



International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal Homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Creative Art

Dr. Praveena Devi¹ and Kamineni Kovida²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, Vaddeswaram, Andhra Pradesh, India.

²Research Scholar, Department of Management, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, Vaddeswaram, Andhra Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT

AI and creatively-led work (broadly: generative systems that generate images, text, music, and video) have the potential to transform the way we conceive of, make, modify, and publish creative work. This paper researches the impact of AI on creative art through a systematic review of research and policy literature. It explores the potential for experimentation and greater access and the potential risks to creative agency, style, labour, cultural diversity, training data, attribution, and copyright. The weight of existing peer-reviewed research and policy literature does not point to a simple driver of "replacing" or "empowering" human creativity. Experimentally, AI systems can both improve the quality or speed of isolated outputs but also reduce the diversity across outputs, and the role of system design influences whether individuals can be recognized as partners or merely as mere editors. Research on poetry and short-form writing cannot necessarily be generalized to visual arts, music, or professional creative practice. The paper finds that creative AI is most beneficial when artists can maintain meaningful control over final works, make autonomous updates or rejections, and receive clear information about data and rights. This is a research review, with no survey or experiment conducted.

Keywords: AI, Creative Art, Generative AI, Human-AI Co-Creation, Creativity, Copyright, Artists, Cultural Diversity.

Problem Statement

Generative AI tools can create images, sounds, text, and moving pictures from prompts within seconds. Artists may use them as sources of inspiration, for reference browsing, for rapid prototyping, for editing, or to generate completed work. These capabilities reduce certain technical entry costs and extend the range of art workflows.

However, artists and arts institutions are left with various open questions: attribution, the source of training images, impact on the arts workforce, stylistic diversity and limiting the audience's perception of art.

Public debate often sees AI art either as an effortless equalizer or the death of human art, but each exaggerates a field where the characteristics of the end product are shaped by the task, interface, artist's role, model, and legal context. This paper thus assesses AI's impact as a series of interconnected creative, social, and institutional effects.

1. Introduction

Creative practice has always included tools, from paint and lens to edit and render software, but generative AI is different from most of these, in that it can generate candidate content as well as record, transmit, or modify an artist's immediate input. Text-to-image generators, music makers, and language models all have instances of offering choices for artists to use, combine, and modify. How AI is being used in creative work has been described as content generation, analysis, augmentation, and production processes (Anantrasirichai & Bull, 2022). The question is not simply can a machine produce art. It is how human intention interacts with generative possibilities, and how that influences creative work and its value.

The paper seeks to answer three questions: (1) how can AI reinforce human creativity? (2) what are the impacts for creative agency, culture, rights and livelihoods? (3) how to embed responsible human-AI co-creation practices? We have assessed relevant policy and research documents, analyzed data, and proposed a framework for responsible human-AI practice that supports human creativity.

2. Review of Literature

The literature on AI and creativity includes contributions in computer science, human-computer interaction, psychology, art theory and legal research. Anantrasirichai and Bull (2022) lay out how AI is used in different creative fields and demonstrate how AI can be involved in many stages of the process, not just the last stage of generating a work of art. Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) consider AI as a collaborator and say that its artistic value should be appraised by its use in context, not by its output.

Data from our past work indicates that the effects on individual creativity and group-level variety may diverge. When Doshi and Hauser (2024) provided access to generative-AI ideas, the judged creativity of some short stories increased, especially for those writers who submitted previously lower-rated stories. But the stories written with AI became more similar to each other, which suggests the existence of a trade-off between individual betterment and group-level variety. Our past work focused on short stories, so these findings should not be directly translated into visual-art or music outcomes.

How you set up the collaboration also makes a difference. In two poetry experiments, McGuire, De Cremer and Van de Cruys (2024) showed that people who received a poem and then edited it, were rated less creative than those who wrote one all on their own. But the difference was not statistically significant in a second experiment when participants who collaborated with the AI took turns shaping the poem. A co-creating approach - where people are involved in shaping the content and direction of an idea - may support a sense of agency.

Artist and author attributions can shift once a viewer knows that an AI technology was used. An empirical study of visual-art co-creation reports found that perceiving AI as the "author" of the work led to decreased ratings of the work and the author-these effects differed depending on the genre of the creative output and the viewer's perceptions of human control (Mazzone, 2024). Such assessments are significant given that art is appreciated not only for its visual or audio qualities but also for its intention, its maker, her efforts, her identity, and her community.

Training Data The training data used by generative models presents a distinct set of issues. Since generative models acquire statistical information from training material, the copyright and cultural origins of the training material need to be considered. The report by the U.S. Copyright Office regarding the copyrightability of works distinguishes between the use of AI as an aid versus where material is created without an adequate amount of human authorship, which further depends on the human and context (U.S. Copyright Office, 2025). This was a U.S. opinion and should not be generalized. WIPO (2024) also covers the ongoing debate surrounding training data, intellectual property rights, and the interests of creators and AI creators.

Cultural diversity. UNESCO's expert work on AI and culture highlights cultural rights, cultural pluralism and fair creative economies, and the dangers that concentration of platforms and algorithmic homogenisation could threaten cultural expression (UNESCO, 2025). These challenges are critical for cultures, languages or communities that are poorly represented in the data used to train a tool. An application can democratise access for some users, while reinforcing stereotypes or increasing the visibility of dominant visual tropes.

3. Research Gap

While the literature provides helpful experiments and policy analysis, it is incomplete. Experiments on specialized tasks like short stories or poetry cannot decide the claim that art is not special. The debate on system design and user experience cannot decide copyright, consent or work.

Legal analysis cannot decide whether a tool seems to let people feel more 'ownership' of what they make, whether audiences think its art is better, or whether their art is less affected.

More research in a variety of settings with both art forms and a range of artists over a longer period of time will be necessary. This paper plugs that hole by bringing those qualities into a single framework and separating evidence from interpretation.

4. Objectives of the Study

The study aims to:

Explore how generative AI is applied in the content creation process from ideation through production and revision.

Summarize research on human creativity, co-creation, and creative self-efficacy.

Examine potential effects on authorship, attribution, training data, cultural diversity and creative work.

Determine which actions are able to contain effective human intervention and promote legitimate AI use in the art space.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Research Design

This is a qualitative secondary-source research project. The approach combines peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and institutional literature surrounding the AI creative industries, human and AI collaboration, copyright, and culture. The source set emphasizes clearly identifiable publications and publications with explicit authorial and temporal information.

Searches were conducted for academic and institutional literature available through October 2026.

The review is thematic rather than statistical, with no new interviews, survey responses, or experimental observations.

5.2 Data Collection and Analysis

Sources were chosen based on how relevant they were to at least one of the three questions of the study and whether they included data and/or a review of creative applications or policy prescript. Data was separated into five categories: access and creative opportunity; human agency and co-creation; diversity of output and review of output; rights, paid labor and intellectual property; and cultural representation. Results were then compared between these categories. Because some evidence was only presented in one media such as poetry or short stories, the paper specifies this as being the only media presented, rather than extrapolating it to include all art media.

5.3 Scope and Limitations of the Method

Selected sources rather than an absolute measure of AI's overall effect. This paper is not a comprehensive systematic review, nor does it attempt to quantify the percentage of artists who use AI. Art and tools evolve quickly, and legal rules vary by jurisdiction. This paper offers a reasoned synthesis of selected sources, rather than an absolute measurement of AI's overall effect.

6. Conceptual Background

6.1 AI as a Creative Tool

Expressive creation. We're considering use of AI in creative art (to be accessible for expressiveness), in this paper as predominantly the creation or transformation of expressive data (images, text, music, video). An artist might leverage a model to suggest options, produce a seed image or text, alter another piece, or automate some part of the creation process. The amount of human involvement isn't dictated by the presence of AI.

6.2 Human Agency and Co-Creation

Creative agency also involves the ability to guide one's intentions, to make important decisions, to edit, and to determine when the piece is finished. McGuire et al. (2024) demonstrate how important the role of the user can be: an interface that allows a person to start and steer a work might help foster creative self-efficacy more than displaying a near-finished AI draft. This is a valuable design principle, but more research is needed in visual art, music, dance, and professional studio work.

6.3 Diversity, Bias, and Cultural Context

A model may create thousands of permutations from a handful of known rules, and individual users might have quick alternatives, but press them too hard on the same tool they risk variations becoming homogenised. And it's not just a matter of appearance. What communities, languages and customs might be unrepresented or misrepresented? These aspects need to be taken into account when training or assessing models for coverage, bias and how artists are able to deviate from the default output (Doshi & Hauser, 2024; UNESCO, 2025).

6.4 Authorship, Rights, and Livelihoods

Three issues are sometimes conflated: "a work created by a human author was used in the training of the model"; "a work created by an AI system reproduces a human-created work that is protected by copyright"; and "a human user of the model was responsible for a sufficiently large percentage of the new work to be eligible for protection" in a particular jurisdiction. They are related but different.

(U.S.Copyright Office, 2025).

As we will see, the copyrightability of outputs does not answer all disputes over training data; other issues crop up for artists in relation to attribution, licensing, competition, and bargaining power (U.S. Copyright Office, 2025; WIPO, 2024).

7. Conceptual Framework

The model considers the effects of interaction among the design of AI tools, the practices of artists, and the broader cultural and economic context. AI capacity and availability determines the scope and rapidity of experimentation, and human control, iteration and skill determine whether access enhances agency or fosters reliance. Data origin, representation, and platform governance determine the risks to rights and cultural diversity. They also determine creative outcomes, audience value, and sustainable art practice.

AI access and system design AI artist role creative process creative agency And architectural process and output.

Data provenance, transparency, and cultural representation rights, trust and diversity

Market structure, recognizing and compensating the state of labor and ensuring sustainability over time

The framework is not asserting that any one factor can be seen to ensure a positive or negative outcome. Rather the framework suggests that responsible outcomes are more likely if artists maintain control over decisions that matter, systems offer helpful transparency, and institutions offer just systems for data, credit and compensation.

8. Key Findings and Analysis

The evidence examined leads to five conclusions. First, AI may increase access to creative exploration in creating multiple variations quickly and helping to achieve effects that might otherwise necessitate niche training. It is not an end in itself that AI raises the quality of art or replaces learning, technique and judgment.

Secondly, human-AI interaction design affects the mechanics of creative agency. Poetry experiments cited in the review by McGuire et al. (2024) seem to imply that co-creation involving more person "up-front", as the person is engaged at every step of the creative process, results in a stronger integrity of the creative self-efficacy than a workflow starting from editing a machine-generated leap-off point. This could potentially be a compelling heuristic for other arts, but direct evidence in these remaining disciplines is required.

Third, individual benefit can happen alongside collective sameness. Doshi and Hauser (2024) observed increased average story quality for some users even as AI stories converged on one another. That is, assistance can help an individual get a stronger answer without increasing the diversity of cultural artifacts all-around.

Fourth, audience perceptions may vary about how they value and interact with creative AI– assisted work and its creators, and particularly those instances where a creative work seems to reflect fewer artist controls or less visible effort by the human agent. These perceptions influence social or economic value, even if a resulting generation is aesthetically or technically impressive (Mazzone, 2024). Disclosures, and transparent records of the workflow, allow audiences to develop their own understanding of a work's genesis, though transparency alone is unlikely to resolve disagreements about fairness or attribution.

Fifth, the studio is not the end of the story. Issues of training data, copyright, platform consolidation, representation, and the division of the spoils determine the beneficiaries of AI-assisted production. These aren't issues that can be solved by simply measuring quality. They depend on industry transparency, clear contractual rights, and culturally intelligent governance (UNESCO, 2025; WIPO, 2024).

9. Practical and Theoretical Implications

From an artist's perspective, the use of AI should be conceptualized as one element in a creative process. Its relative benefit hinges on whether it facilitates the artist's ability to develop, examine, or achieve an intention that is still identified with and owned by the artist. Recording prompts, revisions, source material, and selection criteria may assist with attribution and explanation at a later time. Artists should consult platform terms and consider the use of generated output.

The implications for creators of creative tools: design interfaces where people can steer the process, construct iteratively, and are responsible for important decisions. Systems should communicate uncertainties and constraints, enable revision, and not treat synthesis as a definitive or complete solution. For teachers and cultural institutions, AI literacy means not only critical reading and data provenance, bias, copyright and disclosures, but also getting hands-on with technical skills.

These results can be interpreted as supporting a process-oriented conception of creativity. The relevant unit of analysis is not only the finished product but also the human choices, social factors, and systems that produce it. This perspective illuminates why some workflows render technology more liberating and others more alienating.

10. Recommendations

Maintain artists' authority over foundational creative decisions by utilizing AI for options and exploration, but retain the means to turn down, revise, or redirect its output.

Design AI systems for active co-creation: provide interactive guidance that the user can navigate.

A Document material based AI contributions to your work and share them when they are relevant to attribution, commissioning, exhibition or just audiences' understanding.

Boost transparency regarding sources for training data, necessary permissions, constraints related to the model, and regulations for use for commercial purposes.

Assess and evaluate the cultural and linguistic representations created by AI systems, ensuring artists and communities affected are included in such evaluations.

Contribute to more research with working artists, multiple art forms, and longer term studies of creative production, income, and working conditions.

11. Limitations

This paper is a synthesis of selected literature and policy sources rather than new primary research. The empirical articles are based on particular tasks and samples so their findings may not extend to all artists, genres, cultures, and professional contexts. AI outputs and legislation will be developed and legal determinations depend on the jurisdiction. This paper's suggestions are general research-driven principles rather than legal guidance or a substitute for reviewing contracts locally.

12. Conclusion

Creative art is being impacted by the power of AI, both through greater ease of generation and variation, and through greater displacement of authorship and curatorial control among authors, models, platforms, and audiences. Current data show neither the seemingly inevitable loss of human authorship nor the seeming inevitability of lucrative, high-quality, creative output; benefits will depend on how a system is built and used, the role the artist plays in the process, the nature of the data, and the distribution of economic and cultural value. AI will most likely have a positive impact on creative art when it allows for new forms of authorial choice without sacrificing authors' agency, and when it increases a proactive focus on rights, representation, credit, and remuneration.

References

1. Anantrasirichai, N., & Bull, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: A review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55, 589–656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7>
2. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adn5290>
3. McGuire, J., De Cremer, D., & Van de Cruys, T. (2024). Establishing the importance of co-creation and self-efficacy in creative collaboration with artificial intelligence. *Scientific Reports*, 14, Article 18525. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-69423-2>
4. Mazzone, M. (2024). Co-creating art with generative artificial intelligence: Implications for artworks and artists. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 2(1), 100056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2024.100056>
5. Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019). Art, creativity, and the potential of artificial intelligence. *Arts*, 8(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts8010026>
6. UNESCO. (2025, November 25). A new expert report explores how AI is transforming culture. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/new-expert-report-explores-how-ai-transforming-culture>
7. U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). Copyright and artificial intelligence, Part 2: Copyrightability. <https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-2-Copyrightability-Report.pdf>
8. World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024). Generative AI: Navigating intellectual property. <https://www.wipo.int/publications/en/details.jsp?id=4713>
9. UNESCO. (2023). UNESCO unites diverse perspectives to inform policies for AI in the creative sectors. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-unites-diverse-perspectives-inform-policies-ai-creative-sectors>