



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## Artist's Views: Ai's Role In Modern Art And Creativity

Rahul Negi, MVA 4<sup>TH</sup> Semester, Department of Fine Arts, Graphic Era Hill University, Dehradun-248002, Uttarakhand.

### Abstract

This research paper finds the use of artificial intelligence (AI) on our thinking about human creativity and art values, with respect to contemporary art. nowadays, we have AI art programs (DALL·E, MidJourney, etc) that generates or makes artworks within the seconds, It's a big confusion and complication for artists and art scholars to understand and find out. They are now asking the question if these machine artworks really have feelings or originality, or is it just a copied style without soul? I am collecting and documenting thoughts as well as opinions from a variety of artists and as well as scholars, about their first emotional reactions to AI in their personal works and art practice, for example, Is it helping them be more creative, or slowly replacing them from their place? This paper is trying to show some major difference between human-created artworks and machine-made images with respect of emotions and creativity. Along with the responses, I also matched these points with the existing research and tried to find out what future art will look when both human skills and technology are working together or maybe against each other.

Keywords: AI in art, human creativity, contemporary visual art, artistic emotion, artist perception

### **Introduction**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a new common almost in every field and industry for the last few years, and now it's having a great presence in visual art as well. applications like DALL·E, Midjourney and DeepDream are used to make visual artwork that competes human-made artworks with fine detail and even professional style. Because of these major changes, many artists and scholars are now confused and asking similar types of questions like - What is art now? Is a machine an artist? Is AI is really creative, or is it just copying?

The deep emotions and psychological meanings that human artist have in their art through their life experience and feelings, AI still will not fully copy that. But at the same time, AI artworks are very fast, surprising, unpredictable and sometimes even look like they are just made by humans. Some people think that AI is just a tool for artists for their use, but some others feels that maybe it is slowly replacing them.

This paper tries to explore how both artists and art scholars react to these changes. I am collecting responses through a questionnaire to understand their responses- does AI engage creativity or is there a slow replace with AI? This paper will also relate their responses to materials that they used before.

## Literature Review

(Okafor et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2023) Today, it is common that the entry of AI into visual art is the most major shift in art as we know it. Art has always been a major human activity, born from human emotions, skills, and imagination. As we know, today, machines can make visual presentation that can be at least visually) to have been created by humans. This creates a conundrum for artists and art researchers alike, who wonder—Can a machine be creative, or does it simply have to be very smart to copy? Several authors including Okafor et al. (2024) and Wang et al. (2023) specifically addresses how artists can relate to AI copying artistic styles and forms. They note that while the visual aspects are often there, the emotional depth is absent.

(Kimura et al., 2024). To investigate how audiences respond to AI-generated art through their emotions, Kimura et al. (2024) found a similar experiment used a technique to measure simplicity and connection without source recognition. Their responders saw artworks without any knowing the source of identity as to whether they were made by AI or a human, and while participants get to know that there were some AI artworks that seemed good and liked because of design, they quickly noted that the human artworks created more of emotional connection for them than the AI artworks. This, as it indicated that while the AI artworks may be good in the technical sense, they seemed to lack emotional depth and hence connection. However, emotions are only one part of the story. There is another major challenges facing these artists is related to ownership as well as originality. Patel (2024) and Johnson et al. (2024) said that whenever an artwork is produced from AI, it is made on who deserves the credit, the person who gave the command, or the AI system, or the person who made the tool. Johnson's study pointed out that many artists see AI as an assistant or collaborator, not a complete replacement (Patel, 2024; Johnson et al., 2024).

So many number of artists are already employing AI to guide them in their studios and classrooms. Ahmed and Thakur (2023) mentioned how AI is providing students the opportunity to generate and develop ideas quickly, which allows for experimenting with a large range of ideas, styles and visual ideas. It saves time, provides new visuals ideas, and acts like an extra creative assistant, but in the end of the day, major concept and final idea comes from the human mind. (Ahmed & Thakur, 2023).

Then, there we have the emotional part again. Kim and Ko (2023) talked about how humans regard AI-generated artwork. In their study of people saw AI artwork, they found that even when the AI-generated painting was of good quality, the emotional connection was in a major lack because the painting was produced by machines not by the humans. Human-created paintings still have much deeper thoughts in it (Kim & Ko, 2023). This emotional connection seems somewhat nearly impossible for AI to replicate (Kim & Ko, 2023).

As to creativity, the case is still open. Colton and Wiggins (2012) proposed the idea of computers being called creative if they have produced something original and worthy, which they referred to as computational creativity. However, they also agreed that machines could do much of the work, but not if commands are not related to feelings or live experience, since that is different than human creativity. Colton and Wiggins (2012) further stated that machines are able to help the process, but the essence of art, including a piece or body of art, is about the soul of the artist.

Cultural context is another critical issue. Manovich (2019) stated that AI is trained with thousands of online images but will never be able to understand the cultural background or meaning of the images. This makes a disconnection, especially when the art is based on identity, politics, or heritage. While human artists bring a story with them into their artwork, AI art does not have a true story (Manovich, 2019).

McCormack et al. (2020) explained this as even AI-generated work still has an "intelligence", because all AI-generated work is guided and commanded by an artist, makes choices related to the data used, conceptualizes the intention of the work-In short, if there is no idea from a human being, then the AI is simply running codes. Therefore, while they argue that the traditional role of the artist is lost, it is in fact transposing (McCormack et al., 2020).

Lastly, "ethics". Rusch and Bostrom (2022) also warned that as AI becomes a very common thing in the creative field, the need for new conformance with ownership of work and credit become very important. They also state, it is important that AI does not take away the position of the human artist, especially as machines do not know what it is to express real life stories and struggles (Rusch & Bostrom, 2022).

## Methodology

In my research, I used Qualitative approach for this, I created a Google Form questionnaire and shared it with several visual artists and art scholars to gain their thoughts and perspectives about AI in the realm of art. The questionnaire itself included open-ended questions to allow for their brief responses as a written interview and their perspective and personal opinions regarding this subject.

I received 7 responses from artists who work in painting, sculpture, mixed media, and art history. Some of them self-identified as users of AI tools such as DALL·E and MidJourney and others do not use AI but provided their views based on their understandings.

The data and information were collected online and reviewed manually. I focused the reviews on the emotional responses, the experienced personal accounts and the opinion overall on AI in the creative process. Although response to the google form is unspecified I found it an interesting process to collect and share real time honest and straightforward views and information along with their perspective with real artists in today's time.

## Result and Discussion

After gathering insights and views from 7 artists and scholars, I observed some similar and conflicting thoughts about the ways how AI is impacting their creativity. The majority of artists shared that the AI is can create or we can say able of creating good-looking artworks, but, it lacks the ability to generate real feelings and originality as a human artist do. Some noted that the AI simply recombines data, whereas humans create from their own feelings and lived experiences. But, few of the artists mentioned that they are experimenting with AI tools like DALL·E, MidJourney or Adobe Firefly, in order to brainstorm ideas or play with color and forms. But they were clear that the main thinking and emotion come from the their own possibility. Others mentioned that they do not use AI or never feel the need for it in their artworks. When asked if AI is a threat or an aid, there was a majorly two contasting response. Some artists said that AI offers them freedom to work better and faster, while a couple of them said that it could threaten traditional art if not treated with care.

## Conclusion

The results from this study shows a clear awareness from artists regarding the impact AI may have in the art world. Artists in this study were open and willing to experiment with this medium, but still had deep essential value of human emotions, desired skill, and originality. AI is mainly regard as an additive creative tool and not a clear competitor. Artists feel human creativity is an organ of consciousness, intuition, and feeling--qualities that a machine can never release.

While informed of the potential for AI to replace the traditional "way" of making art and art practices, artists also had optimism that human creativity can grow in conjunction with the innovations presented by AI technology. With the right ethical boundaries and transparency of the process, AI can act as an effective assistant in modern creative practice, and the essence of art can still remain firmly rooted in human experience. Overall, this study shows that human artists are not disappearing; they are evolving.

## References

- Colton, S., & Wiggins, G. A. (2012). Computational creativity: The final frontier? *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 242, 21–26. <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-084-0-21>
- McCormack, J., Gifford, T., & Hutchings, P. (2019). Autonomy, authenticity, authorship and intention in computer generated art. *Procedia Computer Science*, 123, 451–458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2018.01.064>
- Manovich, L. (2019). AI aesthetics. *Digital Creativity*, 30(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14626268.2019.1575115>
- Ahmed, S. M., & Thakur, R. (2023). The rise of generative art: AI's influence on creative practices in design education. *Design Studies Quarterly*, 45(2), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2023.001>
- Kim, Y., & Ko, M. (2023). Emotional authenticity in AI-generated art: Viewer reactions and emotional trust. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 17(1), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000467>
- Patel, V. (2024). Authorship and ethics in the age of AI art: Redefining originality. *Journal of Art and Technology*, 38(1), 55–64.
- Johnson, L., Mehta, S., & Rao, V. (2024). Artists and artificial intelligence: A partnership or a replacement? *Journal of Contemporary Creative Practice*, 11(3), 23–38.
- Rusch, D. C., & Bostrom, N. (2022). Artificial creativity and aesthetic agency: Ethical concerns in human–AI collaborations. *Philosophy & Technology*, 35(3), 24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00483-0>
- Lee, H., & Zhao, L. (2024). Midjourney and the machine muse: How generative AI is reshaping visual language. *Visual Communication Review*, 18(2), 33–47.
- 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*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07068>
- Hertzmann, A. (2018). Can computers create art? *Arts*, 7(2), 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts7020018>

Miller, A. I. (2019). *The artist in the machine: The world of AI-powered creativity*. MIT Press.

Tsingos, N. (2022). AI-generated art and the evolving role of the human artist. *Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism*, 80(1), 134–142. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaac/kpab062>

Knight, W. (2023, January 12). This AI creates art—and sparks debate about what art is. *MIT Technology Review*. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/01/12/1066735/ai-generates-art-controversy/>

Crawford, K., & Paglen, T. (2021). Excavating AI: The politics of training sets for machine learning. *The Gradient*. <https://excavating.ai/>

Kimura, K., Matsuo, Y., & Hanai, K. (2024). Viewer responses to AI and human-generated images: A comparative study. *Art & Perception*, 12(1), 45–58.

Wang, Y., Choi, J., & Sharma, N. (2023). Understanding the cultural gap in AI-generated imagery. *Journal of Cultural Computing*, 6(2), 78–90.

Okafor, E., Singh, R., & Malik, F. (2024). Artificial imagination: Machine-made art and human interpretation. *International Journal of Visual Studies*, 14(3), 29–44.

