

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

## Moderating the link between discrimination and adverse mental health outcomes: Examining the protective effects of cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

Yutong Zhu<sup>1¶\*</sup>, Wisteria Deng<sup>1¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America

16 \* Corresponding author  
17 E-mail: [yutong.zhu@yale.edu](mailto:yutong.zhu@yale.edu) (YZ)

18 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

### 19 Abstract

20 Discrimination is associated with mental health problems. While prior research has  
21 demonstrated the significance of emotion regulation in explaining the onset and development of  
22 discrimination-related anxiety, few studies investigated this dynamic with cognitive flexibility among  
23 sexual and/or racial minority individuals. The current study incorporated cognitive flexibility to  
24 investigate its potential buffering effects on discrimination-related anxiety. 221 individuals, 37.6% of  
25 whom ( $n = 83$ ) identified as sexual and/or racial minorities, responded to an online questionnaire  
26 about their levels of cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation, perceived discrimination, and  
27 anxiety. Moderated mediation analyses were conducted with these variables. Our findings indicated  
28 that emotion regulation difficulty (ERD) mediated the relationship between discrimination and  
29 anxiety, while cognitive flexibility had a strong moderating effect on the relationship between ERD  
30 and anxiety. These results suggested new research directions and implied the therapeutic potential of  
31 advancing cognitive flexibility skills with emotion regulation training in anxiety prevention and  
32 treatments. Future research is needed to investigate cognitive flexibility as a transdiagnostic  
33 mechanism underlying the onset and development of anxiety, to potentially lead to novel prevention  
34 or intervention for marginalized people facing additional stressors like discrimination.

35 *Keywords:* cognitive flexibility, emotion regulation, sexual and racial minorities,  
36 discrimination, anxiety

## 37 **Introduction**

38 Discrimination incurs substantial costs as it associates with negative health outcomes [1].  
39 Discrimination can lead to stress-related difficult emotions such as sadness [2], anger [3], and grief  
40 [4]. These negative emotions can result in adverse physical and behavioral responses, including  
41 cardiovascular diseases [5], sleep difficulties [6], and substance abuse [7]. It is especially harmful to  
42 racial and/or sexual minorities, who may experience low self-esteem, anxiety, and stress-related  
43 disorders as a result of discrimination [8-11]. Asian Americans reported a marked increase in racial  
44 discrimination during the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to worsened anxiety and depression  
45 symptoms [12]. Additionally, a nationally representative survey found that 36% of LGBTQ adults  
46 reported experiencing discrimination, with 52% reporting negative impacts on their mental well-  
47 being [13]. Considering the discrimination experienced by minority populations and subsequent  
48 adverse mental health outcomes, it is important to identify potential risk and protective factors to  
49 inform public health decisions and intervention designs for minority individuals.

50 Given that the association between discrimination and adverse mental health outcomes is  
51 fueled by emotional responses, emotion regulation may moderate this relationship. Previous literature  
52 identifies emotion regulation difficulty (ERD) as a risk factor underlying the development of stress-  
53 related disorders. Emotion regulation refers to one's explicit or implicit control over emotional states  
54 [14]. ERD may manifest as avoidance or suppression of emotional experiences and can lead to  
55 persistent worry and an excessive focus on emotional cues, which contribute to the development of  
56 generalized anxiety disorder [15-16]. Another study has found that ERD is directly linked to anxiety  
57 diagnoses even after controlling for worry, trait anxiety, and depressive symptoms [17].

58 Apart from affective factors, cognitive mechanisms may also influence anxiety levels after  
59 experiencing discrimination. While previous research has demonstrated that ERD can lead to  
60 increased anxiety, little has been explored regarding how cognitive flexibility can interact with  
61 emotion regulation to alleviate adverse mental health outcomes. Cognitive flexibility refers to the  
62 ability to adjust one's beliefs and/or behaviors to better adapt to the environment [18]. People with a  
63 higher level of cognitive flexibility can disengage from the previous mindsets to incorporate new  
64 information and form new beliefs that are more appropriate to the current context. High cognitive  
65 flexibility reflects high cognitive control and the ability to reevaluate current situations (e.g.,  
66 cognitive reappraisal); these cognitive abilities and skills are shared by adaptive emotion regulation  
67 strategies [19-20]. Thus, it can be hypothesized that cognitive flexibility may interact with emotion  
68 regulation ability to buffer against anxiety incurred by discrimination. Meanwhile, employing  
69 maladaptive emotion regulation techniques can result in low moods and reduced motivation to revise  
70 existing beliefs, consequently negatively impacting cognitive flexibility [21]. A better understanding  
71 of the interplay between emotion regulation and cognitive flexibility is crucial to understand the  
72 development of negative mental health impacts of discrimination.

## 73 **Current study**

74 The current study aimed to examine the interaction between cognitive flexibility and emotion  
75 regulation difficulties (ERD) in relation to discrimination-induced anxiety. We hypothesized that  
76 ERD would mediate the relationship between discrimination and anxiety. Additionally, cognitive  
77 flexibility would moderate the association between discrimination and anxiety as well as the link  
78 between ERD and anxiety (i.e., these associations will be weaker for individuals with high cognitive  
79 flexibility) (S1 Fig). By exploring the interplay between emotion regulation and cognitive flexibility,  
80 this study aims to uncover potential protective factors against discrimination-related anxiety. Our  
81 findings may provide valuable insights for public health recommendations and innovative

82 interventions for minority groups who experience prevalent discrimination and heightened anxiety.

## 83 **Materials and methods**

### 84 **Procedure and participants**

85 Participants ( $N = 221$ ,  $M_{age} = 41.18$ ,  $SD_{age} = 12.09$ ) were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical  
 86 Turk (MTurk), an online crowdsourcing platform that provides access to a large and diverse sample  
 87 for mental health research studies (demographics see Table 1). MTurk users who live in the United  
 88 States and are 18 years or older were eligible to participate in this study. According to guidelines for  
 89 research using crowdsourced samples, the study exclusively recruited participants who have a history  
 90 of submitting high-quality answers [22]. All participants need to complete at least 500 MTurk studies,  
 91 with 98% of those studies accepting their responses. Participants received \$6 for study compensation.

92 **Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants.**

	#	%		#	%
Gender			Psychiatric History		
Male	115	52.04%	Yes	55	24.89%
( $M_{age} = 41.25$ , $SD = 12.56$ )					
Female	106	47.96%	No	166	75.11%
( $M_{age} = 41.09$ , $SD = 11.61$ )					
Sexual Orientation			Psychiatric Medication History		
Heterosexual	182	82.35%	Yes	47	21.27%
Homosexual	5	2.26%	No	174	78.73%
Bisexual/Pansexual	26	11.76%	Current Medication (if applicable)		
Asexual/Aromantic	7	3.17%	Mental health	33	56.90%
Queer/Questioning	1	0.45%	Medical problems	27	46.55%
Race/Ethnicity			General health	3	5.17%
White/Caucasian	167	75.57%	Family History of Mental Illness		
Black/African American	23	10.41%	Yes	61	27.60%
Asian	15	6.79%	No	160	72.40%
Native American/Indigenous	1	0.45%	Employment		
Others	15	6.79%	Currently employed, full-time	159	71.95%
Hispanic/Latino	32	14.48%	Currently employed, part-time	28	12.67%
Marital Status			Student	3	1.36%
Single/Never married	78	35.29%	Retired	7	3.17%
Currently married	88	39.82%	Unable to work	3	1.36%
Divorced	21	9.50%	Stay at home parent	5	2.26%
Separated	2	0.90%	Currently unemployed, looking for employment	11	4.98%
Currently in a relationship but not married	32	14.48%	Currently unemployed, not looking for unemployment	5	2.26%
Educational Level			Household Income		
Less than high school	1	0.45%	Less than \$20,000	21	9.50%
High school	15	6.79%	\$20,000 to \$34,999	20	9.05%
Some college	40	18.10%	\$35,000 to \$49,999	45	20.36%
2-year degree/Associate's degree	28	12.67%	\$50,000 to \$74,999	53	23.98%
4-year degree/Bachelor's degree	105	47.51%	\$75,000 to \$99,999	38	17.19%
Master's degree	27	12.22%	\$100,000 to \$149,999	28	12.67%
Doctorate	5	2.26%	\$150,000 to \$199,999	9	4.07%
Native Language			\$200,000 or more	7	3.17%
English	218	98.64%			
Others	3	1.36%			

93 **Measures**

94 **Minority status**

95 Participants were asked to report their race and sexual orientation. We computed a binary  
96 variable called “minority status”: participants were coded 1 (“yes”) if they reported being either non-  
97 heterosexual or non-White. Participants reported to be both heterosexual and White were coded 0  
98 (“no”) in this variable.

99 **Discrimination**

100 Everyday Discrimination Scale (EDS) is a 9-item scale that measures the frequency of day-to-  
101 day microaggression or discrimination [23]. Each item contains a four-point Likert scale ranging  
102 from 0 (“never”) to 5 (“almost every day”). The EDS also contains a follow-up question to ask the  
103 respondent about their perceived “main reasons” for their discriminative experiences (e.g., race,  
104 gender, sexual orientation, etc.). The EDS has been shown to have high construct validity among  
105 racial minority groups [24].

106 **Cognitive flexibility**

107 The Interpretive Inflexibility Task (IIT) is a picture-based scenario task developed from the  
108 Emotional BADE task [25-26]. In contrast to the verbal scenarios used in the Emotional BADE task,  
109 each of the 24 IIT scenarios is based on a photograph of an interpersonal situation and is  
110 progressively presented to the respondents, with 12 leading to a positive resolution and 12 leading to  
111 a negative resolution. Each IIT scenario is presented to the respondent three times: with 80%, 20%,  
112 and 0% of the photograph blurred at each time. The blurred areas were chosen to conceal the  
113 emotional valence of the scenario. By gradually reducing the percentage of blurred photos,  
114 respondents are provided with more information, which may help to resolve the initial blurring. The  
115 IIT produces an interpretation bias index reflecting moment-to-moment fluctuations in interpretation  
116 bias (1), with a high interpretation bias index indicating high flexibility in revising initial biased  
117 interpretations. Scenarios that lead to a positive resolution were scored for positive flexibility,  
118 whereas scenarios that lead to a negative resolution were scored for negative flexibility [25].

*Interpretation flexibility index*

$$= \sqrt{\frac{(\text{bias score stage 3} - \text{bias score stage 2})^2 + (\text{bias score stage 2} - \text{bias score stage 1})^2}{2}} \quad (1)$$

119 **Emotion regulation difficulty (ERD)**

120 The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS) is a self-report assessment designed to  
121 measure an individual's trait-level emotion regulation capabilities. The DERS consists of 36 items,  
122 with higher scores indicating greater difficulties in emotion regulation. This scale assesses an  
123 individual's perceived ability to regulate their emotions, including their awareness of emotions,  
124 acceptance of emotions, and ability to adjust cognitively and behaviorally during times of emotional  
125 distress [27].

126 **State anxiety**

127 State-Anxiety Inventory (STAI) is a commonly used measure of trait and state anxiety [28].  
128 STAI has been widely used in clinical settings for anxiety disorder diagnoses, as it can sensitively  
129 distinguish anxiety from depressive symptoms. We used the short version of the measurement (STAI-  
130 5) developed by Zsido and his colleagues [29]. STAI-5 contains 5 items for trait anxiety and 5 items  
131 for state anxiety. The short version of STAI has been found to have comparable psychometric  
132 properties compared to the 40-item long version [29]. Higher scores indicate a greater level of anxiety.

## 133 Statistical analysis

134 Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Mac Version 26 (SPSS Science, Chicago, IL,  
135 United States). Descriptive analyses were first performed to investigate any potential correlations  
136 among the main study variables. Independent t-tests were conducted comparing the level of  
137 discrimination concerning socio-demographic status. SPSS Macro PROCESS Version 4.1 was used  
138 for the moderated mediation analysis [30]. Analytical procedures of Model 15 instead of 14 were  
139 adopted to investigate the potential moderating effects on the direct and indirect effects. As in the  
140 hypothesized model, daily discrimination was the independent variable and state anxiety was the  
141 dependent variable. ERD was included as the mediator of the relationship between daily  
142 discrimination and anxiety. Positive and negative flexibility were separately analyzed as the  
143 moderator of the relationship between daily discrimination and ERD, and anxiety respectively. In  
144 addition, an alternative model with cognitive flexibility as the mediator and ERD as the moderator  
145 would also be tested to investigate the potential reciprocal influence of emotion regulation and  
146 cognitive flexibility. All variables were centered on the mean to avoid multicollinearity [31]. We used  
147 5,000 bootstrap samples and determined the mediation and moderation effects of the 95% confidence  
148 interval. Moreover, to better account for the moderating effects [32], we examined the conditional  
149 indirect effects of the moderators at -1SD, the mean, and +1SD. Statistical significance was set at a  
150 two-tailed  $p$ -value  $< .05$ .

## 151 Results

### 152 Descriptive statistics

153 Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations for the main study variables.  
154 Reported discrimination was strongly correlated with all other variables: minority status ( $r = .190$ ,  $p$   
155  $= .005$ ), positive flexibility ( $r = -.231$ ,  $p = .001$ ), negative flexibility ( $r = -.189$ ,  $p = .005$ ), state  
156 anxiety ( $r = .389$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and ERD ( $r = .314$ ,  $p < .001$ ). ERD was strongly correlated with state  
157 anxiety ( $r = .498$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Positive and negative flexibility strongly correlated with each other ( $r$   
158  $= .544$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

159 **Table 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations of study variables.**

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Minority Status	.38	.485	-					
2. Positive Flexibility	.728	.438	-.138*	-				
3. Negative Flexibility	1.034	.569	-.154*	.544***	-			
4. State Anxiety	6.28	2.373	.129	-.344***	-.284***	-		
5. ERD	77.82	25.464	.130	-.154*	-.072	.498***	-	
6. Discrimination	20.51	11.112	.190**	-.231**	-.189**	.389***	.314***	-

160  $N = 221$ , \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ . ERD: Emotion Regulation Difficulty

### 161 Socio-demographic data and discrimination

162 There were significant differences in discrimination with respect to minority status. Consistent  
163 with previous literature, racial and/or sexual orientational minority individuals are more likely to  
164 experience discrimination ( $t = -2.870$ ,  $p = .005$ ). Mean comparison showed no significant associations  
165 between discrimination and gender ( $t = -.415$ ,  $p = .679$ ), psychiatric history ( $t = .715$ ,  $p = .475$ ),  
166 marital status ( $t = 1.118$ ,  $p = .349$ ), educational level ( $t = .350$ ,  $p = .910$ ), and household income ( $t =$   
167  $1.894$ ,  $p = .080$ ).

168 **Cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation's moderated mediating**  
169 **effects on state anxiety**

170 When including flexibility in endorsing positive outcomes (i.e., positive flexibility) as the  
171 moderator, the results suggested a significant impact of discrimination on ERD ( $b = .720, t = 4.899, p$   
172  $< .001$ ), and ERD had a significant impact on state anxiety ( $b = .074, t = 7.624, p < .001$ ). Accounting  
173 for the mediating effect of ERD, discrimination did not have a significant impact on state anxiety ( $b$   
174  $= .035, t = 1.517, p = .131$ ). Additionally, positive flexibility significantly moderated the indirect  
175 effect of ERD on anxiety ( $b = -.054, t = -4.753, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .060$ ), but did not moderate the direct  
176 effect of discrimination on anxiety ( $b = .000, t = -.008, p = .993$ ). Bootstrap testing also indicated a  
177 moderating effect on indirect effect. Specifically, individuals with low positive flexibility observed a  
178 stronger relationship between ERD and state anxiety, whereas those with high positive flexibility are  
179 less likely to develop anxiety following ERD. In sum, emotion regulation influenced the relationship  
180 between discrimination and anxiety, while positive flexibility moderated the relationship between  
181 emotion regulation and anxiety (Fig 1).

182 **Fig 1. The standardized regression coefficients for the mediating effect of ERD and the**  
183 **moderating effect of positive flexibility on the relationship between discrimination and anxiety.**  
184  $*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001$ .

185 Similarly, flexibility in endorsing negative outcomes (i.e., negative flexibility) also moderated  
186 the association between ERD and state anxiety. Results indicated that discrimination had a significant  
187 impact on ERD ( $b = .720, t = 4.899, p < .001$ ) and ERD had a significant impact on state anxiety ( $b$   
188  $= .074, t = 6.010, p < .001$ ). Unlike when positive flexibility is the moderator, discrimination still had  
189 a significant impact on state anxiety after being mediated by ERD ( $b = .063, t = 2.207, p = .028$ ).  
190 Negative flexibility significantly moderated the impact of ERD on anxiety ( $b = -.034, t = -3.392, p$   
191  $= .001$ ) but did not moderate the impact of discrimination on anxiety ( $b = -.024, t = -.965, p = .336$ ).  
192 Bootstrap testing indicated a moderating effect on indirect effect and the change of effect size ( $\Delta R^2$ )  
193 was .031. In other words, individuals with high ERD showed a stronger relationship between  
194 discrimination and state anxiety, while high negative flexibility weakened the relationship between  
195 ERD and state anxiety (Fig 2).

196 **Fig 2. The standardized regression coefficients for the mediating effect of ERD and the**  
197 **moderating effect of negative flexibility on the relationship between discrimination and anxiety.**  
198  $*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001$ .

199 Moreover, because of the limitation of cross-sectional data, causation and directionality  
200 cannot be inferred among the variables. Thus, we tested alternative models using ERD as the  
201 moderator and cognitive flexibility as the mediator. The results indicated that positive and negative  
202 flexibility partially mediated the relationship between discrimination and state anxiety. ERD  
203 moderated both the direct and indirect effects when negative flexibility was the moderator, but only  
204 moderated the indirect effect when positive flexibility was the moderator (S2 and S3 Figs for  
205 coefficients). Thus, cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation reciprocally influence each other  
206 while shaping the relationship between discrimination and state anxiety.

207 **Discussion**

208 The current study investigated the effects of emotion regulation and cognitive flexibility on  
209 discrimination-related anxiety. Our findings confirmed that the reported discrimination level is higher  
210 among sexual and racial minorities. ERD mediated the relationship between discrimination and  
211 anxiety, while cognitive flexibility (in endorsing both positive and negative outcomes) moderated the

212 positive association between ERD and anxiety.

213 Consistent with the previous literature [33-35], our findings highlighted the significance of  
214 ERD in explaining discrimination-related anxiety, suggesting the importance of implementing  
215 adaptive emotion regulation strategies for sexual and/or racial minority individuals. Past  
216 neuroimaging results revealed the neural correlates supporting the association between ERD and  
217 anxiety. fMRI studies indicated that ERD arises from dysregulation in the amygdala, as well as  
218 abnormalities in its connectivity with the frontal-cortical areas [36]. Elevated amygdala activation  
219 was found in at-risk individuals without an anxiety disorder diagnosis [37]. Moreover, negative  
220 amygdala-vmPFC connectivity was associated with social anxiety disorder symptomatology, and  
221 effective treatments that improve ERD often reduce this brain abnormality [38]. Another study found  
222 that emotion dysregulation relates to a reduction in amygdala-rVLPFC functional connectivity among  
223 female adolescents, and this hypoconnectivity predicted anxiety symptoms during nine-month follow-  
224 ups [39]. Overall, supported by neuroimaging findings, emotion regulation difficulty is a risk factor  
225 for the onset, development, and maintenance of anxiety.

226 Also, we pointed out the importance of cognitive flexibility in buffering against the  
227 association between ERD and anxiety and subsequently between discrimination and anxiety. These  
228 findings emphasized the importance of incorporating cognitive flexibility training in disseminating  
229 emotion regulation strategies. While existing anxiety interventions targeting emotion dysregulation  
230 often train individuals on transferrable skills that can also improve cognitive flexibility, few of them  
231 structurally include cognitive flexibility as an intervention target. For example, anxiety prevention  
232 programs for children and adolescents included cognitive-behavioral training such as cognitive  
233 restructuring (i.e., the ability to notice negative thinking patterns) [40]. Mennin and Fresco's Emotion  
234 Regulation Therapy (ERT) contains behavioral intervention on regulatory skills such as attentional  
235 flexibility and cognitive reframing skills (i.e., belief flexibility) [41]. However, none of these  
236 intervention frameworks explicitly draw the link between cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation  
237 ability. Given our findings on how cognitive flexibility may interact with emotion regulation to  
238 protect against anxiety, it may be helpful to clearly include cognitive flexibility as a goal of the  
239 intervention. Ultimately, emotion regulation presents a form of flexibility in modifying one's  
240 emotions, which falls in line with the cognitive flexibility required to revise existing beliefs and  
241 thoughts. Drawing connections between these different forms of flexibility may bring about insight,  
242 increase the effectiveness of anxiety interventions, and improve treatment outcomes.

243 Also, it is important to note that the direct effect of discrimination on anxiety was significant  
244 when negative flexibility ( $p = .028$ ), but not positive flexibility ( $p = .131$ ), was the moderator. In  
245 parallel, moderation analyses indicated that the impact of ERD on anxiety is greater when anxiety is  
246 explained by positive flexibility ( $\Delta R^2 = .060$ ) than negative flexibility ( $\Delta R^2 = .031$ ). These findings  
247 supported prior work showing that negative and positive flexibility have differential effects in  
248 predicting affective symptoms [25-26], further confirming the distinct effects of negative and positive  
249 flexibility in explaining anxiety. Compared to negative flexibility, positive flexibility may be more  
250 closely related to the association between emotion regulation and anxiety. Anxiety disorders are  
251 characterized by negative interpretation bias, or the tendency to interpret ambiguous situations as a  
252 negative or catastrophic solution [42]. Therefore, the ability to flexibly revise biased interpretations in  
253 a positive direction may rely more on effective emotion regulation skills and has salient impacts on  
254 anxiety outcomes. To further evaluate the mechanisms of positive and negative flexibility, future  
255 research needs to examine the affective component of biased interpretations and the corresponding  
256 affective processing during belief revision in greater detail.

257 Furthermore, our alternative model using cognitive flexibility as the mediator and ERD as the

258 moderator suggested that cognitive flexibility partially mediated the relationship between  
259 discrimination on anxiety, while ERD moderated this mediation. Altogether, our findings showed that  
260 the interplay of cognitive and affective revisioning processes goes in both directions. Indeed, emotion  
261 regulation and cognitive flexibility interact with each other dynamically during information  
262 processing and together influences the development of discrimination-induced anxiety, as each  
263 moderate the impact of the other. This finding reiterated the therapeutic implications of including  
264 cognitive flexibility training in anxiety prevention and treatments to improve outcomes. Moreover,  
265 considering the transferrable skills between emotion regulation and cognitive flexibility (e.g.,  
266 cognitive reappraisal), cognitive flexibility can also be used as an indicator to evaluate the  
267 effectiveness of anxiety interventions that target emotion dysregulation.

268 The study is not without limitations. First, although the study had a clear objective to include  
269 sexual and racial minorities in the sampling procedure, the online design still restricted our ability to  
270 gather a representative sample. Future research should incorporate in-person participant recruitment  
271 to make sure that minority populations with diverse identities are included. Second, the cross-  
272 sectional nature of this study does not allow for the inference of causal relationships between  
273 variables. In fact, our results indicated that cognitive flexibility and ERD were interchangeable as  
274 mediators and moderators when explaining the association between discrimination and anxiety,  
275 which further suggests the reciprocal influences of these factors during affective processing. Thus,  
276 future research can use real-time data collection methods, such as ecological momentary assessments  
277 (EMAs), to capture the temporal variations paralleling individuals' cognitive and affective processing  
278 [43]. By investigating the dynamics of cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation under real-world  
279 affective contexts, scholars would have a more comprehensive understanding of how affective and  
280 cognitive factors interact in predicting anxiety.

## 281 **Conclusion**

282 Previous research suggested the significance of emotion regulation in explaining the onset and  
283 development of discrimination-related anxiety. The current study further included cognitive  
284 flexibility in this dynamic. We focused on individuals' ability to update existing beliefs and found a  
285 significant moderated mediating impact of cognitive flexibility and ERD on the association between  
286 discrimination and anxiety. ERD mediated the connection between discrimination and anxiety, with  
287 higher difficulties indicating a higher level of anxiety, while both positive and negative flexibility  
288 buffered against the negative impact of ERD. Alternative model analyses suggested the possible  
289 reciprocal influence of cognitive flexibility and emotion regulation in influencing discrimination-  
290 related anxiety. Despite the limitation of the sample diversity and cross-sectional study design, these  
291 findings foreshadowed novel research directions and implied therapeutic applications. Future studies  
292 like this will advance our understanding of anxiety mechanisms and potentially lead to novel  
293 prevention and interventions for marginalized individuals facing additional stressors like  
294 discrimination.



## 295 **Acknowledgments**

296 The authors declare no conflict of interest and the authors received no funding from an  
297 external source.

298

## 299 **References**

- 300 1. Elias A, Paradies Y. Estimating the mental health costs of racial discrimination. *BMC Public*  
301 *Health*. 2016;16(1):1205. doi:10.1186/s12889-016-3868-1
- 302 2. Lorenzo-Blanco EI, Delva J. Examining lifetime episodes of sadness, help seeking, and  
303 perceived treatment helpfulness among US Latino/as. *Community Mental Health Journal*.  
304 2012;48(5):611-626. doi:10.1007/s10597-011-9426-5
- 305 3. Hartshorn KJS, Whitbeck LB, Hoyt DR. Exploring the relationships of perceived  
306 discrimination, anger, and aggression among North American indigenous adolescents. *Society*  
307 *and Mental Health*. 2012;2(1):53-67. doi:10.1177/2156869312441185
- 308 4. Grinage J. Endless mourning: Racial melancholia, Black grief, and the transformative  
309 possibilities for racial justice in education. *Harvard Educational Review*. 2019;89(2):227-250.  
310 doi:10.17763/1943-5045-89.2.227
- 311 5. Panza GA, Puhl RM, Taylor BA, Zaleski AL, Livingston J, Pescatello LS. Links between  
312 discrimination and cardiovascular health among socially stigmatized groups: A systematic  
313 review. *PLoS ONE*. 2019;14(6):e0217623. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0217623
- 314 6. Slopen N, Lewis TT, Williams DR. Discrimination and sleep: A systematic review. *Sleep*  
315 *Medicine*. 2016;18:88-95. doi:10.1016/j.sleep.2015.01.012
- 316 7. Otiniano Verissimo AD, Gee GC, Ford CL, Iguchi MY. Racial discrimination, gender  
317 discrimination, and substance abuse among Latina/os nationwide. *Cultural Diversity and*  
318 *Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2014;20(1):43-51. doi:10.1037/a0034674
- 319 8. Mekawi Y, Hyatt CS, Maples-Keller J, Carter S, Michopoulos V, Powers A. Racial  
320 discrimination predicts mental health outcomes beyond the role of personality traits in a  
321 community sample of African Americans. *Clinical Psychological Science*. 2021;9(2):183-196.  
322 doi:10.1177/2167702620957318
- 323 9. Puckett JA, Maroney MR, Wadsworth LP, Mustanski B, Newcomb ME. Coping with  
324 discrimination: The insidious effects of gender minority stigma on depression and anxiety in  
325 transgender individuals. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2020;76(1):176-194.  
326 doi:10.1002/jclp.22865
- 327 10. Soto JA, Dawson-Andoh NA, BeLue R. The relationship between perceived discrimination  
328 and generalized anxiety disorder among African Americans, Afro Caribbeans, and non-  
329 Hispanic Whites. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*. 2011;25(2):258-265.  
330 doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2010.09.011
- 331 11. Zvolensky MJ, Rogers AH, Bakhshaie J, Viana AG, Walker R, Mayorga NA, Lopez K, Garza  
332 M, Lemaire C, Ruiz AC, Ochoa-Perez M. Perceived racial discrimination, anxiety sensitivity,  
333 and mental health among Latinos in a federally qualified health center. *Stigma and Health*.  
334 2019 Oct;4(4):473-9. doi: 10.1037/sah0000160
- 335 12. Lee S, Waters SF. Asians and Asian Americans' experiences of racial discrimination during  
336 the COVID-19 pandemic: impacts on health outcomes and the buffering role of social support.  
337 *Stigma and Health*. 2021 Jan;6(1):70-8. doi: 10.1037/sah0000275
- 338 13. Mahowald L, Gruberg S, Halpin J. The state of the LGBTQ community in 2020. Center for  
339 American Progress; 2020 Oct 29.

- 340 14. American Psychological Association. APA Dictionary of Psychology. 2022. Available from:  
341 <https://dictionary.apa.org/>
- 342 15. Schäfer JÖ, Naumann E, Holmes EA, Tuschen-Caffier B, Samson AC. Emotion regulation  
343 strategies in depressive and anxiety symptoms in youth: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of*  
344 *Youth and Adolescence*. 2017 Feb;46(2):261-76. doi: 10.1007/s10964-016-0585-0
- 345 16. Mennin DS, Heimberg RG, Turk CL, Fresco DM. Applying an emotion regulation framework  
346 to integrative approaches to generalized anxiety disorder. *Clinical Psychology: Science and*  
347 *Practice*. 2002 Spring;9(1):85-90. doi: 10.1093/clipsy.9.1.85
- 348 17. Mennin DS, Heimberg RG, Turk CL, Fresco DM. Preliminary evidence for an emotion  
349 dysregulation model of generalized anxiety disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*. 2005  
350 Oct;43(10):1281-310. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2004.08.008.
- 351 18. Diamond A. Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2013;64(1):135-68. doi:  
352 10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750
- 353 19. Hofmann SG, Heering S, Sawyer AT, Asnaani A. How to handle anxiety: the effects of  
354 reappraisal, acceptance, and suppression strategies on anxious arousal. *Behaviour Research*  
355 *and Therapy*. 2009 May;47(5):389-94. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2009.02.010
- 356 20. Gabrys RL, Tabri N, Anisman H, Matheson K. Cognitive control and flexibility in the context  
357 of stress and depressive symptoms: the cognitive control and flexibility questionnaire.  
358 *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2018 Jul;9:2219. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02219
- 359 21. Zimmer-Gembeck MJ, Skinner EA, Modecki KL, Webb HJ, Gardner AA, Hawes T, Rapee  
360 RM. The self-perception of flexible coping with stress: a new measure and relations with  
361 emotional adjustment. *Cogent Psychology*. 2018;5(1):1537908  
362 doi:10.1080/23311908.2018.1537908
- 363 22. Chandler J, Shapiro D. Conducting clinical research using crowdsourced convenience samples.  
364 *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2016;12:53-81. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-  
365 093623
- 366 23. Williams DR, Gonzalez HM, Williams S, Mohammed SA, Moomal H, Stein DJ. Perceived  
367 discrimination, race and health in South Africa. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2008;67(3):441-  
368 452. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.021
- 369 24. Krieger N, Smith K, Naishadham D, Hartman C, Barbeau EM. Experiences of discrimination:  
370 validity and reliability of a self-report measure for population health research on racism and  
371 health. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2005;61(7):1576-1596.  
372 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.03.006
- 373 25. Deng W, Everaert J, Creighton M, Bronstein MV, Cannon T, Joormann J. Developing a novel  
374 assessment of interpretation flexibility: reliability, validity and clinical implications.  
375 *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2022;190:111548. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2022.111548
- 376 26. Everaert J, Bronstein MV, Cannon TD, Joormann J. Looking through tinted glasses:  
377 depression and social anxiety are related to both interpretation biases and inflexible negative  
378 interpretations. *Clinical Psychological Science*. 2018;6(4):517-528.  
379 doi:10.1177/2167702617747968
- 380 27. Hallion LS, Steinman SA, Tolin DF, Diefenbach GJ. Psychometric properties of the  
381 Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS) and its short forms in adults with emotional  
382 disorders. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2018;9:539. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00539
- 383 28. Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RL, Lushene R, Vagg PR, Jacobs GA. *Manual for the State-Trait*  
384 *Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1983.

- 385 29. Zsido AN, Teleki SA, Csokasi K, Rozsa S, Bandi SA. Development of the short version of the  
386 spielberger state-trait anxiety inventory. *Psychiatry Research*. 2020;291:113223.  
387 doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113223
- 388 30. Hayes AF. Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: a  
389 regression-based approach. 3rd ed. New York: The Guilford Press; 2022.
- 390 31. Dearing E, Hamilton LC. Contemporary Advances and Classic Advice for Analyzing  
391 Mediating and Moderating Variables. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child*  
392 *Development*. 2006;71(3):88-104. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5834.2006.00406
- 393 32. Aiken LS, West SG, Reno RR. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*.  
394 Sage Publications; 1991. New York, NY.
- 395 33. Graham JR, Calloway A, Roemer L. The buffering effects of emotion regulation in the  
396 relationship between experiences of racism and anxiety in a black American sample.  
397 *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 2015;39(5):553-563. doi:10.1007/s10608-015-9682-8
- 398 34. Mekawi Y, Watson-Singleton NN, Kuzyk E, Dixon HD, Carter S, Bradley-Davino B, Fani N,  
399 Michopoulos V, Powers A. Racial discrimination and posttraumatic stress: Examining  
400 emotion dysregulation as a mediator in an African American community sample. *European*  
401 *Journal of Psychotraumatology*. 2020;11(1):1824398. doi:10.1080/20008198.2020.1824398
- 402 35. Teng CC, Hon S, Wang A, Tsai W. Impact of COVID-19 discrimination fear on  
403 psychological distress among East Asian college students: The moderating role of emotion  
404 regulation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 2022 Jan;92(1):75-82. doi:  
405 10.1037/ort0000659
- 406 36. Leshin JC, Lindquist KA. Neuroimaging of emotion dysregulation. In: Beauchaine TP,  
407 Crowell SE, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Emotion Dysregulation*. New York, NY:  
408 Oxford University Press; 2020. p. 181-201. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190689285.013.14
- 409 37. Wolfensberger SPA, Veltman DJ, Hoogendijk WJG, Boomsma DI, de Geus EJC. Amygdala  
410 responses to emotional faces in twins discordant or concordant for the risk for anxiety and  
411 depression. *NeuroImage*. 2008 Feb 15;41(2):544-552. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.01.053
- 412 38. Young KS, Burklund LJ, Torre JB, Saxbe D, Lieberman MD, Craske MG. Treatment for  
413 social anxiety disorder alters functional connectivity in emotion regulation neural circuitry.  
414 *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging*. 2017 Mar 30;261:44-51. doi:  
415 10.1016/j.pscychresns.2017.01.005
- 416 39. Davis MM, Miernicki ME, Telzer EH, Rudolph KD. The contribution of childhood negative  
417 emotionality and cognitive control to anxiety-linked neural dysregulation of emotion in  
418 adolescence. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2019;47(3):515-527. doi:10.1007/s10802-018-0456-0
- 419 40. Teubert D, Pinquart M. A meta-analytic review on the prevention of symptoms of anxiety in  
420 children and adolescents. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2011;25(8):1046-1059.  
421 doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2011.07.001
- 422 41. Mennin DS, Fresco DM. Emotion Regulation Therapy. In: Gross JJ, editor. *Handbook of*  
423 *Emotion Regulation*. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford Press; 2013.
- 424 42. Chen J, Short M, Kemps E. Interpretation bias in social anxiety: A systematic review and  
425 meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;276:1119-1130. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.07.121
- 426 43. Walz LC, Nauta MH, aan het Rot M. Experience sampling and ecological momentary  
427 assessment for studying the daily lives of patients with anxiety disorders: A systematic review.  
428 *J Anxiety Disord*. 2014;28(8):925-937. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.09.022

429 **Supporting information**

430 **S1 Fig. Hypothesized Model.**

431 **S2 Fig. The standardized regression coefficients for the mediating effect of positive flexibility**  
432 **and the moderating effect of ERD on the relationship between discrimination and anxiety. \* $p$**   
433 **< .05, \*\* $p$  < .01, \*\*\* $p$  < .001.**

434 **S3 Fig. The standardized regression coefficients for the mediating effect of negative flexibility**  
435 **and the moderating effect of ERD on the relationship between discrimination and anxiety. \* $p$**   
436 **< .05, \*\* $p$  < .01, \*\*\* $p$  < .001.**



