

## CRITICAL RESPONSE

### Enchanted Object – Terminal World

The evolution of technology over the last decade has changed our way that we interact on daily basis. We are attached to our devices in an instant moment without necessarily realizing it. As David Rose describes how we “find ourselves in a convergence-obsessed world where IThings rule.” Our society has developed to a certain point that we are more frequently linked with our personal objects, but they don’t rule our actions such that we are the ones that have the choice to refute new technological objects.

Since the first days of screen based technology, we have been looking at screens in an immense scale. Everything started when television was invented. It allowed us to sit in front of a screen with a possibility to connect with the world. In recent years, these screen-based objects have increased such that they are now in our pockets. David Rose declares that these devices don’t fulfill a deep understanding of human desire. He describes how competition between companies is intense because they must invent new innovative ways of interest for the consumers to be attracted to their products. Although these statements might be true, consumers are looking for quality products that can be reliable to their needs. In this way, people accept or refute the new technological objects they see on daily basis. Hirotaka Takeuchi and John Quelch from *Harvard Business Review* confirm this statement by declaring that “the greater attention to product quality in production, the fewer the demands on customer service operation to correct subsequent problems.” (1983) In fact, understanding the consumer and user needs is an important asset to create quality product that respond to their expectations. There is a necessity to iterate through a technological device as much as possible because it must be upgraded in relation to the user demands. Consumers change their intention in the same time using the devices which brings back companies to recap and perfect their products each year.

Additionally, technological gadgets can have different personalities which comes with the design of the object. It gives an interactive response to the consumers look and feeling in their everyday life. David Rose condemns that screens don’t improve our relationship with them and they are passive without personality. This statement wouldn’t be true since people choose devices according to the appearance of the object. Its appearance suits the personality of the person because it gives a social aesthetic when everyone else sees the object in hand which, automatically, answers the consumer needs and customer

satisfaction. University of Seville in Spain did a research related to this topic. Researchers found that the attractive image and design of the phone, the emotional relationship is stronger between the consumers and their product. (2018) This aspect contradicts the initial thoughts of David Rose that screen-based devices don't fulfill the human desire. Consumers want to feel comfortable and inspired which gives us a choice to take the required device we like at first hand, and switch it for something else in case we are not attached to it anymore.

In the last few years we can notice that technology has not moved in a significant way. Companies are making similar products which are familiar and obvious to our eyes. David Rose gives examples to prove this fact such as devices with similar purposes in different sizes, and different places. But, there is a reason why we have been building familiar devices. Society is in a technological transition between the natural technology we have witnessed in the last ten years and the new automated world we are trying to get to. Frank Geels from University of Twente builds an analysis on this aspect by declaring that "technology, of itself, has no power, does nothing. Only in association with human agency and social structures and organisations does technology fulfill functions." (2001) This aspect can be witnessed right now since society is trying to incorporate new ways of interaction with virtual reality and automated devices, but we are not sure that these technological advancements are necessary and powerful enough to lead us towards new innovative ways to live our lives. People are questioning these ways of manipulation and interaction between technology and society. We are accepting some of these technological advancements, also refuting the ones that are not improving our society. Meanwhile there is an experimental world between the familiar and new technological world, companies are developing familiar and purposeful devices that we have been using on daily basis such that they are incorporated in our daily life. We don't notice their natural behaviors with the world around us. Society is in transition to find something new for the people to use in everyday life.

Finally, society is current keeping its familiarity with technology by accepting the looks, experiences, and feelings that current devices provide to them. People augment their personalities while showing they objects to the public. In the same time, experimentation is happening to find new innovative creations that people can interaction in a meaningful way. Society has the power to accept or refute these elements which might not help them evolve in a certain way that humans envision the future.

## Bibliography

1. Geels, Frank W., "Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration process", University of Twente, Denmark, 2001, 39p.
2. Rose, David, "Enchanted Objects", Scribner, New York, 2015, 204p.
3. Takeuch Hirotakai, Quelch John, "Quality is more than making a good product", Harvard Business Review, July 1983.
4. University of Seville. "Consumers choose smartphones mostly because of their appearance." ScienceDaily, October 2018.