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Differences between people are often underexposed during the design process, especially in the area of digital products. If you want to buy a new PDA, DVD-player or microwave there is not much difference between them on an experiential and interaction level. The Interactive Technology Design course at the faculty of Industrial Design Engineering TU Delft focused on obtaining diversity in design, more specifically music players. In this project designs were made and research was carried out to explore if it is possible to design for personality. Using the MBTI type indicator, 16 music player concepts were designed and tested. The results indicate that it is feasible to design for personality.

MBTI TYPE INDICATOR
To classify the different personalities of users, the MBTI typology index of C. Jung, K.C. Briggs, and I. Briggs Myers [1] was used. The theory today is that every individual has a primary mode of operation within four categories. Each personality type consists of four letters corresponding with one of the modes within a category:

Extraversion vs. Introversion. Our flow of energy defines how a person receives the essential part of his or her stimulation, from within or from external sources.
Intuition vs. Sensing. Does a person take in information using the five senses or does he or she rely on instincts?
Feeling vs. Thinking. How does a person prefers to make decisions, based on personal subjective value systems or based on logic and objective consideration?
Judging vs. Perceiving. How does a person deal with the daily world, in an organised and structured way or is he or she flexible and likes alternation?

THE PROCESS Out of the descriptions of the different MBTI types, sixteen personas were created using a combination of text descriptions, atmosphere, images and products that the personas might use. From these personas, visions were derived which were developed on three levels: interaction, product & context. To explain these three levels, catchwords, “sensotraits” images, sound and textures were used. Based on all sixteen personas and visions, 16 different music players were designed and visualised on concept cards, showing the product, interaction and context, and put the MBTI types. The designs fit a person with the corresponding personality type. The designs not reflect specific interests, occupations, or gender.

EXAMPLE Spencer (ENFP) is an active, passionate 45-year-old man. He is admired for his enthusiasm and interest in others and for his focus and ideation. Spencer has many friends, his social life is dynamic. Spencer chooses his music according to his mood. He wants to play his music at varying locations and he wants to have quality time listening to his music. The interaction with his music player should be mentally stimulating, enthusiastic, intense and moving. Therefore the product should be stimulating, adjustable and of high quality. Music Nature is a music player which consists of a pedestal with several features that represent different moods. Because an ENFP person is generally excited and very passionate, the works of art will stimulate to choose between the representations of his feelings.
DESIGNS All players were different in interaction, functionality and appearance. However, we aimed for clear similarities between players for persons that share traits. For example, personas with a Thinking-type have more logical and text-based interactions, opposite to the Feeling-types who are believed to prefer more playful and expressive interactions. The square figure showing the concept cards should be mapped onto a donut to detect the relation between the players. So the top and bottom are connected, as well as the left and right players. Every adjacent player differs one category from his neighbour, two categories when there is one player in between, until four categories when they are as far away as possible.

FIRST TEST The aim of this test was to evaluate the concepts and determine if people have a significant preference for products that are designed for their personality. Nineteen participants joined this test; they differed in age, sex, profession, and personality type, which was established with a MBTI personality test. The concept cards were given to the subjects in order to make an assessment using fourteen bipolar scales. Moreover, they had to select those designs that fit them as a person and that they would really like to possess. Finally, they had to choose one design that they considered to be the best fit and preferred to have.

RESULTS Four out of nineteen participants preferred the music player that was designed for them. The calculated probability (p=0.022) showed a significant preference for products that are designed for personality. This tendency is supported when looking at the choices of the remaining fifteen subjects that selected a 'wrong' player. Almost half of them (7) selected a player with only one divergent category. Five subjects selected a player with two similar categories and only three subjects selected a player with only one similar category in relation to their own personality type. No subjects selected the player for the opposite type (0 similarities).

CONCLUSION The results clearly underlines that it is possible to design for personality. However, we should add one comment. Within the ITD course, there were eight teams participating. Only three teams obtained a similar result, which means that not all designers are able to design for personality; yet! The results of this experiment will be further analysed and hopefully lead to insight in the salient aspects of this relationship, in order to support all designers to obtain personalised designs.
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