

*This is a preprint and has not yet been peer reviewed*

**A comparison of affective-cognitive dynamics in daily life between emerging adults with  
and without past-year non-suicidal self-injury**

Glenn Kiekens<sup>1,2</sup>, Penelope Hasking<sup>3,4</sup>, Matthew, K., Nock<sup>5</sup>, Evan Kleiman<sup>6</sup>, Olivia J. Kirtley<sup>2</sup>,  
Marlies Houben<sup>2,7</sup>, Mark Boyes<sup>3</sup>, Ronny Bruffaerts<sup>8,9</sup>, Inez Myin-Germeys<sup>2</sup>, & Laurence Claes<sup>1,10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Clinical Psychology, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; <sup>2</sup>Department of Neurosciences, Center for Contextual Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; <sup>3</sup>Curtin enAble Institute, Curtin University, Bentley, Australia, <sup>4</sup>School of Population Health, Curtin University, Bentley, Australia; <sup>5</sup>Department of Psychology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA; <sup>6</sup>Department of Psychology, Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, New Jersey, USA; <sup>7</sup>Department of Neurosciences, Mind-Body Research, KU Leuven, <sup>8</sup>Center for Public Health Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; <sup>9</sup>Institute for Social Research, Population Studies Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA; <sup>10</sup>Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (CAPRI), University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Glenn Kiekens, KU Leuven, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Clinical Psychology, Tiensestraat 102, box 3720, 3000 Leuven, Belgium. Email: Glenn.Kiekens@kuleuven.be

**Abstract**

Although the literature suggests trait-like differences in affective and cognitive vulnerabilities between individuals with and without a history of non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI), little is known about how these dispositional differences are experienced in the natural environment. In the present study, we compare the intensity, stability, interaction, and variability of affective (negative and positive affect) and cognitive states (rumination, self-criticism) in daily life between individuals who do and do not engage in NSSI. Using experience sampling methodology (ESM), 60 emerging adults (ages=18-22 years) with and without past-year NSSI (equally distributed) completed a baseline battery of questionnaires and an ESM sampling protocol consisting of eight questionnaires per day for 12 days (in total, 96 questionnaires per participant), resulting in 4,587 assessments (median compliance=83.3%; IQR=71.9-91.7). In a dynamic structural equation modeling framework, dynamic parameters (i.e., mean intensity, carryover effects, spillover effects, and within-person variability) were evaluated using multilevel vector autoregressive models. Emerging adults who engage in NSSI experience higher intensity and greater variability of negative affect, rumination, and self-criticism, whereas lower intensity and greater variability of positive affect. In addition, past-year NSSI predicted stronger affect-cognition interactions over time, with stronger spillover effects of negative and positive affect on subsequent rumination and self-criticism in individuals who engage in NSSI. These differences were partially explained by depressive symptoms and trait levels of emotion dysregulation and self-criticism. Our findings provide evidence of more aversive affective-cognitive dynamics in the everyday lives of people who self-injure and point to the potential relevance of boosting positive emotions to buffer dysfunctional cognitions.

**Keywords:** non-suicidal self-injury, NSSI, experience sampling, ecological momentary assessment, emotion, self-criticism, rumination

## **Introduction**

Non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI), the intentional damage of body tissue for reasons other than ending one's life (e.g., cutting, scratching, and hitting oneself; International Society for the Study of Self-Injury, 2022), is a significant public health concern among young people. Whereas NSSI typically has its onset in adolescence (Gandhi et al., 2018), close to 8% of emerging adults (defined as those aged 18-25 years) report past-year NSSI (Kiekens et al., 2021). Engaging in NSSI is associated with an increased risk for various negative outcomes, including future psychiatric disorders (Kiekens et al., 2021; Wilkinson, Qiu, Neufeld, Jones, & Goodyer, 2018), and suicidal thoughts and behaviors (Hamza & Willoughby, 2016; Kiekens et al., 2018). These findings indicate the importance of understanding the psychological processes underlying NSSI to advance prevention and treatment — a viewpoint that the American Psychiatric Association emphasized with its inclusion of NSSI as a "condition requiring further study" in the DSM-5 (APA, 2013).

Given that NSSI is frequently used to regulate aversive feelings and thoughts (Bentley, Nock, & Barlow, 2014; Brown, Dhingra, Brown, Danquah, & Taylor, 2022; Kuehn et al., 2022; Taylor et al., 2018), contemporary theoretical models posit that affective and cognitive vulnerabilities explain the onset and persistence of NSSI. For example, rumination as a negative cognitive style (i.e., repetitively thinking about the same problem) and negative affect are theorized to reinforce each other in the Emotional Cascade Model (ECM; Selby, Anestis, & Joiner, 2008). These cyclic reinforcing effects are expected to lead to intolerable distress levels that require behaviors with intense potent physical sensations such as NSSI to short-circuit these perpetuating emotional cascades (Hughes et al., 2019; Selby et al., 2008). Alternatively, the Benefits and Barriers Model (BBM; Hooley & Franklin, 2017) proposes a unique role for self-criticism (i.e., negative self-evaluation when perceived expectations of oneself are not met) in explaining who will choose NSSI to regulate aversive emotions and cognitions. Specifically, self-critical individuals are considered more likely to use NSSI

because it gratifies self-punishment desires and is congruent with a highly negative self-view (Hooley & Franklin, 2017). In line with these theories, cross-sectional research consistently shows a positive association between trait levels of negative affect, rumination, and self-criticism and lifetime NSSI (Coleman, Dunlop, Hartley, & Taylor, 2021; Tonta et al., 2022; Zelkowitz & Cole, 2019). Longitudinal studies have also linked these traits to a higher risk of future NSSI (Burke, McArthur, Daryanani, Abramson, & Alloy, 2018; Fox et al., 2018; Nicolai, Wielgus, & Mezulis, 2016). Importantly, however, these dispositional vulnerabilities do not occur in isolation within individuals. For example, Burke and colleagues (2018) found that young individuals with higher negative affect, rumination, and self-criticism but lower positive affect were most likely to engage in NSSI one year later. Although positive affect has received much less empirical attention than negative affect, scholars have recently argued that positive affect may also play a crucial role in NSSI (Perini, Zetterqvist, & Mayo, 2021). For instance, recent work suggests less intensity and stability of positive affect among individuals who engage in NSSI (Boyes, Wilmot, & Hasking, 2020) and that positive affect may attenuate risk for NSSI (Cohen et al., 2015; Hasking, Di Simplicio, McEvoy, & Rees, 2018).

Despite knowledge about a stronger tendency to experience negative affect and vulnerable cognitions among people who self-injure compared to those who do not, few studies have considered how these trait-like differences are experienced in daily life. Emotions and cognitions are not stable factors but dynamic psychological processes that unfold within individuals over time in the natural environment (Hjartarson, Snorrason, Bringmann, Ogmundsson, & Olafsson, 2021; Kuppens & Verduyn, 2017; Zuroff, Sadikaj, Kelly, & Leybman, 2016); meaning that people differ in meaningful ways in the intensity (mean), stability (carryover), and lability (variability) of affective and cognitive states. For example, prior work has linked higher intensity and variability of negative affect to higher levels of psychopathology (Dejonckheere et al., 2019; Scott et al., 2020). While momentary fluctuations in negative affect, rumination, and self-criticism have been identified as precipitants of NSSI (Brown et al., 2022; Burke et al., 2021a; Hughes et al., 2019; Kuehn et

al., 2022), we must also clarify whether their dynamic blueprint varies between people who do and do engage in NSSI to inform how affective and cognitive vulnerabilities theorized to increase susceptibility for NSSI play out in daily life. However, this is not possible with traditional study designs, as cross-sectional studies only assess people once. In contrast, cohort studies generally carry out 2-5 measurements months to years apart, which does not allow for capturing short-term variation. One way to address these shortcomings is to use ecologically valid assessment procedures.

Experience Sampling Methodology (ESM; also called ecological momentary assessment) is a structured self-report diary technique in which individuals provide information on their emotions, cognitions, and contexts as they are experienced in the flow of everyday life (Myin-Germeys et al., 2018; Shiffman, Stone, & Hufford, 2008). Daily diary studies (i.e., that assess constructs once per day) have found that individuals who engage in NSSI report a higher intensity of negative affect and a lower intensity and carryover of positive affect (i.e., previous-day positive affect is less predictive of the intensity of positive affect the next day; Bresin, 2014; Victor & Klonsky, 2014). However, daily diaries still require participants to retrospectively reflect across an entire day, making detecting variation throughout the day impossible and leading to memory biases, as it is well-known that people report mood consistent with how they are feeling at the time of assessment (i.e., mood-congruency effect; Matt, Vázquez, & Campbell, 1992). Recently, Victor, Brown, and Scott (2021) examined affective dynamics up to seven times per day among 166 young adult women (16 of whom reported past-year NSSI). They found that women who reported past-year NSSI experienced more intense and variable negative affect than those without NSSI. In addition, even though no lower average positive affect was found, these authors also observed a lower carryover effect of positive affect (Victor et al., 2021). While these initial studies provide insight into the dynamic emotional signature of people with past-year NSSI, research should replicate and extend previous knowledge in three critical ways.

First, while most work has focused on negative affect, more attention is needed on positive affect and vulnerable cognitions in the everyday lives of young people who engage in NSSI. For instance, evidence is emerging that those who engage in NSSI experience higher levels of momentary self-criticism and higher variability in self-critical thinking (Burke et al., 2021b). However, it remains unclear whether rumination is experienced differently in those with and without a history of NSSI. Better clarifying the blueprint of emotional (negative and positive affect) *and* cognitive states (rumination, self-criticism) among emerging adults who do and do not engage in NSSI would provide meaningful information about the ecological validity of findings observed in traditional study designs.

Second, emotions and cognitions (self-criticism, rumination) do not occur in a vacuum but interact with each other in the natural environment (Hjartarson et al., 2021; Zuroff et al., 2016), which implies there is a need to investigate the short-term interactions of affective-cognitive states in daily life. Research suggests positive affect may buffer subsequent negative states (Fredrickson, Mancuso, Branigan, & Tugade, 2000; Wichers, Lothmann, Simons, Nicolson, & Peeters, 2012). Nevertheless, evidence is mixed regarding whether young people who self-injure experience less intense positive emotion in daily life (Bresin, 2014; Victor & Klonsky, 2014; Victor, Scott, Stepp, & Goldstein, 2019), and if so, benefit in the same way from its potentially dampening effect (Hoorelbeke, Van den Bergh, Wichers, & Koster, 2019). Moreover, according to the ECM and BBM, there will be strong temporal interactions between negative affect and rumination (Selby et al., 2008) and negative affect and self-criticism (Hooley & Franklin, 2017) among individuals who self-injure. However, as far as we know, no study has investigated how the associations between negative and positive affect, on the one hand, and rumination and self-criticism, on the other hand, unfold over time in the natural environment for people who do and do not engage in NSSI. Addressing this knowledge gap would provide a daily life test of the affect-cognition interactions postulated by these theories and generate insights into how affect and cognition might work together to increase or buffer risk for NSSI.

Finally, future work is also needed to understand better *why* affective and cognitive states might be experienced differently between individuals who do and do not engage in NSSI. Theoretical models and emerging work suggest that higher dispositional emotion dysregulation and self-criticism may account for this (Selby et al., 2008; Vansteelandt et al., 2020). For instance, Vansteelandt and colleagues (2020) recently observed that higher trait self-criticism explained higher variability in both negative and positive affective states in a clinical sample of patients with borderline personality disorder (of whom up to 95% generally report self-injury; Goodman et al., 2017). Moreover, based on the ECM (Selby et al., 2008; Selby & Joiner, 2009), reinforcing cyclical cascades can be hypothesized between rumination and negative affect among people with lower trait emotional regulation abilities. Finally, recent studies have found that higher emotional intensity and stability of negative emotions in emerging adults with a history of NSSI might also be accounted for by higher levels of depression (Boyes et al., 2020; Jacobson, Hill, Pettit, & Grozeva, 2015). Building on these findings, addressing why emotions and cognitions might be experienced differently in daily life, would offer valuable information for researchers and scientist-practitioners that work with young people who engage in NSSI.

### **This study**

This study was designed to evaluate whether emerging adults with past-year NSSI (a) show different dynamic properties in terms of intensity (mean), stability (carryover), and lability (variability) of negative and positive affect, rumination, and self-criticism, and (b) experience stronger affective-cognitive interactions over time (i.e., spillover effects) than those without a history of NSSI. Additionally, we tentatively explored whether group differences could be explained by higher levels of depressive symptoms and trait levels of emotion dysregulation and self-criticism among people who self-injure.

## **Material and methods**

### **Procedure and participants**

Emerging adults in an ongoing study of college students in Flanders (Belgium; Kiekens et al., 2019) could voluntarily sign up to participate in this study between March and October 2018. To be eligible, individuals had to have sufficient proficiency in the Dutch language and own a smartphone with at least 4G coverage. Inclusion criteria for the NSSI group were based on the DSM-5 frequency criteria: NSSI on five or more days in the past year and NSSI urges in the past month. The inclusion criteria for the reference group were no lifetime history of NSSI and no prior history of DSM-5 mental disorders. People who met these criteria and wanted to participate were invited for an introductory session. During this session, participants were briefed and conducted the baseline assessment, consisting of an online survey via Qualtrics and a clinical interview. The presence of mental disorders was assessed with the *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5* (SCID; First, Williams, Karg, & Spitzer, 2015). In addition, NSSI characteristics and suicidal thoughts and behaviors were assessed with the well-validated Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors Interview (SITBI; Latimer, Meade, & Tennant, 2013; Nock, Holmberg, Photos, & Michel, 2007). The session concluded with training on completing the ESM protocol via ExpiWell, a user-friendly and secure app for intensive assessment in daily life (<https://app.expiwell.com>). When needed, the research team provided participants with a study phone.

The next day, participants began a 12-day ESM protocol in which they were prompted semi-randomly eight times per day, between 9 a.m. and 9 p.m., in blocks of 1.5hr segments (with a minimum of 15 minutes between assessments). Responses had to be registered within 15 minutes of each prompt to avoid retrospective reporting. In addition, participants were provided with written contact details of licensed clinical psychologists (first and last author), and one item activated a popup within the app with additional resources when participants reported experiencing suicidal thoughts. Finally, one month after the ESM protocol,

participants received a link to a follow-up questionnaire (data not used in this study).

Reimbursement was structured to encourage ESM compliance, with a financial compensation of €25 if compliance ranged between 25% and 50% or if the follow-up questionnaire was not completed, €50 if compliance ranged between 50% and 85%, and €75 if compliance exceeded 85%. The University's Ethical Review Board approved the study, and all procedures aligned with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments.

A total of 65 students initially consented to participate, with the final sample after eligibility assessment comprising 60 emerging adults (81.67% female; Mean age = 19.53,  $SD = 1.28$ , range 18-22 years), evenly distributed across the group with ( $n=30$ ) and without past-year NSSI ( $n=30$ ). There was no difference in the composition of sex assigned at birth across groups (83.33% female reference group versus 80.0% NSSI group,  $\chi^2 = 0.11$ ,  $p = .739$ ), but participants in the NSSI group (Mean = 20.10,  $SD = 1.13$ ) were slightly older than those in the reference group (Mean = 18.97,  $SD = 1.2$ ,  $t_{(58)}=3.79$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Participants with past-year NSSI met the criteria for a median of two mental disorders in the last 12 months, with DSM-5 anxiety and mood disorders being the most prevalent (33.3%–50%). In addition, participants reported a median of NSSI on 17.5 days in the past year (range 5–360 days). For a detailed description of the NSSI sample, see Kiekens et al. (2020). Compliance with the ESM protocol was good (Median = 83.33%; IQR = 71.88-91.67%). Every participant completed an average of 76.45 out of 96 assessments (range 33-95), resulting in 4,587 observations. The groups did not differ significantly in the number of assessments (Mean reference group = 78.83,  $SD = 13.07$ ; Mean NSSI group = 74.07,  $SD = 15.59$ ,  $t_{(58)}=1.28$ ,  $p = .205$ ).

### **Baseline measures**

**Depressive symptoms.** We assessed depressive symptoms using the depression subscale of the Dutch 21-item Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales (DASS; Henry & Crawford, 2005), which assesses depressive symptoms during the past week (e.g., "*I felt down-hearted and blue*"). The DASS items are scored on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (did

not apply to me at all) to 3 (applied to me very much, or most of the time), and the internal consistency of the depression subscale was excellent ( $\alpha = .92$ ).

**Trait emotion-dysregulation.** The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale Short Form was used to assess emotion dysregulation (DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2004; Kaufman et al., 2015). The DERS assesses six aspects of emotion dysregulation, including: nonacceptance of emotional response (e.g., "*When I'm upset, I become embarrassed for feeling that way*"), difficulty in goal-directed behavior (e.g., "*When I'm upset, I have difficulty focusing on other things*"), impulse control (e.g., "*When I'm upset, I become out of control*"), emotional awareness (e.g., "*I care about what I am feeling*"), limited access to emotion regulation strategies ("e.g., *When I am upset, it takes me a long time to feel better*"), and lack of emotional clarity ("*I am confused about how I feel*"). Participants respond to each item on a 5-point scale (0 = almost never, 4 = almost always) regarding how often they use each strategy. Kaufman and colleagues (2015) recently reduced the 36-item DERS into an 18-item short version, which correlated strongly with the original measure ( $r \geq .90$ ) and had comparable psychometric properties. The internal consistency of the total score was excellent ( $\alpha = .91$ ).

**Trait self-criticism.** The Forms of Self-Criticizing/Attacking and Self-Reassuring Scale (Gilbert, Clarke, Hempel, Miles, & Irons, 2004) was used to operationalize self-criticism. This is a 22-item self-report questionnaire that consists of three subscales, being hated-self (e.g., "*I have a sense of disgust with myself*"), inadequate-self (e.g., "*I am easily disappointed with myself*"), and reassuring-self (e.g., "*I am able to remind myself of positive things about myself*"). Participants are asked to rate how these statements reflect themselves following setbacks on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all like me) to 4 (extremely like me). For the present study, we calculated a composite score based on the inadequate-self and hated-self subscales, but to avoid conceptual overlap with group membership, we excluded the hated-self subscale item "*I have become so angry with myself that I want to hurt or injure myself*". The scale's internal consistency was excellent ( $\alpha = .94$ ).

## **Experience sampling measures**

**State negative and positive affect.** Participants rated a range of momentary negative (i.e., stressed, irritated, anxious, sad, hopeless, insecure) and positive emotions (i.e., excited, cheerful, satisfied, relaxed) at each prompt: "*Right now, I feel [emotion].*" The order of these emotions was randomized across assessments and rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much). These emotions were weighted equally to compute negative and positive affect and selected because they represent all four quadrants of the affective circumplex defined by valence and arousal dimensions (Russell, 2003). Using methods described by Shrout and Lane (2012), negative and positive affect demonstrated excellent between-person ( $RKR = 0.99$ ) and good within-person reliability ( $RC = 0.75-0.82$ ).

**State rumination and self-criticism.** Momentary rumination was assessed by asking at each assessment the extent to which participants were dwelling on problems ("*Right now, I am repeatedly thinking about the same problem*") and emotions ("*Right now, my emotions keep me busy*") rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much). Rumination demonstrated excellent between-person ( $RKR = 0.99$ ) and reasonable within-person reliability ( $RC = 0.64$ ). Self-critical thinking was also assessed through two items at each assessment on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much): "*Right now, I am disappointed in myself*", "*Right now, I am angry at myself*". Self-criticism showed excellent between-person ( $RKR = 0.99$ ) and good within-person reliability ( $RC = 0.75$ ).

## **Statistical analyses**

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) are reported for the baseline and momentary variables. Comparisons between baseline variables across groups with and without a history of NSSI were conducted using two-sample  $t$ -tests, with Welch's  $t$ -test used in case of unequal variances across groups. We also calculated the total variance and intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) to indicate the proportion of the total variance accounted for by between-person variance of each momentary variable. Multilevel vector autoregressive

models (MVAR) were constructed within a Dynamic Structural Equation Modeling Framework (DSEM) in Mplus 8 (Asparouhov, Hamaker, & Muthén, 2017; McNeish & Hamaker, 2019). This allowed us to investigate whether emerging adults with past-year NSSI show different affective-cognitive dynamics than those who never self-injured.

Using DSEM, we evaluated the primary study objective (i.e., evaluating differences in mean intensity, carryover effects, and within-person variability between people who do and do not self-injure) by including past-year NSSI as a between-person predictor of random effects. We specified four univariate and four bivariate MVAR models by pairing affective states (positive and negative affect) with cognitive states (rumination and self-criticism). Relative to the univariate models (which do not include spillover effects), the bivariate models contain two intercepts for the means, two carryover effects, two spillover effects, and two residual variances (i.e., each time one for the affective and one for the cognitive state under investigation), displaying the value of these parameters for the participants without a history of NSSI. Eight respective slopes capture the difference in these eight parameters for participants with past-year NSSI. The bivariate models included covariances for the residuals of the between-components of the means and variances, respectively. In DSEM, within-person variances are expressed as the log-normal distribution of the variance. Latent person-mean centering was used to interpret predictor variables at the within-person level in a relative fashion for each person while accounting for sampling error. Finally, we explored whether depressive symptoms, trait emotion dysregulation (for models including state rumination), and trait self-criticism (for models including state self-criticism) accounted for differences in mean intensity, carryover, spillover, and within-person variability of affective-cognitive states across the sample. These baseline variables were grand-mean centered and standardized.

Bayesian estimation was used with non-informative priors based on Markov Chain Monte Carlo using Gibbs sampling. Point estimates were obtained by taking each parameter's median of the posterior distributions. Statistical significance was determined by estimating

95% credibility intervals (CI) around each point estimate, indicating a 95% probability that the true comparison value is not null. A 1-hour transformed time interval was specified to account for unequally spaced intervals due to missing data and random sampling within blocks. This procedure creates a new time variable (measured in hours since the first assessment) and inserts missing data records based on the defined metric when no observation is present (Asparouhov et al., 2017). DSEM handles missing data using a Kalman filter approach to maintain a constant interpretation of lagged relations in discrete-time models (McNeish & Hamaker, 2019). Each model was estimated using a minimum of 2,500 iterations with a thinning parameter of 20. Model convergence was ensured by checking that the potential scale reduction was close to one and trace plots did not contain trends or spikes.

### **Power estimation**

Whereas Bayesian estimation has better performance in smaller samples than a frequentist approach (i.e., posterior distributions are not dependent upon large-sample theory and can be non-normal; Muthén, Muthén, & Asparouhov, 2016), simulation-based analyses were performed to provide an indication of the smallest effects that could be detected with 60 individuals distributed equally across groups. Using a multilevel autoregressive model with 1,000 Monte Carlo replications and maximum likelihood estimation (model 10; Lafit et al., 2021), power was estimated to be adequate ( $>.80$ ) to detect mean group differences as small as  $.37$  (fixed intercept= $2.00$ ,  $SD=0.50$ ) and  $.09$  for carryover effects (fixed slope= $0.28$ ,  $SD=0.05$ ; see parameter values and full results in supplementary materials).

## **Results**

### **Descriptive statistics**

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of the study variables. These findings show that more than half of the variability (i.e., ICC) in momentary negative affect (62%), positive affect (51%), rumination (54%), and self-criticism (56%) was situated at the between-person level. In addition, emerging adults with past-year NSSI reported higher mean levels of

depressive symptoms (Mean NSSI group = 7.53,  $SD = 5.24$ ; Mean reference group = 0.67,  $SD = 1.27$ ,  $t_{\text{Welch}}(32.39) = 6.98$ ,  $p < .001$ ), trait emotion dysregulation (Mean NSSI group = 37.63,  $SD = 10.33$ ; Mean reference group = 15.20,  $SD = 5.48$ ,  $t_{\text{Welch}}(44.12) = 10.51$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and trait self-criticism (Mean NSSI group = 29.90,  $SD = 8.37$ ; Mean reference group = 8.90,  $SD = 6.58$ ,  $t(58) = 10.80$ ,  $p < .001$ ) than those without a lifetime history of NSSI.

[Please include Table 1 here]

### **Comparison of affective-cognitive dynamics in daily life between emerging adults with and without past-year NSSI**

We first examined whether emerging adults with past-year NSSI experience different mean intensity, carryover effects, and within-person variability of affective and cognitive states in daily life compared to peers who do not self-injure (Table 2). Univariate models revealed that emerging adults with past-year NSSI reported higher intensity of negative affect ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = 1.32$ ,  $SD = 0.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ), rumination ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = 1.18$ ,  $SD = 0.21$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and self-criticism ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = 1.11$ ,  $SD = 0.22$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and lower intensity of positive affect ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = -0.99$ ,  $SD = 0.23$ ,  $p < .001$ ) across the ESM period. Participants with past-year NSSI also displayed more within-person variation in affective and cognitive states than those without NSSI history, ranging from 0.19 standard deviations higher for positive affect to 0.61 for rumination. While we did not observe differences in the carryover effects of positive and negative affect in univariate models, higher effects were found for rumination ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = 0.17$ ,  $SD = 0.08$ ,  $p = .009$ ) and self-criticism ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = 0.18$ ,  $SD = 0.08$ ,  $p = .011$ ) among emerging adults with past-year NSSI.

[Please include Table 2 here]

We then constructed bivariate models also to investigate differences in spillover effects between negative and positive affect and rumination and self-criticism (Table 3). Considering negative affect, the observed values of intercepts indicate that higher-than-usual momentary negative affect predicted an increase in state rumination an hour later ( $\beta_{\text{intercept}} = 0.09$ ,  $SD = 0.05$ ,  $p = .018$ ), whereas higher-than-usual momentary rumination also

prospectively predicted an increase in negative affect ( $\beta_{intercept} = 0.18, SD = 0.05, p = .001$ ). Inspecting the slopes of past-year NSSI shows that the spillover effect of negative affect on rumination was stronger for emerging adults with past-year NSSI ( $\beta_{NSSI} = 0.28, SD = 0.07, p < .001$ ). Similarly, higher-than-usual momentary negative affect predicted an increase in state self-criticism across the sample ( $\beta_{intercept} = 0.09, SD = 0.04, p = .014$ ), but this spillover effect was stronger for those with past-year NSSI ( $\beta_{NSSI} = 0.18, SD = 0.06, p = .001$ ). Conversely, higher-than-usual self-criticism had a significant spillover effect on negative affect for emerging adults with past-year NSSI ( $\beta_{NSSI} = 0.12, SD = 0.04, p = .004$ ), but not for those without a history of NSSI ( $\beta_{intercept} = 0.04, SD = 0.03, p = .124$ ).

Regarding positive affect (Table 3), we observed that higher-than-usual momentary positive affect generally had a protective effect on later rumination ( $\beta_{intercept} = -0.05, SD = 0.02, p = .005$ ) and self-criticism ( $\beta_{intercept} = -0.07, SD = 0.03, p = .006$ ). However, these dampening effects were stronger for emerging adults who self-injured during the past year ( $\beta_{NSSI} = -0.16$  to  $-0.14$  range,  $p < .001$ ). Of note, differences in the strength of carryover effects of cognitions observed in univariate models became non-significant in models that allowed for affect-cognition interactions over time (Table 3).

[Please include Table 3 here]

### **Depressive symptoms, trait emotion dysregulation, and trait self-criticism as between-person predictors of within-person affective-cognitive dynamics in daily life**

As the last step, we explored whether differences in within-person affective-cognitive dynamics were explained by levels of depression, trait emotion dysregulation, and trait self-criticism (Tables 4-5). When controlling for these baseline variables, differences in the intensity of affective and cognitive states became non-significant between people who do and do not engage in NSSI. Depressive symptoms consistently explained higher mean negative affect ( $\beta_{Dep} = 0.32$  to  $0.34$  range) and lower mean positive affect ( $\beta_{Dep} = -0.37$  to  $-0.39$ ) in our sample. Higher trait emotion dysregulation also incrementally accounted for higher mean

negative affect ( $\beta_{\text{trait } \text{emodys}} = 0.29$ ) and rumination ( $\beta_{\text{trait } \text{emodys}} = 0.41$ ). Similarly, higher trait self-criticism ( $\beta_{\text{trait } \text{crit}} = 0.42$ ) explained a higher intensity of self-criticism during the 12-day ESM period. Likewise, greater variability in negative affect and self-criticism among people with past-year NSSI became non-significant when controlling for trait self-criticism (Table 5). In contrast, past-year NSSI remained a predictor of within-person variability of rumination ( $\beta_{\text{NSSI}} = 2.14$  to  $2.15$ ) when controlling for depression and trait self-criticism.

Considering carryover and spillover effects, we found that higher trait emotion dysregulation and trait self-criticism predicted lower carryover of negative affect (Tables 4-5). However, these traits did not account for the stronger spillover effects of positive and negative affect on rumination among individuals who engage in NSSI. In contrast, higher levels of depressive symptoms and trait self-criticism explained the cyclic cascade between negative affect and self-criticism among emerging adults with past-year NSSI (Table 5). Finally, trait emotion dysregulation and trait self-criticism also predicted generally stronger spillover effects of rumination and self-criticism on negative affect in our sample.

[Please include Tables 4-5 here]

## **Discussion**

Using an intensive ESM protocol for 12 days in daily life among emerging adults who do and do not engage in NSSI, we observed differences regarding intensity, interaction, and variability of affective and cognitive states in daily life. Three main findings require further comment. First, emerging adults who engage in NSSI reported greater intensity and variability of negative affect, rumination, and self-criticism than those without a history of while also experiencing lower intensity and greater variability of positive affect. Second, we observed stronger aversive interactions over time between emotions and cognitions among individuals who self-injure, supporting theoretical models of NSSI. Third, depressive symptoms, trait emotion dysregulation, and trait self-criticism partially explain differences between individuals who do and do not engage in NSSI.

Given the scarcity of studies that investigated emotional and cognitive experiences in an ecologically valid way among individuals with and without a history of NSSI, a crucial aim was to evaluate whether we could replicate earlier findings. In line with previous daily diary (Bresin, 2014; Victor & Klonsky, 2014) and ESM studies (Burke et al., 2021b; Victor et al., 2021), we found that young people who self-injure experience greater intensity and variability of state negative affect and self-criticism in everyday life than peers without a history of NSSI. Extending these findings, a similar pattern was observed for state rumination, indicating more intense and variable ruminative thoughts in the lives of people who self-injure compared to those who do not. In addition, while previous results were mixed for positive affect (Bresin, 2014; Victor & Klonsky, 2014; Victor et al., 2019), individuals with past-year NSSI experienced a lower intensity and more variable positive affect than those without a history of NSSI. These results support theoretical accounts which suggest that affective and cognitive dysregulation is elevated in people who self-injure (Hooley & Franklin, 2017; Nock, 2010; Selby et al., 2008), as well as survey studies that found higher levels of trait negative affect, rumination, and self-criticism, and lower trait positive affect (Boyes et al., 2020; Coleman et al., 2021; Tonta et al., 2022; Zerkowicz & Cole, 2019).

In contrast to traditional longitudinal and prior daily diary studies, we used a sampling protocol with eight assessments every 90 minutes during waking hours, which enabled us to investigate temporal effects on an hourly time scale. Thus, these are some of the highest-resolution data on the affective and cognitive predictors of NSSI to date (Brown et al., 2022; Burke et al., 2021a; Hughes et al., 2019; Kuehn et al., 2022). Whereas higher carryover of rumination and self-criticism was observed in univariate models, these effects disappeared when considering negative affect at the previous assessment. These findings illustrate that emotions and cognitions do not occur in isolation (Burke et al., 2018) and indicate the importance of considering interactions over time. In line with theoretical models of NSSI (Hooley & Franklin, 2017; Selby et al., 2008), our findings revealed more aversive affect-cognition interactions in everyday life among those who self-injure. Specifically, we observed

a pernicious cyclical cascade in which negative affect and self-criticism reinforce each other over time. These results align with prior research (Burke et al., 2021a, 2021b; Fox et al., 2018) and the Benefits and Barriers Model BBM; Hooley & Franklin, 2017), which postulates that low levels of self-criticism protect against NSSI (i.e., positive self-barrier), and that self-injury is used to cope with negative emotionality (i.e., affective benefit) and/or negative associations with the self (i.e., cognitive benefit). In line with the Emotional Cascade Model (ECM; Selby et al., 2008), the spillover effect of negative affect on rumination was more substantial for emerging adults engaging in NSSI. If replicated, the implications of this pattern of findings are clinically relevant as it suggests that perturbations in negative emotion lead to salient activation of aversive cognitive styles (i.e., self-critical and ruminative thinking) in daily life among young people who self-injure.

Contrary to what could be expected based on the ECM (Selby et al., 2008; Selby & Joiner, 2009), the spillover effect of rumination on negative affect did not differ between emerging adults with and without past-year NSSI. There are two potential explanations for this: (a) the stronger negative affect-rumination relationship observed in people who engage in NSSI is primarily affect-driven, and/or (b) the association between rumination and increased negative affect is a fast-occurring process on a shorter timescale than the hourly scale used in this study (Coppersmith et al., 2022). Future ESM studies with even more dense sampling densities should rule out one of these explanations. Interestingly, although positive affect has received much less attention (Perini et al., 2021), we found that enhancing positive emotions might be one helpful strategy to buffer negative cognitions in daily life for individuals who engage in self-injury. Consistent with recent work in depressed patients (Hoorelbeke et al., 2019), momentary positive affect had a protective effect on subsequent state rumination and self-criticism. A clinically relevant finding is that these dampening effects were stronger for emerging adults with past-year NSSI. While this could be due to floor effects of negative cognitive styles in people without a history of NSSI and mental illness (Wichers et al., 2012), it points to the relevance of focusing on both lowering negative

affect *as well as* enhancing positive emotions in treatment to buffer aversive thoughts in individuals who self-injure.

The final aim of the study was to tentatively explore whether dispositional vulnerabilities and levels of depression could potentially explain differences in affective-cognitive dynamics in daily life. Consistent with experimental work (Boyes et al., 2020), higher depressive symptoms among emerging adults who self-injure accounted for the higher intensity of negative affect and lower intensity of positive affect. Similarly, higher trait levels of emotion dysregulation and self-criticism explained the increased intensity of rumination and self-criticism in daily life among people with past-year NSSI. In line with recent findings (Vansteelandt et al., 2020), higher trait self-criticism also accounted for higher variability of state negative affect and self-criticism. In contrast, emotion dysregulation did not explain greater rumination variability and more potent downstream effects of affective disturbances on rumination among individuals who self-injure. Hence, more work is needed to clarify the salient activation of rumination following negative emotions among individuals who self-injure. Worth mentioning, consistent with the ECM (Selby et al., 2008), emotion dysregulation was associated with lower carryover (i.e., more contextually sensitive state levels) of rumination and more substantial spillover effects on negative affect. Similar associations emerged for trait self-criticism and dynamics of state self-criticism and negative affect, suggesting that dispositional differences in emotion dysregulation and self-criticism might account for greater emotional reactivity following the experience of dysfunctional cognitions.

### **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

Although this ESM study allowed for the most granular comparison of affective and cognitive states in daily life between emerging adults who do and do not engage in NSSI thus far (with 76 longitudinal assessments on average per individual across 12 days, median compliance = 83%), several important limitations should be considered when interpreting the

study findings. First, the sample comprised 60 emerging adults, of whom 82% were female. Therefore, replication in larger and more diverse samples is warranted, including more males as well as emerging adults not attending college. Such studies may also detect smaller effects than those for which our analysis indicated we were powered. Second, as these findings are based on a community sample, statements about generalizability to clinical samples cannot be made and should be studied. For instance, while we purposely sampled emerging adults without a history of NSSI *and* mental illness to keep the reference group as homogenous as possible, it should be investigated whether engagement in NSSI accounts for differences in affective-cognitive dynamics beyond the presence of comorbid mental disorders. Alternatively, clinical samples might also show greater affective-cognitive interactions than we observed in this student sample, which could, for example, indicate a more challenging recovery process (Lewis & Hasking, 2020).

Third, although we investigated how the dynamic blueprint of theoretically-relevant affective and cognitive states might differ in meaningful ways between people who do and do not engage in NSSI, it should be mentioned that we did not evaluate the predictive utility of dynamic properties (mean, stability, interactions, and lability) in gauging future risk of NSSI. Therefore, an exciting future research avenue is to evaluate whether identified affective-cognitive dynamics might help explain the course of NSSI across weeks, months, and years above and beyond traditional severity indicators (e.g., higher frequency and number of NSSI methods; Ammerman et al., 2020). This will require cohort studies incorporating ESM periods to shed light on the relationship between affective-cognitive dynamics with longer-term NSSI outcomes (Kiekens, Robinson, Tatnell, & Kirtley, 2021). Fourth, while the present study was not preregistered, as we had previously accessed the data (Kiekens et al., 2020), we have made the output files and study materials available to increase transparency. Finally, as the sampling schedule involved a relatively high burden for participants, state assessments of rumination and self-criticism were assessed using two items. Although we observed reasonable-to-good multilevel reliability for our state measures, there is a general lack of

validated items for assessing psychological constructs with ESM (Wright & Zimmermann, 2019), indicating a need to develop standardized measures for intensive longitudinal designs as the field progresses (Mestdagh & Dejonckheere, 2021).

### **Conclusions**

These limitations notwithstanding, the findings of this ESM study provide previously unavailable information about how and why affective and cognitive states might be experienced differently in the everyday lives of young people who do and do not engage in NSSI. Perhaps the most critical finding is that we found evidence of higher intensity, variability, and temporal interactions between negative affect and rumination and self-criticism in young people who self-injure. A future meaningful research avenue is to investigate whether boosting positive emotions might be an effective intervention strategy to downregulate dysfunctional cognitions and the future risk of NSSI.

### **Author Statement**

**Funding:** This research was supported by the Research Foundation Flanders [1114717N/1114719N, 12ZZM21N (GK)]. Olivia Kirtley is supported by a Senior Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Research Foundation Flanders (1257821N). Marlies Houben is financially supported by IMEC. Mark Boyes is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council, Australia (Investigator Grant 1173043).

**Acknowledgments:** The authors thank the individuals who participated in this study's intensive and demanding protocol.

**Data availability:** The datasets generated for this study are available on reasonable request to the corresponding author. Materials, code, and output files are available on the Open Science Framework ([https://osf.io/tnyk7/?view\\_only=180ec639e10c435bbabf67d6b889fe2f](https://osf.io/tnyk7/?view_only=180ec639e10c435bbabf67d6b889fe2f)).

**Declaration of interest:** Dr Nock receives publication royalties from Macmillan, Pearson, and UpToDate. He has been a paid consultant in the past three years for Microsoft Corporation, the Veterans Health Administration, and COMPASS Pathways, and for legal cases regarding a death by suicide. He has stock options in Cerebral Inc. He is an unpaid

scientific advisor for Empatica, Koko, and TalkLife. The other authors have no interest to declare.

### References

- American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2013). *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Ammerman, B. A., Jacobucci, R., Turner, B. J., Dixon-Gordon, K. L., & McCloskey, M. S. (2020). Quantifying the importance of lifetime frequency versus number of methods in conceptualizing nonsuicidal self-injury severity. *Psychology of Violence, 10*(4), 442–451. doi:10.1037/vio0000263
- Asparouhov, T., Hamaker, E. L., & Muthén, B. (2017). Dynamic Structural Equation Models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 25*(3), 359-388. doi:10.1080/10705511.2017.1406803
- Bentley, K. H., Nock, M. K., & Barlow, D. H. (2014). The Four-Function Model of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury. *Clinical Psychological Science, 2*(5), 638-656. doi:10.1177/2167702613514563
- Boyes, M. E., Wilmot, A., & Hasking, P. A. (2020). Nonsuicidal Self-Injury-Related Differences in the Experience of Negative and Positive Emotion. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 50*(2), 437-448. doi:10.1111/sltb.12599
- Bresin, K. (2014). Five indices of emotion regulation in participants with a history of nonsuicidal self-injury: a daily diary study. *Behavior Therapy, 45*(1), 56-66. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2013.09.005
- Brown, A. C., Dhingra, K., Brown, T. D., Danquah, A. N., & Taylor, P. J. (2022). A systematic review of the relationship between momentary emotional states and nonsuicidal self-injurious thoughts and behaviours. *Psychology and Psychotherapy. doi:10.1111/papt.12397*

- Burke, T. A., Anne McArthur, B., Daryanani, I., Abramson, L. Y., & Alloy, L. B. (2018). Latent classes of trait affect and cognitive affective regulation strategies are associated with depression, non-suicidal self-injury, and well-being. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 225, 180-187. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.08.015
- Burke, T. A., Fox, K., Kautz, M., Siegel, D. M., Kleiman, E., & Alloy, L. B. (2021a). Real-time monitoring of the associations between self-critical and self-punishment cognitions and nonsuicidal self-injury. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 137, 103775. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2020.103775
- Burke, T. A., Fox, K., Kautz, M. M., Rodriguez-Seijas, C., Bettis, A. H., & Alloy, L. B. (2021b). Self-Critical and Self-Punishment Cognitions Differentiate Those With and Without a History of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury: An Ecological Momentary Assessment Study. *Behavior Therapy*, 52(3), 686-697. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2020.08.006
- Cohen, J. N., Stange, J. P., Hamilton, J. L., Burke, T. A., Jenkins, A., Ong, M. L., Heimberg, R. G., Abramson, L. Y., & Alloy, L. B. (2015). The interaction of affective states and cognitive vulnerabilities in the prediction of non-suicidal self-injury. *Cognition & Emotion*, 29(3), 539-547. doi:10.1080/02699931.2014.918872
- Coleman, S. E., Dunlop, B. J., Hartley, S., & Taylor, P. J. (2021). The relationship between rumination and NSSI: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*. doi:10.1111/bjc.12350
- Coppersmith, D. D., Ryan, O., Fortgang, R., Millner, A., Kleiman, E., & Nock, M. (2022). Mapping the Timescale of Suicidal Thinking. Retrieved from <https://psyarxiv.com/eus2q/>.
- Dejonckheere, E., Mestdagh, M., Houben, M., Rutten, I., Sels, L., Kuppens, P., & Tuerlinckx, F. (2019). Complex affect dynamics add limited information to the prediction of psychological well-being. *Nature Human Behavior*, 3(5), 478-491. doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0555-0

- First, M. B., Williams, J. B. W., Karg, R. S., & Spitzer, R. L. (Eds.). (2015). *Structured clinical interview for DSM-5—Research version (SCID-5 for DSM-5, research version; SCID-5-RV)*. Arlington, VA: : American Psychiatric Association.
- Fox, K. R., Ribeiro, J. D., Kleiman, E. M., Hooley, J. M., Nock, M. K., & Franklin, J. C. (2018). Affect toward the self and self-injury stimuli as potential risk factors for nonsuicidal self-injury. *Psychiatry Research*, *260*, 279-285.  
doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2017.11.083
- Fredrickson, B. L., Mancuso, R. A., Branigan, C., & Tugade, M. M. (2000). The undoing effect of positive emotions. *Motivation and Emotion*, *24*(4), 237-258.
- Gandhi, A., Luyckx, K., Baetens, I., Kiekens, G., Sleuwaegen, E., Berens, A., Maitra, S., & Claes, L. (2018). Age of onset of non-suicidal self-injury in Dutch-speaking adolescents and emerging adults: An event history analysis of pooled data. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *80*, 170-178. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2017.10.007
- Gilbert, P., Clarke, M., Hempel, S., Miles, J. N., & Irons, C. (2004). Criticizing and reassuring oneself: An exploration of forms, styles and reasons in female students. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *43*(Pt 1), 31-50.  
doi:10.1348/014466504772812959
- Goodman, M., Tomas, I. A., Temes, C. M., Fitzmaurice, G. M., Aguirre, B. A., & Zanarini, M. C. (2017). Suicide attempts and self-injurious behaviours in adolescent and adult patients with borderline personality disorder. *Personal Mental Health*, *11*(3), 157-163.  
doi:10.1002/pmh.1375
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional Assessment of Emotion Regulation and Dysregulation: Development, Factor Structure, and Initial Validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *26*(1), 41-54. doi:10.1023/b:Joba.0000007455.08539.94

- Hamza, C. A., & Willoughby, T. (2016). Nonsuicidal Self-Injury and Suicidal Risk Among Emerging Adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 59*(4), 411-415.  
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.05.019
- Hasking, P. A., Di Simplicio, M., McEvoy, P. M., & Rees, C. S. (2018). Emotional cascade theory and non-suicidal self-injury: the importance of imagery and positive affect. *Cognition & Emotion, 32*(5), 941-952. doi:10.1080/02699931.2017.1368456
- Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*(Pt 2), 227-239.  
doi:10.1348/014466505X29657
- Hjartarson, K. H., Snorrason, I., Bringmann, L. F., Ogmundsson, B. E., & Olafsson, R. P. (2021). Do daily mood fluctuations activate ruminative thoughts as a mental habit? Results from an ecological momentary assessment study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 140*, 103832. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2021.103832
- Hooley, J. M., & Franklin, J. C. (2017). Why Do People Hurt Themselves? A New Conceptual Model of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury. *Clinical Psychological Science, 6*(3), 428-451. doi:10.1177/2167702617745641
- Hoorelbeke, K., Van den Bergh, N., Wichers, M., & Koster, E. H. W. (2019). Between vulnerability and resilience: A network analysis of fluctuations in cognitive risk and protective factors following remission from depression. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 116*, 1-9. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2019.01.007
- Hughes, C. D., King, A. M., Kranzler, A., Fehling, K., Miller, A., Lindqvist, J., & Selby, E. A. (2019). Anxious and Overwhelming Affects and Repetitive Negative Thinking as Ecological Predictors of Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 43*(1), 88-101. doi:10.1007/s10608-019-09996-9
- International Society for the Study of Self-injury. (2022). *What is self-injury?* Retrieved from: <https://itriples.org/about-self-injury/what-is-self-injury>.

- Jacobson, C. M., Hill, R. M., Pettit, J. W., & Grozeva, D. (2015). The Association of Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Emotional Experiences with Non-Suicidal Self-Injury in Young Adults. *Arch Suicide Res, 19*(4), 401-413.  
doi:10.1080/13811118.2015.1004492
- Kaufman, E. A., Xia, M., Fosco, G., Yaptangco, M., Skidmore, C. R., & Crowell, S. E. (2015). The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale Short Form (DERS-SF): Validation and Replication in Adolescent and Adult Samples. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 38*(3), 443-455. doi:10.1007/s10862-015-9529-3
- Kiekens, G., Hasking, P., Boyes, M., Claes, L., Mortier, P., Auerbach, R. P., Cuijpers, P., Demyttenaere, K., Green, J. G., Kessler, R. C., Myin-Germeys, I., Nock, M. K., & Bruffaerts, R. (2018). The associations between non-suicidal self-injury and first onset suicidal thoughts and behaviors. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 239*, 171-179.  
doi:10.1016/j.jad.2018.06.033
- Kiekens, G., Hasking, P., Bruffaerts, R., Alonso, J., Auerbach, R. P., Bantjes, J., Benjet, C., Boyes, M., Chiu, W. T., Claes, L., Cuijpers, P., Ebert, D. D., Mak, A., Mortier, P., O'Neill, S., Sampson, N. A., Stein, D. J., Vilagut, G., Nock, M. K., & Kessler, R. C. (2021). Non-suicidal self-injury among first-year college students and its association with mental disorders: results from the World Mental Health International College Student (WMH-ICS) initiative. *Psychological Medicine, 1*-12.  
doi:10.1017/S0033291721002245
- Kiekens, G., Hasking, P., Claes, L., Boyes, M., Mortier, P., Auerbach, R. P., Cuijpers, P., Demyttenaere, K., Green, J. G., Kessler, R. C., Myin-Germeys, I., Nock, M. K., & Bruffaerts, R. (2019). Predicting the incidence of non-suicidal self-injury in college students. *European Psychiatry, 59*, 44-51. doi:10.1016/j.eurpsy.2019.04.002
- Kiekens, G., Hasking, P., Nock, M. K., Boyes, M., Kirtley, O., Bruffaerts, R., Myin-Germeys, I., & Claes, L. (2020). Fluctuations in Affective States and Self-Efficacy to Resist

- Non-Suicidal Self-Injury as Real-Time Predictors of Non-Suicidal Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors. *Front Psychiatry*, 11, 214. doi:10.3389/fpsy.2020.00214
- Kiekens, G., Robinson, K., Tatnell, R., & Kirtley, O. J. (2021). Opening the Black Box of Daily Life in Nonsuicidal Self-injury Research: With Great Opportunity Comes Great Responsibility. *JMIR Mental Health*, 8(11). doi:10.2196/30915
- Kuehn, K. S., Dora, J., Harned, M. S., Foster, K. T., Song, F., Smith, M. R., & King, K. M. (2022). A meta-analysis on the affect regulation function of real-time self-injurious thoughts and behaviours. *Nat Hum Behav*. doi:10.1038/s41562-022-01340-8
- Kuppens, P., & Verduyn, P. (2017). Emotion dynamics. *Curr Opin Psychol*, 17, 22-26. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.06.004
- Lafit, G., Adolf, J. K., Dejonckheere, E., Myin-Germeys, I., Viechtbauer, W., & Ceulemans, E. (2021). Selection of the Number of Participants in Intensive Longitudinal Studies: A User-Friendly Shiny App and Tutorial for Performing Power Analysis in Multilevel Regression Models That Account for Temporal Dependencies. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4(1). doi:10.1177/2515245920978738
- Latimer, S., Meade, T., & Tennant, A. (2013). Measuring engagement in deliberate self-harm behaviours: psychometric evaluation of six scales. *BMC Psychiatry*, 13, 4. doi:10.1186/1471-244X-13-4
- Lewis, S. P., & Hasking, P. A. (2020). Self-injury recovery: A person-centered framework. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. doi:10.1002/jclp.23094
- Matt, G. E., Vázquez, C., & Campbell, W. K. (1992). Mood-congruent recall of affectively toned stimuli: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical psychology review*, 12(2), 227-255. doi: 10.1016/0272-7358(92)90116-P
- McNeish, D., & Hamaker, E. L. (2019). A primer on two-level dynamic structural equation models for intensive longitudinal data in Mplus. *Psychological Methods*. doi:10.1037/met0000250

- Mestdagh, M., & Dejonckheere, E. (2021). Ambulatory assessment in psychopathology research: Current achievements and future ambitions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 41, 1-8. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.01.004
- Muthén, B. O, Muthén, L. K., & Asparouhov, T. (2016). *Regression and mediation analyses using Mplus*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- 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(2), 123-132. doi:10.1002/wps.20513
- Nicolai, K. A., Wielgus, M. D., & Mezulis, A. (2016). Identifying Risk for Self-Harm: Rumination and Negative Affectivity in the Prospective Prediction of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 46(2), 223-233. doi:10.1111/sltb.12186
- Nock, M. K. (2010). Self-injury. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 6, 339-363. doi:10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131258
- Nock, M. K., Holmberg, E. B., Photos, V. I., & Michel, B. D. (2007). Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors Interview: development, reliability, and validity in an adolescent sample. *Psychological Assessment*, 19(3), 309-317. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.19.3.309
- Perini, I., Zetterqvist, M., & Mayo, L. M. (2021). Beyond distress: a role for positive affect in nonsuicidal self-injury. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 39, 209-215. doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.04.012
- Russell, J. A. (2003). Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion. *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 145-172. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12529060>
- Scott, L. N., Victor, S. E., Kaufman, E. A., Beeney, J. E., Byrd, A. L., Vine, V., ... Stepp, S. D. (2020). Affective dynamics across internalizing and externalizing dimensions of psychopathology. *Clin. Psychol. Sci.*, 8(3), 412-427. doi: 10.1177/2167702619898802

- Selby, E. A., Anestis, M. D., & Joiner, T. E. (2008). Understanding the relationship between emotional and behavioral dysregulation: emotional cascades. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *46*(5), 593-611. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2008.02.002
- Selby, E. A., & Joiner, T. E., Jr. (2009). Cascades of Emotion: The Emergence of Borderline Personality Disorder from Emotional and Behavioral Dysregulation. *Review of General Psychology*, *13*(3), 219. doi:10.1037/a0015687
- Shiffman, S., Stone, A. A., & Hufford, M. R. (2008). Ecological momentary assessment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *4*, 1-32. doi:10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091415
- Shrout, P. E., & Lane, S. P. (2012). Reliability. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 1. Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics* (pp. 643–660). American Psychological Association.
- Taylor, P. J., Jomar, K., Dhingra, K., Forrester, R., Shahmalak, U., & Dickson, J. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of the prevalence of different functions of non-suicidal self-injury. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *227*, 759-769. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.11.073
- Tonta, K. E., Boyes, M., Howell, J., McEvoy, P., Johnson, A., & Hasking, P. (2022). Modeling pathways to non-suicidal self-injury: The roles of perfectionism, negative affect, rumination, and attention control. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. doi:10.1002/jclp.23315
- Vansteelandt, K., Houben, M., Claes, L., Berens, A., Sleuwaegen, E., & Kuppens, P. (2020). Self-criticism and dependency predict affective variability in borderline personality disorder: An ecological momentary assessment study. *Personal Disord*, *11*(4), 270-279. doi:10.1037/per0000374
- Victor, S. E., Brown, S. L., & Scott, L. N. (2021). Prospective and Concurrent Affective Dynamics in Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors: An Examination in Young Adult Women. *Behavior Therapy*, *52*(5), 1158-1170. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2021.01.003

- Victor, S. E., & Klonsky, E. D. (2014). Daily emotion in non-suicidal self-injury. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 70*(4), 364-375. doi:10.1002/jclp.22037
- Victor, S. E., Scott, L. N., Stepp, S. D., & Goldstein, T. R. (2019). I Want You to Want Me: Interpersonal Stress and Affective Experiences as Within-Person Predictors of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury and Suicide Urges in Daily Life. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 49*(4), 1157-1177. doi:10.1111/sltb.12513
- Wichers, M., Lothmann, C., Simons, C. J., Nicolson, N. A., & Peeters, F. (2012). The dynamic interplay between negative and positive emotions in daily life predicts response to treatment in depression: a momentary assessment study. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 51*(2), 206-222. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8260.2011.02021.x
- Wilkinson, P. O., Qiu, T., Neufeld, S., Jones, P. B., & Goodyer, I. M. (2018). Sporadic and recurrent non-suicidal self-injury before age 14 and incident onset of psychiatric disorders by 17 years: prospective cohort study. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 212*(4), 222-226. doi:10.1192/bjp.2017.45
- Wright, A. G., & Zimmermann, J. (2019). Applied ambulatory assessment: Integrating idiographic and nomothetic principles of measurement. *Psychological Assessment, 31*(12), 1467-1480.
- Zelkowitz, R. L., & Cole, D. A. (2019). Self-Criticism as a Transdiagnostic Process in Nonsuicidal Self-Injury and Disordered Eating: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 49*(1), 310-327. doi:10.1111/sltb.12436
- Zuroff, D. C., Sadikaj, G., Kelly, A. C., & Leybman, M. J. (2016). Conceptualizing and measuring self-criticism as both a personality trait and a personality state. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 98*(1), 14-21.

**Table 1.**  
Descriptive and variability statistics of study variables.

Study variables	M	SD	Range	Total variance <sup>a</sup>	ICC <sup>b</sup>	95% CI
<b>Momentary constructs</b>						
Negative affect	1.11	1.18	0-6	1.39	0.62	0.53-0.70
Positive affect	3.41	1.39	0-6	1.93	0.51	0.42-0.61
Rumination	1.02	1.41	0-6	1.99	0.54	0.45-0.64
Self-criticism	0.86	1.35	0-6	1.82	0.56	0.47-0.65
<b>Baseline constructs</b>						
Depression past week	4.10	5.12	0-21			
Trait emotion-dysregulation	26.42	13.97	0-72			
Trait self-criticism	19.40	12.96	0-52			

Note: <sup>a</sup> Total variance represents the sum of variance within individuals across time (i.e., within-person variance) and variance in within-person means across individuals (i.e., between-person variance). <sup>b</sup> The Intra-Class Correlation represents the proportion of the total variance that is accounted for by between-person variance. ICC = Intra-Class Correlation, 95% CI = Credibility Interval.

**Table 2.**

Point estimates and 95% credibility intervals of univariate multilevel vector autoregressive models of negative affect, positive affect, rumination, and self-criticism with past-year NSSI as a between-person predictor.

Dynamic parameters	Intercept <sup>a</sup>	Slope past-year NSSI	Intercept <sup>a</sup>	Slope past-year NSSI
	Negative affect		Positive affect	
Mean intensity affect	<b>0.43 (0.20, 0.67)</b>	<b>1.32 (0.99, 1.64)</b>	<b>3.91 (3.60, 4.24)</b>	<b>-0.99 (-1.45, -0.55)</b>
Carryover	<b>0.41 (0.33, 0.49)</b>	0.10 (-0.02, 0.21)	<b>0.53 (0.46, 0.60)</b>	0.01 (-0.08, 0.11)
Log within-person variance	<b>-2.38 (-2.82, -1.95)</b>	<b>1.68 (1.06, 2.32)</b>	<b>-0.89 (-1.12, -0.67)</b>	<b>0.52 (0.20, 0.84)</b>
	Rumination		Self-Criticism	
Mean intensity cognition	<b>0.37 (0.10, 0.66)</b>	<b>1.18 (0.78, 1.59)</b>	0.29 (-0.01, 0.61)	<b>1.11 (0.67, 1.54)</b>
Carryover	<b>0.31 (0.20, 0.41)</b>	<b>0.17 (0.03, 0.33)</b>	<b>0.26 (0.14, 0.37)</b>	<b>0.18 (0.03, 0.34)</b>
Log within-person variance	<b>-2.43 (-2.99, -1.86)</b>	<b>2.37 (1.62, 3.53)</b>	<b>-2.30 (-2.85, -1.74)</b>	<b>2.01 (1.23, 2.83)</b>

*note:* <sup>a</sup> Emerging adults without NSSI history. Credibility intervals are presented within parentheses. Boldface type indicates that there is a 95% probability that the true comparison value is not null (i.e., the credibility interval does not include zero). NSSI = Non-Suicidal Self-Injury.

N

**Table 3.**

Point estimates and 95% credibility intervals of bivariate multilevel vector autoregressive models between affective and cognitive states with past-year NSSI as a between-person predictor.

Dynamic parameters	Intercept <sup>a</sup>		Slope past-year NSSI		Slope past-year NSSI	
	Negative affect and rumination		Negative affect and self-criticism		Negative affect and self-criticism	
Carryover negative affect at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	<b>0.31 (0.21, 0.41)</b>	0.12 (-0.01, 0.26)	<b>0.40 (0.30, 0.49)</b>	0.02 (-0.10, 0.16)		
Carryover cognitive state at $t-1h$ on cognitive state at $t$	<b>0.30 (0.16, 0.41)</b>	0.02 (-0.17, 0.19)	<b>0.19 (0.06, 0.32)</b>	0.14 (-0.03, 0.33)		
Spillover negative affect at $t-1h$ on cognitive state at $t$	<b>0.09 (0.01, 0.20)</b>	<b>0.28 (0.14, 0.42)</b>	<b>0.09 (0.01, 0.18)</b>	<b>0.18 (0.06, 0.30)</b>		
Spillover cognitive state at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	<b>0.18 (0.07, 0.26)</b>	-0.03 (-0.14, 0.09)	0.04 (-0.03, 0.10)	<b>0.12 (0.04, 0.21)</b>		
	Positive affect and rumination		Positive affect and self-criticism			
Carryover positive affect at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	<b>0.52 (0.45, 0.59)</b>	-0.02 (-0.11, 0.09)	<b>0.53 (0.45, 0.60)</b>	-0.05 (-0.16, 0.06)		
Carryover cognitive state at $t-1h$ on cognitive state at $t$	<b>0.27 (0.14, 0.38)</b>	0.11 (-0.05, 0.29)	<b>0.21 (0.07, 0.32)</b>	0.12 (-0.04, 0.31)		
Spillover positive affect at $t-1h$ on cognitive state at $t$	<b>-0.05 (-0.11, -0.01)</b>	<b>-0.16 (-0.24, -0.08)</b>	<b>-0.07 (-0.12, -0.01)</b>	<b>-0.14 (-0.23, -0.06)</b>		
Spillover cognitive state at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	-0.04 (-0.13, 0.06)	-0.05 (-0.17, 0.06)	-0.04 (-0.14, 0.06)	-0.09 (-0.21, 0.03)		

Note. <sup>a</sup> Emerging adults without NSSI history. Credibility intervals are presented within parentheses. Boldface type indicates that there is a 95% probability that the true comparison value is not null (i.e., the credibility interval does not include zero). NSSI = Non-Suicidal Self-Injury.

**Table 4.**

Point estimates and 95% credibility intervals of multilevel vector autoregressive models between affective states and rumination with the multivariate prediction of random effects.

	Past-year NSSI	Depression	Trait emotion-dysregulation
Dynamic parameters: negative affect and rumination			
Mean intensity negative affect	0.43 (-0.06, 0.92)	<b>0.34 (0.13, 0.54)</b>	<b>0.29 (0.02, 0.54)</b>
Mean intensity rumination	0.20 (-0.46, 0.86)	0.27 (-0.01, 0.57)	<b>0.41 (0.06, 0.77)</b>
Carryover negative affect at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	<b>0.28 (0.07, 0.48)</b>	0.07 (-0.03, 0.17)	<b>-0.20 (-0.32, -0.06)</b>
Carryover rumination at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	-0.04 (-0.34, 0.26)	-0.03 (-0.16, 0.12)	0.10 (-0.08, 0.27)
Spillover negative affect at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	<b>0.33 (0.10, 0.56)</b>	0.04 (-0.08, 0.15)	-0.12 (-0.25, 0.03)
Spillover rumination at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	-0.10 (-0.26, 0.07)	-0.04 (-0.12, 0.04)	<b>0.12 (0.00, 0.22)</b>
Log within-person variance negative affect	<b>1.16 (0.13, 2.28)</b>	0.10 (-0.36, 0.58)	0.20 (-0.43, 0.77)
Log within-person variance rumination	<b>2.14 (0.75, 3.54)</b>	0.00 (-0.63, 0.63)	0.04 (-0.76, 0.79)
Dynamic parameters: positive affect and rumination			
Mean intensity positive affect	-0.15 (-0.89, 0.59)	<b>-0.37 (-0.69, -0.05)</b>	-0.22 (-0.63, 0.18)
Mean intensity rumination	0.19 (-0.48, 0.84)	0.27 (-0.02, 0.56)	<b>0.41 (0.04, 0.78)</b>
Carryover positive affect at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	0.13 (-0.04, 0.30)	-0.03 (-0.10, 0.04)	-0.08 (-0.17, 0.02)
Carryover rumination at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	0.01 (-0.28, 0.32)	0.05 (-0.08, 0.17)	0.03 (-0.13, 0.18)
Spillover positive affect at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	<b>-0.25 (-0.41, -0.10)</b>	0.04 (-0.03, 0.11)	0.03 (-0.04, 0.12)
Spillover rumination at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	-0.01 (-0.20, 0.17)	0.01 (-0.06, 0.09)	-0.04 (-0.14, 0.06)
Log within-person variance positive affect	0.32 (-0.19, 0.90)	0.12 (-0.11, 0.36)	0.01 (-0.31, 0.30)
Log within-person variance rumination	<b>2.15 (0.73, 3.56)</b>	-0.01 (-0.64, 0.63)	0.05 (-0.73, 0.83)

Note: Credibility intervals are presented within parentheses. Boldface type indicates that there is a 95% probability that the true comparison value is not null (i.e., the credibility interval does not include zero). NSSI = Non-Suicidal Self-Injury.

**Table 5.**

Point estimates and 95% credibility intervals of multilevel vector autoregressive models between affective states and self-criticism with the multivariate prediction of random effects.

	Past-year NSSI	Depression	Trait self-criticism
Dynamic parameters: negative affect and self-criticism			
Mean intensity negative affect	0.44 (-0.06, 0.92)	<b>0.32 (0.10, 0.55)</b>	0.28 (-0.02, 0.58)
Mean intensity self-criticism	-0.04 (-0.68, 0.65)	<b>0.33 (0.02, 0.65)</b>	<b>0.42 (0.03, 0.82)</b>
Carryover negative affect at $t-1/h$ on negative affect at $t$	0.18 (-0.05, 0.41)	0.10 (-0.01, 0.19)	<b>-0.17 (-0.32, -0.03)</b>
Carryover self-criticism at $t-1/h$ self-criticism at $t$	-0.04 (-0.34, 0.26)	-0.08 (-0.23, 0.06)	<b>0.18 (0.01, 0.36)</b>
Spillover negative affect at $t-1h$ on self-criticism at $t$	0.19 (-0.03, 0.41)	0.07 (-0.03, 0.17)	-0.06 (-0.20, 0.08)
Spillover self-criticism at $t-1/h$ on negative affect at $t$	0.04 (-0.11, 0.18)	<b>-0.07 (-0.15, -0.00)</b>	<b>0.11 (0.01, 0.22)</b>
Log within-person variance negative affect	0.53 (-0.44, 1.55)	-0.21 (-0.69, 0.27)	<b>0.86 (0.22, 1.44)</b>
Log within-person variance self-criticism	0.29 (-0.95, 1.52)	-0.34 (-0.95, 0.25)	<b>1.31 (0.54, 2.05)</b>
Dynamic parameters: positive affect and self-criticism			
Mean intensity positive affect	-0.18 (-0.96, 0.59)	<b>-0.39 (-0.75, -0.04)</b>	-0.17 (-0.63, 0.28)
Mean intensity self-criticism	-0.02 (-0.68, 0.61)	<b>0.34 (0.03, 0.64)</b>	<b>0.42 (0.02, 0.81)</b>
Carryover positive affect at $t-1/h$ on positive affect at $t$	0.10 (-0.09, 0.28)	-0.01 (-0.09, 0.08)	-0.08 (-0.21, 0.03)
Carryover self-criticism at $t-1/h$ self-criticism at $t$	0.01 (-0.28, 0.30)	-0.04 (-0.18, 0.10)	0.10 (-0.07, 0.28)
Spillover positive affect at $t-1h$ on self-criticism at $t$	-0.06 (-0.22, 0.08)	-0.01 (-0.08, 0.08)	-0.04 (-0.13, 0.05)
Spillover self-criticism at $t-1/h$ on positive affect at $t$	-0.05 (-0.23, 0.15)	0.08 (-0.01, 0.17)	-0.10 (-0.22, 0.03)
Log within-person variance positive affect	0.11 (-0.41, 0.68)	0.05 (-0.21, 0.32)	0.19 (-0.16, 0.52)
Log within-person variance self-criticism	<b>0.33 (-0.87, 1.54)</b>	<b>-0.33 (-0.92, 0.26)</b>	<b>1.30 (0.54, 2.05)</b>

Note: Credibility intervals are presented within parentheses. Boldface type indicates that there is a 95% probability that the true comparison value is not null (i.e., the credibility interval does not include zero). NSSI = Non-Suicidal Self-Injury

## Supplementary Tables

**STable 1.**

Monte-Carlo Simulation with 1000 replicates for power estimation multilevel autoregressive model that examines group differences in the autoregressive effects.

Parameters simulation		Values simulation				
Number of participants in Group 0 (reference group)		30				
Number of participants in Group 1		30				
Number of time points		76				
Fixed intercept		2.00				
Effect of the level-2 dummy variable on the intercept		0.37				
Fixed Slope		0.28				
Effect of the level-2 dummy variable on the Fixed Slope		0.09				
Standard deviation of level-1 errors		0.50				
Standard deviation of random intercept		0.50				
Standard deviation of random slope		0.05				
Correlation between the random intercept and slope:		0.30				
Results simulation						
		True effect	Estimate	Bias	95% Coverage	Power
	Fixed intercept	2.00	2.0006	0.0006	0.947	1.000
	Effect of the level-2 dummy on the intercept	0.37	0.3698	-0.0002	0.955	0.805
	Fixed slope	0.28	0.2613	-0.0187	0.863	1.000
	Effect of the level-2 dummy on the slope	0.09	0.0880	-0.0020	0.961	0.801

*Note:* Based on model 10 in Lافit, G., Adolf, J. K., Dejonckheere, E., Myin-Germeys, I., Viechtbauer, W., & Ceulemans, E. (2021). Selection of the Number of Participants in Intensive Longitudinal Studies: A User-Friendly Shiny App and Tutorial for Performing Power Analysis in Multilevel Regression Models That Account for Temporal Dependencies. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4(1). doi:10.1177/2515245920978738

**STable 2.**

Point estimates and 95% credibility intervals of multilevel vector autoregressive models between affective and cognitive states with past-year NSSI as a between-person predictor of random effects.

	Intercept <sup>a</sup>	Slope past-year NSSI
<b>Dynamic parameters: negative affect and rumination</b>		
Mean intensity negative affect	<b>0.41 (0.19, 0.63)</b>	<b>1.34 (1.01, 1.68)</b>
Mean intensity rumination	<b>0.36 (0.06, 0.66)</b>	<b>1.22 (0.80, 1.65)</b>
Carryover negative affect at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	<b>0.31 (0.21, 0.41)</b>	0.12 (-0.01, 0.26)
Carryover rumination at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	<b>0.30 (0.16, 0.41)</b>	0.02 (-0.17, 0.19)
Spillover negative affect at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	<b>0.09 (0.01, 0.20)</b>	<b>0.28 (0.14, 0.42)</b>
Spillover rumination at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	<b>0.18 (0.07, 0.26)</b>	-0.03 (-0.14, 0.09)
Log within-person variance negative affect	<b>-2.41 (-2.83, -1.98)</b>	<b>1.67 (1.04, 2.27)</b>
Log within-person variance rumination	<b>-2.45 (-3.02, -1.88)</b>	<b>2.17 (1.37, 2.97)</b>
<b>Dynamic parameters: negative affect and self-criticism</b>		
Mean intensity negative affect	<b>0.42 (0.20, 0.65)</b>	<b>1.33 (1.00, 1.67)</b>
Mean intensity self-criticism	0.28 (-0.02, 0.58)	<b>1.11 (0.67, 1.56)</b>
Carryover negative affect at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	<b>0.40 (0.30, 0.49)</b>	0.02 (-0.10, 0.16)
Carryover self-criticism at $t-1h$ self-criticism at $t$	<b>0.19 (0.06, 0.32)</b>	0.14 (-0.03, 0.33)
Spillover negative affect at $t-1h$ on self-criticism at $t$	<b>0.09 (0.01, 0.18)</b>	<b>0.18 (0.06, 0.30)</b>
Spillover self-criticism at $t-1h$ on negative affect at $t$	0.04 (-0.03, 0.10)	<b>0.12 (0.04, 0.21)</b>
Log within-person variance negative affect	<b>-2.39 (2.82, -1.97)</b>	<b>1.66 (1.03, 2.27)</b>
Log within-person variance self-criticism	<b>-2.32 (-2.87, -1.75)</b>	<b>1.96 (1.18, 2.73)</b>
<b>Dynamic parameters: positive affect and rumination</b>		
Mean intensity positive affect	<b>3.93 (3.63, 4.24)</b>	<b>-0.97 (-1.45, -0.53)</b>
Mean intensity rumination	<b>0.37 (0.08, 0.67)</b>	<b>1.17 (0.78, 1.60)</b>
Carryover positive affect at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	<b>0.52 (0.45, 0.59)</b>	-0.02 (-0.11, 0.09)
Carryover rumination at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	<b>0.27 (0.14, 0.38)</b>	0.11 (-0.05, 0.29)
Spillover positive affect at $t-1h$ on rumination at $t$	<b>-0.05 (-0.11, -0.01)</b>	<b>-0.16 (-0.24, -0.08)</b>
Spillover rumination at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	-0.04 (-0.13, 0.06)	-0.05 (-0.17, 0.06)
Log within-person variance positive affect	<b>-0.89 (-1.10, -0.67)</b>	<b>0.50 (0.19, 0.80)</b>
Log within-person variance rumination	<b>-2.45 (-3.00, -1.85)</b>	<b>2.23 (1.42, 3.01)</b>
<b>Dynamic parameters: positive affect and self-criticism</b>		
Mean intensity positive affect	<b>3.90 (3.58, 4.23)</b>	<b>-0.96 (-1.44, -0.51)</b>
Mean intensity self-criticism	<b>0.29 (-0.03, 0.60)</b>	<b>1.10 (0.67, 1.55)</b>
Carryover positive affect at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	<b>0.53 (0.45, 0.60)</b>	-0.05 (-0.16, 0.06)
Carryover self-criticism at $t-1h$ self-criticism at $t$	<b>0.21 (0.07, 0.32)</b>	0.12 (-0.04, 0.31)
Spillover positive affect at $t-1h$ on self-criticism at $t$	<b>-0.07 (-0.12, -0.01)</b>	<b>-0.14 (-0.23, -0.06)</b>
Spillover self-criticism at $t-1h$ on positive affect at $t$	-0.04 (-0.14, 0.06)	-0.09 (-0.21, 0.03)
Log within-person variance positive affect	<b>-0.89 (-1.11, -0.68)</b>	<b>0.49 (0.18, 0.80)</b>
Log within-person variance self-criticism	<b>-2.33 (-2.88, -1.76)</b>	<b>1.99 (1.23, 2.76)</b>

Note: <sup>a</sup> Emerging adults without NSSI history. Credibility intervals are presented within parentheses. Boldface type indicates that there is a 95% probability that the true comparison value is not null (i.e., the credibility interval does not include zero). NSSI = Non-Suicidal Self-Injury.