

Labels Generated by Large Language Model Helps Measuring People’s Empathy in Vitro

Md Rakibul Hasan, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Yue Yao, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*,
Md Zakir Hossain, *Member, IEEE*, Aneesh Krishna, Imre Rudas, Shafin Rahman,
and Tom Gedeon, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Large language models (LLMs) have revolutionised numerous fields, with LLM-as-a-service (LLMSaaS) having a strong generalisation ability that offers accessible solutions directly without the need for costly training. In contrast to the widely studied prompt engineering for task solving directly (in vivo), this paper explores its potential in in-vitro applications. These involve using LLM to generate labels to help the supervised training of mainstream models by (1) noisy label correction and (2) training data augmentation with LLM-generated labels. In this paper, we evaluate this approach in the emerging field of empathy computing – automating the prediction of psychological questionnaire outcomes from inputs like text sequences. Specifically, crowdsourced datasets in this domain often suffer from noisy labels that misrepresent underlying empathy. By leveraging LLM-generated labels to train pre-trained language models (PLMs) like RoBERTa, we achieve statistically significant accuracy improvements over baselines, achieving a state-of-the-art Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.648 on NewsEmp benchmarks. In addition, we bring insightful discussions, including current challenges in empathy computing, data biases in training data and evaluation metric selection. Code and LLM-generated data are available at <https://github.com/hasan-rakibul/LLMPathy> (available once the paper is accepted).

Index Terms—Empathy detection, Large language model, Natural language processing, Label noise

I. INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) have become a go-to approach across a variety of tasks such as emotion recognition [1] and empathy detection [2], [3]. Due to high computational demands, coupled with environmental impact, training or fine-tuning LLMs often becomes costly. This limitation has led to increasing adoption of LLMs as a service (LLMSaaS), where users access trained LLMs via online APIs with computation on cloud [4]. LLMSaaS can be utilised *in-vivo*, *i.e.*, prompt engineering to directly solve tasks such as named entity recognition [5], sentiment analysis [6] and empathy detection

[2], [3], or *in-vitro* [7]¹, *i.e.*, integrating LLM outputs into other models.

We are motivated by the following considerations. First, most current applications of LLMSaaS leverage LLM outputs *in-vivo* [2], [3], [5], [6]. We shift to their utility *in-vitro* to fine-tune pre-trained language models (PLMs)² like RoBERTa [8]. In particular, we propose to utilise LLMSaaS in a *data-centric AI* approach [9] to (1) enhance the quality of training labels and to (2) increase the amount of quality training data for supervised training of PLMs.

Second, for representation learning, maintaining data quality is critical – captured succinctly by the phrase, “garbage in, garbage out” [10]. While deep learning research has mostly focused on proposing new algorithms, improvement in data-centric AI is equally important [9]. As a data-centric AI approach, we leverage LLMs to enhance data quality. The effectiveness of our proposed approach is demonstrated in an emerging field – empathy detection.

Empathy is defined as ‘*an affective response more appropriate to another’s situation than one’s own*’ [11]. In psychology, various questionnaires have been developed to measure empathy. Empathy computing³, in computer science, complements these psychological methods by aiming to map the questionnaire outcomes from input stimuli such as text sequences, audiovisual content and physiological signals [12]. One well-known questionnaire is the empathy measurement scale proposed by Batson *et al.* [13], which assesses empathy across six dimensions: sympathetic, moved, compassionate, tender, warm and soft-hearted.

Empathy *computing* offers the potential to improve people’s empathic skills, which in turn strengthens interpersonal relationships across various human interactions [12]. In healthcare, for example, empathic writing in medical documents (*e.g.*, patient reports) can foster understanding and trust between clinicians and patients [15]. Similarly, in education, written communication like emails and feedback on assignments has become a vital medium for expressing care and addressing students’ emotional needs [16]. Journalism also demonstrates the importance of empathy in written narratives. For example,

¹Like [7], we use the term “in-vitro” to refer to leveraging LLM outputs out of the box in a different model.

²We use “pre-trained language models (PLMs)” to refer specifically to smaller models like the BERT family of models, distinguishing them from LLMs, which are also pre-trained but significantly larger.

³We use the terms empathy computing, detection and measurement interchangeably.

M R Hasan, Y Yao, M Z Hossain, A Krishna and T Gedeon are with School of Electrical Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Curtin University, Bentley WA 6102, Australia.

I Rudas is with Obuda University, Budapest, Hungary.

S Rahman is with North South University, Dhaka 1229, Bangladesh.

M R Hasan is also with BRAC University, Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh.

Y Yao and M Z Hossain are also with The Australian National University, Australia.

T Gedeon is also with Obuda University, Budapest, Hungary.

E-mail: {Rakibul.Hasan, Zakir.Hossain1, A.Krishna, Tom.Gedeon}@curtin.edu.au, yue.yao@anu.edu.au, rudas@uni-obuda.hu, shafin.rahman@northsouth.edu

Corresponding author: M R Hasan





Fig. 1. **Left:** Overview of traditional and LLM-based methods to annotate essays for detecting empathy in the essays written in response to the news articles. To be shown in our experiment, existing crowdsourced self-annotation through questionnaires is found to be incorrect in many samples. Our proposed approach involves annotating the essays using LLM, which is then used to reduce label noise and to get additional training data. **Right:** Impact of our LLM usage is showcased through a performance comparison between existing crowdsourced annotations, LLM-based label noise correction and the inclusion of additional data labelled by the LLM. Statistical significance is calculated using `Statannotations` package [14], where * means $0.01 < p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$, ** means $0.001 < p\text{-value} \leq 0.01$ and **** means $p\text{-value} \leq 0.0001$ (*i.e.* more * means higher statistical significance).

a news article on a family’s recovery after a devastating event often goes beyond factual reporting and offers a compassionate perspective that engages readers emotionally and deepens their connection to the news story. Specifically, this paper measures people’s empathy in essays written in response to scenarios reported in newspaper articles.

Empathy is inherently subjective, and machine learning models, including LLMs, used for its detection can exhibit biases across different demographic groups [17]. We, therefore, investigate such biases across different demographics. Additionally, while the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) remains the most commonly used evaluation metric in empathy computing [12], it does not account for the magnitude of the error. To address this, we advocate for complementing PCC with concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) and root mean square error (RMSE).

Neural networks are prone to memorising training data, *i.e.*, overfitting. This issue is exacerbated by noisy labels, where traditional regularisation techniques like dropout and weight decay often fall short [18]. A major challenge in ensuring data quality is, therefore, addressing label noise, defined as labels that deviate from their intended values. It is a significant challenge in empathy computing datasets collected through crowdsourcing. Platforms like Amazon Mechanical Turk offer quick access to large participant pools. Accordingly, crowdsourcing with questionnaire-based self-assessment labelling is a popular way of collecting data in computational social science and human behaviour research, including empathy [19] and emotion recognition [20]. However, such data often suffer from inaccuracies due to inattentiveness or multitasking among participants, compromising data reliability [21]–[23]. This necessitates strategies to enhance data quality post-collection.

The overarching goal of this paper is to address the question: “How can LLMs enhance training of PLMs to improve empathy computing accuracy?” As illustrated in Fig. 1, our proposed in-vitro applications achieve statistically significant

performance improvements. The first application, which automatically adjusts training labels, demonstrates consistent performance improvement across all metrics compared to the baseline PLM trained on the original dataset. The second application, leveraging additional LLM-labelled training data, further enhances model performance, yielding the highest statistically significant performance gains with a $p\text{-value} < 0.0001$ [14].

Our key contributions are summarised as follows:

- 1) We propose two in-vitro applications of LLMs: mitigating label noise and getting additional training data for PLMs.
- 2) We design a novel scale-aware prompt that enables LLMs to annotate data while adhering to annotation protocols grounded in theoretical frameworks.
- 3) We investigate challenges in empathy computing datasets and advocate for new evaluation metrics.
- 4) Our proposed methods achieve statistically significant performance improvements over the baseline models across multiple datasets and set a new state-of-the-art empathy computing performance.

II. RELATED WORK

A. LLM in Data Annotation

The advent of LLMs has inspired numerous studies exploring their application for data annotation, often positioning them as a substitute for traditional human annotation. For instance, Niu *et al.* [24] examined the potential of LLMs in emotion annotation tasks and reported that LLMs can generate emotion labels closely aligned with human annotations. Similarly, Wang *et al.* [25] explored the utility of LLMs in annotating datasets for various natural language processing tasks, including sentiment analysis, question generation and topic classification. While they highlighted the cost-effectiveness of LLM-based annotations, they also noted its limitations compared to human annotators. Departing from this line of work, our approach explores LLM-generated labels

to enhance the training of PLMs. Specifically, we integrate LLM-generated labels with human-generated labels rather than exclusive use of either LLM- or human-generated labels.

We examine our approach in two distinct applications: label adjustment and training data enhancement. Related to our first application, Hasan *et al.* [26] also explored label noise adjustment, but their approach relies on subjects' demographic information (*e.g.*, age, gender and race) in the prompting process. In contrast, our method deliberately avoids any use of demographic details to mitigate potential biases inherent in LLM training. Additionally, the reliance on demographic information may not always be feasible, which makes our approach more broadly applicable. Another key difference with their prompting strategy is the use of multiple input-output examples: while Hasan *et al.* [26] rely on few-shot prompting with multiple example pairs to elicit LLM output in a consistent style, our approach does not require such examples yet still achieves consistent outputs. Furthermore, they experimented solely on the GPT-3.5 LLM, whereas we explore both Llama 3 70B [27] and GPT-4 [28] LLMs in a different dataset.

B. Learning with Label Noise

Training with noisy labels has been extensively studied, particularly in classification tasks, with approaches like semi-supervised learning showing promise [29]. However, most of these techniques [30], [31] are tailored to classification problems, leaving regression tasks under-explored. Final-layer activations, such as `sigmoid` or `softmax`, produce class probabilities that underpin the design of many algorithms designed for learning with noisy labels [32], [33]. Apart from class probabilities, some studies [34], [35] proposed noise modelling by a de-noising loss function based on cross-entropy. In contrast, regression requires dealing with continuous target space without any final-layer activations or cross-entropy loss functions.

Research on label noise in textual regression remains sparse. Wang *et al.* [36] tackled this challenge by iteratively identifying noisy examples and applying one of three strategies: discarding noisy data points, substituting noisy labels with pseudo-labels, or resampling clean instances to balance the dataset. While effective in identifying extreme outliers, their approach has limitations in detecting mild disagreements. Their method performs better in knowledge-dense domains, such as clinical notes and academic papers, where outliers are more prominent, compared to general-purpose datasets with subtler noise patterns.

C. Empathy Computing

Empathy computing is an emerging field, with significant advancements in textual empathy prediction [12]. For a detailed overview of its progress, we refer to a recent systematic literature review by Hasan *et al.* [12].

In textual empathy computing, the most widely studied context is detecting people's empathy in response to newspaper articles. The Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis (WASSA) shared

tasks (2021–2024) have spurred various approaches leveraging PLMs on this task. Most approaches predominantly employed fine-tuning PLMs, with RoBERTa being the most preferred PLM [37]–[49]. Some studies have explored other BERT-based PLMs [50]–[53] or ensemble strategies combining multiple PLMs [54]–[56]. The suitability of fine-tuning RoBERTa is further validated by Qian *et al.* [38], who reported that simple fine-tuning of RoBERTa outperformed more complex multi-task learning in textual empathy computing. Overall, fine-tuning PLMs has emerged as the predominant approach for this task, with RoBERTa being the leading model [12].

More recently, LLMs have been explored for textual empathy prediction through rephrasing text for data augmentation [26], [48], fine-tuning [2] and prompt engineering [3]. Hasan *et al.* [26] adds multi-layer perception layers on top of a RoBERTa PLM to process demographic data, while Li *et al.* [2]'s fine-tuning of LLM demands significant computational resources. Unlike these methods, our approach leverages LLM-generated labels to enhance fine-tuning of a standard RoBERTa PLM, without demographic data or high computational costs.

III. METHOD

A. Problem Formulation

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ represent a dataset, where x_i is the i -th input text sequence, and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes corresponding continuous empathy score. Empathy, being a psychological construct, is challenging to annotate due to subjectivity. Consequently, the target variable y_i often suffers from noise, which is particularly significant in crowdsourced annotations. We denote the noisy ground-truth empathy score as \tilde{y}_i , which serves as a proxy for the true, unobserved empathy score y_i . Thus, the dataset can be reformulated as $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, \tilde{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$. Our goal is to develop a model $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where \mathcal{X} is the space of text sequences, such that $\mathcal{F}(x_i)$ accurately estimates y_i .

The dataset \mathcal{D} is randomly partitioned into three non-overlapping subsets: a training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} = \{(x_i, \tilde{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{train}}}$, used to train the models; a validation set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}} = \{(x_j, \tilde{y}_j)\}_{j=1}^{N_{\text{val}}}$, used for tasks such as hyperparameter tuning; and a hold-out test set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{(x_k, \tilde{y}_k)\}_{k=1}^{N_{\text{test}}}$, reserved for final model evaluation. The reserved $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ has not been altered in any way through the experiment.

Large language models (LLMs) can be leveraged to improve training in such noisy scenarios, specifically to assist a smaller pre-trained language model (PLM) in better estimating the empathy score. We consider two *in vitro* approaches for leveraging LLM-generated labels to enhance model training.

B. Applications of Large Language Model *in-Vitro*

Our proposed framework leverages LLM for empathy prediction, as illustrated in Fig. 2. The first application reduces label noise, while the second application increases the amount of training data by incorporating additional labelled data using LLM. Improved training data from these two applications are fed to a pre-trained language model (PLM) for final empathy prediction.




Fig. 2. Overview of our proposed in-vitro applications of large language models (LLMs) for enhancing textual empathy prediction with pre-trained language models (PLMs). Application 1 involves correcting noisy labels in an existing dataset using an LLM. Application 2 utilises an LLM to label additional text data, which is then added to the existing training dataset.

All of our proposed applications require LLM to output empathy scores from input text sequences. We first construct a prompt by imitating an actual data collection task. For example, NewsEmp datasets used Batson’s Empathy scale, which has six components. Such a *scale-aware* prompt ensures alignment with the crowdsourced labelling protocol. Accordingly, we design a prompt, where we ask LLM to give scores across each dimension as presented in the below excerpts. Refer to Section B for the full prompt.

Now, provide scores with respect to Batson’s empathy scale. That is, provide scores between 1.0 and 7.0 for each of the following emotions: sympathetic, moved, compassionate, tender, warm and softhearted. ... a score of 1.0 means the individual is not feeling the emotion at all, and a score of 7.0 means the individual is extremely feeling the emotion.

Following the same annotation protocol designed for crowdsourced annotation, responses from LLM across six dimensions of the empathy scale are averaged to have a single empathy score y^* . The following subsections present details about how we use these LLM labels in empathy computing.

1) *Application 1: Noise Mitigation in Labels:* The LLM-generated labels y^* are used to identify and replace noisy samples in \tilde{y} . Noisy samples are identified based on the difference between crowdsourced and LLM-provided labels. A revised label y'_i is defined as:

$$y'_i = \begin{cases} y_i^* & \text{if } |\tilde{y}_i - y_i^*| > \alpha \\ \tilde{y}_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where α is a predefined threshold, hereby defined as *annotation selection threshold*, which is used to decide which label to use for which sample. This threshold can be any continuous value between 0 and the range of empathy score (e.g., $7 - 1 = 6$ for the NewsEmp dataset). A smaller α means more LLM labels are included by penalising even smaller

deviations between two annotations. This can make it harder for the model to generalise on the hold-out test set because the hold-out test set is labelled through crowdsourcing. Overall, smaller α would introduce a larger shift in distribution between training and testing data.

Theoretically, a higher value of α would work better for generalisation because it would only penalise larger annotation deviations. This way, the model would avoid training on crowdsourced labels that have a large deviation from LLM labels, and at the same time, it would be trained on crowdsourced labels that have slight deviations from LLM labels. In summary, α balances the distribution shift between training and testing data, and a larger α close to the range of empathy label y would work better to generalise on the test set.

The revised dataset $\mathcal{D}' = \{(x_i, y'_i)\}$ is then used to train a pre-trained language model $\mathcal{F}_{y'}$. We hypothesise that the performance of $\mathcal{F}_{y'}$, trained on the mixture of \tilde{y} and y^* , is better than $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{y}}$, which is trained solely on \tilde{y} .

2) *Application 2: Additional Data Labelled by LLM:* Since deep learning models generally benefit from additional data, we propose to utilise LLM to get additional training data. While common LLM-based data augmentation techniques, such as paraphrasing [26], [45] and summarising [52], are well-documented in the literature, our approach goes a step further. Specifically, we use an LLM to label new essays following the same annotation protocol as our target domain. This method, therefore, enables the integration of any similar data points into the training process.

Mathematically, we prompt LLM to annotate new text samples u and make a new dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{llm}} = \{(u_i, v_i^*)\}_{i=1}^M$ with empathy scores v_i^* . These new data points could be any text similar to the essays x , but it may not have any prior empathy labels. We then annotate it in the same scale of y using LLM. This additional data is combined with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ to create an extended training set:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{extended}} = \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{llm}} = \{(x_i, \tilde{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{train}}} \cup \{(u_i, v_i^*)\}_{i=1}^M \quad (2)$$

Models trained on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{extended}}$ are expected to outperform models trained solely on \mathcal{D} when evaluated on the hold-out test set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$. The extended dataset would enable the model to see a more diverse set of training examples, which should improve the model's ability to generalise to unseen test data.

Similar to labelling training data required for our proposed applications, LLMs can be prompted directly to generate empathy labels for the test set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$. This zero-shot prediction leverages LLM's pre-trained knowledge without requiring further fine-tuning. Compared to the other two applications, zero-shot prediction relies heavily on the inherent capabilities of the LLM.

C. Prediction using Pre-trained Language Model

Fine-tuning a pre-trained language model (PLM) is a widely adopted approach in the empathy computing literature [12]. Accordingly, we utilise the dataset refined through LLM-based approaches to fine-tune a PLM. Each text sequence x_i is first encoded into a contextual representation that serves as an aggregate sequence representation:

$$h_i^{\text{[CLS]}} = \text{PLM}(x_i; \theta) \quad (3)$$

where θ are the parameters of the PLM, and $h_i^{\text{[CLS]}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the [CLS] token representation. The pooled [CLS] representation is then passed through a linear regression head to predict the continuous empathy score:

$$\hat{y}_i = \mathcal{F}(h_i^{\text{[CLS]}}; \phi) = Wh_i^{\text{[CLS]}} + b \quad (4)$$

where $\phi = W \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}, b \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the learnable parameters of the linear layer. The model is trained to minimise the discrepancy between predicted scores \hat{y}_i and target scores y_i^{true} over the dataset:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ell(\hat{y}_i, y_i^{\text{true}}) \quad (5)$$

where $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the mean squared error (MSE) loss function, and N is the number of training examples. The ground truth y_i^{true} refers to the mixed labels y' in Application 1, while in Application 2, it refers to crowdsourced labels y for existing dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ or LLM-provided labels v^* for additional data \mathcal{D}_{llm} . The evaluation is always conducted on the original held-out dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$.

Algorithm 1 presents the overall workflow of our proposed approaches in empathy detection. After partitioning the dataset into training, validation and test subsets, one can choose between Application 1 and 2, as they are mutually exclusive. For Application 1 (label noise correction), the LLM is queried with scale-aware prompts to generate refined labels. If the difference between the original label and the LLM-generated label exceeds a threshold, the label is updated; otherwise, the original label is retained. The revised dataset is then used for PLM fine-tuning. Alternatively, for Application 2 (leveraging additional unlabelled data), the LLM is queried to generate labels for this data, which is then combined with the training set to form an extended dataset. In both cases, a PLM is fine-tuned on the revised or extended dataset. The fine-tuning involves optimising the PLM to predict empathy

Algorithm 1 Leveraging LLM in Empathy Detection

Require: Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, \tilde{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, annotation selection threshold α , additional unlabelled data $\mathcal{U} = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^M$

Ensure: Empathy predictions \hat{y}

- 1: **Partition** \mathcal{D} into $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, \mathcal{D}_{val} and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$
 - 2: **if** Application 1 **then**
 - 3: **go to** 6
 - 4: **else if** Application 2 **then**
 - 5: **go to** 12
 - 6: \triangleright *Application 1: label noise correction* \triangleleft
 - 7: **for** each i in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ **do**
 - 8: Query LLM to generate label y_i^* using scale-aware prompt
 - 9: Update label: $y'_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} y_i^*, & \text{if } |\tilde{y}_i - y_i^*| > \alpha \\ \tilde{y}_i, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 - 10: Form revised dataset $\mathcal{D}' = \{(x_i, y'_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{train}}}$
 - 11: **go to** 18
 - 12: \triangleright *Application 2: additional data labelled by LLM* \triangleleft
 - 13: **for** each u_i in \mathcal{U} **do**
 - 14: Query LLM to generate label v_i^* for u_i using the same prompt
 - 15: Form additional dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{llm}} = \{(u_i, v_i^*)\}_{i=1}^M$
 - 16: Combine datasets: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{extended}} = \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{llm}}$
 - 17: **go to** 18
 - 18: \triangleright *Prediction using pre-trained language model (PLM)* \triangleleft
 - 19: Fine-tune PLM \mathcal{F}_θ on \mathcal{D}' or $\mathcal{D}_{\text{extended}}$:
 - $\hat{y}_i = \mathcal{F}_\theta(x_i) = Wh_i^{\text{[CLS]}} + b$
 - 20: Evaluate \mathcal{F}_θ on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$
 - 21: **return** final predictions \hat{y}
-

scores based on input text embeddings, followed by evaluating its performance on the hold-out crowdsourced test set.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

A. Dataset and Associated Challenges

Buechel *et al.* [57] marked an important step in understanding how individuals empathise with others or nature. They designed a crowdsourced approach where participants read newspaper articles depicting scenarios of harm to people or nature and wrote about their emotional responses. The overarching aim was to capture individuals' reactions to adverse situations faced by others. This dataset, released in 2018, was the first of its kind, following which subsequent datasets were built. We refer to these datasets collectively as *NewsEmp* series, as their central objective is to measure empathy elicited by newspaper articles.

The second NewsEmp dataset was released in 2022, in which Tafreshi *et al.* [19] employed 564 subjects reading 418 news articles, which led to a total of 2,655 samples distributed into training, validation and test splits. Another significant change appeared in the NewsEmp23 dataset [58], which uses only the top 100 most negative articles from the pool of 418 news articles. Collectively, these datasets have become the most widely used dataset for benchmarking empathy detection approaches [12]. This popularity comes from their usage in

the long-standing empathy detection challenge organised under the “Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis (WASSA)” series [19], [37], [43], [59]. In particular, the WASSA 2021 [19] and WASSA 2022 [59] challenges utilised the NewsEmp22 dataset, while WASSA 2023 [43] and the WASSA 2024 [37] utilised the NewsEmp23 and the latest NewsEmp24 datasets, respectively. Refer to Table VII in Appendix Section A for the statistics of the datasets used in this study.

Expectedly, due to the iterative nature of the datasets, there is overlap among some of these datasets. We found that the entire NewsEmp18 dataset is included in the training set of NewsEmp22, and the entire NewsEmp23 training and validation sets appear in the NewsEmp24 training set. In this study, we primarily use NewsEmp22 and NewsEmp24 datasets and partly NewsEmp23 datasets.

Although excluding NewsEmp23 would have been feasible, prior research [37] achieving state-of-the-art results on the NewsEmp24 dataset combined NewsEmp22, NewsEmp23 and NewsEmp24 to train their model. To ensure a fair comparison, we also report findings based on models trained using the combined three datasets.

While this combination may seem unusual due to the overlap, it can be beneficial for improving predictions on the NewsEmp24 test split. Including duplicated samples from the NewsEmp24 training set allows the model to see more samples with a similar distribution because the NewsEmp24 test split should have a closer distribution to its training set than another dataset’s (NewsEmp22) training set.

It is worth noting that if we aim to evaluate a model on the NewsEmp23 dataset, caution is necessary when combining datasets. One interesting finding on NewsEmp datasets is that – although not explicitly stated by dataset providers – 44 out of 100 test samples in the NewsEmp23 dataset are also present in the NewsEmp24 validation set. Due to this data leakage, a model trained on the NewsEmp24 validation set would, therefore, inflate performance on the NewsEmp23 test split. To verify this, we trained a model using NewsEmp24 training and validation sets, which gives a PCC of 0.576, outperforming the state-of-the-art PCC of 0.563 in NewsEmp23 test split [26]. To prevent misleading results in future research, we highlight this overlap in our paper and recommend exercising caution when combining datasets. Throughout our experiments, we ensure that there is no data leakage between training and testing splits.

Overall, we compare the performance of our proposed LLM-based approaches across various dataset combinations, including NewsEmp24, NewsEmp23 and NewsEmp22. We then benchmark our work against the evaluation metrics reported by others on the NewsEmp24 dataset. This dataset was chosen because it is the most recent in this series, and it includes the NewsEmp23 dataset within it. Additionally, the ground truth for the NewsEmp24 test split is publicly available, which is essential for calculating different metrics, while the ground truth for the other datasets is unavailable.

B. Evaluation Metric

Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) is a single metric used in the literature for evaluating empathy computing studies in

this series of datasets [12]. While it measures the linear relationship between predicted and true values, it does not account for the *magnitude* of errors, meaning predictions can have a perfect correlation with true values while being consistently offset (e.g., predictions of 1, 2, and 3 corresponding to ground truths of 5, 6, and 7 yields a PCC of 1). This issue undermines its reliability for assessing model accuracy.

While PCC has been the only metric used in empathy computing literature on NewsEmp datasets, studies on other datasets sometimes use different metrics. For example, Barros *et al.* [60], detecting empathy in an audiovisual dataset, adopted the concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) as their primary metric. The above-mentioned shortcomings of PCC could be solved using CCC, as it calculates both the linear relationship and the magnitude of prediction errors. It ensures that predictions are not only aligned with the trend of true values but also close in magnitude, penalising large errors.

Root mean square error (RMSE) appears to be another choice of evaluation as it directly captures prediction error. Overall, PCC, CCC and RMSE measure three distinct qualities of performance: PCC measures linear relationship, RMSE measures the magnitude of errors, and CCC considers both linearity and error magnitude.

C. Implementation Details

We access llama3-70b-8192 version of the Llama 3 LLM through Groq API and gpt-4o version (accessed on 30 December 2024) of the GPT-4 LLM through OpenAI API. To ensure deterministic and focused LLM outputs, we set the *temperature* parameter of the APIs to 0, minimising randomness, and *top_p* parameter to 0.01, restricting the sampling to only the highest-probability tokens.

All experiments are conducted in Python 3.12.3 running on a single AMD Instinct™ MI250X GPU. As a pre-trained language model (PLM), we fine-tune the pre-trained roberta-base model [8] having 125.7M trainable parameters from Huggingface [61]. Training is conducted for a maximum of 20 epochs with imposing deterministic behaviour through the PyTorch Lightning package. We leverage a delayed-start early-stopping strategy that starts monitoring validation CCC after five epochs and stops training if the score does not improve for two successive epochs. Early stopping based on PCC was ineffective in our experience due to higher metric fluctuations, whereas CCC performed better due to its smoother behaviour. We save the model checkpoint corresponding to the last epoch of training.

We use AdamW optimiser combined with a linear learning rate scheduler. Detailed hyperparameters are reported in the Appendix Table VIII.

Following [8], we report median statistics over five different random initialisations (seeds: 0, 42, 100, 999 and 1234). Since prior works on empathy computing on these datasets reported a single peak score of their model, we also report the peak score from these five runs⁴.

⁴We define *peak* score as the best score (maximum PCC, maximum CCC or minimum RMSE) across five random runs within a *single* experimental setup. Another related terminology used throughout this paper is the *best* score, which refers to the best scores across *different* experimental setups.

TABLE I

EXAMPLES OF MISLABELLED CROWDSOURCED ANNOTATION, DEVIATING FROM BATSON’S DEFINITION OF EMPATHY. THE FIRST EXAMPLE SHOWS AN ESSAY WITH EMPATHIC ELEMENTS BUT THE PARTICIPANT’S ANNOTATION INDICATES THE LOWEST EMPATHY. THE SECOND EXAMPLE HAS THE HIGHEST EMPATHY SCORE DESPITE THE ESSAY LACKING EMPATHIC CONTENT. LLM LABELS APPEAR ACCURATE AND CONSISTENT BETWEEN LLAMA AND GPT.

Essay	Crowd	Llama	GPT
“After reading the article, my heart just breaks for the people that are affected by this. Not only are innocent people being killed daily but also little children as well as babies. These children do not deserve this and it’s sad because they have their whole lives ahead of them. I really hope that war will end one day although it is looking unlikely.”	1.0	6.4	6.08
“I read the article on the China mining disaster. There were 33 miners trapped in the mine. Only two of them survived. Officials stated whoever was responsible would be punished. Smaller mines were shut down immediately until further notice. China has always been known for the deadliest mining.”	7.0	1.83	1.67

Empathic expressions are highlighted in blue.

Labels are in a continuous range from 1 to 7, where 1 and 7 refer to the lowest and highest empathy, respectively.

D. Main Results

This section presents the quantitative results of our proposed applications of LLM as a service (LLMaaS) in empathy predictions.

1) *Noise Mitigation*: We first show evidence of noise in the NewsEmp24 dataset. Table I illustrates the comparison between human participants’ and LLMs’ assessments of empathy on a scale of 1 (lowest empathy) to 7 (highest empathy) in two example essays. It demonstrates interesting disparities between crowdsourced and LLM evaluations – for instance, in one essay expressing deep emotional concern for affected people and children, the human rater assigned a relatively low score of 1.0, while the Llama and GPT LLMs rated it much higher at 6.4 and 6.08, respectively. Conversely, a more factual account of a mining disaster received a maximum empathy score of 7.0 from human raters but a much lower 1.83 and 1.67 from the Llama and GPT LLMs, respectively. Interestingly, both LLMs, despite differences in size and provider, produce highly consistent annotations, which further underscores the potential inaccuracies of the crowdsourced annotation.

We evaluate our proposed LLMaaS application for noise mitigation in three dataset configurations: NewsEmp24 alone, NewsEmp24 + NewsEmp22, and NewsEmp24 + NewsEmp23 + NewsEmp22. While combining the datasets, we combine their training and validation splits of the additional dataset with the training split of the base dataset for training the model. For example, the NewsEmp24 + NewsEmp22 experimental setup uses the training split of NewsEmp24 and training and validation splits of the NewsEmp22 dataset to train the model. In all cases, the model training is optimised for the validation split of the NewsEmp24 dataset and finally evaluated on the hold-out NewsEmp24 test split.

As presented in Table II, our LLM-based noise mitigation approach demonstrates consistent performance improvements across all dataset configurations. For the NewsEmp24 dataset alone, the baseline achieves moderate performance, but noise mitigation using either Llama or GPT LLMs improves the performance. Specifically, Llama labels at $\alpha = 3.5$ achieve the highest median CCC of 0.435, while GPT labels at the same α yield the best median PCC of 0.473 and the lowest median RMSE of 1.558. Overall, the performance improvement between Llama and GPT labels is comparable, with each achieving the best results in certain metrics. Given that Llama is open-source and free of charge, we proceed with the remaining experiments in this application scenario using

TABLE II

RESULTS OF OUR LLM-BASED NOISE MITIGATION APPROACH, EVALUATED ON THE NEWSEMP24 TEST SET.

Labels	PCC \uparrow	CCC \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow
NewsEmp24			
CS	0.331(0.378)	0.307(0.329)	1.656(0.066)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 3.5$)	<u>0.453</u> (0.462)	0.435 (0.455)	1.604(0.087)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 4.0$)	0.384(0.464)	0.378(0.454)	1.647(<u>0.075</u>)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 4.5$)	0.421(0.482)	0.392(0.463)	<u>1.566</u> (0.098)
CS & GPT ($\alpha = 3.5$)	0.473 (0.509)	<u>0.431</u> (0.496)	1.558 (1.499)
CS & GPT ($\alpha = 4.0$)	0.415(0.519)	0.398(<u>0.482</u>)	1.601(1.461)
CS & GPT ($\alpha = 4.5$)	0.370(0.422)	0.325(0.400)	1.646(1.532)
NewsEmp24 + NewsEmp22			
CS	0.536(0.597)	0.461(0.505)	<u>1.356</u> (0.042)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 3.5$)	<u>0.558</u> (0.612)	<u>0.496</u> (0.559)	1.389(0.084)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 4.0$)	0.589 (0.627)	0.516 (<u>0.563</u>)	1.338 (<u>0.054</u>)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 4.5$)	0.551(<u>0.620</u>)	0.478(0.575)	1.378(0.100)
NewsEmp24 + NewsEmp23 + NewsEmp22			
CS	0.528(0.551)	0.469(0.498)	1.380(0.086)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 3.5$)	<u>0.556</u> (0.573)	<u>0.511</u> (<u>0.552</u>)	1.381(<u>0.029</u>)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 4.0$)	0.574 (<u>0.582</u>)	0.529 (0.548)	1.333 (0.021)
CS & Llama ($\alpha = 4.5$)	0.548(0.648)	0.479(0.597)	<u>1.346</u> (0.092)

CS – Crowdsourced labels

Reported metrics are in median(peak) format, calculated from five random initialisations.

Boldface and underline texts indicate the best and the second best scores, respectively.

Llama.

Including the NewsEmp22 dataset enhances performance further, with $\alpha = 4.0$ yielding the best median PCC (0.589) and median CCC (0.516) alongside a reduced median RMSE (1.338). When combined with NewsEmp23, the baseline metrics remain comparable, but $\alpha = 4.0$ again delivers the highest median PCC (0.574) and median CCC (0.529), with RMSE achieving its lowest value of 1.333. Considering peak scores instead of median statistics across five runs, our approach also outperforms the baseline model by achieving the peak PCC of 0.648, CCC of 0.597 and RMSE of 0.021. As illustrated earlier in Fig. 1, the performance improvements are statistically significant.

The value of threshold α signifies the proportion of LLM labels and crowdsourced labels. As demonstrated earlier, a higher value of α means having a higher amount of LLM labels. Having more LLM labels than crowdsourced labels would have made it difficult for the model to predict crowd-sourced labels in the test set. We found that $\alpha = 3.5 \sim 4.5$ provides the best performance across the three dataset configu-

TABLE III
RESULT WITH ADDITIONAL DATA LABELLED BY LLM. REPORTED METRICS ARE MEDIAN OVER FIVE RANDOM INITIALISATIONS.

Training data	PCC \uparrow	CCC \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow
NewsEmp24	0.331(0.378)	0.307(0.329)	1.656(<u>0.066</u>)
+ Crowd-labelled NewsEmp22	0.485(0.594)	0.439(0.480)	1.417 (0.093)
+ Llama-labelled NewsEmp22	0.513 (0.571)	0.490 (0.523)	<u>1.484</u> (0.059)
+ GPT-labelled NewsEmp22	<u>0.495</u> (0.549)	<u>0.446</u> (0.455)	1.581(1.514)
NewsEmp22	0.459(0.477)	0.363(0.411)	1.776(<u>0.046</u>)
+ Crowd-labelled NewsEmp24	<u>0.467</u> (<u>0.478</u>)	<u>0.392</u> (0.435)	<u>1.756</u> (0.062)
+ Llama-labelled NewsEmp24	0.496 (0.519)	0.429 (<u>0.434</u>)	1.729 (0.034)

All evaluations are on test splits except for the evaluation on the NewsEm22 dataset, where CCC and RMSE are calculated on the validation split due to unavailable ground truth of the test split.

Reported metrics are in median (peak) format, calculated across five random initialisations.

Boldface and underline texts indicate the best and the second best scores, respectively.

rations. The correct value of α depends on the composition of the training data, as verified by different α giving best scores at different configurations.

Although the noise mitigation approach outperforms the baseline in terms of median PCCs, CCCs and RMSEs and the peak PCCs and CCCs in all three configurations, it fails to outperform the baseline in terms of peak RMSE in two configurations (*i.e.*, it failed 2 out of 18 test cases). It is worthwhile to note that we do *not* alter the labels of the hold-out test set. It is likely the training set and test set labels have different distributions as we reduce label noise on the training set. Since RMSE only measures the difference between ground truth and predictions, the model trained on noisy labels presumably gave the peak RMSE at a particular runtime.

2) *Additional Data Labelled by LLM*: The first application described above demonstrates that additional training data helps in getting better performance. However, we may not always have the flexibility of having extra data labelled by human participants. This application, therefore, explores whether additional data labelled by LLM could help.

We evaluate this application in two configurations: NewsEmp24 as the base dataset and NewsEmp22 as the base dataset. While evaluating the model on the NewsEmp24 dataset, we consider the NewsEmp22 dataset as additional data and vice versa. This way, we examine the performance if this additional data is labelled either by (1) human participants or (2) LLM.

Table III reports the performance in both settings. When trained with the NewsEmp24 dataset alone, the model achieved a median PCC of 0.331 and 0.307 CCC. Additional NewsEmp22 dataset labelled by human participants boosted performance to 0.485 PCC, 0.439 CCC and 1.417 RMSE. The same NewsEmp22 data – labelled by Llama LLM – make the highest median PCC of 0.513 and CCC of 0.490 while maintaining a competitive RMSE of 1.484. Like our earlier experiment (Application 1), the use of either Llama or GPT LLMs yields similar performance in this set-up; therefore, we proceed with Llama LLMs for the rest of the experiments.

Experiments using NewsEmp22 as the base dataset exhibited a similar trend to those with NewsEmp24 as the base




Fig. 3. Median performance in the NewsEmp24 test set with gradual increase of additional LLM-labelled data. *Baseline* scores refer to the scores achieved using only NewsEmp24 data.

dataset. The model trained with LLM-labelled data achieves the best PCC (0.496) and CCC (0.429), as well as the lowest RMSE (1.729). Notably, the human-labelled data shows improvement over the base dataset but falls short of the performance achieved with LLM-labelled data. Overall, LLM labels are as good as crowdsourced labels, and additional data, either crowdsourced or LLM-labelled, boosts the performance. Overall, incorporating additional data labelled by LLMs consistently improves model performance across both datasets.

Compared to the first application scenario (mixed labels), performance improvement from baseline in this application is statistically more significant in terms of all three evaluation metrics (Fig. 1). In particular, this application scenario demonstrates the highest level of statistically significant improvements in terms of PCC and CCC. This is likely because, in this scenario, the labels of the base training data remain unchanged, which is presumably of a similar distribution to the hold-out test set. The additional data provides extra supervision, which helps achieving better score. Results using additional data labelled by LLM are better than using human labelling in most cases (9 out of 12 test cases), likely because of the higher quality of labels from LLM.

To understand how the amount of additional data affects the performance, we gradually increased the amount of additional data (Fig. 3). In each case, we randomly sampled a percentage of the additional data ranging from 10% to 100%. Surprisingly, the performance increases most rapidly from 10 to 30%, after which the improvement slows down.

Fig. 4 provides a comparative 3D t-SNE visualisation of the embeddings derived from different labelling sources. Embeddings from crowdsourced labels exhibit a slightly dispersed distribution, which suggests the presence of noisy labels. In contrast, embeddings based on LLM labels display a smoother and more distinct separation of empathy scores. This suggests a reduction in label noise. Additional LLM labels provide extra supervision, which results in enhanced structure and further refinement in the embeddings.

E. Zero-Shot Prediction & Demographic Biases

The most direct application of LLM is to predict empathy in a zero-shot manner, *i.e.*, without any training or fine-tuning




Fig. 4. 3D t-SNE visualisation of CLS embeddings from pre-trained language models fine-tuned using crowdsourced labels (**left**), LLM-generated labels (**middle**) and crowdsourced + additional LLM-labelled data (**right**). While abrupt patterns in the embeddings from crowdsourced labels suggest noisy labels, smoother patterns from LLM labels suggest that the noise has been reduced.

TABLE IV
ZERO-SHOT PREDICTION USING LLMs.

Dataset	LLM	Split	PCC \uparrow	CCC \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow
NewsEmp24	Llama	Test	0.441	0.436	1.731
		Validation	0.502	0.457	1.952
	GPT	Test	0.581	0.489	1.715
		Validation	0.480	0.375	2.038
NewsEmp23	Llama	Test	0.380	–	–
		Validation	0.108	0.108	2.18
NewsEmp22	Llama	Test	0.517	–	–
		Validation	0.579	0.573	1.728

Ground truth of the NewsEmp22 and NewsEmp23 test splits are unavailable to calculate CCC and RMSE.

of the LLM. Table IV reports the performances of zero-shot prediction across all validation and test splits.

We further examine how the agreement between crowdsourced annotation and LLM annotation varies across different demographic groups. For this analysis, we combine training, validation and test splits of the NewsEmp24 dataset and compare between crowdsourced and Llama-generated labels. As demonstrated in Fig. 5, both have similar levels of CCC in gender and education demographics. However, CCC changed wildly across race, age and income groups. In particular, it went to negatives in two race groups: “Hispanic/Latino” and “Other”. It is worthwhile to note that there are only four samples in the “Other” category of race.

In terms of the number of samples across different demographics, we see that certain demographic groups (e.g., “4-year bachelor’s degree” education, “White” race, and “31-40” age groups) are highly represented compared to their counterparts. Some demographics, for example, “Less than high school” education and “Native American / American Indian” are not represented in the dataset at all. Such unbalances can presumably introduce bias in the empathy detection model build from such biased datasets. While we do not propose a solution to mitigate this bias, it remains a crucial aspect that

TABLE V
COMPARISON OF OUR PROPOSED MODEL WITH THE LITERATURE ON THE NEWSEMP24 TEST DATASET.

Approach	Base Model (Ref.)	PCC \uparrow	CCC \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow
Training	BERT [53]	(0.290)	–	–
	MLP [62]	(0.345)	–	–
	RoBERTa [49]	(0.375)	–	–
	Not mentioned [63]	(0.390)	–	–
	Llama 3 8B [2]	(0.474)	–	–
	RoBERTa [37]	(0.629)	–	–
	RoBERTa [37] ^a	0.476(0.607)	0.362(0.498)	1.414(0.075)
	RoBERTa (Ours)	0.548(0.648)	0.479(0.597)	1.346(0.092)
Zero-shot	GPT 3.5 [3]	(0.523)	–	–
	GPT 4 (Ours)	(0.581)	(0.489)	(1.715)

^a Our implementation of the earlier SOTA work [37].

Reported metrics are presented as median (peak), calculated across five random initialisations, or as (peak) for studies where only a single score is available.

warrants further attention in empathy computing research.

F. Comparison with the Literature

A quantitative comparison between our proposed framework and other empathy detection works in the literature on the NewsEmp24 dataset is presented on Table V. The best performance in the literature is 0.629 PCC [37], while our best performance is 0.648 PCC. Both Giorgi *et al.* [37] and we use the same amount of dataset – combined NewsEmp24, NewsEmp23 and NewsEmp22.

The reported metrics in the literature are the peak performance from the corresponding model and further on a single evaluation metric. To compare in terms of other evaluation metrics in a similar setting of ours (five random initialisations), we implemented the state-of-the-art work [37]. The mismatch between our implementation and Giorgi *et al.* [37]’s reported result (0.607 vs 0.629) is likely due to hyperparameter choice. Having no public implementation of Giorgi *et al.* [37], we chose default hyperparameters apart from the minimal amount of hyperparameter details reported in their paper. Nevertheless, our approach outperforms Giorgi *et al.* [37]’s results in terms of all metrics (Table V).




Fig. 5. Number of samples and zero-shot (Llama) prediction performance across different demographic groups in the NewsEmp24 dataset. CCC varies rapidly across different race groups.

TABLE VI

CONSISTENCY AND INTER-RATER RELIABILITY AMONG LLAMA, GPT AND CROWDSOURCED ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEWSEMP24 TRAINING SET. THE LOW RELIABILITY BETWEEN LLMS AND CROWDSOURCED ANNOTATIONS, CONTRASTED WITH THE HIGH RELIABILITY BETWEEN TWO DIFFERENT LLMS, SUGGESTS THAT THE CROWDSOURCED ANNOTATIONS ARE NOISY.

Annotator 1	Annotator 2	Krippendorff's Alpha	Mean \pm SD
Llama	Llama	0.99	0.10 \pm 0.21
Llama	GPT	0.80	0.78 \pm 0.70
Llama	Crowd	0.27	1.72 \pm 1.34
GPT	Crowd	0.19	1.81 \pm 1.27

G. Consistency and Inter-Rater Reliability

LLMs are known to produce varying outputs across different API calls [64]. This variability could raise concerns about using LLM to label data as well as evaluating on test set. We calculate two types of consistency: *intra-LLM* consistency, which evaluates whether annotations generated by the same LLM model remain consistent across multiple API calls, and *inter-LLM* consistency, which assesses whether annotations are consistent between two different LLMs.

To assess intra-LLM consistency, we label the NewsEmp24 training set (1,000 samples) twice in the Llama LLM, using separate API calls on separate days. The results (Table VI) demonstrate almost perfect agreement between the two annotation rounds, with a Krippendorff's Alpha (K-Alpha) [65] score of 0.99. Between GPT and LLM annotations (inter-LLM), a K-Alpha of 0.80 is achieved, which lies on the boundary between substantial and almost perfect reliability [65]. Such a high level of consistency, including inter-LLM consistency, suggests the effectiveness of our prompting strategy, which clearly specifies the expectations from the LLM.

As presented in Table VI, the inter-rater reliability between LLMs and crowdsourced annotations is notably lower than the reliability observed between LLMs. It supports our hypothesis

that crowdsourced annotations are inherently noisy.

H. Limitations and Future Work

Although our proposed LLM-based approaches achieved statistically significant performance improvement from baseline methods, a few peak RMSE performances were found to be better in baseline models. While empathy detection literature does not widely report RMSE scores, we argue that it is an important metric. This necessitates future work on inspecting why the performance improvement in correlation-based metrics does not correspond to error-based metrics.

As we note the inherent biases in LLM, it is crucial to exercise caution when using LLM-generated labels if such a system is to be deployed in real life. Zero-shot predictions are likely to exhibit greater bias, as LLMs may inherit biases from their training data. Therefore, downstream models should be trained on diverse and representative datasets that reflect the demographics in which empathy would be detected.

V. CONCLUSION

This work demonstrates potential of large language models (LLMs) in addressing challenges in empathy computing through two in-vitro applications: label refinement and training dataset expansion. Both of these applications resulted in statistically significant performance gains over baseline methods. This proposed framework outperformed state-of-the-art methods, achieving new benchmarks on a public empathy dataset with a Pearson Correlation Coefficient (PCC) of 0.648, among other metrics. Beyond the empirical results, this paper contributes a critical rethinking of evaluation practices in empathy computing, advocating for the adoption of Concordance Correlation Coefficient (CCC) and Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE). The novel scale-aware prompting technique introduced here ensures alignment between LLM annotations and theoretical annotation protocols. We further highlight biases in

the dataset across different demographic groups. Similar to the empathy detection dataset addressed in this paper, many tasks, such as detecting depression, anxiety and other mental health conditions, rely on questionnaire-based self-annotations. The proposed approach, therefore, opens exciting avenues for leveraging LLMs as complementary tools to enhance model training across different domains.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by resources provided by the Pawsey Supercomputing Research Centre's Setonix Supercomputer (<https://doi.org/10.48569/18sb-8s43>), with funding from the Australian Government and the Government of Western Australia.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Ma, W. Wu, Z. Zheng, *et al.*, "Leveraging speech ptm, text llm, and emotional tts for speech emotion recognition," in *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024, pp. 11 146–11 150. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP48485.2024.10445906.
- [2] T. Li, N. Rusnachenko, and H. Liang, "Chinchunmei at WASSA 2024 empathy and personality shared task: Boosting LLM's prediction with role-play augmentation and contrastive reasoning calibration," in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 385–392. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.32>.
- [3] H. Kong and S. Moon, "RU at WASSA 2024 shared task: Task-aligned prompt for predicting empathy and distress," in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 380–384. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.31>.
- [4] T. Sun, Y. Shao, H. Qian, X. Huang, and X. Qiu, "Black-box tuning for language-model-as-a-service," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2022, pp. 20 841–20 855.
- [5] Y. Hu, Q. Chen, J. Du, *et al.*, "Improving large language models for clinical named entity recognition via prompt engineering," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 1812–1820, Jan. 2024. DOI: 10.1093/jamia/ocad259.
- [6] H. Fei, B. Li, Q. Liu, L. Bing, F. Li, and T.-S. Chua, "Reasoning implicit sentiment with chain-of-thought prompting," in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, and N. Okazaki, Eds., Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 1171–1182. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-short.101.
- [7] Z. Zheng, L. Zheng, and Y. Yang, "Unlabeled samples generated by gan improve the person re-identification baseline in vitro," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2017, pp. 3774–3782. DOI: 10.1109/ICCV.2017.405.
- [8] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, *et al.*, "RoBERTa: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1907.11692.
- [9] M. Mazumder, C. Banbury, X. Yao, *et al.*, "Dataperf: Benchmarks for data-centric ai development," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, Eds., vol. 36, Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 5320–5347.
- [10] R. S. Geiger, K. Yu, Y. Yang, *et al.*, "Garbage in, garbage out? do machine learning application papers in social computing report where human-labeled training data comes from?" In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2020, pp. 325–336. DOI: 10.1145/3351095.3372862.
- [11] M. L. Hoffman, *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511805851.
- [12] M. R. Hasan, M. Z. Hossain, S. Ghosh, A. Krishna, and T. Gedeon, *Empathy detection from text, audiovisual, audio or physiological signals: A systematic review of task formulations and machine learning methods*, 2024. arXiv: 2311.00721 [cs.HC]. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.00721>.
- [13] C. D. Batsou, 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.
- [14] F. Charlier, M. Weber, D. Izak, *et al.*, *Statannotations*, version v0.6, Oct. 2022. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7213391.
- [15] 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.
- [16] 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.
- [17] S. Gabriel, I. Puri, X. Xu, M. Malgaroli, and M. Ghassemi, "Can AI relate: Testing large language model response for mental health support," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, Y. Al-Onaizan, M. Bansal, and Y.-N. Chen, Eds., Miami, Florida, USA, Nov. 2024, pp. 2206–2221. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.120.
- [18] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals, "Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 107–115, 2021. DOI: 10.1145/3446776.
- [19] 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>.
- [20] S. Mohammad and P. Turney, "Emotions evoked by common words and phrases: Using mechanical turk to create an emotion lexicon," in *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 workshop on computational approaches to analysis and generation of emotion in text*, 2010, pp. 26–34.
- [21] K. B. Sheehan, "Crowdsourcing research: Data collection with amazon's mechanical turk," *Communication Monographs*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 140–156, 2018. DOI: 10.1080/03637751.2017.1342043.
- [22] R. Jia, Z. R. Steelman, and B. H. Reich, "Using mechanical turk data in is research: Risks, rewards, and recommendations," *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, vol. 41, no. 1, p. 14, 2017.
- [23] J. L. Huang, P. G. Curran, J. Keeney, E. M. Poposki, and R. P. DeShon, "Detecting and deterring insufficient effort responding to surveys," *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol. 27, pp. 99–114, 2012.
- [24] M. Niu, M. Jaiswal, and E. M. Provost, "From text to emotion: Unveiling the emotion annotation capabilities of llms," in *Proc. Interspeech 2024*, 2024, pp. 2650–2654. DOI: 10.21437/Interspeech.2024-2282.
- [25] S. Wang, Y. Liu, Y. Xu, C. Zhu, and M. Zeng, "Want to reduce labeling cost? GPT-3 can help," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2021, pp. 4195–4205. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.354.
- [26] 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>.
- [27] A. Grattafiori, A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, *et al.*, *The llama 3 herd of models*, 2024. arXiv: 2407.21783 [cs.AI].
- [28] OpenAI, J. Achiam, S. Adler, *et al.*, *Gpt-4 technical report*, 2024. arXiv: 2303.08774 [cs.CL].
- [29] W. Dai, X. Li, and K.-T. Cheng, "Semi-supervised deep regression with uncertainty consistency and variational model ensembling via bayesian neural networks," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, 2023, pp. 7304–7313. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v37i6.25890.
- [30] E. Englesson and H. Azizpour, "Robust classification via regression for learning with noisy labels," in *The Twelfth International Conference*

- on Learning Representations, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wfgZc3IMqo>.
- [31] N. Natarajan, I. S. Dhillon, P. K. Ravikumar, and A. Tewari, "Learning with noisy labels," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Weinberger, Eds., vol. 26, Curran Associates, Inc., 2013. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2013/file/3871bd64012152bfb53fd04b401193f-Paper.pdf.
- [32] B. Zhang, Y. Wang, W. Hou, et al., "Flexmatch: Boosting semi-supervised learning with curriculum pseudo labeling," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan, Eds., vol. 34, Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 18 408–18 419. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/995693c15f439e3d189b06e89d145dd5-Paper.pdf.
- [33] K. Sohn, D. Berthelot, N. Carlini, et al., "Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., vol. 33, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 596–608. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/06964dce9addb1c5cb5d6e3d9838f733-Paper.pdf.
- [34] S. Garg, G. Ramakrishnan, and V. Thumbe, "Towards robustness to label noise in text classification via noise modeling," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, 2021, pp. 3024–3028. DOI: 10.1145/3459637.3482204.
- [35] P. Li, X. He, X. Cheng, et al., "An improved categorical cross entropy for remote sensing image classification based on noisy labels," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 205, p. 117 296, 2022, ISSN: 0957-4174. DOI: 10.1016/j.eswa.2022.117296.
- [36] Y. Wang, T. Baldwin, and K. Verspoor, "Noisy label regularisation for textual regression," in *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, N. Calzolari, C.-R. Huang, H. Kim, et al., Eds., Gyeongju, Republic of Korea: International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Oct. 2022, pp. 4228–4240.
- [37] S. Giorgi, J. Sedoc, V. Barriere, and S. Tafreshi, "Findings of WASSA 2024 shared task on empathy and personality detection in interactions," in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 369–379. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.30>.
- [38] 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.
- [39] 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.
- [40] 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.
- [41] 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.
- [42] Y. Wang, J. Wang, and X. Zhang, "YNU-HPCC at WASSA-2023 shared task 1: Large-scale language model with LoRA fine-tuning 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.45>.
- [43] 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.44>.
- [44] 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.50>.
- [45] 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.
- [46] 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>.
- [47] 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.48>.
- [48] 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.54>.
- [49] R. Frick and M. Steinebach, "Fraunhofer SIT at WASSA 2024 empathy and personality shared task: Use of sentiment transformers and data augmentation with fuzzy labels to predict emotional reactions in conversations and essays," in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 435–440. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.40>.
- [50] S. Ghosh, D. Maurya, A. Ekbal, and P. Bhattacharyya, "Team IITP-AINLPML 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.
- [51] 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>.
- [52] 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.
- [53] A. Numanoglu, S. Ateş, N. Cicekli, and D. Küçük, "Empathify at WASSA 2024 empathy and personality shared task: Contextualizing empathy with a BERT-based context-aware approach for empathy detection," in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 393–398. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.33>.
- [54] 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>.
- [55] 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.49>.
- [56] 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. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.wassa-1.52>.
- [57] 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.
- [58] D. Omिताomu, S. Tafreshi, T. Liu, *et al.*, “Empathic conversations: A multi-level dataset of contextualized conversations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12698*, 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2205.12698.
- [59] V. Barriere, S. Tafreshi, J. Sedoc, and S. Alqahtani, “WASSA 2022 shared task: Predicting empathy, emotion and personality in reaction to news stories,” in *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment & Social Media Analysis*, Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 214–227. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.wassa-1.20.
- [60] 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.
- [61] T. Wolf, L. Debut, V. Sanh, *et al.*, “Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*, 2020. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1910.03771.
- [62] R. Chevi and A. Aji, “Daisy at WASSA 2024 empathy and personality shared task: A quick exploration on emotional pattern of empathy and distress,” in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 420–424. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.37>.
- [63] P. Pereira, H. Moniz, and J. P. Carvalho, “ConText at WASSA 2024 empathy and personality shared task: History-dependent embedding utterance representations for empathy and emotion prediction in conversations,” in *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, O. De Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc, and S. Tafreshi, Eds., Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 448–453. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.wassa-1.42>.
- [64] S. Ouyang, J. M. Zhang, M. Harman, and M. Wang, “An empirical study of the non-determinism of chatgpt in code generation,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, Sep. 2024, ISSN: 1557-7392. DOI: 10.1145/3697010. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3697010>.
- [65] K. Krippendorff, “Reliability,” in *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage Publications, 2019. DOI: 10.4135/9781071878781.

APPENDIX A DETAILS OF THE DATASETS

Table VII presents the statistics of the three datasets used in this study.

TABLE VII
STATISTICS OF THE DATASETS USED IN THIS STUDY.

Name	# Train	# Validation	# Test	# Total
NewsEmp22 [19]	1,860	270	525	2,655
NewsEmp23 [58]	792	208	100	1,100
NewsEmp24 [37]	1,000	63	83	1,146

TABLE VIII
HYPERPARAMETERS FOR MODEL TRAINING.

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
Optimiser	AdamW	Learning rate scheduler	Linear
Learning rate	3e-5	Warmup ratio	0.06
AdamW (β_1, β_2)	(0.9, 0.98)	Batch size	16
AdamW ϵ	1e-6	Maximum epochs	20
Weight decay	0.1	Max sequence length	512

APPENDIX B LLM PROMPTS

LLM prompts are usually structured into two primary components: the system prompt and the user prompt. The system prompt defines the task of LLM and establishes the expected behaviour, while the user prompt contains specific instructions from the user. Our system prompt is as follows:

Your task is to measure the empathy of individuals based on their written essays. You will assess empathy using Batson’s definition, which specifically measures how the subject is feeling each of the following six emotions: sympathetic, moved, compassionate, tender, warm and softhearted. Human subjects wrote these essays after reading a newspaper article involving harm to individuals, groups of people, nature, etc. The essay is provided to you within triple backticks.

Following the system prompt, we provide essay samples through the following user prompt template:

Essay: ````{essay}```\n```` Now, provide scores with respect to Batson’s empathy scale. That is, provide scores between 1.0 and 7.0 for each of the following emotions: sympathetic, moved, compassionate, tender, warm and softhearted. You must provide comma-separated floating point scores, where a score of 1.0 means the individual is not feeling the emotion at all, and a score of 7.0 means the individual is extremely feeling the emotion. You must not provide any other outputs apart from the scores.

APPENDIX C HYPERPARAMETER DETAILS

We adopt reported hyperparameters from Liu *et al.* [8], who proposed the original RoBERTa model. Following their reported approach to fine-tuning RoBERTa for downstream tasks, we only tuned the learning rate and batch size for our task. Values of the hyperparameters are reported in Table VIII.