
LEVEL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN EMOTIONS GENERATED BY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND HUMAN EVALUATION: A METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL

A PREPRINT

✉ **Miguel Carrasco***
Facultad de Ingeniería y Ciencias
Universidad Adolfo Ibañez
Santiago, Chile
miguel.carrasco@uai.cl

✉ **César González-Martín[†]**
Faculty of Education Sciences and Psychology
University of Cordoba
cesar.gonzalez@uco.es

✉ **Sonia Navajas-Torrente**
Faculty of Law, Economics and Business
University of Cordoba

Raúl Dastres
Facultad de Ingeniería y Ciencias
Universidad Adolfo Ibañez
Santiago, Chile

October 10, 2024

ABSTRACT

Images are capable of conveying emotions, but emotional experience is highly subjective. Advances in artificial intelligence have enabled the generation of images based on emotional descriptions. However, the level of agreement between the generative images and human emotional responses has not yet been evaluated. To address this, 20 artistic landscapes were generated using StyleGAN2-ADA. Four variants evoking positive emotions (contentment, amusement) and negative emotions (fear, sadness) were created for each image, resulting in 80 pictures. An online questionnaire was designed using this material, in which 61 observers classified the generated images. Statistical analyses were performed on the collected data to determine the level of agreement among participants, between the observers' responses, and the AI's generated emotions. A generally good level of agreement was found, with better results for negative emotions. However, the study confirms the subjectivity inherent in emotional evaluation.

Keywords Agreement · Emotion · Generative Neural Networks

1 Introduction

An image serves as a means of communication, conveying a message capable of evoking emotions based on the intention behind its creation Lyu et al. [2021]. To ensure the accurate interpretation of the message by the observer, it is essential to implement a well-designed visual strategy. This strategy serves as a channel to elicit both conscious and unconscious emotional reactions, which manifest physiologically Li et al. [2021a] and psychologically Hess et al. [2016], Lin and Li [2023], Sharma and Bhattacharyya [2021]. However, one of the main challenges in studying emotions is the subjective nature of emotional responses to experiences, which can vary significantly between individuals Zhao et al. [2022a]. Therefore, reaching a significant agreement between individuals is complex Eser and Aksu [2022], and even more so between generative artificial intelligence and humans.

In addition to subjectivity, other factors affect the correct experience that produces the emotional response, such as the observer's socio-cultural context Ali et al. [2017], their experience Joshi et al. [2011], Lim [2016], Redies et al.

*Corresponding author: personal webpage: <http://mlcarrasco.github.io>

[†]Corresponding author

[2020], Russell [2017], the temporal evolution of the emotion or the location of the image Zhao et al. [2022b], which can produce unexpected reactions Peng et al. [2015] contrary to the initial purpose in visual creation.

These factors pose a challenge for emotion categorization. For this reason, psychology has developed Categorical Emotion States (CES) or discrete models, which identify basic emotions, as proposed by Ekman or Mikels. In contrast, the multi-dimensional model (DES) Wood et al. [2018] categorizes emotions based on valence, which defines pleasure; arousal, ranging from excitement to calm; and dominance, the degree of control. In this model, emotions are often binarized as positive or negative, although sometimes a neutral category is included Wang et al. [2022], Zhao et al. [2022a].

The complexity of the relationship between visual objects and emotions, along with the ongoing quest to understand emotional processes, plays a crucial role in human cognition, communication, and behaviour Lin and Li [2023]. Due to the neurophysiological responses triggered by everyday situations or mental processes such as memories, imagination, or beliefs Li et al. [2021a], this has become a broad field of neuroscience research, focused on the analysis and recognition of emotions Suhaimi et al. [2020], as well as in psychology Egger et al. [2019], Lin and Li [2023], education Imani and Montazer [2019], and health Hasnul et al. [2021]. A wide range of methodologies has been employed Khare et al. [2024], including speech analysis Al-Dujaili and Ebrahimi-Moghadam [2023], facial expressions Leong et al. [2023], body movement Ebdali et al. [2022], thermal measurements Fardian et al. [2022], text analysis Kusal et al. [2022], as well as movies Almeida et al. [2021], music Han et al. [2022], and multimodal approaches Pan et al. [2023].

In addition to these areas, the field of computer science, especially computer vision, has taken an interest in art as an object of study for the analysis of emotions, in visual emotion analysis Zhao et al. [2020], emotion recognition Ahmed et al. [2023], Dzedzickis et al. [2020] or Affective image content analysis Ali et al. [2017], Zhao et al. [2022a], where the denotative elements of the image, known as low-level, local or handcrafted features Bianco et al. [2019], Cetinic et al. [2018], Dewan and Thepade [2020], Wang et al. [2019], Zhao et al. [2014], such as textures Abry et al. [2013], Guo et al. [2022], Kelishadrokhki et al. [2023], Liu et al. [2018a], shapes Lu et al. [2012] or colour Priya and Divya [2020], Bianco et al. [2019], Kang et al. [2018], Peng et al. [2014], are identified and analyzed. Semantics are typically referred to as high-level or global features Ali et al. [2017], Li et al. [2014], Machajdik and Hanbury [2010], Redies et al. [2020], Tu et al. [2023], Zhao et al. [2019, 2022a]. In this context, research has focused on the analysis and classification of aesthetic aspects Fekete et al. [2022], Joshi et al. [2011], places Ali et al. [2017], and emphasis and harmony Zhao et al. [2014], which involves an analysis of several characteristics of the image. In some cases, the relationships between attributes or compositions have been studied, known as mid-level or semi-local features Fernando et al. [2014], Gordo [2015], Machajdik and Hanbury [2010], Zhu et al. [2017].

Thus, studies can be found by analyzing abstract art Alameda-Pineda et al. [2016], He and Zhang [2018], Sartori et al. [2015] and oriental art Hung [2018], Li et al. [2021b], Tian et al. [2020], Wang et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2021], cubist art Ginosar et al. [2014], figurative art Hagtvedt et al. [2008], artwork from various cultures Stamatopoulou and Cupchik [2017], photography Joshi et al. [2011], Štampfl et al. [2023], Yang et al. [2019], and public art Tian et al. [2022], painting in general Bianco et al. [2019], Kang et al. [2018], Tashu and Horváth [2021], drawing Yin et al. [2016], comics She et al. [2019], portraits of different artistic styles Yang et al. [2019] and techniques Guo et al. [2022], or investigating whether there are differences between disciplines Yang et al. [2019], or using the title of the work or the author Sartori et al. [2015], Tashu and Horváth [2021].

Nowadays, in addition to the field of automatic emotion recognition, there is a growing development of generative artificial intelligence (AI) capable of creating images based on emotional input (e.g., prompts) Sivasathiya et al. [2024]. This development has highlighted the need for additional processing to validate the generated content Hajarolasvadi et al. [2020]. Validation can be conducted by considering various aspects of the images, including visual elements such as formats, color, textures, and connotative elements like meaning or intrinsic emotions. Our research focuses on the emotional validation of images generated by AI. Thus, the research hypothesis investigates whether images created through generative processes with a specified emotion align with human emotional responses to a significant degree.

Given this need, and to the best of our knowledge, no previous studies are conducting statistical analyses on the level of agreement between emotions generated by generative artificial intelligence and human judgment, this research proposes a methodology to address this issue. It has been developed in three phases: In the data preparation phase, the Artemis dataset was used to train the generative model StyleGAN2-ADA. In the modelling phase, 20 landscape images were generated, with four variants for each image—two expressing positive emotions and two expressing negative emotions—resulting in a total of 80 images. Finally, in the evaluation phase, an online questionnaire was designed using this set of images, where 61 individuals classified the images according to their emotions. Subsequently, various statistical analyses were conducted to establish the degree of agreement among individuals, including Krippendorff's Alpha, the mode of the individuals and the AI using precision, recall, F1-Score, and Fisher's test, and proportion analysis with Jaccard's index and Fisher's test.

In summary, this research proposes the following results and their validation. The following description does not constitute a methodology but rather outlines the results, as the methodology will be reviewed in subsequent sections:

- Construction of a dataset composed of 80 generated images, artificially categorized into four emotional groups, accomplished using the StyleGAN-ADA2 tool.
- Evaluation among participants for each image to establish a baseline for comparison.
- Comparison between the mode of participants' responses and the emotions generated by AI.
- Evaluation of each individual's response to emotions generated by AI.
- Analysis of the proportions that align with AI-generated emotions.
- Evaluation of the hypothesis, contributing to the field of generative AI, as to our knowledge, no prior studies are measuring the consistency and level of agreement between AI-generated content and human perception.

2 Background

Image generation using computational techniques has experienced significant advancements in recent years. Traditional methods, such as rule-based image processing and image synthesis techniques, have evolved into more sophisticated approaches that rely on machine learning and convolutional neural networks. This transformation is largely attributed to the rapid progress in AI, driven by the continuous generation of large-scale data. Consequently, this advancement has led to the development of considerably more accurate and reliable AI models capable of generating images, that are practically indistinguishable from authentic photographs or paintings.

To examine and understand the computational techniques used in image generation, this section focuses on the current state of these techniques, with particular emphasis on generating artistic images. The analysis will be conducted through a comprehensive review of scientific and technical literature, ranging from traditional methods to the most innovative approaches based on machine learning and neural networks.

2.1 Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN)

Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) are one of the types of networks that have stood out in image generation. This type of network has proven useful for completing images from a section of them. The model presented by Google DeepMind in 2016, called PixelRNN van den Oord et al. [2016a], manages to understand the generality of pixel interdependence, being able to predict missing pixels in an image by receiving only a part of it. This type of network has also been used for generating images from natural language text descriptions Mansimov et al. [2015]. This study proposes an attention-based approach, where the model iteratively draws while focusing on the key words of the given description. The results obtained achieve the generation of higher resolution images than those obtained with other approaches, and generate images with a novel scene composition.

A type of neural network perhaps more widely used than Recurrent Networks are Convolutional Neural Networks or CNNs. Using this architecture, it has been possible to generate three-dimensional images of objects from different perspectives, as in the case of the model presented by Dosovitskiy et al. [2015], where by training convolutional networks, they managed to generate images of chairs from different perspectives. Another example of the use of Convolutional Networks is seen in a study conducted by Google DeepMind van den Oord et al. [2016b], where conditional image generation is explored using convolutional networks through PixelCNN. This model is capable of generating a variety of portraits of the same person using different facial expressions, poses, and lighting conditions. Its results are on par with PixelRNN, but it achieves this at a much lower computational cost.

The use of RNNs and CNNs is not mutually exclusive. For instance, a study on a Recurrent Convolutional Encoder-Decoder architecture Yang et al. [2015] demonstrates this integration. In this approach, convolutional networks handle both encoding and decoding, while a recurrent network manages object rotation. This combined strategy effectively synthesizes unseen versions of three-dimensional objects, enabling the generation of images of faces or chairs from various angles.

2.2 Variational Auto-encoders (VAEs)

The architecture known as Variational Auto-encoders has great utility as a generative model. Numerous studies have demonstrated the use of this architecture for image generation, an example of this is the so-called Deep Recurrent Attentive Writer or DRAW Gregor et al. [2015]. This model uses a neural network that combines a spatial attention mechanism, mimicking the way human eyes move to focus on objects, with a self-encoding framework that allows the

construction of complex images. DRAW has managed to obtain realistic results in the generation of various types of images, such as photographs of house numbers, in addition to the classic handwritten numbers.

Another example of the use of variational autoencoders is PixelVAE Gulrajani et al. [2016]. This model has an autoregressive decoder based on PixelCNN van den Oord et al. [2016b], but unlike this, it requires a smaller number of computationally expensive autoregression layers, making it more efficient. Additionally, this model manages to learn latent codes that are more compressed than a traditional VAE, while still capturing most of the non-trivial structures. This model presents comparable and competitive results, depending on the dataset, with other state-of-the-art methods.

PixelVAE++ Sadeghi et al. [2019], a generative model based on PixelVAE, is a VAE with three types of latent variables and, unlike PixelVAE, uses a PixelCNN++ network as a decoder. This model also presents a renewed architecture, where part of the decoder is reused as an encoder. PixelVAE++ presents superior results on the CIFAR-10 dataset compared to other latent variable models.

Maaløe et al. [2019] present BIVA, a bidirectional interface VAE, characterized by a “skip-connected” generative model and an inference network formed by a bidirectional stochastic inference path. This approach achieves good results, on par with other approaches, but proves to be useful not only for image generation but also for anomaly detection.

2.3 Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)

Generative models have a long history. However, it will not be until the development of Deep Learning, that models will achieve significant advances Cao et al. [2023]. Introduced by Goodfellow et al. [2014], generative adversarial networks (GANs) have achieved important results in image processing and have attracted interest from the academic and industrial worlds in various fields of research and applications Alqahtani et al. [2021], Wang et al. [2020]. The most relevant variants for image generation in GANs are conditional (cGANs), deep convolutional (DCGANs), and recurrent adversarial networks Shahriar [2022].

As proposed by Mirza and Osindero [2014], cGANs allow the generation of images conditioned on an additional input, which could be a class label or a reference image. Over the years, new algorithms based on projections Miyato and Koyama [2018] have emerged, considerably improving the performance of trained generators. Odena et al. [2017] proposed a variant of GANs, called Auxiliary Classifier GANs (AC-GANs). In this new variant, each generated sample has its corresponding class label in addition to the input noise, which is used together to generate an image. The discriminator gives both inputs a probability distribution, which means that the objective function has two parts: the log probability that the source is correct, and the log probability that the class is correct. AC-GANs achieve excellent results compared with traditional cGANs.

The ability to condition GANs on a second input opened the door to countless possibilities for this architecture, from something as basic as training the same model to generate cats and dogs, to something that seems futuristic as generating an image from a natural-language text description. An example is the generation of more realistic images from sketches Kuriakose et al. [2020], Liu et al. [2020, 2018b], Philip and Jong [2017].

Meanwhile, Radford et al. [2015] presented Deep Convolutional GANs (DCGANs), a class of GANs that introduce upscaling convolutional layers between the input and output images of the generator, as well as using convolutional networks in the discriminator to determine whether the image is real or fake. One of the indications for stable DCGANs is that pooling layers should be replaced by scaled convolutions or “strided convolutions” in the discriminator and by scaled fractional convolutions or “fractional-strided convolutions”. This alteration of GANs considerably stabilizes the training and generates higher-quality and higher-resolution images than traditional GANs. Given the success of convolutional neural networks (CNNs) in image and video classification in recent years, DCGAN remains a suitable architecture for image-generation applications Shahriar [2022]. The works of Elgammal et al. [2017], Tian et al. [2020] using Style-based can be highlighted.

Style-based architectures in GANs are based on deconstructing high-level feature attributes from low-level features. An example of this type of architecture is StyleGAN Karras et al. [2021], a variant of GANs presented by NVIDIA, which is inspired by the style transfer literature. Its architecture differs from that of traditional GANs by skipping the latent code input layer instead of starting with a learned constant. Given a latent code, a nonlinear network produces a version of a generative image found in a latent space, which then controls the generator through adaptive instance normalization (AdaIN) in each convolutional layer. This revolutionized image generation is owing to its diversity and high realistic capacity Bandi et al. [2023].

This architecture has received updates, such as StyleGAN2 Karras et al. [2020a], implementing progressive growth and regularizing the generator to drive good conditioning in the mapping of latent codes to images. As an alternative, StyleGAN2-ADA Karras et al. [2020b] was released, where an adaptive discriminator augmentation mechanism was implemented that stabilizes training when training with a limited amount of data. These additions yield good results

even with little data. Finally, the latest update, called StyleGAN3 Zhang et al. [2022], implements small changes to the architecture to ensure that unimportant information does not leak into the hierarchical synthesis process. The resulting networks are on par with the StyleGAN2 FID results but vary completely in their internal interpretation and are completely invariant to translation, even at the sub-pixel scale. The results of this latest version of StyleGAN were better for models focused on videos and animations.

Another style-based GAN architecture was presented by Microsoft StyleSwin Zhang et al. [2022]. This variant explores the option of building a generative adversarial network model using pure transformers, in which the proposed generator adopts the Swin transform. This model is scalable to high-resolution images and achieves excellent results with the FFHQ-1024 and CelebA-HQ 1024 datasets.

On the other hand, one of the challenges that have been addressed in recent years is the generation of new artistic images or those with a different meaning from the original image. Given their performance and good results, GANs have enabled the generation of new images from class labels Mirza and Osindero [2014], Odena et al. [2017] and the synthesis of text descriptions Reed et al. [2016], Xu et al. [2018], Zhang et al. [2017, 2019], which allows the generation of completely new artworks that represent feelings and emotions indicated from text or as classes when training the model.

2.4 Art Generation using GANs

The emergence of GANs had a significant impact on the generation of artistic works, whether transforming photographic images into paintings or generating completely new works. Nakano et al. Nakano [2019] present "Neural Painters", a generative model of brush strokes learned from a real, non-differentiable, and non-deterministic program. They propose a method to "motivate" an agent to paint using more human-like brush strokes when reconstructing digits. Huang et al. [2019] presents a method to teach machines to paint like humans, who are capable of using small brush strokes to achieve excellent results in their paintings. The goal of their model is to decompose the original image into different brush strokes and then recreate them on the canvas. To mimic the human painting process, the agent is trained to predict the next brush stroke based on the current state of the canvas and the reference image to be painted.

A challenge that has been worked on in recent years is the generation of new artistic images or images with a different meaning from the original. The emergence of GANs Goodfellow et al. [2014] and the popularity they have gained in recent years, given their performance and good results, definitely show potential to achieve this goal. GANs have allowed the generation of new images from class labels Mirza and Osindero [2014], Odena et al. [2017] and by synthesizing text descriptions Reed et al. [2016], Xu et al. [2017], Zhang et al. [2017, 2018a], which would allow the generation of completely new artistic works that represent feelings and emotions indicated in the form of text or as classes when training new models. Zhang et al. [2018b] present an approach for generating artistic works with a specific artistic genre, based on the content text given by the user. They build an input and output system called "AI Painting", which consists of three parts: the content, which is an object or scene written in natural language; a word for aesthetic effect, for example, cheerful or depressive; and an artistic genre, for example, impressionism or suprematism. The workflow of this method consists of four steps: 1) generate an image based on the natural language content input using StackGAN++ Zhang et al. [2018a]; 2) modify the image to include the specified aesthetic effect; 3) transfer the image to the corresponding genre using neural style transfer; 4) illustrate the painting process in a short video.

Li et al. [2020] present a method for generating abstract paintings. Using the WikiArt dataset and a k-means algorithm that automatically finds the optimal value of k for color segmentation, they manage to divide each painting into color blocks. Then the image segmented by color blocks is used as a real input image to the discriminator, teaching the generator to paint abstract images with color blocks.

Lisi et al. [2020] introduce a new cGAN training method, which allows the generation of samples from a sequence of distributions. The training was carried out with paintings from a series of artistic movements, which represented a different distribution. Discoveries in each distribution can be used by cGANs to predict "future" paintings. The experiments demonstrate that this training is capable of generating accurate predictions of future art, using paintings from the past as a training dataset.

Özgen and Ekenel [2020] investigated the generation of artistic works in a varied dataset, which includes images with variations in color, shapes, and content. This variation present in the dataset provides originality, which is very important for artistic creation and its essence. One of the main characteristics of this model is that, instead of using phrases as descriptive input, keywords are used. They propose a sequential architecture of GANs, which first processes the given description and creates a base image, while the following stages focus on creating high-resolution artistic-style images without worrying about working with word vectors.

As can be observed, numerous proposals have emerged over the years aimed at generating artistic works using computational techniques. This ongoing research has led to remarkable results, including paintings that are often indistinguishable from real works. However, while some approaches consider emotions in the generation of artistic works Zhang et al. [2018b], Bossett et al. [2021], there are relatively few studies that focus primarily on emotions as the central aspect of the generation process.

3 Materials and Methods

The research was divided into three stages: (1) data preparation, (2) modelling, and (3) evaluation. To provide an overview, we explain each of them in the in-depth process, which is reflected in Fig.1. The first phase consisted of data preparation. This process begins with the selection of artworks associated with the landscape category. It is important to note that owing to the type of training of the algorithm, each artwork must be associated with one or more emotions according to an emotional model (which in this case is discrete; Lang et al. [2020]). This allows the generative art algorithm to be trained using a specific output class. Second, the modelling phase consisted of 20 landscapes generated by StyleGAN2-ADA tool. Each of these images was associated with one of the four predefined emotions during the training process, corresponding to contentment, amusement, sadness, and fear. In total, 80 images (20 landscape versions of their four emotions) were generated, which were individually evaluated by 61 individuals (33 males, 28 females). Each participant classified each image into one of four emotional categories. The evaluation is blind; that is, the evaluators do not know the emotional category generated by the computer in advance, thus ensuring the independence of the experiment between the evaluator and the generative computational tool. Next, we present each stage in detail at a specific level and the intermediate steps associated with each stage (see Fig. 2).




Figure 1: General scheme of the evaluation process of emotions generated by a generative neural. The method comprises three stages: data preparation, modelling and evaluation.

3.1 Data Preparation

This process involves image extraction and selection with certain emotions and categories. Artemis dataset Achlioptas et al. [2021] was used, which is composed of 80,031 records obtained from the WikiArt dataset Mohammad and Kiritchenko [2018]. Artemis has five records for each artwork: (1) artistic style, (2) artwork, (3) emotion declared by the annotator, (4) explanation by the annotator, and (5) number of annotators who participated in that work. Each record




Figure 2: Proposed methodology for emotion evaluation generated by a generative network. Within each stage, there are multiple sub-stages dedicated to image development and evaluation.

had at least five annotators (evaluators) who defined nine types of emotions per image, corresponding to anger, disgust, fear, and sadness as negative emotions and amusement, awe, contentment, and excitement as positive emotions. In total, Artemis collected 454,684 explanatory statements and emotional responses. Although Artemis has ten categories of artistic styles, we used only the landscape category to reduce the level of figuration and identify stimuli and contextual information Dubal et al. [2014], Zhang et al. [2011] in the identification of emotions for an observer. Thus, 13,358 records in this category were included.

The emotional categories of Artemis are discrete Lang et al. [2020], which means that it is possible to determine the predominant emotion, defined as the one with the highest frequency of votes for a given record. However, some artworks do not have a predominant emotion. Therefore, some records were discarded for our analysis. This occurs when there are few evaluations for a given work, and/or several of them have the same frequency (the same number of votes). Thus, the dataset was reduced to 9,750 valid records in this study.

Finally, because all the records in Artemis have the name of the work, we used this information to download the images in RGB format from the WikiArt dataset using a web scraping technique Hassan and Hijazi [2018]. The next process of training the StyleGAN2 ADA neural network was performed using the set of images.

3.2 Modelling

As we have previously discussed, despite the existence of different style transfer tools Cai et al. [2023], we have selected StyleGAN2-ADA since related research indicates that this tool generates good results with a reduced amount of training data Karras et al. [2020a]. This tool has been configured to generate landscape images of the following four emotions: contentment, amusement, fear, and sadness. According to these categories, it is possible to group into positive emotions (contentment and amusement) and negative emotions (fear, sadness). The emotions that have been discarded are astonishment, excitement, anger, and disgust. In the case of astonishment, this can be seen positively and negatively, which would produce a certain ambiguity in its perception Lu et al. [2016]. The other discarded emotions were excitement, anger, and disgust since they could be subordinate to the selected set, therefore they presented within one of the quadrants of a continuous emotional model Russell and Mehrabian [1974]. For this reason, we have finally considered the four emotional categories described above (contentment, amusement, fear, sadness). Furthermore, from the point of view of the continuous emotional scale (CES) Mohammad and Kiritchenko [2018] we observe that

the selected emotional categories are situated in each of the quadrants of valence and arousal, thus facilitating their differentiation from other similar emotions.

To carry out the training process, we have grouped the images into the four emotional categories described above. The selected images have been pre-processed by reducing their size to 256x256 pixels to be compatible with the training of the neural network. This tool has been configured on a virtual machine with an NVIDIA Tesla T4 graphics card and the Linux operating system, using the Ubuntu 18.04 LTS distribution. Within the operating system, the StyleGAN2-ADA-Pytorch GitHub repository has been cloned and a Python 3.8 virtual environment has been created. The training process was completed in 4 days 6 hours and 58 minutes. In this way, the generative art tool generated 20 landscape images, with their four emotional variants (contentment, amusement, sadness, and fear), thus achieving a total set of 80 images (see examples in Fig.3).




Figure 3: Examples of artistic works generated by the StyleGAN2 ADA tool are based on a landscape dataset with four emotional categories. All images are completely new, and there are no existing similar ones in the training set.

3.3 Image voting by emotion

The next step of this research consists of the evaluation of each of the images generated in the previous phase. For this, a form was designed using the Google Form platform, where demographic data was collected regarding age, gender, nationality, level of education and area of knowledge. For the latter, we followed the classification of knowledge area proposed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD [2015]. In the same form, the automatically generated landscapes were presented in their four emotional versions (80 in total) randomly, so as not to influence the evaluators by any pre-established order. Participants had to indicate one emotion out of the four options (contentment, amusement, fear, sadness) for each version of the landscape. The form was available in English and Spanish from October 30 to November 30, 2023. The average age of the evaluators was 30 years ($std = 7$) with a median of 24 years, with a minimum of 18 years, and a maximum of 55 years. Regarding gender, 33 participants declared themselves as male and 28 as female. There were no participants who indicated belonging to another gender (non-binary, or no information). About the area of study, 35% of the participants declared being associated with the area of engineering and technology, 29% with the area of social sciences. The areas of humanities and natural sciences together represent only 11%. Finally, 70% of the participants declared belonging to the group of graduate or postgraduate as the highest level of education attained. The remaining 30% are grouped into students who have obtained a professional or high school degree (see indicators in Fig.4).




Figure 4: Sociodemographic data of study participants: boxplot age, gender male, female, country, area of study, highest level of study obtained. More information about the groupings used in the study will be reviewed in the results section.

3.4 Evaluation

Finally, with the data obtained in the previous phase, a statistical analysis has been carried out to evaluate three aspects: the agreement between evaluators, the agreement between the participants (mode) and the generative tool, and a comparative analysis of the agreement reached between different groups of observers and the generative tool. This analysis has been carried out on the 80 images in the four emotional categories (contentment, amusement, fear, sadness). Additionally, the same analysis grouped into positive (contentment and amusement) and negative (fear and sadness) categories.

3.4.1 Agreement between evaluators

This process consists of analyzing the inter-rater agreement among the survey participants when emotionally classifying the images generated by the generative tool to measure the agreement between them. For this, we use Krippendorff's Alpha coefficient (Krippendorff [2004]), which evaluates the level of agreement between observers or participants in assigning categories to a data set. Unlike other indicators, it can be calculated for more than two evaluators, with different types of variables and metrics, in the case of missing data and for small samples Eser and Aksu [2022], Hayes and Krippendorff [2007], Volkman et al. [2019]. This step aims to assess whether images produced by the generative tool elicit consistent responses across all participants. This will serve as a proxy to analyze the agreement between each participant and the generative tool itself.

3.4.2 Agreement between mode and SG2-ADA

For the evaluation of the agreement between the participants and the generative tool, three aspects are analyzed: the inter-rater agreement, the fisher test and the confusion matrix. In this case, the inter-rater agreement is calculated




Figure 5: Evaluation process and agreement between mode and the StyleGAN2 ADA tool. Each votes on each of the images. Then the mode is calculated for each image to obtain the representative emotion of each image which is compared with the emotional label generated by the generative tool.

by taking one of the evaluators as a reference and comparing it with the other observers. Specifically, we take as a reference the label with which the images have been created by the generative tool and compare it with the predominant classification of the participants, that is, with the mode. Therefore, we evaluate the agreement between two evaluators (AI-mode) using Cohen’s Kappa coefficient Cohen [1960], following the recommendations to use more than one concordance index in a study Eser and Aksu [2022]. Unlike Krippendorff’s Alpha coefficient used in the previous section, Cohen’s kappa coefficient only allows the analysis between two evaluators, so, in this case, we will use the mode and the emotional label used to generate the images with the generative tool. In this way, it is feasible to determine -per image- the level of agreement or concordance between the evaluators and the generative tool (see an example of the process in Fig. 5).

On the other hand, we propose in this new methodology the utilization of the confusion matrix, which is habitually used to evaluate the performance of a classification model. The objective of this process is to compare the classification carried out by the participants in the questionnaire of the images into the four emotions with the label assigned by the generative tool. For the construction of the confusion matrix, we define the true class as that class which is generated by the generative tool, and the predicted class as that defined as the mode of the classification of the participants. The precision, recall, and F1 score metrics of the confusion matrix are also calculated to determine the prediction level obtained as if it were a classification problem. With this, we compare the Precision and Recall metrics, obtained from the confusion matrices, for different groups, utilizing Gender (Male-Female), Area of Knowledge (Engineering and Technology - Social Sciences) and Level of Education (Undergraduate-Postgraduate) as segmentation variables through Fisher’s Test. We chose to compare these groups as they constitute the majority of respondents, providing a representative sample for analysis. Furthermore, the Jaccard index is utilized, which allows for the determination of the level of intersection between the exposed results among different data sets Costa [2021].

3.4.3 Proportion analysis

To evaluate whether the agreement reached in the classification of the images between the participants (mode) and the AI is similar for the images that represent the same emotion, the proportion of agreement is calculated concerning the emotion chosen by the participants (mode) and the emotional label that was provided to the generative tool for each of the 80 images. First, the percentage of agreement is calculated by classifying the images into the four emotional categories, and subsequently, the proportion of agreement is calculated, coding the categories into positive and negative

emotions. Then, in both cases, a proportion comparison test is carried out by Cochran’s Test, using the emotional label with which the images were generated as the grouping variable.

4 Results

The results are presented below according to each of the evaluation stages described in the methodology (Fig.2). In particular, we address the results of agreement, agreement between the IA and individuals and the proportion of agreement.

4.1 Agreement between evaluators

At the level of comparison on the classifications made by the study participants, the results indicate that people do not agree with each other when classifying the images into four emotional categories (contentment, amusement, fear, and sadness). However, when the emotions are dichotomized into positive and negative, the indicator slightly increases according to Krippendorff’s Alpha (see results in Table 1).

Table 1: Level of agreement according to segmentation by group and emotional category

	n	4 category Krippendorff alpha	2 category Krippendorff alpha
All evaluators	61	0.2284	0.452
Female	28	0.2326	0.453
Male	33	0.2216	0.454
Social Science	18	0.2454	¹ 0.490
Engineering and Technology	35	0.2195	0.451
Spain	23	0.2268	0.437
Chile	28	0.2515	¹ 0.472

When analyzing the agreement according to some group segmentation (gender, country, or area of study), we observe slight differences between the different coefficients. The most relevant level of agreement occurs in the group of the social science knowledge area with the dichotomous emotions (0.4900), followed by the grouping by nationality (Chile 0.4721) (see Table 1).

4.2 Agreement between mode and generative IA

This section analyzes the agreement between participant responses and the output of the generative tool (StyleGAN2-ADA). For this, we use the mode of the evaluators’ classifications and the emotion used to generate the images.

Assuming that the emotion generated by the generative tool corresponds to the actual (or true) class, we analyze the precision, recall and F1 score of the obtained data to quantify the level of agreement in the classifications for each group of evaluators and the generative tool. The results reveal important differences according to the group and the emotional category. As stated in Table 2, the best classification results were obtained for the Fear category in most groups, however, the performance changes according to the group analyzed. For example, in the female group, an F1-score=0.76 was obtained, and in the same emotional category, we achieved an F1-score=0.89 for the postgraduate group. The above indicates that by maintaining the same emotional category, different groups of segmentation obtain different performances. In the opposite direction, we observe that for the emotional category contentment, there is a lower level of classification for all groups analyzed. The above could indicate that for individuals it is more complex to classify a positive emotion over a negative one. On the other hand, when the emotions are binarized into positive and negative categories, we obtain a high performance in general. However, in some cases, it is observed that the detection of positive emotions is more difficult than negative emotions (see Table 3). To further analyze the statistical differences, we analyze this point in the following section.

We analyze whether there are significant differences in the agreement between the participants (mode) and the AI when classifying the images (in four categories and two categories) between participants groups: men-women, engineering-social sciences, and graduate-postgraduates. To do this, we compare the precision and recall of the confusion matrices (Table 2 and Table 3) using Fisher’s Test. When the precision of the confusion matrices is compared, the results show that there are only significant differences in the case of the ‘Sadness’ emotion. Specifically, precision is higher for men (p -value=0.007), for individuals in the ‘Engineering and Technology’ area of knowledge at a 10% significance level

Table 2: Level of agreement according to segmentation by group and emotional category

Genre	Female $n = 28$			Male $n = 33$		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Contentment	0.58	0.7	0.64	0.67	0.8	0.73
Amusement	0.81	0.65	0.72	0.94	0.75	0.83
Fear	0.82	0.7	0.76	0.89	0.85	0.87
Sadness	0.65	0.75	0.7	0.76	0.8	0.78
OCDE study area	Social Science $n=17$			Engineering and Tech. $n=34$		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Contentment	0.56	0.7	0.62	0.67	0.8	0.73
Amusement	0.76	0.65	0.7	0.88	0.75	0.81
Fear	0.76	0.65	0.7	0.86	0.9	0.88
Sadness	0.62	0.65	0.63	0.89	0.8	0.84
Country	Spain $n= 23$			Chile $n=28$		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Contentment	0.57	0.65	0.6	0.71	0.85	0.77
Amusement	0.71	0.6	0.65	0.94	0.8	0.86
Fear	0.88	0.7	0.78	0.95	0.9	0.92
Sadness	0.62	0.75	0.68	0.8	0.8	0.8
Study level	Postgraduate			Graduate		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Contentment	0.54	0.70	0.61	0.62	0.75	0.68
Amusement	0.71	0.50	0.59	0.75	0.75	0.75
Fear	0.94	0.85	0.89	0.84	0.8	0.82
Sadness	0.73	0.80	0.76	0.82	0.7	0.76

(p -value=0.07), and for graduates (p -value=0.042) at 5% (see Table 4), showing that these groups coincide to a greater extent with the AI.

If emotions are dichotomized into positive and negative, and different groups are compared, the results show that there are no significant differences in precision in any case (p -value>0.1) (see Table 5).

As we can observe in Table 6, the comparison of Recall for the different groups shows that there are only statistically significant differences in the classification of images of the 'Fear' emotion between the two categories of the 'Area of Knowledge' variable at 10%, with Recall being higher for the 'Engineering and Technology' group (p -value=0.064).

The results in the case of the dichotomous Emotion variable show that there are no significant differences in Recall in any case (p -value>0.1) (Table 7).

To further analyze the results, we use the Jaccard index, which allows us to evaluate the level of intersection between the participants' responses for the image generated by the generative tool. The results of this indicator point to relevant differences between four emotional categories versus two emotional categories (positive and negative). It is observed that there is a greater intersection between the responses of the participants in two categories compared to four emotional categories. This is because there is greater agreement with the emotion expressed by the generative tool when the emotional categories are positive and negative. On the contrary, when we increase the number of emotions, users do not reflect an agreement with what is expressed by the tool. These results are consistent with those previously obtained in Tables 2 and 3.

A relevant result is shown in the Social Science group, where the highest level of agreement with the generative tool is obtained for two emotions (70.08%). The same situation occurs for the participants from Chile, reaching 70.18% agreement with the tool. In general, a 68.49% agreement is obtained between all participants and the generative tool only when we binarize the emotions. This result drops to 37.06% when we have four emotional categories (Table 8).

To visualize the most relevant results at the intersection level, Figures 6 and 7 illustrate all the images that obtained a percentage lower than 75% in the Jaccard index with the generative tool. As can be seen in Fig. 6, there is indiscriminate disagreement in both positive and negative images for both male and female genders, however, the proportion of correct answers is more balanced between positive emotions (contentment and amusement) and negative (fear and sadness).

Table 3: Level of agreement according to segmentation by group and emotional category

Genre	Female $n = 28$			Male $n = 33$		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Positive	0.91	0.97	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.95
Negative	0.97	0.9	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.95
OCDE study area	Social Science $n=17$			Engineering and Tech. $n=34$		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Positive	0.91	0.97	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.96
Negative	0.97	0.9	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.96
Country	Spain $n= 23$			Chile $n=28$		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Positive	0.89	0.97	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Negative	0.97	0.88	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.93
Study level	Postgraduate			Graduate		
Emotion	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Positive	0.95	0.93	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.96
Negative	0.93	0.95	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.96

Table 4: Comparison of the accuracy of the 4 emotions between different groups (Fisher’s test).

Emotion	Male-Female	Eng.Tech. - Social Sciences	Graduate-Postgraduate
$p\text{-value}^1$			
Contentment	0.383	0.319	0.37
Amusement	0.3	0.328	0.56
Fear	0.445	0.492	0.323
Sadness	0.007***↑	0.070*↑	0.042**↑

Regarding the classifications with an agreement above 90% to the emotion generated by the generative tool, differences are observed between the gender categories, although there is one image with the Fear emotion associated, which achieved 100% accuracy in the classification (Fig. 7).

To conclude the study in this section, we analyze the level of agreement using Cohen’s kappa coefficient (Table 9). Recall that in this process we work with the mode and the emotional label used by the generative tool as evaluators. Following Landis and Koch (Landis and Koch [1977]), the results show an almost perfect agreement using the mode of all observers in the binarized emotional category ($k=0.88$). This coefficient is repeated in the grouping of Chilean nationality and the area of knowledge in Engineering and Social sciences.

With the four emotional categories, the coefficients are more disparate, reaching in most cases a substantial level of agreement, except in the grouping of Spanish nationality and the area of social science study, which would be within the moderate agreement Landis and Koch [1977]. The highest percentage of agreement is obtained by the Chilean nationality grouping ($k=0.78$, Table 9).

4.3 Analysis of proportions

This section aims to investigate whether the proportion of participants agreeing with the generative tool (SD-ADA2 GAN) remains consistent across different images. Specifically, we examine if this proportion remains invariant when individuals categorize the 20 images that share the same ground truth label (generative tool). To achieve this, we first quantify the percentage of participants who agree with the AI’s classifications for each of the 80 images. Subsequently, we conduct Cochran’s Test to ascertain if statistically significant differences exist among the images generated with the same emotional label.

We represent in Fig. 10 the percentage of individuals who have agreed with the AI when classifying the image with the emotional label “contentment”. As we can observe, more than 60% of the participants have selected the actual label in 10 of the 20 images. There is also diversity in the agreement, with image 15 version 4 being the one in which more individuals agree with the AI, specifically 79%. In contrast to this percentage, and at the other extreme, only 15% of

Table 5: Comparison of the accuracy of positive/negative emotions between different groups (Fisher’s test).

Emotion	<i>p-value</i>		
	Male-Female	Eng.Tech. - Social Sciences	Graduate-Postgraduate
Negative	0.683	0.74	0.327
Positive	0.512	0.361	0.673

Table 6: Comparison of the Recall of the four emotions between different groups (Fisher’s test).

Emotion	<i>p-value</i>		
	Male-Female	Eng.Tech. - Social Sciences	Graduate-Postgraduate
Contentment	0.358	0.358	0.5
Amusement	0.366	0.366	0.1
Fear	0.255	0.064*↑	0.5
Sadness	0.5	0.366	0.358

participants agree with the AI when classifying image 7 version 1. We can affirm that these differences are statistically significant ($p\text{-value}<0.001$. See Table 10).

In the case of the images that the AI has generated with the label “Amusement”, as observed in Fig. 11, it seems that the percentage of people who agree with the AI is, in general, lower than for the emotion “Contentment”, reaching a proportion greater than 0.6 in only 3 of the 20 images. Although, at first glance, it may seem that the percentages do not differ so much among them, we find significant differences when comparing the proportions with Cochran’s Test ($p\text{-value}<0.001$. See Table 10).

The emotion “Fear” seems to reach a higher agreement, since there are 11 images in which more than 60% individuals have chosen the emotion with which they had been generated, reaching 75% in two of them. However, we also find very low percentages (15% and 16%) for two of the images (Fig.12). Again, there are significant differences when comparing the proportions ($p\text{-value}<0.001$. See Table 10).

Finally, analyzing the emotion “Sadness”, we observe in Fig. 13 that more than 60% of participants agree with the AI when classifying 8 of the 20 images. As has happened with the other emotions, the differences between the proportions are statistically significant ($p\text{-value}<0.001$. See Table 10).

To sum, the results expressed in Table 10 indicate that the proportion of people who agree with the generative tool is not similar for the different images, not even when we compare the classification of images generated for the same emotion ($p\text{-value}<0.001$). Analyzing the proportion of agreement when the emotion variable is dichotomous (negative/positive), there is also no similar percentage for images labelled with the same emotion (Table 11).

5 Discussion

The technological development of artificial intelligence has been exponential in recent years, and the advances in using this tool for analyzing emotional aspects across various fields of knowledge have been significant Cao et al. [2023]. However, to the best of our knowledge, we have not found studies that analyze the level of agreement between the emotions generated by generative artificial intelligence tools and human assessments. Closely related to this issue is the research conducted by Lopatovska (Lopatovska [2016]), which focuses on works created by humans.

For this reason, we propose a novel methodology that begins with training a model using artworks catalogued by emotions from the Artemis dataset Achlioptas et al. [2021] to generate 20 landscape images. For each image, four emotional variants were created (contentment, amusement, sadness, and fear), which can be grouped into positive (contentment and amusement) and negative (sadness and fear) categories by dichotomizing the problem Wang [2022], Zhao et al. [2022b], resulting in a total of 80 images. Using this dataset, an online questionnaire was designed to understand human emotional appreciation, obtaining 61 responses (33 male and 28 female) from participants across different countries, educational levels, and fields of study.

Using the obtained data, different analyses were conducted to address the research hypothesis regarding whether images created by generative processes with a specific emotion align with human emotional responses.

First, the agreement among evaluators regarding their emotional classifications of the AI-generated images was examined. For this purpose, Krippendorff’s Alpha coefficient was utilized. According to Krippendorff Krippendorff [2004], the results indicate a fair level of agreement among the evaluators, with segmentation across the four emotional

Table 7: Comparison of positive/negative emotion recall between different groups (Fisher’s test).

Emotion	Male-Female	<i>p-value</i>	
		Eng.Tech. - Social Sciences	Graduate-Postgraduate
Negative	0.5	0.338	0.692
Positive	0.692	0.753	0.308

Table 8: Jaccard index results segmented by emotional category and analysis group

	<i>n</i>	4 category	2 category
		Jaccard index	Jaccard index
All evaluators	61	0.3706	0.6849
Female	28	0.3565	0.6735
Male	33	0.3825	0.6947
Social Science	18	0.3645	0.7008
Engineering and Technology	35	0.3795	0.6939
Spain	23	0.344	0.6587
Chile	28	0.4069	0.7018

categories ($\alpha=0.21-0.40$). When emotions are categorized as positive and negative, the index increases, indicating a moderate level of agreement ($\alpha =0.41-0.60$).

A comparative analysis of different agreement indices indicates that Krippendorff’s Alpha tends to yield low values Eser and Aksu [2022]. However, its utilization allows for a more nuanced interpretation of the phenomenon, accommodating more evaluators and various data typologies Kim et al. [2024]. The results obtained with Krippendorff’s Alpha align with findings from other studies on agreement and emotions Antoine et al. [2014], underscoring the high level of subjectivity in emotion classification. However, unlike our experiment, these studies utilize ordinal data. This level of subjectivity is further corroborated in our analysis using Cochran’s Test, as it reveals that the evaluators do not achieve similar proportions when classifying the images, even within the same emotional category.

The following analysis aimed to evaluate the level of agreement for each emotion generated by the generative tool, considering this value as the true representation and comparing it with the mode of the classifications made by the observers.

An analysis of precision, recall, and F1 score reveals that the Fear category achieves the best classification performance across all analyzed groups. Specifically, within the Country segmentation, the Fear category exhibits an F1 score of $= 0.92$. In contrast, certain emotional categories consistently demonstrate lower performance, particularly the Contentment category. This suggests a greater level of concordance between the expressions of the generative tool and user responses when the emotion is negative. When performing the same analysis with binarized emotions, the performance in both cases exceeds 90% for the F1 score. This allows us to conclude that there is an agreement between human assignments and artificially generated images regarding the classification of an image as positive or negative.

Next, Fisher’s Test was employed to determine precision and recall among groups of evaluators. Regarding the four emotion categories used, Sadness consistently yields the most significant differences in precision across all cases: in the male-female grouping (p -value= 0.007), in the comparison between Technical Engineering and Social Sciences (p -value= 0.07), and the education level comparison between undergraduate and postgraduate (p -value= 0.042). In contrast, recall demonstrates statistically significant differences for the Fear emotion within the ‘Engineering and Technology’ knowledge area (p -value= 0.064).

To further analyze the results, the Jaccard index was employed to measure how closely the evaluators’ classifications align with the categories generated by the generative tool. The Chilean national group achieved the highest intersection ($J = 0.7018$), followed by the group from the Social Sciences area ($J = 0.7008$).

Finally, following recommendations to utilize more than one concordance index Eser and Aksu [2022], Cohen’s Kappa index was employed. Unlike Krippendorff’s Alpha, Cohen’s Kappa is limited to analysis involving two evaluators. This limitation was addressed in our research by using the mode and the categories generated by the tool.

Following Landis and Koch Landis and Koch [1977], the agreement results fall within the ‘almost perfect’ range across all groups when emotions are binarized into positive and negative. Among the four emotional categories, the Chilean nationality group achieved the highest agreement index, with a $k=0.7833$, followed by the group from the Engineering area ($k=0.75$). This analysis further indicates that agreement is more clearly achieved when the classification is simplified to positive and negative categories. In summary, it is observed that all indicators improve when the emotional

Table 9: Results of Cohen’s Kappa index segmented by emotional category and group of analysis

	<i>n</i>	4 category Cohen’s Kappa	2 category Cohen’s Kappa
All evaluators	61	0.7	0.875
Female	28	0.616	0.85
Male	33	0.716	0.85
Social Science	18	0.5166	0.85
Engineering and Technology	35	0.75	0.875
Spain	23	0.55	0.8
Chile	28	0.7833	0.875

Table 10: Comparison of proportion of agreement between AI and raters (mode) in the classification of images labelled with the same emotion (Cochran’s test).

Emotion	Contentment	Amusement	Fear	Sadness
<i>p-value</i> ¹	<0.001***	<0.001***	<0.001***	<0.001***

classification problem is reduced to these two categories, a common approach in research on emotion recognition and study Maithri et al. [2022]. This suggests that achieving agreement is more feasible both among evaluators and between the mode of human classification and the emotions generated by the generative tool. Notably, negative emotions yielded the highest levels of agreement in our study. Achieving complete agreement seems complex. Evidence for this is found in the research by Lopatovska Lopatovska [2016], which proposes three methodologies for the emotional classification of works of art created by humans, yet does not achieve a significant level of agreement in any case, even with human classifications.

6 Limitations and future directions

Among the main limitations of this research, the small number of evaluators who responded to the questionnaire stands out, as it constitutes a non-representative sample that hinders the ability to draw significant conclusions regarding the level of agreement on emotions, given their inherent subjectivity.

Additionally, it is recognized that social and cultural context plays a crucial role in emotional appreciation. Therefore, expanding the sample to include participants from more countries would facilitate comparative analyses. Similarly, involving individuals from a broader age range would enhance the comprehensiveness of the analysis.

Another factor to consider is that the generated sample for classification was limited to landscapes, which restricts the number of referential elements that could aid in classifying emotions more distinctly (e.g., faces). Future research should incorporate images with varying levels of representation and different elements, enabling an examination of the level of agreement across different degrees of representation. Furthermore, it would be interesting to investigate the key visual elements influencing emotional classification decisions, following previous research that has analyzed aspects such as color, shapes, and textures.

Finally, our study revealed that images conveying negative emotions were classified more effectively than those depicting positive emotions, suggesting that evaluators perceived negative emotions more clearly. This finding opens up new avenues for research to explore the underlying reasons for this phenomenon.

7 Conclusion

Given the need to validate the content generated by artificial intelligence, this research focuses on emotional validation through statistical analysis of the level of agreement between a set of artificially generated images with associated emotions and the classification of these images by humans.

To achieve this, a methodology was proposed that includes training StyleGAN2-ADA using the Artemis dataset to generate 20 landscape images. For each image, four emotional variants were created (Contentment, Amusement, Fear, and Sadness), which can be grouped into positive and negative emotions. The human classification was conducted through an online questionnaire. Based on the obtained data, statistical analyses were performed to evaluate the level of agreement among individuals, the mode of the responses, the emotions generated by the AI, and to analyze proportions.




Figure 6: Percentage of agreement with Jaccard's index for the female gender with the generative tool under 75%.

The research conducted demonstrates the complexity involved in the study of emotions and the high level of subjectivity in their classification. Some results indicate, particularly with emotions binarized into positive and negative categories, a good level of agreement across different analyses, suggesting that the products generated by image tools appear to be reliable.

The main limitation of this research is the sample size, which cannot be considered representative. Future directions for this research include expanding the sample size, both in terms of the number of evaluators and their backgrounds, age, educational level, and areas of study.




Figure 7: Percentage of agreement with Jaccard's index for the male gender with the generative tool under 75%.

We believe it is essential to advance in this field of study, as it would help validate the results generated by generative tools and enhance our understanding of their usefulness and limitations. Additionally, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of human emotional appreciation.

References

- Yanru Lyu, Chih-Long Lin, Po-Hsien Lin, and Rungtai Lin. The Cognition of Audience to Artistic Style Transfer. *Applied Sciences*, 11(7):3290, jan 2021. ISSN 2076-3417. doi:10.3390/app11073290.
- Wei Li, Zhen Zhang, and Aiguo Song. Physiological-signal-based emotion recognition: An odyssey from methodology to philosophy. *Measurement*, 172:108747, feb 2021a. ISSN 0263-2241. doi:10.1016/j.measurement.2020.108747.





Figure 8: Percentage of agreement with Jaccard’s index for the female gender with the generative tool over 90%.

Table 11: Comparison of proportion of agreement between AI and raters (mode) in the classification of images labeled with the same negative or positive emotion (Cochran’s test).

Emotion	Negative	Positive
<i>p-value</i> ¹	<0.001***	<0.001***

Ursula Hess, Konstantinos Kafetsios, Heidi Mauersberger, Christophe Blaison, and Carolin-Louisa Kessler. Signal and Noise in the Perception of Facial Emotion Expressions: From Labs to Life. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(8):1092–1110, aug 2016. ISSN 0146-1672. doi:10.1177/0146167216651851. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.

Wenqian Lin and Chao Li. Review of Studies on Emotion Recognition and Judgment Based on Physiological Signals. *Applied Sciences*, 13(4):2573, jan 2023. ISSN 2076-3417. doi:10.3390/app13042573. Number: 4 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.



AGT: Agreement percentage

Figure 9: Percentage of agreement with Jaccard's index for the male gender with the generative tool over 90%.

Lakhan Dev Sharma and Abhijit Bhattacharyya. A Computerized Approach for Automatic Human Emotion Recognition Using Sliding Mode Singular Spectrum Analysis. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 21(23):26931–26940, dec 2021. ISSN 1558-1748. doi:10.1109/JSEN.2021.3120787. Conference Name: IEEE Sensors Journal.

Sicheng Zhao, Xingxu Yao, Jufeng Yang, Guoli Jia, Guiguang Ding, Tat-Seng Chua, Björn W. Schuller, and Kurt Keutzer. Affective Image Content Analysis: Two Decades Review and New Perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(10):6729–6751, oct 2022a. ISSN 1939-3539. doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3094362. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence.




Figure 10: Proportion of individuals who agree with the AI when classifying images labelled as Contentment.




Figure 11: Proportion of individuals who agree with the AI when classifying images labelled as Amusement




Figure 12: Proportion of individuals who agree with the AI when classifying images labelled as Fear

Mehmet Taha Eser and Gökhan Aksu. Comparison of the results of the generalizability theory with the inter-rater agreement coefficients: Comparison of the results of the generalizability theory. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 14(2):1629–1643, march 2022. ISSN 1993-7660. Number: 2.

Afsheen Rafaqat Ali, Usman Shahid, Mohsen Ali, and Jeffrey Ho. High-Level Concepts for Affective Understanding of Images. In *2017 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 679–687, march 2017. doi:10.1109/WACV.2017.81.




Figure 13: Proportion of individuals who agree with the AI when classifying images labelled as Sadness

- Dhiraj Joshi, Ritendra Datta, Elena Fedorovskaya, Quang-Tuan Luong, James Z. Wang, Jia Li, and Jiebo Luo. Aesthetics and Emotions in Images. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 28(5):94–115, sep 2011. ISSN 1558-0792. doi:10.1109/MSP.2011.941851.
- Nangyeon Lim. Cultural differences in emotion: differences in emotional arousal level between the East and the West. *Integrative Medicine Research*, 5(2):105–109, jun 2016. ISSN 2213-4220. doi:10.1016/j.imr.2016.03.004.
- Christoph Redies, Maria Grebenkina, Mahdi Mohseni, Ali Kaduhm, and Christian Dobel. Global Image Properties Predict Ratings of Affective Pictures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:953, may 2020. ISSN 1664-1078. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00953.
- James A. Russell. Cross-Cultural Similarities and Differences in Affective Processing and Expression. In *Emotions and Affect in Human Factors and Human-Computer Interaction*, pages 123–141. Elsevier, 2017. ISBN 978-0-12-801851-4. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-801851-4.00004-5.
- Sicheng Zhao, Quanwei Huang, Youbao Tang, Xingxu Yao, Jufeng Yang, Guiguang Ding, and Björn W. Schuller. Computational emotion analysis from images: Recent advances and future directions. In *Human Perception of Visual Information*, pages 85–113. Springer International Publishing, 2022b. ISBN 978-3-030-81464-9 978-3-030-81465-6.
- Kuan-Chuan Peng, Tsuhan Chen, Amir Sadovnik, and Andrew Gallagher. A mixed bag of emotions: Model, predict, and transfer emotion distributions. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 860–868, jun 2015. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298687. ISSN: 1063-6919.
- Ian D. Wood, John P. McCrae, Vladimir Andryushechkin, and Paul Buitelaar. A Comparison of Emotion Annotation Approaches for Text. *Information*, 9(5), may 2018. doi:10.3390/info9050117. WOS:000436150100016.
- Yan Wang, Wei Song, Wei Tao, Antonio Liotta, Dawei Yang, Xinlei Li, Shuyong Gao, Yixuan Sun, Weifeng Ge, Wei Zhang, and Wenqiang Zhang. A systematic review on affective computing: emotion models, databases, and recent advances. *Information Fusion*, 83-84:19–52, jul 2022. ISSN 1566-2535. doi:10.1016/j.inffus.2022.03.009.
- Nazmi Sofian Suhaimi, James Mountstephens, and Jason Teo. EEG-Based Emotion Recognition: A State-of-the-Art Review of Current Trends and Opportunities. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2020:e8875426, sep 2020. ISSN 1687-5265. doi:10.1155/2020/8875426. Publisher: Hindawi.
- Maria Egger, Matthias Ley, and Sten Hanke. Emotion recognition from physiological signal analysis: A review. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 343:35–55, may 2019. ISSN 1571-0661. doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2019.04.009.
- Maryam Imani and Gholam Ali Montazer. A survey of emotion recognition methods with emphasis on E-Learning environments. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 147:102423, dec 2019. ISSN 1084-8045. doi:10.1016/j.jnca.2019.102423.
- Muhammad Anas Hasnul, Nor Azlina Ab Aziz, Salem Alelyani, Mohamed Mohana, and Azlan Abd Aziz. Electrocardiogram-Based Emotion Recognition Systems and Their Applications in Healthcare—A Review. *Sensors*, 21(15):5015, jan 2021. ISSN 1424-8220. doi:10.3390/s21155015. Number: 15 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Smith K. Khare, Victoria Blanes-Vidal, Esmaeil S. Nadimi, and U. Rajendra Acharya. Emotion recognition and artificial intelligence: A systematic review (2014–2023) and research recommendations. *Information Fusion*, 102:102019, feb 2024. ISSN 1566-2535. doi:10.1016/j.inffus.2023.102019.

- Mohammed Jawad Al-Dujaili and Abbas Ebrahimi-Moghadam. Speech Emotion Recognition: A Comprehensive Survey. *Wireless Personal Communications*, 129(4):2525–2561, apr 2023. ISSN 1572-834X. doi:10.1007/s11277-023-10244-3.
- Sze Chit Leong, Yuk Ming Tang, Chung Hin Lai, and C. K. M. Lee. Facial expression and body gesture emotion recognition: A systematic review on the use of visual data in affective computing. *Computer Science Review*, 48: 100545, may 2023. ISSN 1574-0137. doi:10.1016/j.cosrev.2023.100545.
- Laleh Ebdali, Kin Fun Li, and Kosuke Takano. An overview of emotion recognition from body movement. In Leonard Barolli, editor, *Complex, Intelligent and Software Intensive Systems*, Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, pages 105–117, Cham, 2022. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-031-08812-4.
- Fardian Fardian, Marty Mawarpury, Khairul Munadi, and Fitri Arnia. Thermography for Emotion Recognition Using Deep Learning in Academic Settings: A Review. *IEEE Access*, 10:96476–96491, 2022. ISSN 2169-3536. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3199736. Conference Name: IEEE Access.
- Sheetal Kusal, Shruti Patil, Jyoti Choudrie, Ketan Kotecha, Deepali Vora, and Ilias Pappas. A Review on Text-Based Emotion Detection – Techniques, Applications, Datasets, and Future Directions, apr 2022.
- João Almeida, Luís Vilaça, Inês N. Teixeira, and Paula Viana. Emotion Identification in Movies through Facial Expression Recognition. *Applied Sciences*, 11(15):6827, jan 2021. ISSN 2076-3417. doi:10.3390/app11156827. Number: 15 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Donghong Han, Yanru Kong, Jiayi Han, and Guoren Wang. A survey of music emotion recognition. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 16(6):166335, jan 2022. ISSN 2095-2236. doi:10.1007/s11704-021-0569-4.
- Bei Pan, Kaoru Hirota, Zhiyang Jia, and Yaping Dai. A review of multimodal emotion recognition from datasets, preprocessing, features, and fusion methods. *Neurocomputing*, 561:126866, dec 2023. ISSN 0925-2312. doi:10.1016/j.neucom.2023.126866.
- Sicheng Zhao, Xuanbai Chen, Xiangyu Yue, Chuang Lin, Pengfei Xu, Ravi Krishna, Jufeng Yang, Guiguang Ding, Alberto L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Kurt Keutzer. Emotional Semantics-Preserved and Feature-Aligned CycleGAN for Visual Emotion Adaptation, nov 2020. arXiv:2011.12470 [cs].
- Naveed Ahmed, Zaher Al Aghbari, and Shini Girija. A systematic survey on multimodal emotion recognition using learning algorithms. *Intelligent Systems with Applications*, 17:200171, feb 2023. ISSN 2667-3053. doi:10.1016/j.iswa.2022.200171.
- Andrius Dzedzickis, Artūras Kaklauskas, and Vytautas Bucinskas. Human Emotion Recognition: Review of Sensors and Methods. *Sensors*, 20(3):592, jan 2020. ISSN 1424-8220. doi:10.3390/s20030592. Number: 3 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Simone Bianco, Davide Mazzini, Paolo Napoletano, and Raimondo Schettini. Multitask painting categorization by deep multibranch neural network. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 135:90–101, nov 2019. ISSN 0957-4174. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2019.05.036.
- Eva Cetinic, Tomislav Lipic, and Sonja Grgic. Fine-tuning Convolutional Neural Networks for fine art classification. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 114:107–118, dec 2018. ISSN 0957-4174. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2018.07.026.
- Jaya H. Dewan and Sudeep D. Thepade. Image Retrieval Using Low Level and Local Features Contents: A Comprehensive Review. *Applied Computational Intelligence and Soft Computing*, oct 2020. ISSN 1687-9724. doi:10.1155/2020/8851931.
- Shenlong Wang, Kaixin Han, and Jiafeng Jin. Review of image low-level feature extraction methods for content-based image retrieval. *Sensor Review*, 39(6):783–809, jan 2019. ISSN 0260-2288. doi:10.1108/SR-04-2019-0092. Publisher: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Sicheng Zhao, Yue Gao, Xiaolei Jiang, Hongxun Yao, Tat-Seng Chua, and Xiaoshuai Sun. Exploring Principles-of-Art Features For Image Emotion Recognition. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 47–56, Orlando Florida USA, nov 2014. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-3063-3. doi:10.1145/2647868.2654930.
- P. Abry, H. Wendt, and S. Jaffard. When Van Gogh meets Mandelbrot: Multifractal classification of painting’s texture. *Signal Processing*, 93(3):554–572, march 2013. ISSN 0165-1684. doi:10.1016/j.sigpro.2012.01.016.
- HanZe Guo, XinYu Liang, and Yawei Yu. Application of Big Data Technology and Visual Neural Network in Emotional Expression Analysis of Oil Painting Theme Creation in Public Environment. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2022:7364473, 2022. doi:10.1155/2022/7364473.
- Morteza Karimian Kelishadrokh, Mohammad Ghataei, and Shervan Fekri-Ershad. Innovative local texture descriptor in joint of human-based color features for content-based image retrieval. *Signal, Image and Video Processing*, jul 2023. ISSN 1863-1711. doi:10.1007/s11760-023-02631-x.

- Jianli Liu, Edwin Lughofer, Xianyi Zeng, and Zhengxin Li. The Power of Visual Texture in Aesthetic Perception: An Exploration of the Predictability of Perceived Aesthetic Emotions. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2018:1812980, 2018a. ISSN 1687-5265. doi:10.1155/2018/1812980. Place: London Publisher: Hindawi Ltd WOS:00044553900001.
- Xin Lu, Poonam Suryanarayan, Reginald B. Adams, Jia Li, Michelle G. Newman, and James Z. Wang. On shape and the computability of emotions. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, page 229, Nara, Japan, 2012. ACM Press. ISBN 978-1-4503-1089-5. doi:10.1145/2393347.2393384.
- Tamil Priya and J. Divya. Affective emotion classification using feature vector of image based on visual concepts. *International Journal of Electrical Engineering and Education*, 2020. doi:10.1177/0020720920936834.
- Dongwann Kang, Hyounoh Shim, and Kyunghyun Yoon. A method for extracting emotion using colors comprise the painting image. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 77(4):4985–5002, feb 2018. ISSN 1573-7721. doi:10.1007/s11042-017-4667-0.
- Kuan-Chuan Peng, Kolbeinn Karlsson, Tsuhan Chen, Dong-Qing Zhang, and Heather Yu. A framework of changing image emotion using emotion prediction. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 4637–4641, oct 2014. doi:10.1109/ICIP.2014.7025940. ISSN: 2381-8549.
- Li-Jia Li, Hao Su, Yongwhan Lim, and Li Fei-Fei. Object Bank: An Object-Level Image Representation for High-Level Visual Recognition. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 107(1):20–39, march 2014. ISSN 1573-1405. doi:10.1007/s11263-013-0660-x.
- Jana Machajdik and Allan Hanbury. Affective image classification using features inspired by psychology and art theory. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, MM '10, pages 83–92, New York, NY, USA, oct 2010. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-60558-933-6. doi:10.1145/1873951.1873965.
- Rong-Cheng Tu, Xian-Ling Mao, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Chengfei Cai, Weize Qin, Wei Wei, Hongfa Wang, and Heyan Huang. Unsupervised Hashing with Semantic Concept Mining. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data*, 1(1):3:1–3:19, may 2023. doi:10.1145/3588683.
- Sicheng Zhao, Zizhou Jia, Hui Chen, Leida Li, Guiguang Ding, and Kurt Keutzer. PDANet: Polarity-consistent Deep Attention Network for Fine-grained Visual Emotion Regression. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 192–201, oct 2019. doi:10.1145/3343031.3351062. arXiv:1909.05693 [cs].
- Anna Fekete, Matthew Pelowski, Eva Specker, David Brieber, Raphael Rosenberg, and Helmut Leder. The Vienna Art Picture System (VAPS): A data set of 999 paintings and subjective ratings for art and aesthetics research. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, pages No Pagination Specified–No Pagination Specified, 2022. ISSN 1931-390X. doi:10.1037/aca0000460. Place: US Publisher: Educational Publishing Foundation.
- Basura Fernando, Elisa Fromont, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Mining Mid-level Features for Image Classification. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 108(3):186–203, jul 2014. ISSN 1573-1405. doi:10.1007/s11263-014-0700-1.
- Albert Gordo. Supervised mid-level features for word image representation. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2956–2964, jun 2015. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298914. ISSN: 1063-6919.
- Xinge Zhu, Liang Li, Weigang Zhang, Tianrong Rao, Min Xu, Qingming Huang, and Dong Xu. Dependency exploitation: a unified CNN-RNN approach for visual emotion recognition. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI'17*, pages 3595–3601, Melbourne, Australia, aug 2017. AAAI Press. ISBN 978-0-9992411-0-3.
- Xavier Alameda-Pineda, Elisa Ricci, Yan Yan, and Nicu Sebe. Recognizing Emotions from Abstract Paintings Using Non-Linear Matrix Completion. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5240–5248, jun 2016. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2016.566. ISSN: 1063-6919.
- Xuanyu He and Wei Zhang. Emotion recognition by assisted learning with convolutional neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 291:187–194, may 2018. ISSN 0925-2312. doi:10.1016/j.neucom.2018.02.073.
- Andrea Sartori, Dubravko Culibrk, Yan Yan, and Nicu Sebe. Who's Afraid of Itten: Using the Art Theory of Color Combination to Analyze Emotions in Abstract Paintings. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 311–320, Brisbane Australia, oct 2015. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-3459-4. doi:10.1145/2733373.2806250.
- Chia-Ching Hung. A study on a content-based image retrieval technique for Chinese paintings. *The Electronic Library*, 36(1):172–188, jan 2018. ISSN 0264-0473. doi:10.1108/EL-10-2016-0219. Publisher: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Jing Li, Dongliang Chen, Ning Yu, Ziping Zhao, and Zhihan Lv. Emotion Recognition of Chinese Paintings at the Thirteenth National Exhibition of Fines Arts in China Based on Advanced Affective Computing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 2021b. ISSN 1664-1078.

- Yingtao Tian, Chikahiko Suzuki, Tarin Clanuwat, Mikel Bober-Irizar, Alex Lamb, and Asanobu Kitamoto. KaoKore: A Pre-modern Japanese Art Facial Expression Dataset, feb 2020. arXiv:2002.08595 [cs, stat].
- Z. Wang, Y. Wang, S. Zhang, and Z. Xiong. Aed: A novel visual representation based on ar and empathy computing in manual assembly. *Revista Internacional de Metodos Numericos para Calculo y Diseno en Ingenieria*, 37(1):1–12, 2021. ISSN 0213-1315. doi:10.23967/J.RIMNI.2021.01.005.
- Jie Zhang, Yingjing Duan, and Xiaoqing Gu. Research on Emotion Analysis of Chinese Literati Painting Images Based on Deep Learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 2021. ISSN 1664-1078.
- Shiry Ginosar, Daniel Haas, Timothy Brown, and Jitendra Malik. Detecting People in Cubist Art, sep 2014. arXiv:1409.6235 [cs].
- Henrik Hagtvedt, Vanessa M. Patrick, and Reidar Hagtvedt. The Perception and Evaluation of Visual Art. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 26(2):197–218, jul 2008. ISSN 0276-2374. doi:10.2190/EM.26.2.d.
- Despina Stamatopoulou and Gerald C. Cupchik. The Feeling of the Form: Style as Dynamic ‘Textured’ Expression. *Art and Perception*, 5(3):262–298, aug 2017. ISSN 2213-4905, 2213-4913. doi:10.1163/22134913-00002066.
- Veronika Štampfl, Helena Gabrijelčič Tomc, and Jure Ahtik. The Role of Light and Shadow in the Perception of Photographs. *Tehnički vjesnik*, 30(4):1347–1356, jun 2023. ISSN 1330-3651, 1848-6339. doi:10.17559/TV-20221014154132. Publisher: Strojarški fakultet u Slavonskom Brodu; Fakultet elektrotehnike, računarstva i informacijskih tehnologija Osijek; Građevinski i arhitektonski fakultet Osijek.
- Heekyung Yang, Jongdae Han, and Kyungha Min. Distinguishing Emotional Responses to Photographs and Artwork Using a Deep Learning-Based Approach. *Sensors*, 19(24):5533, dec 2019. ISSN 1424-8220. doi:10.3390/s19245533.
- Tingyi Tian, Le Wang, Man Luo, and Wei Zhu. A novel psychotherapy effect detector of public art based on resnet and eeg imaging. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 2022:4909294, apr 2022. ISSN 1748-670X. doi:10.1155/2022/4909294.
- Tsegaye Misikir Tashu and Tomás Horváth. Attention-Based Multi-modal Emotion Recognition from Art. In Alberto Del Bimbo, Rita Cucchiara, Stan Sclaroff, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Tao Mei, Marco Bertini, Hugo Jair Escalante, and Roberto Vezzani, editors, *Pattern Recognition. ICPR International Workshops and Challenges*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 604–612, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-68796-0.
- Rujie Yin, Eric Monson, Elizabeth Honig, Ingrid Daubechies, and Mauro Maggioni. Object recognition in art drawings: Transfer of a neural network. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2299–2303, march 2016. doi:10.1109/ICASSP.2016.7472087. ISSN: 2379-190X.
- Dongyu She, Ming Sun, and Jufeng Yang. Learning Discriminative Sentiment Representation from Strongly- and Weakly Supervised CNNs. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications*, 15(3s):96:1–96:19, dec 2019. ISSN 1551-6857. doi:10.1145/3326335.
- Mrs. G. Sivasathiya, Anil kumar D, Harish Rangasamy AR, and Kanishkaa R. Emotion-Aware Multimedia Synthesis: A Generative AI Framework for Personalized Content Generation based on User Sentiment Analysis. In *2024 2nd International Conference on Intelligent Data Communication Technologies and Internet of Things (IDCIoT)*, pages 1344–1350, jan 2024. doi:10.1109/IDCIoT59759.2024.10467761.
- Noushin Hajarolasvadi, Miguel Arjona Ramírez, Wesley Beccaro, and Hasan Demirel. Generative Adversarial Networks in Human Emotion Synthesis: A Review. *IEEE Access*, 8:218499–218529, 2020. ISSN 2169-3536. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3042328. Conference Name: IEEE Access.
- Aäron van den Oord, Nal Kalchbrenner, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Pixel Recurrent Neural Networks. In Maria Florina Balcan and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1747–1756, New York, New York, USA, 2016a. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/oord16.html>.
- Elman Mansimov, Emilio Parisotto, Jimmy Lei Ba, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Generating Images from Captions with Attention, 2015. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02793>. Publisher: arXiv Version Number: 2.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Jost Tobias Springenberg, and Thomas Brox. Learning to generate chairs with convolutional neural networks. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1538–1546, Boston, MA, USA, 2015. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-4673-6964-0. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298761. URL <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7298761/>.
- Aaron van den Oord, Nal Kalchbrenner, Lasse Espeholt, koray kavukcuoglu, Oriol Vinyals, and Alex Graves. Conditional Image Generation with PixelCNN Decoders. In D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016b. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2016/file/b1301141feffabac455e1f90a7de2054-Paper.pdf>.

- Jimei Yang, Scott E Reed, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Honglak Lee. Weakly-supervised Disentangling with Recurrent Transformations for 3D View Synthesis. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1601.00706. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2015/file/109a0ca3bc27f3e96597370d5c8cf03d-Paper.pdf>.
- Karol Gregor, Ivo Danihelka, Alex Graves, Danilo Rezende, and Daan Wierstra. DRAW: A Recurrent Neural Network For Image Generation. In Francis Bach and David Blei, editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1462–1471, Lille, France, 2015. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/gregor15.html>.
- Ishaan Gulrajani, Kundan Kumar, Faruk Ahmed, Adrien Ali Taiga, Francesco Visin, David Vazquez, and Aaron Courville. PixelVAE: A Latent Variable Model for Natural Images, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.05013>. Publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- Hossein Sadeghi, Evgeny Andriyash, Walter Vinci, Lorenzo Buffoni, and Mohammad H. Amin. PixelVAE++: Improved PixelVAE with Discrete Prior, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.09948>. Publisher: arXiv Version Number: 1.
- Lars Maaløe, Marco Fraccaro, Valentin Liévin, and Ole Winther. BIVA: A Very Deep Hierarchy of Latent Variables for Generative Modeling. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/9bdb8b1faaffa4b3d41779bb495d79fb9-Paper.pdf.
- Yihan Cao, Siyu Li, Yixin Liu, Zhiling Yan, Yutong Dai, Philip S. Yu, and Lichao Sun. A Comprehensive Survey of AI-Generated Content (AIGC): A History of Generative AI from GAN to ChatGPT, march 2023. arXiv:2303.04226 [cs].
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative Adversarial Nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- Hamed Alqahtani, Manolya Kavakli-Thorne, and Gulshan Kumar. Applications of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs): An Updated Review. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 28(2):525–552, march 2021. ISSN 1886-1784. doi:10.1007/s11831-019-09388-y.
- Lei Wang, Wei Chen, Wenjia Yang, Fangming Bi, and Fei Richard Yu. A State-of-the-Art Review on Image Synthesis With Generative Adversarial Networks. *IEEE Access*, 8:63514–63537, 2020. ISSN 2169-3536. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2982224. Conference Name: IEEE Access.
- Sakib Shahriar. GAN computers generate arts? A survey on visual arts, music, and literary text generation using generative adversarial network. *Displays*, 73:102237, jul 2022. ISSN 0141-9382. doi:10.1016/j.displa.2022.102237.
- Mehdi Mirza and Simon Osindero. Conditional Generative Adversarial Nets, nov 2014. arXiv:1411.1784 [cs, stat].
- Takeru Miyato and Masanori Koyama. cGANs with Projection Discriminator, aug 2018. arXiv:1802.05637 [cs, stat].
- Augustus Odena, Christopher Olah, and Jonathon Shlens. Conditional Image Synthesis with Auxiliary Classifier GANs. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2642–2651. PMLR, jul 2017. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- Bipin Kuriakose, Theres Thomas, Nikitha Elsa Thomas, Sharon John Varghese, and Veena A. Kumar. Synthesizing Images from Hand-Drawn Sketches using Conditional Generative Adversarial Networks. In *2020 International Conference on Electronics and Sustainable Communication Systems (ICESC)*, pages 774–778, jul 2020. doi:10.1109/ICESC48915.2020.9155550.
- Bingchen Liu, Kunpeng Song, Yizhe Zhu, and Ahmed Elgammal. Sketch-to-Art: Synthesizing Stylized Art Images From Sketches. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- Yifan Liu, Zengchang Qin, Tao Wan, and Zhenbo Luo. Auto-painter: Cartoon image generation from sketch by using conditional Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. *Neurocomputing*, 311:78–87, oct 2018b. ISSN 0925-2312. doi:10.1016/j.neucom.2018.05.045.
- Chikontwe Philip and Lee Hyo Jong. Face sketch synthesis using conditional adversarial networks. In *2017 International Conference on Information and Communication Technology Convergence (ICTC)*, pages 373–378, oct 2017. doi:10.1109/ICTC.2017.8191006.
- Alec Radford, Luke Metz, and Soumith Chintala. Unsupervised Representation Learning with Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks. *CoRR*, nov 2015.

- Ahmed Elgammal, Bingchen Liu, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Marian Mazzone. CAN: Creative Adversarial Networks, Generating "Art" by Learning About Styles and Deviating from Style Norms, jun 2017. arXiv:1706.07068 [cs].
- Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A Style-Based Generator Architecture for Generative Adversarial Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(12):4217–4228, dec 2021. ISSN 0162-8828. doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2020.2970919. Publisher: IEEE Computer Society.
- Ajay Bandi, Pydi Venkata Satya Ramesh Adapa, and Yudu Eswar Vinay Pratap Kumar Kuchi. The Power of Generative AI: A Review of Requirements, Models, Input–Output Formats, Evaluation Metrics, and Challenges. *Future Internet*, 15(8):260, aug 2023. ISSN 1999-5903. doi:10.3390/fi15080260. Number: 8 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, Miika Aittala, Janne Hellsten, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Analyzing and Improving the Image Quality of StyleGAN. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8110–8119. IEEE Computer Society, jun 2020a. ISBN 978-1-72817-168-5. doi:10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.00813.
- Tero Karras, Miika Aittala, Janne Hellsten, Samuli Laine, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Training generative adversarial networks with limited data. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'20*, pages 12104–12114, Red Hook, NY, USA, dec 2020b. Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 978-1-71382-954-6.
- Bowen Zhang, Shuyang Gu, Bo Zhang, Jianmin Bao, Dong Chen, Fang Wen, Yong Wang, and Baining Guo. StyleSwin: Transformer-based GAN for High-resolution Image Generation. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11294–11304, jun 2022. doi:10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.01102. ISSN: 2575-7075.
- Scott Reed, Zeynep Akata, Xinchun Yan, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Bernt Schiele, and Honglak Lee. Generative Adversarial Text to Image Synthesis. In *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1060–1069. PMLR, jun 2016. ISSN: 1938-7228.
- Tao Xu, Pengchuan Zhang, Qiuyuan Huang, Han Zhang, Zhe Gan, Xiaolei Huang, and Xiaodong He. AttnGAN: Fine-Grained Text to Image Generation with Attentional Generative Adversarial Networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1316–1324. IEEE Computer Society, jun 2018. ISBN 978-1-5386-6420-9. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2018.00143.
- Han Zhang, Tao Xu, Hongsheng Li, Shaoting Zhang, Xiaogang Wang, Xiaolei Huang, and Dimitris Metaxas. StackGAN: Text to Photo-Realistic Image Synthesis with Stacked Generative Adversarial Networks. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 5908–5916, oct 2017. doi:10.1109/ICCV.2017.629. ISSN: 2380-7504.
- Han Zhang, Tao Xu, Hongsheng Li, Shaoting Zhang, Xiaogang Wang, Xiaolei Huang, and Dimitris N. Metaxas. StackGAN++: Realistic Image Synthesis with Stacked Generative Adversarial Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 41(8):1947–1962, aug 2019. ISSN 1939-3539. doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2018.2856256. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence.
- Reiichiro Nakano. Neural Painters: A learned differentiable constraint for generating brushstroke paintings, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.08410>.
- Zhewei Huang, Wen Heng, and Shuchang Zhou. Learning to Paint With Model-based Deep Reinforcement Learning, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.04411>.
- Tao Xu, Pengchuan Zhang, Qiuyuan Huang, Han Zhang, Zhe Gan, Xiaolei Huang, and Xiaodong He. AttnGAN: Fine-Grained Text to Image Generation with Attentional Generative Adversarial Networks, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.10485>.
- Han Zhang, Tao Xu, Hongsheng Li, Shaoting Zhang, Xiaogang Wang, Xiaolei Huang, and Dimitris Metaxas. StackGAN++: Realistic Image Synthesis with Stacked Generative Adversarial Networks, 2018a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.10916>.
- Cunjun Zhang, Kehua Lei, Jia Jia, Yihui Ma, and Zhiyuan Hu. AI Painting: An Aesthetic Painting Generation System. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, MM '18, pages 1231–1233, Seoul Republic of Korea, 2018b. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-5665-7. doi:10.1145/3240508.3241386.
- Mao Li, Jiancheng Lv, Jian Wang, and Yongsheng Sang. An Abstract Painting Generation Method Based on Deep Generative Model. *Neural Processing Letters*, 52(2):949–960, 2020. ISSN 1370-4621, 1573-773X. doi:10.1007/s11063-019-10063-3.

- Edoardo Lisi, Mohammad Malekzadeh, Hamed Haddadi, F. Din-Houn Lau, and Seth Flaxman. Modelling and forecasting art movements with CGANs. *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(4):191569, April 2020. ISSN 2054-5703. doi:10.1098/rsos.191569. URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsos.191569>.
- Azmi Can Özgen and Hazım Kemal Ekenel. Words as Art Materials: Generating Paintings with Sequential GANs, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.04383>.
- Daniel Bossett, David Heimowitz, Nidhi Jadhav, Leilani Johnson, Arti Singh, Helen Zheng, and Sabar Dasgupta. Emotion-Based Style Transfer On Visual Art Using Gram Matrices. In *2021 IEEE MIT Undergraduate Research Technology Conference (URTC)*, pages 1–5, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2021. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-66540-595-9. doi:10.1109/URTC54388.2021.9701611.
- Peter J. Lang, Margaret M. Bradley, and Bruce N. Cuthbert. International Affective Picture System, nov 2020. Institution: American Psychological Association.
- Panos Achlioptas, Maks Ovsjanikov, Kilichbek Haydarov, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Leonidas Guibas. ArtEmis: Affective Language for Visual Art. In *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11564–11574, Nashville, TN, USA, jun 2021. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-66544-509-2. doi:10.1109/CVPR46437.2021.01140.
- Saif M. Mohammad and Svetlana Kiritchenko. Wikiart emotions: An annotated dataset of emotions evoked by art. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on language resources and evaluation (LREC 2018)*, May 2018.
- Stéphanie Dubal, Aure-Elise Lerebours, Marine Taffou, Jérôme Pelletier, Yolaine Escande, and Kenneth Knoblauch. A Psychophysical Exploration of the Perception of Emotion from Abstract Art. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 32(1): 27–41, jan 2014. ISSN 0276-2374. doi:10.2190/EM.32.1.EOV.4. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- He Zhang, Eimontas Augilius, Timo Honkela, Jorma Laaksonen, Hannes Gamper, and Henok Alene. Analyzing Emotional Semantics of Abstract Art Using Low-Level Image Features. In João Gama, Elizabeth Bradley, and Jaakko Hollmén, editors, *Advances in Intelligent Data Analysis X*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 413–423, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer. ISBN 978-3-642-24800-9.
- Nihad A. Hassan and Rami Hijazi. *Open Source Intelligence Methods and Tools: A Practical Guide to Online Intelligence*. Apress : Imprint: Apress, Berkeley, CA, 1st ed. 2018 edition, 2018. ISBN 978-1-4842-3213-2. doi:10.1007/978-1-4842-3213-2.
- Qiang Cai, Mengxu Ma, Chen Wang, and Haisheng Li. Image neural style transfer: A review. *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, 108:108723, may 2023. ISSN 0045-7906. doi:10.1016/j.compeleceng.2023.108723.
- Xin Lu, Neela Sawant, Michelle G. Newman, Reginald B. Adams, James Z. Wang, and Jia Li. Identifying Emotions Aroused from Paintings. In Gang Hua and Hervé Jégou, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016 Workshops*, volume 9913, pages 48–63. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016. ISBN 978-3-319-46603-3 978-3-319-46604-0. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
- James A. Russell and Albert Mehrabian. Distinguishing anger and anxiety in terms of emotional response factors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(1):79–83, 1974. ISSN 1939-2117, 0022-006X. doi:10.1037/h0035915.
- OECD. Frascati Manual 2015: Guidelines for Collecting and Reporting Data on Research and Experimental Development, The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities, 2015.
- Klaus Krippendorff. Reliability in Content Analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 30(3):411–433, 2004. ISSN 1468-2958. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2004.tb00738.x.
- Andrew F. Hayes and Klaus Krippendorff. Answering the Call for a Standard Reliability Measure for Coding Data. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 1(1):77–89, apr 2007. ISSN 1931-2458. doi:10.1080/19312450709336664.
- Nina Volkmann, Jenny Stracke, and Nicole Kemper. Evaluation of a gait scoring system for cattle by using cluster analysis and Krippendorff’s alpha reliability. *Veterinary Record*, 184(7):220–220, 2019. ISSN 2042-7670. doi:10.1136/vr.105059.
- Jacob Cohen. A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1): 37–46, apr 1960. ISSN 0013-1644. doi:10.1177/001316446002000104. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Luciano da F. Costa. Further generalizations of the jaccard index, nov 2021.
- J. Richard Landis and Gary G. Koch. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics*, 33(1):159–174, 1977. ISSN 0006-341X. doi:10.2307/2529310. Publisher: [Wiley, International Biometric Society].
- Irene Lopatovska. Three types of affect tags for art images. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 53(1):1–8, 2016. ISSN 2373-9231. doi:10.1002/pra2.2016.14505301039.

- Dutao Wang. Research on the Art Value and Application of Art Creation Based on the Emotion Analysis of Art. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, 2022:e2435361, jan 2022. ISSN 1530-8669. doi:10.1155/2022/2435361. Publisher: Hindawi.
- Minjin Kim, Xixin Qiu, and Yuanheng (Arthur) Wang. Interrater agreement in genre analysis: A methodological review and a comparison of three measures. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 3(1):100097, apr 2024. ISSN 2772-7661. doi:10.1016/j.rmal.2024.100097.
- Jean-Yves Antoine, Jeanne Villaneau, and Anaïs Lefeuvre. Weighted Krippendorff's alpha is a more reliable metrics for multi-coders ordinal annotations: experimental studies on emotion, opinion and coreference annotation. In Shuly Wintner, Sharon Goldwater, and Stefan Riezler, editors, *Proceedings of the 14th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 550–559, Gothenburg, Sweden, apr 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.3115/v1/E14-1058.
- M Maithri, U. Raghavendra, Anjan Gudigar, Jyothi Samanth, Prabal Datta Barua, Murugappan Murugappan, Yashas Chakole, and U. Rajendra Acharya. Automated Emotion Recognition: Current Trends and Future Perspectives. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 215:106646, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.cmpb.2022.106646.