Joseph Asimeng   10/6/21

Communication Design Theory   Due 10/12/21

<p style="text-align:center">1st essay</p>

Joseph Asimeng   10/6/21

Communication Design Theory   Due 10/12/21

1st essay

Shown here above, is the accessible icon. Made by Tim Ferguson Sauder, Brian Glenney and

Sara Hendren. Which is what I will be talking about in this essay.

When it comes to icons, many of us can tell what they mean. Some can't but oh well, that's they're situation. What can you do? Exactly nothing. Icons have been a part of our lives for not just decades. But also since the beginning of time. Whether let's say, if we like it or not. The accessible icon pictured above from 2009 to 2011, is no exception. To me, there is no question to how anyone can look at this and say, "Oh this sign means that anyone with wheelchair disabilities can go to the bathroom." The bathroom for a good example. There probably could be many other instances where signs like this could appear on. Straight from moma.org, they have basically said that the former icon looked like it was being pushed to another place. That symbol is not here, but it's still based on pure facts. This recreated icon shows a person pushing himself or herself. To anywhere he or she wants to go. On his or her own. Within analyzing this same sign, it basically said to "a driver in control of his or her own fate [1]". I wouldn't really say that their fate is what's at stake. The reason being is because fate is a very strong word. For me, it doesn't even show anything fatal. It could probably be less dangerous until that icon crashes into someone else, or if the person from the icon hits his or her head. But it wasn't that dangerous, and it just didn't show any of that, in my eyes. All it shows me was a person in a wheelchair trying to move. The same designers showed what it would possibly look like with a street art campaign as well [1]. This recreated art piece has now been confirmed to be taken with some establishments and companies. In the cities like Massachusetts and Texas [1]. The only city that uses a variation of this sign is New York City. In a form of the individual from the icon on the taxicab [1]. Just to inform people over there about taxi cars available to disabled people. Imagine if those icons were also on uber cars. The creators were responding directly to linguistics because it would tell anyone with a wheelchair that they can go to this place or that place. Just as long as they're the only ones that can go in.

Without well ... anyone else who is not handicapped. In terms of structural linguistics, do I think Ferdinand de Saussure would agree with this? Do I think he would disagree with this? Or do I think it would depend on how anyone is with designing, on these grounds? I'd say it would depend because he said that: "By focusing on the internal constitution of signs rather than focusing on their relationship to objects in the world, Saussure made the anatomy and structure of language something that could be analyzed and studied [2]." That was one of the things which was true about the Swiss linguist (Saussure). There's plenty of other facts about him but still. My point about this remains unchanged. The creators must've responded indirectly to structural linguistics in some way. The whole reason of why I think this is the case, is because the symbol can give a hint to other people and already figure out what it's basically trying to tell them. Which is very good, even on their part, but it doesn't show the body parts in the icon. It doesn't show that type of anatomy in 2-D or 3-D. The sign is just plain flat, created with 2-D shapes with no details with the body and the wheelchair designs, both in the same picture. For semiology purposes, the icon could portray semiology really well. The reason is because semiology is the study or use of signs [3]. Or it could even have something to do with wayfinding, from since it was first created, the present and the future. When it comes to avant-garde art, the definition of that art movement, can be broken down like this. "Any artist, movement, or artwork that breaks with precedent and is regarded as innovative and boundaries-pushing [4]." I think the handicapped person icon would be rejected by the Avant-Garde, as my theory, in which you could also think about in that way. The reason that I think this way about this type of design is because from the definition just given, the art has to transcend and go above and beyond so much that people would say: "oh that's so thought provoking, this art piece is perfect, that it blew my mind away." I still people would most likely say something along those lines. With that being

said, I hope that it paints a bigger picture of this type of wayfinding icon and some of my

theories, with the art theories I covered. I began with a *brief* description of the object, the

designer who created it, and the historical circumstances under which it was made. I considered

these factors, examined the ways in which the creator was responding, directly or indirectly, to

theories related to linguistics or semiology, avant-garde art movements. I discussed the manner

in which the design that I've chosen embodies these theories. I provided direct references to

relevant passages to this essay.

Bibliography in MLA format:

"Tim Ferguson Sauder, Brian Glenney, Sara Hendren. Accessible Icon. 2009-2011 |
MoMA." *MoMA.* Moma.org, Web. 10 Oct 2021.
<http://www.moma.org/collection/works/174871?classifications=34&date_begin=1971&date_en
d=2021&q=&utf8=%E2%9C%93&with_images=1>." [1]

""Linguistic Theories." *Dil Bilimi-Linguistics.* Dil bilimi, Web. 11 Oct 2021.
<http://www.dilbilimi.net/theories.htm>." [2]

"Chang, Hua-Ling Linda. "Semiotics (1) | The Chicago School of Media Theory." *Home |
Humanities Division: Lucian.* Lucian.uchicago.edu, 2003. Web. 11 Oct 2021.
<http://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/mediatheory/keywords/semiotics/>." [3]

"Avant-garde | MoMA ." *MoMA.* Moma.org, Web. 11 Oct 2021.
<http://www.moma.org/collection/terms/avant-garde>." [4]