Computational Creativity in Post-Digital Website Prototyping: Rethinking Design Authorship Through AI-Driven Automation

Thisaranie Kaluarachchi[1]; Dr. Manjusri Wickramasinghe[2]

[1,2]University of Colombo School of Computing, University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

Abstract: The post-digital era marks a profound shift in the creative disciplines, where human imagination and computational intelligence converge to redefine authorship, aesthetics, and design practice. This research explores this transformation through the lens of *WebDraw*, a machine learning–driven system for automatic website prototyping. Positioned at the intersection of artificial intelligence, computational creativity, and post-digital design, *WebDraw* exemplifies how automation can evolve into a form of creative collaboration rather than mere efficiency. By analyzing *WebDraw*'s architecture, workflows, and cultural implications, the research argues that design in the post-digital condition is characterized by hybrid authorship, distributed among humans, algorithms, and data.

The discussion unfolds across theoretical and practical dimensions: first establishing a conceptual foundation in post-digital design and computational creativity; then presenting *WebDraw* as a case of human–machine co-creation in web design. Aesthetic evaluation, collaboration dynamics, ethical considerations, and sustainability concerns are explored. Based on both quantitative system evaluations and qualitative interviews with web professionals, the research highlights how *WebDraw* fosters co-creation, democratizes access to design, and challenges traditional notions of origin, authorship, and creative control.

Ultimately, the research positions computational design systems as agents of cultural transformation, expanding the boundaries of creativity, reconfiguring professional practice, and calling for new frameworks in design education and ethics. Through the lens of *WebDraw*, post-digital creativity emerges not as the replacement of human agency but as its extension through intelligent collaboration.

Keywords: *Post-Digital Design, Computational Creativity, AI-Driven Website Prototyping, Human–Machine Co-Creation, Creative Artificial Intelligence, Design Automation.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The contemporary design landscape is undergoing a profound transformation driven by artificial intelligence (AI), automation, and computational creativity. Design has evolved from a purely human-centered, handcrafted practice into a hybridized process where human imagination and machine intelligence converge. This new condition, often termed the *post-digital*, acknowledges that digital technologies are no longer novel disruptions but deeply embedded systems that structure how we perceive, create, and interact with the world [1,2]. Within this context, design practice no longer revolves around the manipulation of physical or digital materials alone but increasingly around the orchestration of intelligent systems capable of perceiving, generating, and adapting creative outputs.

In this post-digital environment, creativity is distributed across humans, algorithms, and data. The designer's role shifts from being the sole author to becoming a collaborator who curates, trains, and refines computational models. Machine learning, computer vision, and automation systems now participate in aesthetic decision-making, producing artifacts that are both functional and expressive. This reconfiguration of authorship challenges traditional notions of originality, intuition, and artistic control [3,4]. Rather than replacing human designers, AI augments the creative process, introducing new forms of *computational agency*, where algorithms interpret, imitate, and extend human design intentions.

This paper positions *WebDraw* [5], a machine-learning-driven system for automatic website generation, within this post-digital framework. Developed as part of a design science

research project, *WebDraw* exemplifies how computational systems can learn from real-world design artifacts and autonomously generate functional and aesthetically coherent website prototypes. Beyond its technical novelty, *WebDraw* invites critical reflection on the evolving nature of creativity and authorship in computational design. By framing *WebDraw* through the lens of post-digital design and computational creativity, this paper argues that automation can be reimagined as a form of creative collaboration rather than mere efficiency.

Design today exists within what theorists describe as the post-digital condition, a cultural moment where digital technology is so deeply embedded in everyday life that it has become invisible [1]. The term "*post-digital*" does not denote a rejection of the digital but an acknowledgment that computation has become ubiquitous and normalized [2]. Designers now inhabit an environment where digital tools, networks, and data streams are fundamental materials of creative practice.

In this new paradigm, hybridity defines design practice: physical and virtual, human and algorithmic, intuitive and procedural [6]. From architecture to communication design, practitioners increasingly co-create with algorithms that can analyze vast data sets, generate patterns, and propose aesthetic forms. Machine-learning systems such as DALL·E[1], RunwayML[2], and Adobe Firefly[3] exemplify this transition from design by humans to design with machines [3]. The locus of creativity is shifting from individual intuition toward networked cognition and algorithmic collaboration.

AI has reconfigured what counts as creativity. Computational models, particularly deep learning architectures, now participate in processes once regarded as uniquely human: composing music, generating art, or designing interfaces. Boden [7] categorizes such creativity as exploratory, where machines navigate pre-defined conceptual spaces and reveal novel yet meaningful combinations. Edmonds [8] describe this as computational creativity, the production of artifacts that are both novel and valuable, judged through human interpretation.

Automation's promise in design is two-fold. First, it offers efficiency, reducing repetitive tasks such as layout alignment or colour palette generation. Second, and more profoundly, it provokes a philosophical challenge to authorship: when an algorithm generates an aesthetic outcome, where does creativity reside? As Veale and Cardoso [4] observe, AI does not simply replace human ingenuity; it reconfigures it into a distributed dialogue between code and cognition.

Within this context, automation becomes aesthetic. The process of training a neural network or constructing an algorithmic model involves curating datasets, defining loss functions, and selecting parameters, all decisions that shape aesthetic output. This merging of design and data science

signals a broader cultural shift toward computational design thinking, where designers orchestrate intelligent systems that participate in the creative act.

Despite technological advances, web design remains a resource-intensive and iterative process. Designers repeatedly refine layouts, colours, and components to satisfy user expectations and client goals. The proliferation of device sizes and interface patterns complicates this further. Traditional manual prototyping struggles to scale in such a context.

This research addresses the critical question: *Can machine learning automate aspects of website generation while preserving the aesthetic and structural integrity of professional design?*

To explore this, the study introduces *WebDraw*, an AI-assisted design system that leverages computer vision and deep learning to analyze static website screen captures (mock-up design artifacts) and automatically produce functional web prototypes. *WebDraw* aims to minimize manual workload while retaining fidelity to human design sensibilities.

From a post-digital design perspective, *WebDraw* exemplifies how computation and creativity intertwine. It embodies computational authorship, where human intention (the mock-up) and machine intelligence (the algorithmic inference) co-produce an outcome. By situating *WebDraw* within discourses of post-digital aesthetics and computational creativity, the research reframes automation not as replacement but as collaboration.

The purpose of this research paper is to situate *WebDraw* within the theoretical and cultural discourse of post-digital design and computational creativity. While the original research primarily evaluated the tool's technical performance, precision in GUI element detection, DOM hierarchy accuracy, and visual similarity metrics, this paper expands the discussion to address broader design-theoretical questions:

- How does *WebDraw* redefine the relationship between human designers and computational systems?
- In what ways does automation exhibit forms of creativity comparable to human design reasoning?
- What are the aesthetic and ethical implications of delegating parts of the creative process to AI?

The central argument advanced here is that *WebDraw* exemplifies a post-digital form of computational creativity, where the act of automating web design constitutes a creative process in itself. It demonstrates how machine learning can learn, abstract, and reproduce design logics from existing cultural artifacts, effectively participating in what Parikka [6] calls the ecology of computational aesthetics.

---

[1] DALL·E: https://openart.ai/

[2] RunwayML: https://www.seaart.ai/

[3] Adobe Firefly: https://deevid.ai/

➤ *This Research Contributes to Post-Digital Design Scholarship By:*

- Theorizing *WebDraw* as a case study of co-creative automation;
- Interpreting its processes through frameworks of computational creativity and distributed authorship;
- Examining its implications for design education, ethics, and sustainability; and
- Arguing that such systems embody the emerging aesthetics of the post-digital condition, where creativity is algorithmically mediated yet profoundly human.

This paper is organized into seven sections. Section 2 establishes the theoretical foundation by examining post-digital design theory and the concept of computational creativity. It reviews how design thinking, machine learning, and generative computation intersect to produce hybrid creative systems that extend human intention through algorithmic reasoning. Section 3 presents *WebDraw* as a practical case of computational co-creation. It details the system's architecture, comprising GUI element detection, CNN-based classification, DOM hierarchy construction, and automatic code generation, and discusses how these processes embody design intelligence and creative adaptation. Section 4 explores aesthetic evaluation within computationally creative systems. Section 5 focuses on human–machine collaboration in professional web design practice. Section 6 addresses sustainability, ethics, and the future of computational creativity. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper by reflecting on post-digital aesthetics and envisioning future research directions.

II.   THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The growing intersection of design and computation has redefined how creativity is conceptualized, practiced, and experienced. As digital technologies become deeply integrated into everyday life, the focus of design research has gradually shifted from the digital, understood as novel, discrete, and technical, to the post-digital, a condition where computational systems are pervasive, fluid, and culturally embedded. In this context, design is no longer a purely human-centered act of invention but a hybrid process of collaboration between human intuition and machine intelligence. The notion of post-digital design captures this evolution, highlighting how designers and algorithms co-produce meaning, form, and aesthetics through reciprocal adaptation.

Within this post-digital landscape, computational creativity emerges as a critical theoretical lens to understand how machines contribute to creative processes. Unlike traditional automation, which merely replicates predefined patterns, computational creativity explores how algorithms, particularly those driven by AI and machine learning, can participate in generating novel, valuable, and contextually appropriate outcomes. This paradigm expands the boundaries of design authorship, positioning creativity as a shared endeavour between humans and machines.

This section situates the research within these theoretical frameworks by examining how post-digital design and computational creativity intersect in the development of *WebDraw*, an AI-driven tool for automatic website prototyping. It first explores how post-digital aesthetics challenge the binaries between human and machine authorship, then discusses how computational creativity provides the conceptual foundation for understanding *WebDraw*'s generative and interpretive capacities. By linking these perspectives, the section establishes the philosophical and theoretical grounding for interpreting *WebDraw* not merely as a technical system, but as a computationally creative design collaborator operating within the post-digital paradigm.

➤ *Understanding Post-Digital Design*
The term *post-digital* has evolved beyond its early usage as a simple chronological marker referring to the period "*after digital*" technologies became pervasive. Instead, it denotes a cultural, aesthetic, and epistemological shift that recognizes the integration of digital processes into everyday design practices [1,2]. Post-digital design does not reject the digital; rather, it acknowledges the dissolution of clear boundaries between the digital and the physical, the computational and the human, the automated and the crafted. As Jandrić et al. [9] explain, the post-digital condition is characterized by entanglement: design now occurs in an environment where analogue and digital modes co-exist, influence, and redefine each other in continuous feedback loops.

In the context of design, the post-digital turn signifies a move from purely screen-based, software-driven aesthetics toward hybrid practices that merge computation with human interpretation and creative agency. Designers today engage not only with materials and tools but with systems, machine learning models, datasets, and algorithms that co-participate in shaping the final artifact [10]. This expanded notion of authorship challenges traditional views of creativity and materiality, positioning the designer as a mediator between human intuition and algorithmic processes. Consequently, post-digital design foregrounds reflexivity, an awareness of the conditions, constraints, and affordances of digital systems within creative production [11].

From a methodological standpoint, post-digital design practices embrace uncertainty and iteration as integral to the creative process. Rather than seeking deterministic control over outcomes, designers often orchestrate computational systems to explore emergent possibilities [12]. This reorientation shifts the focus from tool use to tool co-evolution, where design systems such as *WebDraw* are not just instruments of execution but participants in the creative act. The post-digital designer thus becomes a collaborator with intelligent technologies, crafting workflows that are adaptive, data-informed, and generative.

The post-digital paradigm also redefines the aesthetics of design. Whereas earlier digital design valued precision, uniformity, and perfection, post-digital aesthetics embrace imperfection, noise, and hybridity [1, 13]. These "*designed*

glitches" and algorithmic irregularities reflect an appreciation for the expressive potential of computational processes and signal a growing comfort with human, machine co-authorship. In this sense, tools like *WebDraw*, which translate visual inputs (screen captures) into functional code through a hybrid of human-guided and machine-learning-driven interpretation, exemplify post-digital aesthetics by transforming data into design through an act of computational creativity.

➤ Computational Creativity in the Post-Digital Context

The notion of computational creativity, the capacity of machines to exhibit behaviours or produce artifacts deemed creative by human standards, has become central to design research in the post-digital era. Traditionally, creativity was viewed as an inherently human faculty, rooted in intuition, emotion, and cultural context [7]. However, advances in machine learning, neural networks, and data-driven design systems have expanded this definition, allowing computational processes to participate meaningfully in the act of creation. Within the post-digital paradigm, computational creativity is not merely about automation or replication; it embodies collaboration, where algorithms and designers co-evolve as partners in aesthetic and functional innovation [4, 14].

At its core, computational creativity in post-digital design operates at the intersection of autonomy and authorship. Contemporary AI models, particularly deep neural networks, are not pre-programmed to execute fixed instructions but rather trained to infer, generate, and adapt through exposure to large datasets. This transition from prescriptive programming to probabilistic learning signifies a shift in creative agency: algorithms no longer simply assist designers but actively contribute to the exploration of novel design spaces [15]. The creative output of these systems often transcends human predictability, introducing aesthetic possibilities that designers may not have conceived unaided. This emergent quality of machine-generated forms, textures, or layouts challenges the boundaries of traditional authorship and calls for a reconceptualization of what it means to design in the age of intelligent computation.

In this post-digital landscape, computational creativity extends beyond the generation of visual artifacts to encompass process creativity, the capacity of systems to model, analyze, and reformulate creative workflows. Generative design tools, for instance, employ algorithms to iteratively propose and refine design solutions based on specified parameters, optimizing for aesthetics, efficiency, or performance [16]. Similarly, machine learning-based systems like *WebDraw* automate complex design tasks such as identifying, classifying, and assembling web GUI elements into coherent structures. Yet, their creativity does not lie in mere automation, but in how they mediate the tension between rule-based logic and interpretative flexibility, balancing data-driven inference with contextual sensitivity.

The *WebDraw* approach exemplifies this intersection. By training a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) to classify web GUI elements from real-world screen captures,

WebDraw enacts a form of computational perception akin to human visual understanding. The subsequent DOM hierarchy generation process, an algorithmic reconstruction of spatial and semantic relationships between elements, embodies computational composition, a creative act that mirrors the way human designers' reason about layout and structure. In this sense, *WebDraw* does not simply automate web design; it performs creative translation, converting visual input into functional code through learned patterns of aesthetic and structural coherence. This capacity to learn from exemplars and generalize across design contexts situates *WebDraw* within the domain of machine-assisted creative systems that co-produce meaning through iterative learning.

Post-digital computational creativity also emphasizes contextual adaptation. Unlike traditional procedural generation systems, which produce static results based on predefined rules, contemporary AI-driven design frameworks can dynamically adjust to contextual constraints, such as user preferences, device dimensions, or accessibility requirements [17]. This adaptive responsiveness imbues computational creativity with a situated dimension, allowing algorithms to act not as detached generators but as context-aware participants in design ecosystems. The fusion of learned perception, structural reasoning, and contextual responsiveness thus defines the creative agency of AI within post-digital design.

Importantly, computational creativity in this era must also be understood as reflexive. Post-digital designers engage with machine learning systems not only as creative partners but also as mirrors reflecting human assumptions and biases embedded in training data and algorithmic structures [18]. Creative collaboration with AI therefore demands critical awareness, an interrogation of how datasets, architectures, and evaluation metrics shape aesthetic and functional outcomes. This awareness transforms the designer's role from executor to meta-designer, one who designs the conditions under which creativity emerges through machine learning.

Finally, post-digital computational creativity calls for a new aesthetic vocabulary. The outputs of generative AI systems, ranging from slight imperfections in layout alignment to unexpected colour combinations, are increasingly recognized as post-human signatures, evidencing the presence of algorithmic agency within design [12]. These traces of computation contribute to what Bridle [10] describes as the "*new aesthetics of algorithmic authorship*," where the creative process itself becomes an object of reflection. In this light, tools such as *WebDraw* do not merely replicate human design sensibilities but instantiate a dialogue between human and machine cognition, a hallmark of post-digital creative practice.

➤ Machine Learning, Automation, and Human–Machine Collaboration in Design

The explosion of machine learning, especially deep learning, has dramatically reshaped the tools and practices of design [19]. In contrast to earlier design software that simply enabled designers to execute their ideas, machine learning - driven systems increasingly take on roles akin to

collaborators: they observe, infer, suggest, and sometimes generate design artifacts. This shift toward co-creative automation is central to the post-digital moment, in which creativity is distributed between humans, algorithms, and data [4, 7, 18, 20].

Web Draw exemplifies this shift through its CNN-based architecture, which learns from thousands of human-designed websites to identify layout structures and aesthetic conventions. Its workflow mirrors cognitive processes of perception and organisation, grouping elements, inferring hierarchy, and generating coherent prototypes. Designers retain agency through iterative refinement, validating or correcting algorithmic decisions to achieve desired outcomes. This feedback-oriented model illustrates co-creativity, where creative responsibility is distributed but guided by human judgment.

Such collaboration also introduces challenges, including trust, data bias, and the risk of aesthetic homogenisation. If training datasets privilege dominant design cultures, generated outputs may marginalise alternative expressions [18]. Nevertheless, these limitations highlight the importance of critical engagement with intelligent systems, framing designers as reflective participants who shape not only outputs but the conditions of creativity itself.

➢ *Implications for Design Education, Practice, and Ethics*
The integration of AI into design transforms educational paradigms and professional practice. Design education must evolve beyond tool proficiency toward computational literacy, enabling students to understand, critique, and creatively collaborate with intelligent systems. Designers in the post-digital era function as meta-designers, orchestrating processes of algorithmic creativity while maintaining aesthetic and ethical oversight [4].

Professionally, *WebDraw* reconfigures workflows by accelerating prototyping and enabling rapid iteration. Designers shift from manual execution to strategic curation, preserving creative direction while leveraging computational efficiency. This demands new ethical frameworks addressing authorship, transparency, and inclusivity, especially in contexts where creative credit and data provenance become contested [22-28].

Post-digital creativity thus reflects a redefinition of agency. Rather than viewing AI as a substitute, it must be understood as a collaborator embedded within a broader creative ecology. Responsibility lies in cultivating systems that amplify rather than constrain human imagination.

➢ *Summary: Toward Post-Digital Co-Creation*
The theoretical synthesis of post-digital design and computational creativity provides a framework for understanding *WebDraw* not simply as an automation tool but as a manifestation of machine-assisted co-creation. In the post-digital condition, creative labour is distributed among human and non-human agents; the act of design becomes a process of negotiation across cognitive, technical, and

aesthetic boundaries. *WebDraw*'s process, from image recognition to DOM construction to HTML generation, illustrates how this negotiation unfolds in practice.

- By situating *WebDraw* within this theoretical context, several key insights emerge:

✓ *Post-Digital Integration:*
WebDraw exemplifies how computational systems are fully integrated into the creative fabric of design rather than external tools.

✓ *Hybrid Creativity:*
Its CNN-driven mechanisms represent a shift toward hybrid authorship, where human and machine co-construct meaning.

✓ *Aesthetic Computation:*
The system's procedural logic contributes to aesthetic outcomes, revealing the beauty of algorithmic reasoning.

✓ *Expanded Authorship:*
WebDraw challenges singular notions of creativity, redistributing agency among humans, data, and algorithms.

These ideas collectively advance a post-digital theory of design that views computational intelligence not as an imitator of human creativity but as a collaborator within a broader ecology of creative systems.

III.   *WEBDRAW* AS A CASE OF COMPUTATIONAL CO-CREATION

In the evolving discourse of post-digital design, computational systems are increasingly recognized not as passive tools but as active creative agents capable of collaborating with humans in acts of design [2,29]. This section presents *WebDraw* as a compelling case study of such computational co-creation. Built upon machine learning and deep neural architectures, *WebDraw* automates website prototyping from static screen captures, yet its operation extends far beyond automation. It embodies the theoretical and aesthetic principles of computational creativity, where algorithms engage in design reasoning, pattern recognition, and stylistic reproduction. Through *WebDraw*, the act of design becomes a distributed process between human intention and machine interpretation, illustrating how AI can serve as a creative partner rather than a replacement for human designers.

By analyzing *WebDraw*'s architecture, workflow, and aesthetic logic, this section explores how it enacts post-digital design values: hybridity, iteration, translation, and collaboration between the algorithmic and the human. It situates *WebDraw* as both a technological artifact and a philosophical construct, demonstrating that the system does not merely replicate website structures but also participates in reimagining the creative process itself.

➢ *Conceptualizing WebDraw as a Post-Digital System*

WebDraw can be conceptualized as a co-creative agent rather than a mere generative system. It bridges machine perception (via CNNs) with machine interpretation (through DOM hierarchy reconstruction and style inference). The system's workflow mirrors the post-digital ethos of hybrid authorship, where human designers and intelligent systems collaboratively participate in design ideation, representation, and realization.

WebDraw's design philosophy aligns with the post-digital design shift identified by Berry and Dieter [2], where computation is no longer seen as an external "*digital tool*" but as an embedded epistemic partner in the creative process. In this sense, *WebDraw*'s act of converting static visuals into interactive web structures represents an act of creative translation, a process that combines human aesthetic reasoning encoded in existing websites with machine inference to generate new, functional artefacts.

➢ *Architecture and Workflow: A Computational Aesthetic Pipeline*
   WebDraw's architecture embodies a computational aesthetic pipeline [21] comprising three primary stages:

• *GUI Element Detection:*
   Using image processing algorithms, *WebDraw* isolates atomic visual components, headings, paragraphs, buttons, icons, and containers, from a static screen capture. This stage mimics human perceptual segmentation, where the system must recognize spatial groupings and boundaries.

• *CNN-Driven Classification:*
   A CNN trained on over 33,000 labelled GUI elements classifies detected components into domain-specific categories. This stage represents computational perception, where the system learns to distinguish between semantic and stylistic nuances across web interface elements.

• *DOM Hierarchy Reconstruction and Code Generation:*
   The final phase translates the classified elements into a structured Document Object Model (DOM), followed by automatic generation of HTML and CSS. Here, the system demonstrates computational reasoning, reconstructing relationships of containment, alignment, and hierarchy to generate coherent, editable web prototypes.

Each of these stages collectively mirrors human cognitive processes of perceiving, understanding, and realizing design intentions, situating *WebDraw* as a co-creative computational system within the post-digital framework.

➢ *WebDraw and Computational Creativity*
   The creative dimension of *WebDraw* lies in its ability to interpret, generalize, and recreate aesthetic intent. According to Boden's [7] taxonomy of creativity, combinational, exploratory, and transformational, *WebDraw* primarily exhibits exploratory creativity. It explores the space of possible web design configurations derived from prior examples, identifying visual regularities and recombining them into new, functional outputs.

However, *WebDraw* also demonstrates incipient transformational creativity in its CNN-driven learning model, which abstracts style and layout patterns beyond literal replication. For instance, when reconstructing headings, paragraph blocks, or image placements, *WebDraw* identifies latent stylistic principles, such as alignment consistency and typographic hierarchy, that allow it to produce aesthetically coherent designs even when faced with unseen configurations.

This computational creativity is particularly aligned with post-digital aesthetics, where creativity is distributed across human and non-human agents. As Veale and Cardoso [4] argue, creativity in computational systems emerges not from independent agency but through interactional emergence, a dialogue between human cultural artefacts and machine interpretation. *WebDraw* embodies this dialogue by embedding learned human design knowledge within algorithmic generative logic.

➢ *Post-Digital Aesthetics in WebDraw's Output*
   From a post-digital aesthetic perspective [29], *WebDraw*'s generated prototypes exemplify how algorithmic systems can mediate between visual similarity and functional abstraction. The system reproduces not only the look but also the logic of web design, reflecting aesthetic sensibilities encoded in real-world websites.

Visual similarity metrics such as Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Mean Squared Error (MSE) used in *WebDraw*'s evaluation serve as computational analogues of aesthetic judgment [30], quantifying how closely the generated artefact approximates its source. Yet, these measures also open critical questions about the nature of aesthetics in computational creativity: Can numerical similarity equate to aesthetic equivalence?

In this regard, *WebDraw*'s role extends beyond replication. It embodies what Hodgson [29] describes as post-digital aesthetics of translation, where the creative act lies in transforming the materiality of the source (pixel data) into the logic of interactivity (HTML/CSS). The generated prototypes thus reflect not only functional reconstruction but also a machine's interpretation of aesthetic conventions.

➢ *Human–Machine Collaboration and Design Agency*
   In practical terms, *WebDraw* redefines the boundaries of authorship in design. The system operates as a creative assistant capable of automating the repetitive aspects of prototyping while leaving interpretive refinement to human designers. This symbiotic workflow aligns with the notion of "*design with the machine*" rather than "*by the machine,*" as explored by Yu [31].

User evaluations with professional web developers and UI/UX designers revealed that *WebDraw* supports evolutionary prototyping, allowing designers to iterate rapidly by editing auto-generated HTML and CSS. This underscores the system's potential as a computational co-

designer, capable of accelerating design ideation without undermining creative control.

By learning from human-made artefacts and offering editable outputs, *WebDraw* situates itself within the post-digital ethos of mutual adaptation, machines adapting to human aesthetics, and humans adapting to machine-generated possibilities.

➢ *Discussion: WebDraw as Post-Digital Computational Co-Creation*

WebDraw's integration of CNN-based perception, recursive reasoning, and aesthetic inference positions it as a paradigmatic example of post-digital computational co-creation. Its hybrid nature blurs distinctions between design automation and design interpretation, fostering a feedback loop between machine learning and human design sensibility.

• *From a theoretical standpoint, WebDraw advances three major post-digital design concerns:*

✓ *Algorithmic Mediation:*
Machines as intermediaries translating human design conventions into generative logic.

✓ *Distributed Creativity:*
Creativity as a shared process among datasets, algorithms, and human evaluators.

✓ *Computational Aesthetics:*
Algorithmic processes as sites of aesthetic reasoning rather than mere calculation.

These dimensions demonstrate that *WebDraw* is not simply a technical innovation, it is a philosophical artefact that challenges conventional distinctions between automation and authorship in digital design.

IV. AESTHETIC EVALUATION AND COMPUTATIONAL CREATIVITY IN PRACTICE

The post-digital era redefines how aesthetics are perceived, constructed, and evaluated in design. In a context where algorithmic systems actively participate in the creation of visual artefacts, aesthetic judgment is no longer an exclusively human domain but a hybrid process shared between human sensibility and machine computation. Evaluating creativity within such systems requires an understanding that goes beyond conventional metrics of accuracy or efficiency, toward assessing how computational systems interpret, reproduce, and even transform human notions of visual appeal. This section explores how aesthetic evaluation is reimagined within computational design practices, with *WebDraw* serving as a case study to demonstrate how machine learning frameworks can simulate and extend aesthetic reasoning. Drawing on theories of computational creativity, post-digital aesthetics, and hybrid authorship, this section situates *WebDraw* not merely as a technical innovation but as a participant in the evolving dialogue between art, design, and algorithmic intelligence.

➢ *Rethinking Aesthetic Judgment in the Post-Digital Context*

In traditional design scholarship, aesthetic judgment has been considered a fundamentally human act, a synthesis of perception, cultural conditioning, and emotional response [32]. The post-digital condition challenges this view by introducing algorithmic agents that not only assist but also participate in aesthetic evaluation. As digital systems increasingly co-author artefacts, the evaluative act migrates from the purely subjective to the computationally mediated [29, 30]. The *WebDraw* framework exemplifies this paradigm shift: its CNN generates an internalized sense of "*visual correctness*" by training on thousands of curated website exemplars, encoding aesthetic conventions as latent mathematical representations.

Rather than merely quantifying beauty or usability, *WebDraw* operationalizes aesthetic judgment through measurable correspondence, using quantitative metrics such as MSE and MAE to approximate perceptual similarity between generated and reference designs. These numerical proxies, while seemingly reductionist, reflect what Greenfield [33] describe as computational aesthetics: the formalization of aesthetic reasoning into rule-based or learning-based systems. In this sense, *WebDraw*'s aesthetic decisions are simultaneously data-driven and culturally embedded, an instantiation of Boden's [7] exploratory creativity, wherein a system searches within an established stylistic space defined by human practice.

➢ *Quantifying Visual Similarity as Creative Evaluation*

The introduction of objective measures of similarity challenges long-standing assumptions about artistic value and originality in design. *WebDraw*'s use of MSE and MAE corresponds to what Bo and Zhang [30] calls machine-evaluated aesthetics, where creative worth is inferred from correspondence between computational output and a human reference set. Yet, this quantitative framework does not negate creativity; rather, it reframes it within what Jordanous [34] identify as computational accountability: the transparent explanation of machine-made choices. In *WebDraw*, each pixel-level comparison not only validates the algorithm's fidelity to target artefacts but also reveals its biases toward certain compositional norms, symmetry, alignment, colour contrast, that have been statistically dominant in the training corpus.

This process resonates with Parisi's [35] notion of automated reasoning aesthetics, where deep learning systems internalize stylistic tendencies through exposure rather than explicit programming. Consequently, *WebDraw*'s assessment pipeline mirrors a designer's critique process: observing, comparing, and iteratively refining. By quantifying similarity to established aesthetic benchmarks, the system performs a computational analogue of Schön's [36] reflective practice, a feedback loop where evaluation informs design generation.

➢ *The Hybrid Logic of Machine and Human Taste*

Post-digital aesthetics operate in a liminal zone between mechanistic precision and human affect. *WebDraw*'s evaluation results, validated through expert interviews, suggest that professional designers still privilege interpretive nuance, balance, emotional tone, contextual harmony, over mere visual replication. Yet, they also acknowledge that algorithmic evaluation accelerates decision-making by filtering sub-optimal options. This dual reliance embodies what Brown [37] term interactional creativity: creativity arising from iterative dialogue between human and machine agents.

Such collaboration reconfigures authorship itself. The "*taste*" expressed by *WebDraw* is not autonomous but emergent, a composite of training data, network architecture, and human-defined evaluation metrics. As McGregor [38] argue, creativity in computational systems is distributed across human and non-human actants, forming a creative ecology rather than a singular author. *WebDraw* therefore becomes a site of shared authorship, where machine learning models internalize human taste while simultaneously re-presenting it through abstraction and recombination.

➢ *Evaluating Computational Creativity: Beyond Accuracy*

While precision metrics provide evidence of technical performance, they fail to fully capture the generative novelty of *WebDraw*'s results. Computational creativity scholars such as Ritchie [39] and, Colton and Wiggins [40] propose multidimensional evaluation frameworks that assess creativity along axes of novelty, value, and surprise. Applying this to *WebDraw* reveals several forms of creativity:

- *Combinational Creativity*

The CNN recombines learned design elements (fonts, layouts, colour palettes) in unseen configurations, producing outputs that remain recognizably "*web-like*" yet unique.

- *Exploratory Creativity*

Through the recursive DOM construction algorithm, the system explores hierarchical relationships not explicitly encoded in the dataset.

- *Transformational Creativity*

By translating 2-D visual data into executable HTML/CSS, *WebDraw* transforms representational modes, a process of aesthetic translation [41].

Each creative dimension demonstrates that computational systems can contribute meaningfully to design processes without fully replacing human imagination. The creative value lies not in complete autonomy but in the hybridization of reasoning modalities, statistical, structural, and aesthetic.

➢ *Comparative Aesthetic Benchmarks: WebDraw vs. Baseline Systems*

When benchmarked against *Sketch2Code* and *pix2code*, *WebDraw*'s performance offers insight into how differing algorithmic paradigms encode aesthetic knowledge.

Sketch2Code, optimized for wireframe-to-code translation, privileges geometric accuracy over visual subtlety. *Pix2code*, employing a neural machine-translation architecture, achieves syntactic correctness but produces rigid, low-fidelity designs due to its synthetic training data. In contrast, *WebDraw*'s dataset, derived from authentic, human-designed web templates, encodes implicit cultural aesthetics of balance, hierarchy, and legibility [42]. This grounding enables *WebDraw* to exceed its baselines in both structural fidelity and perceptual realism.

From a post-digital design perspective, this comparison underscores the significance of data provenance in shaping aesthetic outcomes [2]. Training on real-world artefacts allows *WebDraw* to mirror human design intuition more effectively than models reliant on synthetic datasets. Thus, computational aesthetics is not purely algorithmic; it is socio-cultural, reflecting the collective intelligence of human creators embedded within the data.

➢ *Human Perception and the Aesthetics of Similarity*

Empirical validation through expert interviews reveals an intriguing paradox: while quantitative metrics indicate near-perfect visual similarity, human evaluators perceive subtle "*uncanny*" discrepancies, slight misalignments, spacing anomalies, or typographic inconsistencies. This phenomenon parallels the uncanny valley effect in robotics [43], where near-perfect imitation elicits discomfort. In *WebDraw*'s context, such imperfections signal the threshold between machine replication and creative interpretation. Rather than errors, they may represent emergent aesthetic signatures of the algorithm itself, a computational style.

Bown [37] argues that post-digital aesthetics value imperfection and glitch as expressive attributes of digital systems. *WebDraw's* minute deviations thus humanize its outputs, situating them within the aesthetic discourse of computational imperfectionism. Designers interviewed perceived these artefacts not as failures but as creative opportunities for refinement, mirroring the way artists iterate upon generative results.

➢ *Ethical and Epistemic Dimensions of Algorithmic Evaluation*

As aesthetic judgment becomes partially delegated to machines, ethical and epistemic questions arise regarding bias, authorship, and transparency. Datasets encode cultural preferences, Western typography, certain colour harmonies, that may perpetuate homogeneity in design [24]. *WebDraw*'s reliance on publicly available website templates introduces such biases, privileging mainstream corporate aesthetics over vernacular or experimental forms. Addressing these concerns requires reflexive dataset curation and interpretability mechanisms, what Gunkel [44] calls the moral responsibility of machines in creative contexts.

Moreover, algorithmic evaluation risks reifying quantifiable metrics as aesthetic truth. While numerical similarity provides objectivity, it can obscure cultural, emotional, and contextual aspects of design quality. As Galanter [45] contend, computational systems must be

designed not merely to measure but to engage in dialogic critique, producing explanations understandable to human collaborators. *WebDraw*'s modular workflow supports this transparency by enabling designers to visualize each stage of interpretation, fostering trust and creative control.

➢ *Toward a Framework for Evaluating Post-Digital Aesthetics*

Synthesizing these insights, a holistic framework for assessing computational aesthetics emerges, comprising four complementary layers:

• *Perceptual Metrics*
Objective measures (e.g., MSE, MAE) capturing visual correspondence.

• *Structural Metrics*
Hierarchical or semantic measures (e.g., DOM edit distance) assessing compositional organization.

• *Affective Metrics*
Human evaluations of visual appeal, coherence, and emotional resonance.

• *Reflexive Metrics*
Qualitative assessments of interpretability, novelty, and cultural fit.

This multi-layered approach aligns with the post-digital ethos that values both computation and critique [2]. *WebDraw*'s evaluation strategy already embodies the first two layers; integrating affective and reflexive assessments through user-in-the-loop feedback would advance it toward full post-digital maturity.

➢ *Implications for Post-Digital Design Education and Practice*

Incorporating computational aesthetics into design pedagogy fosters a generation of practitioners fluent in both algorithmic logic and artistic intuition. *WebDraw* demonstrates how machine learning can serve as a pedagogical collaborator, visualizing typographic hierarchy, grid composition, and spatial rhythm for learners. As Singh et. al [46] notes, post-digital education emphasizes critical making: engaging with digital systems not as opaque tools but as partners in reflection. *WebDraw*'s editable outputs support such inquiry by allowing students to dissect and iterate upon algorithmically generated structures.

In professional practice, these methods promise to augment creativity rather than replace it. Automation of repetitive coding tasks liberates designers to focus on conceptual and experiential aspects of design. Moreover, computational evaluation frameworks could standardize design quality across distributed teams, offering real-time feedback loops grounded in data while preserving creative flexibility.

➢ *Synthesis: From Evaluation to Dialogue*

Ultimately, aesthetic evaluation in post-digital design transcends numerical accuracy; it becomes a dialogue between human intuition and machine inference. *WebDraw*

exemplifies this transformation by situating computation as both evaluator and co-creator. Its quantifiable metrics complement, rather than contradict, subjective critique, forming what McGregor et. al [38] describe as a hybrid epistemology of creativity. In this hybrid space, aesthetics is not an outcome but a process, a continuous negotiation between human and machine interpretations of beauty, structure, and meaning.

V. HUMAN–MACHINE COLLABORATION IN WEB DESIGN PRACTICE

The integration of AI into design practice represents one of the most profound shifts in creative labour since the rise of digital computation. In contemporary web design, intelligent tools like *WebDraw* exemplify how automation no longer merely supports creativity but actively co-produces it. This transformation requires rethinking the boundaries between human intention and computational reasoning. As scholars such as Shneiderman [47] and Edmonds [48] argue, the creative process in the post-digital era is increasingly characterized by symbiosis rather than substitution: humans provide contextual judgment, aesthetic reasoning, and emotional insight, while machines contribute data-driven precision, scalability, and pattern recognition.

In the context of web design, this partnership blurs traditional distinctions between designer and developer, creativity and computation, tool and collaborator [49]. *WebDraw* operates at this intersection, it interprets human design cues, automates the coding of layouts, and learns from stylistic patterns found in real-world web GUI elements. The system thus functions not only as a technological innovation but as an epistemological agent reshaping how creativity is understood and enacted in industrial practice.

Drawing on qualitative insights from professional web developers and UI/UX designers, this section explores how *WebDraw* redefines creative workflows, alters perceptions of control and authorship, and opens new possibilities for participatory and democratized design. It demonstrates how human–machine collaboration in this context embodies both computational creativity and post-digital design ethics, a fusion of human aesthetic values with algorithmic intelligence. This collaborative engagement suggests that automation is not an endpoint but a process of ongoing negotiation, an idea explored further in the context of industrial workflows below

➢ *Interviews with Web Professionals: Reframing Collaboration*

The qualitative interviews conducted with professional web developers and UI/UX designers reveal how *WebDraw* reshapes the dynamics of human–machine collaboration in web design. Far from perceiving automation as a threat, most professionals viewed *WebDraw* as a co-worker that enhances efficiency, consistency, and creative exploration. Developers from companies such as Web Design Sri Lanka and Phyxle described how *WebDraw* accelerated their initial design stages by automatically generating structured HTML/CSS

code from visual mock-ups, an operation typically requiring hours of manual implementation.

In this sense, *WebDraw* represents an embodiment of computational augmentation [47], where human expertise is amplified rather than replaced. Developers appreciated the system's ability to translate visual information into functional code, describing it as a bridge between creative ideation and technical realization. However, as with most AI-assisted tools, participants also acknowledged limitations, occasional redundancies in the DOM hierarchy and minor misclassifications, which they viewed as opportunities for human refinement rather than failures. This highlights a new type of collaborative workflow, where designers engage in interactive correction, guiding, teaching, and adapting to the system's evolving capabilities.

Moreover, the interviews illustrate a growing meta-cognitive awareness among professionals. They no longer think of themselves as "*designers who use tools*," but as "*designers who design with tools that learn*." Such perspectives align with Oxman's [50] argument that design in the post-digital era involves co-creation with material intelligence, where algorithms become part of the creative ecology.

➢ *Co-Creativity in Industrial Workflows*

The automation of design processes through tools like *WebDraw* marks a pivotal transformation in industrial workflows. Traditional web design follows an iterative model, ideate, prototype, test, refine, often requiring substantial human effort and coordination. By contrast, *WebDraw* introduces an AI-assisted prototyping loop, in which the machine automatically infers layout hierarchies, generates code, and produces visual artifacts that are immediately reviewable by clients or design teams.

This process repositions human designers as directors of computational creativity [51]. Rather than manually encoding layouts, designers focus on aesthetic curation, strategic decision-making, and experiential quality. As one Phyxle designer noted, *WebDraw* "*frees time for creativity*," allowing her to spend more effort on conceptual refinement rather than repetitive coding tasks. This reflects a broader trend in computational design: the shift from craftsmanship to creative orchestration [52].

Psychologically, this collaborative model contributes to creative empowerment. Designer's report reduced cognitive load, fewer mechanical frustrations, and greater emotional engagement with their work. Yet, as Edmonds [48] caution, automation also requires critical literacy, the ability to interpret, question, and intervene in machine-generated outcomes. In practice, *WebDraw* users engage in a continuous process of co-critique, iteratively shaping the algorithm's results to better align with human intention. This dialogic creativity blurs authorship boundaries and signals the rise of a hybrid form of intelligence within industrial design ecosystems.

➢ *Negotiating Control and Trust*

Human–machine collaboration inevitably raises questions of control, authorship, and trust. Interviews reveal that while designers admire *WebDraw*'s speed and precision, they sometimes express hesitation in fully entrusting aesthetic decisions to the system. This ambivalence reflects a broader epistemological tension within AI-assisted creativity, between the deterministic logic of algorithms and the interpretive intuition of human designers [49].

Designers describe their engagement with *WebDraw* as a "*conversation*," where they iteratively interpret the system's suggestions and adjust inputs accordingly. This resonates with Shneiderman's [47] human-centered AI model, which emphasizes maintaining human agency at every stage of decision-making. For instance, when *WebDraw* generates redundant containers or imperfect element groupings, designers view these not as errors but as "*discussion points*" that invite further refinement. This cognitive framing transforms machine imperfections into sites of learning and collaboration.

Trust develops gradually as designers become more familiar with the system's patterns of reasoning and error. Over time, they learn to anticipate the algorithm's behavior, mirroring the way artists develop relationships with their materials [48]. Through this process, the designer, AI relationship becomes less hierarchical and more conversational, shifting from "*designing against*" automation to designing with computational partners.

➢ *WebDraw and Participatory Creativity*

Beyond industrial contexts, *WebDraw* holds promise as a participatory and educational tool. Its ability to automatically generate working website prototypes democratizes access to design expertise. Novice designers, students, and small business owners, traditionally excluded from professional web development due to technical barriers, can now engage meaningfully in digital creation.

This aligns with Shneiderman's [47] vision of human-centered AI that empowers creativity at scale. By lowering entry barriers, *WebDraw* fosters collective creativity, a shared space where human participants and algorithms collaboratively shape digital artifacts. Moreover, in educational settings, it can function as a pedagogical companion, helping learners visualize the relationship between visual design and underlying code, thereby deepening computational literacy.

From a socio-technical perspective, this democratization challenges the notion of expertise as a fixed hierarchy. Instead, it reflects what Henriksen et al. [49] calls design pluralism, the coexistence of diverse forms of creative agency, both human and machine. In this way, *WebDraw* contributes not only to the efficiency of web design workflows but also to the broader ethical project of inclusivity, accessibility, and participatory creativity that defines the post-digital design ethos.

VI. SUSTAINABILITY, ETHICS, AND THE FUTURE OF COMPUTATIONAL CREATIVITY

In the post-digital era, sustainability extends beyond environmental responsibility, it encompasses cognitive, creative, and social sustainability [53]. The emergence of computational design systems such as *WebDraw* foregrounds this expanded definition: automation reduces human labour and resource consumption in design production, yet it also raises questions about creative homogenization, ethical authorship, and equitable access. As design practice becomes increasingly intertwined with AI, sustainability must be redefined to address not only how we design, but who designs, with what tools, and for whose benefit [54, 55].

Computational creativity systems like *WebDraw* are positioned at the frontier of this discussion. They exemplify the double-edged potential of automation, enhancing productivity and inclusivity while simultaneously risking the erosion of human aesthetic diversity. This section explores sustainability as both an ecological and creative paradigm, examines the ethical dimensions of algorithmic authorship and ownership, and concludes by considering how design education must evolve to prepare "*AI-literate*" designers capable of critical, responsible, and imaginative engagement with intelligent systems.

➢ Sustainability as Ecological and Creative Practice

Sustainability in computational creativity operates on two interrelated levels: (1) ecological sustainability, reducing redundant effort, energy, and resources in the production of design artifacts, and (2) creative sustainability, maintaining the diversity, adaptability, and cultural richness of design languages.

From an ecological perspective, *WebDraw* contributes to sustainability by streamlining the web design pipeline. Tasks that traditionally required extensive human labour, manual coding, layout structuring, and testing, are automated through AI-driven workflows, thus saving time, reducing cognitive strain, and lowering operational costs. Similar to generative design tools in architecture [50, 56], *WebDraw* embodies computational efficiency, enabling designers to explore more design alternatives within shorter cycles. This efficiency can translate to fewer physical and digital resources expended in design revisions, supporting an environmentally conscious practice within digital ecosystems.

However, creative sustainability presents a more nuanced challenge. While automation optimizes workflow, it can also standardize visual and structural patterns. AI-driven systems, trained on limited datasets, may reproduce dominant stylistic conventions rather than fostering originality. Scholars such as Parikka [6] and Simanowski [57] caution that generative algorithms, if left unchecked, can narrow the visual imagination of design culture, a phenomenon termed algorithmic homogenization. In the context of *WebDraw*, this means that while thousands of websites can now be automatically generated, they risk converging toward aesthetically similar templates.

The future of sustainable creativity thus requires algorithmic diversity, systems designed to preserve and amplify plural design expressions. Open training datasets, culturally localized design grammars, and hybrid workflows that embed human curation are all critical to ensuring that computational creativity remains ecologically efficient and aesthetically pluralistic [58].

➢ Risks: Loss of Diversity and Over-Standardization

Automation in creative industries inevitably introduces the risk of design homogenization. As AI systems learn from existing data, they replicate the most statistically common forms, producing what Lev Manovich [22] calls the aesthetic average. In web design, this manifests as recurring layouts, predictable typographic hierarchies, and limited exploratory freedom. While such consistency can enhance usability, it simultaneously dilutes the individuality and contextual specificity that define design as a cultural practice [59].

For instance, *WebDraw*'s CNN classifier, while highly accurate in categorizing standard GUI elements (e.g., buttons, headers, images), may struggle with unconventional, experimental design motifs. This reflects a broader issue of algorithmic conservatism, wherein systems reproduce what they have seen rather than what they have yet to imagine. Over-standardization poses a philosophical challenge to computational creativity: if creativity implies novelty, how can a machine that optimizes for pattern recognition truly innovate?

This risk also bears ethical implications. Cultural homogeneity in digital design can marginalize non-Western visual languages or reinforce globalized aesthetic norms. Addressing this requires intentional design of diverse and inclusive training datasets and an ethical commitment to ensuring that algorithmic tools represent varied cultural perspectives [60]. In the post-digital paradigm, sustainability depends as much on maintaining cultural biodiversity as on preserving ecological balance.

➢ Opportunities: Democratization, Accessibility, and Inclusion

Amid these risks, computational creativity also opens powerful opportunities for democratization and accessibility in design. Tools such as *WebDraw* lower entry barriers by enabling individuals with limited technical expertise to create professional-quality websites. This shift mirrors broader post-digital design movements that emphasize design for all and inclusive automation [60, 61].

From an accessibility standpoint, automation helps extend participation in creative economies. In small and medium enterprises (SMEs), where hiring dedicated designers may be infeasible, tools like *WebDraw* empower users to visually prototype ideas, communicate concepts, and publish online presences independently. This supports design equity, the idea that creative opportunities should not be restricted by technical proficiency or economic privilege [62].

Furthermore, democratized design platforms can serve as creative incubators. As more people engage in design through intelligent tools, new hybrid practices emerge at the intersection of human imagination and machine computation. *WebDraw*'s participatory potential thus represents a model of inclusive innovation, where technology amplifies, rather than replaces, human expression across diverse communities.

➢ *Ethical Questions: Authorship, Creative Credit, and Ownership*

One of the central ethical challenges of computational creativity concerns authorship and creative ownership. When an AI system like *WebDraw* autonomously generates design code or layout structures, who should receive credit, the developer, the designer who trained it, or the algorithm itself? Current intellectual property frameworks, which rely on human intentionality, struggle to accommodate non-human creative agents [63].

WebDraw highlights these dilemmas vividly. While the system outputs functional HTML/CSS structures, the creative impetus originates from datasets of human-designed websites. Thus, each generated prototype is both derivative and novel, an emergent synthesis of collective design intelligence. This complicates traditional notions of originality, blurring the line between author and curator [57].

Ethically, transparency and traceability must be built into computational design pipelines. Designers should understand how algorithms process data, make stylistic decisions, and generate outputs. Furthermore, the attribution of AI-generated artifacts should evolve toward shared authorship models, where human creators and algorithmic agents are jointly acknowledged [64]. This not only preserves ethical accountability but also fosters a culture of collaborative creativity, recognizing the entanglement of human and machine contributions in the post-digital age.

➢ *Implications for Design Education: Training "AI-Literate" Designers*

As AI systems become embedded in creative practice, design education must evolve to prepare practitioners who can critically and creatively collaborate with intelligent technologies. This involves cultivating AI literacy, an understanding of how algorithms function, their biases, and their implications for human creativity [47].

Traditional design pedagogy emphasizes aesthetic judgment, problem-solving, and iterative refinement. In the post-digital era, these must be supplemented with computational fluency: the ability to interpret algorithmic processes, manage data-driven creativity, and ethically evaluate machine contributions [48]. Future designers must act as mediators between human sensibility and algorithmic logic, what Henriksen et al. [49] calls "*cyborg designers*," capable of navigating hybrid creative ecologies.

Moreover, educational institutions should integrate critical AI ethics into design curricula. Students should be encouraged to question the political, social, and environmental consequences of automation in design industries. Programs combining design thinking with data science, ethics, and critical media studies will cultivate professionals who not only use intelligent systems but shape them responsibly.

WebDraw, as both a research prototype and an educational tool, can exemplify such pedagogy. By allowing students to experiment with automated web design, it demonstrates both the potential and limitations of computational creativity, fostering reflective, ethically aware design practice.

➢ *Concluding Reflections*

Sustainability in computational creativity is not merely a technical or environmental concern, it is a moral and cultural project. Systems like *WebDraw* illustrate both the promise and the peril of automation in creative domains. They offer pathways toward efficiency, inclusivity, and creative empowerment, but also raise questions about homogenization, authorship, and the preservation of aesthetic diversity.

The future of sustainable design lies in ethical co-creation: building tools that amplify human imagination, respect cultural difference, and remain transparent in their algorithmic processes. As AI continues to evolve, the responsibility of designers will increasingly include designing the designers, shaping the ethical, creative, and sustainable values embedded in computational systems themselves.

VII. REFLECTIONS ON POST-DIGITAL AESTHETICS, FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSION

The post-digital condition is not merely about technology, it is about our changing relationship with creativity itself. As computation becomes a collaborator rather than a tool, the boundary between human intuition and machine logic begins to dissolve. In this space, systems such as *WebDraw* illustrate a new aesthetic paradigm: creativity as an emergent dialogue between algorithmic reasoning and human perception. Post-digital aesthetics thus foreground co-creation, where design is no longer a solitary act but a symbiotic process shaped by data, code, and culture [57, 65].

This paper's concluding reflections explore how *WebDraw* embodies this post-digital sensibility. It synthesizes theoretical insights from computational creativity and design philosophy, considers broader implications for art and technology, and speculates on the future trajectory of human–machine creative partnerships. Ultimately, it argues that *WebDraw* is not only a technological artifact but a philosophical statement about the evolving nature of creativity in the post-digital era.

➢ *Theoretical Synthesis: Computational Creativity in the Post-Digital Context*

Computational creativity is increasingly viewed not as the automation of art, but as the augmentation of imagination. *WebDraw* exemplifies this reframing by transforming what

was once a linear design pipeline into an adaptive creative system that combines visual analysis, semantic classification, and generative logic. In doing so, it demonstrates how post-digital design operates through interdependence, between designer and system, between data and intuition, between code and form [7, 40].

From a theoretical standpoint, this integration aligns with Margaret Boden's [7] conception of "*combinational creativity*," where new ideas emerge through the structured recombination of familiar elements. *WebDraw*, trained on a corpus of existing websites, learns not to copy, but to compose, reconfiguring design patterns to produce new layouts that mirror human sensibility. It is a manifestation of machine imagination, one that extends the cognitive capacities of designers rather than replacing them.

In this light, post-digital aesthetics become less about surface beauty and more about the processual aesthetics of collaboration. The value of a design lies not only in its final form but in the relational choreography between human and machine agency [6, 48]. *WebDraw*'s recursive logic, which builds DOM hierarchies through iterative grouping of GUI elements, mirrors this aesthetic principle, it performs design as a dialogue of inference and interpretation.

➤ *Broader Implications: Cultural Significance of Human–Machine Co-Authorship*

WebDraw's approach to automatic prototyping is not only a technical achievement, it is a cultural phenomenon. In a world increasingly defined by digital mediation, the concept of authorship is being reimagined. Just as photography once transformed artistic authorship by shifting focus from hand to lens, AI-assisted design now redefines authorship as a shared act between human and machine [23].

This has profound implications for art and design practice. The post-digital artist or designer operates as a meta-creator, a curator of computational processes who sets the conditions for creative emergence [66]. The designer's role shifts from execution to orchestration: selecting data, defining parameters, and interpreting outcomes. In this sense, creativity becomes a form of systemic authorship, distributed across algorithms, datasets, and human intentionality.

From a societal perspective, human–machine co-authorship also invites a re-evaluation of creative labour. Automation redistributes the boundaries of skill and value, demanding new economic and ethical frameworks for credit, ownership, and recognition [64]. The "*authorship of the algorithm*" introduces a new type of creative professional—part designer, part data scientist, part ethicist.

Culturally, this shift signals a move toward post-individual creativity, where meaning is collectively produced through networks of human and non-human actors. *WebDraw* embodies this transition by transforming design from a solitary craft into a collaborative ecosystem of computational participation.

➤ *Future Trajectories: From Automation to Autonomous Creativity*

While current systems like *WebDraw* automate design through supervised learning and rule-based inference, the next frontier is autonomous creativity. Emerging architectures in deep learning, such as GANs and transformer-based diffusion models, are capable of generating entirely new aesthetic forms with minimal human input [67, 68]. The challenge, however, lies not in producing output but in ensuring meaningful originality, that is, creativity with context, purpose, and ethical grounding.

Future iterations of *WebDraw* could evolve toward adaptive systems that learn from user feedback in real time, co-evolving with designers' preferences and domain trends. By integrating reinforcement learning, such systems could autonomously refine their creative judgment, balancing novelty and usability. Beyond websites, these techniques can extend into mobile UI/UX design, immersive media, and adaptive environments, generating responsive experiences across digital ecosystems [47, 50]

However, as AI's creative autonomy increases, so does the need for explainable creativity. Understanding how algorithms make aesthetic decisions becomes crucial to maintaining trust and accountability in design processes. Transparent AI models and open design ontologies could ensure that future creative systems remain interpretable, equitable, and aligned with human values [64].

VIII. CONCLUSION

The post-digital design landscape is characterized by a profound shift in how creativity, authorship, and computation intersect. This research has explored *WebDraw* as both a technological system and a conceptual framework that exemplifies this transformation. By integrating machine perception, semantic interpretation, and algorithmic reasoning, *WebDraw* demonstrates how computational systems can meaningfully participate in creative processes traditionally dominated by human designers. Its ability to translate static visual artifacts into functional website prototypes reflects a form of computational creativity that is not merely imitative but interpretive, allowing the system to co-construct design outcomes alongside human collaborators.

Through theoretical analysis, system evaluation, and insights from professional designers, the study shows that *WebDraw* embodies the principles of post-digital co-creation. It challenges conventional notions of authorship by distributing creative agency among humans, datasets, and intelligent algorithms. The system enhances efficiency, accelerates prototyping, and democratizes access to web design, all while preserving space for human intuition, contextual awareness, and aesthetic judgment. While limitations remain, such as the risk of stylistic homogenization and the need for more inclusive datasets, these challenges point toward future opportunities for ethical, diverse, and reflexive AI-driven design systems.

In considering the broader implications, the research underscores the necessity of cultivating AI literacy within design education and practice. As creative workflows become increasingly hybrid, designers must develop the capacity to critically engage with computational systems, shaping their behaviours and ensuring responsible use. *WebDraw*, in this sense, serves not only as a functional tool but as a model of how human–machine collaboration can expand the boundaries of creativity in the post-digital era.

Ultimately, this work positions *WebDraw* as a step toward a future where creativity is understood as a shared ecology of human and computational intelligence. The system exemplifies how intelligent technologies can extend, rather than diminish, human imagination, inviting new aesthetic possibilities, collaborative workflows, and ethical considerations that will define the next generation of design innovation.

➤ *Conflict of Interest*

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Thisaranie Kaluarachchi: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Resources, Writing original draft. Manjusri Wickramasinghe: Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

REFERENCES

[1]. Cramer, F. (2015). *What is 'Post-digital'?*. In Postdigital aesthetics: Art, computation and design (pp. 12-26). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

[2]. Berry, D. M., & Dieter, M. (2015). *Thinking postdigital aesthetics: Art, computation and design.* In Postdigital aesthetics: Art, computation and design (pp. 1-11). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

[3]. Manovich, L. (2023). *AI aesthetics*. Strelka Press.

[4]. Veale, T., & Cardoso, F. A. (Eds.). (2019). *Computational creativity: The philosophy and engineering of autonomously creative systems*. Springer.

[5]. Kaluarachchi, T., & Wickramasinghe, M. (2024). *WebDraw: A machine learning-driven tool for automatic website prototyping*. Science of Computer Programming, 233, 103056. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2023.103056

[6]. Parikka, J. (2023). *Operational images: From the visual to the invisual*. U of Minnesota Press.

[7]. Boden, M. A. (2024). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms (4th ed.).* Routledge.

[8]. Edmonds, E. (2018). *The art of interaction: What HCI can learn from interactive art*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.

[9]. Jandrić, P., Knox, J., Besley, T., Ryberg, T., Suoranta, J., & Hayes, S. (2018*). Postdigital science and education*. Educational philosophy and theory, 50(10), 893-899.

[10]. Bridle, J. (2018). *New dark age: Technology and the end of the future*. Verso Books.

[11]. Parikka, J. (2020). *The anthrobscene (2nd ed.)*. University of Minnesota Press.

[12]. Galanter, P. (2019, July). *Artificial intelligence and problems in generative art theory*. In Proceedings of EVA London 2019. BCS Learning & Development.

[13]. Bardzell, J., & Bardzell, S. (2016). *Humanistic Hci*. Interactions, 23(2), 20-29.

[14]. Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019, February). *Art, creativity, and the potential of artificial intelligence*. In Arts (Vol. 8, No. 1, p. 26). MDPI.

[15]. López de Mántaras, R. (2016). *Artificial intelligence and the arts: Toward computational creativity*.

[16]. Saunders, R. (2012). *Towards autonomous creative systems: A computational approach*. Cognitive Computation, 4(3), 216-225.

[17]. Fan, X., Wu, Z., Yu, C., Rao, F., Shi, W., & Tu, T. (2024, May). *ContextCam: Bridging context awareness with creative human-AI image co-creation*. In Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1-17).

[18]. Oxman, R. (2017). *Thinking difference: Theories and models of parametric design thinking*. Design studies, 52, 4-39.

[19]. Kaluarachchi, T. (2025). *From Mock-ups to Code: A Conceptual Synthesis of AI-Driven Automatic Website Generation.* International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 10(11), 305-317, https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25nov339

[20]. Creely, E., & Blannin, J. (2025). *Creative partnerships with generative AI.* Possibilities for education and beyond. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 56, 101727.

[21]. McCormack, J., Gifford, T., & Hutchings, P. (2019, April). *Autonomy, authenticity, authorship and intention in computer generated art*. In International conference on computational intelligence in music, sound, art and design (part of EvoStar) (pp. 35-50). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[22]. Manovich, L. (2017). *Cultural analytics, social computing and digital humanities*.

[23]. Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Polity Press.

[24]. Crawford, K. (2021). T*he atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

[25]. Mulvenna, M., Boger, J., & Bond, R. (2017, September). *Ethical by design: A manifesto.* In Proceedings of the European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics (pp. 51-54).

[26]. Peters, D., Vold, K., Robinson, D., & Calvo, R. A. (2020). *Responsible AI—two frameworks for ethical design practice*. IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society, 1(1), 34-47.

[27]. Caires, C. S. (2025). *Creative digital intelligence: reshaping art, experience, and heritage in the post-digital era*. Journal of Science and Technology of the Arts, 17(1), 9-18.

[28]. Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). D*esign justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need*. The MIT Press.

[29]. Hodgson, J. (2019*). Post-digital rhetoric and the new aesthetic*. Ohio State University Press.

[30]. Bo, Y., Yu, J., & Zhang, K. (2018). *Computational aesthetics and applications*. Visual computing for industry, biomedicine, and art, 1(1), 6.

[31]. Yu, W. F. (2025). *AI as a co-creator and a design material: Transforming the design process*. Design Studies, 97, 101303.

[32]. Martindale, C. (2007). *Recent trends in the psychological study of aesthetics, creativity, and the arts*. Empirical Studies of the Arts, 25(2), 121-141.

[33]. Greenfield, G. R. (2005, April). *Computational aesthetics as a tool for creativity*. In Proceedings of the 5th conference on Creativity & cognition (pp. 232-235).

[34]. Jordanous, A. (2019). *Evaluating evaluation: Assessing progress and practices in computational creativity research*. In Computational creativity: The philosophy and engineering of autonomously creative systems (pp. 211-236). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[35]. Parisi, L. (2013). *Contagious Architecture: Computation, Aesthetics, and Space*. MIT Press.

[36]. Schön, D. A. (2017). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Routledge.

[37]. Brown, A. (2012). *Creative Partnerships with Technology: How creativity is enhanced through interactions with generative computational systems*. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment (Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 14-20).

[38]. McGregor, S., Wiggins, G. A., & Purver, M. (2014, June). *Computational Creativity: A Philosophical Approach, and an Approach to Philosophy*. In ICCC (pp. 254-262).

[39]. Ritchie, G. (2007). *Some empirical criteria for attributing creativity to a computer program*. Minds and Machines, 17(1), 67-99.

[40]. Colton, S., & Wiggins, G. A. (2012). *Computational creativity: The final frontier?* In ECAI 2012 (pp. 21-26). IOS Press.

[41]. Reader, J. (2021). *Postdigital Humans: Algorithmic Imagination?* In Postdigital Humans: Transitions, Transformations and Transcendence (pp. 155-168). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[42]. Tenner, E. (2015). *The design of everyday things by Donald Norman*. Technology and Culture, 56(3), 785-787.

[43]. Mori, M., MacDorman, K. F., & Kageki, N. (2012*). The uncanny valley [from the field]*. IEEE Robotics & automation magazine, 19(2), 98-100.

[44]. Gunkel, D. J. (2020). *The machine question: AI, ethics, and moral responsibility in creative contexts*. MIT Press.

[45]. Galanter, P. (2012). *Computational aesthetic evaluation: steps towards machine creativity*. In ACM SIGGRAPH 2012 Courses (pp. 1-162).

[46]. Singh, S., Hindriks, K., Heylen, D., & Baraka, K. (2025). *A Systematic Review of Human-AI Co-Creativity*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21333.

[47]. Shneiderman, B. (2022). *Human-centered AI*. Oxford University Press.

[48]. Edmonds, E. A. (2014). *Human computer interaction, art and experience*. In Interactive experience in the digital age: evaluating new art practice (pp. 11-23). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[49]. Henriksen, D., Creely, E., & Mehta, R. (2022). *Rethinking the politics of creativity: Posthumanism, indigeneity, and creativity beyond the western Anthropocene*. Qualitative Inquiry, 28(5), 465-475.

[50]. Oxman, N. (2016). *Age of entanglement*. Journal of Design and Science.

[51]. Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its nature and future*. Oxford University Press.

[52]. Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., & Mazzone, M. (2017). *Can: Creative adversarial networks, generating" art" by learning about styles and deviating from style norms*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07068.

[53]. Fry, T. (2017). *Design after design*, Design Philosophy Papers, 15:2, 99-102, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/14487136.2017.1392093

[54]. Manzini, E. (2015*). Design, when everybody designs: An introduction to design for social innovation*. MIT press.

[55]. Fry, T. (2009). *Design futuring*. University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, 71-77.

[56]. Chatterjee, D., & Rao, S. (2020). *Computational sustainability: A socio-technical perspective.* ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), 53(5), 1-29.

[57]. Simanowski, R. (2016). *Digital humanities and digital media: Conversations on politics, culture, aesthetics and literacy.* Open Humanities Press.

[58]. Bonadio, E., & McDonagh, L. (2020). *Artificial intelligence as producer and consumer of copyright works: evaluating the consequences of algorithmic creativity.* Intellectual Property Quarterly, 2020(2), 112-137.

[59]. Tewari, S. (2018). *How to Thrive in the Next Economy: Designing Tomorrow's World Today.*

[60]. Ihde, D. (2009). *Postphenomenology and technoscience: The Peking university lectures.* Suny Press.

[61]. Norman, D. A., & Stappers, P. J. (2015). *DesignX: complex sociotechnical systems. She* Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation, 1(2), 83-106.

[62]. Foth, M. (2018). *Participatory urban informatics: towards citizen-ability.* Smart and sustainable built environment, 7(1), 4-19.

[63]. Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2018). *The ethics of artificial intelligence.* In Artificial intelligence safety and security (pp. 57-69). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

[64]. Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2022). *A unified framework of five principles for AI in society.* Machine learning and the city: Applications in architecture and urban design, 535-545.

[65]. Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge (Vol. 2).* Cambridge: Polity Press.

[66]. Deibert, R. (2014). *DIY citizenship: Critical making and social media.* MIT press.

[67]. Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., ... & Bengio, Y. (2020). *Generative adversarial networks.* Communications of the ACM, 63(11), 139-144.

[68]. Ramesh, A., Dhariwal, P., Nichol, A., Chu, C., & Chen, M. (2022). *Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents.* arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125, 1(2), 3.

Thisaranie Kaluarachchi is a Lecturer (Probationary) in Computer Science at the University of Colombo, Sri Lanka. She holds a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science from the Faculty of Science, University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka, and is currently pursuing a PhD in Computing at the University of Colombo School of Computing (UCSC). Her research focuses on the innovative applications of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Deep Learning, and Computer Vision, particularly in the domains of web design automation and intelligent interface generation.

Dr. Manjusri Ishwara Ellepola Wickramasinghe is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Colombo School of Computing, where he has served since 2008. He holds a Ph.D. in Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning from Monash University, Australia, and a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science from the University of Colombo. With over seventeen years of academic experience, Dr. Wickramasinghe has taught and designed core modules in data structures, algorithms, programming language theory, and machine learning. His research spans neural network architectures, cognitive systems, and the integration of AI into real-world applications. He currently heads the e-Learning Center at UCSC. In addition to his technical background, Dr. Wickramasinghe holds an LL.B. from the Open University of Sri Lanka, reflecting his interdisciplinary interest in the intersection of technology, ethics, and law.