At the beginning of Unit 2, I raised the question: When designers relinquish direct control over the visual outcomes, how do the rules they establish guide participants' behaviour and generate visual forms? Through the triangulation of Δ1 and Δ2, I shifted between the roles of rule-maker and participant, and my research focus gradually moved from rules towards creative intention. I understand creative intention as the relationships a creator establishes between visual elements and hopes to communicate through their work. In my projects, creative intention does not reach the reader directly. Instead, it is communicated through three interconnected means: interactive mechanisms that structure participants' behaviour, the arrangement of text and images that establishes relationships between elements, and the reading process that guides the formation of meaning. As my projects developed, I began to ask: How is creative intention preserved, understood and transformed during communication? What happens to the original intention when multiple participants become involved?

My first projects, *Graphic Maze* and *Dot_t.*, established this inquiry. In *Graphic Maze*, participants navigated a maze, translating actions into images through predefined rules. Even without knowing my intention, their behaviour was guided by these rules. *Dot_t.* combined word chaining with connecting dots: each participant interpreted a previous contribution before responding, making outcomes unpredictable. I realised that relinquishing control does not erase authorship; designers still structure participation through rules and interfaces. Yet I had not examined the limits of that control.

In my Δ1 visual narrative project, *The Twenty-Fifth Room*, my role shifted from rule-maker to participant. Inspired by Georges Perec's constraint-based writing approach in *Life: A User's Manual*, I constructed a narrative framework using a 5 × 5 grid, a knight's tour[1] and an element allocation table. Each chapter was assigned five required elements, which I then used to develop the writing and illustrations within these constraints. Through this process, I discovered that rules could determine the presence of elements but could not fully define their meaning within a narrative or image. The same elements could be organised into different stories or generate new interpretations through different visual relationships. Rules determine which elements are present, while creators establish relationships between them through form and arrangement. This finding led me to reconsider the relationship between rules and individual creative intention.

In my Δ2 writing project, *The Space of Rules*, I revisited the ideas of *Conditional Design*. While Δ1 focused on the allocation of elements and creative outcomes, *Conditional Design'*s emphasis on process shifted my attention towards the differences that emerge when rules are applied. I began to ask: How does the communication of information differ when the same rules are expressed through different forms? To explore this question, I rearranged *The Twenty-Fifth Room*, presenting each chapter in four forms: keywords, illustrations, written narratives, and a combination of a one-sentence summary and an illustration. These forms represent four different ways of communicating information. Keywords present the constraints of the rules themselves. Illustrations give the rules a visual form while leaving relationships between elements open to interpretation. Written narratives establish specific relationships between the keywords through storytelling, while the combination of a one-sentence summary and an illustration makes both the visual elements and their relationships more explicit. Roland Barthes' discussion of the polysemy of images

provided a theoretical perspective for understanding these differences. It also helped me realise that creative intention exists not only within the content itself, but is also continuously constructed through the organisation of information and the sequence of reading.

I then invited 25 participants to write stories from the illustrations without reading my original novel. They generally retained visible relationships, such as a spider on a telephone wire or a newspaper beneath a chessboard, but invented different plots and causes. Nearly half also introduced imagery of memory or absence found in my novel. Readers with different intentions can therefore make similar associations from the same visual clues. Overlapping meanings do not necessarily indicate accurate transmission; they may arise from personal experience or coincidence.

Looking back across these three stages of research, I found that the author's creative intention is not always fully reproduced through communication, nor does it completely disappear when participants become involved. Interactive mechanisms preserve the behavioural conditions established by the author, but cannot predetermine participants' choices. The arrangement of text and images establishes visible relationships between elements, but cannot fix their underlying meanings. Text and the reading process further guide interpretation, making some meanings more explicit while leaving others open. Creative intention is continuously transformed through these processes, rather than remaining in its original form.

When participants become involved, the designer’s intention becomes a starting point rather than an outcome to be replicated. They retain some predefined relationships but create new narratives through their experiences. I therefore see designers and participants not as competing for control, but as interconnected contributors to meaning-making. This answers my original question: relinquishing direct control means giving up exclusive authority over final meaning, not creative intention itself. Designers still organise behaviour through rules, establish relationships through text and image, and guide reading, while participants extend or reinterpret these intentions. For graphic communication design, this suggests that design is not only the accurate transmission of predetermined meanings, but also the creation of conditions for meaning to emerge. Authorship resides not only in the final work, but also in designing participation and possibilities for interpretation.

[1] A knight's tour follows the knight's move in chess (two squares in one direction, then one square perpendicular to it), visiting every square of the board exactly once.

References

Barthes, R. (1977) 'Rhetoric of the Image', in *Image Music Text*. Translated by S. Heath. London: Fontana, pp. 32–51.

Maurer, L., Paulus, E., Puckey, J. and Wouters, R. (no date) *Conditional Design: a manifesto for artists and designers*. Available at: https://conditionaldesign.org/manifesto/ (Accessed: 21 October 2026).

Perec, G. (2018) *Rensheng pintuban* [人生拼图版; *Life A User's Manual*]. Translated by X. Ding and Y. Lian. Beijing: CITIC Press.