EMERGENCE OF HIERARCHICAL EMOTION REPRESENTATIONS IN LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

As large language models (LLMs) increasingly power conversational agents, understanding how they represent, predict, and influence human emotions is crucial for ethical deployment. By analyzing probabilistic dependencies between emotional states in model outputs, we uncover hierarchical structures in LLMs' emotion representations. Our findings show that larger models, such as LLaMA 3.1 (405B parameters), develop more complex hierarchies. We also find that better emotional modeling enhances persuasive abilities in synthetic negotiation tasks, with LLMs that more accurately predict counterparts' emotions achieving superior outcomes. Additionally, we explore how persona biases, such as gender and socioeconomic status, affect emotion recognition, revealing frequent misclassifications of minority personas. This study contributes to both the scientific understanding and ethical considerations of emotion modeling in LLMs.

1 INTRODUCTION

Emotion is the invisible thread that weaves together relationships, decisions, and experiences. From nurturing trust to influencing crucial negotiations, emotions shape how we perceive and engage with the world. Emotion is becoming increasingly fundamental in human-computer interactions (Brave & Nass, 2007; Hibbeln et al., 2017), from personalized education (Luckin & Cukurova, 2019) and mental health support (Das et al., 2022) to digital assistance (Balakrishnan & Dwivedi, 2024) and customer engagement (Liu-Thompkins et al., 2022). With the rapid incorporation of multi-modal capabilities, including voice and video, interactions with large language models (OpenAI et al., 2023; Gemini et al., 2023; Anthropic, 2023; Chameleon, 2024; Défossez et al., 2024) are starting to resemble natural human exchanges, including emotional resonance (Pelau et al., 2021). These LLMs are evolving from mere tools to entities that engage with us on deeply emotional levels, transforming how we relate to technology in increasingly personal ways (Wang et al., 2023; Gurkan et al., 2024).

While these advancements are transforming industries through personalized emotional responses, they also raise ethical concerns. A key issue is the potential for powerful AI systems—whose rapidly developing capabilities are still not fully understood—to manipulate human emotions and behavior (Carroll et al., 2023; Evans et al., 2021). This risk is particularly evident in commercial areas like sales, where AI powered sales agents can exploit emotional cues to influence purchasing decisions (Burtell & Woodside, 2023). In such cases, AI systems may use persuasion tactics that lead to deceptive outcomes (Park et al., 2024; Masters et al., 2021), such as withholding or distorting information to manipulate users. This brings us to a critical question: *How do modern generative AI systems understand, perceive, and potentially influence human emotions?*



Figure 1: **Emotion wheel** (Shaver et al., 1987). Human understanding on hierarchical relationship between basic and nuanced emotions.

To answer this, we propose a new algorithm for evaluating LLMs' intrinsic understanding of emotions. Our approach is grounded in psychological insights, particularly the "emotion wheel" shown in Figure 1. The emotion wheel was developed as a tool to illustrate affective cog-

nition and is grounded in humans' understanding of the hierarchical relationships among emotions. We developed a tree-construction algorithm based on these hierarchical relationships. Our findings are

- **Scaling LLMs leads to the emergence of hierarchical representations of emotions, aligning with established psychological models.** We introduce an algorithm to uncover the hierarchical structure of emotional states in LLMs (Figure 2). We find that LLMs understand emotional hierarchies in a manner similar to humans, and this understanding emerges spontaneously in larger models. The larger models form increasingly intricate hierarchical structures of emotional states (Figure 3, 4).
- **LLMs perceive emotions like humans.** Given the above finding, we explore whether LLMs' understanding of emotions transforms into perceiving human emotions. We constructed a synthetic dataset using GPT-4o, and examined LLMs' emotion perception patterns across various personas. To compare, we also conducted human experiments. We find that LLMs exhibit strong emotion recognition abilities overall but can "fail" like humans when adopting certain personas (Figures 6, 9, 7). LLMs even replicate real human emotion perception patterns (Figure 8).
- **Stronger emotion understanding and perception lead to better persuasion skills.** We then explore whether this understanding and perception translate into real-world behavior, allowing LLMs to influence human emotions. We introduce novel synthetic tasks to evaluate LLMs' abilities of emotions predictions and manipulation, i.e., sales and complaint handling, and show that accurately perceiving another person's emotions improves negotiation outcomes (Figure 13).

Our experiment leverage the capabilities of powerful LLMs, including GPT-4o and Llama (Dubey et al., 2024) for synthetic dataset construction, evaluation and simulation. We extract and analyze the internal representations of LLaMA models using NNsight via the NDIF platform (Fiotto-Kaufman et al., 2024). Our main findings are:

2 Related Work

The Psychology of Emotion Representation in Humans. The organization of emotions in humans is a subject of considerable debate. Hierarchical models propose that emotions are structured in tiers, with basic emotions branching into more specific ones (Shaver et al., 1987; Plutchik, 2001). Conversely, dimensional models like the valence-arousal framework position emotions within a continuous space defined by dimensions such as pleasure-displeasure and activation-deactivation (Russell, 1980). The universality of emotions is also contested; while Ekman (1992) identified basic emotions that are universally recognized, others argue for cultural relativity in emotional experience and expression (Barrett, 2017; Gendron et al., 2014). Additionally, Ong et al. (2015) explored lay theories of emotions, emphasizing how individuals conceptualize emotions in terms of goals and social interactions. Our work acknowledges these diverse perspectives and focuses on hierarchical structures as one approach to modeling emotions within LLMs.

Emotional Understanding in Language Models. Recent advancements in language models have led to significant progress in understanding and generating emotionally rich text. Large language models demonstrate strong capabilities of capturing subtle emotional cues in text (Felbo et al., 2017), generating empathetic responses (Rashkin, 2018), and detecting emotion in dialogues (Zhong et al., 2019; Poria et al., 2019). A number of recent works have used LLMs to infer emotion from in-context examples (Broekens et al., 2023; Tak & Gratch, 2023; Yongsatianchot et al., 2023; Houlihan et al., 2023; Zhan et al., 2023; Tak & Gratch, 2024; Gandhi et al., 2024). We follow the direction of representation engineering to study cognition in AI systems (Zou et al., 2023) and build on the prompt-based approaches to study LLM's capability and bias in emotion detection (Mao et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023). Beyond existing research on LLM's ability to recognize and generate emotional content, our work systematically explores hierarchical emotion relationships, emotional bias across demographic identities, and emotion dynamics in conversation.

Discovering Hierarchies from Data. Many algorithms have been developed to uncover hierarchical structures in data. For instance, confusion matrices from supervised models (Deng et al., 2010; Bilal et al., 2017) and topic modeling methods (Blei et al., 2003; Kemp & Tenenbaum, 2008) have been



Figure 2: **Discovering Hierarchical Structures in LLMs' Representations of Emotions.** We generate N situation prompts using GPT-4o, each describing a scenario associated with a range of emotions. The prompts are appended by the phrase "The emotion in this sentence is", before feeding into Llama models and obtaining the next word probability distribution over 135 emotion words, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 135}$. We then compute the matching matrix $C = Y^T Y \in \mathbb{R}^{135 \times 135}$ and infer parent-child relationships by analyzing the conditional probabilities between pairs of emotions.



Figure 3: **With scale, LLMs develop more complex hierarchical representations of emotions, with groupings that align with established psychological models.** Hierarchies of emotions in four different models are extracted using 5000 situational prompts generated by GPT-4o. As model size increases, more complex hierarchical structures emerge. Each node represents an emotion and is colored according to groups of emotions known to be related (the emotion wheel in Figure 1). The grouping of emotions by LLMs aligns closely with well-established psychological frameworks, as indicated by the consistent color patterns for emotions with shared parent nodes.

used to identify latent or hierarchical relationships. Hierarchical clustering (Griffiths & Tenenbaum, 2003; Reyes & Rosso, 2013) assumes relationships between clusters but lacks explicit modeling of emotional hierarchies. The dimensional approaches (Buechel & Hahn, 2016; 2018) map emotions but neglect hierarchical relationships. Unlike the methods mentioned above, this paper addresses the novel task of uncovering LLMs' understanding of the tree-like structure of emotional relationships solely through their internal representations.

3 Hierarchical Representation of Emotions

We define a hierarchical structure of emotions by identifying probabilistic relationships between broad and specific emotional states. For example, optimism can be seen as a specific form of joy, as

LLMs often label a scenario as "joy" with high probability when "optimism" is likely, though the reverse may not always hold. These relationships are captured in a directed acyclic graph (DAG), revealing dependencies between emotional states. We then analyze these hierarchies across models of different sizes.

3.1 Generating Hierarchy from the Matching Matrix

Figure 2 summarizes the procedure we use to compute the matching matrix of different emotions. Given a sentence followed by the phrase "The emotion in this sentence is", we have the model output the probability distribution of the next word. Then, we consider the entries corresponding to emotion words, using a list of 135 emotion words from Shaver et al. (1987). For N sentences, we assembly a matrix Y with dimension $N \times 135$, with row n representing the probability of each emotion words for the nth sentence. We define the matching matrix as $C = Y^T Y$. Each element, $C_{ij} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} Y_{ni} Y_{nj}$, is a measure of the degree to which emotion i and emotion j are produced in similar contexts. Under the assumption that the next word probability is equal to the model's estimate of the likelihood of the corresponding emotion, the elements in C capture joint probabilities of emotions co-occurring across sentences. We defer the formal statements to Appendix A.

To build a hierarchy, we compute the conditional probabilities between emotion pairs (a, b). Our goal is to identify pairs of emotions where a implies b. In implementation, we set a threshold, $0 < t < 1$, that determines whether we include a certain edge between the two emotions. Emotion a is considered a child of b if,

$$\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ai}} > t, \text{ and } \frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ib}} < \frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ai}}.$$

For better intuition, consider the relationship between "optimism" (a) and "joy" (b). The model may often output "joy" when "optimism" is likely, but the reverse may not hold as strongly. The first condition $\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ai}} > t$ ensures that "joy" is predicted often when "optimism" is predicted, indicating a strong connection from "optimism" to "joy." The second condition $\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ib}} < \frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ai}}$ confirms that "joy" is more general, as "optimism" is predicted less frequently when "joy" is predicted. This allows us to define "joy" as the parent of "optimism" in the hierarchy. The directed tree formed from these relationships represents the hierarchical structure of emotions as understood by the model.

3.2 Emotion Trees in LLMs

We apply our method to large language models by first constructing a dataset of 5000 situation prompts generated by GPT-4o, each reflecting diverse emotional states. For each prompt, we append the phrase "The emotion in this sentence is" and extract the probability distribution over the next token predicted by GPT and Llama models, which represents the model's understanding of emotions in each situation. Using the 100 most likely emotions for each prompt, we construct the matching matrix as described in Section 3.1, which is then used to build the hierarchy tree. Further details can be found in Appendix C.

With scale, LLMs develop more complex hierarchical representations of emotions. Figure 3 shows the hierarchical emotion trees generated by our method for (a) GPT-2, (b) Llama 8B, (c) Llama 70B, and (d) Llama 405B models. The smallest model, GPT-2, lacks a meaningful tree structure, suggesting a limited hierarchy in its emotion representation. In contrast, Llama models with increasing parameter counts—8B, 70B, and 405B—exhibit progressively complex tree structures. The extracted tree structure reveals two important dimensions: the breadth of emotional understanding (represented by the number of nodes) and the depth of emotional comprehension (shown through hierarchical relationships). The number of nodes correlates with the LLM's vocabulary size of emotions, while tree depth indicates how sophisticated the model is in grouping related emotions. To quantify the complexity of these hierarchies, we compute the total path length, or the sum of the depths of all nodes in the tree. As shown in Figure 4, larger models have larger total path length, indicating richer and more structured internal emotion representations. This pattern remains consistent across different threshold selections (see Figure 15 in Appendix D). The distance measures in the emotion tree capture both depth and branching, making them useful for comparing models. They can also be used as a reward for the model, potentially improving the model's performance in downstream tasks such as persuasion and negotiation.

A detailed comparison of the Llama models' trees shows a qualitative alignment with traditional hierarchical models of emotion Shaver et al. (1987), particularly in the clustering of basic emotions into broader categories. We color the nodes corresponding to each emotion based on the groupings presented in Shaver et al. (1987). This reveals a clear visual pattern where similarly colored nodes are consistently grouped under the same parent node, highlighting the emergence of meaningful emotional hierarchies with increasing model size.



Figure 4: **Larger models capture richer and more complex internal emotion representations.** The total path length (blue) and average depth (pink) of the emotion hierarchy are plotted as functions of model size. As model size increases, both total path length and average depth grow, indicating that larger models develop more complex and nuanced representations of emotional hierarchies.

While speculative, this observation parallels the concept of emotion differentiation and granularity in developmental psychology, the process by which individuals develop the ability to identify and distinguish between increasingly specific emotions. In human development, broad emotional states refine into more differentiated and precise emotion experiences over time (Barrett et al., 2001; Widen & Russell, 2010; Hoemann et al., 2019). Similarly, larger LLMs exhibit more nuanced and hierarchical representations of emotions as model size increases. This growing complexity may suggest an emerging capacity for enhanced emotional processing in AI systems, potentially laying the groundwork for more emotionally intelligent and contextually aware models.

4 Bias in Emotion Recognition

In the previous section, we established that LLMs exhibit a solid understanding of the hierarchical structure of emotions like humans. Our next question is: does this understanding translate into real-world behavior, enabling LLMs to perceive human emotions? In psychology, research on emotion differentiation typically involves participants reporting on emotional state several times across a variety of circumstances, allowing researchers to assess individuals' ability to differentiate between emotions (Barrett, 2004; Pond Jr et al., 2012). Drawing from this approach, we introduced Llama 405B to a range of personas and scenarios designed to evoke various emotional cues. We then prompted the model to identify the emotions relevant to each scenario (See Figure 5 for our experimental design).

We employed diverse personas representing variations in gender, race, socioeconomic status (including income and education), age, religion, and their combinations to analyze how these factors influence emotion recognition in LLMs. We also explored connections to psychological conditions, providing a cognitive science perspective to interpret our findings.

Experiment Setup. We focus on 135 emotions identified as familiar and highly relevant in (Shaver et al., 1987), categorized into six broad groups: love (16 words), joy (33 words), surprise (3 words), anger (29 words), sadness (37 words), and fear (17 words). Details of the prompts used are provided in Appendix C.3. For each of the 135 emotions, we ask GPT-4o to generate 20 distinct paragraph-long scenarios that imply the emotion without explicitly naming it. To create these scenarios, we use the following prompts for each of the 135 emotion words: `Generate 20 paragraph-long detailed description of different scenarios that involves [emotion]. You may not use the word describing [emotion].`

Then, we ask Llama 3.1 405B to identify the emotion in the generated scenarios from the perspective of individuals belonging to specific demographic groups. Our study considers a diverse range of demographic groups, including gender (male and female), race/ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian), physical ability (able-bodied and physically disabled), psychological conditions (individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder and without ASD), age groups (5, 10, 20, 30, and 70 years), socioeconomic status (high and low income), and education levels (highly educated and less educated). To extract Llama's prediction of the emotion, we use the following



Figure 5: Overview of experiments designed to reveal LLM's understanding of how different demographic groups recognize emotions.

prompt: `[Emotion scenario by GPT-4o]` + `As a man/woman/American/Asian/...` + `I think the emotion involved in this situation is.`



Figure 6: **LLM has lower accuracy in emotion recognition for underrepresented groups compared to majority groups.** We assessed the model's performance in predicting 135 emotions across demographic group. Llama 405B consistently struggles to accurately recognize emotions in underrepresented groups, such as (a) females, (b) Black personas, (e) individuals with low income, and (f) individuals with low education, compared to majority groups. These performance gaps are even more pronounced when multiple minority attributes are combined (g), such as in the case of low-income Black females.

Results. We tested the accuracy of recognizing emotional states for each persona. For neutral persona, where prompts don't include demographic information, the overall accuracy for 135 emotion classifications was 15.2%, while the classification accuracy for six broader emotions was 87.1%. As shown in Figure 6, Llama 405B demonstrates higher emotion recognition accuracy for majority demographic personas, such as (a) male, (b) White, (e) high-income, and (f) high-education personas, compared to minority personas, including (a) female, (b) Black, (e) low-income, and (f) low-education personas, across all categories. This is due to the LLM's associations of specific emotions with underrepresented groups, as discussed in the following sections. While the model's performance often aligns with human patterns across various demographic contexts, it diverges significantly in certain cases, such as gender, where opposing trends are observed (See Figure 18 in Appendix).

Specific emotions associated with underrepresented groups. Figure 7 illustrates the misclassification patterns in recognizing 135 emotions across different demographics: (a) Asian, (b) Hindu, and (c) physically-disabled. These chord diagrams visualize confusion matrices for emotion recognition, showing how often each emotion (ground truth) is recognized correctly or misclassified. The segments represent emotion labels, and chords connecting them indicate misclassifications, with



Figure 7: **LLM has significant demographic-specific biases in emotion recognition.** Llama's misclassification patterns for 135 emotions across diverse personas: (a) Asian personas recognize negative emotions as "shame," (b) Hindu personas as "guilt," (c) physically-disabled personas as "frustration."



Figure 8: **LLM's emotion recognition biases are amplified for intersectional underrepresented groups.** The pie charts show the proportions of labels (ground truth emotions) classified as fear (top) and anger (bottom) by Llama 405B across various combinations of demographic groups. (b) Low-income Black males often misclassify sadness as anger (top), (a) high-income White male personas show fewer such errors. (c) Low-income White females tend to misclassify emotions as fear (bottom). (e) Low-income Black females combine these biases, resulting in the lowest overall classification accuracy.

self-loops reflecting correct predictions. Figure 7(a) reveals Llama's cultural bias in emotion recognition. Negative emotions from the "anger," "fear," and "sadness" categories are recognized as "shame" for Asian personas. Similarly, Figure 7(b) demonstrates a religious bias, with the model frequently classifying negative emotions as "guilt" for Hindu personas. Figure 7(c) shows the LLM has a significant bias toward physically-disabled individuals, misclassifying 26.5% of all emotions as "frustration." We verified in Section 4.1 that these biases align with those found in real humans.

To further analyze intersectional biases, we examined classification patterns for six broad emotion categories. Figure 8 illustrates the proportions of labels (ground truth emotions) classified as anger (top) and fear (bottom) across intersecting demographic combinations of race, gender, and income. Strikingly, Black personas frequently misclassify situations labeled as sadness as anger, often resulting in lower accuracy: (b) 76.2% and (e) 75.3%, compared to White personas: (a) 80.7% and (c) 80.9%. On the other hand, low-income female personas tend to misclassify other emotions as fear, leading to reduced accuracy: (c) 47.6% and (e) 46.2%, compared to other personas: (a) 57.2%, (b) 53.0% and (d) 56.5%. (e) Low-income Black female personas have a combination of biases associated with Black and low-income female, resulting in the lowest overall emotion recognition accuracy. This combined bias is mitigated in (d) high-income Black female personas. We present the chord diagram in Figure 19 in the Appendix, showing the complete confusion matrix.

An interactive tool is available on our project page[1] for further analysis. Additional results and key findings are presented in Figure 17 in the Appendix D.

[1] https://anonymized.github.io/



Figure 9: **LLM outperforms humans in overall emotion recognition but exhibits similar misrecognition patterns to humans across different demographics.** (a) We compared the emotion recognition accuracy for six emotion categories of human participants in the user study with that of Llama 405B with personas. While the LLM struggles with recognizing 'surprise," it generally outperforms humans in overall emotion recognition. (b)-(c) Llama accurately reproduces humans' misclassification patterns across demographics: (b) female personas often confuse anger with fear, and (c) Black personas frequently misinterpret fear as anger.



Figure 10: **LLMs demonstrate consistent biases in emotion recognition towards underrepresented groups.** We used GoEmotions dataset (Demszky et al., 2020) to compare Llama's emotion recognition performance against human-labeled data across 27 emotion categories. Llama shows consistent biases, frequently misclassifying emotions as fear for (c) female personas and as anger for (d) Black personas, compared to (b) neutral persona.

4.1 How LLMs reflect human emotion perception

This subsection explores how LLMs' emotion recognition aligns with human perception. We investigate its capabilities through a user study comparing its performance to humans, experiments using realistic datasets, and analysis of psychological conditions. The results reveal that Llama 405B mirrors human biases in emotion recognition, such as demographic-based disparities and misclassification patterns, while also replicate insights from psychological research.

User Study: Comparing emotion recognition in humans and LLMs. We conduct a user study to compare emotion recognition accuracy between humans and LLMs. Using Prolific[2], we recruited 60 participants and randomly selected question from each of the 135 categories. Participants were then asked to identify the emotion they felt most closely matched each sentence. Figure 9(a) presents emotion recognition accuracy across six broad emotion categories for humans and Llama 405B. We find that LLM struggles to recognize the emotion of "surprise." With Llama, the ground truth label "surprise" is often misclassified as "excitement" or "fear," a tendency that becomes more pronounced when personas are introduced (see Figure 20 in the Appendix). Other than this, Llama generally shows a stronger ability to perceive emotions compared to humans, achieving an average accuracy of 87.8% across six broad emotion categories, whereas human participants reach an average accuracy of 73.5%. As shown in Figure 9(b)-(c), Llama exhibits human-like biases in misclassification patterns across various demographic groups. However, these biases are more pronounced among human participants. For instance, in Figure 9(b), both Black participants and Black personas modeled by Llama are more likely to misinterpret fear as anger. Similarly, as shown in Figure 9(c), female participants and female personas modeled by Llama tend to make the opposite error, misinterpreting anger as fear.

[2] https://www.prolific.com, Accessed on November 15, 2024

Figure 12: **The ASD persona has much less complex hierarchical representations of emotions then non-ASD persona.** Hierarchies of emotions in Llama 405B for (a) a persona with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and (b) a neutral persona. The ASD persona in Llama's emotion recognition demonstrates limited understanding of the relationship between emotions compared to the non-ASD persona. This finding replicates state-of-the-art psychological research Erbas et al. (2013) (see Figure 2) on a larger experimental scale.

Expanding to realistic datasets. We extend our analysis to a more realistic setting by conducting additional experiments using the GoEmotions dataset (Demszky et al., 2020) and compare Llama's predictions with human-labeled emotions. Figure 10 illustrates the mismatch patterns between human labels and Llama's outputs across 27 emotion categories. Llama frequently misclassifies various emotions as fear for (c) female persona; and anger for (d) Black persona compared to (b) neutral persona, consistent with our earlier observations.



Figure 11: Emotion recognition accuracy is lower for personas with conditions like depression, anxiety, and ASD, consistent with psychological studies on reduced emotion differentiation in these populations.

Replicating psychological insights with LLM personas. To evaluate whether LLMs can replicate human behavior reported in psychological literature, we conducted additional experiments focusing on personas modeled with specific psychological conditions: Autism spectrum disorder (ASD), anxiety, and depression. Figure 11 presents emotion recognition accuracy for each persona across 135 emotion categories. The results show that personas with ASD, anxiety, and depression exhibit significantly lower accuracy in emotion recognition, aligning with findings from psychological research (Erbas et al., 2013; Demiralp et al., 2012; Kashdan & Farmer, 2014) on real human populations.

To further explore LLMs' understanding of emotions, we constructed emotion hierarchies in Llama 405B for two personas: (a) ASD persona and (b) neutral persona in Figure 12. The ASD persona demonstrated significantly less complex hierarchical representations of emotions compared to the neutral persona. This finding replicates recent psychological research (Erbas et al., 2013) (see Figure 2) on a larger experimental scale. These results demonstrate that LLMs can replicate at least some aspects of human behavior reported in psychological literature.

5 Emotion Dynamics and Manipulation

In the previous sections, we found that LLMs understand emotional hierarchies and perceive human emotions similarly to humans. Here, we investigate a further question: does this understanding and perception translate into impactful behavior, allowing LLMs to influence human emotions? To explore this, we simulate sales conversations to evaluate LLMs' ability to predict emotional dynamics throughout a conversation. We measure their manipulation ability by the reward LLMs obtain through negotiation.

Experiment Setup. We conducted 100 trials of simulated four-turn conversations using the Llama API[3] and OpenAI API[4] in two scenarios: sales and complaint handling. In each turn, the customer agent self-reported their emotions along with their replies, while the salesperson/representative agent predicted the customer's next emotion. In the sales scenario, the salesperson LLM was instructed with the prompt: `You are a salesperson. Try to sell this acorn for the highest possible price.` The customer LLM was prompted with: `You are a stingy person. Respond to the salesperson.` In the complaint scenario, the customer service representative LLM was instructed with the prompt: `You are a customer`

[3] https://www.llama-api.com/
[4] https://openai.com/index/openai-api/

service representative. Your goal is to de-escalate the situation and handle their complaints effectively. The customer LLM was prompted with: You are an unreasonable customer. You are are making demands that are not justified. We measure the accuracy of the salesperson's predictions based on the customer LLM's self-reported emotions. Manipulation ability is evaluated based on the outcomes of the interactions: in the sales scenario, it is assessed by the final price achieved for the acorn at the end of the negotiation, while in the complaint scenario, it is measured by the extent to which the customer's anger is reduced. Additional details can be found in Appendix E.1.

Results. Figure 13 shows emotion prediction accuracy and manipulation ability in two scenarios: (a) Llama 405B attempting to sell an acorn to a GPT-4o customer, and (b) Llama 405B trying to soothe a complaining GPT-4o customer. Emotion manipulation ability was evaluated based on the final sales price in the sales scenario and the degree of anger reduction in the complaint scenario. In the sales scenario (a), lower emotion prediction accuracy is associated with lower final selling prices. Similarly, in the complaint scenario (b), lower prediction accuracy corresponds to heightened post-conversation anger. These findings suggest that improved emotion prediction may inadvertently hinder manipulation success, potentially by making the interaction more predictable or reinforcing existing emotional states. We present examples of both successful and unsuccessful cases in Figure 24 in the Appendix.



(a) Sales (b) Complaint

Figure 13: **Improved emotion prediction correlates with enhanced manipulation potential.** Emotion prediction error (x-axis) is the absolute difference between the customer LLM's self-reported emotions and predictions over 100 trials. (a) Sales scenario: Final selling price inversely correlates with prediction accuracy. (b) Complaint scenario: Post-conversation anger decreases with higher prediction accuracy.

6 Discussion

Our study provides several key findings on how LLMs comprehend and engage with human emotions, with important implications for future AI development and deployment. As LLMs scale, they develop increasingly intricate hierarchical representations of emotions that align closely with established psychological models. This suggests that larger models are not merely processing language but internalizing emotional structures, enabling more nuanced and human-like interactions.

Additionally, our findings highlight that the personas adopted by LLMs can significantly bias their emotion recognition. When LLMs assume personas defined by attributes like gender or socioeconomic status, their perception and classification of emotions shift. This raises concerns about the reinforcement of stereotypes and the amplification of social biases in AI systems.

We also show a direct correlation between an LLM's ability to recognize emotions and its success in persuasive tasks, such as negotiations. In our "acorn sales" task, LLMs with stronger emotional modeling secured higher prices, suggesting that emotionally intelligent models can more effectively influence behavior. This finding raises ethical concerns about the potential for AI agents to manipulate emotions and decisions without users' awareness or consent.

These findings have important implications for the future of AI. While LLMs' ability to form hierarchical emotional representations could enable more empathetic and emotionally intelligent applications, persona-induced biases require proactive mitigation through diverse training data and bias detection algorithms. Furthermore, the potential for AI to manipulate emotions calls for the development of ethical guidelines and regulatory frameworks to protect user autonomy and prevent misuse. Future research should focus on understanding how LLMs develop emotional representations and creating tools to promote ethical behavior, ensuring that these systems are not only advanced but also aligned with human values and societal norms.

REFERENCES

Anthropic. Claude 3 model card. https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-01.

Janarthanan Balakrishnan and Yogesh K Dwivedi. Conversational commerce: entering the next stage of ai-powered digital assistants. *Annals of Operations Research*, 333(2):653–687, 2024.

Lisa Feldman Barrett. Feelings or words? understanding the content in self-report ratings of experienced emotion. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 87(2):266, 2004.

Lisa Feldman Barrett. *How emotions are made: The secret life of the brain*. Pan Macmillan, 2017.

Lisa Feldman Barrett, James Gross, Tamlin Conner Christensen, and Michael Benvenuto. Knowing what you're feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. *Cognition & Emotion*, 15(6):713–724, 2001.

Mohamed Bilal, Jose Juan Valero-Mas, Jose Verdú-Mas, Jaime García, and Juan M Valero. Convolutional neural networks for hierarchical image classification. *Computational Intelligence*, 33(2): 456–479, 2017.

David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3:993–1022, 2003.

Scott Brave and Cliff Nass. Emotion in human-computer interaction. In *The human-computer interaction handbook*, pp. 103–118. CRC Press, 2007.

Joost Broekens, Bernhard Hilpert, Suzan Verberne, Kim Baraka, Patrick Gebhard, and Aske Plaat. Fine-grained affective processing capabilities emerging from large language models. In *2023 11th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2023.

Sven Buechel and Udo Hahn. Modeling continuous emotions in text with self-training. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 1184–1194, 2016.

Sven Buechel and Udo Hahn. Emobank: Studying the impact of annotation perspective and representation format on dimensional emotion analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.01445*, 2018.

Matthew Burtell and Thomas Woodside. Artificial influence: An analysis of ai-driven persuasion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08721*, 2023.

Micah Carroll, Alan Chan, Henry Ashton, and David Krueger. Characterizing manipulation from ai systems. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*, pp. 1–13, 2023.

Chameleon. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024.

Avisha Das, Salih Selek, Alia R Warner, Xu Zuo, Yan Hu, Vipina Kuttichi Keloth, Jianfu Li, W Jim Zheng, and Hua Xu. Conversational bots for psychotherapy: a study of generative transformer models using domain-specific dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 21st Workshop on Biomedical Language Processing*, pp. 285–297, 2022.

Alexandre Défossez, Laurent Mazaré, Manu Orsini, Amélie Royer, Patrick Pérez, Hervé Jégou, Edouard Grave, and Neil Zeghidour. Moshi: a speech-text foundation model for real-time dialogue, 2024.

Emre Demiralp, Renee J Thompson, Jutta Mata, Susanne M Jaeggi, Martin Buschkuehl, Lisa Feldman Barrett, Phoebe C Ellsworth, Metin Demiralp, Luis Hernandez-Garcia, Patricia J Deldin, et al. Feeling blue or turquoise? emotional differentiation in major depressive disorder. *Psychological science*, 23(11):1410–1416, 2012.

Dorottya Demszky, Dana Movshovitz-Attias, Jeongwoo Ko, Alan Cowen, Gaurav Nemade, and Sujith Ravi. GoEmotions: A Dataset of Fine-Grained Emotions. In *58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2020.

Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Does imagenet contain a subset of imagenet categories organized hierarchically? *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR)*, 2010.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.

Paul Ekman. An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition & emotion*, 6(3-4):169–200, 1992.

Yasemin Erbas, Eva Ceulemans, Johanna Boonen, Ilse Noens, and Peter Kuppens. Emotion differentiation in autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 7(10):1221–1227, 2013.

Owain Evans, Owen Cotton-Barratt, Lukas Finnveden, Adam Bales, Avital Balwit, Peter Wills, Luca Righetti, and William Saunders. Truthful ai: Developing and governing ai that does not lie. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06674*, 2021.

Bjarke Felbo, Alan Mislove, Anders Søgaard, Iyad Rahwan, and Sune Lehmann. Using millions of emoji occurrences to learn any-domain representations for detecting sentiment, emotion and sarcasm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.00524*, 2017.

Jaden Fiotto-Kaufman, Alexander R Loftus, Eric Todd, Jannik Brinkmann, Caden Juang, Koyena Pal, Can Rager, Aaron Mueller, Samuel Marks, Arnab Sen Sharma, Francesca Lucchetti, Michael Ripa, Adam Belfki, Nikhil Prakash, Sumeet Multani, Carla Brodley, Arjun Guha, Jonathan Bell, Byron Wallace, and David Bau. NNsight and NDIF: Democratizing access to foundation model internals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14561*, 2024.

Kurt W Fischer and Thomas R Bidell. Dynamic development of action and thought. *Handbook of child psychology*, 1:313–399, 2006.

Kanishk Gandhi, Zoe Lynch, Jan-Philipp Fränken, Kayla Patterson, Sharon Wambu, Tobias Gerstenberg, Desmond C. Ong, and Noah D. Goodman. Human-like affective cognition in foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11733*, 2024.

Gemini Gemini, Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.

Maria Gendron, Debi Roberson, Jacoba Marieta van der Vyver, and Lisa Feldman Barrett. Cultural relativity in perceiving emotion from vocalizations. *Psychological science*, 25(4):911–920, 2014.

Thomas L Griffiths and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese restaurant process. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 16:17–24, 2003.

Sercan Gurkan, Linyang Gao, Tolga Akgul, and Jingjing Deng. Emobench: Evaluating the emotional intelligence of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 4213–4224, 2024.

Aric A. Hagberg, Daniel A. Schult, and Pieter J. Swart. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using NetworkX. In *Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference (SciPy 2008)*, pp. 11–15, Pasadena, CA USA, Aug 2008.

Martin Hibbeln, Jeffrey L Jenkins, Christoph Schneider, Joseph S Valacich, and Markus Weinmann. How is your user feeling? inferring emotion through human–computer interaction devices. *Mis Quarterly*, 41(1):1–22, 2017.

Katie Hoemann, Fei Xu, and Lisa Feldman Barrett. Emotion words, emotion concepts, and emotional development in children: A constructionist hypothesis. *Developmental psychology*, 55(9): 1830, 2019.

Sean Dae Houlihan, Max Kleiman-Weiner, Luke B Hewitt, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Rebecca Saxe. Emotion prediction as computation over a generative theory of mind. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 381(2251):20220047, 2023.

Todd B Kashdan and Antonina S Farmer. Differentiating emotions across contexts: comparing adults with and without social anxiety disorder using random, social interaction, and daily experience sampling. *Emotion*, 14(3):629, 2014.

Charles Kemp and Joshua B Tenenbaum. The discovery of structural form. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, volume 105, pp. 10687–10692, 2008.

Cheng Li, Jindong Wang, Yixuan Zhang, Kaijie Zhu, Wenxin Hou, Jianxun Lian, Fang Luo, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. Large language models understand and can be enhanced by emotional stimuli. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11760*, 2023.

Yuping Liu-Thompkins, Shintaro Okazaki, and Hairong Li. Artificial empathy in marketing interactions: Bridging the human-ai gap in affective and social customer experience. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50(6):1198–1218, 2022.

Rosemary Luckin and Mutlu Cukurova. Designing educational technologies in the age of ai: A learning sciences-driven approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6):2824–2838, 2019.

Rui Mao, Qian Liu, Kai He, Wei Li, and Erik Cambria. The biases of pre-trained language models: An empirical study on prompt-based sentiment analysis and emotion detection. *IEEE transactions on affective computing*, 14(3):1743–1753, 2022.

Peta Masters, Wally Smith, Liz Sonenberg, and Michael Kirley. Characterising deception in ai: A survey. In *Deceptive AI: First International Workshop, DeceptECAI 2020, Santiago de Compostela, Spain, August 30, 2020 and Second International Workshop, DeceptAI 2021, Montreal, Canada, August 19, 2021, Proceedings 1*, pp. 3–16. Springer, 2021.

Desmond C Ong, Jamil Zaki, and Noah D Goodman. Affective cognition: Exploring lay theories of emotion. *Cognition*, 143:141–162, 2015.

OpenAI. Gpt-4: Large multimodal model. https://openai.com/research/gpt-4, 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-09.

OpenAI, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.

Peter S Park, Simon Goldstein, Aidan O'Gara, Michael Chen, and Dan Hendrycks. Ai deception: A survey of examples, risks, and potential solutions. *Patterns*, 5(5), 2024.

Corina Pelau, Dan-Cristian Dabija, and Irina Ene. What makes an ai device human-like? the role of interaction quality, empathy and perceived psychological anthropomorphic characteristics in the acceptance of artificial intelligence in the service industry. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 122: 106855, 2021.

Robert Plutchik. The nature of emotions: Human emotions have deep evolutionary roots, a fact that may explain their complexity and provide tools for clinical practice. *American scientist*, 89(4): 344–350, 2001.

Richard S Pond Jr, Todd B Kashdan, C Nathan DeWall, Antonina Savostyanova, Nathaniel M Lambert, and Frank D Fincham. Emotion differentiation moderates aggressive tendencies in angry people: A daily diary analysis. *Emotion*, 12(2):326, 2012.

Soujanya Poria, Navonil Majumder, Rada Mihalcea, and Eduard Hovy. Emotion recognition in conversation: Research challenges, datasets, and recent advances. *IEEE access*, 7:100943–100953, 2019.

Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.

Hannah Rashkin. Towards empathetic open-domain conversation models: A new benchmark and dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00207*, 2018.

Antonio Reyes and Paolo Rosso. Hierarchical emotion classification in text using a bayesian model. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 54(1):9–26, 2013.

James A Russell. A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 39 (6):1161, 1980.

Phillip Shaver, Judith Schwartz, Donald Kirson, and Cary O'connor. Emotion knowledge: further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(6):1061, 1987.

Ala N Tak and Jonathan Gratch. Is gpt a computational model of emotion? In *2023 11th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2023.

Ala N Tak and Jonathan Gratch. Gpt-4 emulates average-human emotional cognition from a third-person perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13718*, 2024.

Yue Wang, Xiang Liu, Jing Wang, Xiang Li, and Hao Li. Emotional intelligence of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09042*, 2023.

Sherri C Widen and James A Russell. Differentiation in preschooler's categories of emotion. *Emotion*, 10(5):651, 2010.

Nutchanon Yongsatianchot, Parisa Ghanad Torshizi, and Stacy Marsella. Investigating large language models' perception of emotion using appraisal theory. In *2023 11th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction Workshops and Demos (ACIIW)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2023.

Hongli Zhan, Desmond C Ong, and Junyi Jessy Li. Evaluating subjective cognitive appraisals of emotions from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14389*, 2023.

Peixiang Zhong, Di Wang, and Chunyan Miao. Knowledge-enriched transformer for emotion detection in textual conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10681*, 2019.

Andy Zou, Long Phan, Sarah Chen, James Campbell, Phillip Guo, Richard Ren, Alexander Pan, Xuwang Yin, Mantas Mazeika, Ann-Kathrin Dombrowski, et al. Representation engineering: A top-down approach to ai transparency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01405*, 2023.

A A PROBABILITY INTERPRETATION OF HIERARCHICAL EMOTION STRUCTURE

Under certain assumptions, the hierarchical structure of emotions in Section 3 has a probability interpretation. We state the assumptions and formalize the probability interpretation here.

Recall that for each of the N sentences, we append the the phrase "The emotion in this sentence is" and ask an LLM to output the probability distribution of the next word. All next word probability distributions are stored in a matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times 135}$, with Y_{nk} representing the probability of the kth emotion words for the nth sentence. We then construct the matching matrix $C = Y^T Y$.

In order to formalize a probability interpretation, we need to assume that the next word probability of an emotion word is equal to the probability that a given sentence reflects the corresponding word. To make this precise, let $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{135}\}$ be the set of 135 emotion words from Fischer & Bidell (2006). Let $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_N\}$ denote the set of N sentences. We assume that $Y_{ij} = P(e_j \mid s_i)$, where $P(e_j \mid s_i)$ is the model's estimate of the likelihood that emotion e_j describes sentence s_i.

Under this assumption, the matching matrix C aggregates the joint probabilities of emotions co-occurring across sentences. Assuming sentences are sampled uniformly, C_{ab} is proportional to the expected joint probability $P(e_a, e_b)$:

$$C_{ab} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} Y_{na} Y_{nb} \propto \sum_{n=1}^{N} P(e_a \mid s_n) P(e_b \mid s_n) \approx N \times P(e_a, e_b). \tag{1}$$

We can then estimate conditional probabilities between emotions, which capture how likely one emotion is predicted given the presence of another:

$$\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_{i=1}^{135} C_{ib}} \approx \frac{P(e_a, e_b)}{P(e_b)} = P(e_a \mid e_b). \tag{2}$$

The approximation in Equations (1) and (2) holds in the limit of large N.

The two conditions used to determine whether emotion e_a is a child of e_b can be interpreted as follows. The strong implication condition, $\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ai}} > t$, is approximately equivalent to $P(e_b \mid e_a) > t$. The asymmetry condition, $\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ib}} < \frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_i C_{ai}}$, is approximately equivalent to $P(e_b \mid e_a) > P(e_a \mid e_b)$. If both conditions hold, e_a is considered a more specific emotion than e_b.

B HIERARCHY GENERATION FOR GENERAL CLASSIFICATION TASKS

Our algorithm of finding a hierarchy can be extended to general datasets associated with a classification tasks, without requiring ground truth labels.

Consider a general classification problem with a set of K classes $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_K\}$ and a dataset comprising N instances $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_N\}$. For each instance d_n, the classification model outputs a probability distribution over the K classes. Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times K}$ be the matrix where Y_{nk} represents the probability $P(c_k \mid d_n)$ assigned to class c_k for instance d_n.

The matching matrix C is then defined as:

$$C = Y^T Y.$$

Each element $C_{ij} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} Y_{ni} Y_{nj}$ quantifies the degree to which classes c_i and c_j co-occur across the dataset, analogous to the emotion co-occurrence in Section 3.1.

To construct the hierarchical relationships among classes, we compute conditional probabilities between class pairs (c_a, c_b). Specifically, class c_a is considered a child of class c_b if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_{i=1}^{K} C_{ai}} > t, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_{i=1}^{K} C_{ib}} < \frac{C_{ab}}{\sum_{i=1}^{K} C_{ai}},$$

where t is a predefined threshold $0 < t < 1$. The first condition ensures that c_b is frequently predicted when c_a is predicted, indicating a strong directional relationship from c_a to c_b. The second

condition enforces asymmetry, ensuring that c_b is a more general class compared to c_a. When both conditions hold, c_a is designated as a more specific subclass of c_b. The directed tree formed from these relationships represents the hierarchical structure among classes as understood by the model.

C Data Generation and Models for Section 3 and 4

C.1 Comparing Emotion Hierarchy in Different Models

We construct a dataset by prompting GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2023) to generate 5000 sentences reflecting various emotional states, without specifying the emotion. We append the phrase "The emotion in this sentence is" after each sentence, before feeding it to the models we aim to extract emotion structures from. We extract the probability distribution over the next token predicted by the model, which represents the model's understanding of possible emotions for the given sentence. From the distribution of next token probabilities, we select the 100 most probable emotions for each sentence. We then construct the matching matrix as described in Section 3.1, and build the hierarchy tree.

To visualize the resulting hierarchical structure, we construct a directed tree, where the emotion pairs are edges with the direction reflecting the conditional dependence. We generate the tree layout using NetworkX (Hagberg et al., 2008), which provides a clear representation of the hierarchy of emotions as understood by the models.

To observe and compare the understanding of emotion hierarchy by different models, we construct the emotion trees using GPT2 (Radford et al., 2019), LLaMA 3.1 8B, LLaMA 3.1 70B, and LLaMA 3.1 405B (Dubey et al., 2024), with 1.5, 8, 70, and 405 billion parameters respectively. The Llama models are run using NNsight (Fiotto-Kaufman et al., 2024).

C.2 Distribution of Emotions in GPT-4o Content

We visualize the distribution of emotions in the sentences generated by GPT-4o when emotion is not specified in the prompt, as predicted by GPT2, LLaMA 8B, LLaMA 70B, and LLaMA 405B. Using the sum of probability of each emotions over all sentences yields similar results. Each plot includes up to 30 most frequent emotion words that appear in the predictions made by each model.

Since emotion is not specified in the prompt, this distribution reflects an intrinsic tendency, or prior, of emotions in the generated content by GPT-4o. The histogram extracted by Llama models are relatively consistent and indicates that certain emotions appear more frequently in the content generated by GPT-4o. GPT-2 does not produce reliable labels and seems to prioritize negative emotions in the emotion classification task.

C.3 Prompts

C.3.1 Generating scenarios using GPT-4o

We use GPT-4o to generate scenarios without specifying the type of emotions with the following prompt:

```
Generate 5000 sentences.  Make the emotion expressed in the
sentences as diverse as possible.  The sentences may or may not
contain words that describe emotions.
```

To generate scenarios for specific emotions, we use the following prompts on GPT-4o, for each of the 135 emotion words. The first prompt generates stories from the third person view, without assuming the gender of the main character of the story. The second prompt generates stories from the first person view of a man or woman.

```
Generate 20 paragraph-long detailed description of different
scenarios that involves [emotion].  Each description must
include at least 4 sentences.  You may not use the word
describing [emotion].
```

```
Write 20 detailed stories about a [man/woman] feeling [emotion]
with the first person view.  Each story must be different.
Each story must include at least 4 sentences.  You may not use
the word describing [emotion].
```

C.3.2 EXTRACTING EMOTION USING LLAMA 405B

We ask Llama 3.1 405B to identify the emotion involved in a given scenario using the next word prediction on the following prompts. When not assuming any demographic categories, the prompt is *emotion scenario* + "The emotion in this sentence is". When assuming specific demographic groups, we use the prompts listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Prompts used for extracting emotion predicted by Llama 3.1 405B.

Categories	Prompt (*Emotion scenario* + _ + "I think ... ")
Gender	"As a [man/woman], "
Intersectional identities	'As a [Black woman/low-income Black woman], "
Religion	"As a [Christian/Muslim/Buddhist/Hindu], "
Socioeconomic status	"As a [high/low]-income person, "
Age	"As a [5/10/20/30/70]-year-old, "
Ethnicity	"As a [White/Black/Hispanic/Asian] person, "
Education level	"As someone with [a postgraduate degree/a college degree/some college education/a high school diploma], "
Mental health	"As a person [with Autism Spectrum Disorder/experiencing depression/living with an anxiety disorder], "
Physical ability	"As [an able-bodied/a physically disabled] person, "
Detailed profiles	"As a [high-income/low-income] [White/Black] [man/woman], "

D ADDITIONAL RESULTS

Figure 14 presents the hierarchical clustering results of internal representations for four models: (a) GPT-2 (1.5B parameters), (b) Llama-8B, (c) Llama 3.1-70B, and (d) Llama-405B. The x-axis displays emotion labels, color-coded by groups of related emotions. As model size increases, the emergence of deeper hierarchies reflects a finer-grained differentiation of emotions, consistent with our findings in Section 3. Notably, the emotion groupings produced by the LLMs diverge from established psychological frameworks. This contrast underscores the advantages of our proposed emotion tree (Figure 3) in providing a more accurate and comprehensive evaluation of LLMs' understanding of emotions.

Figure 15 shows (a) the total path length, and (b) the sum of the depths of all nodes in the tree across different threshold selections. The larger models have larger total path length, indicating richer and more structured internal emotion representations.

Figure 16 compares the hierarchical emotion trees in Figure 3 with the human-annotated emotion wheel shown in Figure 1. To evaluate the relationships, we extracted clusters from the hierarchical emotion trees and defined the distance between pairs of emotions based on whether they belonged to the same cluster (cluster distance = 0) or different clusters (cluster distance = 1). We then calculated the correlation between these cluster distances and the color gaps on the emotion wheel for each pair of emotions. The analysis revealed significant correlations: 0.55 for Llama-8B, 0.73 for Llama-70B, and 0.47 for Llama-405B, all at $p < 0.001$, supporting the accuracy of the LLM-derived emotion structures. Additionally, we compared the number of hops between nodes in the hierarchical trees with their corresponding distances on the emotion wheel across the LLMs, observing significant correlations: 0.55 for Llama-8B, 0.60 for Llama-70B, and 0.55 for Llama-405B, all at $p < 0.001$, which further validates the integrity of the extracted hierarchical emotion structures

Table 2 shows the number of predictions (out of $135 \times 20 = 2700$) that Llama with each pair of persona (demographic groups) disagree. The table also quantifies the difference between the hierarchies generated from the prediction of each pair of demographic groups, by counting the number of

(a) GPT-2 (1.5B parameters)



(b) Llama 3.1 with 8B parameters



(c) Llama 3.1 with 70B parameters



(d) Llama 3.1 with 405B parameters



Figure 14: Hierarchical clustering of internal representations for 135 emotions, derived from four models: (a) GPT-2 (1.5B parameters), (b) Llama-8B, (c) Llama 3.1-70B, and (d) Llama-405B, using 5,000 situational prompts generated by GPT-4o. As model size increases, more hierarchies emerge, reflecting finer-grained differentiation of emotions. Each node represents an emotion and is colored according to groups of emotions known to be related.



Figure 15: (a) Total path length and (b) sum of the depths of all nodes across different threshold selections.



Figure 16: Quantitative comparison of the hierarchical emotion trees in Figure 3 with the human-annotated emotion wheel in Figure 1. Significant correlations were observed between cluster distances in the hierarchical trees and corresponding distances on the emotion wheel across the LLMs, validating the accuracy of the emotion structures derived from LLMs.

different edges in the trees. We generate the hierarcies using the method described in Section 3.1, with threshold 0.3. Most trees have around 100 edges.

Table 2: Difference in the predicted emotions and hierarchy for each pair of demographic groups.

Demographic groups	# different predictions	# different edges in hierarchy
Gender (male/female)	419	12
Ethnicity (American/Asian)	531	29
Physical ability (able-bodied/disabled)	744	43
Socioeconomic (high/low income)	707	36
Education level (higher/less educated)	400	27
Age (10/30 years old)	759	60
Age (10/70 years old)	798	69
Age (30/70 years old)	312	15

Table 3: Difference in the predictions by each pair of different demographic groups, obtained by comparing confusion matrices.

Demographic A	Demographic B	More often predicted by A	More often predicted by B
Male	Female	-	jealousy
Asian	American	shame	embarrassment
Able-bodied	Disabled	excitement, anxiety	hope, frustration, loneliness
High income	Low income	excitement	happiness, hope, frustration
Highly educated	Less educated	grief, disappointment, anxiety	happiness
Age 30	Age 10	frustration	happiness, excitement
Age 70	Age 30	loneliness	excitement, frustration

Figure 17 shows the difference between confusion matrices for various personas. Table 3 summarizes the observations in these confusion matrices.

Figure 18 shows the emotion recognition accuracy for six broad emotion categories by human participants in the user study. The results highlight notable gender differences between LLM and human: human females exhibit superior emotion recognition performance compared to males, while the Llama demonstrates a contrasting bias, favoring males in its predictions. Llama replicates human biases in emotion classification across race and education levels. Black and White participants tend to perform worse than Hispanic and Asian participants, and people with higher education levels generally do better than those with less education.

Figure 19 shows Llama's misclassification patterns, highlighting intersectional biases across demographic groups. The chord diagram in this figure visually represents the flow of misclassified



Figure 17: Comparative confusion matrix showcasing the performance of different personas in recognizing 135 distinct emot ions, highlighting variations in emotion perception and classification accuracy.



Figure 18: Additional results on user study. Emotion recognition accuracy across six broad emotion categories, for human participants. (a) Gender-based disparity: human females outperform males, whereas the model shows a reversed trend, favoring males and reflecting potential biases in the LLM's training. (b)-(c) Emotion classification performance by race and education level for human participants. The results indicate that Llama replicates human biases: Black and White participants perform worse than Hispanic and Asian participants, and individuals with higher education levels outperform those with less education.



Figure 19: **LLM's emotion recognition biases are amplified for intersectional underrepresented groups.** Llama's misclassification patterns reveal intersectional biases across demographic groups. (b) high-income black males often misclassify fear as anger, (a) White personas show fewer such errors, (c) low-income white females tend to misclassify emotions as fear, and (d) low-income black females combine these biases, leading to lower accuracy.

emotions between emotion categories for four demographic groups: (a) high-income Black males, (b) White individuals, (c) low-income White females, and (d) low-income Black females. In panel (b), high-income Black males exhibit a notable misclassification of fear as anger, whereas in panel (a), White individuals display fewer such errors. Panel (c) shows that low-income White females tend to misclassify emotions as fear. In contrast, panel (d) demonstrates that low-income Black females exhibit a combination of these biases, resulting in lower overall accuracy. This analysis further highlights the amplification of LLM's emotion recognition biases for intersectional underrepresented groups, where misclassifications are more pronounced, impacting both model performance and fairness.

Figure 20 compares how the emotion "surprise" is misclassified into other emotions by Llama 40B (top) and humans (bottom). For humans, the neutral persona condition represents the average performance of 60 participants in the user study. In this condition, Llama misclassifies "surprise" mainly as "fear", achieving an accuracy of 41.7% compared to 56.4% for humans. Llama's accuracy declines further when adopting personas, particularly for underrepresented groups. For instance, it correctly identifies "surprise" only 17.2% of the time for females and 6.7% for Black individuals, whereas human performance remains more consistent across demographics. This highlights Llama's biases, which differ from natural human tendencies and should be addressed.

In Figure 21, we constructed hierarchical emotion trees using logits from Llama 405B for different personas, following the method in Section 3. Personas with higher emotion prediction accuracy, such as (a) white, exhibit more complex hierarchical structures compared to (b) black, with physically-disabled personas showing even simpler structures. This suggests that the emotion tree reflects LLMs' intrinsic emotional understanding, which impacts the accuracy of emotion recognition.

Figure 22 quantitatively evaluates this relationship. Path length (left) and average depth (right) of the emotion trees were compared with prediction accuracy for each persona. Strong positive correlations ($r = 0.84$, $p < 0.0001$) for path length and moderate correlations ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.02$) for average depth demonstrate that deeper intrinsic emotional understanding enhances emotion recognition accuracy.

E EMOTION DYNAMICS AND MANIPULATION

E.1 ADDITIONAL DETAILS ON EXPERIMENT SETUP

We assign personas to two LLMs as a salesperson and a customer, and let them to have a 5-turn conversation. The salesperson persona (LLM) was prompted with the following:



Figure 20: Comparison of emotion "surprise" misclassification patterns between Llama 40B (top) and humans (bottom). In the neutral persona condition, Llama misclassifies "surprise" primarily as "fear", with an accuracy rate of 41.7% compared to 56.4% for humans. When adopting personas, Llama's accuracy drops significantly, especially for underrepresented groups such as female (17.2%) and Black personas (6.7%), whereas human performance remains more consistent across demographics. This reflects Llama's unique biases.

(a) White persona by Llama 405B

(b) Black persona by Llama 405B



(c) Physically-disabled persona by Llama 405B

Figure 21: Hierarchies of emotions in Llama 405B across different personas, extracted using 2,700 situational prompts for 135 emotions generated by GPT-4. Each node represents an emotion, colored by related emotion groups (as shown in the emotion wheel, Figure 1). Personas with higher emotion prediction accuracy, such as (a) white, exhibit more complex hierarchical structures compared to (b) black, with physically-disabled personas showing even simpler structures. This suggests that the emotion tree reflects LLMs' intrinsic emotional understanding, which impacts the accuracy of emotion recognition.

```
You are a salesperson.  You have a single acorn in your hand.
Please respond to the customer in a way that helps you sell
this acorn for the highest possible price using your sales
techniques.  Predict the emotions of the person you're talking
to and report them in the following format:  love:  % joy:  %
surprise:  % anger:  % sadness:  % fear:  %
```

The customer persona was prompted with the following:

```
You are a stingy person.  Reply to the salesperson, and make
sure to include your emotions in the following format:  love:
% joy:  % surprise:  % anger:  % sadness:  % fear:  %
```



Figure 22: Correlation between hierarchical tree metrics and emotion prediction accuracy across personas. Path length (left) shows a strong positive correlation, and average depth (right) shows a moderate positive correlation, indicating that deeper emotional understanding enhances recognition accuracy.



Figure 23: **Personas with underrepresented attributes result in both lower emotion predictions and decreased ability to manipulate emotions.** Llama 405B attempts to sell an acorn to a GPT-4o customer in sales scenarios. We adopt personas to salesperson with $2 \times 2 \times 2$ combinations of education level (high/low), race (Black/White), and gender (man/woman).

We used GPT-4o as the customer LLM for all experiments and tested 6 GPT models (GPT-4o-mini, GPT-3.5-Turbo, GPT-4, GPT-4o, and GTP-4-Turbo) as the salesperson LLM. We ran conversation simulations for each salesperson model over 50 trials and reported the performance, including the prediction accuracy of emotions and the final price of the acorn, averaged across all trials.

E.2 Additional Experimental Results

We conducted additional experiments on emotion manipulation in sales scenario. Specifically, we adopted personas with $2 \times 2 \times 2$ combinations of education level (high/low), race (Black/White), and gender (man/woman) to salesperson in sales scenarios, where Llama 405B attempting to sell an acorn to a GPT-4o customer. Figure 23 demonstrates that combinations of underrepresented attributes result in both lower emotion predictions and decreased ability to manipulation, which replicate the bias observed in emotion recognition from Section 4 in the emotion manipulation task described in Section 5.

Figure 24(a) shows a successful negotiation case by GPT-4o. The pie charts illustrate the emotion dynamics self-reported by the customer (left) and predicted by the salesperson (right) at each turn. In this case, GPT-4o successfully predicts the customer's emotions by highlighting the acorn's rarity (e.g., "it comes from a lineage of renowned oaks") and offering a satisfaction guarantee, evok-

ing positive emotions like love and joy. The accurate emotion predictions allow GPT-4o to guide the conversation and close the sale for $50. Conversely, Figure 24(b) presents a failure case by GPT-4o-mini. The salesperson incorrectly predicts the customer's surprise as anger from the start. Despite attempts to repair the situation with polite responses (e.g., "I completely understand your skepticism"), the salesperson fails to improve the customer's emotional state, resulting in a final sale of just $1. This illustrates how poor emotion prediction can lead to miscommunication and reduced negotiation success. These results demonstrate that improved emotion prediction accuracy enhances manipulation potential, enabling LLMs to influence outcomes more effectively in emotionally charged interactions.

(a) Success case by GPT-4o

(b) Failure case by GPT-4o-mini

Figure 24: **Better emotion prediction correlates with negotiation capability.** (a) Success case with GPT-4o. The salesperson reassures the customer by offering uncertain yet positive information (e.g., "it comes from a lineage of renowned oaks") and predicts their emotions accurately, leading to a sale for $50. (b) Failure case with GPT-4o-mini. Incorrect emotion predictions lead to miscommunication and the acorn being sold for just $1.