

# Journal of Arts, Music, Design & Creative Industries



## **Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Creative Work: Rethinking Authorship, Originality, and Human Creativity in the Creative Industries**

**Larry Burns**

# Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Creative Work: Rethinking Authorship, Originality, and Human Creativity in the Creative Industries

Larry Burns

*How to cite this article:* Burns, L. (2026). Artificial intelligence and the future of creative work: Rethinking authorship, originality, and human creativity in the creative industries. *Journal of Arts, Music, Design, and Creative Industries*, 1(1), 1–17.

## Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence has moved rapidly from a specialist computational technology to an everyday creative infrastructure capable of producing text, images, music, video, design concepts, and other cultural outputs. Its diffusion across the creative industries has intensified long-standing questions about what creativity is, who may legitimately claim authorship, how originality should be evaluated, and which forms of human skill retain value when machines can generate plausible creative material at scale. This conceptual article critically synthesizes scholarship from creativity research, computational creativity, human–computer interaction, labour studies, intellectual property, design, and cultural production. It argues that generative AI should neither be understood simply as an autonomous creator nor reduced to a neutral instrument. Instead, contemporary creative production is increasingly hybrid: human intention, cultural experience, prompts, models, training data, platform architectures, iterative selection, and post-generation editing interact in producing outputs. Evidence suggests that generative AI can improve productivity, support ideation, lower technical barriers, and raise the assessed quality of some individual outputs, while also creating risks of homogenization, deskilling, weak attribution, labour displacement, and the extraction of value from prior creative work. The article therefore proposes a human-centred model of hybrid creativity in which authorship is linked to meaningful creative control, originality is assessed through situated transformation rather than mere novelty, and the future value of creative labour rests increasingly on judgment, direction, interpretation, contextual knowledge, and accountable human agency.

*Keywords:* generative artificial intelligence, creative industries, authorship, originality, human creativity, creative labour, hybrid creativity

## 1. Introduction

Generative AI has entered the creative industries with remarkable speed. New systems can create images, prose, music, speech, video, animation, and design concepts from natural language instructions and are now integrated into workflows traditionally centred on specialized human expertise. The importance of this change lies not only in faster production but also in a transformation in how creative production is organized. Generative systems now operate in domains historically associated with imagination, expression, taste, interpretation, and cultural meaning. The creative industries therefore provide a crucial context for examining whether AI merely alters creative tools or changes the broader social meaning of creative work itself (Amankwah-Amoah et al., 2024; OECD, 2024).

Contemporary discussion is often framed too narrowly as a contest between human creators and machines. This framing obscures the layered structure of actual creative practice. A designer may generate dozens of visual directions, discard most of them, combine elements from several outputs, redraw selected parts, and integrate the result into a wider brand system. A musician may use an AI model for harmony, timbre, voice transformation, or ideation while remaining responsible for arrangement, performance, editing, sequencing, and release. A writer may use a language model to generate alternatives while retaining decisive control over voice, narrative architecture, factual accuracy, and meaning. In each case, the output emerges through interaction rather than from either a lone person or an independently acting machine (Bomba & De Angeli, 2025; McCormack et al., 2019).

This interaction has revived foundational questions about authorship. Conventional understandings of authorship generally assume a human agent capable of intention, judgment, responsibility, and expressive choice. Generative AI complicates this assumption because the immediate form of an output may be generated by a system whose internal operations are not directly controlled by the user. Recent legal and philosophical scholarship therefore distinguishes between merely initiating generation and exercising sufficiently meaningful control over expression (Kucharzyk et al., 2026; Mazzi, 2024; U.S. Copyright Office, 2025). The more important question is not simply whether a human used AI, but what kind of creative contribution the human made before, during, and after generation.

Originality is equally unsettled. Creativity is commonly understood in relation to both novelty and appropriateness or value, rather than novelty alone (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). Generative models, however, learn statistical relationships from large bodies of previous cultural production and can produce outputs that appear new while remaining dependent on patterns learned from existing material. This creates a difficult distinction between formal novelty, cultural originality, and meaningful transformation. The issue is significant in art, music, design, advertising, publishing, and fashion, where value is derived not only from producing a new arrangement but also from expressing a situated point of view, extending a tradition, or challenging established conventions (Boden, 2004; Hertzmann, 2018).

The labour dimension is also significant. In some writing and ideation tasks, generative AI can reduce the time required for production, and experimental research has reported improvements in productivity and assessed quality under specific conditions (Noy & Zhang, 2023). In creative tasks, AI can also improve individual performance, especially among less experienced or initially less creative participants, although this may be accompanied by greater similarity across outputs (Doshi & Hauser, 2024). These developments raise wider concerns about the commodification of creativity, occupational exposure, bargaining power, and the future value of distinctive expertise (Berg et al., 2025; OECD, 2024).

This article critically examines these tensions through the interconnected themes of authorship, originality, human creativity, and creative labour. It asks four questions: How does generative AI change the organization of creative work? How should authorship be understood when creative activity is distributed between humans and computational systems? How do originality and authenticity change when cultural production is mediated by generative models? Which human qualities become more, rather than less, important in environments where generative AI is increasingly present? The central argument is that neither replacement nor technological neutrality provides an adequate framework. Creative work is becoming increasingly hybrid, with human and

machine contributions interdependent but not equivalent, while interpretation, accountability, cultural positioning, and the assignment of meaning remain crucial human responsibilities.

## **2. Conceptual Approach and Scope**

The article adopts a critical integrative review approach. It brings together peer reviewed literature on creativity studies, computational creativity, human computer interaction, design research, cultural production, labour studies, and intellectual property, alongside recent reports from international institutions concerned with employment and creative rights. The research problem cannot be adequately addressed through a single discipline because authorship is simultaneously aesthetic, legal, social, and economic, while originality functions both as a creativity construct and as a cultural judgment. An integrative approach is therefore appropriate. The analysis consequently emphasizes conceptual convergence and tension rather than attempting a meta analysis of dissimilar outcome measures.

The discussion gives priority to scholarship produced after the widespread diffusion of generative AI, large language models, and text to image systems, while retaining foundational work on creativity and computational art where it remains conceptually important. Recent empirical studies are used to examine broad claims concerning productivity, audience evaluation, design work, and diversity of output. Institutional reports are used selectively to illuminate labour exposure, governance, and copyright developments. The article does not seek to resolve jurisdiction specific copyright doctrine; instead, legal developments are treated as evidence of the broader difficulty of translating human centred conceptions of authorship into hybrid creative processes (Mazzi, 2024; WIPO, 2024).

Creative industries are understood broadly as sectors in which cultural, symbolic, aesthetic, or expressive value plays a central role in production, including visual art, design, music, film, publishing, advertising, fashion, digital media, and related forms of cultural production. These fields differ substantially in business models and professional norms, but they share a dependence on reputation, intellectual contribution, stylistic differentiation, and audience judgments of authenticity. This common ground makes a cross sector conceptual analysis possible while also requiring caution against assuming that all creative occupations are affected by AI in the same way (Berg et al., 2025; OECD, 2024).

## **3. Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Creative Work**

The current generation of creative AI differs from earlier digital tools in its ability to perform a wide range of tasks through a single interface. Earlier software generally required creators to manipulate predefined functions: a designer adjusted layers, a musician edited waveforms, and an animator controlled frames or rigs. Generative systems can instead propose content at the level of the creative object itself. They can draft copy, generate illustrations, reproduce visual styles, create synthetic voices, suggest melodies, produce storyboards, and transform rough sketches into polished graphics. The shift is significant because part of the creative process moves from direct making toward specification, selection, evaluation, and revision (Amankwah-Amoah et al., 2024; Furtado et al., 2024).

This change is visible in design practice. A task oriented framework for generative AI in design shows how generative systems can support combinational, exploratory, and transformational forms of creativity by generating alternatives, rendering sketches, suggesting materials, and assisting with analytical tasks (Furtado et al., 2024). Research with future designers likewise shows

increasing attention not only to the technical capabilities of generative image tools but also to usability, user experience, emotional response, and the quality of resulting design concepts (Casteleiro-Pitrez, 2024). These findings suggest that adoption depends on more than the ability of AI to produce attractive graphics; it also depends on whether AI can be integrated meaningfully into professional design processes. Experimental work in fashion design similarly treats AI as a collaborator whose usefulness depends on how it is embedded within a human led design process (Rizzi & Bertola, 2025).

Recent experimental evidence complicates the assumption that greater automation automatically improves expert work. Studies of design tasks indicate that generative AI can reduce fixation during ideation, yet efficiency gains during implementation vary according to expertise, with some experienced designers obtaining fewer benefits or encountering new forms of friction (Hou et al., 2025). This point is important for creative organizations because the usefulness of AI is both task dependent and expertise dependent. A tool that helps beginners by generating options may constrain experts if it redirects their attention toward model generated possibilities or adds additional evaluation work.

Qualitative research in fashion and textile design similarly identifies both practical value and substantial barriers. Generative tools can accelerate visual exploration and support the development of textile concepts, yet professionals remain concerned about controllability, material realism, production feasibility, and alignment with the designer's intentions (Wu & Li, 2025b). Comparable issues arise in architecture, advertising, illustration, and product design. Creative work is not limited to making a concept appear plausible; it also requires knowledge of constraints, audiences, materials, contexts, and consequences. Professional value often resides in knowing which outputs are usable and why. Reviews of computational creativity in fashion likewise emphasize that technical generative capacity does not remove the designer's role in evaluation, contextual fit, and creative direction (Wu & Li, 2025a).

Generative AI is also changing the economics of iteration. Traditionally, producing alternatives in many creative settings required considerable time, labour, or specialist expertise. AI lowers the marginal cost of variation, allowing creators and clients to generate dozens or even hundreds of options rapidly. This abundance expands experimentation, but it can also create a new challenge: attention. As generation becomes cheaper, selection becomes more important. The creator's role increasingly involves defining the problem, directing the system, recognizing quality, filtering generic outputs, identifying ethical or factual weaknesses, and assembling a coherent final product. Creative judgment may therefore become more valuable even as some forms of execution become easier.

The transformation is best understood as a reallocation of creative tasks. In professional writing, Noy and Zhang (2023) found that generative AI reduced completion time and increased assessed quality, with larger gains among participants who initially performed less well. Although such tasks are not identical to art or design, the underlying mechanism is relevant: AI can move human effort away from first draft production and toward ideation, evaluation, and editing. In the creative industries, this reallocation may be productive when it allows creators to focus on higher order decisions, but it may also reduce opportunities to develop foundational skills if early stage creative work is delegated before expertise has been established.

Labour market assessments reflect the scale of this transition. The International Labour Organization identifies substantial exposure in media and cultural occupations, especially roles

involving text, translation, visual content, and other digitally mediated tasks, while performance and physically embodied creative work remain less directly automatable (Berg et al., 2025). OECD analysis similarly suggests that cultural and creative occupations may experience significant task exposure to generative AI, although exposure should not be treated as equivalent to job replacement (OECD, 2024). A more immediate concern is how job content, rates, career entry pathways, and control over creative decisions will change.

#### **4. Rethinking Authorship in the Age of Generative AI**

Authorship has never been a purely individual activity. Films, recordings, games, fashion collections, advertisements, and architectural works commonly involve teams, institutions, editors, producers, technicians, and clients. Nevertheless, conventional authorship still assumes that relevant contributors are human agents who can form intentions, understand norms, accept responsibility, and explain their choices. Generative AI introduces a system that can produce expressive detail without possessing human experience or accountability. The central challenge is therefore not simply the number of contributors but the asymmetry between different kinds of contribution (McCormack et al., 2019).

One response is to maintain a clear distinction between human authors and computational tools. Hertzmann (2018) argues that art is embedded in social practices of attribution and interpretation, making authorship more than the mechanical production of an artifact. This perspective remains powerful because artistic authorship ordinarily implies a relationship between a work and a socially situated agent. The generation of visible or audible material does not automatically give software a claim comparable to that of a person who develops a purpose, chooses a context, responds to criticism, and assumes responsibility for publication.

However, describing generative AI as merely a neutral tool is also inadequate. Recent empirical and conceptual research increasingly treats AI assisted works as distributed problems of authorship and ownership because such works can reflect contributions from users, systems, developers, and previous cultural materials (Chen & He, 2026; Singh, 2026). A paintbrush does not propose compositions or offer unexpected variations based on patterns learned from millions of prior works. Contemporary systems can materially shape the possibility space presented to the user. They introduce stylistic defaults, probabilistic associations, hidden training influences, and platform constraints into the creative process. Bomba and De Angeli (2025) therefore describe authorship in AI art as relational and entangled, emphasizing interaction among artists, data, algorithms, and systems rather than attributing the result to a single isolated creator.

A similar logic appears in the collective centred creation framework, which argues that generative outputs emerge from many hands and that claims to creative credit may vary according to the significance of different contributions (Kawakami & Venkatagiri, 2024). This approach draws attention to actors often absent from popular discussion, including model developers, platform designers, curators of training corpora, and creators whose previous works shaped the learned representational space. It therefore challenges the simple equation of prompt authorship with full authorship of the resulting output.

Prompting itself occupies an ambiguous position. A detailed prompt can contain substantial conceptual work, references, constraints, narrative direction, compositional requirements, and iterative refinements. In some workflows, prompting is only one stage in a much longer process involving inpainting, outpainting, compositing, editing, masking, retouching, sound design, sequencing, or manual redrawing. In other situations, a brief prompt may produce a nearly

complete artifact. Treating these circumstances as equivalent would erase meaningful differences in creative control (Mazzi, 2024).

The U.S. Copyright Office's 2025 report illustrates this distinction in legal form. It maintained that the use of AI as an assistive tool does not remove protection from human authored expression, but purely AI generated material or output that lacks sufficient human control is not treated in the same way. It also concluded that prompts alone, under many currently available systems, do not necessarily provide users with sufficient control over expressive elements (U.S. Copyright Office, 2025). Although this position arises from U.S. copyright administration, it reflects a broader principle: an authorship claim becomes stronger as intentional human decisions become more identifiable in the form and meaning of the finished work.

Authorship should therefore be analysed through creative control rather than through tool use alone. Creative control includes setting the purpose of the work, defining constraints, evaluating alternatives, making consequential selections, transforming outputs, incorporating contextual knowledge, and assuming responsibility for the final artifact. This does not deny the causal role of AI. Instead, it separates causal contribution from normative authorship. A system may be essential to producing an output without being the kind of agent to whom a cultural community assigns responsibility, reputation, or moral rights.

This distinction also matters for disclosure. Even when the finished work is aesthetically successful, undisclosed AI use may affect trust if audiences, employers, publishers, clients, or award bodies attach value to the process of creation. Studies of audience judgment show that identical or comparable works may be evaluated less favourably when they are labelled as AI made, suggesting that perceived authorship affects aesthetic valuation (Grassini & Koivisto, 2024; Horton et al., 2023; Millet et al., 2023). Whether such bias is justified is a separate issue. What matters for creative industries is that provenance can become part of the market and cultural meaning of the work.

A defensible model of authorship in the AI era is therefore neither machine authorship by default nor automatic human ownership of anything produced after a prompt. Authorship is better understood as a situated claim supported by meaningful, traceable, and accountable creative decisions. This allows room for co creation without reducing all contributions to equivalence. It also recognizes that tools, conventions, collaborators, and inherited cultural materials have always shaped creative practice while preserving the importance of human intention and responsibility.

## **5. Originality, Authenticity, and the Value of Creative Difference**

Originality is one of the most difficult concepts in debates about generative AI because it can refer to several different qualities. A work may be statistically uncommon, aesthetically distinctive, legally original, culturally innovative, or personally authentic. These categories can overlap, but they are not synonymous. Creativity scholarship has long rejected novelty as a sufficient definition of creativity and commonly requires that an idea or product also be appropriate, effective, useful, or valuable within a domain (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). This distinction is important because a model can produce endless novelty without necessarily producing cultural significance.

Boden's account of creativity is useful because it distinguishes combinational, exploratory, and transformational creativity (Boden, 2004). Generative AI is highly capable of recombining learned elements and exploring extensive spaces of possible outputs. It may also contribute to transformational outcomes when creators use it to challenge established processes or produce

forms that would have been difficult to achieve using conventional tools. However, it is harder to establish that the system itself transforms a cultural domain because cultural transformation depends on interpretation, uptake, institutions, and historical context, not simply on producing an unusual artifact.

The reliance of generative models on existing data intensifies questions about derivative production. Human creators also learn from existing culture: musicians absorb genres, designers study precedents, and writers learn language and narrative forms. The key distinction is therefore not that AI learns from previous work while humans do not. More important differences concern scale, consent, traceability, and the absence of human biography. A human artist's influences are filtered through embodied experience, social relationships, memory, intention, and an evolving relationship with the world. A generative model converts large corpora into statistical parameters and produces outputs through learned distributions.

This distinction does not mean that AI generated content is automatically unoriginal, but it alters how originality should be understood. Formal novelty can be produced at a scale beyond the reach of an individual creator. Cultural originality, however, often depends on a relationship between form and situated meaning. A new visual configuration becomes artistically consequential when it participates in a dialogue, advances a position, responds to a context, or alters expectations. The human contribution may therefore increasingly lie in contextualization: deciding why a generated possibility matters and what it is intended to express.

Empirical evidence also reveals tension between individual and collective originality. Doshi and Hauser (2024) found that writers given access to generative AI ideas produced stories that were judged more creative, better written, and more enjoyable, with larger gains among participants who were initially less creative. Yet the AI assisted stories were also more similar to one another. This result captures a central risk for the creative industries. If many creators use similar models, defaults, prompting conventions, and optimization targets, individual performance may improve while collective diversity narrows.

Homogenization therefore deserves serious attention because creative markets depend on differentiation. If generative tools make competent production widely accessible, technical polish may become less scarce. Value may shift toward concept, taste, identity, world building, performance, community, provenance, and the ability to produce a recognizable point of view. AI may therefore increase the value of distinctiveness even as it reduces the cost of producing conventional quality. The premium may increasingly move from execution toward direction.

Authenticity introduces a related but distinct question. In cultural consumption, audiences often care about the perceived relationship between an artifact and a creator's effort, emotion, identity, or life experience. Millet et al. (2023) found that participants evaluated artworks less positively when they were told that the works had been created by AI. Horton et al. (2023) similarly found systematic devaluation of AI labelled art across several dimensions, even though many participants reported that they could not reliably distinguish it from human made work. These findings demonstrate that aesthetic value cannot be reduced to formal visual characteristics because beliefs about origin also matter.

These findings should not be interpreted as evidence that AI art is objectively inferior. Rather, they show that authorship attribution forms part of aesthetic judgment. Audiences may value human effort, intentionality, vulnerability, skill, or social connection independently of formal appearance. Creative industries already reflect this principle through the value attached to handmade objects,

live performances, original recordings, limited editions, and works connected to particular biographies. AI therefore makes provenance more contested, not irrelevant.

Authenticity may consequently become less about the absence of technology and more about the integrity of the relationship among human intention, process, and presented work. A creator can use technologically advanced tools authentically when those tools serve a coherent artistic purpose and the process is not misrepresented. Conversely, a superficially human looking work can create authenticity concerns where substantial AI involvement is concealed from audiences who reasonably expect human production. Transparency becomes culturally significant because process increasingly shapes interpretation.

Situated transformation therefore provides a strong basis for understanding originality in the AI era. The relevant question is not only whether an output differs from prior outputs, but whether the creator has transformed available material into something meaningful within a specific cultural context. This standard allows room for AI assisted innovation while resisting the equation of generation with originality. It also focuses attention on human activities that models do not independently supply: purpose, historical awareness, ethical judgment, lived experience, and accountable interpretation.

## **6. Human Creativity in an AI Mediated Environment**

Debates about whether machines are creative can become trapped in definitional disputes. A more productive question is what forms of creativity matter in human cultural life and how AI changes their organization. Human creativity includes the generation of possibilities, but it also involves problem framing, curiosity, risk taking, interpretation, emotional investment, social communication, and the capacity to recognize why an idea matters. These qualities connect creativity to human experience rather than merely to the statistical novelty of an output (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Amabile, 1996).

Generative AI can strengthen some components of creativity by expanding the range of available possibilities. It can help users overcome blank page effects, visualize alternatives, explore unexpected combinations, translate ideas across media, and prototype at relatively low cost. For creators with limited technical skills or resources, this can widen participation. A person without photorealistic drawing skills can still explore visual composition; a musician can test arrangements without access to a full studio; and a small design team can examine multiple directions before committing substantial production resources. These affordances are meaningful and should not be dismissed simply because they rely on automation.

At the same time, creativity can be weakened when creators accept generated suggestions too quickly or allow model outputs to define the problem space. The risk involves not only dependence but also anchoring. Because generative systems can return plausible and polished material almost immediately, users may stop searching before reaching less obvious possibilities. Doshi and Hauser's (2024) finding that AI assisted stories became more similar is consistent with this concern. High quality generation can therefore produce convergence when many creators are guided toward the same learned patterns.

Expertise moderates this relationship. Experienced creators possess domain knowledge that allows them to identify clichés, technical infeasibility, stylistic inconsistency, weak symbolism, or inappropriate references that novices may overlook. Findings from design experiments suggest that AI can reduce fixation during ideation but may not provide the same benefits for experts during

implementation (Hou et al., 2025). Expertise therefore remains important, although the role of the expert may shift from producing every component manually toward controlling, interrogating, and transforming machine generated proposals.

This shift has important implications for creative education. If students move too quickly from intention to generated output, they may bypass the slow acquisition of craft through which perceptual judgment develops. Drawing teaches observation, editing develops rhythm, instrumental practice develops timing and phrasing, typography develops sensitivity to visual hierarchy, and repeated drafting strengthens narrative control. These skills are valuable not only because they produce artifacts but also because they develop the creator's capacity to evaluate quality. An education system that teaches prompting without foundational practice risks producing users who can request outputs but cannot diagnose their weaknesses.

The appropriate educational response is therefore integration rather than prohibition. AI literacy should sit alongside foundational craft, history, ethics, research, and critical interpretation. Students need to understand how models are trained, where bias can enter, how outputs may reproduce stereotypes or inaccuracies, when disclosure is required, and how they should document their own creative contribution. They also need opportunities to work without generative assistance so that creative confidence and judgment are not entirely outsourced.

Human creativity is also relational. Research on AI assisted creative writing indicates that users may reconceptualize creativity as distributed across human and non human agents while still retaining active interpretive roles (Tsao & Nogues, 2024). Creative meaning emerges through interaction with audiences, communities, collaborators, institutions, and cultural traditions. Csikszentmihalyi's systems view of creativity emphasizes that creative achievement is recognized within domains and fields rather than existing solely in an individual's mind (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). Generative AI does not remove this social process. Indeed, social validation may become more important as the volume of generated material increases and scarcity shifts from content production toward attention and trusted selection.

Human creativity should therefore not be defended by claiming that machines can never produce impressive artifacts. As systems improve, such a claim becomes increasingly difficult to sustain. A stronger account emphasizes the capacities that make creative work socially and culturally accountable: establishing purpose, assuming responsibility, understanding consequences, positioning work within social histories, negotiating ethical tensions, and maintaining relationships with audiences. Even where AI contributes substantially to form, human agents still decide what enters public culture and under what claims.

## **7. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Creative Labour**

The labour effects of generative AI are likely to be uneven. Creative occupations consist of bundles of tasks rather than a single activity called creativity. An illustrator may conduct research, sketch, negotiate with clients, produce assets, revise work, prepare files, manage rights, and market a portfolio. A musician may compose, perform, engineer, promote, tour, license, teach, and maintain relationships with audiences. AI may automate or accelerate some tasks while leaving others unchanged or making them more valuable. Analyses of occupational exposure therefore provide a stronger starting point than predictions of wholesale replacement (Berg et al., 2025; Gmyrek et al., 2025).

The International Labour Organization's work on media and culture shows that the effects of generative AI extend beyond routine administrative tasks into content production and creative decision making. It identifies risks involving displacement, revenue loss, consent, compensation, and creative control, while also emphasizing the growing need for digital and AI related competencies (Berg et al., 2025). This combination shows that the central labour issue is not simply the number of jobs. It also concerns the distribution of bargaining power and income where firms can substitute generated content for some forms of commissioned creative work.

Entry level creative work may be especially vulnerable. Junior designers, copywriters, illustrators, editors, and production assistants often develop expertise by performing tasks that are relatively easy to automate, including first drafts, variations, clean up, basic layouts, transcription, simple graphics, or preliminary concepts. If organizations eliminate these roles, they may also weaken the pathway through which experienced practitioners are trained. A short term efficiency gain can therefore create a long term capability problem unless organizations develop new apprenticeship models around AI assisted workflows.

Freelance markets may also experience price pressure because clients can generate acceptable content internally or use AI to request a larger number of alternatives. At the same time, creators who combine deep domain expertise with AI may produce more work or offer services that were previously uneconomic. The likely outcome is segmentation rather than uniform decline. Generic production may become cheaper, while distinctive high trust work, live performance, bespoke creative direction, and work associated with recognized creative identity may retain or gain value.

The economics of training data introduces another labour concern. Generative systems derive capability from large collections of existing text, images, music, and other cultural materials, much of which was created through human labour. Where creators have limited control over whether their work is used for training, disputes arise over consent and compensation. WIPO (2024) identifies training data, ownership, confidentiality, and output risks as central intellectual property concerns for organizations adopting generative AI. From a labour perspective, these are also questions about whether value generated from earlier cultural work is captured by platforms without corresponding bargaining power for creators.

The labour debate should therefore distinguish automation, augmentation, and reorganization. Automation occurs when a task is substantially transferred to a system. Augmentation occurs when AI helps a worker perform a task more effectively. Reorganization occurs when the presence of AI changes who does what, how work is evaluated, and which capabilities matter. Most creative occupations are likely to experience all three processes simultaneously. This is why measures of exposure should not be translated directly into predictions of unemployment.

The emerging skill profile of creative professionals will combine technical and interpretive capabilities. AI literacy, prompt design, model selection, output evaluation, rights awareness, verification, editing, and data stewardship will matter, but so will skills that are difficult to commodify, including strategic imagination, cultural intelligence, storytelling, aesthetic judgment, client interpretation, ethics, and the development of a distinctive creative identity. The strongest creative professional may not be the person who generates the largest volume of content, but the person who knows what should be created, what should be rejected, and how work can become meaningful within a specific context.

Organizations also face important governance choices. If AI is introduced only as a cost reduction mechanism, it may weaken morale, reduce experimentation, and concentrate decision making

power. If it is introduced as a collaborative infrastructure with clear rules for disclosure, attribution, compensation, and human oversight, it can expand creative capacity. The International Labour Organization's emphasis on compensation, control, and consent provides a useful basis for evaluating workplace adoption because it recognizes that technological benefit cannot be separated from the conditions under which workers participate (Berg et al., 2025).

## **8. Ethical and Industry Challenges**

Ethical concerns in AI-assisted creativity begin with training data. Generative systems learn from extensive cultural corpora whose contents may include copyrighted or personally significant work. The legal status of different training practices varies across jurisdictions and remains contested, but the ethical issue is broader than legal compliance. Creative workers may reasonably ask whether their work should contribute to systems that can subsequently imitate their style, compete for commissions, or reduce demand for their labour without consent or compensation (WIPO, 2024).

Attribution is another challenge. AI-assisted outputs can contain influences that are difficult to trace, while creators may not know which works were present in model training. This opacity complicates conventional practices of citation, influence, and artistic lineage. It also creates reputational risks where outputs resemble living artists or reproduce protected brand elements. Responsible creative practice therefore requires stronger provenance tools, clearer platform documentation, and workflow records capable of distinguishing human-created, licensed, transformed, and generated components.

Bias and cultural representation present additional concerns. Models trained on unequal data distributions may reproduce dominant visual conventions, language hierarchies, gender stereotypes, racialized representations, or geographically narrow ideas of beauty and professionalism. Creative industries do not merely reflect culture; they actively produce symbols through which groups are represented. An efficiency tool that reproduces historical imbalance at scale can therefore amplify cultural exclusion. Human review must include representational judgment, not only technical quality.

Homogenization is a related systemic risk. If major platforms optimize for outputs that users rate highly, the result may favour familiar visual and narrative patterns. This can be commercially attractive but culturally narrowing. Doshi and Hauser's (2024) experimental evidence of reduced collective diversity provides an early indication of this dynamic in writing. The issue is not that all AI output will look the same, but that shared models can create common attractors around style, phrasing, composition, and genre.

Disclosure policies will increasingly matter. Creative industries may need differentiated standards rather than a universal label for any use of AI. Using AI for noise reduction or colour correction is different from generating a lead vocal, a central illustration, or an entire screenplay. A useful disclosure framework should therefore focus on materiality: whether AI contributed substantially to expressive elements that audiences, clients, judges, or collaborators would reasonably understand as human-created. Such standards can preserve trust without making routine technical assistance burdensome.

Sustainability should also enter the discussion. Generative models require computational infrastructure, and creative organizations adopting AI at scale should consider the environmental costs associated with model training and inference. This issue is often separated from authorship

debates, yet it belongs to responsible creative production. The ethical value of a workflow cannot be judged solely by output quality if its broader material costs are ignored.

Finally, governance should protect experimentation while maintaining accountability. Excessively rigid regulation may freeze practices before they mature, while laissez-faire adoption can transfer risks to individual creators. The most workable approach is likely to combine platform transparency, rights management, professional standards, collective bargaining, sector-specific disclosure, and human responsibility for public outputs. Creative industries have historically adapted to new production technologies; the difference now is that the technology operates directly on expressive material and therefore touches the core of professional identity.

## **9. Discussion: Toward a Human-Centred Model of Hybrid Creativity**

The evidence reviewed in this article supports a model of hybrid creativity rather than a binary division between human and machine creation. Hybrid creativity refers to cultural production in which human intention, domain knowledge, model capabilities, training data, platform architecture, iterative interaction, selection, editing, and social evaluation jointly shape the final artifact. The concept does not imply that all components contribute equally. It recognizes interdependence while preserving normative distinctions between computational generation and accountable human agency.

The first element of the model is human intention and problem framing. Creativity begins before generation because the creator decides what kind of problem is worth solving, what audience matters, what constraints apply, and what values the work should embody. Generative systems can assist with framing, but they do not independently possess social obligations or life projects. The second element is model-mediated exploration, where AI expands the space of candidate ideas, forms, or combinations. This is where generative systems are strongest and where they can reduce the cost of experimentation.

The third element is evaluative selection. As generation becomes abundant, the ability to reject becomes as important as the ability to produce. Selection requires taste, domain expertise, knowledge of context, and sensitivity to unintended meanings. The fourth element is human transformation. Outputs are edited, combined, redrawn, re-performed, rewritten, or embedded in larger structures. This stage is central to authorship because it reveals how the creator imposes sustained expressive control rather than merely accepting the first plausible result.

The fifth element is contextualization and accountability. A creative artifact enters a social world where it affects audiences, markets, communities, and other creators. Human actors decide how it is named, credited, disclosed, distributed, and defended. This stage clarifies why causal contribution is not enough for authorship. A model can generate material, but it does not enter contractual relationships, respond to ethical criticism, or assume responsibility for deception, appropriation, or harm. Human creators and organizations remain accountable for those decisions.

This model also reframes originality. Originality need not require technological purity or creation from nothing. Creative work has always involved influence, conventions, genres, and tools. What matters is whether the final work displays meaningful transformation under responsible human direction. AI can contribute novelty, but the creator contributes situated significance by connecting generated possibilities to purpose, history, culture, and audience. Originality therefore becomes less about proving that no machine participated and more about demonstrating what the human contribution transformed.

The model further explains why authenticity remains valuable. Authenticity is not synonymous with manual production. Photographers, filmmakers, electronic musicians, and digital artists have long produced authentic work through technological mediation. What audiences often seek is a credible relation among creator, process, and claim. A creator who openly uses AI to pursue a distinctive artistic inquiry can be more authentic than one who conceals generative dependence while presenting the result as purely handmade. Transparency strengthens the relationship between creative identity and method.

Hybrid creativity also changes competitive advantage. When competent content is cheap, differentiation moves upstream toward concept and downstream toward curation, narrative, reputation, and community. This does not eliminate craft. Instead, craft includes knowing how to orchestrate multiple tools and when not to use them. High-value creators may distinguish themselves through a combination of technical fluency and strong boundaries: they know which aspects can be delegated without loss and which require direct human attention.

The framework therefore rejects both technological determinism and romantic human exceptionalism. Technological determinism assumes that whatever AI can automate will inevitably be automated, ignoring institutions, rights, labour relations, audience preferences, and professional norms. Romantic exceptionalism assumes that creativity is protected simply because it is human, ignoring evidence that machines can contribute meaningfully to ideation and production. A human-centred hybrid model instead asks how systems should be designed and governed so that automation expands creative possibility without eroding accountability, diversity, and fair participation.

## **10. Implications for Creative Industries**

For creative professionals, the immediate implication is to develop AI capability without allowing AI to define creative identity. Practitioners should learn model strengths and limitations, document meaningful human contributions, protect confidential material, verify outputs, and preserve independent craft. Portfolios may increasingly need to communicate process as well as product, especially where clients or audiences value evidence of authorship. Distinctive point of view will become more important as generic competence becomes easier to obtain.

For creative firms, AI adoption should be evaluated by task rather than by broad job category. Organizations should identify where generation genuinely improves exploration, where expert review is indispensable, and where automation might damage learning or client trust. Policies should address disclosure, ownership, confidential inputs, training-data risk, and responsibility for final outputs. Firms should also avoid eliminating entry-level work without creating alternative pathways through which junior staff can acquire judgment and domain knowledge.

For educational institutions, curricula should combine foundational making with AI literacy. Students should learn to create with and without generative systems, compare outcomes, critique model defaults, and explain their own decision-making. Assessment practices may need to give greater weight to process documentation, reflection, iteration, and oral defence of creative choices. The aim should not be to preserve old workflows unchanged but to ensure that students become capable directors of technology rather than passive consumers of generated options.

For policymakers and professional associations, the central challenge is to protect creative agency while allowing innovation. Rights frameworks should support clarity around training data, attribution, and human authorship; labour policy should consider bargaining power and income

effects; and professional standards should define appropriate transparency. WIPO (2024) and the ILO's work on media and culture both indicate that intellectual property and labour governance cannot be treated separately because the same technological systems affect creative rights, remuneration, and control (Berg et al., 2025).

For technology developers, human-centred design should prioritize controllability, provenance, consent mechanisms, and support for iterative co-creation rather than maximizing autonomous output alone. Creative professionals need systems that expose meaningful controls, preserve version histories, support rights information, and make it easier to understand how outputs were produced. A model that generates impressive content but weakens user agency may be less valuable for professional creative practice than a more transparent system designed around deliberate human direction.

## **11. Conclusion**

Generative artificial intelligence is changing creative work because it intervenes directly in the production of expressive material. Its significance cannot be captured by asking whether machines can create impressive images, text, or music. The deeper questions concern who directs creative processes, how cultural value is assigned, what originality means when generation depends on learned patterns, and how creative workers retain agency when production becomes increasingly automated. Evidence reviewed in this article shows genuine benefits in productivity, ideation, accessibility, and experimentation, but also substantial risks involving homogenization, attribution, labour displacement, training-data governance, and loss of creative control.

Authorship in this environment should be grounded in meaningful human creative control rather than in the mere use or non-use of AI. Human authorship becomes strongest where creators frame purposes, make consequential choices, transform outputs, integrate contextual knowledge, and accept responsibility for the finished work. Similarly, originality is better understood as situated transformation than as simple novelty. AI can generate new forms, but cultural originality depends on how those forms are interpreted, positioned, and made meaningful within a domain.

The future of creative work is therefore likely to be hybrid. Human creators will increasingly work with systems that can propose, simulate, remix, and generate at extraordinary speed. The value of human creativity will not disappear, but its centre of gravity may move toward judgment, direction, cultural intelligence, ethical responsibility, and the capacity to build meaningful relationships between artifacts and audiences. These capacities are not residual functions left over after automation; they are central to why creative work matters.

The challenge for the creative industries is to shape this transition deliberately. AI should expand the range of human creative possibility without normalizing opaque appropriation, weakening pathways into creative professions, or reducing cultural production to statistically optimized sameness. A sustainable creative future will depend on institutions, technologies, and professional norms that preserve human agency while making productive use of computational capability. In that sense, the most important question is no longer whether AI can create, but how societies want creativity to be organized when machines can participate in making culture.

## References

- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Westview Press.
- Amankwah-Amoah, J., Abdalla, S., Mogaji, E., Elbanna, A., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2024). The impending disruption of creative industries by generative AI: Opportunities, challenges, and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, 79, 102759.
- Berg, J., Gmyrek, P., Licata, M., Gwenyaya, T., & Sánchez Freytes Scaiano, M. (2025). *Generative AI and the media and culture industry*. International Labour Organization.
- Boden, M. A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Bomba, F., & De Angeli, A. (2025). Agency and authorship in AI art: Transformational practices for epistemic troubles. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 205, 103652.
- Casteleiro-Pitrez, J. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence image tools among future designers: A usability, user experience, and emotional analysis. *Digital*, 4(2), 316–332.
- Chen, Z., & He, Y. (2026). Ethical dilemmas in artificial intelligence-generated art: Authorship, ownership, and the blurring of creative boundaries. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 41(2), 647–661.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.
- Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Krayner, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2026). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of artificial intelligence on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Organization Science*.
- Doshi, A. R., & Hauser, O. P. (2024). Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances*, 10(28), eadn5290.
- Furtado, L. S., Soares, J. B., & Furtado, V. (2024). A task-oriented framework for generative AI in design. *Journal of Creativity*, 34(2), 100086.
- Gmyrek, P., Berg, J., Kamiński, K., Konopczyński, F., Ładna, A., Nafradi, B., Rosłaniec, K., & Troszyński, M. (2025). *Generative AI and jobs: A 2025 update*. International Labour Organization.
- Grassini, S., & Koivisto, M. (2024). Understanding how personality traits, experiences, and attitudes shape negative bias toward AI-generated artworks. *Scientific Reports*, 14, 4113.
- Hertzmann, A. (2018). Can computers create art? *Arts*, 7(2), 18.

- Horton, C. B., Jr., White, M. W., & Iyengar, S. S. (2023). Bias against AI art can enhance perceptions of human creativity. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 19001.
- Hou, J. (J.), Wang, L., Wang, G., Wang, H. J., & Yang, S. (2025). The double-edged roles of generative AI in the creative process: Experiments on design work. *Information Systems Research*.
- Kawakami, A., & Venkatagiri, S. (2024). Engaging the many-hands problem of generative-AI outputs: A framework for attributing credit. *AI and Ethics*.
- Kucharzyk, B., Laskowska-Litak, E., & Brożek, B. (2026). Are we machine or are we author? Rethinking authorship and its ties to copyright amid artificial intelligence creativity. *Regulation & Governance*.
- Mazzi, F. (2024). Authorship in artificial intelligence-generated works: Exploring originality in text prompts and artificial intelligence outputs through philosophical foundations of copyright and collage protection. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 27(3), 410–427.
- McCormack, J., Gifford, T., & Hutchings, P. (2019). Autonomy, authenticity, authorship and intention in computer generated art. In A. Ekárt, A. Liapis, & M. L. Castro Pena (Eds.), *Computational intelligence in music, sound, art and design* (pp. 35–50). Springer.
- Millet, K., Buehler, F., Du, G., & Kokkoris, M. D. (2023). Defending humankind: Anthropocentric bias in the appreciation of AI art. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 143, 107707.
- Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192.
- OECD. (2024). *Job creation and local economic development 2024: The geography of generative AI*. OECD Publishing.
- Rizzi, G., & Bertola, P. (2025). Exploring the generative AI potential in the fashion design process: An experimental experience on the collaboration between fashion design practitioners and generative AI tools. *European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 15.
- Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92–96.
- Singh, A. (2026). Creativity reimagined: Ethical authorship, ownership and social impact of AI-generated art. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 24(2), 250–263.
- Tsao, J., & Nogues, C. (2024). Beyond the author: Artificial intelligence, creative writing and intellectual emancipation. *Poetics*, 102, 101865.

- U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). *Copyright and artificial intelligence, Part 2: Copyrightability*. Library of Congress.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024). *Generative AI: Navigating intellectual property*. WIPO.
- Wu, J. X., & Li, L. (2025a). AI-driven computational creativity in fashion design: A review. *Textile Research Journal*, 95(5–6).
- Wu, X., & Li, L. (2025b). Qualitative-empirical insights into generative AI for textile design in the fashion design process. *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation*, 13(4), 322–357.