Fears of compassion magnify the harmful effects of threat of COVID-19 on mental health and social safeness across 21 countries

Short title: Fears of compassion magnify psychosocial distress during COVID-19

Marcela Matos*[1], Kirsten McEwan[2], Martin Kanovský[3], Júlia Halamová[4], Stanley R. Steindl[5], Nuno Ferreira[6], Mariana Linharelhos[1], Daniel Rijo[1], Kenichi Asano[7], Sónia Gregório[1,8], Margarita G. Márquez[8], Sara P. Vilas[8], Gonzalo Brito-Pons[9], Paola Lucena-Santos[1], Margareth da Silva Oliveira[10], Erika Leonardo de Souza[11], Lorena Llobenes[12], Natali Gumiy[12], Maria Ileana Costa[12], Noor Habib[13], Reham Hakem[13], Hussain Khrad[13], Ahmad Alzahrani[13], Simone Cheli[14], Nicola Petrocchi[15], Elli Tholouli[16], Philia Issari[16], Gregoris Simos[17], Vibeke Lunding-Gregersen[18], Ask Elklit[19], Russell Kolts[20], Allison C Kelly[21], Catherine Bortolon[22,23], Pascal Delamillieure[24,25], Marine Paucsik[22], Julia E. Wahl[26,27], Mariusz Zieba[27], Mateusz Zatorski[27], Tomasz Komendziński[28,29], Shuge Zhang[30], Jaskaran Basran[2], Antonios Kagialis[6], James Kirby[5], & Paul Gilbert[2]

[1] University of Coimbra, Center for Research in Neuropsychology and Cognitive Behavioral Intervention (CINEICC), Coimbra, Portugal

[2] University of Derby, College of Health, Psychology and Social Care, Centre for Compassion Research and Training, Derby, United Kingdom

[3] Comenius University, Institute of Social Anthropology, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Bratislava, Slovakia

[4] Comenius University, Institute of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Bratislava, Slovakia

[5] University of Queensland, School of Psychology, Compassionate Mind Research Group, Brisbane, Australia

[6] University of Nicosia, Department of Social Sciences, Nicosia, Cyprus

[7] Mejiro University, Japan

[8] Universidad Europea de Madrid, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Biomedical and Health Sciences. Behavior, emotions, and health research group, Spain

[9] Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile

[10] Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Evaluation and Treatment in Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies - Research Group (GAAPCC), Porto Alegre, Brazil

[11] Conectta: Mindfulness & Compassion, São Paulo, Brazil

[12] Motivación Compasiva, Buenos Aires, Argentina

[13] King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Centre (KFSH&RC), Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

[14] University of Florence, School of Human Health Sciences, Italy

[15] John Cabot University, Department of Economics and Social Sciences, Rome, Italy

[16] National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Center for Qualitative Research in Psychology and Psychosocial Well-being, Athens, Greece

[17] University of Macedonia, Department of Educational and Social Policy, Thessaloniki, Greece

[18] Mindwork Psycological Center, Copenhagen, Denmark

[19] University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

[20] Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA, USA

[21] University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

[22] Grenoble Alpes University, 38000, Grenoble, France

[23] Centre Hospitalier Alpes Isère, C3R - Réhabilitation psychosociale et remédiation cognitive, Grenoble, France

[24] CHU de Caen, Service de Psychiatrie Adulte, 14000, Caen, France

[25] University of Normandy, UNICAEN, ISTS, GIP Cyceron, Caen, France

[26] The Mind Institute Poland, Poland

[27] SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw & Poznań, Poland

[28] Nicolaus Copernicus University, Department of Cognitive Science, Poland

[29] Nicolaus Copernicus University, Neurocognitive Laboratory, Centre for Modern Interdisciplinary Technologies, Poland

[30] University of Derby, School of Human Sciences, United Kingdom

Corresponding author information:

Marcela Matos

Centro de Investigação em Neuropsicologia e Intervenção Cognitivo Comportamental (CINEICC)

Rua do Colégio Novo, 3000-115 Coimbra, Portugal

e-mail: marcela.matos@fpce.uc.pt

ORCID ID

Marcela Matos 0000-0001-7320-7107

Kirsten McEwan 0000-0002-0945-0521

Martin Kanovský 0000-0001-6055-6551

Júlia Halamová 0000-0002-2655-2327

Stanley R. Steindl 0000-0001-8934-5096

Nuno Ferreira 0000-0002-5787-904X

Mariana Linharelhos 0000-0002-7778-8612

Daniel Rijo 0000-0002-5368-0770

Kenichi Asano 0000-0003-3839-5733

Sónia Gregório 0000-0002-8638-4927

Margarita G. Márquez 0000-0002-2783-9004

Sara P. Vilas 0000-0002-1594-9345

Gonzalo Brito-Pons 0000-0002-5002-3863

Paola Lucena-Santos 0000-0003-3023-0715

Margareth da Silva Oliveira 0000-0002-6490-5170

Nicola Petrocchi 0000-0002-7210-2319

Elli Tholouli 0000-0002-8984-5696

Philia Issari 0000-0002-8043-5180

Gregoris Simos 0000-0003-4033-2010

Ask Elklit 0000-0002-8469-7372

Russell Kolts 0000-0002-1803-8002

Allison C Kelly 0000-0001-5956-1396

Catherine Bortolon 0000-0002-5118-7827

Marine Paucsik 0000-0002-9751-4985

Pascal Delamillieure 0000-0003-0215-2430

Julia E. Wahl 0000-0002-6388-3395

Mateusz Zatorski 0000-0002-0043-0815

Mariusz Zieba 0000-0002-3492-2236

Tomasz Komendziński 0000-0003-3273-0764

Shuge Zhang 0000-0002-6935-8831

Jaskaran Basran 0000-0002-8640-2953

Antonios Kagialis 0000-0002-9211-0455

James Kirby 0000-0002-0703-1534

Paul Gilbert 0000-0001-8431-9892

Data availability statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, MM, upon reasonable request.

Conflict of interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical standards:

The authors assert that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

Fears of compassion magnify the harmful effects of threat of COVID-19 on mental health and social safeness across 21 countries

Short title: Fears of compassion magnify psychosocial distress during COVID-19

Abstract

Background The COVID-19 pandemic is a massive global health crisis with damaging consequences to mental health and social relationships. Exploring factors that may heighten or buffer the risk of mental health problems in this context is thus critical. Whilst compassion may be a protective factor, in contrast fears of compassion increase vulnerability to psychosocial distress and may amplify the impact of the pandemic on mental health. This study explores the magnifying effects of fears of compassion on the impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on depression, anxiety and stress, and social safeness.

Methods Adult participants from the general population (N=4057) were recruited across 21 countries worldwide, and completed self-report measures of perceived threat of COVID-19, fears of compassion (for self, from others, for others), depression, anxiety, stress, and social safeness.

Results Perceived threat of COVID-19 predicted increased depression, anxiety and stress, and lower social safeness. The three flows of fears of compassion predicted higher levels of depression, anxiety and stress and reduced social safeness. All fears of compassion moderated (heightened) the impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on psychological distress. Only fears of compassion from others moderated the effects of likelihood of contracting COVID-19 on social safeness. These effects were consistent across all countries.

Conclusions Fears of compassion have a universal magnifying effect on the damaging impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and social safeness. Compassion focused interventions and communications could be implemented to reduce resistances to compassion and promote mental wellbeing during and following the pandemic.

Keywords: Fears of compassion; Mental health; Social safeness; Moderator effect; Perceived Threat of COVID-19; COVID-19 pandemic; Multinational study

Key Practitioner Message

- Fears of offering compassion to oneself, receiving compassion from others, and offering compassion to others have been found to significantly predict poorer mental health and social safeness.

- These fears of compassion were found in this study to also predict poorer mental health and social safeness during the COVID-19 pandemic.

- Importantly, fears of compassion (for self, for others and from others) magnified the damaging impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on mental health, but only fears of receiving compassion from others heightened this impact on social safeness.

- It is recommended that individual, group and community-based compassion-focused interventions, such as compassion focused therapy and compassionate mind training, be used to reduce fears of compassion and therefore help protect against mental health difficulties during and following the pandemic.

Fears of compassion magnify the harmful effects of threat of COVID-19 on mental health and social safeness across 21 countries

Introduction

The current coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic presents modern societies a challenge of historic proportions. The World Health Organisation (WHO) declared early that the pandemic is a public health emergency of international concern (WHO, 2020), and a year later infection rates remain very high across many countries, and the number of deaths have now far surpassed two million worldwide (Worldmeter, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic not only affects physical health, but also has multifaceted severe consequences to mental health and social well-being (e.g., Palgi et al., 2020; Rajkuman, 2020), and can be viewed as a global stressor because of the threat to health, damaging economic consequences and disruption of daily routines.

Throughout history, the sudden emergence and rapid spread of novel infectious diseases have caused much fear and consternation, as well as strict interventions by authorities, such as social distancing, isolation and lockdown, which then caused further fear and a terrifying sense of other people as threats (Van Damme & Van Lerberghe, 2000). Similarly, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, countries throughout the world have implemented several strategies to limit the spread of the virus and reduce pressures on healthcare services. Some of these strategies include community level restrictions with varying degrees of social distancing measures, such as self-isolation or lockdown procedures, which cause significant disruption to people's daily lives. Although government regulations are necessary to address the main challenges posed by the current pandemic, there is a lack of consideration towards the impact such measures have on mental health and psychosocial well-being (Serafini et al., 2020). These restrictions and the characteristics of the virus itself (e.g., being highly contagious, invisible in nature), have resulted in common social behaviours (e.g., shaking hands, hugging) being aversive and potentially deadly, and in others being perceived as potential threats to survival (Schimmenti et al., 2020), ultimately affecting one's feelings/experiences of social safeness. Research has indeed begun to emerge showing that paranoia and conspiratorial thinking are associated with COVID-19 (Larsen et al., 2020).

There is growing consensus that the restrictions to human interaction and resultant social isolation, termed the 'loneliness pandemic' (Palgi et al., 2020), posed by the uncertainty of living with this new pathogen are a severe risk to the mental health of the general population (Prout et al., 2020; WHO, 2020). The implementation of lockdown measures has significantly impacted mental health, with increasing cases or exacerbation of stress, depression, anxiety, loneliness and sleep problems in the general population (Gloster et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2020; Murphy et al., 2020; Serafini et al., 2020; van Tilburg et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020a; Wang et al., 2020b; Wong et al., 2020). Pervasive and uncontrolled fears related to COVID-19 have been associated with poor mental health indicators (e.g., Ahorsu et al., 2020; Fitzpatrick, et al., 2020; Bitan et al., 2020; Kanovsky & Halamová, 2020). Additionally, research has revealed that psychosocial factors aggravated by the COVID-19 pandemic (such as stress, depression, loneliness, social support) may not only increase risk of infection after exposure to a virus (Cohen, 2021), but also impair the immune system's response to vaccination (Madison, et al., 2021), which may therefore have implications for susceptibility to COVID-19 and to the efficacy of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine.

Despite the impact of these unprecedented physical distancing measures on people's social lives and feelings of social safeness, it has been suggested that factors such as resilience and social support could have a protective role in coping with the current crisis (Serafini et al., 2020). Recent research has shown social connectedness to potentially buffer against the negative physical and mental health impact of the coronavirus pandemic, and promote resilience (Nitschke et al., 2020; Palgi et al., 2020; Saltzman et al., 2020). Hence, investigating reputed protective and risk factors that might either buffer or magnify the mental health effects of the COVID-19 pandemic is critical and has been considered a research priority for mental health science (Holmes et al., 2020; Vinkers et al., 2020). Compassion is one such construct that is already known to play a fundamental protective role in mental states, emotion regulation and social relationships (Gilbert, 2020; Mascaro et al., 2020; Seppälä et al., 2017), and might thus emerge as a key protective factor against the pervasive impact of the pandemic on mental health. However, fears of compassion, which can be seen as an antithesis to the buffering effects of compassion, are known to increase vulnerability to psychological distress (Kirby et al., 2019), and might actually magnify the effect of mental health difficulties being experienced in the current pandemic context. The present study is part of a broader multinational longitudinal study looking at compassion, mental health and social safeness in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

In recent years, research has documented the major psychological, social and neurophysiological effects of compassion and compassion training on promoting well-being, reducing mental health difficulties, and fostering prosocial behavior (Di Bello et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2020; Gilbert, 2017a; Petrocchi & Cheli, 2019; Seppälä et al., 2017; Singer & Engert, 2019; Stevens & Woodruff, 2018; Weng et al., 2013). Although definitions of compassion may vary (e.g., Gilbert, 2017b; Mascaro et al., 2020), in evolutionary focused models (Gilbert, 2019, 2020), compassion has been conceptualized as a prosocial motivation that involves "*the sensitivity to suffering in self and others, with a commitment to try to alleviate and prevent it*" (Gilbert, 2014, p. 19). According to this model, compassion operates through evolved psychological (e.g., social intelligence and competencies) and physiological (e.g., the myelinated vagus nerve, oxytocin) mechanisms that underpin caring motives and behaviour rooted in the mammalian care-giving systems (Carter, 2014; Gilbert 2020; Porges, 2007). Compassion involves two components: 1) a sensitivity and engagement with distress; and 2) competencies to alleviate distress in a way that is helpful not harmful (Gilbert, 2014). Compassion can also be seen as a multidimensional construct and a dynamic intra and interpersonal process that occurs in a social interactional context, in the sense that it can be directed inwards, in the form of self-compassion and compassion received from others, and outwards, in the form of compassion given to others (Gilbert et al., 2011). These dimensions have been defined as the different 'flows' of compassion (for self, from others and for others), which while highly interactive, can also be independent (Gilbert, 2014; Gilbert et al, 2017). For example, one might be able to be compassionate towards others yet struggle with being self-compassionate (Lopez et al., 2018).

An extensive literature supports the finding that self-compassion is a buffer against psychological distress (see MacBeth & Gumley, 2012, for a review). However, the multidimensional flows of compassion for self, from others and for others, have been less researched, although evidence suggests they are protective factors against psychological distress (Gilbert et al., 2017; Lindsey, 2017; Matos et al., 2017a; Steindl et al., 2018). Indeed, in the context of COVID-19, both self-compassion as a unidimensional construct (Jimenez et al., 2020; Kavakli et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021), and the flows of compassion as a multidimensional construct (Matos et al., 2021a) have been shown to be protective factors against psychological distress. In the same multinational study across 21 countries as the current study, Matos et al. (2021a) found compassion for self was a reliable moderator between the perceived threat of COVID-19 and lower psychological distress. Whilst

compassion from others was a consistent moderator between fears of contracting COVID-19 and higher social safeness.

Despite the benefits of the three flows of compassion to psychological well-being and mental health (Kirby et al., 2017a), many individuals are unable to activate or use caring and compassionate motivational systems and affect regulators (Ebert et al., 2018), and can develop and experience fears of giving and receiving compassion (Gilbert & Mascaro, 2017; Gilbert et al., 2011). Fears of compassion might include the belief that compassion is weak or self-indulgent, or that one will become too distressed or unable to cope, or that others, or indeed oneself, do not deserve compassion (Gilbert et al., 2011). Fears of compassion are seen as inhibitors that prevent compassionate motivation being 'turned-on' or 'acted on', in that the signal of suffering is either not noticed/avoided or does not result in an action to prevent or alleviate that suffering. Fears of compassion then inhibit an individual's ability to activate compassionate motivational systems across the three flows, which negatively affects their physiological and psychological health and well-being (Kirby et al., 2017b).

A recent meta-analysis (Kirby et al., 2019) found that fears of self-compassion and fears of receiving compassion from others had significant moderate associations with mental health outcomes, such as depression, anxiety, stress and well-being, and vulnerability factors, such as self-criticism and shame. These associations were even stronger in clinical populations struggling with a diagnosed mental health difficulty. Research has also revealed that fears of compassion predict paranoid ideation about other people as potential threats, and that fears of compassion for self and from others can mediate the relationship between adverse events and paranoid ideation (Matos et al., 2017b). Thus, higher fears of compassion, especially for self and from others, may result in poorer psychosocial wellbeing outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. Helpfully, fears of compassion can be diminished with training. For example, Fox et al., (2020) found that fears of compassion improved following Compassionate Mind Training (CMT) and these effects predicted further improvements in self-reassurance, self-criticism, shame and psychological distress. Another study demonstrated that a brief CMT reduced fears of compassion for self, for others and from others (Matos et al., 2017a), and that these fears (in particular for self and from others) mediated changes in self-criticism, shame, depression, stress and safe positive affect induced by the intervention (Matos et al., 2021b). In support, Dupasquier et al. (2018) found compassion training weakened the link between fears of receiving compassion from others and perceived risks of disclosing distress.

In addition to exacerbating psychological distress, the pandemic and its associated social distancing restrictions are contributing to increased feelings of social isolation (Palgi et al 2020). Social isolation, in the form of insecure attachment styles (Basran et al., 2018) and a lack of social safeness (Carvalho et al., 2019; Dias et al., 2020; Kelly & Dupasquier, 2016) have consistently been associated with fears of self-compassion and fears of receiving compassion from others. Whilst social anxiety disorder symptom severity was uniquely predicted by fears of receiving compassion (Merritt & Purdon, 2020).

Aims

Considering the reports of elevated psychological distress (Rajkuman, 2020) and social isolation (Palgi et al., 2020) resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, and given the potential for fears of compassion (especially for self and from others) to predict psychological distress (Kirby et al., 2019) and a lack of social safeness (Kelly & Dupasquier, 2016), this study aimed to examine fears of compassion across the three flows (for self, from others and for others) and their relationships with mental health indicators and social safeness. Specifically, the current study aimed to examine whether fears of compassion would moderate the effects of perceived threat of COVID-19 (i.e., fear and likelihood of contracting SARS-Cov-2) on symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, and on feelings of social safeness, in a global adult population across 21 countries from Europe, Middle East, North America, South America, Asia and Oceania. It was hypothesised that fears of compassion for self and from others (more so than fears of compassion for others) would predict psychological distress and a lack of social safeness during the pandemic. Further, it was hypothesised that fears of compassion would magnify the relationship between the perceived threat of COVID-19 and psychological distress and social safeness.

Methods

Participants & procedures

This study is part of a larger longitudinal multinational study exploring compassion, social connectedness and trauma resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic. The procedures of the current study complied with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional

committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008. A detailed description of the procedures can be found at Matos et al. (2021a).

The research sample was collected in 23 countries through social and traditional media platforms and institutional emailing lists in each country using snowball sampling. The samples from Peru (N = 16) and Uruguay (N = 23) were excluded, given that inclusion criterion was a minimum of 30 participants per country. The total sample consisted of 21 countries with 4057 participants, mean age 41.45 (SD = 14.96), with 80.8% (N = 3279) women, 18.2% (N = 739) men, 0.4% (N = 15) other and 0.6% (N = 24) preferred not to respond: Argentine (N = 257), Australia (N = 109), Brazil (N = 299), Canada (N = 115), Chile (N = 282), China (N = 77), Columbia (N = 50), Cyprus (N = 38), Denmark (N = 141), France (N = 115), Great Britain (N = 268), Greece (N = 145, Italy (N = 160), Japan (N = 522=, Mexico (N = 181), Poland (N = 82), Portugal (N = 394), Saudi Arabia (N = 256, Slovakia (N = 46), Spain (N = 392), United States of America (N = 128). For more details on sociodemographic information per country see Supplementary Online Material 1.

The present study used cross-sectional data gathered between mid-April 2020 and mid-May 2020 across the 21 countries. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before they completed the study protocol in an online survey, after being informed about the study aims, procedures and the voluntary, anonymous and confidential nature of their participation.

Measures

The online survey consisted of a set of questions assessing sociodemographic information (nationality, country of residence, age, gender) and self-report questionnaires measuring perceived threat of COVID-19, fears of compassion (for self, for others, from others), psychological distress (depression, anxiety and stress), and social safeness.

The Perceived Coronavirus Risk Scale (PCRS; Kanovský & Halamová, 2020, adapted from Napper et al., 2012) is an 8-item self-report questionnaire that assesses participants' fear of getting infected with SARS-Cov-2 and encompasses two dimensions: Fear of Contraction (affective aspect) and Likelihood of Contraction (cognitive aspect). Participants are asked to rate on a five-point Likert scale how much they agree with each sentence from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores represent higher perceived threat of COVID-19. In the original study, Kanovsky and Halamová (2020) reported internal consistency to be

acceptable (Fear of Contraction α = .72; Likelihood of Contraction α =.71). In the present study, internal consistency was acceptable (Fear of Contraction α = .70; Likelihood of Contraction α = .70).

Fears of Compassion Scales (FCS; Gilbert et al., 2011) are three scales that assess fears of compassion, one for each flow: 1) fears of feeling and expressing compassion for others (10-items), 2) fears of receiving compassion from others (13-items), 3) fears of compassion for self (15-items). Respondents are asked to rate on a five-point Likert scale how much they agree with each statement, from 0 (don't agree at all) to 4 (completely agree). Higher scores represent higher fears of compassion. In the original study, Cronbach's alphas were .72 for FCS for others, .80 for FCS from others, and .83 for FCS self-compassion (Gilbert, et al., 2011). In the current study, internal consistencies ranged between .89 and .95 (FCS self-compassion α = . 93, FCS compassion for others α = . 89, FCS compassion from others α = . 95).

Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS-21; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995) is a 21-item self-report instrument that consists of three subscales measuring Depression, Anxiety and Stress (seven items per subscale). Participants are asked to rate how often each statement applied to them over the past week on a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (did not apply to me at all) to 3 (applied to me very much, or most of the time). Higher scores represent higher severity of symptoms. Lovibond and Lovibond (1995) reported the subscales internal consistency to range between excellent and good (Depression α = .91; Anxiety α = .84; Stress α = .90). In the present study internal consistency also ranged from good to excellent (Depression α = .91, Anxiety α = .87, Stress α = .88).

Social Safeness and Pleasure Scale (SSPS; Gilbert et al., 2008) is an 11-item self-report questionnaire that measures the extent to which people usually experience their social world as safe, warm and soothing and how connected they feel to others. Participants are asked to rate how often they feel as described in each sentence on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost all the time). Higher scores represent higher perceived social safeness and connectedness to others. In the original study, internal consistency was excellent (α= .92). In the present study, internal consistency was also excellent (α=.94).

Data analysis

The structure of data (a set of multiple dependent variables) suggests that a multivariate multilevel model must be considered, at least for the three-dimensional DASS-21 scale. In

spite of the fact that multivariate analysis increases the complexity in a multilevel context, it is a crucial tool which enables the performance of a single test of the joint effects of our independent variables on several dependent variables (Hox et al., 2017; Snijders & Bosker, 2012). Our study measured three different output variables (i.e., three dimensions of the DASS-21: anxiety, depression, and stress). Data were collected from respondents who were clustered within countries. It would be possible to fit three separate models, but the overall picture would have been lost. Therefore, multivariate multilevel analysis was preferable and it increases statistical power. Each of the models had three levels: measurements of dimensions of the DASS-21 were the level 1 units, the respondents were the level 2 units, and the countries were the level 3 units.

The following statistical procedure for the three-dimensional DASS-21 was proceeded: (1) fitting six multilevel multivariate models, each with three dependent variables (depression, anxiety, stress): a) PCRS fear of contraction as the predictor, FCS self-compassion as the predictor, and their interaction (FCS self-compassion being the moderator); b) PCRS likelihood of contraction as the predictor, FCS self-compassion as the predictor, and their interaction (FCS self-compassion being the moderator); c) PCRS fear of contraction as the predictor, FCS compassion for others as the predictor, and their interaction (FCS compassion for others being the moderator); d) PCRS likelihood of contraction as the predictor, FCS compassion for others as the predictor, and their interaction (FCS compassion for others being the moderator); e) PCRS fear of contraction as the predictor, FCS compassion from others as the predictor, and their interaction (FCS compassion from others being the moderator); f) PCRS likelihood of contraction as the predictor, FCS compassion from others as the predictor, and their interaction (FCS compassion from others being the moderator); (2) for each model, we tested the fit of three nested models with the data by two likelihood-ratio tests and information criteria AIC (Akaike information criterion) and BIC (Bayes Schwarz information criterion): a) the first model was the multilevel model without taking into account three dimensions of the DASS-21, and having two predictors without the moderation; b) the second model was the multivariate multilevel model taking into account three dimensions of the DASS-21, and having two predictors without the moderation; and finally c) the third model was the multivariate multilevel model taking into account three dimensions of the DASS-21, and having two predictors with the moderation. Our hypothesis could have been retained if and only if: a) the second model had a better fit than the first one (taking into account dimensions of the DASS-21 was justified – respondents provided different answers in different dimension of the DASS-21, otherwise the use of the multivariate model was not warranted); b) the third

model had the better fit than the second one, in that adding moderation improved the fit. If not, only main effects (and no moderation) could have had an impact; (3) if the third model had the best fit, we would report and interpret its coefficient (p-values would be corrected by Bonferroni procedure to account for multiple testing); (4) we also provided the graphical representations of effects.

Since the SPSS is a unidimensional scale the univariate multilevel model was sufficient. Two models were fitted: (a) PCRS fear of contraction as the predictor, and (b) PCRS likelihood of contraction as predictor, and both models contained the same set of three moderators: FCS self-compassion, FCS compassion for others, and FCS compassion from others.

For statistical analyses we used the R program version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020), the package "lme4" (Bates et al., 2015). The effects were displayed through the package "sjPlot" (Lüdecke, 2018). As fixed effects, we entered the mean-centred PTCS subscale scores in an interaction with the mean-centred CEAS subscales scores for each dimension of DASS-21. As random effects, we used intercepts for participants and countries for each dimension of DASS-21. For mean centering we used the package "questionr" (Barnier et al., 2017).

The R code syntax for the model is given in Supplementary Online Material 2. R^2 ('variance explained') statistics were used to measure the effect size of the model. However, there is no consensus as to the most appropriate definition of R^2 statistics in relation to mixed-effect models (Edwards et al., 2008; Jaeger et al., 2016; LaHuis et al., 2014; Nakagawa & Schielzeth, 2013). Even though several methods for estimating the coefficient of determination (R^2) for mixed-effect models are accessible, the estimation of R^2 marginal and R^2 conditional in the package "MuMIn" (Barton, 2015) was performed. The marginal R^2 is the proportion of variability explained by the fixed effects/predictors, the conditional R^2 is the proportion of variability explained by both fixed and random effects (differences between respondents and differences between countries).

Results

Table 1 presents the likelihood-ratio tests and information criteria AIC and BIC.

[Insert Table 1 here]

As we can see in Table 1, all multivariate models (b-models) consistently had a better fit than models that did not take dimensionality into account. However, only some models with FOCS as moderators (1c, 3c, 5c, 6c) had a better fit than models without moderation.

Fears of Compassion for self

The coefficients of best fitting models for fears of self-compassion (1c, 2b) are presented in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2 here]

The main effects of fear of contraction on depression, anxiety and stress were all significant (and positive). The main effects of fears of self-compassion on all three dimensions of the DASS-21 were all significant as well (and positive as well). Interaction effects were significant in all three dimensions of the DASS-21 indicating that fears of self-compassion significantly moderate the impact of the fear of contraction on depression, anxiety and stress, across all countries. The variability among respondents was lowest in anxiety, and so was the variability among countries, which was in general larger than the individual variability, particularly in depression and stress. Fig. 1. displays marginal effects of moderation of fears of self-compassion in the case of fear of contraction: all slopes for subjects scoring highly in fears of self-compassion (green) were steeper than other slopes, therefore fears of self-compassion magnifies the impact of fear of contraction on depression, anxiety and stress, with the largest effect of moderation (the least parallel lines) being for anxiety, followed by depression and stress.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

A similar pattern was present when the predictor was likelihood of contraction, but only main effects were significant (and weaker). Therefore, fears of self-compassion did not significantly moderate the impact of the likelihood of contraction on the DASS dimensions.

Fears of compassion for others

In Table 3, coefficients of best fitting models for compassion for others (3c, 4b) are presented.

[Insert Table 3 here]

The main effects of fear of contraction on depression, anxiety and stress were again all significant (and positive), but the main effect of the fears of compassion for others was

significant (and positive) only in depression. However, interaction effects were significant only for the anxiety subscale, revealing that fears of compassion for others moderate the impact of fear of contraction on anxiety, but not on the other two DASS-21 dimensions (across all countries). The variability among respondents was again lowest in anxiety, and so was the variability among countries, which was larger than the individual variability, in both depression and stress. A slightly different pattern was present for the predictor the likelihood of contraction, where all main effects were significant (likelihood of contraction and fears of compassion for others). Fears of compassion for others did not significantly moderate the impact of the likelihood of contraction on the DASS-21 dimensions.

Fear of Compassion from others

Table 4 presents the coefficients of best fitting models for compassion from others (5c, 6c).

[Insert Table 4 here]

The main effects of fear of contraction and likelihood of contraction on depression, anxiety and stress were all significant (and positive), and so were all main effects of fears of compassion from others. The moderation effects were all significant (except of moderation between likelihood of contraction and stress subdimension), suggesting that fears of compassion from others moderate the impact of fear of contraction and likelihood of contraction on depression, anxiety and stress (across all countries), with one exception (out of six relations). The variability among respondents was lowest in anxiety, and so was the variability among countries, which was larger than the individual variability, both in depression and stress.

Social safeness

In Table 5, coefficients of two models with the social safeness and pleasure scale (SSPS) are presented.

[Insert Table 5 here]

The main effect of fear of contraction and the main effect of likelihood of contraction on SSPS were not significant, and all main effects for fears of self-compassion, fears of compassion from others, and fears of compassion from others were significant in both models. Only fears of compassion from others significantly moderated the effect of fear of contraction and likelihood of contraction on the SSPS, across all countries.

Discussion

Taking together recent reports that the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in elevated psychological distress (Rajkuman, 2020) and social isolation (Palgi et al., 2020), and mounting evidence that fears of compassion (especially for self and from others) predict psychological distress (Kirby et al., 2019) and lack of social safeness (Kelly & Dupasquier, 2016), this study aimed to assess fears of compassion across the three flows (for self, from others and for others) and their relationships with psychological distress and social safeness in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Perceived threat of COVID-19 was a significant predictor of higher psychological distress (depression, anxiety and stress) and lower social safeness. This is consistent with other studies which have shown that fears of COVID-19 are related to poor mental health indicators (e.g., Ahorsu et al., 2020; Bitan et al., 2020; Fitzpatrick et al., 2020; Kanovsky & Halamová, 2020; Matos et al., 2021a). This is also in line with research indicating that loneliness and social isolation are prevalent in the context of COVID-19 pandemic (Lee et al., 2020; Palgi et al., 2020; Saltzman et al., 2020).

Thus, it was hypothesised that fears of compassion for self and from others (more so than fears of compassion for others) would predict psychological distress (Kirby et al., 2019) and a lack of social safeness (Kelly & Dupasquier, 2016) during the pandemic. Indeed, in a related study (Matos et al., 2021a) compassion for self and from others were highly associated with lower psychological distress and higher social safeness. In the current study, this hypothesis was supported with all three flows of fears of compassion predicting psychological distress (depression, anxiety and stress) and social safeness. This is consistent with previous findings that compassion as a multidimensional construct predicts psychological distress (Kirby et al., 2019) and social safeness (Kelly & Dupasquier, 2016), and is in accordance with a related study examining the flows of compassion in relation to COVID-19 (Matos et al., 2021a).

Given the findings from a related study (Matos et al., 2021a) which found that self-compassion moderated the relationship between perceived threat of COVID-19 and psychological distress, whilst compassion from others moderated the relationship between fear of contraction of COVID-19 and social safeness, it was hypothesised that fears of compassion would moderate the relationship between the perceived threat of COVID-19 and psychological distress/social safeness. In the next sections we discuss the specific findings that partially support our hypothesis.

Fear of self-compassion

Fears of self-compassion moderated the impact of fear of contraction of COVID-19 on symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, whilst it only moderated the likelihood of contraction of COVID-19 on anxiety. This suggests that fears of being compassionate to oneself magnify the effects of fear of contracting COVID-19 on psychological distress and also strengthen the association between likelihood of contraction and anxiety. For example, when confronted with a threatening context, a person with high fears of self-compassion might fear appearing weak or how that might be perceived in interrelational contexts, or might fear that self-compassion would make them self-indulgent or selfish, or perhaps too self-pitying, and therefore may put on a brave face or shift to a more self-attacking or self-berating style, thus magnifying the effect of the fears of contraction on psychological distress.

This finding is consistent with Matos et al. (2021a) which found self-compassion moderated the impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on psychological distress, and with Matos et al. (2017b) finding that fears of self-compassion mediated the relationship between adverse events and depression and anxiety. Although our study found that fears of self-compassion significantly predicted diminished social safeness in the context of COVID-19, which is in line with previous research reporting fears of self-compassion to be negatively associated with social safeness (Kelly & Dupasquier, 2016), these fears did not moderate the impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on social safeness.

Fear of compassion from others

Fear of compassion from others moderated the impact of fear of contraction of COVID-19 on depression, anxiety and stress, and additionally moderated the impact of likelihood of contraction on depression and anxiety (but not stress). In addition, fears of compassion from others emerged as a significant moderator between the impact of the likelihood of contraction and social safeness. So, it seems that being frightened and resistant to receiving compassion from others amplifies the impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on increased psychological distress and reduced feelings of social safeness. Fears of receiving compassion from others may create a state in which others are seen as threats, and therefore such fears magnify the negative effect of fears of contraction on social safeness in particular.

This is in support of previous research showing that fears of compassion from others was a significant mediator of the impact of adverse events on depression and anxiety symptoms (Matos et al., 2017b), and amplified the depressogenic effect of self-criticism (Hermanto et al., 2016). This is also consistent with Kirby et al. (2019) who found that fears of compassion

for self and from others were both significant predictors of psychological distress. Although this is the first study to explore social safeness in the context of fears of compassion and COVID-19, a previous study found that fears of compassion from others was a mediator between adverse events and paranoid ideation, which can be seen as an indicator of lack of social safeness (Matos et al., 2017b).

Fear of compassion for others

Fear of compassion for others moderated the impact of the fear of contraction of COVID-19 on anxiety only, and did not moderate the relationship between likelihood of contraction and psychological distress. This finding may again be related to the notion that during the COVID-19 pandemic, others have become threats, fueling fears of contraction, and therefore inhibiting compassion involving contact with others, either receiving compassion from others or offering compassion to others, resulting in increased anxiety. This is consistent with findings from the related study (Matos et al., 2021a) which found compassion for others did not moderate the relationship, and previous findings which have generally found that fears of compassion for others has less impact on psychological distress (Kirby et al., 2019).

Overall, these results extend the findings from Matos et al. (2021a) where self-compassion was the only flow that emerged as a significant moderator in relation to mental health outcomes, and indicate that when going beyond compassion to consider the inhibitors of compassionate motivation, a distinct pattern of results emerges with the three flows of fears of compassion all magnifying the impact of perceived threat of COVID-19 on psychological distress, across all 21 countries. Therefore, the inability to activate compassionate motivational systems across the three flows negatively affects psychological health and well-being in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, the pandemic and associated social distancing measures may contribute to heightened fear experiences, focused for example in others becoming potential threats or in one being potentially dangerous to others (Schimmenti et al., 2020), and seem to be related to increased paranoia and conspiratorial thinking (Larsen et al. 2020). Thus, under this global threat that is the COVID-19 pandemic, understanding and addressing the factors underlying the experience fears of compassion might be relevant to promote psychosocial well-being.

While the course of the COVID-19 pandemic will likely change over time, its effects on mental health and psychosocial well-being are likely to persist well into the future (Prout et al., 2020). Thus, the implementation of community-based strategies to support resilience and promote

mental health in this period is critical (Serafini et al., 2020). The current study has demonstrated that fears of compassion magnify the pervasive effects of perceived threat of COVID-19 on psychological distress and social safeness. Thus, compassion-focused interventions could be used to reduce inhibitors of compassionate motivation to protect against mental health difficulties during and following the pandemic. In particular, CMT has been shown effective in diminishing fears of compassion across the three flows with a positive impact on mental well-being (Dupasquier et al., 2018; Fox et al., 2020; Matos et al, 2017a) and can be delivered online, and in group or individual format (McEwan et al., 2015, 2018). Indeed, recent studies have documented that compassion-focused interventions can ameliorate psychological distress in the specific context of the pandemic (Cheli et al., 2020; Schnepper et al., 2020). Moreover, psychological interventions that decrease anxiety and depression may boost immune responses to vaccines (Madison et al., 2021; Vedhara et al., 2019), and hence future research could investigate CMT as a possible facilitator of the efficacy of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. For wider impact amongst the general population, authorities and policy makers could implement compassionate social marketing and public health communications to reduce fears of COVID-19 and resistances to compassion, and promote psychosocial wellbeing.

Limitations and future directions

As with any multinational study there may be differences across countries which can affect the results. In this case the differences in rates of COVID-19 and Government responses to the pandemic may affect variables such as psychological distress and the amount of social contact people receive in different countries. It is therefore reassuring that the results of this study were found to be consistent across countries. It is also important to note that the sample is not entirely representative, in the respect that more female participants consented to take part in the study, and there was no representation from the continent of Africa. Thus, in the future research should attempt to recruit more men and greater efforts should be made to collect data across all continents. Finally, the cross-sectional nature of the study prevents the establishment of causality, although the study is currently collecting longitudinal data throughout the pandemic.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the present study demonstrates the universal magnifying effects of fears of compassion, in particular fears of self-compassion and of receiving compassion from others,

on the damaging impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and social safeness. Addressing the harmful effects of the pandemic on mental health and social relationships (e.g., Gloster et al., 2021; Palgi et al., 2020) should be treated as a public health priority. Public health policy-makers and providers should adopt compassion focused interventions and communications to reduce fears of compassion and thus foster resilience and mental wellbeing during and in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic.

References

Ahorsu, D. K., Lin, C.-Y., Imani, V., Saffari, M., Griffiths, M. D., & Pakpour, A. H. (2020). The fear of COVID-19 scale: development and initial validation. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00270-8.

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1), 1–48.

Barnier, J., Briatte, F., & Larmarange, J. (2017). Functions to Make Surveys Processing Easier. Package 'questionr', Version 0.6.2. Retrieved from: https://juba.github.io/questionr/

Barton, K. (2015) Package 'MuMIn'. Model selection and model averaging based on information criteria. R package version 1.15.11.

Bitan, D. T., Grossman-Giron, A., Bloch, Y., Mayer, Y., Shiffman, N., & Mendlovic, S. (2020). Fear of COVID-19 scale: psychometric characteristics, reliability and validity in the Israeli population. *Psychiatry Research, 113100*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113100

Carter, C. S. (2014). Oxytocin pathways and the evolution of human behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 17–39.

Carvalho, S.A., Pinto-Gouveia, J., Gillanders, D. & Castilho, P. (2019). Obstacles to social safeness in women with chronic pain: The role of fears of compassion. *Current Psychology.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00489-2

Cheli, S., Cavalletti, V. & Petrocchi, N. (2020). An online compassion-focused crisis intervention during COVID-19 lockdown: a cases series on patients at high risk for psychosis, *Psychosis,* 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1080/17522439.2020.1786148

Cohen, S. (2021). Psychosocial vulnerabilities to upper respiratory infectious illness: Implications for susceptibility to coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 16*(1), 161–174. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1745691620942516

Di Bello, M., Carnevali, L., Petrocchi, N., Thayer, J. F., Gilbert, P., and Ottaviani, C. (2020). The compassionate vagus: a meta-analysis on the connection between compassion and heart rate variability. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 116,* 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.06.016

Dias, B.S., Ferreira, C. & Trindade, I.A. (2020). Influence of fears of compassion on body image shame and disordered eating. *Eat Weight Disord 25,* 99–106 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-018-0523-0

Dupasquier, J. R., Kelly, A. C., Moscovitch, D. A., & Vidovic, V. (2018). Practicing self-compassion weakens the relationship between fear of receiving compassion and the desire to conceal negative experiences from others. *Mindfulness*, *9*(2), 500-511. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0792-0

Ebert, A., Edel, M.-A., Gilbert, P., and Brüne, M. (2018). Endogenous oxytocin is associated with the experience of compassion and recalled upbringing in borderline personality disorder. *Depression and Anxiety, 35*, 50–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/ da.22683

Edwards, L. J., Muller, K. E., Wolfinger, R. D., Qaqish, B. F., & Schabenberger, O. (2008). An R2 statistic for fixed effects in the linear mixed model. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(29), 6137–6157.

Fitzpatrick, K. M., Harris, C., & Drawve, G. (2020). Fear of COVID-19 and the mental health consequences in America. *Psychological trauma: theory, research, practice, and policy*, 12, S17–S21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000924

Fox., J., Cattani, K. & Burlingame, G.M. (2020). Compassion focused therapy in a university counseling and psychological services center: A feasibility trial of a new standardized group manual, *Psychotherapy Research*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2020.1783708

Gilbert, P. (2014). The origins and nature of compassion focused therapy. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 53,* 6-41.

Gilbert, P. (ed.) (2017a). *Compassion: Concepts, research and applications*. London: Routledge.

Gilbert, P. (2017b). Compassion: definitions and controversies. In P. Gilbert (ed), *Compassion: Concepts, research and applications* (pp. 3–15). London: Routledge,

Gilbert, P. (2019). Explorations into the nature and function of compassion. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 28,* 108–114.

Gilbert, P. (2020). Compassion: From its evolution to a psychotherapy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 3123.

Gilbert, P., & Mascaro, J. (2017). Compassion: fears, blocks, and resistances: an evolutionary investigation. In E. M. Seppälä, E. Simon-Thomas, S. L. Brown, M. C. Worline, L. Cameron & J. R. Doty (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compassion Science* (pp. 399–420). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gilbert, P., Catarino, F., Duarte, C., Matos, M., Kolts, R., Stubbs, J., Ceresatto, L., Duarte, J., Pinto-Gouveia. J & Basran, J. (2017). The development of compassionate engagement and action scales for self and others. *Journal of Compassionate Health Care*, 4(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40639-017-0033-3

Gilbert, P., McEwan, K., Mitra, R., Franks, L., Richter, A., & Rockliff, H. (2008). Feeling safe and content: A specific affect regulation system? Relationship to depression, anxiety, stress, and self-criticism. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *3*(3), 182-191.

Gilbert, P., McEwan, K., Matos, M., & Rivis, A. (2011). Fears of compassion: Development of three self report measures. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 84,* 239-255. https://doi.org/10.1348/147608310X526511

Gloster, A. T., Lamnisos, D., Lubenko, J., Presti, G., Squatrito, V., Constantinou, M., Nicolaou, C., Papacostas, S., Aydın, G., Chong, Y. Y., Chien, W. T., Cheng, H. Y., Ruiz, F. J., Garcia-Martin, M. B., Obando-Posada, D. P., Segura-Vargas, M. A., Vasiliou, V. S., McHugh, L., Höfer, S., Baban, A., … Karekla, M. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health: An international study. *PloS one, 15*(12), e0244809. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244809

Hermanto, N., Zuroff, D.C., Kopala-Sibley, D.C., Kelly, A.C., Matos, M, & Gilbert, P. (2016). Ability to receive compassion from others buffers the depressogenic effect of self-criticism: A cross-cultural multi-study analysis: *Personality and Individual Differences* 98, 324–332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.055

Holmes, E. A., O'Connor, R. C., Perry, V. H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., ... & Bullmore, E. (2020). Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1

Hox J. J., Moerbeek, M. & Van de Schoot, R. (2017), *Multilevel analysis: techniques and applications.* 3rd ed., London: Routledge.

Jiménez, O., Sánchez-Sánchez, L.C. & García-Montes, J.M. (2020). Psychological Impact of COVID-19 Confinement and Its Relationship with Meditation. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 17*, 6642.

Kanovsky, M. & Halamová, J. (2020). Perceived Threat of the Coronavirus and the Role of Trust in Safeguards: A Case Study in Slovakia. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 11:554160. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.554160

Kavaklı, M., Ak, M., Uğuz, F. & Türkmen, O.O. (2020). The mediating role of self-compassion in the relationship between perceived COVID-19 threat and death anxiety. *Turkish J Clinical Psychiatry, 23*, 15-23. https://doi.org/10.5505/kpd.2020.59862.

Kelly, A. C., & Dupasquier, J. (2016). Social safeness mediates the relationship between recalled parental warmth and the capacity for self-compassion and receiving compassion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *89*, 157-161. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.017

Kim, J. J., Parker, S. L., Doty, J. R., Cunnington, R., Gilbert, P., & Kirby, J. N. (2020). Neurophysiological and behavioural markers of compassion. *Scientific Reports*, *10*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-63846-3

Kirby, J.N., Tellegen, C.L. & Steindl, S.R. (2017a). A Meta-Analysis of Compassion-Based Interventions: Current State of Knowledge and Future Directions. *Behavior Therapy, 48(6),* 778-792. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2017.06.003

Kirby, J. N., Doty, J. R., Petrocchi, N., & Gilbert, P. (2017b). The current and future role of heart rate variability for assessing and training compassion. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *5*, 40. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00040

Kirby, J. N., Day, J., & Sagar, V. (2019). The 'Flow' of compassion: A meta-analysis of the fears of compassion scales and psychological functioning. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *70*, 26-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.03.001

LaHuis, D. M., Hartman, M. J., Hakoyama, S., & Clark, P. C. (2014). Explained variance measures for multilevel models. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(4), 433–451.

Larsen, E. M., Donaldson, K., & Mohanty, A. (2020). Conspiratorial thinking during COVID-19: The roles of paranoia, delusion-proneness, and intolerance to uncertainty. *Preprint manuscript*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/mb65f

Lee, C. M., Cadigan, J. M., & Rhew, I. C. (2020). Increases in Loneliness Among Young Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Association with Increases in Mental Health Problems. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine, 67*(5), 714–717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.08.009.

Li, A., Wang, S., Cai, M., Sun, R. & Liu, X. (2021). Self-compassion and life-satisfaction among Chinese self-quarantined residents during COVID-19 pandemic: A moderated mediation

model of positive coping and gender. *Personality and Individual Differences, 170.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110457.

Lindsey, S. (2017) *Examining the Psychometric Properties of the Compassionate Engagement and Action Scales in the General Population*. Other thesis, University of Essex.

Lopez, A., Sanderman, R., Ranchor, A. V., & Schroevers, M. J. (2018). Compassion for others and self-compassion: Levels, correlates, and relationship with psychological well-being. *Mindfulness, 9,* 325–331. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0777-z.

Lovibond, S. H. & Lovibond, P. F. (1995). *Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales*. *(2nd. Ed.)* Sydney: Psychology Foundation.

Lüdecke, D. (2018). sjPlot: Data visualization for statistics in social science. (R package version 2.6.1). Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package =sjPlot

Madison, A. A., Shrout, M. R., Renna, M. E., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (2021). Psychological and Behavioral Predictors of Vaccine Efficacy: Considerations for COVID-19. *Perspectives on Psychological Science,* 1745691621989243. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691621989243

Matos, M., Duarte, C., Duarte, J., Pinto-Gouveia, J., Petrocchi, N., Basran, J. & Gilbert, P. (2017a). Psychological and physiological effects of compassionate mind training: A pilot randomized controlled study. *Mindfulness, 8* (6), 1699-1712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0745-7

Matos, M., McEwan, K., Kanovský, M., Halamová, J., Steindl, S., Ferreira, N., Linharelhos, M., Rijo, D., Asano, K., Gregório, S., Márquez, M., Vilas, S. Brito-Pons, G., Lucena-Santos, P., Oliveira, M., Souza, E., Llobenes, L., Gumiy, N., Costa, M.,… & Gilbert, P. (2021a). Compassion protects mental health and social safeness during the COVID-19 pandemic across 21 countries. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

Matos, M., Duarte, C., Duarte, J., Pinto-Gouveia, J., Petrocchi, N., & Gilbert, P. (2021b). Cultivating the compassionate self: An exploration of the mechanisms of change in compassionate mind training. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

Mascaro, J. S., Florian, M. P., Ash, M. J., Palmer, P. K., Frazier, T., Condon, P., & Raison, C. (2020). Ways of knowing compassion: How do we come to know, understand, and measure compassion when we see it? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.547241

MacBeth, A. & Gumley, A. (2012). Exploring compassion: a meta-analysis of the association between self-compassion and psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology Review, 32*, 545–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.06.003

McEwan, K., Elander, J. & Gilbert, P. (2018). Evaluation of a web-based self-compassion intervention to reduce student assessment anxiety. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology, 2,* 6.

McEwan, K. & Gilbert, P. (2015). A pilot feasibility study exploring the practicing of compassionate imagery exercises in a nonclinical population. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1111/papt.12078.

Merritt, O.A. & Purdon, C.L. (2020). Scared of compassion: Fear of compassion in anxiety, mood, and non-clinical groups. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59*, 3. 354-368. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjc.12250

Murphy, D., Williamson, C., Baumann, J., Busuttil, W., & Fear, N. T. (2020). Exploring the impact of COVID-19 and restrictions to daily living as a result of social distancing within veterans with pre-existing mental health difficulties. *BMJ military health,* bmjmilitary-2020-001622. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjmilitary-2020-001622

Nakagawa, S., & Schielzeth, H. (2013). A general and simple method for obtaining R2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4(2), 133-142.

Nitschke, J. P., Forbes, P. A., Ali, N., Cutler, J., Apps, M. A., Lockwood, P. L., & Lamm, C. (2020). Resilience during uncertainty? Greater social connectedness during COVID-19 lockdown is associated with reduced distress and fatigue. *British Journal of Health Psychology.* https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12485

Palgi, Y., Shrira, A., Ring, L., Bodner, E., Avidor, S., Bergman, Y., ... & Hoffman, Y. (2020). The loneliness pandemic: Loneliness and other concomitants of depression, anxiety and their comorbidity during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 275, 109-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.06.036

Petrocchi, N., & Cheli, S. (2019). The social brain and heart rate variability: implications for psychotherapy. *Psychology and Psychotherapy,* 92, 208–223. https://doi.org/10.1111/papt.12224

Porges, S. W. (2007). The polyvagal perspective. *Biological Psychology, 74,* 116–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2006.06.009.

Prout, T. A., Zilcha-Mano, S., Aafjes-van Doorn, K., Békés, V., Christman-Cohen, I., Whistler, K., Kui, T., & Di Giuseppe, M. (2020). Identifying Predictors of Psychological Distress During COVID-19: A Machine Learning Approach. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 586202. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.586202

R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from http:/ /www.R-project.org/.

R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from http:/ /www.R-project.org/.

Rajkuman, P. (2020). COVID-19 and mental health: A review of the existing literature. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 52, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102066

Saltzman, L. Y., Hansel, T. C., & Bordnick, P. S. (2020). Loneliness, isolation, and social support factors in post-COVID-19 mental health. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 12, S55–S57. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000703

Schimmenti, A., Billieux, J., & Starcevic, V. (2020). The four horsemen of fear: An integrated model of understanding fear experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry*, *17*(2), 41-45. https://doi.org/10.36131/CN20200202

Schnepper, R., Reichenberger, J. & Blechert, J. (2020) Being My Own Companion in Times of Social Isolation – A 14-Day Mobile Self-Compassion Intervention Improves Stress Levels and Eating Behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:595806. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.595806

Seppälä, E. M., Simon-Thomas, E., Brown, S. L., Worline, M. C., Cameron, C. D., & Doty, J. R. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of compassion science*. Oxford University Press.

Serafini, G., Parmigiani, B., Amerio, A., Aguglia, A., Sher, L., & Amore, M. (2020). The psychological impact of COVID-19 on the mental health in the general population. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine*, *113*(8), 531-537. https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcaa201

Singer, T., and Engert, V. (2019). It matters what you practice: differential training effects on subjective experience, behavior, brain and body in the ReSource project. *Current Opinion in Psychology,* 28, 151–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc. 2018.12.005

Snijders, T. A. B. & Bosker, R. J. (2012). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modelling* , 2nd ed., Sage.

Steindl, S., Matos, M. & Creed, A. (2018). Early Shame and Safeness Memories, and Later Depressive Symptoms and Safe Affect: The Mediating Role of Self-Compassion. *Current Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9990-8

Stevens, J., and Woodruff, C. C. (2018). *The neuroscience of empathy, compassion and self-compassion*. London: Academic Press.

Van Damme, W., & Van Lerberghe, W. (2000). Epidemics and fear. Tropical Medicine and International Health, 5(8), 511-514. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.2000.00599.x

Vedhara, K., Ayling, K., Sunger, K., Caldwell, D. M., Halliday, V., Fairclough, L., Avery, A., Robles, L., Garibaldi, J., Welton, N. J., & Royal, S. (2019). Psychological interventions as vaccine adjuvants: A systematic review. *Vaccine, 37*(25), 3255–3266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.04.091

Vinkers, C. H., van Amelsvoort, T., Bisson, J. I., Branchi, I., Cryan, J. F., Domschke, K., ... & van der Wee, N. J. (2020). Stress resilience during the coronavirus pandemic. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, *35*, 12-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2020.05.003

Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C. S., & Ho, R. C. (2020a). Immediate Psychological Responses and Associated Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Epidemic among the General Population in China. International journal of environmental research and public health, 17(5), 1729. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051729

Wang, S., Zhang, Y., Ding, W., Meng, Y., Hu, H., Liu, Z., . . . Wang, M. (2020b). Psychological distress and sleep problems when people are under interpersonal isolation during an epidemic: A nationwide multicenter cross-sectional study. *European Psychiatry, 63*(1), E77. https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.78

Weng, H. Y., Fox, A. S., Shackman, A. J., Stodola, D. E., Caldwell, J. Z., Olson, M. C., et al. (2013). Compassion training alters altruism and neural responses to suffering. *Psychological Science,* 24, 1171–1180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612469537

Wong, S., Zhang, D., Sit, R., Yip, B., Chung, R. Y., Wong, C., Chan, D., Sun, W., Kwok, K. O., & Mercer, S. W. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on loneliness, mental health, and health service utilisation: a prospective cohort study of older adults with multimorbidity in primary care. *The British journal of general practice: The journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners, 70*(700), e817–e824. https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp20X713021

World Health Organization (WHO) (2020). Mental health and psychosocial considerations during the COVID-19 outbreak. World Health Organization. Retrieved from https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331490/WHO-2019-nCoV-MentalHealth-2020.1-eng.pdf

Worldometer – COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic. Retrieved 11th February 2021. Available at: https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/

Table 1

The likelihood-ratio tests and information criteria AIC and BIC for the different models

Model	Predictor	Moderator	deviance	χ² (df)	p-value	AIC	BIC
1a			66258			66268	66305
1b	fear of contraction	Fear of compassion for self	62552	3706(14)	< .001	62590	62731
1c			62481	71 (3)	< .001	62525	62688
2a			66393			66403	66440
2b	likelihood of contraction	Fear of compassion for self	62744	3649 (14)	< .001	62782	62923
2c			62732	13 (3)	NS	62776	62939
3a			67073			67083	67120
3b	fear of contraction	Fear of compassion for others	63505	3569 (14)	< .001	63543	63684
3c			63482	23 (3)	< .001	63526	63689
4a			67217			67227	67264
4b	likelihood of contraction	Fear of compassion for others	63706	3512 (14)	< .001	63744	63884
4c			63696	10 (3)	NS	63740	63903
5a			66466			66476	66513
5b	fear of contraction	Fear of compassion from others	62808	3658 (14)	< .001	62846	62987
5c			62755	52 (3)	< .001	62799	62962
6a			66599			66609	66646
6b	likelihood of contraction	Fear of compassion from others	62998	3601 (14)	< .001	63036	63177
6c			62965	34 (3)	< .001	63009	63172

Table 2

Coefficients of the best-fitting models for fear of compassion for self

	fixed effects		
Model 1c	**main effects**		**moderation**
β [95% CI]	**fear of contraction**	**Fear of compassion for self**	**fear:for self**
Anxiety	0.32 [0.29:0.36]***	0.12 [0.11:0.13]***	0.013 [0.010:0.016]***
Depression	0.19 [0.15:0.24]***	0.21 [0.20:.22]***	0.009 [0.005:0.012]***
Stress	0.35 [0.30:0.39]***	0.16 [0.14:0.17]***	0.008 [0.004:0.011]***
	random effects		
σ²	**respondents**	**countries**	
Anxiety	6.86	9.67	residual = 4.49
Depression	11.24	23.00	R^2 (marginal) = .114
Stress	12.32	38.36	R^2 (conditional) = ..896
Model 2b	**main effects**		**moderation**
β [95% CI]	**likelihood of contraction**	**Fear of compassion for self**	**likelihood:for self**
Anxiety	0.16 [0.13:0.20]***	0.14 [0.13:0.15]***	N/A
Depression	0.12 [0.08:0.16]***	0.22 [0.21:0.23]***	N/A
Stress	0.23 [0.19:0.27]***	0.17 [0.15:0.18]***	N/A
	random effects		
σ²	**respondents**	**countries**	
Anxiety	7.70	10.23	residual = 4.41
Depression	11:58	22.39	R^2 (marginal) = .103
Stress	12.92	38.96	R^2 (conditional) = .900

Table 3

Coefficients of the best-fitting models for fear of compassion for others

	fixed effects		
Model 3c	**main effects**		**Moderation**
β [95% CI]	**fear of contraction**	**Fear of compassion for others**	**fear:for others**
Anxiety	0.40 [0.36:0.44]***	0.002 ns	0.010(0.08:0.12) ***
Depression	0.27 [0.22:0.32]***	0.13 [0.12:0.15] ***	0.005(-0.01:0.10)
Stress	0.40 [0.36:0.45]***	0.10(0.08:0.12)	0.004(-0.01:0.009)
	random effects		
σ²	**Respondents**	**Countries**	
Anxiety	8.41	9.66	residual = 4.49
Depression	15.42	23.14	R² (marginal) = .050
Stress	14.62	38.43	R² (conditional) = .896
Model 4b	**main effects**		**Moderation**
β [95% CI]	**likelihood of contraction**	**Fear of compassion for others**	**likelihood:for others**
Anxiety	0.20 [0.17:0.24]***	0.10 [0.09:0.12]***	N/A
Depression	0.18 [0.14:0.23]***	0.15 [0.13:0.17]***	N/A
Stress	0.28 [0.23:0.32]***	0.12 [0.10:0.14]***	N/A
	random effects		
σ²	**Respondents**	**Countries**	
Anxiety	9.97	10.02	residual = 3.66
Depression	16.53	23.32	R² (marginal) = .037
Stress	16.00	38.77	R² (conditional) = .916

Table 4

Coefficients of best-fitting models for fear of compassion from others

	fixed effects		
Model 5c	**main effects**		**Moderation**
β [95% CI]	**fear of contraction**	**Fear of compassion from others**	**fear:from others**
Anxiety	0.33 [0.29:0.37]***	0.13 [0.12:0.16]***	0.013 [0.009:0.16]***
Depression	0.20 [0.16:0.25]***	0.22 [0.21:0.24]***	0.009 [0.004:0.013]***
Stress	0.35 [0.31:0.40]***	0.17 [0.15:0.18]***	0.008 [0.004:0.012]*
	random effects		
σ²	**Respondents**	**Countries**	
Anxiety	7.29	9.38	residual = 4.44
Depression	12.34	22.74	R² (marginal) = .103
Stress	12.87	38.17	R² (conditional) = .897
Model 6c	**main effects**		**Moderation**
β [95% CI]	**likelihood of contraction**	**Fear of compassion from others**	**likelihood:from others**
Anxiety	0.17 [0.13:0.20]***	0.15 [0.14:0.16]***	0.008 [0.004:0.011]***
Depression	0.13 [0.08:0.17]***	023 [0.22:0.24]***	0.009(0.006:0.013) ***
Stress	0.24 [0.19:0.28]***	0.18 [0.16:0.19]***	0.005(-0.01:0.09)
	random effects		
σ²	**Respondents**	**Countries**	
Anxiety	8.78	9.82	residual = 3.61
Depression	13.33	22.95	R² (marginal) = .091
Stress	14.19	38.59	R² (conditional) = .917

Table 5

Coefficients of the two models related to social safeness and connectedness (SPSS)

Model 1	fixed effects		
	main effects		moderation
β [95% CI]	**Intercept**	**Fear of compassion from self**	**fear:for self**
	40.49 [39.82:41.15]***	-0.12 [-0.15:-0.09]***	0.001 ns
	fear of contraction	**Fear of compassion for others**	**fear:for others**
	0.03 [-0.06:.11]	0.09 [0.05:.0.13] ***	0.013 ns
		Fear of compassion from others	**fear:from others**
		-0.53 [-0.57:-0.49]***	-0.009 [-0.021:0.003]
	random effects		
σ²	**countries**	**residual**	R² (marginal) = .351
	1.92	61.17	R² (conditional) = .371
Model 2	fixed effects		
	main effects		Moderation
β [95% CI]	**Intercept**	**Fear of compassion from self**	**likelihood:for self**
	40.52 [39.85:41. 81]***	-0.11 [-0.15:-0.08]***	0.009 ns
	likelihood of contraction	**Fear of compassion for others**	**likelihood:for others**
	-0.08 [-0.15:.0.01]	0.09 (0.05:0.13)***	0.013 ns
		Fear of compassion from others	**likelihood:from others**
		-0. 35 [-0.56:-0.496]***	-0.026 (-0.037:-0.014) *
	random effects		
σ²	**countries**	**Residual**	R² (marginal) = .351
	1.96	60.91	R² (conditional) = .372

Figure 1
Marginal effects of moderation of the fear of self-compassion in the case of fear of contraction

Supplementary Online Material 1

Research samples with sociodemographic information

Country	Size	Male	Female	Other	I prefer not to respond	Mean Age	SD Age
Argentina	257	33	223	0	1	46.48	12.151
Australia	109	16	92	1	0	49.31	14.594
Brazil	299	31	267	1	0	42.79	12.534
Canada	115	24	89	0	2	48.41	18.886
China	77	28	48	0	1	39.95	15.024
Chile	282	32	250	0	0	45.91	11.498
Columbia	50	11	39	0	0	46.30	13.132
Cyprus	38	3	35	0	0	31.55	11.608
Denmark	141	23	118	0	0	48.82	11.869
France	115	21	94	0	0	46.71	16.337
Great Britain	268	30	236	1	1	46.62	13.808
Greece	145	15	130	0	0	35.60	13.532
Italy	160	40	120	0	0	41.47	12.988
Japan	522	183	326	4	9	29.56	13.421
Mexico	181	35	144	0	2	46.89	12.125
Poland	82	12	69	0	1	43.94	12.471
Portugal	394	82	310	1	1	42.16	12.838
Saudi Arabia	256	24	226	0	6	23.89	8.008
Slovakia	46	6	40	0	0	34.89	10.067
Spain	392	78	314	0	0	46.81	12.478
USA	128	12	109	7	0	48.18	14.817

Supplementary Online Materials 2

R code syntax for the model

```
library(lme4) # fit of model

library(questionr) # mean centaring

library(sjPlot) # graphs displaying

library(MuMIn) # R² estimation

# Mean centering code

center_colmeans <- function(x) {

xcenter = colMeans(x)

x - rep(xcenter, rep.int(nrow(x), ncol(x)))

}

dat = subset(data,select=c(3,4,5,6,7)) # data manipulation

data1 = center_colmeans(dat) # mean centering

data1 = rename.variable(data1, "FOCSself", "FOCSselfC") # data manipulation

data1 = rename.variable(data1, "FOCSto", "FOCStoC") # data manipulation

data1 = rename.variable(data1, "FOCSfrom", "FOCSfromC") # data manipulation

data1 = rename.variable(data1, "PTCSfear", "PTCSfearC") # data manipulation

data1 = rename.variable(data1, "PTCSlike", "PTCSlikeC") # data manipulation

data = cbind(data,data1) # data manipulation

# fitting of a multivariate multilevel model

mX = lmer(DASS~dim:(PTCSfearC*FOCSselfC) − 1 + (0+dim|country) + (0+dim|subject), data =
data, control = lmerControl(optCtrl = list(method = "nlminb"), optimizer = "bobyqa",
check.nobs.vs.nlev = "ignore", check.nobs.vs.nRE = "ignore"))

# fitting of a univariate multilevel model

mX                                                                                            =
lmer(SSPS~PTCSfearC+FOCSselfC+FOCSforC+FOCSfromC+PTCSfearC:FOCSselfC+PTCSfearC:FOCSf
orC+PTCSfearC:FOCSfromC + (1|country), data = data,

# plotting marginal fixed effects

plot_model(mX,type="pred",terms = c("PTCSfearC","FOCSselfC","dim"))
```