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Typefaces contain explicit and implicit character in their appearance. They are valuable to the designer to convey an appropriate rhetorical voice. Typefaces can be powerful expressions for the persona of user groups and their specialized information. This interpretive exploratory study looked at design as research. Textual data was collected from several sources that revealed typeface trends. As a precedent, *Helvetica* and *Times* used on National Park plans forecasted Parks Canada’s preference for Helvetica Neue as the current display font family. The second case study revealed several recurrent typefaces used for titles and headings on Canadian Society of Landscape Architects’ professional journals. Lastly, survey data about landscape architects’ current typeface preferences showed a trend for certain styles and persistent connotations. The personality and physical characteristics of these preferences were synthesized into design guidelines and a typeface concept. This representative landscape architecture typeface is intended to promote professional salience and unity.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Ascender – vertical stroke of a letterform rising above the midline

Baseline – implied horizon line upon which all letters are grounded

Bold – dense/thicker version of a typeface

Colour – amassed density of a typeface

Condensed – horizontally compacted spacing between letters

Capline – top of most uppercase letters

Connotative – suggestive of concepts beyond the explicit meaning

Counter – the interior space of a closed letter

Denotative – literal meaning of physical symbol

Descender – root reaching below the baseline

Display type – typeface intended for short strings of words often larger than 14 point

Expanded – horizontally widened version of spacing in a typeface

Font – variations of letters within a typeface that are employed in various situations

Light – thin version of a typeface

Midline – top of most lowercase letters

Point size – from baseline to baseline, letter size based on 1/72 inch

Regular – normal weight of a designed letter

Salience – distinction, prominence

Serif – small terminal stroke at the end of a stem

Stem – main vertical trunk of a letter

Stress – apparent tilt through a letter body implying hand-written with a pen

String – group of letters forming words in a sentence or paragraph

Text type – set less than 14 point based on typeface proportions and legibility

Weight – darkness of a typeface dependent on thickness and stroke homogony

X-height – height of lowercase letters from baseline to midline
My goal as an artist is to discern connections among abstract ideas, events, things and people. I communicate connections as visual stories imbued with gravity and complexity intended to engage an audience and leave an indelible imprint. The core of my practice is to connect with people on a psychological and emotional level and share an understanding of what it is to be of the world.

Representative of this relationship between art and audience is the pairing of textual invitation as a sensual representation of the tone, timber, flavour or temperature of the artwork. I have opted for quiet neutral typefaces as much as I have used extroverted ones to speak about the art an audience will see. In either case the visual rhetoric of the text was a fine balance of clarity and provocation to stimulate anticipation of the project.

In the spirit of academic exploration, research regarding visual rhetoric and typeface design seemed like a challenging topic to investigate. With piqued interest in representing landscape architects typographically, I dedicate this thesis to students and practitioners of landscape architecture whoever struggled to find just the right voice for their message.
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1.0 CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Typography & landscape architecture

Like most design fields, landscape architecture students and professionals have access to a glut of typefaces (also referred to as fonts) with which to assemble a document. However, formal education about typeface appropriateness and connotation is often through a subjective approach of what generally ‘works’ and what does not. People have their favorite typefaces and this makes the goal of matching appropriate type styles to the “body of content” defining projects challenging at the best of times (Lupton, 2004, p. 30).

Much of the Masters Landscape Architecture (MLA) program at University of Guelph (UofG) involves hypothetical design issues encouraging students to write with neutrality and use appropriate images about landscapes, architecture and vegetation. However, students enter the program with different visual communication abilities shaped by their former fields of study. Some have a propensity for graphic layout, spatial arrangement of text and images, and some have not but learn via peer criticism. Although UofG MLA program did not, as of this writing, formally address typography as critical to design communication, it could benefit from exploratory research in the field such as is offered here (Milburn, Brown, Mully, & Hilts, 2003).

At the very least, an understanding about typography can help a landscape architect communicate more effectively with an audience; ambiguous plan views are
clarified by textual information set in typefaces that encourage a feeling of the design concept as in the hand-drawn ‘watery letterforms’ representing the location and lot arrangement on the General Plan of Riverside Park (Figure 1).

Figure 1  ‘General Plan of Riverside’ – with its’ watery flourishes and undulating banner
the hand-lettered title connotes the ‘feel’ of the curvilinear layout plan.

Landscape architects will likely work throughout their careers with a myriad of design professionals more or less trained in the art and science of typography but as technical writers ourselves “visual communication... must become central to our research” (Brumberger, 2003, p. 206). If our understanding of typography expands, then so can interdisciplinary discussion about the impact of typography on project
interpretation. Conversely, remaining unaware of the power of typography and appropriate typeface usage limits the designer to such an extent that those who have graphic dexterity have an enormous advantage to sway opinion (Brumberger, 2003).

As a testament to the status that graphic design has attained, Canada Employment Census, 1991-2006, reports that Graphic Designers increased steadily from 28,000 to 52,000 compared with much slower growth and fluctuations in Landscape Architecture, currently hovering at 2100 practitioners (Service Canada, 2011). This 25:1 ratio suggests an opportunity for a learning relationship among the complementary disciplines that use visual rhetoric as a common language to help convey concepts of images and complex plan views to the public through text. Conversely, if landscape architects rely too heavily on default typefaces without examining alternatives, layout and document design can suffer from creative apathy (Figure 2).

Serpentine Coaster Park

Serpentine Coaster Park

SERPENTINE COASTER PARK

Figure 2 Calibri, Times New Roman or Desdemona…

Which one is more suitable to the context?
Typefaces are sometimes designed for a specific function or user group and intended to represent the context and character of a specialized message. In this way, typefaces can ‘massage the message’ (Doyle & Bottomley, 2009). In an effort to match identity of typeface character and the context of a message, information could be represented by some typefaces more suitably than others.

This can elucidate a message more effectively as in the Figure 3 set in Bauhaus 93 and Tekton Pro Bold respectively (Lewis, 1966). The former conjures the Art Deco period, denoting the ruler and compass, tools used to craft typeface. It is more suitable at larger display scales so the small articulated counters are visible. The latter, on the other hand, is based on Pacific architect Frank Cheng’s iconic printing style, which lends informality to technical drawings or larger display applications. Considering the context with which the faces are paired the latter speaks more about the profession, ergo associations of hand printing and precision characteristic of architecture (MyFonts, 2013).

Figure 3 Bauhaus 93, Tekton Pro Bold – each have a very different look and feel.

Regarding sympathy between typography and landscape architecture it is likely that landscape architects have gravitated to setting information in certain typefaces more so than others. If this is the case perhaps this can become the basis for a typeface designed for the profession, a typeface that synthesizes the ‘look’ and ‘feel’ of the
information they generate. The challenge is to understand where evidence of this exists and how to go about collecting and analyzing it.

1.2 Design as research

This thesis employed an exploratory approach that entwined design as research with Boyer’s scholarship framework (Figure 4): investigation, synthesis, engagement and communication (Deming & Swaffield, 2011). The goal was to present an education and apply the information with the objective to represent, unify and promote the profession of landscape architecture.

Figure 4 Boyer’s scholarship framework: investigation, synthesis, engagement, and
communication. The research approach focused on identity, unity and salience.

Since typeface appropriateness in landscape architecture has received little formal attention, carving a path into this topic is a critical departure for future studies. Typography and pertinent tangential topics of communication design are immense fields. The information used herein is presented as a narrative: the relationship between typography and our profession, academically and beyond. Engaging and communicating a cursory discussion of the topics within the academic environment and wider professional community of landscape architects expands the influence of knowledge, allowing for greater input and interest in continuity of the studies.

The following initial questions helped define the goals and objectives below:

- Are some typefaces more representative of our professional character than others?
- What is the inspiration for a new typeface? Where should design criteria come from to generate a concept?
- What process can a non-specialist follow to design a typeface?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present an education on typography, as a non-specialist</td>
<td><strong>Interpret</strong> typeface data determining frequencies preferences and trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a methodology that can be used in components in future studies</td>
<td><strong>Synthesize</strong> aspects of typeface preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualize landscape architecture typeface through interpretive cues</td>
<td><strong>Design</strong> typeface using guidelines, key informant, supplemental literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Exploratory research strategies

This study utilizes two strategies of data collection to interpret informative characteristics for the design guidelines, a case study approach and a survey. Data samples from the case study were assessed using *WhatTheFont*, an online typeface identifier, and corresponding *Forum* (MyFonts, 2013). Recommended by a key informant as the most comprehensive typeface library and information system, MyFonts is user-friendly and extensively contributed to by the typographic community. It is available to the public and allows for open communication between typographers, graphic designers and the larger design community (McDonald, 2012).

Because the information regards the descriptive character of typefaces (how words and letters appear, are employed for an intended audience) nominal data was maintained throughout the thesis. As many readers will be new to the topic, Chapter 1 Introduction offers a broad review of pertinent information: typeface history, rhetoric, persona and visual communication. This review is specific to the extent of this exploratory study and aids the analysis and discussion of the data.

Chapter 2 presents a literature review highlighting the most important aspects of the typographic field pertinent to this research. Chapter 3 depicts Method A, a *pilot case study* that investigated historical typographic data as precursors for an organizations’ representative ‘voice’ (Boyer & Mitgang, 1996, p. 78). Data group one (DG1) consists of typeface samples of National Park master and management plans. National Parks Canada organization stands as a precedent for regional and national typographic expression. They established a unified national identity within their documents through
semantic properties of typeface convention and personality (Wijnholds, 1997). The literature review and key informant interview provides additional context for the organization’s national identity.

This case study approach was then applied in Chapter 4, Method B to investigate the progression of a ‘rhetorical voice’ of landscape architecture through the titles and headings on Canadian Society of Landscape Architects professional journals. This case study is paired with the second strategy Method C, a survey of landscape architects’ preferences, viewed as an appropriate instrument for accessibility and participation across Canada. Both revealed and analyzed typeface data through triangulation.

Chapter 5 provides an analysis of the complementary studies to clarify the relationship among landscape architecture and typeface trends and aspects that form the basis of the guidelines and inspiration for the type design concept. It also presents limitations of the study. Chapter 6 places the interpreted results into a guideline table to apply to a typeface concept. It also presents supplemental literature as a source of inspiration. Chapter 7 introduces a design concept for the new typeface, LARCHITYPE. Chapter 8 offers a discussion about the larger implications of the research. Chapter 9 refers to a future assessment strategy and final thoughts on the thesis process.
2.0 CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Typography

Typography is the root of graphic design and visual communication. It is the skilled arrangement of short strings of words and long passages in a typeface whose letters possess specific shapes and proportions. Some typefaces contain a wide array of variation, physical expressions within a font family (light, bold, rounded, italic, etc.). Different physical features and variants embed explicit and implicit meaning, are “rhetorically active”, affecting interpretation of the information (Kostelnick, 1990, p.189). This thesis is delivered in Arial, currently considered a safe choice, legible, aids comprehension and sits information in ‘sensible shoes’ (Cahalan, 2007). It is one of many font families that appeals to designers as a ‘crystal goblet’, transparent and neutral, promoting conceptual clarity without adding much implicit meaning to the information (Warde, 1955). Bold, italic and point size font variants create visual hierarchy and maintain unity throughout the document. Many of the typographic conventions outlined in the literature review are put into practice within this non-conforming thesis document.

2.1.1 Typeface lineage

Hand-written communication slowly evolved over thousands of years into a complex system we now call typography, the visual representation of ideas and sounds (Cheng, 2005). Early recorded language was made of carved pictograms, symbols for
actual things, which led to hand-drawn or painted ideograms, compilations of abstract ideas (Figure 5). These were the graphic expressions of artists and scribes, the few translators who drew simplified pictures to represent early language.

Phoenician and Greek alphabets, the origin of our modern English version, were chiseled or drawn symbols representative of a sound (Figure 5). This was a more effective symbol system because it simplified recorded communication and put language into the hands of the many, particularly commercial traders (Craig, 1980).
Figure 6  Language evolved into a set of glyphs representing the sound within the word they symbolized.

Formal typeface design “has its foundations in metal fabrication of letterforms in the mid-1400’s, early Renaissance” (Craig, 1980, p. 114). Although penned letters drawn with lightweight portable tools allowed for personal expression, mechanical production with wood-carved/metal-cast letterforms standardized type on a mass scale. Mechanical typeset letters incorporated decorative aspects like Gothic angular/square strokes or the rounded and continuous handwriting of Humanistic typefaces (Figure 6), providing a systematic and diverse letter representation.

Figure 7  Early mechanical reproduction mimicked hand drawn letterforms.
The state of the art from one period often produced a specific appearance to letterforms that dated that production in later periods of typography, “just as typewritten text in the late nineteenth century transformed the perception of handwritten documents” (Kostelnick, 1990, p 201). Therefore, typefaces are largely defined by era and are often a time code for their own invention; they can have, in the case of new digitally designed typefaces (Figure 7), very little longevity (Cahalan, 2007). But even though tools for typeface design change, designers will forever try to represent information in innovative ways, reflecting on the past and pushing the limits of visual language.

I WAS DESIGNED IN 2012

… but connote Art Deco of the Roaring 20’s.

Figure 8  Roaring 20’s typeface

2.1.2 Typeface categories & classification

Traditional typeface classification relies heavily on a cultural period of development and the technology used around the time of authorship. As such, strategies for classifying typeface have largely remained qualitative. Unlike Landscape Architecture, for instance, which seeks to use scientifically standardized classification systems (plant taxonomy, soil structure) the extent to which typefaces are categorized is variable among sources and is admittedly an imperfect system often due to finite descriptions and hybridization that are not universally accepted (Cheng, 2005). However the literature points to chronological development and visual characteristics, aspects defined mid twentieth century by Maximilian Vox’ classification system. Some authors aspire to associate the divisions between classifications with subclasses related to broad
art and design movements, nationalities or ideologies (Cheng, 2005); others simply use letterform structure (Williams, 2004). Most simplify the Vox classification by offering five or six categories and include ornamental digital display type as a fast growing category with enormous diversity.

There is general agreement about the categories up to 1800: Block, Old Style and Modern. Contention pervades classification after 1800 due to mechanical advances and reinterpretations of older type, situating some in limbo between two distinct eras of production. Some typeface families have undergone expansion and/or refinement as in ubiquitous *Helvetica* (1957/1980) firmly rooted as a Neo-Grotesque. Others are exaggerations of a category such as decorative calligraphic forms (Figure 8) or digital fonts meant exclusively for unique audiences (Figures 9).

![Zapfino Extra, 2003](image)

*Figure 9*

![Alien Incursion](image)

The bulging, square geometry of this face connotes *intensity, authority, vigor and strength.*
Since the 1970’s advances in desktop publishing and digital software produced an explosion of typefaces by armchair designers who have the immediate capability to make plentiful contributions of a wide variety. As such “the ongoing proliferation of type shows no sign of abatement” (Cheng, 2005, p.8).

To the untrained eye, typeface categorization may seem elusive and arbitrary but type is ultimately defined by its form (shape, alluding to tool and era of design), function (how the type operates physically on the page) and intent (appropriate applications) (Dair, 1952). The typeface data in Methods A, B & C were categorized using the following system of six broadly distinct forms (Lynch & Horton, 2005) and MyFonts online typeface library. Subclass, typeface example, timeframe and a brief description is offered for clarity:

**Block Type** - Blackletter: *Lucinda Blackletter*, >1400
- gothic, heavily ornamented with bars and flourishes

**Serif Type** - Old Style: *Garamond*, 1450 - 1900
- stresses, high stroke contrast and serifs (bracket, slab, hairline)

**Sans Serifs Type** - Geometric: *Century Gothic*, 1820 - present
- linear, low stroke contrast, no serifs

**Script Type** - *Monotype Corsiva*, 1950 - present
- emulates handwriting / calligraphy

**Glyphic Type** - *Birch STD*, 1980 - present
- wedge/semi- serifs, display typefaces, genre-related
Graphic Type - *Cracked*, 1980 to present
- decorative, proportions vary

2.1.3 Letter anatomy & environment

It is valuable to understand basic anatomy of a letter structure (Figure 11) that often is described in human terms and the environment letters glyphs occupy (Figure 12). Throughout any sets of letterforms changes in these relative characteristics and spatial properties are causal of an overall typeface expression.

Letters are rendered in all sorts of forms but follow a pattern of recognition unchanged for several centuries. We look at the head of these forms first; that is, we recognize letter combinations and comprehend visual language by scanning the tops where most of the symbolic information sits (Figure 13) (Zhang, 2006). Research in cognitive psychology determined that clusters of letters form word-shapes or bouma (Larson, 2004). We comprehend the bouma of lowercase letters with greater ease; they typically offer the most structural variety (Figure 14).
Figure 11 Type anatomy
Figure 12 Type environment
We learn to read and comprehend effectively through recognizing word-shape patterns in strings (Larson, 2004). Whether text is used for display or body, it can function efficiently if it is transparent enough to be legible and readable regardless of typeface style. However, if letter proportions and individual characteristics appear distorted as in highly decorative display type (Figure 15), recognition is compromised and comprehension diminishes especially if the type is applied to longer passages (Zhang, 2006). Recognition of word strings hinges on letter unity vs. variety and “depends on the maximum degree of the contrast of form” (Dair, 1952, p. 47).
2.1.4 Typeface attributes

Attributes are adjectives commonly used to assess how different one font might be from another and can clarify typeface associations. Denotative, or explicit attributes, describe the physical aspect of a typeface whereas connotative, or implicit attributes, describe how the typeface resonates psychologically or emotionally.

The attribute assessment method refined by Eva Brumberger in 2003 used twenty non-paired attributes (Cheap, Friendly, Serious, etc.). Participants assessed the appropriateness of disparate fonts for information from particular professions. These attributes are multi-modal; they describe a sensory experience and can be applied to various sources as reflecting the three-dimensional nature of the human personality. To quantify the results ANOVA can determine a semantic differential, how different one font is from another or show how much agreement among participants there was from one font application to another. Semantic differential is avoided in this thesis in favor of generating nominal results appropriate for initial phase of conceptual design (Silie, Dolie, & Pibernik, 2009).

2.1.5 Visual rhetoric

Visual rhetoric is the accumulative voice stimulated by attributes conjured from character structure that suggests a particular quality beyond the actual information. Embedded in “graphic cues and special variations” is the multi-modal experience of typeface rhetoric; that is, they can trigger semantic associations with other senses or experiences for the reader (Kostelnick, 1990, p.189). These physical characteristics are
the link to the internal dialogue we create through imagining human intonation, speech tempo and stressing when we see type (Arnheim, 1969).

A typeface forms “activate cognitive processes, thereby attracting their attention and helping [readers] find useful but unsought information” (Landoni and Forbes, 2000, p.191). This rhetoric can be conspicuous or subtle, conveying explicit and implicit meaning, but when matched appropriately to information with similar character it creates another layer of inner language for the reader (Walker, Smith, & Livingston, 1986). The personality of text is causal for the rhetoric to be influential and can “…trigger a cognitive or emotional response… or rather suggests some sort of meaning… having intellectual or emotional value.” (Wijnholds, 1997, p. 27).

The stylistic choice to use one typeface over another guides the visual language of a heading, passage, document, etc. and suggests a rhetorical stance: serious, conversational, low key, energetic, highly technical or user friendly.” In this way “we see documents before we read them,” ensuring judgments about anticipated information (Kostelnick, 1990, p. 199-200). Employing an appropriate typeface can cultivate enthusiasm and curiosity (Figure 16). Alternatively, “different graphical presentations suggest different readings and can deeply affect the interpretations of the contents of the same text” (Landoni & Gibb, 2000, p.191). Whether applied as attention-grabbing display or text content, type can pull the meaning of the information toward intended connotations (Doyle & Bottomley, 2009).
Visual rhetoric as a product of typographic expression has been under scrutiny for decades, but serious consideration through academic criticism is a recent phenomenon. For most researchers the realm of legibility and quantitative evaluation of fonts has become an increasingly easy task given the rapid growth and availability of computer software to manipulate and measure digital text (Zhang, 2006). However, determining which typeface appropriately expresses certain information falls to the realm of semantics.

Figure 16 Some faces seem more suitable for certain informational situations. Pre-existing opinion might indicate that the friendly, informal script of Dakota and somewhat primitive strokes and irregular terminals of Lithos are better suited to construction (top) than the position of authority, precision and security connoted by notions embodied medical expert (bottom).
2.1.6 Semantics

Semantics, the science of meaning, can be of two types: associative and aesthetic. Given that information interpretation can change from one context or another, typeface character achieves convention, married to its context through popular use, or personality, mutable and multi-faceted. In western culture, convention associations are also determined by individual and collective exposure to influential design of advertising and tourism (Figure 17) (Childers & Jass, 2002).

Figure 17  Identifiable Helvetica font family has been used in Canada for road signs for decades.

In discerning typeface characteristics associated with a profession, it may be that convention and personality intertwine. Our public assumptions about the general practice of certain professional disciplines may well remain when reading a document generated by members of that profession. In this instance longstanding assumptions guide readers’ expectations. However, font association, encompassing traits, moods, conditions and actions, is usually congenial with the textual content of professional messages. The meaning of the content is preferably enhanced but sometimes complicated, especially in the current era flooded with typeface style trends (Wijnholds, 1996). Whereas a specialist may employ a typeface they deem suitable for a message,
their deeper understanding of the subtleties of design and semantic implication may be lost on the average reader.

Further convoluting the process of semantics is that of viewer’s *aesthetic* judgments, ultimately a subjective event. Aesthetics can be read as having roots in biology and physics, on a fundamental level appealing to our senses that seek to be put at ease, elevated, made to feel good (Wijnholds, 1997). Aesthetic preferences are also intrinsically tied to culture. Culture, in turn, has both depth and breadth, is historically based and responsive to current trends. Therefore, aesthetic decisions about typeface appropriateness can be bound to a personal awareness of beauty based on a cultural bias.

New typefaces are developed out of a necessity to explore the subtleties in communication design especially where professional saliency is considered. Take for example North America’s recent response to the originally reviled Helvetica, adopted for federal and professional organizations through the 1960’s. After falling out of favor for its cold character partly due to its overwhelmingly application, it has in recent years been refined and expanded, resurfaced as a sophisticated, elegant and neutral face (Boulet, 2012).

A stylistic change in typography practiced frequently enough by a professional body becomes convention. Typographic conventions are a type of code that when adopted formally have the capacity for rapid changes in the way we understand information generated by a specific design discipline. These changes become more profound to those working with influential design ideas that shape the world around us (Kostelnick, 1990). Nonetheless, the perception of a consistent typographic style,
regularly employed within a design discipline like Landscape Architecture, can become a semantic cue for considering information that acts as a visual unifier among associative design fields and public perception.

### 2.1.7 Intension & reception

“A bank could probably conduct business in a functional aluminum building, but that would contradict what clients expect. To communicate the stability of the organization, the visual text must instead be constructed of materials like brick and stone that typify the genre” (Kostelnick, 1990, p.200). Likewise a team of Landscape Architects could set-up shop on an abandoned airfield tarmac, but public opinion about professional sympathy of natural systems or appropriately designed environments might well be damaged. Graphic Designers and the professional communication field adapted to changes in visual language formats, accompanying other disciplines that recognized the impact type design has in conveying intrinsic messages (Kostelnick, 1990,).

Just as we can understand implied meaning behind representation using certain building materials, iconic shapes or symbols, textual metaphors work in a similar manner. If a type’s shape on a visual field is dislocated from the metaphors within the information the result is dislocated “mechanical reading” (Landoni & Gibb, 2000, p. 193). Disengaging the reader from content can be avoided providing there are shared metaphors between text and content.
Figure 18 shows metaphorical compatibility between the rolling landscape and soft curves of a hand-lettered font style reinforcing the motto’s connotation of communion and friendliness. The intended meaning of a document by its designer and the perception of a message by its audience is a critical relationship, which depends largely on clarity, quality and how its content is dressed. Often, however, judgments about a typeface and how well suited it is to the page and the information conveyed are fueled by reader experience and associations (Childers, 2002). As we read we compose our thoughts and judgments about the information, developing an internal rhetorical environment with sensual characteristics, that is, related to senses like the sharpness of a sound or the softness of a texture. We literally ascribe a voice and persona to the language we perceive.

The style of visual language is often admittedly subjective and “can be measured no more precisely than how it is transmitted verbally” (Kostelnick, 1990, p. 199). Regardless, strong similarities exist between expert and amateur comprehension of rhetorical text passages and their connotations (Brumberger, 2003). We understand visual tone in context of conceptual content and in relation to nearby information.
The compatibility between rational (comprehension and legibility) and intuitive (implied voice) reading of text is partly based on a subjective experience with the content. If someone is familiar with concepts in landscape architecture they will read a document with sensitivity for the profession, in the voice of that professional. The intended use of a specific typeface form as a functional signifier of information has been shown to greatly influence interpretation of the message especially when its for a service or product (Childers & Jass, 202). More importantly, typefaces and professions can share functional characteristics and qualities that imply congruent persona (Walker, Smith, & Livingston, 1986).
3.0 CHAPTER 3

PILOT CASE STUDY: NATIONAL PARKS IDENTITY

3.1 Scope of research

The topic of typeface history and design is rich with meaning and context with a vast international root system. However, in the interest of completing the studies, analysis and resulting design in a timely fashion, the information for this thesis consists of Canadian histories. Enough data was accumulated to make informed interpretations and all the methods and processes are replicable.

Data and timeline end dates were determined by pivotal historical design and technological shifts, seminal dates about the establishment and progression of Landscape Architecture in Canada and editorial benchmarks of CSLA publications.

3.1.1 Timeframe

It was necessary to begin research in May 2012 due to the availability of Parks Canada’s Staff in the summer months. This allowed for ample response time as conversations ensued and led to further data investigation. Conducting a survey in fall 2012 was the best time to engage landscape architects, as they would likely be in an active project period. Simultaneously, communication with the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects (CSLA) provided an opportunity to integrate the study into a professional forum at Halifax, Nova Scotia for the 2012 CSLA Congress.
The bulk of the literature review, research and data collection was conducted May to August, 2012. Data collection and analysis of the survey regarding typographic preferences continued September - December 2012. Additional analysis, discussion and typeface design took place January - March 2013.
3.2 Method A

Rhetorical voice of Parks Canada

This pilot case study addresses a narrow history of a select set of data: the persona attributes and other physical factors of typefaces used for titles and headings on National Park plans. The process that Parks Canada has taken to establish a brand is presented as a large organization that acknowledged the importance of typeface persona and by extension, the public interpretation of its distinctly Canadian identity. National Park documents were chosen as examples because national landscape identity, promoted by Parks Canada, and the larger environmental concerns of Landscape Architecture in Canada, are closely associated; the organizations matured simultaneously throughout the last century.

Data Group 1 (DG1) portrays a typographic history by looking at master and management plan documents from 1967 onward. At the time of this writing, the 2010 National Parks Systems Plan listed all parks by province and year of designation. From this list, the first nationally designated park from each province and territory was chosen as a representative cross-section of Canada’s vast and varied regional landscapes.

Where some parks were established earlier than others, evidence of typographic variety based on state-of-the-art and larger design movements is likely. However, the proposition here is that, regardless of this variety, the data extracted from subsequent master and management plans reveal persistent typeface patterns baring common
attributes and trends. These trends reflect the current persona and professional message of this distinct organization.

3.2.1 Variables

Independent

DG1 titles and headings yield certain qualitative factors: physical characteristics and typeface personas as precursors for future typefaces chosen by the National Parks organization are representative of their core message.

Dependent

The National Parks’ branding guidelines determine a unified look to their documents using typefaces paired for their distinction and strength of character. This choice was informed by typefaces that, working independently, individual park design teams used to represent the character of their own regional landscapes within the federal documents. They were limited by trends and state of the art.

3.2.2 Data collection

The data for this section of the study comes from the following National Parks:

Banff, Alberta (1885), Yoho, British Columbia (1886), Wood Buffalo, Northwest Territories (1922), Prince Albert, Saskatchewan (1927), Riding Mountain, Manitoba (1929), Prince Edward Island National Park, Prince Edward Island (1937), Cape Breton Highlands, Nova Scotia (1937), Fundy, New Brunswick (1948), Terra-Nova,
Newfoundland and Labrador (1957), St Lawrence Islands, Ontario (1967), Forillon, Quebec (1974) and Auyuittuq, Nunavut (1976).

In an effort to first find the *earliest* available National Park master and management plans, searches were conducted through Scholars Portal at the University of Guelph, affiliated universities and the National Archives. Requests for the government documents were placed through *Racer* and *Trellis* at University of Guelph.

Table 1 shows the set numbers and dates of (1a-1970) first available master/management plan for each park arranged chronologically and any other available plan for that park. The documents were categorized by decade for two reasons. Firstly, revised National Park plans are typically published every decade. Within every five years amendments and provisional plans often follow carrying a similar typographic format. Secondly, typographic trends in the latter 20th century shifted approximately every ten years within broader design influences and technology changes.
When the documents arrived, the first few pages of contextual information were scanned on an 11x17 Hewlett Packard flatbed scanner at 300dpi (to assure clarity for extraction of typographic information). The title, initial document descriptors and introduction or executive summary headings establish the visual rhetoric, the tone of the reading and invitation to the information within the document. The first image within each plan (drawing, diagram or photograph depicting park landscape character) was also scanned for possible illustrative use throughout the thesis (Figure 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Banff</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>1a 1970</td>
<td>1b 1988</td>
<td>1c 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Yoho</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>2a 1970</td>
<td>2b 1988</td>
<td>2c 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Wood Buffalo</td>
<td>Northwest Territories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>4a 1970</td>
<td>4b 1980</td>
<td>4c 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Riding Mountain</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Cape Breton Highlands</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Fundy</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Terra-Nova</td>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>St Lawrence Islands</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a 1970</td>
<td>7b 1984</td>
<td>7c 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Forillon</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11a 1972</td>
<td>11b 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Kluane</td>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Auyuittuq</td>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

DG1 Available Park Plans by Year

Current National Parks Plan 2012
The scans were then cropped, saved as (.tiff) images and catalogued accordingly: each park labeled numerically by consecutive designation year (1-13), each set for that park, a consecutive letter (a, b, c, d) and a number assigned to each sample (1, 2, 3), initials of the park and the year of the document. A total of 64 primary data samples were collected in this part of the study.

Figure 19 4c1PA1995 shows the cover page from the fourth data group (4), third data set (c), sample one (1). All extracted typeface images from DG1 in the analysis use this label.

### 3.2.3 Typeface Identification

In order to identify specifically the typefaces used for National Park samples DG1 scans, titles and headings were isolated and cropped (Figure 20). Each sample was uploaded to MyFonts *What The Font?*, which digitally assesses a typeface sample for physical characteristics (x-height, ascenders, colour, stress) and narrows down the possibilities for a positive typeface ID. The following data samples (4c1, 2) show a cover title and interior heading fonts. The image contrast was increased to help the online filter discern letterforms from background information.
All scans were uploaded according to website requirements (Figure 21). Some images were too worn, pale or inconsistent to be read clearly, therefore an alternative method was employed. *MyFonts* provides online typeface ID using a public *Forum* of knowledgeable typeface enthusiasts, typographers and graphic designers eager to help ‘root out’ obscure or unidentifiable typefaces. Remaining samples were uploaded with requests for identification. Within a few hours responses to inquiries reinforced the curiosity and enthusiasm that exists about typographic dialogue. Member suggestions of typeface identification were cross-examined with online typeface glyph galleries in *MyFonts* to confirm DG1 samples.
Figure 21  Uploading process to identify typeface, categorize and determine attributes. Online forum helped discover typefaces that were to worn to ID.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DG1</th>
<th>Document Typeface Hierarchy</th>
<th>Created/ Revived</th>
<th>Historical Category</th>
<th>Intension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Sub-Class</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1a1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a2</td>
<td>Century Old Style (Bold)</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1b1</td>
<td>Quorum (Bld-Bold)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1c1</td>
<td>Quorum (Std-Bold, Caps)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1c2</td>
<td>Janson Text (55 Roman)</td>
<td>1590/1634</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palatino (Italic + Script)</td>
<td>1520/1666</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2a1</td>
<td>Times New Roman (STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a2</td>
<td>Century Old Style (Bold)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2b1</td>
<td>Quorum (Bld-Bold)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b2</td>
<td>Quorum (Std-Bold)</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3c1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3c2</td>
<td>Gill Sans (Std)</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4a1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3a2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4b1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg Caps)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4b2</td>
<td>Century Old Style (Bold)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5a1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman-Bold Caps)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5b2</td>
<td>Standard Typewriter</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Monospaced Slab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5c1</td>
<td>Palatino (Condensed Demi, Outlined)</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Decorative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5c2</td>
<td>Univers 55 (Bld)</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5a2</td>
<td>Volta (Med, Caps)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Clarendon-Slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5b1</td>
<td>Times (Pro Roman-Caps)</td>
<td>1931-1974</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5c2</td>
<td>Helvetica (55 Med Neue, Caps)</td>
<td>1557/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5c1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman-STD Reg, Caps)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5c2</td>
<td>Helvetica (55 Med Neue, Caps)</td>
<td>1557/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5c1</td>
<td>New Baskerville (Bld, Expanded)</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5c2</td>
<td>New Baskerville (Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5a1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bold, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5a2</td>
<td>Palatino (Bold, Caps)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5b1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bold, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5b2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bld Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6a1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6a2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6b1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6b2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Condensed)</td>
<td>1571/1660</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6c1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6c2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Condensed)</td>
<td>1571/1660</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7a1</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bld, Bold, Caps)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Geometric Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a2</td>
<td>Copper Black (Caps)</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a3</td>
<td>Univers (55 Bold, Caps)</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Monospaced Slab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>7b1</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7a2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>neo-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7c1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7c2</td>
<td>Century Old Style (Bld)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7c3</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7c4</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bld, Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7c5</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8a1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8a2</td>
<td>Times (Bld-Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8b1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8b2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Condensed)</td>
<td>1571/1660</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8c1</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1550/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8c2</td>
<td>Helvetica (Condensed)</td>
<td>1571/1660</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9a1</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bld, Bold, Caps)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Geometric Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9a2</td>
<td>Courier (Caps)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Monospaced Slab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>9b1</td>
<td>Cooper Black (Bld)</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9b2</td>
<td>Univers (55 Bold, Caps)</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Monospaced Slab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>9b3</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9b4</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9b5</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9b6</td>
<td>Helvetica (Std Condensed, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10a1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman STD Reg)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10a2</td>
<td>Times (Bld-Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10b1</td>
<td>Cooper Black (Bld, Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10b2</td>
<td>Times (Bld-Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10b3</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps &amp; Italic)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10b4</td>
<td>Palatino (Bld, Caps)</td>
<td>1590/1666</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Old Style-Humanit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10b5</td>
<td>Helvetica (Outline, Caps)</td>
<td>1571/1660</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Gothique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10b6</td>
<td>Standard Typewriter</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Monospaced Slab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unified Typeface for National Parks Documents

- **NP System Plan 2003 to 2010**
  - Palatino
  - Helvetica Neue Condensed
  - 1590/1666
  - Semi-Serif
  - Neo-Gothique

- **NP System Plan 2010 to present**
  - Helvetica Neue
  - 1571/1660
  - Semi-Serif
  - Neo-Gothique
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3.3 Results

3.3.1 Typeface categories

Upon recommendation by Rod Macdonald, pre-eminent Canadian typographer interviewed for Chapter 4, classification and categorical information was sourced from MyFonts. The categories in Table 2 are the roots of typeface persona and the foundation of typeface form, function and intent central to analysis and discussions about organization identity.

The **Typeface Family** ID for each sample, organized chronologically by publication, was listed in the respective hierarchy column. The font of each sample, in brackets, expresses the functional nuances within that family and can influence connotative association.

The year each typeface was **Created/Revived** was included, drawing a trend with publication dates. The era either defines the state of the art or implied technology.

Revealing **Historical Categories** (Main Class and Sub-Class) indicated a sample style trend. It is important to note that subsequent amendments to traditional classification include contemporary digital fonts (Cheng, 2005) by their physical structure (Glyphic, Graphic).

Lastly, each sample’s **Intended Application** is indicated, whether it was designed for display (greater than 14pt. and only a few words strung together as in titles or headings), text (smaller than 14pt. and many words strung together as in sentences and paragraphs) or both.
3.3.2 Overall typeface trend

Listing the typeface families as they occurred within each decade is helpful to understand several important concepts about typographic trending. In Table 3 the typeface samples reflect the state of the art and availability by document era.

Prior to 1979 sets employed fewer typefaces.

From 1980 – 2000 there are just as many fonts as data sets.

After 2000, the variety of typeface families decline to a unified single typeface for display. As an observation, the proliferation of typefaces seemed to result in a reaction whereby Parks Canada unified the documents so they read as parts of a whole system in keeping with a systems approach to conservation and land management.
Table 3 Typeface trends throughout DG1 samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>Times NR</td>
<td>Quorum</td>
<td>Janson</td>
<td>Palitino</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel</td>
<td>Century Old Style</td>
<td>Times NR</td>
<td>Palitino</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>Times ProR</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>Gill Sans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>Standard Typewriter</td>
<td>Peignot Demi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>Univers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper Black</td>
<td>New Baskervilles</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univers</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helvetica Neue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Typeface/Document Sets | 3/2 | 5/7 | 7/7 | 11/11 | 2/4 | 1/13 |
3.3.3 Comparing document & typeface dates

Generally, as we advance through the years of publication of DG1 sets 1-13, the number of years between the document design / publication and the year the typeface used was designed reduced slightly or remained relatively stable (Table 1). Most of the documents generated prior to desktop publishing were using typeface developed during the first half of the 20th century or earlier. The overall typeface trend favors those that were developed or redesigned 1-3 decades prior to the National Park document itself with only a few exceptions showing a use of an earlier designed typeface. This could indicate a preference for using contemporary typefaces, designing a document that appears current instead of retaining a previously used type that may have fallen out of favor or perceived relevance. All the DG1 samples appear in Appendix A.
3.4 Analysis

This analysis comprises several subsections that examine the data and contributes to an understanding of typeface persona as representative of an organization. An analysis of a key informant interview is included; it clarifies some social and historical information about National Parks documents and helps justify the current typeface preference of Parks Canada brand.

3.4.1 Historical Categories

74% of DG1 samples were rendered in serifs from the Old Style/Humanist/Italian sub-class. This suggests that prior to the guidelines drafted in 2003 that directed a sans-serif grotesque be used for titles and headings, the usual suspect was a font with low stroke contrast and small-bracketed serifs. Most park data groups used a sans serif Grotesque in later plans at least once just prior to the official adoption of Helvetica, which coincides with the re-release and impact of the updated face in the 1980’s.

3.4.2 Font variants

DG1 samples were first analyzed for their font variations. What this denotes (Italics, bold, expanded, exclusive use of caps, upper and lower case) is an inclination for certain font styles over others.

Of the 64 Typeface Family samples (both Titles and Headings) there were 29 displayed as uppercase, 30 set in bold; setting word-shapes in this manner risked diminished comprehension because of homogenous letter height or dense colour. 11 typefaces were set in Italics (or a Script type) and 7 rendered in a condensed or
expanded state; letterforms with a greater stress were less preferred and exaggerated spacing was used less. This proposes that flexibility would be paramount; a display typeface that offered many variants in one palette was likely.

3.4.3 Application

Each data group bared similar trends in that early park plans used type intended for text while later plans favored type designed for display or for both purposes. 40% were textual typefaces. 60% can be confidently grouped as display and type used for both display and text.

3.4.4 Typeface persona

This section focuses on typeface frequencies and their common descriptive attributes in order to create a discussion about typeface persona. After determining the typefaces from DG1, all fifteen were listed alphabetically using their family name only, avoiding their respective font features previously analyzed from Table 2.

Typeface descriptions of website-authored definition from MyFonts as well as adjacent public ‘tags’ were sifted. Citing all the connotative adjectives from each typeface description and amassing them in a table alphabetically portrays the richness of semantic qualities. Excluded were adjectives, nouns and adverbs that indicated geography, chronology or culture, as they do not necessarily connote personality similar to the way Brumberger proposes by way of semantic differential. However, denotative characteristics, those that imply the physical proportions and structure, were added to
the end of the table. They denote physically such as letterform volume, proportion or vertical and horizontal and that inform its connotive reading.

Each typeface was marked with every attribute present in the online description. The most recurrent typefaces among DG1 samples (shaded) were cross-referenced with those of the current National Park display typeface to determine which stood out as common and persistent (Table 4 – DG1 Typeface Frequency and Persona Assessment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 Display Typeface Families used 1967-2003</th>
<th>Frequency/62</th>
<th>Denotative Attributes (Physical Construction of Letterform)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Century Old Style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Sans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janson Text (55 Roman)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Baskervilles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peignot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum Std-Bold</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard) Typewriter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univers 55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Unifying Display Typeface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 + Helvetica Neue</td>
<td>all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.4.1 Attributes

The matrix of connotative and denotative attributes shows that some typefaces currently have many and some, like *Nobel*, have only two. However, these are not entirely fixed descriptions; they may be added to, shift or intensify by collating the posts of online members. These empirical opinions and public dialogue about employing a typeface in conventional or unconventional ways reflects *semantic association, convention and aesthetics* (Lynch & Horton, 2005).

From the fifteen DG1 typefaces, those used four times or less were not considered as contributing to repetitive use regarding a preference for certain typographic qualities. The five most frequently used typefaces are considered precursors to Parks Canada's unified brand. The connotative and denotative attributes shared with *Helvetica Neue* are listed in Table 5. The bolded attributes are common.
Table 5 DG1 shared attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes shared among persistent DG1 typefaces</th>
<th>Helvetica Neue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>elegant, modern, legible/clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatino</td>
<td>elegant, graceful, legible/clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>adaptable, clean, corporate, efficient,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modern, modest, static, technical, legible/clear, geometric/linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century Old Style</td>
<td>elegant, legible/clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>technical, legible/clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connotative

A connotative relationship exists between an historical account of typefaces used for display text on master and management plans and the current preference of Helvetica Neue for Parks Canada brand within National Parks System Plan. Of sixteen connotative attributes located for Helvetica Neue, only one stood out as common with three other preferred typefaces... elegant.
Times, for instance, designed as a text face in 1930’s for print news, while possessing extremely legible proportions has amassed complex connotations: domestic, economic, elegant, firm, formal, modern, modest, strong, sturdy (MyFonts, 2013). There is nothing out of scale with the Old Style Times: a modest serif with relatively low contrast between thick and thin strokes, a tight, modern structure without any overt characteristics.

*Palatino*, first introduced mid-century was reinvigorated during the height of desktop publishing. It sits comfortably on documents as a Neo-Humanist typeface, harkening back to hand-penned, heavily stressed, low contrast letterforms also considered graceful and traditional, terms closely associated with elegant.

*Century Old Style* too has low contrast in its strokes and very similar serifs that resemble writing with a broad-nib pen. Again, citing some of its other attributes, natural, traditional or valuable might contribute to its elegant character. On the whole, these three elegant typefaces have similar structural characteristics. According to Zhang (2006) Optical Character Recognition experiments the three share a close range of legibility (98.2%-98.8% recognition rate) with the Helvetica family and affirm a functional similarity, suitable for display.

But what of *Volta*? As slightly taller with its larger serif and letterform pattern, its similarity to Palatino is evident. Described as course, mechanical and technical and oddly traditional, it is unequivocally legible, designed in 1956 alongside Helvetica as a display type.
Denotative

The common *legibility and clarity* of each of the five recurrent typefaces is more apparent when they are grouped…

![Figure 22 Common type character from different font families.](image)

*Helvetica Neue* carries many attributes of its parent Helvetica, which was originally popularized for its neutrality and flexibility, complementing myriad design applications. Designed in 1957, within the next two decades Helvetica was adopted as the crystal clear voice of Canadian federal government. Its architectural bones were based upon the one denotative attribute that it shares with the other typefaces, *legible/clear* (MyFonts, 2013).

DG1 samples reveal that *Helvetica* was used mostly for internal document headings. Revisiting this contemporary sans serif typeface, notwithstanding the presence and popularity of other typefaces, suggests that its character bares appropriate connotative properties for a culturally and ethnically mixed public as information about land character varies from document to document.
3.5 Supplementary literature

This section highlights a key informant interview that draws a hard line between typeface persona and Parks Canada identity. Regional and national document identity is discussed as a progression from individual typeface expression to a national font unity defined by government guidelines.

3.5.1 Key informant interview

Part of the communication with provincial and national park offices included requests for an interview with someone within the organization who might have a wider scope of knowledge about early typographic branding decisions. An interview clarified more intimately the role that typography played in National Parks branding design and revealed how typefaces relate to the identity of a professional organization.

3.5.2 Selection criteria

Barbara Macdonald, Prince Edward Island’s External Relations and Visitor Experience Directorate, recommended contacting a colleague, Gerry Boulet, External Relations and Visitor Experience, Parks Canada in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Through an email and a brief phone conversation he confirmed his interest in an interview regarding typographic history and persona of Parks Canada.

Gerry Boulet was educated in visual communication and has a long career as a cartographic and graphic designer, employed with Parks Canada since 1995. He has been leading his team of 5 designers at the Brand Experience branch of the National Design Center in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Their responsibility is to define and shape the
visual cues of all graphic material published for Parks Canada, chiefly contemporary management planning documents meant for public interpretation.

An interview was arranged with Mr. Boulet during the CSLA annual congress, hosted in Halifax September 13 -15, 2012. In this email exchange he confirmed full disclosure and permission to use his name and any government information without restrictions regarding questions about federal documents or national parks. Further permission was not required to conduct an interview.

3.5.3 Interview

The strategy of an interpretive interview constructed purposefully provides an opportunity to “yield rich and relevant data” specific to research topic (Deming & Swaffield, 2011, p. 156). Mr. Boulet was given a list of structured interview questions. The interview targets included revealing his professional history with Parks Canada, justifications for branding procedures and explanation about recurrent typefaces as precursors to formalizing a typographic style that unified the National Parks documents. He allowed for important tangential explanations and eliminated some inapplicable questions altogether. The interview questions are included (Appendix B).

On the morning of the interview, September 13, 2012, Mr. Boulet provided several early park planning documents and current branding guidelines for reference during the interview. They are also used for supplemental literature.

The interview was recorded with Garage Band on a MacBook Pro and saved as a digital file. After the interview was transcribed to extract pertinent information the digital file was deleted. Interpretation of the interview is presented here.
3.5.4 Interview summary

Over the past ten years the major goal of the branch has been to unify all the National parks with a particular typographic style and logos. Prior to 2000, Mr. Boulet described there was no unifying typographic theme determined by Parks Canada but saw a need throughout the 90’s to increase visibility and corporate identity with “key branding elements”. Not surprising the federal government used Helvetica to connote neutrality and authority. Boulet confirmed that Helvetica was adopted quickly in the 1950’s and employed extensively in both mainstream culture and government to imply modernism, but fell out of favor in pursuit of other humanistic fonts that appear hand-drawn like Palatino (used exclusively for display on NP documents, 2003-2009).

Subtle changes to Helvetica’s font family in 1983 included increasing public availability and font variety. Parks Canada’s use of Helvetica provided typographic flexibility and transparency in a unifying graphic element for the variety of regional landscapes across Canada. An understanding of the power of a well-chosen typeface was invaluable for Parks Canada’s branding mandate that sought to “represent and protect the diversity of Canada’s natural heritage” (Canada, 1990, preface). Through a regional systems approach solidified in 1990, the organization highlighted each region as parts of the whole, an ongoing national investment in the natural environment using Helvetica to spread a clear message.

Instigated in the 1970’s with the use of its parent typeface by the Federal Treasury Board (FTB), the ubiquitous sans serif Helvetica Neue Condensed became the official typeface for display and headings. A major motivation for the FTB to employ this
font was due to an apparent loss of public buy-in to national parks. This was tied to a rise in immigrants with widely different cultural histories many of whom considered relatively young park designations not as important symbols of regional and national identity compared to their native landscape histories. Because Parks Canada recognized and sympathized with its multi-cultural patrons, clarity in national branding applications (road signs, maps, government documents) was imperative for successful cross-cultural marketing campaigns where information should be, first and foremost, legible.

With increased pressure for parks to act as unifying element for Canadian multicultural Identity, park document planners had to abandon typographic individuality: document-specific typefaces supporting images of regional wildlife and landscapes. Under the systems approach the mosaic of national landscapes might differ in scale and landform, but all information is now designed within rigid typographic guidelines. One common display typeface represents unity, transparency and accessibility for Parks Canada. This allows any Canadian to visually access any Parks Canada document and be met with the same welcoming, legible and distinctive service agreement.

3.5.5 Parks Canada documents

National Park documents convey semantic and informational cues of both transparency and preservation. Working Together: Parks and Protected Areas in Canada, released on the eighth anniversary of the ‘92 commitment of Parks Ministers, affirmed the ongoing connectivity of Canada’s protected land and marine regions. Developing a National Parks identity relied heavily on continuity - the Statement of
Commitment was a benchmark for protection and maintenance of vast areas of biological diversity and cultural resources. Pristine wilderness areas were highlighted as paramount to Canadians in several polls discussed in the report (Federal Provincial Parks Council. Parks Canada, 2000). Public buy-in included private land donation and industry endorsement. It discussed aboriginal visibility and the role that the native culture had in encouraging protection strategies. The report summarized a holistic approach to landscape conservation delivered in the neo-humanist serif Palatino.

Parks Canada Identity Program finally produced an official manual in 2003, Publications, Interim Guidelines. Prior to this there was no official guidance for national typography. It outlines that, for all documents, Palatino, easy to read, strong, traditional, clear and elegant would be “used primarily for cover titles and body text.” The secondary typeface was Helvetica Neue (Condensed), a finer version than traditionally used on park signage; it was reserved for “captions, tables, forms, place names and labels,” anywhere that text did not exceed a few words in length but required distinction as an important feature of the document.

In the 395-page report, Exterior Signage (2007), the Federal Identity Program (FIP) insisted that all federal departments aligned with federal graphic standards. Since 2000, the FIP was responsible for ensuring strict graphic guidelines for Parks Canada Identity Program but for two decades the federal government established a convention by favoring Helvetica for its clarity and impartiality; a bold variation, Helvetica Neue 75 was formally adopted to provide “legibility and versatility” for all signage (Parks Canada, 2007, p 78). Moreover, it was designed to be compatible for all computer operating systems. Responding to visitors’ needs by ensuring safety and a universal acceptance
of essential bilingual information was key so as not to “detract from the visitor experience or harm the ecological and commemorative integrity of the parks and sites in which [the signs] are situated” (Parks Canada, 2007, p. 11).

Like the hierarchy in documents Palatino Bold Italic, considered “elegant, warm and inviting”, was used as a complement for smaller more intimate park signs. There were two reasons for this. In contrast to Helvetica, Palatino’s stroke variation and flared serif produced a disruptive halo effect and decreased legibility when viewed as white letters on a dark background at larger signage scales. Additionally, it connoted hand script and therefore was not as suitable for promoting the neutrality needed in multicultural way-finding signs that Helvetica provided.

Parks Canada’s official decision in 2003 began unifying the National Parks brand; use the publicly accessible Palatino and then Helvetica in lieu of multiple typefaces in titles and headings that may be distinctive but less available, particularly in digital format. Although Helvetica Neue is currently paired with a contrasting serif type, Georgia, used only for body text, the exclusive use of the font palette for all display text titles, headings and brief descriptions diverges from park document design prior to 2003 where no regulation existed.

Helvetica Neue (shown here in ultralight italic, 16pt.) is the current typeface family used by Parks Canada for all display text in national park documents. The organization decided by 2010 that the extensive adjustments in 1983 to make the font family arguably one of the largest and most adaptable, provided them with an extrovert
that was “open and friendly… classic… clean, simple and to the point,” according to Parks Canada typographic Design Standards (Ottawa).

However debatable typeface connotative attributes are, the persistence of certain ones within families of typefaces remains an important point for typographic representation. Early experimentation with various typefaces among park documents provided either distinction from or association with other parks, but inadvertently led Parks Canada through a graphic design experience. Persistent semantic associations of convention and personality, were found in the Helvetica font family as the voice of the organization (Figure 23).

Figure 23  1990 – 2010, return to Helvetica
3.6 Limitations

Initial data investigation resulted in several challenges that on the one hand hindered collection of information and on the other helped reshape the trajectory of the study. Regardless, important information surfaced about collection methods and aspects of data analysis.

Consideration was originally given to collecting typographic samples representing different scales of design / management; *original documents* that depicted master plans of municipal, provincial and national parks designed by Landscape Architects. The assumption was that the municipal examples would possess highly expressive and variable typefaces, much less so with those at the national level, and with provincial park documents somewhere in between. However, several factors hindered this collection.

In June 2012, Parks Canada representatives were emailed regarding the whereabouts of the *founding documents* (language corrected by an archivist) of any provincially designated park. Each provincial ministry office and/or parks staff could not necessarily determine where documents were kept. They instead pointed to current management plans available online. Where each province manages their online information in very different ways, hunting for appropriate contacts through regional directories was challenging. Few provincial offices provided a direct line of communication to representatives who were familiar with founding documents about park designation and development.

Although provincial park-planning documents might be available at archives or libraries, several libraries required hiring an in-province researcher to access
information. Due to the number of documents first considered and the gamble of finding examples in every province, the search for provincial (and municipal) park master and management plans was abandoned.

3.6.1 Language & communication

It was important to understand the language used by archivists and Parks Canada staff regarding the topic. Communication about original park plans was reworded to founding and subsequent documents about national park master and management plans.

National Parks provincial staff professional knowledge is bound to park systems management, landscape character and extents and visitor engagement. Responses to emails and phone messages were generally about a lack of information and/or awareness of founding documents and the topic of typography.

3.6.2 Incomplete holdings

Many regional and municipal plans were not easily located requiring a hired archival researcher in several provinces. Where this study was tailored to collect available national documents, a comprehensive regional study may provide additional support for typographic representation and identity.

3.6.3 Damaged data

Many of the DG1 sets were worn and showed signs of age or mishandling. Others had cataloguing labels covering pertinent information leading to difficulties with character recognition by MyFonts online ID system. An effort to label sympathetic to
graphic layout would allow a reader to consider the intention of document design without
distraction.

3.6.4 Typeface identification

Most DG1 samples were identified successfully on the first attempt. Other
samples needed verification from online forum users and empirical comparisons with
font libraries. This carries the risk of confusing character traits of closely related fonts.

3.6.5 Attribute variability

There are denotative and connotative attributes consistently associated with the
personality of some typefaces. The ability of users to access, add or change persona
descriptors can lead to rich but variable semantics. Further studies including semantic
properties could reveal reliable sets of attributes and confidently provide non-specialists
with a library of descriptors.
Landscape architecture typeface preferences were discovered using the exploratory approach of a case study for Method B and a survey for Method C. The two methods are presented as complementary so the interpretive analysis of each can be compared. The objectives were to discern recurrent typefaces in Method B Data Group 2 (DG2), samples from Canadian Society of Landscape Architects (CSLA) professional publications 1961 – 2007 and Method C Data Group 3 (DG3) declarations of landscape architects typeface preferences as well as reveal associated attributes. The goal of employing both methods was for inspiration of the guidelines and concept of LARCHITYPE font family.

4.1 Method B

CSLA Journals & Display Type

As in National Parks plans, CSLA journals published by/for landscape architects have gone through typographic design changes as a maturing professional magazine. These publications were chosen because they traditionally featured articles about education, practice, distinction and promotion of the profession since the founding of its nucleus at Toronto in 1934. Themes were sourced and included as supplementary literature; professional aspirations and the character traits that reinforce the CSLA’s collective identity were used to enrich the design guidelines.
4.1.1 Variables

Independent

The number of title and heading samples used for assessment were based on available journals.

Dependent

The connotative attributes associated with each typeface were determined through MyFonts online font identifier.

4.1.2 Data collection

The data collected is limited to instances where the typeface of titles and headings changed as the journals went through graphic design shifts. The four journals published in succession under the auspice of the CSLA are as follows: The Canadian Landscape Architect (1960-1966), Landscape Architecture Canada (1975-1981), Landscape Architectural Review (1980-1993), Landscapes/Paysages (1999-present) (Clark, 2009). Overlaps and gaps in publication dates indicate major changes in production, direction or the ebb of one journal before the next began.

Each journal cover that underwent a typeface change in the title and/or interior headings was scanned at 300dpi to ensure clarity. Each scan was catalogued according to the title sequence, the set, and sample as well as the title acronym and publication year and saved as a .tiff file at 300dpi (i.e. 2a1LAC1977.tiff). Each typeface title and
heading was extracted from the entire page and saved as a separate image becoming DG2 samples Figure 24). Titles and headings that appeared worn were filtered in Photoshop; image contrast and brightness were increased for letterform clarity. Excluded from analysis are other graphic design elements and devices such as images, drawings, layout and color.

![Image of Landscape Architecture Canada journal samples](image)

Figure 24  CSLA journal samples 2a1, 1.2LAC1977

DG2 samples are presented as an historical timeline map set within the context of professional development of Landscape Architecture in Canada, typographic styles and design movements (Appendix C).
4.1.3 Results

4.1.3.1 Typeface identification

DG2 data, typeface samples, were identified using MyFonts calculator. Most uploads generated a positive match that could be verified using the online font library. If the identification was inconclusive due to an inadequate digital file, the data was submitted to and verified by the online forum (see Figure 1).

4.1.3.2 Typeface categories

After identification each sample was categorized and classified employing the same method set in Method A case study (Table 6). This enriches our understanding of how a typeface functions based on its form as well as contributing valuable semantic cues for design guidelines.

The **Typeface Family** (followed by font character) for each sample was listed in the respective hierarchy column. A column gap indicates the use of a typeface continued. The year each typeface was **Created/Revived** was included, drawing a trend with publication dates. Revealing **Historical Categories** (Class and Sub-Class) indicated a sample style trend. Lastly, each sample is scored for its **Intention**, whether it was developed for text, display or both.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DG2</th>
<th>Document Typeface ID Hierarchy</th>
<th>Created/Revived</th>
<th>Historical Category</th>
<th>Intension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publ. Sample</td>
<td>Tithe Typeface Family</td>
<td>Heading Typeface Family</td>
<td>Era</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1a1</td>
<td>Old Macdonald Wise NF</td>
<td>Clarendon (No1 URW Med)</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Macdonald Wise NF</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>1845/1953</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b2</td>
<td>Bodoni (Italic)</td>
<td>Bodoni (Black Condensed)</td>
<td>1767/1911</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1c1</td>
<td>Helvetic (Compressed)</td>
<td>Helvetica (Bold)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helvetica (Med)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1d1</td>
<td>Monotype Grotesque Std Rom.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Grotesque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monotype Grotesque Std Rom.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2a1</td>
<td>Helvetic (var., Letraset)</td>
<td>Zipper (Reg., Letraset)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eurostile (Bold)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helvetica (Med)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2e1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman-upper)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2e2</td>
<td>Times (New Roman-lower)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3a1</td>
<td>Palatino Linotype (var.)</td>
<td>1950/1986</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zapf Int (Med)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3b1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garamond</td>
<td>1592/1925-36</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3c1</td>
<td>Garamond Classico (Reg.),</td>
<td>ITC Korina Bold</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Semi-Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3d1</td>
<td>Palatino Linotype (var.)</td>
<td>1950/1986</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3e1</td>
<td>Helvetica (75/Bold Outline)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Grotesque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3f1</td>
<td>Times (New Roman-upper)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
<td>Old Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3g1</td>
<td>Century 725 (Condensed)</td>
<td>Amercanica (Bold)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3h2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helvetica (Bold)</td>
<td>1952/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4a1</td>
<td>Janson Text Roman</td>
<td>Janson Text (Italic)</td>
<td>1690/1985</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ITC Avant Garde</td>
<td>1690/1985</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4b1</td>
<td>Univers Pro Roman</td>
<td>Times New Roman</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helvetica Neue (expanded)</td>
<td>1957/1980</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4c1</td>
<td>Triplex Sans</td>
<td>Times New Roman (upper)</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formata BQ</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4d1</td>
<td>DIN Next Pro Regular</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
<td>Neo-Grotesque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Myriad Pro Regular</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Sans Serif</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disp.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1.3.3 Common typeface attributes

After categorization, all the typeface families were listed alphabetically (Table 7 - DG2 Typeface Frequency and Persona Assessment) along with their recurrent frequencies. A row was compiled of all applicable attributes from website authored descriptions in MyFonts library as well as adjacent public ‘tags’. Chronological or cultural descriptors (i.e. ancient, French) were excluded; they do not necessarily connote multi-modals personality traits as proposed by former studies. Any denotative characteristics implying physical structure and how a typeface functions physically on the page were added to the end of the table. Antonyms were paired because they define spatial aspects. For instance narrow/wide indicates horizontality.

Each typeface was scored with its attributes and the most recurrent display typefaces Helvetica and Times were cross-referenced with the current CSLA journal typefaces DIN Next Pro Regular and Myriad Pro to determine which attributes were common.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22 Display Typeface Families used</th>
<th>Frequency of 39 Changes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodoni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 725</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurostile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formata BQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garamond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC Avant Garde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC Korinna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janson Text</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotype Grotesque Std</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Macdonald Wise NF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplex Sans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univers Pro Roman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapf Inti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC Zipper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current CSLA Journal Display Typefaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Din Next Pro Regular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myriad Pro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.3.4 Comparing journal & typeface dates

The typefaces used for display on CSLA journals were designed as early as 1767 (Bodoni) and as late as 2009 (DIN Next Pro Regular). However, the overall trend from earliest to current publication titles progresses from the use of antique to contemporary digital typefaces.

4.1.4 Supplementary literature

Several CSLA editorials cited an ongoing search for appropriate typographic representation.

Earliest issues were limited by the state of the art: mechanical reproduction and cut and paste layout. This novice, energetic use of type and by today’s graphic standards often amounted to visual confusion (Figure 25).

Figure 25 Early CSLA graphic design - font variation
However, what started as a grassroots journal produced by volunteers with a limited knowledge of graphic design, expanded to include graphic designers and external publishers which helped tailor the visual rhetoric (Canadian Society of Landscape Architects, 1980). Working with these and other allied professions (biologists, sociologists, artist) typifies the professional flexibility and inclusive behaviour of the landscape architect in an interdisciplinary work environment (Taylor J. R., 2006, p. 32).

Just as the CSLA currently promotes that Canadian landscape architects are regarded for their creativity, sensitivity and practicality (Canadian Society of Landscape Architects, 2013), the journals perpetuated both professional aspirations and a collective persona. The past five decades of CSLA journals possess countless articles about the trajectory of landscape architecture through a wide range of topics from large-scale environmental intervention (conservation, restoration) and sustaining urban landscapes, “corrupt jungles of disorder and ugliness” (Canadian Society of Landscape Architects, 1961, p. 5). The following highlights addressed recurring themes about the spirit of landscape architecture and contained ‘connotative cues’ regarding a cult of personality.

4.1.4.1 The Canadian Landscape Architect (1960 - 1966)

**connotative cues:** visionary, creative, imaginative, aesthetic, sensual, holistic

Commentary on the environmental decay of countryside and cities in the early 1960’s projected that through restorative education academia could “provide young members with vision and the ability to think creatively” (Bishopric, 1961, p. 4). The journal promoted that "landscape architecture has a direction...art controlled by the
imagination and training of the landscape architect...[with] more emphasis...placed on form and aesthetics" (Harkness, 1961, p. 5).

Rhetoric about controlled, creative design training was chased by a holistic approach in “The five lost senses of Landscape Architecture,” reminding of our innate ability to experience through “the ears, the body, the nose and the mouth as well as through the eyes.” (Hough, 1962). This perception of the environment puts the landscape architect in a position to design using sensual tools; reference to musical harmonics and pleasant tastes and smells can greatly affect psychological states of being. Landscape architects were toted as sensory designers who affected experience in a multi-modal manner.

4.1.4.2 Landscape Architecture Canada (1975 - 1981)

**connotative cues:** roots, diversity, structure, clever, affective

ROOTS, editorial essays on heritage of the profession, attempted to define foundation and progression of Landscape Architecture in Canada (Jacobs, 1977), effectively an attempt to reveal hidden historical information. The potent metaphor introduced was the tree's growth dependent on its feeder and taproots, its footing on the forest floor. A matrix of knowledge gained through years of practice feeds our potential; the profession is bound by structural diversity as a tree is by its roots to the earth.

In *The Oldest Profession* the author suggested that among the allied professions we emulated the hand of the almighty creator who was the original landscape architect. As a representative, the clever landscape architect harmonizes disparate qualities between the primeval and manmade and synthesizes a design into a livable
environment. This deification of the profession promoted the notion that we should not think small about our effect (Hageraats, 1979).

4.1.4.3 Landscape Architectural Review (1980 - 1993)

connotative cues: ecological, conservative, philosophical, environmental, protective, sensual, wholism, peacemaker, classical, sustainable, interpreter

The post-modern design movement of the early 80’s promoted urban-centric articles in LAR with an emphasis on interior plantscaping and construction (Canadian Society of Landscape Architects, 1980), counter to environmental themes of the prior decade. The trend of urban insularity subsided and the journal began to re-establish a connection to ecological conservation and to “broaden the scope of coverage... with a more philosophical and environmental content.” (O’Neill & Rolland, 1985, p. 4).

The stage was set for introspective articles regarding the greater ambitions and roles landscape architects should embody. The landscape architect was personified as a “protector of the natural environment” citing the profession as a key component in National Park initiatives, integrating recreation with preservation. Add to the role set of “stewards, nurturers, designers, facilitators,” peacemaker dedicated to sustainability guided by such organizations as International Federation of Landscape Architects and applications like the World Conservation Strategy (MacLeod, 1988, pp. 18-19).

The impetus generated by articles postulating the future of the profession posed again that landscape architects re-establish a sensual connection to the ‘real’ world and engage their classical sensory tools to save the environment! Ambitious charge for a fifty year-old profession, but one intended to lead a public in thinking about ecological
systems with a sense of “wholism” (Elder, 1985, pp. 8-9). By Spring 1989, LAR combined modern sans and traditional serif on the cover as the typographic “look for the nineties...” and heralded themes of sustainable development and “the beginning of a decade of continued improvement and expansion.”

4.1.4.4 Landscapes/Paysages (1999 - present)

connotative cues: modesty, subversive, sensitive, practical, accommodating

The inaugural issue invited readers into critical discourse and national perspectives with *The nature of excellence: Can we learn something about ourselves from the 1999 CSLA Awards?* the article concludes with “an assessment of the character of landscape architecture in Canada.” Descriptors used were modesty, quiet and, in an attempt to reconcile an apparent lack of theory and innovation, subversive (Simon, 1999). The author felt that much of the work in Canada was a marriage between ecological and conservative processes.

This sentiment was reflected in an editorial which dedicated the summer 2000 issue to landscape and identity. As the host to the CSLA Congress, Ottawa married remnant boreal and manmade elements representative of a sensitive, practical and accommodating national identity (Paine, 2000).

By the late ‘90’s digital media wielded a stronger influence over internal and public communication about professional practice. After a typographic shift streamlined the look of the journal in 2007, an editorial suggested identity evident in the variety of public and private projects nation-wide that characterized places we live, work and play (Irvine, 2009).
4.2 Method C

Landscape Architecture Typeface Survey

A questionnaire delivered to landscape architects across Canada had potential to reveal generalizations about typeface preferences and trends, “phenomenon… that are mutually reinforcing” (Deming & Swaffield, 2011, p. 79). The questionnaire was accessible Fall 2012 in a closed communication circuit (email, professional newsletter, new media directed at regional component chapter affiliates) reducing the risk of unsolicited participation. The objective was to reveal landscape architects’ knowledge about typography and have them assess their preferred typefaces.

4.2.1 Instrument

An outline for an online survey was developed while investigating DG1 and DG2 data. The survey was comprised of a series of 12 multiple-choice questions divided into 3 sections evaluating awareness about preferred typefaces, the way they are manipulated and assessment of their personalities. It was accessible by Landscape Architect or a proxy (sensitive to typeface preferences).

Each section listed the objective so that participants understood the data generated. It was surmised that participants had at least a novice understanding about the principles of visual language specific to this study: informal vs. formal communication, motivation, intention, perception, proportion, shape, character. The terms font and typeface were used because they are often interchangeable.
Each answer allowed the participant to advance through the survey, but their process could be interrupted and resumed at a later date. The survey also included an option to discontinue and withdraw explaining that information might be excluded from the results. Participants were thanked for their contribution and assured confidentiality. An email address was provided to discuss the survey, the topic or express anything relevant to respondent answers.

**Section I** requests general demographic information in order to categorize participants. The questions identified regional and participant trends regarding survey efficacy and execution. Personal information was not requested.

**Question 1** – *declaration of regional chapter affiliation*

**Question 2** – *years of practice*

**Question 3** – *form of practice*

**Question 4** – *company structure*

**Section II & III** Section 2 asks about typeface preferences commonly used within the work environment. The data tells whether common communication text and display typeface preferences are congruent. It could contribute to future design guidelines for an alternative typeface. Section 3 pertains to preferences about presentational display typefaces, the crux of the study. Frequency, correlation, analysis and synthesis more directly affected the design guidelines for Chapter 3.

**Question 5, 9** – *office communication / display typeface preferences*

Anticipating incompatibilities with typeface drop-down lists across digital devices (smart phones, tablets, computers) a fill-in-the-blank was used that regenerated the name of
the type in subsequent questions. Combining these results with the historical data (DG2) helps classify participants based on common typeface choices (Cahalan, 2007).

**Questions 6 & 10 – motivation for using preferred typeface**

Asking if landscape architects see their preferences as either *neutral and universal* or *stylish and distinctive* provides evidence for agreement between specialists and non-specialists about typographic persona (Kostelnick, 1990). Question 10 offered a comment box for enriching the analysis of display typeface preference.

**Questions 7 & 11 – intention / modification**

This question reveals an awareness of inherent appropriateness of a typeface preference and the desire to temper a typeface character to suit the tone of a project. Alternatively, if participants answer that typeface use was either unintentional or not manipulated then it could suggest a reliance solely on its inherent character (Cahalan, 2007).

**Questions 8 & 12 – assessment of preferred typeface**

A list of twenty singular multi-modal attributes on a seven-point scale from *Not At All* to *Very* were presented in a table. Originally developed mid-twentieth century the attributes allowed non-specialists to assess a variety of qualitative data by associating human personality traits (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1964).
4.2.2 Vehicle

Survey questions were constructed with the help of professors and students in landscape architecture at University of Guelph. The survey was posted to Limesurvey, University of Guelph, August 8 and November 30, 2012. A copy is included for reference (Appendix D). The survey was automatically linked to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis.

4.2.2.1 Survey Launch 1

The CSLA advertised the study in their online newsletter, Bulletin, September-November and linked the survey via its URL. Placing the survey in the newsletter connected to the organization on a national level.

During the CSLA conference, September 2012, Halifax NS, I was able to distribute fifty 3X3” cards with the survey description and web address on one side and a QR code for the survey’s URL on the other. It was treated as publicity, a “gentle reminder” for the survey running in the Bulletin. It was intended to encourage participation but was in no way measured as part of the results. By September 30, seventeen participants completed the survey.

4.2.2.2 Survey Launch 2

By the end of September, the survey was re-posted in the CSLA newsletter. Each of the ten provincial CSLA component associations were contacted by email requesting they post the invitation in their regional newsletters to contribute to the study survey.
Where each chapter might present its newsletter differently, a QR code was included (Figure 26) for mobile devices. Although the survey was not tested for its compatibility with phones or tablets the QR code provided a link for future reference.

Figure 26 Survey QR code

Of the ten associations, four responded with various offers for survey publicity:

- BCSLA Marketplace
- CSLA Facebook Page
- MALA Newsletter
- OALA Newsletter
4.2.3 Results

At the close of the survey, Nov 30, 2012, activated surveys totaled 140, 76 complete and 64 incomplete. The raw data generated was cleaned-up, spelling errors corrected and typeface families regrouped. The survey results for each of the following sections are illustrated as bar graphs (Appendix E-I).

4.2.3.1 Demographics

The following statistics are rendered as bar graphs located in Appendix E.

Most respondents declared OALA affiliation (80) followed by MALA (23), BCLA (10), APALA (6), AALA (4), SALA (4), AAPD (2). There was no declaration from NLALA, NTALA or NALA affiliation.

More respondents declared being in practice 6 to 20 years.

Respondents declared a more private (65) than public (53) form of practice with very few from academia (7).

Respondents who worked with smaller groups of co-workers of 1-5 people (57) and 6-15 people (36) had the highest frequencies.

4.2.3.2 Text type

Arial was the most frequent answer among the myriad of typefaces preferred for formal communication in the work environment. Calibri was second and tying for third preferred was Helvetica and Times New Roman. All other faces were declared either once or twice and are excluded from results, analysis and discussion (Figure 27).
Neutral and universal was strongly expressed as the motivation for using Arial and Helvetica for formal communication. Some respondents also declared stylish and distinctive and default as their motivation for using Calibri and Times (Appendix F).

Those who preferred Arial, Helvetica and Times declared that they were used deliberately. Those who preferred Calibri answered that it was used unintentionally as a default typeface (Appendix F).

Twenty bar graphs (Appendix G) portray the strength (color coded) of each multimodal attribute expressed by the number of respondents (y) for the four preferred typefaces (x). For instance, 48% of respondents who preferred Arial thought it was Not at all [Cheap].
4.2.3.3 Display type

*Arial* was most preferred (83 respondents) over the myriad of typefaces declared for display in presentations titles and headings. *Helvetica* was second and *Calibri* in third with a much lower frequency. Tying for fourth place were *Century Gothic* and *Times*. All other faces were cited twice or less and are excluded from analysis (Figure 28).

![Preferred display typefaces](image)

**Figure 28** Five preferred display typefaces & others from survey.

More respondents declared that their preferred display font was *neutral and universal*. In addition there were eighteen comments given regarding motivation. Several stated or implied the common personality attributes *accessible, adaptable, clean, compatible, legible* and *modern* (Appendix H).
Most respondents declared they made *intentional changes* in *weight* and *scale* to the display font. Changes to *letter spacing* and the *height or width* of the inherent font shape/proportions were reported less frequently (Appendix H).

Twenty bar graphs (Appendix I) portray the strength (color coded) of each multi-modal attribute expressed by the number of respondents (y) for the five preferred typefaces (x). For instance, 55% of respondents who preferred *Arial* thought it was *Not at all* [Cheap]. The following are the common attributes that scored *Very* for contemporary typeface preferences (Table 10):

*Arial* and *Helvetica* shared the attribute *elegant*.

*Arial* and *Calibri* shared *inviting, relaxed, scholarly* and *warm*.

*Arial, Helvetica* and *Calibri* shared *confident, dignified, formal, friendly, and professional*.

All four *sans serifs* shared *straightforward*. 
Table 8

Frequencies for Display Type Attributes Assessed as 'Very'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Arial</th>
<th>Helvetica</th>
<th>Calibri</th>
<th>Century Gothic</th>
<th>Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cheap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dignified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elegant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inviting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretentious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholarly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sloppy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straightforward</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Limitations of exploratory studies

4.3.1 Language & communication

- Inconsistent responses to email and phone messages.
- Lack of information of founding park documents or awareness of typography from provincial office staff.
- Stalled communication/engagement with some CSLA component chapters.
- Survey terminology possibly hindered comprehension and increased time investment; it possibly contributed to respondent drop-off.
- Survey was limited by software: ‘drop-down menus’ instead of ‘fill-in windows’ would likely simplify answer execution and accuracy.

4.3.2 Incomplete holdings

- Municipal, provincial and federal master plan documents were not easily located and required hiring a provincial archival researcher.
- Early CSLA publications were absent at libraries and archives.

4.3.3 Damaged data

- Some DG1/DG2 samples were worn through age, mishandling, cataloguing labels covering pertinent information leading to difficulties with character recognition by online identification system.
4.3.4 Identification

• Most DG1/DG2 samples not identified successfully on the first attempt used verification with online forum users and empirical comparisons with font library, which carries the risk of confusing character traits of closely related fonts.

4.3.5 Variable connotative attributes

• Ability of users to access, add or change persona descriptors can lead to rich but variable semantics; repetitive studies sourcing associative meaning could help solidify a more reliable set of connotive attributes.

• Attributes are flexible and can shift slightly affected by aesthetic.

4.3.6 Interpretive strategy

• Subjective assessment of attributes as inspiration for letter structure likely varies slightly with different designers; imposed aesthetic association could influence the design outcome.
Triangulation analysis of Methods B and C, the case study and the survey, reinforces the phenomenon of preferred typefaces deemed appropriate for display within landscape architecture. By focusing attention on display type it pushes this exploratory strategy toward refinement in future studies (Boyer & Mitgang, 1996).

This study was first and foremost a cursory strategy for understanding the relationship between landscape architects and typeface appropriateness as well as a way to delve into an education on the intricacies of visual rhetoric. Although shallow in nature, the exploration was by no means intended to be incomplete but instead an introduction to a topic critical to professional communication. Hopefully readers will be able to develop sensitivity to the implications of typeface design and complex denotative and connotative attributes.

The following subsections offer explanations about the phenomena by comparing the most critical results of both studies to facilitate the thesis objective.

5.1 Typographic representation

From novice graphic design in 1961 to an awareness of the impact of visual culture in the computer-driven design of the 1990’s, landscape architects inevitably aligned, as did other design disciplines, with the graphic design industry to package their messages.
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodoni</td>
<td>Eurostile</td>
<td>Americana</td>
<td>Din Regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>Century 725</td>
<td>Formata BQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>Times New Roman</td>
<td>Garamond</td>
<td>Helvetica Neue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotype Grotesque</td>
<td>Typewriter</td>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>ITC Avant Garde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Macdonald Wise NF</td>
<td>Zipper</td>
<td>ITC Korinna</td>
<td>Janson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palatino</td>
<td>Myriad Pro Regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Times New Roman</td>
<td>Times New Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zapf Intl</td>
<td>Triplex Sans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univers Pro Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typefaces/ Journal Sets</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>8/7</td>
<td>9/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows DG2 samples increasing in later publications... a wider variety of typefaces that intensified throughout the 1980’s, the advent of digital type design.
Employing various typefaces from early to later publications could be interpreted as a search for typographic representation of identity as the profession surpassed its reflective jubilee. On the other hand, all professional designers were likely ubiquitously affected by typeface proliferation and compounding 20th century visual culture.

5.2 Survey demographics

An elevated number of respondents from private sector are congruent with distribution of practice in Canada (Taylor, 2006). Once the survey was featured online by other component chapters, elevated regional response rates followed. New media, especially regional newsletters, seem to be an effective method of engaging and communicating to young to mid-career professionals.

Many respondents claiming 6-20 years of practice would have established themselves in the wake of typeface explosion twenty-five years ago; it is likely that they have witnessed, if not exercised, the proliferation of fonts. It might suggest that these practitioners matched typefaces to project themes as they become aware of effective typefaces.

5.3 Congruent text type

Preferred typefaces for textual communication in office settings among co-workers is congruent with both those preferred for display and the most recurrent type in CSLA journals. Landscape architects likely use these resilient font palettes for a variety of information based on font flexibility and semantic convention. That Arial and Helvetica were deemed neutral and universal shows agreement with specialists about
appropriateness for setting information in technical, legible fonts. Considered stylish and distinctive *Calibri* with its rounded terminals and softer appearance and serif *Times*, a traditional face, might have appealed as a reliable standard for either formal or familiar communication styles.

### 5.4 Display type aspects

Typeface aspect comparisons (classifications, font variants, intentions, attributes) that comprise the guidelines were divided into the following typeface design production categories: form, function and intent.

#### 5.4.1 Form

#### 5.4.1.1 Historical class & subclass

Persistence of font families Helvetica and Times, popularized by their legibility, suggests that their design intent matches the reception by non-specialists. Not surprising, the other preferred typefaces carry a structural resemblance to Helvetica, shaped with precision.

Although the presence of the serif class persisted in both studies the trend seems to swing in favor of sans serifs. This could indicate a settling into a particular visual style of representation based on typeface personality in the absence of anything tailored specifically for the profession. It also likely indicates that landscape architects used these widely accessible fonts that were shared by allied professions.

With them the sub-classes of Neo-Grotesque and Old Style were represented. The nature of delivering landscape architecture information framed in these un-
ornamented typefaces might suggest a desire to have project titles and headings relatively clear of superfluous suggestion. On the other hand there may not have been a typeface available that treated such information respectfully yet contributed to a visual rhetoric connoting the profession.

5.4.2 Function

5.4.2.1 Denotative attributes

Squeezing the most amount of information into the smallest amount of space is typical of presentation layout. Form aside, all the preferred fonts function similarly on the page. With only mild differences in proportion their weight is based on the balance of their structure and guides their legibility: low stroke contrast with no exaggerated features. Letter weight can affect legibility as the ratio between stroke and counters increases. Regardless of Times' higher stroke contrast it maintains legibility.

Comparing the tighter klearning of Helvetica letterforms with that of the mildly pinched counters of DIN Next Pro Regular likely accounts for the common narrow attribute. A predisposition to vertical letter structure, especially for titles and headings, might also explain narrowsness.

To portray the preferred type motivation neutral and universal a Wordle of the survey data in Question 10 was cleaned of extraneous text (the, in, but, etc.) leaving only character descriptors appearing proportionately larger as dominant denotative and connotative adjectives (Figure 29).
5.4.2.2 Font variants

An authoritative tone is revealed by use of capitols on 49% CSLA journal samples. But the use of lower case on 18% of samples indicates that visual impact through case contrast may have been an intra-textual device employed regardless of typeface style. On the other hand infrequent use of bold/black, condensed/expanded and italic suggests a satisfaction with the inherent weight of the typefaces used.

As for the survey respondents, most were likely satisfied with the inherent proportions and shape of their preferred typeface. Most declared creating visual hierarchy by bolding and scaling and avoided spacing or stretching, which can lead to a discernable shift in physical character affecting typeface personality.
5.4.3 Intent

5.4.3.1 Application

Both studies revealed a relatively balanced mix of typefaces intended for display, text or both; throughout the maturation of the journals, type with different intended applications suggest the inclination for flexible font families depending on the graphic situation (Table 10).

Table 9  Shared attributes of preferred faces and current display face for Landscape/Paysages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes shared among persistent DG2 typefaces</th>
<th>DIN Next Pro Regular</th>
<th>Myriad Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helvetica</td>
<td>clean, corporate, technical, legible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>modern, narrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modern, legible</td>
<td>legible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.3.2 Connotative attributes

The paired display typefaces for the bilingual quarterly *Landscapes/Paysages DIN Next Pro Regular* and *Myriad Pro* were designed to accommodate both display and text body. Persistent use of these in lieu of *Helvetica* display faces suggests at the very least, a preference for certain attributes. The clean, corporate, technical and modern faces suggest professional or perhaps impartial. However, attributes that landscape architects scored as *Very* on the seven-point scale for the preferred survey typefaces defined their character differently than the journals adding richness to the scope of semantic associations with the profession.

Having landscape architects assess their own typeface preferences and compare them to trends throughout a history of display fonts used in a prominent journal shaped by professional communication can offer insight into typographic representation. The studies made evident the relationship between the visual rhetoric of display type and the voice of the profession. This is abridged in the following guidelines chapter by categorizing typeface aspects and synthesized by the LARCHITYPE concept design.
6.0 CHAPTER 6

TYPEFACE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Typefaces are often designed for specific uses or user groups but “the urge to create can be quite personal; the impetus might even be an extension of a historical, intellectual or cultural inquiry” (Cheng, 2005, p5). As such, multiple sources of research were used for deriving the guidelines and inspiration for an expressive typeface that represents the collective persona of landscape architects (Deming & Swaffield, 2011). The following key informant and supplementary literature helps define the nature of proposed typeface guidelines and design.

6.1 Key informant

Rod McDonald is a colleague of Gerry Boulet in the typographic industry. Snowballing (Deming & Swaffield, 2011) one key informant from another, Boulet felt that MacDonald could shed light on the most important aspects of designing a typeface by a non-specialist for a specific user group.

6.1.1 Selection criteria

Rod McDonald has worked over forty years in the typographic industry. His accolades include two noteworthy Canadian typeface contributions. Cartier was designed by Canada’s preeminent poet/typographer Carl Dair for the 1967 centennial but remained for years unrefined. Cartier Book is MacDonald’s digital 1997 revival of Carl Dair’s typeface, dignifying the original intent:
“For quite a few years after its release in 1967 Cartier fell into that category; few people used it because it was basically an unfinished and unworkable idea for a typeface. My work on Cartier was motivated largely by a desire to prove that Dair’s design was sound even if his execution wasn’t” (McDonald, 2012).

In 2003, McLean’s magazine established a precedent by launching McDonald’s Laurentian Book as its official type, “the first time in history that a Canadian magazine had commissioned a custom typeface” (Linotype, 2013). Mr. McDonald’s experience with designing for a wide audience and for organizations that sought to match typeface expression to their own character would be invaluable.

6.1.2 Interview

As per his request, a semi-structured interview was scheduled with Mr. McDonald via Skype, conducted at 11:00 am, October 6, 2012. He recommended conditions and a design process for the non-specialist to design a typeface (no personal information was revealed). The most relevant information was summarized.

6.1.3 Interview summary

Initial response from Rod McDonald via email included the following parameters for approaching the process of type design:

- How will the typeface be used, i.e. print, screen, signage?
- Will the typeface be used for text or display, or both?
- Who are the intended readers?
He went on to say that “If a typeface doesn't work under the conditions it was designed for then it really doesn't matter… it simply becomes just another bad typeface in an already over-crowded market”. McDonald raised some important considerations for a non-specialist designing a typeface:

- Start with examples of preferred typefaces
- Use FontLab software, potentially steep learning curve
- Discuss design concept with a typographer who has a vested interest
- Minimum font family consists of regular weight, matching italic, bold and bold italic; display can be a regular and/or italic, bold
- Allow 2 years from concept to testing and publication

6.2 Supplemental literature

One CSLA journal article, *Personality types in landscape architecture: a 1990 Canadian study* (Brown, 1991) directly assessed the landscape architect personality, just after an impetus took LAR in a bold new typographic and thematic direction. The article reported findings by Dr. Robert Brown who surveyed of 77 University of Guelph students and faculty. Using the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (limited to 16 possible Myers-Briggs personality typologies profiles) it was revealed that more landscape architecture participants belonged to the Extroverted Intuitive Feeling Perceptive / Judging (ENFP / ENFJ) typologies than any other which accounts for a small percentage of the general public. Framed within professional development criteria the following characteristics are attributed to the typologies:

1. *Problem solving ability*: analytical, personal or social problem solvers
2. Creative ability: highly creative / ingenious, technical / rational, intuitive
3. Designing / planning ability: analyze, differentiate, deduce / synthesize, integrate, induce
4. As employees: good at time management and peer encouragement, personable
5. As employers: concentrate on end product while trusting employee skills, develop a strong aesthetic and subjective design decisions, persuasive speakers, perfectionists, committed

The study concluded that la participants were different than the general population, being able to decisively “synthesize information and come up with big ideas” (Brown, p. 13), congruent with results from a similar study conducted by American Society of Landscape Architects. It also suggested that practitioners, whose goal is to design and implement for the vast majority, should strive to understand the points of views of others so we might become better designers. These personality descriptors are presented as an additional connotative layer in the design guidelines.

6.3 Synthesized typeface aspects

Table 11 collates pertinent data from Methods B and C into a two-stage design process. Synthesized historical and contemporary preferences and classifications define the typeface Form. Function and Intent refine the form, offering parameters about the execution of letter shape, size and nuances that can lend richness to the explicit character of the letters. A representative persona should result from exercising the aspects, assessing and adjusting the result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Concept / planning</th>
<th>Production / assessment / publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSLA publication titles &amp; headings</td>
<td>Helvetica Times</td>
<td>Denotative attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>legible narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>serif</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | D\N | Old Style | 31% | "amarible"
|        | Next Pro | 28% Neo-Grotesque | "narrow" | "display text body" |
|        | Regular | | | |
|        | Myriad Pro | | | |
| Survey: display type | Arial Helvetica Calibri Century-Gothic Times | Neogrotesque: humanist, modern, geometric Old Style | neutral / universal | "display text body" |
|        | 54% | "serif" | | |
|        | Times | | | |
|        | Sans-serif | | | |
| CSLA articles: connotative cues of professional persona | accommodating, aesthetic, affective, classical, clever, conservative, creative, imaginative, diversity, ecological, environmental, holistic, interpreter, modest, peacemaker, philosophical, practical, protective, rooted, sensual, structure, sustainable, subversive, sensitive, visionary, wholism | legible, neutral & universal, narrower than parent type | "upperscale, bold, ability to scale" | "primarily display, short text passages" |
| Design Guidelines | Arial | Humanist, Neo-Grotesque Old Style | distinctive uppercase, bold, ability to scale | "clean corporate technical modern"
|        | Calibri Century-Gothic Helvetica | nuances | | |
|        | Din NPR Myriad Pro Times | Flared serif | "display text body" | |
|        | Superior | Serif | | |
|        | Times | Flared serif | | |
|        | Times | Serif | | |
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6.4 Guideline summary

6.4.1 Phase 1: Form

The concept / planning stage of typeface design proposes the form. It is recommended that representative typeface combine structural elements from the following faces set in the “regular font” variant: Arial, Calibri, Century Gothic, Helvetica, DIN Pro, Myriad Pro and Times (McDonald, 2012).

The use of serifs, semi-serifs and sans serifs in DG2 samples suggests that vertical strokes could possess a modest flourish or flare on the terminal, ascender and/or descender to distinguish the top of letterforms from one another, given that much “of the [recognizable] character sits there” (Craig, 1980, p. 123).

The synthesized subclasses suggest the face should have low stroke contrast typical of the Neo-Grotesques. It should have a hand-rendered appearance (Humanist) and narrowed nuances in the strokes (Old Style) possessing the structure of different classes. It should also be slightly geometric in structure based on circles, squares or triangles (Figure 30).

Figure 30  Letterform structure
6.4.2 Phase 2: Function & Intent

The second phase of the guidelines describe the function and intent. These are more critical during digital drafting but should be considered during the initial phase. The synthesized denotative attributes refine the explicit character, shape and structure.

The font family should be neutral and universal with cross-cultural appeal. Mass publication by a major font distributor and easy integration into existing font libraries would encourage use. An attempt to eventually make the font accessible in French (Canada) should be a future goal.

The type should be legible at smaller title and heading sizes and from farther away than normal reading distances. Care should be taken to diminish halation (light letters ‘glowing’ on dark backgrounds) for printed panels and signage; keep counters open and avoid close terminals (Figure 31).

Figure 31  Avoid structural pinching

A narrow variant could be considered but care taken with ligatures and confusing letter combinations. Taller proportions should be considered for upper case.
A distinctive bold font should maintain the clarity of the regular font at larger scales without greatly increasing the overall colour and pull too much attention.

6.5 Execution

Hand rendering in the initial phases of designing type encourages creativity and sensitivity to organic curves and a balanced letter structure (Cheng, 2005). Though the entire process is about carefully crafting the proportions of one characteristic with another, it really relies heavily on universal design principals of balancing harmony and contrast which creates a dynamic tension among its parts while avoiding conflict (Dair, 1952). The internationally recognized letter string to use as a design standard is hamburgerFontsiv starting with a e g n o (Cheng, 2005). Render your font style 1" on ‘F’ cap height so a specialist can assess the flavor and recommend further development (McDonald, 2012).
This is offered as an example of a subjective approach to the typeface design process and application of guidelines. Following MacDonald’s recommendations, this chapter offers a brief outline and answers to prime questions for Phase 1 of LARCHITYPE:

I want to design a typeface that connotes the character of the landscape architecture and collective personality of its practitioners. By discovering descriptors associated with the profession and implicitly integrating them into the synthesized forms of preferred typefaces I plan to conceptualize a display type. A display type has the most liberty for designing letter variations and including nuances that differ from other faces. Eventually, with careful crafting, the face will be made accessible to students and professionals and a sign for the rhetorical voice of landscape architecture.

- The display type will be used primarily for print, screen and public presentations. It may be used for signage but likely within the profession.
- Although the face is intended for short strings of display type at larger scales such as titles and headings, it should also be adaptable enough for longer text passages as in mottos other impact statements.
- The intended readers are the public, allied professionals and members of the profession.
7.1 Phase 1: Form

The design process for Phase 1 offered here involved tools and techniques that another non-specialist might useful.

7.1.1 Typeface templates

- Used a lower case letter string with the exception of one capitol, an anagram of ‘landscape architecture’, as well as other recommended letters, numbers, a ligature and punctuation mark:

  \textit{i c F o g \& t h u n d e r k l a p s v 1 2 3}!

- Adobe Illustrator, generated the letter string as a vector graphic in each of the 7 preferred typefaces, regular font 48pt., added a space between the letters.

- Scaled the font strings to equal x-heights (actual heights do not matter at this point) using the transform window and background canvas grid (Figure 32).

\textbf{Figure 32 Adjusting letter strings to proportionately same height.}
• Saved the .ai file as a .pdf (Figure 33).

```
aiFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
micFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
cicFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
gicFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
dicFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
hicFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
ticFog & thud nk l p s v 1 2 3!
```

**Figure 33** Letter strings of each preferred typeface.

• Photoshop, opened .pdf image of font strings, selected each string and saved it as a layer via copy, labeled each string as its respective typeface.

• Transferred strings to a new Photoshop file. Turned all layers off except *Times*. One at a time, turned each layer on, reduced opacity to 20%, overlapped each layer (Figure 34).

**Figure 34** Layering ‘g’.
Matched the important structures within the architecture of each letter:

- ‘i’ - base and to the right side of the vertical
- ‘F’ - cross bar and left side of the vertical
- ‘&’ - both cross points respecting the base
- ‘t’ - base and vertical stroke left side
- ‘h’ - base and vertical stroke left side
- ‘u’ - base of the bowl and right of the vertical
- ‘n’ - base and vertical stroke left side
- ‘d’ - base and vertical stroke left side
- ‘e’ - interior left corner of the eye
- ‘r’ - base and right of the vertical, joint of the hook
- ‘k’ - right side of the vertical stroke at the leg joint
- ‘l’ - base and right side of the vertical
- ‘a’ - base and joint of the vertical
- ‘p’ - base and right side of the vertical
- ‘s’ - base of the bowl centered allowing for span across hooks
- ‘v’ - base at the diagonal joint
- ‘1’ - base and right of the vertical
- ‘2’ - base and lower left outer acute angle
- ‘3’ - base of the bowl and the center arm
- ‘!’ - center base of the dot

Merging visible layers revealed accumulated opacities like an x-ray.

Each composite letter was selected, copied via layer saved each as its character (Figure 35).
7.1.2 Typeface units

This portion of the design stage is a nod to landscape architect Ian McHarg, who used map overlays to define landscape units of a site’s natural features. All things being equal, the transparencies provide darker grey skeleton as a design foundation.

- Autocad, opened each letter file, traced the skeletal outline (Figure 36).

![Figure 36 Typeface units – the skeleton of LARCHITYPE](image-url)
7.1.3 Letterform sketches

Bringhurst states that, “Letters are microscopic works of art as well as useful symbols.” (1997, p. 23) The following letterforms are a collection of concept sketches for LARCHITYPE, the first artistic expression of the muscle that articulates the form around the skeleton of the typeface units. Some notes are included about glyph structure (Figure 37).

![Figure 37 LARCHITYPE concept sketch](image)
In *The Elements of Typographic Style*, Canadian designer, typographer and poet, Robert Bringhurst ruminates about the importance of typography, typeface appropriateness and the designers’ influential hand. Excerpts express each interpretation and opinion about this exploratory study.

“*Typography is the craft of endowing human language with a durable visual form … Its heartwood is calligraphy … and its roots reach into living soil … So long as the root lives, typography remains the source of true delight, true knowledge, true surprise.*”

- Bringhurst, 1997, p. 11

Are some typefaces more representative of landscape architecture persona than others? Perhaps. In order to understand the influence that a well-chosen typeface can have, we need to question a seemingly inconsequential decision to simultaneously use, for example, *Arial* over *Times* for general communication and for visual impact. Professional conspicuity through visual cues such as distinct and well-designed, information could help clarify not only our presence but also our roles to the public. As for our allied professions, recognition of our national unity witnessed through various visual cues including logos, mottos, acronyms of licensure and a typeface emulating our collective character could encourage salience. Regardless, the more that designers explore semantic associations as part of applying visual design theory, the more closed the gap is in matching typeface character to professions.
“Like a typographer, the first task of any designer is to understand and decode information … the second is to analyze and map it … reveal, not replace, the inner composition. Typographers … must as a rule, do their work and disappear.”


Although the introductory literature review supports assumptions about typeface appropriateness, it may be that overall typeface trends revealed here have reflected what was considered ‘safe’ to use rather than anything overtly expressive employed in other specific situations. Landscape architects who missed the survey may have revealed a different set of preferences. It is apparent, however, that certain typefaces and (more accurately) certain classes of typefaces have been used to represent landscape architecture information. These faces bare semantic properties that within our profession are likely associated through of a mix of convention and personality.

Where this exploratory study cast a wide net to capture data, respondents, informants and general information on the topic pertinent for generating guidelines and a design, a deeper study into any one of the methods used could be valuable. An investigative pilot case study to learn about classifying this strain of data as a non-specialist with recommendations from popular literature has its merit. It could stand alone as the basis for subsequent studies about representation of national identity.

As well, either of the methods for analyzing the landscape architecture data could form the basis of refining the method itself or for a deeper exploration of the topic. For instance, a survey looking at typefaces used in specific applications (digital, print) could reveal tendencies for different scales of design and audiences. Likewise, an examination
of various journals regarding scholarly vs. public information could reveal differences of intended communication styles.

Method C used preset multi-modals from prior studies as a nominal assessment method instead of employing semantic differential as a quantitative method. To assess the reception of LARCHITYPE as a viable font, reaching further into the measurement of meaning first envisioned by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum and their contemporaries could be employed.

“Letterforms have tone, timbre, character, just as words and sentences do. The moment a text and typeface are chosen, two streams of thought … two personalities, intersect. They need not live contentedly forever, but they must not as a rule collide.”

- Bringhurst, 1997, p.22

The synthesis of this data into a set of guidelines was used as a point of departure to narrate a landscape architecture identity through the initial stage of the intended LARCHITYPE font. Although the evident typefaces are indisputable, synthesis of the data as inspiration is at the mercy of subjective interpretation, as most designs tend to be, no matter how grounded in methodical science. A discussion about the synthesized connotative and denotative character, the appropriateness of the resulting design for thematic information and general consensus among landscape architects, could validate the representative typeface.
“Letterforms constantly change, yet differ very little, because they are alive.”

- Bringhurst, 1997, p. 10

The search for professional identity is an ongoing one. Stopgaps in every career cause us to examine how we have been changed by our experiences and how we have affected change. We create an interdependent relationship with our fellow practitioners in hopes that we can justify our motivations and revel in our successes. The heart of this relationship is the innate impulse to commune, to share and grow as individuals and as a professional body.

At a much deeper level, this thesis research points to the reflective nature of landscape architecture as an evolutionary process. As we work with systems in flux, ever changing, we are reminded that our character is responsive and active. Therefore we should be attentive always to how we perceive our peers and ourselves as we learn from one another expanding our scope of influence.
Future studies, and extensions of this thesis, might include refining methods to engage affiliated chapter members of CSLA more effectively, for instance, through regional media while bringing attention to national themes of identity and persona. A portion of eventual proceeds from the sale of the typeface intended for professional development could contribute to a graduate level creative design scholarship or bursary. Similarly, Rod McDonalds’ eight-font typeface Gibson, an ode to his mentor, was priced inexpensively at $48.00 and has surpassed expectations for public buy-in. The proceeds funnel directly to the Graphic Designers of Canada education fund (McDonald, 2012).

McDonald recommended, when the LARCHITYPE concept is reasonably rendered, that he review the design and offer suggestions for refinement, recommending a colleague at Canada Type, Toronto, to perhaps be involved in the digital production of Phase 2 and 3. In addition to producing their own faces, typographers often help calligraphers or lettering artists who do not have software skills with their typeface concepts, by first assessing whether it is worthy of further attention. If this route is followed there would likely be a shared royalty for publication.

Another possibility for carrying the project through to completion is crowdfunding, considered a more successful way to manage a modest creative endeavour, whereby the project is posted online and a required minimum level of accumulative bids ($20,000 projected for four font variants) will provide essential funding. Continual tie-in with CSLA
as the project moves forward is likely including endorsement from CSLA President Elect, Peter Briggs.

9.1 Metaphor

To continue the design of LARCHITYPE through to Phase 2, digital rendering, I employed the metaphor of the native Canadian tree *Larix laricina*, Eastern larch (Figure 38). In addition to offering an obvious abbreviation of ‘landscape architecture’, the larch stands here as a symbol upon which I have hung the profile of the landscape architect and the broad characterization of recurrent and preferred typefaces:

*It is a hardy, adaptable tree that extends across the majority of the Canadian landscape. Ambitious in youth, it grows into an upright narrow profile, with relaxed branches in maturity. It invites wildlife that feed on its nutritious fruit, turned from bright pink flowers to cones. Finely textured needles glow golden in autumn setting themselves apart from other conifers in the native habitat. Recommended for use as a natural specimen, larches are often used in bonsai culture for their aesthetic appeal and exemplary form (Meyer, 2004). Suitable for dry land or open water, its wood is durable and resilient to rot, used structurally or decoratively a testament to longstanding flexibility.*
9.2 Future assessment strategy

As Craig states, “Type is wonderfully versatile: it can be solemn, serious, businesslike, playful, or downright silly. Of course there are times when type should be invisible, i.e. unobtrusive and there are times when type can shout. Whatever the approach type should always be appropriate to both the subject matter and the audience” (1980, p. 114). Similarly, use of LARCHITYPE should evoke associated connotative attributes and provide unsought information regarding the tone of a landscape architecture document.

To test the effectiveness of the face could employ multi-modal assessment and semantic differential. Setting information such as the professional designation in this face, others root faces and disparate expressive faces could be a first step in assessing the appeal of the letter construction. Then the application of the typeface by members of a focus group to compare opinions would afford an assessment through a practical application and feedback.

Eleven out of fifteen attributes outlined in the guideline table are from Brumberger’s Likert scale reflecting the value Very for the preferred typefaces. The other four are the common attributes from the preferred typefaces used for CSLA journals. Construction of a multi-modal test using these and an additional group from the connotative cues (classical, clever, creative, modesty, sensual, subversive, etc.) extracted from the CSLA articles interpreting landscape architecture persona leading to a quantitative assessment of visual rhetoric and indicate associated semantic properties (Walker, Smith, & Livingston, 1986). In any case, an assessment needs to be addressed
perhaps with a focus group or refined survey for national agreement about typeface appropriateness and regional representation.

9.3 Final thoughts

This thesis looked at design as research, which is admittedly a challenging cloud to navigate. Qualitative data and analysis is at best a rich, rewarding and a revelatory exploration and at worst elusive and difficult to categorize. Hopefully, a few professionals and students will find this study and its results interesting and useful. The path through the topic of typography has many circuitous routes and parallels that, as a profession, we should at the very least become more aware of, if not learn firsthand, their impact. As I continue along the path to complete the design of LARCHITYPE I will leave the reader with this poignant reflection:

“Typography thrives as a shared concern – and there are no paths at all where there are no shared desires and directions.”

-Bringhurst, 1997, p. 9
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Key informant Gerry Boulet interview questions

- What is your professional designation and affiliation?
- How long have you worked in your current position?
- What department do you currently work in and with how many people do you collaborate? Who are the key players responsible for park plan documents?
- In what capacity do you help with federal design?
- What is the structure of the (branding department)?
- In your experience what significant changes have taken place regarding typography and branding of national parks?
- How important is public relations, marketing and tourism in considering changes to Parks Canada branding mechanisms?
- How has the Department of National Resource’s conservation mandate define national branding mechanisms?
- Are there ever any formal communication / conversations about how documents’ typography reflects national identity of Canada’s parks?
- The typeface and branding used currently on the national parks plan is distinctive from earlier versions. Can you comment on the character of the font used?
- Would you like to weigh in on a typeface designed to represent for a professional body of people. As a visual cue do you think it can help unify and strengthen the presence of a profession like Landscape Architecture?
- Is there anything else you’d like to add not covered in this interview?
Question 1: What is your... provincial affiliation?

Question 2: How long have you been a landscape architect?

Question 3: The majority of your projects are in which form of practice?

Question 4: Which of the following best describes how many Landscape Architects, LA Interns, students and/or drafting technicians you regularly work with on a daily/weekly basis?
Question 6: What is the motivation best describes your preference for using...
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Question 7: Is there an intention for using...
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Question 10: What motivation best describes your preference for...

Appendix H

Question 11: Are the proportions / shape of the display font ever modified to purposefully change its character?

Weight

Scale

Spacing

Height/Width

Count

Count

Count

Count