Designing for profound experiences: Exploring the experience scope

Abstract

The increased focus on experiences and on design that delivers in a meaningful way suggests new territory to be explored, moving beyond problem solving to a deeper exploration of the possibilities in our lived experiences. That leaves designers with a very difficult task – to capture the essence of the vast complexity of the real world, in a way that would allow us to understand and creatively build upon it. This paper addresses these difficult issues and suggests that a division of experiences into three dimensions may be beneficial. The first relates to the instrumental level (tangible products), the second relates to the flow/actions (use-experience), and the third relates to the deeper meaning (profound experience). I describe the differences between them through different examples, leading to proposing the need of different methodologies for each, and suggesting characteristics for a methodology directed at the 3rd dimension - profound experiences. In the paper I further introduce a tool that might fit such a methodology called the Experience Scope Framework (ESF). The ESF is intended as a tool for exploring profound experience by extracting meaning structures from an experience.

The ESF, introduced in this paper, is neither foolproof nor applicable in every circumstance, but it is considered a valuable contribution as a tool for the design process, and as an example of a method that suits the proposed methodology well.
A shift from designing solutions to designing possibilities

Design is generally considered a problem solving activity\textsuperscript{1}, just as identifying problems and exploring possible solutions are the basics of what we typically mean by design thinking. Although the use of ethnographic methods\textsuperscript{2} has become widely established in design\textsuperscript{3} we are still searching for problems rather than possibilities. Shedroff\textsuperscript{4} mentions that designers “regularly do themselves (and their intended audience) a disservice by not addressing the full spectrum of experience when designing solutions. Experiences (and, by default, products, services, events, etc.) are much richer than most design processes reflect”. This implies the need for methods that better enable designers to engage with the full richness of an experience. Desmet & Hassenzahl\textsuperscript{5} have an interesting take on a new approach for design, suggesting that design needs to go from solving problems to exploring possibilities, ultimately creating design for a good and pleasurable life. The issue they see with the problem-driven approach is that it “focuses on 'curing diseases', that is, removing prevailing problems, instead of directly focusing on what makes us happy.”\textsuperscript{6} You could argue that ‘making people happy’ sounds like a shallow goal for design, but a more profound way to design for possibilities might also be the key to a more substantial impact on what is often seen as severe issues in the world\textsuperscript{7}.

\textsuperscript{1} Norbert F. M. Roosenburg, & J. Eekels, Product design: Fundamentals and methods (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1995)


\textsuperscript{2} Such as observing and interviewing people in their natural habitat.


\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, p 2

\textsuperscript{7} Such issues could be shortage of food, water, shelter or health-related issues.
This possibility-driven approach starts – and ends - with human experiences. What really affects us and gives life meaning are the experiences we have. That doesn’t mean people should sell the house, buy a boat and sail around the world in order to have extraordinary experiences. It means that we should design for all experiences in life, with the purpose of making our everyday experiences more meaningful. Every product, service, system etc. we design has an impact on our experiences, so I argue that what we design should be more profoundly grounded in the intended experiential outcome, which is what Experience-based Designing (XbD) is all about. XbD can lead to new opportunities to design for experiences at a more profound level, which can also lead to an exploration of possibilities rather than mere problem solving. At the same time this more profound way of looking at experiences may offer new approaches to issues where problem solving has not proved successful.

**New approaches with greater impact on human lives**

When we start looking at the profound concept of an experience we can start designing with greater impact on human lives. Once we start understanding the whole experience, new product opportunities often appear. Hassenzahl says that: “We should definitely shift attention (and resources) from the development of new technologies to the conscious design of resulting experiences, from technology-driven innovations to human-driven innovations”.\(^8\) Human-driven innovations are in this regard more than what user-centered design methods have usually been able to offer. The incremental innovations that many user-centric methods have often brought about have also been their main cause of criticism\(^9\). The problem with user-centered design is that it often leads to a distinct product-focus and creating solutions for the problems at hand. But considering the profound experience instead might eliminate many

---


\(^9\) Lyle Kantrovich,’To innovate or not to innovate...’. Interactions, Volume 11 Issue 1 (ACM, 2004)
of the problems at hand by doing things completely differently. In other words, it makes little sense to suggest height-adjustable chairs for the workers, if their experience would be better if they were not sitting.

An issue with many stakeholders

From a systemic perspective products (and experiences) are integrated entities in the complex systems that make up peoples lives. As such, they influence each other and every product and experience we have has an impact at many levels and on many stakeholders. Besides from the designer, the person intended to use the product is of course an important stakeholder. Denning and Dunham describe innovation as “new practice adopted by a community”, which means that innovation (products, services etc.) is not just something that is offered to people, it has to be adopted by them. The designer also has a responsibility towards the person he/she is designing for. In this relationship between designer and recipient, Experience-based Designing offers ways of giving the product the best possible chance of being adopted into the lives of people in meaningful ways that reaches beyond initial attraction. This is vital when considering long-term relationships and the need for firms to have loyal customers. “Firms can no longer compete solely on providing superior value through their core products, but rather they must move into the realm of customer experience management, creating long-term, emotional bonds with their customers through the co-creation of memorable experiences potentially involving a constellation of goods and services.”


have shown that product qualities that make initial experiences satisfying do not necessarily motivate prolonged use. “Participants were found to develop an emotional attachment to the product as they increasingly incorporated it in their daily life… …The iPhone is a very personal product as it connects users to loved persons, allows adaptation to personal preferences, and is always nearby.”

This will again affect the society as a whole, seeing that increased meaningfulness of products might prolong their use, which could lead to less consumption.

The three dimensions of an experience

As I will explain in the following, it seems beneficial to distinguish between three dimensions, which in combination make the totality of an experience. These are firstly the tangible (instrumental), secondly the flow/actions (use-experience) and thirdly the meaning (profound) dimension. Heidegger uses the terms “ready at hand” – as the product becomes an extension of the person and you unconsciously act through it – and “present-at-hand” – where the object draws the attention of the user, for example the moment where the brakes on the bike start squeaking. His distinction is also descriptive of the two abstract dimension of an experience: The use-experience (2nd dimension – refers to present-at-hand) and the profound experience (3rd dimension – refers to ready-at-hand). Forlizzi and Battarbee write that “understanding user experience – how people interact with products, other people and the resulting emotions and experiences that unfold – will result in products and systems that improve the lives of those who use them.”

But reaching an understanding of the “resulting emotions and experiences” needs a more profound focus than the use-experience itself. Designing the use-experience will hopefully

---


improve an interaction - and it might ensure that the user is happier with the product – but it will not necessarily improve lives. Improving lives is not about increasing the experiential stimuli\textsuperscript{15}, but rather ensuring that the experience is profoundly meaningful. So I suggest a distinction between these two arguing that they have different characteristics and need to be developed from different approaches.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure1.png}
\caption{The three dimensions of an experience exemplified by a French Press Coffee Maker.}
\end{figure}

Hassenzahl\textsuperscript{16} suggests a similar division, describing three levels to consider in design: Why, what and how. These fit the notion of experience dimensions well as illustrated above.

Consider the experience of making coffee using a French Press Coffee Maker. The profound experience is different than using an ordinary coffee maker. It adds a café-like atmosphere, and the sense that you can take the time to just enjoy the moment.

This meaning is supported by the use experience through the ceremonial act of pouring hot water over the beans, enjoying the aroma, then gently pressing down the lid to complete the ritual. The instrumental dimension is the physical product itself, which allows for these


interactions and resulting experience to happen. In the following I will describe each of the three dimensions.

1st dimension: Instrumental representation

This dimension is concerned with the product that facilitates the other dimensions. It is a tangible, often physical artifact. It can be a product, the physical setup of a service, the scenography of a movie etc. In defining the difference between products and services, Shostack\(^\text{17}\) says that “products are tangible objects that exist in both time and space; services consist solely of acts or process(es), and exist in time only”. Her distinction is relevant to the differences between the instrumental- and use-dimension, but services also need instrumental representation (1st dimension) just as products potentially generate a use-experience (2nd dimension). When Buxton\(^\text{18}\) describes a positive use-experience he had with an orange squeezer that added more emotional appeal to the product by the aesthetics of motion as well as vision, he describes qualities that come from the instrumental representation and adds value to his use-experience.

2nd dimension: Use-experience

A use-experience has many similarities to service design. When designing for use-experiences you do not see the product as the final outcome, but the experience a person has when using the product is the final outcome. In the same way service design moves beyond the physical setup of the service to the orchestrated sequence made of several touchpoints, which again has similarities to the setup of a theatrical performance\(^\text{19}\). Pinhanez\(^\text{20}\) describes a

---

\(^{17}\) G. Lynn Shostack, How to design a service. (European journal of marketing, Vol 16, 1982) pp 49-63

\(^{18}\) Bill Buxton, Sketching User Experiences: Getting the Design Right and the Right Design (Morgan Kaufmann, 2007) p 129

service as a production, saying that two things are important for something to be considered service:

1. The user does not control most means of production. It is “owned” and controlled by someone else.

2. The user is a significant part of the input to the production process.

So the difference between a service and a use-experience of a product is basically about ownership. A product is owned by the user and comes with a latent “do-it-yourself” experience, where the service-setup affords the service provider to ensure that the experience is enabled. Morelli\textsuperscript{21} describes services as “a series of events distributed in time, in which users are supposed to interact with a predesigned set of elements”. If we look at how Hassenzahl\textsuperscript{22} describes an experience as “a story, emerging from the dialogue of a person with her or his world through action” the resemblance is evident. It is about the person engaging with some sort of instrumental representation through specific actions during the course of time.

Use-experiences are building block for the profound experience even though we - once we become fully immersed in the experience - become un-aware of the products and actions that enable us to have that experience.

Forlizzi and Battarbee\textsuperscript{23} describe three categories of use-experiences. The first is smooth and termed \textit{fluent}, the second is less smooth and termed \textit{cognitive}. The \textit{fluent} experience is the most automatic and well-learned one, whereas the \textit{cognitive} requires the user to focus on the product at hand. So \textit{fluent} would be enabled by the good product that allows you to immerse


\textsuperscript{22} Marc Hassenzahl, Experience Design: Technology for All the Right Reasons. (Morgan and Claypool Publishers 2010) p 8

yourself in the experience, where cognitive is the use-experience where you encounter something unfamiliar, or the product acts up in a way you didn’t expect, so it demands your attention. That is also the reason why we are designing products to be as intuitively understood as possible. Their third category is called expressive experiences. That category seems of less importance, and I would question its relevance or value in this concern. They describe it as where users “change, modify, or personalize” the product. But modifying a product – when you for instance use a scissor to change the length of your shorts – is a use-experience between the user and the scissor, not the user and the shorts.

Use-experience from an industrial design perspective tends to have focused a lot on physical aspects where the focus for example would be on how something would work for a person in a wheelchair.

This physical focus often leads to removing as many challenges as possible. Forlizzi & Battarbee write that: “Users need to attain fluency with the product early on, to ensure that they will continue to use the product and not abandon it in frustration.” Although challenges can lead to frustration they can also be a positive thing. But I argue that they should come from the profound experience, not from trouble with the product. “Current usability methods (increasing efficiency, effectiveness, and satisfaction) mostly remove frustration points; they do not yet include techniques to measure and craft other emotions. To exaggerate, a 100% usable product would be boring once it eliminates all the challenges.”

24 Ibid, p 262
25 The focus on physical aspects is typically seen in approaches such as User Centered Design, Participatory Design and Usability.
In the Snackbot project Lee et al. found that “people mainly choose convenience over snack quality, but they do not mind walking for a snack if social interaction is part of the activity”. They developed a robot that delivers snacks to people with focus on the use-experience. In this case it would have made sense to step further back, and start by exploring the profound experience – for instance that getting a snack can be meaningful because it is an experience that affords social interaction. It is highly important to consider the profound experience to decrease the risk of creating products that are in conflict with what is meaningful about the experience.

**3rd dimension: Profound experience**

Imagine riding your bike on a beautiful road. You hear the birds singing, see the trees and meadows passing by, and feel the subtle bumps in the road. You forget all about pedaling. At least that’s what you do if the use-experience is well designed, so the smooth and natural interaction allows you to forget all about the product and just “enjoy the experience”. That’s when you become fully immersed – and that’s the profound experience. It is in this experience we find meaning. Designing for profound experience considers the deeper levels of how products influence the lives of people. Products exist in an ecology of things which fit together in order to give each other meaning and purpose. Take a pen for example, which becomes a pen when I have a paper to write on, but might have been a stirrer if it had been used to stir in my coffee. In a profound experience things become transparent in use, e.g. when you don’t think about pushing the light switch, but only that you want to turn on the light. This is the difference between using and doing. When Nike uses the slogan “just do it” they are actually saying that the product is not important, it’s what you do with it that is. But that, at the same time...
time, implies that their product enables you to have the profound experience you are looking for.

So profound experience is about meaning at a deeper level – the meaning we find once we become fully immersed in the experience. It is not dependent on time in the same way as a use-experience, exemplified by how immersion is often referred to as “being in the moment”. So the profound experience can be considered a higher level offering of meanings in that particular moment, which the use-experience and instrumental representation are the means to enable.

Towards a methodology of understanding and designing (for) profound experiences

As described above, there are clear distinctions between use-experience and profound experience that leads me to suggest that different methodologies are needed for each.

Firstly, most methods used within service design and experience design – such as Conceptual models, Service blueprinting, Experience models or taxonomies - tend to focus on flow


---

30 Methodology is used here as being the "philosophic framework, the fundamental assumptions and characteristics of a human perspective" following van Manen. [Max van Manen, Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy. (State University of New York Press, 1990) p 27]

31 Conceptual models depict a situation by exploring which concepts and tasks it contains and the flow/sequence by which they are connected. [Austin Henderson & Jeff Johnson, Conceptual Models: Core to Good Design. (Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2011)]

32 Service blueprinting are graphic illustrations that depict a predefined sequence, trying to imagine the "journey" people will take. [Susan L. Spraragen & Carrie Chan, Service Blueprinting: When Customer Satisfaction Numbers are not enough. (International DMI Education Conference. Cergy-Pointoise, France. 2008)]

33 Experience models are representations of how experience is framed for the user and are beneficial to distil the important aspects of behavior in a simple form that aids the development of concepts, prioritizing and evaluating design directions, and acts as a shared reference tool. [Rachel Jones, Experience Models: Where Ethnography and Design Meet. (Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings, 2006), 82–93]

34 Taxonomies are models created by deconstructing a situation into component parts and analyzing its aspects, to flush out a more complete understanding of the experience. [Maria Bezaitis & Rick Robinson, 'Valuable to Values: How 'User Research' Ought to Change', In Design Anthropology - Object Culture in the 21st Century, ed. Alison J. Clarke (Springer, 2011) pp 184-201]

35 Taxonomies are models created by deconstructing a situation into component parts and analyzing its aspects, to flush out a more complete understanding of the experience. [Nathan Shedroff, ‘Research methods for designing effective experiences’, In Design Research: Methods and Perspectives, ed. Brenda Laurel (MIT Press 2004) 155-163]
and timed sequences, where a profound experience has less focus on temporal parameters. This is the first characteristic of such a methodology. The mentioned methods typically work at task level, and are therefore more related to the use-experience than the profound experience. They typically focus on how the relationship between a product and user evolves, the timeline of the use-experience (or service) as journey maps, or the relations between objects and actors that influence the experience. Whilst they are very beneficial in designing for the use-experience they don’t explain why beautiful (or horrifying) scenery is an important part of the experience of a computer game for example. So there is also a need for methods that focus on meaning structures, applicable before we start to set out an intended use-experience. This is the second characteristic. These meaning structures are to be found in the personal, lived experiences. It is commonly agreed that experiences are subjective so we cannot design an experience in all its details and emotional impact, but we can design for an experience. The experience, and the subjective meaning the person finds within it, will then be shaped when someone goes through it. As Dourish describes it: “Users, not designers, create and communicate meaning”.

Meaning is often seen as something that enables happiness and pleasure. Methods such as “happiness strategies” or “the four pleasures” focus on positive emotions as design goal.

---


38 “Happiness strategies” is a collection of twelve strategies that are considered to generally make people happy. Examples of these are ‘practicing acts of kindness’ and ‘avoiding over-thinking’.
These approaches can be fruitful in inspiring new ways of making emotional connections and creating new designs with an increased emotional depth. But I argue that they have a tendency to encourage ad-hoc solutions that do not take into account the entire scope of the experience, hence only solving particular issues of interest within an experience instead of reaching a more complete understanding of it. The sought methodology should encompass the full scope of the experience, as the third characteristic.

The phenomenological tradition that Heidegger amongst others represents advocates to look at an experience as the natural involvement in the real world as it unfolds. He argues that in order to obtain insights from an experience, there is a need to study the concrete phenomena of daily life, since this is where real meaning is found. As Dourish describes it, such meaning is “…not a collective of abstract, idealized entities; instead, it is to be found in the world in which we act, and which acts upon us”\(^40\). The assumption that experiences are subjective real world phenomena suggests a qualitative approach through dialogue with the person\(^41\) to obtain insights into the meaning contained within individual experience. This is a fourth characteristic. When Hassenzahl\(^42\) describes an experience as something that transcends the material, it resembles what Heidegger described as being-in-the-world – in his word “dasein”. According

---


\(^40\) Ibid, p 116

\(^41\) Peter Wright & John McCarthy, Experience-Centered Design: Designers, Users, and Communities in Dialogue (Morgan & Claypool, 2010)

to Dourish\textsuperscript{43}, Dasein “...is embodied being; it is not simply embedded in the world, but inseparable from it such that it makes no sense to talk of it having an existence independent of that world.” He further says that: “The embodied interaction perspective begins to illuminate not just how we act ON technology but how we act THROUGH it. These understandings inform not just the analysis of existing technologies, but also the development of future ones”\textsuperscript{44}. This leads to a fifth characteristic: 	extbf{Enabling immersion into lived experiences.}

This being a methodology directed at designing, it should also lead towards a tangible outcome. It becomes a design process only when it has a tangible outcome of some sort – that is, that something is created and a situation has been influenced (design is a mediation). So a methodology should act not only as a perspective by which designers can interpret the world, but also how they might do something with such insights. As Suri\textsuperscript{45} describes it: “Designers need to interpret what they see (and otherwise sense) in ways that will lead to design outcomes”. Models and frameworks can in this situation act as lenses through which we are able to look at and – to some degree – acquire an understanding of the particular experience. Although trying to make simplified models of something as complex as real world phenomena cannot be done without the acknowledgement that such models are “embodying only pure ideas of purposeful activity rather than being descriptions of parts of the real world”,\textsuperscript{46} such lightweight representations are needed in order to translate the data into design, which gives the sixth characteristic.

To summarize, the six identified characteristics for a methodology of understanding and designing (for) profound experiences are:


\textsuperscript{44} Ibid, p 154


\textsuperscript{46} Peter Checkland, A Thirty Year Retrospective. (Systems Research and Behavioral Science, 2000) pp 11-58
I went searching for a tool or method that matched the proposed characteristics of the methodology as well as possible, starting by exploring meaning structures from lived experiences – more precisely the experience of working at the CSSD at a Danish hospital. This led to the development of the Experience Scope Framework, which I will introduce in the following.

**A search for meaning structures in everyday experiences**

“I really enjoy the humorous tone we have amongst each other. There’s always someone to chat with. Of course it can also be too much sometimes. In doing tasks where I really have to concentrate, it’s better if there’s less talking.”

We are in the CSSD, where I was interviewing one of the workers about her experiences at the workplace. The interview was done as part of the CSSD-project, where we applied different ethnographic methods such as interviews, observations and video-analysis, as well as exercises encouraging a more free dialogue and active engagement through design.

---

47 **CSSD is an abbreviation of “Central Sterile Services Department” which is an integrated place in hospitals and other health-care facilities that process cleaning and sterilization on medical devices, equipment and consumables.**

48 **The CSSD-project is concerned with developing and/or adopting technology that will improve the effectiveness. My involvement in this project focused on the experiences the workers had during a workday, trying to identify the meaningful components of their experiences. The goal being to ensure that new concepts were created with sensitivity to how they affect the human experience.**
games\textsuperscript{49} in order to get data about the meaningful aspects of the employees' workday experiences.

\textbf{Fig 2. Taking a closer look.} One of the workers at the CSSD is examining a surgical instrument through a magnifying glass.

Key insights– exemplified by the quote - were extracted from the data and structured in patterns. While structuring the insights a distinct pattern started to occur, showing that there were two ways in which the experience was meaningful. One was the achievement of a goal leading to a feeling of success or accomplishment (denoted goal-oriented), where the other was more about the atmosphere, chats with colleagues etc., i.e. basically everything else than what was goal-oriented. The latter is denoted omni-oriented\textsuperscript{50}, seeing how it is a state where

\textsuperscript{49} Eva Brandt & Jörn Messeter, Facilitating collaboration through design games. (Proc. Participatory Design Conference 2004)

\textsuperscript{50} The term Omni-oriented refers to something universally oriented similarly to how a deity can be considered omnipresent (present in all places at the same time) or something can be omnidirectional. The two orientations were first introduced at CHI’12: Jesper L. Jensen, The theory of experience orientation. CHI’12: Accepted workshop paper. Theories behind UX research and how they are used in practice. (The ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems 2012) Available at: \url{http://di.ncl.ac.uk/uxtheory/workshop-papers/}. (Accessed October 9, 2012)
people are open to whatever happens, i.e. oriented towards wherever something draws their attention.

Goal- and Omni-orientation

Going back to the quote from the worker, the goal-oriented side appears where she says she sometimes needs to close off communication with colleagues in order to concentrate. Conversely the omni-oriented side shows that the communication with her colleagues is very important for her wellbeing. As simple as that may seem, dividing the experience in these two orientations was a significant development in trying to structure the data. The two orientations lead back to the concepts of hedonism and eudaimonia that Aristotle originally introduced. The goal-oriented side is directed towards a goal - what Aristotle called the eudaimonic – and hence very focused. In this type of experience an occurrence that does not lead towards the goal is an obstruction. The other is open to whatever might happen which would also allow for serendipity to occur. This side relates to what Aristotle called hedonic. So where one relates to achievement and positive challenges – also comparable to what Csikszentmihalyi calls flow, the other relates to serendipity. Liang says that there is an “emerging need to articulate serendipity as an experiential quality.” Whilst always present in lived experiences, serendipity has been widely overlooked in product design and interaction, especially seen through the


52 These terms are considered to be too value-laden to be suitable as terms for this framework, and, more importantly, the aspect of orientation needs to be amplified. So instead of applying these terms to the framework, goal- and omni-orientation were preferred as terms.

53 Serendipity is meant as the occurrence of "fortunate discoveries" in the sense of finding something you were not even looking for.


55 Flow refers to the feeling of accomplishment that can be reached through the perfect balance between challenge and skills.

56 Rung-Huei Liang, Designing for unexpected encounters with digital products: Case studies of serendipity as felt experience. (International journal of design Vol. 6 No. 1 2012) p 42
focus on usability and affordances\textsuperscript{57} intended to ensure that users act in a specified way. Even though you cannot design for particular serendipitous things to happen (by the very nature of the concept) I would argue that an openness of the experience might enable serendipity to occur. The goal- and omni-orientations are co-dependent, so a framework of experience needs to support the juxtaposition of elements that relate to both. Goal and Omni orientations are seen as basic orientations meaning that they in combination are believed to expand the full scope of an experience, where one of them will typically be predominant at any point in time. You can however rapidly – consciously or unconsciously - switch between which is the predominant one. In a meeting with Suzanne Currie from Samsung’s User Experience Center America, we discussed these two orientations and how they would be evident in, for example, the experience one would have at a library. In the goal-oriented state you would be searching for a specific book, but in the omni-oriented state you would just be browsing to see if something interesting might pop up – such as a serendipitous meeting with an old friend. That led us to discussing the switch from one orientation to the other, which we also saw as a key factor in an experience. So this switch from one to the other deserves explicit attention, which the juxtaposition of the two orientations allows for.

Another aspect that became evident in the empirical data from the CSSD was the influence of the experience not only directly, but also as derived effect.

\textsuperscript{57} Affordances are meant as the setup and clues that are designed in order to ensure that a user would understand the use and purpose of something. (Introduced by Gibson as affordances.)


Boess and Kanis later called them use-cues, which were product-details created by the designer in order to lay out the path (or several different paths) for the user of a product to follow.

Direct and derived effects

Direct effects deal with the situation at hand. In goal-orientation it is about solving tasks, and in omni-orientation it is about wellbeing. Derived effects reach beyond the situation at hand. In goal-orientation, the derived effect could be about learning. Not only in the sense of cumulative experiences that improves your skills in the particular situation, but also how it affects other situations. When the karate kid\textsuperscript{58} for instance is instructed to wax Mr. Miyagi’s car, the derived goal-oriented aspect leads to improving his karate skills. A derived omni-oriented experience is one that connects to a persons values and personality adding to their happiness. If we go back to the CSSD project, such aspects could be concerned with how a pleasant atmosphere at the workplace can enhance the workers’ general wellbeing and how good conversations with colleagues can enhance the sense of social belonging.

In short the direct effect is about the here and now, and the derived effect is about the then and there.

Introducing the ESF - a tool for mapping meaning structures

The described empirical findings and theories of designing for profound experiences provided the background for developing the Experience Scope Framework (ESF). This is depicted as a two-by-two matrix that juxtapose omni and goal orientation along the one axis and the direct and derived effects along the other. Using the goal- and omni-orientations as a basic concept for understanding the scope of an experience seems beneficial, since it leads to a fuller understanding of the meaning structures thus reducing the risk of jumping at ad-hoc ideas prematurely. The openness of the framework is important to allow us to see what is actually there, gathering data from lived experiences whilst making the meaning explicit, so we don’t overlook hidden but powerfully important aspects.

\textsuperscript{58} Movie: The karate kid (Colombia Pictures Corporation. 1984)
The ESF is directly applicable in a design process, providing a structured way to explore a broader scope of the experience at a profound level. Making the orientations and effects of an experience more explicit – as well as working directly with the switch between them – improves the potential to start designing from a profound experiential level.

**The Ifloor project – adding richness to a library experience**

In 2002-2004 the Ifloor project was conducted at the city library in Aarhus, Denmark, as a design research study. It used an interactive floor built in the main lobby. Visitors could send questions via their mobile phones to a system that would project them onto the floor. The movement of people was tracked with a camera mounted in the ceiling. The system analyzed social interaction on the floor, and if you wanted your question displayed, you had to talk to other visitors. The aim of the project was to bring social interaction back to the libraries.\(^{59}\) This concept at the same time opened for serendipity to occur, by promoting random encounters with other people. It hereby triggered the switch between the goal-oriented aspects (getting a question displayed) and the omni-oriented aspects (the random conversations with others) and

---

\(^{59}\) Ilpo Koskinen et. al., Design research through practice: From the lab, field and showroom (Morgan Kaufmann, 2011)
back. This provided an enriching interplay between goal-orientation and omni-orientation that added to the library experience. So where Desmet & Hassenzahl\textsuperscript{60} suggests that we need two different strategies to design for either achievement or wellbeing, I argue that it is more beneficial to explore both in relation to each other, and also consider the switch from one to the other. The ifloor project supports this argument and illustrates how using the ESF could lead to uncovering both goal-oriented aspects and omni-oriented.

**The process of designing for profound experiences using the ESF**

During the CSSD-project I conducted an exercise with selected participants using the ESF to highlight meaningful aspects of the workday experience. I chose to focus on the three other quadrants than the direct goal-oriented one due to time-constraints and because they represented aspects that were neglected in the project so far. The exercise built on initial insights (found through earlier observations and interviews at the CSSD) and used the ESF to structure them. In some cases the participants found it difficult to separate the goal- and omni-oriented aspects, which illustrates how closely they are connected. You could for instance argue that solving a task would contribute to your wellbeing, just as wellbeing might make you more motivated to solve the task. In some cases an identified issue fits between two quadrants – such as the need for a clean and orderly environment, which helps in solving the task at hand, but also makes the environment more enjoyable to be in.

After the exercise I asked the other participants\textsuperscript{61} whether they felt that using the model provided insights they would not have had otherwise. Their responses can be seen in the following statements from the transcripts:

\textit{Participant-1:} Usually you would have a tendency to not think about the derived things when you are working on a project.

\textit{Participant-2:} Yes, we are probably more direct.

\textit{Participant-1:} Yes, directly towards the direct goal-oriented aspects.

\textit{Participant-2:} Yes, and then thinking about the other things is implied.

\ldots

\textit{Participant-3:} I think it’s an enormously interesting process – educational – as a way to think out of the box.

You focus on something you normally wouldn’t focus on at all.

\textit{Participant-1:} Yes, I’m feeling a bit narrow-minded when I look at what we had actually neglected.

\textit{Participant-3:} I think that in 98\% of the work I usually do, I would only be concerned with the quadrant we chose to skip.

\textsuperscript{61} The participants were project leaders and engineers with considerable experience from development projects similar to the CSSD project.
Participant-2: Yes.

Participant-1: Yes. And I think there were some good discussions thinking about what kind of situation it actually is - a recap of, and our view on, the actual situation.

This discussion highlights how using the ESF led the group to a fuller understanding of the profound experience than they had before the exercise. So using the ESF is a way to form the basic understanding of the experience we intend to design for, which can then lead to idea generation with focus on meaning structures in the profound experience (3rd dimension).

During the following steps of designing for the use-experience and the product (2nd- and 1st- dimensions) the model can also be used as reference to ensure the design will support the intended profound experience.

**Conclusion**

The paper argued for a division of experiences in three dimensions, and focused especially on some of the characteristics that a methodology relating to the 3rd dimension (profound experiences) might require. These characteristics were fundamental in the development of a new method – the ESF - introduced in the article. The ESF is considered a valuable tool to identify and visualize the meaning structures of an experience, leading to new opportunities not previously considered, as the exercise done with participants from the CSSD-project showed. The ESF was also introduced here as a way of generating further discussion, and possibly so that new projects will lead to further development and testing, also moving closer to a methodology of understanding and designing (for) profound experiences.

The intention behind this approach is to increase our understanding of lived human experiences brought about by experience-based designing. Design that better engages the profound experience can lead to products, systems and services that better support the experiences we would wish to have. I argue that experiences should be at the root of
designing and act as a vital source of new possibilities, ensuring a human-centered approach that makes technology work for people, and not the other way around.
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