

# ENC1102 Annotated Bibliography – Project 1

*Kenneth Emond II*

**Research Goal:** Exploring the ethical boundaries between artists and generative AI – what are the concerns regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence in the landscape of human artistry?

Zhou, Eric and Dokyun Lee. "Generative Artificial Intelligence, Human Creativity, and Art." *PNAS Nexus* 3, no. 3 (2024): 1-8.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae052>

This article discusses how artists who use generative AI can leverage it to boost creativity. The initial lens through which the researchers framed this paper was that of rising concern that GAI (generative artificial intelligence) may stifle human creativity and infringe upon it. Due to this, it focuses on asking if indeed GAI helps or hurts this endeavor. It also discusses how GAI "levels the playing field" where more likes become more distributed across users rather than aggregated towards a certain section of the userbase. However it does seem to stress that these benefits of course are useful only to those who can leverage it properly. This was a primary research study which aggregated images from 53,000 sample users from a "prominent art site".

Fundamentally, this is a good article for displaying the great benefits of GAI, through the lens of creativity in the competing space of GAI and social media. This will be a useful source for citing how some research finds that overall productivity and community approval improves over time with the use of GAI. However, the results were marginal, and not substantial (the exception being that of overall productivity), and though the data supports that GAI is useful and increases various metrics, there is a concern for long-term homogeneity, as they found that over time the visual novelty of the images became more normalized from a form of stylistic convergence.

Higgs, Jennifer M, and Amy Stornaiuolo. "Being Human in the Age of Generative AI: Young People's Ethical Concerns about Writing and Living with Machines." *Reading Research Quarterly* 59, no. 4 (2024): 632-650.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.552>

A paper exploring the use of AI within the context of schools and student bodies (specifically at the highschool level) and how these students are interacting with the AI tools. It makes particular note of the fact that students appear to be actively engaging in the discourse surrounding the ethicality of GAI in the human sphere, and are very aware of human authenticity as an important realization. The paper finds that the majority of the youth use AI for administrative tasks, double-checking spelling or grammar validity, or for sorting through vast amounts of data quickly to "get

the gist" of the material. Many voice concerns about plagiarism and unintentional bias from the AI systems. Schools should work diligently to educate their students on proper usage of the available tools, and efforts should be taken to ensure all demographics have access to this information and training according to this publication. This was a primary study performed in two demographically different highschools in the USA.

While specifically focusing on GAI used by young people, this paper seems to be a good source of insight on some of the more ethical and critical considerations surrounding the general use of not only GAI but also general AI (such as Chat-GPT), though in this case primarily through schools and with regards to students. However, they are a significant userbase of current GAI, so I believe this paper will be a good source as a specific lens of critique and research from that perspective. Interrogating what it means to be human and how to use these tools, especially in context of young people and their education. Ensuring ability to criticize, question and validate these options (in terms of writing or other GAI content) is an important consideration. I should take note to include the fact that students are acutely aware of "human authenticity" in relation to AI.

Hutson, James, and Peter Cotroneo. "Praxis and Augmented Creativity: A Case Study in the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Art in the Digital Art Classroom." *The International Journal of Technologies in Learning* Vol 31, Issue 1 (2023): 113-132.  
<https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0144/CGP/v31i01/113-132>

This paper explores the usage of GAI within digital media art classes in academia, focusing on a primary study performed on 10 students in an online Digital Arts course. They surveyed the students and teacher before and after the assignment, and showcased 5 of the 10 artworks with both the Craiyon output and the final student submission. On the whole, most students were either neutral or positive about the use of AI, however almost all believed that it should be limited to essentially "casual" execution and usage of the tool.

This study will be useful in showcasing the overall response and stance artists are taking on the role of AI within human artistry. In the study, the "Craiyon" text-to-image GAI tool used was far from refined and contained many distortions and inaccuracies. This was true of the study at the time, but looking at "Craiyon" now (2025) it has evolved to the point of extreme visual clarity, leagues ahead of what was being used at the time of this paper. Though this paper is recent, it has already become outdated in the specific toolset that was employed. I would argue that GAI should have stayed where it was at the time of this paper: a fun and goofy (sometimes horrific) tool that could barely pass as intelligible images. This left room for creativity and innovation to come in and "prop up" what was there, but now these tools eclipse even the capabilities of most artist in terms of realism and effectiveness. Essentially, this source will be good in showcasing real artist critique and perspective, along with how fast-paced the field is growing and how the landscape continues to evolve.

AbuMusab, Syed. "Generative AI and Human Labor: Who Is Replaceable?"  
\_AI & Society\_ 39, no. 6 (2023): 3051-53.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01773-3>

This paper highlights the arguments of the importance of human labor and who has already been replaced in the past by factory machines. It also highlights that now GAI is threatening that of "ivory tower denizens", people who held knowledge work as their security blanket. The paper asks where do humans stand in this, and what will be our action from this point?

An opinionated piece such as this is a useful voice to showcase in my research. Especially the two futures he describes, as well as the unfortunate connections to past human replacement by machines with labor workers, which all ties into the question of ethics for machine-led workloads. Also, the particular account of how art can be defined by technique and the steps required to achieve a result rather than the result itself, which AI skips ahead of.

Thomas, Sarah. "'Somebodies' and 'Nobodies': Generative AI and Audiovisual Performer Labor." \_The Velvet Light Trap\_ no. 94 (2024): 64-75  
<https://doi.org/10.7560/VLT9407>

The author explores the ethical considerations behind both using actor's performances as training material for AI and as a basis for extending their performances with accurate facsimiles. She frames the current climate under that of neoliberalism, stating that the current stance is that existing actors should curate a cohesive identity to properly brand themselves to protect against the theft of their likeness being used with AI. She astutely points out, however, that this does not account for the average "journeyman" working actor, who typically bills themselves as a generalist, taking on many roles that may not all fall under specific branding umbrellas.

This article specifically speaks to the ethical considerations surrounding that of voice actors and movie actors. This space is as much a valid consideration as image GAI and textual GAI. So far, the consensus brought about by the strikes in 2023 is that if an AI facsimile should share the likeness of a real actor, they require that the studio receives usage permissions and compensates the actor accordingly. However this doesn't cover their likeness being used with training models or to protect the average worker who makes their living by creating. This speaks not only to actors, but can be applied to all areas of artistic endeavor. The mere presence of economical AI solutions pushes out real working people from the workforce in substantial and damaging ways, and expecting people to react accordingly to the technology and not reframing the technology to serve human interests is a present concern and immediate issue.