Our purpose was to analyze some main aspects of human interaction, the empathy and the emotion regulation, in a sample of teenagers with psychopathological tendencies aged between 16 and 18. But with the poster we will present one of the research we are developing: Emotion and Emotion Regulation as a function of the psychopathy components of the social interaction and the emotion regulation tendencies as to the self-prime dimension. This connection is so much more interesting, because of the structured dimensions of the psychopathic personality and to the extent this structure of personality failures both of other respect (empathy) and expectation to Emotion and the emotion regulation tendencies for the Portuguese population of the following instruments: BES-Basic Ematy Scale (Joffit & Farrington, 2006) a CERQ – Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Garnefski & Kraaij, 2006) and a self- (Kemmel, Paulhus, & Hare, 2007).

The first question that we do ask is: “Why these concepts have to relate to each other? To answer this question we need one hermeneutic frame.

A hermeneutic frame to understand why and how these concepts are related together.

We are following a proposal (Cardoso, 2008) that corrosificates the affective system as dynamic system comprehending affective processes and cognitive environment in the process of this (regulation).

1. The affective system: One that comprehends a good bad dimension structure (Arnold, 1962) that had a function to evaluate the things of the world. This subsystem serves also to analyze and categorize the individual preferences. It is egoist.

a) We could consider liking vs. disliking, wanting and reward processes and correspondent structures (cf. Berridge & Kringlbach, 2008).

The second system is defined by subsystems of basic Emotions:

2. The basic emotions: The Emotions comprehend, as we know, programs of action (cf. Tomkins, Eisman, Lang, Fridja, etc.) that had in the wild and continue to have nowadays a survival value (e.g., Tooby & Cosmides, 2000) and yet, with a change because of a development of cultural matrix.

a) They trigger by specific situations and by specific stimulus;

b) They are also a dimension (Plutchik, Fridja, 1996; Cardoso, 1998);

c) They have an urgency of action (Fridja);

d) They comprehend an implicit judgment (not a rational judgment as Solomon (1980) said);

e) They are self-protective and serve a personal self-identity;

f) They are, fear, sad, happy, disgust, anger, surprise? (cf. Eisman);

g) They could form a mix or compound emotions (Wendt, e.g., when is trigger fear and angry emotions simultaneously; see Plutchik) apprehended by consciousness.

Regulated by the previous systems in interaction with peers and cultural environments emerge the social-emotions system and regulated social-emotions.

3. An attachment system: That has a function of responding to the others and launch (create) social bondings, it is empathic and is modulated by attachment or hetero-synchrony/organismic way that comprehends a good bad dimension structures (Arnold, 1962) that had a function to evaluate the things of the world. This system is a feed-forward system.

The attachment system is:

a) the key for pro-social behavior that emerge from a set of psychological organizers since the early stage, the key that has to redeem in the look of the others, to smile, to appraise the others in the implicit sense to embed the others;

b) fundamental for construction (early) affective memories with positive or negative valences signified to the historical system.

4. The social emotions: By interaction of affective and cognitive systems the social emotions emerge modulated by cultural rules within the groups. These are: a) guilt, shame, embarrassment, jealousy, anxiety (fair - expected high or uncertainty about future); b) self-esteem (self-reflection - the cognitive basis), and empathy.

a) They relate and regulate human beings in society so as to contribute for construction of social norms of expression, affects and emotions (cf. Lutz, 1988);

b) They are self-referential and serve the neural identity of the self.

So, the affective system, taken in its multiple facets, reveal to be in service of differentiation and Realization, having a proximity of accommodation within the groups, through reinforcement and transaction processes in order to preserve, enlarge or restrain, and sustaining or disrupting degree of subjectivity.

5. The social system: We could define EMPATHY as an ability to feel what another feels and to have consciousness of what others are feeling. It is more than an attitude, because it is a purpose consistent of all attitudes to the others. That claims a consciousness, dispositional and cognitive aspects of the human being in interaction with others, to the extent that the expression of only one will reduce the richness of human interaction.

In the ample sense, being empathic is having the ability to attune the feelings of one to another living organism (we don’t know how far this ability ends phylogenetically), and in resilient sense with human beings, is the capacity of feeling the pain of the affective plight of the others and to have the competence of responding adequately. It is also to understand the subjective living space of others (cf. Snyder & Lopez, 2007). One way of taking the perspective of the other self. In the same vein it is noteworthy the impoartant of affective processes, like mimmy the others and emotion contagion as Hatfield and Rapson (1994) have noted, have relevance with ethological data with micro-social interaction.

So, EMPATHY is an ability that depends on co-construction processes of the development competences of the individual, as e.g. Baeby and Plangel recognized, occurring in ecological systems in interaction with peers of same species, and in humans with other species too, because of our capacity to construct and atribute a ‘theory of mind’. It could be comprehended by two factors: Affective and Cognitive (cf. Joffit & Farrington).

6.1 The emotional regulation: Emotion regulation, as one aspect of expression of the affectivity, could be comprehend in different perspectives as we can see:

1. Self-regulatory organismic process depending on the interactions that the psychological system establishes within the environment interfaces; Gross (2007), Garnefski & Kraaij (2007), Gerhardt (2004) and (Frans 1994).

It is a homodynamic process, but at physiological and immunological organismic levels.

2. As interactional process with psychological environments (following, Bowlby, Spitz, Ainsworth):

a) self-regulated and affective;

b) as a process in individuation and personalization (Damasio, 1999, Cardoso, 2008; Lorr, 2000);

c) constructing and preserving the self-consciousness (with or without self-evaluation) and Self-identity (Lowe, 2000);

d) regulating the interactions within the group. (e.g., Rim, 2007).

6.2 Emotion Regulation takes place at two emotional levels:

a) at first level concerning to the Basic Emotions –Fear, sad, happy, disgust, and surprise; implicates regulating its urgency of action as well as the intensity of its expression;

b) at second level concerning to the Social Emotions – e.g., Embarrassment, Guilty and self-blame, Shame, and Envy (…) implicates a regulation addressed to nuclear-self as well as the way one presents and deals with the others.

6.3.1 Sections 1 and 2 shows that Attachment system and its quality is fundamental for developing Emotion and Emotion Regulation (see also Cassidy, in Fox, 1992). However, these dimensions (or factors) are not independent. They are related to each other and to the extent this structure of personality failures both of respect (empathy) and expectation to Emotion and emotion regulation tendencies for the Portuguese population of the following instruments: BES-Basic Ematy Scale (Joffit & Farrington, 2006) a CERQ – Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Garnefski & Kraaij, 2006) and a self- (Kemmel, Paulhus, & Hare, 2007).

Subsequently, affective regulation, taken as a whole should be comprehend by following aspects:

a) Basic systems (basic level and social level);

b) Empathy (cognitive vs. affective);

c) Emotion regulation (basic level and social level);

d) Self-identity.

6.4 Psychotherapy

The concept of “psychotherapy”: regardless of aetiology, refers to an organization and a behavioral expression that, in the words of Clyde (1988/1943) will result in two contradictory versions: “The surface of the psychopath... shows up as equal or better than normal and gives me at all of a disorder within. Nothing about him suggests oddness, inadequacy, or moral fault. His mask is that of robust mental health... Yet he has a disorder that manifests itself in conduct far more severe...”. It is expected to find in the subjects who scored high in SRP-III low values of Empathy differing than those who scored high in SRP-III in terms of affective and cognitive components. Which together sustain instrumental actions with abuse and/or aggression on the other resulting in benefits to the agent and, subsequently, in losses for those who suffer action, without any feeling of remorse/regret or guilt.

These actions are supported by:

a) lack of inhibitory mechanism of violence (VM model; see Blair, Mitchell, & Blair, 2005);

b) lack of empathy (cognitive and affective);

c) violation of the social rules in exchange of a self-referential: A psychopathic i.e as measure of all (fair) and self-interest (see also Paulhus & Verhulst, 1999).

d) lack of emotion regulation (primary and social emotions).

6.5 The Instruments

For measuring Empathy we select the Basic Empaty Scale (BES, Joffit & Farrington, 2006). The BES present good psychometric qualities as so convergent and divergent validities; it is applied to children of ages 8 to 18 years old. Although, neuropsychological tests were applied and a Self-report questionnaire (SRP-III) was a good measure of the variables. This scale is composed for 20 items obtained by confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA); quoted in Likert type scale and scored between strongly agree to strongly disagree.

For measuring Emotion Regulation we adopt the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ, Garnefski, N & Kraaij, 2007). The 9 subscales are addressed to cognitive aspects of social emotions, self-consciousness of aspects of emotions, self-identity and cognitive capacity of putting in perspective; they are: Self-blame, Blaming others; Acceptance, Focus on thought/externallization; Positive refocusing; Refocus on planning; Positive reappraisal; Catastrophizing and putting into perspective.

For measuring Psychopathy tendencies we selected a Self-Report Psychopathy (SRP-III, Williams, Paulhus, & Hare, 2007) which are composed for 40 items, with a 5-point Likert scale response organized in 4 factors: Criminal tendencies, erratic life style, interpersonal manipulation, and Callous affect.