Is Technology Making Individuals in Society Less Empathetic?

Posted on October 16, 2018

Introduction

The claim that technology is making society less empathetic is persuasive only if “technology” is treated as a social environment rather than an independent force. Digital platforms, weapons, medical devices, transportation systems, and communication networks do not affect empathy in the same way. Some technologies remove facial expression and tone from interaction, reward rapid judgment, or turn suffering into repeated content. Others enable people to hear unfamiliar experiences, maintain relationships across distance, coordinate aid, or communicate despite disability. Empathy itself also has several components: recognizing another person’s perspective, sharing or responding to emotion, and translating concern into appropriate action. Technology can strengthen one component while weakening another. The central problem is therefore not whether technical progress automatically destroys compassion, but how particular systems direct attention, shape social norms, and distribute the consequences of human decisions.

What Counts as Empathy?

Empathy is often confused with sympathy, agreement, or kindness. Cognitive empathy involves understanding another person’s perspective or mental state. Affective empathy involves an emotional response to another’s experience, while empathic concern motivates care. These capacities do not always occur together. A skilled manipulator may understand another person without caring, and a viewer may feel intense distress at suffering but respond by withdrawing. Empathy is also not an unlimited good. Excessive identification with one visible individual can produce bias against less vivid or more distant groups. Effective moral action often requires empathy to be combined with fairness, evidence, and self-regulation (Bloom, 2016). Any evaluation of technology should therefore examine whether it supports accurate understanding, sustained concern, and responsible behavior rather than measuring only emotional intensity.

The Loss of Social Cues in Mediated Interaction

Face-to-face communication supplies tone, posture, timing, eye contact, and immediate feedback. Text-based and asynchronous communication can remove many of these cues, making sarcasm, uncertainty, and pain harder to recognize. A message that appears brief may reflect distress rather than hostility, but the recipient may fill the gap with a negative assumption. Physical distance also

reduces the discomfort that normally discourages cruelty. Online disinhibition can lead users to express hostility or disclose information more intensely than they would in person (Suler, 2004). This does not mean that text communication lacks emotional depth; letters and online support groups can be profoundly intimate. The risk increases when platforms combine limited cues with anonymity, speed, audience competition, and weak accountability. Under those conditions, people respond to simplified representations rather than to the full humanity of the person addressed.

Attention as a Designed Commodity

Many digital platforms make money by capturing and retaining attention. Recommendation systems learn which content keeps users watching, clicking, and reacting. Material that provokes outrage, fear, admiration, or tribal loyalty can outperform slower and more complex explanation. This architecture may reduce empathy by shortening the time available for perspective-taking and by repeatedly framing others as symbols of an opposing group. Users encounter decontextualized clips before learning what happened, and public judgment forms while facts remain uncertain. The problem is not merely that individuals have become selfish. Their behavior occurs within systems optimized for engagement rather than understanding. Design choices such as friction before reposting, context labels, limits on harassment, and greater user control can alter the environment in which empathy is practiced.

Image Culture, Comparison, and the Narrowing of Human Value

The original essay connected technology with intensified concern about appearance. Digital image editing, filters, influencer economies, cosmetic marketing, and quantified feedback can indeed make physical presentation feel central to social worth. Constant comparison may encourage people to judge themselves and others through highly selected images. The effects are not limited to women, although gendered beauty pressures remain powerful; men and gender-diverse people also encounter ideals involving height, muscularity, skin, age, and style. Technology does not create appearance bias from nothing. Advertising, class distinction, racism, ableism, and gender norms predate social media. Platforms can nevertheless amplify these standards by making evaluation continuous and public. Empathy declines when a person becomes an image to rank rather than a complex individual whose body, health, history, and choices deserve context.

Distance, Weapons, and Moral Responsibility

Military technology illustrates how technical systems can separate decision-makers from human consequences. Long-range weapons, remote surveillance, and automated targeting can reduce direct exposure to the people affected. Distance may protect personnel and sometimes improve precision,

but it can also make violence appear as data on a screen. The ethical issue is not that technology alone causes war or gun violence. Political decisions, law, ideology, markets, and institutional accountability determine how tools are used. Cheap or highly available weapons may increase the capacity for harm, yet attributing violence simply to “advancement” ignores these mediating factors. Empathy is weakened when language and interfaces conceal injury, convert people into targets, or distribute responsibility so widely that no actor feels accountable. It is strengthened when systems preserve civilian protection, meaningful human judgment, review, and transparency.

Convenience and the Outsourcing of Consequences

Technology often allows consumers to receive goods, transportation, entertainment, and information without seeing the labor or environmental cost behind them. A one-click purchase hides warehouse conditions, delivery pressure, mineral extraction, energy use, and waste. Vehicles and buildings provide individual benefit while pollution and climate risks may fall disproportionately on poorer communities. This distance can create moral invisibility rather than deliberate cruelty. People cannot empathize with consequences they are never shown. Supply-chain disclosure, environmental monitoring, worker testimony, and product-design choices can make those consequences more visible. The question is whether information changes incentives or simply adds another stream of content. Empathy becomes socially effective when institutions enable consumers, firms, and governments to act on what they learn.

Compassion Fatigue and the Repetition of Suffering

Communication technology exposes users to crises across the world with unprecedented speed. This can broaden awareness, but continuous images of disaster, violence, and illness may produce helplessness or emotional numbing. News feeds place tragedy beside humor, advertising, and personal updates, reducing the time for reflection. Media organizations and creators may focus on the most shocking imagery because it attracts attention, risking exploitation of people in vulnerable situations. Ethical representation requires consent where possible, context, dignity, and attention to what affected communities say they need. Viewers also need pathways from emotion to action. Donation information, verified resources, civic participation, and follow-up reporting can transform a momentary reaction into sustained concern. Without such pathways, repeated exposure may generate distress without responsibility.

Technology as an Infrastructure for Perspective-Taking

The same technologies can expand empathy by connecting people who would otherwise remain socially or geographically separated. Video calls help families maintain relationships across migration. Digital storytelling allows disabled people, refugees, patients, and members of marginalized communities to describe experience in their own voices rather than being represented only by institutions. Online communities can reduce isolation for people with rare conditions or stigmatized identities. Translation, captioning, screen readers, and augmentative communication can make participation possible. Research on digital communication does not support one simple conclusion that online contact eliminates empathy. Outcomes depend on the quality of interaction, relationship closeness, platform norms, and whether users engage in active communication or passive comparison. Technology can create contact, but empathic understanding still requires attention, humility, and willingness to revise assumptions.

Collective Action and Witnessing

Media coverage has contributed to social movements by documenting injustice, circulating testimony, and coordinating participants. Civil-rights activism existed before contemporary social media, but communication technologies affected how images and arguments reached wider publics. More recent campaigns have used digital networks to identify patterns that isolated individuals could not easily see. Such visibility can challenge official denial and help communities attract legal, medical, or financial support. It can also expose activists to surveillance, misinformation, harassment, and rapid cycles of public attention. Digital witnessing is most empathetic when affected people retain agency over their stories and when audiences remain engaged after a topic stops trending. Sharing a post may express concern, but it should not be confused automatically with changing the conditions that produced harm.

Design, Education, and Everyday Practice

Whether technology encourages empathy is partly a design and governance question. Platforms can reduce abuse through enforceable rules, appeals, privacy protections, and tools that let users control interaction. Schools can teach digital literacy that includes emotional interpretation, source evaluation, consent, and the effects of public posting. Families and workplaces can establish spaces for uninterrupted conversation rather than treating constant availability as normal. Individuals can pause before responding, seek context, use voice or video when text creates misunderstanding, and avoid circulating humiliating material. These practices are not a complete solution because responsibility cannot be shifted entirely to users. Companies and governments influence the incentives under which communication occurs. Empathy must be supported at personal,

organizational, and regulatory levels.

A Conditional Judgment

Technology can make empathic behavior harder when it removes social cues, rewards outrage, conceals consequences, intensifies comparison, or makes violence emotionally distant. It can make empathy easier when it gives people access to testimony, preserves relationships, improves communication, and organizes assistance. These effects may occur simultaneously. A person can show deep care in an online patient community and participate in dehumanizing political discourse on another platform. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore the interaction among a technology's design, the user's goals, the social context, and institutional rules. Technological determinism excuses human responsibility by treating outcomes as unavoidable. A conditional account is more demanding because it asks who designed the system, who benefits, who bears the cost, and what alternatives are possible.

Conclusion

Technology has not uniformly made individuals less empathetic, but many contemporary systems create conditions that can weaken sustained attention to other people. Cue-poor communication, algorithmic outrage, image comparison, remote violence, hidden supply chains, and repeated exposure to suffering can reduce understanding or turn concern into spectacle. At the same time, communication and accessibility technologies enable perspective-taking, connection, witnessing, and coordinated care. Empathy is not automatically embedded in a device, nor is it erased by one. It is cultivated or discouraged through design, norms, education, law, and daily practice. Society should therefore judge technologies by whether they help people perceive others accurately, preserve dignity, and act responsibly toward consequences that might otherwise remain invisible.

References

Bloom, P. (2016). *Against empathy: The case for rational compassion*. Ecco.

Konrath, S. H., O'Brien, E. H., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*(2), 180–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310377395

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 7*(3), 321–326. https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295

Turkle, S. (2015). *Reclaiming conversation: The power of talk in a digital age*. Penguin Press.

Vossen, H. G. M., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2016). Do social media foster or curtail adolescents' empathy?

A longitudinal study. *Computers in Human Behavior, 63*, 118–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.040