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Mounting evidence supports the position that human beings are inherently emotional beings and that emotion and affective development impacts human development and behavior in a wide variety of important ways. This paper provides an overview of emotion and the affective domain, including developmental considerations and methods that can be used to facilitate development in this domain. Also discussed are instruments and methods to assessment emotional and affective development.

Life in America at the dawning of the 21st century exhibits a complex tapestry of distressful social and cultural problems, including public school and church shootings, racial and ethnic tensions, apathy and cynicism in the political sphere, grave challenges to the family unit, and disturbing levels of youth violence, drug abuse, alcoholism, and teen pregnancy. All of these problems have an important feature in common – they are heavily influenced and, in some cases, dominated by the power of human emotions (Goleman, 1995; Greenspan, 1997; LeDoux, 1996). Most psychologists agree that the study of emotion and the affective domain is one of the most perplexing topics in the field of psychology (Plutchik, 2001). However, even the somewhat confusing picture produced to date has led researchers to conclude that one’s emotional awareness and ability to manage emotions may be even more important than IQ in determining success and contentment throughout all areas of life (Gardner, 1995; Sternberg, Wagner, Williams & Horvath, 1995).

A variety of definitions have been provided for emotion and its relation to the affective domain. Aristotle gave one of the earliest when he described emotions as “all those feelings that so change [people] as to affect their judgments, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure” (Jenkins, Oatley & Stein, 1998; p. 7). However, Plutchik (2001) estimated that more than 90 different definitions of emotion were proposed throughout the 20th century. One of the most well-known was provided by Goleman (1995) who defined emotion as, “a feeling and its distinctive thoughts, psychological and biological states, and range of propensities to act” (p. 289).

The affective domain refers to emotions as well as their outward expression. As with the concept of emotion, descriptions of the affective domain are rather vague, lacking a universal, operationalized definition. While emotion is at the core of the affective domain, it spreads quickly from there. This is because emotion is often seen as involving three subcomponents: feeling, cognition, and behavior. Feeling is the physiological sensation one experiences. Cognition is the subjective thoughts that accompany the sensation. Behavior, which might be facial display, body positioning, or a variety of other actions, is related to both feelings and accompanying cognitions. Thus, the affective domain encompasses physiological, cognitive, and behavioral processes related to emotion. It also encompasses our awareness or discernment of our and other’s emotions, the ability to connect our emotions to those of others, the display of emotion, and the ability to manage or regulate one’s emotions.
While the affective domain has been a subject of research for centuries, there are three individuals who are typically considered the founding fathers of research on emotions: Charles Darwin (1998), William James (1884), and Sigmund Freud (1960). Darwin founded his concept of ethology with observations of emotional expression in natural settings and connected them to human evolution. James emphasized physiological changes in the body and showed that emotions are involved in monitoring our bodies. Freud offered the method of listening to what people said about their emotional lives and people may need to discuss their emotions with others in order to be understood. More recently the concept of appraisal has become an important influence on research in the affective domain.

Theories of Emotion

As with any concept, researchers and theorists have differing views as to the function and importance of the affective domain. Some see it as a regulatory system whereas others see it as an activation system. Some see emotion as a precipitating event whereas others see it as a resulting event. This section will discuss some of the current theories and models.

In the Communicative Theory (Oatley & Johnson-Laird, 1995), emotions are viewed as caused by conscious or unconscious cognitive evaluations. Each evaluation produces a signal that is transmitted through multiple processors of cognitive architecture to produce a basic emotion. This signal functions to control organization of the brain in order to ready the mechanisms of action and bodily resources, to direct attention, to set up biases of cognitive processing, and to make the issue the caused the emotions salient in consciousness. The phenomenological experience of the signal is a distinctive feeling, or emotion (e.g. happiness, sadness, anger, etc.). Thus, in essence, emotions are seen as managing goals.

The Feedback Theory (Parkinson & Manstead, 1992) assumes that emotions arise as a consequence of a bodily reaction, rather than cognitive appraisals of a presenting situation. This theory dates to William James (1884), who drew attention to the fact the bodily responses, including facial, postural, motor, and autonomic changes, are central aspects to our idea of experiencing emotion. Our relationship with an object evoking the emotion is expressed through the body (e.g., turn away from unpleasant sights, approach pleasant sights). Thus, part of experiencing emotion is to feel oneself expressing a physical attitude toward an object. Furthermore, James proposed that feelings are a result, rather than cause of emotional behavior (e.g., we are happy because we smile).

A similar theory, the Discrete Emotion Theory (Fogel, Nwokah, Dedo, Messinger, Dickson, Matusov, and Hold, 1992) suggests that emotions organize and motivate action such that a discrete emotion can be defined as a particular set of neural processes that lead to a specific expression and a corresponding specific feeling. The emotion program is believed to be phylogenetically adapted with respect to the basic function of survival. This theory breaks down each emotion, suggesting that patterns of neural stimulation cause associated changes in feeling, and are associated with distinct sets of facial, vocal, respiratory, skin, and muscle responses. These theorists focus primarily on the face in expression of emotion, and believe emotional development is controlled by maturation of the central nervous system (CNS), and that the organism must learn rules that modify and modulate expression. An example of research that supports this position had participants hold a pencil between their teeth for a period of time, a task that uses the facial muscles involved with smiling. Results showed that the participants reported feeling happy.
According to the Functionalist Model (Campos, Mumme, Kermoian, & Campos, 1994), emotion is “the attempt by the person to establish, maintain, change, or terminate the relation between the person and the environment on matters of significance to the person” (p. 285). This model is closely aligned with Lazarus’ Relational model (1991) discussed in more detail below. Emotional development begins with a core set of CNS emotions programs, which are defined with respect to basic functional or survival relationships between the individual and environment, and involve tendencies of the entire body. Emotions are part of innate routines for social communication and serve to initiate and maintain contact with others.

Lastly, the Social-Constructivist Model of Emotion (Jenkins et al., 1998), similar to the functionalist model, also views emotional experience as embedded in the conditions that justify it. This perspective emphasizes that we learn to give meaning to our experiences through our social exposure and cognitive developmental capacities. Thus, one’s emotional experience is contingent upon specific factors, which contribute to our learning what it means to feel something and then do something about it.

**Appraisal and Viability**

Magda Arnold introduced the concept of appraisal into emotions research around 1954 (Jenkins et al., 1998). Building on the ideas of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas, Arnold developed the view that emotions are judgments of the relation of objects and events to goals. Since then, there has been a host of research on the issue of appraisal in emotion research.

In describing his Relational Model of emotion, Lazarus (1991) wrote that appraisal involves an appreciation of a particular harm or benefit in the relationship with the environment and carries with it implications for well-being, action, and coping. Simply put, emotions can be viewed as reactions to events perceived as significant by the individual. However, a reaction must include recognition that the event carries significance for one’s personal well-being in order to count as emotional. Thus, one’s reaction is generated as a consequence of evaluation of the situation and the individual’s relation to it.

Lazarus (1991) identified three aspects of appraisal: primary, secondary, and reappraisal. Primary appraisal concerns whether something of relevance to one’s well-being has occurred (i.e., does the person have a personal stake in an encounter). Secondary appraisal concerns coping options (i.e., whether a given action may prevent, ameliorate, or produce harm or benefit). Finally, all encounters with the environment are in a continual state of change. Primary and secondary appraisals are continually changing, and feedback from the environment and one’s actions constitute new information that must be evaluated. Lazarus termed this third process of evaluation reappraisal. Therefore, in reappraisal, the original encounter is reevaluated in terms of the success or failure of implemented coping strategies.

Lazarus (1991) elaborated on both primary and secondary appraisal, breaking each down into three subcomponents. Primary appraisal includes goal relevance, goal congruence or incongruence, and type of ego-involvement. Goal relevance refers to whether or not one cares about or has a personal stake in an encounter. Goal congruence or incongruence refers to the extent to which a transaction foils or facilitates one’s personal goals. Type of ego-involvement refers to aspects of one’s ego-identity.

Secondary appraisal includes the subcomponents blame or credit, coping potential, and future expectations. Blame and credit deal with the process of determining who is accountable or responsible for an emotion resulting from an encounter. Coping potential refers to an evaluation
of one’s ability to manage the demands of an encounter. Future expectancy deals with whether things are likely to change psychologically for the better or worse (i.e., become more or less goal congruent).

In the ongoing story of each human life, inside the brain of every individual, there are complex systems that are making an appraisal, moment by moment, both unconsciously and consciously, of whether or not there are threats or opportunities confronting the individual (Damasio, 1999). The inputs to the appraisal mechanism are both internal and external. Internal threats and opportunities can originate from the organs and physiology of the body or from processes occurring within the mind. External threats and opportunities can originate in the physical environment or in the realm of social interaction. However, the affective domain’s importance does not end with appraisal. Once a situation is appraised, one must make a decision as to what course of action should be taken to respond to the situation. Thus, cognitive processing and accompanying behavior are seen as embedded with affective domain.

Mechanisms of Emotion. In the appraisal/viability theory of human emotions, the affective system in every person is simultaneously the home of the most sublime human experiences and darkest impulses. To achieve the goal of enhancing personal viability, the affective system integrates the highest and most advanced regions of the human brain with ancient parts that evolved at a time when reptiles ruled the earth. The appraisal mechanism is operating constantly and utilizes diverse processes (LeDoux, 1996). Depending on the situation an individual is facing, to make the viability determination, the appraisal mechanism uses either rapid stimulus or pattern recognition processing (Goleman, 1995; LeDoux; Niehoff, 1999) or complex, personal and cultural rules that can be labeled as emotional schemas (Greenberg, Rice & Elliott, 1993; Nathanson, 1992; Ohmdahl, 1995; Ortney, Clore & Collins, 1988). These two aspects of the affective appraisal system interact constantly and are actually identified with different parts of the brain (Carter, 1998; LeDoux). The rapid stimulus or pattern recognition aspect of the appraisal mechanism depends upon the amygdala, the hypothalamus, and the brain stem, brain structures active at an exclusively unconscious level and the home of emotional memory, the mind-body link, and the fight-or-flight mechanism (Carter; Damasio, 1999; LeDoux; Rossi, 1993). The portion of the appraisal mechanism processing emotional schemas does so in the prefrontal cortex of the brain, which is the home of conscious emotions, rational planning, and decision-making.

A threat situation is often experienced with a concurrent and negative emotion such as fear, anger, hostility, envy, disliking, hatred, guilt, shame, sadness, pain, or surprise. Depending on the situation, the intensity level and duration of the emotion can vary (LeDoux, 1996; Ortney, Clore and Collins, 1988; Ekman and Davidson, 1994). Perceptions of threats originate from either internal or external sources. When they are perceived, either consciously or unconsciously, the general human response is avoidance.

The opposite of threats are opportunities. An opportunity situation is often experienced with a concurrent, positive emotion such as love, joy, liking, enthusiasm, interest, affection, flow, pleasure, satisfaction, confidence, or surprise. As with threats, the intensity level for opportunities may be very mild or overwhelmingly strong and the duration may be long-lasting or very brief. Perceptions of opportunities also originate from either internal or external sources. When they are perceived, either consciously or unconsciously, the general human response is to approach.

Combined states, such as fear and courage, indicate the push and pull of multiple emotions going on simultaneously. Conflicts between perceived threats and opportunities arise
when attraction and repulsion are experienced simultaneously, as in when a much loved parent
does something hurtful to a child or when achieving some long-desired goal requires finding the
inner courage with which to vanquish an overwhelming fear. Regardless of the situation, in
general, if a situation is perceived as enhancing viability, an individual tends to move towards it,
either physically or psychologically. Likewise, if a situation is perceived as a threat to well-
being, an individual tends to move away from it, all the while internally experiencing the
complex fabric of concurrent, matching, and sometimes conscious human emotions.

The Relationship of the Affective Domain to Other Domains

The affective domain provides a unique arena of human behavior, involving complex
information processing, fundamentally unlike, but intimately related to, all the other domains of
human development. As stated above, the affective domain combines body sensation of feelings,
a perception of positive or negative well-being, the activation of related emotions, and an arousal
for action, such that people tend to approach opportunities which they perceive as helping their
viability and to avoid dangers which undermine it (Carney and Jordan, 1976; Damasio, 1999).
And while development in the affective domain has been related to such disparate topics as
moral character development (Hoffman, 2000), motivation (Gollwitzer & Bargh, 1996),
performance appraisal (Hirt, Levine, McDonald & Melton, 1997), reasoning and problem
solving (Isen, 1993; Murray, Sujan, Hirt & Sujan, 1990; Russ, 1999), self-regulation (Aspinwall,
1998), and spiritual development (Hay & Nye, 1998). it is probably most closely associated with
social behavior (Nathanson, 1992; Pinkar, 1997). The affective domain is seen as contributing to
social interactions through a concept often referred to as social-emotional learning (SEL) skills.
SEL can be defined as “the process through which people learn to recognize and manage
emotions, care about others, make good decisions, behave ethically and responsibly, develop
positive relationships, and avoid negative behavior” (Fredericks, 2003).

Emotions and related SEL skills are important in social interactions because emotional
knowledge and expression function to guide social interactions, both directly and indirectly.
Denham and Weissberg (2003) report that emotion knowledge yields not only information about
emotional expressions and experience in self and others, but also about events in the
environment. Additionally, emotion can play a role in guiding goal-directed behavior, as well as
providing social information to others, thereby affecting their behavior as well (Denham, 1986;
There is accumulating evidence that children who understand and are able to balance their
positive and negative emotions tend to be more prosocially responsive to their peers, are rated as
more likable by their peers, and are rated as more socially skilled by teachers.

Emotional competence is also useful in determining motives and states in others. Human
beings are also biologically hardwired to consciously and unconsciously answer the viability
question as it applies to other people, especially those who are close. People notice the physical
signs of distress in others. Expressive facial movements, tone of voice, and body language are all
observed, though often unconsciously. Individuals listen for signs of anger or happiness, sadness
or joy, in their conversations with others. Just as people are perceiving and inferring the
emotional states of others, so also does each person either broadcast or conceal his or her own
conscious or unconscious affective states through the same channels of communication (Ekman
and Davidson, 1994; Pinkar, 1997). Thus, the viability question becomes elaborated in the social
arena as, "How well are others doing right now," and self-reflexively as "How well do others
think I’m doing right now?” This, in turn, can also affect how others respond in a non-ending, recursive manner.

When the answer to the viability question is negative, an emotional state such as repulsion motivates an individual to either move away from a threat or to make it move away from them. When the answer to the viability question is positive, an emotional state such as acceptance motivates an individual to move towards that which is helping him to feel good or to find ways to bring it closer. In either case, the issue is distance (interpreted either physically, psychologically, or socially, depending on context). No doubt human ancestors long ago learned that viability would be increased if threats prompted an increase in distance and opportunities prompted a decrease.

Summary

Basic emotions have evolved to deal with fundamental life tasks. In the continuous, complex, and moment by moment flow of daily existence, the affective system enables human beings to answer the most fundamental question of survival: "How well am I doing right now?" In the ongoing story of each human life, inside the brain of every individual, there are complex systems which are making an appraisal, moment by moment, both unconsciously and consciously, of whether or not there are threats or opportunities confronting the individual (Damasio, 1999). The inputs to the appraisal mechanism are both internal and external. Internal threats and opportunities can originate from the organs and physiology of the body or from processes occurring within the mind. External threats and opportunities can originate in the physical environment or in the realm of social interaction. Taken together, the viability criterion, the appraisal mechanisms, the dimensions of affective expression, and the approach/avoidance response tendencies are the essence of the affective domain.

Developmental Issues

Child development is typically viewed through an organizational, biological lens. As such, development is seen as going through specific stages, with transitions to new stages being influenced by, or contingent upon accomplishments attained in earlier stages. Just as children’s language or mental capabilities develop as a result of maturation and experience, so too does children’s affective development. Affective development is often seen as progressing in the same manner, and as being impacted by both internal (biological predispositions, within-child abilities) and external (physical and social environment) influences. Additionally, there are stable differences among children that impact development in the affective domain. For example, a small percentage of children are highly active while another small percentage is slow to warm up (Kagan, 1994). Additionally, Plomin (1990) presents research suggesting a genetic basis for empathy by showing that identical twins are more alike in their empathetic responses than fraternal twins.

Greenspan and Greenspan (1985) identified six emotional milestones that infants and young children go through as they develop. The first milestone is to feel peaceful despite the inundation on the newborn’s senses by stimulation and to reach out to that stimulation during the first few weeks after birth. In the second stage, the infant takes an interest in the human world, as well as the sights and sounds that encompass it. The third milestone is met when the infant realizes that the world is cause-and-effect. For example, this might be demonstrated when a
Affective Domain

baby’s movement produces a corresponding movement in a mobile. The infant shows his or her preparedness for the fourth stage by taking the “emotional dialogue with the world one step further and learning to connect small units of feeling and social behavior into large, complicated, orchestrated patterns” (Greenspan & Greenspan, p. 6). During the fifth stage, children are able to hold an image (their mother, for example) in their minds even when that object, person, etc. is not present. In the sixth and final milestone, young children are better able to understand the ideas of “pleasure and dependency, curiosity, assertiveness, anger, self-discipline or setting their own limits, even empathy and love” (Greenspan, p. 6).

While children may be able to understand these concepts in early childhood, they have a narrow vocabulary for communicating their feelings (Denham, 1998; Vernon, 1999). During this stage of life, children have a hard time comprehending that it is possible to feel many different emotions concurrently about a particular event, even though they do understand that it is possible to have different feelings at different times. By the end of the preschool period, children begin to respond to other people’s emotions, though they usually concentrate on the most evident characteristics of an emotional experience, such as being angry or happy.

Young children are typically amateurs in utilizing the affective domain. In everyday interactions, children are constantly attempting to understand both their own and others’ behavior. Emotions play a significant role in this understanding by conveying crucial interpersonal information that can guide interaction. In social interactions, the child uses information conveyed through the behavior, emotions, perceived intentions, and the likely effect of others’ behavior to help guide their own response or behavior. A child who is able to regulate emotions is more likely to be able to utilize a problem-solving process that allows him or her to generate and focus on adaptive goals that will build and enhance a relationship (e.g., avoid conflict, not hurt others’ feelings). Those who are less skilled may focus on more external and self-serving goals, which lead them to react in less adaptive ways that do not promote successful interaction (e.g., revenge, spite).

The development SEL skills are thought to be of particular importance during the preschool period, when children are learning to interact with their peers. Denham and Weissberg (2003) reported that children who enter kindergarten with positive SEL profiles also develop positive attitudes about school, successfully adjust to the new experiences they encounter in the school setting, and demonstrate good grades and achievement. Conversely, they reported that children with specific SEL deficits are more likely to experience difficulties in social relationships. There is accumulating evidence that SEL components contribute to overall success in interacting with others. Children who understand and are able to balance their positive and negative emotions tend to be more prosocially responsive to their peers, are rated as more likeable by their peers, and are rated as more socially skilled by teachers (Denham, 1986; Denham & Couchoud, 1991; Denham, McKinley, Couchoud, & Holt, 1990; Strayer, 1980).

During middle childhood, children are capable of more complex emotionality (e.g., guilt, shame, and pride), and recognize that it is possible to experience different emotions simultaneously. Children of this age are also more cognizant of other people’s emotions and can camouflage their feelings to prevent upsetting someone else. Finally, those in middle childhood may begin to experience school or peer-related anxiety.
Impacting the Affective Domain

Although it would be extravagant to suggest that schooling by itself has the power to solve all these problems, it is difficult to imagine any effective long-term solutions that exclude it. Well-conceived, systematically designed learning experiences, utilizing well-chosen techniques, technology, and media, can lead to significant gains in resolving important social and personal issues. Additionally, research shows that child do better academically when schools attend to emotional and social development (Gewertz, 2003).

Unfortunately, despite the potential, educational efforts aimed at these problems have not always been successful (Kilpatrick, 1992; Sonnie, 1989). In fact, some attempts to utilize the affective domain, such as the so-called “affective education,” “self-esteem” and “values clarification” approaches, have actually caused harm, leading to increases in the incidence of illicit drug usage, alcoholism, teen pregnancy, and sexually transmitted diseases among youths exposed to these approaches (Kilpatrick).

This failure of schooling to effectively address the affective domain is in sharp contrast to the successes achieved in other arenas. For example, the cognitive-behavioral, the person-centered, and other schools of psychotherapy have devised increasingly effective ways to help people recover from specific emotional problems (Corey, 1996; Martin, 1999; McMullin, 1986). Likewise, marketers have built a multibillion dollar global advertising industry by learning how to systematically and effectively evoke those human emotions that prompt consumers to buy their products (Reis and Trout, 1993; Schoell and Guiltman, 1992). Whereas specialists in these disciplines have articulated concepts of the affective domain suited to the purposes of their specific disciplines, those in schooling have mostly avoided it (Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964; Martin and Briggs, 1985).

Difficulty in the field of schooling with the affective domain may be a result of several influences. First, one must consider the cognitive-structuralist and deontological theories that underlie much of the schooling system. In these theories, moral education and emotions are typically seen as conflicting concepts. Proponents of these theories suggest that the central aim of moral education is a desirable state of mind (Roebben, 1995), an autonomous and free-thinking person (Smeyers, 1992). Moral learning is considered to be a matter of developing innate intellectual capacities, and not one of supplying missing emotions and motives (Spiecker, 1988, p. 44). The involvement of emotion is often considered detrimental to the attainment of these qualities. It is believed that every emotion has a specific paradigmatic scenario, which, once learned, is applied to situations which are relevantly similar to the paradigm scenario in which it originated (Roebben). In this view, emotions can act as a barrier, which disturbs the ongoing process of moral reasoning, and works against critical thinking, leading to a potentially biased or flawed view of one’s environment.

One the other hand, Hoffman (2000) proposes that empathy is foundational to moral development. His research shows that empathy, the connecting of one’s feelings and emotions to another’s, can be discerned in infants and develops in readily identifiable stages. He proposes that justice, a core value in Kohlberg’s (1984) theory of moral development, has two components, care and equity, and that empathy provides a foundation for both. Hoffman, therefore, advocates that adults encourage children to share the feelings of those he or she has mistreated as essential for moral development. Piel (2000) goes even further, suggesting that emotions are an individual’s moral compass, evolutionarily developed to guide one’s self-regulating and adaptive behavior.
A second potential influence in the dearth of emotionally-focused school programs may lie in the fact that, to date, researchers have developed no comprehensive conception of usefulness of emotion for purposes of academic learning and instruction (Goleman, 1995; Price, 1998; Salovy & Sluyter, 1997; Sonnier, 1989). In past affective education approaches, young people were taught to treat all social values as equally acceptable; they were led to believe that there are no right answers in ethical situations; they were encouraged to invent their own value systems without reference to accepted standards or the needs of society at large; they were encouraged to get in-touch with their feelings regardless of what those feelings might be; and they were convinced to claim self-esteem through self-talk even while test scores and other measures of academic achievement were falling (Kilpatrick, 1992). Yet, educators could not continue in this direction once longitudinal studies became available which indicated an increase of youth violence, teen pregnancy, alcoholism, and drug abuse among students exposed to these affective education approaches.

This brings schooling into the horns of a dilemma. Any approach to learning in the affective domain that smacks of indoctrination, that is too touchy-feely, or that promotes self-esteem at the expense of accomplishment has been rejected and will continue to be rejected by parents and educators. But the problems that are tearing at the fabric of society and shattering individual lives are almost certainly unsolvable without recourse to education and training involving the affective domain. Somehow, new steps must be taken towards a revised view of the affective domain as it applies to the field of education.

**Fostering Emotional Functioning**

Denham (1998) suggests three categories of emotional functioning: emotional understanding, emotional expression, and emotional regulation and management. In terms of emotional understanding, she suggests that students need to be able to discern one’s own emotional states as well as those of others and properly use emotional vocabulary.

In terms of emotional expression, Denham (1998) includes the use of gestures to display emotional messages nonverbally, demonstrating empathy by connecting one’s emotions to those of others, displaying both self-conscious as well as complex social emotions, and realizing there are differences between experiencing an emotion and how one acts.

The category of emotional regulation and management includes coping with both pleasurable and aversive/distressing emotions as well as the regulation of those situations that elicit them. This category also includes the ability to use this experience to strategically organize the experience in terms of setting goals and learning to motivate oneself and others.

As in the other domains, parents play a crucial role in a child’s development before he or she begins school. One of the most important ways to get children off to a good start in this domain is through a secure attachment relationship with caring adults (Denham and Weissberg, 2003). Consistent and sensitive caregiving, particularly during the first years of life, can foster such attachment. Early experiences and interactions with caregivers form the basis from which children develop their view of the world. Positive and meaningful interactions can lead children to develop a positive world view (i.e., The world is a safe place; Others are predictable and readable; I am important and worthy of care.). Research has shown that secure relationships with caregivers predict not only concurrent emotional development, but also later ability to relate to peers (Howes, 1997). In contrast, emotional insecurity can cause a child to be resistant to learning about emotions and more apt to experience aversive emotions.
Modeling of appropriate behavior is also an important influence in children’s learning. Research on the impact of vicarious learning has led us to accept the implications of the old saying “Do as I say, not as I do”. Children constantly observe the behavior of others and often incorporate this learning into their own behavior. Children use such information to determine what is and is not acceptable or appropriate, and in which contexts. Thus, through their emotional displays, adults are sending a powerful message. Therefore, adults who model adaptive and appropriate emotional responses can help guide their child’s learning of emotional regulation.

Positive guidance by parents and early caregivers is a third way to foster effective and appropriate emotional and related social skills. From a very young age, children are learning what it means to be part of a group. Children need assistance in learning appropriate rules for behavior in group and social settings. Young children learn best when they have clear rules and limits set for them, and when they receive both direct and indirect guidance (Denham and Weissberg, 2003). Direct guidance refers to concise rules as to appropriate behavior. Indirect guidance refers to providing an environment that is conducive to positive emotion and behavior. In providing positive guidance, there are three specific socialization techniques considered as crucial: teaching about emotions and behaviors, modeling positive emotional expression and behaviors, and demonstrating accepting and helpful reactions to children’s emotions and behaviors.

Positive guidance also includes reaction to childrens’ emotions. Contingent reactions to child behavior by adults should be linked to the child’s emotional development (Denham & Weissberg, 2003). This includes behavioral and/or emotional reinforcement or discouragement of specific behaviors and emotional responses (Tomkins, 1991). The dismissing or ignoring of emotions may be perceived by children as punishment for showing emotion, which can cause confusion and interfere with the development of adaptive and effective SEL skills. However, positive reactions by adults (tolerance, comfort, validation, empathy) can convey the message that emotions are not only manageable, but also even useful (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven 1997).

Coaching about emotions can be done through discussing children’s feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. Central to this is providing reasons or explanations for events, including correction of inappropriate behavior. For example, alerting children to potential consequences of behaviors can be effective (i.e., Johnny may not want to play with you anymore if you do not share.). Additionally, helping children to consider the viewpoint of others is also important (i.e., That hurt Johnny’s feelings. Look at how sad he looks.). Adults who demonstrate an awareness of emotions and discuss them with their children can assist in development of self-management skills, and help in formulating other-awareness (for developing empathy).

Thus, the four main components for contributing to the development in the affective domain for young children are secure attachment, modeling, positive guidance and coaching. There are specific techniques that parents and early caregivers can use for facilitating learning in this domain. These techniques include: distracting the child and assisting him/her in choosing a more appropriate substitute behavior, ignoring inappropriate behavior (when there is not threat of harm to self or others), telling the child what to do (as opposed to what not to do), and stating expectations clearly and in a manner suitable to the child’s cognitive level. Such techniques can help guide children toward appropriate emotional and behavioral responses.

While it is known that individuals raised in a loving, caring environment have been found to have a substantially lower incidence of major illness and disease in mid-adulthood (Russek and Schwartz, 1997), educators can also have a significant impact on affective development. The
same approaches laid out for parents and early caregivers can be applied by teachers: attachment, modeling, guidance, and coaching. As mentioned previously, development of a positive, consistent, and emotionally supportive relationship with important adults is crucial to development in the affective domain. As such, children who have not experienced secure attachments with other caregivers may seek such attachment with teachers. Therefore, teachers can also utilize techniques to foster a secure attachment relationship with students.

Teachers can also provide positive behavior management and guidance to students. For example, Bergin and Bergin (1999) advocate the use of persistent persuasion to increase compliance and help instruct and guide students toward appropriate behavior and emotional displays. Teachers can also utilize inductive guidance techniques that focus on the consequences of the child’s behaviors on others, including the feelings of others.

Finally, teachers can help children develop better knowledge and understanding of their own and others’ emotions by utilizing emotion language. Children, especially young children, may not have much experience in using language to express their feelings. Being able to attach a label to emotions and feelings can bring them to consciousness, which, in turn, assists in emotional regulation (Denham and Weissberg, 2003).

Assessment and Measurement

There are three primary areas of development in the affective domain that need to be addressed: emotional understanding (including discernment of emotions in both self and others), emotional behavior (including demonstrating empathy), and emotional self-regulation and management (including warming oneself up or cooling oneself down).

Emotional Understanding

According to Saarni (1999), for emotional discernment in self to occur, the child must be cognizant that he or she is the one feeling something. It has also been proposed that for one to be emotionally self-aware, he or she must be able to recognize that emotionally-related felt bodily sensations are inherently different than other bodily sensations that may occur such as feeling hungry.

Research suggests that children at a relatively young age are able to discern the emotions of others (Saarni, 1999). According to Saarni (1999, p. 109), the following characteristics must be present in children to encompass sophisticated insight into others’ emotions: “they need to be able to decode the usual meanings of emotional facial expressions; they need to understand common situational elicitors of emotion; they need to realize that others have minds, intentions, beliefs, or what has otherwise been referred to as ‘inner states;’ they need to take into account unique information about the other that might qualify or make comprehensible a nonstereotypical emotional response or a response that differs from how oneself would feel in the same situation; and they need to be able to apply emotion labels to emotional experience so that they can verbally communicate with others about their feelings.”

Parents can help their children discern emotions by providing labels for different feelings that their children might have (Gottman, 1997). When a child knows the uncomfortable feeling they are having has a name, it seems more manageable and more like a part of everyday life (Gottman, 1997). This process of labeling emotions for children can also help in the child’s development of empathy (Gottman, 1997). For example, if you notice a child is feeling down
and you say, “You’re feeling sad, aren’t you,” the child now feels both understood by the empathic statement and comforted by knowing that there is a word to describe how he/she is feeling (Gottman, 1997).

**Emotional Expression**

Denham (1998) discusses items from the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP; Parks, 1992), which includes lists of behaviors considered appropriate development of children from birth to three years of age. Denham (1998, p. 210) specifically lists items from several different subscales of the HELP pertaining to the expression of emotions and feelings that are developmentally appropriate for children aged 18 to 36 months, including (Parks, 1992, pp. 280-321):

- Expresses affection
- Shows jealousy at attention given to others, especially other family members
- Shows a wide variety of emotions (e.g., fear, anger, sympathy, modesty, guilt, joy)
- Feels easily frustrated
- Attempts to comfort others in distress
- Tantrums peak
- Dramatizes feelings using a doll
- Fatigues easily
- May develop sudden fears, especially of large animals
- Demonstrates extreme emotional shifts and paradoxical responses

Parents and educators can also use the aforementioned developmentally appropriate behaviors to appraise where their children are compared to what is considered average ability for that particular age group.

**Emotional Regulation**

While school psychologists may conduct most assessments on children with special needs, parents and early childhood educators can conduct their own informal assessments on children to see where they are developmentally. There are formal tests used by psychologists that judge emotional discernment by showing children pictures of faces with different expressions then asking the child what emotion that particular face is displaying. Parents and teachers can easily replicate this, but must remember that young children will most likely not answer correctly all the time, particularly when shown more complex emotions, such as guilt and shame.

It is typically the school psychologist who has been assigned the responsibility of assessing emotional regulation in school-aged children. Historically, the approach exemplified in federal guidelines, and thus most commonly used in assessment, has been a deficit-focused approach (Buckley, Sorino, and Saarni, 2003). However, the tides do seem to be turning, and strength-based assessment is beginning to receive more attention in literature. Yet there remains a great need for additional psychometric attention in the area of emotional assessment.

In the following section, we will outline several existing measures that can be used in assessing some of the skills associated with emotional competence. However, it is important to note that these measures were not designed to measure emotional competence, and thus have not been validated for this purpose. However, by attending to aspects of the measure that address
specific emotional competence skills, results of such assessment instruments can be useful in overall assessment.

*Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC; Shields and Cicchetti, 1997).* The ERC is a survey measuring affective behaviors in school-aged children. It contains two subscales considered as useful in assessment of emotional competence: Lability/Negativity and Emotion Regulation. The Lability/Negativity subscale examines mood swings, angry reactivity, affective intensity, and dysregulated positive emotions. The Emotion Regulation subscale captures emotional understanding, empathy, and equanimity. Internal consistency for these two subscales was .96 for Lability/Negativity and .83 for Emotion Regulation (Buckley, et al., 2003).

*Emotion Regulation Q-Sort (Shields and Cicchetti, 1997).* The Q-Sort is related to the ERC, both of which are directly applicable to the measurement of emotional regulation. The Q-Sort measures reactivity, empathy, and socially appropriate expressions. Though administration is somewhat cumbersome, it is suitable for a wide age range, and is useful for longitudinal research.

*The Behavior Emotion Rating Scale (BERS; Epstein and Sharma, 1998).* The BERS is a survey measuring behavioral and emotional strengths of children ages five to 18. It provides an overall strength quotient, and addresses five dimensions. The dimensions most relevant to emotional competence are the interpersonal, intrapersonal, and affective strength domains. The BERS has strong content validity, moderate to high reliability, consistency among raters, stability overtime, and adequate convergent validity with several measures (Epstein, Harniss, Pearson, and Ryser, 1999).

*The Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale - Short Version (MEIS; Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, 1997).* The MEIS was used to measure emotional intelligence prior to implementation and again after the conclusion of the Connecting program. The MEIS consists of eight tasks that are divided into components representing three levels of emotional reasoning ability: perceiving, understanding, and regulating emotions. The scale yields four scores: and overall score reflecting general emotional intelligence and a score for each of the three emotional reasoning abilities. The short version of the MEIS consists of 258 items, and is scored by an expert scoring method, in which each response is compared with an expert answer, or one that MEIS experts believe is the most accurate assessment of a particular ability (Lam, and Kirby, 2002).

*Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEI; Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, 1997).* The MSCEIT is an extension of the MEIS. This test also an ability test designed to measure aspects of emotional intelligence. However, it was designed for use with individuals 17 years old an up. The MSCEIT measures the following four branches of emotional intelligence:

1. **Identifying emotions** - the ability to recognize how you and those around you are feeling. The examinee is presented with faces and situations, and are asked to pick out the extent to which certain feelings are present.
2. **Using emotions** - the ability to generate an emotion, and then reason with this emotion. Examinees are asked to imagine specific events that trigger particular feelings - while feeling each feeling, the examinee is asked to indicate the extent to which the feeling is for instance light or dark, warm or cold.
3. **Understanding emotions** - the ability to understand complex emotions and emotional 'chains', how emotions transition from one stage to another. Examinees are assessed
through definitions of emotions and also through specific situations which they are presented with.

4. **Managing emotions** - the ability which allows you to manage emotions in yourself and others. Examinees are presented with a range of scenarios and are asked to determine the effectiveness of taking particular actions.

*The Social Skills Rating Scale (SSRS; Gresham and Elliott, 1990).* The SSRS has two forms, one for use with children grades three through six, and another for use with children grades seven through 12. The measure yields scores on three scales, Social Skills, Problem Behaviors, and Academic Competence. However, it is questions within the Social Skills scale that appear to capture several emotional competencies, such as capacity for empathetic responses, affective expression, and emotional regulation and coping (Buckley, et al., 2003).

Existing research has indicated the importance of emotional competence in multiple areas of functioning, including academics. Furthermore, research continues to provide support for the role of systemic, ongoing social-emotional education in optimal cognitive and behavioral development (Buckley, et al., 2003). Thus, it is certainly arguable that additional research attention to the area of emotion and emotional competence is warranted. Nevertheless, empirical studies investigating emotional competency programs are rather limited. Furthermore, intervention programs typically emphasize broad social competencies rather than emotional competencies (Buckley, et al., 2003).

**Summary and Conclusions**

The promotion of emotional and related social competence is essential for the development of informed, responsible, and caring individuals (Richardson, 2000). Competence in recognizing and managing feelings and social relationships are crucial for success across settings, including home, school, and the workplace. Furthermore, emotional competence is considered a central predictor of later mental health and well-being (Denham, Blair, DeMulder, Levitas, Sawyer, Auerbach-Major, and Queenan, 2003). Young people who lack social and emotional competence tend to have more discipline problems and are frequently unsuccessful in their academic pursuits (Richardson, 2000). Similarly, poorly managed emotions and emotional reactions can lead to behavior problems as well as create physiological conditions that inhibit cognitive processes involved learning and potentially increase the risk of certain diseases later in life (McCraty, Atkinson, Tomasino, Goelitz, and Mayrovitz, 1999).

Goleman’s (1995) theory of emotional intelligence rests on the notion that self-awareness and the ability to control how we respond to our own moods or feelings are keys to achieving success. By gaining knowledge of one’s own emotional state and associated labels, an individual gains the ability to handle his or her responses in a productive manner, which, in turn, allows the person to motivate oneself, to solve problems, to make moral decisions, and to interact successfully with others. Thus, through the acquisition of this knowledge and ability, other skills can be further developed. Goleman argues that the ability to delay gratification is a skill representative of self-awareness, which he refers to as *metamood*, and that exhibiting such awareness is a sign of emotional intelligence and potential success (Kaschub, 2002).

If this brief description of the affective domain is valid, what does it mean to speak of educating the emotions? Is the affective domain unteachable, as some have alleged, or is the affective domain within the potential scope of education, as others have asserted? As recent findings in psychology, neuroscience, and other disciplines are beginning to demonstrate, the
answer to both of these questions is “yes” (Goleman, 1995; Keller, 1987; Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia, 1964; Martin and Briggs, 1986; Price, 1998; Salovy and Sluyter, 1997).

Humans appear to be biologically predisposed to rapidly react to certain things, such as large looming animals with big teeth, slithering creatures on the ground, sharp objects flying through the air, extremely sour tastes, foul odors, and sudden booming sounds (Pinkar, 1997). No doubt the viability of humanity’s distant ancestors was greatly enhanced by obeying such inborn instructions. Little or no thought was involved, training was not needed, and precision was not required (Goleman, 1995). The creature moving on the grass might not be a poisonous snake, but there is no cost in avoiding it. Errors made on the side of caution generally produced positive viability results.

Pattern recognition involves making approximate and rapid judgments, which are frequently unconscious, and which are able to generate sudden feelings, which are then instantly processed in terms of emotional memories of past experiences. In general, these responses are engaged rapidly, the memories formed are likely to become permanent, and the response tendencies are not easily modified by new learning (LeDoux, 1996).

On the other hand, rules of culture (DeAndrade, 1995), emotional schemas (Greenberg, Rice, and Elliott, 1993; Nathanson, 1992; Ortney, Clore and Collins, 1988), and environmental situations are highly variable. No genetic pattern could code for them rapidly enough to be passed on to subsequent generations. Even if they could, such genetic instructions would not add to viability because conditions will probably be changed by the time the next generation is born. The human being is known for the remarkable plasticity of the brain (that is, its power to learn new responses from life experiences) (Brue, 1997; Driscoll, 2000) and a relatively long childhood period (Pinkar, 1997). Together, these provide a context in which a growing human being can learn the appropriate approach/avoidance responses to life’s infinitely diverse situations. Thus, although the smile response itself appears to be universal (Ekman and Rosenberg, 1997; Darwin, 1889/1998), the young child learns gradually whose smiles are to be trusted and whose are not (Greenspan, 1997). Children learn to be shy or outgoing depending upon whether the smile is coming from an adult never seen before or from a parent, sibling, or other close relative. Perhaps never explained in exact words, but unceasingly coded as emotional memories (Greenspan, LeDoux, 1996), as he matures, the child unfailingly learns through direct experience and parental training what situations bring benefits and which ones bring harm.

Some emotional learning is astoundingly fast, permanent, and precise. For instance, anyone who has accidentally received a shock while working with an electrical appliance or been the victim of a mugging never has to repeat the experience. Once is enough. The brain takes care of that - right down to the cellular level. An emotional memory is created instantly, complete with context, arousal, thoughts, and feelings. The entire experience is deeply encoded due to a brain process at the cellular level known as long term potentiation (LTP) (Carter, 1998; LeDoux, 1996). Thus, some emotional learning comes about through rapid stimulus and response conditioning and once learned cannot be easily extinguished.

Other emotional learning is slow, accumulative, and ill-structured in nature. As noted, since there are many variations along the friend/stranger continuum, the human mind must form over many experiences a general image of whom to approach and whom to avoid. Similarly, values, such as citizenship, morality, good-character, motivation to learn, and self-esteem must be embedded in a near infinite diversity of situations and examples before a complete picture emerges. In this arena, conscious thought becomes the ally of emotional memories (Greenspan, 1997; LeDoux, 1996). Personal emotional schemas are built up over time and combined with
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society’s rules which are also gradually acquired. As they become blended together in each individual, one’s unique attitudes, beliefs and personality take shape.

The unconscious, rapid emotional systems and the conscious, slower ones interact constantly, generally in a manner similar to a car’s accelerator and brake. For instance, an individual walking on a city street hears a loud cracking sound at night and ducks down instantaneously, without any conscious planning. Then, the mind of the individual, finding itself suddenly hugging the pavement and observing a car with a smoking tail pipe speeding away, quickly analyzes the situation and realizes that the loud sound was not gunfire, but rather an engine backfiring. The individual breathes a sigh of relief because a perceived danger has been avoided. Likewise, when a friend says words that are hurtful, the first instinct is to feel anger, but in a few seconds most people are able to realize it was just an unfortunate choice of words and are able to mute their anger.

In both of these examples, the rapid emotional systems are engaged instantly while the conscious mind rushes to catch up (LeDoux, 1996; Zajonc, 1984). The conscious mind makes a more precise judgment of whether or not the sudden reaction is justified. If not, it acts upon the body and mind like a brake, quieting the internal alarm and controlling impulses to react (Goleman, 1995). On the other hand, the conscious faculties may identify the danger as real and thus further prime the automatic fight-or-flight systems to keep going, like an accelerator (LeDoux, 1996). The point is that, although the affective system is biased towards preserving safety with its rapid stimulus or pattern recognition and approximate reactions, both the conscious and the unconscious systems work together, interacting literally on a second-by-second basis to modulate the appraisal and adjust the individual's responses based on the viability criterion.

In sum, then, affective experience is largely unconscious and partly conscious. Some emotional learning is extremely rapid and based on single experiences, occurring primarily through priming or stimulus-response conditioning. Some of it is slower and cumulative, resulting from the gradual acquisition of emotional memories and the elaboration of complex emotional schemas, interacting with other cognitive schemas as well. Some of the learning is quite precise, as in "Don’t put your finger in the electric outlet" Some of it is ill-structured, as in learning whom to approach as a friend and whom to avoid as a stranger. All aspects of the affective domain are organized around the principle of maintaining viability and well-being, generating an arousal to approach that which is perceived as positive to personal well-being and to avoid that which is perceived as negative to well-being.

It is clear that there is much of the affective domain that may be susceptible to training, particularly involving learning outcomes which aim to enhance the effectiveness of the appraisal mechanisms or which promote positive interaction between intelligent thought processing and affective reactions. Some obvious examples include: a) Learning to discern the emotional states of others as expressed in their words, their tone of voice, their body language, and in the deeds they do; b) Learning ways of expressing emotions that improve the amount and quality of mutual understanding between oneself and others; and c) Learning to coherently apply one’s affective experience, intellectual abilities and coping mechanisms in order to enhance viability, to resolve approach/avoidance conflicts, to generate moral behaviors, and to solve problems in the social or personal context. Each of these learning outcomes, and many others, when understood in terms of the viability framework described herein, can be susceptible to a teaching and learning process. Not only can specific component skills be identified in the case of each learning outcome, but, within the viability framework, the goal and purpose of the teaching and learning
experience can be more easily articulated and understood. This sets the stage for constructive analysis of specific learning outcomes and the initiation of instructional design activities within the affective domain.

Empathy is a core skill that benefits virtually all human relations, whether professional or personal. Think about any significant relationship – parenting, teaching, counseling, friendships, business relations and so on – and one finds empathy at the foundation. Speaking of the empathy that counselors must develop, Martin (1999) defines empathy as follows:

Empathy is "communicated understanding of the other person's intended message, especially the experiential part." …It is not enough to understand what the person said; you must hear what he or she meant to say, the intended message. It is not enough to understand, even deeply; you must communicate that understanding somehow. It is absolutely essential that the other person feel understood—that the understanding be perceived… The part of the intended message that will be critical is the emotional or experiential part of the message… You will be listening for what your client is trying to say, and one way you will be doing this is to hear the feelings implicit in his or her message. (p. 11)

According to Goleman (1995), those who lack empathy have a serious shortfall in emotional intelligence. He states that this lack of empathy can be found in “criminal psychopaths, rapists, and child molesters” (p. 96) and points out that people rarely express to others in words what they are feeling. Rather, we must read and understand nonverbal cues to understand another’s emotions. Psychologists have found that babies only a few months old will start crying when they observe another child crying. Furthermore, young children’s empathic capabilities appear to be influenced by their observation of people react to the distress of others.

Crucial to empathy is that it involves understanding and communication “as if” from the other person’s point of view, taking the other person’s perspective, while at the same time not losing sight of the fact that the feelings and thoughts in fact belong to the other person. Empathy is multidimensional in the sense that the understanding of the other person may be either cognitive or affective or both. Empathy may go beyond understanding of the other person to include emotional responsiveness or resonance such that an individual comes to experience the same or compatible emotions of the other person. Thus, along with understanding the situation as if from the other person's perspective, an aspect of empathy may include feeling distress when confronted with the distress of others, or it may include pity in response to another's sorrow and loss. Empathy is thus a complex process that involves both cognitive and affective abilities such as listening to key ideas and discerning core emotions in emotion stories; being able to recognize the facial display of emotion; identifying emotion in verbal statements, tone of voice and body language; carefully selecting appropriate emotion words when preparing a response; emitting appropriate emotional responses; internally "resonating" with compatible feeling; offering sensitive reflection statements; and generalizing emotional content to new or comparable situations (Martin, 1999; Goldstein and Michaels, 1985).
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