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INTRODUCTION

It has been almost ten years since the self-declared design and emotion movement organized its first conference in 1999 (1). Meanwhile, it has evolved from a collection of rather naïve observations regarding the dullness of experiences offered by contemporary products, as in the comparison between the gramophone and the black-box CD player (Hummels, 1999), towards a full-fledged design movement with its own inventory of references to certain theories of psychology (Dewey, 1958, Lazarus, 1991).

Yet, in spite of the expansion of the territory covered by the movement and the increasing depth within which its questions are researched, it is still debated how the design field has become interested in the exploration and conquest of emotionality. According to Yagou (2006), emotions have always been an important part of the design process, even when they were not declared as such. On the other hand, Wensveen (1999, 23) argued that the movement offered a “new focus” on the “designing for experiencing”.

Is the proponent of emotional experiences a conquistador, a discoverer of a new and fertile territory, or an anti-Columbus, who has mistaken his backyard for a new continent? A satisfactory answer requires a reframing of the question and a critical reading of the design and emotion movement as a text. Though it is clear that the movement cannot be reduced to a homogeneous set of questions and arguments, there exists a set of statements, by the help of which a singular way in which design relates to emotions is promoted. Some of these can be located in the work of the Delft University of Technology’s ID Studio. Others are found in the scholarship of several authors that posit emotional experience as a novel yet essential subject of usability, as in Norman (2004) and Jordan (2000). This paper aims to read these texts to foreground a particular aspect of the engagement of design with emotions; that is, the underlying logic of market which is rarely announced in the texts themselves. In this manner, it is also
intended to assess the success of these works in serving the aspirations of the movement itself; namely, providing “emotionally rich interactions” (Wensveen and Overbeeke, 2001) for the user.

**MARKETING EMOTIONS IN ADVERTISING**

One particularly resourceful path to track the product-emotion relation can be found in advertising, for the designerly ways of relating to emotions, as advocated by the movement, are interestingly similar to the way advertising handles them. Although Desmet (2004) argues that typologies of emotions offered by the research on advertising are not compatible with the design researcher’s expectations, it is apparent that advertising and product design share the role of defining emotional resonances of products at bottom. Indeed, Demirbilek et al. (2004), citing Mahajan and Wind (2002), refer to the use of marketing campaigns to anchor the mental associations of the product for the consumer, thus influencing the emotions that a product elicits.

Advertising, in this regard, has already been utilizing emotional experiences to promote products ever since it stopped being mere announcements. As early as 1916, Coca-Cola was mentioning the “pleasure of thirst”, while a Jordan motor car advertisement dating back to 1919 was concerned with the “erotic-experiential” pleasure of driving (Falk, 1994, 178). It was not too long before such practices of attaching feelings and experiences to products became a routine of advertising.

This exercise of linking products with emotional experiences as they are marketed involves a creatively high number of emotional situations besides mere pleasure, such as confidence (“Witty, confident, devastatingly feminine: Chanel No15”), security (“Promise, confidence, security: Helifax”), happiness (“Happiness Foam-In-Hair Color”) or attention (“She claimed attention with her clean skin: LenPak Cleansing Lotion”) (Williamson, 2004), and negative emotions like aggression, fear, social incompetence and sadness. According to Falk (1994, 179), when the advertisement utilizes the latter, it almost always has to conclude positively, for it is the way in which the advertisement should eventually relate to the product.

Admitting that the whole of advertising practice cannot be molded into a singular structure, the semiotic theory of advertising is still useful in revealing the relationship between advertising and emotions in such routines: According to Williamson (2004), advertising functions by transferring the positively charged meaning embedded in either the whole narrative or any particular element of the advertisement onto the object of the advertisement. In this manner, the product is made a signifier of that emotional meaning, to the extent that it becomes almost that meaning itself.

During the collapse of the signifier and the signified that occurs as the product is transformed into an emotional experience, not only the product is defined by the emotion, but also the emotion is defined through the product (Williamson, 2004). An overt illustration of the latter case is offered by automobile advertising. When the pleasure evoked in the driver is translated into “the pleasure of driving”, a specialized emotional experience is defined as opposed to the generic emotional category, “pleasure”. It becomes a special type of pleasure associated with, and even defined through, the act of driving. In advertising, this is amplified to the extent that the pleasure of driving automobile A is effectively differentiated from the pleasure of driving automobile B not only quantitatively, but
also qualitatively. To demonstrate this argument, the slogan from Ethyl Gasoline advertisement, “Have you forgotten the fun of driving?”, where the pleasure of driving is measured quantitatively can be contrasted to the Saab 9-5 Aero advertisement: “To find out what that Aero feeling is about ... drive it.” In this manner, a product can generate its own emotional experience, which is obtained only through the purchase, possession and/or use of the product.

THE THREE TYPES OF PRODUCT EXPERIENCE

Such an understanding of emotion as the ultimate promise of products, or emotional experience as overruling the product, is closer than expected to the definitions of emotion common in the studies conducted by the design and emotion scholars. A number of illustrative examples can be found in Desmet and Hekkert’s (2007, 57) categorization of “affective responses that can be experienced in human-product interaction”. The authors observe three categories, which are the “aesthetic experience”, the “experience of meaning” and the “emotional experience” (Desmet and Hekkert, 2007, 58-9).

However, these categories are not unique to Desmet and Hekkert’s study. A similar framework was proposed by Norman (2004) in a psychological sense and by Rafaeli and Vilnai-Yavetz (2004) in organizational theory. Crilly, Moultrie and Clarkson (2004, 552), too, offered a similar typology comprising “aesthetic impression”, “semantic interpretation” and “symbolic association”, following the works of a number of design and emotion scholars including Norman (2004) and Cupchik (1999). A common source for this popular classification can be traced back to Dewey’s *Art as Experience* (1958), which is cited quite often by the researchers of design and emotion movement. Yet, it is not the aim of this paper to pursue the categorization to its antecedents, neither is it to criticize its validity. Rather, it is aimed to underline certain points in the authors’ definitions of and examples for these categories, in order to indicate their affinity with the advertising syntax that connects emotions to products.

Aesthetic Experience: Naturalization of Desire

The first category, “aesthetic experience” is composed of the basic sensory pleasures obtained from a product. The experience is attributed to a pleasantness “intrinsic” to the product (Scherer, 2001 in Desmet and Hekkert, 2007, 62), and its appraisal is considered to be prompted by the essential human motivation “to seek products that provide pleasure and avoid products that provide displeasure” (62).

A very interesting example the authors give is the enjoyment provided by the sound of the “fragile porcelain lid” of a “Chinese teacup souvenir” (59). Yet, upon close examination, it becomes evident that the emotion evoked by the fragility of the porcelain is hardly a natural, “visceral-level” (Norman, 2004, 65-9) appreciation of the product’s material qualities itself. The aesthetic experience of the “Chinese teacup souvenir” cannot be separated from its socially-constituted meaning; namely, the connotations of quality and luxury the material evokes and its being a souvenir.

The authors do mention their emotional attachment with the teacup as a memento of a visit to China, and classify this experience under the second category, the “experience of meaning”. However, the problem is not the permeability of the borders separating these categories (a statement with which the authors would agree) or their being ill-designed. The product
experience exists only as a part of the system of objects as they are made meaningful in daily life and in the marketplace. In other words, the sound of the porcelain cannot be appreciated without understanding its difference from ordinary ceramics, or the exotic/orientalist experience, of which it is not only a proof but also a tangible manifestation.

Then, the touristic discourse acts upon the teacup in a way quite similar to the advertisements: The product is turned into the promise of a particular experience, to the extent that it becomes the oriental experience itself. The sound is bound to become the sound of Chinese teacups, as the pleasure of driving becomes the pleasure of driving Saab Aero.

The implications of this structure are significant. It redefines aesthetic judgment as a visceral-level appraisal that leads to the immediate emotional reaction of desiring the product (Norman, 2004, 68), and justifies it with the idea of a self-evident human motivation for pleasure (Desmet and Hekkert, 2007, 62). The structure thus realizes the ideological function of rendering the consumption economy natural and a historical, pertaining to the internality of the human-being. Another example of the same function can be found in Desmet’s study (2006) of the emotional category of “desire”, which leads to the purgation of the very concept of desire by listing it among other emotions.

**Experience of Meaning: Pathways for Consumption**

According to Baudrillard (1970, 27), advertisements, brand names etc. help products form sets, or “complex super-objects” defined by a unique coherent meaning, and thus constitute “object pathways” that direct the consumer from one product to the other. Design can also be regarded as a fundamental actor in assembling products into wider clusters of meaning, and ensuring a particular product’s inclusion into the correct set. Examples of aesthetic experience offered by design and emotion scholars, such as the “individual or culturally shared taste for wines” (Desmet and Hekkert, 2007, 62) or the “lightweight, high-tech-look of transparent materials” (Chang and Wu, 2004, 7), also refer to such meanings in circulation within the marketplace, rather than being pleasurable qualities intrinsic to the product.

The “experience of meaning”, the second category, even better illustrates the existence of such sets and their correspondence with certain experiences. According to Desmet and Hekkert (2007, 62), “[a] car model can resemble a shark; a teddy bear can represent nostalgic value; and a laptop can be exclusive, masculine, old-fashioned, elegant etc.”, and the assessment of these meanings by the consumer leads to the eliciting of emotions.

Curiously, the authors do not mention with equal emphasis that one type of “experience of meaning”, which has the power to transcend the meanings created in circulation within the marketplace. It is close to the “personal component” defined by Norman (2004, 6) as a personal connection with the object which is established through a story or a remembrance. It is also similar to what Baudrillard (1981, 64) calls the “symbolic exchange value”, which is best illustrated by the gift.

There has been, of course, a number of studies within the design and emotion movement, grouped under the title of “attachment study” by Demir, Desmet and Hekkert (2006). Yet, the subject remains peripheral to the focus of the movement. The difficulty seems to lie in the fact that emotions arising from personal connections with the product do not easily
yield to design or marketing, because of “the paradox of the gift” described by Baudrillard (1981, 64). The paradox posits that the relative arbitrariness of the product that is involved in the transaction on the one hand, and the uniqueness of the product that is attached to on the other, renders the gift devoid of both use and economic exchange value. This resistance makes the personal connections inaccessible to product design for the most part (2).

Emotional Experience: Consumer Choice

Desmet and Hekkert’s (2007, 61) third category of product experience, “emotional experience”, regards the satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) obtained from the use of the product. It also corresponds to the category of “semantic interpretation” in Crilly, Moultrie and Clarkson’s classification (2004, 559), or to “behavioral level” in Norman’s (2004, 69), which is basically the user/consumer’s assessment of the product’s utility.

Desmet and Hekkert (2007, 61) offer the appraisal theory, which is adapted from emotional psychology, to explain the eliciting of emotions at this level. Appraisal is the weighing of the product against a person’s “concerns”, an instantaneous evaluation, deciding whether the product is “beneficial, harmful, or not relevant for personal well-being” (Desmet, 2007). The resulting emotions also have an “action tendency” (Desmet and Hekkert, 2007, 59, 61), or “behavioral response”, which is either approaching or avoiding the product appraised (Crilly, Moultrie and Clarkson, 2004, 553-554).

Beyond the psychologism of the argumentation, it is obvious that “emotional experience”, as defined by the authors, deals primarily with a purchase decision. Furthermore, this comment is valid for all three levels of product experience: Be it a desire elicited in the visceral level, or a choice of style among possible product sets in the meaning level, or an appraisal of product’s utility in the emotional level, it is basically a question of purchase.

For example, Desmet elsewhere (2007, 11-3) analyzes the emotions evoked by a navigation device, by utilizing the appraisal theory. His analysis includes evaluation of the product’s shape, brand, technical precision, interface, performance, functionality and efficiency, as well as the pride and the “new sense of freedom and lightness” the product evokes. The analysis closely resembles consumer reviews, and appraisal of each aspect of the product by the consumer is argued to evoke certain emotional responses that lead him/her toward or away from purchase.

A critical reading of the three product experience categories thus reveals that design and emotion movement has so far been favoring a very much market-oriented understanding of the human-product interaction, modeling its subject after the consumer rather than the user or the human. Beneath the psychological theories and widespread scientism, product design as promoted by the movement shares the advertising syntax, and the aspirations of marketing in general, in relating to the emotionality of the consumer. Overlooking the fact that products are classified and made meaningful in the market, it naturalizes consumer choice and the desire for consumption by providing them with visceral/emotional justifications.

THE INTEREST IN EMOTIONS

In fact, several authors indicated the existence of a growing interest in emotions and experience in a variety of disciplines (see, e.g. Desmet and Hekkert, 2007), leading critics to search for the social and historical
conditions of existence of the current emphasis on emotion. Yagou (2006), citing Kotchemidova (2005), argued that cheerfulness became an “emotional norm”, aiding the persistence of the capitalist mode of production and consumption, and that design and emotion movement appeared as an outcome of this development. The argument is reminiscent of Baudrillard’s (1981) discussion of “fun morality”, referring to the way in which enjoyment has been posited as an obligation for the consumer, who is driven by the fear that he/she might miss an enjoyable experience.

On the other hand, according to Kurtgözü (2003) the movement arose as a reaction of the design field to the dissatisfaction with the artificial, alienated experiences offered by consumer society. However, the logic of the market is quick to appropriate the emotional experience into the “vicious cycle of authenticity and alienation,” converting the design and emotion movement into another market mechanism that creates anxiety about alienation in the consumer, only to satisfy it with more products (Kurtgözü, 2003, 58). Falk (1994, 157) indicated that this “emphasis on the experiential nature of consumption” (original emphasis) belongs to a latest phase of the consumption economy, where advertising images, too, tend to focus more on the “intangible” aspects of products rather than their efficiency and ease of use.

Kim and Boradkar (2002) offer the term “Sensibility-Design”, distinct from modernism and postmodernism, including those products with “the capacity to carry and transmit meaning and sensibility to consumers”. Authors suggest that Sensibility-Design comprises especially those designs that followed the potentials brought by new technologies and materials in the 90s, from Chrysler’s PT Cruiser to Starck’s Juicy Salif. If the anthropomorph products of Koziol, or Frog Design with its motto, “Form follows emotion”, are added to the inventory of emotional product designs, it becomes quite plausible to argue that emotion has been under the focus of product design since the mid-80s, much earlier than the relatively novel scholarly movement of design and emotion.

Yagou (2006, 2-4) even argues that “emotions have always been a driving force in design”, and that early product designers utilized emotional elements in their designs as well, even though the modernist discourse refrained from acknowledging it. According to the author, design and emotion movement is merely a scholarly re-framing of emotional aspects of product design. Would it suffice, then, to see design and emotion as a rationalization of the use of emotions in design practice, while it became articulated to the demands of the late consumer society? Or, is the movement a scholarly counterpart of Alessi with the duty of measuring its success or failures?

Yagou’s argument is seemingly critical towards the main arguments of design and emotion, yet it actually runs parallel to them. The argument implies that emotions are and always have been an important part of design activity, but only now rendered visible, considerable for research and even scientifically measurable. It accuses the modernists in the same way that scholars of design and emotion do; namely, of neglecting the emotional dimension.

**USABILITY OF EMOTIONS AND THE HIERARCHY OF NEEDS**

The same criticism has been echoed by human factors researchers, as well. In the editorial of the Ergonomics issue on “affective human factors”, editors argue that “[t]he measurement of systems performance has taken
MARKETABLE EMOTIONS OR ENGAGING EXPERIENCES

one step further: from performance and pain to pleasure” (Helander and Tham, 2003, 1269). Also Jordan (2000, 4) states that usability approaches to product design are limited in creating added-value in the market, and holistic approaches which are including pleasurable aspects of user-product relationship could “contribute far more”.

One common emphasis in studies arguing for the inclusion of the emotional into human factors is a certain hierarchical structuring of the needs of the user. For Norman (2004, 70), utility, or “fulfilling needs”, is the very first requirement a product has to satisfy. Other levels of emotional interaction can be realized only after the utility of the product is successfully obtained. Jordan (2000), too, gives priority to function, and argues that a product lacking proper functionality would simply cause dissatisfaction. Citing Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs, Jordan (2000) proposes a three-step hierarchy, comprising functionality, usability and pleasure (3).

Such a subordination of the emotional to the functional is generally accepted throughout the design and emotion literature. For example, the hierarchy can also be applied to the three categories of emotionality discussed above. “Emotional experiences” in Desmet and Hekkert’s terms (2007), where the user’s satisfaction with functionality is concerned, corresponds to the first and the second levels, usability and functionality of the product. The third level of the pyramid, pleasurability, is concerned with the emotional meaning and aesthetics.

When the emotional categories are translated into the hierarchy of needs, there remains the quest to discover and fulfill them. And the questions arise: “How can one predict user and customer needs for affect?” (Helander and Tham, 2003, 1269) Or,

“How does one discover ‘unarticulated needs’ [of the end-user]? Certainly not by asking, not by focus groups, not by surveys or questionnaires… Who would have thought to mention the need for cup holders in a car, or on a stepladder, or on a cleaning machine? … Because most people are unaware of their true needs, discovering them requires careful observations in their natural environment. … But once an issue has been pointed out, it is easy to tell when you have hit the target. The response of the people who actually use the product is apt to be something like, ‘Oh, yeah, you’re right, that’s a real pain. Can you solve that? That would be wonderful.’” (Norman, 2004, 75)

Though both parties would differ on the methodology, similar questions had been investigated earlier by motivational researchers. Very controversial in their impact, these scholars studied consumer behavior, aiming to elucidate the emotional motives of purchase decisions. It is quite intriguing that not only their aims, but also the content of their analyses are very similar to those of the design and emotion movement.

Dichter, the originator of motivational research, argued that “emotions are part of the same continuum which governs the rational factors in human motivation” (1960, 14). Therefore, he considered products to be capable of playing an emotional role in consumer decisions, including but not limited to security, social recognition and possession. For example, he remarked on the emotional attachment to the first automobile which is “often the place where first erotic experiences occur” (1960, 35), or to furniture through childhood memories (1964, 136). He also observed the experiences of meaning elicited by furniture, which can be puritanical, luxurious, sensuous or voluptuous (1964, 134); or fruits, which can feel sunny, cool, old, young, fast, slow, gay, sedate, friendly, reserved etc. (1960, 101-102).
His detailed observations on the emotional characteristics of colors and materials (1960, 100-104) strongly resemble those presented by Jordan (2000, 89-92).

This comparison does not only help us underline the implications of the concept of emotional needs, but it is also useful for indicating the specificity of the argument as utilized by the design and emotion movement. The principal point of divergence between Dichter and Jordan lies in the psychological theories each appropriates. While the former utilizes psychoanalytical theory to investigate the latent meanings in products, everything is crystal-clear for the latter: There are no latent needs; on the contrary, emotional motives of users can be known, measured and reproduced. Indeed, the appraisal theory discussed above, having been adapted from Lazarus (1991), emphasizes cognition instead of latent psychological structures.

Then, the aim of design and emotion can be identified as the discovery and fulfillment of the obvious-yet-much-neglected emotional needs of users, with its theory derived from cognitive psychology. The appraisal theory and the hierarchy of needs are fundamental elements of this schema; they are not only theoretical tools imported from related disciplines to explain certain phenomena, but they are also powerful concepts that underlie the primary assumptions of the movement.

In his study of consumption, Baudrillard (1970) fastidiously analyses the concept of need, which is an important concept in consumer behavior research and economics in general. He argues that there are no singular needs, and that needs are produced by the system of production as a system where a product is presented for each conceivable need (Baudrillard, 1970, 74-5). Needs are not natural, they are rather produced.

Findings of Savaş (2004) regarding the difference between upper-class and lower-class users in interpreting the emotional aspects of products are illustrative of such construction. As the study shows, the former are more ready to understand and evaluate the emotional aspects of products, more disposed to appreciating the product as pure experience, while the latter tend to disregard those in favor of a functional and economical appraisal of products. It can be concluded that such hierarchies are built in accordance with the production of tastes in a consumer society, discrediting the naturality of any hierarchy of needs.

THE EMOTIONAL FIT

The concept of need, however, is not simply dispensable. The principal function of the concept of need is to facilitate the connection between subject and object, constructing a necessary relation between autonomous subjects and autonomous objects (Baudrillard, 1981).

Such a definition of need has its own role and story in the history of industrial design. According to Baudrillard (1981, 187), what Bauhaus, and design in general, did was to “dissociate every complex subject-object relationship into simple, analytic, rational elements that can be recombined in functional ensembles.”

Venturing away from his theory of the sign, it can be argued that the subject-object pair has been reassembled on various grounds throughout the history of design; through function in Bauhaus, bodily dimensions in anthropometry, efficiency in usability and communication in product semantics. Design and emotion is the heir of this tradition, attempting to
recombine the pair through emotional experiences, and the concept of emotional needs.

Kurtgözü (2007) also has attempted an alternative history of product design, where the aim of the discipline is posited as ensuring a frictionless relationship between user and product. The role of design and emotion is to overcome such a friction in the emotional interaction between the two parties. Desmet, Overbeeke and Tax (2001, 32) unknowingly point to the aim to create such a seamless fit, arguing that “for designers it is important to design products that ‘fit’ the emotions of the users, that is, products that elicit the emotions that the user would like to experience.”

Within the movement, researchers embark on this quest for an emotional fit by either controlling the emotions elicited by a product, or detecting the user’s emotions and responding accordingly. The former is, as discussed above, practiced in a similar manner to advertising. The latter is attained by artificial intelligence systems where the product interprets behavioral as well as manually entered data. The “emotion-aware office chair”, which guesses the emotional condition of the user and changes posture accordingly (Overbeeke, Vink and Cheung, 2001), the alarm clock that computes the data derived from user’s behavior when setting the alarm or switching to snooze and deciding on the amount of snooze time (Wensveen and Overbeeke, 2001), or No.21, another alarm clock which acts after learning about the user (Klauser and Walker, 2007) are examples in this regard.

The general obsession with taxonomies within the movement, too, seems to have resulted from the aim to provide easy-to-use guidelines to designers for creating tight-fits. Desmet alone contributes five different classifications: A classification of design-related emotions into twenty-five categories (Desmet, 2004), of the sources of emotions into nine (Desmet, 2007), of emotions elicited by products into three (Desmet and Hekkert, 2007) and five (Desmet, 2003), and of emotions elicited by appearance into eighteen (Desmet, 1999). Such prolific lists of emotions not only confirm the difficulty of proposing a satisfactory final list, but also indicate the preference for a pragmatic science and quick-and-dirty research methods instead of rigorous research on the complex constructs called emotions (see, especially, the discussion on the virtue of such methods in Desmet, Overbeeke and Tax, 2001, 5).

CONCLUSION

It was not the aim of this paper to clash two incompatible bodies of work, one from design and emotion and the other by critics of consumption, or to criticize the former with the tools of the latter. It was rather to create a dialog between them, to juxtapose them however unharmonious the duo is, in order to facilitate a discussion of the implications of the ongoing study on emotion in product design or indicate its unstated assumptions.

So, first of all, it was demonstrated that the movement is closely interested in understanding and manipulating the purchase decisions of the consumer, though it is for the most part left unsaid (4). For this purpose, it employs strategies quite similar to those employed by advertising. It marks the product as a sign of an emotion, a promise which is to be realized after the product’s purchase. Second, the movement offers the concept of emotional need as another step in the hierarchy of needs, and undertakes the duty of its satisfaction by creating an emotional fit between the subject and objects of consumption. It is, in this regard, a
continuation -and not necessarily a completion- of the series of strategies (modernism, ergonomics, product semantics etc.) developed to fit one to the other. Furthermore, or as a third point, the concept of emotion creates the ideological effect of naturalizing the otherwise historical and social dynamics of consumer society, because the emotional is considered to be belonging to the interiority of the consumer, therefore natural, irrational and devoid of responsibility. Then, to provide an answer to the very first question, it can be concluded that the novelty of the movement lies in the unique combination of these three points that constitute an equally unique way in which design relates to emotions.

However, this mode of relating design and emotional experience is in stark contrast with the declared aspirations of design and emotion, which have been towards “emotionally rich interactions” (Wensveen and Overbeeke 2001, 245) so far; for through such an approach the outcome of the design activity may not accomplish more than giving away reckless promises of marketable experiences. There are, of course, certain deviations from the structure I have discussed here, for the movement is quite heterogeneous, comprising scholars from cognitive science, psychology, and human factors. Yet, it seems likely that design and emotion research ends up producing knowledge for efficient manipulation of product aesthetics with the sole purpose of creating not-necessarily -honest but-definitely-attractive emotional profiles for products, which eventually leads to purchase or, better yet, to build up a brand loyalty on emotional grounds - which leads to even more purchase.
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ABSTRACT

This paper attempts an analysis of the body of texts offered within the boundaries of the design and emotion movement, in order to explicate the logic of marketing and advertising underlying its most prominent statements. In this manner, it is aimed to answer the question of novelty of the movement, as well as to evaluate whether the movement is capable of satisfying its declared aspirations; namely, providing the user with richer, more engaging and, therefore, prolonged experiences with products. This is realized by, firstly, facilitating a reading of the classification of emotions offered by the movement, more specifically the categories offered by Desmet and Hekkert (2007), and comparing the way they function to the semiological structure of advertising as formulated by Williamson (2004), and the system of consumption as elaborated by Baudrillard (1981, 1970). It is thus revealed how the concept of emotion is utilized to naturalize the intricacies of the consumer society. Then, attention is directed to the arguments within the movement which advocate the inclusion of the so-called emotional needs into usability studies. In this manner, the significance of the concept of need in the system of consumption as a mediator between subject and object is discussed and the novelty of the movement is sought within this novel way in which it attempts to connect the subject (of consumption) and the object (of consumption) through emotional needs.