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**Measuring Experience: The Challenge of Quantifying the Intangible**

Every time I encounter UX (User Experience) research, a recurring question surfaces: “Can we truly measure experience?”Experience, by nature, is subjective, situational, and often ineffable—it includes feelings that are difficult to articulate. Yet, research seeks to quantify and systematize it. This paradox lies at the heart of UX studies.

In this context, standardized measurement toolsbecome essential. For instance, how people perceive a robot—how human-like (anthropomorphic), likable, or intelligent it feels—varies widely. But researchers must compare these perceptions across participants. The Godspeed questionnairesare among the most well-known tools designed for this purpose.

These questionnaires use semantic differential scales, such as “friendly vs. unfriendly” or “fast vs. slow,” to capture emotional impressions in a compact form. This technique allows researchers to convert psychological impressions into measurable data, and it enables cross-study comparisons in Human-Robot Interaction (HRI). It's especially effective in reducing subjectivity without entirely discarding emotion.

**Can Machines Be Social Beings? The Case for New Evaluation Frameworks**

But is it enough to ask whether a robot feels friendly or safe? As machines increasingly take on social roles, I believe we need to evaluate whether people perceive them as actual social actorswith autonomy, emotion, and legitimacy.

This is where the newly proposed MASE (Machines as Social Entities) scaleoffers a meaningful shift. Unlike traditional tools that measure surface impressions, MASE probes how much people believe machines are capable of social interaction, emotional response, and even theory of mind (ToM)—the ability to ascribe mental states to others.

What makes MASE significant is not just its technical innovation, but the deeper question it raises: “Are we beginning to see machines as social participants?”Increasingly, people don’t just treat Siri or ChatGPT as tools—they joke with them, confide in them, and sometimes even follow their advice. In such cases, our interaction is no longer purely functional—it becomes social, even relational.

This changing relationship between humans and AI calls for a more nuanced and multi-dimensional frameworkto capture how machines are not only used, but receivedas entities.

**Beyond Numbers: What Metrics Miss in Experience**

While standardized tools like Godspeed or MASE are powerful, they can’t fully capture the fluid, context-dependent nature of human experience. Not all trust in AI comes from perceived warmth or intelligence. Sometimes, it’s about consistency, responsiveness, or the machine’s ability to handle complex contexts appropriately.

For example, a robot might be deemed trustworthy because it behaves consistently. But if that behavior is too rigid or context-insensitive, users might feel alienated or even frustrated. These complex emotional reactions are often lost in traditional metrics.

This is why I believe quantitative metrics must always be complemented by qualitative insightsin UX research. Numbers provide comparison and generalizability, but they can’t fully articulate the “why” behind user behavior. UX measurement isn’t just about scoring interactions—it’s about translating affect into interpretable signals.

Thus, measuring experience is less about capturing a fixed quantity, and more about understanding the texture of the user's reaction, their expectations, and the evolving relationship with the system.

**UX Researchers as Interpreters, Not Just Measurers**

To measure UX is to try to grasp the ungraspable. Tools like Godspeed and MASE aren’t just instruments—they are efforts to make sense of how people interpret, respond to, and relate to intelligent systems.

The value of a measurement tool lies not in its statistical rigor alone, but in how well it captures the psychological and relational threadsbetween human and machine. Just because AI gets smarter doesn’t mean people will automatically feel more comfortable. What matters is how users perceive its intentions, emotional depth, and responsiveness.

That’s why UX researchers must act not only as measurers but also as interpreters—translators of the subtle distance and tension between humans and machines. We must always ask, “What is this metric not telling us?”That question isn’t a flaw—it’s the starting point of deeper insight.

Ultimately, it’s this reflective, questioning attitude that makes UX research not just a science of metrics—but also a human-centered art of interpretation.