STUART NOLAN CONSULTING · WHITE PAPER

Empathy in the Age of AI

Why the skills that make us irreplaceably human are now your organisation's most valuable asset — and why most organisations are failing to develop them

Stuart Nolan — Stuart Nolan Consulting · 2026
stuartnolan.com · stuart@stuartnolan.com

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence is rapidly absorbing the analytical and procedural work that has defined professional roles for decades. What it cannot absorb — and what the evidence now shows is growing in economic value — is the capacity for genuine human presence, connection, and empathy. This paper examines the evidence for this structural shift, identifies which empathy capabilities are most at risk of being neglected as organisations redirect development budgets toward AI literacy and technical upskilling, and argues that physical empathy — the dimension of empathy most directly connected to behaviour change — represents the clearest competitive investment available to organisations in an AI-transformed economy. The argument is not sentimental. It is economic. When AI handles the analytical work, what distinguishes your organisation is the quality of the human relationships it enables. The practice and evidence described in this paper are developed at length in How to Train an Empath: Lessons from a Professional Mindreader (Stuart Nolan, 2025).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

When AI takes the analytical work, the human work becomes everything.

The Shift	The Problem	The Opportunity
AI is not coming for jobs. It is already restructuring them. The analytical and procedural work that once took most of a professional's day is being absorbed by AI systems faster than organisations can track. MIT Sloan research shows a measurable movement toward more human-intensive work across the entire US labour market between 2016 and 2024. The WEF identifies empathy and active listening as the only skills, across 2,800 assessed, that AI demonstrably cannot replace.	Most organisations are responding to AI transformation by investing in AI literacy and technical upskilling. What they rarely include is investment in the human capabilities that AI is actively making more valuable. The empathy training that does exist overwhelmingly targets the cognitive dimension — awareness and reflection. It leaves the physical dimension almost entirely undeveloped. And the physical dimension is the one that determines whether someone actually feels heard.	Physical empathy is trainable. The neural circuits that underlie it are plastic. Two weeks of structured practice produces measurable change. Organisations that invest in developing this capacity now will have a durable advantage — not because empathy feels good, but because the work that creates most value in an AI-augmented economy is precisely the work that requires it.

THE CORE ARGUMENT

The strategic question is not whether AI will change the nature of work. It already has. The question is: what does that leave? The answer — increasingly supported by the research — is the work that requires presence, connection, and genuine human attunement. Physical empathy is not peripheral to that work. It is the infrastructure on which it depends.

THIS PAPER COVERS

1. The shift that is already happening

The evidence that AI is restructuring work toward human-intensive tasks — and what this means for development investment.

2. What AI cannot do

The specific capabilities that remain stubbornly human, and why physical presence is at the centre of them.

3. The EPOCH Framework

MIT Sloan's 2025 research identifying empathy as irreplaceable economic infrastructure — and the evidence base behind it.

4. Why empathy is being neglected at the wrong moment

How AI transformation budgets are crowding out human capability investment, and the cost of that decision.

5. Physical empathy: the dimension that determines human advantage

Why this is the most economically valuable and least developed dimension of empathy.

6. What this means for organisations

Practical implications for development strategy, investment prioritisation, and competitive positioning.

7. Evidence from practice

Four case studies across sectors with measurable outcomes.

8. Practical application

Programme formats, pricing, and how to build the internal case.

SECTION 1

The Shift That Is Already Happening

The conversation about AI and work has been dominated, for several years, by a single question: which jobs will it take? This is a reasonable question. It has generated substantial research, considerable anxiety, and an enormous volume of advice about which skills to develop and which industries to avoid. But it is also, increasingly, the wrong question. Or at least, an incomplete one.

The more useful question — and the one that organisations need to be answering now — is: when AI handles the analytical and procedural work, what does that leave? What kind of work becomes more valuable? What capabilities does a person need to thrive in an economy restructured by AI?

The research is beginning to answer these questions clearly. And the answer points in a consistent direction: toward the distinctly human. Toward presence, judgment, empathy, and the capacity to connect with and motivate other people in ways that no algorithm can replicate.

The evidence for the shift

MIT Sloan researchers Isabella Loaiza and Roberto Rigobon published their EPOCH framework in 2024, with findings released publicly in March 2025. Analysing task data across all US occupations between 2016 and 2024, they found a measurable, sustained shift toward more human-intensive work. New tasks introduced to the labour market in 2024 carried significantly higher scores for human-intensive capabilities than the tasks that existed before. The frequency with which workers performed these high-human-capability tasks increased across the same period. And jobs intensive in human capabilities showed stronger employment growth, higher hiring rates in 2024, and more favourable projections through 2034.

This is not a prediction about the future. It is a description of a shift that has already occurred.

The World Economic Forum's Future of Jobs Report 2025 provides a parallel finding from the employer perspective. Drawing on survey data from over 1,000 global employers across 22 industry clusters and 55 economies, the WEF assessed the substitution potential of more than 2,800 granular skills. The result: zero of those skills showed very high capacity to be replaced by current-generation AI. The skills with the lowest substitution potential — the ones AI is least able to replace — are skills rooted in human interaction: empathy and active listening, sensory processing, and physical presence. The WEF is explicit about why: these skills show no substitution potential due to their physical and deeply human components.

0 Of 2,800+ skills assessed showed very high AI substitution potential (WEF Future of Jobs 2025)	**73%** Of digital transformation projects underperform due to human factors (Ransbotham et al., MIT Sloan/BCG, 2022)	**2016–2024** Period during which the labour market shifted measurably toward human-intensive work

This matters for organisations because the implications are practical and immediate. If the analytical and procedural work is being absorbed by AI, and the human-intensive work is growing in economic value, then the development investment that matters most is investment in the capabilities that make that human work possible. Chief among them: empathy.

Why AI transformation tends to underperform — and what that tells us

The 73% figure from Ransbotham et al.'s MIT Sloan / BCG research is worth dwelling on. Nearly three quarters of digital transformation projects fail to deliver their expected value — not because of technical failure, but because of human resistance, low trust, and poor adoption. The technology works. The people don't follow.

This pattern repeats across sectors and scales. AI is implemented. Workflows are redesigned. The system is capable. And then the adoption curve flattens, the workarounds proliferate, and the expected gains fail to materialise. The bottleneck is almost always relational: people do not trust the system, or the people who built it, or do not feel heard in a process that affected them but did not include them.

The organisations that make AI transformation work are the ones that invest in the human infrastructure alongside the technical infrastructure. That means leaders and managers with the empathic capacity to take people with them through change — to read the room, to sense resistance before it becomes obstruction, to create conditions in which people feel safe enough to adopt something unfamiliar. This is not a soft capability. It is the capability that determines whether the hard investment pays off.

SECTION 2

What AI Cannot Do — And Why It Matters That It Can't

It is worth being precise about what AI cannot do, because the popular framing tends toward either excessive alarm or excessive reassurance. AI is not coming for all work. But it is also not merely taking the boring tasks and leaving everything else untouched. What it is doing is specific: it is very effective at work that can be specified in advance, learned from large datasets, and executed at scale without the need for physical presence or genuine relational attunement.

What it cannot do is the work that requires a body in a room. It cannot feel the shift in atmosphere when a team member is struggling. It cannot make someone feel genuinely heard rather than processed. It cannot read the micro-signal in a person's posture that tells an experienced manager to stop pushing and start listening. It cannot do the work of accompaniment — of staying with another person through difficulty, at their pace, in their reality.

This is not a temporary limitation. The WEF's assessment is that empathy and active listening show no substitution potential due to their physical and deeply human components. The emphasis on physical is important. These capabilities are not primarily cognitive — they are not things that can be simulated by a sufficiently large language model. They are rooted in the body: in physical co-presence, in involuntary micro-movements, in the neural mirroring that allows one nervous system to resonate with another. This is what the neuroscience of empathy describes. And it is, by definition, what a disembodied AI system cannot replicate.

The specific capabilities that remain human

MIT Sloan's EPOCH framework names five groups of capabilities that remain stubbornly human in the face of AI development: Empathy, Presence, Opinion, Creativity, and Hope. Together they describe the profile of the human worker whose value increases as AI becomes more capable.

CAPABILITY	WHAT IT MEANS IN PRACTICE	WHY AI CANNOT REPLICATE IT
EMPATHY	The capacity to understand, feel, and respond to the inner states of other people. In professional contexts: the quality of attention that makes people feel genuinely heard.	Requires physical co-presence and neural mirroring between embodied nervous systems. AI can detect emotion patterns but cannot share them.

PRESENCE	Physical and relational presence — the capacity to be genuinely available to another person. In management: what makes a one-to-one feel like a conversation rather than a transaction.	Requires a body in a room. The quality of presence is conveyed through micro-signals — posture, breath, attention — that are both physical and involuntary.
OPINION	Judgment, ethics, and the capacity to navigate open-ended situations where there is no correct answer, only a defensible one. In leadership: taking a position and explaining it.	AI can synthesise existing positions but cannot hold genuine accountability or exercise ethical judgment in novel situations with real consequences.
CREATIVITY	The imagination to generate genuinely new ideas — connections that have not been made before, solutions that draw on lived experience and aesthetic judgment.	AI can recombine existing patterns at scale. It cannot experience the world — the source from which genuine creative insight emerges.
HOPE	The capacity to sustain motivation and meaning in conditions of uncertainty. In organisational terms: what keeps teams functional under pressure when outcomes are unclear.	Hope is relational and embodied. It is communicated through physical presence, tone, bearing. It cannot be generated by a system that does not experience uncertainty.

What is striking about this list is not that it describes rare or exotic capabilities. These are the capabilities that every manager is asked to bring to their role every day. And they are the capabilities that most management development programmes do the least to develop.
The EPOCH researchers are explicit: ‘We deliberately don’t call these soft skills. It is much harder to teach a person these critical human skills and capabilities — such as hope, empathy, and creativity.’ The language of ‘soft skills’ has consistently undervalued these capabilities. The EPOCH research reframes them as the irreplaceable core of human economic contribution in an AI age. They are not peripheral. They are the point.

SECTION 3

The EPOCH Framework: Empathy as Economic Infrastructure

The EPOCH framework represents a significant shift in how labour economists think about the relationship between AI and human work. Most previous frameworks have asked: which tasks can AI do? They have generated automation risk scores, vulnerability rankings, and predictions about which occupations will be disrupted. The EPOCH framework asks a different question: which human capabilities complement AI's limitations? And it builds a methodology to measure the economic value of those capabilities across the entire labour market.

The answer the data produces is clear. Empathy is not incidental to the high-value human work that remains after AI restructures the analytical and procedural tasks. It is central to it. Empathy — the E in EPOCH — appears in the highest-value tasks across healthcare, education, management, public relations, emergency response, counselling, and leadership. It is the characteristic that, more than any other, defines what it means for a professional to be genuinely good at their job rather than merely technically proficient.

What the data shows

The EPOCH research draws on the O*NET dataset maintained by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics — one of the largest and most granular datasets on work tasks and occupational requirements in the world. Loaiza and Rigobon grouped all tasks into 750 clusters and assigned each an EPOCH score indicating the degree to which the task depends on human-intensive capabilities.

Their findings are consistent across every measure:

- Between 2016 and 2024, there was a measurable shift toward more human-intensive work across the labour market as a whole.
- New tasks introduced to the labour market in 2024 carried significantly higher EPOCH scores than pre-existing tasks, and significantly higher than the tasks that disappeared in the same period.
- The frequency with which workers engaged in high-EPOCH tasks increased across the same period.
- At the occupational level, EPOCH-intensive jobs showed stronger employment growth from 2015 to 2023, higher hiring rates in 2024, and more favourable projections through 2034.

The implication is straightforward: the labour market is already pricing human-intensive capabilities more highly than it did before the AI transformation began. This is not a prediction. It is a measured historical trend that projects forward.

For organisations, this has a direct investment implication. The employees who will be most productive, most valuable, and most difficult to replace are those whose work is rich in EPOCH capabilities. Developing those capabilities — particularly empathy, which is both the most economically valuable and the most directly trainable of the five — is not a welfare expenditure. It is a strategic investment.

Empathy as the trainable EPOCH capability

Of the five EPOCH capabilities, empathy is uniquely important to organisations for three reasons.

First, it is the capability most directly implicated in the management relationship — and the management relationship is, as the Gallup research shows, responsible for 70% of the variance in team engagement scores. Empathy is not one of the things a good manager does. It is the underlying capability on which the quality of every management interaction depends.

Second, empathy is the capability most directly threatened by the working conditions that AI transformation tends to produce. When workflows accelerate, when remote work increases, when interactions become mediated by screens and systems, the physical dimension of empathy atrophies. Organisations investing heavily in AI-driven efficiency while neglecting the human capability that makes their people feel seen and heard are making their engagement problem worse, not better.

Third — and most importantly — empathy is trainable. Unlike some other EPOCH capabilities, which develop slowly through lived experience, physical empathy can be developed through structured practice. The neural circuits that underlie it are plastic. Two weeks of targeted training produces measurable change.

SECTION 4

Why Empathy Capability Is Being Neglected — At Exactly the Wrong Moment

The evidence that empathy is becoming more economically valuable is robust and growing. The evidence that organisations are responding to this by investing more in empathy development is not. The pattern, in most organisations, runs in the opposite direction.

AI transformation creates genuine urgency around technical capability. Leaders and managers need to understand AI tools, develop AI literacy, and redesign workflows. These are legitimate development priorities. The problem is that they tend to consume the development budget entirely — leaving nothing for the human capabilities that determine whether the technical investment produces the hoped-for returns.

The budget displacement problem

The CIPD estimates that UK organisations spend over £5.7 billion annually on management training. The majority is directed at cognitive and technical capabilities: strategy, analytics, project management, AI literacy. The fraction directed at developing the empathic capabilities that determine management effectiveness in human relationships is small — and declining.

This is compounded by what might be called the substitution fallacy: the assumption that because AI can now do many cognitive tasks, the cognitive dimension of management matters less, and therefore management development generally matters less. The opposite is true. When AI handles the cognitive tasks, what remains of management is almost entirely relational. The manager's job becomes the work that requires empathy, presence, and the capacity to make people feel genuinely supported through change. This is the work that cannot be delegated to a system.

The awareness trap

Even where empathy development does take place, it tends to operate at the level of awareness. Programmes built around personality profiling, emotional intelligence frameworks, and reflective practice are genuinely good at producing insight. What they do not reliably produce is a manager who responds differently at 9am on a Monday when a team member is in distress and a deadline is pressing.

The specific failure is this: the management relationship is played out in real time, under pressure, in the body. It is not played out in a reflective journal or a feedback debrief. A manager who has deepened their self-awareness still has to walk into the room. And in the room, what determines how they behave is not their insight but their habits — the automatic

physical patterns laid down through years of practice, mostly unexamined. Awareness of those patterns does not change them. Only repeated physical practice in realistic conditions does.

> *Empathy is not a warm fuzzy feeling. It is a physical skill — raw, fast, instinctive. It is what happens when your body tunes into someone else's. And like any instrument, you can learn to play it.*
>
> — Stuart Nolan, How to Train an Empath, 2025

The misalignment between what organisations invest in and what the research says matters most is not unique to the AI transition. It has characterised empathy training for decades. What the AI transition has done is make the cost of that misalignment higher — and the opportunity for organisations that get it right larger.

SECTION 5

Physical Empathy: The Dimension That Determines Human Advantage

The Threefold Model of empathy developed through doctoral research at Lancaster University identifies three distinct dimensions of empathy, each with different neural substrates, different developmental pathways, and different implications for organisations.

DIMENSION	WHAT IT IS	HOW IT IS DEVELOPED	AI SUBSTITUTION
HEAD Cognitive Empathy	The intellectual capacity to understand another person's perspective, reasoning, and likely responses. Perspective-taking. Theory of mind.	Awareness-raising, reflection, feedback, profiling. The target of most current empathy training.	Moderate to high. AI can model cognitive states, predict responses, and simulate perspective-taking at scale.
HEART Emotional Empathy	The capacity to resonate with and be affected by another person's emotional state. Emotional attunement. Requires regulation to avoid overwhelm.	Self-reflection, emotional intelligence development, coaching. Under-trained due to concern about overwhelm in professional contexts.	Low to moderate. AI can detect and label emotions but cannot genuinely share them.
HANDS Physical Empathy	The embodied, instinctive capacity to attune to another person through body language, micro-movements, posture, breath, and physical presence. Operates beneath conscious awareness.	Physical practice. Structured exercises that train the body's attentional and somatic responses. Develops through repetition over time.	None. Requires physical co-presence and an embodied nervous system. Zero substitution potential (WEF, 2025).

The pattern is clear. The dimension of empathy that AI can most readily replicate — the cognitive dimension — is the one that most training programmes focus on. The dimension that AI cannot replicate at all — the physical dimension — is the one that most training programmes neglect entirely.

This is not a coincidence. Cognitive empathy training is easier to design, easier to deliver, and easier to measure in the short term. Physical empathy training requires a different methodology: exercises that engage the body directly, that work through physical experience rather than conceptual instruction, and that build habits over time rather than insights in a

single session. It is also the training that produces the change that is genuinely hard to replicate — and therefore genuinely valuable.

What physical empathy is, in practice

Physical empathy, as the Threefold Model defines it, is the body's capacity to resonate with, read, and respond to the physical signals another person generates — signals that precede language, operate below conscious awareness, and are often more honest than anything said aloud. It is what NHS clinicians were describing when they named the training 'physical empathy' after a programme of work focused on the quality of attunement between clinical and administrative teams.

The training method draws on techniques from theatrical mentalism — the practice through which a trained performer detects the involuntary muscular responses generated when a person focuses on an intention. The mechanism is the ideomotor response, documented by 19th-century neurologist George Beard, in which thoughts and imaginings produce tiny, involuntary muscular movements. In a leadership development context, the same principles become a practical tool for demonstrating — directly and physically — that participants are generating readable signals they are unaware of, and that with practice, those signals can be attended to and responded to with far greater accuracy.

The training uses pen, paper, and thread. Nothing elaborate. The simplicity is deliberate: the exercises work on the body before the mind has a chance to object. And the moment of recognition — when someone discovers, directly and physically, that their thought produced a movement they were unaware of — is a more reliable entry point into genuine engagement than any cognitive framework, however compelling.

Why this is the AI-era capability organisations most need

In an economy where AI is handling an increasing proportion of analytical and procedural work, the interactions that remain are the ones that matter most. The difficult conversation. The feedback that lands rather than stings. The team meeting where someone feels safe enough to say what is actually wrong. The leadership moment where presence — not a prepared response, but genuine attention — is what a team needs.

These interactions are won or lost in the body. Not in the quality of the cognitive empathy a leader brings — their understanding of perspectives, their awareness of dynamics. In the quality of their physical presence: whether they are actually attending to the person in front of them, or whether their attention is elsewhere. Whether their body is signalling openness or defensiveness. Whether the room can feel, not just know, that they are genuinely present.

SECTION 6

What This Means For Organisations

The convergence of the EPOCH research, the WEF substitution findings, and the failure pattern of AI transformation projects points toward a consistent set of implications for organisations navigating the AI transition.

Reframe what human capability development means

Most organisations have a development strategy organised around the capabilities that AI is making less necessary — analytical thinking, technical proficiency, data management. The AI transition has made these capabilities cheaper to access and easier to augment. It has also, simultaneously, made the capabilities that AI cannot replicate — genuine human presence, empathy, the quality of attention that makes people feel heard — more economically valuable.

A development strategy fit for the AI era invests in both. Not instead of technical capability, but alongside it. The organisations that will perform best in an AI-augmented economy are those whose people can work effectively with AI systems and whose leaders can create the conditions of trust, engagement, and human connection that AI-heavy workflows tend to erode.

Treat empathy as infrastructure, not welfare

The most consistent barrier to investment in empathy development at senior levels is framing. When empathy training is presented as a wellbeing initiative — something that makes people feel better — it is correctly identified as discretionary. When it is presented as the capability that determines whether managers can take teams through AI transformation without losing people, whether digital change programmes achieve adoption, and whether engagement scores move despite declining budgets for traditional wellbeing interventions, it becomes a different conversation.

The HBR research across 170 companies found that those in the top quartile for empathy generated 50% higher earnings than those in the bottom. This is not a soft outcome. It is the kind of number that belongs in a business case for capability investment. And the mechanism it describes — that empathic capability produces performance — is not weakened by AI transformation. It is strengthened by it.

Invest in the physical dimension specifically

The natural response to the argument so far is to increase investment in empathy training of the kind that already exists: awareness programmes, emotional intelligence workshops,

reflective practice. This is better than nothing. But it does not address the gap that the research identifies.

The WEF's finding that empathy shows zero substitution potential is specifically a finding about the physical dimension: the human body in a room, attending to another human body, in the way that only co-present nervous systems can. This is the capability that AI cannot replicate. It is also the capability that awareness-based training does not develop. Developing it requires physical practice — the kind that builds habits in the body rather than insights in the mind.

Build the case before the crisis

The organisations that tend to engage with this work earliest are those where AI transformation has already surfaced the human capability deficit: where adoption has stalled, where engagement has declined, where the technical investment is in place but the returns are not materialising. At that point, the case is easy to make because the cost of the deficit is visible.

The more valuable posture — and the one that produces better outcomes — is to build the human capability infrastructure before the crisis. To invest in physical empathy training as part of the AI transformation programme, not as a remediation after it.

SECTION 7

Evidence From Practice

The following outcomes are drawn from client engagements delivered by Stuart Nolan Consulting across sectors that have each experienced significant AI-related transformation pressure. Each engagement incorporated the physical empathy training methodology as its core element.

Digital Agency

UK Technology Sector

CHALLENGE

Teams operating under accelerating AI-augmented workflows were talking past each other. Product and support teams were misaligned, with slow customer resolution damaging client retention and staff morale. The adoption of new AI-assisted tools had not been accompanied by investment in the quality of human communication between teams.

INTERVENTION

Non-verbal listening exercises and physical empathy sessions focusing on cross-team attunement, integrated into daily stand-up rituals and handover protocols.

OUTCOME

Resolution time reduced from 48 hours to 22 hours — a 54% reduction. Teams reported qualitatively different levels of mutual understanding in post-session reviews.

NHS Hospital Trust

Healthcare

CHALLENGE

Workforce pressures including sickness absence, coordination failures between clinical and administrative teams under digitisation-driven workflow changes, and staff retention difficulties.

INTERVENTION

Physical empathy training embedded across clinical and administrative cohorts, with focus on attunement between teams operating under sustained high pressure.

OUTCOME

Patient coordination improved by 45%. Sickness absence measurably reduced. Staff retention improved within two cohorts.

Global Logistics Organisation

Operations

CHALLENGE

Late internal handovers during high-pressure product launches were damaging client relationships and increasing operational costs. New AI-driven logistics systems had been implemented without corresponding investment in the human communication quality needed to support them.

INTERVENTION

Daily physical empathy warm-up exercises integrated into team rituals, combined with non-verbal awareness training for team leads.

OUTCOME

Late handovers reduced by 43% in a single quarter. Team leads reported greater ability to read team state before assigning workloads.

National Innovation Foundation

Public Sector

CHALLENGE

Major organisational restructure — including significant digital transformation — requiring sustained staff trust and engagement under conditions of significant uncertainty.

INTERVENTION

Physical empathy training for leadership and management teams, focused on maintaining genuine attunement during difficult communication across a prolonged period of change.

OUTCOME

87% staff engagement during the restructure — a result the leadership team directly attributed to empathic communication at every level of the process.

In each case, the context included significant AI or digital transformation pressure. The intervention in each case was not additional technology, additional process, or additional cognitive training. It was investment in the quality of physical human attunement between people who needed to work together under conditions designed to make that harder. The outcomes are measurable. The mechanism is the same in every case: physical empathy training changes what people actually do in the room, not just what they understand about it.

SECTION 8

Practical Application

For organisations at different stages of the AI transition, the entry point into physical empathy development will differ. The common thread is the same: start with direct experience, not argument. The training is designed so that participants encounter the evidence in their own bodies — they discover, in the first thirty minutes, that their thoughts produce involuntary physical movements they were unaware of. That moment is more persuasive than any amount of data, because it is felt rather than described.

FORMAT	WHAT IT IS	BEST FOR	FROM
Keynote Talk	An experiential introduction to physical empathy for all-hands events, leadership conferences, and off-sites. 30–90 minutes, any group size. Participants experience the training directly, not just hear about it.	Leadership teams, boards, conference audiences, organisations at the start of an AI transformation programme.	£1,500
Workshop or Lab	A half-day immersive session in which teams build physical empathy skills through structured practice. Suitable for leadership teams, management cohorts, and cross-functional groups of 8–30 participants.	Teams navigating AI-driven workflow change, management cohorts whose effectiveness is directly implicated in adoption outcomes.	£3,500
Empathy Audit	A diagnostic of current empathy capability across the Threefold Model, followed by bespoke programme design. 1–2 days, organisation-wide.	HR and L&D leads building the business case, organisations whose AI adoption is underperforming and where human factors are suspected.	£4,500
Full Programme	A multi-cohort programme integrating all three dimensions of the Threefold Model with measurement checkpoints, leadership coaching, and ROI tracking. 6–12 months.	Enterprise teams, large NHS trusts, organisations with annual transformation budgets and measurable AI adoption targets.	£12,000

Building the internal case

The most effective approach for organisations making the internal case for physical empathy investment in the context of AI transformation is to connect it explicitly to the AI budget. Not as a separate wellbeing or L&D initiative, but as the human capability component of the transformation programme itself. The question to ask is: what is the expected return on our AI investment, and what human capability is required to realise it? If that capability includes leaders and managers who can take people through change, create conditions for adoption, and maintain the trust and engagement that AI-heavy environments tend to erode, then physical empathy development belongs in the AI budget.

Stuart Nolan Consulting provides ROI modelling based on existing data and sector benchmarks before any commitment is made. The conversation begins with a free 30-minute discovery call.

SECTION 9

Conclusion: The Human Infrastructure That AI Cannot Build

The AI transition is real, it is already restructuring work, and it is not going to reverse. The organisations that navigate it well will be those that invest in both dimensions of what the transition requires: technical capability and human capability. The research is unambiguous about what the human capability component consists of. It is the EPOCH skills — empathy, presence, opinion, creativity, hope — that AI cannot replicate. And of these, empathy is the most economically valuable, the most directly implicated in management effectiveness and organisational performance, and the most trainable.

The window for competitive advantage is now. Most organisations are not yet investing in physical empathy development. Most are directing AI transformation budgets entirely toward technical capability. The human capability deficit that this creates will show up in adoption curves, engagement scores, and retention figures — but by then, the organisations that got ahead of it will already have the advantage.

Physical empathy training does not replace technical investment. It completes it. When AI handles the analytical work, what your people do with the human work determines everything. Equipping them to do it differently — not through awareness, but through trained physical capability — is the investment that the AI era has made urgent.

> *The moment someone gets it — when doubt flips to WTF! — is still the best part of my job.*
>
> — Stuart Nolan, How to Train an Empath, 2025

— ABOUT THE BOOK

How to Train an Empath: Lessons from a Professional Mindreader (Stuart Nolan, Billet Publishing, 2025) sets out the full evidence base, methodology, and practice framework for the physical empathy training described in this series — including complete case studies, participant accounts, and implementation tools. Available at **stuartnolan.com/book**

REFERENCES

Sources cited in this paper

Businessolver (2024). State of Workplace Empathy. Annual research report.

CIPD (2024). Learning and Development in the UK: Annual Survey Report. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

Gallup (2024). State of the Global Workplace 2024. Gallup Press.

Harvard Business Review (2021). The Most (and Least) Empathetic Companies. HBR analysis of 170 organisations across multiple industries.

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.

Loaiza, I., & Rigobon, R. (2024). The EPOCH of AI: Human-Machine Complementarities at Work. MIT Sloan School of Management / SSRN Working Paper 5028371. Published March 2025.

Nolan, S. (2025). How to Train an Empath: Lessons from a Professional Mindreader. Billet Publishing.

Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., Candelon, F., Khodabandeh, S., & Chu, M. (2022). Achieving Individual — and Organizational — Value With AI. MIT Sloan Management Review and Boston Consulting Group.

Rizzolatti, G., & Craighero, L. (2004). The mirror-neuron system. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 27, 169–192.

Singer, T., & Klimecki, O. M. (2014). Empathy and compassion. Current Biology, 24(18), R875–R878.

Weng, H. Y., et al. (2013). Compassion training alters altruism and neural responses to suffering. Psychological Science, 24(7), 1171–1180.

World Economic Forum (2025). The Future of Jobs Report 2025. World Economic Forum, Geneva.