

UniMEEC: Towards Unified Multimodal Emotion Recognition and Emotion Cause

Guimin Hu[†], Zhihong Zhu[♠], Daniel Hershcovich[†], Hasti Seifi[♡], Jiayuan Xie

[†]University of Copenhagen

[♠]Peking University

[♡]Arizona State University

{rice.hu.x}@gmail.com

Abstract

Multimodal emotion recognition in conversation (MERC) and multimodal emotion-cause pair extraction (MECPE) have recently garnered significant attention. Emotions are the expression of affect or feelings; responses to specific events, thoughts, or situations are known as emotion causes. Both are like two sides of a coin, collectively describing human behaviors and intents. However, most existing works treat MERC and MECPE as separate tasks, which may result in potential challenges in integrating emotion and cause in real-world applications. In this paper, we propose a **Unified Multimodal Emotion recognition and Emotion-Cause analysis framework (UniMEEC)** to explore the causality and complementarity between emotion and emotion cause. Concretely, UniMEEC reformulates the MERC and MECPE tasks as two mask prediction problems, enhancing the interaction between emotion and cause. Meanwhile, UniMEEC shares the prompt learning among modalities for probing modality-specific knowledge from the Pre-trained model. Furthermore, we propose a task-specific hierarchical context aggregation to control the information flow to the task. Experiment results on four public benchmark datasets verify the model performance on MERC and MECPE tasks and achieve consistent improvements compared with state-of-the-art methods.

1 Introduction

With the rapid development of multimodal learning and dialog systems, multimodal emotion recognition in conversations (MERC) and multimodal emotion-cause pair extraction (MECPE) have attracted increasing attention (Zhang et al., 2021a,b; Hu et al., 2021a,b). Generally, MERC and MECPE play crucial roles in dialog systems, especially in empathetic response generation (Fu et al., 2023; Qian et al., 2023; Tian et al., 2022).

MERC detects the emotion category shown in each utterance in a conversation, while MECPE




Figure 1: Illustration of emotion and emotion cause. The tokens marked with red are prediction slots and "3" denotes the index of emotion cause utterance.

aims to mine the reasons that trigger a certain emotion and then matches the emotion and cause simultaneously. Most existing works treat MERC and MECPE as two separate tasks although both studies can be summarized into multimodal fusion (Yang et al., 2021), context modeling (Mao et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022a) and external knowledge (Ghosal et al., 2020). However, separately training MERC and MECPE can result in potential challenges in integrating the two tasks seamlessly in real-world application scenarios. A natural question arises: *Can we coordinate their outputs and ensure they align in a practical application?*

On the one hand, emotions are often responses to specific events, thoughts, or situations—there are known as emotion causes (Marks, 1982; Cabanac, 2002). For example, receiving good news might cause happiness, while facing a challenge may lead to frustration. In the context of emotion constructions, the causal relation is established by the link between a cause and the emotional state (Lee et al., 2019). On the other hand, emotion and its emotion causes are like two sides of a coin, interdependent and mutually influential (Russell, 1990; Lee

et al., 2019). Emotion and emotion cause are interdependent and mutually corroborative. The two serve as auxiliaries for each other to supplement information, leading to a more nuanced system capable of recognizing not just emotions but also the underlying factors triggering them (Baumeister and Cooper, 1981; Dirven, 1997). Together, they provide a comprehensive description of human behavior and intents. In Figure 1, we illustrate how emotion and emotion cause construct a causal context in the verbal or non-verbal, and could be formalized into mask prediction problems.

Based on the above motivation, we propose a **Unified Multimodal Emotion** recognition and **Emotion-Cause** pair extraction framework (UniMEEC), which fully exploits the complementary knowledge between them. In order to unify MERC and MECPE, we reformulate MERC and MECPE as two mask prediction tasks and train UniMEEC based on modality-specific prompts. The modality-specific prompt constructs a prompt template for each modality, aiming to encode the representations of unfilled slots with the interaction between unimodality and the pre-trained model.

Furthermore, existing MERC and MECPE works mainly focus on multimodal fusion (Yang et al., 2021), modal alignment (Tsai et al., 2019), and external knowledge (Ghosal et al., 2020). A long-overlooked fact is that the inter-utterance dependencies and contexts in a conversation. Hence, we propose a task-specific hierarchical context aggregation module to capture the contexts oriented to specific tasks. This module takes a three-level graph attention network as the backbone and controls the information flow among emotion-specific, cause-specific, and utterance-specific nodes to aggregate the contextual information.

In a nutshell, the main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We propose a **Unified Multimodal Emotion** recognition and **Emotion Cause** pair extraction framework (UniMEEC), which reformulates MERC and MECPE as two mask prediction problem to exploit the causality and complementarity between them.
- UniMEEC contains modality-specific (i.e., text, video and audio modalities) prompt learning (MPL) and task-specific context aggregation (THC), where MPL probes the modality-specific knowledge from pre-trained language model (PLM) and shares prompt learning

among modalities, and THC orderly capture the contexts oriented to specific tasks.

- Experimental results demonstrate that UniMEEC achieves a new state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance on MELD, IEMOCAP, ConvECPE and ECF datasets, further demonstrating the effectiveness of a unified framework for multimodal emotion recognition and emotion-cause pair extraction.

2 Related Work

Multimodal Emotion Recognition in Conversations (MERC) We categorize the works of MERC into three main groups: multimodal fusion, context-aware models, and the works that integrated with external knowledge. The first group focuses on the fusion representation in which some works (Hu et al., 2022a, 2021c; Joshi et al., 2022) employed the graph neural networks to model the inter/intra dependencies of utterances information, and some works proposed cross-attention Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) to model cross-modality interaction. Addressing context incorporation, Sun et al. (2021); Li et al. (2021b); Ghosal et al. (2019) construct graph structures to represent contexts and further model inter-utterance dependencies, while Mao et al. (2021) introduces the concept of emotion dynamics to capture context. In the last group, advanced MERC studies integrate external knowledge, employing techniques such as transfer learning (Hazarika et al., 2019; Lee and Lee, 2021), commonsense knowledge (Ghosal et al., 2020), multi-task learning (Akhtar et al., 2019), and external information (Zhu et al., 2021) to introduce more auxiliary information to help model understand conversation.

Multimodal Emotion-Cause Pair Extraction (MECPE) As more and more NLP tasks extend to the multimodal paradigm (Han et al., 2021; Luo et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2022a; Hazarika et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2022), Wang et al. (2021) defined multimodal emotion-cause pair extraction (MECPE) and constructed Emotion-Cause-in-Friends (ECF) dataset based on MELD (Poria et al., 2019). Beside that, Li et al. (2022a) built an English conversational emotion-cause pair extraction multimodal dataset based on IEMOCAP (Busso et al., 2008). The goal of MECPE is to identify the corresponding cause utterances given the emotion utterance, yielding pairs of utterances. With MECPE only




Figure 2: The overview of UniMEEC. PLM denotes the Transformer-based model such as BERT, T5 and so on. We set up the representation of $P_{(\cdot)}$ sharing for text, audio and video in prompt learning. We set $|w| = 2$ for each level.

emerging for a relatively short time, there are a few baseline methods in this field. In the previous studies, Wang et al. (2021); Li et al. (2022a) establish baseline methods by integrating multimodal features to tackle the MECPE task. These works extend emotion-cause pair extraction to multimodal settings, but they only simply modify baselines of emotion-cause pair extraction in texts to address MECPE, overlooking the importance of inter-utterance context and multimodal fusion in understanding emotion cause.

Prompt-tuning Prompt-tuning (Li and Liang, 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Su et al., 2021), inspired by GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020; Ding et al., 2023), is a new paradigm to fine-tuning, particularly geared towards addressing few-shot scenarios. Recently, prompt-tuning has been widely used in addressing NLP tasks and achieved remarkable performances (Zheng et al., 2022; Li et al., 2021a; Yang et al., 2023; Su et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2022). The initial input X undergoes modification through a template to form a textual string prompt X' with unfilled slots. Subsequently, the language model is employed to probabilistically fill in the missing information, resulting in a final string \hat{X} from which the model outputs y (Liu et al., 2023). Prompt template contains manual template engineering and automated template learning (Liu et al., 2023). Manual template is to manually create intuitive templates and the auto-prompt template (Li and Liang, 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Su et al., 2021) includes

discrete prompts, represented by actual text strings, and continuous prompts, described directly within the embedding space of the underlying language model. In this work, UniMEEC unifies MERC and MECPE into a manual prompt template and sets modality-specific prompt learning paradigm to utilize the interaction between prompt and LLM.

3 Methodology

3.1 Overall Architecture

As shown in Figure 2, UniMEEC is composed of modality-specific prompt learning (MPL) and task-specific context aggregation (THC). The modality-specific prompt template contains modality information $[X]$, auxiliary prompt tokens $P_{(\cdot)}$, and mask tokens $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$. Based on the representations of $[X]$, $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$ on text, audio, and video modalities, we concatenate them and then construct THC. THC takes the emotion-specific, cause-specific, and utterance-specific representations as nodes and models their dependencies in the context window. We predict the emotion category and the position of cause utterance in a conversation based on the representations of $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$ respectively.

3.2 Task Formalization

Given a multi-turn conversation $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{|U|}\}$, U has $|U|$ utterances and each utterance $u_i = \{I_i^t, I_i^a, I_i^v\}$ contains three modalities. We use $I_i^m, m \in \{t, a, v\}$ to represent

uni-modal raw sequence drawn from video fragment i , where $\{t, a, v\}$ denote the three types of modalities—text, acoustic and visual, respectively. MERC predicts the emotion category of u_i , and MECPE predicts the index of corresponding cause utterance of non-neutral utterance u_i based on the result of MERC, i.e., $\{1, 2, \dots, |U|\}$. To unify MERC and MECPE, we formalize MERC and MECPE as the mask prediction problems, which uses the language model to probabilistically fill the unfilled slots to obtain prediction results of MERC and MECPE tasks.

3.3 Modality-specific Prompt Learning(MPL)

On the one hand, modality-specific prompt ensures the model can probe the modality-specific features from PLM. On the other hand, modality-specific prompts share auxiliary prompt tokens in the prompt template to enable inter-modality and inter-task semantic interaction.

3.3.1 Modality-specific Prompt Construction

We manually design a text-specific prompt template, and it consists of a text input [X], the emotion category slot $[M]_1$, the cause index slot $[M]_2$ and auxiliary prompt part. [X] is the slot filled with original textual sequences to get the prompt template. $[M]_1$ indicates the emotion category of an utterance, e.g., "happy" or "sad." $[M]_2$ indicates the location of cause utterance in a conversation, e.g., "1", "2". Both are unfilled answer slots and predicted by the proposed UniMEEC. For example, given a text sequence I_i^t , the text-specific prompt template is "the emotion category of I_i^t is $[M]_1$, and its corresponding cause utterance index is $[M]_2$ ", where the textual strings "the emotion category of", "is", and "and its corresponding cause utterance index is" are auxiliary prompt parts. For audio-specific and vision-specific prompts, we replace the [X] part of the prompt with the acoustic and visual representations to construct audio-specific and vision-specific prompts, respectively.

We use $X_{i,m}, \hat{X}_{i,m} \in R^{l_m \times d_m}$ to represent the modality representation of $I_i^m, m \in \{t, a, v\}$, l_m and d_m are the sequence length and the representation dimension of modality m , respectively. Specifically, we obtain $X_{i,t}$ with the word embedding layer of the model. We processed raw acoustic input into numerical sequential vectors by librosa¹ to extract Mel-spectrogram as $X_{i,a}$ and use efficient-

Net (Tan and Le, 2019) pre-trained (supervised) on VGGface² and AFEW dataset to extract $\hat{X}_{i,v}$.

3.3.2 Modality-specific Prompt Encoder

We take stacked Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) of Transformer-based model (e.g., BERT(Devlin et al., 2019)) as the encoder of the modality-specific prompt. The stacked Transformer contains multiple Transformer layers, and each Transformer layer contains a self-attention module, FFN, and layer normalization (Ba et al., 2016). We take the former N_t Transformer layers as the text-specific prompt encoder and take the latter N_a and N_v Transformer layers as the visual- and acoustic prompt encoders, respectively. First, a text-specific prompt template is fed into the text-specific prompt encoder to get the representations of text modality, auxiliary prompt part, and $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$, with the supervision of real ground answers of slots. Next, we obtain the text-specific prompt sequence, which contains the hidden states of $h_{P_{1,t_1}}, X_{i,t}, h_{P_{2,t_3}}, h_{[M]_1}, h_{P_{4,t_5}}$ and $h_{[M]_2}$, where $h_{(\cdot)}$ denotes the representation of token or token sequence, $h_{P_{1,t_1}}, h_{P_{2,t_3}}$ and $h_{P_{4,t_5}}$ denote the representations of auxiliary prompt parts.

To align the audio and visual modalities, we pass the acoustic representation $X_{i,a}$ and visual representation $\hat{X}_{i,v}$ into the Bi-LSTM. Due to the dimensions and sequence lengths of audio and vision modalities being less than the dimensions and sequence length of text modality, we pad the audio and vision feature with zero to achieve consistency with the representation of text modality. We take $\hat{X}_{i,a}$ and $\hat{X}_{i,v}$ to represent audio and vision representations after alignment and padding, respectively. We replace [X] part of the prompt representation with $\hat{X}_{i,a}$ and $\hat{X}_{i,v}$, and feed them into N_a and N_v Transformer layers respectively. For (n-1)-th Transformer layer, the modality-specific prompt learning is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,m}^{n-1} &= [h_{P_{1,t_1}}, X_{i,m}^{n-1}, h_{P_{2,t_3}}, h_{[M]_1}^m, h_{P_{4,t_5}}, h_{[M]_2}^m] \\ P_{i,m}^n &= \text{Transformer}(P_{i,m}^{n-1}, P_{i,m}^{n-1}, P_{i,m}^{n-1}) \\ X_{i,m}^n &= P_{i,m}^n, m \in \{t, a, v\} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $P_{i,m}^{n-1}$ denotes the prompt representation of utterance u_i under the modality m . $P_{i,m}^{n-1}$ is composed by the hidden states of [X], $[M]_1$ $[M]_2$, and auxiliary prompt strings. $X_{i,t}^0 = X_{i,t}$, $X_{i,a}^0 = \hat{X}_{i,a}$,

¹<https://github.com/librosa/librosa>.

²https://www.robots.ox.ac.uk/vgg/software/vgg_face/.

and $X_{i,v}^0 = \hat{X}_{i,v}$. $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the concatenation operation.

After the modality-specific prompt encoder, we obtain the modal fusion representations of mask tokens $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$ via concatenation, respectively. Similarly, we obtain the fusion representation of u_i via the concatenation of $X_{i,t}^{N_t}$, $X_{i,a}^{N_a}$ and $X_{i,v}^{N_v}$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{[M]_1}^f &= [h_{[M]_1}^t, h_{[M]_1}^a, h_{[M]_1}^v] \\ h_{[M]_2}^f &= [h_{[M]_2}^t, h_{[M]_2}^a, h_{[M]_2}^v] \\ h_{u_i}^f &= [X_{i,t}^{N_t}, X_{i,a}^{N_a}, X_{i,v}^{N_v}] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $X_{i,t}^{N_t}$, $X_{i,a}^{N_a}$ and $X_{i,v}^{N_v}$ are text, audio and video representations of u_i encoded by N_t , N_a and N_v Transformer layers respectively.

3.4 Task-specific Hierarchical Context(THC)

The representations of $[M]_1$ (i.e., $h_{[M]_1}^f$) and $[M]_2$ (i.e., $h_{[M]_2}^f$) fail to capture the context information in a conversation, which inspires us to build a hierarchical context aggregation structure to control the direction of context aggregation in a conversation. Meanwhile, we set the context windows for each utterance to avoid bringing the noise information into representation learning.

3.4.1 Hierarchical Graph Construction

We construct a 3-level graph attention network (GAT) (Velickovic et al., 2018) as the encoder of contexts, which includes top, middle, and bottom levels. Each level has a context window to focus on the local context of utterance. Formally, we define a graph $G = (V, E)$, V and E denote the node and edge sets respectively. We take the utterance-level representation h_u as the bottom node, cause-specific token representation $h_{[M]_2}^f$ as the middle node, and the emotion-specific token representation $h_{[M]_1}^f$ as the top node. For the intra-level nodes, we set undirected edges for any two adjacent nodes in the context window of the same level. For the inter-level nodes, we set the undirected edges between the top nodes and middle nodes. We set the directed edges from the bottom to the middle nodes in the context window, aiming to control the direction of the information flow among nodes.

Considering that graph G contains multiple type node representations, we set five edge types respectively to model the dependency relations among different nodes. The former three edges are constructed between the slot nodes to slot nodes, i.e., $h_{[M]_1} \leftrightarrow h_{[M]_1}$, $h_{[M]_1} \leftrightarrow h_{[M]_2}$ and $h_{[M]_2} \leftrightarrow h_{[M]_2}$,

which are represented with t_{ee} , t_{ec} and t_{cc} respectively. The fourth edge type is constructed from utterance node to slot node, i.e., $h_u \leftrightarrow h_{[M]_2}$, represented by t_{uc} . The last is from utterance node to utterance node, i.e., $h_u \leftrightarrow h_u$, denoted by t_{uu} . The subscripts "e" and "c" in edge type represent $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$, respectively, and "u" represents the utterance. For one edge type $t \in \{t_{ee}, t_{ec}, t_{cc}, t_{uc}, t_{uu}\}$, its adjacent matrix is given as:

$$a_{i,j}^t = \begin{cases} 1 & j \in \{i - |w|, i + |w|\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $a_{i,j}^t \in A$, $A \in R^{V \times V}$. V denotes the number of utterances in a conversation. $|w|$ denotes the size of the context window. i and j represent the indexes of utterances in a conversation, and they are located on the same or adjacent levels of THC.

3.4.2 Task-specific Context Aggregation

We set a contextual window for each node at each level to ensure that the model only aggregates the node representations in its contextual window. This operation reduces the computational cost and avoids introducing noise to the representation learning. Given an utterance u_i , the prediction slots of emotion and emotion cause are $[M]_{i,1}$ and $[M]_{i,2}$ respectively. We aggregate the representation from the bottom to top levels in the graph, and the representations of bottom nodes are not updated by aggregating the representations of the top or middle nodes to them. For the bottom node u_i , its representation is aggregated by the bottom nodes in the context window:

$$h_{u_i}^n = \text{ReLU}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{u_i}} a_{i,j}^{t_{uu}} W^{uu, n-1} h_{u_j}^{n-1} + b^{n-1}\right) \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{N}_{u_i} denotes the neighbor nodes of utterance u_i and $h_{u_j}^0 = h_{u_j}^f$. When the model comes to the middle node $[M]_{i,2}$, the representations is aggregated by the top and middle nodes in the context window, which is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{[M]_{i,2}}^n &= \text{ReLU}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{[M]_{i,2}}} a_{i,j}^{t_{cc}} W^{cc, n-1} h_{[M]_{j,2}}^{n-1} \right. \\ &+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{[M]_{i,1}}} a_{i,j}^{t_{ec}} W^{ec, n-1} h_{[M]_{j,1}}^{n-1} \left. \right) \\ &+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{u_i}} a_{i,j}^{t_{uc}} W^{uc, n-1} h_{u_j}^{n-1} + b^{n-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\{\mathcal{N}_{[M]_{i,1}}, \mathcal{N}_{[M]_{i,2}}\}$ denote the neighbor nodes of tokens $[M]_1$ and $[M]_2$ respectively. $h_{[M]_{j,1}}^0 = h_{[M]_{j,1}}^f$, $h_{[M]_{j,2}}^0 = h_{[M]_{j,2}}^f$. When the model comes to the top node $[M]_{i,1}$, its representation is aggregated by the top, and the middle nodes in the context window, which is given by:

$$h_{[M]_{i,1}}^n = \text{ReLU}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{[M]_{i,1}}} a_{i,j}^{tee} W^{ee,n-1} h_{[M]_{j,1}}^{n-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{[M]_{i,2}}} a_{i,j}^{tec} W^{ec,n-1} h_{[M]_{j,2}}^{n-1} + b^{n-1}\right) \quad (6)$$

We stacked N task-specific context aggregation modules and then use $h_{[M]_{i,1}}^N$ and $h_{[M]_{i,2}}^N$ as final representations of slots $[M]_{i,1}$ and $[M]_{i,2}$ respectively.

3.5 Grounding Mask Predictions to MERC and MECPE

We use $h_{[M]_{i,1}}^N$ to predict the potential answers for slot $[M]_1$, and use $h_{[M]_{i,2}}^N$ to predict the potential answers for slot $[M]_2$. The predictions of $[M]_1$ (i.e., \hat{y}_i^e) and $[M]_2$ (i.e., \hat{y}_i^c) are given as respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_i^e &= f(W^e h_{[M]_{i,1}}^N + b^e) \\ \hat{y}_i^c &= f(W^c h_{[M]_{i,2}}^N + b^c) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\{\hat{y}_i^e, \hat{y}_i^c\}$ denote the prediction results for MERC and MECPE tasks, respectively. Based on the predictions, we use the sum of the cross-entropy losses of MERC and MECPE tasks as the objective loss of UniMEEC.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We conduct experiments on four publicly available benchmark datasets of MERC and MECPE. For MERC task, its benchmark datasets include multi-modal emotionLines dataset (**MELD**) (Poria et al., 2019), interactive emotional dyadic motion capture database (**IEMOCAP**) (Busso et al., 2008). **IEMOCAP** consists of 7532 samples, and each sample is labeled with six emotions for emotion recognition, including happiness, sadness, anger, neutral, excitement, and frustration. **MELD** contains 13,707 video clips of multi-party conversations, with labels following Ekman’s six universal emotions, including joy, sadness, fear, angry, surprise and disgust. For more details, please see Appendix A. For MECPE task, its benchmark datasets

Datasets	Train	Valid	Test	All
MELD	9989	1108	2610	13707
IEMOCAP	5354	528	1650	7532
ConvECPE	5303	486	1644	7433
ECF	9457	1351	2701	13509

Table 1: The statistics of MELD, IEMOCAP, ConvECPE, and ECF.

include **ConvECPE** (Li et al., 2022a), and emotion-cause-in-friends (**ECF**) (Wang et al., 2021). **ConvECPE** is a multimodal emotion cause dataset constructed based on IEMOCAP, in which each non-neutral utterance is labeled with the emotion cause. It contains 151 dialogues with 7,433 utterances. Similarly, (Wang et al., 2021) annotated the emotion cause of each sample in MELD and then constructed multimodal emotion cause dataset ECF. ECF contains 1,344 conversations and 13,509 utterances. The detailed statistics of four datasets are shown in Table 1. For datasets IEMOCAP and MELD, we follow previous works (Li et al., 2021c; Lu et al., 2020), and we use accuracy (ACC) and weighted F1 (WF1) as the evaluation metric for the MERC task. For datasets ECF and ConvECPE, we use precision (P), recall (R), and F1 as the evaluation metric for the MECPE task.

4.2 Baselines

For MERC, the baselines can be grouped into three categories: 1)the methods focusing on emotion cues like **EmoCaps** (Li et al., 2022b), **FacialMMT-RoBERTa** (Zheng et al., 2023), **MVN** (Li et al., 2021c). These works aim to improve model performance by tracking emotional states in a conversation, and 2)the methods fusing multimodal information like **QMNN** (Li et al., 2021c), **GA2MIF** (Li et al., 2023), **MALN**(Ren et al., 2023), **Multi-EMO** (Shi and Huang, 2023), and **UniMSE** (Hu et al., 2022b). These works focus on better multimodal fusion, and 3)the methods incorporating context information like **DialogueGCN** (Ghosal et al., 2019), **MMGCN** (Hu et al., 2021c), **MM-DFN** (Hu et al., 2022a), **BC-LSTM** (Poria et al., 2017), **DialogueRNN** (Majumder et al., 2019) and **IterativeERC** (Lu et al., 2020). These works aggregate the context to understand the whole conversation.

MECPE has a few baselines due to MECPE only emerging for a relatively short time. Most baselines address MECPE tasks based on two-step frameworks of emotion-cause pair extrac-

Methods	IEMOCAP							MELD							
	Happiness	Sadness	Neutral	Anger	Excitement	Frustration	WF1	Neutral	Surprise	Fear	Sadness	Joy	Disgust	Angry	WF1
BC-LSTM(Poria et al., 2017)	34.43	60.87	51.81	56.73	57.95	58.92	54.95	73.80	47.70	5.40	25.1	51.30	5.20	38.40	55.90
DialogueRNN(Majumder et al., 2019)	33.18	78.80	59.21	65.28	71.86	58.91	62.75	76.23	49.59	0.00	26.33	54.55	0.81	46.76	58.73
DialogueGCN(Ghosal et al., 2019)	51.87	76.76	56.76	62.26	72.71	58.04	63.16	76.02	46.37	0.98	24.32	53.62	1.22	43.03	57.52
IterativeERC(Lu et al., 2020)	53.17	77.19	61.31	61.45	69.23	60.92	64.37	77.52	53.65	3.31	23.62	56.63	19.38	48.88	60.72
QMNN(Li et al., 2021c)	39.71	68.30	55.29	62.58	66.71	62.19	59.88	77.00	49.76	0.00	16.50	52.08	0.00	43.17	58.00
MMGCN(Hu et al., 2021c)	42.34	78.67	61.73	69.00	74.33	62.32	66.22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.65
MM-DFN(Hu et al., 2022a)	42.22	78.98	66.42	69.77	75.56	66.33	68.18	77.76	50.69	-	22.93	54.78	-	47.82	58.65
MVN(Ma et al., 2022)	55.75	73.30	61.88	65.96	69.50	64.21	65.44	76.65	53.18	11.70	21.82	53.62	21.86	42.55	59.03
UniMSE(Hu et al., 2022b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.66	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.51
EmoCaps(Li et al., 2022b)	<u>71.91</u>	85.06	64.48	68.99	78.41	66.76	71.77	77.12	63.19	3.03	42.52	57.50	7.69	57.54	64.00
GA2MIF(Zheng et al., 2023)	46.15	84.50	<u>68.38</u>	<u>70.29</u>	75.99	66.49	70.00	76.92	49.08	-	27.18	51.87	-	48.52	58.94
FacialMMT-RoBERTa(Zheng et al., 2023)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.13	59.63	19.18	41.99	64.88	18.18	56.00	66.58
MALN(Ren et al., 2023)	55.50	81.80	64.10	69.10	78.00	71.40	70.80	82.00	58.60	21.20	43.00	64.30	17.60	52.40	66.90
MultiEMO(Shi and Huang, 2023)	65.77	85.49	67.08	69.88	77.31	70.98	72.84	79.95	60.98	29.67	41.51	62.82	36.75	54.41	66.74
UniMEEC (Ours)	69.52	88.51	69.74	72.63	78.80	72.98	74.83	82.75	64.28	30.78	43.31	66.91	37.72	58.46	68.75

Table 2: Results on IEMOCAP and MELD datasets. The best results are highlighted in bold. The results with underline denote the previous SOTA performance.

tion in text, like **Joint-GCN** (Li et al., 2022a), **Joint-Xatt**(Li et al., 2022a) and **Inter-EC**(Li et al., 2022a). **C_{Multi-Bernoulli}**(Wang et al., 2021) carries out a binary decision for each relative position to determine the cause utterance. **C_{Multinomial}** (Wang et al., 2021) randomly selects a relative position from all relative positions as the feature to extract emotion-cause pair. We produce some typical multimodal methods based on their open source codes, including **MuLT** (Tsai et al., 2019), **MMGCN** (Hu et al., 2021c), **MMDFN** (Hu et al., 2022a), **UniMSE** (Hu et al., 2022b) and **GA2MIF** (Li et al., 2023).

4.3 Experimental Settings

We use pre-trained BERT as the encoder of modality-specific prompt learning. ConvECPE and ECF are constructed based on IEMOCAP and MELD respectively, so we integrate the emotion and cause labels of IEMOCAP, MELD, ConvECPE and ECF to train the model. The batch size is 64, the learning rate for BERT fine-tuning is set at 3e-4, and the learning rate for UniMEEC is set to 0.0001. The hidden dimension of acoustic and visual representation is 64, the BERT embedding size is 768, and the fusion vector size is 768. We use the former 9 Transformer layers of BERT as the text-specific prompt encoder, the following 10th and 11th as the audio-specific prompt encoder, and the last Transformer layer of BERT as the video-specific prompt encoder. The THC module stacks two graph network layers, where the first layer has one attention head and the second layer has four attention heads. For more details, see Appendix B.

4.4 Results of Emotion Recognition

We compare UniMEEC with the baselines of MERC on IEMOCAP and MELD datasets, and the comparative results are shown in Table 2. Early

works like BC-LSTM and DialogueRNN did not perform well on both datasets. Recent methods like MMGCN, and GA2MF achieve low performance in recognizing the happiness label for the IEMOCAP dataset and recognizing the disgust label for the MELD dataset. The low performance is caused by the dataset’s label imbalance of emotion categories. Compared with the baselines, UniMEEC significantly improves WF1 by 1.99% and 1.85% on IEMOCAP and MELD datasets, respectively. Specifically, UniMEEC improves the emotion recognition performance on most emotion categories for two datasets. The possible reason for the improvements is that the unified framework of MERC and MECPE provides more auxiliary information, enhancing the interaction between emotion and emotion cause, thereby alleviating the label imbalance of IEMOCAP and MELD datasets. Furthermore, UniMEEC unifies the annotated labels of MERC and MECPE tasks and constructs a causal context between emotion and cause utterances, which implements the causality of response (emotion) and event (emotion cause). In summary, UniMEEC consistently surpasses the state-of-the-art (SOTA) in most emotion category recognition on both datasets. These results indicate the superiority of UniMEEC in emotion recognition and illustrate the effectiveness of a unified framework in model causality between MERC and MECPE.

4.5 Results of Emotion-Cause Pair Extraction

Emotion-cause pair extraction can be divided into cause recognition and pair extraction, where cause recognition is to predict the location of cause utterance and pair extraction is to match the emotion utterance and cause utterance. The results of UniMEEC on ECF and ConvECPE datasets are shown in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. Furthermore, we reproduce the performance of

Methods	Cause Recognition			Pair Extraction		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
E _{True} + C _{Multi-Bernoulli} (Wang et al., 2021)	55.69	57.20	55.47	49.40	25.22	33.39
E _{True} + C _{Multinomial} (Wang et al., 2021)	57.21	56.38	56.85	49.33	25.18	33.34
MC-ECPE-2steps(Wang et al., 2021)	<u>57.76</u>	56.71	<u>57.09</u>	<u>49.43</u>	53.76	<u>51.32</u>
MuLT*(Tsai et al., 2019)	55.19	53.43	54.79	30.48	37.85	39.02
MMGCN*(Hu et al., 2021c)	56.51	54.82	55.30	35.43	38.19	37.48
MM-DFN*(Hu et al., 2022a)	54.28	56.35	55.17	37.90	39.08	38.10
UniMSE*(Hu et al., 2022b)	56.55	57.09	56.73	44.48	54.25	49.08
GA2MIF*(Zheng et al., 2023)	56.48	<u>58.33</u>	56.67	46.15	<u>54.26</u>	50.16
UniMEEC(Ours)	59.87	58.85	59.18	49.88	59.29	54.61

Table 3: Results on ECF dataset. The baselines with * are reproduced with their open sources.

Methods	Cause Recognition			Pair Extraction		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
<i>Joint-GCN(Joint-EC)(Li et al., 2022a)</i>	71.47	86.35	78.21	38.23	37.08	37.65
<i>Joint-Xatt(Joint-EC)(Li et al., 2022a)</i>	69.68	89.42	78.33	38.23	37.08	37.65
<i>Inter-EC(Li et al., 2022a)</i>	68.55	85.55	76.11	30.91	37.34	33.82
MuLT*(Tsai et al., 2019)	75.15	71.43	73.05	44.61	52.59	48.74
MMGCN*(Hu et al., 2021c)	78.57	74.52	76.07	42.18	42.67	42.11
MM-DFN*(Hu et al., 2022a)	79.84	74.11	76.90	46.79	50.36	48.50
UniMSE*(Hu et al., 2022b)	80.37	73.09	75.58	44.24	49.33	46.69
GA2MIF*(Zheng et al., 2023)	81.42	75.36	78.71	46.54	48.59	47.40
UniMEEC(Ours)	87.21	92.95	89.88	50.61	50.41	50.83

Table 4: Results on ConvECPE dataset. The baselines with italics indicate it only uses textual modality.

some typical multimodal sentiment analysis methods like MuLT, MMGCN, MM-DFN, UniMSE, and GA2MIF on cause recognition and pair extraction tasks. UniMEEC significantly outperforms SOTA in all metrics on ECF and most metrics on ConvECPE datasets. For the ECF dataset, multimodal baseline methods like MuLT and MM-DFN do not perform better. Compared with the baselines, UniMEEC improves metrics P, R, and F of cause recognition by 2.11%, 0.52%, and 2.09%, respectively, and P, R, and F of pair recognition by 0.45%, 5.03%, and 3.29% respectively. For the ConvECPE dataset, multimodal methods perform better than text-based ones. Furthermore, UniMEEC improves by at least 2% on most metrics for cause recognition and pair extraction. These results demonstrate the unified framework’s effectiveness in emotion-cause pair extraction and verify the feasibility of jointly training MERC and MECPE tasks.

4.6 Ablation Study

We conducted extensive ablation studies on IEMOCAP and MELD datasets, and the results are shown in Table 5. First, we remove MECPE part in the prompt template. We can observe that the removal of MECPE results in a performance drop by 3.57% and 1.96% on IEMOCAP and MELD respectively, demonstrating that jointly training MERC and MECPE can bring improvements for MERC tasks. Then, we eliminate MPL and THC modules from UniMEEC to verify their impacts on model performance. Removing MPL and THC

	IEMOCAP		MELD	
	ACC	WF1	ACC	WF1
UniMEEC(Ours)	73.67	74.83	74.85	68.75
- w/o MECPE	68.55	71.26	71.41	66.79
- w/o MPL	68.04	72.70	71.52	65.32
- w/o THC	69.16	72.84	71.09	65.28
- w/o A	70.19	72.08	73.42	65.66
- w/o V	71.02	72.87	73.65	66.89
- w/o A, V	67.75	71.23	69.76	65.47

Table 5: Ablation study of UniMEEC on IEMOCAP and MELD datasets. V and A represent visual and acoustic modalities, respectively. MPL and THC represent modality-specific prompt learning and task-specific context aggregation modules.

hurt the performance, especially in metrics ACC on both datasets, illustrating that MPL and THC modules are effective for MERC and MECPE.

These results further prove that MPL and THC are necessary to improve model performance. Furthermore, we eliminate acoustic, visual, and both modalities from multimodal signals, resulting in performance degradation by 2.75%, 1.96%, and 3.56%, respectively, on WF1 for IEMOCAP. Similarly, the performance drops also occur for MELD dataset when we remove acoustic, visual, and both. These results indicate that the visual and acoustic modalities are necessary for MERC, demonstrating the complementarity of text, acoustic, and visual modalities. We also find that the acoustic modality is more important than the visual to UniMEEC. It is believed that introducing our unified framework to other tasks can also bring improvements. For more experiments, please see Appendix C.

5 Conclusion

This paper presents a **Unified Multimodal Emotion** recognition and **Emotion-Cause** analysis framework (**UniMEEC**) to explore the feasibility and effectiveness of jointly modeling emotion and its underlying emotion causes. UniMEEC reformulates MERC and MECPE tasks as two mask prediction problems, tunes LLM via modality-specific prompts, and aggregates task-specific context in a conversation. Experiments on IEMOCAP, MELD, ConvECPE, and ECF consistently gain significant improvements on most metrics compared to the previous SOTA, further demonstrating the effectiveness of UniMEEC in addressing MERC and MECPE. We believe this work provides a new perspective to MERC and MECPE communities.

Limitations

Due to the dimensions and sequence lengths of audio and vision modalities being less than the dimensions and sequence length of text modality, UniMEEC pads the audio and vision feature with zero to achieve consistency with the representation of text modality. This operation might introduce some unnecessary information in fusion representation learning. Furthermore, UniMEEC is set up to detect emotion and emotion cause in multimodal scenarios, fails to effectively address ERC and ECPE in text, which will also be solved in our future work.

Ethics Statement

The data used in this study are all open-source data for research purposes. While making machines understand human emotions and behaviors sounds appealing, it could be applied to emotional companion robots or intelligent customer service. However, even in simple multi-class emotion recognition, the proposed method can achieve only 74% and 68% in accuracy on IEMOCAP and MELD respectively, which is far from usable in real-world application.

References

- Md. Shad Akhtar, Dushyant Singh Chauhan, Deepanway Ghosal, Soujanya Poria, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2019. [Multi-task learning for multi-modal emotion recognition and sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 370–379. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Jimmy Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2016. [Layer normalization](#). *CoRR*, abs/1607.06450.
- Roy F Baumeister and Joel Cooper. 1981. Can the public expectation of emotion cause that emotion? 1. *Journal of Personality*, 49(1):49–59.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Carlos Busso, Murtaza Bulut, Chi-Chun Lee, Abe Kazemzadeh, Emily Mower, Samuel Kim, Jeanette N. Chang, Sungbok Lee, and Shrikanth S. Narayanan. 2008. [IEMOCAP: interactive emotional dyadic motion capture database](#). *Lang. Resour. Evaluation*, 42(4):335–359.
- Michel Cabanac. 2002. What is emotion? *Behavioural processes*, 60(2):69–83.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bosheng Ding, Chengwei Qin, Linlin Liu, Yew Ken Chia, Boyang Li, Shafiq Joty, and Lidong Bing. 2023. [Is GPT-3 a good data annotator?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 11173–11195.
- René Dirven. 1997. Emotions as cause and the cause of emotions. *The language of emotions*, pages 55–83.
- Fengyi Fu, Lei Zhang, Quan Wang, and Zhendong Mao. 2023. E-core: Emotion correlation enhanced empathetic dialogue generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15016*.
- Deepanway Ghosal, Navonil Majumder, Alexander F. Gelbukh, Rada Mihalcea, and Soujanya Poria. 2020. [COSMIC: commonsense knowledge for emotion identification in conversations](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, Online Event, 16-20 November 2020*, pages 2470–2481.
- Deepanway Ghosal, Navonil Majumder, Soujanya Poria, Niyati Chhaya, and Alexander F. Gelbukh. 2019. [DialogueGCN: A graph convolutional neural network for emotion recognition in conversation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, pages 154–164. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei Han, Hui Chen, and Soujanya Poria. 2021. [Improving multimodal fusion with hierarchical mutual information maximization for multimodal sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*,

- EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021, pages 9180–9192. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Devamanyu Hazarika, Soujanya Poria, Rada Mihalcea, Erik Cambria, and Roger Zimmermann. 2018. **ICON: interactive conversational memory network for multimodal emotion detection**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 2594–2604.
- Devamanyu Hazarika, Soujanya Poria, Roger Zimmermann, and Rada Mihalcea. 2019. **Emotion recognition in conversations with transfer learning from generative conversation modeling**. *CoRR*, abs/1910.04980.
- Dou Hu, Xiaolong Hou, Lingwei Wei, Lian-Xin Jiang, and Yang Mo. 2022a. **MM-DFN: multimodal dynamic fusion network for emotion recognition in conversations**. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2022, Virtual and Singapore, 23-27 May 2022*, pages 7037–7041.
- Guimin Hu, Ting-En Lin, Yi Zhao, Guangming Lu, Yuchuan Wu, and Yongbin Li. 2022b. **Unimse: Towards unified multimodal sentiment analysis and emotion recognition**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, pages 7837–7851.
- Guimin Hu, Guangming Lu, and Yi Zhao. 2021a. **Bidirectional hierarchical attention networks based on document-level context for emotion cause extraction**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 16-20 November, 2021*, pages 558–568.
- Guimin Hu, Guangming Lu, and Yi Zhao. 2021b. **FSS-GCN: A graph convolutional networks with fusion of semantic and structure for emotion cause analysis**. *Knowl. Based Syst.*, 212:106584.
- Jingwen Hu, Yuchen Liu, Jinming Zhao, and Qin Jin. 2021c. **MMGCN: multimodal fusion via deep graph convolution network for emotion recognition in conversation**. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 5666–5675. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abhinav Joshi, Ashwani Bhat, Ayush Jain, Atin Vikram Singh, and Ashutosh Modi. 2022. **COGMEN: contextualized GNN based multimodal emotion recognition**. *CoRR*, abs/2205.02455.
- Joosung Lee and Woojin Lee. 2021. **Compm: Context modeling with speaker’s pre-trained memory tracking for emotion recognition in conversation**. *CoRR*, abs/2108.11626.
- S Lee, Sophia Yat Mei Lee, and Zhu. 2019. *Emotion and Cause*. Springer.
- Chengxi Li, Feiyu Gao, Jiajun Bu, Lu Xu, Xiang Chen, Yu Gu, Zirui Shao, Qi Zheng, Ningyu Zhang, Yongpan Wang, and Zhi Yu. 2021a. **Sentiprompt: Sentiment knowledge enhanced prompt-tuning for aspect-based sentiment analysis**. *CoRR*, abs/2109.08306.
- Jiang Li, Xiaoping Wang, Guoqing Lv, and Zhigang Zeng. 2023. **Ga2mif: Graph and attention based two-stage multi-source information fusion for conversational emotion detection**. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*.
- Jiangnan Li, Zheng Lin, Peng Fu, and Weiping Wang. 2021b. **Past, present, and future: Conversational emotion recognition through structural modeling of psychological knowledge**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 16-20 November, 2021*, pages 1204–1214. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qiuchi Li, Dimitris Gkoumas, Alessandro Sordani, Jian-Yun Nie, and Massimo Melucci. 2021c. **Quantum-inspired neural network for conversational emotion recognition**. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 13270–13278.
- Wei Li, Yang Li, Vlad Pandlea, Mengshi Ge, Luyao Zhu, and Erik Cambria. 2022a. **Ecpec: Emotion-cause pair extraction in conversations**. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, pages 1–12.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. **Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation**. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 4582–4597.
- Zaijing Li, Fengxiao Tang, Ming Zhao, and Yusen Zhu. 2022b. **Emocaps: Emotion capsule based model for conversational emotion recognition**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13504*.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2023. **Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing**. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9):1–35.
- Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2021. **P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks**. *CoRR*, abs/2110.07602.

- Xin Lu, Yanyan Zhao, Yang Wu, Yijian Tian, Huipeng Chen, and Bing Qin. 2020. An iterative emotion interaction network for emotion recognition in conversations. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on computational linguistics*, pages 4078–4088.
- Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Botian Shi, Haoyang Huang, Nan Duan, Tianrui Li, Xilin Chen, and Ming Zhou. 2020. **Univilm: A unified video and language pre-training model for multimodal understanding and generation**. *CoRR*, abs/2002.06353.
- Hui Ma, Jian Wang, Hongfei Lin, Xuejun Pan, Yijia Zhang, and Zhihao Yang. 2022. A multi-view network for real-time emotion recognition in conversations. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 236:107751.
- Navonil Majumder, Soujanya Poria, Devamanyu Hazarika, Rada Mihalcea, Alexander F. Gelbukh, and Erik Cambria. 2019. **Dialoguernn: An attentive RNN for emotion detection in conversations**. In *The Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2019, The Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2019, The Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2019, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, January 27 - February 1, 2019*, pages 6818–6825.
- Yuzhao Mao, Guang Liu, Xiaojie Wang, Weiguo Gao, and Xuan Li. 2021. **Dialoguetrm: Exploring multimodal emotional dynamics in a conversation**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 16-20 November, 2021*, pages 2694–2704.
- Joel Marks. 1982. A theory of emotion. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 42(2):227–242.
- Soujanya Poria, Erik Cambria, Devamanyu Hazarika, Navonil Majumder, Amir Zadeh, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2017. **Context-dependent sentiment analysis in user-generated videos**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017, Vancouver, Canada, July 30 - August 4, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 873–883.
- Soujanya Poria, Devamanyu Hazarika, Navonil Majumder, Gautam Naik, Erik Cambria, and Rada Mihalcea. 2019. **MELD: A multimodal multi-party dataset for emotion recognition in conversations**. In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 527–536. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yushan Qian, Bo Wang, Ting-En Lin, Yinhe Zheng, Ying Zhu, Dongming Zhao, Yuexian Hou, Yuchuan Wu, and Yongbin Li. 2023. Empathetic response generation via emotion cause transition graph. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Minjie Ren, Xiangdong Huang, Jing Liu, Ming Liu, Xuanya Li, and An-An Liu. 2023. **MALN: multimodal adversarial learning network for conversational emotion recognition**. *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, 33(11):6965–6980.
- James A Russell. 1990. The preschooler’s understanding of the causes and consequences of emotion. *Child Development*, 61(6):1872–1881.
- Tao Shi and Shao-Lun Huang. 2023. **Multiemo: An attention-based correlation-aware multimodal fusion framework for emotion recognition in conversations**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 14752–14766.
- Yusheng Su, Xiaozhi Wang, Yujia Qin, Chi-Min Chan, Yankai Lin, Huadong Wang, Kaiyue Wen, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, Juanzi Li, et al. 2021. On transferability of prompt tuning for natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.06719*.
- Yang Sun, Nan Yu, and Guohong Fu. 2021. **A discourse-aware graph neural network for emotion recognition in multi-party conversation**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 16-20 November, 2021*, pages 2949–2958. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yueqing Sun, Yu Zhang, Le Qi, and Qi Shi. 2022. Tsgp: Two-stage generative prompting for unsupervised commonsense question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13515*.
- Mingxing Tan and Quoc V. Le. 2019. **Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks**. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6105–6114. PMLR.
- Zhiliang Tian, Yinliang Wang, Yiping Song, Chi Zhang, Dongkyu Lee, Yingxiu Zhao, Dongsheng Li, and Nevin L Zhang. 2022. Empathetic and emotionally positive conversation systems with an emotion-specific query-response memory. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 6364–6376.
- Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Paul Pu Liang, J. Zico Kolter, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. **Multimodal transformer for unaligned multimodal language sequences**. In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 6558–6569. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008.

Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. [Graph attention networks](#). In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*.

Fanfan Wang, Zixiang Ding, Rui Xia, Zhaoyu Li, and Jianfei Yu. 2021. [Multimodal emotion-cause pair extraction in conversations](#). *CoRR*, abs/2110.08020.

Jianing Yang, Yongxin Wang, Ruitao Yi, Yuying Zhu, Azaan Rehman, Amir Zadeh, Soujanya Poria, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2021. [MTAG: modal-temporal attention graph for unaligned human multimodal language sequences](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 1009–1021.

Xiaocui Yang, Shi Feng, Daling Wang, Sun Qi, Wenfang Wu, Yifei Zhang, Pengfei Hong, and Soujanya Poria. 2023. Few-shot joint multimodal aspect-sentiment analysis based on generative multimodal prompt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10169*.

Hanlei Zhang, Hua Xu, and Ting-En Lin. 2021a. Deep open intent classification with adaptive decision boundary. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(16):14374–1438.

Hanlei Zhang, Hua Xu, Ting-En Lin, and Rui Lyu. 2021b. Discovering new intents with deep aligned clustering. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(16):14365–14373.

Zhengkun Zhang, Xiaojun Meng, Yasheng Wang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Zhenglu Yang. 2022. [Unims: A unified framework for multimodal summarization with knowledge distillation](#). In *Thirty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, Thirty-Fourth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2022, The Twelveth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2022 Virtual Event, February 22 - March 1, 2022*, pages 11757–11764.

Wenjie Zheng, Jianfei Yu, Rui Xia, and Shijin Wang. 2023. A facial expression-aware multimodal multi-task learning framework for emotion recognition in multi-party conversations. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15445–15459.

Xiaopeng Zheng, Zhiyue Liu, Zizhen Zhang, Zhaoyang Wang, and Jiahai Wang. 2022. [Ueca-prompt: Universal prompt for emotion cause analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 7031–7041.

Lixing Zhu, Gabriele Pergola, Lin Gui, Deyu Zhou, and Yulan He. 2021. [Topic-driven and knowledge-aware transformer for dialogue emotion detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 1571–1582.

A Dataset

We count emotion categories of MELD and IEMOCAP, and their distributions of the train set, valid set, and test set are shown in Table 7 and Table 6, respectively. For IEMOCAP dataset, the count of "frustrated" is twice or more than that of label "joy". For MELD dataset, the labels of joy, surprise and anger are much more than other labels. How to alleviate label imbalance also need more exploration direction for emotion recognition.

B Experimental Environment

All experiments are conducted in the NVIDIA RTX A100. We take BERT as the Transformer-based model, which has 110M parameters, including 12 layers, 768 hidden dimensions, and 12 heads. We use the former $N_t = 9$ Transformer layers as the text-specific encoder, use the following $N_a = 2$ and $N_v = 1$ Transformer layers as the audio-specific and video-specific encoders respectively. The value of N_t , N_a and N_v are determined by the model performance on valid test. Furthermore, we employ a linear decay learning rate schedule with a warm-up strategy.

	Neural	Frustration	Anger	Sadness	Happiness	Excitement
train	1187	1322	832	762	431	703
dev	137	146	101	77	21	39
test	384	381	170	245	299	143
all	1708	1849	1103	1084	751	885

Table 6: The distribution of emotion category on dataset IEMOCAP.

C Case Study

We select some typical conversations from the test set to conduct the case study for better analyzing the performance of UniMEEC in emotion recognition and emotion-cause pair extraction. The results

	Surprise	Fear	Sadness	Joy	Disgust	Angry
train	1205	268	683	1744	271	1109
dev	150	40	112	163	22	153
test	281	50	208	402	68	345
all	1636	358	1003	2309	361	1607

Table 7: The distribution of emotion category on dataset MELD.

are shown in Table 8. For the first conversation, it contains two utterances. UniMEEC accurately predicts "angry" as the emotion category of u_2 and correctly predicts its emotion cause location. For the second conversation, it contains four utterances. UniMEEC correctly predicts "joy" as the emotion category of u_1 and "surprise" as the emotion category of u_3 , and correctly predicts the emotion cause locations. For the third conversation, it contains three utterances. UniMEEC predicts "angry" as the emotion category of u_3 and predicts the emotion cause location, correctly recognize emotion and emotion cause in a conversation. These results demonstrate that the proposed model UniMEEC can effectively solve MERC and MECPE tasks simultaneously.

diag_id	conversation	emotion category	emotion cause	Prediction	
6_9_7	u_1 : Okay, look, I think we have to tell Rachel she messed up her dessert.	neutral	None	None	
	u_2 : What?! What is with everybody? It's Thanksgiving, not...Truth-Day!	angry	1	angry,1	✓
8_8_13	u_1 : I love your place! Where is this guy	joy	1	joy,1	✓
	u_2 : Uh that's an eighteenth century Indian artifact from Calcutta.	neutral	None	None	
	u_3 : Oh wow! So, you're more than just dinosaurs.	surprise	2	surprise, 2	✓
	u_4 : So much more.	neutral	None	None	
3_9_97	u_1 : Wait no, honey, honey throw it to me	neutral	None	None	
	u_2 : Here you go.	neutral	None	None	
	u_3 : That almost hit me in the face.	angry	3	angry,3	✓

Table 8: Case study.