

Emotion-Aware Adaptive Design in Games: A Critical Review of Progress, Evaluation Bottlenecks, and Future Trends

Jiakang Lu

*Department of Computer Science and Technology, Hebei GEO University, Shijiazhuang, China
kangkangjialu@gmail.com*

Abstract. This paper reviews emotion-aware adaptive game design. It explains how games detecting player feelings can outperform traditional difficulty adjustment, which only tweaks numbers like health or damage. While such tweaks boost performance, they rarely reduce negative emotions or improve immersion. Affective computing now allows cameras and mics to spot frustration or boredom in real time. However, better detection does not always improve experience—a "last-mile" issue caused by overusing simple number tweaks, harming player control, and using weak testing. The review blends ideas from difficulty, immersion, emotion detection, audio, and story. It uses a three-part framework: how emotions are detected, what game elements are adapted, and how success is measured. Future games should adjust feedback, pacing, sound, and story while keeping players in control. Future paths include stable real-world emotion detection, modular engine tools, and long-term testing.

Keywords: affective gaming, dynamic difficulty adjustment, emotion recognition, immersion, player experience evaluation

1. Introduction

Balancing games for diverse players is key. Dynamic difficulty adjustment (DDA) tunes game settings on the fly to keep things fun—not too hard, not too easy [1]. It improves performance but rarely boosts feelings like competence or immersion. Affective computing aims to sense emotions—using facial expression recognition and audio-visual fusion to detect frustration. Yet emotion-aware balancing often fails to reduce negative feelings or boost competence. Three reasons: (1) numeric tuning can't fix frustration from unclear goals or poor feedback; (2) hidden help feels manipulative, hurting trust; (3) evaluation tools like the GEQ are retrospective and poorly validated [2]. This paper reviews emotion-aware adaptive design. Contributions: (1) summary from DDA to multimodal sensing; (2) a three-axis framework (input × adaptation × evaluation); (3) key bottlenecks; (4) future trends in multi-dimensional content adaptation and modular engine support. Better emotion detection alone isn't enough. We need wider adaptation and better evaluation.

2. Background: key ideas everyone can understand

2.1. Dynamic difficulty, change blindness, and player control

Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment (DDA) tweaks game settings on the fly to keep things fun—not too hard, not too easy [1]. It watches how you play (like deaths or resource use) to scale difficulty up or down. The golden rule? Keep it invisible so players stay immersed [1].

Most DDA just tweaks numbers because it's easy, assuming frustration only comes from the game being too tough. But honestly, frustration often comes from clunky controls or confusing goals—stuff that lowering enemy health won't fix [3].

DDA relies on "change blindness"—focused players rarely notice subtle tweaks. But with emotion-sensing tech, feeling "watched" can kill trust. Designers have to balance hidden help with respecting player choice.

Also, if help is too obvious, it ruins player agency. Nobody wants unearned wins; novices feel patronized, and experts feel cheated. So, instead of auto-lowering difficulty when you're frustrated, systems should offer optional hints that let you keep that sense of achievement [3].

2.2. Immersion and flow: how players stay engaged

Immersion basically means getting sucked into the game world. It usually happens in three stages [4]: first you have engagement (figuring out the controls and rules); then comes engrossment (actually caring about the story and characters); and finally, total immersion (where you completely lose track of time and feel fully "in" the game).

Here's the thing: negative emotions usually kick in right at that first stage—like when the controls are confusing or the instructions make no sense—long before the actual difficulty becomes a problem. That's why any emotion-aware system needs to fix basic usability issues first [4].

Then there's **Flow**. This is basically that sweet spot where you're completely zoned in and genuinely loving the challenge [5, 6]. To get into that zone, you need a perfect balance between how hard the game is and how good you are at it, along with clear goals and instant feedback. The tricky part? Flow and emotions shift super fast while you're playing, but most studies just ask players how they felt *after* the session is over. That leaves a massive gap in the data. So, if we actually want to support flow, the game needs to react at the exact right moment with the exact right kind of help [5].

3. How we reviewed the research

We did a deep dive into the research to map out everything happening in emotion-aware game design over the last two decades (from 2004 to 2025). To make sure we didn't miss anything important, we scoured the top academic databases—Google Scholar, the ACM Digital Library, and Scopus. We used a mix of keywords like "dynamic difficulty adjustment," "affective gaming," "frustration," and "immersion" to find where player psychology and tech adaptation overlap.

The screening process was pretty intense. We started by looking at around 50 papers based on their titles and abstracts. After digging into the actual content, we narrowed it down to the 16 highest-quality studies that were perfect for a deep analysis [7, 8]. We set some strict ground rules to keep things practical: we only picked studies that actually built and tested working adaptive game systems—and crucially, included real-world measurements of how players felt [8, 9].

On the flip side, we tossed out any papers that just focused on isolated emotion-recognition algorithms without actually connecting them back to the gameplay. We also skipped purely

theoretical ideas that hadn't been tested on real users [10]. To make sense of all this info, we came up with a simple way to compare the studies across three main areas: Input (what sensors or methods were used to read emotions), Adaptation (what parts of the game actually changed in response), and Evaluation (how they measured if it worked) [5, 7, 10, 11].

4. What we learned: key findings

4.1. Emotion detection: better tech does not mean better experience

Today's games can detect emotions using cheap cameras and microphones without disturbing play [12]. Multimodal systems that combine face, voice, and game actions are better at recognizing frustration because they avoid problems like a face being covered [8]. However, better detection only improves the input part of the system—it does not guarantee the game's response will help [7].

Many studies show a clear gap: Akbar et al. [7] built a system that detects faces and adjusts difficulty but did not reduce negative feelings; de la Fuente et al. [8] created very accurate frustration detection but did not connect it to actual game changes; Kalateh et al. [13] showed real-world problems like noise, lighting, and privacy limit real-world use. For emotion systems to work, detection must be reliable, work in messy real-game conditions, and respect player privacy [13]. Systems should also fall back to game performance data if cameras or microphones fail [8, 13].

4.2. Why simple difficulty changes usually fail

Changing only numbers when frustration is detected fails for three clear reasons: wrong cause, wrong solution (frustration often comes from confusion, not difficulty [4]); damaged sense of achievement (players feel manipulated when the game secretly makes things easier [3]); bad timing and bad measurement (emotions change fast, but after-play surveys are inaccurate [2]). The solution is to stop using "frustration = easier difficulty" and instead use targeted help: clearer instructions, better feedback, calming sound, or short breaks [3, 7, 11].

4.3. The big problem: measuring player experience

Honestly, figuring out whether these adaptive tweaks actually work is one of the toughest nuts to crack in this field [2].

So, what's wrong with the current methods? We're either asking the wrong questions, relying on players' shaky memories, using survey tools that haven't been properly validated, or completely ignoring the fact that a player's emotions shift in real-time while they're playing [5, 2].

So, what's the best way forward? Triangulation [5, 2]. You just need to piece these three things together: What the player says (self-reports). What the player does (behavioral data, like repeatedly dying at the same spot). What the sensors pick up (emotion data).

Only by combining all three can you truly figure out if that adaptive adjustment was a total win or a complete flop.

5. Moving beyond numbers: adapting sound and story

5.1. Adaptive audio: gentle, effective emotion regulation

Because it can shift a player's mood directly without actually changing the game's real difficulty [11]. Calm, soothing music can help cool down players who are frustrated or stressed out. On the

flip side, energetic tunes can instantly snap a sleepy player back to attention [11].

But here's a trap you need to watch out for:

You've got to respect the player's taste. Some players couldn't care less about the in-game soundtrack and just want to jam to their own playlists, so giving them an option to turn it off is super important [5]. Also, to keep the gameplay smooth, the transitions have to be silky! If the background music cuts in and out like a glitchy radio, players will get pulled right out of the experience. It has to feel natural and seamless [4, 11].

5.2. Adaptive narrative: keeping players engaged through story

Tweaking the story on the fly based on the player's emotions is a killer move for boosting immersion and motivation [6].

So how does it actually work? You could adjust the pacing of the plot, change how choices are presented, trigger different cutscenes, or even shift the whole emotional vibe of the story [6].

Here's a pretty interesting finding:

One study showed that while tailoring the story to a player's personality does boost satisfaction, nothing beats giving players actual agency [6]. Compared to a story that perfectly matches their personality, players care way more about whether they can truly call the shots in the game.

So, what's the bottom line for adaptive storytelling?

It has to stay logically consistent and believable. If the plot starts contradicting itself or makes players feel like "the game is trying to manipulate me," you'll lose their trust in a heartbeat [6].

5.3. Simple rules for good emotion adaptation

Instead of the old rule "if frustrated, make easier," we propose four practical groups: high frustration/stress (give short breaks, calm sound, or optional hints); boredom (add new content or speed up the story); positive engagement (preserve productive struggle and reward success); system rules (avoid rapid changes and respect player settings [3, 13]).

6. Future trends: what comes next

6.1. Reliable real-world emotion detection

Future systems must work in real gaming environments: moving heads, changing light, blocked faces, and noisy rooms [8, 13]. Key improvements include better multimodal fusion, privacy-first design with on-device processing, and systems that gracefully fail when sensors are unavailable [13].

6.2. Modular affective game engines

Right now, emotion systems are built separately for each project. In the future, game engines will include built-in emotion tools [7, 14, 15]. These engines will provide standard sensor access, emotion models, adaptation rules, and evaluation tools to make emotion adaptation available to all developers [7, 14, 15].

6.3. Better testing: real-time and long-term

Great emotion-aware systems need better ways to test them [5, 9]: in-situ testing during natural breaks; long-term studies over days or weeks; measuring trust and transparency; and following ethical rules with clear permission and limited data collection [5, 13, 9].

6.4. Limitations and open questions

This review is not an exhaustive systematic review, so some studies may be missing. Studies use different genres and measures, making direct comparisons difficult [2, 6]. Most research is in English and uses short lab sessions, so long-term behavior is less understood [9]. Future research should focus on valid emotion representations, causal evaluation, affect-to-intervention mapping, cross-genre generalization, and ethical deployment [8, 13, 6, 14, 15].

7. Conclusion

Emotion-aware adaptive design takes traditional difficulty adjustment further by using player feelings to guide changes [12]. Great progress has been made in detecting emotions using cameras, microphones, and machine learning [8, 7]. However, better detection does not improve experience if games only adjust numeric difficulty [3, 7]. The three main barriers are: using difficulty changes to fix non-difficulty problems [4], hidden help that reduces achievement and trust [3], and inaccurate real-time emotion measurement [5, 2].

Future games should use a multi-part approach: adjust feedback, pacing, sound, and story—not just difficulty—while keeping players in control [3, 11, 6]. Modular game engines will make this technology easier to use [7, 14, 15], and better testing methods will ensure systems truly help players [5, 9]. Emotion-aware game design is a complete system connecting sensing, decision-making, content design, and measurement [12, 7, 9]. By moving beyond simple numeric changes and respecting players, future games can be more fun, fair, and emotionally supportive [13, 9].

References

- [1] Hunnicke, R. (2005). The case for dynamic difficulty adjustment in games. *ACE 2005*.
<https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/1067343.1067349>
- [2] Law, E. L.-C., et al. (2018). Validation of the game experience questionnaire (GEQ). *CHI PLAY 2018*.
<https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3270316.3270594>
- [3] Yli-Olli, V. (2020). *Understanding player engagement: Flow theory in video game design*. Bachelor's thesis, JAMK University. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/72345>
- [4] Brown, E., & Cairns, P. (2004). A grounded investigation of game immersion. *CHI '04*.
<https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/985921.985950>
- [5] Perttula, A., Kiili, K., Lindstedt, A., & Tuomi, P. (2017). Flow experience in game-based learning. *International Journal of Serious Games*, 4(1). <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S240589281730005X>
- [6] Auer, C., & Lankes, M. (2025). Personality-based narrative adaptation. *FDG '25*.
- [7] Akbar, M. T., et al. (2019). Enhancing game experience with facial expression recognition. *Procedia Computer Science*, 157. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050919308530>
- [8] de la Fuente, C., et al. (2023). Multimodal recognition of frustration during gameplay. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 82. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11042-022-14347-8>
- [9] Nunes, C., & Darin, T. (2024). Echoes of player experience: Audio assessment in games. *PACM HCI*, 8(CHI PLAY). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3678288>
- [10] Hudlicka, E. (2009). Affective game engines: Motivation and requirements. *FDG '09*.
<https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/1746757.1746760>

- [11] Poels, K., et al. (2012). Player emotions and game preferences. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(1). <https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/cyber.2011.0162>
- [12] Kotsia, I., Zafeiriou, S., & Fotopoulos, S. (2013). Affective gaming: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE CVPR Workshops*, 663–670. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6611957>
- [13] Kalateh, S., et al. (2024). Multimodal emotion recognition: A systematic review. *IEEE Access*, 12. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10401913>
- [14] Hudlicka, E. (2008). *Affective computing for game design*. GAMEON-NA 2008. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266345754_Affective_computing_for_game_design
- [15] Hudlicka, E., & Broekens, J. (2009). *Modeling emotions in game characters*. ACII 2009. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5304132>