in adolescence.

429 This study has some limitations that must be recognized. The CERSA was designed to assess  
430 ER strategies and abilities in different negative emotional situations. Thus, it does not take into  
431 account the regulation of positive emotions that are part of the development of ER (Gilbert, 2012).  
432 While ER strategies and abilities assessed in the CERSA were related to the CERQ dimensions and  
433 to satisfaction with life, further studies with larger samples and other measures classically associated  
434 with ER, such as different aspects of well-being, could strengthen these results. The CERSA  
435 comprises one scenario per emotion in order to evaluate adolescents' ER. A potential risk of using a  
436 limited number of scenarios is to confuse the effects related to the situation itself and the emotion felt  
437 by the adolescents. Moreover, as might be expected in everyday situations, some adolescents  
438 reported feeling mixed emotions. Thus, further studies using multiple situations per emotion are  
439 required to understand how adolescents regulate a specific emotion. Furthermore, the situations  
440 presented have focused on interpersonal contexts in school which are important in the development  
441 of ER. Further studies should be conducted by transposing CERSA situations in other contexts that  
442 are relevant to adolescents' emotional life (e.g., adolescent-family interactions at home, academic  
443 achievements) in order to get a better understanding of their ER flexibility.

#### 444 **Conclusion**

445 This study focused on the construction and the validity of the CERSA. This new tool has  
446 proven to be valid and its use should provide promising insights for studying ER in a more  
447 contextualised way in adolescence. Our results demonstrate that ER strategies and abilities are both  
448 distinguishable and interconnected, as was theoretically assumed by Tull and Aldao (2015).  
449 Furthermore, the mean levels of strategies and abilities reported by adolescents varied according to

450 the situations. Similarly, some gender differences in ER strategies and abilities were situation-  
451 dependent. Further research is needed to replicate our results in other samples of adolescents using  
452 the CERSA. Given the importance of ER flexibility development in adolescence, studies should also  
453 focus on its links with psychological outcomes.

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468 **References**

- 469 Aldao, A. (2013). The future of emotion regulation research: Capturing context. *Perspectives on*  
470 *Psychological Science*, 8(2), 155-172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459518>
- 471 Aldao, A., Sheppes, G., & Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation flexibility. *Cognitive Therapy and*  
472 *Research*, 39(3), 263-278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-014-9662-4>
- 473 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using  
474 *lme4*. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1-48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- 475 Bender, P. K., Reinholdt-Dunne, M. L., Esbjørn, B. H., & Pons, F. (2012). Emotion dysregulation  
476 and anxiety in children and adolescents: Gender differences. *Personality and Individual*  
477 *Differences*, 53(3), 284-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.027>
- 478 Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of  
479 covariance structures. *Psychological bulletin*, 88(3), 588.  
480 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588>
- 481 Bentler, P. M., & Yuan, K. H. (1999). Structural Equation Modeling with Small Samples: Test  
482 Statistics. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 34, 181-197.  
483 <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327906Mb340203>
- 484 Blais, M. R., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Brière, N. M. (1989). L'échelle de satisfaction de  
485 vie : Validation canadienne-française du " Satisfaction with Life Scale.". *Canadian Journal of*  
486 *Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 21(2), 210.

- 487 Bonanno, G. A., & Burton, C. L. (2013). Regulatory flexibility: An individual differences  
488 perspective on coping and emotion regulation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(6),  
489 591-612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613504116>
- 490 Brenning, K. M., & Braet, C. (2013). The emotion regulation model of attachment: An emotion-  
491 specific approach. *Personal Relationships*, 20(1), 107-123.  
492 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2012.01399.x>
- 493 Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit. *Sociological*  
494 *Methods & Research*, 21(2), 230–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005>
- 495 Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement  
496 invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(3), 464-504.  
497 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
- 498 Cracco, E., Van Durme, K., & Braet, C. (2015). Validation of the FEEL-KJ: an instrument to  
499 measure emotion regulation strategies in children and adolescents. *PloS one*, 10(9),  
500 e0137080. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137080>
- 501 Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life  
502 scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- 503 Dixon-Gordon, K. L., Aldao, A., & De Los Reyes, A. (2015). Repertoires of emotion regulation: A  
504 person-centered approach to assessing emotion regulation strategies and links to  
505 psychopathology. *Cognition and Emotion*, 29(7), 1314-1325.  
506 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.983046>

- 507 d'Acremont, M., & Van der Linden, M. (2007). How is impulsivity related to depression in  
508 adolescence? Evidence from a French validation of the cognitive emotion regulation  
509 questionnaire. *Journal of adolescence*, 30(2), 271-282.
- 510 Dryman, M. T., & Heimberg, R. G. (2018). Emotion regulation in social anxiety and depression: A  
511 systematic review of expressive suppression and cognitive reappraisal. *Clinical Psychology  
512 Review*, 65, 17-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2018.07.004>
- 513 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A. *et al.* (2009). Statistical power analyses using G\*Power 3.1: Tests  
514 for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods* 41, 1149–1160.  
515 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- 516 Ford, B. Q., Gross, J. J., & Gruber, J. (2019). Broadening our field of view: The role of emotion  
517 polyregulation. *Emotion Review*, 11(3), 197-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073919850314>
- 518 Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (2009). Methods and measures: The network of relationships  
519 inventory: Behavioral systems version. *International journal of behavioral development*,  
520 33(5), 470-478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025409342634>
- 521 Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & Spinhoven, P. (2001). Negative life events, cognitive emotion regulation  
522 and emotional problems. *Personality and Individual differences*, 30(8), 1311-1327.
- 523 Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & van Eten, M. (2005). Specificity of relations between adolescents'  
524 cognitive emotion regulation strategies and internalizing and externalizing  
525 psychopathology. *Journal of adolescence*, 28(5), 619-631.  
526 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.12.009>

- 527 Gilbert, K. E. (2012). The neglected role of positive emotion in adolescent psychopathology. *Clinical*  
528 *psychology review*, 32(6), 467-481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.05.005>
- 529 Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and  
530 dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in  
531 emotion regulation scale. *Journal of psychopathology and behavioral assessment*, 26(1), 41-  
532 54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-008-9102-4>
- 533 Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of*  
534 *general psychology*, 2(3), 271-299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271>
- 535 Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes:  
536 Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
537 *Psychology*, 85, 348–362. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>
- 538 Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological*  
539 *Inquiry*, 26(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781>
- 540 Gullone, E., Hughes, E. K., King, N. J., & Tonge, B. (2010). The normative development of emotion  
541 regulation strategy use in children and adolescents: A 2-year follow-up study. *Journal of*  
542 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(5), 567-574.  
543 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02183.x>
- 544 Gullone, E., & Taffe, J. (2012). The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire for Children and Adolescents  
545 (ERQ–CA): A psychometric evaluation. *Psychological assessment*, 24(2), 409.  
546 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025777>

- 547 Eschenbeck, H., Kohlmann, C. W., & Lohaus, A. (2007). Gender differences in coping strategies in  
548 children and adolescents. *Journal of individual differences*, 28(1), 18-26.  
549 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.28.1.18>
- 550 Hampel, P., & Petermann, F. (2005). Age and gender effects on coping in children and  
551 adolescents. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 34(2), 73-83.  
552 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-005-3207-9>
- 553 Harrell Jr, F. E. (2019) (2021). Package 'Hmisc'. *CRAN2019*, 235-236. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc)  
554 [project.org/package=Hmisc](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc)
- 555 Herts, K. L., McLaughlin, K. A., & Hatzenbuehler, M. L. (2012). Emotion dysregulation as a  
556 mechanism linking stress exposure to adolescent aggressive behavior. *Journal of abnormal*  
557 *child psychology*, 40(7), 1111-1122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-012-9629-4>
- 558 Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., & Westfall, P. (2008). Simultaneous inference in general parametric  
559 models. *Biometrical Journal*, 50(3), 346-363. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.200810425>
- 560 Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2021). semTools: Useful  
561 tools for structural equation modeling. R package version 0.5-4. *CRAN.R-project*.  
562 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools>.
- 563 Josse, J., & Husson, F. (2016). missMDA: a package for handling missing values in multivariate data  
564 analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 70(1), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v070.i01>
- 565 Kobylńska, D., & Kusev, P. (2019). Flexible emotion regulation: How situational demands and  
566 individual differences influence the effectiveness of regulatory strategies. *Frontiers in*  
567 *psychology*, 10, 72. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00072>

- 568 Lennarz, H. K., Hollenstein, T., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Kuntsche, E., & Granic, I. (2019). Emotion  
569 regulation in action: Use, selection, and success of emotion regulation in adolescents' daily  
570 lives. *International journal of behavioral development*, 43(1), 1-11.  
571 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025418755540>
- 572 Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., Côté, S., Beers, M., & Petty, R. E. (2005). Emotion regulation abilities and  
573 the quality of social interaction. *Emotion*, 5(1), 113-118.  
574 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.113>
- 575 Lougheed, J. P., & Hollenstein, T. (2012). A limited repertoire of emotion regulation strategies is  
576 associated with internalizing problems in adolescence. *Social Development*, 21(4), 704-721.  
577 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2012.00663.x>
- 578 Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-  
579 testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu  
580 and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural equation modeling*, 11(3), 320-341.  
581 [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1103\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1103_2)
- 582 Matsunaga, M. (2010). How to Factor-Analyze Your Data Right: Do's, Don'ts, and How-  
583 To's. *International journal of psychological research*, 3(1), 97-110.  
584 <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.854>
- 585 McLaughlin, K. A., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Mennin, D. S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2011). Emotion  
586 dysregulation and adolescent psychopathology: A prospective study. *Behaviour research and*  
587 *therapy*, 49(9), 544-554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2011.06.003>
- 588 McRae, K., Gross, J. J., Weber, J., Robertson, E. R., Sokol-Hessner, P., Ray, R. D., Gabrieli, J. D., &  
589 Ochsner, K. N. (2012). The development of emotion regulation: an fMRI study of cognitive

- 590 reappraisal in children, adolescents and young adults. *Social cognitive and affective*  
591 *neuroscience*, 7(1), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsr093>
- 592 McRae, K., Jacobs, S. E., Ray, R. D., John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Individual differences in  
593 reappraisal ability: Links to reappraisal frequency, well-being, and cognitive control. *Journal*  
594 *of Research in Personality*, 46(1), 2-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.10.003>
- 595 Nelis, D., Kotsou, I., Quoidbach, J., Hansenne, M., Weytens, F., Dupuis, P., & Mikolajczak, M.  
596 (2011). Increasing emotional competence improves psychological and physical well-being,  
597 social relationships, and employability. *Emotion*, 11(2), 354.  
598 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021554>
- 599 Neto, F. (1993). The satisfaction with life scale: Psychometrics properties in an adolescent  
600 sample. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 22(2), 125-134.
- 601 Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives*  
602 *on psychological science*, 3(5), 400-424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x>
- 603 Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Aldao, A. (2011). Gender and age differences in emotion regulation  
604 strategies and their relationship to depressive symptoms. *Personality and individual*  
605 *differences*, 51(6), 704-708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.012>
- 606 Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2012). Emotion regulation and psychopathology: The role of gender. *Annual*  
607 *review of clinical psychology*, 8, 161-187. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143109)  
608 143109

- 609 Pepping, C. A., Duvenage, M., Cronin, T. J., & Lyons, A. (2016). Adolescent mindfulness and  
610 psychopathology: The role of emotion regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 99*,  
611 302-307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.089>
- 612 Preece, D. A., Becerra, R., Robinson, K., Dandy, J., & Allan, A. (2018). Measuring emotion  
613 regulation ability across negative and positive emotions: The Perth Emotion Regulation  
614 Competency Inventory (PERCI). *Personality and Individual Differences, 135*, 229-241.  
615 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.07.025>
- 616 R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
617 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 618 Revelle, W. (2020). Psych: procedures for personality and psychological research. *CRAN.R-project*.  
619 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- 620 Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling and more. *Journal of*  
621 *statistical software, 48*(2), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- 622 Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2016). A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling  
623 (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- 624 Sheppes, G., Gross, J. J. (2011). "Is timing everything? Temporal considerations in emotion  
625 regulation". *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15* (4): 319–331.  
626 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310395778>
- 627 Siedlecka, E., & Denson, T. F. (2019). Experimental methods for inducing basic emotions: A  
628 qualitative review. *Emotion Review, 11*(1), 87-97.  
629 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073917749016>

- 630 Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2003). Adolescents' emotion regulation in daily life: Links  
631 to depressive symptoms and problem behavior. *Child development, 74*(6), 1869- 1880.  
632 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-8624.2003.00643.x>
- 633 Tamres, L.K., Janicki, D., & Helgeson, V.S. (2002). Sex differences in coping behavior: A meta-  
634 analytic review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology*  
635 *Review, 6*, 2–30. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0601\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0601_1)
- 636 Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: A theme in search of definition. *Monographs of the*  
637 *society for research in child development, 25-52*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166137>
- 638 Tull, M. T., & Aldao, A. (2015). Editorial overview: New directions in the science of emotion  
639 regulation. *Current opinion in psychology, 3*, iv-x.  
640 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.03.009>
- 641 Williams, W. C., Morelli, S. A., Ong, D. C., & Zaki, J. (2018). Interpersonal emotion regulation:  
642 Implications for affiliation, perceived support, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of*  
643 *personality and social psychology, 115*(2), 224. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000132>
- 644 Zeman, J., Shipman, K., & Suveg, C. (2002). Anger and sadness regulation: Predictions to  
645 internalizing and externalizing symptoms in children. *Journal of clinical child and adolescent*  
646 *psychology, 31*(3), 393-398. <https://doi.org/10.1207/153744202760082658>
- 647 Zeman, J., Cassano, M., Perry-Parrish, C., & Stegall, S. (2006). Emotion regulation in children and  
648 adolescents. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 27*(2), 155-168.  
649 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004703-200604000-00014>

650 Zimmermann, P., & Iwanski, A. (2014). Emotion regulation from early adolescence to emerging  
651 adulthood and middle adulthood: Age differences, gender differences, and emotion-specific  
652 developmental variations. *International journal of behavioral development*, 38(2), 182-194.  
653 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025413515405>

**Tables****Table 1**

*Descriptive statistics on the reported emotions for each situation and percentage of adolescents who have experienced them at least one time*

	Sadness	Fear	Anger	% of occurring
<i>Situations</i>	<i>M (ET)</i>	<i>M (ET)</i>	<i>M (ET)</i>	
Sadness situation	5.25 (1.50)	2.45 (1.66)	2.38 (1.70)	62.38
Fear situation	1.82 (1.45)	5.26 (1.66)	3.13 (2.05)	77.62
Anger situation	3.50 (2.11)	3.11 (2.06)	6.08 (1.35)	69.29

**Table 2**

*Standardised factor loadings from Confirmatory Factor Analysis with maximum likelihood robust (MLR) estimator for the 81 remaining items of the CERSA*

Factor/Items	Standardised Factor Loadings		
	Situations		
	Sadness	Fear	Anger
<b>Distraction</b>			
S1 – F19 – A19	.785	.934	.924
S8 – F20 – A18	.840	.896	.942
S13 – F3 – A7	.860	.650	.755
<b>Reappraisal</b>			
S2 – F10 – A16	.689	.794	.867
S7 – F18 – A6	.735	.848	.753
S15 – F13 – A20	.843	.829	.895
S19 – F16 – A2	.853	.808	.653
<b>Expressive suppression</b>			
S10 – F4 – A13	.828	.704	.802
S11 – F6 – A12	.881	.819	.873
S12 – F8 – A10	.819	.765	.789
S14 – F11 – A3	.888	.850	.605
<b>Support seeking</b>			
S4 – F14 – A8	.613	.681	.743
S6 – F17 – A14	.709	.704	.804
S16 – F9 – A17	.895	.889	.854
S20 – F5 – A1	.799	.803	.655
<b>Rumination</b>			
S3 – F1 – A11	.794	.797	.795
S5 – F12 – A9	.686	.583	.717
S9 – F7 – A15	.811	.807	.803
S17 – F2 – A5	.774	.771	.643
<b>Controlling experience</b>			
S21 – F27 – A26	.721	.899	.825
S23 – F25 – A21	.724	.609	.554
S26 – F21 – A24	.654	.643	.683
S28 – F28 – A28	.835	.888	.889
<b>Dysregulation</b>			
S22 – F22 – A25	.609	.717	.859
S24 – F26 – A27	.826	.831	.828
S25 – F24 – A23	.831	.815	.891
S27 – F23 – A22	.790	.798	.788

Note. Items numbers with S for sadness, F for fear and A for anger situations of the CERSA

**Table 3***Factor correlations and McDonald's  $\omega$  for CERSA situations*

Sadness situation							
Factors	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	A1	A2
S1 Distraction	-						
S2 Reappraisal	.250***	-					
S3 Expressive suppression	.109**	.012	-				
S4 Support seeking	.162***	.165***	-.253***	-			
S5 Rumination	.003	-.161***	.058	.432***	-		
A1 Controlling experience	.119**	.364***	.222***	-.294***	-.537***	-	
A2 Dysregulation	.086*	-.170***	-.009	.326***	.662***	-.681***	-
McDonald's $\omega$	.866	.864	.916	.846	.852	.827	.854
Fear situation							
Factors	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	A1	A2
S1 Distraction	-						
S2 Reappraisal	.396***	-					
S3 Expressive suppression	.253***	.153***	-				
S4 Support seeking	.029	.222***	-.213***	-			
S5 Rumination	.011	.008	.028	.306***	-		
A1 Controlling experience	.232***	.297***	.263***	-.113**	-.340***	-	
A2 Dysregulation	.072	.004	.003	.272***	.521***	-.530***	-
McDonald's $\omega$	.873	.892	.867	.854	.830	.857	.869
Anger situation							
Factors	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	A1	A2
S1 Distraction	-						
S2 Reappraisal	.462***	-					
S3 Expressive suppression	.268***	.188***	-				
S4 Support seeking	.197***	.105*	-.089*	-			
S5 Rumination	-.120**	-.210***	-.017	.352***	-		
A1 Controlling experience	.344***	.400***	.362***	-.084	-.426***	-	
A2 Dysregulation	-.177***	-.205***	-.132**	.209***	.624***	-.710***	-
McDonald's $\omega$	.908	.873	.854	.851	.830	.834	.906

Note.  $p < .05$ \*\*\*,  $p < .01$ \*\*,  $p < .001$ \*\*\*. S for strategy and A for ability factors

**Table 4***Correlations between CERSA, CERQ and SWLS dimensions with McDonald's  $\omega$  for CERQ and SWLS dimensions*

Sadness situation										
Dimensions	Self-B	Accept	Rumin	Pos Refoc	Refoc Plan	Pos Reap	Put Persp	Catas	B-Others	Satis L
Distraction	-.123*	.173**	-.087	.379***	.188***	.251***	.187***	-.045	.016	.226***
Reappraisal	.032	.355***	-.007	.288***	.437***	.466***	.346***	.055	.008	.275***
Expressive suppression	.271***	.116*	.272***	-.043	.066	-.015	.006	.176**	.065	-.232***
Support seeking	.092	.093	.173***	.237***	.163**	.185**	.117*	.057	.051	.052
Rumination	.373***	.039	.581***	-.129*	-.110	-.148**	-.065	.448***	.150*	-.413***
Controlling experience	-.235***	.118*	-.305***	.253***	.339***	.317***	.166**	-.169**	-.004	.392***
Dysregulation	.278***	.032	.396***	-.048	-.083	-.165**	-.046	.366***	.205***	-.385***
Fear situation										
Dimensions	Self-B	Accept	Rumin	Pos Refoc	Refoc Plan	Pos Reap	Put Persp	Catas	B-Others	Satis L
Distraction	.000	.100	-.050	.298***	.113*	.134*	.110	.064	.105	.389***
Reappraisal	-.060	.221***	-.061	.323***	.428***	.407***	.262***	.038	.065	.159**
Expressive suppression	.177**	.173**	.173**	.008	.096	.058	.103	.103	.016	-.126*
Support seeking	.019	.112*	.144*	.218***	.236***	.210***	.123*	.134*	.095	.065
Rumination	.269***	.111*	.417***	-.048	-.079	-.080	.011	.357***	.108	-.230***
Controlling experience	-.265***	.016	-.295***	.257***	.298***	.266***	.115*	-.182**	.054	.339***
Dysregulation	.310***	.084	.382***	-.098	-.114*	-.129*	-.077	.382***	.189***	-.335***
Anger situation										
Dimensions	Self-B	Accept	Rumin	Pos Refoc	Refoc Plan	Pos Reap	Put Persp	Catas	B-Others	Satis L
Distraction	-.122*	.104	-.196***	.330***	.152**	.194***	.143*	-.056	.021	.247***

**Table 4***Correlations between CERSA, CERQ and SWLS dimensions with McDonald's  $\omega$  for CERQ and SWLS dimensions*

Reappraisal	-.016	.187***	-.115*	.256***	.348***	.402***	.227***	-.028	-.055	.214***
Expressive suppression	.219***	.245***	.144*	.037	.137*	.144*	.101	.148**	.026	-.024
Support seeking	.036	.126*	.114*	.247***	.225***	.229***	.147**	.103	.121*	.036
Rumination	.429***	.111*	.566***	-.121*	-.102	-.151**	-.052	.407***	.246***	-.414***
Controlling experience	-.262***	.110*	-.342***	.268***	.362***	.345***	.197***	-.199***	-.030	.428***
Dysregulation	.278***	-.007	.459***	-.048	-.159**	-.230***	-.121*	.358***	.256***	-.426***
McDonald's $\omega$	.826	.705	.876	.837	.781	.719	.709	.705	.787	.929

Note.  $p < .05$ \*\*\*,  $p < .01$ \*\*,  $p < .001$ \*\*\*. CERQ dimensions: Self B for Self-Blame, Accept for Acceptation, Rumin for Rumination, Pos Refoc for Positive Refocusing, Refoc Plan for Refocus on Planning, Put Persp for Putting into Perspective, Catas for Catastrophising, B Others for Blaming Others. SWLS dimension: Satis L for Satisfaction with Life.

**Table 5***Summary of Multi-group Comparisons for Invariance across gender of CERSA situations*

Model	$\chi^2$ Robust ( <i>df</i> )	CFI Robust	RMSEA Robust (90% CI)	SRMR	S-B $\Delta\chi^2$ ( $\Delta df$ )	$\Delta$ CFI Robust	$\Delta$ RMSEA Robust	$\Delta$ SRMR
<b>Sadness situation</b>								
Configural Model	1150.291*** (606)	.947	.050 (.046-.054)	.053	--	--	--	--
Metric Model	1185.863*** (626)	.946	.050 (.045-.054)	.056	35.205* (20)	-.001	.000	.003
Scalar Model	1207.150*** (646)	.946	.049 (.045-.053)	.056	18.790 (20)	.000	-.001	.000
Residual Model	1248.084*** (673)	.944	.049 (.045-.053)	.056	43.769* (27)	-.002	.000	.000
<b>Fear situation</b>								
Configural Model	1090.498*** (606)	.951	.048 (.043-.053)	.054	--	--	--	--
Metric Model	1117.536*** (626)	.951	.048 (.043-.052)	.054	25.322 (20)	.000	-.001	.001
Scalar Model	1174.948*** (646)	.947	.048 (.043-.053)	.055	61.683*** (20)	-.003	.001	.001
Residual Model	1198.254*** (673)	.947	.048 (.043-.052)	.055	31.565 (27)	-.001	-.001	.000
<b>Anger situation</b>								
Configural Model	1006.056*** (606)	.960	.044 (.037-.047)	.052	--	--	--	--
Metric Model	1026.688*** (626)	.961	.044 (.036-.046)	.053	17.752 (20)	.000	-.001	.001
Scalar Model	1063.689*** (646)	.959	.044 (.036-.046)	.053	34.845** (20)	-.002	.000	.000
Residual Model	1126.999*** (673)	.954	.045 (.039-.048)	.053	56.238*** (27)	-.005	.002	.001

Note.  $p < .05$  \*,  $p < .01$  \*\*,  $p < .001$  \*\*\*. CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker Lewis index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, CI = confidence interval, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual

**Table 6***Latent mean comparisons between gender groups for each factor of the CERSA*

Factors/Situations	Latent $\Delta M$	Latent $SD$	$Z$	$p$	$d$
Sadness situation					
S1 Distraction	- 0.309	1.597	2.672	.008	0.193
S2 Reappraisal	- 0.100	1.341	1.005	.315	0.075
S3 Expressive suppression	- 0.009	1.881	0.066	.948	0.005
S4 Support seeking	0.659	1.315	6.455	<.001	0.501
S5 Rumination	0.838	1.699	6.234	<.001	0.493
C1 Controlling experience	- 0.681	1.434	5.987	<.001	0.475
C2 Dysregulation	0.335	1.313	3.675	<.001	0.255
Fear situation					
S1 Distraction	- 0.175	1.916	1.216	.224	0.091
S2 Reappraisal	- 0.244	1.623	2.034	.042	0.150
S3 Expressive suppression	- 0.153	1.569	1.354	.176	0.098
S4 Support seeking	0.520	1.504	4.355	<.001	0.346
S5 Rumination	0.291	1.664	2.341	.019	0.175
C1 Controlling experience	- 0.700	1.854	5.380	<.001	0.377
C2 Dysregulation	0.216	1.352	2.248	.025	0.160
Anger situation					
S1 Distraction	- 0.325	1.995	2.318	.020	0.163
S2 Reappraisal	- 0.565	1.499	4.844	<.001	0.361
S3 Expressive suppression	- 0.060	1.857	0.457	.648	0.032
S4 Support seeking	0.938	1.657	7.232	<.001	0.566
S5 Rumination	0.720	1.648	5.504	<.001	0.437
C1 Controlling experience	- 0.438	1.646	3.584	<.001	0.266
C2 Dysregulation	0.439	1.913	3.240	.001	0.230

Note. S for strategy and A for ability factors

**Table 7***Fixed effects from mixed linear models with situations as predictors for emotion regulation strategies and abilities*

	Sadness situation	Fear situation	Anger situation					
<i>Strategies</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Marginal R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Conditional R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Order</i>
Distraction	3.94 (1.82)	3.48 (1.93)	3.50 (1.95)	25.51	< .001	.012	.392	S > F, A
Reappraisal	3.67 (1.67)	3.43 (1.77)	2.85 (1.61)	90.98	< .001	.040	.449	S > F > A
Expressive suppression	4.17 (1.97)	3.83 (1.84)	3.88 (1.82)	13.67	< .001	.006	.430	S > F, A
Support seeking	3.49 (1.77)	3.64 (1.82)	3.72 (1.85)	8.57	< .001	.003	.592	A, F > S
Rumination	3.56 (1.81)	3.16 (1.70)	4.07 (1.79)	106.06	< .001	.043	.492	S, A > F
<i>Abilities</i>								
Controlling experience	4.26 (1.59)	4.33 (1.64)	3.82 (1.61)	47.76	< .001	.020	.496	S, F > A
Dysregulation	2.87 (1.65)	2.57 (1.61)	3.57 (1.91)	151.05	< .001	.056	.535	A > S > F

Note. S for sadness, F for fear and A for anger situations of the CERSA

## Appendices

**Table A.1**

*Summary of the results of linear mixed models with orthogonal contrasts for the three emotions (hypothesis contrast and residual contrast) for each situation*

Contrasts/Situation	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Sadness situation						
Hypothesis contrast	4.940	0.127	1658	38.99	< .001	1.92
Residual contrast	0.657	0.073	1658	8.98	< .001	0.44
Fear situation						
Hypothesis contrast	5.195	0.123	1658	42.24	< .001	2.07
Residual contrast	1.680	0.071	1658	23.66	< .001	1.16
Anger situation						
Hypothesis contrast	6.661	0.131	1658	51.06	< .001	2.51
Residual contrast	0.757	0.075	1658	10.05	< .001	0.49

Note. *SD* = Standard deviation, *df* = degrees of freedom, *d* = Cohen's *d*

**Table A.2**

*Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis results for the CERSA sadness situation using ordinary least square extraction method and promax rotation*

Items	Factor Loadings							h <sup>2</sup>
	Dist	Rea	Suppr	Support	Rum	Control	Dys	
Strategies items								
SQ1	.82							0.61
SQ8	.88							0.72
SQ13	.87							0.74
SQ18								0.24
SQ2		.67						0.48
SQ7		.73						0.54
SQ15		.84						0.71
SQ19		.88						0.75
SQ10			.83					0.69
SQ11			.89					0.79
SQ12			.82					0.66
SQ14			.89					0.79
SQ4				.59				0.41
SQ6				.75				0.52
SQ16				.92				0.80
SQ20				.81				0.64
SQ3					.91			0.69
SQ5								0.48
SQ9					.98			0.76
SQ17					.54			0.60
Abilities items								
SQ21						.72		0.54
SQ23						.74		0.54
SQ26						.75		0.54
SQ28						.76		0.68
SQ22							.69	0.42
SQ24							.71	0.66
SQ25							.87	0.70
SQ27							.78	0.64
Eigen values	2.21	2.52	2.97	2.41	2.18	2.36	2.69	
% of variance	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.10	
Cum. % of variance	0.08	0.17	0.28	0.37	0.45	0.53	0.62	

Note. Dist = distraction, Rea = reappraisal, Suppr = expressive suppression, Support = support seeking, Control = controlling experience, Dys = dysregulation, Cum. = Cumulative. Only factor loadings > .40 are reported here

**Table A.3**

*Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis results for the CERSA fear situation using ordinary least square extraction method and promax rotation*

Items	Factor Loadings							h <sup>2</sup>
	Dist	Rea	Suppr	Support	Rum	Control	Dys	
Strategies items								
FQ19	.95							0.84
FQ20	.94							0.81
FQ3	.66							0.44
FQ15	.58							0.44
FQ10		.78						0.64
FQ18		.85						0.72
FQ13		.81						0.69
FQ16		.83						0.66
FQ4			.72					0.50
FQ6			.84					0.69
FQ8			.72					0.58
FQ11			.85					0.72
FQ14				.74				0.53
FQ17				.71				0.53
FQ9				.91				0.77
FQ5				.78				0.60
FQ1					.87			0.67
FQ12					.41			0.43
FQ7					.84			0.66
FQ2					.79			0.60
Abilities items								
FQ27						.90		0.76
FQ25						.69		0.46
FQ21						.68		0.52
FQ28						.88		0.74
FQ22							.81	0.57
FQ26							.69	0.68
FQ24							.86	0.69
FQ23							.77	0.65
Eigen values	2.57	2.72	2.48	2.50	2.22	2.56	2.54	
% of variance	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	
Cum. % of variance	0.09	0.19	0.28	0.37	0.45	0.54	0.63	

Note. Dist = distraction, Rea = reappraisal, Suppr = expressive suppression, Support = support seeking, Control = controlling experience, Dys = dysregulation, Cum. = Cumulative. Only factor loadings > .40 are reported here

**Table A.4**

*Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis results for the CERSA's anger situation using ordinary least square extraction method and promax rotation*

Items	Factor Loadings							h <sup>2</sup>
	Dist	Rea	Suppr	Support	Rum	Control	Dys	
Strategies items								
AQ19	1.01							0.85
AQ18	1.01							0.87
AQ7	.74							0.61
AQ4								0.36
AQ16		.88						0.72
AQ6		.83						0.61
AQ20		.92						0.78
AQ2		.65						0.45
AQ13			.84					0.67
AQ12			.91					0.77
AQ10			.78					0.60
AQ3			.59					0.38
AQ8				.72				0.55
AQ14				.83				0.67
AQ17				.84				0.73
AQ1				.67				0.44
AQ11					.91			0.70
AQ9					.53			0.54
AQ15					.85			0.66
AQ5					.53			0.45
Abilities items								
AQ26						.49		0.60
AQ21						.60		0.44
AQ24						.81		0.63
AQ28						.57		0.72
AQ25							.96	0.76
AQ27							.79	0.68
AQ23							.96	0.80
AQ22							.72	0.61
Eigen values	2.55	2.73	2.47	2.40	2.16	1.85	3.47	
% of variance	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.12	
Cum. % of variance	0.09	0.19	0.28	0.37	0.44	0.51	0.63	

Note. Dist = distraction, Rea = reappraisal, Suppr = expressive suppression, Support = support seeking, Control = controlling experience, Dys = dysregulation, Cum. = Cumulative. Only factor loadings > .40 are reported here

### A.5. Contextualised Emotion Regulation Survey for Adolescents (CERSA)

**Situation 1** : Pendant la récréation, tu apprends que ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) va déménager et ne sera plus dans ta classe ni dans ton établissement scolaire l'année prochaine.

Est-ce que tu as déjà vécu cette situation ?  Jamais  Une fois  Plusieurs fois

Indique les émotions que cette situation te ferait ressentir. Pour cela,

Entoure pour chaque émotion proposée le nombre qui correspond à ce que tu ressentirais de 1 « pas du tout » à 7 « Très fortement ».

	Pas du tout						Très fortement
<b>Peur</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Tristesse</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Colère</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Face à cette situation, comment réagirais-tu ? Pour chacune des réactions proposées, entoure le chiffre qui te correspond le plus de : 1 « Pas du tout comme ça » à 7 « Tout à fait comme ça ».

	Pas du tout comme ça						Tout à fait comme ça
Je m'occupe l'esprit en faisant quelque chose d'autre.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'essaie de voir la situation sous un autre angle.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je n'arrête pas de penser à ce que j'ai ressenti dans cette situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je cherche quelqu'un qui me calme.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cette situation me met dans un tel état que je ne peux pas me concentrer sur autre chose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'en parle à quelqu'un en qui j'ai confiance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je change ma façon de penser la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais autre chose pour me distraire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je pense sans cesse aux émotions que cette situation a provoquées en moi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je ne montre pas mes sentiments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais attention à ne pas montrer ce que je ressens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais comme si de rien n'était devant les autres.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Rappel de la situation 1** : Pendant la récréation, tu apprends que ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) va déménager et ne sera plus dans ta classe ni dans ton établissement scolaire l'année prochaine.

	Pas du tout comme ça							Tout à fait comme ça
J'essaie de me changer les idées en faisant autre chose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je ne laisse rien voir de ce que je ressens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je pense à d'autres façons d'interpréter la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je cherche du soutien autour de moi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je reste bloqué(e) sur ce qu'il s'est passé.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je n'y pense pas et j'essaie d'oublier.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
J'essaie de changer ma manière de voir la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je demande de l'aide ou des conseils dans mon entourage.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

**Face à cette même situation, comment te décrirais-tu ? Pour chacune des propositions, entoure le chiffre qui te correspond le plus de : 1 « Pas du tout comme moi » à 7 « Tout à fait comme moi ».**

	Pas du tout comme moi							Tout à fait comme moi
J'arrive à maîtriser mes émotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je dis ou je fais des choses qui dépassent ma pensée.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
J'arrive à trouver des solutions pour gérer la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je me laisse déborder par mes émotions au point de ne plus savoir ce que je fais.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Mes émotions me font dire et faire n'importe quoi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je pense pouvoir gérer la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je n'arrive pas à contenir mes réactions même si elles ne sont pas adaptées.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Je suis capable de contrôler mes émotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

**Situation 2** : Tu dois faire un exposé oral très important devant ta classe. Pendant la récréation, juste avant de le passer, tu as l'impression d'avoir oublié tout ce que tu avais préparé.

Est-ce que tu as déjà vécu cette situation ?  Jamais  Une fois  Plusieurs fois

Indique les émotions que cette situation te ferait ressentir. Pour cela,

Entoure pour chaque émotion proposée le nombre qui correspond à ce que tu ressentirais de 1 « pas du tout » à 7 « Très fortement ».

	Pas du tout			Très fortement			
<b>Peur</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Tristesse</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Colère</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Face à cette situation, comment réagiras-tu ? Pour chacune des réactions proposées, entoure le chiffre qui te correspond le plus de : 1 « Pas du tout comme ça » à 7 « Tout à fait comme ça ».

	Pas du tout comme ça			Tout à fait comme ça			
Je n'arrête pas de penser à ce que j'ai ressenti dans cette situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je reste bloqué(e) sur ce qu'il s'est passé.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'essaie de me changer les idées en faisant autre chose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je ne montre pas mes sentiments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je demande de l'aide ou des conseils dans mon entourage.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais attention à ne pas montrer ce que je ressens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je pense sans cesse aux émotions que cette situation a provoquées en moi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais comme si de rien n'était devant les autres.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je cherche du soutien autour de moi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'essaie de voir la situation sous un autre angle.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je ne laisse rien voir de ce que je ressens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cette situation me met dans un tel état que je ne peux pas me concentrer sur autre chose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Rappel de la situation 2** : Tu dois faire un exposé oral très important devant ta classe. Pendant la récréation, juste avant de le passer, tu as l'impression d'avoir oublié tout ce que tu avais préparé.

	Pas du tout comme ça							Tout à fait comme ça						
J'essaie de changer ma manière de voir la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je cherche quelqu'un qui me calme.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je n'y pense pas et j'essaie d'oublier.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je pense à d'autres façons d'interpréter la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'en parle à quelqu'un en qui j'ai confiance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je change ma façon de penser la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je m'occupe l'esprit en faisant quelque chose d'autre.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais autre chose pour me distraire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Face à cette même situation, comment te décrirais-tu ? Pour chacune des propositions, entoure le chiffre qui te correspond le plus de : 1 « Pas du tout comme moi » à 7 « Tout à fait comme moi ».**

	Pas du tout comme moi							Tout à fait comme moi						
Je pense pouvoir gérer la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je dis ou je fais des choses qui dépassent ma pensée.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je n'arrive pas à contenir mes réactions même si elles ne sont pas adaptées.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mes émotions me font dire et faire n'importe quoi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'arrive à trouver des solutions pour gérer la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je me laisse déborder par mes émotions au point de ne plus savoir ce que je fais.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'arrive à maîtriser mes émotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je suis capable de contrôler mes émotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Situation 3** : Pendant la récréation, tu entends qu'un(e) ami(e) discute avec d'autres personnes de quelque chose que tu lui avais demandé de garder secret.

Est-ce que tu as déjà vécu cette situation ?  Jamais  Une fois  Plusieurs fois

Indique les émotions que cette situation te ferait ressentir. Pour cela,

Entoure pour chaque émotion proposée le nombre qui correspond à ce que tu ressentirais de 1 « pas du tout » à 7 « Très fortement ».

	Pas du tout			Très fortement			
<b>Peur</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Tristesse</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Colère</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Face à cette situation, comment réagiras-tu ? Pour chacune des réactions proposées, entoure le chiffre qui te correspond le plus de : 1 « Pas du tout comme ça » à 7 « Tout à fait comme ça ».

	Pas du tout comme ça			Tout à fait comme ça			
Je demande de l'aide ou des conseils dans mon entourage.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je pense à d'autres façons d'interpréter la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je ne laisse rien voir de ce que je ressens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je n'y pense pas et j'essaie d'oublier.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je reste bloqué(e) sur ce qu'il s'est passé.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je change ma façon de penser la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'essaie de me changer les idées en faisant autre chose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je cherche quelqu'un qui me calme.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cette situation me met dans un tel état que je ne peux pas me concentrer sur autre chose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais comme si de rien n'était devant les autres.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je n'arrête pas de penser à ce que j'ai ressenti dans cette situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais attention à ne pas montrer ce que je ressens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Rappel de la situation 3** : Pendant la récréation, tu entends qu'un(e) ami(e) discute avec d'autres personnes de quelque chose que tu lui avais demandé de garder secret.

	Pas du tout comme ça							Tout à fait comme ça						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je ne montre pas mes sentiments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'en parle à quelqu'un en qui j'ai confiance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je pense sans cesse aux émotions que cette situation a provoquées en moi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'essaie de voir la situation sous un autre angle.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je cherche du soutien autour de moi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je fais autre chose pour me distraire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je m'occupe l'esprit en faisant quelque chose d'autre.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'essaie de changer ma manière de voir la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Face à cette même situation, comment te décrirais-tu ? Pour chacune des propositions, entoure le chiffre qui te correspond le plus de : 1 « Pas du tout comme moi » à 7 « Tout à fait comme moi ».**

	Pas du tout comme moi							Tout à fait comme moi						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'arrive à trouver des solutions pour gérer la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je n'arrive pas à contenir mes réactions même si elles ne sont pas adaptées.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mes émotions me font dire et faire n'importe quoi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je pense pouvoir gérer la situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je dis ou je fais des choses qui dépassent ma pensée.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J'arrive à maîtriser mes émotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je me laisse déborder par mes émotions au point de ne plus savoir ce que je fais.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Je suis capable de contrôler mes émotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7