Creativity support research "in the wild" for the development of human-centered AI

<u>https://junkato.jp</u> <jun.kato@aist.go.jp> NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (AIST)

Background



Creativity support tools (CSTs), including AI-based tools, support people's creative activities.

Creativity support has been identified as one of the grand challenges in Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) research [1].

To realize human-centered AI systems, what can we learn from research on CSTs?

O Creativity over economy

Creative products can enrich society through discoveries, artifacts, and experiences, which are measured beyond economic impact [1, 2, 3]. CSTs inherently embody power dynamics, as the tool design may constrain creativity [4]; thus, the CST landscape should not be optimized through a capitalist framework.

Jun Kato

2 Cultural background matters



Technologies are always developed under a particular cultural context. However, current research is heavily biased toward WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) population [5], often criticized to have a colonial, universalizing impulse [6].



This cultural bias limits the field because the resulting systems only fit majority workflows, while overlooking opportunities to derive generalizable insights from minority contexts. As a counter example, our study of a storyboarding tool highlighted the benefits of vertical timelines in anime storyboards, a feature with broader applicability, and contributed to a diverse CST landscape [7].

Oreativity, not necessarily efficiency



Many creative activities are open-ended, with goals that are initially unknown. As a result, high-level automation is often avoided, and a manual, exploratory process is preferred [8]. Our study of a storyboarding tool supports this insight, as users favored features for low-level productivity support (e.g., undo and redo) and for exploratory actions (e.g., an interface for a quick overview of the entire storyboard content) [7].

Computational support, including AI-based capabilities, should augment rather than replace human action. Long-term user observations and collaborations help avoid "cherry-picking" user problems [9].

Co-adaptation between people and technologies

<complex-block>

People get used to and influenced by tools, and tools should adapt to their use [10]. It is important to acknowledge their social behavior is heavily affected by tool design. For example, our music video authoring tool allows programmers and users to share the same environment, so the tool can co-evolve with people, unlike a typical authoring tool that can only be extended by "plug-ins" developed outside the environment [11].

In addition to the socio-technical perspective, there is still room for technical theories of tools, namely "instrumental interaction" [12].

For instance, a storyboarding tool implements a pen tool and other tools such as stopwatches, where tool-to-tool interaction design is non-trivial [7].



5 Symbiotic ecosystem of people, creativity support tools, and creative artifact



Creativity and culture are intertwined: the former uses the signs and tools made available by the latter to produce new cultural resources that go on to facilitate future creative acts [13]. Thus, it is important to focus not only on the direct outcomes of CSTs, but to take a more holistic view of the ecosystem. Our work in proposing a novel interactive media format, which we call "lyric apps [14]" has not only provided technical contributions, but has also reported on their use "in the wild" in a longitudinal study. We believe that we should acknowledge our responsibility for how technologies are used in society.

[1] Shneiderman. 2007. Creativity support tools: accelerating discovery and innovation. CACM 50(12), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1145/1323688.1323689 [2] Cherry and Latulipe. 2014. Quantifying the Creativity Support of Digital Tools through the Creativity Support Index. TOCHI 21(4), Article 21, 25 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/2617588 [3] Kerne et al. 2013. Evaluation methods for creativity support environments. In CHI EA '13, p.3295–3298. https://doi.org/10.1145/2468356.2479670 [4] Li et al. 2023. Beyond the Artifact: Power as a Lens for Creativity Support Index. TOCHI 21(4), Article 21, 24, Article 47, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606831 [5] Linxen et al. How WEIRD is CHI? In Proc. CHI '12, Article 143, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445488 [6] Dourish and Mainwaring. 2012. Ubicomp's colonial impulse. In Proc. UbiComp '12, p.133–142. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445488 [6] Dourish and Mainwaring. 2012. Ubicomp's colonial impulse. In Proc. UbiComp '12, p.133–142. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445488 [6] Dourish and Mainwaring. 2012. Ubicomp's colonial impulse. In Proc. UbiComp '12, p.133–142. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642121 [8] Li et al. 2021. What We Can Learn From Visual Artists About Software Development. In Proc. CHI '24, Article 233, p.1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445682 [9] Kato. 2023. On the Relationship between HCI Researchers and Creators---Or How I Became a Toolsmith. XRDS 29, 4 (Summer 2023), p.26–31. https://doi.org/10.1145/3596927 [10] Mackay. 2000. Responding to cognitive overload : Co-adaptation between users and technology. Intellectica 30, 1 (2000), p.177–193. https://doi.org/10.3406/intel.2000.1597 [11] Kato et al. 2015. TextAlive: Integrated Design Environment for Kinetic Typography. In Proc. CHI '15, p.3403–3412. https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702140 [12] Beaudouin-Lafon. 2000. Instrumental interaction: an interaction model for designing post-WIMP user interfaces. In Proc. CHI '00, p.446–453. https://doi.org/10.1145/33040.332473 [13] Glaveanu et a



Scan the QR code for the list of references and more details on our work.

