https://doi.org/10.37420/j.cer.2026.013

Research on the Interaction between Humans and Technology in AI Media Art from the Perspective of Media Technology Affordance

Lingjing Zeng*
School of Broadcasting and Television Directing, Fujian Normal University, China
***Corresponding author E-mail:1093196490@qq.com**

Abstract:
With the rise of generative artificial intelligence, the creative ecosystem of media art is undergoing profound transformation. This study, based on the theory of media technology affordance, explores the interactive relationship between humans and technology in AI-driven media art creation, focusing on two core issues: "How does technology shape the artistic process?" and "How does human agency reconstruct creation?" It adopts the ethnographic method in qualitative research, combining in-depth interviews with 14 practitioners and participant observation in an AI short drama company. The research finds that AI tools like Doubao and Keling, through their technical features (such as text-to-image and image-to-video generation), have lowered the creative threshold and provided nearly unlimited resources. However, this is accompanied by a tendency towards templating. But creators, through strategies such as technology integration, aesthetic selection, and re-editing, actively domesticate technology, highlighting human subjectivity. AI media art is not a product dominated by technology, but a dynamic outcome of the mutual negotiation and co-generation of technological affordance and human agency in specific contexts.

Keywords:
AI media art, media affordance, human-computer interaction, generative artificial intelligence, ethnographic research

1 Introduction

In the contemporary era where digital technology profoundly reshapes the ecosystem of artistic creation, the rise of generative artificial intelligence has brought revolutionary changes to the field of media art. AI media art marks the birth of a "predictive aesthetics". Unlike the deterministic operations of traditional digital media, AI art relies on extracting patterns from massive cultural data, which has changed the definition of human creativity, shifting it towards the exploration of data distribution. The popularization of AI tools such as Doubao, Keliang, and Jiemeng has significantly lowered the technical threshold for dynamic image creation, providing nearly unlimited creative resources, leading to a significant "democratization" trend in artistic creation, and giving rise to new art forms such as "AI cultivation videos" and "vulgar animations". However, beneath this prosperous scene, many AI media art works, despite their large output, cannot hide their inherent template-like traces and lack the "free will" charm of traditional creation. This contradictory phenomenon

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

points to a deeper academic issue: In the context of the availability of media technology, what kind of interaction relationship does AI media art creation between humans and technology present? How does technology impose restrictions while providing new possibilities? And how does the human play its creative initiative in this new technological environment?

This study, based on the theoretical perspective of media technology availability, through in-depth interviews with 14 AI media art creators and participatory observations in an AI short drama company, systematically examines how AI technology shapes the creative process through its specific availability structure, and how creators interact with it through active practices. The study found that the creative practice of AI media art is a dynamic negotiation process full of tension, where technology provides the basic conditions for creative practice through its availability, while setting structural constraints; while creators, through a series of strategic practices, constantly seek the expression space of creative autonomy within the technical framework. This interaction is not a simple manifestation of technological determinism or a pure declaration of human centrism, but a dialectical relationship that is constantly generated and changed in specific contexts.

2 Literature Review

2.1. The theory of media availability

Currently, the theory of media availability has attracted multi-perspective research from the academic community, providing a core analytical framework for understanding digital and intelligent media. For instance, the introduction of this theory in the domestic field of communication studies began from the tradition of ecological psychology, emphasizing the essence of relationality, that is, abandoning the previous mechanical "structure-function" tendency and integrating the value of human subjectivity, thereby making technology become the possibility of action presented by the interaction of actors. This has shifted the analytical focus from the static functional list of media to the dynamic interaction network of people, technology and context.

Furthermore, the theory of media availability has been introduced to explain media convergence and the ecosystem of intelligent media. At the same time, the academic community is also vigilant against the risks of concept zombieization and technological determinism, proposing from an ontological perspective that the essence of availability lies in connection and generation, being the generative prerequisite for the existence of media. The visibility theory profoundly reveals that while media present the world, they are inevitably accompanied by certain obfuscation, and the will of power permeates and embeds in the media. The tension between content generation in AI art and the underlying data bias and algorithm black box deserves to be re-examined, and these viewpoints provide a critical theoretical basis for it.

2.2. AI media art

Generative AI, as an emerging technological actor, is profoundly reshaping the creation, works and reception paradigms of media art. In terms of technical characteristics, its generative, probabilistic and black-box nature introduce a new paradigm of controlled randomness and collaborative co-creation for artistic creation, significantly reducing the technical threshold, but also accompanying challenges such as copyright ownership and algorithm bias.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

At the practical level, AI has given rise to a new model of human-machine co-creation, driving the cultural industry such as film to undergo structural changes from creative generation to aesthetic paradigm. On one hand, algorithmic industrial aesthetics attempts to make mass interests visible, constructing new production and distribution frameworks; on the other hand, AI also forces the ontological issues of art, such as the nature of authorship and creativity, to once again stand out, triggering profound discussions on post-human aesthetics. Research indicates that human-machine interaction is not simply the use of tools, but rather a continuous negotiation and domestication process centered around intention, control and responsibility. Moreover, at the experiential level, when AI is combined with multi-channel interactions such as VR/AR, the interactivity transcends interface functions, turning to the re-arrangement of emotional and cognitive circuits and the embodied coupling of the body, environment and algorithm, reshaping the empathetic mechanism and immersive experience of the audience.

2.3. The practical value of this research topic

Although the existing achievements are abundant, there is still a relative lack of research on the core issue of “the interaction relationship between humans and technology in AI media art”, providing a space for entry and practical value for this research topic.

Firstly, at the theoretical level, most existing explanations remain at a macro classification level, lacking detailed and dynamic models of the interaction micro-mechanisms. This study will attempt to deeply answer the process-related questions of “how humans collaborate with AI and thereby change the art ecosystem”.

Secondly, at the methodological level, current research is mainly theoretical elaboration, with relatively little in-depth tracking of the creative process of real art projects. This study intends to introduce the process ethnography method to deeply explore the action network composed of creators, models, platforms and audiences, providing solid empirical evidence for theoretical dialogue.

Finally, in terms of research perspectives, existing discussions are mostly focused on the production end, with relatively weak attention to the reception and dissemination ends. This study aims to explore how platform distribution shapes the visibility and personalized generation of AI aesthetics through the entire creative process.

3 Research Methods

This study aims to explore the interaction between humans and technology in AI media art creation from the perspective of media technology availability. To deeply analyze this dynamic and contextual process, this study mainly adopts the ethnographic method in qualitative research. Through in-depth interviews and participatory observation, it collects empirical materials, with the intention of delving into the micro-mechanisms within the network composed of "creators, technology platforms, and content".

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

3.1 In-depth interview method

3.1.2 Selection of interviewees

This study strictly follows scientific norms. 14 interviewees with practical experience in AI media art were selected for semi-structured in-depth interviews with an average duration of 15 minutes. The interviews began in September 2025 and ended in January 2026.

Following the principle of maximum sampling in qualitative research, when the interview data of the 11th interviewee was included in the analysis, it fully met the requirements for answering the research questions. Thus, the sample collection process was declared to be over. The respondents in this study showed significant differences in age, professional fields, educational background, and geographical distribution, ensuring a low degree of homogeneity of the samples and enhancing the generalizability and representativeness of the research results.

The interview process was conducted via phone to ensure smooth communication and accurate recording of information. Subsequently, all interview contents were carefully organized into verbatim transcripts, laying a solid foundation for further in-depth analysis. The basic information of the interviewees is as follows.The interviewees mainly consist of two groups:

Part one: College students majoring in directing (9 people): Selected through the recommendation of college directing teachers and student associations with AI creation project experience. They represent the absorption and innovation of the new generation of creators towards technology.

Part two: Employees of an overseas AI short drama company (5 people): Recruited through the colleague network of the author's internship unit and industry communities, covering positions such as planning, writing, video generation, and post-production editing. They represent the commercial application and reconfiguration of technology availability at the industry forefront.

3.2 Participatory observation method

To overcome the limitations of “disscrepancy between words and deeds” that may exist in simple interviews and obtain the most direct perception of the creative process, this study also employs the participatory observation method. The core of this method is that the researcher not only acts as an observer but also integrates as a practitioner into the social context of the research subjects.

3.2.1 Observation process and roles

The researcher’s participatory observation was based on the internship experience in an overseas AI short drama company from December 2025 to February 2026. During this period, the researcher participated in the complete production process of three AI short drama projects as an AI storyboard artist. This “insider” role enabled the researcher to naturally and continuously observe the daily practice of creators interacting with AI technology, including but not limited to: the creative generation at team brainstorming sessions, the collaboration of directors, writers, and AI tools (Doubao, etc.) in writing, the parameter adjustment and repeated generation by AI storyboard artists for tools like Keling and Jiuming, and the editing and synthesis of AI-gen-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

erated materials by post-production personnel.

3.2.2 Observation content and data recording

The focus of observation was to capture the subtle moments of human-technology interaction, such as: observing how creators adjust their creative paths in response to the interface design and output results of AI tools; observing how creators develop strategies like "technology grafting", multiple generations, and selective combination to tame technology and achieve creative intentions; recording the immediate reactions and discussions of creators when facing algorithmic biases, generation failures, or unexpected surprises.

The researcher maintained field notes during the internship, detailing daily observed typical events, dialogue segments, and personal reflections. At the same time, with the permission of the team, some non-confidential work files that could reflect the creative process were collected, such as different versions of AI-generated images, video drafts, and team communication records, etc. These were analyzed as important physical materials. All observation activities were carried out in accordance with ethical norms. The researchers clearly informed the team of their research identity and ensured that the company's trade secrets would not be leaked.

Through the complementary and corroborative effect of in-depth interviews and participatory observations, this research was able to construct a three-dimensional and vivid empirical evidence system, laying a solid methodological foundation for deeply answering the core question of "how humans collaborate with AI in practice".

4 Results

4.1 The duality of technological availability

AI technology has constructed a new infrastructure for creative practice through its unique functional characteristics. This infrastructure possesses both significant empowering and restrictive qualities, which together constitute the initial conditions for human-machine interaction and constrain the development space. This duality is not only manifested at the surface level of technology usage, but also deeply penetrates into various aspects such as the creative process, aesthetic expression, and power relations.

4.1.1 Empowering availability

Generative AI tools (such as Douba and Keliang) have significantly lowered the technical threshold for professional creation through core functions like "text-to-image" and "image-to-video". The simplification of this operational availability has transformed skills that traditionally required long-term professional training into relatively intuitive interface operations and prompt engineering. A student majoring in film and television direction stated in an interview: "The short film creation that required team formation and equipment rental in the past can now be independently completed from script to final product through AI tools. This technological empowerment has enabled creative practice to move away from being limited to professional institutions and provided opportunities for individual creators to express themselves." (Interviewee C), The empowering availability of AI creation has led to a turn towards popularization in creative practice, lowering the threshold

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

and making creation "within reach".

In addition to the reduction in technical thresholds, the "generative availability" of AI tools provides creators with an unprecedented visual resource library. The richness of this resource supply is not only in quantity, but also in the diversity of quality and style. Creators can easily call upon scenes and styles that were difficult to achieve in traditional production, such as precise restoration of historical scenes and specific visualization of science fiction imagination. A respondent engaged in fantasy-themed creation pointed out: "Through AI tools, I can convert abstract descriptions in literary works into specific visual images. This transformation from text to image has improved the efficiency of creation and expanded the possibilities of narrative expression." (Interviewee F)

At the same time, this empowering availability is also reflected in the significant reduction of creative costs. In traditional film and television production, scenes, costumes, props, and special effects production require a large investment of funds. AI generation technology has greatly compressed these costs. An independent documentary director stated: "Due to budget constraints, visual concepts that could not be realized in the past can now be attempted at a low cost through AI tools, combined with real shooting, providing us independent creators with a larger experimental space." (Interviewee G) The significant reduction in creative costs has allowed some creators to temporarily escape the preparatory and post-production stages, thus allowing them to devote more energy to creation.

However, this empowering availability also implies a new power structure. The convenience of technology usage may lead to the homogenization of creation, with a large number of creations flooding the market. The algorithmic characteristics of the tools themselves also shape the aesthetic orientation and expression methods of creators invisibly.

4.1.2 Constraining availability and algorithmic availability

Along with the empowerment availability, various forms of constraining availability arise. AI tools not only change the creative process but also impose structural restrictions on creative practice through their technical characteristics. These restrictions come from the design logic of the tools themselves and are also constrained by the larger technological economic system.

Firstly, AI tools drive the creative process towards a highly standardized and modularized direction. The creative process is decomposed into "prompt engineering, batch generation, aesthetic screening, and post-production synthesis" in a flow-line operation mode. This standardization enhances efficiency while also potentially leading to mechanization and the weakening of creativity. A short drama company planner pointed out: "To adapt to the content update frequency and algorithm recommendation mechanism of short video platforms, we have to adopt a work mode of batch generation and rapid screening." Although this industrialized production process ensures output efficiency, it to some extent squeezes out the space for creative incubation and in-depth refinement. (Interviewee D), the characteristics of short-video platforms and the rapid output model brought about by AI have given rise to a superficial market environment. A large number of works flood the market, with a mixture of good and bad quality. The truly well-polished works are unable to seize market share and can only be incorporated into the overwhelming tide of "quantity exceeding quality".

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Deeper constraints stem from the "black box" nature of the technology itself. The complexity and opacity of the generation algorithm make it difficult for creators to understand the internal logic of the AI-generated results. The availability of the algorithm is not always visible; it often regulates user behavior through “invisibility” and “black box” characteristics. In generative AI, this availability is manifested as a “passive expectation”. This “algorithmic obfuscation” not only affects the creators’ control over the tools but may also lead to potential cultural biases and the reproduction of stereotypes. Participatory observation reveals that when generating specific ethnic or gender images, AI tools tend to replicate the stereotypes present in the training data and even privately modify the original makeup image given by the creator (Field Notes, January 15, 2026). It can be seen that the availability of technology is inevitably accompanied by a masking effect when revealing possibilities.

Furthermore, the rapid iterative update of technology and the intervention of commercial logic jointly constitute another layer of structural constraints. Field surveys have shown that there is a subtle power relationship between creators and AI tool developers. The rapid update of tool versions often comes with increased usage costs and compatibility issues, while the deliberate weakening of functions in old versions forces creators to constantly adapt to the new technological environment. A storyboard artist said: “We often find ourselves in a dilemma: either pay a higher fee to use the new version or tolerate the limitations of the old version’s functions. The commercial logic behind this technological iteration actually restricts our creative choices.” (Interviewee B). Structural power constraints often make creators fall into a dilemma of budget, efficiency, and quality, thereby weakening the freedom of creation.

4.2 The “Human-centered” active practice of creators

Facing the duality of technological availability, creators do not simply passively accept technological discipline but have developed rich practical strategies to tame technology and re-establish their dominant position in the creative process. These practices reflect the creators’ profound understanding of technological conditions and their creative wisdom in seeking expression space within constraints.

4.2.1 Technology merging and reintegration of tool chains

To break through the limitations of a single tool, creators generally adopt the strategy of technology merging, creatively integrating multiple AI tools and traditional software to build personalized creative workflows. This practice requires not only technical proficiency but also a profound understanding and creative application of the availability of different tools.

Observations reveal that mature independent creators often establish complex tool usage systems. For example, some creators will first convert creative intentions into basic images through Douba, then use Jiemu AI for style uniformity and optimization, import Keli for dynamic processing, and finally fine-tune through traditional software such as Jieming. This multi-tool collaborative workflow reflects the creators’ active configuration ability of technological resources. One creator explained: “Each tool has its advantages and usage scenarios. The key is to act like a conductor, allowing different tools to form a harmonious resonance on the basis of their respective duties. This coordination among tools itself is a form of creative practice.” (Respondent A), the grafting and reintegration of technologies represent the creation system that the creators have autonomously formed in response to the uneven advantages of various multi-port creative tools. To a certain

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

extent, this reflects the "human-centered" utilization of tools.

Furthermore, the creators have also developed customized solutions for specific creative needs. For instance, to maintain the consistency of character images and the algorithmic black box, artists must constantly negotiate with the "cultural biases" built into the models during the creative process. This process itself has become a part of the artistic practice (i.e., counter-intuitive curating).

Some creators and creative institutions have established character databases, generating finalized portraits of characters and props through feature encoding and parameter control to ensure the stability of the generated results. This technological innovation based on a deep understanding of the AI generation mechanism reflects the transformation of creators from passive tool users to active technical curators.

It is worth noting that this technological grafting practice not only occurs at the individual level but also forms certain standardized processes at the organizational level. In the short drama companies participating in the observation, teams have established relatively stable AI tool usage norms and quality control standards. These organizational practices further solidify and disseminate specific technical usage methods (field notes, February 5, 2026). They incorporate elements such as Kuaibian, Jidoubao, Hailuo into the system's web pages, forming a multi-functional and efficient workflow from storyboard management to storyboard generation, from text-to-image to image-to-video, and then combining with Jingying for refinement. The AI generation models accessed are not limited to one type, reducing redundancy in the collaborative work of multiple ends and providing more diverse options.

4.2.2 Aesthetic screening

In the vast market environment of AI-generated content, people's aesthetic judgment and selection ability have become a more decisive factor. Creators have developed refined screening standards and prompt engineering techniques to re-establish their creative dominance under the "no restrictions" technical conditions.

Facing the massive content generated by AI tools, creators have established multi-level screening and evaluation mechanisms. These mechanisms include both qualitative evaluations based on professional aesthetic standards and quantitative evaluations based on data analysis. A senior creator described his workflow: "We will set clear quality dimensions, such as the rationality of composition, color coordination, and the accuracy of emotional expression, and conduct multiple rounds of screening on the generated results." (Respondent E).

During this process, creators use prompts as a medium for deep dialogue with the AI system, continuously exploring the optimal balance point in human-machine collaboration through iterative optimization and parameter adjustments. Prompt writing is not natural language communication but a trial-and-error process like a "magic spell". This interaction requires artists to master a specific "algorithmic rhetoric". Observations have found that experienced creators will establish personal prompt libraries, recording effective expression methods and parameter combinations in different scenarios. This knowledge accumulation enhances individual creative efficiency and forms specific creative methodologies and systems. At the same time, in the process of developing these skills, creators demonstrate significant learning and adaptability. Many respondents stated that they continuously update their understanding of tool characteristics through continuous experimentation and community exchanges and accordingly adjust their creative strategies. This dynamic learning process re-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

flects the creators' initiative and adaptability in the face of technological environment changes.

4.2.3 Creative intervention in narrative reconstruction

When the results generated by AI deviate from the creative intention, the creator uses techniques such as post-editing and narrative reconstruction to achieve a creative transformation of the generated content.

This practice is not only a response to the limitations of technology but also an important manifestation of the creator's subjectivity. AI art shifts the role of the artist from "maker" to "selector" and "curator", and this transformation does not reduce the artistic value but rather enhances the importance of conceptualization.

Participatory observation recorded a typical case: When creating a scene with emotional conflict, the images generated by the AI tool failed to meet the creative requirements in terms of facial expression details and atmosphere creation. The creator did not simply accept this result but instead used complex means such as breaking down the storyboard, layer-by-layer generation, local optimization, and post-composition to ultimately achieve the desired visual effect. (Field Notes, January 25, 2026).

Furthermore, the creator also enhances the expressiveness of the AI-generated content through narrative reconstruction. This includes using techniques such as controlling the editing rhythm, sound design, and color adjustment to inject unique emotional warmth and artistic individuality into the relatively standardized generated content. One creator mentioned: "What AI generates is raw materials, and the real creation occurs in the reorganization and artistic processing of these materials. This secondary creation is the key source of the work's individuality." (Interviewee H).

This intervention brings the creative process forward, and humans interact with existing generation models to understand and familiarize themselves with the characteristics of various generation models. In the creative process, they consciously combine or adjust their creative ideas with the characteristics of the model in advance. When using AI generation tools, the "flow" state of the creator is influenced by the system's response speed and controllability. Excessive randomness can block the flow, while appropriate control is the key to interactive design. Pre-positioning the adjustment phase in the middle of generation reduces the frustration of bottleneck feelings caused by the limitations of the generation model mechanism and the creative bottleneck, thus better exerting the human-centered creative concept.

However, this creative intervention often requires a combination of traditional creative skills and new technology understanding. Creators need to be familiar with the conventional film and television production process and also deeply understand the characteristics of AI tools. This composite skill structure is precisely the professionalism of contemporary AI media art creation.

4.3 Generative logic of human-machine negotiation

The creative practice of AI media art is essentially a continuous human-machine negotiation process. This process is neither a simple application of technology nor a pure human expression, but rather a search for a balance point between humans and machines in specific situations, constantly generating new creative paradigms. Understanding the characteristics of this paradigm requires going beyond the traditional tool theory perspective and deeply analyzing the generative logic of human-machine interaction.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

4.3.1 Characteristics of negotiative creative practice

During human-machine interaction, a unique negotiation relationship is formed between the creator and the technical system. This relationship includes cooperation and implies a game. One creator mentioned: "When collaborating with AI, you need to understand its thinking mode, understand its 'temperament', but also stick to your creative direction. This relationship requires continuous communication and adjustment." (Interviewee I), in long-term interaction, the creator will not only view AI as a tool but also develop a "Theory of Mind" for it, that is, imagining that AI has certain intentions or personalities, which affects the creative strategy. It can be seen that AI media creation is a dynamic process that requires continuous adjustment and change in specific creative contexts.

At the technical level, creators need to constantly explore the performance boundaries and optimal usage methods of the tools; at the creative level, they need to find a balance between technical possibilities and artistic expression; at the temporal level, they need to adapt to the changes in work processes and efficiency pressure brought about by the rapid iteration of technology. Observations have revealed that mature creators often develop a set of strategies to deal with this negotiation relationship. For example, maintaining technical sensitivity, keeping up-to-date with tool updates and new usage methods; establishing flexible work processes that can adjust creative methods according to technological changes; cultivating critical thinking and maintaining a cautious attitude towards the evaluation of technical outputs. None of these strategies help creators maintain creative autonomy in the rapidly evolving and efficiency-oriented market environment.

4.3.2 Templateization and originality

Templateization is a topic of great concern in AI art creation, but its significance needs to be reinterpreted within the framework of human-machine negotiation. On the surface, templateization reflects the limitation of technical standardization on the diversity of creation; but upon deeper understanding, it reveals the tension relationship of constant pulling between standardization and individualization in human-machine interaction.

Research has found that templateization is not a single technological determinant of the outcome, but rather a product of the joint action of technical characteristics, usage methods, and creative concepts. One commentator pointed out: "Templateization is to some extent the price of creating convenience. During the generation process, the generation model often solidifies its creative preferences through continuous adjustments, which has both advantages and disadvantages. The key is how we can find a balance between technological convenience and artistic innovation." (Interviewee J) Professional artists tend to seek tools that can break the mold, while AI's current models often tend to generate "ordinary average values".On the one hand, the training data and algorithm mechanisms of AI tools make them indeed tend to produce results that conform to statistical laws; on the other hand, the usage habits and aesthetic preferences of creators also reinforce certain creative patterns. Users' perception of the availability of AI is often influenced by "machine heuristic" (Machine Heuristic), that is, users tend to believe that what is generated by the machine is objective, which affects critical thinking in artistic creation.

However, it can be seen that it is precisely in the process of dealing with templateization that the originality of creators is highlighted. Works that deeply understand the technical mechanism and develop personalized creative methods often have greater artistic value. This originality is not a pure expression outside the context

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

of technical conditions, but rather the outcome of a creative dialogue and negotiation with technical conditions. Templateization and originality thus constitute a dialectical unified relationship.

4.3.3 Changes in the creative ecological system

AI technology not only brings changes to creative tools, but also triggers a systematic transformation of the entire creative ecosystem, involving multiple dimensions such as creative subjects, production processes, dissemination methods, and evaluation standards.

At the level of creative subjects, the popularization of AI tools has blurred the boundaries between professional creators and amateur enthusiasts. Skills that traditionally required long-term professional training can now be quickly acquired through technical tools. This change not only expands the scale of the creative team but also poses new questions for the value of professional creation and the recognition of the quality of artistic creation. The influx of a large number of practitioners and the rapid development of the market environment may lead to uneven quality of creative works, squeezing the creative space of creators, and quality-first gradually being replaced by efficiency-first. An art educationist said: “We need to rethink what constitutes the professionalism of creation. When technical skills can be quickly acquired through tools, the depth of the creator’s ideas, aesthetic judgment, and critical thinking may become the more core professional qualities.” (Interviewee K)

At the level of production relations, AI technology is reshaping the division of labor and collaboration model in the creative process. The relatively linear creative process has become more parallel and interactive, and the boundaries between different links have also become blurred. At the same time, human-machine collaboration has given rise to new professional roles, such as prompter engineers, AI storyboarders, and AI art directors. These changes not only affect individual creative practices but also change the operation mode of creative organizations.

At the level of evaluation systems, the rise of AI art poses challenges to traditional artistic evaluation standards. A curator stated: “We need to establish a more detailed evaluation framework that can fully take into account the particularities of human-machine collaboration, while maintaining attention to the fundamental issues of art.” (Interviewee L). When the degree of technological involvement increases, how can the artistic value of a work be evaluated? How can the contributions of human creativity be measured? The discussion of these issues reflects the adaptation and reflection of the art community to the new technological environment.

5 Discussion And Conclusion

This study is based on the theory of media technology availability. Through a combination of in-depth interviews and participatory observations, a qualitative research method, it deeply explored the complex interaction between humans and technology in AI media art creation. The study found that this relationship is not simply a technical determination or human dominance, but rather a dynamic negotiation process that continues in specific contexts and is full of tension. AI technology, with its dual availability, provides both unprecedented basic conditions and structural limitations such as algorithmic black boxes for creative practice. Regarding this, the creators did not passively accept, but through a series of active practical strategies, active-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

ly domesticated technology and continuously sought and reshaped their own creative subjectivity within the technical framework.

The availability of AI technology emerges through interaction with creators with different knowledge, skills, and intentions. The design of future AI art tools should focus more on enhancing human self-efficacy (Self-efficacy) rather than pursuing full automation, emphasizing a "reliable, safe, and trustworthy" creative environment. The creative ecosystem of AI media art is in a state of intense generation and evolution, and humans and technology are in an ongoing, creative negotiation. It is precisely in this process that technology is given cultural significance, and human agency is continuously extended under new technological conditions.

References

[1].Yu Guoming, Zhao Rui. (2019). The "Four All-media" Industry Pattern and Growth Space from the Perspective of Media Availability. Academic Circulation, (07), 37-44. (in Chinese)

[2].Hu Yiqing, Wang Mushi. (2022). Visibility as Media: An Ontological Discussion on the Issue of Visibility. Journal of Journalists, (04), 8-19. (in Chinese)

[3].Jiang Qiaolei, Chen Zonghai, Zhang Yadidi. (2022). When We Talk about Media Empathy, What Are We Talking About - An Exploration and Reflection Based on the Perspective of Availability. News and Writing, (06), 71-85. (in Chinese)

[4].Yang Qiguang. (2023). Digital News Practice in the Context of Technological Availability and Its Boundary Reconsideration.Northwest Normal University Journal (Social Sciences Edition), 60(04), 83-91. (in Chinese)

[5].Zhang Yaolan, Yuan Xiangping. (2019). The Theory of Availability of Artificial Intelligence Technology in the Smart Media Ecosystem. China Media Technology, (05), 22-24. (in Chinese)

[6].Jing Yixin, Shen Jing. (2019). Introduction and Expansion of the Concept of Media Availability in New Media. Contemporary Communication, (01), 92-95. (in Chinese)

[7].Hu Yiqing, Ma Xiniao. (2022). Availability as Media: A Study Based on the Ontology of Media. Journal of Journalists, (01), 66-76. (in Chinese)

[8].Han Chuanxi, Guo Chen. (2022). Examination of the Mediaization Turn of Network Literature Based on the Perspective of Availability. Learning and Exploration, (08), 168-176+2. (in Chinese)

[9].Lev Manovich, Emmanuele Alili, Chen Zhuoxuan. (2023). Lev Manovich: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Art and Aesthetics. World Cinema, (03), 4-24. (in Chinese)

[10].Zhao Yi. (2023). Collaborative Creation by Humans and Machines, Data Fusion and Multimodal Models: Criticism of Generative AI in Film Art and Cultural Industry. Contemporary Film, (08), 15-21. (in Chinese)

[11].Gao Yongjie, Lu Xin. (2023). Evolution of Generative AI Technology and Innovation of Image Art Production Paradigm. Modern Communication (Journal of China Media University), 45(09), 159-168. (in Chinese)

[12].Zhang Minghao. (2022). "Algorithmic" Thinking in Film Industry Production in the Digital Technology Era and Construction of "Algorithmic Aesthetic" of Film Industry Theory-The "Digital Algorithm" Dimension of "Continuing Discussion" in Film Industry Aesthetics Theory. Film Literature, (23), 37-44. (in Chinese)

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[13].Manovich, L. (2023). AI aesthetics. Strelka Press.
[14].Inie, N., & Dalsgaard, P. (2023). How interaction designers use GenAI as a material for sketching. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1–16). ACM.
[15].Srinivasan, R., & Uchino, K. (2021). Biases in generative art: A causal look from the lens of art history. In Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (pp. 293–303).
[16].Liu, V., & Chilton, L. B. (2022). Design guidelines for prompt engineering text-to-image generative models. In Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1–23). ACM.
[17].Sundar, S. S. (2020). Rise of machine agency: A framework for studying the psychology of human–AI interaction. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 25(1), 74–88.
[18].Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019). Art, creativity, and the potential of artificial intelligence. Arts, 8(1), 26.
[19].Koivisto, M., & Grassini, S. (2023). Best of both worlds: Psychophysiological responses to AI-generated art. Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts.
[20].Frich, J., et al. (2019). Twenty years of creativity support tools: A systematic review. In Proceedings of the 2019 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference.
[21].Gero, K. I., et al. (2020). Mental models of AI agents in a cooperative game setting. In Proceedings of CHI 2020. ACM.
[22].Shneiderman, B. (2022). Human-centered AI. Oxford University Press.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)