

## Reflection on audience engagement

In this Unit 3 project, I shared my work with young audiences who are not from a design background, as well as two art editors with publishing experience. I wanted to receive feedback from people with different perspectives. My project uses poetry as a medium. Through coding, I break down key words in the poem into multiple possible meanings, and allow viewers to select different interpretations to generate their own image combinations. In this way, the project explores the instability of language and how audiences participate in the process of meaning making.

During the interaction with audiences, I observed different ways of engagement. Some viewers started from the words, carefully reading the poem and thinking about the possible meanings of each word. However, other viewers were first attracted by the visual images and focused more on the changes of the images rather than the words itself. This is different from my original intention, where words should be the main element and images should be supportive. It also suggests that the current visual hierarchy is not clear, and the images sometimes take over the dominant role from the text.

Feedback from the art editors further pointed out problems in the visual structure. They mentioned that each image element works well on its own, but when combined together, the overall composition feels quite chaotic. Although the elements are supposed to be equal, there seems to be an unclear hierarchy between them, which affects the clarity of the work. In addition, even though the images are visually complex, the final combinations created by different viewers do not look very different from each other. This weakens my original intention to show that different people can have different interpretations.

Some viewers also mentioned that their choices were influenced by my personal visual style. For example, they felt that the tone of the poem was soft because of the visual style, so they tended to choose softer images. This made me realise that I may have introduced my own visual language too early in the process, which limited the audience's imagination. The images are no longer open suggestions, but become a kind of guidance or hint from the author. This reduces the openness of the work in terms of audience participation in meaning making.

Those feedbacks made me rethink the relationship between words, image, and audience. In the current version, images not only express meaning but also dominate visually, which prevents the multiple meanings of words from being fully explored. In the next stage, I plan to adjust the visual hierarchy to strengthen the role of text, so that viewers will focus on the language first. At the same time, I will improve the interaction by adding more variation, so that the final results can show clearer differences while still keeping a consistent visual style.

In terms of method, I may also delay or reduce the use of my personal style, for example by using more neutral visual elements or making the image generation system more open. This could reduce the influence of my subjective style on the audience's understanding. In addition, I would like to record and analyse the audience's selection process, and treat the process itself as part of the research, rather than only focusing on the final result.