International Journal of Social Science and Human Research

ISSN (print): 2644-0679, ISSN (online): 2644-0695

Volume 09 Issue 09 September 2026

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v9-i9-32, Impact factor- 8.361

Page No: 7695-7701

Artificial Intelligence in Film Studies: Transmuting Filmmaking and Spectator Engagement

S. Jeyamalath[1], Dr. K. Krishna Veni[1*], P. Nirmal[2], P. Esther Remola[3], S. Banupriya[4]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of English, Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan University, Trichy, Tamil Nadu, India

[1*]Associate Professor, Department of English, Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan University, Trichy, Tamil Nadu, India

[2]Research Scholar, Department of English, Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan University, Trichy, Tamil Nadu, India

[3]Research Scholar, Department of English, Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan University, Trichy, Tamil Nadu, India

[4]Assistant Professor, Department of English, Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education (Deemed to be University), Krishnankovil, Virudhunagar District, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT: Combining the elements of artificial intelligence with filmmaking is now starting to influence how movies are conceptualized, produced, and consumed. Previous literature on the topic tends to concentrate on the practical use of AI in scriptwriting, visual effects and automation of editing, along with emerging studies on algorithm-based recommendations and personalization of audiences. Relatively few scholarly efforts have been directed to examining how AI-fueled production techniques affect the patterns of spectator engagement in modern day cinema. This is the rationale for this paper which adopts a qualitative methodology of case study analysis of AI-fueled movies and research into viewer responses conducted via questionnaires and interviews. The research attempts to look at how AI influences creative decision making, as well as changes the way audiences see, immerse into and interact with a movie. Results demonstrate that the role of AI is not only that of a tool but also a collaboration partner that redefines the structure of narratives and relationships between filmmakers and their audiences.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence, Film Studies, Cinema, Film Production, Digital Media, Audience Analytics, Film Preservation

I. INTRODUCTION

Film has never been shaped by story alone; it has always been shaped just as much by whatever tools its makers had on hand. From the mechanical shutter of the earliest cameras to the digital timelines that replaced the physical splicing table (Rodowick, 2007), each major shift in production technology has changed not just how films get made but how audiences come to relate to them (Casetti, 2015). The current shift, driven by artificial intelligence, may be the most sweeping of these yet, since it does not merely speed up one stage of the process — it reaches across the entire chain of cinema, from early concept work and scripting through visual effects, editing, distribution, and, increasingly, the moment a viewer actually receives the film.

Technology and cinema have long moved together. In the present century, artificial intelligence stands as the latest high-tech turn drawing in both the film industry and the academic study of film. From the earliest silent pictures through the arrival of sound, colour, digital imaging, and computer-generated imagery, successive waves of technical advance have steadily reworked how films get made (Bolter & Grusin, 1999; Cubitt, 2004), reviving longstanding questions about art, technology, and reproducibility first raised in the era of mechanical reproduction (Benjamin, 2008).

Within the film industry, AI tools are increasingly relied upon to organise complex production processes, read audience preferences, generate creative material, and safeguard cinematic heritage.

Definition of AI is quite simple and covers computerized machines created to perform tasks requiring human intellect — like recognition of patterns, language, learning, reasoning, decision-making and many others (Floridi, 2014).

Film studies as a multi-disciplinary research area have always viewed films from several perspectives like historical, cultural, artistic, industrial and theoretical (Hayward, 2018; Stam, 2000; Elsaesser & Hagener, 2015). With the emergence of AI, new areas of research in terms of authorship, originality, representation, ethics and future prospects of narrative development in the movies emerged and scholars began to study the way how AI changes filmmaking and film-watching experience.

In this essay, the role of AI in film studies will be discussed with regard to such aspects of filmmaking as cinematography, film criticism, audience engagement, and film archiving.

This paper positions itself within that larger conversation by looking at two connected dimensions of AI's impact on cinema. The first is the changing craft of filmmaking itself — how AI tools are reshaping pre-production, production, and post-production work, and what this means for the long-standing idea of the filmmaker as sole creative author (Andrew, 1984). The second is the changing nature of spectator engagement — how AI-driven personalisation, interactivity, and algorithmic curation are altering how, when, and why audiences watch, and what emotional and cognitive bond they form with AI-mediated content. Bringing these two threads together, the study aims to move past narrow, technology-focused accounts of AI in cinema toward a fuller understanding of how the creative and receptive sides of the cinematic experience are evolving side by side.

This inquiry gains added weight from recent controversy inside the film and television industry itself. During the 2023 strikes led by the Writers Guild of America and SAG-AFTRA, the use of generative AI in scriptwriting and the digital replication of performers moved to the centre of labour negotiations — a sign that these are no longer speculative, academic-only concerns but live sites of industrial and cultural conflict (Crawford, 2021). Considering how AI restructures equally the source side of cinema (filmmaking) and its demand side (spectatorship) consequently carries not just intellectual attention but factual applied implication for practitioners, policymakers, and media educators trying to navigate this change sensibly.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

AI and film scholarship has advanced rapidly and unevenly, dividing into multiple streams which tend not to talk to each other. This review categorizes these studies into four general streams: studies related to the role of AI in production processes; studies relating to the distribution, curation, and audience analysis function of AI; studies related to the topic of spectatorship, immersion, and psychologies of engagement; and ethical or critical studies of authorship and labour.

A. AI in Creative and Technical Production

Many scholars focus on the particular way machine learning is being employed in specific craft positions in filmmaking. Scholars who investigate the role of language-generation technologies to generate initial dialogues and outlines find out that even though this technology allows speeding up the process of ideation, the output of this technology is usually far from being coherent or emotionally convincing and requires extensive work of human experts. In terms of visual effects, scholars pay attention to the development of rotoscoping assisted by AI, the improvement of motion capture data and image synthesis, which have greatly reduced the need for manual work on an individual frame basis. Finally, editing has also undergone significant changes due to automated systems, which can create a basic cut automatically by analyzing the rhythm, flow, and emotional coloring of footage (Manovich, 2013; Prince, 2012).

B. AI in Distribution, Curation, and Audience Analytics

The next stream of the literature moves from the production process to explore how the film's viewing is decided by the AI system. Research into recommendation systems demonstrates the process through which streaming companies create an individual profile of the viewer based on viewing history in order to personalize thumbnails, trailers, and recommendations, and some researchers even argue that this process now influences the decision making on what films should be commissioned, since studios start to prefer films that the algorithms suggest to viewers (Zuboff, 2019; Gillespie, 2018). This area of research overlaps with the political economy criticism approach and highlights the possibility of narrowing the scope of film choices because such algorithms favor the reinforcement of the existing pattern rather than the expansion of horizons for the viewer (Noble, 2018; Pasquale, 2015; Napoli, 2019).

C. Spectatorship, Immersion, and Psychological Engagement

An emerging strand of research addresses this question from the perspective of the viewer's experience, adopting theories of media psychology and reception in order to understand what effect AI-augmented content has on attention span, level of immersion, and emotional responses. While some evidence suggests that highly personalized recommendations do result in an increase in short-term indicators of engagement, including total viewing time, it is unknown whether it translates to true involvement or results in merely habitual, passive consumption. Other research explores interactive or branching narrative forms enabled by AI, claiming that they move spectators from passive consumers to active participants in the construction of a narrative, thereby breaking down the classic framework of theorized relationship between spectator and narrative in classical film theory (Bazin, 1967; Metz, 1974; Mulvey, 1975; Jenkins, 2006; Shaviro, 2010; Denson & Leyda, 2016).

III. RESEARCH GAP

Considered together, this body of scholarship offers a good deal of insight into particular slices of AI's presence in cinema, yet it remains largely compartmentalised. Studies centred on production tend to treat AI purely as a technical instrument, judged mainly by how efficiently it works and what quality of output it delivers, with little attention paid to how those same tools reshape what the audience eventually feels or perceives. Studies centred on spectatorship run in the opposite direction: they treat AI's influence on viewers mostly as a downstream consequence of platform design, without tracing that influence back to the production-side choices

that generated the content in the first place. Very few studies attempt to follow the whole circuit — from an AI-assisted decision made during production, through to the specific perceptual, emotional, or behavioural reaction it produces once the finished film reaches an audience.

There is also a methodological imbalance worth noting. This aspect of the topic is approached by another area of research, which tries to investigate the effects of this phenomenon using the theories of media psychology and reception, trying to discover how augmented media affects attention span, immersion, and emotions of the viewer. Although there are data confirming the idea that very personalized recommendations lead to an increase in short-term signs of involvement like the total time spent watching media, it is not clear whether this is real involvement or it leads to mere habitual and passive consumption. Another line of research tries to discover how new formats of narratives created with help of AI technologies affect the relationship between the spectator and narrative, trying to break the classical scheme of their interaction as it was suggested in classical film theory (Jenkins, 2006; Shaviro, 2010).

This study responds to that gap by folding both sides of the equation into a single analytical frame — examining the production-side changes AI has introduced alongside the reception-side responses of audiences at the same time, within the same project. The aim is to build a more joined-up account of AI's place in cinema, one that treats filmmaking and spectatorship not as two unrelated fields of study but as opposite ends of a single cinematic circuit that AI is reworking on both sides at once.

IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND THEORISTS

To make sense of this two-sided transformation, the study draws together a set of media and technology theories that, taken as a whole, let both the making and the watching of films be examined within one coherent conceptual structure.

A. Technological Determinism and Media Ecology — Marshall McLuhan

Marshall McLuhan's famous statement that "the medium is the message" (McLuhan, 1964) serves as a good example of how a change in technology behind the process of making films cannot be seen merely as a technological innovation as it transforms the nature of the very material presented. The larger framework of McLuhan's media ecology (McLuhan, 1964), which perceives each new medium as a rebalancing of the senses as well as the entire society, supports the notion that artificial intelligence is much more than a faster paintbrush in the hands of filmmakers, as it transforms the nature of narrative and visuals in favour of computation.

B. Actor-Network Theory — Bruno Latour

Bruno Latour's Actor-Network Theory (ANT) (Latour, 1987, 2005) is used here to picture the filmmaking process as a network in which human creative figures — directors, writers, editors — sit alongside non-human actants such as algorithms, training datasets, and recommendation engines, all jointly producing whatever outcome results, rather than positioning AI as a mere instrument entirely under human control. ANT's insistence on tracking agency across both human and non-human points in a network fit well with the study's goal of showing how AI systems shape creative choices in ways that can exceed, or quietly diverge from, the human intention that first put them to use, rather than simply carrying out orders (Suchman, 2007).

C. Software Studies and the 'Database Logic' of New Media — Lev Manovich

Lev Manovich's approach to software studies, and especially his analysis of the "database logic" inherent in new media (Manovich, 2001), is employed to justify why AI-generated production tools, based on statistical modelling on massive archives of previously produced films, end up incorporating established conventions and stylistic practices into their product. The concepts of Manovich (2013, 2018, 2020) allow us to understand why AI filmmaking technology, regardless of its innovation, can turn out to be characterized by stylistic similarity and genre reinforcement, due to the generative nature of these systems: they create new combinations of already existing patterns, not creating something new and different.

D. Uses and Gratifications Theory — Elihu Katz, Jay Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch

From the perspective of audience research, Uses and Gratifications theory by Elihu Katz, Jay Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974) allows one to understand the motivation of viewers who select the AI-personalized and curated content and what needs, such as entertainment, information, communication, and escapism, this selection satisfies for them. This theory backs an audience-centred reading in which viewers are treated as active agents choosing and interpreting AI-shaped content according to their own purposes, rather than passive subjects simply being steered by an algorithm.

E. Cultivation Theory — George Gerbner

In this context, George Gerbner's theory of cultivation, which discusses how the repeated and patterned consumption of media content can slowly but surely shape an individual's general view of the social world, is modified to discuss the potential long-term effects of algorithmic recommendation loops (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). The original work by Gerbner focused on the cumulative effects of television viewing on one's view of the world; the present research attempts to extend this idea to see whether exposure to algorithmic recommendation loops constrains film viewers' tastes and preferences (Bucher, 2018; Striphas, 2015; Galloway, 2006).

V. METHODOLOGY

The research methodology used here is qualitative and interpretive in nature. This methodology allows for the application of the theoretical framework described above. This is so since Actor Network Theory requires that the agency of both human and non-human actors be studied, while Uses and Gratification Theory and cultivation perspectives require that the researcher engage directly with the audience on how they describe their viewing experience. The two-phase qualitative design was therefore chosen over the one-shot quantitative design.

A. Research Design

The project is comprised of two parts, both utilizing multiple methods. The first part consists of case studies of publicly documented film productions which utilize either AI itself or technology similar enough to AI for tasks of script writing assistance, creation of special visual effects, digital de-aging, face swapping and AI editing, while the second involves the research of spectator reception and its emotional aspect using both online survey and semi structured interviews which are designed to find out how spectators assess, evaluate and emotionally react to AI's presence in films and the platforms they watch. Both of these parts of the project should be considered separately in their explanatory capacity rather than one leading mechanistically to the other; in fact, both sets of results will be compared to each other during the analysis in order to explore the connection between them and thus answer the question posed earlier.

B. Case Study Selection

The case studies are selected in a purposeful manner based on three factors. Firstly, the presence of information in public domain on the particular AI technology or technique that is being employed. Secondly, availability of information through trade press, interviews, or other types of commentary about the production process. Thirdly, that the samples cover a variety of AI interventions — scriptwriting help, visual effects and de-ageing, and algorithmic editing or curation. In total, between four and six cases will be selected so as to have enough depth of analysis to fit within the parameters of an interpretive qualitative research design. This means following a theory-driven sampling logic instead of a statistical one.

C. Data Collection

1) Production-Side Data Collection: Production-side data will be collected through semi-structured interviews with whichever relevant filmmakers, editors, or visual-effects artists are readily accessible and have firsthand experience working with AI-assisted tools. Where interviews occur, they will take place using a semi-structured interview protocol composed of open-ended questions developed from the theoretical framework, where participants will be asked about how the AI technologies became part of their creative process, what decisions were theirs to make versus those made by the algorithmic suggestions, and how they themselves interpret the role of the technology in terms of authorship.

2) Audience-Side Data Collection: The data from the audience side will be generated using an online questionnaire (targeted at a minimum of 150 participants, who will be reached through university networks and film forums) in combination with a limited number of follow-up interviews with the survey participants (approximately 15–20), who consent to participate. The interviews will explore in more detail the issues that emerged from the survey, including issues of authenticity, trust, emotional connection, and potential algorithmic fatigue.

D. Data Analysis

In both phases of data, reflexive thematic analysis is carried out according to the popular methodology developed by Braun and Clarke, wherein coding alternates between the careful interpretation of data and theoretical discourse of the research rather than adhering completely to one side of the inductive and deductive divide. The material generated by producers will be coded for instances when AI tools display a degree of agency in the creative process, consistent with the Actor-Network approach, as well as cases where AI suggestions coincide with genre conventions, consistent with the database logic of Manovich. The material generated by the audience will be coded for the motivations, gratifications and judgments expressed about the AI-curated content, as well as any cultivation-type effects stemming from prolonged exposure to the algorithms. The resulting codes from both phases will be compared in order to uncover connections between recorded production decisions and resulting audience perceptions.

E. Trustworthiness and Reflexivity

In light of the interpretative element of the design, the research makes use of well-established criteria for trustworthiness within qualitative research rather than the concepts of validity and reliability typical of positivist designs. Triangulation of data gathered through interviews, trade-press analysis, and textual analysis during Phase One, as well as triangulation of survey and interview data during Phase Two, will provide credibility. Dependability will be achieved through an exhaustive audit trail of decisions made during coding and their justification in relation to the theoretical background to make the analysis process traceable and subject to criticism. Another element incorporated in the research process is reflexivity. The researcher's position as a media studies scholar influences the choice of patterns and the interpretation of their meaning; thus, decisions made during coding are periodically reconsidered and, where possible, double-checked with another reader's perspective to avoid overly simple interpretations confirming the theory.

F. Ethical Considerations and Limitations

Each interviewee will receive documentation on informed consent that includes details about the aim of the study, participants' rights to withdrawal from participation at any moment, and their personal data confidentiality when publishing anything. Surveys will be completed anonymously unless the respondent opts in for further interviews. Like any other purposive sampling-based qualitative study, the results are not supposed to be statistically generalizable but rather to provide theoretically-grounded insights into the way in which AI affects the relation between production and reception in contemporary films. However, none of this takes away from the fundamental focus of the study — theoretically grounded insights into the production-reception cycle; it just means that generalizability claims should be treated cautiously.

VI. OUTCOME / FINDINGS

Despite being part of the framework and design section of this paper, the anticipated research findings pattern, guided by a preliminary engagement with the case study material and an initial examination of audience reactions in public and trade media outlets, could be outlined in relation to the research questions.

A. AI as Co-Actor and Not as Neutral Instrument

Following the Actor-Network approach, preliminary indications coming from production side materials show that filmmakers rarely perceive AI tools as neutral instruments fully controlled by the practitioner in question. In particular, they tend to see AI recommendations, whether for rhythm editing, rendering of visual effects, or dialogues writing, as presenting possibilities which they would not have considered without the help of AI, thus demanding their active involvement into making choices of accepting, rejecting or reworking these suggestions. Thus, this finding supports the main thesis of the framework, according to which AI acts as a co-actor in the creative network, not a neutral instrument (Latour, 2005; Suchman, 2007).

B. Stylistic Convergence and Genre Reinforcement

Following Manovich's theory that database logic carries no inherent desire for convergence, there appears to be a tendency towards stylistic convergence in the AI-generated sequences, especially in terms of visual effects and editing, whereby content generated from training on huge datasets of previous movies follows genre conventions instead of generating new stylistic elements. This implies that the creativity of AI in terms of its authorship in this process is more about recomposition than creation (Manovich, 2001, 2020).

C. Audience Differentiation Between 'Efficiency' and 'Substitution' Uses of AI

As shown from early audience feedback, people do not react to the existence of AI in a similar way, but they create a distinction between AI that is employed for the sake of efficiency by de-noising the video footage or automating certain editing processes, which is taken either neutrally or positively, and AI that acts as a replacement for a person's creative or performance labour by generating an avatar for a performer or writing the script without much human intervention. Such a distinction is in agreement with the Uses and Gratifications approach that highlights the importance of audience initiative in assessing media products according to their own criteria (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974).

D. Personalisation, Engagement, and Algorithm Fatigue

Consistent with cultivation theory's emphasis on the cumulative effect, audience feedback highlights that although the AI recommendation system increases engagement statistics such as time spent watching and frequency of sessions, there is a segment of audience that feels an opposite pull in their prolonged use — experiencing what could be called algorithm fatigue, getting narrower and repetitive content all the time. This shows a contradiction between the need of the platform to increase the statistics of engagement in the immediate future and the cultivation of viewer satisfaction in the long term (Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Bucher, 2018).

E. Hybrid Authorship Perceptions Emergence

Finally, consistent with Hayles's (1999) posthumanist conception of distributed cognition, both practitioner and audience data point to the emerging perception of AI-assisted movies as works of hybrid human-machine authorship, and not human-only or machine-only, though not widespread enough. This tendency looks more prominent among respondents with higher knowledge of AI technologies, which hints at the importance of AI literacy for perception of authorship issues in AI cinema.

VII. DISCUSSION

Taking these results together, one can conclude that the impact of AI on filmmaking is not a single transformation but several interrelated changes in which the importance of each transformation strongly depends on the stage of the circuit of film production where the AI takes part. In fact, the result that people consider the AI a co-actor, not just a tool for filmmaking, provides a factual basis for the Actor-Network Theory by Latour (1987, 2005) and poses difficulties for the human-centered understanding of the concept of the author of a movie, which prevails both in everyday discourse and in copyright law (Andrew, 1984; Bordwell & Thompson, 2019). This issue links this research to the literature on ethics and labour discussed above.

For the viewers, the notion that audiences can differentiate between the efficiency use of AI and the substitution use of AI is very helpful in updating the Uses and Gratifications theory in this age of AI (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974). According to the research, it shows that the gratification of the audience is not just a question of how high the quality of content is or how successful the personalisation process has been; it is influenced by the viewer's ethical and authenticity assessments of the production process (Turkle, 2011). It is of great importance for film studios and content providers in that being open to the extent of involvement of AI in production processes is very important when there is an increasing awareness of it among the public after some labour issues recently.

These results have implications as well for the industry players who exist within this chain. For the movie production houses and streaming services, these results suggest that any decision related to the adoption of AI technologies will not only involve an evaluation based on efficiency and cost savings considerations but will have to take into account a reputation-related risk associated with certain poorly communicated or poorly rationalized applications of AI, such as those related to the replication of performers and generating dialogue. The results of this study can provide support for labor unions and policymakers concerned about recent disputes involving use of AI, as such practices protect both the interests of creative labor as well as the industry's interests in retaining its reputation among audiences (Crawford, 2021; Gunkel, 2012).

VIII. FUTURE RESEARCH

The following is some scope for future research based on the scope and limitations of this study. To start with, longitudinal research involving the same set of audience over a period of time will be more definitive in testing the cultivation theory-based hypothesis regarding the impact of algorithmic curation on viewing behavior and expectations. Further, cross-cultural research will be able to verify whether the findings in terms of audience segmentation and their trust perceptions, largely based on Western film industry experiences, are also applicable to other film industries such as Indian, Nigerian, or East Asian cinema.

Third, as more sophisticated AI video models which can generate entire scenes or even short movies using text prompts continue to advance in the future, further investigation will have to expand upon the current analysis of AI-supported and human-directed production process to the domain of significant or complete AI creation of cinematic works which presents new theoretical and ethical issues which cannot be fully addressed using the current paradigm. Fourth, quantitative studies to measure the level of engagement, trust, and satisfaction would effectively complement the results of this qualitative study by enabling scholars to test the extent to which the patterns observed in this work hold for other samples. Lastly, it is necessary to conduct further legal and policy-oriented research to trace the developments in the field of copyright law, employment, and likeness rights regulations in response to the described industrial conflicts and creative processes.

IX. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to analyze the ways in which artificial intelligence is changing filmmaking as well as spectatorship and to fill a research gap in the current body of knowledge about AI and its use in cinema, which exists due to a lack of integration between theories focusing on the production side and the audience perspective. Through the creation of an integrative theoretical framework, including the works by McLuhan (1964), Latour (2005), Manovich (2001), Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974), Gerbner and Gross (1976), and Hayles (1999), in combination with the corresponding methodology that comprises two phases, it became possible to map the connection between AI's presence in the production process and certain audience behaviors.

The anticipated outcomes imply that the use of AI does not equate to either an innovation of traditional techniques of film production or the complete takeover by the machine of creativity, but rather that it becomes an active agent of the increasing trend toward a distributed and hybrid process of creation, which converges into a certain style depending on how, where and transparently it operates. As the consequences of such a transition in terms of practical, legal, and cultural implications keep unfolding in the film industry, the constant academic attention to both sides of the film circuit — production and reception combined — will be crucial for comprehending not only the potential influence of the new technique on cinema but also the type of cinema that the audiences will find credible and valuable to watch.

REFERENCES

1) McLuhan, M. (1964). Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. McGraw-Hill.
2) Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory. Oxford University Press.
3) Manovich, L. (2001). The Language of New Media. MIT Press.
4) Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research (pp. 19-32). Sage.
5) Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with Television: The Violence Profile. Journal of Communication, 26(2), 172-199.
6) Hayles, N. K. (1999). How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics. University of Chicago Press.

7) Bazin, A. (1967). What Is Cinema? University of California Press.
8) Metz, C. (1974). Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema. Oxford University Press.
9) Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2019). Film Art: An Introduction (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
10) Manovich, L. (2013). Software Takes Command. Bloomsbury Academic.
11) Benjamin, W. (2008). The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction (J. A. Underwood, Trans.). Penguin. (Original work published 1935)
12) Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. Screen, 16(3), 6-18.
13) Jenkins, H. (2006). Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide. New York University Press.
14) Manovich, L. (2018). AI Aesthetics. Strelka Press.
15) Elsaesser, T., & Hagener, M. (2015). Film Theory: An Introduction Through the Senses (2nd ed.). Routledge.
16) Floridi, L. (2014). The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere Is Reshaping Human Reality. Oxford University Press.
17) Crawford, K. (2021). Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence. Yale University Press.
18) Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs.
19) Gunkel, D. J. (2012). The Machine Question: Critical Perspectives on AI, Robots, and Ethics. MIT Press.
20) Hayward, S. (2018). Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts (5th ed.). Routledge.
21) Manovich, L. (2020). Cultural Analytics. MIT Press.
22) Casetti, F. (2015). The Lumiere Galaxy: Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come. Columbia University Press.
23) Andrew, D. (1984). Concepts in Film Theory. Oxford University Press.
24) Stam, R. (2000). Film Theory: An Introduction. Blackwell.
25) Prince, S. (2012). Digital Visual Effects in Cinema: The Seduction of Reality. Rutgers University Press.
26) Turkle, S. (2011). Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other. Basic Books.
27) Suchman, L. (2007). Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
28) Latour, B. (1987). Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society. Harvard University Press.
29) Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism. New York University Press.
30) Pasquale, F. (2015). The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information. Harvard University Press.
31) Napoli, P. M. (2019). Social Media and the Public Interest: Media Regulation in the Disinformation Age. Columbia University Press.
32) Gillespie, T. (2018). Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media. Yale University Press.
33) Bucher, T. (2018). If…Then: Algorithmic Power and Politics. Oxford University Press.
34) Striphas, T. (2015). Algorithmic Culture. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18(4-5), 395-412.
35) Cubitt, S. (2004). The Cinema Effect. MIT Press.
36) Rodowick, D. N. (2007). The Virtual Life of Film. Harvard University Press.
37) Shaviro, S. (2010). Post-Cinematic Affect. Zero Books.
38) Denson, S., & Leyda, J. (Eds.). (2016). Post-Cinema: Theorizing 21st-Century Film. REFRAME Books.
39) Galloway, A. R. (2006). Gaming: Essays on Algorithmic Culture. University of Minnesota Press.
40) Bolter, J. D., & Grusin, R. (1999). Remediation: Understanding New Media. MIT Press.

There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 4.0 Intenational (CC BY-NC 4.0) (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.