(revised) Looking back at Unit 2, I realised that my research focus has gradually shifted from observing visual culture within a specific context to a more structural investigation centred on *semiology*. Saussure defines semiology as "a science that studies the life of signs within society," which explores how language and other systems of signs express ideas and produce meaning through shared cultural structures (Saussure, 1959, p.15). While the public often sees language merely as a name-giving system, such a view prevents us from understanding its true nature.

This shift of my project did not happen suddenly but has been built through two stages of continuous experimentation and reflection: from Positions through Contextualising, where I used fashion magazines to reflect on how female visual identities are socially constructed; to Positions through Triangulating, where I examined how women's complexity is reduced and simplified into stereotypes through systems of power.

Gradually, I came to understand that power operates not only in how images are viewed, but also in how signs are used. Signs can be used to simplify complexity, perhaps they can also be used to restore it. My focus has therefore moved from visual representation to semantic construction, from the body that is seen to the sign that is defined.

1. **Women are GAZED.**
– *The Gentlewoman* vs *Harper's Bazaar* **(& John Berger, *Ways of Seeing*) (on female and male presence)**
2. **WHO is woman?**
– **Positions through dialogue – with Mio Kojima**
3. **Is text a WEAPON?**
– **Barbara Kruger, *Your Body is a Battleground* (& Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*)**
4. **Text IS a weapon.**
– **Jenny Holzer, *Truisms* (& Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*)** (the main part, from Δ2 writing)
5. **ORDER can speak as well.**
– **Veronika Spierenburg, *In Order of Pages***

6. Power speaks BEFORE resistance. / From resisting to REVEALING.

– On shifting from countering stereotypes to tracing how language systems produce them.

As I mentioned earlier, in the process of collecting and layering knowledge, I've realised that it is impossible to avoid discussing systems of power. My project uses two kinds of "databases" to restore the complexity that stereotypes erase. Reflecting on both the discussion of power and the development of form, I still feel uncertain about the role of the AI-generated version in my work. Although it is still in an early stage, I believe it cannot be simply removed. If I continue to treat AI as a parallel output to the human-generated version, its vocabulary should directly enter the artwork but stay strongly connected to the printed version. if treated as a research tool, it might act as a conceptual starting point – a way to reveal how meaning is generated within different systems of power.

From the earlier stage of redesigning fashion magazines, I first saw AI merely as a supportive tool for rewriting images. Now I realise it has already become another "author". The logic of AI actively shapes our current systems of meaning. This leads me to rethink that the production of meaning no longer belongs solely to human experience but is now dispersed across both social and algorithmic fields.

In other words, power now comes not only from social structures but also from algorithmic ones. Therefore, the question is not whether AI should be seen as a tool or a collaborator, but how its algorithmic logic shapes the way we perceive and understand language in the digital age. In our interactions with AI, we are also influenced by the information it generates; the boundary between the active and the passive becomes blurred. From the moment I begin communicating with AI, its linguistic structure, cultural context, and built-in bias already participate in constructing meaning.

However, it is also important to clarify that AI is not the origin of such bias; it merely amplifies and selects from tendencies that already exist within human discourse. In other words, the AI-generated list functions like a magnifying glass: it reflects

Wen Wen

the underlying logic that has long been embedded in human language, reproducing and exaggerating those linguistic habits that have been culturally internalised.

Therefore, I am not moving away from the human perspective; on the contrary, it remains the foundation of my project. The human-generated list demonstrates how meaning develops from personal experiences and collective memories, with each participant bringing her own emotions and cultural background into the text. Through these human contributions, meaning becomes layered, contextual, and resistant to standardisation. In contrast, the AI-generated list reveals what happens when meaning becomes detached from lived experience and is processed through collective data; it exposes the structure of simplification itself.

Human and AI languages, therefore, support my enquiry from two different perspectives: one expresses resistance through the diversity of human experience, while the other reproduces simplification by repeating what is already dominant in social discourse. Together, they reveal how simplification is sustained and how complexity can be rebuilt through the very structures that simplify it.

(new) Although human and AI languages serve as different tools for addressing ideology, this distinction hides a binary trap: the assumption that human language is "free" while AI language is "restricted." Yet, similarities also exist between them. In the word-association experiment, both systems occasionally produced the same or nearly identical terms (such as *bloom* and *sprout*), showing that their underlying associative logic is not entirely different. In this sense, the stereotypical expressions found in AI outputs actually reflect the unconscious linguistic tendencies collectively shared by human society. This subtle resemblance opens a space for further exploration: despite their differences, both human and algorithmic systems seem to operate within a shared cultural-semantic framework, continuing certain linguistic habits shaped by history and power.

This is my enquiry at this stage: stereotypes simplify complexity, and signs, whether shaped by human experience or machine data, are the sites where this simplification takes place. Through my project, I attempt to reclaim diversity through text signs, transforming the very structures that once carried the language of power into a space that questions power itself. In this process, complexity is no longer what power suppresses but what resists power.

(new) However, I have gradually realised that this simplification is not only social or visual; it is deeply rooted in the structure of language itself. Stereotypes are sustained through linguistic habits that persist across collective histories, which is why I instinctively began testing how different language systems reproduce them: one grounded in human experience, the other driven by algorithmic logic. Their differences reveal how the same textual signs can carry simplified meanings through different mechanisms; yet their similarities are equally revealing, as both inherit linguistic conventions shaped by power. In this sense, AI may not invent new biases – it reflects and amplifies those already embedded in human language. Therefore, my project would shift from simply resisting stereotypes to studying the various (and perhaps fundamentally similar) linguistic systems that produce them. Complexity, then, might not only be restored outside structures of power but can also be rebuilt within them.

On this basis, new questions begin to emerge:
> I have used both human and AI learning to examine stereotypes, but are these the only systems that shape them? Are human experience and algorithmic logic binary, or are there other kinds of "archives" we have ignored? Also, why do I consider the AI database to be biased in the first place?
> If both humans and AI project collective bias while constructing meaning and generating signs, is it still possible to resist bias through the sign system itself? Or will this resistance eventually become another loop of bias – a Möbius strip that turns back on itself?

These questions may form the starting point for my next stage of research…

Wen Wen