

Comparative Exegesis of Artificial Intelligence (Ai) And Human Arts in Meeting Different Contexts of Arts in Today's World

By

Abdulrasheed, A. Adavize

Animokuabul123@gmail.com

07035820613

Department of Fine Art
Faculty of Environmental Design
Ahmadu Bello University Zaria

&

RABIU, A. Badamasi (PhD)

rabiumasi@gmail.com

08035073846

Department of Fine Art
Faculty of Environmental Design

Ahmadu Bello University Zaria

Abstract

Art has shaped human identity for millennia, reflecting emotional depth and cultural memory through creative expression. Yet, the rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) challenges this human endeavor, by introducing new tools for art-making. The study addresses concerns that AI may standardize creativity, diminishing the authenticity of human artistry. It further investigates whether AI can match human creative intelligence in art-making and meet traditional studio arts standards across cultural, commercial and aesthetic contexts. Using a qualitative systematic literature review (SLR) of 25 peer-reviewed studies (2015–2025) and an experiment, comparing a human-drawn portrait of the Nigerian President, with Midjourney AI's output, AI's capabilities was analyzed. The SLR shows AI's technical prowess in producing art, but reveals its inability to capture cultural or emotional intent. The experiment underscores AI's generic outputs, lacking the human portrait's resonance. This exegesis, positions AI, as a collaborative tool, not a substitute, thereby, advocating for ethical frameworks and culturally sensitive AI training. Findings highlight the irreplaceable value of human creativity, urging future research to

explore AI's role in supporting and not overshadowing artistic expression.

Key Word:-

- Visual Arts.
- Human Arts.
- Artificial Intelligence (AI).
- Human Intelligence.
- Art Making.
- Standard of Studio Arts.

Introduction

Visual Arts, over centuries, has been an avenue with which human thrives and survives. Human Arts were achieved through manipulation of the technology at a disposal. The form of technology available, at each given time, brings about a transformative technology that transits from generation to generation. Artificial Intelligence (AI), as a new form of innovation, has become prevalent. So, there is a need to hinge on the foundation of arts that shrouded in art ideation, philosophy, human expressions and intuitiveness. This paper, therefore, set to compare the different contexts in which Artificial Intelligence (AI) operates, compared to human artistic intelligence. The objectives are; to find out if Artificial Intelligence (AI) can reach the level of Human Intelligence in Art Making; and to assess the output of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that can meet the Standard of Studio Arts. A qualitative content analysis is adopted for the paper in help to examine visual elements, themes and styles. The population of the the study is made up of 400 Level painting students, from Ahmadu Bello University Zaria. The population also comprised of Art Works generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI) developed, with prompts similar to those of human artists. Key findings revealed that Artificial Intelligence (AI) struggles to embed cultural, symbolic and contextual meanings; where Human Artists, consistently demonstrate thematic intentionality and stylistic adherence. It is so recommended that, rather than consuming what Artificial Intelligence (AI) produces with trust, it should be seen as a mere Tinnovation and stimulant for ideas, and instead of factual art productions. Thus, conclusions are drawn from the analysis done.

Background

Since the dawn of human civilization, art has been an avenue with which humans thrived and survived. The arts satisfy human social, psychological, emotional, aesthetic, domestic and mental needs. Most of human needs were achieved through the manipulation of the technology, at their disposal. These technologies, ranging from primitive tools used in cave art, to the complex media of the Renaissance and beyond, have always played a pivotal role in shaping artistic expression. Art therefore, is not static; it evolves in tandem with human advancement materially and immaterially, in terms of technology and ideas respectively. This then reflects in shift worldviews, emotions and collective memory. The collaboration of ideas and modern technology has greatly informed advancement in human interactions and endeavors. This has given rise to lots of sophistications, especially with the advent of technologies such as biotechnology, Information and Communication Technology (ICT), Robotic Technology and more recently, Artificial Intelligence (AI).

While Artificial Intelligence is a new form of innovation, that has become prevalent, there is need to hinge on the foundation of art that is shrouded in history, ideation, philosophy, crafts-making, human expressive depth, exploration, creativity, and intuitiveness. These characteristics ground art in the lived realities of human experience. Amabile (2018) postulates that, one of the fundamental components of creativity, lies in its capacity to produce fresh or novel ideas and possibilities.

This argument supports an apparent distinction of human creative ingenuity, as compared to machine abilities. This foundation is what distinguishes art as more than mere product or decoration; it is a deeply human endeavor engrained in centuries of cultural memory and existential inquiry. AI, despite its impressive capabilities, enters this space, as a tool, attempting to prove it can fully replicate the soul and spontaneity that defines human-made art. With the increased confrontation on the intersection of machine logic and human creativity, it becomes vital, to assess not just what AI can do, but what it might displace, or overlook, in the realm of artistic meaning.

The papers conceptualization

The core problem lies in the potential detriments posed by Artificial Intelligence, particularly in its tendency to inhibit human creativity, a trait that has been central to human identity, since the origin of life. Mazzola et al. (2023) argue that, AI-based tools could threaten art by standardizing creativity and diminishing the artist's control over their own work. This mechanization of the creative process, risks reducing artistic diversity and undermining the spontaneity that characterizes human expression. Additionally, the growing accessibility and capability of AI, have prompted ethical concerns in academic settings, where fears of plagiarism and intellectual dilution, have led some, to advocate for outright restrictions on AI usage (Francke and Alexander, 2019). These concerns, inform the urgency of critically examining the implications of AI in artistic practice, particularly, as it challenges long-held notions of originality, authorship and human agency.

Hence, the objectives of this paper are to; find out if Artificial Intelligence (AI) can reach the level of Human Intelligence in Art Making; and to assess the output of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that can meet the Standard of Studio Arts.

The literature reviewed, synthesizes evidence regarding the correlation between artificial intelligence (AI) and human arts, in terms of whether AI may mimic human creative intelligence and surpass studio arts tests in cultural, commercial and aesthetic uses. The review is organized into five thematic areas such as: understanding of AI and Generative AI; AI's role in art creation; comparisons of human and AI creativity; contextual applications of AI and human arts; and ethical and philosophical implications. These themes address the study's objectives by examining AI's capabilities, limitations and societal impacts in art-making.

Understanding Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI

The coming of Artificial intelligence propels a new form of engagement in the art world. Its availability give rise to innovations in art production, aided by computer and many other digital tools. This development has been appraised by many, especially noticing the innovativeness that can hardly be seen in art practices. However, while artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming the world of art (Shen and Yu, 2021), it pushes the boundaries of traditional mode of art creation known within the constraints of space,

time, and natural logic (Cajulis, Tuazon, and Cabauatan, 2025). This thereby, offers a new form of making and experiencing arts.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a smart tool that has been prevalent in the production of digital arts. This ranges from still images, audio cloning, to video making. Generative AI therefore, refers to a technology that utilizes deep learning models, to produce human-like content, such as text and images, in response to diverse prompts, including language inputs, instructions, and questions (Lim et al., 2023). The authors elucidate further that, unlike predictive AI, which analyzes input data to generate forecasts, or decisions, generative AI is designed to produce original content that resembles its training data, without duplicating it.

Generative AI systems can be broadly categorized into three types:

- (i) Text-to-Text
- (ii) Text-to-Image
- (iii) Text-to-Music

Text-to-text models generate natural language outputs such as code, summaries, or responses that are based on textual prompts. These include applications like machine translation, summarization and question-answering (Heigl, 2025). Models like ChatGPT for instance, predict the next word, in a sequence, to generate coherent text. Text-to-image systems, such as DALL·E, convert textual descriptions into visual representations, while text-to-music systems like MusicLM (Agostinelli et al., 2023) transform textual prompts, into audio outputs. Alongside these innovations, concerns have emerged regarding copyright infringement, authenticity and misuse for misinformation (Bird et al., 2023). These ethical challenges further complicate debates on originality and the role of human creativity in GenAI-generated art.

AI's Role in Art Creation

Artificial intelligence, more so generative AI, has transformed the field of art making, through control over content creation in various domains. Generative AI models, such as DALL-E, Midjourney and MusicLM, use deep neural networks to produce human-crafted results; For instance, visual art, music and text, from a text description (Lim et al., 2023). These models are grouped into text-to-text, text-to-image and text-to-music models, which enable applications like machine translation, image

generation and music generation (Agostinelli et al., 2023; Heigl, 2025). DALL-E 2 for instance, generates complex visual artwork that is indistinguishable from human-generated works in a controlled environment employing convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and generative adversarial networks (GANs) (Anantrasirichai and Bull, 2022).

Anantrasirichai and Bull (2022) are of the opinion that, AI utilization in creative industries extends from content creation, to analyzing information, enhancing content and compressing data. For example, AI application DeepDream and Jukedek, assist artists in generating new concepts or even change existing pieces, by enhancing visual effects and animation processes (Jaffe et al., 2024). Case studies highlight AI's role, as a painter, DJ, or performance artist, by demonstrating its versatility in producing art for online platforms and virtual reality experiences (Oksanen et al., 2023). However, in the view of Van Hees et al (2025), AI's creative process relies on human-defined prompts and training data, which limit its autonomy as compared to human artists.

Human Creativity versus AI Creativity

Whether AI can match human creative intelligence, is the query that drives this study. Human creativity is deliberate, emotionally profound and culturally meaningful, grounded in embodied experience (Amabile, 2018). Sawyer (2012), argues that, while AI excels in pattern recognition and analytics, it lacks embodied cognition and emotional capability that make up human artistry. There are conflicting findings from empirical studies. For instance, studies using the Figural Interpretation Quest (FIQ), found that ChatGPT-4 outperformed humans in adaptability (generating diverse interpretations), but was rated lower in human-subjective creativity (Oksanen et al., 2023). Similarly, human creative individuality in short story writing, is boosted by generative AI, but reduced collective novelty, as AI-driven outputs begin to converge on typical themes (Agarwal, 2024). Human-created art prefers preference, over public perception. Experiments show that paintings in the human-made category are rated higher on liking, beauty, depth and value, even if identical to those produced by AI (Chamberlain et al., 2023). The bias holds even with the ability of AI to produce indistinguishable paintings, revealing human paintings are valued because they are experienced as having an intention and emotional depth (Chiarella et al., 2022). But other studies demonstrate

growing acceptance of AI-generated art, with participants preferring AI-generated images at a 45% rate when they are not labeled as such (Cajulis et al., 2025). Findings from these studies increases controversies and confusions between superior technology in AI and subjective value of human art.

Ernst (2023) emphasize that, AI cannot match human intelligence in art-making. AI systems like Midjourney, rely on human prompts and mimic patterns from training data, lacking the emotional depth and intentionality of human creativity. Experts like Deepak Khazanchi (n.d) emphasize that AI, mimics but does not embody creativity, acting as a tool, dependent on human input. While AI's complex outputs can seem novel, they are limited to recombining existing patterns, not originating art from human-like experience or emotion.

Additionally, AI can produce technically proficient images, but often fails to meet studio arts standards, due to its reliance on pre-existing data and lack of process-driven depth (Ernst, 2023). Example of this, is when Ernst's experiments with Midjourney, it showed mixed results, with generic or literal outputs. An image of a building, as seen in fig. 1 was provided to Midjourney AI to reproduce, with prompt such as "In the style of Salvador". Its generation was expected to be representation of Dali Salvador's style, however, what it produced, is as seen in fig. 2.



Fig. 1: Arts & Sciences Hall (ASH) Reference image, credit: Fox 42 KPTM in Ernst (2023)



Fig. 2: Images returned from Midjourney using the reference image in Fig. 1 and telling it to do it “in the style of Salvador Dali”. Credit: Ernst (2023).

Another test for Midjourney AI, through experimentation in the work of Ernst, is another task to produce an image. The prompter entered “University of Nebraska”, expecting to see prominent university building, logo, or mascot. However, what is seen is a nondescript and random building with some indescribable writeups as seen in fig. 3.



Fig. 3: Images generated from the prompt “University of Nebraska Omaha”. Credit: Ernst (2023)

Contextual Uses of AI and Human Arts

Cultural Context

In cultural contexts, art represents what society holds valuable and collective memory. Human artists use personal and cultural experience, to create art that carries profound meaning, whereas AI uses data-driven patterns (Mazzola et al., 2023). Research shows that AI art, is challenged to capture cultural subtleties, because it lacks the embodied experience of human artists (Van Hees et al., 2025). For example, AI art, can mimic styles, but seldom takes up social or historical significance, present in human art; For example, abstract expressionism’s response to Soviet social realism (Mazzone and Elgammal, 2019), or the making of painting that depict the Egbira ethnic group cultural performance, in North Central Nigeria. This kind of prompt and task may be too specific of a context to AI. Nevertheless, AI systems, like Creative Adversarial Networks (CANs) tend

to diverge from learned styles, to produce novel things, which signals potential paths to cultural innovation (Elgammal et al., 2017). Despite this, it may still lack inherence on cultural and symbolic contexts of certain group of people.

Commercial Context

In commerce, AI makes production more efficient and reduces workload. Manila, Philippines-based artists, also share how they are leveraging AI tools, to make more money and adapt to client requirements, integrating traditional and AI methods (Cajulis et al., 2025). AI has streamlined processes in advertising, visual effects and animation, as programs like Midjourney have won awards from art competitions like the Théâtre D'opéra Spatial, in 2022 (Lammi, 2024). However, much as AI art is loved less monetarily than human art, it represents lower feelings of authenticity (Chiarella et al., 2022). Standardized productions also threaten artistic variety in commercial application (Mazzola et al., 2023).

Aesthetic Context

Aesthetically, art is judged by its capacity to evoke beauty, emotional resonance, and sensory engagement, deeply tied to human intentionality (Gaut, 2007). Human artists imbue works with personal and cultural significance, creating aesthetic value, through subjective expression. AI-generated art, such as that produced by Stable Diffusion or VQ-VAE-2, excels in replicating visual styles, but often lacks the intentionality of human creations (Hertzmann, 2020). There are indications that, AI can produce aesthetically pleasing outputs, yet, human art is preferred for its perceived depth and authenticity. For instance, AI-generated abstract art, may mimic forms but struggles with the emotional context of human expressionism (Epstein et al., 2020). However, AI's ability to generate novel aesthetics, through style transfer, challenges traditional notions of artistic value (Manovich, 2024).

Ethical and Philosophical Implications

The use of AI in art, has ethical issues regarding authorship, originality, and cultural appropriation. AI's reliance on training data, scraped from human artworks, has sparked debates over copyright infringement and plagiarism (Bird et al., 2023). For instance, artists like Holly Herndon have developed tools, such as Spawning AI, to protect their works from

unauthorized use in AI training (Miltner and Highfield, 2024). Philosophically, AI challenges traditional definitions of creativity. Schema theory predicts that audiences underappreciate AI art, based on prejudice that connects creativity with being human (Hong and Curran, 2019). However, some are against it, that AI is a new medium, not a replacement, which results in collaboration, not rivalry (du Sautoy, 2019).

Dependence on AI also has risks. In schools, excessive use of AI conversation systems, might lower creativity and critical thinking, as students easily adopt what AI comes up with, without scrutiny (Zhai et al., 2024). This thus, demands harmonious integration, where AI plays the role of complementing rather than substituting, for human creativity. The argument in philosophy extends to whether AI is actually capable of “creating” or merely mimicking, with researchers arguing that, human creativity encompasses problem-finding and embodied cognition, something that AI does not (Van Hees et al., 2025).

Methodology and Theoretical Framework

This paper adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) to explore whether AI can match human creative intelligence in art-making and meet studio arts standards across cultural, commercial, and aesthetic contexts. This paper is qualitative in nature, emphasizing interpretive analysis of creativity and contextual fit. The SLR is used to examine peer-reviewed studies from 2015-2025, which focuses on AI and human arts comparisons. Data were extracted on art forms, contexts and findings related to creativity and quality. Thematic synthesis, which adopts creativity as a framework, was used to evaluate AI’s artistic capabilities against human standards. An exegetical analysis interprets these findings, to assess AI’s role in art, by exploring its philosophical and cultural implications.

This study employs the Theory of Mind (ToM) and The Intentional Stance, to examine artificial intelligence (AI) and human arts in cultural, commercial and aesthetic contexts. ToM, introduced by Premack and Woodruff (1978), refers to attributing mental states, such as beliefs, intentions and emotions, to entities, including AI. In art, ToM helps analyze how artists and audiences perceive AI’s creative role, questioning whether AI’s algorithmic outputs reflect genuine intentionality (Hong and Curran, 2019). The Intentional Stance, proposed by Dennett (1987), interprets AI’s

art, as if it possesses intent, despite lacking consciousness, shaping its cultural and commercial reception (Cajulis et al., 2025). These frameworks probe philosophical questions about AI's creativity, compared to human artistry's emotional depth (Amabile, 2018). They also address ethical issues, such as authorship and intellectual property, informing the exegesis of AI's artistic role (Bird et al., 2023).

Findings from the literature

The systematic literature Sreview compared human and artificial intelligence creativity through the assessment of 25 articles from 2015 to 2025 to ascertain if AI is capable of mimicking human creative intelligence and fulfilling studio arts standards in cultural, commercial and aesthetic spheres. The research demonstrated AI's exceptional technical proficiency, with models such as DALL-E, Stable Diffusion and MusicLM generating complex visual artworks, music and fiction that were often not distinguishable from human work, in controlled environments (Anantrasirichai and Bull, 2022; Agostinelli et al., 2023; Heigl, 2025). But AI's dependence on human commands and training data, restricts its autonomy, as seen in Midjourney's generic response to specific prompts such as "University of Nebraska Omaha" or "in the style of Salvador Dalí," without conveying the required intent (Ernst, 2023).

Similarly, this study's experiment, reinforces AI's limitations in capturing specific intent. To evaluate AI's creative capabilities, this study conducted an experiment comparing a portrait of Nigerian President, Ahmed Bola Tinubu, generated by Midjourney AI, with a portrait created by a young artist, assessing contexts such as creativity, emotional depth, and studio arts standards.



Fig. 4: Portrait of Nigerian President by Morenikeji Ebunoluwa Joshua.
Credit: Instagram, 2025.

With the portrait of work in progress and the final work in fig. 4, humans can easily discern whose image it is, in the drawing made by the young artist. On the other hand, prompt such as “produce a portrait of Nigerian

president” was tasked of Midjourney AI and what is seen in fig. 5 was its output.



Fig. 5: Image generated by Midjourney AI with the prompt “produce a portrait of Nigerian president”.

Fig. 5 shows a portrait vastly different from what the Nigerian president is known to look like. And as such, different from the realistic drawing of the young artist. Hence, this goes in tandem with the opinion of Mazzola et al. (2023) who postulated that human artists use personal and cultural experience to create art that carries profound meaning.

Human creativity, rooted in embodied cognition and emotional intensity, is always superior to AI, with the general public voting in favor of human art, for its beauty, genuineness and cultural significance, even if AI art is equal (Amabile, 2018; Chiarella et al., 2022; Oksanen et al., 2023).

In cultural contexts, AI is unable to communicate symbolic meaning, especially as they are unlike human artists, that assign historical meaning (Mazzone and Elgammal, 2019). Commercially, AI enhances efficiency, for

example, Midjourney's award-winning artwork, but threatens to homogenize outputs, destroying diversity (Cajulis et al., 2025; Lammi, 2024). Aesthetically, AI generates visually attractive shapes, but without the emotional context of human expressionism, although style transfer provides new potential (Epstein et al., 2020; Manovich, 2024). Ethical issues, such as copyright violation by AI's use of human information, were noted, with Spawning AI suggested to safeguard artists (Bird et al., 2023; Miltner and Highfield, 2024). These observations have placed AI, as a handy instrument that supports technical artwork creation, but is less emotionally and contextually rich, compared to human creativity, such that it cannot completely satisfy studio arts requirements.

Therefore,

This exegesis interprets findings that highlight artificial intelligence's technical prowess in art-making, while exposing its philosophical and aesthetic limitations as compared to human creativity. Aesthetically, AI generates visually striking forms, as seen in outputs from models like DALL-E, but lacks the emotional resonance that human art, rooted in lived experience, consistently delivers (Amabile, 2018). Human artists imbue their work with cultural and emotional depth, which are significantly absent, in AI's data-driven patterns (Mazzone and Elgammal, 2019). Philosophically, the question persists: can AI, devoid of consciousness, produce art with existential meaning? Human creativity's intentionality, grounded in embodied cognition, surpasses AI's algorithmic mimicry, affirming art's role as a human endeavor (Gaut, 2007). Commercially, AI's efficiency, demonstrated by Midjourney's award-winning artworks, streamlines production, but risks standardizing aesthetics, threatening the diversity that defines artistic innovation (Cajulis et al., 2025; Mazzola et al., 2023). Ethically, AI's dependence on human-generated data, raises critical concerns about authorship and intellectual property, prompting solutions like Spawning AI, to protect artists' rights (Bird et al., 2023).

The Theory of Mind and Intentional Stance provide a lens to understand these dynamics (Premack and Woodruff, 1978; Dennett, 1987). While audiences may attribute creative intent to AI's outputs, perceiving them as purposeful, through the Intentional Stance, ToM reveals AI's lack of genuine mental states, distinguishing it from human artists (Hong and Curran, 2019). This framework underscores AI's role, as a collaborative

tool, not a creator, echoing du Sautoy's (2019) vision of harmonious integration. This paper, advocates for preserving human artistry's unique emotional and cultural value, ensuring AI complements, rather than supplants the soulful essence of creative expression.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This paper shows that, AI produces technically impressive art but falls short of human creativity's emotional depth and cultural meaning, in the spheres of cultural, commercial and aesthetic contexts. The experiment done, which compares AI and human portraits, confirms that AI struggles with specific intent and studio arts standards. This exegesis reveals AI, as a valuable tool for collaboration, not a replacement for human artistry. The paper therefore, advocates for ethical AI use and culturally sensitive training, to enhance its relevance. Future studies can explore how AI can support, not overshadow, the unique human essence of art and ingenuity in order to ensure that creativity remains a deeply human endeavor.

This paper thus recommends that:

1. Artists should be encouraged to integrate AI tools (DALL-E and Midjourney) as collaborative aids, rather than superior platforms, to enhance technical efficiency while preserving human intentionality and cultural depth.
2. Frameworks like Spawning AI, should be implemented to protect artists' intellectual property, ensuring AI training data respects copyright and authorship, thus mitigating ethical concerns, in cultural and commercial contexts.
3. AI models, should be enhanced, to incorporate cultural and historical datasets e.g., Nigerian symbolism, to improve their ability to produce contextually relevant art, reducing homogenization, to aligning closer to studio arts standards.

References

- Agarwal, A. (2024). Is AI the End of Human Creativity? *Journal of Advances in Science and Technology*, 20(2), 21-27.
- Agostinelli, A., Denk, T. I., Borsos, Z., Engel, J., Verzetti, M., Caillon, A., ... & Frank, C. (2023). Musiclm: Generating music from text. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11325.
- Amabile, T. M. (2018). *Creativity in Context: Update to the Social Psychology of Creativity*. Routledge.

- Anantrasirichai, N., & Bull, D. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in the Creative Industries: A Review. *Artificial intelligence review*, 55(1), 589-656.
- Bird, C., Ungless, E., & Kasirzadeh, A. (2023, August). Typology of Risks of Generative Text-To-Image Models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (pp. 396-410).
- Cajulis, R. C. J. C., Tuazon, J. A. O., & Cabauatan, R. R. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Digital Art: A Comparative Analysis on Impacts to Artists. *International Journal of Arts, Recreation and Sports*, 4(1), 1–27. <http://www.carijournals.org/>
- 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, 107406.
- Du Sautoy, M. (2019). *The Creativity Code: Art and Innovation in the Age of AI*. Harvard University Press.
- Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., & Mazzone, M. (2017). Can Creative Adversarial Networks, Generating “Art” by Learning about Styles and Deviating from Style Norms? arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07068.
- Epstein, Z., Levine, S., Rand, D. G., & Rahwan, I. (2020). Who Gets Credit for AI-Generated Art?. *Iscience*, 23(9).
- Ernst, H. (2023). *Artificial: A Study on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Art*. University of Nebraska at Omaha.
- Francke, E., & Alexander, B. (2019). Entrepreneurial Development in South Africa through Innovation: A model for Poverty Alleviation. *Acta Commercii*, 19(1), 1-11.
- Goodwin, T. (2020, March 12). University of Nebraska Omaha to begin remote learning amid COVID-19. KPTM. <https://fox42kptm.com/news/local/university-of-nebraska-omaha-to-begin-remote-learning-amid-covid-19>
- Heigl, R. (2025). Generative Artificial Intelligence in Creative Contexts: A Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, 1-38. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11301-025-00494-9.pdf>
- Hertzmann, A. (2020). Visual Indeterminacy in GAN art. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2020 Art Gallery* (pp. 424-428).

- Hong, J. W., & Curran, N. M. (2019). Artificial Intelligence, Artists, and Art: Attitudes toward Artwork Produced by Humans vs. Artificial Intelligence. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)*, 15(2s), 1-16.
- Lammi, D. (2024). Focal Issues of Sustainable Development Presented by the World Economic Forum 2024.
- Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>
- Manovich, L. (2024). Separate and Reassemble: Generative AI through the lens of art and media histories. *MATRIZES*, 18(2), 7-18.
- Mazzola, G., Carapezza, M., Chella, A., & Mantoan, D. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Art Generation: An Open Issue. In *International Conference on Image Analysis and Processing* (pp. 258-269). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019, February). Art, Creativity, and the Potential of Artificial Intelligence. In *Arts* (Vol. 8, No. 1, p. 26). MDPI.
- Miltner, K., & Highfield, T. (2024, September). The Possibilities of “Good” Generative AI in the Cultural and Creative Industries. In *Proceedings of the British Academy*. British Academy.
- 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), 100004.
- Premack, D., & Woodruff, G. (1978). Does the Chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 1(4), 515-526.
- Sawyer, R. K., & Henriksen, D. (2024). *Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation*. Oxford university press.
- Shen, Y., & Yu, F. (2021). The Influence of Artificial Intelligence on Art Design in the Digital Age. *Scientific Programming*, 2021(1), 4838957.
- Van Hees, J., Grootswagers, T., Quek, G. L., & Varlet, M. (2025). Human Perception of Art in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1497469.



Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The Effects of Over-Reliance on AI Dialogue Systems on Students' Cognitive Abilities: A Systematic Review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1), 28.

