

The Stereotype of Successful Women under the Influence of Platform Feminism

group 7

201942354
201936384
201981767
201938365
201942171

Introduction

- We created this AI-generated vlog to understand how digital platforms quietly shape the image of a “successful woman.” Instead of designing the visuals ourselves, we let different AI tools write the script and generate the scenes. Even when we tried to correct the model by giving explicit instructions to avoid stereotypes, the final video still overlooked the everyday realities of most women.
- Through this experiment, we were able to see more clearly how platform logic, data sorting, and aesthetic preferences keep reproducing narrow gender and class ideals. The video is not only something we produced—it also reveals the mechanisms behind these patterns.

tool selection



Script Production Platform:

- Gemini
- Copilot
- Chatgpt
- Claude
- DeepSeek
- DouBao

Video Production Platform:

- 可灵3.0 (Kling 3.0)

How does the video help with understanding?

The generated videos visually confirmed AI's ingrained stereotypes. When six major systems received the same prompt, they produced highly homogeneous scripts of successful women—fixated on age, appearance, and affluent lifestyles. Even after explicit instructions to avoid these traits, some models refused to comply, proving the bias is embedded deep within model weights, not just at the prompt level.



Applying data feminism, the project revealed how seemingly natural footage—women cheerfully juggling childcare and cooking—masks the exhaustion and tedium of invisible domestic labor. AI, trained under capitalist and platform logic, transforms housework into heartwarming aesthetics, erasing the psychological and emotional costs women bear balancing career and family (Robert, 2009).

Finally, the product exposed class filtering: even with non-stereotypical roles specified, videos defaulted to consumerist markers of elite womanhood. AI consistently equated female success with material wealth, erasing working-class women and those struggling with work-family conflicts (Andi, 2017). This reveals how algorithms perpetuate hidden harm by filtering out diverse, non-affluent success stories.

Why is the video mode appropriate?

- Directly exposed

From script creation to video generation, it is all led by algorithms, which can most purely and directly reflect the original logic of the algorithms.

- Multidimensional presentation

Through the picture, scene, attitude, behavior, life signs and other visual factors, the invisible bias is stereographically manifested.

- Variable controllable

The unified instruction inputs multiple AI iteration scripts. Relying on AI videos, the scripts are transformed into audio-visual language. This controlled variable comparative experiment is conducted to confirm that AI biases are widespread.

- Terse and forceful

The video content is highly condensed, balancing the completeness of the life-oriented narrative with the feasibility of academic analysis.

Link Visual Elements to Critical Theories

1. Elite visibility narrows the algorithmic definition of womanhood
 - The video centers white women, luxury interiors, and flawless beauty, while excluding working-class, rural, and manual-labor women.
 - This selective representation shows how algorithms reproduce power structures and define “successful women” through elite aesthetics (Noble, 2018).
2. Algorithmic imagination produces homogeneity and reinforces bias
 - AI repeatedly outputs uniform, idealized female images, creating a fixed template of “success.”
 - Continuous exposure normalizes these images and reinforces gender stereotypes (Bucher, 2017).
3. Data feminism: domestic labor is romanticized and rendered invisible
 - Scenes of graceful cooking and childcare aestheticize domestic work as soothing lifestyle moments.
 - The exhausting, fragmented nature of housework disappears, contradicting data feminism’s call to make invisible labor visible (D’Ignazio & Klein, 2020).
4. Calculated publics: algorithms construct exclusive elite publics
 - The vlog exemplifies Gillespie’s (2014) calculated publics, where algorithmic sorting elevates seaside architecture, flawless morning routines, and high-end aesthetics.
 - By filtering out the textures of working-class labor, the system isolates privileged subjects into an exclusive public, erasing diverse forms of female achievement.
5. Algorithmic culture: commercial aesthetics reshape femininity
 - Following Striphas (2015), the vlog shows how algorithmic culture turns data sorting into a cultural engine.
 - Scenes of painting beside a vinyl player or cooking in a silk blouse transform domestic labor into a polished lifestyle product, weaponizing commercial aesthetics to dictate modern femininity.

6. Implicit algorithmic bias: success is tied to economic capital

- Even without explicit corporate tropes, implicit bias persists: success is visually bound to economic capital, symbolized by cooking while carrying a luxury leather tote.
- Platform traffic dynamics prioritize these sanitized class markers, quietly amplifying structural inequalities under the guise of aesthetic empowerment.



Reference



Safiya Umoja Noble 2018. Algorithms of Oppression : How Search Engines Reinforce Racism [Online]. NYU Press. Available from: <https://www.perlego.com/book/719748/algorithms-of-oppression-how-search-engines-reinforce-racism-pdf>.

Bucher, T. 2017. The algorithmic imaginary: exploring the ordinary affects of Facebook algorithms. Information, communication & society. 20(1), pp.30–44.

D’ Ignazio, C. and Klein, L.F. 2020. Data feminism. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Noble, S.U., 2018. Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York: New York University Press.

Gillespie, T., Boczkowski, P.J. and Foot, K.A. 2015. Media technologies : essays on communication, materiality, and society [Online]. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. Available from: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/bkabstractplus.jsp?bkn=6731153>.

Striphas, T., 2015. Algorithmic culture. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18(4-5), pp.395-412.

Zeisler, A. 2016. We were feminists once : from Riot Grrrl to CoverGirl®, the buying and selling of a political movement First edition. New York: BBS, PublicAffairs.

Goldman, R., Heath, D. and Smith, S.L. 1991. Commodity feminism. Critical studies in mass communication. 8(3), pp.333–351.