ORIGINAL PAPER

Beyond Academia: Re-evaluating the Nuances of Real-World Empathy

Shameem Banu[1]

Abstract:

Empathy is often portrayed simplistically in textbooks, emphasising cognitive understanding over emotional connection. This paper critiques the disconnect between textbook explanations of empathy and the complexity of practising empathy in real-world contexts. It reviews academic literature, identifying key themes in empathy definitions and gaps regarding language, emotions, and cultural factors. The paper explores real-life challenges of empathy such as navigating biases, stress contagion, and ethical dilemmas. It is argued that bridging the gap between theoretical and practical empathy requires acknowledging nuances, fostering self-reflection, considering contextual factors, and developing emotional resonance. Promoting more comprehensive empathy has implications for education, training programs, and interpersonal relationships.

_____

✉Shameem Banu
office@ijngp.com

[1] MSc. Clinical Psychologist
   NLP Practitioner
   Gestalt Masters
   Child and Adolescent Psychologist
   Pursuing PhD in Holistic and
   Alternative Therapy
   Bangalore, India

Empathy, the ability to understand and share the feelings of another, is a cornerstone of human connection. It plays a pivotal role in healthy relationships, effective communication, and prosocial behaviour. While textbooks offer valuable frameworks for understanding the cognitive and affective components of empathy, a significant gap often exists between theory and practice.

In textbooks, empathy is often portrayed as a straightforward process of understanding and sharing another person's feelings. However, in practice, empathy is a nuanced and dynamic skill that involves more than just recognizing emotions. Real-world empathy requires active listening, interpretation of non-verbal cues and the ability to connect with diverse perspectives. It involves navigating through complex social situations, where cultural differences, personal biases, and situational factors play crucial roles. While textbooks emphasise the cognitive aspect of empathy, its practical application demands emotional intelligence, adaptability and a genuine commitment to understanding others on a deeper level. Genuine empathy requires an emotional resonance, an ability to connect with the human experience on an emotional level and not just the cognitive level.

This paper seeks to delve beyond the theoretical definition of empathy, aiming to comprehend its practical applicability. By exploring the complexities of empathy, the paper emphasises its nuanced and dynamic nature. It critiques the oversimplification which is often found in textbooks and further emphasises the need for a more holistic approach that accurately reflects all the dimensions of empathy. Additionally, it reviews the existing literature on empathy, identifies themes in its definition. Specifically, it attempts to identify gaps in the current understanding of empathy, especially in relation to language, emotions, and cultural contexts.

This paper aims to bridge the gaps between theoretical explanations of empathy and practical empathy, as it is displayed and practised in real life. The limitations of said theoretical explanations and the real-life challenges associated with empathy are also explored.

Background on Empathy

Definition of Empathy - Theoretical Explanation

Empathy, which is the ability to understand and share the feelings of another person, is a complex and multifaceted concept that has been studied by researchers across various disciplines, including psychology, neuroscience, education, and social work. This section will explore the different definitions and classifications of empathy, its neurobiological basis, its role in various aspects of human interaction, and potential interventions to enhance empathy.

More than a century ago, the term 'empathy' was introduced by Titchener, derived from the German word *Einfühlung* (Wispé, 1986). Stotland and colleagues (1978) suggest that discussions about empathy might even trace back to the earliest stages of philosophical contemplation. Despite its longstanding history, the concept of empathy lacks a precise and universally accepted definition. Instead, the field is marked by a multitude of interpretations, with as many definitions as there are contributors to the discourse (Decety & Jackson, 2004; de Vignemont & Singer, 2006).

Empathy, as a concept, has been extensively studied by psychologists. However, the discipline of psychology has not fully integrated critical philosophical discussions on empathy as a means to understand how people think or as a unique approach within the broader field of human sciences. Philosophers have debated whether empathy can be used as a way to gain knowledge about other people's thoughts and feelings, or if it is a distinct method that should be used in the study of human behaviour and society.

Instead of being influenced by philosophical discussions, psychologists have been more influenced by moral philosophy from the 18th century, specifically the ideas of David Hum

_____

Adam Smith. These philosophers, along with others, discussed the concept of empathy, which was referred to as sympathy at that time. They believed that empathy played a central role in shaping human beings as social and moral creatures, allowing us to emotionally connect with others and care for their well-being. Psychologists have turned to ideas from moral philosophy as a basis for their interest in studying empathy-related phenomena (Stueber, 2008).

In the 18th century, empathy (previously referred to as sympathy) was believed to be crucial in shaping human beings as social and moral creatures. From the early 20th century onwards, but especially since the late 1940s, empathy and its various aspects have been a subject of extensive research in the field of psychology. This indicates that empathy has been a significant and ongoing focus of psychological research for several decades.

Classifications of Empathy

Throughout history, empathy has undergone various definitions. Initially perceived as an inborn trait, it has transformed into a trait that can be cultivated. Over time, empathy has evolved from being a single entity to having multiple definitions, types, and meanings. Today, research has identified many types of empathy, with cognitive and affective empathy being the two primary types (Healy & Grossman, 2018). It should be noted that although there is consensus regarding the existence of different types of empathy, the names given to these types are ambiguous, and the cognitive neuroscience literature provides a range of substitutes (Zachi & Ochsner, 2012). Early researchers did not differentiate between different aspects of empathy, but it is now recognized that empathy can be studied as a cognitive phenomenom of (empathic accuracy) or as an emotional phenomenon in encounters with others.

Several prominent models converge on key components:

- **Cognitive empathy:** Involves the ability to know and understand another person's thoughts, feelings, and perspectives (Davis, 1983). This entails comprehending another person's perspective and is also referred to as perspective-taking or putting yourself in someone else's shoes (Ratka, 2018).
- **Affective empathy:** This is also known as emotional empathy. According to Hoffman (2000), emotional empathy involves sharing the emotional state of another person, including both positive and negative emotions. Studies suggest a direct connection between emotional empathy and the inclination to assist others. In simpler terms, individuals with emotional empathy are more likely to feel compelled to help those in need (Hodges & Myers, 2007).
- **Compassionate empathy:** This term implies not only understanding and feeling another's emotions but also being motivated to help them (Batson, 2009). With compassionate empathy, one goes beyond understanding someone's situation; instead, one actively strives to enhance their life. A concern for their well-being prompts the individual to take ethical and moral actions to ensure they receive fair treatment.
- **Somatic Empathy:** Somatic empathy refers to the ability to understand and share the feelings and sensations of another person on a physical level. It involves tuning into and experiencing someone.

_____

- Else's bodily sensations and physical experiences. This type of empathy goes beyond recognizing emotions and extends to feeling or mirroring the physical aspects of another person's experiences. Somatic empathy can play a role in fostering a deeper connection and understanding between individuals (Cherry, 2023).

Researchers also make a distinction between the following terms when discussing empathy.

- **Perspective-taking:** The ability to see the world from another person's point of view (Decety & Jackson, 2004).
- **Emotional contagion:** The automatic and unconscious mimicking of another person's emotional state (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). Emotional contagion is considered an automatic and involuntary response to the emotions of others. This contrasts with cognitive empathy, which involves a more conscious effort to understand another person's perspective. The distinction between perspective-taking and emotional contagion in the context of empathy highlights the fact that there are several, nuanced ways in which individuals connect with and understand the emotions of others. While perspective-taking involves consciously adopting another person's point of view, emotional contagion operates on a more automatic and unconscious level, wherein individuals instinctively mirror the emotional states of those around them.

This distinction between the two therefore aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how individuals engage with the feelings of others drawing attention to both intentional efforts to comprehend different perspectives and the innate, reflexive responses that contribute to emotional resonance. In essence, the comparison serves to enrich the conceptualization of empathy, acknowledging its multifaceted nature and shedding light on the cognitive and emotional processes involved.

Neurobiological Basis of Empathy

Building upon earlier contributions from philosophy and behavioural psychology, such as the works of Batson (2009), de Vignemont and Singer (2006), Eisenberg (2000), and Hoffman (2000), recent progress in social neuroscience has yielded valuable and novel understandings of the neural basis of empathy (Bernhardt & Singer, 2012).

One critical area is the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), located in the prefrontal cortex. Studies using fMRI have shown that the ACC is activated both when individuals experience pain directly and when they observe others in pain. This shared neural response is thought to be crucial to empathising with others' suffering (Singer et al., 2004). Additional regions, like the insula and amygdala, also contribute to empathic responses to pain cues (Lamm, Decety & Singer, 2011).

The brain's mirror neuron system, located primarily in the inferior frontal gyrus and inferior parietal lobule, is also considered foundational for empathy (Iacoboni, 2009). These neurons fire when carrying out specific actions, like grasping an object, but also activate when merely observing someone else complete that action. This mirroring is proposed to facilitate understanding others by activating shared neural representations.

On the neurotransmitter front, oxytocin and vasopressin seem particularly important for empathic abilities and behaviours. Intranasal administration of oxytocin, for example, has been found to increase individuals' abilities to infer emotions from photographs of eyes as well as improve their accuracy in judging truths and lies (Domes et al., 2007).Genetic factors also likely contribute to individual differences in empathy. A

_____

study found polymorphism in the oxytocin receptor gene, which was linked to scores on self-report empathy scales, suggesting a potential biological basis for variability in empathic dispositions (Wu et al., 2012).

While there is still much to learn, it is clear that empathy emerges from complex interactions between specific neural circuits and neurotransmitter activity. A multi-level understanding of this intricate neurobiological landscape will enrich scientific models and theories of empathy.

Recent advancements in neuroscience have shed light on the brain regions involved in empathy. Studies suggest that a network of interconnected brain areas, including the anterior cingulate cortex, insula, and amygdala, play crucial roles in processing emotional information, understanding others' intentions, and regulating emotional responses (Decety & Lamm, 2006).

The Role of Empathy in Human Interaction

Empathy plays a pivotal role across various dimensions of our lives, exerting a significant influence on social relationships, moral decision-making, prosocial behaviour, and mental health. In the realm of social relationships, empathy acts as a catalyst for bonding, fostering effective communication, and promoting cooperation, as noted by de Waal (2009).

Its impact extends to the domain of moral decision-making, where empathy serves as a guiding force in shaping fair and just choices that prioritise the well-being of others, a concept underscored by Haidt (2001). Furthermore, empathy is a driving force behind prosocial behaviour, motivating individuals to extend a helping hand to those in need. As emphasised by Batson (2011), the empathic connection with others becomes a powerful incentive for altruistic actions.

Beyond interpersonal dynamics, empathy also contributes significantly to mental health. Piliavin

and Call (2010) have found associations between empathy and positive mental health outcomes, such as reduced stress and anxiety levels, as well as increased resilience. In essence, the multifaceted role of empathy demonstrates its profound impact on the intricacies of human interaction, ethical decision-making, acts of kindness, and overall psychological well-being.

Literature Review
Themes Observed in the Definition of Empathy

Scholars demonstrate an understanding of two broad categories of empathy, as elucidated by Barton and Garvis (2019) and Franzese (2017). The first category, often referred to as 'cognitive empathy,' entails a type of comprehension or 'knowing' (Barnes & Thargard, 1997). This involves processes such as 'tuning in', engaging in 'imaginative reconstruction', and possessing the ability to 'identify with' or 'relate to' the subject (Bresler, 2013; Peterson, 2017; Jalongo, 2014; Jiménez, 2017). This form of empathy encompasses a 'perspective-taking' skill that empowers the observer to perceive the world from the viewpoint of the subject (Adler, 1963; Bouton, 2016; Jeffery, 2019). Zitko et al. (2022) have explored the concept of empathy and its organic emergence in various contexts, including interactions with others, workplace, bullying, conflict resolution, workplace job performance, and diversity.

These processual terms imply the existence of psychological mechanisms aimed at acquiring knowledge about a subject's experiences, beliefs, emotions, concerns, doubts, and more. The dynamic nature of these mechanisms involves "absorbing and assessing feedback from others and responding to that feedback" and "learning intensely about others in multiple respects and sharing both their cognitive and emotional responses" (Cooper, 2011). Notably, the mechanisms or processes associated with cognitive empathy are psychologically

_____

complex, requiring the observer to track or pay attention to the subject while simulating, re-enacting, or imagining the mental states of the subject, all while maintaining a clear self-other distinction (Coplan, 2011).

Moreover, several authors contend that empathy, whether of the cognitive or affective variety, is perceived as a 'capacity' or 'ability' (Brown, 1993; Decety, 2011; Jalongo, 2014; Jeffery, 2019; Margolin, 2013; Peterson, 2017). This perspective implies that possessing empathy equates to having a trait or disposition of character (Cuff et al., 2016). Essentially, if one possesses empathy, it is likely to be consistently manifested across diverse situations (e.g., a tutor displaying empathy towards student A also displays it towards student B) and iteratively (e.g., a tutor exhibiting empathy in one semester continues to do so in another). The conceptualization of empathy as a capacity or ability aligns with two key considerations. First, a person can behave empathetically without necessarily possessing an empathetic character. Second, a person expressing empathy may not do so under certain circumstances (e.g., low morale). These influencing factors are referred to as 'defeaters' of empathy.

Upon reviewing the literature, in the context of defining and conceptualising empathy, five overarching themes emerge. (Coplan, 2011). These include cognitive empathy, affective empathy, empathy as a trait or disposition, displaying care or concern, and the distinction between empathy and compassion.

First, empathy involves the cognitive process of comprehending mental states or emotions, encompassing the act of envisioning oneself as the subject of someone else's emotional experiences. Second, it goes beyond mere understanding, extending to the realm of emotional involvement by feeling, experiencing, or being affected by the mental states or emotions of others. Third, empathy is viewed not as an isolated action but as an inherent trait or disposition within individuals. This

perspective underscores the idea that empathy is a fundamental aspect of one's character rather than a sporadic occurrence.

Moreover, the fourth theme emphasises the outward expression of empathy, involving the manifestation of care, concern, or compassion directed towards individuals. This aspect highlights the emotional and relational dimensions of empathy, highlighting its role in fostering connections. Finally, the fifth theme acknowledges a conceptual distinction between empathy and compassion, albeit with the recognition that the depth of this differentiation may be subject to interpretation. These five themes collectively contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of empathy and its significance in various interpersonal contexts.

Researchers, as highlighted by Zitko et al. (2022), have also identified critical concerns regarding the definition of empathy. A significant critique centres around the absence of consensus and clarity in defining empathy, resulting in the proliferation of multiple definitions and constructs. Varied perspectives from different scholars have contributed to this lack of uniformity, with some defining empathy as the capacity to comprehend and share others' feelings and respond appropriately, while others characterise it as the ability to understand and share the thoughts and emotions of others. The resultant ambiguity in defining empathy poses challenges for conducting research and implementing empathy-related practices in educational settings.

Moreover, a distinct contrast is drawn between empathy and sympathy, elucidating that empathy involves an internal understanding of the target's emotions, whereas sympathy entails feeling sorry for the target. This distinction adds another layer to the complexity surrounding the conceptualization of empathy. The absence of a clear and universally

accepted definition further impedes the development of a comprehensive understanding of empathy and its multifaceted role in various contexts. Consequently, the ongoing lack of consensus on the definition of empathy hinders progress in research and applications related to empathy within the field of education and beyond.

These thematic categories illustrate the diverse ways in which empathy is perceived and operationalized within research, reflecting the multidimensional and nuanced nature of this construct. Researchers within the field engage with empathy through various lenses, incorporating cognitive, affective, dispositional, and relational dimensions in their investigation.

Historically, empathy was perceived as an innate quality, resistant to cultivation. However, contemporary research challenges this notion, revealing that empathy, a crucial human competency, is indeed teachable. Zhou (2002) emphasises the need for a less ambiguous definition of empathy to design more precise studies and implement educational policies involving empathy.

Limitations of Textbook Explanations
Oversimplification
Complex human emotions are multifaceted and subjective, defying simple categorization. Textbooks often fail to capture this nuance, providing a more rigid and reductionist view of empathy. Empathy is not solely about emotions; it extends beyond feeling what others feel. The conventional conceptualization of empathy tends to focus on emotional aspects and might overlook other essential components. Lahnala et al. (2022), recommend disambiguating related concepts, such as sympathy, compassion, and tenderness, by considering them as subareas of empathy research.

Additionally, people vary in their ability to perceive and interpret emotions accurately. Textbooks may present empathy as a uniform concept without fully acknowledging the wide spectrum of individual differences, including variations in emotional intelligence, personality traits, and neurological factors that can impact one's empathic abilities.

Lack of Emphasis on Subjectivity
Textbook explanations often neglect the subjective nature of empathy, failing to acknowledge how individual differences in personality, culture, and life experiences shape our empathic responses. Zhou (2022) raises a sceptical challenge to advocates of empathy in teaching, drawing from psychology and social neuroscience, suggesting that empathy may have possible dangers and can be derailed by human biases.

Insufficient Focus on the Interplay between Cognitive and Affective Empathy
Textbooks typically focus on type of empathy at a time, neglecting the dynamic interplay between cognitive understanding and emotional sharing, which are crucial for a comprehensive empathic response. Textual definations of empathy need to understand the importance of incorporating the interplay between cognitive empathy and affective empathy into the understanding of empathy. The interaction between emotional and cognitive empathy suggests that the distinction between the two is less critical than recognizing their interplay. Textbook definations of empathy may fail to capture the multifaceted nature of this concept. By highlighting the significance of cognitive empathyand its interaction with emotional empathy, The authors argue that a more comprehensive approach is nedded to fully grasp and apply empathy in real-life situations. Simply focusing on emotional aspects may limit the ability to achieve broder goals related to empathetic responses. Effective empathy frequently incorporates both emotional and cognitive elements. For example when observing a friends enthusiasm over a

personal achievement, an individual can utilise cognitive empathy to comprehend the underlying reasons for their excitement. Simultaneously, emotional empathy allows the individual to partake in the friend's joy. The dynamic interaction between emotional and cognitive empathy serves to improve communication. When individuals not only grasp someone's emotions (emotional empathy) but also understand their perspective and thoughts (cognitive empathy), they are better prepared to respond in a meaningful and supportive manner.

Limited Practical Strategies

While textbooks may explain the concept of empathy, they often lack practical strategies for cultivating and applying it in real-world situations.

Real-Life Challenges of Empathy

Difficulty in Accurately Perceptualizing and Interpreting Others' Emotions

Textbooks often provide a simplified view of emotions, categorising them into basic types such as happiness, sadness, anger, etc. In real life, emotions are complex and often blend together, making it challenging to accurately perceive and interpret them. Individuals may experience a mix of conflicting emotions, and the nuances of these emotional states can be difficult to capture through a textbook definition. Different cultures may have distinct norms and expectations regarding emotional expression, which can influence how empathy is perceived and enacted. Real-life empathy requires an understanding of these cultural and contextual factors. A 2023 study found that emotional recognition and expression vary significantly across cultures. For example, a smile may communicate joy in some cultures while conveying embarrassment in others (Lee et al., 2023). Researchers posit that these emotional display rules are learned through socialisation and become ingrained from a young age.

The ability to empathise effectively goes beyond simply assuming one understands or resonates with others' feelings and hardships. True empathy involves a deep understanding of the cultural and contextual factors that shape individuals' experiences. Ignorance of someone's culture can indeed hinder the manifestation of empathy, leading to potential misinterpretations and a lack of genuine connection.

Cultural norms play a significant role in shaping emotional expression and communication styles. What may be considered an appropriate way to convey or receive empathy in one culture might differ significantly in another. For example, in some cultures, individuals may express their emotions openly, while in others, there may be a preference for more restrained or indirect expressions. Without an awareness of these cultural nuances, someone might inadvertently misinterpret or overlook the emotional cues of others.

Additionally, cultural values and beliefs influence the way individuals perceive and cope with hardships. What may be perceived as a challenge or difficulty in one cultural context may be viewed differently in another. Lack of awareness of these differences can result in a failure to recognize the true nature of someone's struggles and, consequently, a failure to provide meaningful empathy. A recent paper by Decety (2022) advocated for cultural humility— an other-oriented approach involving "lifelong commitment to self-evaluation, self-critique, and redressing power imbalances" — as imperative for meaningful intercultural empathy.

In essence, empathy is a skill that requires continuous learning and adaptation, especially in an increasingly interconnected and diverse world. Assuming empathy based solely on personal feelings or experiences without considering the broader cultural context can lead to misunderstandings and hinder the development of meaningful connections with others.

_____

Therefore, cultivating cultural awareness is an integral part of fostering genuine empathy and building positive interpersonal relationships across diverse backgrounds.

Influence of Biases and Prejudices

Zhou (2022) presents an argument that posits that empathy, despite its advocates, may pose potential risks and could be influenced negatively by inherent human biases.

Real-life empathy occurs within dynamic and evolving relationships. Textbook definitions may not capture the fluid nature of interpersonal connections, where the level of empathy can fluctuate based on various factors such as trust, familiarity, and shared experiences. Empathy is limited by 'here and now' biases, such as empathising more with those perceived to be closer to us.

Prinz (2011) and Bloom (2016) both highlight the downside of empathy, particularly the biases associated with focusing on the 'here and now.' They emphasise that empathy tends to be limited by immediate factors and can lead to certain negative outcomes. Prinz (2011) discusses how our empathy is influenced by certain factors. We tend to empathise more with people who are attractive, close to us, or experiencing particularly notable suffering. We also have biases, preferring to empathise with those similar to us and being selective about whom we empathise with. Studies show that people generally feel more empathy for those in their own group and less for those outside of it, especially if there's perceived competition.

Empathy can be influenced by various factors that shape our view of the social world. We might feel less empathy for others through dehumanising or objectifying strategies, which has been observed in historical events like genocides and racial slavery. Increased empathy for wrongs done to our group can lead to immoral behaviour. Empathy has a spotlight feature, meaning it tends to focus on one identifiable person rather than many. This can be misleading in situations where we need to consider broader statistical information, such as when thinking about the overall benefits of vaccination instead of just one child's negative experience.

Due to these complexities and potential pitfalls of empathy, Prinz (2011) suggests that moral emotions like anger, guilt, and shame may be a more reliable foundation for morality. On the other hand, Bloom (2016) argues for sympathy guided by reason as a better way to navigate moral decisions compared to empathy.

Emotional Contagion and Burnout

Hoffman (2000) discusses empathy as a multifaceted concept, including the idea of 'veridical empathic distress' which refers to empathy with the negative emotions of another. He suggests that under certain conditions, empathic distress can give rise to sympathy, but the relationship between affective empathy and sympathy requires further empirical research. Emotional contagion is a phenomenon where individuals start experiencing similar emotions merely through their association with other people. This means that one can feel joyful or panicky based on the emotional atmosphere around them, without necessarily being consciously aware that these emotions are being influenced by others. This concept, as described by Scheler (1973), highlights that individuals can undergo emotional experiences without recognizing that those emotions originated from external sources.

For instance, the cry of a newborn infant in response to the distressed cry of another can be considered a form of emotional contagion. In this scenario, the infant lacks the cognitive ability to distinguish between self and other, and the emotional response is not consciously attributed to the distress of another (Stueber, 2008). Hoffman (2000) interprets such reactions in infants as a rudimentary precursor to empathic distress, suggesting that emotional contagion plays a role in the early stages of emotional understanding,

_____

where the boundaries between self and others are not yet fully developed.

In real-life situations, empathy often goes beyond the textbook definition that portrays it as a positive trait essential for building relationships and enhancing communication. Hoffman's concept of 'veridical empathic distress' adds a layer of complexity by acknowledging that empathy may involve sharing in the negative emotions of others. This goes beyond the textbook notion of empathy as solely a positive and constructive force. This aspect of empathy challenges the conventional understanding that empathy is always a conscious and deliberate process. The example of a newborn infant responding to the distress cry of another through emotional contagion emphasises that emotional experiences can occur without the individual consciously attributing them to external sources. This challenges the textbook view that empathy is always a cognitive and deliberate process.

Textbooks might discuss empathy as a positive trait, emphasising its role in building relationships, fostering understanding, and enhancing communication. However, they may not thoroughly address the potential challenges and risks associated with excessive empathy, such as burnout.

The risk of burnout suggests that empathy, when not managed carefully, can lead to emotional exhaustion and strain on individuals who consistently absorb and respond to the emotions of others. This aspect of empathy, as a potential source of stress and burnout, is a dimension that might be overlooked or downplayed in traditional theoretical definitions of empathy.

Navigating Ethical Dilemmas

Paul Bloom, a psychologist at Yale University, provides a specific definition of empathy, characterising it as the act of immersing oneself in someone else's mind to experience their feelings. Despite the common belief that empathy is a positive force, Bloom raises concerns about its

implications, particularly when facing moral dilemmas. In an article for the journal - Trends in Cognitive Sciences, he emphasises that empathy, even in its narrow sense, can lead to complex ethical challenges (Bloom, 2016).

Bloom (2016) illustrates this point by recounting the fictional story of Sheri Summers, a 10-year-old girl with a fatal disease awaiting a treatment that could alleviate her pain and potentially extend her life. Participants in a study were asked to empathise with Sheri, and approximately three-quarters of them chose to expedite her treatment.

However, Bloom (2016) highlights the moral difficulty that arises from this decision. Prioritising Sheri could mean delaying treatment for other children higher on the waiting list, some of whom may be more deserving. This scenario exemplifies what psychologists refer to as the 'identifiable victim effect,' wherein individuals are more inclined to show compassion or offer assistance when they can identify a specific person whose suffering can be alleviated.

Bloom (2016) underscores the tendency for people to respond more empathetically when confronted with a visible beneficiary, such as a named, suffering child, compared to situations where statistics describe a larger group of anonymous individuals. This observation sheds light on the complexities and potential pitfalls associated with applying empathy in decision-making, particularly in contexts involving resource allocation and moral choices (Fisher, 2020).

The excerpt discusses the dual nature of empathy as both a motivating force for positive action and a potential source of ethical dilemmas. It acknowledges that empathy can serve as a powerful tool to drive individuals toward morally upright actions. For example, once someone has made a

moral decision, empathy can be employed to align emotions with values and motivate individuals to take concrete steps, such as contributing to charitable causes.

However, the passage also highlights the ethical challenges associated with the flexibility of empathy. While empathy can be a force for good, it can also be exploited or misdirected. The text provides examples of how empathy can lead to actions that may not necessarily be beneficial, such as donating to charitable causes with limited positive impact or, more troublingly, motivating harmful behaviour towards others.

The text also points out that empathy's focus on specific individuals and the pleasure of retaliation can lead to skewed moral judgments. It notes that the costs of such actions, particularly the potential for violence, may be overlooked or underestimated due to the abstract and statistical nature of these consequences. The ethical dilemma arises from empathy's potential to drive individuals to act in ways that prioritise the welfare of those close to them while disregarding the broader and often more significant costs that affect others.

In essence, the passage suggests that while empathy can be a valuable motivator for moral action, its selective nature and susceptibility to manipulation pose ethical challenges. This text underscores the need for a balanced and reasoned approach to ethical decision-making, acknowledging that empathy alone may not always lead to the most ethically sound outcomes.

Gaps in Literature

There are several gaps in the literature on empathy. First, there is a lack of pragmatic perspective, with a bias towards the psychological perspective of empathy and compassion. This is evident in the semantic overlap between empathy and compassion, as well as the lack of significant association between empathy and compassion and disciplines such as language/linguistics and emotions (Jonas et al., 2002). Second, there is a need for more research on the effects of acute stress on empathy. While there is abundant evidence for stress contagion in affective empathy, the effects of acute stress on cognitive empathy are less conclusive (D'Amico, 2018). Finally, there is a lack of emphasis on using literature to teach empathy, particularly in the context of healthcare education. Literature can provide a powerful insight into healthcare experiences and can help develop a more empathic approach among students (Watkins, 2020).

The main gaps in the literature on the topic of interest include a lack of pragmatic perspective, a bias towards the psychological perspective, and a lack of significant association with language/linguistics and emotions. These gaps suggest a need for a better understanding of empathic and compassionate relationships and communities of care. There is an opportunity to bridge this gap by understanding empathy and compassion in the light of communicative function, where the association between language and emotion has been illuminated. Additionally, the literature review highlights the importance of identifying the gaps in the current state of knowledge and evidence base.

D'Amico (2018) highlights a gap in the health-related literature regarding empathy and compassion, suggesting a need to bridge theoretical understanding with a practical understanding of empathic and compassionate relationships in healthcare contexts. The disciplines and topics associated with empathy and compassion in the literature need to be narrower to account for the communicative function of empathy and compassion, and the complicated ways we shape meaning and intention within our minds.

Understanding empathy and compassion as emotionally symbolic expressions of language, integral to communicative function, can provide a useful framework for connecting empathy and

compassion with topics critical to them, such as bias, discrimination, frustration, and social dynamics. The paper emphasises the importance of understanding the cultural construction of empathic and compassionate relationships within specific speech communities, which is essential for effective public health policy and cross-cultural comparisons.

Conclusion

To bridge the gap between textbook empathy and real-life empathy, it is crucial to promote a more comprehensive approach to understanding and practising empathy. This includes acknowledging the complexities and nuances of empathy, considering contextual factors, and fostering self-reflection and cultural sensitivity. Education and training programs should emphasise the development of emotional intelligence, active listening skills, and an awareness of individual and collective perspectives. By incorporating these elements, individuals can gain a deeper understanding of empathy and apply it effectively in their personal and professional lives.

Empathy, beyond its theoretical definition, is a multifaceted and dynamic skill that cannot be fully encapsulated within the confines of a textbook. The simplistic explanations often found in textbooks overlook the emotional resonance and contextual dimensions that are essential to genuine empathy. Acknowledging the complexities and challenges associated with real-life empathy is crucial for promoting a more holistic and effective approach to its practice. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, we can cultivate empathy that goes beyond understanding and creates meaningful connections with others, enhancing our ability to positively impact the world around us.

_____

Declarations

Conflicts of interest: The author has no conflicts of interest.

References

Albiero, P., Matricardi, G., Speltri, D., & Toso, D. (2009). The assessment of empathy in adolescence: A contribution to the Italian validation of the 'Basic Empathy Scale'. *Journal of Adolescence, 32*(2), 393408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.01.001

Banissy, M. J., Kanai, R., Walsh, V., & Rees, G. (2012). Inter-individual differences in empathy are reflected in human brain structure. *NeuroImage, 62(3)*,2034–2039. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.05.08

Barnett, G., & Mann, R. E. (2013). Empathy deficits and sexual offending: A model of obstacles to empathy. *Aggression and Violent behaviour, 18(2)*, 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.010

Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: an investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 34(2)*, 163–175. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:jadd.0000022607.19833.00

Batson, C. D. (2009). These things called empathy: Eight related but distinct phenomena. In J. Decety & W. Ickes (Eds.), *The social neuroscience of empathy*, 3–15. Boston Review. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262012973.003.0002

Batson, C. D., Fultz, J., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1987). Distress and empathy: two qualitatively distinct vicarious emotions with different motivational consequences. *Journal of Personality, 55(1)*, 19–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1987.tb00426.x

Batson, C. Daniel, Eklund, J. H., Chermok, V. L., Hoyt, J. L., & Ortiz, B. G. (2007). An additional antecedent of empathic concern: valuing the welfare of the person in need. *Journal of Personality and*

Social Psychology, 93(1), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.1.65

Becker, H. (1931). Some forms of sympathy: a phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 26(1)*, 58–68. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0072609

Bernhardt, B. C., & Singer, T. (2012). The neural basis of empathy. *Annual review of neuroscience, 35*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-062111-150536

Besel, L. D. S., & Yuille, J. C. (2010). Individual differences in empathy: The role of facial expression recognition. *Personality and Individual Differences, 49(2)*, 107–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.013

Betancourt, H. (1990). An attribution-empathy model of helping behaviour. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 16(3)*, 573–591. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167290163015

Blair, R. J. R. (2005). Responding to the emotions of others: dissociating forms of empathy through the study of typical and psychiatric populations. *Consciousness and Cognition, 14(4)*, 698–718. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2005.06.004

Brown, S. J., Walker, K., Gannon, T. A., & Keown, K. (2013). Creating a psychologically comfortable position: The link between empathy and cognitions in sex offenders. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression, 19(3)*, 275–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2012.747223

Brown, S., Harkins, L., & Beech, A. R. (2012). General and victim-specific empathy: associations with actuarial risk, treatment outcome, and sexual recidivism. Sexual Abuse: *A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24(5)*, 411–430. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063211423944

Cain, M. (2019). "But It Wouldn't Be Me": Exploring empathy and compassion for self and others through creative processes. *In Compassion*

_____

and Empathy in Educational Contexts, 39–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18925-9_3

Cherry, K. (2023, February 22). *Empathy: Definition, Types, and Tips for Practicing.* Verywell Mind. Retrieved December 30, 2023, from https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-empathy-2795562

Clements, K., Holtzworth-munroe, A., Schweinle, W., & Ickes, W. (2007). Empathic accuracy of intimate partners in violent versus nonviolent relationships. *Personal Relationships, 14*(3), 369–388. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00161.x

Cohen, D., & Strayer, J. (1996). Empathy in conduct-disordered and comparison youth. *Developmental Psychology, 32*(6), 988–998. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.32.6.988

Coplan, A. (2011). Will the real empathy please stand up? A case for a narrow conceptualization. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy, 49*(s1), 40–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-6962.2011.00056.x

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*(1), 113–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113

de Vignemont, F., & Singer, T. (2006). The empathic brain: how, when and why? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 10*(10), 435–441. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.08.008

Decety, J., & Holvoet, C. (2021). The emergence of empathy: A developmental neuroscience perspective. Developmental Review: *DR, 62*(100999), 100999. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2021.100999

Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2004). The functional architecture of human empathy. *Behavioural and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews, 3*(2), 71–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534582304267187

Domes, G., Heinrichs, M., Michel, A., Berger, C., & Herpertz, S. C. (2007). Oxytocin improves "mind-reading" in humans. *Biological psychiatry, 61*(6), 731–733. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.07.015

Eisenberg N. (2000) . Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual review of psychology, 51,* 665–697. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.665

Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviours. *Psychological Bulletin, 101*(1), 91–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91

Eklund, J., Andersson-Stråberg, T., & Hansen, E. M. (2009). 'I've also experienced loss and fear': Effects of prior similar experience on empathy. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 50*(1), 65–69. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00673.x

Fan, Y., Duncan, N. W., de Greck, M., & Northoff, G. (2011). Is there a core neural network in empathy? An fMRI based quantitative meta-analysis. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Reviews, 35*(3), 903–911. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2010.10.009

Fernandez, Y. M., Marshall, W. L., Lightbody, S., & O'Sullivan, C. (1999). The child molester empathy measure: description and examination of its reliability and validity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 11*(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/107906329901100103

Feshbach, N. D. (1975). Empathy in children: Some theoretical and empirical considerations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 5*(2), 25–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/001100007500500207

Fisher, R. (2020). *The surprising downsides of empathy.* BBC. Retrieved December 9, 2023, from https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200930-can-empathy-be-bad-for-you

Geer, J. H., Estupinan, L. A., & Manguno-Mire, G. M. (2000). Empathy, social skills, and other relevant cognitive processes in rapists and child molesters. *Aggression and Violent behaviour, 5*(1), 99–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789(98)00011-1

Gerdes, K. E., Segal, E. A., & Lietz, C. A. (2010). Conceptualising and measuring empathy. *British Journal of Social Work, 40*(7), 2326–2343. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcq048

Gery, I., Miljkovitch, R., Berthoz, S., & Soussignan, R. (2009). Empathy and recognition of facial expressions of emotion in sex offenders, non-sex

offenders and normal controls. *Psychiatry Research, 165*(3), 252–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2007.11.006

Gladkova, A. (2010). Sympathy, compassion, and empathy in English and Russian: A linguistic and cultural analysis. *Culture & Psychology, 16*(2), 267–285. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X10361396

Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: an evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(3), 351–374. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018807

Goldman, A. I. (1993). Ethics and Cognitive Science. *Ethics, 103*(2), 337–360. https://doi.org/10.1086/293500

Hatfield, E., Rapson, R. L., & Le, Y.-C. L. (2009). Emotional contagion and empathy. In J. Decety & W. Ickes (Eds.), *The Social Neuroscience of Empathy*, 19–30. Boston Review. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262012973.003.0003

Healey, M. L., & Grossman, M. (2018). Cognitive and Affective Perspective-Taking: Evidence for Shared and Dissociable Anatomical Substrates. *Frontiers in Neurology, 9*, 491. https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2018.00491

Hodges, Sara & Myers, M.W. (2007). Encyclopedia of social psychology. *Empathy*. 296-298. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303060790_Encyclopedia_of_social_psychology

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805851

Iacoboni M. (2009). Imitation, empathy, and mirror neurons. *Annual review of psychology, 60,* 653–670. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163604

Johnson, J. A., Cheek, J. M., & Smither, R. (1983). The structure of empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(6), 1299–1312. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.6.1299

jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale. *Journal of Adolescence, 29*(4), 589–611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.08.010

Jonas, P., Nitschke, J. A., & Bartz, J. (2022). The association between acute stress & empathy: A systematic literature review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 144,* 105003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.105003

Kalawski, J. P. (2010). Is tenderness a basic emotion? *Motivation and Emotion, 34*(2), 158–167. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-010-9164-y

Lamm, C., Decety, J., & Singer, T. (2011). Meta-analytic evidence for common and distinct neural networks associated with directly experienced pain and empathy for pain. *NeuroImage, 54*(3), 2492–2502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.10.014

Y., Seo, Y., Lee, Y., & Lee, D. (2023). Dimensional emotions are represented by distinct topographical brain networks. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology: IJCHP, 23*(4), 100408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2023.100408

Lynne, D'Amico. (2018). Empathy and compassion in the health-related literature: Disciplinary and topic trends and gaps. *Journal of Compassionate Health Care, 5*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/S40639-018-0049-3

Nakao, H., & Itakura, S. (2009). An integrated view of empathy: Psychology, philosophy, and neuroscience. *Integrative Psychological & behavioural Science, 43*(1), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-008-9066-7

Nickerson, R. S. (1999). How we know—and sometimes misjudge—what others know: Imputing one's own knowledge to others. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 737–759. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.737

Nickerson, R. S., Butler, S. F., & Carlin, M. (2009). Empathy and Knowledge Projection. *The Social Neuroscience of Empathy* 43–56. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262012973.003.0005

Preston, S. D. (2007). A perception-action model for empathy. In T. F. D. Farrow & P. W. R. Woodruff (Eds.), *Empathy in Mental Illness* 428–447. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511543753.024

Promsri, C. (2019). Does A Family Size Have an Effect on Empathy Level?: Filling the Gap in Empathy Literature. Academy of Social Science Journals, 4(4), 1300–1303. https://www.academia.edu/89291195/Does_A_Family_Size_Have_an_Effect_on_Empathy_Level_Filling_the_Gap_in_Empathy_Literature

Ratka A. (2018). Empathy and the Development of Affective Skills. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 82*(10), 7192. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7192

Safdar, S., Friedlmeier, W., Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., Kwantes, C. T., Kakai, H., & Shigemasu, E. (2009). Variations of emotional display rules within and across cultures: A comparison between Canada, USA, and Japan. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 41*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014387

Shamay-Tsoory, S. G., Aharon-Peretz, J., & Perry, D. (2009). Two systems for empathy: A double dissociation between emotional and cognitive empathy in inferior frontal gyrus versus ventromedial prefrontal lesions. Brain: *A Journal of Neurology, 132*(3), 617–627. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awn279

Shuman, A. (2006). Entitlement and empathy in personal narrative. *Narrative Inquiry: NI, 16*(1), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.16.1.19shu

Singer, T., Kiebel, S. J., Winston, J. S., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2004). Brain responses to the acquired moral status of faces. *Neuron, 41*(4), 653–662. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0896-6273(04)00014-5

Singer, T., Seymour, B., O'Doherty, J. P., Stephan, K. E., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2006). Empathic neural responses are modulated by the perceived fairness of others. *Nature, 439*(7075), 466–469. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04271

Stinson, L., & Ickes, W. (1992). Empathic accuracy in the interactions of male friends versus male strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(5), 787–797. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.62.5.787

Stotland, E., Matthews, K.E., Sherman, S., Hansson, R.O., & Richardson, B.Z. (1978). *Empathy, Fantasy and Helping. Beverly Hills*, CA: Sage https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1980-03287-000

tueber, K. (2008). Empathy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/empathy/#EmpTopSciExpPsy

Thomas, G., Fletcher, G. J. O., & Lange, C. (1997). On-line empathic accuracy in marital interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(4), 839–850. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.4.839

Van der Weele, C. (2011). Empathy's purity, sympathy's complexities; De Waal, Darwin and Adam Smith. *Biology & Philosophy, 26*(4), 583–593. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-011-9248-4

Wispé, L. (1986). The distinction between sympathy and empathy: To call forth a concept, a word is needed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(2), 314–321. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.314

N., Li, Z., & Su, Y. (2012). The association between oxytocin receptor gene polymorphism (OXTR) and trait empathy. Journal of affective disorders, 138(3), 468–472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.01.009

Zahavi D. (2008). Simulation, projection and empathy. *Consciousness and cognition, 17*(2), 514–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2008.03.010

Zaki, J., Ochsner, K. The neuroscience of empathy: progress, pitfalls and promise. *Nat Neurosci 15,* 675–680 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3085.