https://doi.org/10.37708/ezs.swu.bg.v24i3.16

ETHICS IN CREATIVE PRODUCTION WITH A FOCUS ON THE (ITALIAN) PUBLIC'S PERCEPTIONS

Alessandra Micalizzi

Pegaso University, Italy
Email: alessandra.micalizzi@unipegaso.it

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6467-3023

ABSTRACT: The rapid diffusion of generative artificial intelligence is reshaping creative practices, cultural production, and the ways creativity is understood and evaluated. Moving beyond a purely technical perspective, this article adopts a socio-technical and cultural approach to examine how AI is appropriated, perceived, and ethically negotiated within contemporary creative contexts. AI is conceptualised not as a neutral tool or autonomous creator, but as a form of epistemic and aesthetic mediation that reconfigures agency, authorship, and symbolic value. The study draws on a multi-method research design conducted in Italy, combining desk research, experimental evaluation, in-depth interviews, and a large-scale CAWI survey on a representative sample of the population. Participants were exposed to AI-generated and human-produced creative artefacts (sound and visual works) to assess perceptions of quality, originality, authorship, and creativity. The findings reveal an ambivalent public attitude: while AI-generated outputs are often recognised as technically proficient and aesthetically convincing, they are rarely acknowledged as fully creative or authorial. This reluctance reflects persistent anthropocentric conceptions of creativity, closely tied to human intentionality, emotional experience, and lived context. At the same time, the results highlight a pragmatic accommodation of AI in everyday cultural practices, where ethical concerns are often absorbed through use rather than resolved through abstract opposition. The article argues for moving beyond polarised narratives of substitution or competition, proposing an integrated ethical framework grounded in practice, cultural literacy, and reflexive agency.

KEYWORDS: artificial creativity, computational creativity, cultural production, ethics, aesthetics, authorship, agency

Negotiating AI in Creative Contexts: Trust, Resistance, and Agency

The growing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into creative practices brings into focus questions that extend beyond the scope of technical or functional assessment. Rather than being reducible to matters of efficiency or performance, AI demands consideration of the imaginaries, competences, and value systems through which relations between human subjects and technological artefacts are articulated. From this perspective, technological appropriation is best understood not as a linear process of adoption but as a negotiated and contingent dynamic shaped by symbolic resistance, emergent trust, and cultural tensions between human agency and automation, as well as between authorial authority and computational delegation.

Socio-technical scholars have long emphasised that the adoption of technologies unfolds as a non-linear and situated process, mediated by local practices and emergent meanings (Orlikowski, 2000; Oudshoorn & Pinch, 2003).

In creative contexts, this process becomes particularly dense, as it directly affects the foundations of artistic identity and the conception of creativity as an intentional and subjective act. Within this framework, AI represents a critical threshold. On the one hand, it operates as a powerful instrument capable of expanding expressive possibilities; on the other, it reactivates long-standing anxieties surrounding authenticity, originality, and the role of the human in the production of meaning (Manovich, 2019; Crawford & Paglen, 2021).

Empirical research further suggests that trust in technology does not develop uniformly, but follows differentiated trajectories shaped by experience, competence, and individual cultural backgrounds (Shank et al., 2019; Park & Eun Woo, 2022). In creative domains, engagement with AI may generate forms of functional trust grounded in the perceived effectiveness of the technology in supporting specific tasks—such as pattern generation, code translation, or audio-visual modelling—while simultaneously provoking deeper symbolic resistance linked to the belief that creativity should remain an inherently human prerogative (Micalizzi & Epifani, 2025). These ambivalences resonate with Latour's (1994) notion of "co-agency" between human and non-human actors, in which action and meaning are distributed across heterogeneous actants rather than residing in a single source.

Within the cultural and creative industries, such ambivalence materialises in differentiated modes of appropriation. Some practitioners approach AI with enthusiasm, framing it as a driver of innovation and experimentation, while others adopt a more cautious stance, expressing concern over expressive flattening or the standardisation of creative languages. These tensions are further intensified by the introduction of what Pasquale (2015) defines as a regime of "opaque transparency," in which algorithmic operations remain largely invisible and difficult to interrogate, increasing the epistemic distance between users and technological processes. As Simondon (1958) argues, every technology carries a "margin of indeterminacy" that can be productively reworked only if users are enabled to understand its functioning and engage with it critically.

From this standpoint, AI cannot be treated as a neutral tool. As Crawford (2021) underscores, artificial intelligence is a social and political construction that embodies specific values, interests, and power asymmetries. Consequently, creative practices involving AI require new forms of technical and cultural literacy, enabling users to comprehend operational mechanisms, interact consciously with automated systems, and critically orient their uses. Such literacies allow technical indeterminacy to be transformed into a space for experimentation and agency rather than passive dependence.

Resistance, in this context, should not be interpreted merely as a regressive refusal of innovation. Instead, it can be understood as an active mode of interrogation, selection, and ethical–pragmatic positioning in relation to the affordances offered by technological systems. At a pragmatic level, trust is consolidated through situated experiences of coherence and effectiveness, yet it becomes fragile when technologies fail to meet expectations of control,

personalisation, or intelligibility. This fragility highlights the need for an ethics of use capable of distinguishing between technical enablement and projectual autonomy.

In this sense, human–artificial co-production calls for reflexive forms of agency grounded not only in efficiency, but also in the capacity to attribute meaning to actions generated in collaboration with automated systems (Floridi, 2018). Appropriating AI within creative processes therefore entails navigating a field of tension between project-driven enthusiasm and symbolic resistance, between operational potential and ethical uncertainty. Far from constituting a linear transition, this process invites a rethinking of the relationship between subject, technology, and creation as an unstable and dynamic configuration, in which trust is never given once and for all, but emerges through continuous practices of interpretation, contextualisation, and responsibility.

Within this socio-cultural process—beyond its individual and relational dimensions, and within the specific human–machine dynamic—new practices take shape and new modes of action emerge. For this reason, any ethical reflection on AI cannot be separated from the pragmatic conditions that structure action within a given culture and society.

Computational Creativity: Reframing the Debate

Recent debates on artificial intelligence and creativity increasingly converge on a shared premise: the widespread adoption of generative AI challenges consolidated assumptions about authorship, originality, and the very nature of aesthetic production. Rather than merely introducing new tools, AI compels a reconsideration of how creative acts are framed, evaluated, and culturally understood. As Arielli and Manovich (2024) argue, generative AI disrupts established aesthetic categories by reconfiguring the relationship between perception, pattern recognition, and artistic intention, thereby calling into question long-standing distinctions between human creativity and technical production.

From this perspective, artificial intelligence can be understood not simply as an assistive technology, but as an epistemic one (Knorr Cetina, 1999): a system that actively reshapes the conditions under which knowledge and creativity are produced. AI introduces new operational logics, redistributes forms of authority, and contributes to the emergence of novel aesthetic regimes, particularly in data-driven and generative media. Creative production thus becomes increasingly embedded in computational processes that mediate, rather than merely support, artistic expression.

This shift is closely tied to broader transformations in human cognition. As de Kerckhove (2024) suggests, intelligence is no longer confined to the individual mind but is progressively externalised and distributed across technical systems, interfaces, and networks. In creative contexts, AI functions as a cognitive partner, influencing perception, memory, and decision-making processes. Such dynamics reflect a fundamental principle of neuroplasticity: media technologies do not simply extend cognition but actively reorganise cognitive practices. Digital

systems, and generative AI in particular, intensify the externalisation of mental functions—such as memory, calculation, and judgement—while simultaneously fostering new forms of collective and connective intelligence.

This perspective shed the light on the need to reconceptualizing the "authorship". Rather than being understood as a stable attribute located in an individual subject, authorship increasingly appears as a distributed and relational function emerging from interactions among human agents, technical systems, datasets, and institutional frameworks (Foucault, Bauchartd, 1977; Latour, 2005). In AI-mediated production, intentionality is no longer the sole criterion of authorship; instead, authorship becomes a negotiated status shaped by degrees of control, delegation, and interpretative responsibility. This perspective aligns with posthumanist and actor-network approaches that frame creation as an assemblage process rather than an individual act (Hayles, 1999; Manovich, 2019).

As a result, creative outputs can no longer be attributed to individual intentionality alone. They emerge instead from hybrid assemblages in which human actors, datasets, and algorithmic processes are deeply entangled. This reorganisation raises significant epistemological and ethical questions. On the one hand, AI, as already argued, challenges traditional notions of authorship and originality; on the other, it places pressure on the concept of human agency, introducing the risk of an uncritical delegation of creative and evaluative capacities to automated systems.

These tensions are reflected in a polarised scholarly debate. Some accounts frame AI as a prosthesis of imagination, capable of expanding expressive and generative possibilities beyond human limits. Others warn against the automation of invention and the standardisation of symbolic production, arguing that algorithmic creativity may erode the ecological diversity of cultural forms (Boden, 1998; Russell & Norvig, 2021; Celis Bueno et al., 2024). As Arielli and Manovich (2024) caution, such oppositions often obscure the fundamentally ambivalent character of AI aesthetics: a domain in which machines neither simply imitate human creativity nor operate independently of cultural frameworks but rather expose the conventions and myths that underpin aesthetic judgement itself.

In this sense, artificial intelligence should be approached as a technology of symbolic mediation rather than as a neutral instrument. It shapes economies of attention, influences criteria of aesthetic efficiency, and conditions the processes through which creative products are legitimised and valued. The critical task, therefore, is not to determine whether AI can be deemed "creative," but to analyse how its adoption transforms the cultural, material, and ethical premises of creativity (Pasquinelli, 2019; Zuboff, 2019; Crawford, 2021). AI does not merely generate content; it produces contexts, redefines the boundaries between human and non-human agency, and reshapes the tension between experimentation and standardisation in contemporary cultural production.

User Perceptions of AI-Based Creative Outputs: An Empirical Study

The theoretical premises outlined above provided the framework for the development of an empirical investigation conducted on the Italian population, structured in both exploratory and extensive phases. Promoted by the Digital Humanities Research Centre of Pegaso University, the study aimed to examine users' perceptions of creative products generated with artificial intelligence, with a specific focus on generative AI. Rather than limiting the inquiry to abstract attitudes toward creativity and technology, the research sought to objectify evaluative processes by exposing participants to concrete creative artefacts.

To this end, respondents were presented with a set of curated stimuli. These included two sound productions—one generated through AI technologies and the other composed by a young musician in training—as well as three realistic photographic images, two produced using generative technologies and one authored by a professional photographer. This design enabled the comparison of aesthetic evaluations across different forms of authorship while controlling for stylistic and formal variables.

From the overarching research aim, several operational objectives were derived. First, the study sought to reconstruct levels of awareness regarding the possibilities and outputs enabled by generative technologies. Second, it aimed to analyse users' perceptions of AI-based creative practices. Third, it investigated whether respondents had any direct experience with such content, either as creators or as audiences. Finally, the research explored concerns, biases, and expectations related to future scenarios involving artificial intelligence in creative domains.

The articulation of these objectives required a multi-method research design. An initial desk-based phase was conducted by a humanities-oriented research team, focusing on twentieth-century literary production in order to trace the cultural roots of shared imaginaries surrounding the human–machine relationship. This literary analysis was complemented by content analysis and textual analysis techniques, supported by artificial intelligence tools and TLab software. Although not exhaustive, this preliminary work allowed the researchers to delineate key contours of the cultural imaginary, highlighting a persistent tendency to anthropomorphise technology—attributing to it superior cognitive and physical capabilities, while simultaneously constraining its perceived creative and emotional capacities (Micalizzi, 2025a).

Building on this groundwork, a second, experimental phase was implemented and combined with in-depth interviews. Participants were divided into three groups and asked to listen to two musical tracks. One group was correctly informed about the authorship of each piece (well-informed), a second group received no information regarding the origins of the works (not-informed), and a third group was provided with incorrect information (mis-informed). The aim was to assess the extent to which perceived authorship influenced aesthetic evaluation, capturing biases, expectations, and interpretive frames.

Ninety-five participants were involved across two separate waves. Evaluations were collected using a rating scale based on five dimensions: emotional impact, melody, rhythm, tone, and originality. Despite limitations related to the conditions of audio presentation and the construction of the musical stimuli themselves, the results revealed a measurable influence of perceived authorship on aesthetic judgement, even in cases where respondents claimed to adopt a rational and autonomous evaluative stance.

The experimental sessions were followed by in-depth interviews with the same participants, designed to further investigate their perceptions and lived experiences concerning the use of AI in creative production. These qualitative insights informed the final, extensive phase of the research, which consisted of a CAWI survey administered to a representative sample of 2,500 individuals from the Italian population. This phase aimed to weight and generalised the most relevant findings emerging from the qualitative and experimental stages.

The questionnaire incorporated a validated measurement instrument developed by the research group—the Artificial Creativity Attitude Scale (ACAS)—as well as three photographic stimuli: two generated by artificial intelligence and one produced by a human photographer (Micalizzi & Epifani, 2025). Due to space constraints, it is not possible to discuss each research phase in detail here; for a more comprehensive account, see Micalizzi and Selmi (2024), Micalizzi (2025a), and Micalizzi (2025b).

Rather than offering an exhaustive methodological discussion, the purpose of this section has been to reconstruct the methodological and theoretical framework underpinning the reflections developed in the following pages. While public debate has largely focused on the impact of generative AI on creative professions, professional practices, and output quality, comparatively less attention has been paid to users—specifically to processes of appropriation, perception, and expectation, as well as to the long-term implications for cultural imaginaries, knowledge production, and shared cultural heritage.

The synthesis of the main empirical findings presented in the next section is therefore intended to contribute to a critical reflection on the ethical dimensions of AI in creative contexts, addressing not only practices of production but also those of reception and cultural consumption.

Creativity, Authorship, and Ethics in AI-Generated Cultural Production. Main results

The analysis of the empirical findings reveals a complex and layered perception of artificial intelligence within creative processes, particularly about the evaluation of AI-generated works. While the appropriation of AI by cultural producers appears to be advancing in an irreversible manner, the position of audiences remains more ambiguous and stratified. Public attitudes oscillate between curiosity and scepticism, openness and critique, reflecting a rapidly evolving technological landscape in which artificial intelligence—often operating invisibly—has become an increasingly pervasive presence.

Anticipating some of the broader conclusions of this study, it can be argued that audiences, regardless of their initial stance, have largely accommodated the ethical implications of AI in favour of a pragmatic orientation. AI-based creative practices are increasingly perceived as part of an inevitable process of technological integration and extension of human capabilities, echoing perspectives that frame AI as a continuation rather than a disruption of human cognitive and creative faculties (de Kerckhove, 2024). In this sense, the use of AI in creative production is rarely experienced as surprising and is instead normalised within everyday cultural practices.

However, this forward-looking and pragmatic stance cannot be fully described as "integrated" in Eco's (1991) terms. Residual forms of resistance persist, often manifesting in an a priori and prejudicial manner. Although respondents generally acknowledge AI's capacity to generate outputs that are aesthetically coherent and formally convincing, they express significant reluctance to recognise such outputs as genuinely creative. This hesitation is rooted in a deeply anthropocentric conception of creativity, understood as inseparable from human intentionality, lived experience, emotional depth, and cultural situatedness. For many participants, a creative work must bear traces of a human lifeworld, a conscious communicative intent, and an imaginative process that AI is perceived as incapable of authentically reproducing.

At the same time, qualitative evidence points to a limited ability to reliably identify "synthetic" creative products. Participants often rely on indirect and not always effective cues—such as excessive realism, hyper-defined details, or a strong sense of visual familiarity—to infer authorship. These markers are less indicative of artistic quality than of attempts to attribute or deny human agency. In this context, authorship becomes a central interpretive lens through which aesthetic evaluation is filtered.

A particularly revealing dimension concerns so-called "hallucinations," that is, the random or anomalous errors produced by AI systems. While these errors are frequently interpreted by audiences as evidence of machine failure, some artists deliberately incorporate them as signs of uniqueness and creative authenticity (D'Isa, 2024). Audience responses, however, often reveal an effort to "unmask" the machine, attributing to it deceptive intentions—such as imitation or dissimulation—through a process of anthropomorphising that scholars have identified as both pervasive and unavoidable in human–machine interaction (Esposito, 2022; D'Isa, 2024; Micalizzi, 2023). Paradoxically, it is precisely interaction that enables originality, as AI-mediated creativity neither replicates human conversation nor follows a fully predetermined linguistic script (D'Isa, 2024, p. 32).

These dynamics point to a fundamental ambiguity embedded in the very notion of artificial intelligence. Despite its name, AI operates without intentionality or consciousness, yet it is persistently framed through cognitive and moral categories traditionally reserved for human actors. One of the most recurrent defensive strategies identified in the data is discrediting: when prompted

to reflect on creativity at a deeper level, respondents struggle to recognise the elements that define an output as creative in a strict sense. Consequently, AI is predominantly framed as a sophisticated tool capable of imitation and recombination, but not as an agent of genuine invention. Its outputs are understood as products of statistical computation rather than expressive or intentional acts.

This perception has a direct impact on aesthetic evaluation. Even when AI-generated works elicit admiration or surprise, they are often assigned a lower cultural status than human-produced works, as if lacking an "authorial aura" (Benjamin, 1955). In some cases, respondents express discomfort at attributing artistic value to a non-sentient entity, reinforcing the belief that creativity necessarily entails the capacity to feel, imagine, and communicate meaning beyond technical execution.

The tendency to value AI's imitative competence while devaluing its creative potential also reveals a partial misunderstanding of how generative systems operate, as well as an implicit concern about the diminishing role of the artist within computational creative processes. Yet, as Barale (2020) argues, the loss of control has always been a constitutive element of creative practice. In this sense, AI-based art foregrounds—rather than negates—the encounter between human intentionality and unforeseen outcomes, transforming the medium itself into a creative partner and generating novel forms of interaction. This conversational dimension of AI-mediated creativity aligns with Esposito's (2022) view of artificial communication and supports the recognition of creative outcomes as socially validated forms of novelty (Csíkszentmihályi, 2023).

Among respondents—particularly those involved in the qualitative phase—a clear semantic distinction emerges between "creation" and "production." AI is widely perceived as an efficient producer of content, but not as a creator in the existential sense attributed to human artists. Creation is associated with risk, intuition, and rupture, whereas AI is seen as bound to derivation and recombination. Even the most striking outputs are thus framed as "products of an algorithm" rather than expressions of a creative mind.

Importantly, this scepticism is only partially correlated with levels of technological familiarity. Even participants with advanced digital skills and openness toward computational art remain hesitant to attribute creative legitimacy to AI. This suggests that resistance is not merely a matter of technical literacy but reflects deeper tensions surrounding the definitions of creativity and authorship themselves. AI is therefore acknowledged as an auxiliary or coadjutant but rarely accepted as an author.

Such positions can be interpreted as ethical strategies aimed at preserving a clear boundary between human and artificial creativity, thereby safeguarding human agency while overlooking its continued presence within computational processes and the role of the cultural field in legitimising creative outputs. This dichotomous separation—human versus artificial, natural versus computational—offers cognitive reassurance yet proves less effective for developing an integrated ethical framework.

To move beyond this divide, D'Isa (2024), drawing on Navas (2022), introduces the notion of "meta-creativity" to describe artistic processes that extend beyond human production to include non-human systems. In this framework, the artist no longer produces the work directly but designs the conditions under which a creative process unfolds through algorithmic execution (Navas, 2022, in D'Isa, 2024, p. 137).

From an ethical standpoint, audience concerns focus less on environmental impact and more explicitly on two interconnected issues: labour and authorship. With regard to labour, respondents echo concerns identified in prior research, highlighting the effects of AI on employment opportunities, professional roles, and economic recognition. While AI systems are often perceived as autonomous and opaque, empirical evidence suggests that output quality remains strongly dependent on the intentions, skills, and interpretive labour of the human prompter (D'Isa, 2024). Nonetheless, the perceived absence of "creative effort" continues to undermine the economic and symbolic value attributed to AI-assisted works.

Authorship constitutes the second major ethical concern. While legal frameworks remain unsettled, everyday practices—particularly among non-professionals—tend to neglect issues of source verification and copyright, reinforcing the need for clearer regulation and ethical guidance. The data reveal a mix of concern, fascination, and curiosity toward AI-generated outputs, confirming the persistence of what Moriggi and Pireddu (2024) describe as enduring technological "ghosts": oscillations between distrust and uncritical faith.

Ultimately, the findings suggest that practice itself functions as a key mechanism for navigating ethical uncertainty. Through situated use, experimentation, and critical engagement, ethical concerns are not eliminated but reconfigured, giving rise to a more nuanced and reflexive awareness. It is within this pragmatic dimension of experience that the possibility emerges to move beyond rigid dichotomies and toward a more integrated understanding of creativity, agency, and artificial intelligence.

Discussion

Taken together, these findings suggest that the encounter between audiences and AI-mediated creativity should not be interpreted as a simple trajectory of acceptance or rejection, but rather as an ongoing process of symbolic negotiation through which the boundaries of creativity, authorship, and agency are continuously redefined. The empirical evidence indicates that public responses to AI-generated works are structured less by technological competence than by deeply rooted cultural schemas concerning intentionality, human experience, and the social validation of artistic value. In this sense, resistance does not function merely as opposition to technological innovation, but as a cognitive and ethical strategy aimed at preserving meaningful distinctions between human and artificial production.

At the same time, the data show that everyday interaction with AI gradually destabilises these rigid distinctions. While audiences remain reluctant to attribute

full creative legitimacy to artificial systems, their evaluative practices reveal a growing familiarity with hybrid forms of production and a pragmatic willingness to engage with them. Rather than signalling a stable resolution, this coexistence of scepticism and acceptance points to a transitional cultural condition in which AI is neither fully integrated nor categorically excluded from the domain of creativity.

The study therefore contributes to current debates by demonstrating that the key site of transformation is not the technology itself, but the interpretive frameworks through which it is understood and evaluated. AI-mediated creativity emerges as a relational phenomenon, shaped by interactions among users, cultural expectations, technical affordances, and institutional norms. From this perspective, the future of creative AI will depend less on advances in computational capability than on the evolving socio-cultural criteria through which creativity is recognised, legitimised, and valued.

After the Myth of Human Creativity: Ethical Reorientations for AI

Contemporary debates on artificial intelligence are marked by a persistent polarisation of interpretative positions. Floridi (2022) elucidates this divide by outlining a framework that maps the dominant stances while intentionally distancing himself from both. Drawing on a religious lexicon to highlight their conceptual fragility, he characterises these positions as forms of uncritical attitude. On one side stand proponents of technological singularity, who anticipate the transcendence of human limitations—competence, vulnerability, and finitude—through AI, often invoking the prospect of a superintelligence whose consequences may not be benign. On the other side are what Floridi terms AI-theists, who insist on the irreducible uniqueness of the human species and attribute to it exclusive qualities beyond machine replication, yet without articulating plausible scenarios for integrated coexistence.

Moriggi and Pireddu (2024) suggest that reflection on the everyday appropriation of AI remains constrained by a persistent perspectival limitation—an "original sin" of sorts—namely the tendency to rely on oppositional and comparative frameworks. Whether approached with enthusiasm or anxiety, AI continues to be evaluated primarily in relation to the human rather than analysed as part of a wider socio-technical ecology. This comparative reflex proves especially restrictive in the domain of creative production, where the perception of unavoidable competition between humans and machines appears conceptually difficult to escape. Creativity, much like emotion, is still widely treated as an exclusively human prerogative, reinforcing a zero-sum logic that positions AI either as a threat or as an inferior imitator.

Arielli and Manovich (2024) challenge precisely this anthropocentric myth of creativity. Instead of asking whether machines can be creative on human terms, they propose revisiting the history of art and media in order to foreground the longstanding entanglement between human expression and technical mediation. From this perspective, generative AI does not constitute an unprecedented rupture;

rather, it renders visible a structural condition of aesthetic production that has always been present. Creativity, in this view, emerges through interaction with tools, constraints, conventions, and infrastructures. AI therefore functions less as a competitor to human creativity than as a medium that exposes and reshapes the conventions through which creativity is culturally recognised.

Within this interpretative horizon, machines—and artificial intelligence in particular—can be understood as forms of amplification and extension rather than substitution. As Manovich (2022) notes, AI systems operate as resources that facilitate recombination, exploration, and paradigm shifts in cultural production. This position resonates with de Kerckhove's notion of augmented cognition, according to which intelligence is distributed, connective, and technologically extended rather than internally contained. Framed in these terms, the relevant question is no longer whether AI diminishes human agency, but how agency is redistributed across human–machine assemblages.

Moving beyond technological "ghosts" does not entail a naïve endorsement of innovation. Rather, it requires re-centring human values, sensibilities, and responsibilities within AI-mediated practices. An ethics of creative AI must therefore be grounded not in abstract opposition but in shared awareness of processes, opportunities, and consequences. Ethical concerns are not resolved through denial or idealisation, but through situated practices of use, interpretation, and governance.

Given the pace of technological transformation, definitive conclusions would be premature. It is nevertheless possible to outline a set of orienting principles for guiding reflection and debate. First, the individual—together with their resources, agency, and intelligence—must remain central in defining the intentions, meanings, and directions of creative action. Second, machines should be approached not as intelligent or sentient entities but as powerful extensions of computational and mnemonic capacities, to be employed with critical awareness rather than delegated authority. Third, cultural fields and domains must be actively cultivated (Csíkszentmihályi, 2023) to prevent the flattening of imaginaries and creative production under conditions of algorithmic standardisation. Finally, ethical engagement requires sustained attention to processes rather than reductive human–machine comparisons, fostering integrated approaches capable of supporting responsible, reflexive, and culturally grounded uses of artificial intelligence.

Acknowledgements

Artificial intelligence (Chat GPT Atlas) was used solely for language polishing. The intellectual content of the article, including the research, analysis, and conclusions, is entirely the work of the author.

REFERENCES:

Arielli, E., & Manovich, L. (2024). *Estetica dell'intelligenza artificiale e il mito antropocentrico della creatività*, Milano: Numero Cromatico Editore.

Barale, A. (Ed.) (2020). *Arte e intelligenza artificiale*, Roma: Jaka Book.

Benjamin, W. (1955*).* *L'opera d'arte nell'epoca della sua riproducibilità tecnica*, Torino: Einaudi.

Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*, 103(1–2), pp. 347–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(98)00055-1

Celis Bueno, C., Chow, PS. & Popowicz, A. (2024). Not "what", but "where is creativity?": Towards a relational-materialist approach to generative AI, *AI & Soc*, (2025) 40:339–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01921-3

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*, CT: Yale University Press. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300252392

Crawford, K., Paglen, T. (2021). Excavating AI: The politics of images in machine learning training sets, *Artificial Intelligence and Society*, 36, pp. 701–712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01162-8

Csikszentmihályi, M. (2023). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*, New York, NY: Harper Perennial.

De Kerckhove, D. (2024). Elucubrazioni sul Capitale Cognitivo Digitale delle Biblioteche. Atti convegno Digital *MAB*, "*Dicolab. Cultura al digitale, Roma*", 16 dicembre, 2024.

D'Isa, F. (2024). *La rivoluzione algoritmica delle immagini: Arte e intelligenza artificiale*, Milano: Luca Sossella Editore.

Esposito, E. (2022). *Comunicazione artificiale: Come gli algoritmi producono intelligenza sociale*, Milano: Bocconi University Press.

Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial Intelligence, Education, and the Fourth Industrial Revolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376(2133), pp.1–9.

Floridi, L. (2022). *Etica dell'intelligenza artificiale: Sviluppi, opportunità, sfide*, Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Foucault, M., & Bouchard, D. (1977). *What is an Author? Language, counter-memory, practice: selected essays and interviews*. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 113-38.

Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we Became Posthuman*. Chicago, III: University of Chicago Press.

Knorr Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1994). On technical mediation. *Common Knowledge*, 3(2), pp. 29–64.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford university press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199256044.001.0001

Manovich, L. (2019). *AI Aesthetics*, Mosca: Strelka Press.

Manovich, L. (2022). AI and myths of creativity. *Architectural Design*, 92(3), pp. 60–65. https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.2814

Micalizzi, A. (2025a). Creating the "new" and the "different": the main points of AI applied to creative industries, in a cura di A. Micalizzi, *Computational Arts and Creative Products: Languages, Spaces and Practices*, Nova Publishing, UK, pp.10-22. https://doi.org/10.52305/GOFF2836

Micalizzi, A. (2025b). Images and Imaginaries of Generative AI: Survey-Based Research, in a cura di E. Lupano & P. Orrù, *Artificial Intelligence and Human Perception: Media Discourse and Public Opinion*, Milano: Franco Angeli, pp. 221-245.

Micalizzi, A. (2024). Artificial Creativity. Perceptions and prejudices on AI music production, in Xin-She Yang, Simon Sherratt, Nilanjan Dey, Amit Joshi (eds),

Proceedings of Ninth International Congress on Information and Communication Technology: ICICT 2024, London, Volume 8, Springer Nature, p.123-143. DOI https://doi.org//10.1007/978-981-97-0251-8_26

Micalizzi, A., & Epifani, M. (2025). L'atteggiamento verso i prodotti creativi computazionali: la validazione della scala Acas. In *Sociologia e ricerca sociale*, 2025 (135), pp.25-46. https://doi.org/10.3280/SR2024-135002

Micalizzi, A., Selmi, S. (2024). Experiencing computational creativity: social research on users' prejudice, in AAVV, *ICASSEH proceedings*, Springer Nature, Amsterdam.

Moriggi, S., Pireddu, M. (2024). *L'intelligenza artificiale e i suoi fantasmi: Vivere e pensare con le reti generative*. Trento: Il Margine.

Navas, E. (2022). *The rise of metacreativity: AI aesthetics after remix*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003164401

Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, 11(4), pp.404–428.

Oudshoorn, N., Pinch, T. eds(2003). *How Users Matter: The Co-construction of Users and Technology*. Cambridge (USA): MIT Press.

Park, J., & Woo, S. E. (2022). Who likes artificial intelligence? Personality predictors of attitudes toward artificial intelligence. The Journal of psychology, 156(1), p.68-94.

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge (USA): Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674736061

Pasquinelli, M. (2019). Three Thousand Years of Algorithmic Rituals: The Emergence of AI from the Computation of Space. *e-flux Journal*, 101, p. 23-34.

Russell, S. J. & Norvig P. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.), Londra: Pearson.

Shank, D. B., Graves C., Gott, A., Gamez, P., & Rodriguez, S. (2019). Feeling our way to machine minds: People's emotions when perceiving mind in artificial intelligence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *98*, pp.256-266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.04.001

Simondon, G. (1958). *Du mode d'existence des objets techniques*, Parigi: Aubier.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.

Copyright © 2026 Micalizzi. This is an open-access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence CC BY 4.0