Linguistic Shifts: A Relatively Effortless Route to Emotion Regulation?
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Abstract
Prior research indicates that psychological distance facilitates emotion regulation. Here, we propose that the ability to transcend one’s immersed perspective may be hidden in plain sight, within the very structure of language. We review evidence regarding two linguistic mechanisms, distanced self-talk and generic “you,” that promote emotion regulation by allowing speakers to shift from an immersed to a more distanced perspective through the words they use to reflect on the self (e.g., shifting from “I” to their own name or other non-first-person-singular pronouns). We conclude by suggesting that these linguistic shifts occur relatively seamlessly and thus may provide a less effortful route to emotion regulation.
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How Linguistic Shifts Promote Psychological Distance

One of the most distinctive properties of human language is that it requires people to take a stance on any given experience (Slobin, 1996). Language does not permit a speaker to represent the full complexity of a
moment. Rather, it requires boiling down a richness of percepts, thoughts, and emotions into a mere handful of words—hence the idiom, “A picture is worth a thousand words.” With language, a speaker is forced to be selective, making choices regarding vocabulary, syntax, and perspective within milliseconds (Traxler & Gernsbacher, 2011). For example, a person on stage in front of an audience could say either, “I looked out at the crowd” or “The crowd looked at me.” Both sentences express a person’s experience of the same event, but they convey dramatically different ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving in the moment.

In line with this idea, our proposal is that two linguistic mechanisms—distanced self-talk and generic “you”—can alter people’s perspective as they reflect on negative experiences in ways that promote psychological distance. The psychological distance afforded by these linguistic shifts allows people to think differently about their situation, promoting emotion regulation. Distanced self-talk involves taking an outsider’s perspective by using one’s own name and non-first-person pronouns (e.g., “you,” “she”) to address the self. As illustrated above, for example, Malala said to herself, “Malala, just take a shoe and hit him.” Given that first-person pronouns are commonly used to refer to the self, whereas names and non-first-person pronouns are habitually used to refer to others, we suggest that reflecting on the self using language typically reserved for others should promote emotion regulation by allowing people to reflect on their experiences from a distance (Kross et al., 2014).

Whereas distanced self-talk involves reflecting on the self from an outside perspective, generic “you” involves broadening one’s perspective to refer to people in general (similar to how one might use “people” or “one”). Prior work demonstrates that generic noun statements (e.g., “Cats chase mice”) express generalizations that apply broadly, beyond any specific time or place (Gelman, Ware, & Kleinberg, 2010; Rhodes, Leslie, & Tworek, 2012). Similarly, using generic “you” to reflect on one’s own negative experiences allows a person to craft a generalization but, in this case, one that is deeply self-relevant. For example, consider Malala’s use of the word “you” as she reflected on her own near-death experience: “When you see death, things change.” We suggest that viewing one’s experience in this way, as part of a broader phenomenon that is not restricted to the self, should facilitate emotion regulation by promoting psychological distance (Orvell, Kross, & Gelman, 2017). Figure 1 illustrates these linguistic mechanisms compared with the default mode of reflecting on the self from an immersed perspective, using “I.”

Do Distanced Self-Talk and Generic “You” Promote Emotion Regulation?

Experimental research indicates that reflecting on negative personal events using distanced (vs. immersed) self-talk leads people to consider their experiences akin to the perspective of an outside observer (Kross et al., 2014) and promotes emotion regulation in a variety of contexts (Dolcos & Albarracin, 2014; Kross & Ayduk, 2017; Kross et al., 2014; Leitner et al., 2017). When preparing for an anxiety-eliciting speech task, for example, individuals who were cued to use distanced self-talk were more likely to view the upcoming speech as a challenge that they could cope with rather than as a threat over which they had no control (Kross et al., 2014; Streamer, Seery, Kondrak, Lamarche, & Saltsman, 2017). They also reported lower levels of anxiety (Kross et al., 2014) and reduced physiological reactivity (Streamer et al., 2017).

Generic “you” likewise promotes psychological distance, helping people make meaning from negative experiences (Orvell et al., 2017). Experimental evidence demonstrates that increased usage of generic “you” leads people to perceive a negative event as farther away from the self in time and space (Orvell et al., 2017). This increased psychological distance is associated with higher levels of reconstrual (i.e., thinking about the event differently) and lower levels of emotional reactivity when people try to make meaning from negative experiences (Orvell et al., 2017).

Individual-differences research indicates that people spontaneously draw on both of these linguistic mechanisms when placed in situations in which they need to control their thoughts, feelings, or behaviors (Orvell et al., 2017; Zell, Warriner, & Albarracin, 2012). For example, people use “you” to address the self (i.e., distanced self-talk) when working through hypothetical situations that require self-control (Zell et al., 2012), and people are nearly five times more likely to spontaneously use generic “you” when prompted to make meaning from, as opposed to relive, negative experiences (Orvell et al., 2017). These studies demonstrate that people shift from their default, immersed perspective to a more distanced one intuitively in situations that involve emotion regulation.

Both of these linguistic mechanisms are also available to young children, highlighting how the capacity to switch from an immersed to a distanced perspective through language is potentially fundamental. For example, instructing 4- and 5-year-olds to use distanced self-talk increases their performance during an executive-function task and their persistence during a boring work task (White & Carlson, 2016; White et al.,
Jeff’s Manuscript Was Just Rejected From a Journal for the Third Time.
He Could Think to Himself . . .

From a Default, Immersed Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question to Self</th>
<th>Resulting Construal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do I feel about being rejected?</td>
<td>I’ll never get better. I’m a terrible academic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, Jeff Is Maintaining a Default, Immersed Perspective by Thinking About Himself Using “I.”

OR

From a Distanced Perspective Using Distanced Self-Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question to Self</th>
<th>Resulting Construal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff, how do you feel about being rejected?</td>
<td>Well, Jeff, you can make this paper even better now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, Jeff Is Switching Perspectives by Talking to Himself Directly Using His Own Name and “You.”

OR

From a Distanced Perspective Using Generic “You”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question to Self</th>
<th>Resulting Construal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel when you’re rejected?</td>
<td>Well, you learn more from failure than from success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, Jeff Is Switching Perspectives by Generalizing From His Own Experience and Referring to People in General Using Generic “You.”

Fig. 1. Three perspectives that individuals can take when reflecting on the self. The orange text represents how the same content can be expressed using immersed self-talk, distanced self-talk, and generic “you,” respectively. The blue text represents the theorized implications of adopting each of these perspectives when reflecting on one’s negative emotions. Pronouns are boldfaced for clarity. Whereas immersed self-talk typically leads to increased negative thoughts about the self, distanced self-talk and generic “you” promote psychological distance, which should in turn allow people to more adaptively reconstruct their situation. The distinction between distanced self-talk statements in the second person and generic “you” statements in the second person primarily lies in the identity of the referent. For distanced self-talk statements in the second person, the referent is the self; for self-relevant generic “you” statements, the referent is people in general. Generic “you” statements are further characterized by “you” accompanied by a verb in the present tense, which is not marked by a temporal aspect.
2017). Children as young as 5 years old also spontaneously use generic “you” when instructed to make meaning from (vs. relive) negative hypothetical events, demonstrating that they are able to generalize from negative experiences by understanding them as representative of broader phenomena (Orvell, Kross, & Gelman, 2019).

In sum, distanced self-talk and generic “you” provide adults and children with a way to shift from an immersed to a more distanced perspective through the words they use to reflect on the self. In this way, both of these linguistic shifts serve as levers that promote emotion regulation by enhancing psychological distance. At the same time, because these linguistic mechanisms are readily observable, they also function as windows, providing insight into when people are regulating their emotions. In this vein, these mechanisms add to a growing body of research on other linguistic indices of distance that provide insight into emotion-regulation processes (e.g., Chung & Pennebaker, 2007; Doré, Morris, Burr, Picard, & Ochsner, 2017; Nook, Schleider, & Somerville, 2017; Tackman et al., 2019).

**A Relatively Effortless Route to Emotion Regulation?**

We began by proposing that the structure of language allows people to gain psychological distance through the words they use when reflecting on the self. Here, we advance the hypothesis that these linguistic shifts occur relatively seamlessly and may thus provide people with a less effortful route to emotion regulation compared with traditionally studied cognitive emotion-regulation strategies that involve, for example, assuming the perspective of a detached observer when reflecting on negative experiences.

Traditionally studied cognitive emotion-regulation strategies directly cue participants to think differently about an emotional experience. For example, participants may be instructed to positively reinterpret the stimulus itself or the nature of the situation, or to adopt the perspective of a detached observer (Ochsner, Silvers, & Buhle, 2012). Meta-analyses reveal that implementing these types of reappraisal tactics is cognitively effortful, relying on frontoparietal circuitry to effectively downregulate affective processing in other areas of the brain, principally those that are involved in generating emotional responses (e.g., Braunstein, Gross, & Ochsner, 2017; Buhle et al., 2014). In contrast, distanced self-talk and generic “you” rely on shifting the parts of speech that a person uses to reflect on the self to promote psychological distance and hasten cognitive change. We therefore suggest that distanced self-talk and generic “you” may be less cognitively demanding than traditionally studied routes to reappraisal, including those that aim to promote psychological distance (such as assuming the perspective of a detached observer).

This hypothesis is supported by the linguistic concept of *shifters*, which are words whose meaning changes depending on the identity of speakers or their location (a phenomenon also known as *deixis*; e.g., Jakobson, 1957). These include personal pronouns (such as “I” and “you”) and other words (e.g., “here,” “there,” “this,” “that”) that situate a speaker in a given context. The hallmark of deixis is that the words’ referents change as a function of context. For example, if Maya asks, “Can you pass me the cookies?” and Dani replies, “Here you go,” the referent of “you” changes, referring to Dani first and Maya second. By age 2, most children grasp the shifting nature of pronouns—using “me” to refer to the self and “you” to refer to others—and understand that other people do the same. Moreover, at this young age, children flexibly shift between canonical and generic uses of “you” (Orvell, Kross, & Gelman, 2018). This sensitivity reveals an early appreciation that perspective is fluid and context sensitive. Starting early in development and continuing into adulthood, then, individuals repeatedly and flexibly shift perspective to communicate. Furthermore, they do so habitually and extremely quickly—within milliseconds (Filik, Sanford, & Leuthold, 2008).

We suggest, therefore, that adopting different perspectives on the self is intrinsic to language use, highly practiced, and entrenched in everyday communicative practices, providing people with the ability to seamlessly shift from an immersed to a distanced perspective. The psychological distance afforded by these linguistic shifts may thus facilitate emotion regulation relatively effortlessly.

**Empirical Evidence**

Three lines of evidence provide initial support for the hypothesis that these linguistic shifts may provide people with a relatively effortless route to emotion regulation.

First, a pair of event-related-potential (ERP) and functional MRI experiments illustrates that reflecting on negative emotions using distanced (vs. immersed) self-talk reduces self-reported negative affect and neural activity associated with self-referential emotional processing without leading to increased brain activity in regions identified a priori as being associated with the effortful control of emotion (Moser et al., 2017). These findings stand in contrast to a large body of research linking the efficacy of traditionally studied cognitive reappraisal strategies (including those that target enhanced psychological distance, such as adopting the perspective of a detached observer) to increased...
activation in these same cognitive control networks (for a review, see Buhle et al., 2014; note that this meta-analysis did not include studies examining the neural correlates of distanced self-talk or generic “you”).

Another way to examine the role of effort as it relates to distanced self-talk and generic “you” is by examining how they operate under stress, which taxes the same cognitive control networks needed to successfully implement traditionally studied reappraisal strategies (Arnsten, 2009). In this vein, several studies have found that reappraisal is less effective under highly stressful conditions (Raio, Oreduru, Palazzolo, Shurick, & Phelps, 2013; Shafir, Schwartz, Blechert, & Sheppes, 2015; Sheppes, Brady, & Samson, 2014). To the extent that linguistic shifters rely less on cognitive control networks when used in the context of emotion regulation, we would not expect emotional intensity to influence their effectiveness. Consistent with this idea, findings from three experiments demonstrated that distanced self-talk is effective for downregulating negative affect, even when people reflect on highly stressful experiences (Kross et al., 2017; Orvell et al., 2019).

Finally, a third way to examine the issue of effort is by considering how these linguistic mechanisms operate developmentally when cognitive control networks such as the frontoparietal network are still developing (Anderson, 2002). Several studies indicate that young children, including those with low levels of executive function and effortful control, benefit from distanced self-talk in situations that require emotion regulation (Grenell et al., 2019; White & Carlson, 2016; White et al., 2017; also see Kaplow et al., 2018). Furthermore, children as young as 5 years old spontaneously use generic “you” to generalize from negative experiences when cued to make meaning (Orvell et al., 2019). Given that young children can flexibly use these linguistic mechanisms, these findings are consistent with the possibility that using these linguistic devices to reflect on the self is a relatively effortless process that promotes emotion regulation by enhancing psychological distance.

In sum, several lines of evidence support the possibility that these linguistic devices may provide people with a relatively effortless route to emotion regulation. These findings contribute to a growing body of research on effortless, automatic, and habitual routes to self-regulation (e.g., Braunstein et al., 2017; Fishbach & Shah, 2006; Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2004; Fujita & Han, 2009).

Future research should continue to interrogate the extent to which distanced self-talk and generic “you” promote emotion regulation relatively effortlessly and should directly compare them with other emotion-regulation strategies, including cognitive reappraisal, distraction, and suppression. Future research should also examine their implications for regulating a wider range of emotions and their efficacy among vulnerable populations who struggle to implement traditional reappraisal strategies (e.g., children or individuals with clinical depression).

### Concluding Comment

Decades of research have focused on identifying how people can effectively control their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. We suggest that one solution may lie in the structure of language and, more specifically, in the words people use to reflect on the self. In this way, linguistic routes to emotion regulation may be more basic and foundational than previously recognized.
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