

The Myth of Universal Emotions: Reconstructing Emotional Life Through the Theory of Constructed Emotion

Authors

Mardoche Sidor, M.D.^{1,2}

Karen Dubin, Ph.D., LCSW¹

1. SWEET Institute, New York, NY
2. Urban Pathways, New York, NY; Former Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Columbia University; Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research, Columbia University

Abstract

The belief that emotions are biologically hardwired and universally expressed across cultures has shaped psychological theory, educational systems, and even legal practices for decades. However, recent research in neuroscience and affective science challenges this classical model. The Theory of Constructed Emotion (TCE), proposed by Lisa Feldman Barrett, posits that emotions are not innate reflexes but are constructed by the brain through predictions, interoceptive signals, and socially learned concepts. This article examines the scientific basis for rejecting the classical theory, presents the core components of TCE, and explores its implications for clinical practice, education, and emotional intelligence development.

Keywords

Constructed Emotion, Emotion Theory, Interoception, Emotional Granularity, Predictive Coding, Lisa Feldman Barrett, Universal Emotions, Emotional Intelligence

Introduction

For decades, dominant emotion theories have asserted that humans are born with a set of biologically hardwired “basic” emotions—such as fear, anger, sadness, happiness, disgust, and surprise—expressed similarly across cultures and situations (Ekman, 1992). This classical view has influenced cross-cultural studies, psychological diagnostics, law enforcement protocols, and artificial intelligence systems.

Yet a growing body of scientific evidence reveals that emotions do not have distinct neural signatures, consistent facial expressions, or universal physiological markers (Barrett, 2006; Lindquist et al., 2012). The Theory of Constructed Emotion (TCE) offers a compelling alternative, proposing that emotions are dynamically created by the brain as it makes meaning of internal and external sensory information through learned concepts, prior experiences, and contextual interpretation (Barrett, 2017).

Theoretical Framework

Classical Theory of Universal Emotions

Paul Ekman’s theory of basic emotions (1992) postulates six core emotions with universal facial expressions. These emotions are thought to emerge from evolutionarily conserved neural

circuits and produce stereotyped physiological responses (Ekman, 1999). Despite its popularity, empirical challenges have mounted.

Cross-cultural studies show substantial variability in emotion recognition and expression (Gendron et al., 2014). Moreover, meta-analyses fail to find consistent neural correlates for specific emotions (Barrett, 2006; Lindquist et al., 2012), undermining the biological essentialism of this model.

Theory of Constructed Emotion

Barrett's Theory of Constructed Emotion asserts that emotions are not innate but constructed through a predictive coding process that integrates:

- Interoception: Awareness of internal bodily signals (Craig, 2002)
- Conceptualization: Applying learned emotional concepts to bodily sensations
- Contextualization: Incorporating environmental and social context
- Prediction: The brain's prior experiences shape current perception (Clark, 2013)

Instead of reacting, the brain predicts what the body is experiencing and constructs an emotion accordingly—a process shaped by one's culture, language, and personal history (Barrett, 2017).

Application/Analysis

Interoception and Emotion Construction

Interoceptive accuracy (the ability to perceive internal states) plays a central role in emotional experience. High interoceptive awareness correlates with emotional clarity and regulation (Mehling et al., 2009). Disorders such as anxiety and depression have been associated with altered interoceptive processing (Khalsa et al., 2018), supporting TCE's premise that emotions are deeply rooted in bodily signals.

Conceptual Learning and Emotional Granularity

Children and adults with a richer emotional vocabulary—what researchers call emotional granularity—are better able to identify, label, and regulate their emotions (Kashdan et al., 2015). This finding aligns with TCE's emphasis on conceptual learning: emotions are not hardwired reactions but learned categories shaped by linguistic and cultural exposure (Lindquist & Gendron, 2013).

Neuroscientific Evidence

Meta-analyses of fMRI studies reveal no single brain region or pattern consistently associated with any one emotion (Lindquist et al., 2012). Instead, domain-general networks such as the default mode network, salience network, and limbic system are flexibly involved across emotional experiences (Barrett & Satpute, 2013), undermining the idea of biologically distinct emotion circuits.

Implications

Clinical Practice

Understanding emotions as constructions rather than reflexes allows clinicians to help patients reframe emotional experiences by building new emotion concepts and expanding emotional vocabulary. Therapies such as CBT, DBT, and ACT may be enhanced by integrating interoceptive training and predictive flexibility (Barrett, 2017; Mehling et al., 2011).

Education and Emotional Literacy

Educational systems that promote emotional vocabulary and body awareness may foster healthier emotional development. Tools like emotion wheels, mindfulness-based interoceptive practices, and reflective journaling align with TCE's model and may improve student well-being (Feldman et al., 2017).

Cross-Cultural Understanding

The TCE challenges ethnocentric emotion assumptions. For example, the Japanese term “amae” (indulgent dependency) or the Czech word “lítost” (a mix of grief, longing, and remorse) lack direct English equivalents, emphasizing how culture shapes emotion concepts (Wierzbicka, 1999). This insight encourages cultural humility in global mental health and communication efforts.

Conclusion

The Theory of Constructed Emotion reshapes how we understand, experience, and intervene upon emotional life. Emotions are not universal fingerprints stamped by evolution, but dynamic constructs built from brain predictions, bodily signals, language, and social context. Embracing this model opens new pathways in therapy, education, cross-cultural work, and emotional intelligence development.

References

- 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. (2017). *How emotions are made: The secret life of the brain*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Barrett, L. F., & Satpute, A. B. (2013). Large-scale brain networks in affective and social neuroscience: Towards an integrative functional architecture of the brain. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 23(3), 361–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2012.12.012>
- Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 181–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12000477>
- Craig, A. D. (2002). How do you feel? Interoception: The sense of the physiological condition of the body. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3(8), 655–666. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn894>
- Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 6(3–4), 169–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939208411068>

- Ekman, P. (1999). Basic emotions. In T. Dalgleish & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 45–60). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Feldman, L., Barrett, L. F., & Gross, J. J. (2017). Emotion regulation: Conceptual and practical issues. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (2nd ed., pp. 3–20). Guilford Press.
- Gendron, M., Roberson, D., van der Vyver, J. M., & Barrett, L. F. (2014). Perceptions of emotion from facial expressions are not culturally universal: Evidence from a remote culture. *Emotion*, 14(2), 251–262. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036052>
- 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>
- Khalsa, S. S., Adolphs, R., Cameron, O. G., Critchley, H. D., Davenport, P. W., Feinstein, J. S., ... & Paulus, M. P. (2018). Interoception and mental health: A roadmap. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 3(6), 501–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2017.12.004>
- Lindquist, K. A., & Gendron, M. (2013). What's in a word? Language constructs emotion perception. *Emotion Review*, 5(1), 66–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912451351>
- Lindquist, K. A., Wager, T. D., Kober, H., Bliss-Moreau, E., & Barrett, L. F. (2012). The brain basis of emotion: A meta-analytic review. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 35(3), 121–143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X11000446>
- Mehling, W. E., Price, C., Daubenmier, J. J., Acree, M., Bartmess, E., & Stewart, A. (2009). The Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA). *PLOS ONE*, 7(11), e48230. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0048230>
- Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals*. Cambridge University Press.