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INTRODUCTION

1965 Silver Cloud Rolls Royce

On the contrary, cosmetic research focuses chiefly in one sense in isolation. Furthermore, cross-cultural studies are subject to esoteric phenomena and are only tasted in regard to visual effects (Latto, 1995). In order to unveil potential aesthetic primitives of our body, it would be useful to study complex stimuli that stimulate more than one sense at the time, i.e., Compound stimulation, and that can exhibit behavior.

This project aimed at investigating whether aesthetic preferences for aspects of behavioral function exist in compound situations.

RATIONALE

In order to unveil potential aesthetic primitives of our body, it would be useful to study complex stimuli that stimulate more than one sense at the time, i.e., compound stimulation, and that can exhibit behavior.

This project aimed at investigating whether aesthetic preferences for aspects of behavioral function exist in compound situations.

Experiments

Stimuli:

Interactive Objects (IOs)
The IOs are artificial physical artefacts that exhibit autonomous behavioral function handled:

Size: Bigger is better

Shape: Smooth curvature effect

Angular

Curved

Texture:

Surface

Behavior

Soft

Smooth/soft

Emit a light

Envy

Quaintness

Procedure

The novelty of exploration Carbon & Jakesch (2013)

Stage 1

Qualitative investigation (finding the dimensions)

175 participants

Hypothetical, emotionally, and physically

24 synonyms and antonyms paired to define dimensions, e.g., "smooth" and "rough" (sphere)

Differences in disagreement but not in the qualitative tactile interaction due to the object without any manipulation

To gather features from the novel objects are globalization and internationalization into a hypertextual judgment (touch the object, manipulate the tactile elements such as tiles, feel the texture) to 1) evaluate the cognitive and emotional aspect and 2) aesthetics emotion in the touch and now

Stage 2

Quantitative investigation

146 participants

2/3 girls, 1/3 boys

2500 cm²

The future English

Feedback:

Arousal: Novelty

Conclusions

Behavior influences ratings more than any other objective characteristic: may it be considered as an aesthetic primitive in Latto (1995)'s terms?

Three interpretations:

1) Novelty: Humphrey (1972) showed that the "interesting" dimension is mainly being driven by novelty. Objects more interesting are, in general, more pleasant. However, besides measuring the effect of "interestingness" versus "surprisingness", participants were explicitly requested to rate the objects in terms of "relieving--difficult" and "comfortable--painful". A surprising sensory effect purely on arousal or novelty would predict the effect of the former but not of the latter dimensions.

2) Arousal: Moving stimuli attract attention and arousal more than static stimuli (Franconeri & Simons, 2007) and aesthetic positively correlates with arousal (Marković, 2012). IOs' reaction to the user can be intended, in some way, as moving stimuli. It can be therefore hypothesised that IOs enhance arousal and this improves the aesthetic experience.

3) Feedback: Another possible interpretation may be that the objects produce behaviour in opposition to the action of the participants. They activated when picked up and stopped when put down. If this were the case, they could be argued that objects have actively "interacted" with the participants, "acknowledging" that they have been touched by them. The feedback might work as a reward that is positively evaluated.

Is the smoothness effect a genuine preference for curvature?

a) Angular objects display behaviours are preferred over angular quotient objects.

b) The difference between the preferences for smooth and sharp contours reduces when objects display behaviours.

c) It is reasonable to assume that a threatening (because sharp) quotient object would be even more threatening if it displays a behavior when picked up. But this was not found.

Hence, this result supports the hypothesis that the smooth curvature effect is a genuine preference for curvature as suggested by Palumbo, Ruta, & Bertamini (2015) and not a "dislike" for angularly shaped.