

Positions through dialogue

Name: Yike Liu

ID: 24006407

1:1 Tutorial with Deshna Mehta

In my one-to-one tutorial with Deshna Mehta, we discussed how people build meaning from their first impressions, and how design can challenge these fixed associations. She gave a clear example from children's learning. For instance, some children see the letter **C** as the moon and the letter **A** as a tower. These connections stay in memory and later shape the way people continue to read letters and words. Deshna explained that if children were taught letters in another logic from the beginning, these links would not exist. This idea made me reflect on my project about the word "door." I realised that the structure of a word is not only linguistic, but also based on the first personal images and experiences we attach to it.

We also talked about how this process is similar to the way people understand smell. A smell is usually strongly linked with one memory or object, and people rarely question it. But if we try to connect the same smell with something different, the meaning can shift completely. Deshna encouraged me to think of words in the same way: not as flat signs, but as things that can hold many dimensions of meaning. She suggested I explore language like building it in three dimensions, giving each word extra content through sound, image, or sensory experience. In this way, people can rediscover a word they thought they already knew.

Finally, Deshna gave me feedback on my small booklet. She suggested that the page layout should make the relation between image and text more clear, because too much content on one page may confuse the audience.

This tutorial changed my view of graphic communication design. It is not only about clear form; it is also about guiding new connections. By using form, sound, and sense together, I can question fixed meanings and invite the audience to rebuild “door” in their own way.

Dialogue with an Art Editor

In my dialogue with an art editor from a publishing house, he offered an insightful comparison. He described my project as being like the title of a novel. For a reader who has no knowledge of the content, the title is just a word without depth. But once they finish the book, the same title becomes charged with emotions and layered meaning, able to spark associations that reach far beyond its literal sense. He linked this process of semantic transformation to my exploration of the word “door.” Through repetition, the word can lose its original meaning, while the addition of new layers of information can generate fresh interpretations. This made me realise that the fluidity of language extends across disciplines: it is not limited to literary narratives but can also shape visual and auditory experiments.

At the same time, he raised a critical question about my final project: why transform “door” into a living organism? He suggested that moving from a concrete concept to abstraction helps audiences break away from fixed understanding. However, shifting from abstraction to a new form of concreteness might risk confusing them. His comment led me to reflect on whether my design is overly focused on formal “defamiliarisation” at the expense of audience comprehension. Perhaps I need to reconsider how to balance the process of “losing meaning” with “generating new meaning.” By carefully guiding this progression, I can ensure that the audience follows the

project's logic and enters into the work, rather than being left behind at a sudden turn.