

# Measuring Emotions

Development and application of an instrument to measure emotional responses to products

Pieter M.A. Desmet

Delft University of Technology

Department of Industrial Design

p.m.a.desmet@io.tudelft.nl

To be published in: M.A. Blythe, A.F. Monk, K. Overbeeke, & P.C. Wright (Eds.),

Funology: from usability to enjoyment.

*This chapter introduces the Product Emotion Measurement instrument (PrEmo), an instrument to assess emotional responses to consumer products. The non-verbal self-report instrument measures a set of 14 emotions. Each emotion in this set is portrayed with an animated cartoon character by means of dynamic facial, bodily, and vocal expression, and presented on a computer interface. Participants can report their responses by selecting those animations that correspond with their felt emotion(s). The chapter discusses the development of PrEmo in the context of existing instruments. In addition, an illustrative cross-culture study is reported, in which emotions evoked by car models have been measured in Japan and in The Netherlands.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Our emotions play an important role throughout the span of our lives because they enrich virtually all of our waking moments with either a pleasant or an unpleasant quality. Cacioppo and his colleagues wrote that “emotions guide, enrich an ennobled life; they provide meaning to everyday existence; they render the valuation placed on life and property” (Cacioppo et al. 2001 p. 173), which illustrates that also the relationship with our physical world is emotional. It therefore doesn't come as a surprise that consumer researchers have found that emotions evoked by products enhance the pleasure of buying, owning, and using them (Hirschman & Holbrook 1982). In addition, it has often been argued that the experiential or emotional quality of products is becoming more and more important for differential advantage in the marketplace because products are now often similar with respect to technical characteristics, quality, and price. In some purchase decisions, emotional responses may even be a decisive factor. Clearly, the ‘fun of use,’ i.e. the fun one experiences from owning or using a product, belongs to this affective rather than to the rational domain. The difficulty in studying affective concepts as ‘joy of use’ or ‘fun of use’ is that they seem to be as intangible as they are appealing. Even more, rather than being an emotion as such, ‘having fun’ is probably the outcome of a wide range of possible emotional responses. Imagine, for example, the fun one has when watching a movie. This person will experience all kinds of emotions, such as fear, amusement, anger, relief, disappointment, hope, etcetera. Instead of one isolated emotion,

it is the *combination* of those emotions that contributes to the experience of fun. It is not implausible that the same applies to other instances of fun, whether it is sharing a joke, using a product, or interacting with a computer.

Knowledge of the process of emotion, i.e. how emotions are evoked, can enhance our understanding of what makes us enjoy interacting with a computer or, for that matter, with any other kind of product. So far, however, little is known about how people respond emotionally to products and what aspects of design or interaction trigger emotional reactions. In my view, an instrument that enables us to measure emotional responses can support the study and exploration of relationships between subjective affective responses, and objective interaction and design characteristics. Given this application purpose, the instrument should be able to measure subtle (i.e. low intensity) emotions, and mixed emotions (i.e. more than one emotion experienced simultaneously). In addition, our research requires an instrument that is applicable cross-culturally and therefore language independent.

The quest for instruments to measure emotions has a long history. Traditionally, attempts to measure emotions have been done in the field of psychology and sociology. More recently (i.e. the last twenty years), acknowledging the important role of emotions in their field of research, consumer and marketing researchers have developed instruments which measure the emotional responses to advertisement and consumer experiences. Even more recently (i.e. the last ten years), and as a result of the rapid invasion of computers into our daily lives, computer science has also become a player in the field of measurement of emotions. Unfortunately, none of these developed instruments appears to be applicable for the measurement of emotional responses to products because none meets all the above stated requirements. Given the limitations of existing instruments for the current measurement aims, a new instrument was developed: the Product Emotion Measurement instrument (PrEmo). This development was an iterative design process. Over a period of five years, six versions of the instrument have been created. The creation of each version was followed by an evaluation of its strengths and weaknesses, and on the basis of this evaluation renewed starting points were defined. Each subsequent version was designed to correct the flaws of the previous version. This chapter presents the development, validation, and application possibilities of the sixth PrEmo version. Note that the development of all PrEmo versions is reported in detail in Desmet (2002). Earlier versions have also been discussed in previous publications (see e.g. Desmet & Hekkert 1998; Desmet, Overbeeke, & Tax 2001; Desmet, Hekkert, & Jacobs 2000).

## **2. APPROACHES TO MEASURE EMOTION**

Before one can measure emotions, one must be able to characterise emotions and distinguish them from other states. Unfortunately, this is a problem that currently belongs to those yet unsolved. Although the concept of emotion appears to be generally understood, it is surprisingly difficult to come up with a solid definition. When surveying emotion research in psychology, one finds various traditions that hold different views on

how to go about defining, studying, and explaining emotions. The last 100 years, psychologists have offered a variety of definitions, each focussing on different manifestations or components of the emotion. As there seems to be no empirical solution to the debate on which component is sufficient or necessary to define emotions, at present the most favoured solution is to say that emotions are best treated as a multifaceted phenomenon consisting of the following components: behavioural reactions (e.g. approaching), expressive reactions (e.g. smiling), physiological reactions (e.g. heart pounding), and subjective feelings (e.g. feeling amused). Each instrument that is claimed to measure emotions in fact measures one of these components. As a consequence, both the number of reported instruments and the diversity in approaches to measure emotions is abundant. Today's instruments range from simple pen-and-paper rating scales to dazzling high-tech equipment that measures brain waves or eye movements. In this chapter, the distinction is made between non-verbal (objective) instruments and verbal (subjective) instruments.

## **2.1 Non-verbal instruments to measure emotions.**

This category comprises instruments that measure either the expressive or the physiological component of emotion. An expressive reaction (e.g. smiling or frowning) is the facial, vocal, and postural expression that accompanies the emotion. Each emotion is associated with a particular pattern of expression (Ekman 1994). For example, anger comes with a fixed stare, contracted eyebrows, compressed lips, vigorous and brisk movements and, usually, a raised voice, almost shouting (Ekman & Friesen 1975). Instruments that measure this component of emotion fall into two major categories: those measuring facial and those measuring vocal expressions. Facial expression instruments are based on theories that link expression features to distinct emotions. Examples of such theories are the Facial Action Coding System (FACS; Ekman & Friesen 1978), and the Maximally Discriminative Facial Moving Coding System (MAX; Izard 1979). Generally, visible expressions captured on stills or short video sequences are analysed. An example is the Facial Expression Analysis Tool (FEAT; Kaiser & Wehrle 2001). Also subtle expressions, invisible to the naked eye, can be measured because the facial muscle activity of these expressions result in electrical potentials (facial electromyographic activity: EMG). This EMG activity can be assessed by determining the voltage from two electrodes placed on the skin's surface over a particular muscle group (see Cacioppo & Petty 1989). Like the facial expression instruments, vocal instruments are based on theories that link patterns of vocal cues to emotions (e.g. Johnstone & Scherer 2001). These instruments measure the effects of emotion in multiple vocal cues such as average pitch, pitch changes, intensity colour, speaking rate, voice quality, and articulation.

A physiological reaction (activation or arousal, e.g. increases in heart rate) is the change in activity in the autonomic nervous system (ANS) that accompanies emotions. Emotions show a variety of physiological manifestations that can be measured with a diverse array of techniques. Examples are instruments that measure blood pressure responses, skin responses, pupillary responses, brain waves, and heart responses. Researchers in the field of affective computing are most active in developing ANS

instruments, such as IBM's emotion mouse (Ark, Dryer, & Lu 1999) and a variety of wearable sensors designed by the Affective Computing Group at MIT (e.g. Picard 2000). With these instruments, computers can gather multiple physiological signals while a person is experiencing an emotion, and learn which pattern is most indicative of which emotion.

The major advantage of non-verbal instruments is that, as they are language-independent, they can be used in different cultures. A second advantage is that they are unobtrusive because they do not disturb participants during the measurement. In addition, these instruments are often claimed to be less subjective than self-report instruments because they do not rely on the participants' own assessment of the emotional experience. For the current application however, this class of instruments has several limitations. First, these instruments can only reliably assess a limited set of 'basic' emotions (such as anger, fear, and surprise). Reported studies find a recognition accuracy of around 60-80% for six to eight basic emotions. Moreover, these instruments cannot assess mixed emotions. Given these limitations, it was decided not to use this approach for measuring emotions evoked by products.

## **2.2 Verbal instruments to measure emotions.**

The above mentioned limitations of non-verbal instruments are overcome by verbal self-report instruments, which typically assess the subjective feeling component of emotions. Subjective feeling (e.g. feeling happy or feeling inspired) is the conscious awareness of the emotional state one is in, i.e. the subjective emotional experience. Each emotion involves a specific feeling which is a basic, irreducible kind of mental element (Titchener 1908). These subjective feelings can only be measured through self-report. The most often used self-report instruments require respondents to report their emotions with the use of a set of rating scales or verbal protocols.

The two major advantages of the verbal instruments is that rating scales can be assembled to represent any set of emotions, and can be used to measure mixed emotions. The main disadvantage is that they are difficult to apply between cultures. In emotion research, translating emotion words is known to be difficult because for many emotion words a one-to-one, 'straight' translation is not available. Between-culture comparisons are therefore notoriously problematic. To overcome this problem, a handful of non-verbal self-report instruments have recently been developed that use pictograms instead of words to represent emotional responses. An example is the Self-Assessment Manikin (SAM; Lang 1985). With SAM, respondents point out the puppets that in their opinion best portray their emotion. Although applicable in between-culture studies, these non-verbal scales also have an important limitation, which is that they do not measure distinct emotions but only generalised emotional states (in terms of underlying dimensions such as pleasantness and arousal). It was therefore decided to develop a new instrument for emotions evoked by products. This instrument was developed to combine the advantages of existing non-verbal and verbal self-report instruments: it measures distinct (and mixed) emotions but does not require the participants to verbalise their emotions.

### 3. THE PRODUCT EMOTION MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT

People are expert at interpreting emotional expressions. In the face-to-face encounters of everyday life we constantly monitor the emotions of others. Does my question annoy him? Is she amused by my story? Ettcoff and Magee (1992) showed that in some cases facial expression provides a means of communicating emotions that is even more effective than verbal expression. This interpretation skill was the starting point for the development of PrEmo. PrEmo is a non-verbal self-report instrument that measures 14 emotions that are often elicited by product design. Of these 14 emotions, seven are pleasant (i.e. desire, pleasant surprise, inspiration, amusement, admiration, satisfaction, fascination), and seven are unpleasant (i.e. indignation, contempt, disgust, unpleasant surprise, dissatisfaction, disappointment, and boredom). Instead of relying on the use of words, respondents can report their emotions with the use of expressive cartoon animations. In the instrument, each of the 14 measured emotions is portrayed by an animation by means of dynamic facial, bodily, and vocal expressions. Figure 1 shows the measurement interface.




Figure 1. Product Emotion Measurement instrument interface

The procedure of a PrEmo experiment is self-running. The computer screen displays instructions that guide respondents through the procedure, which includes an explanation of the experiment and an exercise. The program's heart is the measurement interface, which was designed to be simple and intuitive in use. The top section of this interface depicts stills of the 14 animations. Each still is accompanied by a (hidden) three-point

scale. These scales represent the following ratings: “I do feel the emotion,” “to some extent I feel the emotion,” and “I do not feel the emotion expressed by this animation.” The rating scales are ‘hidden behind’ the animation frames. A scale appears on the side of the animation frame only after the animation is activated by clicking on the particular still. The lower section of the interface displays a picture of the stimulus and an operation button. During an experiment, the respondents are first shown a (picture of a) product and subsequently instructed to use the animations to report their emotion(s) evoked by the product. While they view an animation, they must ask themselves the following question: “does this animation express what I feel?” Subsequently, they use the three-point scale to answer this question. Visual feedback of the scorings is provided by the background colour of the animation frame.

### 3.1 Emotions measured by PrEmo

The 14 measured emotions were selected to represent a manageable cross-section of all emotions that can be elicited by consumer products. For this selection, a multistage method was used. First, a set of emotions was assembled that is sufficiently extensive to represent a general overview of the full repertoire of human emotions. This set of 347 emotions was compiled by merging and translating reported lists of emotions. In the first study, participants ( $N = 20$ ) rated these emotions on the dimensions ‘pleasantness’ and ‘arousal,’ which represent the dimensions of the ‘Circumplex of Affect’ developed by Russell (1980). Both dimensions were rated on a three-point scale: pleasant-neutral-unpleasant, and calm-moderate-excited respectively. In addition, participants marked emotion words with which they were not familiar. On the basis of these ratings, the set emotions was divided in eight categories (see Table 1). Note that one combination, i.e. neutral-neutral is not included. It is left out because it is not considered to be an emotional category in the Circumplex model. Emotions that were ambiguous or marked as unfamiliar were omitted from the set.

*Table 1. emotion categories*

<i>Category</i>	<i>Amount of included emotions</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Amount of included emotions</i>
Excited pleasant	30	Calm unpleasant	34
Average pleasant	53	Average unpleasant	61
Calm pleasant	24	Excited unpleasant	46
Calm neutral	14	Excited neutral	20

In order to further reduce the set, the second study was designed to select those emotions that are most often elicited by products. In this study, participants ( $N = 22$ ) used a rating procedure to indicate which emotions they often, and which they do not often experience in response to product design. They were instructed to do this for each of the eight emotion sets. On the basis of the sum scores, 69 emotions were selected that are evoked regularly by product design (the sum scores of these emotions were significantly higher

than the average score). Subsequently, in the third step, the set was further shortened by eliminating those emotions that are approximately similar to others in the set. Participants ( $N = 40$ ) rated the similarity of the emotions in pairs. With the use of a hierarchical cluster analysis, the set of 69 emotions was reduced to a set of 41 emotions. In a final study, participants ( $N = 23$ ) rated all 41 emotions on a five-point scale (from ‘very relevant to product experience’ to ‘not relevant to product experience’). On the basis of the mean scores, the final set of 14 emotions was selected. Although, evidently, products can elicit more than these 14 emotions, these are the ones that can be considered to occur most frequently. Moreover, PrEmo requires a set that is surveyable. The set of 14 is regarded as a workable balance between comprehensive and surveyable.

### 3.2 Dynamic cartoon animations

The idea to use expressive portrayals of the 14 emotions was based on the assumption that emotional expressions can be recognized reliably. Ekman (1994) found that facial expressions of basic emotions (e.g. fear and joy) are not only recognised reliably, but also univocally across cultures. As the emotions measured by PrEmo are subtler than the basic emotions, more information than merely the facial expression is needed to portray them reliably. Our approach to this problem was to incorporate total body expression, movement, and vocal expression. It was decided to use a cartoon character because these are often particularly efficient in portraying emotions. This efficiency is achieved with abstracting which reduces the emotional expression to its essence. Abstracted portrayals can make the task of recognizing emotional expressions easier because the amount of irrelevant information is reduced (Bernson & Perret 1991). Moreover, with cartoon character it is possible to amplify (or exaggerate) the expressive cues that differ between emotional expressions (see Calder et al. 1997). A professional animator designed the character and created the animated expressions. A vocal actor synchronized the vocal expressions. To enable the animator to create clear portrayals, a study with actors was conducted. In this study, four professional actors (two males, two females) were instructed to portray each of the 14 emotions as expressive and precise as they could. These portrayals were recorded on videotape and analysed by the author and the animator. On the basis of this analysis, the animator created the animations. By ways of example, Figure 2 shows the animation sequences of *disgust* and *inspiration*.




Figure 2. two animation sequences

### 3.3 Validity and reliability

The validity of PrEmo, i.e. the degree to which it accurately measures the emotions it was designed to measure, was assessed in a two-step procedure. The first step was to examine the validity of the animations. As an important requirement was that PrEmo should be applicable in different cultures or language areas, the study included participants from four different countries ( $N = 120$ , participants from Japan, United States, Finland, and The Netherlands). Participants were shown three animations and asked which of these three best portrayed a given emotion. Of the three animations shown, one was designed to portray the given emotion, and the other two portrayed other emotions. The animation that was supposed to portray the given emotion was considered valid when it was selected more often than could be expected from chance. A strict significance level (i.e.  $p < .001$ ) was applied because it was important to identify also slightly inaccurate animations. On the basis of the results, it was concluded that in order to be valid, the animations portraying *desire* and *disappointment* needed further development. These two animations were found to be invalid in Japan and therefore adjusted on the basis of a study with four Japanese actors.

In the second study ( $N = 30$ ) the validity and reliability of the instrument was examined with a test-retest design. In this study, both PrEmo and a verbal scale were used to measure emotions evoked by six chairs. The level of association between the results obtained with PrEmo and those obtained with the verbal scales was analysed. The correlations between emotion scores measured with the two methods were high ( $r$  varied from .72 to .99) and all but one (i.e. *amusement*) were significant ( $p < .05$ ). For each emotion a repeated measures MANOVA was performed to examine interaction effects between chair model and instrument. None of the analyses found a significant interaction effect. In agreement with the high correlation, these findings indicate that the participants did not respond differently to each of the chairs as a result of the measurement instrument applied. Based on these results, it was concluded that PrEmo is satisfactory with respect to its convergent validity. Moreover, participants reported in a questionnaire that they preferred using the animations to using words for reporting their emotional responses. The animations were found to be more intuitive in use and, also important, much more enjoyable.

## 4. CROSS-CULTURAL APPLICATION

The application possibilities of PrEmo have been explored with a between-culture study in which emotions evoked by six car models (see Figure 3) were measured both in Japan ( $n = 32$ ) and in The Netherlands ( $n = 36$ ). It was decided to use cars because in previous studies we found that car models that vary in appearance can elicit strongly different emotions (see e.g. Desmet, Hekkert, & Jacobs 2000). Participants were matched on gender and age (20-60 years old). In a written introduction, it was explained that the purpose of the experiment was to assess emotional responses to the car designs. After the introduction, participants were shown a thumbnail display that gave an overview of all



the models. Subsequently, photos of the six car models were presented in random order. After looking at a photo, participants reported their response with the 14 PrEmo animations.



Figure 3. stimuli used in the application study

In order to obtain a graphical representation of the results a correspondence analysis was performed with two factors: Emotion (14 levels) and Car combined with Culture (12 levels). Correspondence analysis is a technique for describing the relationship between nominal variables, while simultaneously describing the relationship between the categories of each variable. It is an exploratory technique, primarily intended to facilitate the interpretation of the data. Figure 4 shows the two-dimensional solution of the analysis, which explains 90,3 % of the total variance: the ‘product & emotion space.’

This product & emotion space visualises the associations between the car models and the reported emotional responses. Pleasant emotions are indicated with a triangle and unpleasant with a circle. The results of the Japanese participants are indicated with a ‘J,’ and those of the Dutch with an ‘N.’ The distances between the car models reflect the relationships between the car models (with similar models plotted close to each other). Similarly, the distances between the car models and the emotions reflect the relationship between them. This means that car models that are plotted close to each other evoked similar emotions, whereas those plotted at a distance from each other evoked different emotions. Cars A and D, for example, evoked similar emotions, whereas Cars A and B evoked noticeably different emotions.

In the product & emotion space some effects catch the eye. Clearly, the degree to which car models differ from each other also varies. The difference between Cars A and D, for example, is smaller than the difference between Cars A and B. Moreover, some car models appear to have elicited mainly pleasant emotions (e.g. Car D), some mainly unpleasant (e.g. Car B), and some both pleasant and unpleasant (e.g. Car F). In addition, two between-culture effects can be observed. First, the degree to which the emotional responses of the cultures differ depends on the car model. The space indicates that cultural differences are greatest for Cars E and C. Cars, A, B, and D, on the other hand, appear to have elicited similar emotions in Japan and in The Netherlands. Secondly, the

product & emotion space indicates that the Japanese experienced generally higher ratings on pleasant emotions than the Dutch. The three car models that showed the largest cultural differences elicited more pleasant emotions in Japan than in The Netherlands.




Figure 4. 'product & emotion space' of Dutch and Japanese participants for six car models

## 4.1 Between-culture differences

The correspondence analysis is an exploratory technique, primarily intended to facilitate the interpretation of the data. Because it is not appropriate to draw conclusions, the observed between-culture effects have been examined in more depth, with an analysis of variance. For each emotion a two-way repeated measures MANOVA was performed with Car (six levels) as within-participants factor, Culture (two levels) as between-participant factor, and the emotion as dependent variable. Some interesting culture effects have been found. For three emotions, cultural differences independent of car model were found. Japanese participants showed higher mean scores on the following emotions: *admiration*, *satisfaction*, and *fascination* ( $p < .01$ ). This may point to a cultural difference in how car models are experienced: apparently Japanese people are generally more admiring of, satisfied, and fascinated by car models that the Dutch. Some Car x Culture interaction effects indicated that there are also cultural differences in responses with respect to the

particular car models used in the study. Interaction effects were found for *disgust*, *unpleasant surprise*, *dissatisfaction*, *amusement*, *admiration*, and *satisfaction*. For example, the Dutch participants were not amused by the same car models as the Japanese.

A notable finding was that, contrary to expectations, cultural differences cannot be explained by product-familiarity. For instance, for Car B (Fiat Multipla) no significant cultural differences were found with respect to the emotions it elicited. This was not expected, because the Dutch participants were familiar with this model, and the Japanese were not. These findings confirm the idea that in product development, cultural differences must be recognized, and that these differences are both difficult to predict and to explain. Companies involved in ‘global marketing’ should be aware of these differences and should perhaps develop various design strategies for different cultures, instead of attempting to market identical products in different countries.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The unique strength of PrEemo is that it combines two qualities: it measures distinct emotions and it can be used cross-culturally because it does not ask respondents to verbalise their emotions. In addition, it can be used to measure mixed emotions, that is, more than one emotion experienced simultaneously, and the operation requires neither expensive equipment nor technical expertise. And, also important, respondents reported that the measurement task with PrEemo is pleasant or even enjoyable. A limitation for the application in human computer interaction is that the 14 measured emotions represent a cross-section of emotions experienced towards static product design. It is not said that this set also represents emotions that are experienced towards dynamic human product interaction. Some emotions may be over-represented, whereas others may be missing. Before PrEemo is applied for the measurement of emotions evoked by interacting with a computer (or any other product) it must be studied if the 14 emotions are adequate and, if not, the set animations should be adjusted.

What is the point of measuring emotions evoked by products or computer programs? More interesting than to discover which particular emotions are evoked by a set of stimuli, is to understand *why* those stimuli evoke these particular emotions. This information can be used in the development of new products, to elicit pre-defined emotion profiles. Hence, the interpretation of PrEemo results requires theoretical propositions about how product emotions are related to the product’s appearance and interaction, and the characteristics of the person who experiences the emotions. In cognitive emotion psychology emotions are regarded as outcomes of appraisal processes. According to Frijda (1986), emotions are elicited when a subject appraises a stimulus as important for the gain of some personal concern. A concern can be any goal, standard, attitude, or motive one has in life, e.g., achieving status, feeling safe, or respecting the environment. In following Arnold (1960), Frijda argues that when we appraise a stimulus as beneficial to our concerns, we will experience positive emotions and try to approach this particular stimulus. Likewise, when we appraise a stimulus as colliding with our

concerns, we will experience negative emotions and try to avoid it. As concerns are personal, different subjects have different concerns. As a result, individual subjects will appraise a give a given product differently. As different types of emotions are evoked by different kinds of appraisals, appraisals can be used o differentiate emotions (e.g., Ortony, Clore, & Collins 1988). For the 14 emotions measured by PrEmo, Desmet (2002) described the specific appraisal patterns underlying each emotion. Understanding these patterns could guide designers in controlling the emotional responses to their designs.

A second application possibility of PrEmo is to use it as a means to communicate emotional responses to products. The emotional aspects of a design are often difficult to discuss because, often, they are based on intuition. The ‘product & emotion space’ that results from a PrEmo experiment makes the intangible emotional responses tangible. In various design workshops, the space has proven to be a valuable support to discuss emotional aspects of design in a design team. In addition, designers found it to be effective when used as a means to communicate, argue, and defend their ideas to non-designers who are also involved in the product development (e.g. marketing, engineering, etcetera).

What are the characteristics that make one product more enjoyable or attractive than another? Some of us find riding a roller coaster fun, whereas others wouldn’t want to be found dead in one. Some consider the death fear experienced when thrown from a bridge with an elastic tied to one’s ankles to be fun whereas others prefer to play a game of bridge. Whatever the interpersonal differences in what we find to be fun, it would clearly be incorrect to assume that that fun is related only to pleasant emotions. Frijda and Schram (1995) stated that art often elicits paradoxical emotions, that is, positive and negative emotions simultaneously, and that it is precisely these paradoxical emotions that we seek en enjoy. In the word of Frijda (p. 2) “we enjoy watching tragic miseries, and we pay fair amounts of money to suffer threat and suspense.” It may be interesting for designers and design researchers to investigate the possibilities of designing such paradoxical emotions. Eventually, these efforts may result in products that are unique, innovative, rich in their interaction, interesting, and fun to use.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by Mitsubishi Motor R&D, Europe GmbH, Trebur, Germany. Paul Hekkert (Delft University) is acknowledged for his contribution to this research.

## 7. REFERENCES

- Ark, W., Dryer, D.C., & Lu, D.J. (1999). The emotion mouse. *Proceedings of HCI International '99*, Munich Germany, August 1999.
- Arnold, M.B. (1960). *Emotion and Personality: vol 1. Psychological aspects*. New York: Colombia University Press.

- Bernson, P.J., & Perrett, D.I. (1991). Perception and recognition of photographic quality facial caricatures: implications for the recognition of natural images. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 3, 105-135.
- Cacioppo, J.T., & Petty, R.E. (1989). The elaboration likelihood model: The role of affect and affect-laden information processing in persuasion. In P. Cafferata & A.M. Taybout (Eds.), *Cognitive and affective responses to advertising* (pp. 69-90). Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Cacioppo, J.T., Bernston, G.G., Larsen, J.T., Poehlmann, K.M., & Ito, T.A. (2001). The psychophysiology of emotion. In M. Lewis & J.M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions (2nd ed.)* (pp. 173-191). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Calder, A.J., Young, A.W., Rowland, D., & Perrett, D.I. (1992). Micro-expressive facial actions as a function of affective stimuli: Replication and extension. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 515-526.
- Desmet, P.M.A. (2002). *Designing Emotions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Desmet, P.M.A., & Hekkert, P. (1998). Emotional reactions elicited by car design: A measurement tool for designers. In D. Roller (Ed.), *Automotive Mechatronics Design and Engineering* (pp. 237-244). Düsseldorf, Germany: ISATA.
- Desmet, P.M.A., Hekkert, P., & Jacobs, J.J. (2000). When a car makes you smile: Development and application of an instrument to measure product emotions. In: S.J. Hoch & R.J. Meyer (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research* (vol. 27, pp. 111-117). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Desmet, P.M.A., Overbeeke, C.J., & Tax, S.J.E.T. (2001). Designing products with added emotional value; development and application of an approach for research through design. *The Design Journal*, 4(1), 32-47.
- Ekman, P. (1994). Strong evidence for universals in facial expressions: a reply to Russell's mistaken critique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 268-287.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W.V. (1975). *Unmasking the face: A guide to recognizing emotions from facial cues*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W.V. (1978). *Facial Action Coding System: A technique for the measurement of facial movement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Ettcoff, N.L., & Magee, J.J. (1992). Categorical perception of facial expressions. *Cognition*, 44, 227-240.
- Hirschman, E.C., & Holbrook, M.B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: Emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46, 92-101.
- Izard, C.E. (1979). *The Maximally Discriminative Facial Movement Coding System (MAX)*. Newark: Instructional Resources Centre, University of Delaware.
- Johnstone, T., & Scherer, K.R. (2001). Vocal communication of emotion. In M. Lewis & J.M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions (2nd ed.)* (pp. 220-235). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kaiser, S., & Wehrle, T. (2001). Facial expressions as indicator of appraisal processes. In K. Scherer, A. Schorr, & T. Johnstone (Eds.), *Appraisal processes in emotion* (pp. 285-300). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lang, P.J. (1985). *The cognitive psychophysiology of emotion: anxiety and the anxiety disorders*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Picard, R.W. (2000). Towards computer that recognize and respond to user emotion. *IBM Systems Journal*, 39(3&4).
- Titchener, E.B. (1908). *Lectures on the elementary psychology of feeling and attention*. New York: Macmillan.