

Empathy Detection from Text, Audiovisual, Audio or Physiological Signals: Task Formulations and Machine Learning Methods

Md Rakibul Hasan, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Md Zakir Hossain, *Member, IEEE*, Shreya Ghosh, Aneesh Krishna, and Tom Gedeon, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Empathy indicates an individual’s ability to understand others. Over the past few years, empathy has drawn attention from various disciplines, including but not limited to Affective Computing, Cognitive Science and Psychology. Detecting empathy has potential applications in society, healthcare and education. Despite being a broad and overlapping topic, the avenue of empathy detection leveraging Machine Learning remains underexplored from a systematic literature review perspective. We collected 828 papers from 10 well-known databases, systematically screened them and analysed the final 61 papers. Our analyses reveal several prominent task formulations – including empathy on localised utterances or overall expressions, unidirectional or parallel empathy, and emotional contagion – in monadic, dyadic and group interactions. Empathy detection methods are summarised based on four input modalities – text, audiovisual, audio and physiological signals – thereby presenting modality-specific network architecture design protocols. We discuss challenges, research gaps and potential applications in the Affective Computing-based *empathy* domain, which can facilitate new avenues of exploration. We further enlist the public availability of datasets and codes. We believe that our work is a stepping stone to developing a robust empathy detection system that can be deployed in practice to enhance the overall well-being of human life.

Index Terms—Empathy, Deep Learning, Detection, Machine Learning, Recognition, Systematic Review

arXiv:2311.00721v2 [cs.HC] 26 Jun 2024

1 INTRODUCTION

EMPATHY, the ability to understand others’ point of view, is essential for effective communication in all aspects of human life, including social dynamics [1], healthcare [2] and education [3]. Empathy towards other individuals is essential for the survival of our species and contributes significantly to enhancing the quality of life and the depth of social interactions [4], [5]. Research on empathy has been a major topic across various disciplines, including Social Science, Psychology, Neuroscience, Health and, most recently, Computer Science [6], [7]. Although contexts of empathy research vary across disciplines, all agree on its crucial role in human well-being [6]. In Computer Science, a major body of literature deals with operationalising empathy using Machine Learning (ML) tools.

ML is a subdomain of artificial intelligence, which involves the development of algorithms to enable systems to learn from data. ML algorithms can be further classified into (1) classical ML, such as Decision Tree (DT) and Support Vector Machine (SVM), and (2) Deep Learning (DL), such as Multi Layer Perceptron (MLP) and Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) approaches. With the emergence of ML methodologies, detecting emotional information has become a growing area of research in Affective Computing [8], [9]. Emotion and facial expression recognition technolo-




Fig. 1. Hierarchy of empathy detection task formulations and representative datasets.

gies have achieved maturity and widespread deployment, whereas empathy recognition lags in its development and practical implementation.

Several reviews and surveys are available on various Affective Computing domains, such as facial affect recognition [10], [11] and emotion recognition [12], [13]. There are a few review papers [7], [14]–[16] available on empathy recognition, but all of these are specialised to specific use cases,

- All authors are with the School of Electrical Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Curtin University, Perth WA 6102, Australia. E-mail: {Rakibul.Hasan, Zakir.Hossain1, Shreya.Ghosh, A.Krishna, Tom.Gedeon}@curtin.edu.au
- M. R. Hasan is also with BRAC University, Bangladesh.
- M. Z. Hossain is also with The Australian National University, Australia.
- T. Gedeon is also with the University of Óbuda, Hungary.




Fig. 2. Growth of ML-based empathy detection literature from 2013 to 2024 (June). There are 39 text-based, 14 audiovisual-based, 5 audio-based and 3 physiological signal-based studies.

such as artificial agents and social robots. Paiva *et al.* [7] and Yalcin and DiPaola [14] reviewed computational empathy in the context of artificial agents in 2017 and 2018, respectively. Park and Whang [15] systematically reviewed the empathy of various social robots in the human-robot interaction context in 2022. Published in the same year, Raamkumar and Yang [16] reviewed empathic conversational systems that primarily aim to *generate* empathic responses. Therefore, there has been a lack of comprehensive review on empathy, particularly in the context of *detecting* empathy using ML methods. A systematic literature review, in this case, facilitates systematically evaluating *all* published works against predefined criteria instead of cherry-picked papers. It offers valuable insights into emerging trends, generates new research ideas, identifies gaps and sheds light on the existing body of work. We, therefore, present a systematic review of ML-based empathy detection that covers any human interaction. Our method follows the PRISMA standard practice of systematic literature review [17]. We first devised search keywords and examined ten databases, including Scopus, Web of Science and IEEE Xplore. We screened the resulting 801 papers against five Exclusion Criteria (EC). Through rigorous title-and-abstract and full-text screenings, the final 61 papers are thoroughly reviewed in this paper.

We categorise our analysis of datasets based on various task formulations found in the literature and analyse ML methods across four input modalities: text, audiovisual, audio and physiological signals. As shown in Figure 2, the distribution of papers from 2013 to June 2024 reveals a predominant focus on text-based empathy detection ($n = 39$), followed by audiovisual ($n = 14$), audio ($n = 5$), and physiological signals ($n = 3$). Interestingly, no ML-based empathy detection works were reported in 2013 and 2014.

Our major contributions include:

- a. A systematic review of all ML-based empathy detection works published between 2013 and June 2024, with several key insights into:
 - i. Various task formulations for measuring empathy and corresponding datasets
 - ii. Detailed characteristics of datasets, including their

statistics and public availability

- iii. Overview of the studies, including ML models utilised and availability of the code
- iv. Identification of frequently used and high-performing ML methods applied to popular datasets
- v. Prospective applications of empathy detection systems
- vi. Potential applications of empathy detection systems in diverse domains
- vii. Discussion of challenges and opportunities inherent in different task formulations and ML-based empathy detection approaches

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 defines empathy and empathy detection based on seminal works in Psychology. Section 3 describes the paper search and screening process adopted in this systematic literature review. Section 4 introduces various task formulations with a comprehensive overview of representative datasets. Our dataset analysis includes their statistics, annotation protocol and public availability of the whole annotated dataset. Section 5 presents ML models specific to four input modalities – text sequences, audiovisual content, audio signals and physiological signals – where we discuss studies involving the datasets introduced in Section 4. In presenting empathy detection works, we report public availability of the software code, best-performing models and their performance. Both Section 4 and Section 5 end with a consolidating discussion on findings, challenges and opportunities. Finally, we exemplify some applications of empathy detection in Section 6 and conclude the paper in Section 7.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Empathy and Related Concepts

With broad usage across various disciplines, the definition of empathy varies. Cuff *et al.* [18] reviewed 43 discrete definitions of empathy and identified eight themes related to its nature. Themes include distinguishing empathy from similar concepts and determining whether it is cognitive or affective. The term ‘empathy’, as defined by Hoffman [19], is predominantly involuntary and vicarious reaction to emotional signals from another individual or their circumstances. In another work, Hoffman [4] defines empathy as ‘an affective response more appropriate to another’s situation than one’s own’. Empathy is a multifaceted concept that involves perceiving, understanding and sharing the emotional thoughts of others [20]. It can also be defined as a multidimensional concept, such as four-dimensional empathy (perspective taking, fantasy, empathic concern and personal distress) [21], and two-dimensional empathy (empathic concern and personal distress) [22].

Numerous endeavours have been made to disentangle empathy from other similar concepts [18]. Some scholars (e.g., [22], [23]) conceptualise empathy as a comprehensive category including emotional contagion, sympathy and compassion. Empathy is defined as comprehending another’s emotions through adopting their perspective; other related psychological states include *compassy* (feelings shared due to shared circumstances), *mimpathy* (copying another’s emotions without personally experiencing them),

sympathy (intentionally responding emotionally), transpathy (emotional contagion, where one becomes ‘infected’ by another’s emotions) and unipathy (an elevated form of emotional contagion) [24], [25]. Despite the inherent ambiguity in defining empathy, scholars such as Ickes [24] and Blair [26] advocated separating these terms. The two most related terms are empathy and sympathy, which can be described as ‘feeling *as*’ versus ‘feeling *for*’, respectively [27]. Neuroscientific evidence supports the distinction between empathy and sympathy as they have distinct neural processes [28].

Perhaps the two most common forms of empathy are cognitive empathy and emotional (also called affective) empathy [29]. Understanding someone’s thoughts and perspective is known as cognitive empathy, whereas vicarious sharing of emotion is known as emotional empathy [29]. Cognitive empathy is closely related to the theory of mind, that is, understanding another person’s mental state, such as wants, beliefs and intentions [26]. In other words, cognitive empathy is ‘I *understand* what you feel’, whereas emotional empathy is ‘I *feel* what you feel’ [30].

Empathy detection differs from emotion detection, although both involve analysing human responses. Emotion detection focuses on recognising an *individual’s* emotional state, such as happiness or sadness [31]. In contrast, empathy detection goes into a deeper analysis of the interactions between *multiple* individuals. It considers the initial emotion expressed by one person and the emotional response of the other whose empathy is being detected. For example, if someone expresses sadness, empathy detection would analyse how the listener emotionally supports the speaker in response [32].

2.2 Empathy Measurement

In Psychology, questionnaires are widely employed to measure self-reported empathy levels [21]. These instruments typically present participants with statements or scenarios, prompting them to indicate their level of agreement or emotional response. Examples of widely used empathy questionnaires include the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) [33], the Empathy Quotient [34], Batson’s Empathy Scale [22] and the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire [35].

Another method of operationalising empathy is empathic accuracy, which assesses how accurately an individual can infer another person’s thoughts and emotions. Experimentally, it is often determined by comparing one person’s reported thoughts and emotions with their partner’s in a dyadic interaction [36].

In Affective Computing, computational methods are developed to objectively measure empathy levels from verbal and non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice and body language. To achieve this, self-reported empathy levels through Psychology questionnaires often provide the necessary ground truths for utilising ML algorithms.

3 PAPER SELECTION

To ensure reproducibility, we adhere to the PRISMA standard guidelines [17] when screening relevant papers for this systematic review. Our paper selection strategy uses the following Exclusion Criteria (EC):

- EC1. Not a full-length research paper (e.g., conference abstracts and conference proceeding books)
- EC2. No use of artificial intelligence, machine learning or deep learning
- EC3. Not peer-reviewed
- EC4. Published before 2013
- EC5. Review, survey, meta-analysis, thesis or dissertation

Following the PRISMA standard, we report the paper search and screening results in the following subsections.

3.1 Paper Search

We formulate a search string using logical operators (AND and OR) among synonymous terms of empathy, detection and artificial intelligence: `empath* AND (detect* OR recog*) AND (“deep learning” OR “machine learning” OR “artificial intelligence” OR AI)`. The asterisk (*) is a wildcard character that facilitates the inclusion of any number of characters in place of the asterisk.

With the search string, we searched ten databases (see Table 1 for more details) on 24 February 2023. Among the search engines, ACL Anthology does not support logical search. We, therefore, built a program¹ to search in the ACL database using the available bibliography document. Several search engines, such as Scopus and Web of Science, support filtering based on publication year (EC4) and paper type (EC5), so we automatically filtered out the search results. Table 1 presents the number of search results, search condition (e.g., title, abstract, full-paper, etc.), automatic-filtering results and corresponding filtering criteria.

3.2 Paper Screening

Figure 3 illustrates step-by-step paper screening process. We found 801 papers initially. After removing duplicates and retracted papers, we screened the remaining ones by reading titles and abstracts in the Covidence systematic review management software [37]. In this stage, papers were excluded if and only if they fall under any of the EC. We screened the remaining 86 papers by reading their full texts against the EC.

We screened another 27 recent papers, which we received through notifications and reference checking. Several search engines, such as Scopus, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, ACM and Google Scholar, offer email notification-based services on a predefined search string. In the case of reference checking, we identified a few relevant papers by examining the reference lists of the papers we were reviewing. As the latest change, we added eight recent papers [38]–[45] on 06 June 2024, which makes a total of 61 relevant papers in this systematic review. We categorise the analysis of the selected papers based on task formulations and data modality: text, audiovisual, audio and physiological signals.

4 TASK FORMULATIONS IN DETECTING EMPATHY

Let X be the input content on which empathy y will be measured. The content can be multimodal, i.e., $X \in \{X^s, X^a, X^v\}$, where X^s , X^a , X^v refer to text sequences, audio and video messages, respectively. The empathy labels

1. <https://github.com/hasan-rakibul/boolean-search-bib-abstract>

TABLE 1
Initial Search Results with Details in All 10 Databases.

SL	Database	Search condition	Items	Auto-filtering criteria	Post-filter items
1	Scopus	Searched in title, abstract and keywords	233	EC4, EC5	198
2	Web of Science	Searched in title, abstract, keywords on all databases	227	EC4, EC5	183
3	ScienceDirect	Search engine did not support wildcard	27	EC4, EC5	16
4	IEEE Xplore	Searched in all metadata	93	EC4	84
5	ACM Guide to Computing Literature	Searched in abstracts	25	EC4	22
6	dblp	Combined dblp search; search string: empath (detect recog)	37	-	37
7	Google Scholar	Sorted by relevance	18,100	EC4, First 100	100
8	PubMed	Searched in all fields	55	EC4	51
9	ProQuest	Searched in abstracts	93	EC4	88
10	ACL Anthology	Searched in title and abstract	22	-	22




Fig. 3. Number of papers at different stages in the screening process.

y can be multiple levels of empathy as a classification problem or a degree of empathy as a regression problem. Further, the content X can consist of N segments X_i , where $i \in [1, N]$. Accordingly, measuring empathy on some segments of the content $X_i = [x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+m}]$, where $0 \leq m < N$, can be interpreted as *localised* measurement, whereas measuring empathy on the whole content X can be interpreted as *global* measurement.

A range of experimental setups have been proposed in the literature to define and structure the specific goals for detecting empathy. Firstly, in *Monadic Response*, the focus is on measuring empathy on self-contained, individual responses of a person. Secondly, in *Dyadic Interaction*, empathy is measured from the interactions between two individuals. Expanding beyond dyads, in *Group Interaction*, empathy is measured on multiple individuals engaging in communication and collaboration.

4.1 Monadic Response

Datasets and corresponding task formulations from monadic responses are illustrated in Table 2. The following subsections explain each of these task formulations and associated datasets.

4.1.1 Localised Measurement

In detecting empathy at a localised level of monadic responses, the *MedicalCare* dataset by Shi *et al.* [46] consists of 774 narrative essays of simulated patient-doctor interactions written by pre-med students. Sentences of the essays were labelled as either ‘empathic’ or ‘non-empathic’ by six trained undergraduate students, followed by two meta-annotators. Samples were considered ‘empathic’ if they displayed cognitive or affective empathy. As an extension of this task formulation, Dey and Girju [47] selected 440 essays from the pool of 774 *MedicalCare* essays and re-annotated them into four labels: cognitive empathy, affective empathy, prosocial behaviour and non-empathy, hereinafter referred to as the *MedicalCare v2* dataset. Dey and Girju [47]’s task formulation, therefore, aims to measure different types of empathy rather than different levels of generalised empathy like Shi *et al.* [46]. As a further extension of the *MedicalCare v2* dataset, Dey and Girju [44] formulated an empathy versus non-empathy classification problem by collapsing cognitive, affective and prosocial labels into a single ‘empathic’ class, hereinafter referred to as the *MedicalCare v3* dataset. In this updated dataset, the authors also identified four themes that a healthcare provider might express during the interactions: (1) empathic language, (2) medical procedural information, (3) both empathy and information and (4) neither empathy nor information. Such a thematic approach can help healthcare providers communicate effectively, given that they need to empathise as well as deliver procedural information.

Another dataset modelling localised measurement is the *LeadEmpathy* dataset, consisting of email messages from participants acting as leaders in a business organisation [38]. First, each participant wrote an email to their subordinate regarding a severe hypothetical concern that resulted in losing a customer. In the second phase of the experiment, the participants were asked to rewrite their emails to increase empathy. Both emails were considered for empathy detection, and exploratory data analysis supports increased empathy in the second email. The annotation protocol considers empathy success and failure in both cognitive and affective empathy. Segments of emails are annotated into discreet empathy scores ranging from -4 to $+7$, which facilitates modelling it either as a classification task or a regression task. In addition, scores of 1 and below can be mapped to ‘low’ empathy and scores of 2 and higher to ‘high’ empathy in a binary classification setup [38].

TABLE 2
Task Formulations and Corresponding Datasets for Empathy Detection from Monadic Responses.

SL	Name	Data	Statistics	Output label ^a	Annotation	Public
Localised Measurement						
1	MedicalCare [46]	Essays on simulated patient-doctor interaction	774 essays	{0, 1}	Third party	×
2	MedicalCare v2 [47]	Re-annotation of a subset of MedicalCare dataset	440 essays	{Cognitive, Affective, Prosocial, None}	Third party	×
3	MedicalCare v3 [44]	Re-annotation of MedicalCare v2 dataset	440 essays	{0, 1}	Third party	×
4	LeadEmpathy [38]	Leaders’ email to their subordinates	770 emails, 385 participants	{−4, −3, . . . , 6, 7}	Third party	✓
Global Measurement						
5	NewsEssay [48]	Written essays in response to news articles	403 participants, 1,860 essays, 418 articles	[1.0, 7.0], {0, 1}	Self	✓
6	NewsEssay v2 [49]	Extension of the NewsEssay dataset	564 participants, 2,655 essays, 418 articles	[1.0, 7.0]	Self	✓
7	NewsEssay v3 [50]	New essays based on a subset of articles of NewsEssay dataset	140 participants, 1,100 essays, 100 news articles	[1.0, 7.0]	Self	✓
8	FacebookReview [51]	Comments from Facebook pages	900 reviews, 48 hospitals	{0, 1}	Third party	×
9	fMRI [52]	Resting-state fMRI data from cocaine-dependent subjects	24 subjects	\mathbb{R}	Self	✓

^a Output labels in $[x, y]$ refer to continuous values between x and y

^a Output label {0, 1} refers to binary labelling to represent {No Empathy, Empathy}

^a \mathbb{R} – real number, unspecified in the paper

4.1.2 Global Measurement

In predicting empathy on the whole content level, the `NewsEssay` dataset consists of essays written by Amazon Mechanical Turk participants about news articles involving harm to individuals, groups or nature. In addition to the essays, the dataset consists of participants’ demographic information, such as age, gender, income and education level. This dataset has gone through a series of enhancements, serving empathy detection challenges in a conference workshop named Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis (WASSA)². The WASSA 2021 and 2022 challenges use the same `NewsEssay v2` dataset [49], whereas WASSA 2023 challenge release the updated `NewsEssay v3` dataset [50], both of which extend from the inaugural `NewsEssay` dataset [48] by involving new participants in the data collection experiment. Empathy labels in these datasets came from the essay writers themselves as they filled in Batson’s empathy and distress scale [22]. This scale includes questions related to six empathy-related emotions (sympathetic, compassionate, tender, etc.) and eight personal distress-related emotions (alarmed, upset, worried, etc.). The responses were collected on a 7-point Likert scale, where a value of one and seven means the participant is not feeling the emotion at all and extremely feeling the emotion, respectively. After averaging the scores across questions, this dataset’s ground truth degree of empathy ranges from 1 to 7 for each written essay.

2. <https://workshop-wassa.github.io/>

People often leave reviews on products or services through online forums, including for hospitals. A. Rahim *et al.* [51] collected people’s reviews on the official Facebook pages of 48 public hospitals. Two hospital quality managers labelled the reviews of this `FacebookReview` dataset into ‘yes’ or ‘no’ empathy. This task formulation aimed to analyse the service quality of the hospitals in addition to other characteristics such as assurance, responsiveness and reliability.

Apart from individuals’ expressed contents like written essays, empathy can be measured from physiological signals since these indicate individuals’ internal emotional states [53]. The `fMRI` dataset [52] consists of resting-state functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) data from 24 cocaine-addicted subjects. The subjects filled in the well-known IRI questionnaire [21], [33], which provides continuous empathy scores for empathy assessment.

4.2 Dyadic Interaction

Table 3 presents datasets featuring empathy detection task formulations from dyadic interactions grouped into subcategories. Each of these task formulations is discussed in the following subsections.

4.2.1 Localised Unidirectional Empathy

In most dyadic interactions, one person empathises with another (unidirectional empathy), such as a therapist empathising with a client. Such interactions happen in various situations, as explained in the following subsections.

TABLE 3
Task Formulations and Corresponding Datasets for Empathy Detection from Dyadic Interactions.

SL	Name	Data	Statistics	Output label ^a	Annotation	Public
Localised Unidirectional Empathy						
1	iEmpathize [32]	Discussions from online cancer survivors network	5,007 sentences	{Seeking, Providing, None}	Third party	✓
2	LungBreastCSN [54]	Discussions from online cancer survivor’s network (lung and breast)	2,107 messages	{0, 1}	Third party	×
3	RolePlayMI ^c [55], [56]	Counselling conversations from online video sharing platforms	253 conversations	{0, 1}	Third party	✓
4	PEC ^c [55], [57]	General conversations from Reddit	355K conversations	{0, 1}	Third party	✓
5	EmpathicDialogues [55], [58]	Dyadic conversations regarding any personal situation	810 participants and 24,850 conversations	{0, 1}	Third party	✓
6	MultimodalMI [40], [41]	Real-world motivational interviewing psychotherapy sessions	301 patients, 16 therapists and 301 sessions (each 50–60 minutes)	[0, 1], {High, Low}	Third party	×
7	MEDIC [42]	Psychological counselling	771 video clips (total 11 hours)	{None, Weak, Strong} Expression	Third party	✓
8	DAIC-WOZ [59], [60]	Semi-structured interviews with virtual agent	186 participants and 2,185 conversations	{Negative, Positive, None}	Third party	×
Localised Parallel Empathy						
9	NewsConv [50]	Conversation about news articles	140 participants and 12,601 speech-turns	[0.0, 5.0]	Third party	✓
Global Unidirectional Empathy						
10	Brand-Customer [61]	Customer queries and brand response from Twitter	108 brands, 667,738 customers, and 2,013,577 tweets	{None, Weak, Strong}	Third party	×
11	TwittEmp [62]	Cancer and 200 high-rating empathy words-related tweets	3,000 tweets	{Seeking, Providing, None}	Third party	✓
12	EPITOME [63]	Responses towards help-seeking posts in TalkLife and Reddit	8 million posts and 26 million interactions	{None, Weak, Strong}	Third party	✓
13	EPITOME v2 [64]	EPITOME, relabelled into two classes	8 million posts and 17 million interactions	{Positive, Negative}	Third party	✓
14	AcnEmpathize [43]	Posts, quotes and replies from an online acne support forum	12,212 samples	{0, 1}	Third party	✓
15	MI [65]	Motivational interviews between therapists and patients of drug or alcohol use	176 therapists and 348 sessions	{High, Low}, [1.0, 7.0]	Third party	×
16	MI v2 [66]	Same as the MI dataset	348 sessions	{High, Low}	–	×
17	CTT [67], [68]	Motivational interviewing sessions of drug and alcohol counselling	200 sessions	[1, 7], {High, Low}	Third party	×
18	COPE [69], [70]	Conversations between cancer patient and healthcare provider(s)	425 sessions	{0, 1}	Third party	×
19	EmpathicDialogues v2 [71]	Samples from a dialogue generation dataset [58], re-annotated into five labels	400 conversations	{Not Empathic, A Little, Somewhat Empathic, Empathic, Very Much}	Third party	✓
20	CallCentre [72]	Human-human conversation in call centre	905 conversations	{0, 1}	Third party	×
21	Human-Robot [73]	Human participants listen to six scripted stories from a robot	46 participants and 6.9 hours audiovisual data	{Empathy, Less Empathy}	Self	✓
22	Human-Avatar [74]	Interaction between avatar and normotypical, Down syndrome and intellectual disability people	50 participants and 24,000 interactions	{0, 1}	Other ^c	×
23	Human-VirtualAgent [75]	Human participants watched a sad virtual character in virtual reality	28 participants and 56 surveys	[0, 20]	Self	×

^a Output labels in $[x, y]$ refer to continuous values between x and y

^a Output label $\{0, 1\}$ refers to binary labelling to represent $\{\text{No Empathy, Empathy}\}$

^c Normotypical users’ data are annotated as empathic; Down syndrome and intellectual disability users’ data as non-empathic)

4.2.1.1 **Social Media:** In empathising by one person towards another, several studies leverage dyadic interaction from online forums. For example, the `iEmpathize` dataset [32] consists of discussion threads from a website named Cancer Survivors Network³. Collected from the same website, the `LungBreastCSN` dataset [54] includes only lung and breast cancer data. The `iEmpathize` dataset aims to detect empathy direction: seeking, providing or none. In contrast, the `LungBreastCSN` dataset is annotated into two categories: empathic and non-empathic sentences.

The `RolePlayMI` dataset [55] consists of counselling conversations from video-sharing platforms, such as YouTube and Vimeo, which were originally collected in a separate study on counselling quality analysis [56]. Wu *et al.* [55] later annotated this dataset into utterance-level empathic and non-empathic categories.

Being a versatile platform, Reddit is often popular for accessing data across different topics of interest. The `PEC` dataset [55], [57] consists of general conversations from three subreddits (forums dedicated to specific topics in Reddit), which are labelled heuristically. Utterances from the ‘Happy’ and ‘OffMyChest’ subreddits and the `EmpathicDialogues` corpus (dyadic conversations regarding any personal situation) [58] are considered empathic labels, whereas samples from the ‘CasualConversation’ subreddit are considered non-empathic labels.

4.2.1.2 **Patient-Doctor Interaction:** The `MultimodalMI` dataset [40], [41] consists of two real-world motivational interviewing sessions: (Dataset 1) students assigned to MI sessions due to alcohol-related matters, and (Dataset 2) volunteering heavy drinkers aged 17–20 years. The therapists’ empathy (through a sequence of texts) is annotated primarily through a Likert scale, which is also converted to binary labels (low vs high empathy). This dataset, therefore, allows empathy detection as either a classification problem [41] or as a regression problem [40]. Annotation protocols utilise Motivational Interviewing Skill Code (MISC) 2.5 guidelines [76] for Dataset 1 and Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity (MITI) 3.1 code [77] for Dataset 2. The dataset consists of speech transcripts and audio, enabling it to model a multimodal empathy detection problem.

Another multimodal dataset is the `MEDIC` dataset [42], which consists of video, audio and text sequences of counselling case videos. It evaluates counsellors’ empathy through three mechanisms: expression of experience, emotional reaction and cognitive reaction. The ‘expression of experience’ mechanism aims to measure a client’s expression to trigger empathy from a counsellor. In contrast, the ‘emotional reaction’ and ‘cognitive reaction’ mechanisms aim to measure the empathy of counsellors. Five trained students annotated the speech turns into none, weak, and strong expressions for each mechanism.

4.2.1.3 **Interaction with Non-Human Entity:** The `DAIC-WOZ` dataset comprises semi-structured interviews between human participants and a virtual agent, which aims to measure the empathy of the virtual agent towards the human participants. The conversations are segmented into small time windows and annotated by third-party annota-

tors into three classes: negative empathy, positive empathy and no empathy [59], [60]. Responses such as ‘That sounds really hard’ are considered ‘negative empathy’, whereas no responses, expressed fillers or responses without sentiment are considered ‘no empathy’.

4.2.2 Localised Parallel Empathy

In one study covering localised empathy measurements, both persons provide empathy to someone else (parallel empathy), such as two persons conversing and empathising with some disadvantaged people. This `NewsConv` dataset [50] consists of dyadic conversations regarding newspaper articles featuring harm to individual, entity or nature. Speech turns of the conversations are annotated by independent annotators on a scale of 0 to 5. It is worthwhile to note that the same news articles were used in the `NewsEssay v3` dataset, which aims to measure the empathy of individual study participants towards others through written essays. In contrast, the `NewsConv` dataset aims to measure the empathy of two persons in the conversations.

4.2.3 Global Unidirectional Empathy

Unlike localised empathy measurements, all reported studies in the global empathy measurement in dyadic interaction assess unidirectional empathy, i.e., one person empathises with the other through interaction.

4.2.3.1 **Social Media:** Several studies assess empathy globally from social media data – primarily Twitter, Reddit and Facebook – which are annotated by trained annotators. For example, the `Brand-Customer` dataset [61] consists of Twitter threads about customer service-related queries and corresponding brand responses. The authors [61] annotated the engagement between brands and customers into three categories – none, weak and strong empathy (of brand agents) – in their primary goal of engagement estimation.

The `TwittEmp` dataset [62] consists of cancer-related tweets labelled into three categories: seeking, providing and no empathy. In a binary classification setting, the ‘seeking’ and ‘providing’ samples are considered positive, and the no empathy samples are considered negative.

Apart from these, various online forums facilitate consultations and mental health support. Sharma *et al.* [63] proposed a widely-recognised empathy detection framework, named `EPITOME`, which consists of three communication mechanisms: emotional reactions, interpretations and explorations. Mental health-related help-seeking posts were collected from Reddit and TalkLife (a dedicated mental health support network) and annotated into three categories – none, weak and strong – for each of the three mechanisms. `EPITOME` was relabelled by Hosseini and Caragea [64] into two classes: weak and strong communication as the positive samples, and no communication as the negative samples, hereinafter referred to as the `EPITOME v2` dataset.

The `AcnEmpathize` dataset consists of discussions from an online acne-related forum⁴. Adopting the annotation principle of `EPITOME` [63], three annotators labelled each of the discussion components (posts, replies and quotes) as either ‘empathic’ or ‘not empathic’. A discussion component

3. <https://csn.cancer.org/>

4. <https://www.acne.org/>

is labelled as empathic if any part exhibits any of the three communication mechanisms (emotional reactions, interpretations and explorations) of the EPITOME framework.

4.2.3.2 Patient-Doctor Interaction: Global measurement has been formulated in several datasets of counselling sessions between therapists and patients. For example, the motivational interviewing dataset, named MI [65], comprises interview sessions from clinical interviews with patients of drug or alcohol use from six clinical studies. Another similar dataset (MI v2) [66] also evaluates session-level empathy in motivational interviewing. The CTT dataset [67], [68] includes 200 sessions between therapists and patients of drug and alcohol abuse. The annotation includes a continuous degree of empathy between 1 and 7 to model a regression problem and a low or high empathy level to model a classification problem.

The COPE dataset [69], [70] consists of 425 oncology encounters between cancer patients and healthcare providers. The task of this dataset is to detect empathic interactions and filter out non-empathic ones. Two trained annotators labelled this dataset into binary labels, where empathic interaction refers to when a patient expressed negative emotions and the oncologists responded empathically.

4.2.3.3 General Conversation: Apart from peer support communities and patient-doctor interactions, empathy is measured in general conversations. The EmpathicDialogues dataset – consisting of conversations regarding any personal situation and used in localised empathy prediction [55], [58] – was relabelled into five categories (not empathic, a little, somewhat, empathic, very much empathic) [71]. We refer to this data with the new labelling scheme as EmpathicDialogues v2 dataset.

Empathy strengthens the quality of support from call centres. For this reason, the CallCentre dataset [72] was collected, which consists of 905 human-to-human call-centre conversations. A conversation session is labelled either empathic if the session contains at least one empathic segment or non-empathic otherwise.

4.2.3.4 Interaction with Non-Human Entity: Several global empathy detection datasets include interactions between humans and non-human entities, such as avatars and robots. The Human-Robot data collection includes a robot telling scripted stories to human participants [73]. Stories were told in either first-person or third-person point-of-view. To measure the participants' empathy towards the robot or story content, the participants answered a custom questionnaire of eight questions on a 5-point Likert scale. Thresholding based on the median statistic binarised the empathy scores into empathic and less-empathic labels.

The Human-Avatar dataset aims to assess the empathy of human participants interacting with an avatar expressing six types of emotion [74]. Rather than self-reported annotation or third-party annotation, each interaction is labelled as empathic for normotypical participants and non-empathic for participants having social communication disorders such as Down syndrome and intellectual disability. Such a labelling approach was formulated to diagnose social communication disorders through empathy assessment.

In the Human-VirtualAgent dataset [75], human participants watched a virtual character expressing sadness in a virtual reality environment. Participants fill in the Toronto

empathy questionnaire [35] and another post-experiment questionnaire to reflect how much empathy they feel towards the agents. The questionnaire responses are leveraged as self-assessed ground truth empathy scores on a scale of 0 to 20.

4.2.4 Localised Emotional Contagion

Emotional contagion – the process by which one person's emotions and behaviours trigger similar emotions and behaviours in others – is an element of empathy [22], [23]. Some studies exclusively aim to measure emotional contagion, and, as such, they are discussed in this separate category of task formulation.

One dataset, named OMG-Empathy, is formulated to measure localised levels of emotional contagion [78]. This dataset consists of audiovisual conversations with semi-scripted stories in a speaker-listener setup. Following the conversations, the listeners answered how the story impacted their emotional state in terms of valence score on a scale from -1 to $+1$. Using the OMG-Empathy dataset, an empathy detection challenge⁵ was organised as part of the IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition in 2019. This dataset offers two detection protocols: personalised protocol, which detects the valence score of each listener across all conversations, and generalised protocol, which detects the valence score towards each story by all listeners.

4.2.5 Global Emotional Contagion

Three datasets aim to measure emotional contagion at the global level. These datasets are collected through passive dyadic interaction, where the subjects often look at some stimuli, for example, still images, video or text sequences (Table 4).

Some studies use the subject's physiological signals during a passive interaction. For example, the EEG dataset [79] contains Electroencephalogram (EEG) signals from 52 participants watching an emotional video (a young girl being abused as a domestic enslaved person) in virtual reality. The EEG signals were collected from the frontal, central and occipital regions of the brain before, during and after watching the video. Before the experiment, the participants filled in the Toronto empathy questionnaire [35], which was utilised as self-annotation. Although the range of annotation could be 0 to 96 according to the questionnaire, the participant's responses varied from 49 to 86. Using a median split, annotation into high and low empathy groups is also available in this dataset. Both regression and classification tasks in this dataset offer empathy detection at all three times when the EEG was collected: before, during and after.

The PainEmp dataset [80] comprises Electrocardiogram (ECG) and skin conductance data from 36 participants with different levels of autistic traits. After viewing pictures of individuals with different pain levels, the participants filled in a questionnaire regarding cognitive and affective empathy. Although it may sound a little frightening, the painful pictures (24 in total) were, in fact, collected from eight individuals going through different levels of electrical

5. https://www2.informatik.uni-hamburg.de/wtm/omgchallenges/omg_empathy_description_19.html

TABLE 4
Task Formulations and Corresponding Datasets for Emotional Contagion and Empathy from Group Interactions.

SL	Name	Data	Statistics	Output label ^a	Annotation	Public
Emotional Contagion						
1	OMG-Empathy [78]	Speaker-listener conversations based on eight semi-scripted stories	4 speakers, 10 listeners and 80 audiovisual data (total 480 minutes)	$[-1, +1]$	Self	✓
2	EEG [79]	Participants' EEG while watching an emotional video in virtual reality	52 participants and 52 EEG samples	$[0, 96]$, {High, Low}	Self	×
3	PainEmp [80]	Participants viewing pictures of individuals with pain or no pain	36 participants, 36 ECG and skin conductance data	{High, Low}	Self	×
4	PathogenicEmp [81]	Facebook posts and responses to a questionnaire	2,405 participants and 1,835,884 posts	\mathbb{R}	Self	×
Group Interaction						
5	Teacher-Student [82]	Class lecture from one teacher to 5-10 students	10 teachers, 63 lectures, 338 audiovisual data	$[0.0, 10.0]$, {Excellent, Good}	Third party	×

^a Output labels in $[x, y]$ refer to continuous values between x and y

^a \mathbb{R} – real number, unspecified in the paper

stimulation on the back of their hands. This dataset's task is to classify cognitive and affective empathy into high or low levels.

Finally, the `PathogenicEmp` dataset aims to measure emotional contagion from Facebook posts. Abdul-Mageed *et al.* [81] define pathogenic empathy as the automatic contagion of negative emotions from others, which may lead to stress and burnout. The authors argued that this negative side of empathy is risky for the health and well-being of empathic people. The participants answered a questionnaire, which was made of eight questions on a Likert scale, with 'not at all like me' on one end and 'very much like me' on the other end of the scale. The average of the responses is considered the ground truth pathogenic empathy score.

4.3 Group Interaction

As reported in Table 4, there is only one dataset where empathy is measured from more than two persons as a group. This dataset, hereinafter referred to as the `Teacher-Student` dataset, consists of 63 online audiovisual lectures in a one-to-many teaching setup [82]. Expert annotators label each lecture session on a scale of 0 to 10 (regression task), which are then thresholded to binarise into 'Excellent' and 'Good' categories (classification task). The broader aim of Pan *et al.* [82]'s work is to evaluate teaching quality through five characteristics of a good lecture: empathy, clarity, interaction, technical management and time management.

4.4 Discussion: Findings, Challenges and Research Gaps

The variety of task formulations and trends across all datasets results in several key findings and opportunities, which are discussed in the following subsections.

4.4.1 Prospective Task Formulations

Although unidirectional empathy is well studied in localised and global-level measurements (Figure 1), there is a notable gap in exploring parallel empathy. Only one study

has focused on parallel empathy in localised measurement. Future research should, therefore, investigate parallel empathy, where multiple individuals empathise with a common target, especially in global-level measurements. Such studies should include as controls pairs of individuals performing the same task without interaction, to be able to determine whether parallel empathy is a useful and meaningful concept.

Beyond parallel empathy, a new task formulation featuring bidirectional empathy – individuals empathising with each other – could be researched. This approach has not been explored and thus presents an opportunity for advancing empathy detection research.

Studies are scarce in group interactions, with only one study addressing the global measurement of unidirectional empathy. Future research should, therefore, expand on group settings, exploring both parallel and bidirectional empathy with localised measurements. Investigating these new task formulations could significantly enrich our understanding of the evolution and change in empathy during complex social interactions.

4.4.2 Empathy from Observer's Physiological Signals

Physiological signals contain essential affective cues in detecting internal states of people, which are often difficult to detect in other ways, such as classifying posed smiles [83] and pretended anger [84] from their real counterparts. Hossain *et al.* [83]'s observer-based smile veracity detection shows that it is possible to objectively measure subjective reactions. Considering the subjective nature of empathy, accurately assessing someone's *actual* (ground truth) empathy level can be challenging, making physiological signals potentially valuable.

Out of all the task formulations we review in this paper, three studies measured empathy from the subject's physiological signals, including ECG, EEG, fMRI and skin conductance. Firstly, other types of physiological signals that showed effectiveness in Affective Computing, such as pupillary response [84] and blood volume pulse [83] may be experimented with for empathy detection. Secondly, instead

of physiological signals from one person, we could leverage signals from all parties involved, for example, both people in a dyadic interaction. Thirdly, detecting empathy from an observer’s physiological signal could be an interesting avenue of exploration. This way, physiological signals can be collected from an observer observing the interaction on which we want to measure empathy. Then, we could investigate if the signals correlate with participants’ empathy.

4.4.3 Annotation Protocol

Supervised ML requires labelled data, and empathy detection datasets are annotated primarily in two ways: self-annotation and third-party annotation. Self-rated annotation is a popular way to get labelled data in Affective Computing [85], which in the empathy detection context refers to study participants filling in empathy-related questionnaires such as the IRI [21], [33] and the Toronto [35] questionnaires. In contrast, third-party annotation refers to annotations by third-party trained annotators instead of the study participants from whom the data is collected.

The use of self-annotation versus third-party annotators remains debatable in the literature. Of all the datasets we examine in this paper, 10 used self-annotation, and 25 used third-party annotation. Buechel *et al.* [48] argued that self-annotation provides a more appropriate measure of empathy than third-party annotators. Shi *et al.* [46] used `MedicalCare` dataset, annotated by trained third-party annotators, and `NewsEssay` dataset, annotated by study participants themselves. One interesting conclusion of their study is that third-party annotation could be more robust than self-rated annotation [46]. Using ensemble methods to combine the results of multiple third-party annotators is likely to be the most robust, which should be investigated thoroughly.

The `NewsEssay v3` and `NewsConv` datasets use the same participants but differ in annotation protocols, with self-assessment for essays and third-party annotation for conversations, respectively. As shown in Table 5, researchers have achieved higher empathy detection performance in the `NewsConv` dataset than in the `NewsEssay v3` dataset, potentially suggesting that third-party annotation provides greater consistency.

Judgement varies across individuals; for example, a certain empathic interaction can be felt as ‘high’ by someone, whereas the same can be felt as ‘medium’ by someone else. In this case, employing multiple third-party annotators to label many of the samples separately and subsequently testing their inter-rater reliability to reach a consensus for confounding samples should be preferred. However, third-party annotators’ conscious labelling of *subjective* reactions is worse than their non-conscious judgement [83]. Therefore, it can be argued that a third-party annotator may be unable to accurately assess the perceived empathy of the subject because empathy is subjective. To come to a conclusion, both self-annotation and third-party annotation while fixing the other aspects (such as dataset and model) would be a prospective research domain to understand more about annotation and simultaneously find an appropriate annotation scheme.

4.4.4 Public Availability of Datasets

Among the 37 empathy detection datasets reviewed, 18 are publicly available. This accessibility facilitates reproducibility, comparative studies and benchmarking research. The lack of availability for the remaining 19 datasets potentially hinders progress and replication efforts.

The challenges associated with making data public include privacy and ethical considerations. Ensuring the anonymisation of sensitive information and obtaining proper consent from participants are crucial steps, supposedly for which patient data such as `MI`, `CTT`, and `COPE` are unavailable. Additionally, there may be legal and institutional restrictions that prevent the sharing of certain datasets. Addressing these challenges is essential during the early stage of planning to ensure data availability. We urge the authors of the 19 non-public datasets to take active steps towards making them public.

5 MODALITY-SPECIFIC EMPATHY DETECTION METHODS

Design protocols for empathy detection methods, including the choice of preprocessing techniques and specific ML models, are primarily influenced by the input data modality. This section outlines the methods based on four input modalities observed across different task formulations: text sequences, audiovisual contents, audio signals and physiological signals.

5.1 Text Sequence

In Natural Language Processing (NLP) research, empathy is detected from various textual content, such as essays, conversations and social media discussions. Such text-based datasets are predominantly employed with transformer-based DL algorithms and, to a lesser extent, with classical ML algorithms. Figure 4 illustrates the usage of algorithms in text-based empathy detection studies. With the recent successes of fine-tuning pre-trained language models in a variety of NLP tasks [86], it comes as no surprise that pre-trained language models dominate the landscape of text-based empathy detection studies. Among different variants of pre-trained language models, the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT)-based Robustly Optimised BERT Pretraining Approach (RoBERTa) is mostly used, followed by the BERT base model itself.

Both a continuous degree of empathy (regression) and a distinct level of empathy (classification) detection tasks are described in the literature, which are discussed in the following subsections.

5.1.1 Regression Task (Degree of Empathy)

Table 5 summarises all regression tasks using textual data, highlighting the best-performing models across commonly used datasets. Most works used `NewsEssay` and its variants to detect empathy as a continuous value. The average performance in detecting empathy in essays from the `v3` dataset is relatively lower than that observed in the `v1` and `v2` datasets, which may be attributed to the smaller size of the `v3` dataset.




Fig. 4. Usage of ML algorithms in text-based empathy detection studies, demonstrating a substantial use of transformer-based architectures.

Interestingly, only 2 out of 22 studies on *NewsEssay* datasets do not leverage any pre-trained language models. For example, Buechel *et al.* [48] leveraged fastText [104] for text embeddings, followed by a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) regression model, achieving a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.404 in the *NewsEssay* dataset. Vettigli and Sorgente [88] employed Linear Regression (LR) classical ML method on the v2 dataset and reported a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.516. This performance is competitive with studies utilising transformer-based language models such as BERT and RoBERTa, where the Pearson correlation coefficient ranges from 0.470 to 0.558 [90], [91]. This exceptional performance using classical ML can be attributed to incorporating handcrafted features, such as lexicon-based, n-gram and demographic-based features [88]. Handcrafted features combined with additional raw data should be experimented with transformer architectures, as this might yield even better performance.

Instead of traditional ML and DL models, Hasan *et al.* [39] introduces a novel system called Large Language Model (LLM)-Guided Empathy (LLM-GEM) that leverages GPT-3.5 LLM for three distinct purposes: converting numerical demographic numbers into semantically meaningful text, augmenting text sequences and rectifying label noises. Experiments on *NewsEssay* v1, v2 and v3 datasets demonstrate that LLM-GEM achieves state-of-the-art performance on the v1 and v3 datasets using a RoBERTa-based pre-trained language model as the prediction model. On the v2 dataset where LLM-GEM underperformed, Mundra *et al.* [90] reported the best result (Pearson correlation coefficient: 0.558) using an ensemble of ELECTRA and RoBERTa models. Such a higher performance can be attributed to the ensemble of two language models (ELECTRA and RoBERTa).

Performance on the *NewsConv* dataset is higher than

TABLE 5
Summary of Empathy Detection Studies Modelled as a *Regression* Task (Degree of Empathy) from Text Sequences.

Dataset	Study	Best Model	Performance ^b	Code Avail. ^a
<i>NewsEssay</i>	[48]	fastText-CNN	PCC: 0.404	✓
	[39]	LLM-RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.924	✓
<i>NewsEssay</i> v2	[87]	BERT-MLP	PCC: 0.473	✓
	[88]	LR	PCC: 0.516	✓
	[89]	RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.517	✓
	[90]	ELECTRA + RoBERTa	PCC: 0.558	✓
	[91]	RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.470	U
	[92]	BERT-MLP	PCC: 0.479	×
	[93]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.504	U
	[94]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.524	✓
	[95]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.537	×
	[96]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.541	×
	[39]	LLM-RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.505	✓
<i>NewsEssay</i> v3	[97]	BERT	PCC: 0.187	✓
	[98]	RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.270	×
	[99]	RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.329	×
	[100]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.331	×
	[101]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.348	✓
	[102]	RoBERTa-SVM	PCC: 0.358	×
	[103]	{RoBERTa, EmoBERTa}-MLP	PCC: 0.415	×
	[50]	RoBERTa	PCC: 0.536	×
	[39]	LLM-RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.563	✓
	<i>NewsConv</i>	[97]	BERT	PCC: 0.573
[101]		RoBERTa	PCC: 0.652	✓
[50]		RoBERTa	PCC: 0.660	×
[98]		RoBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.665	×
[103]		{RoBERTa, EmoBERTa}-MLP	PCC: 0.669	×
[100]		DeBERTa	PCC: 0.674	×
[99]	DeBERTa-MLP	PCC: 0.708	×	
MI	[65]	LR	SCC: 0.611	×
PathogenicEmp	[81]	RR	PCC: 0.252	×
LeadEmpathy	[38]	BERT	PCC: 0.816	✓

Note: Studies using common datasets are sorted year-wise chronologically, followed by performance, where best results and methods are **bolded**.

^a U – Unofficially available on the Internet but not provided with the paper

^b PCC – Pearson correlation coefficient

^b SCC – Spearman’s correlation coefficient

NewsEssay datasets, with 0.708 as the highest Pearson correlation coefficient using a Decoding-Enhanced BERT with Disentangled Attention (DeBERTa) model [99]. Plausible reasons could be the annotation protocols (as discussed earlier, *NewsConv* uses third-party annotation, which is likely to be more consistent and reduce the noise in the labels) and the size of the datasets (12,601 samples in the *NewsConv* dataset compared to 1,100–2,655 samples in the *NewsEssay* datasets).

Other continuous degrees of empathy detection works include therapists’ empathy detection on MI dataset [65] and pathogenic empathy detection on social media [81]. Both of them leveraged classical ML methods: LR and Ridge Regression (RR). Classical MLs require fewer computational resources but often underperform transformer-based DL algorithms, and as such, future research may explore recent algorithms, such as transformers, with these datasets.

5.1.2 Classification Task (Level of Empathy)

In the case of modelling empathy as a classification task, a diverse array of datasets and algorithms is used, as summarised in Table 6. Only two datasets – EPITOME and iEmpathize – are used in multiple studies to allow comparative analysis.

TABLE 6
Summary of Empathy Detection Studies Modelled as a *Classification* Task (Level of Empathy) from Text Data.

Dataset	Study	Best Model	Performance ^a	Code Avail.
EPITOME	[63]	RoBERTa	Acc ∈ [79.4%, 92.6%], F1 ∈ [62.6%, 74.5%]	✓
	[45]	Sentence-BERT, EBM	Acc ∈ [88.3%, 95.3%] , F1 ∈ [59.5%, 62.7%]	✓
iEmpathize	[32]	BERT	F1 ∈ [78.9%, 85.8%]	×
	[105]	RoBERTa	Acc: 81.1%	×
MedicalCare + NewsEssay	[46]	SVM	Acc: 89.4%, F1: 78.4%	×
MedicalCare v2	[47]	BERT	F1 ∈ [75%, 85%]	×
MedicalCare v3	[44]	BERT	F1 ∈ [66%, 75%]	×
AcnEmpathize	[43]	DistilBERT, RoBERTa	Acc 89.3%, F1 ∈ [77.4%, 93.1%]	×
LeadEmpathy	[38]	SVM (Binary), BERT (Multi)	F1: 81.7% (Binary), 49.9% (Multi)	×
MI	[65]	NB	Unweighted average recall: 75.3%	×
MI v2	[66]	MLP-LSTM	Unweighted average recall: 79.6%	×
LungBreastCSN	[54]	CNN-LSTM	F1: 78.4%	×
PEC, EmpathicDialogues, RolePlayMI	[55]	BERT	Matthews correlation coefficient ∈ [≈ 0.56, ≈ 0.95]	×
EmpathicDialogues v2	[71]	PBC4cip	AUC: 62.5%	×
NewsEssay	[62]	BERT-MLP	F1: 68.4%	×
EPITOME v2, NewsEssay	[64]	BERT, RoBERTa	Acc ∈ [61.5%, 71.8%]	×
TwittEmp	[62]	BERT-MLP	F1 ∈ [68.6%, 85.7%]	×
Brand-Customer	[61]	RoBERTa	F1: 73%	×
FacebookReview	[51]	SVM	Acc: 21.5%, F1: 75.7%	×

Note: Studies using common datasets are sorted year-wise chronologically, followed by performance, where best results are **bolded**.

^a Range of performance is reported when overall classification performance is unavailable

Sharma *et al.* [63] used both unsupervised learning (domain adaptive pre-training) and RoBERTa-based supervised learning on their EPITOME framework. In contrast, Lee *et al.* [45] used Micromodels [106] as an attempt towards explainable ML. Lee *et al.* [45]’s approach first calculates semantic similarity scores between the Sentence-BERT representations of some fixed seed utterances and dataset samples. The similarity scores are then used as a feature in an Explainable Boosting Machine (EBM) model to classify empathy in each of the mechanisms of EPITOME. In terms of quantitative scores, Lee *et al.* [45]’s model provides better accuracy (a maximum of 95.3% vs 92.6%) but less F1 score (a maximum of 62.7% vs 74.5%) than Sharma *et al.* [63]’s models on the EPITOME dataset. However, one important insight from Lee *et al.* [45]’s study is that the current empathy detection models probably consider surface-level information rather than the whole conversation context.

In detecting empathy on the iEmpathize dataset, Hosseini and Caragea [32], [105] leveraged BERT and RoBERTa models, respectively. Despite being the same dataset, their reported classification performances are on different evaluation metrics: a maximum F1 score of 85.9% is reported in [32], and a classification accuracy of 81.1% is reported in [105]. The key contribution of Hosseini and Caragea [105]’s work is a data-agnostic technique for prompt-based few-shot learning to improve the performance of pre-trained language models on empathy and emotion classification tasks, especially when training data is limited and noisy.

As seen in Table 6, the remaining studies used separate datasets, which may not allow performance comparison between studies. However, a distinction can be made between classical ML and DL-based language model usage. For example, on detecting empathy in medical essays, Shi *et al.* [46] experimented with SVM and Naïve Bayes (NB) on MedicalCare dataset, yielding an F1 score of 78.4%. In MedicalCare v2 dataset, Dey and Girju [47]

experimented with BERT, RoBERTa, SVM, NB, Logistic Regression (LogR), Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) and Bidirectional LSTM (BiLSTM) models and reported an F1 score of 85%. Similar experiments are also conducted with the MedicalCare v3 dataset [44]. Both experiments reveal the superior performance of BERT-based models. Incorporation of FrameNet pre-trained model [107] boosted the baseline performance in the v2 dataset [47]. In the v3 dataset [44], various linguistic constructions – such as active or passive voice, static or energetic tone – enhanced binary empathy classification performance compared to the baseline BERT model.

Lee and Parde [43] experimented with two classical ML algorithms (NB and LogR) and four pretrained language model (including BERT, RoBERTa and Distilled BERT (DistilBERT)) on the AcnEmpathize dataset. Among these, DistilBERT resulted in the best overall accuracy of 89.3%, while the accuracy of BERT and RoBERTa was also close: 89.1% and 88.5%, respectively. Due to the unbalanced nature of the dataset, the authors also reported class-wise precision, recall and F1 scores. Although NB provided better precision in the empathy class and better recall in the no-empathy class, it underperforms the BERT-based models in the precision and F1 scores. The best F1 scores of 77.4% in the empathy class and 93.1% in the no empathy class are achieved by RoBERTa and DistilBERT, respectively.

On the LeadEmpathy dataset, Sedefoglu *et al.* [38] employed SVM for binary classification and BERT for a 10-class classification task. The 10-class F1 score was notably lower at 45.7%, reflecting the challenge of fine-grained empathy classification compared to the more straightforward binary classification, which achieved a higher F1 score of 81.7%.

Instead of language models, several studies leveraged traditional DL models like LSTM and CNN. Gibson *et al.* [65] reported NB as the optimal model in MI dataset. In a later study, Gibson *et al.* [66] reported that a combination of




Fig. 5. Usage of ML algorithms in audiovisual content-based empathy detection studies.

MLP and LSTM are the optimal model in the closely related MI v2 dataset, yielding a higher unweighted average recall from 75.3% to 79.6%. Khanpour *et al.* [54] used a combination of CNN and LSTM on the LungBreastCSN dataset. Other than commonly known models, Montiel-Vázquez *et al.* [71] reported Pattern-Based Classifier for Class Imbalance Problems (PBC4cip) – exclusively designed for imbalanced datasets – as the most effective classifier compared to several classical ML baselines on EmpathicDialogues v2 dataset.

Hosseini and Caragea [62], [64] used knowledge distillation, which refers to the process of transferring knowledge from a large, complex model (teacher) to a smaller, simpler model (student) to improve the latter’s performance while maintaining efficiency. Hosseini and Caragea [64] used EPITOME v2 as an in-domain dataset and NewsEssay as an out-of-domain dataset to transfer knowledge from a RoBERTa teacher model to a RoBERTa student model. Their knowledge distillation framework boosted the performance compared to BERT and RoBERTa baselines. In their study, the NewsEssay dataset was used in a binary classification setting instead of the dataset’s default usage as a regression task. Such binary classification setup is also utilised by Shi *et al.* [46] and Hosseini and Caragea [62] using SVM and BERT-MLP models, respectively.

5.2 Audiovisual Content

Empathy detection from audiovisual contents is designed mostly as a multimodal system combining computer vision and NLP techniques, with inputs such as facial expressions, hand gestures and audio conversations. This section, therefore, includes some multimodal approaches, which utilise audio, video and sometimes text sequences. Figure 5 illustrates the application of algorithms in audiovisual-based empathy detection works. As usual, DL models are the predominant choice, although classical ML models are also widely employed. Within the DL category, CNN and RNN-

based models are most frequently used, whereas in the classical ML category, SVM enjoys a higher level of usage.

Table 7 summarises the studies involving empathy detection from audiovisual datasets. There are nine studies detecting continuous degrees of empathy (regression task) and six studies detecting discrete levels of empathy (classification task). The following subsections describe these studies.

5.2.1 Regression Task (Degree of Empathy)

Seven out of nine papers use the OMG-Empathy dataset to predict continuous degrees of empathy. Barros *et al.* [78] provides a baseline result with VGG16 architecture to process facial expression and LSTM to process spatial-temporal features. The outputs of these two networks were then concatenated and fed to a SVM for empathy detection, which resulted in 0.17 and 0.23 correlation coefficients in the personalised and generalised empathy protocols, respectively.

Barros *et al.* [78], the organiser of the OMG-Empathy prediction challenge, provides the best results on OMG-Empathy dataset, and challenge participants [108]–[112] have not managed to outperform Barros *et al.* [78]. The closest one, Barbieri *et al.* [112], achieved a 0.17 correlation coefficient on both personalised and generalised protocols. They used separate models for separate modalities – Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) on audio signals, LSTM on audio transcripts (text) and CNN on vision (face and body images) – followed by MLPs. To integrate the predictions across different modalities, they used a weighted average proportional to the validation score on each modality, followed by a Butterworth low-pass filter.

Tan *et al.* [111] extracted multimodal features using VGG-Face [115] on faces, openSMILE [116] on audio and GloVe embedding [117] on texts. Using a multimodal LSTM model, they reported a correlation coefficient of 0.14 on both personalised and generalised protocols. Mallol-Ragolta *et al.* [110] reported correlation coefficients of 0.11 and 0.06 in personalised and generalised protocols, respectively, using openSMILE for extracting audio features and OpenFace [118] for extracting video features, followed by a BiLSTM network.

In addition to verbal and non-verbal features from audio, image and text, Azari *et al.* [109] experimented with a different type of feature: mutual or contagious laughter as a measure of synchrony between the speaker and listener during the interaction. Hinduja *et al.* [108] used facial landmarks and spectrogram as hand-crafted features and CNN output as deep features in a Random Forest (RF) model. Lastly, Lusquino Filho *et al.* [113] leveraged a different type of model – Weightless Artificial Neural Network (WANN) – and reported a correlation coefficient of 0.25 on the validation set of the OMG-Empathy dataset.

Other works in empathy detection as regression tasks primarily utilised classical ML models. Kroes *et al.* [75] leveraged a LR model on the Human-VirtualAgent dataset. With the Teacher-Student dataset, Pan *et al.* [82] comprehensively experimented with a wide range of features from audio and video in an AdaBoost model. Their extracted features include mid-level behavioural features – such as facial expression, head pose and eye gaze – and high-level

TABLE 7
Summary of Empathy Detection Studies from Audiovisual Content.

Dataset	Study	Best Model	Performance ^a	Code Avail. ^b
Regression				
OMG-Empathy	[108]	CNN, RF	CCC: 0.02 (P), 0.04 (G)	×
	[109]	SVM	CCC: 0.08 (P)	U
	[110]	BiLSTM	CCC: 0.11 (P), 0.06 (G)	✓
	[111]	LSTM	CCC: 0.14 (P, G)	✓
	[112]	GRU, LSTM, CNN, MLP	CCC: 0.17 (P, G)	✓
	[78]	VGG16-LSTM-SVM	CCC 0.17 (P), 0.23 (G)	×
	[113]	WANN	CCC: 0.25 (Validation set)	×
Human-VirtualAgent	[75]	LR	R ² : 0.485	×
Teacher-Student	[82]	AdaBoost	MSE: 0.374	✓
Classification				
Teacher-Student	[82]	DT	Acc: 90.9%, F1: 90.1%	✓
Human-Robot	[73]	XGBoost	Acc: 69%, AUC: 72%	×
Human-Avatar	[74]	LogR	F1 ∈ [72%, 78%]	×
DAIC-WOZ	[59]	ResNet, BERT, GRU, MLP	F1: 71%	×
MEDIC	[42]	LSTM	Acc ∈ [77.6%, 86.4%], F1 ∈ [77.7%, 86.3%]	×
Various online sources ^c	[114]	CNN	Acc: 98.9%, AUC: 99%, F1: 91%	×

Note: Studies using common datasets are sorted year-wise chronologically, followed by performance, where best results and methods are **bolded**.

^a Performance refers to test-set performance unless otherwise stated

^a P – Personalised protocol; G – Generalised protocol

^a CCC – Concordance Correlation Coefficient

^b U – Unofficially available on the Internet but not provided with the paper

^c Description of the dataset, such as the number of samples and ground truth label space, are unavailable on the paper

interpretable features, such as video length, frequency of speaker switch and total number of words. Such feature extraction often yields good results but may require substantial computational resources and careful tuning to optimise the model.

5.2.2 Classification Task (Level of Empathy)

In classifying empathy levels, most studies leveraged a variety of classical ML algorithms without using any common dataset across the studies. Mathur *et al.* [73] experimented with eight classical ML and two DL models and reported XGBoost as the best model on the Human-Robot dataset.

On the DAIC-WOZ dataset, Tavabi *et al.* [59] leveraged pre-trained BERT to calculate text embedding and pre-trained Residual Network (ResNet) to calculate visual features in addition to action units and head pose features from OpenFace. As audio features, they extracted extended Geneva minimalistic acoustic parameter set and Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC) [119] using OpenSMILE. With these features, they experimented with GRU and MLP in different fusion techniques, where GRU-based fusion of temporal audio and video sequences appeared to be the best fusion strategy in their setting, resulting an F1 score of 71%. Their ablation experiment shows that text modality is more effective than video and audio modalities: text alone resulted in an F1 score of 64%, whereas the video and audio individually provided F1 scores of 46% and 38%, respectively.

On the MEDIC dataset [42], the best result is achieved using SWAFN, a multimodal LSTM network proposed by Chen and Li [120]. The network uses three individual LSTMs to encode video, audio and textual modalities, followed by a novel aggregation strategy using a multi-task learning framework. Among the three mechanisms of the MEDIC dataset, the client’s expression of experience was

TABLE 8
Summary of Empathy Detection Studies from Audio Signals.

Dataset	Study	Best Model	Performance	Code Avail.
Regression				
CTT	[67]	LR	PCC ∈ [0.65, 0.71]	×
MultimodalMI	[40]	RoBERTa-GRU	CCC ∈ [0.408, 0.596]	✓
Classification				
CTT	[67]	SVM	Acc ∈ [80.5%, 89.9%], F1 ∈ [85.3%, 90.3%]	×
COPE	[69]	SVM	Avg. precision: 7.61%	×
CallCentre	[72]	SVM	Unweighted avg. recall: 65.1%	×
MultimodalMI	[41]	RoBERTa, HuBERT, GRU, MLP	F1 ∈ [58.3%, 72.6%]	✓

better classified than the counsellor’s empathy [42], which supports the difficult nature of empathy detection compared to expression (i.e., emotion) recognition.

5.3 Audio Signals

Audio-based empathy detection works include audio from conversations in various contexts, such as healthcare and call centres. By audio-based empathy detection studies, we refer to studies that exclusively leverage audio, which differs from multimodal audiovisual studies presented earlier.

Processing audio includes two primary approaches: directly utilising audio as a signal or converting it into text and employing text-based methods. Table 8 summarises six studies and their methods for detecting empathy from audio datasets. Most of the studies reported classical ML algorithms as the best in corresponding experiments: SVM in empathy classification on the CTT [67], COPE [69] and CallCentre [72] datasets and LR in the regression study on the CTT dataset by Xiao *et al.* [67].

Given that audio-based datasets involve conversations between two persons, the work of Chen *et al.* [69] and Xiao *et*

TABLE 9
Summary of Empathy Detection Studies from Physiological Signals.

Dataset	Study	Best Model	Performance	Code Avail.
Regression				
fMRI	[52]	LR	Pearson correlation: 0.54, MSE: 20.1	×
EEG	[79]	LR	MSE \in [51.749, 150.556]	×
Classification				
PainEmp	[80]	SVM	Acc \in [79%, 84%]	×
EEG	[79]	SVM, DT	Acc \in [61.8%, 74.2%], F1 \in [61.5%, 74.3%]	×

al. [67] include voice activity detection (speech or no speech) and speaker diarisation (separate speakers) in the empathy detection workflow. Xiao *et al.* [67], Chen *et al.* [69], and Alam *et al.* [72] converted the audio into text sequences, followed by extracting features from the text sequences. Chen *et al.* [69] and Alam *et al.* [72] extracted several lexical features, such as text embedding, from the audio transcripts and several acoustic features, such as MFCC, from the audio signal. Chen *et al.* [69] reported better performance of lexical features than acoustic features. Lastly, Xiao *et al.* [67]’s empathy detection model on audio-based CTT dataset is entirely text-based – leveraging uni-gram, bi-gram and tri-gram language models – without audio-based features.

On the recently created (but non-public) `MultimodalMI` dataset, Tavabi *et al.* [40] used a distilled RoBERTa pre-trained language model, a bi-directional GRU layer followed by a two-head self-attention layer to predict continuous empathy score between 0 and 1 (regression task). Using the same dataset, Tran *et al.* [41] proposes a multimodal empathy classification system utilising both audio and text transcripts to predict high vs low empathy. Features from the audio and texts are extracted using Hidden-Unit BERT (HuBERT) [121] and distilled RoBERTa pre-trained models, respectively. The features are then passed through a bi-directional GRU model, followed by modality fusion. They experimented with early and late fusion through MLP layers. A wide range of experiments supports the effectiveness of late fusion in most experimental conditions, early fusion in some cases and text-only prediction in very few cases.

5.4 Physiological Signals

Research in physiological signal-based empathy detection typically adopts feature extraction, followed by ML algorithms. Table 9 reports the studies and methods of physiological signal-based empathy detection. All of these studies leveraged classical ML algorithms: LR and SVM each in two studies.

With the `PainEmp` dataset, Golbabaee *et al.* [80] extracted ten features and leveraged a SVM with radial basis function kernel to detect cognitive and affective empathy. Lastly, Kuijt and Alimardani [79] extracted 15 features from the EEG data and leveraged multiple LR in the regression task and LR, SVM and DT in the classification task. In the classification task, they only used five best-performing features. In both regression and classification settings, the participants’ empathy before the experiment is better detected than ‘after’ and ‘during’ the experiment.

5.5 Discussion: Findings, Challenges and Research Gaps

5.5.1 Lack of Benchmarking

The lack of unified dataset usage hinders benchmarking and comparative analysis, particularly in the audio signal and physiological signal domains, where no common datasets are used across multiple studies. A plausible reason for this is the limited availability of public datasets. Effective benchmarking requires publicly accessible datasets. Despite the limited number of available public datasets, future research should prioritise their use to facilitate better comparisons and advancements in the field.

5.5.2 Evaluation Metrics

A diverse range of evaluation metrics are employed across different studies. However, similar to the lack of unified dataset usage, the absence of standardised evaluation metrics significantly hampers comparative analysis and makes it challenging to consistently assess the effectiveness of different models. The following subsections discuss common evaluation metrics used in empathy detection research.

5.5.2.1 Regression Task (Degree of Empathy): In studies that aim to predict a continuous value representing the degree of empathy (regression task), various correlation coefficients are commonly used as evaluation metrics. Notably, the Pearson correlation coefficient, Spearman’s correlation coefficient and concordance correlation coefficient are leveraged in works utilising datasets such as `NewsEssay`, `MI` and `OMG-Empathy`, respectively. Additionally, metrics like mean squared error and R^2 are employed in datasets such as `Teacher-Student` and `Human-VirtualAgent`, respectively.

5.5.2.2 Classification Task (Level of Empathy): Various evaluation metrics are utilised in studies focused on predicting discrete levels of empathy (classification task). Commonly used metrics include classification accuracy, F1 score and Area Under the receiver operating characteristics Curve (AUC). Additionally, metrics like average precision, unweighted average recall and the Matthews correlation coefficient are employed.

5.5.3 Code Availability

Although there are fewer restrictions on making code publicly available compared to datasets, only a limited number of studies have shared their code. Out of 50 text-based empathy detection models (Table 5 and Table 6), only 18 have released their code. Among the 15 audiovisual empathy detection models (Table 7), 6 have public code. For audio signal- and physiological signal-based models, 2 out of 6 (Table 8) and 0 out of 4 (Table 9), respectively, have shared their code.

Publicly available code is crucial for reproducibility, but the low rate of code sharing limits these benefits. Possible challenges in code sharing may include a lack of thorough documentation, intellectual property concerns and the effort required to prepare code for public release. Promoting a culture of openness and providing incentives for code sharing can help overcome these challenges and enhance the impact of empathy detection research. Mandating the publication of code alongside research findings can further ensure transparency and facilitate progress in the field.

5.5.4 Multimodal Empathy Detection

The growth of empathy detection modalities, as illustrated in Figure 2, shows a dominant rising trend in text-based empathy detection since 2020. However, the current body of research lacks equivalent development in audiovisual, audio, and physiological signals. Empathy detection systems based on these modalities can be particularly effective in scenarios where such signals are available and potentially provide a more comprehensive measure of empathy. While spoken information from video and audio can be converted to text for text-based empathy detection, video and audio contain additional information such as facial expressions and pitch. These elements can significantly enhance the accuracy and quality of empathy detection, which necessitates dedicated research in these areas.

A multimodal empathy detection system can effectively integrate these different types of data. Additionally, analysing the contributions of different modalities provides insights into the most important factors for an effective empathy detection system. Few studies [41], [42], [59], [82] have shown proof of concept towards multimodal empathy detection. Overall, the multimodal approach holds promise for creating a robust empathy detection system by leveraging the strengths of various input modalities.

5.5.5 LLM in Empathy Detection

The recent success of LLMs presents an opportunity to utilise them in empathy detection tasks. LLMs can serve as the primary prediction model or as a supportive tool to enhance predictions made by conventional models. While LLMs may excel in empathy detection due to their extensive language understanding capabilities, their training and deployment often require substantial resources, which may be impractical for low-resource settings. Smaller optimised models like BERT and RoBERTa can offer reasonable performance with better resource efficiency and may be better suited for certain applications, such as remote areas with limited healthcare access, community counselling centres, education settings in low-income schools, and humanitarian aid and crisis response.

Even when not utilised as the primary prediction model, LLMs can contribute to empathy prediction tasks, particularly in data preprocessing tasks such as text rephrasing [99] and empathy annotation [39]. A recent study [122] has shown that LLMs achieve human-level performance in theory of mind tasks. Drawing on the close relationship between cognitive empathy and theory of mind [26], this indicates that LLMs possess (or can mimic) empathic skills that could potentially assist in empathy detection.

As envisioned in a PhD project by Hasan *et al.* [123], multimodal LLMs can detect empathy in real-life audiovisual interactions. This approach capitalises on LLMs' language understanding and multimodal capabilities to analyse the subtleties of natural conversations across audio, visual and text modalities. With the emergence of multimodal LLMs like OpenAI's GPT-4o and Google's Gemini, this approach holds promise for achieving robust empathy detection in diverse real-world scenarios.

6 APPLICATIONS OF EMPATHY DETECTION

Empathy is important across various real-life domains, including social life, healthcare, education and business [6]. The assessment of empathy in empathy-seeking scenarios will allow us to identify areas of improvement. Consequently, strategies can be adopted to improve empathic capabilities. The following subsections discuss some potential applications of empathy detection in specific domains.

6.1 Society and Culture

Since empathy is a social skill, its detection directly impacts society. The ability to empathise can vary across cultures and may be influenced by social norms and upbringing. Existing studies on empathy detection so far have not considered cultural aspects, which could be an exciting research direction.

Socially assistive robots could provide better support and care if they could detect and respond empathically to the emotional states of the people they assist, such as elderly individuals, stroke survivors, and individuals with autism spectrum disorder or Alzheimer's disease [124], [125]. Empathy detection between humans and other intelligent agents, such as robots [73], [114] and virtual agents [59], [75], could help assess the quality of the support target individuals receive.

Empathy is key to effective and supportive communication among people at different levels. Empathy can build strong and healthy connections in spousal relationships, as partners who display empathy can indicate that they understand and support each other's emotional needs [1]. Empathy detection systems can assist marital counselling by identifying moments where empathy is lacking and, subsequently, interventions can be applied to improve relationships.

Empathy is important for politicians, community leaders and religious leaders. Evaluating leaders' empathy, such as in their recorded lectures, can help them gauge the emotional climate of their audience, allowing them to respond more effectively and address concerns with greater sensitivity.

In long-distance audiovisual communications, such as those between international students and their families or during online interviews for jobs or university admissions, empathy detection can help reduce anxiety and stress by ensuring that interactions remain supportive and understanding. Like live transcripts, we can envision live empathy scores on online meeting tools like Zoom and Microsoft Teams. This way, people can see how their words and expressions are perceived in real time, allowing them to adjust their communication to be more empathic and responsive. Such a feature could enhance virtual interactions by providing immediate feedback on emotional tone, fostering more meaningful and supportive conversations even from a distance.

People often seek mental support through social media platforms. Accordingly, several works have detected empathy in various social media, such as Reddit [63], Twitter [62], and cancer survivors networks [32], [54], [105]. We can envision a peer support platform where non-empathic comments are filtered out through an empathy detection system. This way, the use of empathy detection systems on

social media platforms has the potential to foster empathic responses while discouraging non-empathic ones. Such a system can be key in cultivating a more compassionate online environment, providing timely support and reducing the risk of negative interactions.

It is important to consider that the visibility of empathy scores through detection systems might encourage individuals to feign empathy. This potential for manipulation parallels the challenge of detecting fake facial expressions, indicating a need for future research focused on identifying and addressing fake empathy. Developing robust methods to differentiate genuine empathy from feigned responses will be crucial to ensure the reliability and effectiveness of empathy detection systems.

6.2 Healthcare

Empathic doctors are better equipped to communicate medical information in a fashion that the patient will attend to, leading to improved communication and patient outcomes [2]. A study on patient-doctor relationships showed that 85% of 563 patients changed their doctor or were thinking of changing, where one of the main reasons was a lack of effective communication related to empathy [126], [127].

Empathy detection systems can help diagnose diseases and cognitive disorders where a lack of empathy is a symptom, such as autism, psychopathy and alexithymia [128]. Several studies have shown proof of concepts for such healthcare applications, such as diagnosing social communication disorders (Down syndrome, intellectual disability) [74] and autism spectrum disorders [80].

The service quality of healthcare providers and hospitals can be assessed in terms of empathy, for example, patient-doctor consultation or hospital service quality [51]. Assessment of healthcare providers can be in various contexts, such as counselling sessions between therapists and patients [55], [65]–[67], oncology encounters [69] and other general patient-doctor interactions [46], [47].

Telehealth has surged in popularity since COVID-19, making empathy evaluation particularly valuable due to its remote nature. For instance, the quality of mental health consultations can be assessed through empathy measurement, allowing specialists to evaluate their empathy and engagement with patients [43]. This advancement could revolutionise healthcare for regional individuals relying heavily on telehealth services. Incorporating a live empathy score in telehealth consultations can provide real-time feedback, enhancing the quality of care and ensuring more empathetic interactions between healthcare providers and patients.

6.3 Education and Development

In teaching – especially with the shift towards online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic – educators endowed with empathic capabilities are better positioned to understand their students' emotional states and create a positive learning environment [3]. Beyond teacher-student interactions, in student-student interactions in team activities, empathy helps extract the most out of the learning experience when students can extend support to their peers. Engineering students are believed to lack empathy as compared to different disciplines, leading to challenges when engaging

in group projects later in their professional careers [129]. Inclusion of empathy is required in software engineering curricula to meet industry demands [130] and, accordingly, an empathy detection system can assist in teaching empathy. Quantitative assessment of empathy can create scope to improve team dynamics through targeted interventions, such as empathy training programs.

Empathy evaluation can be used as a tool to assess teaching quality, as demonstrated by Pan *et al.* [82]. Such a teaching quality assessment system – acknowledging the importance of emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills – can aid traditional evaluation methods, leading to a better education system.

Empathy is a critical component in design thinking [131] and user-centred design [132], enabling deeper connections with users, clients and customers. Integrating an empathy detection system into the design process can help simulate and detect potential users' empathy, leading to more successful and widely adopted products.

6.4 Economics and Business

Empathy plays a crucial role in economics, where understanding and accounting for others' emotional states is essential in making informed business decisions [133]. A lack of empathy in real-life business interactions can harm customer experience and overall business success. By incorporating empathy into business strategies and decision-making, businesses can provide better services, increase customer satisfaction and ultimately drive growth and success.

Empathy can help businesses analyse customer reviews and customer support. Nowadays, customers can leave product reviews on online platforms, such as Yelp and Product Review websites, where empathy can be detected to understand genuine customer dissatisfaction and identify areas of improvement [134].

Customer care representatives who display empathy in call-centre interactions can resolve customer issues more effectively, leading to higher customer satisfaction [135]. The skilful identification and validation of customers' emotions through empathy can foster loyalty and trust [136] and enhance customer experiences [137]. Thus, call-centre conversations can be analysed to detect empathy, which could also benefit training the agents [72]. Empathy can be detected as a measure of engagement in asynchronous customer service systems, where customers and agents are not necessarily active simultaneously [61].

Empathy is important in emotional intelligence, a crucial aspect of individuals' aptitude in business and workplace settings [138]. It can enhance organisational efficacy through constructive interpersonal relationships in employer-employee and employee-employee interactions. Empathetic interactions can promote overall employee well-being, job satisfaction [139] and cohesive team dynamics [140] in contemporary business environments. It can further play a key role in high-level negotiations in management as it fosters a deeper understanding of stakeholders' perspectives, leading to more effective decision-making and conflict resolution. In such negotiations, where complex issues and diverse interests are at play, empathic leaders can bridge gaps and build trust among parties, ultimately enhancing collaboration and achieving mutually beneficial outcomes.

7 CONCLUSION

Empathy, the capacity to comprehend and provide emotional support to others, has emerged as a promising research area across several disciplines. Empathy detection in Computer Science, particularly through ML methodologies, has grown substantially in recent years. In this research endeavour, this paper presents a rigorous systematic literature review following PRISMA guidelines for reproducibility. Starting with an extensive search across ten scholarly databases, we select 61 papers after a thorough screening process, including abstract and full-text screening based on exclusion criteria. We discuss and group similar papers based on task formulations and ML methodologies. We present a task formulation hierarchy with representative datasets and their details, such as data collection, experiment detail, statistics, annotation protocol and public availability. To describe ML methodologies, we group our findings based on four input modalities: text sequences, audiovisual data, audio signals and physiological signals. In each modality, we enumerate the algorithms used, their performance and code availability.

This review uncovers several new insights into the computational empathy domain and identifies critical avenues for future research and development. Exploring novel task formulations such as parallel and bidirectional empathy, particularly in group settings and global-level measurements, can advance our understanding of empathy in complex social interactions. Further research comparing self-annotation and third-party annotation under controlled conditions is necessary to determine the most appropriate annotation scheme for empathy detection. The limited public availability of datasets and codes poses significant challenges for reproducibility and benchmarking in the field. At the same time, the diversity and lack of standardisation in evaluation metrics complicate consistent model comparison. Physiological signals offer promising avenues for more accurate empathy detection. Finally, the potential of LLMs and multimodal approaches to enhance empathy detection systems presents exciting opportunities for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Dr Susannah Soon, Senior Lecturer at Curtin University, for her comments on the initial version of this paper.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AUC Area Under the receiver operating characteristics Curve
BERT Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers
BiLSTM Bidirectional LSTM
CNN Convolutional Neural Network
DeBERTa Decoding-Enhanced BERT with Disentangled Attention
DistilBERT Distilled BERT
DL Deep Learning
DT Decision Tree
EBM Explainable Boosting Machine
EC Exclusion Criteria

ECG Electrocardiogram
EEG Electroencephalogram
fMRI functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging
GRU Gated Recurrent Unit
HuBERT Hidden-Unit BERT
IRI Interpersonal Reactivity Index
LLM Large Language Model
LR Linear Regression
LogR Logistic Regression
LSTM Long Short-Term Memory
MFCC Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients
MISC Motivational Interviewing Skill Code
MITI Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity
ML Machine Learning
MLP Multi Layer Perceptron
NB Naïve Bayes
NLP Natural Language Processing
PBC4cip Pattern-Based Classifier for Class Imbalance Problems
ResNet Residual Network
RNN Recurrent Neural Network
RF Random Forest
RoBERTa Robustly Optimised BERT Pretraining Approach
RR Ridge Regression
SVM Support Vector Machine
WANN Weightless Artificial Neural Network
WASSA Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Verhofstadt, I. Devoldre, A. Buysse, *et al.*, "The role of cognitive and affective empathy in spouses' support interactions: An observational study," *PLoS one*, vol. 11, no. 2, e0149944, 2016. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0149944.
- [2] B. D. Jani, D. N. Blane, and S. W. Mercer, "The role of empathy in therapy and the physician-patient relationship," *Complementary Medicine Research*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 252–257, 2012. DOI: 10.1159/000342998.
- [3] K. Aldrup, B. Carstensen, and U. Klusmann, "Is empathy the key to effective teaching? a systematic review of its association with teacher-student interactions and student outcomes," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 1177–1216, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-021-09649-y.
- [4] M. L. Hoffman, *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511805851.
- [5] N. Eisenberg and A. S. Morris, "The origins and social significance of empathy-related responding: a review of empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice by M. L. Hoffman," *Social Justice Research*, no. 1, pp. 95–120, 2001. DOI: 10.1023/A:1012579805721.
- [6] J. A. Hall and R. Schwartz, "Empathy present and future," *The Journal of social psychology*, vol. 159, no. 3, pp. 225–243, 2019. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.2018.1477442.
- [7] A. Paiva, I. Leite, H. Boukricha, and I. Wachsmuth, "Empathy in virtual agents and robots: A survey," *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TiiS)*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1–40, 2017. DOI: 10.1145/2912150.
- [8] J. Zhang, Z. Yin, P. Chen, and S. Nichele, "Emotion recognition using multi-modal data and machine learning techniques: A tutorial and review," *Information Fusion*, vol. 59, pp. 103–126, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.inffus.2020.01.011.
- [9] S. D'Mello, A. Kappas, and J. Gratch, "The affective computing approach to affect measurement," *Emotion Review*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 174–183, 2018. DOI: 10.1177/175407391769658.

- [10] E. Sariyanidi, H. Gunes, and A. Cavallaro, "Automatic analysis of facial affect: A survey of registration, representation, and recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1113–1133, 2015. DOI: 10.1109/TPAMI.2014.2366127.
- [11] Y. Liu, X. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Zhou, X. Li, and G. Zhao, "Graph-based facial affect analysis: A review," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, pp. 1–20, 2022. DOI: 10.1109/TAFFC.2022.3215918.
- [12] E. A. Veltmeijer, C. Gerritsen, and K. V. Hindriks, "Automatic emotion recognition for groups: A review," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 89–107, 2023. DOI: 10.1109/TAFFC.2021.3065726.
- [13] A. klauskas, A. Abraham, I. Ubarte, et al., "A review of ai cloud and edge sensors, methods, and applications for the recognition of emotional, affective and physiological states," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 20, 2022, ISSN: 1424-8220. DOI: 10.3390/s2207824.
- [14] Ö. N. Yalcin and S. DiPaola, "A computational model of empathy for interactive agents," *Biologically inspired cognitive architectures*, vol. 26, pp. 20–25, 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.bica.2018.07.010.
- [15] S. Park and M. Whang, "Empathy in human–robot interaction: Designing for social robots," *International journal of environmental research and public health*, vol. 19, no. 3, p. 1889, 2022. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19031889.
- [16] A. S. Raamkumar and Y. Yang, "Empathetic conversational systems: A review of current advances, gaps, and opportunities," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 2022. DOI: 10.1109/TAFFC.2022.3226693.
- [17] M. J. Page, J. E. McKenzie, P. M. Bossuyt, et al., "The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews," *International journal of surgery*, vol. 88, p. 105906, 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijisu.2021.105906.
- [18] B. M. Cuff, S. J. Brown, L. Taylor, and D. J. Howat, "Empathy: A review of the concept," *Emotion Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 144–153, 2016. DOI: 10.1177/1754073914558466.
- [19] M. L. Hoffman, "Toward a theory of empathic arousal and development," in *The Development of Affect*, M. Lewis and L. A. Rosenblum, Eds. Boston, MA: Springer US, 1978, pp. 227–256. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4684-2616-8_9.
- [20] D. Goleman, *Emotional intelligence*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.
- [21] M. H. Davis et al., "A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy," 1980.
- [22] C. D. Batson, J. Fultz, and P. A. Schoenrade, "Distress and empathy: Two qualitatively distinct vicarious emotions with different motivational consequences," *Journal of Personality*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 19–39, 1987. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1987.tb00426.x.
- [23] S. D. Preston and F. B. M. de Waal, "Empathy: Its ultimate and proximate bases," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2002. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X02000018.
- [24] W. Ickes, *Everyday mind reading: Understanding what other people think and feel*. Prometheus Books, 2003.
- [25] H. P. Becker, "Some forms of sympathy: A phenomenological analysis," *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 26, pp. 58–68, 1931. DOI: 10.1037/h0072609.
- [26] R. J. R. Blair, "Responding to the emotions of others: Dissociating forms of empathy through the study of typical and psychiatric populations," *Consciousness and cognition*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 698–718, 2005. DOI: 10.1016/j.concog.2005.06.004.
- [27] G. Hein and T. Singer, "I feel how you feel but not always: The empathic brain and its modulation," *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 153–158, 2008. Cognitive neuroscience, ISSN: 0959-4388. DOI: 10.1016/j.conb.2008.07.012.
- [28] J. Decety and K. J. Michalska, "Neurodevelopmental changes in the circuits underlying empathy and sympathy from childhood to adulthood," *Developmental Science*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 886–899, 2010. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00940.x.
- [29] A. Smith, "Cognitive empathy and emotional empathy in human behavior and evolution," *The Psychological Record*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 3–21, 2006. DOI: 10.1007/BF03395534.
- [30] M. L. Healey and M. Grossman, "Cognitive and affective perspective-taking: Evidence for shared and dissociable anatomical substrates," *Frontiers in neurology*, vol. 9, p. 372314, 2018. DOI: 10.3389/fneur.2018.00491.
- [31] R. W. Picard, *Affective Computing*. MIT press, 2000.
- [32] M. Hosseini and C. Caragea, "It takes two to empathize: One to seek and one to provide," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, 2021, pp. 13 018–13 026. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v35i14.17539.
- [33] M. H. Davis, "Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach," *Journal of personality and social psychology*, vol. 44, no. 1, p. 113, 1983. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113.
- [34] S. Baron-Cohen and S. Wheelwright, "The empathy quotient: An investigation of adults with asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences," *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, vol. 34, pp. 163–175, 2004. DOI: 10.1023/B:JADD.0000022607.19833.00.
- [35] R. N. Spreng*, M. C. McKinnon*, R. A. Mar, and B. Levine, "The toronto empathy questionnaire: Scale development and initial validation of a factor-analytic solution to multiple empathy measures," *Journal of personality assessment*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 62–71, 2009. DOI: 10.1080/00223890802484381.
- [36] J. A. Hall and M. Schmid Mast, "Sources of accuracy in the empathic accuracy paradigm," *Emotion*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 438–446, 2007. DOI: 10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.438.
- [37] Veritas Health Innovation, *Covidence systematic review software*, Melbourne, Australia. [Online]. Available: www.covidence.org.
- [38] D. Sedefoglu, A. C. Lahnal, J. Wagner, L. Flek, and S. Ohly, "LeadEmpathy: An expert annotated German dataset of empathy in written leadership communication," in *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, N. Calzolari, M.-Y. Kan, V. Hoste, A. Lenci, S. Sakti, and N. Xue, Eds., Torino, Italy: ELRA and ICCL, May 2024, pp. 10 237–10 248.
- [39] M. R. Hasan, M. Z. Hossain, T. Gedeon, and S. Rahman, "LLM-GEM: Large language model-guided prediction of people's empathy levels towards newspaper article," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*, Y. Graham and M. Purver, Eds., St. Julian's, Malta: Association for Computational Linguistics, Mar. 2024, pp. 2215–2231. [Online]. Available: https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-eacl.147.
- [40] L. Tavabi, T. Tran, B. Borsari, et al., "Therapist empathy assessment in motivational interviews," in *2023 11th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, 2023, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/ACII59096.2023.10388176.
- [41] T. Tran, Y. Yin, L. Tavabi, et al., "Multimodal analysis and assessment of therapist empathy in motivational interviews," in *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, ser. ICMI '23, Paris, France: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 406–415. DOI: 10.1145/3577190.3614105.
- [42] Z. Zhu, C. Li, J. Pan, et al., "MEDIC: A multimodal empathy dataset in counseling," in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 6054–6062. DOI: 10.1145/3581783.3612346.
- [43] G. Lee and N. Parde, "AcnEmpathize: A dataset for understanding empathy in dermatology conversations," in *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, N. Calzolari, M.-Y. Kan, V. Hoste, A. Lenci, S. Sakti, and N. Xue, Eds., Torino, Italia: ELRA and ICCL, May 2024, pp. 143–153. [Online]. Available: https://aclanthology.org/2024.lrec-main.13.
- [44] P. Dey and R. Girju, "Investigating stylistic profiles for the task of empathy classification in medical narrative essays," in *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Construction Grammars and NLP (CxGs+NLP, GURT/SyntaxFest 2023)*, C. Bonial and H. Tattar Madabushi, Eds., Washington, D.C.: Association for Computational Linguistics, Mar. 2023, pp. 63–74. [Online]. Available: https://aclanthology.org/2023.cxgsnlp-1.8.
- [45] A. Lee, J. K. Kummerfeld, L. An, and R. Mihalcea, "Empathy identification systems are not accurately accounting for context," in *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, A. Vlachos and I. Augenstein, Eds., Dubrovnik, Croatia: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2023, pp. 1686–1695. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.eacl-main.123.
- [46] S. Shi, Y. Sun, J. Zavala, J. Moore, and R. Girju, "Modeling clinical empathy in narrative essays," in *2021 IEEE 15th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC)*, 2021, pp. 215–220. DOI: 10.1109/ICSC50631.2021.00046.
- [47] P. Dey and R. Girju, "Enriching deep learning with frame semantics for empathy classification in medical narrative essays," in *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Health Text*


- Mining and Information Analysis (LOUHI)*, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid): Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2022, pp. 207–217. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.louhi-1.23>.
- [48] S. Buechel, A. Buffone, B. Slaff, L. Ungar, and J. Sedoc, “Modeling empathy and distress in reaction to news stories,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Brussels, Belgium: Association for Computational Linguistics, Oct. 2018, pp. 4758–4765. DOI: 10.18653/v1/D18-1507.
- [49] S. Tafreshi, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, S. Buechel, J. Sedoc, and A. Balahur, “WASSA 2021 shared task: Predicting empathy and emotion in reaction to news stories,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Apr. 2021, pp. 92–104. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.wassa-1.10>.
- [50] V. Barriere, J. Sedoc, S. Tafreshi, and S. Giorgi, “Findings of WASSA 2023 shared task on empathy, emotion and personality detection in conversation and reactions to news articles,” in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 511–525. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.44.
- [51] A. I. A. Rahim, M. I. Ibrahim, K. I. Musa, S.-L. Chua, and N. M. Yaacob, “Assessing patient-perceived hospital service quality and sentiment in Malaysian public hospitals using machine learning and Facebook reviews,” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 18, 2021, ISSN: 1660-4601. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18189912.
- [52] L. Wei, G.-R. Wu, M. Bi, and C. Baeken, “Effective connectivity predicts cognitive empathy in cocaine addiction: A spectral dynamic causal modeling study,” *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, vol. 15, pp. 1553–1561, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s11682-020-00354-y.
- [53] A. Tapus and M. J. Mataric, “Socially assistive robots: The link between personality, empathy, physiological signals, and task performance,” in *AAAI spring symposium: emotion, personality, and social behavior*, 2008, pp. 133–140.
- [54] H. Khanpour, C. Caragea, and P. Biyani, “Identifying empathetic messages in online health communities,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, Taipei, Taiwan: Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Nov. 2017, pp. 246–251. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/I17-2042>.
- [55] Z. Wu, R. Helaoui, D. Reforgiato Recupero, and D. Riboni, “Towards low-resource real-time assessment of empathy in counselling,” in *Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop on Computational Linguistics and Clinical Psychology: Improving Access*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jun. 2021, pp. 204–216. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2021.clpsych-1.22.
- [56] V. Pérez-Rosas, X. Wu, K. Resnicow, and R. Mihalcea, “What makes a good counselor? learning to distinguish between high-quality and low-quality counseling conversations,” in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2019, pp. 926–935. DOI: 10.18653/v1/P19-1088.
- [57] P. Zhong, C. Zhang, H. Wang, Y. Liu, and C. Miao, “Towards persona-based empathetic conversational models,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2020, pp. 6556–6566. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.531.
- [58] H. Rashkin, E. M. Smith, M. Li, and Y.-L. Boureau, “Towards empathetic open-domain conversation models: A new benchmark and dataset,” in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2019, pp. 5370–5381. DOI: 10.18653/v1/P19-1534.
- [59] L. Tavabi, K. Stefanov, S. Nasihati Gilani, D. Traum, and M. Soleymani, “Multimodal learning for identifying opportunities for empathetic responses,” in *2019 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, 2019, pp. 95–104. DOI: 10.1145/3340555.3353750.
- [60] J. Gratch, R. Artstein, G. Lucas, et al., “The distress analysis interview corpus of human and computer interviews,” in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’14)*, Reykjavik, Iceland: European Language Resources Association (ELRA), May 2014, pp. 3123–3128.
- [61] S. Singh and A. Rios, “Linguistic elements of engaging customer service discourse on social media,” in *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science (NLP+CSS)*, Abu Dhabi, UAE: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2022, pp. 105–117. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.nlpccs-1.12>.
- [62] M. Hosseini and C. Caragea, “Distilling knowledge for empathy detection,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 3713–3724. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.314.
- [63] A. Sharma, A. Miner, D. Atkins, and T. Althoff, “A computational approach to understanding empathy expressed in text-based mental health support,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2020, pp. 5263–5276. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.425.
- [64] M. Hosseini and C. Caragea, “Calibrating student models for emotion-related tasks,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2022, pp. 9266–9278. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.629>.
- [65] J. Gibson, N. Malandrakis, F. Romero, D. C. Atkins, and S. S. Narayanan, “Predicting therapist empathy in motivational interviews using language features inspired by psycholinguistic norms,” in *Sixteenth annual conference of the international speech communication association*, 2015, pp. 1947–1951.
- [66] J. Gibson, D. Can, B. Xiao, et al., “A deep learning approach to modeling empathy in addiction counseling,” *Commitment*, vol. 111, no. 21, pp. 2016–554, 2016. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2016-554.
- [67] B. Xiao, Z. E. Imel, P. G. Georgiou, D. C. Atkins, and S. S. Narayanan, “‘Rate my therapist’: Automated detection of empathy in drug and alcohol counseling via speech and language processing,” *PloS One*, vol. 10, no. 12, e0143055, 2015. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0143055.
- [68] J. S. Baer, E. A. Wells, D. B. Rosengren, B. Hartzler, B. Beadnell, and C. Dunn, “Agency context and tailored training in technology transfer: A pilot evaluation of motivational interviewing training for community counselors,” *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 191–202, 2009. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsat.2009.01.003.
- [69] Z. Chen, J. Gibson, M.-C. Chiu, et al., “Automated empathy detection for oncology encounters,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/ICHI48887.2020.9374402.
- [70] J. A. Tulskey, R. M. Arnold, S. C. Alexander, et al., “Enhancing communication between oncologists and patients with a computer-based training program: A randomized trial,” *Annals of internal medicine*, vol. 155, no. 9, pp. 593–601, 2011. DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-9-2011111010-00007.
- [71] E. C. Montiel-Vázquez, J. A. Ramírez Uresti, and O. Loyola-González, “An explainable artificial intelligence approach for detecting empathy in textual communication,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 19, p. 9407, 2022. DOI: 10.3390/app12199407.
- [72] F. Alam, M. Danieli, and G. Riccardi, “Can we detect speakers’ empathy?: A real-life case study,” in *2016 7th IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Informatics (CogInfoCom)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 000 059–000 064. DOI: 10.1109/CogInfoCom.2016.7804525.
- [73] L. Mathur, M. Spitale, H. Xi, J. Li, and M. J. Mataric, “Modeling user empathy elicited by a robot storyteller,” in *2021 9th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/ACII52823.2021.9597416.
- [74] R. Hervás, E. Johnson, C. G. L. de la Franca, J. Bravo, and T. Mondéjar, “A learning system to support social and empathy disorders diagnosis through affective avatars,” in *2016 15th International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing and Communications and 2016 International Symposium on CyberSpace and Security (IUCC-CSS)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 93–100. DOI: 10.1109/IUCC-CSS.2016.021.

- [75] K. Kroes, I. Saccardi, and J. Masthoff, "Empathizing with virtual agents: The effect of personification and general empathic tendencies," in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Virtual Reality (AIVR)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 73–81. DOI: 10.1109/AIVR56993.2022.00017.
- [76] W. R. Miller, T. B. Moyers, D. Ernst, and P. Amrhein, "Manual for the motivational interviewing skill code (mise)," *Unpublished manuscript*. Albuquerque: Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse and Addictions, University of New Mexico, 2003.
- [77] T. Moyers, T. Martin, J. Manuel, W. Miller, and D. Ernst, "Revised global scales: Motivational interviewing treatment integrity 3.1. 1 (miti 3.1. 1)," *Unpublished manuscript*, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, 2010.
- [78] P. Barros, N. Churamani, A. Lim, and S. Wermter, "The omg-empathy dataset: Evaluating the impact of affective behavior in storytelling," in *2019 8th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7. DOI: 10.1109/ACII.2019.8925530.
- [79] A. Kuijt and M. Alimardani, "Prediction of human empathy based on eeg cortical asymmetry," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Human-Machine Systems (ICHMS)*, 2020, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ICHMS49158.2020.9209561.
- [80] S. Golbabaei, N. SammakNejad, and K. Borhani, "Physiological indicators of the relation between autistic traits and empathy: Evidence from electrocardiogram and skin conductance signals," in *2022 29th National and 7th International Iranian Conference on Biomedical Engineering (ICBME)*, 2022, pp. 177–183. DOI: 10.1109/ICBME57741.2022.10053068.
- [81] M. Abdul-Mageed, A. Buffone, H. Peng, J. Eichstaedt, and L. Ungar, "Recognizing pathogenic empathy in social media," in *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, vol. 11, 2017, pp. 448–451. DOI: 10.1609/icwsm.v11i1.14942.
- [82] Y. Pan, J. Wu, R. Ju, *et al.*, "A multimodal framework for automated teaching quality assessment of one-to-many online instruction videos," in *2022 26th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 1777–1783. DOI: 10.1109/icpr56361.2022.9956185.
- [83] M. Z. Hossain, T. Gedeon, and R. Sankaranarayana, "Using temporal features of observers' physiological measures to distinguish between genuine and fake smiles," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 163–173, 2020. DOI: 10.1109/TAFFC.2018.2878029.
- [84] L. Chen, T. Gedeon, M. Z. Hossain, and S. Caldwell, "Are you really angry? detecting emotion veracity as a proposed tool for interaction," in *Proceedings of the 29th Australian Conference on Computer-Human Interaction*, New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 412–416. DOI: 10.1145/3152771.3156147.
- [85] S. Afzal and P. Robinson, "Natural affect data: Collection and annotation," in *New Perspectives on Affect and Learning Technologies*, R. A. Calvo and S. K. D'Mello, Eds., New York, NY: Springer New York, 2011, pp. 55–70. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-9625-1_5.
- [86] M. Mars, "From word embeddings to pre-trained language models: A state-of-the-art walkthrough," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 17, p. 8805, 2022. DOI: /10.3390/app12178805.
- [87] Y. Butala, K. Singh, A. Kumar, and S. Shrivastava, "Team Phoenix at WASSA 2021: Emotion analysis on news stories with pre-trained language models," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Apr. 2021, pp. 274–280. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.wassa-1.30>.
- [88] G. Vettigli and A. Sorgente, "EmpNa at WASSA 2021: A lightweight model for the prediction of empathy, distress and emotions from reactions to news stories," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Apr. 2021, pp. 264–268. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.wassa-1.28>.
- [89] A. Kulkarni, S. Somwase, S. Rajput, and M. Marathe, "PVG at WASSA 2021: A multi-input, multi-task, transformer-based architecture for empathy and distress prediction," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Apr. 2021, pp. 105–111. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.wassa-1.11>.
- [90] J. Mundra, R. Gupta, and S. Mukherjee, "WASSA@IITK at WASSA 2021: Multi-task learning and transformer finetuning for emotion classification and empathy prediction," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis*, Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Apr. 2021, pp. 112–116. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.wassa-1.12>.
- [91] H. Vasava, P. Uikey, G. Wasnik, and R. Sharma, "Transformer-based architecture for empathy prediction and emotion classification," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, 2022, pp. 261–264. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.27.
- [92] S. Ghosh, D. Maurya, A. Ekbal, and P. Bhattacharyya, "Team IITP-AINLPLM at WASSA 2022: Empathy detection, emotion classification and personality detection," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, 2022, pp. 255–260. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.26.
- [93] S. Qian, C. Orašan, D. Kanojia, H. Saadany, and F. Do Carmo, "SURREY-CTS-NLP at WASSA2022: An experiment of discourse and sentiment analysis for the prediction of empathy, distress and emotion," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, 2022, pp. 271–275. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.29.
- [94] A. Lahnala, C. Welch, and L. Flek, "CAISA at WASSA 2022: Adapter-tuning for empathy prediction," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, 2022, pp. 280–285. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.31.
- [95] Y. Chen, Y. Ju, and S. Kübler, "IUCL at WASSA 2022 shared task: A text-only approach to empathy and emotion detection," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, 2022. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.21.
- [96] F. M. Plaza-del-Arco, J. Collado-Montañez, L. A. Ureña, and M.-T. Martín-Valdivia, "Empathy and distress prediction using transformer multi-output regression and emotion analysis with an ensemble of supervised and zero-shot learning models," in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 239–244. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.23.
- [97] M. R. Hasan, M. Z. Hossain, T. Gedeon, S. Soon, and S. Rahman, "Curtin OCAI at WASSA 2023 empathy, emotion and personality shared task: Demographic-aware prediction using multiple transformers," in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 536–541. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.47.
- [98] A. S. Srinivas, N. Barua, and S. Pal, "Team_Hawk at WASSA 2023 empathy, emotion, and personality shared task: Multi-tasking multi-encoder based transformers for empathy and emotion prediction in conversations," in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 542–547. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.48.
- [99] X. Lu, Z. Li, Y. Tong, Y. Zhao, and B. Qin, "HIT-SCIR at WASSA 2023: Empathy and emotion analysis at the utterance-level and the essay-level," in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 574–580. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.54.
- [100] Y. Wang, J. Wang, and X. Zhang, "YNU-HPCC at WASSA-2023 shared task 1: Large-scale language model with LoRA finetuning for empathy detection and emotion classification," in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 526–530. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.45.
- [101] F. Gruschka, A. Lahnala, C. Welch, and L. Flek, "Caisa at wassa 2023 shared task: Domain transfer for empathy, distress, and personality prediction," in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop*

- on *Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 553–557. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.50.
- [102] T. Chavan, K. Deshpande, and S. Sonawane, “PICT-CLRL at WASSA 2023 empathy, emotion and personality shared task: Empathy and distress detection using ensembles of transformer models,” in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 564–568. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.52.
- [103] T.-M. Lin, J.-Y. Chang, and L.-H. Lee, “NCUEE-NLP at WASSA 2023 shared task 1: Empathy and emotion prediction using sentiment-enhanced RoBERTa transformers,” in *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 548–552. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.wassa-1.49.
- [104] P. Bojanowski, E. Grave, A. Joulin, and T. Mikolov, “Enriching word vectors with subword information,” *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 5, pp. 135–146, 2017, ISSN: 2307-387X. DOI: 10.1162/tacl_a_00051.
- [105] M. Hosseini and C. Caragea, “Feature normalization and cartography-based demonstrations for prompt-based finetuning on emotion-related tasks,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, 2023, pp. 12 881–12 889. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v37i11.26514.
- [106] A. Lee, J. K. Kummerfeld, L. An, and R. Mihalcea, “Micromodels for efficient, explainable, and reusable systems: A case study on mental health,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, M.-F. Moens, X. Huang, L. Specia, and S. W.-t. Yih, Eds., Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 4257–4272. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.360.
- [107] C. F. Baker, C. J. Fillmore, and J. B. Lowe, “The Berkeley FrameNet project,” in *36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Volume 1*, Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 1998, pp. 86–90. DOI: 10.3115/980845.980860.
- [108] S. Hinduja, M. T. Uddin, S. R. Jannat, A. Sharma, and S. Canavan, “Fusion of hand-crafted and deep features for empathy prediction,” in *2019 14th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2019)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–4. DOI: 10.1109/FG.2019.8756522.
- [109] B. Azari, Z. Zhang, and A. Lim, “Towards an emocog model for multimodal empathy prediction,” in *2019 14th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2019)*, 2019, pp. 1–4. DOI: 10.1109/FG.2019.8756612.
- [110] A. Mallol-Ragolta, M. Schmitt, A. Baird, N. Cummins, and B. Schuller, “Performance analysis of unimodal and multimodal models in valence-based empathy recognition,” in *2019 14th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2019)*, 2019, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/FG.2019.8756517.
- [111] Z.-X. Tan, A. Goel, T.-S. Nguyen, and D. C. Ong, “A multimodal lstm for predicting listener empathic responses over time,” in *2019 14th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2019)*, 2019, pp. 1–4. DOI: 10.1109/FG.2019.8756577.
- [112] F. Barbieri, E. Guizzo, F. Lucchesi, G. Maffei, F. M. del Prado Martín, and T. Weyde, “Towards a multimodal time-based empathy prediction system,” in *2019 14th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2019)*, 2019, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/FG.2019.8756532.
- [113] L. A. D. Lusquino Filho, L. F. R. Oliveira, H. C. C. Carneiro, et al., “A weightless regression system for predicting multi-modal empathy,” in *2020 15th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition (FG 2020)*, 2020, pp. 657–661. DOI: 10.1109/FG47880.2020.00086.
- [114] S. A. Alanazi, M. Shabbir, N. Alshammari, M. Alruwaili, I. Hussain, and F. Ahmad, “Prediction of emotional empathy in intelligent agents to facilitate precise social interaction,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 1163, 2023. DOI: 10.3390/app13021163.
- [115] O. Parkhi, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman, “Deep face recognition,” in *BMVC 2015-Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference 2015*, British Machine Vision Association, 2015.
- [116] F. Eyben, F. Wening, F. Gross, and B. Schuller, “Recent developments in openSMILE, the munich open-source multimedia feature extractor,” in *Proceedings of the 21st ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 2013, pp. 835–838. DOI: 10.1145/2502081.2502224.
- [117] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning, “GloVe: Global vectors for word representation,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, 2014, pp. 1532–1543. DOI: 10.3115/v1/D14-1162.
- [118] B. Amos, B. Ludwiczuk, M. Satyanarayanan, et al., “OpenFace: A general-purpose face recognition library with mobile applications,” *CMU School of Computer Science*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 20, 2016.
- [119] M. R. Hasan, M. M. Hasan, and M. Z. Hossain, “How many Mel-frequency cepstral coefficients to be utilized in speech recognition? a study with the Bengali language,” *The Journal of Engineering*, vol. 2021, no. 12, pp. 817–827, 2021. DOI: 10.1049/tje2.12082.
- [120] M. Chen and X. Li, “SWAFN: Sentimental words aware fusion network for multimodal sentiment analysis,” in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, D. Scott, N. Bel, and C. Zong, Eds., Barcelona, Spain (Online): International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2020, pp. 1067–1077. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.93.
- [121] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhoria, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021. DOI: 10.1109/TASLP.2021.3122291.
- [122] W. Street, J. O. Siy, G. Keeling, et al., *Llms achieve adult human performance on higher-order theory of mind tasks*, 2024. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2405.18870. arXiv: 2405.18870 [cs.AI].
- [123] M. R. Hasan, M. Z. Hossain, A. Krishna, S. Rahman, and T. Gedeon, “Thesis proposal: Detecting empathy using multimodal language model,” in *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, St. Julian’s, Malta: Association for Computational Linguistics, Mar. 2024, pp. 338–349. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-srw.27>.
- [124] H. Abdollahi, M. H. Mahoor, R. Zandie, J. Siewierski, and S. H. Qualls, “Artificial emotional intelligence in socially assistive robots for older adults: A pilot study,” *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 2020–2032, 2023. DOI: 10.1109/TAFFC.2022.3143803.
- [125] M. Spitale, S. Okamoto, M. Gupta, H. Xi, and M. J. Mataric, “Socially assistive robots as storytellers that elicit empathy,” *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction (THRI)*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1–29, 2022. DOI: 10.1145/3538409.
- [126] N. Cousins, “How patients appraise physicians,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 313, no. 22, pp. 1422–1424, 1985.
- [127] P. S. Bellet and M. J. Maloney, “The importance of empathy as an interviewing skill in medicine,” *JAMA*, vol. 266, no. 13, pp. 1831–1832, Oct. 1991, ISSN: 0098-7484. DOI: 10.1001/jama.1991.03470130111039.
- [128] C. Lamm, H. Bukowski, and G. Silani, “From shared to distinct self–other representations in empathy: Evidence from neurotypical function and socio-cognitive disorders,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 371, no. 1686, p. 20 150 083, 2016. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2015.0083.
- [129] C. Rasool, H. Danielsson, and T. Jungert, “Empathy among students in engineering programmes,” *European Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 427–435, 2012. DOI: 10.1080/03043797.2012.708720.
- [130] W. Groeneveld et al., “Software engineering education beyond the technical: A systematic literature review,” in *Proceedings of the 47th SEFI Conference 2019*, SEFI-European Society for Engineering Education, vol. 47, 2019, pp. 1607–1622.
- [131] T. Kelley and D. Kelley, *Creative confidence: Unleashing the creative potential within us all*. Currency, 2013.
- [132] L. Crossley, “Building emotions in design,” *The Design Journal*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 35–45, 2003. DOI: 10.2752/146069203789355264.
- [133] A. Kirman and M. Teschl, “Selfish or selfless? the role of empathy in economics,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 365, no. 1538, pp. 303–317, 2010. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2009.0192.
- [134] M. S. Hossain and M. F. Rahman, “Detection of potential customers’ empathy behavior towards customers’ reviews,” *Journal*

of retailing and consumer services, vol. 65, p. 102881, 2022. DOI: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102881.

- [135] C. M. Clark, U. M. Murfett, P. S. Rogers, and S. Ang, "Is empathy effective for customer service? evidence from call center interactions," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 123–153, 2013. DOI: 10.1177/10506519124688.
- [136] T. Hennig-Thurau, K. P. Gwinner, and D. D. Gremler, "Understanding relationship marketing outcomes: An integration of relational benefits and relationship quality," *Journal of service research*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 230–247, 2002. DOI: 10.1177/1094670502004003006.
- [137] V. Kumar, I. Dalla Pozza, and J. Ganesh, "Revisiting the satisfaction–loyalty relationship: Empirical generalizations and directions for future research," *Journal of retailing*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 246–262, 2013. DOI: 10.1016/j.jretai.2013.02.001.
- [138] P. E. Salovey and D. J. Sluyter, *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications*. Basic Books, 1997.
- [139] P. N. Lopes, D. Grewal, J. Kadis, M. Gall, and P. Salovey, "Evidence that emotional intelligence is related to job performance and affect and attitudes at work," *Psicothema*, pp. 132–138, 2006.
- [140] K. Cameron and J. Dutton, *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2003.



Md Rakibul Hasan received his BSc (Hons) (2019) and MSc (2021) degrees from Khulna University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh. Currently, he is a PhD candidate in Computing at the 'Human-Centric Group in AI' at Curtin University, Western Australia, where he builds deep learning models to detect empathy from multimodal data, including text, video and audio signals. His overarching research interest includes advancing Affective Computing and multimodal systems using deep learning

algorithms. As a young academician, he has several publications on deep learning applications, including Affective Computing.



Md Zakir Hossain completed the BSc (2011) and MSc (2014) from Khulna University of Engineering & Technology (KUET), Khulna, Bangladesh in Electrical and Electronic Engineering, and PhD (2019) from the Australian National University (ANU), Canberra, Australia, in Computer Science. He is a Senior Research Fellow at the Curtin University. He has working experience with several universities and organisations, including KUET, ANU, University of Canberra, Macquarie University, and CSIRO. His

research direction leads to the development of advanced technologies for health-related prediction, including emotion recognition, human computing, and diagnosing and managing diseases. He has published a number of articles in the field of affective computing and computer vision.



Shreya Ghosh received a BTech degree in CSE from the Govt. College of Engineering and Textile Technology, Serampore, India, and the MS(R) degree in computer science and engineering from the Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, India, and the PhD degree from the Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, in 2022. She is currently a research academic at Curtin University. Prior to this, she was a post-doctoral fellow with Monash University, funded by DARPA. Her research interests include affective

computing, computer vision, and deep learning.



Aneesh Krishna is currently an Associate Professor and Discipline Lead of Computing within the School of Electrical Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Curtin University, Australia. He holds a PhD in computer science from the University of Wollongong, Australia. He was a lecturer at the School of Computer Science and Software Engineering, University of Wollongong, Australia (from February 2006 - June 2009). His research interests include AI

for software engineering, model-driven development/evolution, data mining, computer vision, and machine learning. He has published more than 180 articles in reputed journals and international conferences. His research is (or has been) funded by the Australian Research Council (ARC), and various Australian government agencies as well as companies such as Woodside Energy, Amristar Solutions, Autism West Incorporated, BW Solar Australia, Western Australia Dementia Training Center and Andrew Corporation. He serves as an assessor (Ozreader) for the ARC. He has been on the organising committee, served as invited technical program committee member of many conferences and workshops in the areas related to his research.



Tom Gedeon is the Human-Centric Advancements Chair in AI and was recently the Optus Chair in AI at Curtin University. Prior to this, he was a Professor of Computer Science and former Deputy Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science at ANU. He gained his BSc (Hons) and PhD from the University of Western Australia. Professor Gedeon's main research area is Responsive and Responsible AI. His focus is on the development of automated systems for information extraction, from

eye gaze and physiological data, as well as textual and other data, and for the synthesis of the extracted information into humanly useful information resources, primarily using neural/deep networks and fuzzy logic methods, and delivered in real, augmented and virtual environments.

Professor Gedeon has over 400 publications and has run multiple international conferences. He is a former president of the Asia-Pacific Neural Network Assembly and former President of the Computing Research and Education Association of Australasia. He has been General Chair for the International Conference on Neural Information Processing (ICONIP) three times. He has been nominated for VC's awards for postgraduate supervision at three Universities. He was a member of the Australian Research Council's College of Experts from 2018-2021 and continues from 2024-2026. He is an associate editor of the IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems and the INNS/Elsevier journal Neural Networks.