

The Role of Incidental Affective States in Appetitive Risk Behavior: A Meta-Analysis

Rebecca A. Ferrer

National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland

Jennifer M. Taber

Kent State University

Paschal Sheeran

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Angela D. Bryan

University of Colorado Boulder

Linda D. Cameron

University of California, Merced

Ellen Peters

University of Oregon

Jennifer S. Lerner

Harvard University

Emily Grenen

ICF International, Fairfax, Virginia

William M. P. Klein

National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland

Objective: Appetitive risk behaviors (ARB), including tobacco use, alcohol consumption, consumption of calorie dense/nutrient-poor foods, and sexual risk behavior contribute substantially to morbidity and mortality. Affective states that arise from a wide array of unrelated circumstances (i.e., incidental affect) may carry over to influence ARB. A meta-analysis is needed to systematically examine causal evidence for the role of incidental affect (including specific emotions) in influencing ARB. **Method:** Integrating effect sizes from 91 published and unpublished experimental studies that include both an incidental-affect induction and neutral-control condition ($k = 271$ effect sizes: $k = 183$ negative affect, $k = 78$ positive affect), this meta-analysis examines how negative and positive affective states influenced ARB and related health cognitions (e.g., intentions, evaluations, craving, perceived control). **Results:** Negative affective states reliably increased ARB, in analyses where all negative affective states were analyzed ($d = .29$) and in stratified analyses of just negative mood ($d = .30$) and stress ($d = .48$). These effects were stronger among study populations coded as clinically at risk. Positive affective states generally did not influence ARB or related health cognitions, except in the presence of a craving cue. Design issues of extant literature largely precluded conclusions about the effects of specific positive and negative affective states. **Conclusion:** Taken together, findings suggest the importance of strategies to attenuate

This article was published Online First September 17, 2020.

 Rebecca A. Ferrer, Basic Biobehavioral and Psychological Sciences Branch, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland;  Jennifer M. Taber, Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University;  Paschal Sheeran, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill;  Angela D. Bryan, Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Colorado Boulder; Linda D. Cameron, Psychological Sciences, University of California, Merced;  Ellen Peters, Center for Science Communication Research, University of Oregon;  Jennifer S. Lerner, Harvard Kennedy School of Public Policy, Harvard University; Emily Grenen, ICF International, Fairfax, Virginia;  William M. P. Klein, Behavioral Research Program, National Cancer Institute.

We thank Emily Goettsche and Jennifer Scheideler for their contributions to the meta-analytic coding. We appreciate Arturo Durazo, Amber Koblit, Daniel Ramen, and Christopher Wally, for contributions to the analyses reported here. The content of this article does not necessarily represent the opinion or policy of the National Cancer Institute or National

Institutes of Health. Rebecca A. Ferrer served as lead for conceptualization, methodology, project administration, supervision, data curation, formal analysis, data interpretation, writing the original draft, review, and editing. Jennifer M. Taber served as co-lead for methodology, project administration, supervision, data curation, data interpretation, writing, review, and editing and served in a supporting role for conceptualization, formal analysis, and data interpretation. Paschal Sheeran, Angela D. Bryan, Linda D. Cameron, Ellen Peters, and Jennifer S. Lerner served in a supporting role for conceptualization, methodology, data interpretation, review, and editing. Emily Grenen served in a supporting role for methodology and writing, reviewing and editing, and data interpretation. William M. P. Klein served in a supporting role for conceptualization, methodology, data interpretation, writing, reviewing, and editing. Jennifer S. Lerner, served in a supporting role for conceptualization, data interpretation, and editing.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rebecca A. Ferrer, Basic Biobehavioral and Psychological Sciences Branch, National Cancer Institute, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Rockville, MD 20850. E-mail: ferrera@mail.nih.gov

negative affect incidental to ARB to facilitate healthier behavioral patterns, especially among clinically at-risk individuals.

Keywords: incidental affect, incidental emotion, appetitive risk behavior, health risk behavior, meta-analysis

Supplemental materials: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hea0001019.supp>

People often engage in hedonically pleasing but unhealthy behavior to fulfill appetitive/craving states. Appetitive risk behaviors (ARB), including tobacco use, alcohol consumption, consumption of calorie dense/nutrient poor foods, and sexual risk behavior, contribute substantially to disease-related morbidity and mortality (Gomes, Tadrous, Mamdani, Paterson, & Juurlink, 2018; Kanny et al., 2015; Ma, Siegel, Jacobs, & Jemal, 2018; Micha et al., 2017; Scaglione et al., 2015; Siddiqi, Hall, Hu, & Song, 2016). Despite these significant health risks, engagement in ARB is prevalent (Duffey & Popkin, 2011; Han & Powell, 2013; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2015; Wang et al., 2018).

Health behavior theory often examines ARB through a social-cognitive lens, examining determinants such as risk perception, attitudes, social norms, and self-efficacy, which can together predict a moderate amount of variance in these behaviors (Albarracín et al., 2001; Hausenblas, Carron, & Mack, 1997; McEachan, Conner, Taylor, & Lawton, 2011; Sheeran et al., 2016; Sheeran & Taylor, 1999). However, behavior may be less driven by these social-cognitive determinants when people are in an emotional state, compared with a neutral state (Nordgren, van der Pligt, & van Harreveld, 2008). Despite this being the case, affect is relatively understudied in the health behavior change literature (Conner, Rhodes, Morris, McEachan, & Lawton, 2011; Ellis, Collins, Homish, Parks, & Kiviniemi, 2016; Ferrer & Mendes, 2018; Lawton, Conner, & McEachan, 2009; Williams & Evans, 2014; Williams, Rhodes, & Conner, 2018). The current meta-analysis examines whether affective states that are incidental to, and not elicited by, the ARB in question influence such behaviors.

Here, the term *affective state* refers to an overarching category of experiences, including specific emotions (i.e., discrete categories of affective states that are relatively fleeting and attributable to a specific cause), moods (i.e., general positive or negative affective states that are more “free-floating” rather than directly attributable to one specific cause), and stress (i.e., the experience of negative affect and physiological arousal as the result of specific life experiences, often related to social evaluation or life adversity; see Cowen & Keltner, 2017; Keltner & Lerner, 2010). The present meta-analysis focuses specifically on affect that is elicited by sources unrelated (i.e., incidental) to the ARB that may follow them (Harlé & Sanfey, 2007; Lerner, Li, Valdesolo, & Kassam, 2015; Loewenstein & Lerner, 2003), because the majority of theories on affect and ARB have highlighted the importance of this type of affect as opposed to integral affect (i.e., affect that is elicited by the ARB itself). For example, positive affect elicited by (i.e., integral to) hedonically pleasing food might increase consumption of that food; however, job-related stress that is not elicited by hedonically pleasing food (i.e., is incidental to it) may also increase consumption.

Several theoretical perspectives and a growing body of evidence suggest that incidental emotion may be a particularly robust predictor of ARB (Cohn, Fredrickson, Brown, Mikels, & Conway, 2009; DeSteno, Gross, & Kubzansky, 2013; Ferrer, Green, & Barrett, 2015; Ferrer, Klein, Lerner, Reyna, & Keltner, 2016; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002; Magnan, Shorey Fennell, & Brady, 2017). Negative affect in general could increase ARB through several pathways. First, negative affect may increase reward sensitivity, and make appetitive stimuli even more enticing than if one were in a neutral state (Wagner, Boswell, Kelley, & Heatherton, 2012; Wagner & Heatherton, 2014). Second, people experiencing negative affect may wish to escape those feelings and prioritize temporary mood-repair goals over other, longer term goals (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999). Thus, motivations to attenuate negative affect may lead people to engage in hedonically pleasing, appetitive behaviors (Adam & Epel, 2007; Canetti, Bachar, & Berry, 2002; Tice, Bratslavsky, & Baumeister, 2001). Finally, negative affect can impair decision-making capacity, and working memory in particular (Johns, Inzlicht, & Schmader, 2008; Schoofs, Preuss, & Wolf, 2008), which can make it difficult to self-monitor ARB (e.g., to keep track of how much one has eaten or drunk).

Other theories suggest that not all negative affective states will have a similar influence on ARB, but rather that specific negative emotions may influence ARB depending on appraisals and action tendencies (Consedine & Moskowitz, 2007; Lerner & Keltner, 2000, 2001; Lerner et al., 2015). For example, the specific emotion of sadness—which arises from experiences of uncontrollable loss (Lazarus, 1991)—may trigger action tendencies (Frijda, 1986; Scherer, 1988) to mitigate or replace loss by acquiring and consuming hedonically pleasing goods (Cryder, Lerner, Gross, & Dahl, 2008; Dorison et al., 2020; Garg & Lerner, 2013; Lerner & Keltner, 2000; Lerner, Small, & Loewenstein, 2004; Raghunathan & Pham, 1999; Zeelenberg, Nelissen, Breugelmans, & Pieters, 2008). Conversely, disgust, with appraisal themes of avoiding contamination (Lazarus, 1991; Rozin & Fallon, 1987; Rozin, Markwith, & Stoess, 1997) and action tendencies motivating avoidance (Frijda, 1986; Scherer, 1988), should reduce ARB (regardless of whether the behavior is hedonically pleasing; Han, Lerner, & Keltner, 2007; Han, Lerner, & Zeckhauser, 2012; Lerner et al., 2004).

Positive affect may also be implicated in engagement in ARB. Indeed, positive affect has been linked to better health outcomes (Consedine & Moskowitz, 2007; Pressman & Cohen, 2005), perhaps in part because it increases engagement in healthy behaviors and deters engagement in risky behaviors (Pressman & Cohen, 2005). Although positive affect is theoretically orthogonal to negative affect (as opposed to being a polar opposite; Emmons & Diener, 1985; Lindquist, Satpute, Wager, Weber, & Barrett, 2016), it may influence ARB through

some of the same pathways posited for negative affect. Additionally, positive affect can improve self-regulation (Aspinwall, 1998; Tice, Baumeister, Shmueli, & Muraven, 2007), which is likely to improve health behavior, including ARB (Cameron & Leventhal, 2003). Positive affect can also enhance affect regulation resources and decrease reward salience (Cohn et al., 2009; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002), which, in turn, may decrease the need to rely on hedonically pleasing but risky health behavior as a compensatory affect regulation strategy. Moreover, positive affect can facilitate greater engagement with longer term goals (Clare & Huntsinger, 2007; Fishbach & Labroo, 2007; Orehek, Bessarabova, Chen, & Kruglanski, 2011). Additionally, positive affect can improve decision making (Isen, 2008) by increasing sensitivity to positive and negative consequences (Carpenter, Peters, Västfjäll, & Isen, 2013), facilitating greater thought about future consequences (Isen & Reeve, 2005; Oettingen, Mayer, Thorpe, Janetzke, & Lorenz, 2005), and enhancing the ability to delay reward (DeSteno, Li, Dickens, & Lerner, 2014; Moore, Clyburn, & Underwood, 1976), thereby deterring hedonically pleasing but risky ARB (Daugherty & Brase, 2010). However, it is also possible that positive affect could increase risky behavior, given research that some individuals tend to engage in risky behavior when experiencing high levels of positive affect (Zapolski, Cyders, & Smith, 2009).

Despite theoretical support for the link between positive affect and health behavior, one meta-analysis found that positive affect increases eating behavior (Cardi, Esposito, Clarke, Schifano, & Treasure, 2015), and another found null effects of positive affect on health cognitions and behavior (Cameron, Bertenshaw, & Sheeran, 2015). However, no meta-analytic inquiry examined the influence of positive affect on a comprehensive suite of ARB. Similarly, although there are grounds for thinking that specific positive emotions (e.g., pride, hope) may have particular influences on ARB (Consedine & Moskowitz, 2007; Shiota et al., 2017; Tugade, Fredrickson, & Barrett, 2004), no meta-analytic synthesis has been conducted on this research.

Gaining a better understanding of the role affect may play in ARB is crucial to developing effective interventions (DeSteno et al., 2013; Ferrer et al., 2015; Ferrer et al., 2016; Magnan et al., 2017). The present meta-analysis synthesizes published and unpublished studies of the impact of incidental affect on a suite of outcomes related to ARB. It is also the first to focus specifically on studies that experimentally manipulated incidental positive and negative affect and tested effects on ARB. The meta-analysis sought to answer two primary research questions: (1) Do positive and negative affective states influence ARB? and (2) Can specific positive and negative affective states be differentiated in their influence on ARB? Outcomes include self-reported and observed behavior and health cognitions that precede or are associated with ARB, namely behavioral intentions and (implicit and explicit) attitudes and evaluations of ARB. This meta-analysis also examines whether conceptual factors were associated with effect-size magnitude: the extent to which the behavioral outcome was hedonically pleasing, whether the sample was considered “at risk” (e.g., high in tendency for emotional eating or drinking alcohol to cope with stress, eating disorder diagnosis, obesity status), and whether participants were in a craving state (e.g., fasting or smoking abstinence). Finally, this meta-analysis examines whether a variety

of participant and procedural characteristics influenced the magnitude of effect sizes.

Method

This meta-analysis followed Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for conducting and reporting meta-analyses (Moher et al., 2015). A review protocol was not registered.

Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (1) included experimental inductions of emotions, mood, or stress that were incidental (i.e., not normatively relevant) to the ARB; (2) contained at least one outcome related to the performance of an ARB (behavior, intentions, craving/hunger/arousal, attitudes/evaluations, implicit measures of attention/evaluations, perceived behavioral control, information seeking); (3) included a neutral affect comparison condition in a between-subjects design; and (4) examined adults (i.e., over the age of 18). Studies were excluded if they (1) examined outcomes related to ARB performed on behalf of someone else (e.g., proxy feeding), (2) targeted an affective state in a larger study design (e.g., a gratitude induction presented in the context of a larger randomized controlled trial designed to influence behavior in multiple ways), and (3) did not include necessary statistical information to calculate effect sizes and study authors were unreachable or unable to provide such information. All articles located in the search were published in English. Figure 1 contains a PRISMA diagram of the search process (Moher et al., 2009). The final database includes 91 published and unpublished studies ($k = 271$ independent effect sizes).

Search Strategy

The search was performed on November 15, 2018 and was updated on January 22, 2019 using the PsycINFO database. The same search was performed in PubMed, and no additional articles not indexed in PsycINFO were identified. Search terms are detailed in the [online supplemental materials](#). Additionally, queries were sent to relevant listservs (Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Society for Experimental Social Psychology, Society for Judgment and Decision Making, and Social and Affective Neuroscience Society) and to individual authors known to publish studies investigating affective influences on ARB to identify unpublished studies.

Coding and Reliability

Each study was coded by two independent coders (some combination of two of the following: authors Jennifer Taber, Emily Grenen, Rebecca Ferrer, a post-masters-level government contractor; and a post-baccalaureate-level fellow). Coders were trained by the first and second authors (Rebecca Ferrer, Jennifer Taber). Interrater agreement was high ($\kappa > .80$). Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. The following variables were coded.

Conceptual factors. The extent to which participants were considered “at risk” for engaging in an ARB was coded; participants coded as at risk were those high in emotional eating, drinking alcohol to cope, restrained eating; dieting; with obesity; with eating disorders. The extent to which a behavior was hedonically




Figure 1. Flow of information through the phases of the review. ARB = appetitive risk behavior.

pleasing was also coded, using a three-level variable (0 = not hedonically pleasing, e.g., water or baby carrots; 1 = somewhat hedonically pleasing, e.g., crackers; 2 = very hedonically pleasing, e.g., M&Ms, cigarettes [among smokers], alcohol), because some affective science theory specifies effects for specific emotions on ARB only to the extent that the behavior is pleasing or rewarding. If there was an additional craving cue present (e.g., smell of buttered popcorn), it was also coded.

Target affective state. Each test was coded regarding the specific affective state targeted (with individual codes for negative mood, positive mood, and specific emotions of stress, fear, anger, sadness, happiness, etc.). Then, each test was also coded as targeting negative affect (a single code applied to all studies targeting negative mood, stress, fear, etc.) or positive affect (a single code applied to all studies targeting positive mood, happiness, etc.). Because labeling of affective states by study authors was not always consistent (e.g., two studies using an identical induction were often coded as targeting two different affective states), the two lead authors (Rebecca Ferrer and Jennifer Taber) developed systematic coding rules for the affective state targeted based on induction procedures rather than the induction label in the original publication. For example, studies using the same sad video clip might state they targeted sadness or negative mood; the systematic coding rules categorized tests using this induction as sadness regardless of the label in the publication. To develop consensus on these rules, the lead authors reviewed 23 published and unpublished articles (39 inductions) within these categories. Then, these authors separately coded an additional 10 articles (21 inductions; including inductions in categories described in the preceding text, as well as all other induction types) to develop interrater reliability

($\kappa_s > .86$). In 18.5% of instances, the induction was ambiguous (e.g., when a music or film clip or segment could not be identified) and the coders' best judgment was used to code the target affective state. As a result, a separate code was developed for whether the target affective state was ambiguous or unambiguous to code. (See Table 1 for all predictors [affective states], moderators, and outcomes.) Additional details about the coding process for target affective state are included in the [online supplemental materials](#).

Induction type. Table 2 includes descriptions of the 10 types of inductions used. These were coded as separate variables because some procedures used multiple inductions. The number of inductions used in each procedure was also coded.

Outcome characteristics. Effect sizes were coded for the ARB examined (eating, alcohol consumption, smoking, sex, caffeine consumption, drug use). To assess potential bias, effect sizes were also coded to note the extent to which a behavior was public (0 = privately performed or self-reported on paper-and-pencil or computer, 1 = observed by an experimenter, 2 = observed by an experimenter and other participants); and whether behavior was measured objectively (e.g., observation, weighing the amount of food consumed) or through self-report.

Procedural details. Effect sizes were coded for whether participants were instructed to enter the study in a craving state (e.g., not eating or smoking for a certain number of hours). Coding also captured whether the study took place online or in person; whether there was an additional craving cue present (e.g., smell of buttered popcorn); and whether a message about the health risks of the ARB was presented before the outcome was assessed. To assess potential bias, coding indexed whether the publication specified that participants were randomized to affective induction condition; and whether procedures to blind participants to the study purpose and hypotheses were reported (e.g., using a cover story).

Sociodemographic characteristics. The percentage of women in the sample was coded for each test. Participant race was coded as the percentage of White individuals in the sample; a more nuanced coding of race and ethnicity was not undertaken because only a small number of studies reported participant race/ethnicity, and those that did were most likely to report the percentage of participants who were White. The percentage of individuals in the sample with some college education was also coded (studies enrolling students only were coded as 100%).

Outcomes and Effect Sizes

Effect sizes (Cohen's d , mean difference between the experimental condition and comparison condition divided by the pooled standard deviation) were calculated for each ARB and for the induction checks, using comprehensive meta-analysis (CMA; Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2014). If means and standard deviations were not included in the publication, other statistical information (e.g., t or p values) was used to calculate d (Johnson & Eagly, 2000; Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). A positive effect size indicated an increase in the ARB (or related outcome) compared with the comparison condition, whereas a negative effect size indicated a decrease in ARB. To correct for bias due to sample size, effect sizes were weighted by the inverse of the variance of d (Hedges, 1981).

When an experiment included more than one neutral affect condition, the condition most closely resembling the experimental

Table 1
Meta-Analysis Predictors, Moderators, and Outcomes

Predictor	Moderator	Outcome
Negative affective state	Induction factor	Behavior
Negative mood	Induction check effect size	Intentions
Stress	Induction check effect size squared	Craving
Anger	Presence of induction check	Attitudes/evaluations
Disgust	Ambiguous induction	Implicit evaluation/attention
Fear	Induction type	Perceived behavioral control
Guilt	Participant characteristic	Information seeking
Loneliness	Publication status	
Sadness	<i>M</i> age	
Shame	Percentage female	
Positive affective state	Percentage White	
Positive mood	Percentage some college	
Amusement	Participant "at risk"	
Contentment	Procedural details	
Excitement	Craving state induced	
Happiness	Participant blinding specified	
Hope	Internet research	
Pride	Craving cue present	
Surprise	Presence of ARB health risk message	
	Outcome characteristics	
	Appetitive behavior	
	Hedonic outcome	
	ARB outcome observed vs. private	
	Self-reported outcome	

Note. ARB = appetitive risk behavior.

induction was selected as the comparison (e.g., a neutral autobiographical induction would be selected to compare with an autobiographical emotion induction instead of a neutral video induction if both neutral conditions were included). When a study included multiple treatments, the sample size was divided by the number of relevant conditions to avoid "double counting" participants (Boenestien, 2009). For example, if a study included fear, anger, and neutral inductions with $n = 100$ in each condition, two effect sizes

were calculated: fear ($n = 100$) versus neutral ($n = 50$) and anger ($n = 100$) versus neutral ($n = 50$).

Analysis Strategy

The Q statistic was calculated to examine whether effect sizes were homogenous (i.e., whether all studies produced a statistically equitable effect size for the comparison of experimental condition

Table 2
Description of Inductions in Included Studies

Induction	Description
Autobiographical recall	Participants are instructed to write in detail about an experience that made them feel a specified affective state. Such inductions often involve instructing participants to list three to five events that made them feel most emotional before choosing one about which to write.
Imagination	Participants are asked to vividly imagine themselves in affectively evocative situations, sometimes using guided imagery.
Fabricated situations	Participants are exposed to a fabricated situation to induce affect, such as being placed in a situation where they interact with an anger-inducing confederate (i.e., an actor).
Music	A piece of music designed to elicit the target affective state is played.
Picture	Previously validated (and often taken from standard databases [(e.g., International Affective Pictures System; (Bradley & Lang, 2007))] are presented.
Priming	Words and/or pictures associated with an affective state are presented as supraliminal stimuli.
Reading	Participants are presented with and asked to read to themselves paragraphs of text with affectively laden content, such as newspaper articles, jokes, or portions of textbooks.
Trier social stress test (presentation)	Participants are told that they will develop and give a presentation in an evaluative social situation.
Trier social stress test (mathematics)	Participants are given difficult or impossible mathematical or reasoning tasks and provided negative social feedback as they attempt to solve the problems.
Velten mood induction procedure	Participants are instructed to put themselves into a target mood state and to subsequently read a series of self-referent statements.
Film	Film clips, usually excerpted from a feature length film and often selected from a validated set of clips, are presented.

to comparison condition on the target affective state manipulation check). Because heterogeneity in effect sizes was detected, and to generalize these findings, random-effects procedures were used throughout (Hedges & Vevea, 1998). All analyses were performed using CMA (Borenstein et al., 2014). First, main effects of inductions across studies were examined to determine the overall effect. Separate analyses were conducted on each outcome. Next, metaregressions tested whether coded factors moderated effect sizes. Moderator analyses were undertaken only when there was significant heterogeneity of effect sizes (evaluated by a significant p value for the Q statistic) and there were 15 or more effect sizes (i.e., $k \geq 15$). Within each sample of studies, and for each outcome, each coded factor was entered into a univariate metaregression. Additionally, analyses examined whether the effect size for the induction check predicted the effect sizes for each outcome.

Results

Induction Checks

Affect inductions were largely successful in inducing target affective state. Of the 17 affective states for which induction checks were reported, all but positive mood, hope, and contentment were significant ($ds = 0.29$ – 3.11 , $ps < .013$, Table 3).

Main Effects Analyses

Effect sizes for the impact of negative affective states appear in Table 4. Negative affective states (i.e., any induction targeting a negatively valenced affective state, including specific negative emotions, negative mood, and stress) increased engagement in ARB ($k = 120$, $d = 0.29$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.45], $p < .001$) and craving ($k = 31$, $d = 0.29$, 95% CI [0.00, 0.58], $p = .049$), but did not influence intentions, implicit or explicit evaluations, perceived behavioral control, or information seeking.

Experimentally induced negative mood increased ARB ($k = 26$, $d = 0.30$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.57], $p = .023$) and decreased perceived

behavioral control ($k = 4$, $d = -0.81$, 95% CI [-1.27, -0.34], $p = .001$), but did not influence any other outcome. Stress increased ARB ($k = 43$, $d = 0.48$, 95% CI [0.15, 0.80], $p = .004$), but did not influence any other outcome. Disgust decreased ARB ($k = 1$, $d = -0.42$, 95% CI [-0.80, -0.03], $p = .034$), intentions ($k = 1$, $d = -0.42$, 95% CI [-0.82, -0.02], $p = .041$), and craving ($k = 1$, $d = -0.34$, 95% CI [-0.57, -0.10], $p = .005$), but did not influence implicit or explicit attitudes; however, each effect size was generated based on only one test.

Effect sizes for positive affective states are in Table 5. Positive affective states (i.e., any induction targeting a positively valenced affective state, including specific positive emotions and positive mood) did not influence any outcome. Positive mood increased perceived behavioral control ($k = 1$, $d = 0.54$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.57], $p = .023$), but did not influence other outcomes; however, only one study targeted positive mood and assessed perceived control. Amusement increased ARB intentions in two studies ($d = 0.98$, 95% CI [0.43, 1.53], $p < .001$) and decreased ARB information seeking in one study ($k = 1$, $d = -0.39$, 95% CI [-0.75, 0.03], $p = .032$). The other specific positive emotions did not influence any behavior or health cognition outcomes.

Metaregression Analyses

Complete findings for metaregression analyses are reported in the online supplemental materials; only significant findings are discussed here. Main effects with at least one significant meta-analytic predictor for effect-size magnitude are specifically noted in Tables 4 and 5.

Induction check effect sizes. Outcome effect sizes were not linearly predicted by the magnitude of the induction check effect size. However, for negative affective states, and for stress in particular, effects on ARB were predicted by the square of the induction check effect size (see Figure S1 in the online supplemental materials).

Conceptual factors. Negative affective states (i.e., any induction targeting a negatively valenced affective state, including spe-

Table 3
Induction Check Effect Sizes

Affective state	k	d	95% CI	p	Q	$p(Q)$	I^2	τ^2
Negative affect	115	0.91	[0.86, 35.70]	<.001	1059.88	<.001	89.24	0.63
Negative mood	27	1.12	[0.89, 1.35]	<.001	76.60	<.001	66.06	0.22
Stress	31	0.92	[0.69, 1.16]	<.001	93.86	<.001	63.04	0.28
Anger	6	0.72	[0.31, 1.12]	.001	33.52	<.001	85.08	0.20
Disgust	3	0.76	[0.06, 0.29]	.002	8.75	.013	77.14	0.13
Fear	6	3.11	[1.70, 4.52]	<.001	59.30	<.001	91.57	1.44
Guilt	3	0.69	[0.43, 0.94]	<.001	0.29	.865	0.00	0.00
Loneliness								
Sadness	36	1.21	[0.83, 1.59]	<.001	703.58	<.001	92.03	1.22
Shame	5	1.26	[0.67, 1.86]	<.001	15.22	.004	73.71	0.29
Positive affect	50	0.62	[0.40, 0.85]	<.001	405.47	<.001	87.92	0.48
Positive mood	12	0.46	[-0.25, 1.16]	.201	130.08	<.001	91.54	1.36
Amusement	14	1.30	[0.85, 1.75]	<.001	67.91	<.001	80.86	0.46
Contentment	4	-0.13	[-0.76, 0.51]	.695	11.78	.008	74.53	0.30
Excitement								
Happiness	13	0.43	[0.10, 0.76]	.011	81.75	<.001	85.32	0.29
Hope	2	-0.11	[-0.30, 0.07]	.239	0.04	.846	0.00	0.00
Pride	5	1.13	[0.60, 1.66]	<.001	12.60	.013	68.26	0.23
Surprise	2	0.29	[0.06, 0.52]	.013	0.44	.508	0.00	0.00

Table 4
Impact of Negative Affect on Appetitive Risk Behaviors and Cognitions

Behavior/cognition	<i>k</i>	<i>d</i>	95% CI	<i>p</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>p</i> (<i>Q</i>)	<i>I</i> ²	τ ²
Negative affective states (all)								
Behavior	120	0.29^a	[0.13, 0.45]	<.001	622.08	<.001	80.87	0.58
Intentions	25	0.06 ^a	[−0.04, 0.16]	.208	29.22	.212	17.87	0.01
Craving	31	0.29^a	[0.00, 0.58]	.049	188.34	<.001	84.07	0.50
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	22	0.11	[−0.02, 0.23]	.085	27.33	.160	23.15	0.02
Implicit evaluations/Attention	16	0.05	[−0.26, 0.36]	.763	72.48	<.001	79.30	0.29
Perceived behavioral control	17	−0.34 ^a	[−0.73, 0.04]	.076	118.13	<.001	86.46	0.52
Information seeking	5	−0.06	[−0.44, 0.32]	.757	5.10	.278	21.52	0.04
Negative mood								
Behavior	26	0.30	[0.04, 0.57]	.023	71.79	<.001	65.18	0.28
Intentions	2	0.03	[−1.08, 1.14]	.956	4.95	.026	79.80	0.51
Craving	1	0.58	[−0.23, 1.40]	.162				
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	5	0.07	[−0.15, 0.30]	.529	4.01	.404	0.29	0.00
Implicit evaluations/Attention	5	0.01	[−0.66, 0.69]	.969	34.59	<.001	88.44	0.52
Perceived behavioral control	4	−0.81	[−1.27, −0.34]	.001	8.11	.044	63.00	0.14
Stress								
Behavior	43	0.48^a	[0.15, 0.80]	.004	269.07	<.001	84.39	0.93
Intentions	1	−0.03	[−0.46, 0.40]	.882				
Craving	21	0.24 ^a	[−0.10, 0.58]	.172	74.70	<.001	73.23	0.43
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	5	0.08	[−0.19, 0.35]	.549	6.47	.167	38.15	0.03
Implicit evaluations/Attention	4	0.29	[−0.58, 1.15]	.513	24.55	<.001	87.79	0.67
Perceived behavioral control	7	−0.13	[−0.77, 0.52]	.692	36.24	<.001	83.44	0.60
Anger								
Behavior	6	0.29	[−0.00, 0.58]	.051	2.43	.787	0.00	0.00
Intentions	5	0.10	[−0.05, 0.25]	.195	1.95	.745	0.00	0.00
Craving	1	−0.02	[−0.52, 0.48]	.940				
Information seeking	2	0.20	[−0.49, 0.90]	.566	0.01	.923	0.00	0.00
Disgust								
Behavior	1	−0.42	[−0.80, −0.03]	.034				
Intentions	1	−0.42	[−0.82, −0.02]	.041				
Craving	1	−0.34	[−0.57, −0.10]	.005				
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	1	0.19	[−0.37, 0.75]	.502				
Implicit evaluations/Attention	1	−0.06	[−0.61, 0.50]	.833				
Fear								
Behavior	4	0.44	[−0.59, 1.47]	.400	14.50	.002	79.31	0.87
Intentions	3	0.05	[−0.12, 0.22]	.556	0.32	.854	0.00	0.00
Guilt								
Behavior	1	0.58	[−0.05, 1.20]	.071				
Intentions	2	0.08	[−0.52, 0.26]	.794	4.87	.027	79.45	0.15
Loneliness								
Behavior	3	0.47	[−0.14, 1.09]	.133	1.61	.447	0.00	0.00
Sadness								
Behavior	33	0.10	[−0.06, 0.25]	.211	60.66	.002	47.25	0.09
Intentions	7	0.16	[−0.05, 0.37]	.145	3.49	.745	0.00	0.00
Craving	7	0.53	[−0.26, 1.33]	.187	82.61	<.001	92.74	1.03
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	7	0.08	[−0.11, 0.28]	.405	9.07	.170	33.82	0.02
Implicit evaluations/Attention	4	0.02	[−0.21, 0.25]	.860	0.10	.992	0.00	0.00
Perceived behavioral control	6	−0.23	[−0.98, 0.52]	.548	56.06	<.001	91.08	0.79
Shame								
Behavior	7	−0.03	[−1.81, 1.76]	.978				
Intentions	4	0.07	[−0.36, 0.49]	.760	6.87	.083	55.13	0.10
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	5	0.25	[−0.28, 0.78]	.360	8.43	.077	52.56	0.18
Implicit evaluations/Attention	2	−0.38	[−2.46, 1.70]	.721	9.32	.002	89.28	2.01

Note. When an outcome is not listed under a particular affective state, this indicates that no studies targeting that affective state assessed that outcome. Significant overall effect sizes are displayed in boldface type.

^a Indicates main effects with at least one significant moderator.

Table 5

Impact of Positive Affect on Appetitive Risk Cognitions and Behavior

Cognition/behavior	<i>k</i>	<i>d</i>	95% CI	<i>p</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>p</i> (<i>Q</i>)	<i>I</i> ²	τ^2
Positive affective states (all)								
Behavior	41	0.08 ^a	[−0.22, 0.39]	.592	264.78	<.001	84.89	0.78
Intentions	22	0.08 ^a	[−0.10, 0.25]	.392	39.38	.009	46.68	0.08
Craving	5	0.41	[−0.26, 1.08]	.226	26.66	<.001	85.00	0.48
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	19	−0.10 ^a	[−0.27, 0.07]	.238	30.43	.033	40.86	0.06
Implicit evaluations/Attention	12	0.02	[−0.17, 0.21]	.807	10.56	.480	0.00	0.00
Perceived behavioral control	3	0.30	[−0.13, 0.73]	.168	2.82	.244	29.01	0.05
Information seeking	5	0.09	[−0.37, 0.56]	.694	6.83	.145	41.46	0.11
Positive mood								
Behavior	13	0.24	[−0.05, 0.52]	.104	20.39	.040	46.05	0.11
Craving	2	0.75	[−0.59, 2.08]	.272	15.27	<.001	93.45	0.87
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	4	0.02	[−0.28, 0.33]	.879	1.23	.772	0.00	0.00
Implicit evaluations/Attention	7	−0.13	[−0.38, 0.12]	.308	2.36	.853	0.00	0.00
Perceived behavioral control	1	0.54	[0.13, 0.95]	.009				
Amusement								
Behavior	15	−0.05 ^a	[−0.47, 0.37]	.818	58.70	<.001	76.15	0.45
Intentions	2	0.98	[0.43, 1.53]	<.001	1.13	.288	11.47	0.02
Craving	2	0.42	[−0.15, 1.00]	.149	0.04	.846	0.00	0.00
Implicit evaluations/Attention	3	0.33	[−0.00, 0.66]	.052	1.33	.514	0.00	0.00
Information seeking	1	−0.39	[−0.75, 0.03]	.032				
Contentment								
Behavior	1	0.23	[−0.75, 1.22]	.645				
Intentions	2	−0.01	[−0.43, 0.41]	.961	0.00	.961	0.00	0.00
Craving	1	−0.25	[−0.71, 0.21]	.286				
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	3	−0.23	[−0.54, 0.09]	.154	1.37	.503	0.00	0.00
Happiness								
Behavior	5	0.00	[−0.42, 0.42]	.995	6.41	.170	37.61	0.09
Intentions	12	0.02	[−0.15, 0.19]	.824	5.60	.899	0.00	0.00
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	10	−0.07	[−0.37, 0.24]	.674	21.15	.012	57.45	0.13
Implicit evaluations/Attention	2	−0.11	[−0.95, 0.73]	.802	1.75	.186	42.75	0.16
Information seeking	2	0.38	[−0.31, 1.07]	.277	0.09	.761	0.00	0.00
Hope								
Intentions	2	0.05	[−0.26, 0.35]	.773	0.78	.376	0.00	0.00
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	2	−0.08	[−0.74, 0.59]	.820	3.27	.057	72.43	0.17
Information seeking	2	0.38	[−0.30, 1.07]	.275	0.42	.518	0.00	0.00
Pride								
Behavior	7	0.39	[−1.45, 2.23]	.676	165.76	<.001	96.38	5.80
Intentions	6	0.04	[−0.58, 0.66]	.889	20.75	.001	75.90	0.45
Attitudes/Evaluations/Expectancies	5	−0.20	[−0.70, 0.30]	.429	14.70	.005	72.78	0.22
Implicit evaluations/Attention	2	−0.11	[−0.95, 0.73]	.802	1.75	.186	42.75	0.16
Surprise								
Intentions	2	−0.09	[−0.45, 0.26]	.605	0.14	.712	0.00	0.00

Note. When an outcome is not listed under a particular affective state, this indicates that no studies targeting that affective state assessed that outcome. Significant overall effect sizes are displayed in boldface type.

^a Indicates main effects with at least one significant moderator.

cific negative emotions, negative mood, and stress) had a larger effect on ARB for participants coded as at risk compared with those not at risk ($B = 0.61$, 95% CI [0.27, 0.95], $p < .001$); stress also had greater effect sizes for ARB among at-risk participants ($B = 1.14$, 95% CI [0.45, 1.83], $p = .001$). Positive affective states (i.e., any induction targeting a positively valenced affective state, including specific positive emotions and positive mood) were more likely to decrease ARB when participants were coded as at risk compared with those not at risk ($B = -0.78$, 95% CI [−1.54, −0.02], $p = .044$). Unexpectedly, the effect of negative

affective states on outcomes was smaller with more hedonically pleasing behaviors ($B = -0.98$, 95% CI [−1.92, −0.04], $p = .041$). Similarly, stress had less effect on behavior when the behavior was coded as more hedonically pleasing ($B = -1.03$, 95% CI [−1.86, −0.20], $p = .015$). Positive affect's effects on intention were larger when a craving cue, such as a hedonic smell, was present ($B = 0.88$, 95% CI [0.43, 1.34], $p < .001$). Of note, effects on behavior were not qualified by whether the outcome was observed or self-reported, whether the observed outcomes were public (e.g., observed by the experimenter or other participants) or

private, or whether studies were conducted on the Internet versus in person.

Induction type. The effect of stress ($B = 1.37$, 95% CI [0.48, 2.23], $p = .002$) and positive affect ($B = 0.97$, 95% CI [0.38, 1.56], $p = .001$) on ARB was larger for video inductions compared with other categories of induction.

Outcome characteristics. The effect of negative mood on behavior was larger for smoking studies ($B = 0.81$, 95% CI [0.06, 1.55], $p = .033$), compared with other ARBs. Positive affective states had larger effects on explicit evaluations (attitudes/evaluations/expectations) for studies examining sexual behavior ($B = 0.73$, 95% CI [0.28, 1.17], $p = .001$).

Sociodemographic characteristics. The effect of stress on craving was larger in studies with older participants ($B = 0.16$, 95% CI [0.05, 0.27], $p = .005$). The effects of positive affective states on intention ($B = -0.01$, 95% CI [-0.01, -0.00], $p = .037$) and attitudes ($B = -0.01$, 95% CI [-0.02, -0.00], $p = .015$) were smaller when studies had a higher proportion of women. Positive affective states had larger effects on explicit evaluations (attitudes/evaluations/expectations) in studies with older participants ($B = 0.05$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.08], $p = .005$). The effect of amusement on behavior was higher when there were more women in the sample ($B = 0.03$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.05], $p = .004$), and was lower with younger participants ($B = 0.61$, 95% CI [0.27, 0.95], $p < .001$). Race and education did not predict effect sizes; however, these sample characteristics were inconsistently reported, and relevant metaregressions were underpowered.

Publication Bias

Publication bias analyses were conducted for affective state-outcome combinations with significant effect sizes and for which there were three or more comparisons contributing to the overall effect size. Forest plots and relevant analyses (see the [online supplemental materials](#)) did not provide evidence for publication bias (Egger's coefficients = 0.69–1.44, $ps > .162$), with the single exception of perceived behavioral control (Egger's coefficient = -3.55, $p = .046$).

Discussion

This meta-analysis of 271 independent effect sizes (91 studies) examined whether positive and negative affective states influence appetitive risk behavior (ARB; e.g., tobacco use, alcohol consumption, consumption of calorie dense/nutrient poor foods, sexual risk behavior), and if so, whether the influence of specific positive and negative emotions could be differentiated in their influence on ARB. Analyses indicated that incidental negative affective states increased engagement in ARB, an effect that was not qualified by objective versus self-reported assessment. These effects emerged when all types of negative affect (negative emotions, negative mood, and stress) were examined together ($k = 120$), as well as when analyses were stratified to focus on negative mood or stress independently. Conversely, no main effects emerged for positive affective states ($k = 41$) on ARB or related cognitions, replicating a previous meta-analysis on the null effects of positive affect on health cognitions and behavior (Cameron et al., 2015).

Although specific emotion effects may exist, it was not possible to differentiate the effects of specific positive or specific negative

emotions on ARB when aggregating studies due to limitations in the extant literature, even though relevant emotion inductions appeared to be successful in producing the target affective state. Indeed, with the exception of amusement (and single comparison analyses of disgust), no reliable significant effects of specific emotions on ARB were observed. Notably, there was substantial heterogeneity in effect sizes among specific emotion inductions that was not predicted by the moderators examined here, suggesting the possibility that other (unmeasured) factors may predict when specific emotions are most likely to influence ARB (e.g., Garg, 2019).

A number of moderators of effect sizes emerged. No outcomes were linearly predicted by the magnitude of the effect size for induction checks. However, for negative affective states and stress, a curvilinear association existed between the induction checks and behavior, such that at lower levels of negative affect and behavior, associations of affect induction check effect size and behavior effect size were null, but effects accumulated exponentially to the extent that the study-level induction check effect sizes were larger. However, this finding should be interpreted with caution given that effects only emerge when induction check effect sizes are exceptionally large.

Effects of negative affective states on ARB were stronger for participants coded as at risk (e.g., participants high in emotional eating or drinking to cope, who were dieting, or who had obesity) than for participants coded as not at risk. Relatedly, effects of negative mood on behavior were stronger in smoking studies, consistent with the notion that effects are stronger for at-risk individuals (because smoking is addictive, smokers are arguably at higher risk than those engaging in nonaddictive behavior; Benowitz, 1988). This moderating effect has substantial clinical significance, as it suggests that negative affect may be a particularly important driver among "at-risk" populations and among smokers.

Whether an ARB was coded as hedonically pleasing also emerged as a moderator of the effects of certain types of negative affect, although the nature of this interaction was unexpected. For example, the effects of negative affective states on implicit evaluations of ARB were weaker when the outcome was coded as more hedonically pleasing. Similarly, the effects of stress on behavior were weaker when the outcome was coded as more hedonically pleasing. These findings are counterintuitive given expectations that negative affect would increase ARB due to increased reward salience, priority of mood regulation goals over longer term goals, and reliance on rewarding behavior as an affect regulation strategy. It is possible that this finding reflects a mismatch between affective state and behavior (such that individuals in negative affective states may not feel as though they would enjoy a rewarding behavior) or a match between affective state and behavior (such that negative affect makes people realize how unhealthy the ARB is and as such consumption is reduced; Kroese, Evers, & De Ridder, 2011). It is also possible, however, that imprecision in coding whether an ARB outcome was hedonically pleasing at the study level, rather than the individual level, contributed to this unexpected finding. For example, although chocolate consumption would be coded as highly pleasing, people differ in how much they enjoy sweet, savory, or salty foods, as well as fruits and vegetables (Conner, Haddon, Pickering, & Booth, 1988). Similarly, among drinkers, there are individual differences in enjoyment of specific alcoholic drinks (Klatsky,

Armstrong, & Kipp, 1990). As such, more primary research is necessary to explicitly examine whether the subjective hedonic pleasantness of a behavior moderates the effects of negative affective states.

Interestingly, despite no main effects of positive affective states on ARB or related health cognitions, positive affect was more likely to decrease ARB among at-risk individuals compared with those not at risk. Moreover, positive affect had greater impact on intentions when a craving cue (e.g., appetitive smell) was present at the time that intentions were assessed. This finding is consistent with research suggesting that the effects of positive emotion can be modulated by a currently activated goal (Fishbach & Labroo, 2007), in that the craving cue may have activated goals related to pursuing pleasure (as opposed to longer term health goals), thus increasing the impact of positive affect.

Taken together, these findings have a number of clinical implications. First, they suggest that health care providers should consider a patient's incidental affective state, particularly when the affective state is negative, when providing counseling regarding the reduction of ARB. Second, they suggest that interventions designed to discourage ARB, particularly among at-risk populations, should include strategies that facilitate healthier ways to cope with negative affect or ways to disrupt the link between negative affect and behavior (Sheeran et al., 2018). Findings also have implications for the affective science theories that inform health behavior change interventions. For example, negative affect increased actual ARB but not intentions to engage in future ARB or ARB-related cognitions. These findings may be explained in terms of how negative affect reduces future-oriented thinking (e.g., Liu, Feng, Chen, & Li, 2013): Negative affect may focus individuals on shorter-term solutions rather than longer term intentions and health cognitions. These findings are also consistent with the notion that negative affect can directly stimulate action (Canetti et al., 2002; DeSteno et al., 2013; Garg & Lerner, 2013; Lerner et al., 2015) in addition to affecting action indirectly through expectations of how one will feel in the future (Baumeister, Vohs, DeWall, & Zhang, 2007), given that effects were stronger and more reliable for behavior than intentions. It is also possible that negative affective states did not increase intentions to engage in ARB because individuals anticipated that they would be able to repair future negative affect in other ways. Regardless of mechanism, this finding has clinical implications by warranting appetitive behavior interventions that focus affect regulation strategies that can be deployed in situ to manage the direct effects of incidental affect on cravings and behavior.

This meta-analysis has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, limitations in the literature may make it difficult to differentiate among specific affective states, underscoring that these analyses cannot be interpreted as evidence supporting valence versus discrete emotion theories. Second, there were ambiguities in coding specific affective states targeted by inductions; for example, an unknown proportion of the inductions coded as targeting negative mood may have targeted, or produced, a specific emotion. Third, it is possible that some specific affect inductions failed to achieve specificity. For example, one study included in analyses had a sadness induction that increased sadness, but also anger, compared with neutral emotion (Ferrer, Klein, & Graff, 2017). As such, it is possible that lack of specificity may mask specific emotion effects. However, this possibility cannot be sys-

tematically examined in these data because most studies included only an assessment of the target affective state, making specificity of inductions impossible to examine. Taken together, these limitations point to the importance of collective standards for precision in descriptions of affect inductions, the specific affect induced, and the measurement of (multiple types of) induced affect to allow for theory testing.

The present review is also limited by the fact there were too few studies to fully examine moderator effects except in analyses that grouped all positive and all negative affective states. For example, only four studies targeted fear and included a behavioral outcome, meaning analyses of the conditions under which fear may influence ARB were not possible. Additionally, because of limitations in the database, analyses were unable to systematically examine the effects of a homogeneous set of specific emotion inductions (e.g., autobiographical sadness inductions vs. music sadness inductions vs. autobiographical fear inductions vs. music fear inductions), as the cell size for some of these categories was too small. Finally, we were unable to examine whether the timing of the affect induction with respect to ARB outcome assessments moderated effect sizes, as few studies included an extended follow-up.

Notwithstanding these limitations, this meta-analysis synthesized a large number of studies and demonstrated that negative affect leads to robust increases in ARB, particularly among populations at risk. The present review observed little influence of positive incidental affect on ARBs, with the exception of a significant effect on intentions when a craving cue was present. It is notable that inducing positive or negative affect generally did not influence cognitions or cravings; the largest effect size was observed here was for behavior and for negative affect inductions. Taken together, these findings point primarily to the importance of addressing negative affective states as a precursor of unhealthy ARB, particularly among clinically at-risk populations. Further studies that develop collective standards for affective science methods that identify potential mechanisms underlying the impact of negative affect on ARBs (e.g., increased reward sensitivity, heightened activation of the goal of mood repair, reduced cognitive capacity leading to reduced self-monitoring), and that afford standardized comparisons of specific emotion states, should be a priority in future research.

References

- References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.
- Adam, T. C., & Epel, E. S. (2007). Stress, eating and the reward system. *Physiology & Behavior*, 91, 449–458. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.04.011>
- *Abras, W. S., & Telch, C. F. (1998). The effects of caloric deprivation and negative affect on binge eating in obese binge-eating disordered women. *Behavior Therapy*, 29, 491–503. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(98\)80045-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(98)80045-2)
- *Agrawal, N., & Duhachek, A. (2010). Emotional compatibility and the effectiveness of antidrinking messages: A defensive processing perspective on shame and guilt. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47, 263–273. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.47.2.263>
- Albarracín, D., Johnson, B. T., Fishbein, M., & Muellerleile, P. A. (2001). Theories of reasoned action and planned behavior as models of condom use: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 142–161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.1.142>

- *Allen Catellier, J. R. (2012). *Understanding the effects of emotion on information seeking and health behaviors: Improving communication to promote healthy lifestyles*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Buffalo, NY: State University of New York at Buffalo
- *Andrade, E. B. (2005). Behavioral consequences of affect: Combining evaluative and regulatory mechanisms. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, 355–362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/497546>
- Aspinwall, L. G. (1998). Rethinking the role of positive affect in self-regulation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 22, 1–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1023080224401>
- *Bacon, A. K., & Engerman, B. (2018). Excluded, then inebriated: A preliminary investigation into the role of ostracism on alcohol consumption. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 8, 25–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2018.05.002>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Heatherton, T. F. (1996). Self-regulation failure: An overview. *Psychological Inquiry*, 7, 1–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0701_1
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., DeWall, C. N., & Zhang, L. (2007). How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection, rather than direct causation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 167–203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1088868307301033>
- Benowitz, N. L. (1988). Drug therapy. Pharmacologic aspects of cigarette smoking and nicotine addiction. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 319, 1318–1330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198811173192005>
- *Bongers, P., Jansen, A., Havermans, R., Roefs, A., & Nederkoorn, C. (2013). Happy eating: The underestimated role of overeating in a positive mood. *Appetite*, 67, 74–80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.03.017>
- *Bongers, P., van den Akker, K., Havermans, R., & Jansen, A. (2015). Emotional eating and Pavlovian learning: Does negative mood facilitate appetitive conditioning? *Appetite*, 89, 226–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.02.018>
- Borenstein, M. (2009). Effect sizes for continuous data. In H. Cooper, L. Hedges, & J. Valentine (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis meta-analysis* (pp. 221–235). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J., & Rothstein, H. (2014). *Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) software (Version 3.0)*. Englewood, NJ: Biostat. Retrieved from <https://www.meta-analysis.com/>
- *Boyer, C. (1998). *Dysphoric mood, restraint, and eating behavior*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Newark, DE: University of Delaware. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=7528118>
- Bradley, M. M., & Lang, P. J. (2007). *The International Affective Digitized Sounds (2nd ed.; IADS-2): Affective ratings of sounds and instruction manual*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida. Retrieved from <https://csea.phhp.ufl.edu/index.html>
- *Briddell, D. W., Rimm, D. C., Caddy, G. R., & Dunn, N. J. (1979). Analogue assessment, affective arousal, and the smoking taste test. *Addictive Behaviors*, 4, 287–295. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603\(79\)90042-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603(79)90042-X)
- Cameron, D. S., Bertenshaw, E. J., & Sheeran, P. (2015). The impact of positive affect on health cognitions and behaviours: A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Health Psychology Review*, 9, 345–365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2014.923164>
- Cameron, L. D., & Leventhal, H. (2003). *The self-regulation of health and illness behaviour*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Canetti, L., Bachar, E., & Berry, E. M. (2002). Food and emotion. *Behavioral Processes*, 60, 157–164. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357\(02\)00082-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357(02)00082-7)
- Cardi, V., Esposito, M., Clarke, A., Schifano, S., & Treasure, J. (2015). The impact of induced positive mood on symptomatic behaviour in eating disorders. An experimental, AB/BA crossover design testing a multimodal presentation during a test-meal. *Appetite*, 87, 192–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.12.224>
- *Cardi, V., Leppanen, J., & Treasure, J. (2015). The effects of negative and positive mood induction on eating behaviour: A meta-analysis of laboratory studies in the healthy population and eating and weight disorders. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 57, 299–309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.08.011>
- Carpenter, S. M., Peters, E., Västfjäll, D., & Isen, A. M. (2013). Positive feelings facilitate working memory and complex decision making among older adults. *Cognition and Emotion*, 27, 184–192. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.698251>
- *Carvalho, J., Pereira, R., Barreto, D., & Nobre, P. J. (2017). The effects of positive versus negative mood states on attentional processes during exposure to erotica. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46, 2495–2504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0875-3>
- *Chan, C., Van Boven, L., Andrade, E. B., & Ariely, D. (2014). Moral violations reduce oral consumption. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 24, 381–386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2013.12.003>
- *Chua, J. L., Touyz, S., & Hill, A. J. (2004). Negative mood-induced overeating in obese binge eaters: An experimental study. *International Journal of Obesity and Related Metabolic Disorders*, 28, 606–610. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.ijo.0802595>
- Clare, G. L., & Huntsinger, J. R. (2007). How emotions inform judgment and regulate thought. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 393–399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.08.005>
- Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9, 361–368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015952>
- Conner, M. T., Haddon, A. V., Pickering, E. S., & Booth, D. A. (1988). Sweet tooth demonstrated: Individual differences in preference for both sweet foods and foods highly sweetened. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 275–280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.73.2.275>
- Conner, M., Rhodes, R. E., Morris, B., McEachan, R., & Lawton, R. (2011). Changing exercise through targeting affective or cognitive attitudes. *Psychology & Health*, 26, 133–149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2011.531570>
- Consedine, N. S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2007). The role of discrete emotions in health outcomes: A critical review. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 12, 59–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appsy.2007.09.001>
- *Cools, J., Schotte, D. E., & McNally, R. J. (1992). Emotional arousal and overeating in restrained eaters. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 101, 348–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.101.2.348>
- Cowan, A. S., & Keltner, D. (2017). Self-report captures 27 distinct categories of emotion bridged by continuous gradients. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(38), E7900–E7909. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702247114>
- Cryder, C. E., Lerner, J. S., Gross, J. J., & Dahl, R. E. (2008). Misery is not miserly: Sad and self-focused individuals spend more. *Psychological Science*, 19, 525–530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02118.x>
- Daugherty, J. R., & Brase, G. L. (2010). Taking time to be healthy: Predicting health behaviors with delay discounting and time perspective. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 202–207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.10.007>
- DeSteno, D., Gross, J. J., & Kubzansky, L. (2013). Affective science and health: The importance of emotion and emotion regulation. *Health Psychology*, 32, 474–486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030259>
- DeSteno, D., Li, Y., Dickens, L., & Lerner, J. S. (2014). Gratitude: A tool for reducing economic impatience. *Psychological Science*, 25, 1262–1267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797614529979>
- *Dobbs, S. D., Strickler, D. P., & Maxwell, W. A. (1981). The effects of stress and relaxation in the presence of stress on urinary pH and smoking behaviors. *Addictive Behaviors*, 6, 345–353. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603\(81\)90050-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603(81)90050-2)

- *Dorison, C. A., Wang, K., Rees, V. W., Kawachi, I., Ericson, K. M. M., & Lerner, J. S. (2020). Sadness, but not all negative emotions, heightens addictive substance use. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117, 943–949. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1909888116>
- Duffey, K. J., & Popkin, B. M. (2011). Energy density, portion size, and eating occasions: Contributions to increased energy intake in the United States, 1977–2006. *PLoS Medicine*, 8(6), e1001050. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001050>
- *Dutton, C. E. (2017). *An experimental test of the effects of social conflict on posttraumatic stress symptoms and alcohol craving*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2442/>
- Ellis, E. M., Collins, R. L., Homish, G. G., Parks, K. A., & Kiviniemi, M. T. (2016). Perceived controllability of condom use shifts reliance on implicit versus explicit affect. *Health Psychology*, 35, 842–846. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hea0000336>
- *Emery, N. N., & Simons, J. S. (2015). Mood & alcohol-related attentional biases: New considerations for gender differences and reliability of the visual-probe task. *Addictive Behaviors*, 50, 1–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.06.007>
- Emmons, R. A., & Diener, E. (1985). Personality correlates of subjective well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11, 89–97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167285111008>
- *Emond, M., Ten Eycke, K., Kosmerly, S., Robinson, A. L., Stillar, A., & Van Blyderveen, S. (2016). The effect of academic stress and attachment stress on stress-eaters and stress-undereaters. *Appetite*, 100, 210–215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.01.035>
- *Evers, C., Adrianse, M., de Ridder, D. T., & de Witt Huberts, J. C. (2013). Good mood food. Positive emotion as a neglected trigger for food intake. *Appetite*, 68, 1–7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.04.007>
- *Evers, C., Marijn Stok, F., & de Ridder, D. T. (2010). Feeding your feelings: Emotion regulation strategies and emotional eating. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 792–804. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167210371383>
- *Fedorikhin, A., & Patrick, V. M. (2010). Positive mood and resistance to temptation: The interfering influence of elevated arousal. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 698–711. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/655665>
- Ferrer, R. A., Green, P. A., & Barrett, L. F. (2015). Affective science and cancer control: Towards a mutually beneficial research agenda. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10, 328–345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691615576755>
- *Ferrer, R. A., Klein, W. M., & Graff, K. A. (2017). Self-affirmation increases defensiveness toward health risk information among those experiencing negative emotions: Results from two national samples. *Health Psychology*, 36, 380–391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hea0000460>
- Ferrer, R. A., Klein, W. M. P., Lerner, J. S., Reyna, V., & Keltner, D. (2016). Emotions and health decision-making: Extending the appraisal tendency framework to improve health and healthcare. In C. Roberto & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Behavioral economics and public health* (pp. 101–131). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ferrer, R. A., & Mendes, W. B. (2018). Emotion, health decision making, and health behaviour. *Psychology & Health*, 33, 1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2017.1385787>
- *Field, M., & Powell, H. (2007). Stress increases attentional bias for alcohol cues in social drinkers who drink to cope. *Alcohol and Alcoholism (Oxford, Oxfordshire)*, 42, 560–566. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agn064>
- *Field, M., & Quigley, M. (2009). Mild stress increases attentional bias in social drinkers who drink to cope: A replication and extension. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 17, 312–319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017090>
- Fishbach, A., & Labroo, A. A. (2007). Be better or be merry: How mood affects self-control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 158–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.158>
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Joiner, T. (2002). Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. *Psychological Science*, 13, 172–175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00431>
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- *Frost, R. O., Goolkasian, G. A., Ely, R. J., & Blanchard, F. A. (1982). Depression, restraint and eating behavior. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 20, 113–121. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(82\)90111-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(82)90111-5)
- *Fucito, L. M., & Juliano, L. M. (2009). Depression moderates smoking behavior in response to a sad mood induction. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 23, 546–551. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016529>
- *Gardner, M., & Steinberg, L. (2005). Peer influence on risk taking, risk preference, and risky decision making in adolescence and adulthood: An experimental study. *Developmental Psychology*, 41, 625–635. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.41.4.625>
- Garg, N. (2019). Misery wants control: The roles of helplessness and choice in the sadness–consumption relationship. *Australian Journal of Management*, 44, 407–424. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0312896219830152>
- *Garg, N., & Lerner, J. S. (2013). Sadness and consumption. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23, 106–113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2012.05.009>
- *Garg, N., Wansink, B., & Inman, J. J. (2007). The influence of incidental affect on consumers' food intake. *Journal of Marketing*, 71, 194–206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.1.194>
- *Glad, W., & Adesso, V. J. (1976). The relative importance of socially induced tension and behavioral contagion for smoking behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 85, 119–121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.85.1.119>
- *Goldsmith, A. A. (2008). *Effects of mood induction on the relationship between generalized anxiety and alcohol-related beliefs in young adult drinkers*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati. Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/pg_10?0::NO:10:P10_ACCESSION_NUM:ucin1240954956
- Gomes, T., Tadrous, M., Mamdani, M. M., Paterson, J. M., & Juurlink, D. N. (2018). The burden of opioid-related mortality in the United States. *Journal of the American Medical Association Network Open*, 1(2), e180217–e180217.
- *Grunberg, N. E., & Straub, R. O. (1992). The role of gender and taste class in the effects of stress on eating. *Health Psychology*, 11, 97–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.11.2.97>
- Han, E., & Powell, L. M. (2013). Consumption patterns of sugar-sweetened beverages in the United States. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 113, 43–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2012.09.016>
- Han, S., Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2007). Feelings and consumer decision making: The appraisal-tendency framework. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 17, 158–168. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1057-7408\(07\)70023-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1057-7408(07)70023-2)
- Han, S., Lerner, J. S., & Zeckhauser, R. (2012). The disgust-promotes-disposal effect. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 44, 101–113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11166-012-9139-3>
- Harlé, K. M., & Sanfey, A. G. (2007). Incidental sadness biases social economic decisions in the Ultimatum Game. *Emotion*, 7, 876–881. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.876>
- Hausenblas, H. A., Carron, A. V., & Mack, D. E. (1997). Application of the theories of reasoned action and planned behavior to exercise behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19, 36–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.19.1.36>
- *Heatherington, T. F., Herman, C. P., & Polivy, J. (1991). Effects of physical threat and ego threat on eating behavior. *Journal of Personality and*

- Social Psychology*, 60, 138–143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.1.138>
- *Heatherton, T. F., Striye, M., & Wittenberg, L. (1998). Emotional distress and disinhibited eating: The role of self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 301–313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167298243007>
- Hedges, L. V. (1981). Distribution theory for Glass's estimator of effect size and related estimators. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 6, 107–128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/10769986006002107>
- Hedges, L. V., & Vevea, J. L. (1998). Fixed-and random-effects models in meta-analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 3, 486–504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.486>
- *Herhaus, B., Päßler, S., & Petrowski, K. (2018). Stress-related laboratory eating behavior in adults with obesity and healthy weight. *Physiology & Behavior*, 196, 150–157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2018.08.018>
- *Hillebrand, J. (2000). New perspectives on the manipulation of opiate urges and the assessment of cognitive effort associated with opiate urges. *Addictive Behaviors*, 25, 139–143. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603\(99\)00007-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603(99)00007-6)
- *Houlihan, A. E. (2008). *Stress and self-control: A test of contrasting pathways to health risk behavior*. (Doctoral dissertation). Ames, IA: Iowa State University. Retrieved from <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/15697/>
- *Hufford, M. (1998). *Drowning your sorrows: The effects of a negative mood induction on normal drinkers' alcohol expectancies*. University of Pittsburgh. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=5530622>
- Isen, A. M. (2008). Some ways in which positive affect influences decision making and problem solving. *Handbook of Emotions*, 3, 548–573.
- Isen, A. M., & Reeve, J. (2005). The influence of positive affect on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Facilitating enjoyment of play, responsible work behavior, and self-control. *Motivation and Emotion*, 29, 295–323. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9019-8>
- *Jansen, A., Vanreyten, A., van Balveren, T., Roefs, A., Nederkoorn, C., & Havermans, R. (2008). Negative affect and cue-induced overeating in non-eating disordered obesity. *Appetite*, 51, 556–562. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.04.009>
- Johns, M., Inzlicht, M., & Schmader, T. (2008). Stereotype threat and executive resource depletion: Examining the influence of emotion regulation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 137, 691–705. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013834>
- Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Quantitative synthesis of social psychological research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 496–528). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kanny, D., Brewer, R. D., Mesnick, J. B., Paulozzi, L. J., Naimi, T. S., & Lu, H. (2015). Vital signs: Alcohol poisoning deaths—United States, 2010–2012. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 63, 1238–1242.
- Keltner, D., & Lerner, J. S. (2010). Emotion. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 317–352). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy001009>
- Klatsky, A. L., Armstrong, M. A., & Kipp, H. (1990). Correlates of alcoholic beverage preference: Traits of persons who choose wine, liquor or beer. *British Journal of Addiction*, 85, 1279–1289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1990.tb01604.x>
- *Klein, M. I. (1996). *Effect of induced depressed mood on subclinical anorexics and bulimics and restrained and unrestrained eaters*. (unpublished dissertation). Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York.
- Kroese, F. M., Evers, C., & De Ridder, D. T. D. (2011). Tricky treats: Paradoxical effects of temptation strength on self-regulation processes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 281–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.771>
- *Larsen, H., Engels, R. C., Granic, I., & Huizink, A. C. (2013). Does stress increase imitation of drinking behavior? An experimental study in a (semi-)naturalistic context. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, 37, 477–483. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2012.01942.x>
- Lawton, R., Conner, M., & McEachan, R. (2009). Desire or reason: Predicting health behaviors from affective and cognitive attitudes. *Health Psychology*, 28, 56–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013424>
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46, 819–834. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.46.8.819>
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgement and choice. *Cognition and Emotion*, 14, 473–493. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/026999300402763>
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 146–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.146>
- Lerner, J. S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., & Kassam, K. S. (2015). Emotion and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 799–823. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043>
- Lerner, J. S., Small, D. A., & Loewenstein, G. (2004). Heart strings and purse strings: Carryover effects of emotions on economic decisions. *Psychological Science*, 15, 337–341. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00679.x>
- *Lindgren, K. P., Ramirez, J. J., Wiers, R. W., Teachman, B. A., Norris, J., Olin, C. C., . . . Neighbors, C. (2018). Mood selectively moderates the implicit alcohol association-drinking relation in college student heavy episodic drinkers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 32, 338–349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/adb0000360>
- Lindquist, K. A., Satpute, A. B., Wager, T. D., Weber, J., & Barrett, L. F. (2016). The brain basis of positive and negative affect: Evidence from a meta-analysis of the human neuroimaging literature. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N. Y.)*, 26, 1910–1922. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhv001>
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Liu, L., Feng, T., Chen, J., & Li, H. (2013). The value of emotion: How does episodic prospection modulate delay discounting? *PLoS ONE*, 8(11), e81717. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081717>
- Loewenstein, G., & Lerner, J. S. (2003). The role of affect in decision making. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 619–642). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- *Loxton, N. J., Dawe, S., & Cahill, A. (2011). Does negative mood drive the urge to eat? The contribution of negative mood, exposure to food cues and eating style. *Appetite*, 56, 368–374. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2011.01.011>
- Ma, J., Siegel, R. L., Jacobs, E. J., & Jemal, A. (2018). Smoking-attributable mortality by state in 2014, U.S. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 54, 661–670. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2018.01.038>
- Magnan, R. E., Shorey Fennell, B. R., & Brady, J. M. (2017). Health decision making and behavior: The role of affect-laden constructs. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11(8), e12333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12333>
- *Mayer, B., Bos, A. E., Muris, P., Huijding, J., & Vlieland, M. (2008). Does disgust enhance eating disorder symptoms? *Eating Behaviors*, 9, 124–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2007.07.003>
- McEachan, R. R. C., Conner, M., Taylor, N. J., & Lawton, R. J. (2011). Prospective prediction of health-related behaviours with the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5, 97–144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2010.521684>
- *McKee, S. A., Wall, A.-M., Hinson, R. E., Goldstein, A., & Bissonnette, M. (2003). Effects of an implicit mood prime on the accessibility of smoking expectancies in college women. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 17, 219–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.17.3.219>

- *McQueen, A. L. (2003). *The effects of self-affirmation and positive mood on the reduction of defensiveness after exposure to personally relevant health-risk information* (unpublished dissertation). University of Houston, Houston, Texas. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=5388204>
- Metcalf, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review*, 106, 3–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.106.1.3>
- *Meyer, C., & Waller, G. (1999). The impact of emotion upon eating behavior: The role of subliminal visual processing of threat cues. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 25, 319–326. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-108X\(199904\)25:3<319::AID-EAT10>3.0.CO;2-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199904)25:3<319::AID-EAT10>3.0.CO;2-9)
- Micha, R., Peñalvo, J. L., Cudhea, F., Imamura, F., Rehms, C. D., & Mozaffarian, D. (2017). Association between dietary factors and mortality from heart disease, stroke, and type 2 diabetes in the United States. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 317, 912–924. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.0947>
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G., & the PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 151, 264–269, W64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00135>
- Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., . . . the PRISMA-P Group. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, 4, 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1>
- *Monreal, T. K. (2012). *The role of impulsivity, affect, and expectations in alcohol use and disordered eating* (unpublished dissertation). University of California San Diego. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0nc642f2>
- Moore, B. S., Clyburn, A., & Underwood, B. (1976). The role of affect in delay of gratification. *Child Development*, 47, 273–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1128312>
- *Morrison, P. M., Noel, N. E., & Ogle, R. L. (2012). Do angry women choose alcohol? *Addictive Behaviors*, 37, 908–913. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.03.018>
- *Munsch, S., Michael, T., Biedert, E., Meyer, A. H., & Margraf, J. (2008). Negative mood induction and unbalanced nutrition style as possible triggers of binges in binge eating disorder (BED). *Eating and Weight Disorders*, 13, 22–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03327781>
- *Nesic, J., & Duka, T. (2006). Gender specific effects of a mild stressor on alcohol cue reactivity in heavy social drinkers. *Pharmacology, Biochemistry, and Behavior*, 83, 239–248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pbb.2006.02.006>
- *Newman, E., O'Connor, D. B., & Conner, M. (2008). Attentional biases for food stimuli in external eaters: Possible mechanism for stress-induced eating? *Appetite*, 51, 339–342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.03.007>
- Nordgren, L. F., van der Pligt, J., & van Harreveld, F. (2008). The instability of health cognitions: Visceral states influence self-efficacy and related health beliefs. *Health Psychology*, 27, 722–727. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.27.6.722>
- Oettingen, G., Mayer, D., Thorpe, J. S., Janetzke, H., & Lorenz, S. (2005). Turning fantasies about positive and negative futures into self-improvement goals. *Motivation and Emotion*, 29, 236–266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9016-y>
- Orehek, E., Bessarabova, E., Chen, X., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2011). Positive affect as informational feedback in goal pursuit. *Motivation and Emotion*, 35, 44–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-010-9197-2>
- *Persky, S., Ferrer, R. A., & Klein, W. M. (2016). Genomic information may inhibit weight-related behavior change inclinations among individuals in a fear state. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 50, 452–459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12160-016-9771-2>
- *Petrican, R., Burris, C. T., & Moscovitch, M. (2015). Shame, sexual compulsivity, and eroticizing flirtatious others: An experimental study. *Journal of Sex Research*, 52, 98–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.829796>
- *Polivy, J., Herman, C. P., & McFarlane, T. (1994). Effects of anxiety on eating: Does palatability moderate distress-induced overeating in dieters? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 505–510. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.103.3.505>
- *Pomery, E. A. (2009). *The influence of positive and negative affect on the processing of outcome expectancies related to risky sexual practices* (unpublished dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
- Pressman, S. D., & Cohen, S. (2005). Does positive affect influence health? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 925–971. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.925>
- Raghunathan, R., & Pham, M. T. (1999). All negative moods are not equal: Motivational influences of anxiety and sadness on decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 79, 56–77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2838>
- *Raghunathan, R., & Trope, Y. (2002). Walking the tightrope between feeling good and being accurate: Mood as a resource in processing persuasive messages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 510–525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.3.510>
- *Ralston, T. E., & Palfai, T. P. (2010). Effects of depressed mood on drinking refusal self-efficacy: Examining the specificity of drinking contexts. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 39, 262–269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2010.501809>
- *Read, J. P., & Curtin, J. J. (2007). Contextual influences on alcohol expectancy processes. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 68, 759–770. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2007.68.759>
- *Reznick, H., & Balch, P. (1977). The effects of anxiety and response cost manipulations on the eating behavior of obese and normal-weight subjects. *Addictive Behaviors*, 2, 219–225. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603\(77\)90020-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0306-4603(77)90020-X)
- *Ridgway, P. S., & Jeffrey, D. B. (1998). A comparison of the Three-Factor Eating Questionnaire and the Restraint Scale and consideration of Lowe's three-factor model. *Addictive Behaviors*, 23, 115–118. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603\(97\)00031-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603(97)00031-2)
- *Rotenberg, K. J., & Flood, D. (1999). Loneliness, dysphoria, dietary restraint, and eating behavior. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 25, 55–64. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-108X\(199901\)25:1<55::AID-EAT7>3.0.CO;2-#](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199901)25:1<55::AID-EAT7>3.0.CO;2-#)
- *Rousseau, G. S., Irons, J. G., & Correia, C. J. (2011). The reinforcing value of alcohol in a drinking to cope paradigm. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 118, 1–4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.02.010>
- Rozin, P., & Fallon, A. E. (1987). A perspective on disgust. *Psychological Review*, 94, 23–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.1.23>
- Rozin, P., Markwith, M., & Stoess, C. (1997). Moralization and becoming a vegetarian: The transformation of preferences into values and the recruitment of disgust. *Psychological Science*, 8, 67–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00685.x>
- *Salerno, A., Laran, J., & Janiszewski, C. (2014). Hedonic eating goals and emotion: When sadness decreases the desire to indulge. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 135–151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/675299>
- Scaglione, S., Kliethermes, S., Cao, G., Shoham, D., Durazo, R., Luke, A., & Volk, M. L. (2015). The epidemiology of cirrhosis in the United States. *Journal of Clinical Gastroenterology*, 49, 690–696. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MCG.0000000000000208>
- *Scattolon, Y. S., & Nicki, R. M. (1995). Worry as an inhibitor of dietary restraint. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 23, 25–33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1352465800017604>
- Scherer, K. R. (1988). Criteria for emotion-antecedent appraisal: A review.

- In V. Hamilton, G. D. Bower, & N. H. Frijda (Eds.), *Cognitive perspectives on emotion and motivation* (pp. 89–126). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-2792-6_4
- Schoofs, D., Preuss, D., & Wolf, O. T. (2008). Psychosocial stress induces working memory impairments in an n-back paradigm. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 33, 643–653. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2008.02.004>
- *Shapiro, J. R., & Anderson, D. A. (2005). Counterregulatory eating behavior in multiple item test meals. *Eating Behaviors*, 6, 169–178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2004.08.001>
- Sheeran, P., Maki, A., Montanaro, E., Avishai-Yitshak, A., Bryan, A., Klein, W. M., . . . Rothman, A. J. (2016). The impact of changing attitudes, norms, and self-efficacy on health-related intentions and behavior: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology*, 35, 1178–1188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hea0000387>
- Sheeran, P., & Taylor, S. (1999). Predicting intentions to use condoms: A meta-analysis and comparison of the theories of reasoned action and planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 29, 1624–1675. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb02045.x>
- Sheeran, P., Webb, T. L., Gollwitzer, P. M., Oettingen, G., Williams, D., Rhodes, R., & Conner, M. (2018). Self-regulation of affect-health behavior relations. In D. M. Williams, R. E. Rhodes, & M. T. Conner (Eds.), *Affective determinants of health behavior* (pp. 90–114). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Shiota, M. N., Campos, B., Oveis, C., Hertenstein, M. J., Simon-Thomas, E., & Keltner, D. (2017). Beyond happiness: Building a science of discrete positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 72, 617–643. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0040456>
- *Shmueli, D., & Prochaska, J. J. (2012). A test of positive affect induction for countering self-control depletion in cigarette smokers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 26, 157–161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023706>
- Siddiqi, A. E., Hall, H. I., Hu, X., & Song, R. (2016). Population-based estimates of life expectancy after HIV diagnosis. United States 2008–2011. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 72, 230–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0000000000000960>
- *Sproesser, G., Schupp, H. T., & Renner, B. (2014). The bright side of stress-induced eating: Eating more when stressed but less when pleased. *Psychological Science*, 25, 58–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797613494849>
- *Steiner, S. M. (2004). *The role of affective memories and mood in judgments of alcohol use*. (unpublished dissertation). University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=8840143>
- *Stojek, M. K., Fischer, S., & MacKillop, J. (2015). Stress, cues, and eating behavior. Using drug addiction paradigms to understand motivation for food. *Appetite*, 92, 252–260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.05.027>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2015). *2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health*. Retrieved from <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUH-DetTabs-2015/NSDUH-DetTabs-2015/NSDUH-DetTabs-2015.htm#tab2-41b>
- *Telch, C. F., & Agras, W. S. (1996). Do emotional states influence binge eating in the obese? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 20, 271–279. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-108X\(199611\)20:3<271::AID-EAT6>3.0.CO;2-L](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199611)20:3<271::AID-EAT6>3.0.CO;2-L)
- *Thomas, S. E., Bacon, A. K., Randall, P. K., Brady, K. T., & See, R. E. (2011). An acute psychosocial stressor increases drinking in non-treatment-seeking alcoholics. *Psychopharmacology*, 218, 19–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00213-010-2163-6>
- *Thomas, S. E., Merrill, J. E., von Hofe, J., & Magid, V. (2014). Coping motives for drinking affect stress reactivity but not alcohol consumption in a clinical laboratory setting. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 75, 115–123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2014.75.115>
- Tice, D. M., Baumeister, R. F., Shmueli, D., & Muraven, M. (2007). Restoring the self: Positive affect helps improve self-regulation following ego depletion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 379–384. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.05.007>
- Tice, D. M., Bratslavsky, E., & Baumeister, R. F. (2001). Emotional distress regulation takes precedence over impulse control: If you feel bad, do it! *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 53–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.1.53>
- *Trautmann, S., Muehlhan, M., Kirschbaum, C., Wittchen, H. U., Höfler, M., Stalder, T., & Steudte-Schmiedgen, S. (2018). Biological stress indicators as risk markers for increased alcohol use following traumatic experiences. *Addiction Biology*, 23, 281–290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/adb.12487>
- Tugade, M. M., Fredrickson, B. L., & Barrett, L. F. (2004). Psychological resilience and positive emotional granularity: Examining the benefits of positive emotions on coping and health. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 1161–1190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00294.x>
- *Turner, S. A., Luszczynska, A., Warner, L., & Schwarzer, R. (2010). Emotional and uncontrolled eating styles and chocolate chip cookie consumption. A controlled trial of the effects of positive mood enhancement. *Appetite*, 54, 143–149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2009.09.020>
- *Tybur, J. M., Bryan, A. D., Lieberman, D., Hooper, A. E. C., & Merriman, L. A. (2011). Sex differences and sex similarities in disgust sensitivity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 343–348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.04.003>
- *van Strien, T., Herman, C. P., Anschutz, D. J., Engels, R. C., & de Weerth, C. (2012). Moderation of distress-induced eating by emotional eating scores. *Appetite*, 58, 277–284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2011.10.005>
- *von Helversen, B., Amstadt, C., Klotz, J., Neth, A., & Schneider, S. (2015). *The effect of valence and arousal on food choice*. (Unpublished manuscript).
- Wagner, D. D., Boswell, R. G., Kelley, W. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (2012). Inducing negative affect increases the reward value of appetizing foods in dieters. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 24, 1625–1633. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00238
- Wagner, D. D., & Heatherton, T. E. (2014). Emotion and self-regulation failure. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (2nd ed., pp. 613–628). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Wang, T. W., Asman, K., Gentzke, A. S., Cullen, K. A., Holder-Hayes, E., Reyes-Guzman, C., . . . King, B. A. (2018). Tobacco product use among adults—United States, 2017. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 67, 1225–1232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6744a2>
- *Wardell, J. D., Read, J. P., Curtin, J. J., & Merrill, J. E. (2012). Mood and implicit alcohol expectancy processes: Predicting alcohol consumption in the laboratory. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, 36, 119–129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2011.01589.x>
- *Weinberger, A. H., & McKee, S. A. (2012). Gender differences in smoking following an implicit mood induction. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research: Official Journal of the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco*, 14, 621–625. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntr198>
- *Werthmann, J., Renner, F., Roefs, A., Huijbers, M. J., Pluimans, L., Krott, N., & Jansen, A. (2014). Looking at food in sad mood: Do attention biases lead emotional eaters into overeating after a negative mood induction? *Eating Behaviors*, 15, 230–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2014.02.001>
- *Wilcox, K., Kramer, T., & Sen, S. (2010). Indulgence or self-control: A dual process model of the effect of incidental pride on indulgent choice. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 38, 151–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/657606>
- *Wildes, J. E., Marcus, M. D., Bright, A. C., Dapelo, M. M., & Psychol, M. C. (2012). Emotion and eating disorder symptoms in patients with

- anorexia nervosa: An experimental study. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 45, 876–882. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eat.22020>
- Williams, D. M., & Evans, D. R. (2014). Current emotion research in health behavior science. *Emotion Review*, 6, 277–287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1754073914523052>
- Williams, D. M., Rhodes, R. E., & Conner, M. (2018). Overview of affective determinants of health behavior. In D. M. Williams, R. E. Rhodes, & M. T. Conner (Eds.), *Affective determinants of health behavior* (pp. 1–18). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190499037.003.0001>
- *Willner, P., Field, M., Pitts, K., & Reeve, G. (1998). Mood, cue and gender influences on motivation, craving and liking for alcohol in recreational drinkers. *Behavioural Pharmacology*, 9, 631–642. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00008877-199811000-00018>
- *Winterich, K. P., & Haws, K. L. (2011). Helpful hopefulness: The effect of future positive emotions on consumption. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 38, 505–524. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/659873>
- *Yeomans, M. R., & Coughlan, E. (2009). Mood-induced eating. Interactive effects of restraint and tendency to overeat. *Appetite*, 52, 290–298. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.10.006>
- *Zack, M., Poulos, C. X., Aramakis, V. B., Khamba, B. K., & MacLeod, C. M. (2007). Effects of drink-stress sequence and gender on alcohol stress response dampening in high and low anxiety sensitive drinkers. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, 31, 411–422. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2006.00322.x>
- *Zack, M., Poulos, C. X., Fragopoulos, F., Woodford, T. M., & MacLeod, C. M. (2006). Negative affect words prime beer consumption in young drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors*, 31, 169–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2005.04.016>
- Zapolski, T. C., Cyders, M. A., & Smith, G. T. (2009). Positive urgency predicts illegal drug use and risky sexual behavior. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 23, 348–354. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014684>
- Zeelenberg, M., Nelissen, R. M., Breugelmans, S. M., & Pieters, R. (2008). On emotion specificity in decision making: Why feeling is for doing. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 3, 18–27.

Received January 13, 2020

Revision received May 5, 2020

Accepted June 3, 2020 ■