Expertise in Emotion: A Scoping Review and Unifying Framework for Individual Differences in the Mental Representation of Emotional Experience

Katie Hoemann¹, Catie Nielson^{2*}, Ashley Yuen^{3*}, J. W. Gurera^{2*}, Karen S. Quigley^{2,4}, & Lisa Feldman Barrett^{2,5}

1. Department of Psychology, KU Leuven
2. Department of Psychology, Northeastern University
3. Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
4. Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans Hospital
5. Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School/
Athinoula A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Massachusetts General Hospital

* Indicates equal authorship

Abstract

Expertise refers to outstanding skill or ability in a particular domain. In the domain of emotion, expertise refers to the observation that some people are better at a range of competencies related to understanding and experiencing emotions, and these competencies may help them lead healthier lives. These individual differences are represented by multiple constructs including *emotional awareness*, *emotional clarity*, *emotional complexity*, *emotional granularity*, and *emotional intelligence*. These constructs derive from different theoretical perspectives, highlight different competencies, and are operationalized and measured in different ways. The full set of relationships between these constructs has not yet been considered, hindering scientific progress and the translation of findings to aid mental and physical well-being. In this paper, we use a scoping review procedure to integrate these constructs within a shared conceptual space. Scoping reviews provide a principled means of synthesizing large and diverse literatures in a transparent fashion, enabling the identification of similarities as well as gaps and inconsistencies across constructs. Using domain-general accounts of expertise as a guide, we build a unifying framework for expertise in emotion and apply this to constructs that describe how people understand and experience their own emotions. Our approach offers opportunities to identify potential mechanisms of expertise in emotion, encouraging future research on those mechanisms and on educational or clinical interventions.

Keywords: alexithymia, emotional awareness, emotional creativity, emotional granularity, emotional intelligence

Remember the old story about the blind men and the elephant? Each touching a different part of an elephant to learn what it is like, they proclaim it to have different properties. The blind men analogy illustrates how important constructs in psychology are re-discovered, defined in slightly different ways and labeled with slightly different words. The domain of emotion has an example of one of these situations, represented by constructs including *emotional awareness*, *emotional clarity*, *emotional complexity*, *emotional granularity*, and *emotional intelligence*. These constructs share the observation that some people are better than others at a range of competencies related to understanding and experiencing emotions, and these competencies may help them lead healthier lives. There are differences in how these constructs are operationalized and measured, and in the theoretical perspectives that inform them. There have been calls to directly compare and integrate these constructs and their measures (e.g., Gohm & Clore, 2000; Grossmann et al., 2016; Grühn et al., 2013; Ivcevic et al., 2007; Joseph & Newman, 2010; Kang & Shaver, 2004; Kashdan et al., 2015; Lindquist & Barrett, 2008; Lumley et al., 2005; Maroti et al., 2018; Schimmack et al., 2000). In response, we collected them under the term “expertise” for its reference to outstanding skill or ability in a particular domain (Ericsson et al., 2018). Our goal is to craft a unifying framework to evaluate findings, offering an opportunity to accumulate knowledge with clear ties to mental and physical well-being.

To create this framework, we use domain-general accounts of expertise to deductively articulate a set of core features. We then use this framework to structure the findings from a scoping review of constructs that describe individual differences in emotional competencies. Scoping reviews provide a principled means of synthesizing large and diverse literatures in a transparent fashion, allowing scientists to identify similarities as well as gaps and inconsistencies across constructs (Pham et al., 2014). We use the results of our scoping review to evaluate an integrative framework for structuring future work, with implications for the conceptual model that may best guide that work. This approach, we suggest, organizes scientific knowledge, and reveals potential mechanisms to motivate programs of research and intervention. As proof of concept, we focus this paper on the mental representation of one’s own emotional experience. Future work can expand this framework to include, for example, constructs related to the representation of others’ emotional experiences, or to the regulation of emotion.

We begin this paper by briefly reviewing the history of individual differences in the mental representation of emotional experience, illustrating the proliferation of constructs in this domain and its consequences for scientific research and clinical practice. Next, we introduce the construct of expertise and the features of our unifying framework. In the methods section, we provide details on the scoping review procedure that we used to integrate included constructs (noted in *italics* throughout) within a shared conceptual space. In the results, we illustrate this conceptual space using a series of networks that allow us to visualize and describe the relationships between constructs. We then re-map the included constructs onto a common expertise framework, through this process interrogating the theoretical perspectives associated with different constructs, as well as the relationship between construct and measurement. Finally, in the discussion, we consider the conceptual and methodological advances suggested by our unifying framework, including their potential impacts on future work.

Individual Differences in the Mental Representation of Emotional Experience

There is a growing number of constructs that describe how people understand and experience their own emotions. A brief history of this domain provides a sense of its scope and complexity. Interest in individual differences in the mental representation of emotional

experience is found within the psychoanalytic tradition around the beginning of the 20th century (e.g., Freud, 1891, 1895). With few exceptions (e.g., Meltzoff & Litwin, 1956; Saul, 1947; Wessman & Ricks, 1966), early scientific study was focused on clinical diagnosis and treatment (e.g., Freedman & Sweet, 1954; Henry & Shlien, 1958; Ruesch, 1948)¹. This research often centered on patients with psychosomatic disorders (e.g., Alexander, 1950; MacLean, 1949; Marty & de M'Uzan, 1963), leading to the formalization of the construct of *alexithymia* in the 1970s (e.g., Nemiah, 1970; Nemiah et al., 1976; Sifneos, 1972). (Construct definitions can be found in Table 2; for more in-depth construct summaries, see supplemental materials.)

In the 1980s and 1990s, an explosion of emotion-related research produced constructs such as *emotional intelligence* (e.g., Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), *emotional awareness* (Lane et al., 1990; Lane & Schwartz, 1987), *emotional complexity* (e.g., Larsen & Cutler, 1996; Tobacyk, 1980), *emotional creativity* (Averill & Thomas-Knowles, 1991), *emotional literacy* (e.g., Steiner, 1984), and *emotional fitness* (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). *Emotional intelligence*, especially, became a hotspot of activity in both the academy (e.g., Bar-On, 1997; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Schutte et al., 1998) and industry (e.g., Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Grandey, 2000; Law et al., 2004). Constructs continued to proliferate, such as *emotion differentiation* (Barrett et al., 2001) and its synonym *emotional granularity* (Tugade et al., 2004), *emotional clarity* (e.g., Palmieri et al., 2009), and *emotional flexibility* (Waugh et al., 2011). Today, a quick Internet search turns up additional constructs, such as *emotional agility* (David, 2016), *emodiversity* (Quoidbach et al., 2014), and *affective agnosia* (Lane et al., 2015). To make matters more complex, most constructs are associated with multiple measures (e.g., there are nine measures for alexithymia in adults reviewed in Bermond et al., 2015), and some measures are used to assess more than one construct. For example, the Toronto Alexithymia Scale (e.g., Bagby et al., 1994) has been used as an index of *emotional clarity* (e.g., Erbas et al., 2018) and the Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS; Lane et al., 1990) has been used as a measure of *alexithymia* (e.g., Lane et al., 1996).

When a phenomenon is important in psychological science, it is discovered again and again, each time with a different name and emphasizing different features. There are many reasons for this state of affairs (e.g., “Psychologists treat other peoples’ theories like toothbrushes — no self-respecting person wants to use anyone else’s.”; Mischel, 2008). Nonetheless, this construct proliferation comes with a cost: it slows the accumulation of knowledge, causes problems with reproducibility, and obscures common mechanisms. Construct proliferation also limits the applied potential of research in this domain. Each construct purports to – and often does – predict indicators of mental and physical health, among other real-world outcomes. This overlap is problematic if scientists and clinicians do not understand why a construct confers protection. For example, *alexithymia* is (positively) associated with mental health disorders, substance abuse and eating disorders, chronic pain and functional gastrointestinal disorders, and coronary heart disease (for reviews, see Bermond et al., 2015; Lumley et al., 2007; Taylor, 2000). However, *emotional intelligence* is also (negatively) associated with depression and anxiety symptoms, substance abuse, and physical health complaints (for reviews, see Bar-On, 2000; Mayer et al., 2008; Salovey et al., 2002; Zeidner et al., 2012).

¹ The idea of individual differences in *social intelligence* also originated around the beginning of the 20th century (e.g., Thorndike, 1920). This idea later came to be regarded as the foundation of *emotional intelligence* (e.g., Bar-On, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1993; for review and discussion, see Landy, 2005, 2006).

Many constructs for how people understand and experience their own emotions have in common the idea that mentally representing emotional experience is an ability or skill that can be learned, practiced, and honed, making these constructs particularly compelling targets for research and intervention. Improvement in ability over time provides insight into developmental pathways and means by which skills can be harnessed for well-being. Viewing the mental representation of emotional experience as an ability or skill also connects these constructs with the concept of expertise. In the next section, we expand upon this connection and use it to motivate our unifying framework.

What is Expertise?

Expertise has previously been mentioned with regard to emotion-related abilities (e.g., Mayer et al., 2001; McBrien et al., 2018; Pistoia et al., 2018; Salisch, 2001), but has not been used as a framework for systematic investigation and synthesis. Expertise has several defining characteristics that are relevant to the domain of emotion, as it is: (i) supported by extensive and specific domain knowledge, (ii) characterized by enhanced information-processing capacities, (iii) demonstrated through reliable task performance, and (iv) developed through awareness and deliberate practice (e.g., Bédard & Chi, 1992; Steels, 1990; Sternberg, 1998; Ullén et al., 2016). To create a framework that can be flexibly applied to constructs for individual differences in emotional competencies, we distilled these defining characteristics into a set of 12 core features (Table 1). We identified these features deductively, based on prior literature on expertise and findings in domain-general psychological science. We briefly review each of these features (noted in **bold** throughout), use it to describe a quality of experts in contrast to novices, and pose a hypothesis about its role in the domain of emotion.

Extensive and specific domain knowledge. Expertise requires a **broad and efficiently-structured** body of specialized domain knowledge (Bédard & Chi, 1992). This knowledge includes both explicit, declarative knowledge of domain-relevant concepts, as well as implicit, functional knowledge of how those concepts might be deployed (Sternberg et al., 1995; Sternberg, 1998; see also the distinction between deep and surface knowledge by Steels, 1990). In other words, there are **types of knowledge** that experts must possess. Experts' concepts are organized into highly-interconnected networks, as opposed to novices who have fewer and weaker links between concepts (Bédard & Chi, 1992; Sternberg, 1998). Experts' concepts are also more specific, and lead to a subordinate-level shift in categorization (e.g., Bukach et al., 2006). For novices, categorization proceeds according to boundaries established as 'cognitively basic' in a given cultural context (Rosch et al., 1976). In contrast, experts are able to differentiate between more specific categories (Tanaka & Taylor, 1991; see also Schyns, 1991; Schyns et al., 1998). While novices might see only yellow versus green, color experts such as painters might distinguish lime, olive, and chartreuse. This differentiation extends to how experts **verbally represent** their experience by using language to label specific categories or describe specific properties (Tanaka & Taylor, 1991; Tversky & Hemenway, 1984).

In the domain of emotion, these features suggest that experts possess concepts for emotion that are varied and precise. We hypothesize that these concepts build upon functional knowledge of the domain: what emotions can and typically mean, when they are helpful or appropriate, how to smoothly navigate transitions, etc. We further hypothesize that experts can easily name the experiences that correspond with these concepts, going beyond conventional levels of description (e.g., "angry") to pinpoint their feelings more exactly (e.g., "livid", "resentful", "amped up").

Enhanced information-processing capacities. Experts also differ from novices in how they implement domain-relevant knowledge (Steels, 1990), and exhibit enhanced information processing capacities (Bédard & Chi, 1992; Sternberg, 1998; Ullén et al., 2016). Whereas novices rely on surface-level perceptual features to make decisions and predictions, experts harness abstract, functional features to optimally address task demands (Bédard & Chi, 1992; Schyns et al., 1998). For example, a novice may believe olive and chartreuse work equally well for painting a wall ‘green’, whereas an expert would consider the impacts of undertone and lighting on perceived color – and may ultimately suggest emerald to create a balanced calm (e.g., Goldstone, 1995). Experts can differentiate between categories that seem equivalent to novices (e.g., olive and chartreuse) because they employ more precise features to encode similarities and contrasts (e.g., breaking down “color” into the properties of hue, saturation, and brightness; Burns & Shepp, 1988; Goldstone, 1994; see also Schyns et al., 1998; Tanaka, 1998; Williams et al., 1998). In this way, experts easily construct sophisticated **mental representations**, and use non-obvious properties (e.g., the mood associated with a color) to determine which action is maximally effective at achieving a given goal (Sternberg, 1998). This type of holistic and relational processing is a hallmark of expertise and impacts how new knowledge is acquired. While novices learn by rote, experts can efficiently generalize to new exemplars using abstract, functional similarities (Bukach et al., 2006).

In the domain of emotion, ‘mental representation’ suggests, at its most fundamental level, that individuals can process information from the body (e.g., visceral sense data) and/or from the world (e.g., vocal tones of others) as features of emotional experience. We hypothesize that experts in emotion build on this ability by identifying the psychological features that are most functionally salient and disregarding perceptual similarities or contrasts that are functionally irrelevant (e.g., by understanding that heart palpitations and fatigue can both signal anxiety in the context of an upcoming deadline).

Reliable task performance. Expertise is not only a matter of having domain-relevant knowledge and enhanced information-processing capacities; these must also be demonstrated through measurable behavioral outcomes. Experts are distinguished from non-experts on the basis of **ability or skill** in task performance that is reliable and replicable (Ericsson & Lehmann, 1996; Ericsson & Ward, 2007). For example, an expert painter produces works of art that consistently exemplify color theory; an expert interior designer is highly recommended by satisfied customers. This suggests that individual differences in expertise should be derived from a series of **adaptive responses**, observed over time or across contexts and judged according to their **context-specific** efficacy (Ericsson & Lehmann, 1996; Ericsson & Smith, 1991). In contrast to novices, experts flexibly adapt their actions to the situation at hand. Multiple methods can be used to assess expertise depending on the ability or skill in question. Different aspects of color expertise might be demonstrated via perceptual discrimination, verbal fluency, or practical application (e.g., interior design that leads to shorter recovery time, reduced pain medication, and increased satisfaction in hospital patients; Rubin et al., 1998).

In the domain of emotion, these features suggest that expertise is best assessed using tasks that require individuals to ‘perform’ mental representation of emotional experience – in other words, to document or communicate their thoughts and feelings. We hypothesize that these tasks vary in the amount of constraint placed on the response (e.g., endorsing a set of emotion adjectives vs. freely describing an emotional episode), but in principle should be unconstrained enough to allow for variation across contexts (i.e., flexibility). We further hypothesize that these tasks should be repeated to assess patterns of behavior over time (i.e., reliability).

Awareness and deliberate practice. Scientists debate the extent to which expertise in a particular domain is due to trait-level dispositions or genetic factors (e.g., Ericsson, 2014; Plomin et al., 2014b, 2014a). There is overall consensus, however, that substantial training is critical to developing expertise and that expertise can be enhanced through **deliberate practice** (Ullén et al., 2016). Deliberate practice involves both improving existing skills and expanding the set and scope of skills. This is done by updating knowledge, identifying alternative solutions, and encountering novel experiences (Ericsson, 2006; Ericsson & Charness, 1994). An expert painter might seek out opportunities to work with new colors, subject matter, or materials, and might spend time learning about pigments and application techniques to create particular impressions (Ford, 2016; Protter, 1997). These processes require **awareness** and sustained **attention** (Ericsson, 2007; Ullén et al., 2016). Experts engage in reflective and careful monitoring of their domain understanding and abilities (Sternberg, 1998). This regular evaluation leads to more effective resource allocation (Sternberg, 1984; Sternberg & Kagan, 1986), such that experts are better at determining what information to attend to and how to prepare for upcoming demands. That is, experts are better at **predicting** what will happen next and planning their actions accordingly, thereby minimizing error and meeting situation-specific needs more efficiently.

In the domain of emotion, these features suggest that experts continue to hone their ability to mentally represent emotional experiences. We hypothesize that they do so by actively attending to their experiences of emotion, and by receiving repetitive, unambiguous feedback from social others (Laland, 2017). By ‘practicing’ emotion in these ways, we hypothesize that experts become better equipped for future events and challenges.

Table 1. Features of Expertise

Feature	Description
Structure of knowledge	Differentiated, efficiently organized concepts
Breadth of knowledge	Diverse, elaborated concepts
Type of knowledge	Specialized, domain-relevant concepts
Mental representation	Sophisticated, relational processing
Verbal representation	Specific labeling, description
Ability or skill	Reliable, task-based performance
Adaptive responses	Effective actions, outcomes
Context-specificity	Situation-dependent flexibility
Awareness	Conscious access
Attention	Reflective monitoring
Deliberate practice	Intentional improvement, expansion
Prediction	Proactive planning, adjustment

The features in Table 1, when taken together, describe expertise as skilled performance within a given domain and relative to situation-specific needs. Experts must possess the ‘basic’ domain knowledge shared by other culture members (e.g., a color expert must learn primary and secondary color categories, their prototypical hues, boundaries, and names) as well as specialized knowledge shared by other domain experts (e.g., the difference between hue, saturation, and brightness). Experts can also flexibly deploy this knowledge, depending on context-driven goals or functions: for example, an expert uses different language when describing the color of a toy apple to an American toddler (“red”) than when suggesting a pigment for painting a stormy night sky (“Pantone 7545c”). These become important points as we return to the discussion of

expertise in the domain of emotion and use the above features to build an organizational framework. To inform this process, we conducted a scoping review of individual differences in the mental representation of emotional experience, which we describe next.

Method

Scoping Review Overview

Scoping reviews are a rigorous and transparent process for surveying the literature on broad topics (Pham et al., 2014) that aim to map key constructs and sources and types of data (Mays et al., 2001), as well as to depict the interrelations among these constructs. As such, scoping reviews can be particularly useful when the topic is complex or heterogeneous because they can identify gaps and assess the value of undertaking further research (Daudt et al., 2013). The most common scoping review procedure is the iterative process proposed by Arksey and O'Malley (2005), which involves identifying the research question; identifying relevant studies; selecting studies; charting the data; and collating, summarizing, and reporting the results.

In the present paper, we followed this approach to synthesizing research. After formulating our research question, we (1) identified relevant constructs; (2) selected relevant publications; (3) extracted and (4) organized the data; and (5) summarized, illustrated, and synthesized the results. Throughout this process, we were guided by the materials from the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) workgroup (Liberati et al., 2009; Moher et al., 2009). We also looked to qualitative synthesis methods to inform our use of expertise as an *a priori* framework for situating and re-mapping the included constructs. Framework synthesis (Pope et al., 2000), for example, offers a deductive approach to extract and synthesize a large volume of data from qualitative research, and suggests the use of feature-based charts to visually interrogate the nature of constructs under study (for details, see Data Organization section, below; see also Kastner et al., 2012).

Construct Identification

We identified potential constructs to include in the review via several sources, with the goal of being as inclusive as possible. The constructs included in Kashdan et al. (2015) – *alexithymia*, *awareness*, *clarity*, *complexity*, and *differentiation/granularity*² – served as an initial base, as this review provided a comprehensive recent starting point. To these, we added other constructs for individual differences in emotional knowledge, repertoire, or skill (i.e., those that describe how people understand and experience their own emotions). The first and senior authors developed a preliminary list of constructs based on their knowledge of the literature, frequent Google Scholar search terms (e.g., which words are suggested after typing “emotion[al]”), and popular science pieces on emotional health. Constructs were iteratively added to the list during publication selection, screening, and full-text review, as described below.

We excluded constructs from further consideration if they dealt exclusively with the perception, expression, or regulation of emotion. These domains were out of scope for the present review due to concerns with size and feasibility. The decision to omit constructs related to emotion regulation was also based on the ontological debate of whether the regulation of emotion is fundamentally different from its mental representation or experience (Gross & Barrett, 2011). However, the close relationship between emotion representation and regulation also meant that it was impossible to draw a clean line for construct inclusion. Some constructs,

² From now on, we refer to constructs (e.g., *emotional awareness*, *emotional granularity*) as *awareness*, *granularity*, etc. for ease of reading.

such as *intelligence* and *competence*, include the ability to regulate emotion (among other core aspects). We have retained these constructs because of their prominence in the literature on emotion-related abilities and previous ties to expertise (e.g., Mayer et al., 2001).

Constructs were also excluded if they: were not specific to emotion (e.g., *social skill*; Riggio, 1986 or *resilience*; Connor & Davidson, 2003); had strictly interpersonal meanings (e.g., *affective sensitivity*; Kagan & Schneider, 1987 or *emotional literacy*; Steiner, 1984); were formulated only within a developmental, lifespan, or industrial/organizational context (e.g., *affective social competence*; Halberstadt et al., 2001 or *emotional fitness*; Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). Because our focus is on the mental representation of emotional experiences, we excluded constructs dealing with general affect (i.e., pleasant vs. unpleasant mood) and the dynamics therein (e.g., affect intensity; Larsen & Diener, 1987, affective instability; Trull et al., 2008, or trait affect; Watson & Walker, 1996). We were interested in constructs with impacts for health and well-being; however, this was not a formalized criterion.

The first author reviewed example publications for each potential construct to determine if it met criteria for inclusion. Final decisions regarding inclusion were made through discussion with the senior author. In cases of uncertainty or disagreement, we erred on the side of inclusion. In total, we considered 133 constructs, of which 40 were included. For a full list of included constructs and corresponding publication search results, see Table S1. For a full list of excluded constructs, example publications, and reasons for exclusion, see Table S2.

Publication Selection

The American Psychological Association's PsycINFO database was used to locate literature published up to the date of search; primary searches were conducted between May and October of 2018, going back to the earliest print date of 1927. Literature for each construct was searched separately, with the construct name as the keyword for the search (e.g., "alexithymia"). Multi-word constructs were searched using several keyword phrases to ensure all possible variants were included in review: "emotional [CONSTRUCT]" (e.g., "emotional awareness"), "emotion [CONSTRUCT]" (e.g., "emotion awareness"), "affective [CONSTRUCT]" (e.g., "affective awareness"), and "affect [CONSTRUCT]" (e.g., "affect awareness")³. Only literature written in English and in peer-reviewed journals or edited volumes was included; gray literature (e.g., dissertations or theses) was not considered. Results were further filtered to include only publications in which the keyword (phrase) was included in the title or abstract. See Figure 1 for a flowchart of publication identification, screening, and review. For a full list of search terms, dates, and hits, see Table S1.

Four search terms generated more than 500 hits in PsycINFO, even after filters were applied: "alexithymia" (2,529 records), "emotional awareness" (548 records), "emotional competence" (681 records), and "emotional intelligence" (3,428 records). Because the volume of results for these four constructs far outweighed that of the others (which together yielded 1,316 records), and would have been unfeasible to review, we followed a two-part procedure to select relevant literature. First, we entered these search terms in Clarivate's Web of Science database (which covers publications from 1900), where we could sort search results based on the number of citations. As before, we searched only for phrases appearing in the publication 'topic', with publications limited to articles, reviews, and book chapters written in English. In this case,

³ The phrase "affect [CONSTRUCT]" (e.g., "affect awareness") often did not include any publications relevant to the present research, because "affect" can be used as a verb. If a given search yielded no relevant publications (as determined by visual inspection by the first author), the search results were excluded from further review.

however, we only selected those publications with at least 100 citations. This resulted in a much-reduced set of 382 records to be screened across the four constructs (Table S1). Second, to ensure we captured all key publications, we consulted a set of reviews for each construct (Table S3). Based on and including these reviews, we identified 66 publications potentially related to construct definition and measurement. These records were individually added to the list for further screening. Altogether, this process yielded 1,764 publications; 95 duplicates were removed, leaving 1,669 unique records.

Two trained undergraduate research assistants screened abstracts for identified publications to confirm they met the criteria for inclusion. Publications were excluded from further review if they: (a) described the construct or measure in relation to a specific domain (e.g., art appreciation, romantic relationships); (b) assessed the construct using only biological measures (e.g., fMRI or EEG); or (c) merely applied an existing measure to a sample of participants, without modifying that measure or directly comparing it to another (Table S4). Throughout this screening process, our goal was to identify publications that introduced, reformulated, critiqued, or compared the constructs of interest and their corresponding measures. We focused on these publications because they are especially likely to provide clear construct definitions and direct information on interrelationships between multiple constructs or measures. Of note, comparisons between constructs or measures could be either conceptual or empirical. All abstracts were screened independently by both research assistants, with the first and/or senior author adjudicating difficult or ambiguous cases. Of the 1,669 publications screened, 1,473 were excluded (i.e., 196 were retained at this stage).

Figure 1. Flow chart describing identification, abstract screening, and full review of publications, based on PRISMA guidelines by Moher et al (2009).

Data Extraction

Data from publications were extracted following a coding procedure designed to capture each construct's definition, measurement, validity, and relationships with other psychological and health variables, as well as theoretical background. For each publication, we recorded the information provided in Figure 2. Because publications could describe more than one construct, construct-specific items could be repeated until all constructs were documented.

<i>Bibliographic Information</i>	
Authors	(free response)
Year	(free response)
Title	(free response)
Format	Journal article; Book chapter; Other
Journal/book title	(free response)
Type	Empirical; Review; Meta-analysis; Theory
<i>Construct Information</i>	
Construct name	(free response)
New construct introduced?	Yes; No; Not sure
Definition offered?	Yes; No
Definition	(free response)
Explicitly described as a(n)...	Trait; Ability; State; Implied trait; Not sure; More than one (comment); Other (comment)
Measure used	(free response)
How measure analyzed	(free response)
Measure type	Global self-report; Experience sampling; Task performance; Other (comment)
New measure introduced?	Yes; No; Not sure
Construct validity approach(es)	Reliability analysis; Factor/principal components analysis; Convergent validity; Discriminant validity; Concurrent validity; Predictive validity; Other (comment)
Relationship(s) with other constructs	(free response)
Relationship(s) with health/well-being	(free response)
Predicted associations not tested	(free response)
Personality traits (e.g., Big Five) analyzed?	Yes; No; Other (comment)
<i>Theoretical Information</i>	
Particular theoretical approach evidenced?	Yes, mentioned explicitly; Yes, but it's implicit; No
Name of approach (if applicable)	Appraisal (state type); Basic emotion; Constructionist; Psychoanalytic/psychodynamic; Other (comment)
Evidence for approach	(free response)
<i>Review Information</i>	
Reviewer name	(free response)
Flag for discussion/exclusion?	Yes; No
Overall notes/conclusions	(free response)
Anything to add to the list to review?	(free response)

Figure 2. Data extraction template completed for each fully reviewed publication. Questions regarding a specific construct ('Construct Information' box) were repeated until all included constructs had been documented.

Publications were randomly assigned to a team of two reviewers. Both members of the team independently read and coded the publication and resolved any discrepancies through discussion to produce a consensus record⁴. Difficult or ambiguous cases were addressed in meetings with all reviewers. As part of data extraction, reviewers were asked to identify, from

⁴ Because our primary variables of interest were free-text responses, we were not able to compute meaningful measures of inter-rater reliability such as intraclass correlations or kappa coefficients.

the works cited, any additional publications that may be relevant. This iterative identification method extended our previous search and selection steps, as it was not constrained by the presence of specific keywords. Ninety-six publications were added in this way, 27 of which passed screening for further review, bringing the total to 223 publications. Full print or online versions could not be located for 13 records (e.g., they were published in books only held by European libraries), such that data were extracted for 210 publications.

Reviewers could recommend that a publication be excluded from analysis. For example, the full version of an article might have clarified that one or more of the inclusion criteria had not been met (see Figure 1 for list of reasons for exclusion). Through reading and discussion, we also decided to exclude all publications related to *affective/emotional style*, as well as those related to *affective/emotional variability*. We found that *style* (e.g., Davidson, 1992, 1998, 2000) did not provide sufficient treatment of the mental representation and behavioral measurement of specific emotional experiences (instead focusing on tendencies to approach vs. withdraw and underlying brain systems). *Variability* was initially included in because it can refer to range, diversity, or context-specificity in experienced emotion (e.g., Barrett, 2009; Waugh et al., 2011). However, the publications that met our selection criteria dealt exclusively with affective dynamics⁵. With these records removed, 141 publications remained. See Table 1 for a final list of included constructs and the number of publications representing each. The final database of publications, including key data extracted for each, is available via our online data repository (<https://osf.io/a6vzk/>).

Data Organization

We approached our goal of mapping the selected domain of research, individual differences in the mental representation of emotional experience, in three ways. First, we summarized the definition, common measures, and dominant theoretical perspective of each included construct. To do this, we reviewed the definitions extracted for a given construct, and selected a representative (and typically recent) definition based on one or two of the included publications. We also used the extracted data to identify commonly used measures for the construct and their corresponding measurement type. For example, we identified two commonly used measures for *awareness*. Most of the publications we reviewed used the Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS; Lane et al., 1990), which is a performance-based measure, but there were also publications that used the Clarity and Attention subscales of the Trait Meta-Mood Scales (TMMS; Salovey et al., 1995), which is a global self-report measure. Similarly, we identified the dominant theoretical approaches or perspectives adopted in publications about the construct. We summarize these data in Table 2 to provide a high-level overview of the constructs pertaining to the mental representation of emotional experience and illustrate key commonalities and differences among constructs.

Second, we illustrated the interrelationships between constructs, considering both conceptual and empirical connections. To determine conceptual connections, we reviewed all definitions extracted for a given construct, and any notes made from the included publications' discussion sections. Constructs were often comprised of multiple facets (i.e., subordinate

⁵ To the authors' knowledge, only two publications discuss emotional variability as the range, diversity, or context-specificity of experienced emotion. Barrett (2009) was excluded from the present review as it is a theory piece that discusses emotional experience more generally, rather than an individual difference construct. Waugh et al. (2011) is ostensibly about emotional flexibility (which those authors relate to variation in both the type and intensity of emotion), but was excluded because flexibility is measured using only biological measures (i.e., EMG).

constructs). For example, Kang and Shaver (2004) define *complexity* as comprised of range and differentiation; as such, we documented ‘range’ and ‘differentiation’ as facets of ‘complexity’, as well as links between each facet and the superordinate construct⁶. Furthermore, publications often referred to relationships between the constructs in our review. For example, Kang and Shaver (2004) also discuss the relationship between *complexity* and *intelligence*, which we documented. In this way, we compiled a list of all the constructs and their facets, and a matrix of the conceptual connections between them.

Using a similar procedure, we built a matrix of empirical connections between constructs, with connections established whenever publications reported correlations between two or more of our included constructs. For each empirical connection, we documented the average effect size of the relationship (i.e., the *r* value) and the specific measures used. We used the matrices of conceptual connections and empirical connections (available via our online data repository) to build networks that allowed us to examine the hypothesized relationships between constructs as well as the relationships between constructs apparent in the literature.

Third, we inductively generated a list of the features of expertise represented by each construct. To do this, we reviewed the definitions, measurement information, and notes extracted from each publication and noted salient characteristics about the construct in question. We then compared these characteristics to the features of domain-general expertise described in Table 1. For example, *awareness* stresses the role of conscious cognition in emotional experience (Lane et al., 1990; Lane & Schwartz, 1987), and so it fulfills the feature of **awareness**. Likewise, *granularity* stresses the need for differentiated emotion concepts (Barrett, 2004, 2017a), and so it fulfills the feature of **structure of knowledge**. In this way, we used constructs’ key characteristics to map them onto an integrated framework. We present the results of this synthesis as a polar plot illustrating the distribution of features across constructs for the mental representation of emotional experience.

Results

Summarizing Constructs for the Mental Representation of Emotional Experience

Table 2 presents the final list of included constructs along with their definitions, common measures, dominant theoretical perspectives, number of reviewed publications, and key publications (for individual construct summaries, see pages 11-20 of the supplemental materials). Ignoring modifiers (e.g., “emotion[al]”, “affect[ive]”), there were 15 constructs represented in the extracted data. Two pairs of constructs were synonymous: *differentiation* and *granularity* (Kashdan et al., 2015; Smidt & Suvak, 2015)⁷, and *intelligence* and *quotient* (e.g., Bar-On, 1997, 2000). For the present analyses, we adopted the labels “granularity” and “intelligence”. Four constructs – *agnosia*, *diversity*, *utilization*, and *range* – were represented by only one or two publications each. Based on this small literature size and the constructs’ definitions, we (i)

⁶ We made the a priori decision to exclude constructs that exclusively dealt with the perception, expression, and regulation of emotion. However, some constructs that met our criteria included perception, expression, or regulation as facets (e.g., the model of *intelligence* proposed by Mayer & Salovey, 1997). We incorporated these facets into our network to avoid discarding data from the publications in our review.

⁷ We also included “emotional heterogeneity” (e.g., Charles, 2005) in our list of search terms. None of the resulting publications were selected for inclusion because they described the construct strictly within a lifespan development context. However, based on the definition of *heterogeneity* as the simultaneous experience of multiple negative emotions, we would have also considered it a type of (low) *granularity*. See Table S1 for further details.

merged *diversity* and *range*, (ii) subsumed *agnosia* under *alexithymia*, and (iii) subsumed *utilization* under *competence*. Together, these decisions produced a final total of 10 constructs.

Two constructs – *alexithymia* and *intelligence* – had particularly large literatures to summarize, with 43 and 44 included publications, respectively. In each case, there are several competing definitions and measures, the history and details of which were out of scope for the present review⁸. For current purposes, we focused on the work of Taylor, Bagby, and Parker for *alexithymia* (e.g., Bagby et al., 1994; Taylor et al., 1985) and the work of Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso for *intelligence* (e.g., Mayer et al., 2002; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). The definitions and measures introduced by these research groups are the most widely-used and/or psychometrically-validated in their respective literatures (*alexithymia*: Lumley et al., 2007; but see Kooiman et al., 2002; *intelligence*: Cherniss, 2010; Joseph & Newman, 2010; Livingstone & Day, 2005; but see Maul, 2012; Roberts et al., 2010). Other prominent definitions and measures are presented in the supplemental materials (e.g., the Emotional Quotient Inventory [EQ-i]; Bar-On, 1997; the Bermond-Vorst Alexithymia Questionnaire [BVAQ]; Bermond & Oosterveld, 1994).

⁸ Interested readers are referred to the following reviews: for *alexithymia* (Bar-On, 2004; Bermond et al., 2015; Sifneos, 1996); for *intelligence* (Akerjordet & Severinsson, 2007; Conte, 2005; Siegling et al., 2015).

Table 2. Summary of Constructs for the Mental Representation of Emotional Experience

Construct	Definition	Common Measure(s)	Measure Type	Dominant Theoretical Perspective(s)*	Publications Reviewed [†]	Publications Included	Example Publication(s)
<i>Alexithymia</i> ¹	The inability to identify, describe, and introspect about one's emotional experiences (Aaron et al., 2018); the inability to mentally represent one's emotional experiences (Lane et al., 2015)	Toronto Alexithymia Scale, 20-item version (TAS-20; Bagby et al., 1994) [‡]	Global self-report	Psychoanalytic (historical)	164	43	Nemiah & Sifneos (1970); Taylor et al. (1985)
<i>Awareness</i>	The extent to which one understands, describes, and attends to one's emotional experiences (Mankus et al., 2016)	Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS; Lane et al., 1990); Trait Meta-Mood Scales (TMMS) for Clarity, Attention (Salovey et al., 1995)	Task performance; Global self-report	Cognitive-developmental; Appraisal	148	13	Lane & Schwartz (1987); Thompson et al. (2009)
<i>Clarity</i>	The extent to which one unambiguously identifies, labels, and describes one's own emotional experiences (Boden & Thompson, 2017)	TMMS, Clarity subscale (Salovey et al., 1995); TAS-20, Identification subscale (TAS-20, DIF; Bagby et al., 1994)	Global self-report	Appraisal	148	12	Salovey et al. (1995); Boden & Berenbaum (2011)
<i>Competence</i> ²	The extent to which one identifies, expresses, understands, regulates, and uses one's own emotions and those of others (Brasseur et al., 2013) to facilitate appropriate actions (Izard, 2009)	Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI; Boyatzis et al., 2000); Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC; Brasseur et al., 2013) [§]	Multi-rater assessment; Global self-report	Basic emotion; Appraisal (causal)	44	5	Boyatzis et al. (2000); Brasseur et al. (2013)

<i>Complexity</i>	The extent to which one simultaneously experiences different(ly valenced) emotions, and/or differentiates between a varied and nuanced set of emotions (Grühn et al., 2013)	Range and Differentiation of Emotional Experiences Scale (RDEES; Kang & Shaver, 2004); Empirically derived indices from emotion intensity ratings	Global self-report; Experience sampling [¶]	Cognitive-developmental; Appraisal	126	18	Kang & Shaver (2004); Grühn et al. (2013)
<i>Creativity</i>	The ability to produce emotional responses that are novel, authentic, and effective, as well as one's preparedness to use this ability (Averill, 1999)	Emotional Creativity Inventory (Averill, 1999); Emotional Consequences, Emotional Triads (Averill & Thomas-Knowles, 1991)	Global self-report; Task performance	Constructionist (social)	33	6	Averill & Thomas-Knowles (1991); Averill (1999)
<i>Diversity</i> ³	The variety and relative abundance of the emotions one experiences (Quoidbach et al., 2014); the breadth of emotions one experiences (Kang & Shaver, 2004)	Empirically derived index across emotion frequency ratings; RDEES, Range subscale (Kang & Shaver, 2004)	Experience sampling [¶] ; Global self-report	Appraisal; Constructionist (psychological)	53	4	Quoidbach et al. (2014); Sommers (1981)
<i>Flexibility</i>	The ability to adapt one's emotional experiences in a situation-specific manner (Fu et al., 2018)	Changes in emotion intensity ratings after mood induction; Emotional Flexibility Scale (Fu et al., 2018)	Mood induction; Global self-report	Appraisal	54	4	Waugh et al. (2011); Zhu & Bonanno (2017)
<i>Granularity</i> ⁴	The ability to represent one's emotional experience in a nuanced and specific manner, often (but not	Within-person correlations (e.g., intraclass correlations) across emotion	Experience sampling [¶] ; Global self-report	Constructionist	153	24	Barrett (2017a); Barrett et al. (2001);

	always) marked through language (Lee et al., 2017; Tugade et al., 2004)	intensity ratings; RDEES, Differentiation subscale (Kang & Shaver, 2004)					Tugade et al. (2004)
<i>Intelligence</i> ⁵	The ability to perceive and express emotion, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others (Mayer et al., 2000)	Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al., 2002) [‡]	Task performance	Basic emotion; Appraisal (causal)	353	44	Mayer & Salovey (1997); Bar-On (1997); Siegling et al. (2015)

Note: * Without modifiers, names of theoretical perspectives are inclusive of all variants (e.g., ‘appraisal’ includes ‘descriptive’ and ‘causal’ perspectives; ‘constructionist’ includes ‘psychological’, ‘neural’, ‘developmental’, etc.). Research on *alexithymia* is historically derived from the psychoanalytic tradition, with contemporary accounts departing from this theoretical perspective. † Number of publications identified through database searching and/or key reviews; ‡ Other common measures are discussed in the supplemental materials. § Also assessed as *intelligence*; ¶ Experience sampling measures are analyzed to produce behavioral indices. Superscripts: ¹ Includes *agnosia*; ² Includes *utilization*; ³ Includes *range*; ⁴ Includes *differentiation*; ⁵ Includes *quotient*.

The first trend made clear by this summary is a similarity in how these constructs are typically measured. In the research shown in Table 2, nine of the 10 constructs were measured using global self-report instruments (e.g., the Toronto Alexithymia Scale, 20-item version [TAS-20]; Bagby et al., 1994). Seven of the 10 constructs were (also) measured using indices/scores derived from performance-based tasks (e.g., the Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale [LEAS]; Lane et al., 1990), retrospective emotion frequency ratings (e.g., for calculating diversity; Quoidbach et al., 2014), or in-the-moment emotion intensity ratings (e.g., intraclass correlations for granularity; e.g., Tugade et al., 2004). In-the-moment intensity ratings, which are typically gathered via experience sampling procedures, have been described as a behavioral measure of emotion because they do not rely on memory or aggregation over time (Barrett & Barrett, 2001; Robinson & Clore, 2002). It has been argued that behavioral measures are more appropriate for measuring the skills or abilities represented by the present constructs (Joseph & Newman, 2010; Kashdan et al., 2015; Siegling et al., 2015), whereas global self-report instruments may capture individuals' beliefs about themselves and other biases (e.g., Barrett, 1997; Mayer et al., 2001; Robinson & Clore, 2002). Notwithstanding, all of the measures reviewed evidenced construct validity and had predictive utility for outcomes of interest (e.g., Bagby et al., 2020).

Another key take-away from Table 2 is the role played by various theoretical perspectives on emotion. Across all 10 constructs, appraisal-theoretic influences appeared most often. These influences included both 'causal' appraisal perspectives (e.g., Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991; Plutchik, 1980; Roseman, 1991; Scherer, 1984), which hold that appraisals are mental processes that give rise to the experience of emotion, as well as 'descriptive' appraisal perspectives (e.g., Clore & Ortony, 2000, 2008; Moors et al., 2013; Scherer, 2009a, 2009b), which hold that appraisals capture the content or meaning of emotional experience (for the distinction between these approaches, see Barrett, 2016; Barrett et al., 2007; Gross & Barrett, 2011). Work on *clarity*, *diversity*, and *flexibility* has been mostly influenced by appraisal perspectives, whereas work on *intelligence* and *competence* has also been shaped by basic emotion perspectives (e.g., Ekman, 1972; Izard, 1993; Tomkins, 1962, 1963) and work on *awareness* and *complexity* has also been shaped by cognitive-developmental perspectives (e.g., Labouvie-Vief & Medler, 2002; Lane & Schwartz, 1987; Piaget, 1937; Werner & Kaplan, 1963).

Work on *alexithymia* has been historically situated within a psychoanalytic or psychodynamic tradition (e.g., Freud, 1891; Marty & de M'Uzan, 1963; Ruesch, 1948), which understands emotional experience as a way of symbolizing or processing internal or unconscious conflicts (e.g., Krystal, 1979; Lesser, 1981; Nemiah & Sifneos, 1970; Taylor, 1984). Contemporary accounts of *alexithymia*, however, understand it as deficits in the processing of emotional information (e.g., Lane et al., 2000; Lumley et al., 2007). Work on *creativity* and *granularity* has been anchored in a (social) constructionist framework (e.g., Averill, 1980; Barrett, 2009; James, 1884; Russell, 2003), which emphasizes the influence of individual history, cultural background, and physical and situational context on the experience of emotion. Each of these theoretical perspectives has implications for understanding individual differences in the mental representation of emotional experience, how they can be measured, and whether they can be improved. We return to this point in the construct synthesis section, below.

Illustrating Relationships between Constructs

Conceptual relationships. Figure 3 provides a descriptive network illustration of the conceptual interrelationships between constructs and their facets as they are defined in the published literature. Nodes corresponding to constructs are teal, while nodes corresponding to

facets are light gray; for clarity of viewing (and in keeping with Table 2), all nodes are labeled without modifiers (e.g., “emotion[al]”). Nodes and their labels are sized according to their number of connections. Connections linking a facet to a broader construct are indicated with an arrow directed at the construct; connections linking two ‘peer’ constructs are indicated with an arrow at either end. Connections (edges) are weighted by the number of publications represented, from a scale of one (a single publication; thinnest lines) to five (five or more publications; thickest lines). Weights were capped at five to provide a representative sense of endorsement rates, while accounting for differences in publication selection for high-volume constructs such as *alexithymia* and *intelligence*. Finally, facets have been renamed to facilitate integration in the network. For example, source clarity (Boden & Berenbaum, 2011; Boden & Thompson, 2015; Cameron et al., 2013; Lischetzke & Eid, 2017) is referred to as “appraisal” to highlight connections to appraisal-theoretic perspectives as well as to other constructs such as *competence* (Scherer, 2007) and *intelligence* (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Furthermore, constructs and facets defined as inabilities have been conceptually inverted. For example, *alexithymia* is defined as “the inability to identify, describe, and introspect about one’s emotional experiences” (Aaron et al., 2018); when inverted as ‘(a)lexithymia’, these facets became the abilities of identification, description, and introspection⁹. As identification was also a facet of *awareness* (Bagby et al., 2006; Boden & Thompson, 2015), *clarity* (Boden & Berenbaum, 2011; Lischetzke & Eid, 2017), and *competence* (Brasseur et al., 2013), this node could be connected accordingly.

Across the network, connections between constructs reflect underlying relationships between subdomains, research groups, and theoretical perspectives. Missing connections between constructs at the periphery reflect, then, opportunities for conceptual integration. For example, we observed that the constructs of *flexibility* and *diversity* shared fewer connections with their neighboring constructs (i.e., their nodes were smaller): *flexibility* was indirectly connected to *competence* (via the facets of regulation and expression), and *diversity* was only directly connected to *complexity*. In contrast, the constructs of *intelligence*, *(a)lexithymia*, *awareness*, and *clarity* had many complex connections (i.e., their nodes were larger and connected by thick lines to multiple other nodes). These constructs were directly linked to each other and indirectly linked via the facets of appraisal, attention, and identification. In other words, these constructs were often described as separate but related, and were conceptualized with overlapping features.

Broadly, we interpret the network in Figure 3 as depicting several interrelated clusters of constructs with *intelligence*, *(a)lexithymia*, and *awareness/clarity* as hubs. The *intelligence* cluster was the largest, and included constructs oriented toward applied contexts, such as *competence* and *flexibility*. *Creativity* also formed a part of this cluster, although as a satellite of *intelligence*; this relationship reflects the theoretical context in which *creativity* was introduced as a constructionist alternative to *intelligence* (e.g., Averill, 2004; Ivcevic et al., 2007). The *(a)lexithymia* cluster, the second largest, evidenced its clinical origins through the neurological construct of *(a)gnosia* (Lane et al., 2015), and facets derived from the psychoanalytic tradition such as introspection (i.e., the inverse of externally oriented thinking) and imagination (i.e., the

⁹ There is precedent for interpreting *alexithymia* as the conceptual inverse of emotion-related abilities (e.g., Lumley et al., 2005), and the term “lexithymics” has also been used to describe emotionally-intelligent individuals (Moormann et al., 2008). However, the most common measure of *alexithymia* – the TAS-20 (Bagby et al., 1994) – only assesses the presence or absence of impairment, not the degree of skill at the other end of the continuum. In this sense, alexithymia, as measured, does not capture expertise.

inverse of reduced fantasy). Still, this cluster had many nodes in common with the *awareness/clarity* cluster, which bridges clinical application with a basic science interest in describing the mental representation of emotional experience (e.g., voluntary vs. involuntary attention; Huang et al., 2013; source vs. type clarity; Boden & Berenbaum, 2011). This descriptive emphasis is shared by the *complexity* cluster, whose constructs additionally seek to capture individual differences across the lifespan (e.g., Grühn et al., 2013) and across cultures (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2016). *Granularity* did not have a clear cluster membership; it shared a strong connection with *complexity* but was also situated between *(a)lexithymia* and *awareness*.

Figure 3. Network based on conceptual interrelationships documented between constructs and their facets. Node color distinguishes constructs summarized in Table 2 (teal) from facets added during data extraction (light gray). Only publications by Taylor, Bagby, and colleagues (e.g., Bagby et al., 1994; Taylor et al., 1985) and Mayer, Salovey, and colleagues (e.g., Mayer et al., 2002; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) are represented for *alexithymia* and *intelligence*, respectively. For a version of this network including other definitions of these constructs, see Figure S1. Nodes and their labels are sized according to their number of connections (i.e., degree). Facets are connected to broader constructs with an arrow directed at the construct; constructs are connected to each other with an arrow at both ends. Connections are weighted counts of the number of publications represented, such that the thinnest lines represent a single publication, and the thickest lines represent five or more publications. Nodes renamed from the original publications to facilitate integration: “granularity” also refers to differentiation (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001); “covariation” also refers to dialecticism (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2016); “regulation” also refers to repair (Salovey et al., 1995); “appraisal” also refers to source clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “identification” also refers to type clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “voluntary attention” (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2015) also refers to redirected attention (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Facets noting the use of language to verbalize emotion (e.g., labeling; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) are referred to as “description” (following Bagby et al., 1994). Nodes conceptually inverted: ‘(a)gnosia’; ‘(a)lexithymia’ and its facets identification, description, introspection (vs. externally oriented thinking), and imagination (vs. reduced fantasy). Network visualization created in Gephi (Bastian et al., 2009) using the Yifan Hu Proportional layout (Hu, 2005).

Empirical relationships. Figure 4 provides a descriptive network illustration of the empirical interrelationships between constructs. As in Figure 3, constructs are represented by teal nodes, facets by light gray nodes, and nodes are sized by their number of connections. In this network, however, connections between nodes represent statistical relationships (i.e., correlations) between the constructs/facets, regardless of the measure used to collect this data. The connections represent mean effect sizes (r) of all reported correlations and are colored according to the direction of correlation (blue for positive, purple for negative). Importantly, because (*a*)*lexithymia* and its facets were conceptually inverted, so were corresponding connections: publications documenting negative correlations between *alexithymia* and *intelligence* (e.g., Parker et al., 2001), for example, are displayed as positive (blue) connections between the two nodes. Additionally, the network layout was structured using the strength of the mean effect sizes. Connections are undirected (i.e., there are no arrows), denoting bidirectional relationships.

This network provides a high-level snapshot of how data are collected and analyzed in relation to the constructs reviewed. In Figure 3, conceptual connections between constructs were sparser and organized into several interrelated but distinguishable clusters. In Figure 4, empirical connections between constructs are numerous. Constructs were frequently compared against each other, even if they were not considered to be conceptually related. There were also a variety of comparisons made, although it was rare for more than two constructs to be compared within a single publication (cf. Lumley et al., 2005). Facets of (*a*)*lexithymia* and *intelligence* were dominant in this network, reflecting the ubiquity of their corresponding measures (e.g., TAS-20, Bagby et al., 1994; MSCEIT, Mayer et al., 2002). The most common comparison (i.e., largest node) was with the facet of identification (shared by (*a*)*lexithymia*, *awareness*, *clarity*, and *competence*), emphasizing how important the ability to categorize emotional experience is for measuring multiple constructs. Several nodes – (*a*)*gnosia*, context sensitivity, and *flexibility* – remained unconnected and therefore are not represented in this network. Also, note, however, that because our goal was to review a representative rather than comprehensive set of publications, it is likely that there are missing comparisons – particularly for the high-volume constructs of *alexithymia* and *intelligence*.

This network suggests overlap in what constructs measure and, from this perspective, lends credibility to our proposal to integrate these constructs within a unifying framework. The overall relationship, after inverting (*a*)*lexithymia*, is positive; negative correlations are few and generally weak. Nodes generally form one cluster, except for constructs such as *diversity* and *competence* whose measures were less often compared in the publications we reviewed. This observation builds on prior meta-analytic comparisons of common measures for (*a*)*lexithymia* (TAS-20) and *awareness* (LEAS; Maroti et al., 2018) and on studies comparing multiple constructs and measures for each (e.g., Gohm & Clore, 2002; Ivcevic et al., 2007; Kang & Shaver, 2004; Lumley et al., 2005). These studies have found positive, small effect-size relationships between measures, which researchers have typically interpreted as discriminant validity for the constructs in question. For example, a significant but weak meta-analytic correlation of $r = .12$ was used to argue that (*a*)*lexithymia* and *awareness* were separate but related (Maroti et al., 2018). Figure 4 situates these findings with respect to a larger network, emphasizing the similarity of these constructs when viewed from a higher level. Nonetheless, the interpretation of correlation strength also depends upon the conceptual model used to structure a given domain (Bollen & Lennox, 1991), a point to which we return in the discussion.

Figure 4. Network based on empirical interrelationships documented between constructs and their facets. Node color distinguishes constructs summarized in Table 2 (teal) from facets added during data extraction (light gray). Connection color distinguishes direction of correlation (blue for positive, purple for negative). Only publications by Taylor, Bagby, and colleagues (e.g., Bagby et al., 1994; Taylor et al., 1985) and Mayer, Salovey, and colleagues (e.g., Mayer et al., 2002; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) are represented for *alexithymia* and *intelligence*, respectively. For a version of this network including other definitions and measures of these constructs, see Figure S2. Connections are undirected. The network is structured according to the strength of the mean effect sizes. Nodes renamed from the original publications to facilitate integration: “granularity” also refers to differentiation (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001); “covariation” also refers to dialecticism (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2016); “regulation” also refers to repair (Salovey et al., 1995); “appraisal” also refers to source clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “identification” also refers to type clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “voluntary attention” (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2015) also refers to redirected attention (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Facets noting the use of language to verbalize emotion (e.g., labeling; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) are referred to as “description” (following Bagby et al., 1994). Nodes conceptually inverted: ‘(a)gnosia’; ‘(a)lexithymia’ and its facets identification, description, introspection (vs. externally oriented thinking), and imagination (vs. reduced fantasy). Network visualization created in Gephi (Bastian et al., 2009) using the Yifan Hu Proportional layout (Hu, 2005).

Synthesizing Constructs based on Features of Expertise

Figure 5 presents the set of 12 features hypothesized to constitute expertise in emotion, as determined deductively from accounts of domain-general expertise. These features are presented in the same order as in Table 1. The polar plot summarizes which features are represented by the constructs included in this review, as determined inductively from definitions, measures, and notes extracted from the selected publications. Features are plotted along radial lines, with constructs plotted along concentric circles in alphabetical order from (*a*) *lexithymia* (the innermost circle) to *intelligence* (the outermost circle). Data points indicate where a feature is present; in cases of disagreement or conflicting accounts within the literature, the data point is not filled (see Table S5 for example publications in support of each point).

Overall, in Figure 5 we see a many-to-many (rather than one-to-one) mapping between constructs and features. Two things are especially noteworthy. First, features varied in the number of constructs in which they were present. Every construct satisfied the feature of **mental representation**. This is by design, as this feature was a conceptual prerequisite for inclusion in our review. Other than the criterion, however, there is no single feature that is present in all constructs. Some aspects of the feature space are under-represented. Second, constructs varied in the number of features they covered. *Intelligence*, *granularity*, and *creativity* were the most comprehensive, while *flexibility* and *diversity* were the least. However, more comprehensive constructs were not necessarily consistent in the features they covered. Moreover, the number of features covered by a construct is not intended as an index of quality or utility: as we discuss next, the presence of features was largely driven by underlying theoretical assumptions about the nature of emotions and methods of measurement.

One of the primary dimensions on which constructs differed is the nature of the conceptual knowledge underlying the mental representation of emotional experience. Most construct definitions explicitly acknowledged that knowledge or ‘mental content’ is a central feature of expertise. The majority of constructs specified something about the **structure (i.e., quality) of knowledge**: *granularity*, for example, required emotion concepts (i.e., accrued knowledge and experience) to be nuanced and precise (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001; Tugade et al., 2004), while *complexity* emphasized high-dimensionality (e.g., Carstensen et al., 2000; Ong et al., 2017) and *creativity* underscored person-specificity (e.g., Averill, 1999; Fuchs et al., 2007). *Creativity* and *granularity* – along with *diversity* and *complexity* – also highlighted the **breadth of knowledge** supporting emotional experience. In the case of *diversity* and *complexity*, this could be seen in the emphasis on range (e.g., Kang & Shaver, 2004; Quoidbach et al., 2014). For *creativity*, breadth was captured by an emphasis on novelty (e.g., Averill, 1999; Ivcevic et al., 2017), whereas for *granularity* breadth was implied by having emotion concepts that are specific rather than overlapping (thereby covering more conceptual ‘space’; Barrett, 2017a).

Instead of speaking to the structure or breadth of knowledge, work on *intelligence* and *competence* focused on the **type of knowledge**. That is, these constructs followed the assumption (from basic and/or causal appraisal accounts of emotion) that one could be ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ in one’s knowledge – and that accuracy was critical for expertise (e.g., Izard et al., 2011; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Scherer, 2007). By these accounts, having more, or differently-structured, knowledge does not necessarily enhance expertise, if one does not already know the specific things one should know about emotions, such as their (evolutionarily-endowed) forms and functions (e.g., Izard, 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Scherer, 2007).

Figure 5. Features of expertise in emotion, as determined deductively through consultation of accounts of domain-general expertise. For an alternative presentation of these data, see Table S5. Features are plotted along radial lines, with constructs plotted along concentric circles in alphabetical order from *(a)lexithymia* (the innermost circle) to *intelligence* (the outermost circle). Data points indicate where a feature is present; in cases of disagreement or conflicting accounts within the literature, the data point is not filled.

Another primary dimension of expertise in emotion was whether it was considered an **ability or skill** versus a trait. Four of the 10 constructs we reviewed were conceptualized predominantly as abilities or skills: *competence* (e.g., Brasseur et al., 2013), *creativity* (e.g., Averill, 1999), *granularity* (e.g., Kashdan et al., 2015), and *intelligence* (e.g., Mayer et al., 2000)¹⁰. Ability models broadly assumed that expertise is not a latent capacity, but something that is continually acquired throughout the lifespan and can be actively improved (e.g., Kashdan et al., 2015; Mayer et al., 2016). In contrast, five constructs were described, either implicitly or explicitly, as traits: (*a*)*lexithymia*, *awareness*, *clarity*, *complexity*, and *diversity*. *Awareness* (e.g., Lane & Schwartz, 1992) and *complexity* (e.g., Lindquist & Barrett, 2008) have alternatively been conceptualized as abilities or skills.

Three features captured the types of behaviors that indicate expertise. By most accounts, **verbal representation** of emotional experience provides key – if not unparalleled – insight into mental representation. ‘Verbal representation’ included the identification (i.e., labeling) and description of emotion, and formed a central part of (*a*)*lexithymia* (e.g., Bermond et al., 1999; Sifneos, 1973; Taylor, 1984), *awareness* (e.g., Lane & Schwartz, 1987; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995; Thompson et al., 2009), *clarity* (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2017; Lischetzke & Eid, 2017), and *granularity* (e.g., Barrett, 2004; Lee et al., 2017). The appropriate (i.e., normative) use of language was also included in some conceptualizations of *competence* (e.g., Scherer, 2007) and *intelligence* (e.g., Ivcevic et al., 2007).

Adaptive responses were a further concomitant of *competence*, *creativity*, *granularity*, and *intelligence*, although these constructs differed in their understanding of ‘adaptive’. As noted above, measures of *competence* and *intelligence* tended to assume universal or at least strongly normative operationalizations of emotional behaviors (e.g., Izard, 2009; Mayer et al., 2000). These constructs also assumed that expertise should meet criteria that are more-or-less context-invariant (e.g., Averill, 2004; Petrides, 2010), with these criteria taken from hypotheses about evolutionarily-endowed forms and functions (e.g., Izard, 2009; Scherer, 2007), established by a panel of emotion researchers (Mayer et al., 2000), or derived from a sample of US participants (Mayer et al., 2000). In all cases, there was an assumption of a single ‘best’ way to respond, with individual variability in response considered an undesirable deviation from this norm¹¹.

By comparison, constructs such as *complexity*, *creativity*, and *granularity* stressed **context-sensitivity** in assessment and interpretation (e.g., Averill, 1999; Kashdan et al., 2015; Lindquist & Barrett, 2008). The cross-cutting assumption – based largely on constructionist and descriptive appraisal perspectives – was that expertise is a relative rather than absolute measure, and varies naturally as a function of culturally-, personally-, and situationally-relevant goals and constraints (e.g., Averill, 1999; Barrett, 2017a).

Two features related to how expertise shapes emotional experience. Most constructs specified that expertise included **awareness** of emotion – that individuals consciously represent and navigate emotional experience (e.g., Lane & Schwartz, 1987; Subic-Wrana et al., 2005;

¹⁰ Outside of Mayer and colleagues’ ‘ability model’ of *intelligence*, there were also several competing ‘trait’ or ‘mixed model’ accounts (e.g., Bar-On, 1997; Petrides et al., 2007).

¹¹ The need for normative criteria for assessing adaptive responses (i.e., behaviors) is specifically a problem for ability models of *intelligence* and *competence*. Trait or mixed-model accounts of *intelligence* and *competence* do not suffer these same criticisms because they are predominantly assessed using global self-report measures (e.g., Bar-On, 1997; Petrides et al., 2007), which capture individuals’ beliefs about themselves rather than (directly measuring) abilities or skills. For further reading on the debate between ability and mixed or trait models of *intelligence* with regard to measurement, the interested reader is referred to Averill (2004), Conte (2005), Petrides (2010), and Roberts et al. (2010).

Thompson et al., 2009). *Granularity* was a notable exception to this trend. Although the measurement of *granularity* invokes the use of verbal representation (which requires conscious access), the experience of granular emotions does not per se require subjective awareness (Barrett, 2017a, 2017b; see also Lambie & Marcel, 2002). Constructs such as *(a)lexithymia* and *awareness* expanded subjective awareness further to include **attention** to emotions. This attention can take the form of active scanning or monitoring (e.g., Coffey et al., 2003; Gohm & Clore, 2002; Salovey et al., 1995; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) or of introspection or internally-oriented thought (e.g., Marty & de M'Uzan, 1963; Taylor et al., 1985), and can be voluntary or involuntary (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2015; Elfenbein & MacCann, 2017)¹².

Two final features related to how expertise is acquired and implemented. Many accounts of domain-general expertise speak to its acquisition via **deliberate practice** (e.g., Ullén et al., 2016). The only constructs to explicitly advocate for such an approach to emotion were *creativity* and *granularity*. With its facet of 'preparedness', *creativity* directly tapped the intuition that individuals develop expertise through intentional engagement with and reflection upon their emotions (Averill, 1999). Similarly, individuals can improve their *granularity* by being "collectors of experience" (Barrett, 2017a), seeking out new ways to expand their perspective and gain new, more nuanced concepts. *Granularity* further emphasized that these new concepts lead to improved **prediction** (Barrett, 2017a). Individuals with greater expertise are more skilled at using their knowledge and can better anticipate and adjust to upcoming challenges. While constructs such as *creativity* and *flexibility* did emphasize context-sensitivity, as discussed above, they did not capture the proactive planning accounted for by prediction. Prediction was also discussed in some accounts of *(a)lexithymia* (Lane et al., 2015) and *complexity* (Lindquist & Barrett, 2008).

Discussion

The idea that some people are better or worse than others at understanding and experiencing emotions is widely held. Decades of research support the existence of individual differences in emotional competencies, with thousands of studies demonstrating the various ways in which individuals can excel or be deficient, and the downstream consequences of these individual differences for mental health, physical health, and other real-world outcomes. Yet the volume of research and variety of individual differences can also be a hindrance to scientific discovery and practical application. There are dozens of psychological constructs (and an even greater number of measures) pertaining to individual differences in the mental representation of emotional experience, and research on these constructs is often found in separate literatures with separate audiences, research goals, and theoretical assumptions.

In the present paper, we have proposed a means to integrate these constructs within a unifying framework based on features of domain-general expertise. Through a scoping review procedure, we conducted an iterative and systematic review of the literature. We identified 10 core constructs: *alexithymia*, *awareness*, *clarity*, *complexity*, *competence*, *creativity*, *diversity*, *flexibility*, *granularity*, and *intelligence*. For each construct, we interrogated a representative set of publications to determine the features of expertise represented, the primary methods of measurement, and their underlying theoretical perspectives. We also situated constructs with respect to each other in terms of definition and measurement, illustrating conceptual and empirical relationships using networks. Finally, we re-mapped constructs to a set of deductively

¹² Involuntary attention to emotion is itself negatively associated with other facets of *awareness*, *clarity*, and overall expertise (Boden & Thompson, 2015; Huang et al., 2013; Mankus et al., 2016).

generated features for expertise so that we could compare them. Throughout this process, we observed overlaps, gaps, and inconsistencies in construct definition and measurement that provide insight into the nature of expertise in emotion as it pertains to the mental representation of emotional experience. These findings provide a framework for interpreting a broader set of emotion-related individual differences and have implications for future research.

Scoping Review Summary

We created an expertise framework for emotion as a means of querying and comparing constructs in this domain. Returning to the opening analogy of the blind men and the elephant, our intention was to integrate a diverse set of individual differences so that we could describe the different parts and examine how (and if) they all fit together. We explored the nomological network for the mental representation of emotional experience by illustrating the relationships between constructs. The conceptual network, based primarily on construct definitions, reflected the motivations of theorists. The connections in this network revealed a body of research with several interrelated clusters of constructs, anchored by *intelligence*, *alexithymia*, and *awareness* and *clarity*. We interpret these clusters as evidence of the conceptual splintering or re-discovery that has produced the different ‘parts of the elephant’. This splintering was not as evident, however, when we examined the empirical connections between constructs as measured. Instead, the web of correlations between these constructs and their facets suggested broad overlap across the network – that these constructs may be part of the same elephant, even if they do differ in some way or another.

We explored the nature of these conceptual differences by analyzing the features of expertise represented by each construct. We identified several features that were shared by many of the surveyed constructs, beyond the feature that served as an inclusion criterion (i.e., **mental representation**). Among the major commonalities were that experts are **consciously aware** of their experiences and that experts use specific language to **verbally represent** them. In line with domain-general accounts, expertise in emotion was often seen as an **ability or skill**. There were also clear distinctions. Perhaps the most notable was between constructs that focus on **types of knowledge** and normative or stipulated responses in determining expertise, such as *competence* and *intelligence*, and those that focus on the **structure of the knowledge** and **context-sensitivity** of the response, such as *creativity* and *granularity*. These differences were often rooted in theoretical assumptions about emotion – such as the contrast we highlighted between the basic emotion and causal appraisal accounts that ground *competence* and *intelligence* and constructionist accounts that ground *creativity* and *granularity*. Differences between constructs were also influenced by other motivating factors, such as the goals of a program of research (e.g., to help managers work with personnel, to help clinicians treat patients, to better understand underlying mechanisms).

There are some useful general observations that we can make from this work. In both our network- and feature-based analyses, we observed that certain constructs are more central to this domain than others. *Flexibility* and *diversity*, for instance, may be peripheral constructs. It is possible that these constructs have less support because they are backed by less literature. It is also possible that these constructs are less representative of expertise in emotion. Likewise, we ‘zoomed in on’ only one portion of a much larger nomological network of constructs related to individual differences in emotional competencies. As such, the connections between our sub-network and its neighboring networks are not visible. For example, we excluded constructs that dealt exclusively with the perception, expression, and regulation of emotion. Yet these processes

emerged as facets of *competence* (e.g., Brasseur et al., 2013), *flexibility* (e.g., Fu et al., 2018), and *intelligence* (e.g., Mayer & Salovey, 1997). We interpret this as an indication of the overlap between a set of interrelated bodies of research.

Limitations

Although we sought to integrate across many different emotional competencies, there are necessary limits on the scope of this work. A more comprehensive account of expertise in emotion would also include constructs related to the regulation of emotion in oneself (e.g., *coping*, *control*), those related to the representation of others' emotional experiences (e.g., *recognition*, *empathy*), and those related to the management of emotion in others (e.g., *capital*, *attunement*; see Table S2). It may further include research on affective dynamics, changes across the lifespan, and disordered emotional health. We conceptualize the understanding and management of emotions as an umbrella, the exact structure of which should be determined through systematic review and synthesis of relevant constructs. In this regard, we echo prior work that has conceptualized *emotional intelligence* as a broad, multi-faceted domain (e.g., Baron-On, 1997; Elfenbein & MacCann, 2017; Palmer et al., 2008; Tett et al., 2005). In their initial 1990 publication, Salovey and Mayer proposed a taxonomic framework for *emotional intelligence* as a set of skills related to emotion in oneself and others. Here, we have built upon this framework by introducing a set of domain-general features that provide a basis for interpretation of expertise in emotion writ broadly.

Another consideration is whether our scoping review has sufficiently sampled the included constructs. For constructs with large literatures – *alexithymia*, *awareness*, *competence*, and *intelligence* – we certainly did not sample all possible results, intentionally limiting our review to a set of representative publications. For all constructs, we excluded publications that did not introduce, reformulate, critique, or compare constructs or their measures. These decisions could have influenced our conclusions if excluded publications contained new constructs or measures or documented new definitions or interrelationships. This seems relatively unlikely given our goal of representative rather than comprehensive sampling and the conceptual focus of our review. Even so, these conceptual limitations should be addressed by future research.

There are also important methodological limitations to note. We excluded gray literature and non-English sources. These decisions are likely to have inadvertently perpetuated biases in which research gets published and which cultural viewpoints are represented (Arnett, 2009; Medin et al., 2017; Rad et al., 2018), tempering the universality of our conclusions. This possibility is particularly relevant given widely documented sociocultural variation in emotion-related processes (e.g., Boiger et al., 2018; Gendron et al., 2018; Niedenthal et al., 2019; Tamir et al., 2016) and must be dealt with to ensure the generalizability of our proposed framework. The databases we used may have likewise limited our results (e.g., Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016). We propose that PsycINFO, our primary database, was a reasonable starting place given that we sought to survey constructs for the mental representation of emotional experience. However, emotion research is highly interdisciplinary, spanning anthropology, computer science, linguistics, philosophy, and more. PsycINFO does not cover all historical publications from these fields (Burman, 2018). Nevertheless, an advantage to using PsycINFO as our starting point was that it allowed us to seed an expertise framework within a more targeted literature. Indeed, one purpose of our scoping review was to gauge whether our approach merits further research, including detailed reviews that incorporate (unpublished) sources in a variety of languages, and databases with more multidisciplinary coverage (e.g., Walters, 2007). We believe that it does.

What is Expertise in Emotion?

Fundamentally, our approach of bringing constructs into a common feature space defined by expertise is an ontological pursuit. We selected a set of constructs with family resemblance; our goal was, at least in part, to assess whether these constructs are related. The results of our scoping review suggest that they are. Yet we observed that the constructs were not fully overlapping and that some were more central to this domain than others. In other words, there does not appear to be support for an underlying construct of ‘emotional expertise’ that gives rise to *alexithymia*, *awareness*, *intelligence*, etc. We are unable to formally test this possibility, however, because we have only theoretical suggestions (conceptual network), correlational evidence (empirical network), and inductive properties (feature synthesis). Moreover, such a test would presume that constructs for expertise in emotion follow a latent variable model, where indicators (i.e., the constructs we have surveyed) are explained by a given construct, are highly correlated with each other, and can be considered independent to the extent that they reliably stand in for one another (Bollen & Lennox, 1991). This conceptual model is dominant in psychological science (Borsboom et al., 2003; Coan, 2010) and corresponds with classical measurement theory in which construct validity is established through internal consistency and reliability (Spearman, 1904a, 1904b). It also has historical connections with expertise in emotion, as the best-known latent variable model, intelligence (Borsboom et al., 2003), is echoed in work on *emotional intelligence* (e.g., Mayer et al., 2008; but see Salovey & Mayer, 1990). However, it carries with it the overall assumption that indicators are manifestations of, and can be reduced to, a single causal entity. The results of our scoping review do not support this assumption.

Instead, our observations are more consistent with an emergent variable model, in which the indicators explain the construct and, in this sense, are formative (Barrett, 2000, 2011; Bollen & Lennox, 1991; Coan, 2010). In an emergent variable model, indicators jointly constitute the construct, and so no one can substitute for any other – just as socioeconomic status (SES) cannot be explained by occupation, income, or education alone (Bollen & Lennox, 1991). The construct is a product of the interaction of the indicators, rather than an underlying essence. This conceptual model also has implications for measurement: a consensus of indicators is necessary to fully understand the construct (Bollen & Lennox, 1991) – indicators are neither interchangeable nor sufficient in isolation (Coan, 2010). Each has separate value, and there is no requirement that they should be highly correlated. Because an emergent variable model cannot rely on internal consistency and reliability, however, it is psychologically uninterpretable in isolation: its validity is determined via its effects on extrinsic criteria (Bollen & Lennox, 1991; see also Barrett, 2000). In the domain of emotion, these criteria are the clinical and real-world impacts of having more or less expertise.

An emergent variable approach is particularly apt for the analogy of the blind men and the elephant because it explains why we cannot understand the trunk from touching the toes: only together do they describe what an elephant is (i.e., they contribute different information to the model). The elephant cannot be explained by its trunk alone but, because its features are jointly constitutive, would also not be an elephant without it. An emergent variable approach values the parts because it is only through understanding their relationship to the larger whole that we can assess their contribution (Barrett, 2000, 2011). This approach still implies the existence of a ‘larger whole’, or an inferred construct, but can more flexibly accommodate different types of indicators and the relationships between them (Coan, 2010). For example, it could be that some of the constructs we surveyed in the present review can be merged, whereas

others have utility for sampling separate parts of the expertise feature space. These are questions for future research. Understanding expertise in emotion as an emergent variable provides a roadmap for the theoretical and empirical tasks that comprise this research, as we discuss next.

Implications for Future Research

An emergent variable model suggests that multiple indicators combine to give rise to expertise in emotion. This approach has two main implications for future research. First, it implies the need for multiple measurements and methods as often as possible because one indicator cannot stand in for another (Barrett, 2000, 2011; Coan, 2010). This emphasis on multi-method assessment builds on previous recommendations (e.g., Bagby et al., 2006; Lumley et al., 2005; Scollon et al., 2003; Smith, Killgore, & Lane, 2018) with new insights from an expertise framework. Domain-general accounts of expertise recommend measures that allow individuals to demonstrate expert performance as an ability or skill, so that this performance can be related to situation-specific goals and needs. Expertise in emotion also emphasizes facility of verbal representation, such that individuals' use of language to describe emotions can be considered a key aspect of performance. Taken together, these criteria promote the use of performance-based tasks (e.g., responses to scenarios gathered using the LEAS; Lane et al., 1990) and momentary reports repeated over time (e.g., data gathered using experience sampling methods; Barrett & Barrett, 2001). These measures can be complemented by global self-report instruments that capture individuals' aggregate understandings and experiences, but may also reflect their self-concept (e.g., Robinson & Clore, 2002).

An emergent variable approach also implies a focus on the mechanisms that link indicators to each other as well as to expertise in emotion (Barrett, 2000, 2011; Coan, 2010). Broadly speaking, the mental representation of emotional experience is supported by both biological and interpersonal processes (Barrett et al., 2007). Several contemporary models of emotional experience offer hypotheses for how these processes relate to the present set of individual difference constructs. For example, *emotional awareness* (Smith, Killgore, & Lane, 2018; see also Smith et al., 2017), *emotional granularity* (Barrett, 2017b, 2017a), and *emotional intelligence* (Smith, Killgore, Alkozei, et al., 2018) are supported by brain-based and mechanistic models that may be used to anchor future research. In the present review, we excluded constructs and publications that used only neural or physiological measures, as well as those that relied solely on perceptual or dyadic measures, as these were not necessary for describing the mental representation of one's own emotional experience as a set of behaviors. Moving forward, there is a need to integrate the constructs identified here with research on the biological processes supporting the implementation of expertise and research on the interpersonal processes guiding its development. This integration is necessary to connect expertise in emotion with consequences for health and well-being.

Biological measures can provide insight into the nature and implementation of expertise in emotion. Brain-based models of emotion (e.g., Barrett, 2017b; Smith, Killgore, & Lane, 2018) suggest that measures of neural structure and function can provide a window onto the mental representation of emotion. One potential path forward is represented by recent work demonstrating that differences in emotion knowledge are reflected in the neural representation of categories of emotional facial configurations (Brooks et al., 2019). Future research can use this approach to investigate how individual differences in neural representation are associated with the breadth and structure of other types of emotion knowledge and whether they vary according to situation-specific goals. Using expertise to make adaptive, context-sensitive responses may

also be reflected in measures of peripheral physiological activity. Prior research suggests that respiratory sinus arrhythmia (RSA; also known as high frequency heart rate variability) is associated with flexible responding and emotional health. Individuals with lower resting RSA and blunted or excessive RSA reactivity demonstrate poorer emotion regulation and higher incidence of psychopathology (e.g., Beauchaine, 2015), whereas individuals with higher resting RSA report greater subjective well-being supported by adaptive regulation (e.g., Geisler et al., 2010). Models that explicitly connect RSA with neural (i.e., central) measures (e.g., Thayer & Lane, 2000, 2009; see also Smith et al., 2017) may provide a way to link potential physiological correlates of expertise in emotion.

To address social mechanisms, research is needed that can provide insight into how expertise in emotion is developed and practiced as a form of cultural learning. Here, computational models can be used to leverage data from experiments to simulate and predict the spread and maintenance of emotion knowledge, as has been done for language (e.g., Kirby et al., 2008). To ground these models, future research can look to work in discursive psychology and sociolinguistics to examine how emotional knowledge is represented in interactions (e.g., Edwards, 1999; Parkinson, 1996). Language provides a means to efficiently transmit and build knowledge about emotion (Bamberg, 1997; Gelman & Roberts, 2017), and plays a role in both typical (e.g., Nook et al., 2017, 2019) and atypical (e.g., Hobson et al., 2019) emotional development (see also Hoemann et al., 2019). Culture likewise shapes expertise in emotion by provisioning individuals with a set of relevant concepts (Gendron et al., 2020), including values for what emotions should be experienced (Tamir et al., 2016; Tsai et al., 2006) and what aspects should be emphasized (Dere et al., 2012; Dzokoto, 2010). Research has also found that individuals' fit with the prevailing emotional patterns of their cultural context is associated with well-being and sense of belonging (e.g., De Leersnyder et al., 2011, 2014). A better understanding of these interpersonal processes is therefore critical to charting the development of expertise in emotion and understanding how it translates into observable skills.

Another way to expand research on expertise in emotion is to measure it within as well as between persons. Momentary estimates of the mental representation of emotional experience can capture fluctuations over time as individuals navigate context-specific goals. Such estimates have recently been introduced for *emotional awareness* (Versluis et al., 2021) and *emotional granularity* (Erbas et al., 2021; see also Grossmann et al., 2016; Tomko et al., 2015). Another possibility is to use network analysis to model temporal dynamics of expertise in emotion (e.g., Howe et al., 2020; Lange et al., 2020; Pe et al., 2015). Network analysis allows for multiple properties of the overall construct of interest to be characterized, while simultaneously modeling the relationships between features or facets, and quantifying variation in all of these over time (Epskamp et al., 2018). Future research can integrate within-person measures with ambulatory peripheral physiological monitoring (e.g., Hoemann et al., 2021; Wilhelm & Grossman, 2010) and other forms of in-the-world recording and observation (e.g., Mehl et al., 2012) to examine how the biology and behavior of expertise predict one another.

Lastly, and perhaps most critically, research is needed that can link specific features of expertise with aspects of mental and physical health. All the constructs we reviewed are associated with real-world outcomes in one or more domains. However, it is premature to recommend a particular path forward for clinical applications because we do not yet know how constructs and mechanisms link together to support outcomes. Taking an emergent variable approach, one way to assess the contribution of different constructs is to adopt ways of modeling that do not require strong correlations between them. For example, clustering analyses could be

used to look for differences in how measured constructs – and the features of expertise they represent – group together, via linear or non-linear relationships, within or across individuals (e.g., Hoemann et al., 2020; Wormwood et al., 2019). Such analyses would allow future research to examine which clusters of constructs or features have the most predictive utility for outcomes of interest, for which individuals, and in which contexts. Ultimately, the approach we have outlined in this discussion positions future research to not only apply state-of-the-art measurement and analytical techniques to the study of expertise in emotion, but also to integrate and interpret these findings within a unified conceptual framework based on features of expertise. These empirical and theoretical advancements place the science of emotion on a better footing to systematically answer questions about expertise in emotion and their relationship to health and well-being in everyday life.

Author Notes

This work was performed at Northeastern University in partial fulfillment of a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Psychology awarded to Katie Hoemann. Portions of this work were presented at the 2018 annual meeting of the Society for Affective Science. K.H. was supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (grant number 1F31HL140943-01) and a P.E.O. International Scholar Award.

K.H., K.S.Q., and L.F.B. designed the scoping review. K.H. and L.F.B. determined constructs for inclusion and criteria for publication selection. K.H. performed database searches; K.H. and A.Y. reviewed the abstracts; K.H., A.Y., C.N., and J.W.G. reviewed the full publications and extracted the data. K.H. synthesized and visualized the data and wrote the manuscript. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript.

The authors are grateful to Dr. Maria Gendron for her input on review design, to Chloe David for her assistance with abstract review, and to Dr. Erik Nook and Dr. Batja Mesquita for their feedback on earlier versions of the manuscript.

A database of all publications reviewed in this paper, as well as data underlying network visualizations, are available via a repository hosted by the Center for Open Science at <https://osf.io/a6vzk/>.

References

- Aaron, R. V., Snodgrass, M. A., Blain, S. D., & Park, S. (2018). Affect labeling and other aspects of emotional experiences in relation to alexithymia following standardized emotion inductions. *Psychiatry Research*, 262, 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.02.014>
- Akerjordet, K., & Severinsson, E. (2007). Emotional intelligence: A review of the literature with specific focus on empirical and epistemological perspectives. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16(8), 1405–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01749.x>
- Alexander, F. (1950). *Psychosomatic medicine: Its principles and applications*. W. W. Norton.
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32.
- Arnett, J. J. (2009). The neglected 95%, a challenge to psychology's philosophy of science. *American Psychologist*, 64(6), 571–574. <https://doi.org/10/b726hb>
- Averill, J. R. (1980). A constructivist view of emotion. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (Eds.), *Emotion: Vol. 1. Theory, Research, and Experience* (pp. 305–340). Academic Press.
- Averill, J. R. (1999). Individual differences in emotional creativity: Structure and correlates. *Journal of Personality*, 67(2), 331–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00058>
- Averill, J. R. (2004). A tale of two snarks: Emotional intelligence and emotional creativity compared. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 228–233.
- Averill, J. R., & Thomas-Knowles, C. (1991). Emotional creativity. In K. T. Strongman (Ed.), *International Review of Studies on Emotion* (Vol. 1). Chichester Wiley.
- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale—I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 38(1), 23–32.
- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D., & Taylor, G. J. (2020). Twenty-five years with the 20-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 131, 109940. <https://doi.org/10/gjv728>
- Bagby, R. M., Taylor, G. J., Parker, J. D. A., & Dickens, S. E. (2006). The development of the Toronto Structured Interview for Alexithymia: Item selection, factor structure, reliability and concurrent validity. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 75, Issue 1, pp. 25–39).
- Bamberg, M. (1997). Language, concepts and emotions: The role of language in the construction of emotions. *Language Sciences*, 19(4), 309–340. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001\(97\)00004-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(97)00004-1)
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *BarOn Emotional Quotient-Inventory (BarOn EQ-i®)*.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace* (EBSCOhost; pp. 363–388). Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description and summary of psychometric properties. In G. Geher (Ed.), *Measuring Emotional Intelligence: Common Ground and Controversy* (pp. 115–145). Nova Science Publishers.
- Barrett, L. F. (1997). The relationships among momentary emotion experiences, personality descriptions, and retrospective ratings of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(10), 1100–1110. <https://doi.org/10/d95fwp>

- Barrett, L. F. (2000, February). *Modeling emotion as an emergent phenomenon: A causal indicator analysis*. Annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology.
- Barrett, L. F. (2004). Feelings or words? Understanding the content in self-report ratings of experienced emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 266–281. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.266>
- Barrett, L. F. (2009). Variety is the spice of life: A psychological construction approach to understanding variability in emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 23(7), 1284–1306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930902985894>
- Barrett, L. F. (2011). Bridging token identity theory and supervenience theory through psychological construction. *Psychological Inquiry*, 22(2), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2011.555216>
- Barrett, L. F. (2016). Navigating the science of emotion. In H. L. Meisselman (Ed.), *Emotion Measurement* (pp. 31–63). Elsevier.
- Barrett, L. F. (2017a). *How emotions are made: The secret life of the brain*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Barrett, L. F. (2017b). The theory of constructed emotion: An active inference account of interoception and categorization. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw154>
- Barrett, L. F., & Barrett, D. J. (2001). An introduction to computerized experience sampling in psychology. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(2), 175–185.
- Barrett, L. F., Gross, J., Christensen, T. C., & Benvenuto, M. (2001). Knowing what you're feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. *Cognition and Emotion*, 15(6), 713–724. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000239>
- Barrett, L. F., Mesquita, B., Ochsner, K. N., & Gross, J. J. (2007). The experience of emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 373–403. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085709>
- Bastian, M., Heymann, S., & Jacomy, M. (2009). Gephi: An open source software for exploring and manipulating networks. *Third International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Beauchaine, T. P. (2015). Respiratory sinus arrhythmia: A transdiagnostic biomarker of emotion dysregulation and psychopathology. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 3, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.01.017>
- Bédard, J., & Chi, M. T. H. (1992). Expertise. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1(4), 135–139.
- Bermond, B., & Oosterveld, P. (1994). *Bermond-Vorst Alexithymia Questionnaire: Construction, reliability, validity and uni-dimensionality*. University of Amsterdam: Faculty of Psychology. Department
- Bermond, B., Oosterveld, P., & Vorst, H. C. M. (2015). Measures of alexithymia. In G. J. Boyle, D. H. Saklofske, & G. Matthews (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs* (pp. 227–256). Academic Press.
- Bermond, B., Vorst, H. C. M., Vingerhoets, A., & Gerritsen, W. (1999). The Amsterdam Alexithymia Scale: Its psychometric values and correlations with other personality traits. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 68, Issue 5, pp. 241–251).

- Boden, M. T., & Berenbaum, H. (2011). What you are feeling and why: Two distinct types of emotional clarity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 652–656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.009>
- Boden, M. T., & Thompson, R. J. (2015). Facets of emotional awareness and associations with emotion regulation and depression. *Emotion*, 15(3), 399–410. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000057>
- Boden, M. T., & Thompson, R. J. (2017). Meta-analysis of the association between emotional clarity and attention to emotions. *Emotion Review*, 9(1), 79–85.
- Boiger, M., Ceulemans, E., De Leersnyder, J., Uchida, Y., Norasakkunkit, V., & Mesquita, B. (2018). Beyond essentialism: Cultural differences in emotions revisited. *Emotion*, 18(8), 1142–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000390>
- Bollen, K., & Lennox, R. (1991). Conventional wisdom on measurement: A structural equation perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(2), 305. <https://doi.org/10/cpdt2n2>
- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2003). The theoretical status of latent variables. *Psychological Review*, 110(2), 203–219. <https://doi.org/10/dx9rw9>
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, 99(6), 343–362.
- Brasseur, S., Gregoire, J., Bourdu, R., & Mikolajczak, M. (2013). The Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC): Development and validation of a self-reported measure that fits dimensions of emotional competence theory. In *PloS One* (Vol. 8, Issue 5).
- Brooks, J. A., Chikazoe, J., Sadato, N., & Freeman, J. B. (2019). The neural representation of facial-emotion categories reflects conceptual structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(32), 15861–15870. <https://doi.org/10/gg94gj>
- Bukach, C. M., Gauthier, I., & Tarr, M. J. (2006). Beyond faces and modularity: The power of an expertise framework. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(4), 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.02.004>
- Burman, J. T. (2018). Through the looking-glass: PsycINFO as an historical archive of trends in psychology. *History of Psychology*, 21(4), 302. <https://doi.org/10/gfkgbf>
- Burns, B., & Shepp, B. E. (1988). Dimensional interactions and the structure of psychological space: The representation of hue, saturation, and brightness. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 43(5), 494–507. <https://doi.org/10/btgr3>
- Cameron, C. D., Payne, B. K., & Doris, J. M. (2013). Morality in high definition: Emotion differentiation calibrates the influence of incidental disgust on moral judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(4), 719–725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.02.014>
- Carstensen, L. L., Pasupathi, M., Mayr, U., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2000). Emotional experience in everyday life across the adult life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 644–655. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.644>
- Charles, S. T. (2005). Viewing injustice: Greater emotion heterogeneity with age. *Psychology and Aging*, 20(1), 159.
- Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Toward clarification of a concept. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 110–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01231.x>
- Clore, G. L., & Ortony, A. (2000). Cognition in emotion: Always, sometimes, or never. *Cognitive Neuroscience of Emotion*, 24–61.

- Clore, G. L., & Ortony, A. (2008). Appraisal theories: How cognition shapes affect into emotion. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (3rd ed., pp. 628–642). Guilford Press.
- Coan, J. A. (2010). Emergent ghosts of the emotion machine. *Emotion Review*, 2(3), 274–285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910361978>
- Coffey, E., Berenbaum, H., & Kerns, J. (2003). Brief report. *Cognition and Emotion*, 17(4), 671–679.
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82.
- Conte, J. M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 433–440. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.319>
- Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations* (Vol. 4). Grosset/Putnam.
- Daudt, H. M., van Mossel, C., & Scott, S. J. (2013). Enhancing the scoping study methodology: A large, inter-professional team’s experience with Arksey and O’Malley’s framework. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 13(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10/f4r6rw>
- David, S. (2016). *Emotional agility: Get unstuck, embrace change, and thrive in work and life*. Penguin.
- Davidson, R. J. (1992). Emotion and affective style: Hemispheric substrates. *Psychological Science*, 3(1), 39–43.
- Davidson, R. J. (1998). Affective style and affective disorders: Perspectives from affective neuroscience. *Cognition and Emotion*, 12(3), 307–330.
- Davidson, R. J. (2000). Affective style, psychopathology, and resilience: Brain mechanisms and plasticity. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1196–1214.
- De Leersnyder, J., Mesquita, B., Kim, H., Eom, K., & Choi, H. (2014). Emotional fit with culture: A predictor of individual differences in relational well-being. *Emotion*, 14(2), 241–245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035296>
- De Leersnyder, J., Mesquita, B., & Kim, H. S. (2011). Where do my emotions belong? A study of immigrants’ emotional acculturation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(4), 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211399103>
- Dere, J., Falk, C. F., & Ryder, A. G. (2012). Unpacking cultural differences in alexithymia: The role of cultural values among Euro-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43(8), 1297–1312. <https://doi.org/10/fx3nw8>
- Dzokoto, V. (2010). Different ways of feeling: Emotion and somatic awareness in Ghanaians and Euro-Americans. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*, 4(2), 68. <https://doi.org/10/ghvkh8>
- Edwards, D. (1999). Emotion discourse. *Culture and Psychology*, 5(3), 271–291.
- Ekman, P. (1972). *Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion* (J. Cole, Ed.; Vol. 19, pp. 207–282). University of Nebraska Press.
- Elfenbein, H. A., & MacCann, C. (2017). A closer look at ability emotional intelligence (EI): What are its component parts, and how do they relate to each other? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11(7), e12324. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12324>
- Epskamp, S., Borsboom, D., & Fried, E. I. (2018). Estimating psychological networks and their accuracy: A tutorial paper. *Behavior Research Methods*, 50(1), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-017-0862-1>

- Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., Kalokerinos, E. K., Houben, M., Koval, P., Pe, M. L., & Kuppens, P. (2018). Why I don't always know what I'm feeling: The role of stress in within-person fluctuations in emotion differentiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(2), 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000126>
- Erbas, Y., Kalokerinos, E., Kuppens, P., van Halem, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2021). *Momentary Emotion Differentiation: The derivation and validation of a framework to study within-person fluctuations in emotion differentiation*.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2006). The influence of experience and deliberate practice on the development of superior expert performance. *The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance*, 38, 685–705.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2007). Deliberate practice and the modifiability of body and mind: Toward a science of the structure and acquisition of expert and elite performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 38(1), 4–34.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2014). Why expert performance is special and cannot be extrapolated from studies of performance in the general population: A response to criticisms. *Intelligence*, 45, 81–103.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Charness, N. (1994). Expert performance: Its structure and acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 49(8), 725–747.
- Ericsson, K. A., Hoffman, R. R., & Kozbelt, A. (2018). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Lehmann, A. C. (1996). Expert and exceptional performance: Evidence of maximal adaptation to task constraints. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47(1), 273–305.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Smith, J. (1991). *Toward a general theory of expertise: Prospects and limits*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Ward, P. (2007). Capturing the naturally occurring superior performance of experts in the laboratory: Toward a science of expert and exceptional performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(6), 346–350.
- Ford, A. (2016, December 16). *How artists use color*. Head for Art. <http://headforart.com/2016/12/16/how-artists-use-colour/>
- Freedman, M. B., & Sweet, B. S. (1954). Some specific features of group psychotherapy and their implications for selection of patients. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 4(4), 355–368.
- Freud, S. (1891). *On aphasia: A critical study*. International Universities Press.
- Freud, S. (1895). *Project for a scientific psychology*. International Universities Press.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fu, F., Chow, A., Li, J., & Cong, Z. (2018). Emotional flexibility: Development and application of a scale in adolescent earthquake survivors. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 10(2), 246–252.
- Fuchs, G. L., Kumar, V. K., & Porter, J. (2007). Emotional creativity, alexithymia, and styles of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(2–3), 233–245.
- Geisler, F. C., Vennewald, N., Kubiak, T., & Weber, H. (2010). The impact of heart rate variability on subjective well-being is mediated by emotion regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(7), 723–728. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.06.015>
- Gelman, S. A., & Roberts, S. O. (2017). How language shapes the cultural inheritance of categories. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(30), 7900–7907. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1621073114>

- Gendron, M., Crivelli, C., & Barrett, L. F. (2018). Universality reconsidered: Diversity in making meaning of facial expressions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(4), 211–219.
- Gendron, M., Mesquita, B., & Barrett, L. F. (2020). The brain as a cultural artifact: Concepts, actions, and experiences within the human affective niche. In L. J. Kirmayer, C. M. Worthman, S. Kitayama, R. Lemelson, & C. Cummings (Eds.), *Culture, Mind, and Brain: Emerging Concepts, Models, and Applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gohm, C. L., & Clore, G. L. (2000). Individual differences in emotional experience: Mapping available scales to processes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(6), 679–697. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200268004>
- Gohm, C. L., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Four latent traits of emotional experience and their involvement in well-being, coping, and attributional style. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16(4), 495–518.
- Goldstone, R. L. (1994). Influences of categorization on perceptual discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 123(2), 178–200. <https://doi.org/10/fwtqz2>
- Goldstone, R. L. (1995). Effects of categorization on color perception. *Psychological Science*, 6(5), 298–304. <https://doi.org/10/cn4dng>
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books, Inc.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95–110.
- Gross, J. J., & Barrett, L. F. (2011). Emotion generation and emotion regulation: One or two depends on your point of view. *Emotion Review*, 3(1), 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910380974>
- Grossmann, I., Huynh, A. C., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2016). Emotional complexity: Clarifying definitions and cultural correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111(6), 895–916. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000084>
- Grühn, D., Lumley, M. A., Diehl, M., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2013). Time-based indicators of emotional complexity: Interrelations and correlates. *Emotion*, 13(2), 226–237.
- Halberstadt, A. G., Denham, S. A., & Dunsmore, J. C. (2001). Affective social competence. *Social Development*, 10(1), 79–119.
- Henry, W. E., & Shlien, J. M. (1958). Affective complexity and psychotherapy: Some comparisons of time-limited and unlimited treatment. In *Journal of Projective Techniques* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 22, pp. 153–162).
- Hobson, H., Brewer, R., Catmur, C., & Bird, G. (2019). The role of language in alexithymia: Moving towards a multiroute model of alexithymia. *Emotion Review*, 11(3), 247–261. <https://doi.org/10/gjsvk6>
- Hoemann, K., Khan, Z., Feldman, M. J., Nielson, C., Devlin, M., Dy, J., Barrett, L. F., Wormwood, J. B., & Quigley, K. S. (2020). Context-aware experience sampling reveals the scale of variation in affective experience. *Scientific Reports*, 10, 12459. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-69180-y>
- Hoemann, K., Khan, Z., Kamona, N., Dy, J., Barrett, L. F., & Quigley, K. S. (2021). Investigating the relationship between emotional granularity and cardiorespiratory physiological activity in daily life. *Psychophysiology*, e13818. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13818>

- Hoemann, K., Xu, F., & Barrett, L. F. (2019). Emotion words, emotion concepts, and emotional development in children: A constructionist hypothesis. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(9), 1830–1849. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000686>.
- Howe, E., Bosley, H. G., & Fisher, A. J. (2020). Idiographic network analysis of discrete mood states prior to treatment. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12295>
- Hu, Y. (2005). Efficient, high-quality force-directed graph drawing. *Mathematica Journal*, 10(1), 37–71.
- Huang, S., Berenbaum, H., & Chow, P. I. (2013). Distinguishing voluntary from involuntary attention to emotion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(8), 894–898.
- Ivcevic, Z., Bazhydai, M., Hoffmann, J. D., & Brackett, M. A. (2017). Creativity in the domain of emotions. In J. C. Kaufman, V. P. Glăveanu, J. Baer, J. C. Kaufman, V. P. Glăveanu, & J. Baer (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity Across Domains* (EBSCOhost; pp. 525–548). Cambridge University Press.
- Ivcevic, Z., Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2007). Emotional intelligence and emotional creativity. *Journal of Personality*, 75(2), 199–235.
- Izard, C. E. (1993). Four systems for emotion activation: Cognitive and noncognitive processes. *Psychological Review*, 100(1), 68–90.
- Izard, C. E. (2009). Emotion theory and research: Highlights, unanswered questions, and emerging issues. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163539>
- Izard, C. E., Woodburn, E. M., Finlon, K. J., Krauthamer-Ewing, E. S., Grossman, S. R., & Seidenfeld, A. (2011). Emotion knowledge, emotion utilization, and emotion regulation. In *Emotion Review* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 44–52).
- James, W. (1884). What is an emotion? *Mind*, 34, 188–205.
- Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 54–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017286>
- Kagan, N., & Schneider, J. (1987). Toward the measurement of affective sensitivity. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65(9), 459–464.
- Kang, S.-M., & Shaver, P. R. (2004). Individual differences in emotional complexity: Their psychological implications. *Journal of Personality*, 72(4), 687–726. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00277.x>
- Kashdan, T. B., Barrett, L. F., & McKnight, P. E. (2015). Unpacking emotion differentiation: Transforming unpleasant experience by perceiving distinctions in negativity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414550708>
- Kastner, M., Tricco, A. C., Soobiah, C., Lillie, E., Perrier, L., Horsley, T., Welch, V., Cogo, E., Antony, J., & Straus, S. E. (2012). What is the most appropriate knowledge synthesis method to conduct a review? Protocol for a scoping review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 12(1), 1–10.
- Kirby, S., Cornish, H., & Smith, K. (2008). Cumulative cultural evolution in the laboratory: An experimental approach to the origins of structure in human language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(31), 10681–10686. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0707835105>

- Kooiman, C. G., Spinhoven, P., & Trijsburg, R. W. (2002). The assessment of alexithymia—A critical review of the literature and a psychometric study of the Toronto Alexithymia Scale-20. In *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* (Vol. 53, Issue 6, pp. 1083–1090).
- Krystal, J. H. (1979). Alexithymia and psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 33(1), 17–31.
- Labouvie-Vief, G., & Medler, M. (2002). Affect optimization and affect complexity: Modes and styles of regulation in adulthood. *Psychology and Aging*, 17(4), 571.
- Laland, K. (2017). *Darwin's unfinished symphony: How culture made the human mind*. Princeton University Press.
- Lambie, J. A., & Marcel, A. J. (2002). Consciousness and the varieties of emotion experience: A theoretical framework. *Psychological Review*, 109(2), 219.
- Landy, F. J. (2005). Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence. In *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 26, Issue 4, pp. 411–424).
- Landy, F. J. (2006). The long, frustrating, and fruitless search for social intelligence: A cautionary tale. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *A critique of emotional intelligence: What are the problems and how can they be fixed?* (pp. 81–123). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lane, R. D., Lee, S., Reidel, R., Weldon, V., Kaszniak, A., & Schwartz, G. E. (1996). Impaired verbal and nonverbal emotion recognition in alexithymia. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 58(3), 203–210.
- Lane, R. D., Quinlan, D. M., Schwartz, G. E., Walker, P. A., & Zeitlin, S. B. (1990). The Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale: A cognitive-developmental measure of emotion. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55(1–2), 124–134.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.1990.9674052>
- Lane, R. D., & Schwartz, G. E. (1987). Levels of emotional awareness—A cognitive-developmental theory and its application to psychopathology. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 144(2), 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.144.2.133>
- Lane, R. D., & Schwartz, G. E. (1992). Levels of emotional awareness: Implications for psychotherapeutic integration. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 2(1), 1.
- Lane, R. D., Sechrest, L., Riedel, R., Shapiro, D. E., & Kaszniak, A. W. (2000). Pervasive emotion recognition deficit common to alexithymia and the repressive coping style. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 62(4), 492–501.
- Lane, R. D., Weihs, K. L., Herring, A., Hishaw, A., & Smith, R. (2015). Affective agnosia: Expansion of the alexithymia construct and a new opportunity to integrate and extend Freud's legacy. In *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 55, pp. 594–611).
- Lange, J., Dalege, J., Borsboom, D., van Kleef, G. A., & Fischer, A. H. (2020). Toward an integrative psychometric model of emotions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(2), 444–468.
- Larsen, R. J., & Cutler, S. E. (1996). The complexity of individual emotional lives: A within-subject analysis of affect structure. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 15(2), 206–230.
- Larsen, R. J., & Diener, E. (1987). Affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic: A review. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 1–39.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Song, L. J. (2004). The construct and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (Vol. 89, Issue 3, pp. 483–496).

- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46(4), 352–367.
- Lee, J. Y., Lindquist, K. A., & Nam, C. S. (2017). Emotional granularity effects on event-related brain potentials during affective picture processing. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 11.
<http://ezproxy.neu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2017-15680-001&site=ehost-live&scope=site csnam@ncsu.edu>
- Lesser, I. M. (1981). A review of the alexithymia concept. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 43(6), 531–543. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-198112000-00009>
- Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P., Clarke, M., Devereaux, P. J., Kleijnen, J., & Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 62(10), e1–e34.
- Lindquist, K. A., & Barrett, L. F. (2008). Emotional complexity. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (3rd ed., pp. 513–530). Guilford Press.
- Lischetzke, T., & Eid, M. (2017). The functionality of emotional clarity: A process-oriented approach to understanding the relation between emotional clarity and well-being. In M. D. Robinson, M. Eid, M. D. Robinson, & M. Eid (Eds.), *The Happy Mind: Cognitive Contributions to Well-Being* (EBSCOhost; pp. 371–388). Springer International Publishing.
- Livingstone, H. A., & Day, A. L. (2005). Comparing the construct and criterion-related validity of ability-based and mixed-model measures of emotional intelligence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 65(5), 757–779.
- Lumley, M. A., Gustavson, B. J., Partridge, R. T., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2005). Assessing alexithymia and related emotional ability constructs using multiple methods: Interrelationships among measures. *Emotion*, 5(3), 329–342.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.3.329>
- Lumley, M. A., Neely, L. C., & Burger, A. J. (2007). The assessment of alexithymia in medical settings: Implications for understanding and treating health problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 89(3), 230–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890701629698>
- MacLean, P. D. (1949). Psychosomatic disease and the “visceral brain.” *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 11(6), 338–352.
- Mankus, A. M., Boden, M. T., & Thompson, R. J. (2016). Sources of variation in emotional awareness: Age, gender, and socioeconomic status. In *Personality and Individual Differences* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 89, pp. 28–33).
- Maroti, D., Lilliengren, P., & Bileviciute-Ljungar, I. (2018). The relationship between alexithymia and emotional awareness: A meta-analytic review of the correlation between TAS-20 and LEAS. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 453.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00453>
- Marty, P., & de M’Uzan, M. (1963). La pensée opératoire. *Review of French Psychoanalysis*, 27, 1345–1356.
- Maul, A. (2012). The validity of the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) as a measure of emotional intelligence. *Emotion Review*, 4(4), 394–402.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912445811>

- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Selecting a measure of emotional intelligence: The case for ability scales. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace* (pp. 320–342). Jossey-Bass.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2016). The ability model of emotional intelligence: Principles and updates. In *Emotion Review* (Vol. 8, Issue 4, pp. 290–300).
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 507–536.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093646>
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17(4), 433–442.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications* (pp. 3–34). Basic Books, Inc.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) item booklet*.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. In *Emotion* (Vol. 1, Issue 3, pp. 232–242).
- Mays, N., Roberts, E., & Popay, J. (2001). Synthesising research evidence. In N. Fulop, P. Allen, A. Clarke, & N. Black (Eds.), *Studying the organisation and delivery of health services: Research methods* (pp. 188–219). Routledge.
- McBrien, A., Wild, M., & Bachorowski, J. A. (2018). Social-Emotional Expertise (SEE) Scale: Development and initial validation. *Assessment*, 1073191118794866.
- Medin, D., Ojalehto, B., Marin, A., & Bang, M. (2017). Systems of (non-)diversity. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(5), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10/gfzkhs>
- Mehl, M., Robbins, M., & Deters, F. (2012). Naturalistic observation of health-relevant social processes: The electronically activated recorder methodology in psychosomatics. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 74(4), 410–417.
- Meltzoff, J., & Litwin, D. (1956). Affective control and Rorschach human movement responses. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 20(6), 463–465.
- Mischel, W. (2008, December 1). The toothbrush problem. *Observer*, 21(11).
<https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/the-toothbrush-problem>
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Group, P. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*, 6(7), e1000097.
- Mongeon, P., & Paul-Hus, A. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: A comparative analysis. *Scientometrics*, 106(1), 213–228. <https://doi.org/10/f77hzh>
- Moormann, P. P., Bermond, B., Vorst, H. C., Bloemendaal, A. F., Teijn, S. M., & Rood, L. (2008). New avenues in alexithymia research: The creation of alexithymia types. In *Emotion Regulation* (pp. 27–42). Springer.
- Moors, A., Ellsworth, P. C., Scherer, K. R., & Frijda, N. H. (2013). Appraisal theories of emotion: State of the art and future development. *Emotion Review*, 5(2), 119–124.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912468165>
- Nemiah, J. C. (1970). Affect and fantasy in patients with psychosomatic disorders. *Modern Trends in Psychosomatic Medicine*, 2, 26–34.

- Nemiah, J. C., Freyberger, H., Sifneos, P. E., & Hill, O. W. (1976). Alexithymia: A view of the psychosomatic process. *Modern Trends in Psychosomatic Medicine*, 3, 430–439.
- Nemiah, J. C., & Sifneos, P. E. (1970). Psychosomatic illness: A problem in communication. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 18(1–6), 154–160.
<https://doi.org/10.1159/000286074>
- Niedenthal, P. M., Rychlowska, M., Zhao, F., & Wood, A. (2019). Historical migration patterns shape contemporary cultures of emotion. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(4), 560–573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619849591>
- Nook, E. C., Sasse, S. F., Lambert, H. K., McLaughlin, K. A., & Somerville, L. H. (2017). Increasing verbal knowledge mediates development of multidimensional emotion representations. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(12), 881–889.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0238-7>
- Nook, E. C., Stavish, C. M., Sasse, S. F., Lambert, H. K., Mair, P., McLaughlin, K. A., & Somerville, L. H. (2019). Charting the development of emotion comprehension and abstraction from childhood to adulthood using observer-rated and linguistic measures. *Emotion*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000609>
- Ong, A. D., Zautra, A. J., & Finan, P. H. (2017). Inter- and intra-individual variation in emotional complexity: Methodological considerations and theoretical implications. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 22–26.
- Palmer, B. R., Gignac, G., Ekermans, G., & Stough, C. (2008). A comprehensive framework for emotional intelligence. *Emotional Intelligence: Theoretical and Cultural Perspectives*, 17–38.
- Palmieri, P. A., Boden, M. T., & Berenbaum, H. (2009). Measuring clarity of and attention to emotions. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(6), 560–567.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890903228539>
- Parker, J. D. A., Taylor, G. J., & Bagby, R. M. (2001). The relationship between emotional intelligence and alexithymia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(1), 107–115.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00014-3)
- Parkinson, B. (1996). Emotions are social. *British Journal of Psychology*, 87(4), 663–683.
- Pe, M. L., Kircanski, K., Thompson, R. J., Bringmann, L. F., Tuerlinckx, F., Mestdagh, M., Mata, J., Jaeggi, S. M., Buschkuhl, M., Jonides, J., Kuppens, P., & Gotlib, I. H. (2015). Emotion-network density in major depressive disorder. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 3(2), 292–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702614540645>
- Petrides, K. V. (2010). Trait emotional intelligence theory. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 136–139.
- Petrides, K. V., Perez-Gonzalez, J. C., & Furnham, A. (2007). On the criterion and incremental validity of trait emotional intelligence. In *Cognition and Emotion* (Vol. 21, Issue 1, pp. 26–55).
- Pham, M. T., Rajić, A., Greig, J. D., Sargeant, J. M., Papadopoulos, A., & McEwen, S. A. (2014). A scoping review of scoping reviews: Advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 5(4), 371–385.
- Piaget, J. (1937). *La construction du réel chez l'enfant*. Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Pistoia, F., Conson, M., Carolei, A., Dema, M. G., Splendiani, A., Curcio, G., & Sacco, S. (2018). Post-earthquake distress and development of emotional expertise in young adults. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 12, 91.

- Plomin, R., Shakeshaft, N. G., McMillan, A., & Trzaskowski, M. (2014a). Nature, nurture, and expertise. *Intelligence*, 45, 46–59.
- Plomin, R., Shakeshaft, N. G., McMillan, A., & Trzaskowski, M. (2014b). Nature, nurture, and expertise: Response to Ericsson. *Intelligence*, 45, 115–117.
- Plutchik, R. (1980). A general psychoevolutionary theory of emotion. In *Theories of Emotion* (pp. 3–33). Elsevier.
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Analysing qualitative data. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 320(7227), 114–116.
- Protter, E. (1997). *Painters on painting*. Courier Corporation.
- Quoidbach, J., Gruber, J., Mikolajczak, M., Kogan, A., Kotsou, I., & Norton, M. I. (2014). Emodiversity and the emotional ecosystem. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(6), 2057–2066. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038025>
- Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of Homo sapiens: Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(45), 11401–11405. <https://doi.org/10/gfnv94>
- Riggio, R. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 649–660.
- Roberts, R. D., Matthews, G., & Zeidner, M. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Muddling through theory and measurement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 140–144.
- Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: Evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(6), 934–960. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.128.6.934>
- Rosch, E., Mervis, C. B., Gray, W. D., Johnson, D. M., & Boyes-Braem, P. (1976). Basic objects in natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, 8(3), 382–439.
- Roseman, I. J. (1991). Appraisal determinants of discrete emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 5(3), 161–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939108411034>
- Rubin, H. R., Owens, A. J., & Golden, G. (1998). *Status report (1998): An investigation to determine whether the built environment affects patients' medical outcomes*. Center for Health Design.
- Ruesch, J. (1948). The infantile personality; the core problem of psychosomatic medicine. *Psychosomatic Medicine*.
- Russell, J. A. (2003). Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion. *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 145–172. <https://doi.org/10/cjkdr6>
- Salisch, M. von. (2001). Children's emotional development: Challenges in their relationships to parents, peers, and friends. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25(4), 310–319.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., & Caruso, D. (2002). The positive psychology of emotional intelligence. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (Vol. 159, p. 171).
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, Disclosure, and Health* (pp. 125–154). American Psychological Association.

- Saul, L. J. (1947). *Emotional maturity: The development and dynamics of personality*. Lippincott.
- Scherer, K. R. (1984). On the nature and function of emotion: A component process approach. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to Emotion* (pp. 293–317). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Scherer, K. R. (2007). Componential emotion theory can inform models of emotional competence. In G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *The Science of Emotional Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns* (pp. 101–126). Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, K. R. (2009a). Emotions are emergent processes: They require a dynamic computational architecture. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1535), 3459–3474. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0141>
- Scherer, K. R. (2009b). The dynamic architecture of emotion: Evidence for the component process model. *Cognition and Emotion*, 23(7), 1307–1351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930902928969>
- Schimmack, U., Oishi, S., Diener, E., & Suh, E. (2000). Facets of affective experiences: A framework for investigations of trait affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(6), 655–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200268002>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. In *Personality and Individual Differences* (Vol. 25, Issue 2, pp. 167–177).
- Schyns, P. G. (1991). A modular neural network model of concept acquisition. *Cognitive Science*, 15(4), 461–508. <https://doi.org/10/d9n3cr>
- Schyns, P. G., Goldstone, R. L., & Thibaut, J. P. (1998). The development of features in object concepts. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21(1), 1–17; discussion 17–54.
- Scollon, C. N., Kim-Prieto, C., & Scollon, C. N. (2003). Experience sampling: Promises and pitfalls, strengths and weaknesses. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 4(1), 5–34. <https://doi.org/10/d8ggjd>
- Siegling, A. B., Saklofske, D. H., & Petrides, K. V. (2015). Measures of ability and trait emotional intelligence. In *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs* (pp. 381–414).
- Sifneos, P. E. (1972). *Short-term psychotherapy and emotional crisis*. Harvard University Press.
- Sifneos, P. E. (1973). The prevalence of ‘alexithymic’ characteristics in psychosomatic patients. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 22(2–6), 255–262.
- Sifneos, P. E. (1996). Alexithymia: Past and present. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 153(7), 137–142.
- Smidt, K. E., & Suvak, M. K. (2015). A brief, but nuanced, review of emotional granularity and emotion differentiation research. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 3, 48–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.02.007>
- Smith, R., Killgore, W. D. S., Alkozei, A., & Lane, R. D. (2018). A neuro-cognitive process model of emotional intelligence. *Biological Psychology*, 139, 131–151. <https://doi.org/10/gfqqrp>
- Smith, R., Killgore, W. D. S., & Lane, R. D. (2018). The structure of emotional experience and its relation to trait emotional awareness: A theoretical review. *Emotion*, 18(5), 670–692. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000376>

- Smith, R., Thayer, J. F., Khalsa, S. S., & Lane, R. D. (2017). The hierarchical basis of neurovisceral integration. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 75, 274–296. <https://doi.org/10/f92324>
- Sommers, S. (1981). Emotionality reconsidered: The role of cognition in emotional responsiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(3), 553–561.
- Spearman, C. (1904a). “General intelligence” objectively determined and measured. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 201–292.
- Spearman, C. (1904b). The proof and measurement of association between two things. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 72–101.
- Steels, L. (1990). Components of expertise. *AI Magazine*, 11(2), 22–28.
- Steiner, C. (1984). Emotional literacy. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 14(3), 162–173.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1984). Toward a triarchic theory of human intelligence. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 7(2), 269–287.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Abilities are forms of developing expertise. *Educational Researcher*, 27(3), 11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1176608>
- Sternberg, R. J., & Kagan, J. (1986). *Intelligence applied: Understanding and increasing your intellectual skills*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sternberg, R. J., Wagner, R., Williams, W., & Horvath, J. (1995). Testing common sense. *American Psychologist*, 50(11), 912–927.
- Subic-Wrana, C., Bruder, S., Thomas, W., Lane, R. D., & Kohle, K. (2005). Emotional awareness deficits in inpatients of a psychosomatic ward: A comparison of two different measures of alexithymia. In *Psychosomatic Medicine* (Vol. 67, Issue 3, pp. 483–489).
- Swinkels, A., & Giuliano, T. A. (1995). The measurement and conceptualization of mood awareness—Monitoring and labeling ones mood states. In *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (Vol. 21, Issue 9, pp. 934–949).
- Tamir, M., Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Riediger, M., Torres, C., Scollon, C., Dzokoto, V., Zhou, X., & Vishkin, A. (2016). Desired emotions across cultures: A value-based account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000072>
- Tanaka, J. W. (1998). Parts, features, and expertise. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21(1), 37–38. <https://doi.org/10/ckgf7h>
- Tanaka, J. W., & Taylor, M. (1991). Object categories and expertise: Is the basic level in the eye of the beholder? *Cognitive Psychology*, 23(3), 457–482. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(91\)90016-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(91)90016-H)
- Taylor, G. J. (1984). Alexithymia—Concept, measurement, and implications for treatment. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 141(6), 725–732.
- Taylor, G. J. (2000). Recent developments in alexithymia theory and research. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 45(2), 134–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370004500203>
- Taylor, G. J., Ryan, D., & Bagby, R. M. (1985). Toward the development of a new self-report alexithymia scale. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 44, Issue 4, pp. 191–199).
- Tett, R. P., Fox, K. E., & Wang, A. (2005). Development and validation of a self-report measure of emotional intelligence as a multidimensional trait domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(7), 859–888.
- Thayer, J. F., & Lane, R. D. (2000). A model of neurovisceral integration in emotion regulation and dysregulation. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 61(3), 201–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-0327\(00\)00338-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-0327(00)00338-4)

- Thayer, J. F., & Lane, R. D. (2009). Claude Bernard and the heart–brain connection: Further elaboration of a model of neurovisceral integration. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 33(2), 81–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.08.004>
- Thompson, R. J., Dizén, M., & Berenbaum, H. (2009). The unique relations between emotional awareness and facets of affective instability. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(5), 875–879. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.07.006>
- Thorndike, R. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227–235.
- Tobacyk, J. J. (1980). Comparison of five measures of affective complexity derived from P-technique factor analysis. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 50(3, Pt 2), 1259–1262.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1962). *Affect imagery consciousness: Volume I: The positive affects* (Vol. 1). Springer Publishing Company.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1963). *Affect imagery consciousness: Volume II: The negative affects* (Vol. 2). Springer Publishing Company.
- Tomko, R. L., Lane, S. P., Pronove, L. M., Treloar, H. R., Brown, W. C., Solhan, M. B., Wood, P. K., & Trull, T. J. (2015). Undifferentiated negative affect and impulsivity in borderline personality and depressive disorders: A momentary perspective. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 124(3), 740–753. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000064>
- Trull, T. J., Jahng, S., Wood, P. K., & Watson, D. (2008). Affective instability: Measuring a core feature of borderline personality disorder with ecological momentary assessment. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117(3), 647–661.
- Tsai, J. L., Knutson, B., & Fung, H. H. (2006). Cultural variation in affect valuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(2), 288.
- Tugade, M. M., Fredrickson, B. L., & Barrett, L. F. (2004). Psychological resilience and positive emotional granularity: Examining the benefits of positive emotions on coping and health. *Journal of Personality*, 72(6), 1161–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00294.x>
- Tversky, B., & Hemenway, K. (1984). Objects, parts, and categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113(2), 169–193. <https://doi.org/10/fjddn8>
- Ullén, F., Hambrick, D. Z., & Mosing, M. A. (2016). Rethinking expertise: A multifactorial gene–environment interaction model of expert performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(4), 427–446. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000033>
- Versluis, A., Verkuil, B., Lane, R. D., Hagemann, D., Thayer, J. F., & Brosschot, J. F. (2021). Ecological momentary assessment of emotional awareness: Preliminary evaluation of psychometric properties. *Current Psychology*, 40(3), 1402–1410. <https://doi.org/10/gjsymb>
- Walters, W. H. (2007). Google Scholar coverage of a multidisciplinary field. *Information Processing & Management*, 43(4), 1121–1132. <https://doi.org/10/fp7g2g>
- Watson, D., & Walker, L. M. (1996). The long-term stability and predictive validity of trait measures of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 567–577.
- Waugh, C. E., Thompson, R. J., & Gotlib, I. H. (2011). Flexible emotional responsiveness in trait resilience. *Emotion*, 11(5), 1059–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021786>
- Werner, H., & Kaplan, B. (1963). *Symbol formation: An organismic-developmental approach to language and the expression of thought*. Wiley.
- Wessman, A. E., & Ricks, D. F. (1966). *Mood and personality*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

- Wilhelm, F. H., & Grossman, P. (2010). Emotions beyond the laboratory: Theoretical fundamentals, study design, and analytic strategies for advanced ambulatory assessment. *Biological Psychology*, 84(3), 552–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2010.01.017>
- Williams, P., Gauthier, I., & Tarr, M. J. (1998). Feature learning during the acquisition of perceptual expertise. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21(1), 40–41.
- Wormwood, J. B., Khan, Z., Siegel, E., Lynn, S. K., Dy, J., Barrett, L. F., & Quigley, K. S. (2019). Physiological indices of challenge and threat: A data-driven investigation of autonomic nervous system reactivity during an active coping stressor task. *Psychophysiology*, 56(12). <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13454>
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). The emotional intelligence, health, and well-being nexus: What have we learned and what have we missed? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 4(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2011.01062.x>
- Zhu, Z., & Bonanno, G. A. (2017). Affective flexibility: Relations to expressive flexibility, feedback, and depression. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 5(6), 930–942.

Supplemental Materials

Table S1. Constructs Included and Search History

Construct Search Term	Search Date	PsycINFO		Web of Science			Notes
		Raw	Filtered	Raw	Filtered	> 100 Citations	
Affective agnosia	10/21/2018	4	4				Merged with alexithymia
Affective anomia	10/21/2018	0	N/A				
Alexithymia	7/25/2018	4211	2529*	5384	3386	160	
Emotional awareness	7/25/2018	876	548*	1017	580	38	
Emotion awareness	5/24/2018	134	89				
Affective awareness	5/24/2018	37	21				
Affect awareness	5/24/2018	33	N/A				
Emotional clarity	5/24/2018	172	145				
Emotion clarity	5/24/2018	5	N/A				
Affective clarity	5/24/2018	3	3				
Affect clarity	5/24/2018	1	N/A				
Emotional competence	7/25/2018	1158	681*	1108	594	21	
Emotion competence	7/5/2018	30	13				
Emotional complexity	5/24/2018	109	85				
Emotion complexity	5/24/2018	7	5				
Affective complexity	5/24/2018	24	19				
Affect complexity	5/24/2018	18	17				
Emotional creativity	7/5/2018	56	33				
Emotion creativity	7/5/2018	8	N/A				
Affective creativity	7/5/2018	3	N/A				
Emotion differentiation	5/17/2018	87	61				Merged with granularity
Emotional differentiation	5/17/2018	55	32				
Affective differentiation	5/17/2018	15	13				
Affect differentiation	5/24/2018	34	28				
Emodiversity	5/24/2018	7	6				
Emotional diversity	5/24/2018	7	6				
Emotion diversity	5/24/2018	2	N/A				
Affective diversity	5/24/2018	8	N/A				
Affect diversity	5/24/2018	8	N/A				
Emotional flexibility	5/24/2018	52	41				
Emotion flexibility	5/24/2018	5	N/A				
Affective flexibility	5/24/2018	20	13				

Construct Search Term	Search Date	PsycINFO		Web of Science			Notes
		Raw	Filtered	Raw	Filtered	> 100 Citations	
Affect flexibility	5/24/2018	8	N/A				
Emotional granularity	5/17/2018	20	13				
Emotion granularity	5/17/2018	0	N/A				
Affective granularity	5/17/2018	0	N/A				
Affect granularity	5/24/2018	30	N/A				
Emotional heterogeneity	10/21/2018	3	2				No papers included in final database (Would be merged with granularity)
Emotion heterogeneity	10/21/2018	2	2				
Affective heterogeneity	10/21/2018	1	1				
Affect heterogeneity	10/21/2018	2	1				
Emotional intelligence	7/25/2018	7045	3428*	9261	4157	163	
Emotion intelligence	5/24/2018	35	22				
Affective intelligence	5/24/2018	32	22				
Affect intelligence	5/24/2018	25	N/A				
Emotional quotient	5/24/2018	559	146				Merged with intelligence
Emotion quotient	5/24/2018	7	N/A				
Affective quotient	5/24/2018	0	N/A				
Emotional range	5/24/2018	45	41				
Emotion range	5/24/2018	1	N/A				
Affective range	5/24/2018	14	N/A				
Affect range	5/24/2018	7	N/A				
Emotional style	5/24/2018	148	70				Excluded from final database
Emotion style	5/24/2018	9	N/A				
Affective style	5/24/2018	215	146				
Affect style	5/24/2018	8	N/A				
Emotion utilization	10/21/2018	12	10				Merged with competence
Emotional variability	5/24/2018	46	37				Excluded from final database
Emotion variability	5/24/2018	10	6				
Affective variability	5/24/2018	25	23				
Affect variability	5/24/2018	59	53				
Mood variability	7/5/2018	110	87				

Note: N/A Full search results were empty or did not include any relevant publications; * Over 500 PsycINFO results after filters applied; alternative search procedure conducted using Web of Science.

Table S2. Constructs Excluded

Construct	Example Publication(s)	Reason Excluded
<i>Trait affect</i>	Watson & Walker (1996)	Related to temperament
<i>Trait affectivity</i>	Heller et al. (2002)	Related to temperament
<i>Emotional agility</i>	David (2016)	No peer-reviewed literature
<i>Emotional alchemy</i>	Cooper & Sawaf (1997)	From I/O literature
<i>Emotional ambivalence</i>	Rees et al. (2013)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Feeling aphasia</i>	Sifneos (1996)	Captured as part of alexithymia
<i>Emotional approach coping</i>	Stanton et al. (1994)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>Trait arousability</i>	Mehrabian (1995)	Related to temperament
<i>Attention to emotions</i>	Huang et al. (2013)	Captured as part of emotional awareness
<i>Emotion attention regulation</i>	Elfenbein & MacCann (2017)	Captured as part of emotional intelligence
<i>Emotional attunement</i>	Gottman (2011)	Interpersonal construct
<i>Emotional availability</i>	Biringen & Robinson (1991)	Interpersonal construct
<i>Interoceptive awareness</i>	Herbert et al. (2011); Mehling et al. (2012)	Not specific to emotion
<i>Affect balance</i>	Bradburn (1969); Schwartz & Garamoni (1989)	Related to temperament
<i>Affective bipolarity</i>	Dejonckheere et al. (2019)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Callous-unemotional traits</i>	Frick et al. (2003)	From developmental literature
<i>Emotional capability</i>	Huy (1999)	From I/O literature
<i>Emotional capital</i>	Cottingham (2016)	Interpersonal construct
<i>Affective chronometry</i>	Hemenover (2003)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective coherence</i>	Centerbar et al. (2008)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional coherence</i>	Mauss et al. (2005)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective coloring</i>	Helson & Klohnen (1998)	Related to temperament
<i>Affective (social) competence</i>	Halberstadt et al. (2001)	From developmental literature
<i>Affective control</i>	Meltzoff & Litwin (1956)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>Emotion control</i>	Roger & Najarian (1989)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>Emotional control</i>	Watson & Greer (1983)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>Emotional depth</i>	Cooper & Sawaf (1997)	From I/O literature
<i>(Emotional) dialecticism</i>	Schimmack et al. (2002)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotion disposition</i>	Scherer & Brosch (2009)	Related to temperament
<i>Emotional disposition</i>	Skaggs (1942)	Related to temperament
<i>Emotion-network density</i>	Pe et al. (2015); Bringmann et al. (2016)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Negative/positive emotionality</i>	Eisenberg et al. (2001)	Related to temperament
<i>Emotion expression</i>	Banase & Scherer (1996); Malatesta & Haviland (1982)	Process rather than individual difference
<i>Emotional expressiveness</i>	King & Emmons (1990)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional fitness</i>	Cooper & Sawaf (1997)	From I/O literature
<i>Expressive flexibility</i>	Westphal et al. (2010)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>(Emotional) flux</i>	Moskowitz & Zuroff (2004)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective forecasting</i>	Wilson & Gilbert (2003)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>Emotional geography</i>	Hochschild (1996)	Interpersonal construct
<i>Emotional inflexibility</i>	Brose et al. (2015)	Inverse of emotional flexibility
<i>Emotion-related impulsivity</i>	Whiteside & Lynam (2001)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional impulsivity</i>	Barkley & Fischer (2010)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional inertia</i>	Kuppens et al. (2010)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill

Construct	Example Publication(s)	Reason Excluded
<i>Affective instability</i>	Trull et al. (2008)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional instability</i>	Thompson et al. (2012)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Social intelligence</i>	Weis & Süß (2007)	Not specific to emotion
<i>Affect intensity</i>	Larsen & Diener (1987)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective intensity</i>	Keltner (1996)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotion intensity</i>	Frijda et al. (1992)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional intensity</i>	Diener et al. (1985)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>(Emotional) irregularity</i>	Pincus et al. (2008)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotion knowledge</i>	Izard et al. (2001)	From developmental literature
<i>Emotional knowledge</i>	Garner & Power (1996)	From developmental literature
<i>Affective lability</i>	Gerson et al. (1996)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional lability</i>	Morris et al. (1993)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Mood level</i>	Underwood & Froming (1980)	Related to temperament
<i>Emotional literacy</i>	Cooper & Sawaf (1997); Steiner (1984)	From I/O literature; Interpersonal construct
<i>Affect maturity</i>	Thompson (1985)	Captured as part of alexithymia
<i>Emotional maturity</i>	Saul (1947)	Not specific to emotion
<i>Meta-mood experience</i>	Mayer & Gaschke (1988)	Captured as part of emotional intelligence
<i>Mixed emotions</i>	Barford & Smillie (2016); Hershfield et al. (2008)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional openness</i>	Komiya et al. (2000)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affect optimization</i>	Labouvie-Vief & Medler (2002)	Related to emotion regulation
<i>Emotion perception</i>	Phillips et al. (2003a, 2003b); Barrett et al. (2011)	Process rather than individual difference
<i>(Emotional) pulse</i>	Kuppens et al (2007); Moskowitz & Zuroff (2004)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective reactivity</i>	Emmons & King (1989)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotion reactivity</i>	Nock et al. (2008)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional reactivity</i>	Suls et al. (1998)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Mood reactivity</i>	Underwood & Froming (1980)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotion recognition</i>	Elfenbein & Ambady (2002)	Process rather than individual difference
<i>Emotion regulation</i>	Gross (1998b)	Process rather than individual difference
<i>(Emotional) resilience</i>	Bonanno et al. (2007); Connor & Davidson (2003)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Mood seasonality</i>	Murray (2003)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective sensitivity</i>	Kagan & Schneider (1987)	Interpersonal construct
<i>Emotion sensitivity</i>	Carpenter & Trull (2013)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional sensitivity</i>	Martin et al. (1996)	Related to emotion perception
<i>Social skill</i>	Riggio (1986)	Not specific to emotion
<i>(Emotional) spikiness</i>	Pincus et al. (2008)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affect spin</i>	Park (2015)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>(Emotional) spin</i>	Kuppens et al. (2007); Moskowitz & Zuroff (2004)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional stability</i>	Hills & Argyle (2001)	Related to temperament
<i>Emotional susceptibility</i>	Caprara et al. (1985)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional switching</i>	Houben et al. (2016)	Specific to borderline personality disorder
<i>Affective synchrony</i>	Rafeali et al. (2007)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective tone</i>	Mason & Griffin (2003)	From I/O literature
<i>Emotional tone</i>	Williams et al. (2012)	Interpersonal construct

Construct	Example Publication(s)	Reason Excluded
<i>Affective understanding</i>	Anders et al. (2016)	From developmental literature; Interpersonal construct
<i>Emotion understanding</i>	Denham et al. (1994)	From developmental literature; Interpersonal construct
<i>Emotional understanding</i>	Thompson (1987)	From developmental literature; Interpersonal construct
<i>Affective volatility</i>	Adams et al. (2014)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional volatility</i>	Blair (2013)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Affective vulnerability</i>	Gregor et al. (2005)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill
<i>Emotional vulnerability</i>	MacLeod & Hagan (1992)	Unrelated to knowledge/skill

Table S3. Reviews Consulted for Large-Literature Constructs

Construct	Review
<i>Alexithymia</i>	Kanbara & Fukugana (2016) Kooiman et al. (2002) Lane et al. (2015a) Lesser (1981) Lumley et al. (2007) Maroti et al. (2018) Taylor et al. (1991) Taylor (2000) Taylor et al. (2016)
<i>Emotional awareness</i>	Gu et al. (2013) Lane (2008) Smith et al. (2018)
<i>Emotional competence</i>	Scherer (2018)
<i>Emotional intelligence</i>	Akerjordet & Severinsson (2007) Andrei et al. (2016) Cartwright & Pappas (2008) Cherniss (2010) Conte (2005) Davis & Nichols (2016) Elfenbein & MacCann (2017) Fiori (2009) Gómez-Leal et al. (2018) Maul (2012) Mayer et al. (2008) Mayer et al. (2004) Mayer & Salovey (1995) Peña-Sarrionandia et al. (2015) Van Rooy et al. (2005) Zeidner et al. (2012)

Note: Selected publications were narrative reviews or meta-analyses identified by searching Google Scholar for the construct name along with the word “review” (e.g., “alexithymia review”).

Table S4. Exclusion Criteria

A Priori Criterion	Applied To
Not specific to emotion	Construct
Interpersonal construct	Construct

From developmental or lifespan literature	Construct
From I/O literature	Construct
Unrelated to knowledge/skill	Construct
Related to temperament/disposition	Construct
Dealt only with affect (e.g., positive vs. negative mood) rather than emotion	Publication
Discussed only within a developmental, lifespan, or applied (i.e., industrial/organizational) context	Publication
Described only in relation to a specific domain (e.g., art appreciation, romantic relationships)	Publication
Measured using only biological measures (e.g., fMRI or EEG)	Publication
Merely applied an existing measure to a sample of participants	Publication

Figure S1. Network based on conceptual interrelationships documented between constructs and their facets, including all definitions for *alexithymia* and *intelligence* (i.e., not limited to those by Taylor, Bagby, and colleagues and Mayer, Salovey and colleagues, respectively). Node color distinguishes constructs summarized in Table 2 (teal) from facets or constructs added during data extraction (light gray). In cases where definitions included two levels of facets and ‘subfacets’ (e.g., Bar-On, 1997 defines *awareness* as a facet of *intrapersonal intelligence*, which is itself a facet of *intelligence*), only the first level of facets are displayed (e.g., the link between ‘awareness’ and ‘intrapersonal intelligence’ has been omitted). Nodes are labeled without any modifiers (e.g., “emotion[al]”, “affect[ive]”), and sized (along with their labels) according to their number of connections (i.e., degree). Facets are connected to broader constructs with an arrow directed at the construct; constructs are connected to each other with an arrow at both ends. Connections are weighted counts of number of publications represented, such that the thinnest lines represent a single publication, and the thickest lines represent five or more publications. Nodes renamed from the original publications to facilitate integration: “granularity” also refers to differentiation (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001); “covariation” also refers to dialecticism (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2016); “regulation” also refers to repair (Salovey et al., 1995); “appraisal” also refers to source clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “identification” also refers to type clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “voluntary attention” (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2015) also refers to emotion attention regulation (Elfenbein & MacCann, 2017) and redirected attention (Salovey & Mayer, 1990a). Facets noting the use of language to verbalize emotion (e.g., labeling; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) are referred to as “description” (following Bagby et al., 1994). Whereas “regulation” refers to an intrapersonal process, “management” refers to the regulation of emotions in others. Nodes conceptually inverted: ‘(a)gnosia’; ‘(a)lexithymia’ and its facets identification, description, introspection (vs. externally oriented thinking), and imagination (vs. reduced fantasy). Network visualization created in Gephi (Bastian et al., 2009) using the Yifan Hu Proportional layout (Hu, 2005).

Figure S2. Network based on empirical interrelationships documented between constructs and their facets, including all definitions for *alexithymia* and *intelligence* (i.e., not limited to those by Taylor, Bagby, and colleagues and Mayer, Salovey and colleagues, respectively). Node color distinguishes constructs summarized in Table 2 (teal) from facets or constructs added during data extraction (light gray). Connection color distinguishes direction of correlation (blue for positive, purple for negative). Connections are undirected. The network layout is structured according to the strength of the mean effect sizes. Nodes renamed from the original publications to facilitate integration: “granularity” also refers to differentiation (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001); “covariation” also refers to dialecticism (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2016); “regulation” also refers to repair (Salovey et al., 1995); “appraisal” also refers to source clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “identification” also refers to type clarity (e.g., Boden & Berenbaum, 2011); “voluntary attention” (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2015) also refers to emotion attention regulation (Elfenbein & MacCann, 2017) and redirected attention (Salovey & Mayer, 1990a). Facets noting the use of language to verbalize emotion (e.g., labeling; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) are referred to as “description” (following Bagby et al., 1994). Whereas “regulation” refers to an intrapersonal process, “management” refers to the regulation of emotions in others. Nodes conceptually inverted: ‘(a)gnosia’; ‘(a)lexithymia’ and its facets identification, description, introspection (vs. externally oriented thinking), and imagination (vs. reduced fantasy). Network visualization created in Gephi (Bastian et al., 2009) using the Yifan Hu Proportional layout (Hu, 2005).

Table S5. Features of Emotional Expertise

Feature	(A)lexithymia ¹	Awareness	Clarity	Competence ²	Complexity	Creativity	Diversity ³	Flexibility	Granularity ⁴	Intelligence ⁵
Structure of knowledge		✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	
Breadth of knowledge					✓	✓	✓		Barrett (2017a)	
Type of knowledge				✓						✓
Mental representation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Verbal representation	✓	✓	✓	Scherer (2007)					✓	Ivcevic et al. (2007)
Ability or skill		Lane & Schwartz (1992)		✓	Lindquist & Barrett (2008)	✓			✓	✓
Adaptive responses				✓		✓			✓	✓
Context-specificity					✓	✓		✓	✓	
Awareness	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Attention	✓	✓								Salovey & Mayer (1990a)
Deliberate practice						✓			Barrett (2017a)	
Prediction	Lane et al. (2015a)				Lindquist & Barrett (2008)				✓	

Note: Column 1 lists the features hypothesized to constitute emotional expertise, as determined deductively through consultation of accounts of domain-general expertise. Columns 2 through 11 summarize which features are represented by the constructs and measures included in this review: check marks indicate where a feature is present; in cases of disagreement or conflicting accounts within the literature, example publication(s) in support of the feature are noted. Features for (a)lexithymia and intelligence are predominantly based upon, respectively, the work of Taylor, Bagby, and colleagues and Mayer, Salovey, and colleagues. Superscripts: ¹ Includes (a)gnosia; ² Includes utilization; ³ Includes range; ⁴ Includes differentiation; ⁵ Includes quotient.

Construct Summaries

Below, we provide individual summaries of the constructs included in the present review. Additional details are available in an abridged version of the final database of reviewed publications, which is provided via our online data repository (<https://osf.io/a6vzk/>). This database includes, for each of the 141 publications included in the final review: bibliographic information, constructs covered, page locations of construct definitions, measurement method(s), relationships with other constructs and/or measures of health/well-being, the theoretical approach adopted by the authors, and any review notes.

Alexithymia

The word “alexithymia” literally translates to ‘a lack of words for feelings’ (Nemiah et al., 1976; Nemiah & Sifneos, 1970; Sifneos, 1972) and refers to a condition “involving a severe affective experiential deficit” (Lane et al., 2015b, p. 597). The construct itself is complexly defined, typically including a set of inter-related difficulties in the processing of emotional information, such that individuals with alexithymia are unable to identify, describe, and introspect about their own emotional experiences (Aaron et al., 2018; Bagby et al., 1994; Edwards & Wupperman, 2017; Erbas et al., 2014; Saklofske et al., 2003; Sifneos, 1973; Taylor & Bagby, 2004). Further, the definition of *alexithymia* often includes a reduction in daydreaming, fantasy, and overall imaginal ability (Bagby et al., 1986; Bermond et al., 2015; Gori et al., 2012; Kleiger & Kinsman, 1980; Kooiman et al., 2002; Koven & Thomas, 2010; Lesser, 1981; Maroti et al., 2018; Sifneos, 1972; Taylor et al., 1985; Zech et al., 1999). Broadly, these four facets of *alexithymia* can be understood as difficulties with awareness of emotional experience (subsuming identification and description) and difficulties with the analysis or symbolization of experience (subsuming imagination and introspection; Bagby et al., 2006; Porcelli & Mihura, 2010). Bermond and colleagues (1999) further elaborated the construct with a (fifth) facet describing difficulties in experiencing emotions (see also Gori et al., 2012; Vorst & Bermond, 2001). These difficulties (in identification, description, introspection, imagination, and experience) represent the modal definitions of *alexithymia*, although the exact nature and number of facets varies by research group as well as over time.

The construct of *alexithymia* has been historically anchored in a psychoanalytic or psychodynamic theory of emotion, in which conflicts that are not expressed and dealt with through words or images (i.e., symbolically) are expressed through bodily symptoms (i.e., they are somatized; Haviland et al., 2000; Lesser, 1981). In this view, *alexithymia* can be seen as a defense against anxiety and neurotic conflicts (Taylor & Bagby, 2013). Research on *alexithymia* evolved from clinical observations of patients presenting with psychosomatic disorders: corresponding features were first described by Ruesch (1948) and MacLean (1949) as “infantile personality” and underdeveloped symbolic ability¹. Although the term “alexithymia” was coined by Sifneos (1972), independent groups of researchers documented similar sets of features that have likewise influenced the construct. For example, Marty and de M’Uzan (1963) described “pensée opératoire”, in which patients were noted as having a concrete, utilitarian, ‘operative’ thinking style that involved little to no affective or figurative content. In contemporary research, *alexithymia* can also be understood more generally, as a global impairment in the processing of emotional information (e.g., Donges & Suslow, 2017; Lane et al., 2000; Maroti et al., 2018). In this view, alexithymia is considered a deficit or deficiency (rather than a psychological defense; Lane et al., 2000; Lumley et al., 2007), or “an impoverished conceptual system for emotion” (Kashdan et al., 2015, p. 12). More recent work has also expanded the description of *alexithymia* to involve problems with empathy or recognizing the emotional experiences of others (e.g., Kashdan et al., 2015; Lane et al., 1996; Taylor & Bagby,

¹ These patients have also been referred to as “emotional illiterates” (Freedman & Sweet, 1954).

2013). In 2015, Lane and colleagues introduced the related neurological construct of *affective agnosia* to describe “a deficit in the ability to mentally represent the meaning of emotional responses” (Lane et al., 2015b, p. 595) which, they contend, can be contrasted with a predominantly ‘anomia’ model of *alexithymia* in which experiences are mentally represented but cannot be labeled (i.e., symbolized or described).

Alexithymia has been assessed using a variety of measurements, including projective tests and content analysis, observational scales and interviews, and self-report questionnaires (for reviews, see Bermond et al., 2015; Linden et al., 1995; Taylor et al., 2000). Projective tests and content analysis are used to assess individuals’ verbal expression of emotion and capacity for fantasy or symbolization (Taylor, 1984), and include the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; H. A. Murray, 1943), the Rorschach Inkblot Test (Exner, 1993) and Rorschach Alexithymia Scale (RAS; Porcelli & Mihura, 2010), the objectively-scored Archetypal9 test (SAT9; Cohen et al., 1985; Demers-Desrosiers et al., 1983), and various verbal content analysis techniques (e.g., Gottschalk & Gleser, 1969; Taylor & Doody, 1982; von Rad et al., 1977). Observational scales and interviews are completed by clinicians or relatives and acquaintances, and include versions of the Beth Israel Hospital Psychosomatic Questionnaire (Apfel & Sifneos, 1979; Sifneos, 1973), the Alexithymia Provoked Questionnaire (APRQ; Krystal et al., 1986), the California Q-set Alexithymia Prototype (CAQ-AP; Haviland & Reise, 1996), the Observation Alexithymia Scale (OAS; Haviland et al., 2000), the Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research (DCPR; Galeazzi et al., 2004), and the Toronto Structured Interview for Alexithymia (TSIA; Bagby et al., 2006).

Self-report measures, however, are by far the most widely used means of assessing *alexithymia*. Furthermore, other types of measures have often suffered from methodological flaws or lack of adequate psychometric data that have led researchers to caution against their use (Bermond et al., 2015; Parker et al., 1991; Zech et al., 1999). Two self-report measures have received particular attention: the 20-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20; Bagby et al., 1994), and the Bermond-Vorst Alexithymia Questionnaire (BVAQ; Vorst & Bermond, 2001). The TAS-20 is the latest version of the Toronto Alexithymia Scale (e.g., Taylor et al., 1985, 1992) and the dominant measure in the literature. It is comprised of subscales for Difficulty Identifying Feelings (DIF), Difficulty Describing Feelings (DDF), and Externally Oriented Thought (EOT). The BVAQ extends upon the Amsterdam Alexithymia Scale (Bermond et al., 1999) and is comprised of subscales for Emotionalizing, Fantasizing, Identifying, Analyzing, and Verbalizing. Less-common self-report measures include the Psychological Treatment Inventory – Alexithymia Scale (PTI-AS; Gori et al., 2012), the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Alexithymia Scale (MMPI-A; Kleiger & Kinsman, 1980), and the Schalling-Sifneos Personality Scale (SSPS; Apfel & Sifneos, 1979).

Research on alexithymia’s relationship to clinical and non-clinical outcomes has been extensive. Alexithymia is associated with, among others, anxiety disorders (Berardis et al., 2008; Robinson & Freeston, 2014), depression (Honkalampi et al., 2000), post-traumatic stress disorder (Frewen et al., 2008), schizophrenia (O’Driscoll et al., 2014), autism spectrum disorders (Kinnaird et al., 2019; Poquérousse et al., 2018), addiction and substance abuse disorders (Mahapatra & Sharma, 2018; Marchetti et al., 2019; Morie et al., 2016; Thorberg et al., 2009), eating disorders (Nowakowski et al., 2013; Westwood et al., 2017), Parkinson’s Disease (Assogna et al., 2016), immune dysregulation (Uher, 2010), chronic pain (Aaron et al., 2019), functional gastrointestinal disorders (Carrozzino & Porcelli, 2018), and coronary heart disease (Beresnevaite, 2000).

Awareness

Emotional awareness is broadly defined as “how people understand, describe, and attend to their emotional experience” (Mankus et al., 2016, p. 28). This construct was introduced by Lane and

Schwartz (1987), who proposed that there are five levels of *emotional awareness*: bodily sensations, action tendencies, single emotions, blends of emotions, and combinations of blends (Lane & Schwartz, 1987; see also Lane et al., 1990). Anchoring on a cognitive-developmental (e.g., Piaget, 1937; Werner & Kaplan, 1963) approach to emotion, Lane and Schwartz (1987) proposed that these five levels are arranged hierarchically and achieved through cognitive development. For example, if an individual were to describe their current experience as a “stomachache” (bodily sensation), this would be considered a lower level of awareness than a description of “makes me want to punch something” (action tendency) or “upset” (single emotion). Lane and colleagues (1990) also introduced the Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS), a performance-based measure of *emotional awareness*. In the LEAS, participants are presented with a variety of evocative written scenarios and asked to describe, in free response, how each person in the scenario (‘you’ and another person) would feel. Responses are scored based on the demonstrated level of emotional awareness (Lane et al., 1990). The LEAS has been shown to predict both behavioral and physiological outcomes (Lane et al., 1995, 1996), and to be sensitive to changes in psychosomatic patients over the course of treatment (Subic-Wrana et al., 2005).

In 2009, Thompson, Dizen, and Berenbaum introduced a new formulation of *emotional awareness* defined in terms of facets rather than levels, and based on descriptive appraisal models of emotion and emotion regulation (e.g., Gross, 1998b, 1998a; Lazarus, 1991; Schwarz & Clore, 1983). Thompson and colleagues’ (2009) original facets of *emotional awareness* were ‘attention’ (i.e., “the extent to which one notices, thinks about, and monitors one’s mood”, p. 875) and ‘clarity’ (i.e., “how clearly one understands one’s own emotions, discriminates among one’s own emotions, and knows how to label these emotions”, p. 875). These facets were measured using the attention and clarity subscales from the self-report Trait Meta-Mood Scales (TMMS; Salovey et al., 1995).

Boden and Thompson (2015) further developed *emotional awareness* by defining sub-facets for clarity and attention. They differentiated between ‘type clarity’ (measured using items from the clarity subscale of the TMMS and from the Difficulty Identifying Feelings [DIF] subscale of the 20-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale [TAS-20; Bagby et al., 1994]) and ‘source clarity’ (measured using items from the Source of Emotions Scale [SES; Boden & Berenbaum, 2011]). For attention, Boden and Thompson (2015) delimited ‘voluntary attention’ (measured using items from the attention scale of the TMMS and from the Externally-Oriented Thought [EOT] subscale of the TAS-20) and ‘involuntary attention’ (measured using items from Huang et al., 2013). To these facets and sub-facets, Mankus and colleagues (2016) added negative emotional granularity (i.e., differentiation), “the complexity with which people identify, distinguish, and label specific negative emotions” (p. 29), which they estimated using the intra-class correlation (ICC) of emotion intensity ratings to negatively-valenced photographs (as in e.g., Erbas et al., 2014; for more details, see the Granularity section below). With the exception of involuntary attention to emotion, these facets of *emotional awareness* have been shown to predict adaptive emotion regulation strategies and fewer depression symptoms (e.g., Boden & Thompson, 2015).

A closely-related construct is *mood awareness*, which describes “a form of attention directed toward one’s mood states” (Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995, p. 934). *Mood awareness* is parsed into two facets: ‘mood monitoring’, “the tendency to scrutinize and focus on one’s moods” (p. 934) and ‘mood labeling’, “the ability to identify and categorize one’s moods” (p. 934). Both facets are measured using the self-report Mood Awareness Scale (MAS; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995). Whereas mood labeling is associated with positive outcomes such as satisfaction with social support and life, mood monitoring is associated with negative outcomes such as rumination and poor emotion regulation (Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995).

Clarity

Emotional clarity, also known as *affective clarity* (e.g., Lischetzke et al., 2005), is defined as the extent to which an individual takes a meta-emotional perspective to unambiguously identify, label, and characterize their emotional experiences (Boden et al., 2013; Boden & Thompson, 2017; Eckland et al., 2018; Gohm & Clore, 2002; Lischetzke & Eid, 2017). Research on *emotional clarity* has typically focused on trait-level assessments of how individuals understand their moods and emotions (e.g., Boden et al., 2013; Gohm & Clore, 2002), although some studies have measured momentary, state-level clarity (e.g., Lischetzke et al., 2005). Boden and Berenbaum (2011) proposed two facets of *emotional clarity*: ‘source awareness’ (i.e., the degree to which individuals understand the causes of their emotional experiences) and ‘type awareness’ (i.e., the degree to which individuals can distinguish between the experiences of specific emotion categories, such as discriminating anger vs. fear; see Boden & Thompson, 2015 for a similar formulation, as addressed in the Awareness section above).

Common measures for trait-level *emotional clarity* include the Trait Meta Mood Scale (TMMS – Clarity of Feelings subscale; Salovey et al., 1995), the 20-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20 – Difficulty Identifying Feelings subscale; Bagby et al., 1994), the Mood Awareness Scale (MAS – Mood Labeling subscale; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995), and the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS – Lack of Emotional Clarity subscale; Gratz & Roemer, 2004). Boden and Berenbaum (2011) measured the sub-facet of source awareness using a set of custom items, and measured the sub-facet of type awareness using items from the TMMS and TAS-20. Momentary *emotional clarity* has been assessed using state-level forms of the subscales mentioned above or, as an indirect measure, by calculating response latencies to momentary affect ratings (Lischetzke et al., 2005). This indirect assessment of *emotional clarity* assumes that the clearer an individual’s emotions are, the fewer cognitive resources are required to identify and label these emotions, resulting in faster responses to affect ratings. Higher levels of clarity have been shown to be related to emotional intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998) and may facilitate emotion regulation processes (Boden et al., 2013; Boden & Thompson, 2017; Lischetzke et al., 2005).

Competence

Emotional competence is defined as how an individual “identifies, expresses, understands, regulates, and uses his emotions or those of others” (Brasseur et al., 2013, p. 1). Some perspectives have further elaborated *emotional competence* by breaking the construct down into constituent facets. For example, Scherer (2007) suggested that *emotional competence* consists of ‘appraisal competence’ (i.e., accurate judgment of important emotion events to inform subsequent response), ‘regulation competence’ (i.e., correction of inappropriate responses to emotion events due to inaccurate appraisals), ‘communication competence’ (i.e., appropriate signaling of emotion response to others), and ‘perception competence’ (i.e., accurate perception of emotion responses signaled by others). Izard and colleagues (2009; 2011) dissected *emotional competence* into two facets: ‘emotion knowledge’ (i.e., an understanding of one’s own or another’s emotions; Izard et al., 2011) and ‘emotion utilization’ (i.e., the ability to effectively exploit such understanding for constructive purposes and actions; Izard, 2009). Other perspectives have incorporated *emotional and social competence* into a single construct (ESC; Boyatzis et al., 2004). Originally created to characterize an individual’s performance in a workplace setting, this perspective proposed four basic competency clusters: ‘self-awareness’, ‘self-management’, ‘social awareness’, and ‘relationship management’ (Boyatzis et al., 2004).

Emotional competence is typically assessed using self-report measures, including the Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC; Brasseur et al., 2013), the Emotion Questionnaire (EQ; Rydell et al., 2003), the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI; Boyatzis et al., 2000), and the Mayer-

Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). These measures have been used to assess the sub-competencies theorized to comprise *emotional competence*, such as emotion knowledge (e.g., using the MSCEIT) and emotion utilization (e.g., using the EQ). In developmental samples, emotion knowledge has also been assessed using a performance-based measure, the Emotion Matching Task (EMT; Morgan et al., 2010). Greater emotional competence is thought to benefit mental health, social skills, and academic performance (Trentacosta & Schultz, 2015). Studies have shown positive relationships between emotional competence and trait positive affect, subjective health, and quality of social relationships (Brasseur et al., 2013).

Complexity

Emotional complexity has been defined in several ways in the emotion literature. Broadly, it describes a combination of covariation, granularity (i.e., differentiation), and/or range in emotional experience, as well as elaboration in propositional knowledge of emotion categories (e.g., Grossmann et al., 2016; Grossmann & Ellsworth, 2017; Hay & Diehl, 2011; Lindquist & Barrett, 2008). Some researchers focus on covariation and granularity (e.g., Grossmann & Ellsworth, 2017; Hay & Diehl, 2011), while others emphasize granularity and range (e.g., Kang & Shaver, 2004; Ong et al., 2017) or covariation, granularity, and knowledge (e.g., Lindquist & Barrett, 2008). Each of these facets (i.e., covariation, granularity, range, and propositional knowledge) is summarized in turn.

‘Covariation’ – also referred to as “dialecticism” (e.g., Grossmann & Ellsworth, 2017) and “poignancy” (e.g., Carstensen et al., 2000; Hay & Diehl, 2011) – describes an individual’s tendency to simultaneously experience positive and negative emotions. Previous work investigating covariation has hypothesized that greater co-occurrence of positive and negative affect is indicative of greater emotional complexity (Brose et al., 2015; Carstensen et al., 2000; Charles et al., 2017; Grossmann et al., 2016; Grühn et al., 2013; Hay & Diehl, 2011; Kashdan et al., 2015). Data for measuring covariation are typically collected via experience sampling or daily diary reports of positive and negative affect, most commonly using the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS; David Watson et al., 1988). These data are then used to compute intra-individual correlations between positive and negative affect (e.g., following Grühn et al., 2013). Covariation has also been indexed at an absolute level, in which mean positive and negative emotion levels are calculated from daily ratings of emotional experience (Ready et al., 2008).

‘Emotional granularity’ (i.e., emotion differentiation) describes the precision with which an individual differentiates their emotional experiences (e.g., Brose et al., 2015; Grühn et al., 2013; Hay & Diehl, 2011; Kang & Shaver, 2004; Ready et al., 2008). Individuals showing a propensity to distinguish nuance within emotion categories are thought to have greater emotional granularity and therefore greater emotional complexity (Kang & Shaver, 2004). Measurement of emotional granularity typically relies on experience sampling data, which are used to compute intra-individual estimates of overlap in intensity ratings across emotions (e.g., intra-class correlations [ICCs], following Tugade et al., 2004). Other studies have assessed self-reported emotional granularity using the Range and Differentiation of Emotional Experiences Scale (RDEES; Kang & Shaver, 2004). For more details about emotional granularity, see the corresponding section below.

‘Emotional range’ refers to the variety in an individual’s emotion experiences (e.g., Kang & Shaver, 2004; Ong et al., 2017). It has been measured using the RDEES and with experience sampling and daily diary measures (for a review, see Ong et al., 2017). For more details about emotional range, see the Diversity section below.

‘Propositional knowledge’ describes an individual’s explicit understanding of emotional experiences in specific situations (Lane et al., 1990; Lane & Pollermann, 2002; Lane & Schwartz, 1987). The complexity of propositional knowledge is frequently assessed using the Levels of

Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS; Lane et al., 1990). In the LEAS, participants are presented with evocative written scenarios and asked to describe how each person in the scenario would feel (see the Awareness section above for more details). Participants who score higher on the LEAS are considered to have greater emotional complexity (Lindquist & Barrett, 2008).

Another, related construct is *affect* (or *affective*) *complexity*, which has been defined as “the ability to coordinate positive and negative affect into flexible and differentiated structures” (Labouvie-Vief & Medler, 2002, p. 571). Early measures of *affect complexity* involved clinician-scoring of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; H. A. Murray, 1943) for subjective complexity (e.g., Henry & Shlien, 1958; Kantrowitz et al., 1986). More recent studies generally use measures of range or covariation on the PANAS or other mood reports (e.g., Bodner et al., 2013; Brose et al., 2015; Larsen & Cutler, 1996; Tobacyk, 1980). However, Labouvie-Vief and Medler (2002) assessed *affect complexity* using performance-based tasks. For example, in one task participants were asked to generate statements about themselves, which were then scored according to how complexly the self and others are represented (following Labouvie-Vief, 1994).

Creativity

Emotional creativity is generally defined as an individual’s ability to produce emotional responses that are novel, authentic, and effective, as well as their preparedness to use this ability (Averill, 1999, 2004; Ivcevic et al., 2017). Introduced by Averill and Thomas-Knowles (1991), *emotional creativity* is rooted in Averill’s social constructionist theory of emotion, which posits that emotions are performances based on sociocultural expectations and learned experience, heavily influenced by the current social and environmental context. An emotionally creative person, then, is a more creative performer: an individual who combines social scripts in new and effective ways. In this way, *emotional creativity* is conceptualized as a type of creativity, in a similar way and around the same time that *emotional intelligence* was posited as a type of intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990b). In fact, Averill (2004) compares these two constructs theoretically, arguing that *emotional creativity* is more comprehensive than *emotional intelligence* due to its ability to account for the role of culture and context in emotional expression and experience, while *emotional intelligence* is more narrow and presumes that there is a ‘correct’ or agreed-upon emotional response in a given scenario.

Emotional creativity is typically assessed using the self-report Emotional Creativity Inventory (Averill, 1999). It has also been assessed using performance-based measures: the Emotional Consequences task, which assesses individuals’ originality and quantity of their responses to a unique emotion situation, and the Emotional Triads task, where participants are given three dissimilar emotion words (e.g., “calm”, “confused”, and “joyous”) and asked to generate a situation in which someone could experience all three (Averill & Thomas-Knowles, 1991; described in Ivcevic et al., 2017). At least one study has shown empirical support for convergent validity between these measures (Fuchs et al., 2007). Studies have also shown that *emotional creativity* is positively related to *emotional intelligence* (Ivcevic et al., 2007) and negatively related to *alexithymia* (Fuchs et al., 2007), although these constructs are empirically distinguishable. Studies have further shown that emotional creativity is positively correlated with artistic creativity, such as poetry writing (Ivcevic et al., 2007, 2017).

Diversity

The variety of emotions that an individual experiences has been variously called *emotional range* (Sommers, 1981) and *emodiversity* (a blended form of “emotional diversity”; Quoidbach et al., 2014). The term “emotional range” was introduced first by Sommers (1981). She measured *emotional range* by asking participants to tell a story based on a vignette with emotional content

and then coding the number of unique emotion words freely generated in their stories. Using this measure, Sommers (1981) found that higher emotional range was related to better social cognitive ability, or the ability to know how to act around social others. More recent work has situated *emotional range* as a feature of *emotional complexity* (e.g., as measured using the Range and Differentiation of Emotional Experience Scale [RDEES; Kang & Shaver, 2004]).

The term “emodiversity” was introduced several decades later by Quoidbach and colleagues (2014). *Emodiversity* draws conceptually on Shannon’s entropy (Shannon, 1948) and a biodiversity index (Magurran, 2013), which captures both the variety (i.e., range) and relative amounts (i.e., evenness) of organisms in an ecosystem. To measure *emodiversity*, Quoidbach and colleagues (2014) asked participants to report the relative frequency with which they experience a set of positive and negative emotions. These data were used to calculate a custom measure of *emodiversity*, with higher values indicating that an individual reported experiencing a greater number of emotions at about the same frequency. Higher emodiversity was found to predict lower depressive and physical health symptoms over and above mean frequency of overall emotional experience (Quoidbach et al., 2014). However, this model was challenged by Brown and Coyne (2017), who questioned whether it was theoretically appropriate to measure *emodiversity* in a similar way as biodiversity. Brown and Coyne (2017) also reanalyzed Quoidbach and colleagues’ (2014) data and found evidence of multicollinearity between emotion frequency and emodiversity, significantly impacting their interpretation that emodiversity explains unique variance in positive outcomes. Thus, despite the theoretical importance of accounting for range or diversity in emotional experience, more research is necessary in this area to determine the appropriate measures for predicting greater well-being.

Flexibility

Emotional flexibility, also referred to as *affective flexibility* (e.g., Zhu & Bonanno, 2017), is defined as the capability to adapt to changing emotional contexts (Beshai et al., 2018; Fu et al., 2018). Fu and colleagues (2018) elaborate upon this definition by specifying two core facets of *emotional flexibility*: sensitivity to situational demands, and the ability to regulate emotions accordingly (i.e., emotion regulation). *Emotional flexibility* has been conceptualized as both an ability (e.g., Fu et al., 2018; Zhu & Bonanno, 2017) and a trait (e.g., Beshai et al., 2018).

Emotional flexibility has been assessed using both self-report and performance-based measures. The Emotional Flexibility Scale (EFS; Fu et al., 2018) is a self-report measure that assesses how likely the individuals are to either enhance or suppress their emotions based on situations-specific needs. EFS items have been found to load onto three factors, described by Fu and colleagues (2018) as: tuning of negative emotions, tuning of positive emotions, and emotion communication. EFS scores have been found to be positively correlated with self-reported psychological well-being (Fu et al., 2018).

There are two performance-based measures of *emotional flexibility*: the Affective Flexibility Task (AFT; Zhu & Bonanno, 2017) and the Visual Analogue Mood Scale (VAMS; Beshai et al., 2018). In the AFT, participants are asked to rate the intensity of their affective experience in response to negatively-valenced and neutral photographs (Zhu & Bonanno, 2017). Participants are told to enhance, suppress, or only view the photographs; ‘enhancement ability’ and ‘suppression ability’ scores are derived by subtracting the intensity ratings during enhance and suppress conditions, respectively, from the average intensity during the view-only condition. Zhu and Bonanno (2017) found that change in affective enhancement and suppression scores over the course of the study was associated with fewer symptoms of depression. In the VAMS, participants are asked to rate the intensity of their affective experience before and after negative and positive mood inductions (Beshai et al., 2018). *Emotional flexibility* is estimated as the differences in scores

between mood inductions and between the negative mood induction and recovery, such that higher scores (i.e., greater differences) indicate that an individual is able to change emotions according to context and to spontaneously recover from negative mood. Based on their results, Beshai and colleagues (2018) hypothesized that greater emotional flexibility would be associated with mindfulness, self-compassion, and resilience.

Granularity

Emotional granularity refers to individual differences in the tendency or ability to “represent emotional experiences with precision and specificity” (Tugade et al., 2004, p. 1168). Individuals with higher emotional granularity “make fine-grained distinctions between emotional experiences” (Aaron et al., 2018, p. 116) and describe and “label [their] emotions in a nuanced and specific manner” (Lee et al., 2017, p. 1). In contrast, individuals with lower emotional granularity represent and describe their emotional experiences in a global manner, often using broad affective terms such as “good” or “bad” that primarily capture pleasure or displeasure (Barrett, 2004). The term “emotional granularity” was first coined by Barrett in 2004 (Barrett, 2004; Tugade et al., 2004), although the construct is based on her older work examining the emphasis that individuals place on valence or arousal when reporting their experiences (i.e., ‘valence focus’ and ‘arousal focus’; Barrett, 1998, 2004; Feldman, 1995a, 1995b)². In this regard, *emotional granularity* captures “the ability to distinguish between distinct emotions of similar valence” (Dixon-Gordon et al., 2014, p. 617), such that individuals higher in granularity represent their experiences using more than a single pleasant-unpleasant dimension (e.g., they exhibit more arousal focus). *Emotionally granularity* is synonymous, in most cases, with *emotion(al) differentiation* (e.g., as defined by Barrett et al., 2001; for contrasting definitions, see Goldston et al., 1992; Plonsker et al., 2017).

Work on *emotional granularity* has been predominantly anchored in a constructionist approach to emotion (Barrett, 2006, 2017b, 2017a). Broadly, this approach proposes that the experience of emotion occurs when the brain uses concepts for emotion (i.e., prior experiences and accrued knowledge) to make meaning of current affect (i.e., feelings of valence and arousal derived from interoceptive signals from the body) in a context-specific manner. From this perspective, it follows that higher emotional granularity is the ability to create instances of emotion that are tailored to the situation at hand, and effective at facilitating goal-relevant and culturally congruent outcomes.

Emotional granularity is typically measured using data collected from momentary self-reports repeated over time. These data are most often gathered using experience sampling methods (ESM; Barrett & Barrett, 2001; Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987) or ecological momentary assessment (EMA; Shiffman & Stone, 1998; Stone & Shiffman, 1994). These studies ask participants to respond to a series of prompts throughout their day, at each point rating the intensity of their current experience on a set of emotion words (e.g., Barrett, 2004; Boden et al., 2013, Study 2; Dixon-Gordon et al., 2014; Erbas et al., 2014, Study 1; Sheets et al., 2015; Trull et al., 2015; Tugade et al., 2004). Repeated emotion intensity ratings have also been collected retrospectively, using daily diary methods (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2017). Alternatively, these data have been collected in the lab, by having participants provide emotion intensity ratings to a series of emotionally-evocative photographs (e.g., Barrett, 2004, Study 2; Erbas et al., 2013, 2014, Study 3, 2019; Lee et al., 2017; Plonsker et al., 2017; Suvak et al., 2011), film clips (e.g., Aaron et al., 2018; Barrett, 2004, Study 3), scenarios (e.g., Boden et al., 2013, Study 1; Cameron et al., 2013), or other types of emotion inductions (e.g., Barrett, 2004, Study 3; Edwards & Wupperman, 2017). In a few

² Work on valence focus has also continued in parallel with work on emotional granularity (Barrett & Niedenthal, 2004; Pietromonaco & Barrett, 2009; Suvak et al., 2011).

studies, emotion intensity ratings have been gathered using a social perception task, in which participants are asked to rate people in their lives (e.g., partner, best friend, parents) on a set of emotion words (e.g., Erbas et al., 2014, Study 2; Goldston et al., 1992).

Estimates of emotional granularity are derived from repeated emotion intensity ratings in several, related ways. Most commonly, intraclass correlations (ICCs; Shrout & Fleiss, 1979) are calculated across ratings for positively- and negatively-valenced emotion words, respectively (e.g., Boden et al., 2013; Cameron et al., 2013; Kashdan et al., 2010; Pond et al., 2012; Tugade et al., 2004)³. ICCs can be calculated using either absolute agreement across ‘raters’ (here, emotion words; e.g., Dixon-Gordon et al., 2014; Tugade et al., 2004) or consistency (e.g., Erbas et al., 2013, 2014, 2019), although in practice these estimates are highly correlated (Erbas et al., 2014). ICCs for positive and negative emotions can be averaged to achieve an overall estimate of granularity (e.g., Edwards & Wupperman, 2017)⁴, and can also be calculated separately for each measurement occasion or day of experience sampling (e.g., Tomko et al., 2015). Less commonly, emotional granularity has been estimated as the average bivariate correlation between all pairs of similarly-valenced words (e.g., Barrett et al., 2001; Zaki et al., 2013), or *P*-correlation matrices (Cattell et al., 1947) are computed for use in further analyses (e.g., Barrett, 2004; Feldman, 1995a; Suvak et al., 2011). In a few studies, emotion differentiation has been estimated by examining person-specific clustering of emotion intensity ratings (Goldston et al., 1992), or the average sum of similarly-valenced emotions endorsed across measurement occasions (Plonsker et al., 2017) – however, it should be noted that these studies followed theoretical approaches (e.g., basic emotion approaches such as differential emotions theory; Dougherty et al., 1996; Izard, 1971, 2013; Malatesta & Wilson, 1988; Tomkins, 1962, 1963) in which there is a specified set of emotions that participants ‘should’ be able to differentiate.

Emotional granularity has also been measured using alternative paradigms to those that generate repeated emotion intensity ratings. For example, Barrett (2004) asked participants to rate the pairwise similarity of a set of emotion words, and then subjected these ratings to group- and participant-level multidimensional scaling (MDS) analyses to identify to what extent each individual’s ratings were captured by the group-level dimensions of valence and arousal (a similar procedure was also used by Suvak et al., 2011). Erbas and colleagues (2013) used a free-sort task in which participants were asked to group emotion words into piles based on their semantic similarity, and counted the number of piles as an index of emotional granularity. Kang and Shaver (2004) introduced a global self-report measure as a subscale of their Range and Differentiation of Emotional Experiences Scale (RDEES). The first to use physiological data to investigate *emotional granularity*, Lee and colleagues (2017) recorded electroencephalography (EEG) while emotionally-evocative photographs were presented to participants, and examined patterns of event-related potentials (ERPs) and de/synchronization (ERD/ERS) in individuals with lower versus higher granularity.

Across all these measurement methods, higher emotional granularity has been associated with a wide variety of positive mental and physical health outcomes (Kashdan et al., 2015), such as improved self-regulation (Barrett et al., 2001; Kalokerinos et al., 2019), reduced depression (Erbas et al., 2019), and healthier recovery from cancer (Stanton et al., 2002). In contrast, lower granularity

³ ICCs can also be calculated within-valence, to examine the relationships between superordinate emotion categories (e.g., ‘anger’, ‘sadness’, ‘fear’) or the relationships between specific emotions within these superordinate categories (e.g., ‘frustration’ vs. ‘rage’ vs. ‘annoyance’ within the category of ‘anger’). See Erbas et al. (2019) for details.

⁴ This procedure avoids interpretation issues that arise from including ratings for all emotion words in a single ICC; because ratings for pleasant and unpleasant emotion words are typically negatively correlated, including all emotion words in the same analysis can result in negative ICC values.

is associated with greater symptoms of anxiety (Mennin et al., 2005) and depression (Erbaş et al., 2014; Starr et al., 2017), and poorer behavioral indices of coping (for reviews, see Barrett, 2017a; Kashdan et al., 2015; Smidt & Suvak, 2015).

The construct of *affect(ive) differentiation* has also been put forward by several groups of researchers. Some of these definitions and measurement approaches closely resemble those outlined for *emotional granularity* and *emotion differentiation*. For example, Terracciano and colleagues (2003) examined “[individual] differences in the ability to differentiate feelings in terms of arousal within the categories of pleasant and unpleasant affect” (p. 673) using a covariance structural modeling approach (CIRCUM; Browne, 1992) to evaluate the fit of a circumplex structure. Other definitions, such as theoretical proposals by Labouvie-Vief and González (2004), have understood *affect differentiation* as the developmental elaboration (Lane & Schwartz, 1987; Piaget, 1937) of a set of primary or basic emotions (Izard, 1971; Tomkins, 1962, 1963) to achieve conceptual and emotional complexity. Lastly, following the Dynamic Model of Affect (e.g., Zautra et al., 2000, 2001, 2005), researchers have defined *affect(ive) differentiation* as “the extent to which [positive and negative affect] operate independently or in a dependent, inverse manner” (Dasch et al., 2010, p. 441). In this line of research, *affect(ive) differentiation* is measured as the correlation between repeated intensity ratings for positively- versus negatively-valenced emotion words (e.g., Dasch et al., 2010; M. C. Davis et al., 2004). Because this operationalization is ultimately about the relationship between positive and negative affect, rather than specific emotion categories, it has not been discussed further.

Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is a multi-faceted, multiply defined construct that has received extensive research attention in the past 30 years. For the purposes of the present review, we have adopted the first definition of *emotional intelligence*, posited by Salovey and Mayer (1990b): “the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions” (p. 189). This definition is generally the most widely-used and psychometrically-validated (Cherniss, 2010; Livingstone & Day, 2005; but see Maul, 2012; Roberts et al., 2010). It encompasses four facets: ‘emotion perception’, ‘emotion understanding’, ‘emotion regulation’ (i.e., ‘emotion management’), and ‘emotion facilitation’ (i.e., using emotion to facilitate thought; e.g., Mayer, Roberts, et al., 2008). Salovey and Mayer’s (1990b) model (sometimes called the Four-Branch Ability model; Mayer, Roberts, et al., 2008) sought to situate *emotional intelligence* as a research-based bridge between prevailing emotion theories of the time (mainly basic emotion and causal appraisal theories, e.g., Arnold, 1960; Izard, 1971; Tomkins, 1962, 1963) and theories of intelligence (broadly construed as abstract reasoning, e.g., Sternberg, 1997; see Mayer et al., 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1993).

In 1995, journalist Daniel Goleman published his book *Emotional Intelligence*, which built upon Salovey and Mayer’s initial work, but included broader social competencies in the construct and made substantive claims about the importance of *emotional intelligence* to personal and workplace success. Goleman’s (1995) book generated public interest in *emotional intelligence* and spurred academic debate. Mayer and colleagues (2000) opposed this broadening, while other researchers such as Bar-On (1997, 2000) embraced it, defining *emotional intelligence* as “a multifactorial array of interrelated emotional, personal, and social abilities that influence our overall ability to actively and effectively cope with daily demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 2000, p. 384). This multi-faceted definition for *emotional intelligence*, which combines abilities with social and personality traits, is one example of a ‘mixed model’, in contrast to the purely ‘ability model’ of Salovey and Mayer (Salovey & Mayer, 1990b; see also Mayer et al., 2000) or a ‘trait model’ (e.g., Petrides & Furnham, 2000). These models of *emotional intelligence* have been extensively

reviewed in past articles (see Elfenbein & MacCann, 2017; Mayer et al., 2000; Mayer, Roberts, et al., 2008; Mayer, Salovey, et al., 2008; Palmer et al., 2008; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Roberts et al., 2010; Salovey & Grewal, 2005; Siegling et al., 2015). Many mixed models and measures have been proposed in the industrial and organizational psychology literature (e.g., Petrides, 2010); however, due to the extensive nature of that literature and its divergence from traditional basic science research, we have excluded these models from our overview.

Measures have been created for both ability and mixed models of *emotional intelligence* (for reviews, see Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Conte, 2005; Livingstone & Day, 2005; Roberts et al., 2010; Siegling et al., 2015). For example, Mayer and colleagues developed a performance-based measure of *emotional intelligence* ability, first as the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS; Mayer et al., 2000), later revised to the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al., 2002, 2003). The MSCEIT consists of eight tasks, two for each of the four facets: for example, selecting an emotion word that corresponds to faces and photographs (emotion perception), reasoning about the relationships between emotion words (emotion understanding), and choosing between various courses of action or feeling in hypothetical scenarios (emotion regulation; Mayer et al., 2002, 2003). Responses can be scored in comparison to ‘correct’ answers as determined by consensus of the authors, or as determined by a normative sample (Mayer et al., 2003). Self-report measures of *emotional intelligence* are also used, especially in the mixed model literature. Common measures include the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; Bar-On, 1997; Dawda & Hart, 2000), the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS; also called the Assessing Emotions Scale; Schutte et al., 1998) and the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaires (TEIQue; Petrides et al., 2007).

Emotional intelligence has been associated with many other psychological constructs and real-world outcomes (for reviews, see e.g., Mayer, Roberts, et al., 2008; Mayer, Salovey, et al., 2008; Salovey et al., 2002). Briefly, both ability and mixed model measures of emotional intelligence have been positively correlated with self-reported empathy (Mayer & Geher, 1996), optimism (Schutte et al., 1998), subjective well-being (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Saklofske et al., 2003), life satisfaction and relationship quality (Ciarrochi et al., 2000). These measures have been negatively correlated with self-reported symptoms of depression (Bar-On, 2000; Dawda & Hart, 2000; Schutte et al., 1998), as well as anxiety and schizophrenia (Bar-On, 2000). There is also evidence that emotional intelligence is related to real-world outcomes such as higher self-reported scores on standardized tests such as the ACT and Verbal SAT (Brackett & Mayer, 2003), lower self-reported risky behavior such as substance use and criminal activity (Salovey et al., 2002; Salovey & Grewal, 2005), and lower self-reported physical health symptoms (reviewed in Bar-On, 2005).

References

- Aaron, R. V., Fisher, E. A., de la Vega, R., Lumley, M. A., & Palermo, T. M. (2019). Alexithymia in individuals with chronic pain and its relation to pain intensity, physical interference, depression, and anxiety: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain, 160*(5), 994.
- Aaron, R. V., Snodgrass, M. A., Blain, S. D., & Park, S. (2018). Affect labeling and other aspects of emotional experiences in relation to alexithymia following standardized emotion inductions. *Psychiatry Research, 262*, 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.02.014>
- Adams, C. E., Chen, M., Guo, L., Lam, C. Y., Hoover, D. S., Correa-Fernández, V., Cano, M. A., Heppner, W. L., Vidrine, J. I., & Li, Y. (2014). Mindfulness predicts lower affective volatility among African Americans during smoking cessation. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 28*(2), 580–585.
- Akerjordet, K., & Severinsson, E. (2007). Emotional intelligence: A review of the literature with specific focus on empirical and epistemological perspectives. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16*(8), 1405–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01749.x>
- Anders, S., de Jong, R., Beck, C., Haynes, J.-D., & Ethofer, T. (2016). A neural link between affective understanding and interpersonal attraction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(16), E2248–E2257.
- Andrei, F., Siegling, A. B., Aloe, A. M., Baldaro, B., & Petrides, K. V. (2016). The incremental validity of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue): A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 98*(3), 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1084630>
- Apfel, R. J., & Sifneos, P. E. (1979). Alexithymia: Concept and measurement. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 32*(1–4), 180–190.
- Arnold, M. B. (1960). *Emotion and personality*. Columbia University Press.
- Assogna, F., Cravello, L., Orfei, M. D., Cellupica, N., Caltagirone, C., & Spalletta, G. (2016). Alexithymia in Parkinson's disease: A systematic review of the literature. *Parkinsonism and Related Disorders, 28*, 1–11.
- Averill, J. R. (1999). Individual differences in emotional creativity: Structure and correlates. *Journal of Personality, 67*(2), 331–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00058>
- Averill, J. R. (2004). A tale of two snarks: Emotional intelligence and emotional creativity compared. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(3), 228–233.
- Averill, J. R., & Thomas-Knowles, C. (1991). Emotional creativity. In K. T. Strongman (Ed.), *International Review of Studies on Emotion* (Vol. 1). Chichester Wiley.
- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale—I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38*(1), 23–32.
- Bagby, R. M., Taylor, G. J., Parker, J. D. A., & Dickens, S. E. (2006). The development of the Toronto Structured Interview for Alexithymia: Item selection, factor structure, reliability and concurrent validity. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 75, Issue 1, pp. 25–39).
- Bagby, R. M., Taylor, G. J., & Ryan, D. (1986). Toronto Alexithymia Scale: Relationship with personality and psychopathology measures. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 45*(4), 207–215.
- Banase, R., & Scherer, K. R. (1996). Acoustic profiles in vocal emotion expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 614–636. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.614>
- Barford, K. A., & Smillie, L. D. (2016). Openness and other Big Five traits in relation to dispositional mixed emotions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 102*, 118–122.

- Barkley, R. A., & Fischer, M. (2010). The unique contribution of emotional impulsiveness to impairment in major life activities in hyperactive children as adults. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 49(5), 503–513.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *BarOn Emotional Quotient-Inventory (BarOn EQ-i®)*.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace* (EBSCOhost; pp. 363–388). Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (2005). The impact of emotional intelligence on subjective well-being. *Perspectives in Education*, 23(1), 41–62.
- Barrett, L. F. (1998). Discrete emotions or dimensions? The role of valence focus and arousal focus. *Cognition and Emotion*, 12(4), 579–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999398379574>
- Barrett, L. F. (2004). Feelings or words? Understanding the content in self-report ratings of experienced emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 266–281. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.266>
- Barrett, L. F. (2006). Solving the emotion paradox: Categorization and the experience of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(1), 20–46. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1001_2
- Barrett, L. F. (2017a). *How emotions are made: The secret life of the brain*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Barrett, L. F. (2017b). The theory of constructed emotion: An active inference account of interoception and categorization. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw154>
- Barrett, L. F., & Barrett, D. J. (2001). An introduction to computerized experience sampling in psychology. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(2), 175–185.
- Barrett, L. F., Gross, J., Christensen, T. C., & Benvenuto, M. (2001). Knowing what you're feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. *Cognition and Emotion*, 15(6), 713–724. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000239>
- Barrett, L. F., & Niedenthal, P. M. (2004). Valence focus and the perception of facial affect. *Emotion*, 4(3), 266–274.
- Bastian, M., Heymann, S., & Jacomy, M. (2009). Gephi: An open source software for exploring and manipulating networks. *Third International AAAIConference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Berardis, D. D., Campanella, D., Nicola, S., Gianna, S., Alessandro, C., Chiara, C., Valchera, A., Marilde, C., Salerno, R. M., & Ferro, F. M. (2008). The impact of alexithymia on anxiety disorders: A review of the literature. *Current Psychiatry Reviews*, 4(2), 80–86.
- Beresnevaite, M. (2000). Exploring the benefits of group psychotherapy in reducing alexithymia in coronary heart disease patients: A preliminary study. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 69(3), 117–122.
- Bermond, B., Oosterveld, P., & Vorst, H. C. M. (2015). Measures of alexithymia. In G. J. Boyle, D. H. Saklofske, & G. Matthews (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs* (pp. 227–256). Academic Press.
- Bermond, B., Vorst, H. C. M., Vingerhoets, A., & Gerritsen, W. (1999). The Amsterdam Alexithymia Scale: Its psychometric values and correlations with other personality traits. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 68, Issue 5, pp. 241–251).
- Beshai, S., Prentice, J. L., & Huang, V. (2018). Building blocks of emotional flexibility: Trait mindfulness and self-compassion are associated with positive and negative mood shifts. *Mindfulness*, 9(3), 939–948.

- Biringen, Z., & Robinson, J. (1991). Emotional availability in mother-child interactions: A reconceptualization for research. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 61(2), 258–271.
- Blair, R. J. (2013). Commentary: Disregard for others: Empathic dysfunction or emotional volatility? The relationship with future antisocial behavior-reflections on Rhee et al. (2013). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 54(2), 167–168.
- Boden, M. T., & Berenbaum, H. (2011). What you are feeling and why: Two distinct types of emotional clarity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(5), 652–656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.009>
- Boden, M. T., & Thompson, R. J. (2015). Facets of emotional awareness and associations with emotion regulation and depression. *Emotion*, 15(3), 399–410. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000057>
- Boden, M. T., & Thompson, R. J. (2017). Meta-analysis of the association between emotional clarity and attention to emotions. *Emotion Review*, 9(1), 79–85.
- Boden, M. T., Thompson, R. J., Dizén, M., Berenbaum, H., & Baker, J. P. (2013). Are emotional clarity and emotion differentiation related? *Cognition and Emotion*, 27(6), 961–978. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.751899>
- Bodner, E., Palgi, Y., & Kaveh, D. (2013). Does the relationship between affect complexity and self-esteem differ in young-old and old-old participants? *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 68(5), 665–673.
- Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucciarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2007). What predicts psychological resilience after disaster? The role of demographics, resources, and life stress. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75(5), 671–682.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, 99(6), 343–362.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Sala, F., & Geher, G. (2004). Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. In *The Measurement of Emotional Intelligence*. Nova Science Publishers.
- Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003). Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(9), 1147–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203254596>
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Aldine.
- Brasseur, S., Gregoire, J., Bourdu, R., & Mikolajczak, M. (2013). The Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC): Development and validation of a self-reported measure that fits dimensions of emotional competence theory. In *PloS One* (Vol. 8, Issue 5).
- Bringmann, L. F., Pe, M. L., Vissers, N., Ceulemans, E., Borsboom, D., Vanpaemel, W., Tuerlinckx, F., & Kuppens, P. (2016). Assessing temporal emotion dynamics using networks. *Assessment*, 23(4), 425–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116645909>
- Brose, A., Schmiedek, F., Koval, P., & Kuppens, P. (2015). Emotional inertia contributes to depressive symptoms beyond perseverative thinking. *Cognition and Emotion*, 29(3), 527–538.
- Brown, N. J. L., & Coyne, J. C. (2017). Emdiversity: Robust predictor of outcomes or statistical artifact? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 146(9), 1372–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000330>
- Browne, M. W. (1992). Circumplex models for correlation matrices. *Psychometrika*, 57(4), 469–497.
- Cameron, C. D., Payne, B. K., & Doris, J. M. (2013). Morality in high definition: Emotion differentiation calibrates the influence of incidental disgust on moral judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(4), 719–725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.02.014>

- Caprara, G. V., Cinanni, V., D'imperio, G., Passerini, S., Renzi, P., & Travaglia, G. (1985). Indicators of impulsive aggression: Present status of research on irritability and emotional susceptibility scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(6), 665–674.
- Carpenter, R. W., & Trull, T. J. (2013). Components of emotion dysregulation in borderline personality disorder: A review. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 15(1), 335–335.
- Carrozzino, D., & Porcelli, P. (2018). Alexithymia in gastroenterology and hepatology: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 470.
- Carstensen, L. L., Pasupathi, M., Mayr, U., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2000). Emotional experience in everyday life across the adult life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 644–655. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.644>
- Cartwright, S., & Pappas, C. (2008). Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00220.x>
- Cattell, R. B., Cattell, A. K. S., & Rhymer, R. M. (1947). P-technique demonstrated in determining psychophysiological source traits in a normal individual. *Psychometrika*, 12(4), 267–288.
- Centerbar, D. B., Schnall, S., Clore, G. L., & Garvin, E. D. (2008). Affective incoherence: When affective concepts and embodied reactions clash. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(4), 560–578.
- Charles, S. T., Piazza, J. R., & Urban, E. J. (2017). Mixed emotions across adulthood: When, where, and why? *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 58–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.05.007>
- Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Toward clarification of a concept. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 110–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01231.x>
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(3), 539–561.
- Cohen, K. R., Auld, F., Demers, L., & Catchlove, R. (1985). The development of a valid and reliable projective measure (the objectively scored archetypal-9 test). *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 173(10), 621–627.
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82.
- Conte, J. M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 433–440. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.319>
- Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations* (Vol. 4). Grosset/Putnam.
- Cottingham, M. D. (2016). Theorizing emotional capital. *Theory and Society*, 45(5), 451–470.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1987). The experience sampling method: Toward a systematic phenomenology. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 175, 526–536.
- Dasch, K. B., Cohen, L. H., Belcher, A., Laurenceau, J.-P., Kendall, J., Siegel, S., Parrish, B., & Graber, E. (2010). Affective differentiation in breast cancer patients. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 33(6), 441–453.
- David, S. (2016). *Emotional agility: Get unstuck, embrace change, and thrive in work and life*. Penguin.
- Davis, M. C., Zautra, A. J., & Smith, B. W. (2004). Chronic pain, stress, and the dynamics of affective differentiation. *Journal of Personality*, 72(6), 1133–1160.
- Davis, S. K., & Nichols, R. (2016). Does emotional intelligence have a “dark” side? A review of the literature. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01316>

- Dawda, D., & Hart, S. D. (2000). Assessing emotional intelligence: Reliability and validity of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) in university students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(4), 797–812.
- Dejonckheere, E., Kalokerinos, E. K., Bastian, B., & Kuppens, P. (2019). Poor emotion regulation ability mediates the link between depressive symptoms and affective bipolarity. *Cognition and Emotion*, 33(5), 1076–1083.
- Demers-Desrosiers, L. A., Cohen, K. R., Catchlove, R. F. H., & Ramsay, R. A. (1983). The measure of symbolic function in alexithymic pain patients. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 39(2), 65–76.
- Denham, S. A., Zoller, D., & Couchoud, E. A. (1994). Socialization of preschoolers' emotion understanding. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 928–936.
- Dixon-Gordon, K. L., Chapman, A. L., Weiss, N. H., & Rosenthal, M. Z. (2014). A preliminary examination of the role of emotion differentiation in the relationship between borderline personality and urges for maladaptive behaviors. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 36(4), 616–625.
- Donges, U.-S., & Suslow, T. (2017). Alexithymia and automatic processing of emotional stimuli: A systematic review. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 28(3), 247–264.
- Dougherty, L. M., Abe, J. A., & Izard, C. E. (1996). Differential emotions theory and emotional development in adulthood and later life. In C. Magai & S. H. McFadden (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotion, Adult Development, and Aging* (pp. 27–41). Academic Press.
- Eckland, N. S., Leyro, T. M., Mendes, W. B., & Thompson, R. J. (2018). A multi-method investigation of the association between emotional clarity and empathy. *Emotion*, 18(5), 638–645.
- Edwards, E. R., & Wupperman, P. (2017). Emotion regulation mediates effects of alexithymia and emotion differentiation on impulsive aggressive behavior. *Deviant Behavior*, 38(10), 1160–1171.
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Spinrad, T. L., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Reiser, M., Murphy, B. C., Losoya, S. H., & Guthrie, I. K. (2001). The relations of regulation and emotionality to children's externalizing and internalizing problem behavior. *Child Development*, 72(4), 1112–1134.
- Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(2), 203–235. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.2.203>
- Elfenbein, H. A., & MacCann, C. (2017). A closer look at ability emotional intelligence (EI): What are its component parts, and how do they relate to each other? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11(7), e12324. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12324>
- Emmons, R. A., & King, L. A. (1989). Personal striving differentiation and affective reactivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(3), 478–484.
- Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., Blanke, E. S., Sels, L., Fischer, A., & Kuppens, P. (2019). Emotion differentiation dissected: Between-category, within-category, and integral emotion differentiation, and their relation to well-being. *Cognition and Emotion*, 33(2), 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2018.1465894>
- Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., Boonen, J., Noens, I., & Kuppens, P. (2013). Emotion differentiation in autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 7(10), 1221–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2013.07.007>
- Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., Lee Pe, M., Koval, P., & Kuppens, P. (2014). Negative emotion differentiation: Its personality and well-being correlates and a comparison of different

- assessment methods. *Cognition and Emotion*, 28(7), 1196–1213.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2013.875890>
- Ersner-Hershfield, H., Mikels, J. A., Sullivan, S. J., & Carstensen, L. L. (2008). Poignancy: Mixed emotional experience in the face of meaningful endings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(1), 158–167.
- Exner, J. E. J. (1993). *The Rorschach: A comprehensive system: Basic foundations* (Vol. 1). John Wiley & Sons.
- Feldman, L. A. (1995a). Valence focus and arousal focus: Individual difference in the structure of affective experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(1), 153–166.
- Feldman, L. A. (1995b). Variations in the circumplex structure of mood. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(8), 806–817.
- Fiori, M. (2009). A new look at emotional intelligence: A dual-process framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13(1), 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308326909>
- Freedman, M. B., & Sweet, B. S. (1954). Some specific features of group psychotherapy and their implications for selection of patients. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 4(4), 355–368.
- Frewen, P. A., Lanius, R. A., Dozois, D. J. A., Neufeld, R. W. J., Pain, C., Hopper, J. W., Densmore, M., & Stevens, T. K. (2008). Clinical and neural correlates of alexithymia in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117(1), 171–181.
- Frick, P. J., Cornell, A. H., Bodin, S. D., Dane, H. E., Barry, C. T., & Loney, B. R. (2003). Callous-unemotional traits and developmental pathways to severe conduct problems. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(2), 246.
- Fu, F., Chow, A., Li, J., & Cong, Z. (2018). Emotional flexibility: Development and application of a scale in adolescent earthquake survivors. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 10(2), 246–252.
- Fuchs, G. L., Kumar, V. K., & Porter, J. (2007). Emotional creativity, alexithymia, and styles of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(2–3), 233–245.
- Galeazzi, G. M., Ferrari, S., Mackinnon, A., & Rigatelli, M. (2004). Interrater reliability, prevalence, and relation to ICD-10 diagnoses of the Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research in consultation-liaison psychiatry patients. *Psychosomatics*, 45(5), 386–393.
- Garner, P. W., & Power, T. G. (1996). Preschoolers' emotional control in the disappointment paradigm and its relation to temperament, emotional knowledge, and family expressiveness. *Child Development*, 67(4), 1406–1419.
- Gerson, A. C., Gerring, J. P., Freund, L., Joshi, P. T., Capozzoli, J., Brady, K., & Denckla, M. B. (1996). The Children's Affective Lability Scale: A psychometric evaluation of reliability. *Psychiatry Research*, 65(3), 189–198.
- Gohm, C. L., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Four latent traits of emotional experience and their involvement in well-being, coping, and attributional style. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16(4), 495–518.
- Goldston, R. B., Gara, M. A., & Woolfolk, R. L. (1992). Emotion differentiation. A correlate of symptom severity in major depression. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 180(11), 712–718.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books, Inc.
- Gómez-Leal, R., Gutiérrez-Cobo, M. J., Cabello, R., Megías, A., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2018). The relationship between the three models of emotional intelligence and psychopathy: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 9, 307. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2018.00307>

- Gori, A., Giannini, M., Palmieri, G., Salvini, R., & Schuldberg, D. (2012). Assessment of alexithymia: Psychometric properties of the Psychological Treatment Inventory-Alexithymia Scale (PTI-AS). *Psychology*, 3(3), 231–236.
- Gottman, J. M. (2011). *The science of trust: Emotional attunement for couples*. WW Norton & Company.
- Gottschalk, L. A., & Gleser, G. (1969). *The measurement of psychological states through the content analysis of verbal behavior*. University of California Press.
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26(1), 41–54.
- Gregor, K. L., Zvolensky, M. J., & Yartz, A. R. (2005). Perceived health among individuals with panic disorder: Associations with affective vulnerability and psychiatric disability. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 193(10), 697–699.
- Gross, J. J. (1998a). Antecedent-and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 224.
- Gross, J. J. (1998b). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 271–299.
- Grossmann, I., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2017). What are mixed emotions and what conditions foster them? Life-span experiences, culture and social awareness. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1–5.
- Grossmann, I., Huynh, A. C., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2016). Emotional complexity: Clarifying definitions and cultural correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111(6), 895–916. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000084>
- Grühn, D., Lumley, M. A., Diehl, M., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2013). Time-based indicators of emotional complexity: Interrelations and correlates. *Emotion*, 13(2), 226–237. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030363>
- Gu, X., Hof, P. R., Friston, K. J., & Fan, J. (2013). Anterior insular cortex and emotional awareness: Anterior insular cortex and emotional awareness. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 521(15), 3371–3388. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.23368>
- Halberstadt, A. G., Denham, S. A., & Dunsmore, J. C. (2001). Affective social competence. *Social Development*, 10(1), 79–119.
- Haviland, M. G., & Reise, S. P. (1996). A California Q-set alexithymia prototype and its relationship to ego-control and ego-resiliency. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 41(6), 597–607.
- Haviland, M. G., Warren, W. L., & Riggs, M. L. (2000). An observer scale to measure alexithymia. *Psychosomatics*, 41(5), 385–392.
- Hay, E. L., & Diehl, M. (2011). Emotional complexity and emotion regulation across adulthood. *European Journal of Aging*, 8(3), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-011-0191-7>
- Heller, D., Judge, T. A., & Watson, D. (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(7), 815–835.
- Helson, R., & Klohnen, E. C. (1998). Affective coloring of personality from young adulthood to midlife. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(3), 241–252.
- Hemenover, S. (2003). Individual differences in rate of affect change: Studies in affective chronometry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(1), 121–131.

- Henry, W. E., & Shlien, J. M. (1958). Affective complexity and psychotherapy: Some comparisons of time-limited and unlimited treatment. In *Journal of Projective Techniques* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 22, pp. 153–162).
- Herbert, B. M., Herbert, C., & Pollatos, O. (2011). On the relationship between interoceptive awareness and alexithymia: Is interoceptive awareness related to emotional awareness? *Journal of Personality*, 79(5), 1149–1175.
- Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2001). Emotional stability as a major dimension of happiness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(8), 1357–1364.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1996). The emotional geography of work and family life. In *Gender Relations in Public and Private* (pp. 13–32). Springer.
- Honkalampi, K., Hintikka, J., Tanskanen, A., Lehtonen, J., & Viinamäki, H. (2000). Depression is strongly associated with alexithymia in the general population. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 48(1), 99–104.
- Houben, M., Vansteelandt, K., Claes, L., Sienaert, P., Berens, A., Sleuwaegen, E., & Kuppens, P. (2016). Emotional switching in borderline personality disorder: A daily life study. *Personality Disorders*, 7(1), 50–60.
- Hu, Y. (2005). Efficient, high-quality force-directed graph drawing. *Mathematica Journal*, 10(1), 37–71.
- Huang, S., Berenbaum, H., & Chow, P. I. (2013). Distinguishing voluntary from involuntary attention to emotion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(8), 894–898.
- Huy, Q. N. (1999). Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 325–345.
- Ivcevic, Z., Bazhydai, M., Hoffmann, J. D., & Brackett, M. A. (2017). Creativity in the domain of emotions. In J. C. Kaufman, V. P. Glăveanu, J. Baer, J. C. Kaufman, V. P. Glăveanu, & J. Baer (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity Across Domains* (EBSCOhost; pp. 525–548). Cambridge University Press.
- Ivcevic, Z., Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2007). Emotional intelligence and emotional creativity. *Journal of Personality*, 75(2), 199–235.
- Izard, C. E. (1971). *The face of emotion*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Izard, C. E. (2009). Emotion theory and research: Highlights, unanswered questions, and emerging issues. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 1–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163539>
- Izard, C. E. (2013). *Human emotions*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Izard, C. E., Fine, S., Schultz, D., Mostow, A., Ackerman, B., & Youngstrom, E. (2001). Emotion knowledge as a predictor of social behavior and academic competence in children at risk. *Psychological Science*, 12(1), 18–23.
- Izard, C. E., Woodburn, E. M., Finlon, K. J., Krauthamer-Ewing, E. S., Grossman, S. R., & Seidenfeld, A. (2011). Emotion knowledge, emotion utilization, and emotion regulation. In *Emotion Review* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 44–52).
- Kagan, N., & Schneider, J. (1987). Toward the measurement of affective sensitivity. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65(9), 459–464.
- Kalokerinos, E. K., Erbas, Y., Ceulemans, E., & Kuppens, P. (2019). Differentiate to regulate: Low negative emotion differentiation is associated with ineffective use but not selection of emotion-regulation strategies. *Psychological Science*, 30(6), 863–879.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619838763>
- Kanbara, K., & Fukunaga, M. (2016). Links among emotional awareness, somatic awareness and autonomic homeostatic processing. *BioPsychoSocial Medicine*, 10(1), 16.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13030-016-0059-3>

- Kang, S.-M., & Shaver, P. R. (2004). Individual differences in emotional complexity: Their psychological implications. *Journal of Personality*, 72(4), 687–726.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00277.x>
- Kantrowitz, J. L., Paolitto, F., Sashin, J., Solomon, L., & Katz, A. L. (1986). Affect availability, tolerance, complexity, and modulation in psychoanalysis: Follow-up of a longitudinal, prospective study. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 34(3), 529–559.
- Kashdan, T. B., Barrett, L. F., & McKnight, P. E. (2015). Unpacking emotion differentiation: Transforming unpleasant experience by perceiving distinctions in negativity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(1), 10–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414550708>
- Kashdan, T. B., Ferrisizidis, P., Collins, R. L., & Muraven, M. (2010). Emotion differentiation as resilience against excessive alcohol use: An ecological momentary assessment in underage social drinkers. *Psychological Science*, 21(9), 1341–1347.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610379863>
- King, L. A., & Emmons, R. A. (1990). Conflict over emotional expression: Psychological and physical correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(5), 864–877.
- Kinnaird, E., Stewart, C., & Tchanturia, K. (2019). Investigating alexithymia in autism: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Psychiatry*, 55, 80–89.
- Kleiger, J. H., & Kinsman, R. A. (1980). The development of an MMPI alexithymia scale. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 34(1), 17–24.
- Komiya, N., Good, G., & Sherrod, N. (2000). Emotional openness as a predictor of college students' attitudes toward seeking psychological help. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(1), 138–143.
- Kooiman, C. G., Spinhoven, P., & Trijsburg, R. W. (2002). The assessment of alexithymia—A critical review of the literature and a psychometric study of the Toronto Alexithymia Scale-20. In *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* (Vol. 53, Issue 6, pp. 1083–1090).
- Koven, N. S., & Thomas, W. (2010). Mapping facets of alexithymia to executive dysfunction in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(1), 24–28.
- Krystal, J. H., Giller, E. L. J., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1986). Assessment of alexithymia in posttraumatic stress disorder and somatic illness: Introduction of a reliable measure. *Psychological Medicine*, 48(1), 84–94.
- Kuppens, P., Oravecz, Z., & Tuerlinckx, F. (2010). Feelings change: Accounting for individual differences in the temporal dynamics of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(6), 1042–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020962>
- Kuppens, P., Van Mechelen, I., Nezlek, J. B., Dossche, D., & Timmermans, T. (2007). Individual differences in core affect variability and their relationship to personality and psychological adjustment. *Emotion*, 7(2), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.262>
- Labouvie-Vief, G. (1994). *Psyche and Eros: Mind and gender in the life course*. Cambridge University Press.
- Labouvie-Vief, G., & González, M. M. (2004). Dynamic integration: Affect optimization and differentiation in development. In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, Emotion, and Cognition: Integrative Perspectives on Intellectual Functioning and Development* (pp. 237–272). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Labouvie-Vief, G., & Medler, M. (2002). Affect optimization and affect complexity: Modes and styles of regulation in adulthood. *Psychology and Aging*, 17(4), 571.
- Lane, R. D. (2008). Neural substrates of implicit and explicit emotional processes: A unifying framework for psychosomatic medicine. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 70(2), 214–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181647e44>

- Lane, R. D., Kivley, L. S., Du Bois, M. A., Shamasundara, P., & Schwartz, G. E. (1995). Levels of emotional awareness and the degree of right hemispheric dominance in the perception of facial emotion. *Neuropsychologia*, 33(5), 525–538.
- Lane, R. D., Lee, S., Reidel, R., Weldon, V., Kaszniak, A., & Schwartz, G. E. (1996). Impaired verbal and nonverbal emotion recognition in alexithymia. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 58(3), 203–210.
- Lane, R. D., & Pollermann, B. Z. (2002). Complexity of emotion representations. In Lisa F. Barrett & P. Salovey (Eds.), *The Wisdom in Feeling: Psychological Processes in Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 271–293). The Guildford Press.
- Lane, R. D., Quinlan, D. M., Schwartz, G. E., Walker, P. A., & Zeitlin, S. B. (1990). The Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale: A cognitive-developmental measure of emotion. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55(1–2), 124–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.1990.9674052>
- Lane, R. D., & Schwartz, G. E. (1987). Levels of emotional awareness—A cognitive-developmental theory and its application to psychopathology. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 144(2), 133–143.
- Lane, R. D., & Schwartz, G. E. (1992). Levels of emotional awareness: Implications for psychotherapeutic integration. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 2(1), 1.
- Lane, R. D., Sechrest, L., Riedel, R., Shapiro, D. E., & Kaszniak, A. W. (2000). Pervasive emotion recognition deficit common to alexithymia and the repressive coping style. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 62(4), 492–501.
- Lane, R. D., Weihs, K. L., Herring, A., Hishaw, A., & Smith, R. (2015a). Affective agnosia: Expansion of the alexithymia construct and a new opportunity to integrate and extend Freud's legacy. In *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 55, pp. 594–611).
- Lane, R. D., Weihs, K. L., Herring, A., Hishaw, A., & Smith, R. (2015b). Affective agnosia: Expansion of the alexithymia construct and a new opportunity to integrate and extend Freud's legacy. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 55, 594–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.06.007>
- Larsen, R. J., & Cutler, S. E. (1996). The complexity of individual emotional lives: A within-subject analysis of affect structure. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 15(2), 206–230.
- Larsen, R. J., & Diener, E. (1987). Affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic: A review. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 1–39.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46(4), 352–367.
- Lee, J. Y., Lindquist, K. A., & Nam, C. S. (2017). Emotional granularity effects on event-related brain potentials during affective picture processing. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00133>
- Lesser, I. M. (1981). A review of the alexithymia concept. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 43(6), 531–543. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-198112000-00009>
- Linden, W., Wen, F., & Paulhus, D. L. (1995). Measuring alexithymia: Reliability, validity, and prevalence. *Advances in Personality Assessment*, 10, 51–95.
- Lindquist, K. A., & Barrett, L. F. (2008). Emotional complexity. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (3rd ed., pp. 513–530). Guilford Press.
- Lischetzke, T., Cuccodoro, G., Gauger, A., Todeschini, L., & Eid, M. (2005). Measuring affective clarity indirectly: Individual differences in response latencies of state. *Emotion*, 5(4), 431–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.4.431>
- Lischetzke, T., & Eid, M. (2017). The functionality of emotional clarity: A process-oriented approach to understanding the relation between emotional clarity and well-being. In M. D.

- Robinson, M. Eid, M. D. Robinson, & M. Eid (Eds.), *The Happy Mind: Cognitive Contributions to Well-Being* (EBSCOhost; pp. 371–388). Springer International Publishing.
- Livingstone, H. A., & Day, A. L. (2005). Comparing the construct and criterion-related validity of ability-based and mixed-model measures of emotional intelligence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 65(5), 757–779.
- Lumley, M. A., Neely, L. C., & Burger, A. J. (2007). The assessment of alexithymia in medical settings: Implications for understanding and treating health problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 89(3), 230–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890701629698>
- MacLean, P. D. (1949). Psychosomatic disease and the “visceral brain.” *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 11(6), 338–352.
- MacLeod, C., & Hagan, R. (1992). Individual differences in the selective processing of threatening information, and emotional responses to a stressful life event. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 30(2), 151–161.
- Magurran, A. E. (2013). *Measuring biological diversity*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mahapatra, A., & Sharma, P. (2018). Association of Internet addiction and alexithymia: A scoping review. *Addictive Behaviors*, 81, 175–182.
- Malatesta, C. Z., & Haviland, J. M. (1982). Learning display rules: The socialization of emotion expression in infancy. *Child Development*, 991–1003.
- Malatesta, C. Z., & Wilson, A. (1988). Emotion cognition interaction in personality development: A discrete emotions, functionalist analysis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(1), 91–112.
- Mankus, A. M., Boden, M. T., & Thompson, R. J. (2016). Sources of variation in emotional awareness: Age, gender, and socioeconomic status. In *Personality and Individual Differences* (EBSCOhost; Vol. 89, pp. 28–33).
- Marchetti, D., Verrocchio, M. C., & Porcelli, P. (2019). Gambling problems and alexithymia: A systematic review. *Brain Sciences*, 9(8), 191.
- Maroti, D., Lilliengren, P., & Bileviciute-Ljungar, I. (2018). The relationship between alexithymia and emotional awareness: A meta-analytic review of the correlation between TAS-20 and LEAS. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 453. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00453>
- Martin, R. A., Berry, G. E., Dobranski, T., Horne, M., & Dodgson, P. G. (1996). Emotion perception threshold: Individual differences in emotional sensitivity. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 30(2), 290–305.
- Marty, P., & de M'Uzan, M. (1963). La pensée opératoire. *Review of French Psychoanalysis*, 27, 1345–1356.
- Mason, C. M., & Griffin, M. A. (2003). Group absenteeism and positive affective tone: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 24(6), 667–687.
- Maul, A. (2012). The validity of the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) as a measure of emotional intelligence. *Emotion Review*, 4(4), 394–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912445811>
- Mauss, I. B., Levenson, R. W., McCarter, L., Wilhelm, F. H., & Gross, J. J. (2005). The tie that binds? Coherence among emotion experience, behavior, and physiology. *Emotion*, 5(2), 175–190. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.2.175>
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Selecting a measure of emotional intelligence: The case for ability scales. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace* (pp. 320–342). Jossey-Bass.

- Mayer, J. D., & Gaschke, Y. N. (1988). The experience and meta-experience of mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(1), 102–111.
- Mayer, J. D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. *Intelligence*, 22(2), 89–113.
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 507–536. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093646>
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17(4), 433–442.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 4(3), 197–208. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849\(05\)80058-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(05)80058-7)
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications* (pp. 3–34). Basic Books, Inc.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) item booklet*.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63(6), 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.6.503>
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT v2.0. *Emotion*, 3(1), 97–105.
- Mehling, W. E., Price, C., Daubenmier, J. J., Acree, M., Bartmess, E., & Stewart, A. (2012). The Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA). *PLoS One*, 7(11), e48230. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0048230>
- Mehrabian, A. (1995). Theory and evidence bearing on a scale of trait arousability. *Current Psychology*, 14(1), 3–28.
- Meltzoff, J., & Litwin, D. (1956). Affective control and Rorschach human movement responses. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 20(6), 463–465.
- Mennin, D. S., Heimberg, R. G., Turk, C. L., & Fresco, D. M. (2005). Preliminary evidence for an emotion dysregulation model of generalized anxiety disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 43(10), 1281–1310.
- Morgan, J. K., Izard, C. E., & King, K. A. (2010). Construct validity of the Emotion Matching Task: Preliminary evidence for convergent and criterion validity of a new emotion knowledge measure for young children. *Social Development*, 19(1), 52–70.
- Morie, K. P., Yip, S. W., Nich, C., Hunkele, K., Carroll, K. M., & Potenza, M. N. (2016). Alexithymia and addiction: A review and preliminary data suggesting neurobiological links to reward/loss processing. *Current Addiction Reports*, 3(2), 239–248.
- Morris, P. L., Robinson, R. G., & Raphael, B. (1993). Emotional lability after stroke. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 27(4), 601–605.
- Moskowitz, D. S., & Zuroff, D. C. (2004). Flux, pulse, and spin: Dynamic additions to the personality lexicon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(6), 880–893.
- Murray, G. (2003). The Seasonal Pattern Assessment Questionnaire as a measure of mood seasonality: A prospective validation study. *Psychiatry Research*, 120(1), 53–59.
- Murray, H. A. (1943). *Thematic apperception test manual*. Harvard University Press.
- Nemiah, J. C., Freyberger, H., Sifneos, P. E., & Hill, O. W. (1976). Alexithymia: A view of the psychosomatic process. *Modern Trends in Psychosomatic Medicine*, 3, 430–439.

- Nemiah, J. C., & Sifneos, P. E. (1970). Psychosomatic illness: A problem in communication. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 18(1–6), 154–160.
- Nock, M. K., Wedig, M. M., Holmberg, E. B., & Hooley, J. M. (2008). The Emotion Reactivity Scale: Development, evaluation, and relation to self-injurious thoughts and behaviors. *Behavior Therapy*, 39(2), 107–116.
- Nowakowski, M. E., McFarlane, T., & Cassin, S. (2013). Alexithymia and eating disorders: A critical review of the literature. *Journal of Eating Disorders*, 1(1), 21.
- O'Driscoll, C., Laing, J., & Mason, O. (2014). Cognitive emotion regulation strategies, alexithymia and dissociation in schizophrenia: A review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 34(6), 482–495.
- Ong, A. D., Zautra, A. J., & Finan, P. H. (2017). Inter- and intra-individual variation in emotional complexity: Methodological considerations and theoretical implications. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 22–26.
- Palmer, B. R., Gignac, G., Ekermans, G., & Stough, C. (2008). A comprehensive framework for emotional intelligence. *Emotional Intelligence: Theoretical and Cultural Perspectives*, 17–38.
- Park, I.-J. (2015). The role of affect spin in the relationships between proactive personality, career indecision, and career maturity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1754.
- Parker, J. D. A., Bagby, R. M., & Taylor, G. J. (1991). Alexithymia and depression: Distinct or overlapping constructs? *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 32(5), 387–394.
- Pe, M. L., Kircanski, K., Thompson, R. J., Bringmann, L. F., Tuerlinckx, F., Mestdagh, M., Mata, J., Jaeggi, S. M., Buschkuhl, M., Jonides, J., Kuppens, P., & Gotlib, I. H. (2015). Emotion-network density in major depressive disorder. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 3(2), 292–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702614540645>
- Peña-Sarrionandia, A., Mikolajczak, M., & Gross, J. J. (2015). Integrating emotion regulation and emotional intelligence traditions: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 160.
- Petrides, K. V. (2010). Trait emotional intelligence theory. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 136–139.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29(2), 313–320. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00195-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00195-6)
- Petrides, K. V., Perez-Gonzalez, J. C., & Furnham, A. (2007). On the criterion and incremental validity of trait emotional intelligence. In *Cognition and Emotion* (Vol. 21, Issue 1, pp. 26–55).
- Phillips, M. L., Drevets, W. C., Rauch, S. L., & Lane, R. (2003a). Neurobiology of emotion perception I: The neural basis of normal emotion perception. *Biological Psychiatry*, 54(5), 504–514.
- Phillips, M. L., Drevets, W. C., Rauch, S. L., & Lane, R. (2003b). Neurobiology of emotion perception II: Implications for major psychiatric disorders. *Biological Psychiatry*, 54(5), 515–528.
- Piaget, J. (1937). *La construction du réel chez l'enfant*. Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Pietromonaco, P., & Barrett, L. (2009). Valence focus and self-esteem lability: Reacting to hedonic cues in the social environment. *Emotion*, 9(3), 406–418.
- Pincus, S. M., Schmidt, P. J., Palladino-Negro, P., & Rubinow, D. R. (2008). Differentiation of women with premenstrual dysphoric disorder, recurrent brief depression, and healthy controls by daily mood rating dynamics. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 42(5), 337–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2007.01.001>

- Plonsker, R., Gavish Biran, D., Zvielli, A., & Bernstein, A. (2017). Cognitive fusion and emotion differentiation: Does getting entangled with our thoughts dysregulate the generation, experience and regulation of emotion? *Cognition and Emotion*, 31(6), 1286–1293.
- Pond, R. S., Jr., Kashdan, T. B., DeWall, C. N., Savostyanova, A., Lambert, N. M., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Emotion differentiation moderates aggressive tendencies in angry people: A daily diary analysis. *Emotion*, 12(2), 326–337.
- Poquérusse, J., Pastore, L., Dellantonio, S., & Esposito, G. (2018). Alexithymia and autism spectrum disorder: A complex relationship. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1196.
- Porcelli, P., & Mihura, J. L. (2010). Assessment of alexithymia with the Rorschach comprehensive system: The Rorschach Alexithymia Scale (RAS). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92(2), 128–136.
- Quoidbach, J., Gruber, J., Mikolajczak, M., Kogan, A., Kotsou, I., & Norton, M. I. (2014). Emodiversity and the emotional ecosystem. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(6), 2057–2066. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038025>
- Rafaeli, E., Rogers, G. M., & Revelle, W. (2007). Affective synchrony: Individual differences in mixed emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(7), 915–932.
- Ready, R. E., Carvalho, J. O., & Weinberger, M. I. (2008). Emotional complexity in younger, midlife, and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 23(4), 928–933.
- Rees, L., Rothman, N. B., Leheavy, R., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2013). The ambivalent mind can be a wise mind: Emotional ambivalence increases judgment accuracy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(3), 360–367.
- Riggio, R. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 649–660.
- Roberts, R. D., Matthews, G., & Zeidner, M. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Muddling through theory and measurement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 140–144.
- Robinson, L. J., & Freeston, M. H. (2014). Emotion and internal experience in obsessive compulsive disorder: Reviewing the role of alexithymia, anxiety sensitivity and distress tolerance. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 34(3), 256–271.
- Roger, D., & Najarian, B. (1989). The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring emotion control. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10(8), 845–853.
- Ruesch, J. (1948). The infantile personality; the core problem of psychosomatic medicine. *Psychosomatic Medicine*.
- Rydell, A.-M., Berlin, L., & Bohlin, G. (2003). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and adaptation among 5-to 8-year-old children. *Emotion*, 3(1), 30–47.
- Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E. J., & Minski, P. S. (2003). Factor structure and validity of a trait emotional intelligence measure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(4), 707–721.
- Salovey, P., & Grewal, D. (2005). The science of emotional intelligence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(6), 281–285.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990a). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990b). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., & Caruso, D. (2002). The positive psychology of emotional intelligence. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (Vol. 159, p. 171).
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, Disclosure, and Health* (pp. 125–154). American Psychological Association.

- Saul, L. J. (1947). *Emotional maturity; the development and dynamics of personality*. Lippincott.
- Scherer, K. R. (2007). Componential emotion theory can inform models of emotional competence. In G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *The Science of Emotional Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns* (pp. 101–126). Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, K. R. (2018). Comment: Comorbidity between mental and somatic pathologies: Deficits in emotional competence as health risk factors. *Emotion Review*, 10(1), 55–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073917719331>
- Scherer, K. R., & Brosch, T. (2009). Culture-specific appraisal biases contribute to emotion dispositions. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(3), 265–288.
- Schimmack, U., Oishi, S., & Diener, E. (2002). Cultural influences on the relation between pleasant emotions and unpleasant emotions: Asian dialectic philosophies or individualism-collectivism? *Cognition and Emotion*, 16(6), 705–719.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. In *Personality and Individual Differences* (Vol. 25, Issue 2, pp. 167–177).
- Schwartz, R. M., & Garamoni, G. L. (1989). Cognitive balance and psychopathology: Evaluation of an information processing model of positive and negative states of mind. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 9(3), 271–294.
- Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1983). Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(3), 513–523.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.
- Sheets, E. S., Bujarski, S., Leventhal, A. M., & Ray, L. A. (2015). Emotion differentiation and intensity during acute tobacco abstinence: A comparison of heavy and light smokers. *Addictive Behaviors*, 47, 70–73.
- Shiffman, S., & Stone, A. A. (1998). Ecological momentary assessment: A new tool for behavioral medicine research. In D. S. Krantz & A. A. Stone (Eds.), *Technology and Methods in Behavioral Medicine* (pp. 117–131). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2), 420–428.
- Siegling, A. B., Saklofske, D. H., & Petrides, K. V. (2015). Measures of ability and trait emotional intelligence. In *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs* (pp. 381–414).
- Sifneos, P. E. (1972). *Short-term psychotherapy and emotional crisis*. Harvard University Press.
- Sifneos, P. E. (1973). The prevalence of ‘alexithymic’ characteristics in psychosomatic patients. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 22(2–6), 255–262.
- Sifneos, P. E. (1996). Alexithymia: Past and present. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 153(7), 137–142.
- Skaggs, E. B. (1942). Sex differences in feeling and emotional disposition in a university population. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(1), 21–27.
- Smidt, K. E., & Suvak, M. K. (2015). A brief, but nuanced, review of emotional granularity and emotion differentiation research. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 3, 48–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.02.007>
- Smith, R., Killgore, W. D. S., & Lane, R. D. (2018). The structure of emotional experience and its relation to trait emotional awareness: A theoretical review. *Emotion*, 18(5), 670–692.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000376>
- Sommers, S. (1981). Emotionality reconsidered: The role of cognition in emotional responsiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(3), 553–561.

- Stanton, A. L., Danoff-Burg, S., Cameron, C. L., & Ellis, A. P. (1994). Coping through emotional approach: Problems of conceptualization and confounding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(2), 350.
- Stanton, A. L., Danoff-Burg, S., & Huggins, M. E. (2002). The first year after breast cancer diagnosis: Hope and coping strategies as predictors of adjustment. *Psycho-Oncology*, 11(2), 93–102.
- Starr, L. R., Hershenberg, R., Li, Y. I., & Shaw, Z. A. (2017). When feelings lack precision: Low positive and negative emotion differentiation and depressive symptoms in daily life. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 5(4), 613–631. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702617694657>
- Steiner, C. (1984). Emotional literacy. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 14(3), 162–173.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). The concept of intelligence and its role in lifelong learning and success. *American Psychologist*, 52(10), 1030–1037.
- Stone, A. A., & Shiffman, S. (1994). Ecological momentary assessment (EMA) in behavioral medicine. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 16(3), 199–202.
- Subic-Wrana, C., Bruder, S., Thomas, W., Lane, R. D., & Kohle, K. (2005). Emotional awareness deficits in inpatients of a psychosomatic ward: A comparison of two different measures of alexithymia. In *Psychosomatic Medicine* (Vol. 67, Issue 3, pp. 483–489).
- Suls, J., Green, P., & Hillis, S. (1998). Emotional reactivity to everyday problems, affective inertia, and neuroticism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(2), 127–136.
- Suvak, M. K., Litz, B. T., Sloan, D. M., Zanarini, M. C., Barrett, L. F., & Hofmann, S. G. (2011). Emotional granularity and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 120(2), 414–426.
- Swinkels, A., & Giuliano, T. A. (1995). The measurement and conceptualization of mood awareness—Monitoring and labeling ones mood states. In *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (Vol. 21, Issue 9, pp. 934–949).
- Taylor, G. J. (1984). Alexithymia—Concept, measurement, and implications for treatment. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 141(6), 725–732.
- Taylor, G. J. (2000). Recent developments in alexithymia theory and research. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 45(2), 134–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370004500203>
- Taylor, G. J., & Bagby, R. M. (2004). New trends in alexithymia research. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 73(2), 68–77.
- Taylor, G. J., & Bagby, R. M. (2013). Psychoanalysis and empirical research: The example of alexithymia. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 61(1), 99–133.
- Taylor, G. J., Bagby, R. M., & Luminet, O. (2000). Assessment of alexithymia: Self-report and observer-rated measures. In J. D. A. Parker & R. Bar-On (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 301–319). Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, G. J., Bagby, R. M., & Parker, J. D. A. (1992). The Revised Toronto Alexithymia Scale: Some reliability, validity, and normative data. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 57(1–2), 34–41.
- Taylor, G. J., Bagby, R. M., & Parker, J. D. A. (2016). What’s in the name ‘alexithymia’? A commentary on “Affective agnosia: Expansion of the alexithymia construct and a new opportunity to integrate and extend Freud’s legacy.” *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 68, 1006–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.05.025>
- Taylor, G. J., & Doody, K. (1982). Psychopathology and verbal expression in psychosomatic and psychoneurotic patients. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 38(1–4), 121–127.
- Taylor, G. J., Michael Bagby, R., & Parker, J. D. A. (1991). The alexithymia construct: A potential paradigm for psychosomatic medicine. *Psychosomatics*, 32(2), 153–164. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0033-3182\(91\)72086-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0033-3182(91)72086-0)

- Taylor, G. J., Ryan, D., & Bagby, R. M. (1985). Toward the development of a new self-report alexithymia scale. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 44, Issue 4, pp. 191–199).
- Terracciano, A., McCrae, R. R., Hagemann, D., & Costa Jr, P. T. (2003). Individual difference variables, affective differentiation, and the structures of affect. *Journal of Personality*, 71(5), 669–704.
- Thompson, A. E. (1985). An object relational theory of affect maturity: Applications to the Thematic Apperception Test. In M. Kissen (Ed.), *Assessing Object Relations Phenomena* (pp. 207–224). International Universities Press.
- Thompson, R. A. (1987). Empathy and emotional understanding: The early development of empathy. *Empathy and Its Development*, 119–145.
- Thompson, R. J., Dizén, M., & Berenbaum, H. (2009). The unique relations between emotional awareness and facets of affective instability. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(5), 875–879. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.07.006>
- Thompson, R. J., Mata, J., Jaeggi, S. M., Buschkuhl, M., Jonides, J., & Gotlib, I. H. (2012). The everyday emotional experience of adults with major depressive disorder: Examining emotional instability, inertia, and reactivity. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121(4), 819–829. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027978>
- Thorberg, F. A., Young, R. M., Sullivan, K. A., & Lyvers, M. (2009). Alexithymia and alcohol use disorders: A critical review. *Addictive Behaviors*, 34(3), 237–245.
- Tobacyk, J. J. (1980). Comparison of five measures of affective complexity derived from P-technique factor analysis. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 50(3, Pt 2), 1259–1262.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1962). *Affect imagery consciousness: Volume I: The positive affects* (Vol. 1). Springer Publishing Company.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1963). *Affect imagery consciousness: Volume II: The negative affects* (Vol. 2). Springer Publishing Company.
- Tomko, R. L., Lane, S. P., Pronove, L. M., Treloar, H. R., Brown, W. C., Solhan, M. B., Wood, P. K., & Trull, T. J. (2015). Undifferentiated negative affect and impulsivity in borderline personality and depressive disorders: A momentary perspective. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 124(3), 740–753. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000064>
- Trentacosta, C. J., & Schultz, D. (2015). Hold tight: Carroll Izard's contributions to translational research on emotion competence. *Emotion Review*, 7(2), 136–142.
- Trull, T. J., Jahng, S., Wood, P. K., & Watson, D. (2008). Affective instability: Measuring a core feature of borderline personality disorder with ecological momentary assessment. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117(3), 647–661.
- Trull, T. J., Lane, S. P., Koval, P., & Ebner-Priemer, U. W. (2015). Affective dynamics in psychopathology. *Emotion Review*, 7(4), 355–361.
- Tugade, M. M., Fredrickson, B. L., & Barrett, L. F. (2004). Psychological resilience and positive emotional granularity: Examining the benefits of positive emotions on coping and health. *Journal of Personality*, 72(6), 1161–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00294.x>
- Uher, T. (2010). Alexithymia and immune dysregulation: A critical review. *Activitas Nervosa Superior*, 52(1), 40–44.
- Underwood, B., & Froming, W. J. (1980). The mood survey: A personality measure of happy and sad moods. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 44(4), 404–414.
- Van Rooy, D. L., Viswesvaran, C., & Pluta, P. (2005). An evaluation of construct validity: What is this thing called emotional intelligence? *Human Performance*, 18(4), 445–462. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1804_9

- von Rad, M., Lalucat, L., & Lolas, F. (1977). Differences in verbal behavior in psychosomatic and psychoneurotic patients. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 28, 83–97.
- Vorst, H. C., & Bermond, B. (2001). Validity and reliability of the Bermond–Vorst alexithymia questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(3), 413–434.
- Watson, D., & Walker, L. M. (1996). The long-term stability and predictive validity of trait measures of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 567–577.
- Watson, David, Anna, L., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063–1070.
- Watson, M., & Greer, S. (1983). Development of a questionnaire measure of emotional control. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 27(4), 299–305.
- Weis, S., & Süß, H.-M. (2007). Reviving the search for social intelligence—A multitrait-multimethod study of its structure and construct validity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(1), 3–14.
- Werner, H., & Kaplan, B. (1963). *Symbol formation: An organismic-developmental approach to language and the expression of thought*. Wiley.
- Westphal, M., Seivert, N., & Bonanno, G. (2010). Expressive flexibility. *Emotion*, 10(1), 92–100.
- Westwood, H., Kerr-Gaffney, J., Stahl, D., & Tchanturia, K. (2017). Alexithymia in eating disorders: Systematic review and meta-analyses of studies using the Toronto Alexithymia Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 99, 66–81.
- Whiteside, S. P., & Lynam, D. R. (2001). The five factor model and impulsivity: Using a structural model of personality to understand impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(4), 669–689.
- Williams, K. N., Boyle, D. K., Herman, R. E., Coleman, C. K., & Hummert, M. L. (2012). Psychometric analysis of the Emotional Tone Rating Scale: A measure of person-centered communication. *Clinical Gerontologist*, 35(5), 376–389.
- Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003). Affective forecasting. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 345–411). Elsevier Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(03\)01006-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(03)01006-2)
- Zaki, L. F., Coifman, K. G., Rafaeli, E., Berenson, K. R., & Downey, G. (2013). Emotion differentiation as a protective factor against nonsuicidal self-injury in borderline personality disorder. *Behavior Therapy*, 44(3), 529–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2013.04.008>
- Zautra, A. J., Affleck, G. G., Tennen, H., Reich, J. W., & Davis, M. C. (2005). Dynamic approaches to emotions and stress in everyday life: Bolger and Zuckerman reloaded with positive as well as negative affects. *Journal of Personality*, 73(6), 1511–1538.
- Zautra, A. J., Reich, J. W., Davis, M. C., Potter, P. T., & Nicolson, N. A. (2000). The role of stressful events in the relationship between positive and negative affects: Evidence from field and experimental studies. *Journal of Personality*, 68(5), 927–951.
- Zautra, A. J., Smith, B., Affleck, G., & Tennen, H. (2001). Examinations of chronic pain and affect relationships: Applications of a dynamic model of affect. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69(5), 786.
- Zech, E., Luminet, O., Rimé, B., & Wagner, H. (1999). Alexithymia and its measurement: Confirmatory factor analyses of the 20-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale and the Bermond–Vorst Alexithymia Questionnaire. *European Journal of Personality*, 13(6), 511–532.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). The emotional intelligence, health, and well-being nexus: What have we learned and what have we missed? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 4(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2011.01062.x>

Zhu, Z., & Bonanno, G. A. (2017). Affective flexibility: Relations to expressive flexibility, feedback, and depression. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 5(6), 930–942.