

Graphic Design as a User-Centered Interface

Daniel Raposo Martins ^{a/b} and Fernando Moreira da Silva ^b

^a Escola Superior de Artes Aplicadas,
Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco
Av. Pedro Álvares Cabral n.º 12,
6000-084 Castelo Branco, Portugal

^b CIAUD, Faculdade de Arquitetura,
Universidade de Lisboa
Rua Sá Nogueira, Pólo Universitário, Alto da Ajuda,
1349-055 Lisboa, Portugal

ABSTRACT

In a globalized world, deeply marked by information and communication technology it would be expected that the computer and other technological artefacts could help to shorten the human tasks. However, it seems that man inventions progress faster than humans can evolve. Like happens in other areas, graphic design can have a contribution to user everyday. The graphic designer should shape messages that belong to others to communicate them to specific audiences. Based in the literature review focused on the design of the corporate visual identity signs, were identified the main arguments of drawing which contribute to the effectiveness of visual identity communication. The Brand marks drawing get special relevance as a way of making complex information more accessible, understandable and easy to memorize. Graphic signs drawing process is discussed in view of their need to ensure the identification, differentiation and articulation between the denotative and connotative meaning, according to human perception and understanding. It analyses several ways of creating semantic emphasis to enhance the sense of the message, influencing the brand perceptions. These associations also influence the memorization, facilitate the recognition and contribute to a significant visual experience.

Keywords: Graphic Design, Brand marks, Human Factors, Cultural Interfaces

INTRODUCTION

Over the years have emerged a series of studies that aim to understand how works the creation of meaning in visual communication, which has often led to the resource to semiology or to semiotics. Chaves (2003, p.123) presents a possible explanation considering that “harassed by the self phobia to the randomness, when the functional or technological factors will be absent, they will seek for explanations in other fields such as, for example, the semantic. They will cling to the semiological science as a lifesaver to come as sort of sign technology”.

We know that from the existing signs, graphic design uses symbols symbolically, that are established and that they vary with the culture and context of use. Resnick (2003, p.123) considers that “symbolism is the term used to describe the art or practice using symbols. A symbol is a thing standing for or representing something else, especially a material thing taken to represent an immaterial or abstract concept.”

Although it is common to find studies that do it, Costa (2008a) argues that semiotics is insufficient to explain the processes of Graphic Design, once it is a branch of study from the linguistics, based in orality and in the written

lenguaje and not on the images – “The language of images does not speak a purely intuitive lexicon. However, photography is a language without code”. Costa (2008a, p.70) supports its assertion explaining that on images there is an absence of a limited repertoire of signs known a priori by sender and recipient, able to combine among them in the discourse to create meaning. The opposite happens with the text, whose repertoires are the letters, the alphabet, words and the grammatical rules. Images do not have such a limited repertoire of signs and are based on the representation or display of scenes or objects that constitute the structure of his speech instantaneous and overall. (Costa, 2008a).

The use of semiotics to understand the functioning of the communication design should be limited to the common aspects between the written and the visual language, such as syntactic (the graphic shape of the sign, its denotation within a system or code), the semantic (symbolic value, the sign expressiveness and connotation), and the pragmatic (legibility, contrast, differentiation, flexibility in use, perception and comprehension of the sign in a given context). In the communication process there is necessarily more than one person, at least the transmitter (which induces) and the receiver (which is induced and deduces). Although in both cases the deduction is conditioned by culture, it does not induce (Costa, 2008a).

This view is shared by Frascara (2008) who says that semiotics sits on a inflexible logic to the human and cognitive behavior, for example when it comes to a specific audience, or like rhetoric, because only affects in the exposure of meanings, it lacks the data that we can found in sociology, psychology or marketing: “rhetoric and semiotics help, but are insufficient when it comes to building real and specific answers to real and specific audiences, relating to real and specific messages dealing with real and specific problems” (Frascara, 2008, p.95). We know that everything has meaning and that not everything that conveys meaning communicates, always that it lacks the sense that allows decoding (Costa 2011.p.52).

Following the same line of thought, Acaso (2006, p.27) writes that the visual language “in particular has little to do with the rest of the languages we know, since both the writing and the verbal are subject to specific rules, fully structured and defined. The visual language (...) is the oldest semistructured communication system we known ... the one that it has the most universal character.” For the author, the feature that more distinguishes the visual language from others is its resemblance to reality, and the many ways of representing itself.

According to Dondis (1976, p.25) there is a basic and common perceptual visual system to all human beings, who suffers variations, for example, by culture. The author believes that it will never be possible to establish a precise system to the visual language as that one existing in the written language, it would be necessary a storage structure and for encoding and decoding, a structure with “a logic that visual literacy is unable to reach.” That is, the visual language does not have a signs repertoire or a universal and unique code. The visual language is composed of basic elements such as color, shape, letters, graphisms, proportions, textures, tones, images and rhythms, each one with its own meaning and possible to change or to be added to the other graphic signs to form a tone of voice or connotation (Bonnici, 2000, p.76).

Research on the visual language grounded in semiotics can be dangerous because, as says Cloutier (1975, p.103), “we must avoid extrapolating too systematic and the structural linguistic analysis can’t be fully applied to the study of languages without language, those who do not have a precise code. But, Smith, Moriarty, Barbatsis and Kenney (2005, p.xiii) van mas lejos y afirma que “in visual communication, however, there is no unifying theory, nor should there be, because the area represents the intersection of thought from many diverse traditions.”

The different models of communication developed by various authors refer to a need to share signs allowing a common code, but this is rarely comprehensive, ie, “...this ideal situation, of complete congruence between the stock of signs on a coincidences field only exists on artificial languages” (Frascara, 2008, p.96). By this way is understood that in the full role of signs, from sender and receiver, the communication process is only possible by a number of more or less shared signs, more or less understood by the same way (intersubjective signs to transmitter and receiver). These considerations are not incompatible with the existence of an effective of Communication Design method, they just shows the complexity of the process and the importance of the designer as author, as a mediator or agent in a society that communicates.

Frascara (2008, p.27) says that “design is an intellectual, cultural and social activity: the technological aspect belongs to a dependent hierarchy” (the author refers to the production and distribution). The same direction is pointed by Providência (2003, p.197-198) clarifying that “we understand that in design - drawing an artifact for cultural interaction - the drawing is one of the stages in the design process, the result of a desire that precedes his purpose, which is revealed as a technical thing but in its genesis, is poetic. (...) The author, moved by the desire (feeling of absence, desiderium) intentionally builds a substitute (purpose) that fills the empty space of that desire.

The desire creates the design, serving a finality (...) the author, to respond to the order (purpose) may assign a metaphor value, shaping his poetry."

The designer is presented as the mediator, which adds value, which humanizes, opposed to mechanical and automated process, he ensures that the interface meets the intent of the program and is perceived in the correct manner. "The designer encodes visual messages by translating the needs of the sender into images and content that connect with the receiver" (Hembree, 2011, p.14).

It is not about that the author assumes his personal style in his work, since the code belongs to the sender and to the receiver – "Design must solve a problem and disappear in its solution, should not be the protagonist of the object. An object-design is a means to an end and design, as Papanek says, should never be an end in itself" (Zimmermann, 2003, p.70). Munari (2001, p.49-53) makes it very clear referring that "... unlike the artist and stylist, the designer does not have a personal style to which can appeal to formally resolve his problems. What the true designer produces doesn't have aesthetic features allowing to characterize him"...

To Kroehl (1987, p.18), communication involves encoding in which a complex reality is simplified and transformed into messages appropriated to the context and culture and again enlarged by the decoding process. This process to transform complex data into common information is the communication goal and Graphic Design is the first way to grant its efficiency, being a true Cultural Interface.

BRAND MARKS IN THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORPORATE VISUAL IDENTITY COMMUNICATION

The effectiveness of the message is not guaranteed when the information arrives at the receiver, the correct decoding also depends on its strength to stand out, and the interest with which it is received and from its attributed value - the message is filtered. The filter is symbolic and cognitive; Neumeier (2006, p.34) believes that "the differentiation happens by the way the human cognitive system works. Our brain acts as a filter to protect us from a vast amount of irrelevant information that surrounds us daily. "For the author, the visual cognition requires that human factors are considered (perceptual, visual, cultural or symbolic), but also others such as aesthetics, which helps to create differentiation and interest. It is important to clarify that "aesthetics is not necessarily associated with enjoyment, but more correctly with experience, which is one of feeling" (Jamieson, 2007, p.92).

Designing a message and transmit it properly requires that the designer knows the visual codes shared between issuer and receiver and especially how to combine those signs abling them to create interest and condition the behaviors. Wheeler (2003, p.20) says that "the design must be appropriate to the company, is target market, and the business sector in which it operates". Also Costa (1980, p.23) states, "The question is therefore to establishing an optimal coordination and coherence among all manifestations of the company, which has certainly an effect on the reputation of the business and its quality, ie its image."

In the context of brand design, drawing is not an end in itself, it is how to shape the message and to the communication program. And "communication begins with the perception. Every perception is an act of finding meaning (...)" (Frascara, 2006, p.69-70). This quest for meaning leads to a general idea, a set of symbols or attributes mentally assigned to the entity, the Corporate Image (Tajada, 2008).

According to Villafane (1999, p.68) "a visual identity program is a series of core elements regulated by a combinatorial code that sets the program itself." The elements of this repertoire are the brand marks (symbol, logo, monogram, etc..) and the identity communication media system, ie, the name, colors, graphics, corporate typography, the layout and its semantic articulation to create a specific style that will be applied to numerous types of objects (Chaves and Belluccia, 2003 and Wheeler, 2003).

That's why Providência (2003, p.201) refers that "designers are interpreters of the world: and its artifacts are suprafunctional objects, that unlike engineering objects, they often present an ulterior motive or an "artistic" value; but on the other hand, and in these case antagonistic to art, they don't abdicate to their integration into the mundanity of everyday and domestic things".

Villafañe (1999) points out that during the design of a visual identity programs, the designer must ensure that it complies with four principles:

1 – The need for the Visual Identity to be a synthesis of Corporate Identity, projected globally according to their

reality and emphasizing the positive attributes, but without lying;

2 – That the Visual Identity highlights the strengths of the project or the business strategy;

3 – The semantic consistency between the behavior and corporate culture with the Visual Identity and the direction of the communication;

4 – The integration of the plan of Visual Identity in the overall strategy of the company and financial plan according to the proposed Corporate Image.

The designer is presented as the mediator that optimizes and adds value, in an humanization process that tries to ensure that the interface fits the corporate program and to the cultural profile of the audience. In this case, as noted, the designer deals with the task of optimizing a message that does not belong to him and to seek its maxim efficiency. That is why the personal style and trends can interfere with the semantic efficiency of communication design objects, specifically when they are reduced to these concepts.

According to Zimmermann (1998, p.84) in opposition to be trendy, what's about sharing a group language, to be similar to others, "having a style is to be unique, being different." In the Visual Identity program, "when it comes to style, we speak of a quality or a characteristic way, a specific way of expressing herself" (Schmitt and Simonson, 1998, p.111), and by this way to create a public expression that should be coherent with the corporate behavior in general.

For the same reasons, Davis (2005) refers that defining the brand style is an important decision that should capture the spirit of Corporate Identity, Values and Personality. Considers that style is as the clothes of the company, it is used depending on the context in which it will be used and depending on the personality of anybody who wears it. This idea is reinforced by Schmitt and Simonson (1998, p.111-112) for whom "styles perform several and important functions for the companies. They contribute to build the visibility and brand reputation, intellectual and emotional associations; distinguish products and services among others; seting relations of affinity; help distinguish varieties within product lines, adjust the marketing mix to different target markets".

The graphical representation of one concept or object can assume different styles or tones (rigorous, realistic, simple, deviant, expressive, synthetic, etc.) and with them determine the semantic content. In this case, the graphic expression affects the semantic meaning. So, a coherent graphic style contributes to position the sign or can be used to give emphasis to specific corporate values and most important personality characteristics (Chaves e Belluccia, 2003).

Visual Identity styles can be organized into two opposing main ranges: the informality (visual dynamism, formal and chromatic contrasts, irregularities, open or unfinished effects, lush or trendy), or structural (proportioned, compactness, pregnante, regular, symmetrical, balanced, simple, contrasts, closed, fewer colored and enduring). Yet there are a variety of possibilities and styles intersections, which can be used (Villafane, 1999).

The notion of corporate credibility works as with people, that is, as consumers we prefer interact with brands that seem the most trusted, which we regard as more professional, more competent and understood in the subject – "The logo should serve as the credible voice of the company's graphics program. But, once again, just as in the case of a person, the logo must be a believable representation of the business it symbolizes to be effective" (Haig and Harper, 1997, p.26).

The same idea is supported by Doyle and Bottomley (2006, p.115) as they refer that "when people encounter a new brand, they necessarily rely heavily on what the brand is trying to signal about itself. One way a brand can do this is through the lettering it adopts."

The topic or the tone is the kind of narrative, which is selected to provide a specific Visual Identity style.

According to Schmitt and Simonson (1998, p.153), the topic or tone of voice is a "mental anchor point and by specific reference" used to express characteristics of a company or brand to the public or to a segment of the audience of that corporation.

Writes Frascara (2006, p.23-31) "design is to coordinate a long list of human and technical factors, the invisible to visible, and to communicate "(...) "the designer essentially designs an event, an act in which the public interacts with the design and communication occurs. The purpose of the visual communication designer, then, is the design of

communicational situations.” In Communication Design, the messages are set (encoded) in accordance to a program of an emitter in order to be easily and correctly received (decoded) by the recipient, persuading his actions without harm to him.

We may conclude that the Visual Identity Design acts as one of the major means of materialization and coding of the corporate values. The designer has the task of interpreting and meeting corporate personality to give it a strategic direction through a global graphic language. To do this, the designer must know well each corporation to adjust the program to communication needs, because as explained by Chaves and Belluccia (2003, p.48) although each organization is unique, "Few organizations can reduce their communication to a single language: different themes and different audiences require dividing the corporate discourse in several rhetorics."

Brand marks as Cultural Interfaces

Azoulay & Kapferer (2003) states that the brand personality is a concept that consists in assigning a set of human characteristics to the brand, such as values, age, emotions, behaviours, attitudes and beliefs. The brand personality fosters lasting relationships between the issuer and the audience because it relies on the communication of identity on a symbolic level recognizable by the public, which seeks to identify objects with archetypal, related with styles of life. To be really effective, all these complex and intangible dimensions need to become visible.

A communication system comprises selecting the graphic signs that are more appropriate and possible to coordinate to express certain global meaning. In these communication processes there is an hierarchy order in which the graphic signs fulfil a specific identification and differentiation functions, like for example the Brand marks and colors, whereas the secondary ones are complementary and to reinforce, clarify or to support the style, such as graphics, texts, formats or textures (Rand, 1993, Chaves and Belluccia, 2003).

Smith, Moriarty, Barbatsis and Kenney (2005, p.48) argued, "The eyes are, in fact extensions of the brain into the environment. The last and most sophisticated of our senses to evolve, our eyes send more data more quickly and efficiently through the nervous system than any other sense." In this way, the eye is responsible for capturing the data to be perceived, that is, "perception, the process by which we derive meaning through experience, is a dynamic, interactive system that utilizes built-in genetic programming to synthesize sensory input, memory, and individual needs."

Perceived by the eye, the Brand marks contain isolated meanings, which are decoded and expanded, when associated with other related graphics signs. The organizations become represented, identified or recognizable by differentiated visual styles charged with meaning.

En términos de dibujo, las Brand marks share many perceptive requirements with pictograms, but they are always a convention result, are more emotional and have a persuasive character.

Parramón (1991) said that Brand marks must be legible, memorable, graphically unique (original and different from all the others), and expressively related to the concept it represents. As discussed, the designer should clarify the concept of visual identity through a graphic style or shapes or colors (Strunck (2007), which is possible because "human beings think visually. The images act directly on the perception of the brain, impressing first for to be analyzed later, the opposite of what happens with the words" (Strunck, 2007, p.52).

Rand (1985, p.7) says that "because graphic design, in the end, deals with the spectator, and because it is the goal of the designer to be persuasive or at least informative, it follows that the designer's problems are twofold: to anticipate the spectator's reaction and to meet his own aesthetic needs. (...) It is in symbolic, visual terms that the designer ultimately realizes his perceptions and experiences; and it is in a world of symbols that man lives. The symbol is thus the common language between artist and spectator."

In general we can consider that the Brand marks require readability and contrast, ie, reading and readability of the name and the symbol (re)presented. But a Brand mark also requires odd aesthetic qualities, whereas here the aesthetic function to create differentiation, recognition, identity and memorability (Heskett, 2005). Even when Brand marks are logotypes, they are words designed to be read and above to be viewed.

From a theoretical point of view, any image, object or concept may be the starting point for designing a Brand mark, but, in practice, their semantics efficacy depends of a program and on a certain design in a cultural context and use. To this purpose, Rand (1985, p.48) states that "visual Statements such as illustrations which do not involve aesthetic judgements and which are merely literal descriptions of reality can be neither intellectually stimulating nor visually

distinctive. But the same token, the indiscriminate use of typefaces, geometric patterns, and abstract shapes (hand or computer generated) is self-defeating when they function merely as vehicle for self-expression”, the Brand mark must be designed to be distinctive in an environment of use.

The formal synthesis is desirable for a Brand marks, once it contributes so that they contain only the necessary data to make it recognizable, contrasting, legible, artificial, individual and memorable, once the eye prefers simplicity. Various laws of Gestalt theory teaches as the eye pursues formal simplicity (Costa, 2011).

Associating these premises, the Brand marks graphical synthesis contributes to the differentiation, memory and fascination, especially when the design includes the exaggeration of attributes considered as most relevant and uniques to materialize the visual identity program (Ramachandran and Hirstein, 1999 y Strunck, 2007).

Finally, by excluding details, the drawing provided to Brand marks a new formal synthesis allowing them to be more flexible into a variety of media and in different sizes (Strunck, 2007).

The signs of identity are based on real objects or concepts, but some of their features are omitted, while others are exaggerated to express graphically and connote specific meanings. The Brand marks design process can ensure the shape synthesis by accentuation or flatness of characteristics that best promote the recognition of object or concept.

However, in the last few years there have been many identity projects using three dimens Brand marks or iconographic, or descriptive and realistic. Healey (2012, p.12) states that it was the way designers found to offer something new to its customers or to follow trends, he writes that “the logo also needs to be updated with the expectations of an increasingly sophisticated audience.”

On the other hand, Rand (1985) believes that there are many complex symbols and images or even objects that have been transformed into symbols of high efficiency, as a result of its use in a systematic, coherent and articulated way. Still, Brand marks require simplicity that can be demonstrated in a simple blur test where its formal structure and key profile should resist. Besides, “a trademark, which is subjecte to an infinite number os uses, abuses, and variations, whether for competitive purposes or for reasons of “self-expression”, cannot survive unless it is designed with utmost simplicity and restraint-keeping in mind that seldom is a trademark favored with more than a glance. Simplicity implies not only an aesthetic ideal, but a meaningful idea, either of content or form, that can be easily recalled” (Rand, 1985, p.34).

The need to ensure that the Brand mark has a recognizable structure and a profile compatible with a specific meaning located in the mental repertoire of the receiver. According to Joly (2008, p.20) “the mental image is distinguished from mental scheme, which combines the enough and necessary visual traits to recognize a drawing or a necessary visual form. This is a perceptual object model, from a formal structure that we have internalized and associate with an object, which can be evoked by some minimum visual features.” Is to say that mental images are a more complex and intersubjective phenomena, because they are a specific form of internal representation, with an associative cognitive prolonged when compared with others similar perception forms. Carreras and Codina (1992, p. 52) explained that “the mental image is obtained according to an amodal perceptual process. The term “amodal” has been established following several studies made on con-genitally blind people, who proved that a mental image is not uniquely based on visual perception.”

From the perspective of psychology, the theory of geons (geometric ions) presented by Irving Biederman (1987) and according to which there are at least thirty six geometric components made up with three-dimensional shapes (such as cylinders, cones, pyramids, etc..) stored in our mind as structural descriptions. Ie, that with these forms all objects can be perceptually decomposed, identifying the most shared structures between the object and geometric figures.

In this sense, Rand (1993, p.58) highlights that drawing a Brand mark with a complex shape or try to express what the company does with an illustration “*will only make identification more difficult and the “message” more obscure. A logo, primarily, says who, not what, and that is its function. Its effectiveness depends on disctingtiveness, visibility, adaptability, memorability, universality, and timeliness.*” So, the subject matter in the symbolic origin of the Brand mark depends on the brand personality, the corporate program, on the audience culture, on the competitors and market rules, the media opinion and in the society interests.

However Brand marks, “effectively distills a great deal into a concise symbol that is ideally attractive, cohesive, conceptual, distinctive, enduring, legible, memorable, relevant, sophisticated, and versatile: the ten characteristics of a great logo”, argues Gernsheimer (2008, p.19). In this way Brand marks must have fascination power created by the use of surprising features; a clear visual hierarhy on its components and a semantic reinforcement; the different

elements must form a structured group, the symmetry and the use of stylistic features related to the subject, contributing to build attractiveness; nevertheless met the cultural codes of an era and time is recommendable shouldn't follow trends or to be ephemeral; readability, comprehension and contrast positively helps in the process of memorization; the sign must be flexible and have a clear structure to ensure the recognition regardless its size or medium in which is been used (Gernsheimer, 2008 and Hardy, 2011).

According to Costa (2011), on visual identity projects, designers and clients tend to value more the symbols than the logotypes. However, symbols and logotypes are just two different ways to solve the need of a graphic identity sign and we have a large number of successful and reputed logotypes that can demonstrate their efficiency. In general, the symbol is evident and has a more arbitrary nature that has the logotype. However, we forget that in addition to its denotative value the logotype is also connotative and its graphical expressiveness depends on the interest of the program (as we can see by comparing the logotype of Siemens with Coca-Cola).

The design of programs Visual Identity is more than a cosmetic job. And for a similar reason, the designer should be aware that designing a new brand has different requirements than redesign. In the case of redesign, it is necessary to note that the existing signs are recognized by audience internal and external to the company. Change is possible, but it requires a more rigorous coordination during its publication process, but also a biggest effort in their resignification, because there is always resistance to change. In the case of design of a new sign, you must create the context and disseminate narrative using specific graphisms and articulated (Gernsheimer, 2008).

Brand marks denotative and connotative meaning

The correct understanding of the Brand marks depends on the semantic level resulting from a intersubjective redundancy between the denotative and connotative meaning.

Denotation refers to the meaning base and concrete while the connotation corresponds to subjective figurative or symbolic meanings that work by association and are beyond the denotative meaning.

Blanchard (2003, p.36) states that "the connotation is an extension of the meaning by which the receiver, by interpreting the context created by the sender, in accordance to its own culture, allowing him to perceive what has not been mentioned in words, through secondary associations".

Referring to this principle refers Mollerup (1997) when he argues that Brand marks produces different types and meaning levels, induced by the graphic expression of the sign, that is, from the different levels of meaning that depend on the connotation resulting from visual style. A metaphorical Brand mark that reinforces graphically what it stands for has more meaning levels.

The connotation results from secondary associations created by the graphic symbol in a given culture or context or by the graphic expressiveness. In terms of graphic expression, we refer to the basic elements of any visual message: point, line, direction, tone, color, texture, scale and proportion, movement, space, reality and appearance (Dondis (1976).

We know that graphic signs can take different levels of iconicity, depending on their formal relationship with reality between two extremes ranging from hyperrealism to the schematic representation). The scale of iconicity by Morris and Hamilton (1965) has had many developments promoted by various authors, which will not be discussed in this paper. Costa (1990, adapted from his 1989 proposal), explains that the connotative value increase proportionally to the schematic level of the graphic signs, but also his need to be fixed by agreement. But there are many possible ways to draw a schematic sign.

Referring to the design of graphic signs, based on objects or concepts, as proposed by Resnick (2003, p.123) the meaning of the Brand marks can be divided into different types of connotation, as analogies, metaphors or puns:

“Analogy, the term for a description derived from a process of reasoning from a parallel or similar cases explaining what unlike things share in common.

Metaphor is a figure of speech in which one thing is compared to another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them.

A pun is the humorous use of a word or image to suggest alternative meaning, a play on words with more than a meaning.”

In a similar way Villafane (1999, p.89-90) also established a set of denotative and connotative possibilities that Brand marks can assume in function of their iconicity and expressiveness:

- 1 – Analogical association (creating a relationship, a description of a concept which becomes similar);
- 2 – Allegorical association (recognizable elements of reality combined an original or unusual way);
- 3 – Logical association (follows a pattern of signs already in place);
- 4 – Emblematic association (the appropriation of external positive values);
- 5 – Symbolic association (adding emotional content);
- 6 – Conventional association (no attempts to highlight any particular attribute, is especially for identification).

In a similar way, Oejo (2000, p.170) also refers that Brand marks they can empower secondary associations, and presents its categories:

- 1 – Analogy (the graphical representation resembles the object);
- 2 – Allegory (combination of recognizable elements);
- 3 – Logic (descriptive of the activity or business);
- 4 – Flagship (heraldry or other institutionalized meanings);
- 5 – Symbolic (use of ideological elements) convention (elements whose meaning is agreed);
- 6 – Contiguity (elements that are as a whole).

From the perspective of neuroscience, the authors Ramachandran and Hirstein (1999) present a subset of eight principles or laws underlying all the diverse manifestations of human artistic experience, that they divided in:

- 1 – Peak shift (fascinating power created by the shape);
- 2 – Isolation and Allocating Attention (emphasis or isolation of individual components to give them more visibility);
- 3 – Perceptual Grouping and Binding (ability to distinguish figure and ground perceptually grouped in an environment);
- 4 – Contrast (distance or approach between the shape and the environment);
- 5 – Perceptual problem solving (the shape contains an element of surprise, which is not entirely obvious or common which affects its capacity to fascination);
- 6 – Abhorrence of unique vantage points (particular and unique point of view from which one looks and designs the sign);
- 7 – Metaphors (use of metaphors or graphic analogies);
- 8 – Symmetry (aesthetic notion of well being and equilibrium).

Talking about the comprehension of graphic signs, Spiekermann and Ginger (2003, p.39) explain that all observers formulate an opinion or mental idea of the message based on the first look that lasts a split second. "In other words, even before you start reading a general impression is created in the mind of the observer. Something similar to how we respond to the presence of a person before knowing it, and a first impression is hard to change later forms."

However, as we have noted, the language of symbols is only one possibility to create the identity system. It was also noted that the creation of connotations begins with issues of expression and graphic style. "Unlike logos or brand names, typography may not trigger the usual suspicion or defence mechanism in the consumer. In other words, typography contains a subtle message or soft power, operating in the realm of the subconscious. (...) We see that the font not only carries information or rational meaning, but send other, subtler messages by way of font shapes

characteristics. This, clearly, is where identity surface – thought the spirit of the letter” (Spiekermann and Ginger, 2003, p.45). It should be noted that some graphic signs, such as typography does have a great emotional weight that goes far beyond the merely denotative meaning, is its double nature of being a symbolic and graphic sign (Montesinos y Hurtuna, 2004).

CONCLUSIONS

Following the premises of Graphic Design, the designer is the indirect mediator of the corporate message. The designer concerns about the Corporate Visual Identity project, selecting and manipulating the inter-subjective codes required for the proper decoding in a given context.

The Visual Identity project refers to a system of integrated Brand marks that gain a new semantic meaning when drawn to to express certain global meaning.

From Design's perspective, Brand marks are identity signs that influence the embodiment of the graphic-semantic positioning in the Visual Identity project, but there is no data on the graphic capabilities of the letter in influencing the definition of Corporate Image.

As observed, Brand marks efficiency depends on its adjustments to human factors to promote the correct understanding, such as cultural codes and perception requirements.

From different perspectives and fields of knowledge we observed how authors considers that the efficiency of Brand marks to be recognizable relies on its need to have a well defined structure and profile compatible with a specific mental scheme.

In the other hand, that the graphic expression or style given to this same Brand mark can increase the number of secondary associations in result of the comparison with mental images.

The different possibilities to draw connotations are approaches to establish connections between sender and receiver, creating the audience interest by giving them something more fashionable and unreal. To do this, designers must consider the different levels on the scale of iconicity as well as the better graphic style.

Visual Identity is the leading factor during the formation of the corporate image, ie, the set of perceptions and mental images created by the public for positioning a company compared to others.

The complexity of the visual language allows the designer to develop a vast number of meanings to be used in different cultural and market contexts. But when there is a program to accomplish, it is fundamental to seek for the appropriate signs, and to coordinate them in accordance to corporate purpose and human factors of the audience. So it isn't possible to use graphic sign randomly.

But when there is a program to accomplish, it is fundamental seek for the appropriate signs, and select how to coordinate them considering the corporate purposes and human factors of the audience. So it isn't possible to use graphic sign randomly.

The meaning of signs is mutable because meanings belong to people, not the graphic shapes. But graphics express certain types of denotations and connotations able to articulate the mental images of that live in individuals. The Corporate Image results from this mediated social process in which corporate identity is the message content, ie of the visual identity.

REFERENCES

- Acaso, M. (2006), “*El lenguaje visual*”, Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós Ibérica S.A.
- Biederman, I. (1987). Recognition-by-components: A Theory of Human Image Understanding. *Venue: Psychological Review*. 94 (2) 115-147
- Bonnici, P. (2000), “*Linguagem Visual: O misterioso meio de comunicação*”, Lisboa: Destarte
- <https://openaccess.cms-conferences.org/#/publications/book/978-1-4951-2107-4>
Ergonomics In Design, Usability & Special Populations II

- Carrieras M., Codina, B. (1992). Spatial cognition of blind and sighted: visual and amodal hypothesis. *European Bulletin of Cognitive Psychology*, 12 (1) 51–78.
- Chaves, N. (2003), El diseño ni arte ni parte, In: A. Calvera (Eds), “*Arte¿?Diseño: Nuevos capítulos en una polémica que viene de lejos*.” Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, pp.119-138.
- Chaves, N., Belluccia, R. (2003), “*La marca Corporativa: Gestión y Diseño de símbolos y logotipos*”, Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Cloutier, J. (1975), “*A era do Emerec ou a Comunicação Audio-scripto-visual na hora dos self-media*”, Lisboa: ITE.
- Costa, J. (1990), Los recursos combinatorios del grafismo funcional In: Moles, A., Janiszewski, L. (Ed.). “*Grafismo Funcional*”, Enciclopedia del diseño. Barcelona: Ediciones CEAC
- Costa, J. (2008), “*En torno a los 60 años de la Ciencias de las Comunicaciones*”, Lição magistral. Barcelona: Universitat Abat Oliba CEU
- Costa, J. (2008a), “*La fotografía creativa: las tecnologías de la ficción; el color en la fotografía; Las variables creativas; el universo de la imagen.*” México: Editorial Trillas.
- Costa, J. (2011), “*Design para os Olhos: Marca, Cor, Identidade, Sinalética.*” Lisboa: Dinalivro.
- Davis, M. (2005), “*More than a name: an introduction to branding.*” UK: Ava Academia.
- Dondis, D. (1976), “*La Sintaxis de la Imagen*”, Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili.
- Frascara, J. (2006), “*El Diseño de Comunicacion*”, Buenos Aires: Ediciones Infinito
- Frascara, J. (2008), “*Diseño gráfico para la gente: Comunicaciones de masa y cambio social*”, Buenos Aires: Ediciones Infinito
- Gernsheimer, J. (2008), “*Designing Logos: The process of creating symbols that endure*”, New York: Allworth Press.
- Haig, W. L., Harper, L. (1997), “*The power of logos: how to create effective company logos*”, New York: International Thomson Publishing Company.
- Hardi, G. (2011), “*Smashing Logo Design*”, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Healey, M. (2012), “*Design de Logótipos*” São Paulo: Rosari.
- Hembree, R. (2011), “*The complete graphic designer: a guide to understanding graphics and visual communication*”, Massachusetts: Rockport Publishers.
- Jacobson, R. (ed) (1999), “*Information Design*” Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jamieson, H. (2007), “*Visual Communication: More Than Meets the Eye*”, Bristol: Intellect Books.
- Joly, M. (2008), “*Introdução à análise da imagem*”, (12 Ed.). São Paulo: Papirus Editora.
- Kroehl, H. (1997), “*Communication Design*”, Zürich: ABC 2000.
- Mollerup, Per (2010), “*Marks of Excellence: The history and taxonomy of trademarks*”, London: Phaidon.
- Morris, C., Hamilton, D. J. (1965), “*Aesthetics, Signs, and Icons*”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. 25 (3) 356-364
- Munari, B. (2001), “*Artista e Designer*”, Lisboa: Edições 70.
- Neumeier, M. (2006), “*The Brand Gap: How to bridge the distance between business strategy and design*”, Berkley: AIGA, 2006.
- Parramón, J. M. (1991), “*Lettering & Logotypes*” New York: Watson-Guption Publications.
- Providência, F. (2003) “Algo más que una hélice”, In: A. Calvera “*Arte¿?Diseño: Nuevos capítulos en una polémica que viene de lejos*”, Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, pp.195-214
- Ramachandran, V. S., William H. (1999). *The Science of Art: A Neurological Theory of Aesthetic Experience*. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 6. (6-7) 15-51.
- Rand, P. (1985), “*A Designer’s Art*”, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985
- Rand, P. (1993), “*Design, Form and Chaos*”, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Raposo, D. (2008), “*Design de Identidade e Imagem Corporativa: Branding, história da marca, gestão de marca, identidade visual corporativa*”, Castelo Branco: Edições IPCB
- Schmitt, B., Simonson, A. (1998), “*Marketing y estética: la gestión estratégica de la marca, la identidad y la imagen*”, Bilbao: Ediciones Deusto.
- Strunck, G. (2007), “*Como criar identidades visuais para marcas de sucesso*”, (3ª Ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Rio Books.
- Tajada, L. Á. S. d. (2008), “*La auditoria de la imagen de empresa: métodos y técnicas de estudio de la imagen*”, Editorial Síntesis.
- Villafañe, J. (1999), “*La gestión profesional de la imagen corporativa*”, Madrid: Ed. Pirámide.
- Zimmermann, Y. (1998), “*Del Diseño*”, Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili.
- Zimmermann, Y. (2003), “El arte es arte, el diseño es diseño”, In: A. Calvera, “*Arte¿?Diseño: Nuevos capítulos en una polémica que viene de lejos*”, Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, pp.57-74