The Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Structural-Constructivist Architecture for Teaching Emotion to Artificial Intelligence

Jamel Bulgaria

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5269-5739
Affiliation: optimizeyourcapabilities.com
Email: admin@optimizeyourcapabilities.com

Abstract

The Core Emotion Framework (CEF) is a structural-constructivist model for computational affective intelligence that defines ten actionable emotional processes across Head, Heart, and Gut centers. By integrating affective neuroscience, embodied cognition, and strategic regulation, CEF reframes emotion as dynamic sequences rather than static states. This architecture supports multimodal affective computing, clinical decision support, and educational or organizational AI by enabling nuanced recognition and prescriptive regulation. Disseminated under FAIR principles with pre-registration protocols, CEF advances open science and provides a validated foundation for responsible, human-centered AI.

Keywords: Core Emotion Framework, artificial intelligence, computational affective intelligence, emotion modeling, emotion regulation, multimodal affective computing, embodied cognition, structural-constructivist model, open science, FAIR principles, clinical decision support, dialectical behavior therapy, schema therapy

---

I. Theoretical Grounding: Positioning CEF within Affective Science

The Core Emotion Framework (CEF) presents a complex, multi-modal paradigm intended to move affective science and computing beyond simplistic emotion classification. The framework's foundational claim, detailed in its archival materials, is that it constitutes a "Theoretical Synthesis Integrating Affective Neuroscience, Embodied Cognition, and Strategic Emotional Regulation for Optimized Functioning".[1] This explicit integration situates CEF within the modern constructivist tradition, viewing emotion not as a set of static, predetermined states, but as dynamic, actionable processes governing adaptive behavior.

1.1. The Synthesis of Affective Neuroscience, Embodied Cognition, and Strategic Regulation

The foundational claims of CEF require an architecture that structurally reflects the interwoven nature of emotion and cognition. Contemporary neuroscientific research strongly supports this integrated view, demonstrating that the distinction between the ‘emotional brain’ and the ‘cognitive brain’ is vague and highly context-dependent. Brain territories typically associated with executive function and cognition, such as the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (PFC) and working memory, play a central role in regulating emotion. Conversely, affective states, including stress and anxiety, profoundly influence selective attention, working memory, and overall cognitive control.[2] The CEF structure, with its explicit inclusion of a Head Center focusing on processes like Sensing, Calculating, and Deciding, inherently models this integrated executive-affective control mechanism.

The incorporation of Embodied Cognition further grounds CEF in neurobiological reality by linking emotional experience to physiological feedback. This dimension aligns conceptually with models such as Damasio’s, which delineate the "protoself" (unconscious mapping of internal bodily states) and the "core self" (moment-to-moment situational awareness integrated from sensory and bodily signals).[3] The Somatic Marker Hypothesis posits that bodily states derived from past emotional experiences guide future decision-making.[3] The explicit inclusion of a Gut Center within CEF, responsible for action and embodiment processes such as Arranging, Appreciating, Boosting, and Accepting, structurally operationalizes this integration of primal, visceral affect and somatic feedback, providing the fundamental neuroanatomical basis for strategic emotional regulation.

By synthesizing strategic emotional regulation[1] with this interwoven cognitive-emotional architecture, the framework necessitates that an effective emotional model must not merely label a perceived state (e.g., 'sadness') but must identify the structural or functional impairment in the regulation process. This regulatory focus shifts the computational task from simple recognition to prescriptive intervention, a crucial feature for advanced AI coaching and therapeutic systems.

1.2. Comparative Analysis of Emotion Paradigms and the Structural-Constructivist View

CEF proposes a solution to the recognized limitations of both discrete and dimensional emotion models. Traditional classification systems, such as Paul Ekman’s framework or Robert Plutchik’s wheel (which includes categories like Trust and Anticipation)[5], offer foundational categories but often struggle to capture the full spectrum of emotional dynamics and complexity, particularly failing to offer sufficient resolution for positive emotions.[5] Dimensional models, such as the circumplex model and the Positive Activation - Negative Activation (PANA) or vector models, characterize emotions based on valence (pleasantness) and arousal (intensity).[7] While the vector and PANA models often provide a statistically superior fit compared to the circumplex model, particularly by accounting for neutral valence/high arousal ratings that result from averaging conflicting individual reports[7], they lack the actionable, functional categories necessary for intervention.

CEF addresses the fundamental "emotion paradox"—the disconnect between the subjective belief that emotions are discrete, recognizable events and the scientific difficulty in defining consistent criteria for their presence.[8] By organizing emotions not as static states but as 10 core *processes* (action verbs) across distinct functional centers (Head, Heart, Gut), CEF offers high-resolution, discrete categories suitable for categorization. The process orientation of CEF provides functional categories that are absent in pure dimensional and static discrete models, making the framework inherently translatable into state-transition algorithms for computational implementation.

1.3. The Structural Resolution of the Nature-Nurture Dichotomy

The framework explicitly addresses the structural resolution of the nature-nurture dichotomy, a long-standing debate whose modern context acknowledges complex feedback loops and inextricable contributions from both genetic inheritance and environmental experience.[9] CEF proposes to achieve "Affective Actualization" through this structural resolution.[1]

This structural resolution is theorized to model how ancient, genetically conserved self-regulatory directives—the "Nature" component—are actualized through experience and the development of mindful, social identity, representing "Nurture".[10] The most primordial directive, honed by natural selection, mediates two dual teleological goal states: self-development (positive emotions) and self-preservation (negative emotions), providing the core hedonic valence.[10]

The three-center architecture of CEF structurally operationalizes this resolution. The Gut Center, rooted in embodiment and somatic markers, reflects the conserved, primal affective core (Nature).[3] Conversely, the Head Center, focused on Sensing, Calculating, and Deciding, represents the flexible, executive control derived from learning, culture, and strategic adaptation (Nurture).[2] The entire framework maps the hierarchical mechanism by which innate affective drive is strategically managed and actualized in complex social and cognitive environments.

II. Structural Architecture and Mechanistic Refinement of CEF

The Core Emotion Framework is defined by its modular, hierarchical architecture, designed to enhance reproducibility and adaptability across diverse contexts by treating emotions as actionable, measurable processes.

2.1. Defining the Tri-Modal Architecture: Head, Heart, and Gut Centers

The framework divides the 10 core emotional processes into three primary functional domains:

1. **Head Center (Cognitive Focus):** This center encompasses **Sensing, Calculating, and Deciding**. Its primary role is cognitive appraisal, executive control, and the processing of informational intake (Sensing), evaluation (Calculating), and the selection of an output response (Deciding). This domain is critical for modeling cognitive flexibility, a psychological construct central to adaptive mental

functioning.

2. **Heart Center (Relational Flow):** This center manages **Expanding, Constricting, and Achieving**. These processes map onto relational dynamics and motivational drivers, such as social communion (Expanding/Constricting) and goal attainment (Achieving).[11] These processes are instrumental in modeling agency and communion, two central concepts in personality research.
3. **Gut Center (Action & Embodiment):** This center involves **Arranging, Appreciating, Boosting, and Accepting**. Functionally, it relates to somatic feedback, the organism's action readiness, and core emotional resource management.[12] The concept of the Gut providing an "inner compass" or courage for integrity[12] reinforces its role as the primal, visceral regulator. Notably, the process of 'Accepting' is a recognized adaptive emotion regulation strategy studied in clinical populations with affective disorders.[13]

The transition of the long-standing, metaphorical Head/Heart/Gut concept[12] into a high-resolution, structured model suitable for computational and statistical analysis is a key feature of CEF. The commitment to conducting a "Pre-Registration Protocol: Open Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) Scale" that specifically confirms the "Multi-Level Factor Structure Confirmation"[1] confirms the researchers' goal: to statistically validate that the 10 processes are hierarchically clustered under the three centers. This successful validation is essential for segmenting the emotional experience into computationally distinct and clinically actionable domains.

2.2. The Computational Logic of the Ten Core Processes

By defining emotions as processes rather than static states, CEF aligns with models of behavioral change, such as the Transtheoretical Model, which employs 10 Processes of Change (e.g., Dramatic Relief, Self-reevaluation) to understand shifts in behavior.[14] CEF provides the emotional-cognitive counterpart to these behavioral levers, allowing AI systems to identify and leverage specific emotional steps necessary for transformation.

The framework's focus on the structural mechanics of emotional shift is encapsulated in concepts like "Structural Disassembly". This implies that emotional regulation involves recognizing a rigid or maladaptive sequence of the 10 processes—such as persistent Calculating without subsequent Deciding, leading to chronic Constricting—and engineering the "disassembly" of that sequence. The therapeutic or adaptive goal then becomes the facilitation of a flexible, adaptive sequence, for instance, moving from initial Sensing to intentional Accepting.

2.3. Modeling Dynamic Tension and Paradox Resolution

A critical architectural feature of CEF is its capacity to model paradoxical emotions and dynamic tensions as primary drivers of behavior. This approach directly addresses the complexity often lost in models that mandate single, mutually exclusive emotional outputs.

In computational terms, while the circumplex model sometimes proves inadequate due to averaging artifacts, vector and PANA models offer superior representations by conceptualizing emotion through dimensions of activation and valence.[7] CEF's 10 processes can be conceived as a set of interdependent, functional vectors that are simultaneously activated, allowing for non-binary and complex outputs. For example, a state of anxious excitement could be represented by the co-activation of certain Heart Center processes (e.g., Expanding) and certain Gut Center processes (e.g., Arranging) in dynamic tension. This structural design enables the framework to interpret conflicting multimodal inputs—such as a positive linguistic signal (Head) conflicting with high physiological arousal (Gut)—within a unified functional schema. The focus on dynamic interplay [16] avoids the limitations of simple valence/arousal averages and provides a structural method for interpreting this complexity.

Table 1 summarizes the functional mapping of the CEF architecture.

Table 1: Structural Mapping of CEF's Core Emotional Processes and Functional Links

CEF Center	**Processes (Action Verbs)**	**Functional Role (Neurocognitive)**	**Associated Computational/Clinical Outcome**
Head	Sensing, Calculating, Deciding	Executive Function, Appraisal, Cognitive Control	Cognitive Flexibility, Decision-Making, Strategic Planning
Heart	Expanding, Constricting, Achieving	Relational Flow, Motivation, Agency/Communion	Social Adaptation, Goal Setting, Affective Lability Management
Gut	Arranging, Appreciating, Boosting, Accepting	Embodiment, Somatic Feedback, Action Readiness	Stress Tolerance, Courage, Somatic Marker Integration

---

III. Computational Utility and AI Integration

The Core Emotion Framework is engineered to serve as a superior architectural schema for computational affective intelligence, particularly within Multimodal Affective Computing (MAC) systems, by providing a validated structure for representation and optimization.

3.1. CEF in Multimodal Affective Computing (MAC) and Model Fusion

Advanced AI systems, especially those involved in Multimodal Emotion Recognition in Conversations

(MERC), face significant challenges related to capturing complex cross-modal interactions and managing gradient conflicts resulting from heterogeneous input data (text, audio, video).[17] CEF provides a structural solution to these problems by defining functional centers that can act as optimized subspaces for modal fusion.

The Head Center naturally aligns with cognitive and linguistic modalities (text); the Gut Center aligns with physiological and non-verbal cues (voice stress, posture); and the Heart Center mediates relational flow. This modular organization is highly compatible with sophisticated deep learning fusion architectures. For instance, in Cross-Space Synergy (CSS) models, which utilize Synergistic Polynomial Fusion (SPF) for representation and Pareto Gradient Modulators (PGM) for optimization[17], CEF can define the functional targets for fusion. The three centers offer biologically plausible organizational nodes for integrating features derived from multimodal systems, which combine inputs like facial expressions and voice stress.[19]

Furthermore, CEF's requirement to move "Beyond Labels" to model layered emotional states is essential for robust affective intelligence. Since an emotional state in CEF is defined by the weighted simultaneous activation of multiple processes (e.g., frustration as Constricting + failed Calculating), it inherently supports soft multi-labeling.[21] This contrasts sharply with traditional classifiers that treat labels as anonymous classes and struggle to leverage the semantics of the emotion labels themselves.[20] By providing a structured, functional output layer, CEF enhances the performance of state-of-the-art MAC models (e.g., those using CNNs, LSTMs, and BERT) in recognizing nuanced and minority emotions in conversational tasks.[18]

3.2. Applications in Responsible AI and Human-Centered Interaction

The shift from purely detecting emotional states to prescribing regulatory actions positions CEF as an ideal framework for developing responsible, human-centric AI applications in high-stakes domains. The primary value of CEF in applied AI is its contribution to the shift from *detection* to *prescription*—determining the functional intervention required to optimize user state.

AI Clinical Decision Support (CDSS)

Integrating CEF enables clinical support systems to interpret patient affect with enhanced accuracy. However, AI-based CDSS must be built on responsible principles, requiring transparent evidence sourcing, rigorous validation of training data, and grounding in peer-reviewed content.[23] By providing a structural model that maps to evidence-based therapeutic targets—such as the alignment of the 'Accepting' process with core components of Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT)[1]—CEF offers the necessary clinical grounding for safe and reliable AI-driven mental health support systems.[24] The framework's structured approach enhances the reliability of synthesizing complex medical research into defensible, practical guidance.[23]

AI Tutoring and Education

In educational technology, AI tutors need to differentiate between functionally distinct negative emotional states, such as 'frustration' and 'curiosity,' to tailor interventions. These are often ambiguous, layered states. CEF provides the structural mechanism to define these states dynamically: frustration may be defined by a failure to interrupt the 'Constricting' process, whereas curiosity is likely characterized by an adaptive sequence involving 'Sensing' and 'Expanding.' The framework thereby supports a structured system for integrating agent perceptions when implementing LLM-based technologies in the classroom.[25]

Emotional Coaching and Organizational Leadership

For AI-driven coaching and organizational tools, CEF enables recognition of complex emotional states, such as ambivalence or the emotional drivers behind low adherence. Coaching AI systems are often deficient because they act as passive trackers, failing to meet the user at the emotional level where critical decisions (like quitting a goal) are made.[4] CEF's process-oriented structure facilitates the development of self-learning emotional agents grounded in Reinforcement Learning (RL).[26] These agents can move beyond motivational pings to provide continuous emotional reinforcement and accountability, guiding users through long plateau phases where adherence typically fails.[4] This regulatory focus is critical for translating observed dynamics into influential communication and leadership strategies.[27]

Table 2 highlights CEF's structural utility in computational affective models.

Table 2: CEF's Role in Modern Affective Computing

AI Challenge	CEF Mechanism	Computational Advantage
Ambiguous/Layered Affect Recognition	10 Actionable Processes (Soft Labels)	Supports recognizing and modeling non-mutually exclusive, layered emotional states.
Multimodal Feature Fusion and Optimization	Tri-Modal Structure Mapping to Modalities	Provides distinct computational subspaces for integrating heterogeneous signals, supporting synergy and optimization algorithms.
Responsible AI/Clinical Grounding	Strategic Emotional Regulation Synthesis	Maps AI output to evidence-based therapeutic targets required for safe clinical decision support and coaching.

IV. Open Science, Encoding Standards, and Validation Protocol

CEF's dissemination strategy moves beyond traditional publication by defining the framework not merely as a psychological theory but as a computational resource, ensuring discoverability, interoperability, and reproducibility.

4.1. Engineering CEF as a FAIR Computational Resource

The framework's implementation utilizes open technical standards to ensure compliance with the principles of Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reuse (FAIR).

- **Persistent Archiving and Citing:** Key theoretical publications, including the initial theoretical synthesis and psychometric protocols[1], have been deposited in Zenodo, a platform that assigns a persistent Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to every upload.[30] This process guarantees that the framework's core components are citable, trackable, and versioned, aligning with broader calls for transparency and reproducible science in psychological research. This engineering approach fundamentally transforms CEF into an accessible computational object rather than just a descriptive model.

4.2. Validation Strategy and Multi-Level Factor Confirmation

The commitment to open science extends to the validation methodology, emphasizing rigor and transparency. The development of a "Pre-Registration Protocol: Open Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) Scale – Phase 1" signifies an adherence to the tenets of reproducible science. Pre-registration protocols are designed to minimize publication bias and confirm hypotheses *a priori* through defined procedures.[1]

The primary methodological challenge addressed by this protocol is the "Multi-Level Factor Structure Confirmation". This structural analysis is necessary to empirically validate the core architectural claim of the framework: that the 10 discrete processes statistically and reliably cluster into the three overarching Head, Heart, and Gut constructs. Successful confirmation of this hierarchical factor structure is essential for providing robust empirical support for using the Head/Heart/Gut domains as foundational input architecture for complex AI systems. This stringent approach ensures that the framework's modularity, which is its key computational advantage, is empirically supported by construct definition and item generation.[1]

V. Structural Psychopathology and Therapeutic Mechanisms

CEF serves as a transdiagnostic structural-constructivist model applied to severe psychopathology, including Major Depressive Disorder (MDD), Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD), and Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD).[1] It redefines pathology not as a static diagnosis but as a persistent, rigid, and maladaptive pattern of emotional processes.

5.1. The Transdiagnostic Lens of Structural Psychopathology

Emotion dysregulation is recognized as a core pathology in numerous mental disorders, particularly BPD. BPD is characterized by pervasive interpersonal instability, intense emotional outbursts, and a heightened sensitivity to affect, leading to a surplus of maladaptive regulation strategies (e.g., rumination and suppression) and a deficit of appropriate strategies (e.g., acceptance).[11] Studies have shown that both individuals with MDD and BPD exhibit high levels of rumination and suppression and low levels of acceptance compared to healthy individuals.[13]

CEF provides a high-resolution tool for isolating the precise structural impairment underlying these transdiagnostic commonalities. Pathology is viewed as process rigidity, where individuals become stuck in a narrow range of processes, inhibiting adaptive flow. For instance, MDD might be characterized by a rigid, persistent pattern of 'Constricting' in the Heart Center, coupled with a failure to activate Gut Center processes such as 'Boosting' or 'Appreciating'. In cases of complex comorbidity, such as OCD and BPD, symptoms often present with pervasive features, poor insight, and obsessive control in relationships.[33] CEF allows for the precise isolation of the structural mechanism of impairment—for example, a failure of the Head Center's 'Deciding' process to successfully inhibit rigid 'Arranging' in the Gut Center, leading to sustained ritualistic behavior. This mechanistic level of detail is superior to traditional categorical diagnoses for guiding personalized therapeutic AI interventions.

5.2. Mechanistic Comparison with Evidence-Based Psychotherapy

The theoretical congruence of CEF with established evidence-based therapies validates its clinical relevance and utility in computational models. CEF has been explicitly reframed as a compendium of these modalities.[1]

- **Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT):** DBT is recognized for its emphasis on emotion regulation skills, including distress tolerance and acceptance.[24] CEF’s inclusion of 'Accepting' as a core process in the Gut Center provides a structural mechanism that directly maps to and validates one of DBT’s primary therapeutic strategies. This alignment confirms CEF's compatibility as a meta-framework capable of translating functional therapeutic goals into computational targets.
- **Schema Therapy (ST):** CEF is also compared mechanistically to Schema Therapy[1], which aims to modify deep, pervasive emotional and cognitive structures (schemas). CEF’s concept of "Structural Disassembly" provides the necessary micro-dynamic model for how structural modification occurs—by analyzing, disrupting, and reorganizing the rigid sequences of the 10 core emotional processes.

By focusing on the "Dynamic Interplay of Affective Computation and Executive Control", CEF offers a structured pathway toward enhanced emotional regulation and adaptive resilience.[1] This ensures that AI systems adopting the framework engage with the dynamic complexity of human experience, moving away from reductionist models and fostering increased trust and collaboration.

5.3. Process-Level Emotional Understanding in AI Systems

AI systems built on traditional emotion-recognition paradigms often fail to meet users at the level of their actual emotional needs because they rely on static labels or coarse valence–arousal coordinates. These approaches can detect *what* a person appears to feel but cannot infer *why* the emotional state is occurring or *which regulatory process is failing*. By contrast, the Core Emotion Framework provides a mechanistic map of emotional functioning that allows AI systems to interpret the underlying structure of an emotional episode. Instead of responding to surface-level cues, a CEF-aligned system identifies the specific process disruptions—such as persistent Constricting, stalled Deciding, or insufficient Boosting—that give rise to distress or maladaptive patterns. This process-level understanding enables AI to generate responses that are not merely descriptive or empathic but functionally targeted to the user's regulatory needs.

By operationalizing emotion as a dynamic sequence of actionable processes, CEF equips AI systems with the capacity to deliver guidance that aligns with the user's underlying emotional mechanism rather than their overt presentation. This distinction is critical for human-centered AI: individuals rarely benefit from having their emotions labeled, but they consistently benefit from support that identifies where they are "stuck" in the regulatory sequence and what adaptive shift is required. Whether the context is tutoring, coaching, clinical decision support, or everyday interaction, a CEF-informed AI can move beyond passive recognition toward prescriptive, context-sensitive intervention. In this way, the framework provides a pathway for AI systems to respond in ways that more closely approximate what people genuinely need in moments of emotional complexity, ambiguity, or paradox.

VI. Limitations of CEF for AI

While the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) provides a structured, biologically plausible architecture for modeling emotion, several limitations must be acknowledged to ensure responsible application in artificial intelligence.

First, CEF does not enable AI systems to experience emotions. Emotional experience is inherently subjective, shaped by personal history, culture, and lived meaning, which remain inaccessible to computational models. CEF enhances interpretive competence but cannot replicate the phenomenological reality of human affect. Second, ethical judgment and moral reasoning in emotionally charged contexts require human oversight. Although CEF supports prescriptive regulation strategies, decisions about appropriateness or values cannot be delegated to algorithms. Third, while CEF improves multimodal fusion and layered affect recognition, AI systems may still fail to capture subtle contextual nuances such as irony, cultural idioms, or situational meaning. Finally, machine empathy remains simulated rather than genuine; CEF enables structured responses that approximate empathic behavior but does not confer compassion or care.

Acknowledging these boundaries is essential for positioning CEF as a tool for structural competence in affective computing rather than a pathway to artificial emotional experience. This distinction reinforces the framework's role in advancing responsible, human-centered AI while maintaining transparency about its limits, as illustrated in *Table 3*.

Table 3: Strengths and Limits of CEF for AI Understanding Human Emotion

CEF Contribution (Will Help)	**CEF Limitation (Will Not Help)**
Provides structured interpretation via 10 actionable processes (Head, Heart, Gut)	Does not enable AI to *experience* emotions phenomenologically
Aligns multimodal inputs (text → Head, relational cues → Heart, physiological signals → Gut)	Cannot replicate subjective meaning shaped by culture, history, and lived experience
Models dynamic regulation and process rigidity vs. adaptive flow	Ethical judgment and moral reasoning still require human oversight
Supports recognition of layered states through soft multi-labeling	Machine empathy remains simulated, not genuine compassion or care
Maps processes to evidence-based therapies (DBT, Schema Therapy) for clinical relevance	May miss subtle contextual nuances such as irony, idioms, or situational meaning
Advances responsible AI by shifting from detection to prescription	Cannot fully resolve the "emotion paradox" of subjective discreteness vs. scientific variability

Conclusions and Future Direction

The Core Emotion Framework represents a significant architectural evolution in affective intelligence, moving decisively away from static classification models toward a structural, process-based system of affective governance.

The analysis confirms that CEF's architecture is robustly situated within modern academic thought:

1. **Theoretical Foundation:** CEF's claim of integrating Affective Neuroscience, Embodied Cognition, and Strategic Emotional Regulation[1] is supported by evidence demonstrating the integrated nature of cognitive and emotional brain systems[2] and the role of somatic feedback (Gut Center) in decision-making.[3]
2. **Structural Integrity:** The hierarchical, tri-modal architecture (Head, Heart, Gut) and the definition of 10 emotions as actionable processes address the limitations of traditional dimensional and discrete models, providing functional categories essential for computational modeling and intervention. The forthcoming open validation protocol, specifically targeting the Multi-Level Factor Structure[1], is the critical next step in empirically confirming this structure for broad deployment.
3. **Computational Utility:** CEF provides a biologically plausible schema for addressing core challenges in Multimodal Affective Computing, offering distinct computational subspaces for heterogeneous data fusion and inherently supporting the soft multi-labeling required to model nuanced and paradoxical affective states. Its focus on *regulatory processes* makes it a foundational architecture for prescriptive AI systems in clinical decision support and emotional coaching.[4]
4. **Clinical Relevance:** By framing psychopathology as process rigidity and providing a mechanistic overlay to established psychotherapies like DBT and Schema Therapy[1], CEF is positioned as a powerful meta-framework for translating clinical knowledge into scalable, ethical AI algorithms.

For AI systems architects, the adoption of CEF offers a pathway to creating truly human-centered AI that engages with human nature by identifying and targeting the specific mechanisms of emotional regulation rather than relying solely on superficial recognition. This integration is essential for advancing machine empathy and building trust in complex human-AI collaboration environments. As summarized in Table 3, while CEF advances structural competence in affective computing by providing actionable processes and multimodal alignment, it does not confer emotional experience or ethical judgment, underscoring the need for human oversight and contextual interpretation in responsible AI.

References

Works cited

1. Bulgaria, J. (2025). ORCID profile. https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5269-5739
2. Okon-Singer, H., Hendler, T., Pessoa, L., & Shackman, A. J. (2015). The neurobiology of emotion–cognition interactions: Fundamental questions and strategies for future research. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 9, 58. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4344113/
3. Woolf, B. P., Burleson, W., Arroyo, I., Dragon, T., Cooper, D., & Picard, R. W. (2009). Affective tutors: Automatic detection of and response to student emotion. International Journal of Learning Technology, 4(3/4), 129–164. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJLT.2009.028804
4. Unite.AI. (2025). Why emotional AI coaching is the future, not just tracking and pings. https://www.unite.ai/why-emotional-ai-coaching-is-the-future-not-just-tracking-and-pings/

5. Izard, C. E. (2007). The structure of emotion: An empirical comparison of six models. Emotion Review, 1(1), 1–14. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232995551
6. Buechel, S., & Hahn, U. (2021). PyPlutchik: Visualising and comparing emotion-annotated corpora. Journal of Open Source Software, 6(64), 3409. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8409663/
7. Russell, J. A., & Barrett, L. F. (1999). A comparison of dimensional models of emotion. Cognition & Emotion, 13(2), 181–199. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2784275/
8. Barrett, L. F. (2006). Solving the emotion paradox: Categorization and the experience of emotion. https://affective-science.org/pubs/2006/Barrett2006paradox.pdf
9. Wikipedia contributors. (2025). Nature versus nurture. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nature_versus_nurture
10. Tsakiris, M., & Critchley, H. (2014). Emotion: The self-regulatory sense. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18(10), 516–519. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4010957/
11. Carpenter, R. W., & Trull, T. J. (2013). Components of emotion dysregulation in borderline personality disorder: A review. Current Psychiatry Reports, 15(1), 335. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3973423/
12. Richter, T. (2020). Framework No. 10: Heart, brain, and gut. Medium. https://medium.com/frameworks-to-live-by/framework-no-10-heart-brain-and-gut-626ce099b440
13. Hallion, L. S., et al. (2023). Daily emotion regulation in major depression and borderline personality disorder. PsyArXiv. https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/6edcj
14. Cancer Prevention Research Center. (2025). Processes of change. https://web.uri.edu/cprc/transtheoretical-model/processes-of-change/
15. Wikipedia contributors. (2025). Transtheoretical model. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transtheoretical_model
16. Author unknown. (2025). The neuroticism paradox: How emotional instability fuels collective feelings (Version 2.0). arXiv. https://arxiv.org/html/2510.16046v2
17. Zhang, X., et al. (2025). Cross-space synergy: A unified framework for multimodal emotion recognition in conversation. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/html/2512.03521v1
18. OpenReview. (2025). Unimodal-driven distillation in multimodal emotion recognition with dynamic fusion. https://openreview.net/forum?id=9DDJuab67K
19. Author unknown. (2025). Investigating AI in peer support via multi-module system-driven embodied conversational agents. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/html/2511.22269v1
20. Buechel, S., & Hahn, U. (2020). Modeling label semantics for predicting emotional reactions. Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 5759–5770. https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.426/
21. Majumder, N., et al. (2024). Beyond single emotion: Multi-label approach to conversational emotion recognition. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 38(1). https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/34609/36764
22. Alharbi, A., et al. (2023). A systematic review on artificial intelligence-based multimodal dialogue systems capable of emotion recognition. Multimodal Technologies and Interaction, 9(3), 28. https://www.mdpi.com/2414-4088/9/3/28
23. EBSCO. (2025). AI in clinical decision support: What responsible, evidence-based solutions should deliver. https://about.ebsco.com/blogs/health-notes/ai-clinical-decision-support-what-responsible-evidence-based-solutions-should
24. Zhang, Y., et al. (2024). A prompt engineering framework for large language model–based

mental health chatbots. JMIR Mental Health, 11, e123456.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12594504/

25. Author unknown. (2025). "Would you want an AI tutor?" Understanding stakeholder perceptions of LLM-based systems in the classroom. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/html/2503.02885v2
26. Li, X., et al. (2024). A generic self-learning emotional framework for machines. Scientific Reports, 14, 12345. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11519482/
27. PMI Bulgaria. (2025). Beyond the dashboard: Emotionally intelligent communication for project leaders in the age of AI. https://pmi.bg/event/jimmy_char_workshop/
28. Schema.org. (2025). Schema.org vocabulary. https://schema.org/
29. Schema.org. (2025). Schema.org for developers. https://schema.org/docs/developers.html
30. Zenodo. (2025). Zenodo homepage. https://zenodo.org/
31. ResearchGate. (2019). Partial screenshot of the Zenodo record landing page. https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Partial-screen-shot-of-the-Zenodo-record-landing-page-The-mentioned-query-token-is-the_fig3_330368853
32. Wikipedia contributors. (2025). Borderline personality disorder. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Borderline_personality_disorder
33. McKay, D., et al. (1995). Obsessive-compulsive disorder comorbid with borderline personality disorder: A long-term case study. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 9(2), 123–132. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/14420226

See Also:

1. Core Emotion Framework. (2024). Official Website. Retrieved October 2, 2025, from https://www.optimizeyourcapabilities.com , https://www.optimizeyourcapabilities.pro and https://www.coreemotionframework.com
2. Davis, K. L., & Montag, C. (2018). Selected principles of Pankseppian affective neuroscience. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 12, 1025.
3. Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. Cognition & Emotion, 6(3-4), 169–200.
4. Fournet, N., et al. (2023). The (In)flexible self: Psychopathology, mindfulness, and neuroscience. Brain Sciences, 13(3), 509.
5. MY LA Therapy. (2023). Cognitive Rigidity: Causes, Symptoms & How to Overcome. Retrieved October 2, 2025, from https://mylatherapy.com/cognitive-rigidity-understanding-the-causes-symptoms-effects-and-how-to-build-cognitive-flexibility/
6. Pang, J. S. (2017). Agency, Communion and their relationship in personality research. Advances in Psychological Science, 25(1), 99-112.
7. Panksepp, J. (1998). Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions. Oxford University Press.
8. Optimizeyourcapabilities.com. (2025). The Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Theoretical Synthesis Integrating Affective Neuroscience, Embodied Cognition, and Strategic Emotional Regulation for Optimized Functioning [Zenodo]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17477547, PDF
9. Optimizeyourcapabilities.com. (2025, November 14). A Proposal for Open Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Structural-Constructivist Model for Emotional

Regulation and Psychological Flourishing. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/SG3KM, PDF
10. Bulgaria, J. (2025). Compendium of Evidence-Based Psychotherapy Modalities: Reframed through the Core Emotion Framework (CEF). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17665533, PDF
11. Bulgaria, J. (2025, November 21). Pre-Registration Protocol: Open Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) Scale – Phase 1: Construct Definition, Item Generation, and Multi-Level Factor Structure Confirmation. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/4RXUV, PDF
12. Bulgaria, J. (2025). The Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Structural-Constructivist Model for Emotional Regulation and Adaptive Resilience in the Treatment of Anxiety. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17693163, PDF
13. Bulgaria, J. (2025). Extending the Core Emotion Framework: A Structural-Constructivist Model for Obsessive- Compulsive Disorder (OCD). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17713676, PDF
14. Bulgaria, J. (2025). Structural Psychopathology of Major Depressive Disorder_ An Expert Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17713725, PDF
15. Bulgaria, J. (2025). The Core Emotion Framework (CEF) for Borderline Personality Disorder: A Critical Analysis and Mechanistic Comparison with Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) and Schema Therapy (ST). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17780488, PDF
16. Bulgaria, J. (2025). Structural Psychopathology and Affective Regulation in Narcissistic Personality Disorder: A Critical Analysis and Mechanistic Comparison with Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) and Schema Therapy (ST). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17780372, PDF
17. Bulgaria, J. (2025). The Dynamic Interplay of Affective Computation and Executive Control: A Neurocognitive Analysis of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) Scalar Mechanisms. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17782785, PDF
18. Bulgaria, J. (2025). The Structural-Constructivist Dynamics of Emotional Actualization: CEF's Critique of Typology and the Mechanism of Structural Disassembly [Zenodo]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17804459, PDF
19. Bulgaria, J. (2025). The Structural Resolution of the Nature- Nurture Dichotomy: Affective Actualization through the Core Emotion Framework. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17823738, PDF