



The Paradox of Artificial Creativity: Challenges and Opportunities of Generative AI Artistry

Manuel B. Garcia

To cite this article: Manuel B. Garcia (30 May 2024): The Paradox of Artificial Creativity: Challenges and Opportunities of Generative AI Artistry, Creativity Research Journal, DOI: [10.1080/10400419.2024.2354622](https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2024.2354622)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2024.2354622>



Published online: 30 May 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 431




View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



The Paradox of Artificial Creativity: Challenges and Opportunities of Generative AI Artistry

Manuel B. Garcia ^{a,b}

^aUniversity of the Philippines Diliman; ^bFEU Institute of Technology

ABSTRACT

Creativity has long been viewed as the bastion of human expression. With the advent of generative artificial intelligence (AI), there is an emerging notion of artificial creativity that contests traditional perspectives of artistic exploration. This paper explores the complex dynamics of this evolution by examining how generative AI intertwines with and transforms the art world. It presents a comprehensive analysis of the challenges posed by generative AI in art, from questions of authenticity and intellectual property to ethical dilemmas and impacts on conventional art practices. Simultaneously, it investigates the revolutionary opportunities generative AI offers, including the democratization of art creation, the expansion of creative boundaries, and the development of new collaborative and economic models. The paper posits that the integration of generative AI in art is not just a technological advancement but a significant cultural shift, which necessitates a reevaluation of our understanding of art and the artist. It concludes with a forward-looking perspective, advocating for a collaborative approach to harness the potential of this technology in enriching human creativity and ensuring the vibrant evolution of the art world in the era of AI-driven generation.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received December 1, 2023

KEYWORDS

Artificial intelligence; generative AI; chatGPT; artificial creativity; art

Introduction

Creativity has long been revered as a cornerstone of human expression and a hallmark of our uniqueness. For many decades, this abstruse construct has perennially engaged the intellectual curiosity of a diverse range of scholars, artists, and scientific investigators (Hagman, 2009; Schei, 2013; Sica, Kapoor, & Ragozini, 2023). Traditionally viewed as an emblematic human trait, creativity has been celebrated as a testament to our capacity for complex cognition and profound emotional resonance. The exploration of creativity spans philosophical inquiries into its metaphysical roots to scientific investigations into the brain's role in creative processes. This journey has sought to unravel the intricacies of creativity, considering it both a psychological phenomenon (e.g., Shafranskyi, 2020; Zinchenko & Revutska, 2020) and a neurological process (e.g., Fink & Benedek, 2019; Yin, Hu, Li, & Luo, 2022). However, as we venture into the digital age, our understanding of creativity undergoes a significant transformation. The continuous rise of the digital revolution, now with artificial intelligence (AI) at the forefront (Acar, 2023; Grilli & Pedota, 2024), extends beyond simply enhancing artistic capabilities with digital tools. This evolution introduces a transformative chapter in the field of creativity, which redefines our traditional

views and positions computational systems as active collaborators in the creative process. Particularly, generative AI represents a critical juncture that weaves the threads of technology into the very tapestry of creative expression (Magni, Park, & Chao, 2023; Wingström, Hautala, & Lundman, 2022).

The intersection of creativity and AI prompts a recalibration of what creativity fundamentally represents (Runco, 2023). As highlighted by Magni, Park, and Chao (2023), the human role within the creative process is likely to evolve from generating ideas to evaluating them. This transition repositions human artists as critical arbiters of creativity, responsible for assessing and determining the significance of creative outputs. Complementing this shift, the expanding capabilities of generative AI programs (e.g., DALL-E, Midjourney, and Adobe Firefly) in producing artworks that align with human aesthetic sensibilities, emulate the stylistic expressions of revered artists, and create novel artistic genres further prompt a thorough reassessment of the essence of creativity (Blok, 2022; Das & Varshney, 2022). While recent advancements highlight the potential of generative AI in complex creative tasks, debates persist on whether it embodies genuine creativity or merely reassembles existing knowledge in novel

arrangements (Atkinson & Barker, 2023; Browne, 2022; Hong & Curran, 2019). Is creativity still an exclusive human trait, or does the machine's capacity to produce art expand its definition beyond anthropocentric bounds? Consequently, the current era is not simply a period of technological transformation but signifies a renaissance wherein the parameters of creative expression are being expansively redefined. In navigating the contours of this digital age, it is imperative to reconcile the traditional anthropocentric perspective of creativity with the nascent recognition of generative AI as a novel agent within the creative sphere (Rezwana & Maher, 2023; Vinchon et al., 2023). The tectonic shift currently unfolding is redefining creativity as a collaborative venture between human and computational intelligence. This redefinition is challenging long-held precepts and necessitates more studies of creativity in the context of an increasingly digitalized society.

Background of the Study

Generative AI

Generative AI refers to an advanced form of AI that utilizes machine learning (ML) algorithms to generate new content semi-autonomously, ranging from text and images to music and other forms of media (Garcia, 2023a). This subset of AI heralds a transformative era in the domain of creative expression by delineating itself from traditional digital art not merely in methodology but in the fundamental conception of artistic creation. Unlike traditional digital art, which typically utilizes computer technology as an instrument of artistic enhancement and relies heavily on the direct input of the artist, generative AI introduces a level of assisted autonomy. By leveraging ML techniques, it synthesizes and produces artistic outputs from large datasets without the need for continuous human guidance. This development in digital creation posits a significant shift from an artist directly wielding digital tools to craft art to an artist utilizing generative AI as a co-creator (Magni, Park, & Chao, 2023). Consequently, this transition raises profound questions about the nature and ownership of the creative process. The distinction between generative AI artistry and traditional digital art becomes particularly salient when considering the element of "creation without explicit direction." In this new dynamic, the artist assumes a role akin to that of a guide or mentor. This role involves defining the initial parameters or creative boundaries for the generative AI system. These parameters can encompass various elements such as themes, styles, or conceptual frameworks. Once these guidelines are set, the artist

takes a step back, allowing the generative AI to independently create art within the established constraints. This process enables the AI system to explore and generate artistic outputs, potentially leading to the discovery of new aesthetics or styles. These are artistic expressions that might not have been explicitly envisioned or consciously developed by the human collaborator. This paradigm challenges the conventional role of the artist and invites a reevaluation of creativity itself—*can creativity be attributed to an algorithmic process, or is it the sole purview of sentient beings?*

Furthermore, the inclusion of machine creativity in contemporary art discourse has sparked vigorous debate within academic and artistic communities. Various studies have examined the differences in perception and valuation between human-created and AI-generated artwork (Bellaiche et al., 2023; Chiarella et al., 2022). On one hand, generative AI is seen as a democratizing force that broadens the spectrum of who can create art and what is considered art. However, alongside this optimistic view, there are also concerns that it might lead to the dilution of traditional artistic skills and intentions. There are even some arguments that the nature of art as a distinctly human endeavor is undermined by AI, particularly in its capacity as an image generator (Jiang et al., 2023). Amidst these contrasting viewpoints, Haase and Hanel (2023) offered a significant contribution to the discourse. Their research indicates that the ideas produced by generative AI, particularly in broad associative thinking, match the originality of human-generated concepts. This evaluation, conducted by both human and AI raters, suggests that generative AI exhibits a form of creativity akin to human creative capacity. This conclusion is further corroborated by the Torrence tests conducted by Guzik, Byrge, and Gilde (2023). They asserted that the creative abilities of AI, including its capacity to generate original outputs, appear to match human abilities for the first time. Meanwhile, Cropley (2023) assessed verbal divergent thinking abilities using the Divergent Association Task (DAT). Although ChatGPT exceeded the average DAT scores of a human sample, these results are moderated by concerns about unreliability and predictability. This revelation bridges the gap between the two sides of the debate, suggesting that while AI may challenge traditional conceptions of art and creativity, it also possesses the potential to complement human creativity, rather than simply replicating or replacing it. Thus, the conversation around AI in art becomes not just a binary of technology versus human skill but an exploration of how these elements can coexist in the world of creative expression.

Artificial creativity

Central to the dialogue on the evolution of creativity in the digital era is the emergent construct of artificial creativity (Fields, 2023). According to the revised standard definition of creativity (Runco, 2023), the concept now encompasses authenticity and intentionality. This adjustment signifies that for a work to be considered creative, it should be not only novel and practical (as traditionally defined) but also authentic and intentional. Consequently, creativity that lacks these elements of authenticity and intentionality is distinguished from traditional human-centric creative processes and is referred to as “artificial creativity.” This term is also employed to encapsulate the phenomenon of creativity as manifested through the outputs of algorithmic processes and ML systems (Moruzzi, 2020). The capability of these systems to analyze extensive datasets, far exceeding human ability, forms the basis of this phenomenon. By utilizing intricate algorithms, they can create works that can replicate the subtleties of human creativity. Oksanen et al. (2023) noted in a systematic review that experimental studies frequently reveal people’s inability to distinguish between art created by humans and that made by AI. The paradoxical aspect of artificial creativity emerges from the dialectic between its genesis in human-developed systems and the subsequent ability of these systems to independently create works of art devoid of continuous human oversight or direct creative input. Such independence presents a profound challenge to the long-held anthropocentric perspective that views creativity as an innate and unique attribute of human intellect and consciousness (Jiang et al., 2023). Instead, it posits a more expansive view of creativity as a series of processes that can be manifest in both the organic substrates of the human brain and the inorganic circuits of computational devices.

This reconceptualization of creativity raises a myriad of philosophical questions and debates, particularly concerning the nature of creativity itself (Atkinson & Barker, 2023). Can the capacity for creativity be ascribed to artificial entities, and what does this imply about the traditional understanding of human artistic genius? This question challenges the conventional belief that human artists are the sole proprietor of creative genius. Additionally, the introduction of AI in creative processes brings questions of authorship to the forefront. The once-clear distinction between the creator and the creation is becoming increasingly ambiguous. Is the artist the programmer who designed the AI, the artist who used the AI, or the AI itself? This blurring of lines

challenges the conventional understanding of what it means to be a creator and could have significant implications for copyright and intellectual property rights in the art world. The rise of artificial creativity signals a schismatic and potentially revolutionary shift in the hermeneutics of creativity. It necessitates a deep and critical examination of the principles that have long defined the creative arts. This paradigm shift does more than merely add a new chapter to the story of creativity as it rewrites the narrative itself. It challenges scholars, artists, and society to reconceptualize not only the role of the creator but also the fundamental nature of the creative act in an era increasingly shaped by the influence of AI (Zeilinger, 2023). This comprehensive rethinking extends well beyond aesthetics and technique, delving into the economic, ethical, and cultural dimensions of art. It involves broader considerations of the meaning of art, particularly in the context of human and machine collaboration. Consequently, exploring this paradox of artificial creativity becomes essential (Runco, 2023) as it unravels the intricate challenges and opportunities presented by generative AI in this transformative era.

Main focus of this paper

The focus of this paper rests at the intersection of generative AI and the human pursuit of artistic creation through artificial creativity – an evolving domain within the broader spectrum of human creativity. Considering the focus on generative AI and artificial creativity, the examination of artistry is specifically directed toward the act of producing images using AI. The main goal of this paper is to examine the transformative changes that AI introduces to traditional artistic paradigms. Central to the examination are the multifaceted challenges posed by these technologies and the opportunities they offer for artistic exploration, cultural commentary, and economic innovation. In doing so, this paper raises an essential discussion on the use of generative AI in arts and its impact on creativity. Given the rapid advancement and growing prevalence of AI applications in creative fields, this inquiry is not only timely but vital. This paper is significant to artists, technologists, policymakers, and academics by guiding them through the evolving dynamics of generative AI in the arts. It positions itself as a pivotal contribution to the discourse by addressing the current state of AI artistry. Overall, this paper aims to further understand the role and harness the transformative power of generative AI in the creative world.

Challenges

Authenticity and originality

The challenge of preserving authenticity and originality in the advent of AI artistry marks a critical point of contention and analysis (Fenwick & Jurcys, 2023). As generative AI becomes increasingly capable of producing complex artworks (Bellaiche et al., 2023; Oksanen et al., 2023), the art world faces profound questions about the nature of authenticity and originality in these AI creations. For example, consider a generative AI program trained on the styles of various Renaissance painters. When a generative AI program produces a new piece that impeccably mimics the style of Leonardo da Vinci (see Figure 1), the art community must grapple with whether this piece can be considered original or merely a derivative imitation. While technically impressive, this AI-generated artwork lacks the personal touch, intention, and context that typically imbues human-made art with authenticity (Chiarella et al., 2022). These elements, crucial to traditional artistic creation, include the unique experiences, emotions, and perspectives of the artist, as well as conscious decision-making and purpose behind the artwork – aspects that AI, in its current form, cannot replicate. The absence of these human elements often leads to a perceptual bias against AI-generated art, reinforcing the traditional view that authentic artistry is an exclusively human endeavor. This perspective raises a fundamental question: *Can art created by an entity without consciousness hold the same authenticity as that crafted by human hands?* This inquiry investigates the heart of what constitutes “authentic” art and challenges traditional views linking an artwork’s value to the human

creator’s touch and intention – qualities inherently absent in AI-generated art (Vinchon et al., 2023). Furthermore, the issue of originality faces a complex redefinition in the age of generative AI. The algorithms that drive these systems often draw from extensive datasets that include human-generated works, leading to outputs that may echo the styles and nuances of their source material. Facilitating a fair and unbiased evaluation of AI-generated art by recognizing its unique characteristics rather than solely its resemblances to human-created art necessitates scrutiny and potentially the development of new criteria for assessment (Bellaiche et al., 2023; Kalpokas, 2023; Moura, Castrucci, & Hindley, 2023).

The implications of generative AI in art extend to the perceived value and market dynamics of artistic works. As AI-generated art becomes more prevalent, there is a risk of oversaturation in the art market, potentially diminishing the rarity – and thus the value – traditionally ascribed to human-made art. The ease and speed at which AI can produce artwork may lead to a reassessment of what qualities confer value on art, be it the technical skill, the emotional depth, or the conceptual innovation of a piece. This capability of AI to mass-produce artworks at an unprecedented scale poses a critical challenge. It necessitates a delicate balance between embracing technological advances and preserving the essence and appreciation of human creativity. The art community, including artists, gallery owners, and curators, along with technologists, ethicists, and legal experts, are confronted with the task of navigating this evolving landscape. They are responsible for establishing new standards and frameworks that can evaluate and appreciate the emerging forms of cultural



Figure 1. The modern last supper painting by DALL-E.

expression brought forth by this technological revolution. These frameworks must be adaptable, nuanced, and inclusive, recognizing the transformative impact of AI while upholding the values and principles that have long been the foundation of artistic endeavor. In doing so, they will not only address the current state of generative AI in art but also shape its future trajectory, ensuring that the integration of AI into the art world enhances rather than diminishes the rich tapestry of human creativity.

Intellectual property and legal concerns

Regarding the ownership rights of AI-generated works, another challenge that generative AI introduces is a labyrinth of intellectual property and legal concerns. The quandary arises from the difficulty in attributing authorship when the artist is an algorithm. For instance, consider a scenario where an AI application creates a new, original piece of visual art. This situation raises complex questions: *Who is the rightful owner of this artwork?* Traditional copyright laws are predicated on human authorship, which becomes a murky area when dealing with generative AI, as the current legal frameworks were not designed to accommodate the concept of non-human creators. This uncertainty is exemplified by recent decisions from the United States Copyright Office (2023), which has refrained from granting copyright protection to works produced by image generators. This stance underscores the growing legal complexity surrounding AI-generated art. Furthermore, as AI art often incorporates elements learned from existing works, the complexity intensifies when considering derivative works within AI artistry. These AI-generated pieces may draw upon the stylistic elements or actual content of copyrighted materials, leading to debates over whether these outputs constitute new, original works or if they are simply unauthorized derivatives of human artists' copyrighted creations (Fenwick & Jurcys, 2023). The challenge lies in crafting new legal statutes or adapting existing ones to fairly navigate the fine line between inspiration and infringement in the realm of AI-generated art. These conundrums necessitate a rethinking of copyright laws to consider the implications of generative AI in creative processes. Legal scholars, policymakers, and the art community must engage in dialogue to establish a transparent, fair, and enforceable system that protects the rights of human artists while also considering the unique nature of AI-generated art. This evolution of legal frameworks must keep pace with technological advancements to ensure that the expanding field of AI art is developed responsibly and sustainably, respecting the intellectual property rights of all parties involved.

Algorithmic bias and diversity

Algorithmic bias represents a significant challenge in generative AI, with profound implications for diversity and representation in the art it produces. These image generators powered by generative AI can distort group identities and encode biases, often leading to the appropriation and reinforcement of stereotypes (Qadri, Shelby, Bennett, & Denton, 2023; Srinivasan & Uchino, 2021). An illustrative example of this can be seen in an AI application trained predominantly in Western art. When tasked with creating new artworks, this tool is likely to replicate styles, themes, and perspectives that are heavily influenced by Western artistic traditions. This bias inadvertently marginalizes other artistic traditions and viewpoints, particularly those from non-Western cultures, leading to a homogenized, Western-centric output. This scenario underscores how ML models, the foundation upon which generative AI is built, inherently reflect the data they are fed (Akter et al., 2023). When datasets lack diversity or contain historical biases, generative AI perpetuates these issues in its outputs, failing to fully encapsulate the rich tapestry of human experience and expression. Consequently, the pursuit of creating diverse and inclusive art with generative AI encounters the hurdle of ensuring that the underlying algorithms are exposed to a wide array of cultural and artistic inputs. Without this breadth, the creative output of generative AI is at risk of offering a homogenized view, potentially excluding underrepresented groups and perspectives. Ensuring diversity in generative AI-generated art is not only a technical challenge but also a curatorial one, requiring intentional oversight over the selection of training data. Addressing these challenges necessitates a collaborative effort among technologists, artists, sociologists, and cultural critics to guide the development of generative AI-powered systems that are not only technically proficient but also culturally cognizant and inclusive.

Economic effects for artists

As generative AI gains prevalence in various sectors, there's an emerging concern about automation potentially displacing specific job roles (Mannuru et al., 2023). This trend raises an intriguing question: *are artists too at risk of being replaced by these advanced technological systems?* The rise of generative AI has introduced intense market competition as its ability to create art quickly and cost-effectively contrasts sharply with traditional methods. This technological advancement risks saturating the art market, potentially diminishing the value and demand for human-made art. Moreover,

generative AI is carving out new revenue streams, prompting artists to venture into digital art markets and AI-assisted design services. Despite initial hesitations, Jiang et al. (2023) reported that artists are increasingly adopting generative AI to maintain job security. This trend reflects the complex decisions facing artists: adapt to new technologies or risk obsolescence. Beyond the direct market implications, AI also introduces economic challenges related to intellectual property and the potential misuse of artists' styles. Tools that can replicate an artist's unique style without permission not only pose ethical concerns but also have significant economic ramifications. The unauthorized use of an artist's signature style by AI tools can lead to economic losses, particularly if such replication dilutes the uniqueness of the artist's work or results in lost opportunities for commissioned pieces. Moreover, the potential for misrepresentation by AI, which can create works not endorsed by the artist, may have a detrimental impact on an artist's market reputation and, subsequently, their economic standing. These factors underscore the importance of legal and ethical frameworks in the digital art market to protect artists' economic interests in an environment increasingly dominated by AI technology.

Ethical and philosophical implications

Ethics has been a serious concern in the field of AI, and similar issues are encountered by generative AI. A prime example is the potential misuse of AI, which has been observed in various scenarios, such as students engaging in academic misconduct (Birks & Clare, 2023) and employees reducing the value of meaningful work (Bankins & Formosa, 2023). In the context of generative AI, a parallel ethical issue is the creation of artworks and other media forms that are intentionally deceptive or manipulative, intended to distort reality or spread disinformation. Such misuse is exemplified by incidents like the fabricated Pentagon explosion news (Bushard, 2023), where AI-generated imagery was used to create false narratives to potentially stir panic or alter public perception under false pretenses. This challenge raises questions about the integrity and truthfulness of artistic expression when intertwined with advanced technology. Additionally, there is the question of accountability for content produced by generative AI applications. Situations where they inadvertently generate culturally insensitive or offensive artwork place ethical responsibilities on the artists and programmers (Latikka, Bergdahl, Savela, & Oksanen, 2023). Another ethical concern is the transparency and honesty in the presentation of AI-generated art. There is a necessity for clear communication with audiences and consumers

regarding the extent of generative AI's involvement in the creative process. Misrepresenting AI-generated art as purely human-created, or vice versa, can lead to ethical issues around authenticity and honesty in artistic expression.

Not only are there ethical considerations with the use of generative AI in art (Bankins & Formosa, 2023; Piskopani, Chamberlain, & Holter, 2023; Rezwana & Maher, 2023), but the field also grapples with profound philosophical implications (Blok, 2022; Kalpokas, 2023; Zhou, Lee, & Harding, 2024). Central to these philosophical debates is the concept of artificial creativity that fundamentally challenges the traditional perception of creativity as a uniquely human attribute (Fields, 2023; Jiang et al., 2023). This reevaluation extends to existential considerations, prompting introspection about the role and value of human artists in an era where machines are capable of art production. The increasing reliance on generative AI for creative production could lead to concerns about the diminishing need for human artistic skills and the potential loss of unique human perspectives in art. This juxtaposition of generative AI's assistance and the possible eclipse of human creativity forms a complex narrative in the existential discourse of art in the digital age (Moura, Castrucci, & Hindley, 2023). Additionally, the potential overshadowing of human creativity by generative AI ignites a debate on preserving artistic heritage and tradition. As generative AI continues to evolve, it raises concerns about maintaining a connection to traditional art forms and techniques that have been passed down through generations. There is a risk that these valued practices might be lost or deemed less significant in the face of rapidly advancing generative AI capabilities.

Public perception and cultural acceptance

Another complex and multifaceted challenge presented by generative AI involves addressing public perception and cultural acceptance. This issue is deeply rooted in how society perceives the evolving interplay between technology and artistic creativity. A key area of public perception centers on whether AI-generated art is recognized and accepted as legitimate art. Despite the ability of generative AI to autonomously create artworks, current copyright laws do not extend protection to such pieces (Fenwick & Jurcys, 2023; Mikalonytė & Kneer, 2022). This situation reflects a broader hesitation in fully embracing AI-generated art pieces within established artistic and legal frameworks. This lack of legal recognition can influence public opinion, often leading to debates about the value and authenticity of art produced by AI compared to that created by human artists.

Another significant aspect of public perception revolves around the emotional aspect. Public skepticism often arises from the belief that, without human experience and emotion, generative AI cannot imbue artworks with the depth and authenticity typically associated with human-created art (Chatterjee, 2022). This skepticism is not just about technical ability but also about the perceived lack of emotional depth and personal expression in generative AI art. According to Bellaiche et al. (2023), the bias in aesthetic judgment and the tendency of people to prefer human-made art over AI-generated pieces stem less from elements specific to visual art and more from the “human” aspects of art, such as the emotions it evokes.

This aspect of public perception may also affect how generative AI art is received and integrated into the broader cultural narrative. The possibility of AI art reshaping established artistic traditions and practices represents a significant concern. As generative AI becomes more common in art creation, it poses the risk of altering long-standing art forms. This threat can potentially lead to shifts in the cultural dynamics of the art world. For example, in regions with a rich heritage in traditional art, such as Europe with its Renaissance legacy, there might be considerable resistance to AI-created artworks. This resistance often arises from the notion that AI cannot fully capture the cultural, historical, and personal nuances that human artists imbue in their work (Morriss-Kay, 2010). Consequently, the ability of AI to understand and authentically replicate these intricate cultural details remains a topic of debate among academics and a matter of scrutiny in public discourse. Moreover, the cultural acceptance of AI art is also influenced by its perceived impact on the artistic community. In many cultures, the identity and personal story of an artist plays a crucial role in the value attributed to their artwork. AI, lacking a personal narrative or identity, challenges these cultural notions of artistry. This deficiency may potentially lead to questions about the place of AI-generated works in the cultural heritage of a society.

Human-AI collaboration and co-creativity

Within the creative industries, AI often acts as an auxiliary tool for artists to create original works either through collaborative efforts or by generating content based on human guidance (Anantrasirichai & Bull, 2022). The concept of human-AI co-creativity is centered on merging human creative abilities with those of AI within an interactive process focused on a standard task (Karimi, Rezwana, Siddiqui, Maher, & Dehbozorgi, 2020). This method underscores the capacity of AI to

engage with human users, acquire new information, and adapt its functions dynamically – a concept often referred to as “human in the loop.” Interestingly, a survey conducted by Adobe highlighted that many artists from the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Japan are open to incorporating AI as an assistant in their creative processes (Moura, Castrucci, & Hindley, 2023). Contrasting this perspective, Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) argued for a more egalitarian view and suggested that AI and human artists should be seen as partners, with neither merely acting as a tool for the other but rather both contributing equally to the creative endeavor. This vision becomes increasingly plausible considering recent computational experiments demonstrating that generative AI is achieving, and at times even exceeding, human levels of capability (Gilhooly, 2024; Guzik, Byrge, & Gilde, 2023). Nevertheless, incorporating generative AI tools into artistic workflows introduces complexities that necessitate artists adapting their creative processes to the unique capabilities and limitations of generative AI technologies. For instance, artists might traditionally invest considerable time in drafting detailed scenes or characters. With generative AI, this process changes as artists input rough ideas or parameters and the AI generates detailed outputs (e.g., Zhang, Wang, Pangaro, Martelaro, & Byrne, 2023). This integration, central to the concept of co-creativity, requires artists to become adept at utilizing these tools, which can significantly alter traditional creative methods and potentially disrupt established artistic practices (Karimi, Rezwana, Siddiqui, Maher, & Dehbozorgi, 2020).

Achieving a balance between human creative control and AI-assisted generation is a pivotal challenge in this collaborative model. The role of generative AI in enhancing the creative process involves providing fresh avenues for exploration, yet it also presents a delicate balance in determining the extent of its influence. In this context, Wingström, Hautala, and Lundman (2022) noted an intriguing finding in their study. Creative professionals acknowledged the ability of AI to imitate facets of the creative process, particularly in areas like problem-solving and divergent thinking. This imitation, however, does not fully encapsulate the entire spectrum of human creativity. Many creative professionals hold reservations about embracing AI due to its absence of inherently human attributes. This skepticism is rooted in the belief that some aspects of creativity, like emotional intelligence, contextual awareness, and intuitive understanding, are uniquely human and cannot be authentically replicated by AI. Therefore, artists engaging in this co-creative process must judiciously manage their input to ensure that the final artwork aligns with

their vision while also capitalizing on the generative AI's innovative capabilities. The dynamics of human-AI co-creativity likewise raise discussions about the nature of this creative partnership. The synergy between human intuition and machine intelligence can give rise to unique artistic creations that neither could accomplish alone. This collaboration, however, hinges on a comprehensive understanding of generative AI's methodologies and outputs, coupled with a readiness to interact with the technology as an equal partner in the creative process. As the relationship between artists and AI continues to develop and evolve, the importance of establishing best practices and frameworks to support this form of co-creativity becomes clear. Such guidelines are crucial for facilitating effective and equitable collaboration, ensuring that contributions from both humans and machines are recognized and valued and that the integrity of the artistic vision is upheld in this new era of co-creative artistry.

Technical limitations and dependability

While groundbreaking, the rapidly evolving domain of generative AI artistry likewise confronts several technical limitations and dependability issues. One significant limitation is the creation of complex narrative art forms, like graphic novels or detailed paintings with a storytelling element. Generative AI applications may efficiently generate individual scenes or characters but may struggle to integrate these elements into a cohesive and comprehensive narrative. The result may be visually impressive yet lacking in the narrative unity and emotional depth intrinsic to human-crafted storytelling. This gap in narrative cohesiveness is a significant challenge, as the essence of many art forms depends on their ability to convey stories and evoke emotional responses. Another aspect where generative AI faces limitations is its dependency on the underlying algorithms and the quality of training data (Akter et al., 2023; Garcia, 2023b). This limitation can lead to variability in artistic quality, which can sometimes be unpredictable or not align with the artist's original vision. When artists have abstract, nuanced, or highly specific concepts in mind, conveying these ideas to a generative AI tool in a way that it comprehends and accurately replicates can be challenging. The abstract nature of concepts like emotions, deep symbolism, or specific stylistic nuances might not be easily translatable into the parameters that generative AI systems understand. Such unpredictability raises concerns about their reliability in consistently producing high-quality art. Given the stochastic nature of algorithms used by generative AI applications, each generation attempt might yield different results.

This variability means that an artist might never get the exact representation of their envisioned artwork.

Opportunities

Expansion of creative boundaries

By its very nature, generative AI creates an opportunity for artists to venture beyond traditional confines, fostering a milieu where new forms and aesthetics are not just imagined but brought vividly to life (Chatterjee, 2022; Messer, 2024; Zhou, Lee, & Harding, 2024). Its capacity to process and reinterpret vast datasets allows artists to experiment with complex patterns, textures, and forms that might be challenging or even impossible to achieve through conventional means (Oksanen et al., 2023). This capability leads to the creation of artworks that can transcend the limitations of human execution, offering a new dimension of artificial creativity that is both novel and intriguing. For instance, an artist might use AI to generate hyper-realistic landscapes that blend elements of the natural world with fantastical imaginings (see Figure 2). The outcome is a fusion of human vision with machine capability, resulting in artworks that push the envelope of what is traditionally conceived as possible. The expansion of creative boundaries through AI is not just a matter of producing new kinds of artwork; it represents a fundamental shift in the way art is conceived and created (Cetinic & She, 2022; Then, Soewandi, Danial, Achmad, & Sutoyo, 2023). By harnessing generative AI, artists are not only exploring uncharted territories of artificial creativity but are also laying the groundwork for the evolution of art in the digital age. It also offers valuable inspiration to human designers, which can lead to the discovery of fresh design ideas that might previously have been missed (Atkinson & Barker, 2023). This fusion of technology and artificial creativity promises to continually expand the horizons of artistic expression (Runco, 2023).

Democratization of art creation

The capacity of AI-powered tools like DALL-E 2, Midjourney, and Adobe Firefly to generate high-quality images with minimal human input has sparked debates about the fate of human creativity and imagination (Atkinson & Barker, 2023; Browne, 2022; Hong & Curran, 2019). Nevertheless, these tools undeniably provide unprecedented opportunities for individuals without formal artistic training to delve into art creation. As described by Newton and Dhole (2023), the concept of art democratization implies that virtually anyone, including individuals with physical limitations or



Figure 2. Enchanted twilight: a journey through a mystical realm by DALL-E.

neurological conditions affecting their motor skills, can engage in creating art. The digital graphic design example further illustrates this democratization, where AI-powered software allows users to generate various design options from simple concepts or themes. For instance, a small business owner without any background in design could use such a tool to create a unique logo. The tool could generate several logo options based on the business type, preferred color scheme, and style, which the owner can then refine and customize. Such an approach significantly reduces the barriers to creating professional-quality designs, thus democratizing quality design for a broader range of people. This example resonates with the perspective that celebrates logography as a transformative force in democratizing the process of image creation (Chesher & Albarrán-Torres, 2023). By lowering barriers to entry and fostering inclusivity, AI is not only transforming the way art is created but also who can create it. This shift toward a more inclusive and democratized creative process promises to enrich the cultural fabric with a multitude of new perspectives and artistic voices (Haase & Hanel, 2023).

New markets and economic models for art

While some authors predict a decrease in the economic earning power of many traditional artists (e.g., Jiang et al., 2023), there simultaneously exist opportunities for others to achieve earnings. The integration of generative AI into the art world is revolutionizing not only artistic practices but also the economic structures of art. This shift is characterized by the growing number of digital marketplaces

and opportunities for the buying, selling, and experiencing of AI-generated artworks. For instance, *Adobe Stock* has opened its platform to content created with generative AI tools, provided they meet legal compliance and commercial viability criteria. Similarly, *Fiverr* has made strides in embracing generative AI by allowing its freelancers to offer AI-enhanced art services through their online marketplace. Unlike traditional galleries or art shows, these digital platforms are accessible to anyone with internet access, which can dramatically increase the reach and potential customer base for artists. In terms of economic models, the use of blockchain technology and non-fungible tokens (NFTs) for selling digital art is now expanding to encompass AI-generated art. *OpenSea*, a web3 marketplace for NFTs and crypto collectibles, serves as a prime example of a platform where AI-generated art is both commercialized and collected. One of the significant advantages of NFTs is the opportunity for people to earn royalties. Artists can set a percentage of sales to receive as royalties for any future transaction of their artwork on the secondary market. This process means that every time their AI-generated artwork is resold on digital marketplaces, the artists continue to earn a portion of the sales. Lastly, although generative AI poses a risk of saturating the art market, potentially diminishing the value of human-made art, it is also essential to consider a possible counter-effect. The proliferation of AI-generated art could lead to a saturation that diminishes its value, subsequently increasing the appreciation and demand for human creativity. This scenario reflects the basic principles of supply and demand, where the uniqueness and emotional depth of human-created art may become more valued as AI art becomes more common.

Art preservation and restoration

Generative AI is becoming increasingly valuable in the art world, not just for the creation of new artworks but also for the preservation and restoration of historical art pieces. Its analytical and generative capabilities offer innovative approaches to conserving art, which ensures that cultural and historical treasures can be maintained for future generations. For instance, one of the most notable opportunities provided by generative AI is its capacity to analyze and predict the deterioration of art materials. Using AI algorithms, conservators can process vast amounts of data regarding factors like light exposure, humidity, temperature, and chemical composition (Ramsay & Jacobs, 2012). By predicting how these factors may cause wear over time, AI can guide preservationists in creating optimal conditions for storing and displaying historical pieces. This approach effectively prolongs the longevity of these valuable works. Another opportunity brought by generative AI is art restoration, where damaged or partially lost artworks are refurbished to their former glory. Such an application of generative AI is unsurprising given the existence of various ML algorithms (e.g., deep neural networks; Gupta, Sambyal, Sharma, & Kumar, 2021) designed for the virtual restoration of digitized artworks. One notable example is the restoration of Rembrandt's *"The Night Watch"* where AI was employed to reconstruct missing sections of the painting (Criddle, 2021). Intelligently, the AI examined the artist's brushstrokes and colors from undamaged parts of the painting and utilized this information to accurately recreate the lost sections. This technique not only offered insights into the painting's original appearance but also highlighted a revolutionary merging of technological innovation and classic artistry.

Global artistic exchange

As Joshi (1976) insightfully noted, "*A nation's artistic achievements are not mere national possessions; they are international wealth for the joy and employ of the whole world.*" This perspective aligns perfectly with the current trend of global artistic exchange that can be facilitated by generative AI. By transcending traditional geographical and cultural barriers, generative AI can revolutionize how artists worldwide interact and collaborate. Such an application of this technology can enable a seamless and dynamic interaction between artists from diverse backgrounds, which can then lead to a rich cross-pollination of ideas, styles, and artistic traditions. Richardson (2016) emphasized that this process of cooperation is crucial to

knowledge production in cultural and artistic work. Consequently, using generative AI to strengthen this synergy allows for the fusion of diverse artistic perspectives. For instance, an artist in Japan can collaborate with another artist in Brazil to combine traditional Japanese aesthetics with Brazilian street art styles. Generative AI can assist in merging these distinct artistic elements to create a cohesive piece that resonates with both cultures. Figure 3 presents a vivid example of this cross-cultural artistic fusion. In this image, the delicate balance and harmony characteristic of traditional Japanese art are seamlessly blended with the vibrant, energetic motifs typical of Brazilian street art. The result is a visually stunning piece that captures the essence of both cultures. By supplying two distinct artworks from different cultural backgrounds into generative AI, it skillfully combined aspects from each style. This integration ensured that the resulting artwork was not only visually appealing but also paid homage to and accurately represented each culture.

Enhanced artistic production

Inspiration is the lifeblood of artistic production, as it is the catalyst that ignites the creative spark within artists. It is the starting point for imaginative exploration, guiding artists toward novel ideas and unique expressions. Likewise, Oleynick, Thrash, LeFev, Moldovan, and Kieffaber (2014) emphasized the importance of inspiration in the creative process by highlighting its role in fostering insight and imaginative thought. With generative AI, artists are finding new wellsprings of inspiration. These tools can suggest unique combinations of styles, themes, and techniques, which consequently broaden the artist's imaginative landscape. For instance, artists can prompt: "*Combine Art Nouveau elements with futuristic cyberpunk aesthetics*" to generate visuals that merge the fluid, organic lines of a historical art movement with the edgy, digital feel of a modern genre. As a result, artists can explore innovative, hybrid art forms that might not have been conceivable without the aid of AI. In the same vein, generative AI can significantly contribute to improving artistic efficiency. It streamlines various aspects of art production, from rapid prototyping of ideas to automating time-consuming tasks. This efficiency allows artists to focus more on the creative aspects of their projects. By minimizing the time and effort spent on technical aspects, generative AI assists in speeding up the transformation of initial concepts into finished artworks.



Figure 3. A fusion of Japanese elegance and Brazilian vibrancy in urban street art by DALL-E.

AI art therapy and healing

Art therapy is a type of psychotherapy that is recognized for its effectiveness in aiding individuals dealing with a range of mental challenges. Considering the rapid advancements in AI technologies, Du et al. (2024) asserted that integrating AI techniques represents a promising way to expand the expressive qualities of digital art-making systems. Unlike typical digital art therapy (Zubala, Kennell, & Hackett, 2021), generative AI's capacity to create personalized and responsive therapeutic experiences offers new avenues for emotional expression and psychological healing. Termed "AI art therapy," this practice involves a collaboration with AI to produce art with a therapeutic purpose. It begins with an idea, an emotion, or a simple phrase and evolves into an artistic journey guided by AI. In therapeutic settings, AI can be employed to facilitate self-expression in individuals who may find traditional means challenging (Fox, 2016). For instance, AI can be programmed to respond to non-verbal cues to assist those with verbal communication difficulties to express themselves artistically. Imagine a system where a person's touch or voice tone alters the visual elements of a digital artwork in real-time. This interaction provides a unique and responsive outlet for emotional expression, which enables individuals to externalize feelings that might be difficult to articulate verbally. Another example is an AI system that could analyze an individual's emotional state through biofeedback and suggest specific art-making activities that are likely to be most beneficial for their current emotional needs. This personalized approach can enhance the effectiveness of art therapy

sessions by making them more engaging and relevant to the person receiving therapy (Shukla, Choudhari, Gaidhane, & Quazi Syed, 2022). As these technologies are not yet widely available, future research and development in this area could offer novel possibilities for enhancing therapeutic experiences through the intersection of AI and art therapy.

Art education and creativity assessment

AI has become increasingly prevalent in the field of education. Its integration into educational systems is driven by its ability to personalize learning experiences, provide instant feedback, and analyze student performance with remarkable accuracy (Garcia et al., 2024; Tavares et al., 2023). With generative AI, this technology is also making inroads into art education. Researchers such as Kong (2020) and Li, Zhang, and Bhardwaj (2022) have investigated the application of AI in art teaching and found significant potential. This technology aids in demonstrating artistic techniques, providing creative inspiration, and even critiquing art. An example of generative AI's application in art education can be seen in virtual art classrooms. In these environments, a generative AI tool can act as an interactive assistant that helps students experiment with different art styles or techniques. The tool can suggest color palettes, guide composition, and simulate various painting styles, which allows students to experiment virtually. Imagine a virtual learning environment where students can select a historical art movement and the AI generates a virtual gallery of that style

accompanied by interactive lessons on its essential characteristics and techniques. Art students can then create their artworks within the virtual environment and apply these methodologies with the generative AI offering suggestions and historical context. It can also provide real-time feedback on their work and suggest improvements and alternative methods. Lastly, the adoption of AI technologies in creativity assessment is also gaining momentum. Computational methods for evaluating creativity have existed for more than five decades, yet the recent advancements in AI have significantly enhanced these methods. For instance, convolutional neural networks are now being used for evaluating the Test of Creative Thinking-Drawing Production (e.g., Cropley & Marrone, 2022). Given the success of recent applications and experiments, Acar (2023) concluded that AI not only holds promise for transforming creativity assessment methods but has already made significant strides in this area.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the exploration of generative AI in artistry presents a complex landscape filled with both challenges and opportunities that are shaping the field in significant ways. The multifaceted challenges range from concerns over authenticity and originality to intellectual property complexities, and from ethical dilemmas to impacts on traditional artists and art education. These challenges highlight the need for a nuanced and collaborative approach to generative AI's integration in art, aiming to enhance, not undermine, human creativity's value. Conversely, the opportunities generative AI offers are revolutionary, from broadening creative boundaries and democratizing art creation to fostering enriched collaborations and emerging new economic models. Generative AI's potential in art therapy, educational transformation, and global artistic exchange underscores its expansive impact. As we stand at this juncture, it is evident that the integration of generative AI into art is not merely a technological trend but a significant cultural shift. The art world must navigate these changes with an eye toward preserving the integrity and soul of artistic expression while embracing the new possibilities that generative AI brings. The future of artistry in the age of generative AI, therefore, is one of co-evolution and synergy. As artists, technologists, educators, and policymakers collaboratively navigate this new terrain, the focus should be on harnessing AI's potential to enrich human creativity, broaden participation in the arts, and enhance the cultural and economic value of art in society. In doing so, we can ensure that the art world

continues to thrive and evolve, reflecting the diverse nature of human imagination, now augmented by the remarkable capabilities of generative AI.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Manuel B. Garcia  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2615-422X>

References

- Acar, S. (2023). Creativity assessment, research, and practice in the age of artificial intelligence. *Creativity Research Journal*, 1–7. doi:10.1080/10400419.2023.2271749
- Akter, S., Sultana, S., Mariani, M., Wamba, S. F., Spanaki, K., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Advancing algorithmic bias management capabilities in AI-Driven marketing analytics research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 114, 243–261. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2023.08.013
- Anantrasirichai, N., & Bull, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: A review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(1), 589–656. doi:10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7
- Atkinson, D. P., & Barker, D. R. (2023). AI and the social construction of creativity. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 29(4), 1054–1069. doi:10.1177/13548565231187730
- Bankins, S., & Formosa, P. (2023). The ethical implications of artificial intelligence (AI) for meaningful work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 185(4), 725–740. doi:10.1007/s10551-023-05339-7
- Bellaiche, L., Shahi, R., Turpin, M. H., Ragnhildstveit, A., Sprockett, S., Barr, N. . . . Seli, P. (2023). Humans versus AI: Whether and why we prefer human-created compared to AI-Created artwork. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 8(1), 1–22. doi:10.1186/s41235-023-00499-6
- Birks, D., & Clare, J. (2023). Linking artificial intelligence facilitated academic misconduct to existing prevention frameworks. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1–6. doi:10.1007/s40979-023-00142-3
- Blok, V. (2022). The role of human creativity in human-technology relations. *Philosophy & Technology*, 35(3), 1–19. doi:10.1007/s13347-022-00559-7
- Browne, K. (2022). Who (or what) is an AI Artist? *Leonardo*, 55(2), 130–134. doi:10.1162/leon_a_02092
- Bushard, B. (2023). *Fake image of explosion near pentagon went viral—even though it never happened*. Forbes. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brianbushard/2023/05/22/fake-image-of-explosion-near-pentagon-went-viral-even-though-it-never-happened/>
- Cetinic, E., & She, J. (2022). Understanding and creating art with AI: Review and outlook. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications*, 18(2), 1–22. doi:10.1145/3475799
- Chatterjee, A. (2022). Art in an age of artificial intelligence [conceptual analysis]. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1024449

- Chesher, C., & Albarrán-Torres, C. (2023). The emergence of autography: The 'magical' invocation of images from text through AI. *Media International Australia*, 189(1), 57–73. doi:10.1177/1329878X231193252
- Chiarella, S. G., Torromino, G., Gagliardi, D. M., Rossi, D., Babiloni, F., & Cartocci, G. (2022). Investigating the negative bias towards artificial intelligence: Effects of prior assignment of AI-Authorship on the aesthetic appreciation of abstract paintings. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 137, 1–12. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2022.107406
- Criddle, C. (2021). *Rembrandt's the night watch painting restored by AI*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-57588270>
- Cropley, D. (2023). Is artificial intelligence more creative than humans? ChatGPT and the divergent association task. *Learning Letters*, 2, 1–8. doi:10.59453/ll.v2.13
- Cropley, D. H., & Marrone, R. L. (2022). Automated scoring of figural creativity using a convolutional neural network. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*. doi:10.1037/aca0000510
- Das, P., & Varshney, L. R. (2022). Explaining artificial intelligence generation and creativity: Human interpretability for novel ideas and artifacts. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 39(4), 85–95. doi:10.1109/MSP.2022.3141365
- Du, X., An, P., Leung, J., Li, A., Chapman, L. E., & Zhao, J. (2024). Deepthink: Designing and probing human-AI Co-creation in digital art therapy. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 181, 1–17. doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2023.103139
- Fenwick, M., & Jurcys, P. (2023). Originality and the future of copyright in an age of generative AI. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 51, 1–12. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105892
- Fields, Z. (2023). Human and artificial creativity. In Z. Fields (Ed.), *Multidisciplinary approaches in AI, creativity, innovation, and green collaboration* (pp. 1–18). IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-6684-6366-6.ch001
- Fink, A., & Benedek, M. (2019). The neuroscience of creativity. *Neuroforum*, 25(4), 231–240. doi:10.1515/nf-2019-0006
- Fox, S. (2016). Domesticating artificial intelligence: Expanding human self-expression through applications of artificial intelligence in prosumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 18(1), 169–183. doi:10.1177/1469540516659126
- Garcia, M. B. (2023a). ChatGPT as a virtual dietitian: Exploring its potential as a tool for improving nutrition knowledge. *Applied System Innovation*, 6(5), 1–18. doi:10.3390/asi6050096
- Garcia, M. B. (2023b). Using AI tools in writing peer review reports: Should academic journals embrace the use of ChatGPT? *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, 52(2), 139–140. doi:10.1007/s10439-023-03299-7
- Garcia, M. B., Arif, Y. M., Khlaif, Z. N., Zhu, M., de Almeida, R. P. P., de Almeida, R. S., & Masters, K. (2024). In *Effective integration of artificial intelligence in medical education: Practical tips and actionable insights*. In transformative approaches to patient literacy and healthcare innovation (pp. 1–19). IGI Global. doi:10.4018/979-8-3693-3661-8.ch001
- Gilhooly, K. (2024). AI vs humans in the AUT: Simulations to LLMs. *Journal of Creativity*, 34(1), 1–5. doi:10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100071
- Grilli, L., & Pedota, M. (2024). Creativity and artificial intelligence: A multilevel perspective. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. doi:10.1111/caim.12580
- Gupta, V., Sambyal, N., Sharma, A., & Kumar, P. (2021). Restoration of artwork using deep neural networks. *Evolving Systems*, 12(2), 439–446. doi:10.1007/s12530-019-09303-7
- Guzik, E. E., Byrge, C., & Gilde, C. (2023). The originality of machines: AI takes the Torrance Test. *Journal of Creativity*, 33(3), 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100065
- Haase, J., & Hanel, P. H. P. (2023). Artificial muses: Generative artificial intelligence chatbots have risen to human-level creativity. *Journal of Creativity*, 33(3), 1–7. doi:10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100066
- Hagman, G. (2009). Art and self. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1159(1), 164–173. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2008.04344.x
- Hong, J.-W., & Curran, N. M. (2019). Artificial intelligence, artists, and art: Attitudes toward artwork produced by humans vs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 15(2), 1–16. doi:10.1145/3326337
- Jiang, H. H., Brown, L., Cheng, J., Khan, M., Gupta, A. . . . Gebru, T. (2023). AI art and its impact on artists. *Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 363–374. doi:10.1145/3600211.3604681
- Joshi, J. H. (1976). International exchange in the arts. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 424(1), 78–84. doi:10.1177/000271627642400109
- Kalpokas, I. (2023). Work of art in the age of its ai reproduction. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 1–19. doi:10.1177/01914537231184490
- Karimi, P., Rezwana, J., Siddiqui, S., Maher, M. L., & Dehbozorgi, N. (2020). Creative sketching partner: An analysis of human-AI Co-creativity. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces* (pp. 221–230). doi:10.1145/3377325.3377522
- Kong, F. (2020). Application of artificial intelligence in modern art teaching. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (ijET)*, 15(13), 238–251. doi:10.3991/ijet.v15i13.15351
- Latikka, R., Bergdahl, J., Savela, N., & Oksanen, A. (2023). AI as an artist? a two-wave survey study on attitudes toward using artificial intelligence in art. *Poetics*, 101, 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2023.101839
- Li, J., Zhang, B., & Bhardwaj, A. (2022). The application of artificial intelligence technology in art teaching taking architectural painting as an example. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2022, 1–10. doi:10.1155/2022/8803957
- Magni, F., Park, J., & Chao, M. M. (2023). Humans as creativity gatekeepers: Are we biased against AI creativity? *Journal of Business and Psychology*. doi:10.1007/s10869-023-09910-x
- Mannuru, N. R., Shahriar, S., Teel, Z. A., Wang, T., Lund, B. D. . . . Vaidya, P. (2023). In *Artificial intelligence in developing countries: The impact of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies for development*. Information Development. doi:10.1177/02666669231200628
- Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019). Art, creativity, and the potential of artificial intelligence. *Arts*, 8(1), 1–9. doi:10.3390/arts8010026

- Messer, U. (2024). Co-creating art with generative artificial intelligence: Implications for artworks and artists. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 2(1), 1–19. doi:10.1016/j.chbah.2024.100056
- Mikalonytė, E. S., & Kneer, M. (2022). Can artificial intelligence make art?: Folk intuitions as to whether AI-Driven robots can be viewed as artists and produce art. *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, 11(4), 1–19. doi:10.1145/3530875
- Morriss-Kay, G. M. (2010). The evolution of human artistic creativity. *Journal of Anatomy*, 216(2), 158–176. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7580.2009.01160.x
- Moruzzi, C. (2020). Artificial creativity and general intelligence. *Journal of Science and Technology of the Arts*, 12(3), 84–99. doi:10.34632/jsta.2020.9481
- Moura, F. T., Castrucci, C., & Hindley, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence creates art? An experimental investigation of value and creativity perceptions. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*. doi:10.1002/jocb.600
- Newton, A., & Dhole, K. (2023). Is AI art another industrial revolution in the making? *arXiv Preprint arXiv: 150302531 2*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2301.05133
- Oksanen, A., Cvetkovic, A., Akin, N., Latikka, R., Bergdahl, J., Chen, Y., & Savela, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence in fine arts: A systematic review of empirical research. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 1(2), 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100004
- Oleynick, V. C., Thrash, T. M., LeFevre, M. C., Moldovan, E. G., & Kieffaber, P. D. (2014). The scientific study of inspiration in the creative process: Challenges and opportunities [hypothesis and theory]. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8, 1–8. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00436
- Piskopani, A. M., Chamberlain, A., & Holter, C. T. (2023). Responsible AI and the arts: The ethical and legal implications of AI in the arts and creative industries. *Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Trustworthy Autonomous Systems*. doi:10.1145/3597512.3597528
- Qadri, R., Shelby, R., Bennett, C. L., & Denton, E. (2023). AI's regimes of representation: A community-centered study of text-to-image models in South Asia. *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 506–517. doi:10.1145/3593013.3594016
- Ramsay, B. A., & Jacobs, J. K. (2012). Art conservation and restoration. *Fine Art and High Finance*, 263–286. doi:10.1002/9781119204688.ch11
- Rezwana, J., & Maher, M. L. (2023). User perspectives on ethical challenges in human-AI Co-creativity: A design fiction study. *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition* (pp. 62–74). doi:10.1145/3591196.3593364
- Richardson, L. (2016). Sharing knowledge: Performing Co-production in collaborative artistic work. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 48(11), 2256–2271. doi:10.1177/0308518X16653963
- Runco, M. A. (2023). Updating the standard definition of creativity to account for the artificial creativity of AI. *Creativity Research Journal*, 1–5. doi:10.1080/10400419.2023.2257977
- Schei, V. (2013). Creative people create values: Creativity and positive arousal in negotiations. *Creativity Research Journal*, 25(4), 408–417. doi:10.1080/10400419.2013.843336
- Shafrenskyi, V. (2020). Creativity as a psychological phenomenon and its conceptual reinterpretation. *Psihologija i suspil'stvo*, 2(80), 89–97. doi:10.35774/pis2020.02.089
- Shukla, A., Choudhari, S. G., Gaidhane, A. M., & Quazi Syed, Z. (2022). Role of art therapy in the promotion of mental health: A critical review. *Cureus*, 14(8), e28026. doi:10.7759/cureus.28026
- Sica, L. S., Kapoor, H., & Ragozini, G. (2023). Grasping creative valences: A person-centered study on creativity as a resource for young people's optimal identity formation. *Identity*, 23(2), 155–169. doi:10.1080/15283488.2022.2050727
- Srinivasan, R., & Uchino, K. (2021). Biases in generative art: A causal look from the lens of art history. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 41–51). doi:10.1145/3442188.3445869
- Tavares, D., Lopes, A. I., Castro, C., Maia, G., Leite, L., & Quintas, M. (2023). The intersection of artificial intelligence, telemedicine, and neurophysiology: Opportunities and challenges. In M. B. Garcia, M. V. López-Cabrera, & R. P. P. de Almeida (Eds.), *Instructional technologies in health education and allied disciplines*. IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-6684-7164-7.ch006
- Then, C., Soewandi, E. J., Danial, M. F., Achmad, S., & Sutoyo, R. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on art - a systematic literature review. *2023 IEEE 9th Information Technology International Seminar (ITIS)* (pp. 1–7). doi:10.1109/ITIS59651.2023.10420208
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). *Re: Zarya of the Dawn (registration # VAu001480196)*. Retrieved from <https://www.copyright.gov/docs/zarya-of-the-dawn.pdf>
- Vinchon, F., Lubart, T., Bartolotta, S., Gironnay, V., Botella, M., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S. ... Gaggioli, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence & creativity: A manifesto for collaboration. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 57(4), 472–484. doi:10.1002/jocb.597
- Wingström, R., Hautala, J., & Lundman, R. (2022). Redefining creativity in the era of AI? Perspectives of computer scientists and new media artists. *Creativity Research Journal*, 36(2), 1–17. doi:10.1080/10400419.2022.2107850
- Yin, J.-T., Hu, Y.-Y., Li, Q.-Y., & Luo, J.-L. (2022). Human creativity escapes in the struggle against threat: Evidence from neural mechanisms. *Biological Psychology*, 172, 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2022.108359
- Zeilinger, M. (2023). The politics of visual indeterminacy in abstract AI art. *Leonardo*, 56(1), 76–80. doi:10.1162/leon_a_02291
- Zhang, C., Wang, W., Pangaro, P., Martelaro, N., & Byrne, D. (2023). Generative image AI using design sketches as input: Opportunities and challenges. *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition* (pp. 254–261). doi:10.1145/3591196.3596820
- Zhou, E., Lee, D., & Harding, M. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Nexus*, 3(3), 1–8. doi:10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae052
- Zinchenko, V., & Revutska, S. (2020). Creativity as a psychological means of pedagogical creativeness. *Humanities Science Current Issues*, 3(4), 190–196. doi:10.24919/2308-4863/34-3-30
- Zubala, A., Kennell, N., & Hackett, S. (2021). Art therapy in the digital world: An integrative review of Current practice and future directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1–20. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.600070