Table of contents

and practical basis for guiding inter-affective learning experiences that stimulate interactive affective sharing about a value conflict.

4.2 Theoretical underpinnings

4.2.1 Affective and inter-affectivity

Apart from the agreement among researchers that there is a domain called "affective", there is little agreement on how to define the "affective domain" (B. L. Martin & Reigeluth, 2017; McLeod, 1991; Miller, 2005). In a general sense, affect is seen as an unspoken and unrecognized force that compels a person to action (Pulido, 2003), and refers to bodily processes that influence how the person feels (Askins, 2009). Personal, contextual and cultural attribution of meaning play a role in how feelings are experienced (Boler, 1999). Some researchers see affect as a connection between one's internal and external world (e.g., Pulido, 2003). They assume that affect is a private matter that originates within an individual and only then moves outward to another. Seeing affect as private prevents affect from being expressed in the classroom (Ahmed, 2004; Boler, 1999). In education, there is a tendency to persist in seeing affect as private and to defend this stance out of feelings of insecurity and as a way to avoid taking a new approach (Jackson, 2018).

In this article, we follow the views of Ahmed (2004) and van Dijke et al. (2020) about affect, which combine the cognitive and holistic perspectives on affective learning: affect is taken to include both an inner, private aspect, one's own feelings, which requires feeling in order to perceive it, and an outer, public aspect, which involves information-providing communication. This resonates with the phenomenological perspective, where the dialogical process at the affective level is called inter-affectivity (De Jaeger, 2013). In inter-affectivity, affect is not a private matter, but is intersubjective (Ahmed, 2004). By intersubjectivity, we mean mutual recognition, in which each person experiences the other as a "similar subject", having a different mind with which to "feel", but still a distinct, separate center of feeling and perception (Benjamin, 2004). Recognizing that the other person is not an object, but also a subject with their own feelings and needs, makes inter-affectivity complex (Benjamin, 2004). How one feels and is touched by another person's feelings is sometimes difficult. To break through this, disclosure of one's own affect is necessary (Ahmed, 2004; Boler, 1999), which requires vulnerability. Vulnerability in the classroom allows students to be subjects in an interpersonal relationship with a teacher and their fellow students (Jackson, 2018).

4.2.2 Pedagogical relationship and inter-affective learning environments

Interactions in the pedagogical relationship between teacher and student at the affective level are always oriented towards a particular aim. The teacher affectively confirms to the student that the student is good as they are and confirms them in whom they might become (Van Kan et al., 2013). The question of becoming concerns affective directedness. The teacher affectively understands and interprets the student's current situation and affective experience and senses the moments in which the student can take a step at the affective level towards becoming an increasingly independent participant in the world (van Manen, 2016).
In addition to the pedagogical relationship between teacher and student, tactful teaching also

requires teachers to encourage interactive affective sharing between fellow students in a group.

This can be seen as an important contribution to fulfilling the pedagogical task of education: namely, to awaken students' desire to exist in a "grown-up" way and to be subjects. Grown-up means that the student learns to relate to different interests, perspectives, and desires, and can ask themself whether what they want from the other and the world is also desirable as such (Osberg & Biesta, 2021).

Therefore, teachers must act in a correct, sensitive, appropriate and desirable way in their relationship with students, individually and as a group (Laumans, 2015; van Manen, 2016; Veldman, 2010). This requires teachers to be able to be present in the moment (Roefs, 2021a, 2021b) and connected with their own individual affective evaluation of a value conflict (Raider-Roth & Holzer, 2009; Rodgers & Raider-Roth, 2006; van Manen, 2016), as well as being vulnerable (Jackson, 2018).

Vulnerability can be seen as being open to sharing one's own beliefs and feelings (Gilson, 2014). The teacher has an important role in encouraging students to be vulnerable in inter-affectivity, and can support them in this by being attentively involved (Bastiaansen, 2022; van Manen, 2016). In inter-affectivity students not only encounter themselves in their vulnerability and feeling, they also "encounter" the other with *their* own vulnerabilities and feelings (J. Martin, 2012). Bringing students into contact with their fellow students who have other experiences and feelings touches on an important goal of the pedagogical relationship, namely, the democratic idea that we try to live together as a group (Biesta, 2020).

This important goal of the pedagogical relationship can be realized by creating a third space in a classroom. A third space can help both teacher and students to be vulnerable as subjects in their intersubjective relationship (Askins, 2009). This third space belongs to neither one person nor the other; instead, it is a neutral space that people can shape together (Benjamin, 2004). The third space can be seen as an inter-affective learning environment. Such a learning environment is one in which teacher and students meet in a group with vulnerability and interpersonal relationships at the affective level.

In this inter-affective learning environment, students can expand their repertoire for coping with inner feelings concerning a value conflict through affective interaction, by exploring the interactive character of taking a stand and by developing affective language (Di Paolo et al., 2018). The vulnerability of both teacher and students (Friesen, 2017; Friesen & Osguthorpe, 2018) is necessary to encourage the group of students to engage with the value conflict through affective involvement and to share their inner feelings (interactive affective sharing; Di Paolo et al., 2018; De Jaeger, 2013). In an inter-affective learning environment, the relationship between teacher and student and fellow students is therefore affective and intersubjective in nature, with an emphasis on trust and dialogical reciprocity (Friesen, 2017; Friesen & Osguthorpe, 2018; van Manen, 2016).

4.2.3 Affective involvement in a value conflict

An inter-affective learning experience in the context of a value conflict includes affective involvement, individual affective evaluation and interactive affective sharing (De Jaeger, 2013). The degree to which one is affectively involved in a value conflict determines the degree to which one tries to justify one's own values (Katz, 1960, 1968; Katz & Stotland, 1959). A high degree of affective involvement indicates a strongly felt connection between the value conflict and one's most important personal values, while a low degree indicates a weakly felt connection (Anderson, 2012). The subjective experience of a value conflict is thus taken from this affective perspective: a person's internal self-perception of the value conflict at the affective level. In this study, we call this *individual affective experience*.

Whether one is aware of one's own inner feelings when faced with a value conflict is determined by whether one is affectively involved in the value conflict in the moment, from the first (I perspective) perceptual position (Andreas & Andreas, 2009). This is in contrast to someone who uses a cognitive perspective (inner distance) to look at the value conflict from the second (other person's perspective) or third (helicopter perspective) perceptual position (Andreas & Andreas, 2009). Someone who is affectively involved in a value conflict is thus present in the moment and sensing from the first perceptual position, with the intention to become aware of their own experience of inner feeling (Alsmith, 2012; Banick, 2019; Legrand, 2007).

4.2.4 Individual affective evaluation of a value conflict

When confronted with an unfamiliar value conflict, one is more likely to use one's own affect as a basis for responding, lacking enough knowledge to come up with a more considered response; personal involvement in this unfamiliar situation is minimal, and there is no ready-to-hand previous evaluation to call upon (Forgas, 2002). The situation at hand determines the affect that is evoked and evaluation of its consequences for oneself or others. This evoked affect then colors one's self-explanation of the value conflict. Individual affective evaluation of the value conflict therefore reflects one's affective experience as feeling pleasant or unpleasant (Charland, 2005; Colombetti, 2005). The dichotomy of pleasant (desired) versus unpleasant (not desired) often serves as a 2-dimensional measure of a person's inner affective state (also referred to as "inner sensation"). The pleasantness or unpleasantness of particular individual affective evaluations for a person depends on the person's values; thus, affect and values are interrelated (Charland, 2005; Colombetti, 2005).

4.2.5 Interactive affective sharing about a value conflict

In interactive affective sharing, one verbally shares one's individual affective evaluation with another person (Matthis, 2000). The person who receives is inwardly affected by what the other expresses. Interactive affective sharing has a mutual affective impact; the people involved are receptive to being inwardly affected and are mutually influenced by the sharing of each other's experiences of inner feeling (De Jaeger, 2013; Kärkkäinen, 2006; van Dijke et al., 2020;). From this feeling of being inwardly affected, a person gives personal meaning to what has been shared by another person. In this way, someone can expand their repertoire of inner affective experience and can develop personal affective language (Di Paolo et al., 2018).