©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS ISSN: 2579-0773

International Digital Organization for Scientific Research IDOSRJAH12100

IDOSR JOURNAL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES 12(1):65-75, 2026.

https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAH/2025/1216575

Generative AI as Co-Author in Creative Practice: Authorship, Originality, and Aesthetics (2020-Present)

Kato Nabirye H.

Faculty of Business, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Since 2020, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) systems have increasingly functioned as co-authors within creative practice, reshaping established understandings of authorship, originality, and aesthetics. This study critically examines the evolving role of GenAI in artistic production across visual arts, literature, music, performance, and multimodal creation. It situates GenAI within theoretical traditions of authorship, drawing on Foucauldian and post-structuralist perspectives, while interrogating the implications of machine participation in processes traditionally reserved for human creativity. The analysis explores shifting notions of originality in an era of algorithmic recombination and data-driven generation, highlighting tensions between novelty, replication, and cultural reuse. It further considers aesthetic evaluation in AI-augmented works, focusing on criteria such as contextual significance, novelty, replicability, and human–machine collaboration. Legal, ethical, and institutional dimensions are also addressed, particularly concerning attribution, intellectual property, bias, and accountability. Through case-based reflections on contemporary creative practices, the study demonstrates how GenAI operates not merely as a tool but as an active participant in iterative creative processes. Ultimately, it argues that GenAI does not abolish traditional frameworks of creativity but instead transforms and extends them, requiring new conceptual, pedagogical, and policy-oriented approaches to authorship in the digital age.

Keywords: Generative AI, Co-authorship, Creativity, Originality, and Aesthetics

INTRODUCTION

Generative AI (genAI) has rapidly evolved from an emerging technology to one widely deployed across various domains, with culturally significant impacts manifesting since mid-2022[1]. Artists, writers, musicians, and performers increasingly rely on AI systems to help create or curate works spanning diverse media such as visual arts, literature, sound, and interactive installations. These systems can assume multiple roles, collaborating with human practitioners in different ways, and are already integrated into educational practices [2]. Collaborating with genAI systems raises urgent questions about the concepts of authorship, originality, and aesthetics in creative practice. The critical analysis proceeds in nine parts. First, a conceptual framework establishes definitions of authorship and originality relevant to human-machine collaboration in generative creative processes and outlines the aesthetic implications of computationally mediated practice [3]. Next, an overview of generative AI as a co-author distinguishes these systems from mere tools through engagement of distinct interaction paradigms and discussions of attribution, entitlement, and ownership [4]. Legal and ethical dimensions including authorship attribution, rights and responsibilities, and the transparency of bias are then considered. A series of case studies documents creative practices with genAI in visual arts, literature, music, performance, and multimodal works since the technology first emerged, illustrating diverse modes of collaboration[5]. The discussion then assesses how aesthetic value and originality are evaluated in AI-augmented work, examining criteria for assessment deployed by critics and appreciated by audiences, as well as the replicability, novelty, and significance of generated content. The subsequent section explores pedagogical implications, including potential curriculum design, skills development, ethical literacy, and assessment frameworks for student and professional projects [6]. Next, policy

and institutional considerations address institutional guidelines for tools and practices, governance and oversight, funding, rights management, dissemination, and international and cross-disciplinary dimensions. Future trajectories address philosophical questions regarding the evolution of authorship, the societal impact of AI-enabled creativity, and open questions for further inquiry [7].

The Conceptual Framework: Authorship and Originality in Creative Practice

The advent of generative AI tools capable of producing textual, visual, and sonic materials has sparked intense debate regarding the nature of authorship and originality in creative practice [1]. These tools have the potential to reshape the way creative agents engage with knowledge and culture throughout the creative process. They can also alter traditional assumptions regarding whether the practice constitutes genuine creativity[2]. Creative works produced with these generative systems exist within a conceptual framework in which traditional notions of authorship and originality are reappraised [2]. It is essential to examine these frameworks to disentangle the complex questions that arise when interactions with generative AI systems participate in the co-creation of artefacts during the creative process [3]. Important issues surrounding authorship, originality, and aesthetics concerning the use of generative AI in creative practice therefore merit careful consideration. Theoretical foundations commonly invoked when examining authorship concern the designation of a creator of knowledge artefacts such as manuscripts, paintings, or sculptures [4]. Legal documentation and legislation address ownership of artefacts, entitlements to royalties, equity in the distribution of social networks, acknowledgements in acknowledgements, and links and tags in social media posts. Academic work often employs distinct yet interconnected concepts of attribution and entitlement, defining the former as a "social statement" about the creator of a work. Such legal documents and concepts may not apply conveniently to materials and arrangements generated in collaboration with generative systems [5].

Theoretical Foundations of Authorship

The concept of authorship is deeply embedded in scholarly discussions that traverse multiple fields, including philosophy, literature, media studies, sociology, and the arts. Yet, a clear and universal definition remains elusive. The French historian and philosopher Michel Foucault offered one of the most influential approaches, posing the question, "What is an author?" in the inaugural lecture for the Collège de France in 1969[6]. For Foucault, the author is a discursive function that imposes a limit on meaning, a classification that determines the status of a work as a text, a system of knowledge that organizes discourse, and both a theoretical and practical instrument for controlling the evolution of a text and establishing the rights of others [7]. Foucault defines authorship as primarily a system of classification that serves to determine the status of a text within cultural discourse and knowledge systems [5]. Later developments of the concept incorporate the rights of authors and the legal regime of copyright that were transformed by the industrial revolution, extending to the historical emergence of the concept, its relation to the development of the printing press and mass media, and the subsequent transformations produced by electronic media [4]. Such analysis has been elaborated extensively by cultural theorists, such as the French philosopher Roland Barthes. Barthes provocatively claimed "the death of the author" in a 1968 essay that argued for greater focus on the reception of a literary work rather than on the authorship that defined its status as literature [3]. Contemporary discussions of authorship by scholars such as the communication theorist Jay David Bolter and the new media theorist Lev Manovich assert that new media technologies may be shifting the very concept of authorship itself. The historicity of authorship as a classification system has thus become a central focus of critical investigations into AI systems that participate in contemporary creative practice [3]. The pervasive systems known as generative models, trained on exceptional amounts of text, images, audio, and other forms of datas are capable of generating new material that closely imitates, emulates, or synthesizes their training datasets. Such functionality poses fundamental questions about the role and identity of authors [2].

Originality in the age of Generative Systems

The impact of generative systems on the perception of originality has become a focal point of debate across various fields. These systems produce outputs that seem to imitate a classical approach of originality, an original interpretation of existing materials [3]. The innovation of remixing and recombination coexists alongside the more traditional view of turning to materials that have yet to be activated. Traditional understandings of originality, such as creativity (originality in terms of expression) or novelty (originality in terms of artefacts), have continued to evolve over centuries [4]. Multiple perspectives align with core principles of independence: works are original if they are not based on prior works; authors are original if they do not reproduce others; and the criteria upheld by others represent a set of individual interpretations or aspects to consider [2]. Generative systems pose a rising challenge to the widely held conviction that creativity, originality, and copyright are merely about painstakingly absorbing art history [5]. Perceptions of these properties swing to the other extreme, amplifying the ambition to become pure generators of the relevant knowledge and art images rather than remaining belief-consuming crowds [1]. AI-enhanced work has augmented rather than displaced the original crafting effort and ideas, which remains the dominating life force in the creation of the knowledge and art image of concern. These paradigms indicate that the extension or invasion of generative technologies into artistic creation

does not necessitate a fundamental paradigm shift in the conceptual framework or the types of modes and resources of creativity and action [2].

Aesthetics and Computational Mediation

As generative AI increasingly shapes creative practice, aesthetic evaluation becomes a primary concern. Several factors differentiate machine-produced from human-produced artefacts, driving nascent human-artificial forms of collaboration [2]. Generative systems offer diverse possibilities to engage computational models in creative workflows, with modalities encompassing visual arts, literature, music, and mixed media. The computational mediation of artefacts engenders a distinctive practice in which both human- and machine-generated artefacts circulate [3]. Determining the aesthetic value of a machine-produced work requires assessing its contextual relationship to a person's creative activity, the system's operational principles, and external factors linked to its manifestation [4]. Clarifying the manner in which generative systems influence creative practice not only directly informs aesthetic evaluation, but also informs authorship attribution and the discourse around originality [3].

Generative AI as Co-Author: Modes of Collaboration

Generative systems such as ChatGPT, DALL-E, and Stable Diffusion have emerged as tools capable of producing artifacts in diverse modalities, including text, imagery, music, and video. With these systems deployed via user-accessible online platforms, the requisite technical skill for leveraging their capabilities is limited, expanding access to new creative possibilities [2]. The term "co-author" applies to generative systems when they contribute ideas and content that informs a creator's work. Within user-directed dialogues, generative systems can assume the role of a knowledgeable collaborator, engaging in back-and-forth discussions, providing targeted feedback, clarifying ineffective prompts, proposing enhancements, or functionally critiquing user-supplied material[4]. The generative system can be seen as a book, section, character, or narrative thread, ranging from conceptually specific to holistic [3]. Significant variation exists in affiliation with generative systems, as both entire artifacts and isolated elements can be generated. Texts generated with explicit attribution still incite questions concerning acceptable levels of incorporation. While textual scholarship affords the freedom to closely engage with and build upon a colleague's work, creative practice may demand more stringent norms [4]. These differences are proportional to the material and contextual significance ascribed to individual contributions, and variation extends across modalities. The role of the generative system must be analyzed using interaction paradigms, or the types of exchanges that unfold during collaboration [6]. The capacities and limitations of these systems differ across modalities such as image, music, text, and video, engendering further differentiation in how they facilitate collaborative engagement [7].

Tool vs. co-author: delineating roles

Generative AI is frequently framed as a novel computational tool that extends human creativity, similar to a camera, musical instrument, or voice synthesizer [5]. Yet a growing number of practitioners characterize it as a co-author or collaborator that creatively participates in the generative process during production, evoking parallels with the role of a human editor [2]. This distinction leads to differing interpretations of the notion of authorship: a traditional view emphasizes the author-centric nature of creative practice and tool use, while a collaborative perspective highlights the involvement of an agent, human or non-human, that contributes substantially to a creative endeavor [3]. Clarifying the roles assumed by generative AI allows a more nuanced examination of alternative interaction modalities, promptting, feedback, and iterative exchange, which can support engagement with such systems. The subsequent section investigates how these roles are assigned in practice[6].

Interaction paradigms: prompting, feedback, and iteration

Emerging generative models allow creation of new visual or audiovisual content, and they have the potential to speed up creative practice and increase opportunities for experimentation in various domains [2]. Tools that provide nondirective suggestions and augment the original ideas of practitioners can be particularly effective in interactive creative applications. Analyzing the potential of these tools involves examining the nature of conversations qualified by generative systems and elaborating interaction situations [1]. Engaging with the current generative solutions for artistic creation shows that they explicitly require humans to write complete sentences, whereas adding some degree of delivery within the interaction might favor exploration of the creative domain [5]. Several interaction schemes can characterize the content of objects and ways of engaging with them. When a practitioner produces items that a generative system makes or modifies, the interaction operates fundamentally in a prompting mode. The system generates one or multiple new candidates in response to what the practitioner creates[6]. When generations are examined, the practitioner can decide whether to keep them, discard them, or ask the system to iterate upon a subset of them. Thus, a supplementary loop enables soliciting feedback on the proposals. In such an approach, several arrangements are possible: a generative model might be used before, during, after, or in parallel with the development of the original [5].

Attribution and entitlement: ownership models

Generative systems are already blurring the boundaries between author and tool. In the arts, such dual roles are commonplace for designers, engineers, and programmers [1]. Nevertheless, practitioners navigate complex moral and legal landscapes around credit, copyright, and ownership of AI-generated works. Generative AI as co-author

is neither novel nor straightforward, requiring nuanced consideration of modes of agency and various models of entitlement [2]. Machine authorship challenges settled norms of attribution and rights to new creations. Establishing credit for machine-generated material requires clarifying the particular human-machine collaboration involved, ranging from tightly supervised to largely autonomous processes [3]. These questions extend to the ownership of material used to train generative models, sometimes referred to as "data provenance" [3]. Creative practitioners increasingly engage with information, still emerging as a collaboratively generated commons [6].

Legal and Ethical Considerations

Generative AI models such as DALL·E and ChatGPT are increasingly used as collaborative tools across a range of creative practices. As such they raise questions about agency, authorship, and originality and challenges to established frameworks of artistic, literary, and musical critique [4]. Authors grapple with attribution, perception, accountability, and the provenance and nature of their inputs to the generative system. These challenges have architectural, aesthetic and organisational dimensions [5]. Generative AI co-authors raise cases of bias and plagiarism together with questions concerning the legitimate use of training datasets. Considerations of rights, responsibilities and credit attribution occupy unclear territory that institutions have yet to resolve. Significant decision-making power concentrates around intellectual property rights and the governance of creative content.

Fundamental questions arise concerning the role and definition of authorship itself [6]. Determining to what extent agency, intention and control matter challenges a received definition of authorship. Elements of transparency regarding the nature of the co-author, the selected genre, and the paces of iteration, influence attribution, application, and creative value, a new kind of machine co-author, provokes calls to shift conceptions of authorship and ownership [2, 3].

Intellectual property and authorship attribution

Generative AIs such as DALL-E, Midjourney, Stable Diffusion, and ChatGPT offer new avenues of creative practice that engage the full set of generative modalities [1]. Generative AIs have the potential to augment the creative abilities of users, allowing them to create work they would not have been able to produce independently. They support and refine rather than replace human authorship [2]. The following case studies detail the constraints, affordances, and generative practices in a variety of creative fields where these AIs are currently being integrated. The interplay of copyright, patent, trade-mark, and trade-secret law permits ownership of generative works. In the United States, copyright law both recognizes and regulates the ownership of works produced by AI from both a legal and a technical perspective[3]. While statutory law, applicable guidance, and case law remain unsettled and varied globally, these frameworks provide insight into an emerging and contentious body of literature addressing the continued development of creative independence within both the human and non-human realms. Various perspectives on existing and developing frameworks are reflected by using generative visuals and textual excerpts to provoke and direct discussion across the humanities and fine arts [4]. Much of the exploration is informed by an understanding that individual practitioners and complexes are entitled to undertake such exploration and expression. Plagiarism is considered primarily in terms of intellectual and artistic responsibility and mediation [5]. AI-generated works are often claimed as copyrighted originals if they are combined with sufficient authorial effort in some countries. A practice-scenario model informs a survey of the wide array of generative systems having access to generative material to explicitly calculate the remaining values of original, derivative, and non-copyrightable engagement of such generative systems [6]. The act of translation characterizes much creative practice, passing through the vernacular, or native, of the generative system and cognate engagement with the proliferating number of legal systems, a phenomenon echoed widely by either re-engagement of character and style 3 or broad-brush engagement at a national or societal scale (such as the large amount of artistic and literary material produced throughout the twentieth century [2].

Rights, responsibilities, and accountability

Artificial intelligence (AI) is being increasingly integrated into creative practices, leading to new technologies, tools, and techniques that expand how people engage with creative expression [1]. In contexts that make extensive use of generative media, the need to address rights, responsibilities, and accountability emerges. Generative AI supports collaborative creative processes as an active participant, an entity that prompts both interest and trepidation regarding its role as co-author [2]. Questions surrounding rights and responsibilities in both law and ethics accrue alongside structuring of material and of generation, rehearsing material generation with or without eventual deployment, and framing of roles between proposals for the entire piece and contributions to encapsulated segments [3]. Creative practitioners deploying generative AI in works and their institutions grapple with challenges that are procedural, technical, conceptual, legal, and ethical. Questions mount concerning the appropriate rights, responsibilities, and standards of accountability for works involving materials that may include population biases from underlying training sets, chosen filtering strategies that accentuate certain forms of bias, and entire segments from collaborators encountered who may or may not hold formal copyrights or related rights to their outputs [3]. Attribution, needed both for ethical acknowledgement and to establish a basis for governance relating to institutional policy, individual ethics, and the shaping of practice

through preventive audit or regulatory models, materializes variously as; explicit citation of the generative system in the credits, - specifying the mode of use or form of generative interaction undertaken, expression of the extent and proportion of the contributor's material adopted, and correspondence with entities or persons whose contributions may have been appropriated and, if required, consultation concerning matters of prior restraint, retraction, or other such postprandial address [4].

Bias, authorship ethics, and transparency

Creative practice increasingly employs creative machines such as generative artificial intelligence (AI). These systems create outputs that imitate and remix cultural material; they are trained on and respond to large datasets. Generative AIs augment traditional creative practices across diverse domains such as visual art, literature, music, and design [2]. Creative practitioners are adopting AI systems as co-authors generally under a hybrid human–machine model. Co-authorship incorporates established frameworks of authorship, understanding rights, responsibilities, and accountability for shared works, which help navigate the changing nature and scope of individual contribution in collaborative environments [3]. Effective engagement with generative systems requires iterative prompting and feedback. Multiple engagement paradigms exist ranging from iteration on user prompts to post-production revision of agency-free machine outputs [4]. Bias in both the input data and the output of generative AIs raises important ethical and governance questions. Generative AIs are themselves products of culture, which shapes their agency and creativity [5]. They refashion and remix an accumulated archive of material based on their training. Cultural biases therefore affect the manner, modus operandi, and material of re-rendering [6]. Ethical discussions around generative AI also invoke scientific principles of disclosure and reproducibility, demanding transparency such as clear statements regarding the use of generative tools and recorded provision of prompts for subsequent review [7].

Creative Practice Case Studies (2020–Present)

Generative AI systems have gained popularity in various creative forms since the release of DALL·E 2 in 2022, offering users intuitive content creation. Art and design workplaces experiment with artificial intelligence to generate images and related materials [1]. The technology gains traction among authors who use ChatGPT for topic ideation, drafting, and stylistic revision, allowing individual practice to emulate larger literary formations 2. Musicians adopt AI to generate musical ideas or entire pieces and songs, feedback on the output further integrating generative technology into composition practice [3]. Significant works of art across these forms have emerged, spanning conceptual, commercial, and promotional dimensions. Case studies illustrated below survey generative AI's use in visual and graphic arts and design, literature, music, sound, performance, and interactive installation since 2020[5].

Visual arts and generative design

Generative design refers to systems that study design specifications to produce "design alternatives" or concepts, addressing the complex design spaces often seen in engineering and architecture. Generative design underscores the co-creative 1 potential of Generative AI tools within the visual arts [4]. Solutions generated might lead creative professionals to discover aesthetic decisions, explore spatial conditions, or arrive at questions that shift future directions [3]. The design alternatives might also challenge aesthetics, content, and medium to explore the nature of visual practice. Generative design varies across 3D modelling, physics-based animation, architectural schematics, and 12-tone compositional systems, creating visual works that invite dialogue, facilitate research, and unsettle dominant commitments [5]. Case studies of visual practice illustrate the range and character of works enabled through Generative AI in the fields of design, illustration, painting, and photography, showing various kinds of interactions, dynamics, and intent [6]. Addressing generative art, Epstein 2 posits that "the introduction of AI as a creative partner leads not just to new outputs but to a reevaluation of the tools and rules guiding the creative process." Inie et al. (2023) note that creative practitioners are reflecting on what constitutes creativity and how Generative AI might aid and augment practice at this historical junction [7]. Generative AI tools such as Stable Diffusion, Midjourney, and DALL·E enable exploration of compositional possibilities and collaborative inquiry about vision, themes, and subsequent actions, particularly when additional modelling or illustration is required to develop an idea, explain a concept, or specify an approach. Various modes of collaboration and interaction appear in existing visual works featuring Generative AI [8]. Designers, modelers, and painters project agentive prompting at early stages to broaden, hone, and redefine goals, laying the conceptual basis for further making. In fine art, 3D software avatars interact with AI-augmented modellers to prod exploration of stylistic shifts. A significant art-in-science project invites generations rooted in scholarship to provoke communal pondering outside conventional provenance and create model variants exploring packaging without recourse to containers[8].

Literary and narrative constructions

Generative AI increasingly plays a role in literary and narrative practices, complementing the existing portfolio of automatic text generation tools [9]. AI-generated texts explore various possibilities that writers perceive, establish dialogue with copyrighted works, and attempt pastiches of canonical styles. Dialogue plays an essential

role in the socio-technical framing of generative AI: narratives introduce characters, personas, and scenes that open avenues for collaboration [3]. In fiction, generative systems can offer concrete yet open-ended continuations of multi-part prompts. This capability, labelled "co-writing," creates many-to-many relationships across styles and experiments with serial formats such as chapterwise deliveries and episodic structures [4]. "Generate 10 endings" extends scenarios generated by the author, while prompts containing models, tropes, and genres evoke meta-textual commentaries.[5].

Music, sound, and multimodal works

Generative AI has begun influencing sound, music, and multimodal composition, yet the practice retains the complexities of narrative text and the associated ambiguities of co-writing status [2]. Numerous composers have released works involving AI but without systematic investigation of the collaborative dimension; publications addressing co-composition with AI have tended to emphasize melody or musical grammar rather than multimodal systems incorporating sound or image processing [5]. Flow Machines is a software suite that assists composers in generating music based on stylistic rules, with an emphasis on melody, the aspect traditionally considered the most personal melody in most music genres, as a way to explore the concept of co-composition [6]. The system enables human co-composers to define references, structural guidelines, and constraints at various levels (such as section, verse, chorus, and licks) and subsequently generates candidate melodies respecting those inputs 8. Although the AI-generated pieces are far from being complete works the task remains fully compliant with the EU directive on moral rights due to the way the software handles input [7]. The software implements a pan-European treadmill of creativity, inviting co-composers to develop their ideas however freely they wish instead of determining melody or harmonic syntax [3]. The Artificial.fm platform offers AI-generated music combined with subjective ratings by the users, thus allowing listeners to co-create new pieces by influencing evolution of music structure [9]. Both examples only focus on musical components without any connection to sound or image synthesis [8]. Data-driven composition remains closely linked to domain-specific knowledge and expertise these limitations would be even more evident in an AI-enhanced music video generation scenario [7].

Performance and interactive installations

The role of AI generative systems in the performing arts interrogates how the systems affect notions of performance and the role of the performer [7]. Since 2020, AI art generation technology has notably advanced. Both performers and how they work may shift as AI generative systems capable of and designed for multimodal outputs become readily accessible [3]. A live performance of "The Lost for Words," designed for an academic conference and incorporating the latest AI art generation models, attempts to articulate the nature of generative systems capable of and designed for multiple modalities [10]. The title echoes a personal sensibility toward generative systems' "artist role": artists must not only be creative but also determine how to create. To refrain from performance is to avoid reinscribing humanity into "art after AI." Even with such speculative aspirations, continuation remains valuable to consider what performance means for a collective [11].

Evaluation of Aesthetic Value and Originality

Generative AI models, ranging from text-to-image synthesis to narrative generation have prompted extensive discourse regarding originality and creative agency [3]. Outputs of creativity, even of the highest quality, constitute the sole measure of aesthetic merit when initially interrogated [4]. In the course of evaluation, creative critics frame first impressions around four interconnected constructs of originality, using Clark's language of the replicable, novel, and significant [3]. By permitting the sharing and juxtaposition of primary sources and modifications, generative algorithms refine their stimulus to implicit specifications. Communal discourse establishes a repository of participative domains, relationships, manners, and other designations of creative action; the ethnographic presence of concept in production, featuring collaborative elaboration by artist and informant, represents unresolved, individual atmospheric channeling [4]. Creative achievement now hinges upon the granularity transferred from the generative AI to an adaptive social form capable of sustaining a rival creed, an articulation of expectation aligned with but distinct from the original system [5]. Audiences and critics express allegiance to technical circuits designated as artless under normative standards of creativity. Features such as assemblage, collage, appropriative remixes, and other forms of traffic do not demand the sanctioning of creator status, as they deviate from an aspirational evolution of original agenda [1]. The collective surrendering of a contemporary aspiration pertaining to art as individualistic irreproducibility and invention widens the field of scrutiny in public reception and regulatory imposition. Aesthetic experience gravitates toward creative form, progressively convening concept within the integrated coalescence, akin to a vernacular salvage-operation adjusted for circulating disposition [5, 6].

Criteria for assessment in AI-augmented works

The role of AI in artistic practices raises questions about the criteria that can be used to assess these works and the conditions under which they can be considered creative [3]. As the nature of authorship evolves alongside the technologies employed in an artwork's creation, it becomes necessary to revisit parameters commonly applied in assessing originality and aesthetic value [3]. The recent proliferation of AI-assisted technologies has led to a

paradigm shift, with the resultant outputs increasingly being regarded as creative, even when the finetuning of the algorithm remains the main form of human intervention [4, 3]. Moreover, the role of human creativity under emphasis is moving away from material production towards the social integration of knowledge, inviting reconsideration of the associated assessment criteria. Aesthetic criteria whose applicability to artefacts created with or through AI have been studied include overall functionality, fit of each component, permanence, and coherence [5]. These criteria were identified for creative works based on a wide range of inputs and transparently share such parameters with the audience. Aesthetic and originality criteria applicable specifically to creative works supplemented with inputs from AI systems were similarly explored [5].

Critics' perspectives and audience reception

Generative systems routinely elicit discourse and debate concerning the nature of creativity, intelligence, and the role of the creator [6]. Critics of machine-generated creative works assert that the outputs are mere remixes or random selections drawn from extensive traning datasets, producing a collage of previously seen content rather than genuinely novel artefacts [3]. AI is perceived simply as a tool whose use does not engender AI-generated work with any intrinsic value, and generative models are characterized as "stochastic parrots." Supporters of human-AI co-creation promote a broader conceptual framework for creativity and innovation, advocating consideration of philosophical and aesthetic elements that extend beyond the object produced [5]. Creativity and originality are inextricably linked to the processes developed by authors; the creation of each object represents but one moment in those processes. The notion of "creative remix" thus emerges, facilitating auto-remixing of source media into distinctive new formats rather than photocopying or copyright violation [7]. The defining properties of a genuinely novel human-created idea are also questioned in light of contemporary work in machine learning and knowledge representation. All human creativity depends upon an author's capacity to distill the output of a vast quantity of observed material, and likewise, all creative work involves elements of reuse [11].

Replicability, novelty, and significance

With new generations of Generative AI Systems (GAIS) especially those based on Large Language Models (LLMS) emerging, the question of whether they replicate outputs from their original training datasets and, in doing so, fall within the range of already-published works, and thus avoid rehashing GRIDS (Guided Research Increative Data Streams), raises questions surrounding the originality of their output. Such inquiries can take various forms [3]. Much like their human collaborators, GAIS replicate knowledge gleaned from training datasets in order to restructure it. When they work on original proposals (OCHHs, Original Creative Highlights) within their domains, GAIS use engineering principles, individual criteria specific to human domains, and themselves, as sources [4]. Novelty can also be evaluated intrinsically and extrinsically at the desired semantic level. Follow-up GAGE-1 systems can enhance exploratory form, further separation, and the utility of outputs' final forms and interfaces. Similarly, the art-science paradox offers another globally meaningful question of originality: when the mathematical pattern of emergence is recognised, the former appears as a hidden driving force behind the unseen outcomes [5]. Rapid parodic and derivative dissemination from the public domain raises another fundamental question: how might one evaluate the significance of the added value brought by either human or GAIS co-creators? General-Archive Guidance Engines serve merely as supplementary material for free individual access to a range of choices [6]. They uncover new paths for other GAGES and human dialogues, ready for further amplification and in-depth connective, diagnostic, feedback, or derivative opportunities [7].

Pedagogical Implications and Practice-What-Ifs

The generative capabilities of contemporary Artificial Intelligence transform the creative practices of numerous people across a range of disciplines, including art, design, literature, music, film, advertising, architecture, and education[5]. While employing these systems, authors must make crucial choices regarding the roles played by themselves and by the generative technology, which in turn influences questions of attribution and entitlement. Furthermore, the dynamics of a practice influence the nature of participants' contributions and the coalescence of their inputs into a final creation [6]. A programme that develops creative skills or design practices no longer needs to be constrained within a conventional approach centred on the production of a discrete and definitive artefact. The active participation of Generative AI in a creative practice raises multiple reflections around idea-generation, experimentation and material manipulation [6]. It also stimulates consideration of the organisation of activity, freedom of choice, and exploration of the reciprocal relationship between human beings and technology [7]. With these matters in mind, a set of creative practice "what-if" scenarios are proposed that engage Generative AI as co-author, aimed at stimulating thinking about new angles on the integration of this technology while retaining a focus on supporting creativity [2].

Curriculum design for AI-infused creativity

Generative AI technologies that automatically generate visual or written content based on text prompts have advanced rapidly, raising concerns among creative professionals regarding their potential impact on creative fields [1]. A qualitative survey of 23 professionals revealed that these tools provoked important reflections on the nature of creativity and the ways in which AI might facilitate creative workflows. These reflections informed the design

of an AI-infused creative curriculum aimed at empowering professionals to navigate their ongoing coexistence with AI [2]. Broadly, a creative curriculum focused on generative AI should consider the following principles: an AI co-author framework, ethical and reflective literacy in creative practice, and collaborative skill development to work with and critique AI tools [3]. When addressed together, these dimensions support participants in an informed exploration of AI-infused creative practice applicable to their personal, professional, and institutional contexts. AI co-author perspectives illuminated the interactions between tools, roles, and outputs [4].

Skill development and ethical literacy

Rapid advances in generative artificial intelligence pose both opportunities and challenges for the education and training of creative professionals [4]. Educational institutions have begun to adapt curricula and rethink the pedagogy of media arts and design. More broadly, the introduction of generative AI into creative practice challenges a number of long-held assumptions about the roles and responsibilities of creative practitioners as well as the foundational notions of authorship, originality, and aesthetics themselves [5]. Generative AI offers creative practitioners systems that collaborate and co-author, with a wide variety of terminology used to describe these technologies (generative art (GARC), GANs, the AI threat to design (Tru), ChatGPT, Stable Diffusion, Sensory, Sonic, DALL·E, and other proprietary names). Co-authorship requires consideration of the increasingly blurred boundaries between practice and audience; designers and artists use terms like "audience as co-author" (GARC) and "descriptive architecture" (GARC) since end-users now assume greater responsibility and under different conditions of authorship [6]. Ethical considerations, including algorithmic bias and data provenance, have become more prominent [4]. The need for skill development and ethical literacy has also emerged as students explore collaborative creative systems in various genres. Co-authorship generates concerns about critical and systematic engagement with technologies that are rapidly evolving and widely presumed to be intelligent, creative, and autonomous [5]. Young practitioners may be tempted to overestimate the novelty and value of their contributions and therefore the degree of creative agency they wish to maintain or assert [7]. Rather than exploring personal questions through the production of material artifacts, they may occupy themselves with coy, clever, or trivial prompt-generation, thus producing ephemeral, disposable amusements devoid of artistic depth and significance [3].

Assessment frameworks for student and professional work

Artistic practitioners working with generative AI models face new challenges in assessment, evaluation, and feedback [2]. Formative assessments bolster the development of ideas, while summative assessments offer insight into perceived levels of completion and achievement. The creative intention of students may not align with the evaluative criteria used by reviewers, and some students adopt a framing and evaluation approach associated with AI art generation [3]. Leaders in private and public sector AI research and education recommend clear guidelines for assessment contextualized by creative intent. Applying existing aesthetic criteria specific to the chosen medium provides a framework for AI-assisted work [4]. A categorical schematic may clarify generative AI system functions, such as generation, help, consultation, assistance and distinguish among levels of collaboration such as generation, curation, and iteration [1, 3].

Policy and Institutional Context

Generative AI systems may produce art and music, compose poetry, and create computer code, engaging with a broad spectrum of creative practices across multiple media [2]. Text-to-image systems such as Midjourney and DALL·E can produce convincing illustrations involving intricate interactions among people, objects, and environments [3]. These examples raise numerous policy issues around intellectual property rights, governance, and equity in academic, state, and industry engagements with such materials, a core consideration institutional and policy frameworks must address [7]. The rapidly evolving AI landscape presents both opportunities and challenges for creative practice, including unresolved questions about the nature of authorship and the philosophy of creativity itself. In generative collaboration, the practice shifts from traditional tool use to a new, deeply interactive co-author model [8]. Beginning with consideration of critical institutional components, these exploratory reflections outline nine primary interconnected trajectories spanning local, national, and international domains and address pressing questions for contemporary creative practice and scholarship [3].

Institutional guidelines and governance

Generative AI raises new questions about creative practice and institutional values. National, regional, and institutional frameworks for responsible AI use stress the importance of transparency and accountability and advocate for broad engagement with diverse perspectives [12]. Generative text and audiovisual systems have become prominent in creative practice, contributing to debates around originality, authorship, and the role of institutions in contemporary art and knowledge [3]. Generative systems also invite reflections on human creativity, particularly regarding the creative influence of nonhuman systems on human practice and culture 4. AI-based systems are subject to scrutiny concerning bias, discrimination, misinformation, attribution, copyright, and content that may violate legal, ethical, cultural, or community standards [4].

Funding, rights management, and dissemination

Arts funding organisations, research institutions, and universities often stipulate how creative works funded by grants should be disseminated and how rights should be managed[1]. Such stipulations are particularly pertinent for AI-augmented creative works, and for collaborative works involving multiple authors. Many works that contain generative AI contributions acknowledge the AI model and accompanying prompt as co-authors; for example, the author credits OpenAI's ChatGPT and the prompt used to produce AI-assisted foundational text [2]. Other works do not credit the AI model but instead only credit the human author for guidance and integration. Such differences in credit may reflect broadening definitions of authorship, originality, and creativity in response to new media technologies [10].

International and cross-disciplinary considerations

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is hardly a new concept to students and researchers, but its rapid development radically transforms formative knowledge work, especially text generation [4]. This transformation is arguably novel, because of assumptions regarding speech. Ephemeral, real-time utterances generally maintain lower expectations than crafted, recorded, considered formulations [5]. Text has, since the advent of ubiquitous word processing, undergone fundamental transformations. Software empowers greater construction, composition, and formalization via editing, revising, and re-editing; not even AI plays can change that. Current iterations of AI text generators output machine-authored utterances of astounding sophistication, across a widening array of topics. Propounds' arrangement and formative principles remain too sophisticated for an AI to deploy independent of either pre-determined rules or finely-tuned datasets of existing texts. As with all encyclopaedics, maintenance becomes progressively harder [6]. Longer essays exhibit a creeping tendency for grammatical dislocations unobserved in briefer paragraphs, though underlaying concert never evaporates. AI might even assist the generation of text[6].
Generative AI raises concerns about exploitation of crowd workers involved in data labeling, often under poor conditions. It may also concentrate market power among few entities. These are among the harms that require further study [7]. Research into human creativity could benefit from insights gained through generative AI, which currently reproduces what it has seen, highlighting the need for new algorithms that embed improvisation and interact with human creativity. AI-generated art reflects themes of automation, corporate control, and the attention economy, raising broader societal questions [8]. The adoption and impact of generative AI depend on decisions made by developers, users, regulators, and civil society, emphasizing the importance of engaging stakeholders like artists and creative laborers in shaping beneficial uses [2].

Future Trajectories and Philosophical Reflections

Creative practices enabled by generative artificial intelligence (AI) have stimulated sweeping changes in workflows across the creative spectrum [3]. Emerging from the culturally prominent 'AI-art' discourse, such practices occasion fundamental reconsideration of the nature and conditions of human creativity and the category of the 'creative' itself [4]. Given the scale of these transformations, desirable future trajectories and implications for creative practice warrant exploration, both as productive societal engagements with generative technology and as provocations to philosophical reflection [5]. Speculation on the future of collective human creativity within increasingly AI-saturated environments suggests inevitable evolutionary change. The emergence of artificial agents capable of creative display whether algorithmic complements to human input or autonomous, self-sufficient agents, profoundly challenges conventional notions of creative authorship itself [6]. The characteristic 'posthuman' authorised by AI discourse invites examination of both the limits and continuing relevance of such authorship. Such deliberation is animated by the broad societal implications surrounding the introduction of generative AI. Works produced in 2020–2023 engage artistically with this intersection of creative practice and pressing cultural concern [7]. They foreground not only the aesthetic dimension of emerging AI-infused creative practice but also the value of critical intersection with the field of AI to sustain cultural discourse surrounding the emerging technology. Such practised attention encourages the presentation of broader questions arising from rapid generative-technology advancement, without presumption of familiarity [2, 3, 1].

Posthuman Creativity and the Evolution of Authorship

Human creativity has been understood to embody an intensity of perceptual and cognitive engagement that can readily be appreciated in performative and artisanal practice, yet also evident in indications of latent creativity, moods of inspiration, insight, and flows of thought and affective disposition towards experience and materials, media and technologies of one sort or another [2, 11]. The eclectic, conceptualist, pluralist canon simultaneously dilutes the normative values of originality and ownership; diminishing their practical significance within the ample territory of what remains poetry, nonetheless accompanied by observation that even the digital "mashups" produced by amateur digital music producers do echo existent melodies and stanzas, evoking readily apprehended derivative authorship [3, 12]. Such collective re-enactment, sharing and at times wilful misrepresentation within the élite creative precincts; the unanalysed and unsanctioned appropriation of "pataphysical" intellectual property, through its wide distribution via souvenirs, publications and networking; and the luxuriant parody, pastiche, tribute and à clef of the alternative rock terrain, occasion their own redundancies of attribution [2]. engender a

widespread prevalence of apathy vis-à-vis conventional unitary attributions, and elicit remarks upon music alone that the tap of the composer's imaginative font long since tapered off[3]. Posthumanism's themes of co-constitution and hybridity, and of a work arriving at completion only through its reception and circulation, gain currency amidst abundant uncertainty surrounding the very nature and specification of a music or a text[10].

Societal Implications and Cultural Reception

New generative tools are playing a significant role in mediating the reception of artistic practice and deepening the understanding of generative systems and their societal implications [2, 3]. Generative AI initially created a crisis in the reputation of artistic, musical, and literary production, while prompting a heated debate about the potential loss of authorship and originality that previously grounded the system's value [2, 4]. Subsequently, artists are now exploring these systems, using their outputs to frame, question, and satirize aspects of the system. For change and critique, algorithms are treated as a new material [3, 5]. AI-generated outputs can serve as an alternative to human-generated artefacts, scrutinizing the system's constraints and weaknesses. Emphasizing the transactional nature of generative processes further enhances this critique. Highly regarded creators are using generative systems to comment on earlier work or significant themes, channeling the apparatus of these generative platforms into the forefront of appreciation [4, 6]. AI-generated art increasingly encapsulates disturbing trends, leading to the emergence of new perspectives on human creativity. A critique revolves around the actions of large platforms, both art components and images marketed, imposing a singular worldview on accessibility, prompting dialogues surrounding community access. Unethical firings of large numbers of workers from various sectors raise alarm about AI's operation within the bounds of human creativity, generating worry that art will fall under subordination similar to other creative efforts [2, 7].

Open Questions and Research Agendas

Recent developments in generative AI prompt critical examination of its implications for creative expression and augmentation [8, 1]. Understanding the functioning of generative technologies and their influence on human creativity remains an essential research agenda. The role of AI in research processes, artistic practices, and procedural generation constitute rich avenues for exploration [9, 2]. The interaction between art and audience, modes of reception, art theory, institutional structures, and the ripple effects of creative practices on society and culture present additional promising directions [10, 3]. Analytical attention to the environmental impact of creative AI and ethical implications in the design and use of such systems continues to gain momentum [11, 4]. The widespread dissemination of generative AI tools urges examination of the technology's ongoing shaping, in particular the integration of socio-cultural, professional, interdisciplinary, and cross-institutional perspectives [12]. Such tools proliferate the notion of AI as a co-creative agent, multiplying the stakes surrounding authorship and originality [12].

CONCLUSION

The integration of generative AI into creative practice marks a significant epistemic shift in how authorship, originality, and aesthetic value are understood and enacted. Rather than replacing human creators, GenAI operates as a collaborative agent that participates in ideation, production, and refinement across diverse artistic domains. This hybrid mode of creation challenges long-standing assumptions of singular authorship and introduces distributed, iterative, and system-mediated forms of creativity. The study demonstrates that originality in the age of generative systems is no longer grounded solely in individual invention but increasingly emerges from processes of recombination, prompting, and human–machine interaction. Similarly, aesthetic value is shaped not only by the final artifact but also by the dynamics of its production, including the interaction between user intent, algorithmic generation, and contextual interpretation. However, these developments also generate unresolved legal, ethical, and institutional questions, particularly concerning attribution, intellectual property, transparency, and bias embedded in training data. As creative ecosystems continue to evolve, there is a growing need for adaptive frameworks that can accommodate shared agency between humans and machines. In conclusion, generative AI does not signal the "end" of authorship but rather its transformation. It expands the boundaries of creative possibility while demanding renewed theoretical, pedagogical, and regulatory engagement with what it means to create in an AI-augmented world.

REFERENCES

1. Inie, N., Falk, J., & Tanimoto, S. (2023). Designing participatory AI: Creative professionals' worries and expectations about generative AI. In Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1–8). Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3544549.3585657.
2. Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Herman, L., Mahari, R., Frank, M. R., Groh, M., Schroeder, H., Smith, A., Akten, M., Fjeld, J., Farid, H., Leach, N., Pentland, A., & Russakovsky, O. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI: A deeper dive. arXiv, arXiv:2306.04141.
3. Sarkar, A. (2023). Exploring perspectives on the impact of artificial intelligence on the creativity of knowledge work: Beyond mechanised plagiarism and stochastic parrots. In Proceedings of the 2nd

Annual Meeting of the Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work (CHIWORK '23) (Article 13, pp. 1–17). Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3596671.3597650.
4. Holzapfel, A., Jääskeläinen, P., & Kaila, A.-K. (2022). Environmental and social sustainability of Creative-Ai. GenAICHI: Generative AI and CHI Workshop (ACM CHI 2022). arXiv:2209.12879.
5. Harwood, B. (2023). CHAI-DT: A framework for prompting conversational generative AI agents to actively participate in co-creation. arXiv, arXiv:2305.03852.
6. Doyle, S., & Senske, N. (2018). Digital provenance and material metadata: Attribution and co-authorship in the age of artificial intelligence. International Journal of Architectural Computing, 16(4), 271–280. doi:10.1177/1478077118800887.
7. Perkins, M., & Roe, J. (2024). Academic publisher guidelines on AI usage: A ChatGPT supported thematic analysis. F1000Research, 12, 1398. doi:10.12688/f1000research.142411.2.
8. Pachet, F., Roy, P., & Carré, B. (2021). Assisted music creation with Flow Machines: Towards new categories of new. In E. R. Miranda (Ed.), Handbook of artificial intelligence for music: Foundations, advanced approaches, and developments for creativity (pp. 485–520). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-72116-9_18.
9. Gordon, S., Mahari, R., Mishra, M., & Epstein, Z. (2022). Co-creation and ownership for AI radio. In M. M. Hedblom, A. A. Kantosalo, R. Confalonieri, O. Kutz, & T. Veale (Eds.), Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Computational Creativity (pp. 241–245). Association for Computational Creativity.
10. Li, Y., Baciu, D. C., Novak, M., & Legrady, G. (2024). Equivalence: An analysis of artists' roles with image generative AI from conceptual art perspective through an interactive installation design practice. arXiv, arXiv:2404.18385.
11. Guljajeva, V. (2022). Synthetic books. In 10th International Conference on Digital and Interactive Arts (ARTECH 2021) (Article 19, pp. 1–7). Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3483529.3483663.
12. Smith, S., Tate, M., Freeman, K., Walsh, A., Ballsun-Stanton, B., Hooper, M., & Lane, M. (2024). A university framework for the responsible use of generative AI in research. arXiv, arXiv:2404.19244.

CITE AS: Kato Nabirye H. (2026). Generative AI as Co-Author in Creative Practice: Authorship, Originality, and Aesthetics (2020-Present). IDOSR JOURNAL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES 12(1):65-75. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAH/2025/1216575