LUISS

Degree Program in BI-Luiss Joint MSc in Marketing

Course of Understanding the Consumer

Everyday Creativity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Why Human Expression Still Matters

Prof. Ludovica Serafini
SUPERVISOR

Prof. Ernesto Cardamone
CO-SUPERVISOR

ID 791271
Hedda Eikemo Bringedal
CANDIDATE

Academic Year 2024/2025

I would like to express by deepest gratefulness to my family for their unconditional support and encouragement throughout this journey. I am also grateful to my classmates, whose support, thoughtful perspectives, and friendship which has enriched this journey and made it truly memorable. Engaging with this research and this master's program has taught me more than I could have anticipated, both in terms of academic knowledge and critical thinking. It has also thought me how to manage complex projects, strengthened my ability to work independently, stay resilient through challenges, and maintain curiosity and creativity throughout the research process. Finally, a special thank you to my supervisor, Ludovica Serafini, for her invaluable guidance, insight, and encouragement every step of the way!

Abstract

This thesis examines how everyday creativity is experienced and valued in an era where AI is increasingly implemented in the creative processes. Using survey data and in-depth interviews, it explores why people still engage in traditional, effortful creative practices when AI can produce art in seconds. The findings show that creativity remains deeply personal and intrinsically motivated, driven by enjoyment, self-expression, and personal growth. While AI is seen as a helpful and democratizing tool, it is not viewed as a replacement for human creativity. Instead, it is considered a collaborator that enhances, rather than replaces, the emotional and experimental nature of art. Despite AI's advantages, concerns around originality and authenticity persist. Ultimately, the research highlights that human-centered creativity continues to hold meaning and value in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Throughout history, creativity has played a central role in artistic achievements, scientific breakthroughs, and human progress. Creativity was traditionally viewed as the domain for exceptionally gifted individuals, whose ideas and works would leave a lasting mark in history. However, recent research has expanded this perspective, highlighting creativity as a universal human capacity, integrated into the routines of everyday life (Güss et al., 2021). Whether in the arts, sciences, or daily problem-solving, creativity enables individuals to invent, adapt, and express themselves in novel and meaningful ways.

While extraordinary creativity has captured scholarly and public attention, there is a growing recognition of the significance of everyday creativity. This form of creativity involves the original and meaningful actions that people engage in as part of their everyday routines, from cooking and journaling to problem-solving at work (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021). Central to the experience of creativity is motivation, particularly intrinsic motivation, which is the enjoyment, challenge, and satisfaction derived from the creative process itself (Benedek et al., 2020). Individuals are drawn to creative activities not only for external rewards or recognition, but because these activities fulfill deep psychological needs for self-expression, discovery, and coping with life's demands.

Recent theoretical developments, such as Kaufman and Beghetto's (2009) Four C Model, further refine our understanding by distinguishing between *mini-c* (personal insights and learning), *little-c* (everyday creativity acts), *Pro-c* (professional-level creativity), and *Big-C* (eminent, field-changing contributions). This variation underscores that everyone possesses creative potential, and that creativity is not a fixed trait but a dynamic process that can be nurtured and developed.

In recent years, the ongoing evolution and accessibility of artificial intelligence (AI) have introduced new opportunities and challenges for creativity. AI tools can now generate poetry, paintings, music, and stories in seconds, raising important questions about the value of traditional, effortful creative processes. How does the presence of AI reshape our understanding of creativity, originality, and authorship? And what motivates individuals to continue engaging in creative activities when technology can produce similar outputs almost instantaneously?

This thesis seeks to explore how everyday creativity is experienced, motivated, and evaluated in a world where AI is increasingly accessible as a creative tool. By combinding survey data and in-depth interviews, the research aims to highlight the evolving relationship between human creativity and AI, and to address the central question: *In a world where anyone can produce a piece of art with AI in seconds, why should someone make art in the traditional, more effort and time-consuming way?*

Chapter 1: Literature Review

1.1 Creativity

Throughout history, creativity has become a crucial driving force behind artistic achievements and scientific breakthroughs, motivating researchers to explore its fundamental processes and effects. As a result, scholars from diverse fields have aimed to define and evaluate creativity to clarify its role in shaping culture, learning, and everyday life. Creativity can be described as the process of coming up with novel and useful products and ideas (Güss et al., 2021, p. 1184). While creativity has traditionally been associated with highly talented and genius individuals, Güss et al. (2021) propose that all people possess the potential for creativity and, to some extent, engage in creative thinking in various ways (p.1184), emphasizing that creativity is at the heart of human intelligence and is a key component of our ability to invent, solve problems, and adapt to new situations (p. 1195).

One of the most prominent frameworks for explaining the creative process is Wallas's four-stage model of the creative process, consisting of the stages: *preparation*, *incubation*, *illumination*, and *verification* (Güss et al., 2021, p. 1184). The stages of preparation and verification are characterized by conscious efforts focused on gathering information and testing ideas. For instance, conducting research on various techniques and materials for a project (preparation) or seeking feedback from peers before finalizing the project (verification). On the other hand, the unconscious stages of incubation and illumination serve as the ground where creativity truly blossoms. This is the phase during which ideas arise unexpectedly, based on balancing structured exploration with spontaneous discovery (Güss et al., 2021, p. 1185). In creative writing, authors often speak of the "*aha*"-moment that arise after periods of distractions from intense focus. In this scenario, the writers are entering the unconscious phase that allows their creativity to blossom unexpectedly. Imagine working tirelessly on a project and suddenly reaching a stage where creative ideas manifest quickly. This sparks curiosity, driving us to explore our boundaries of creativity, and encourage us to build further on these insights. Before we know it, we've might have created a new masterpiece destined to be captured in history books for decades to come, like Leonardo Da Vinci, or in most cases, not.

Every remarkable invention begins with a great vision or the ambition of achieving the impossible. At the heart of these pursuits is a curiosity-driven motivation, defined as "*a desire to know, to see, or to experience that motivates exploratory behavior directed towards the acquisition of new information*" (Litman, 2005, p. 793). This curiosity and the aspiration to achieve the unexpected are crucial elements of motivational processes. These drivers, particularly the pursuit of creativity and exploration, align closely with Maslow's concept of self-actualization as "*the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming*" (Maslow, 1943, p. 10).

Maslow, widely regarded as one of the most influential psychologists of the modern era, made a significant contribution to the field of psychology with his introduction of the hierarchy of human needs in 1943 (Koltko-Rivera, 2006, p. 302). According to his theory, individuals must first satisfy their basic needs,

including physical and emotional safety, love and belonging, and esteem, before they can achieve self-actualization and transcendence (Crandall et al., 2020, p. 274). Building on this idea, Hegarty (2009) claims the key product of self-actualized creativity may be self-expression and even happiness (p. 11). The author highlights that self-expression emerges when creativity is engaged in for its intrinsic value, indicating that creative activities during leisure time are not only meaningful but that self-expression is an important aspect of that behavior (p.11). This perspective emphasizes that fulfilling one's creative potential can lead to deeper satisfaction and emotional well-being, reinforcing the notion that intrinsic value of creativity lies in the self-expressive process rather than solely its outcomes (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611).

Imagine being able to travel back in time and dive into the mind of Leonardo Da Vinci as he set out to paint the Mona Lisa or Ludwig van Beethoven while composing Für Elise. Did they foresee that these creations would become timeless masterpieces, or were they simply driven by a curiosity to explore the boundaries of their creativity and to reach the impossible? Their journeys, among other well-known creators, remind us of the transformative power of curiosity and the endless possibilities of self-actualization, urging each of us to pursue our own vision with the same imagination and creativity. People strive to express themselves and do often turn to creative activities, and then especially visual arts, literature and music (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 622). Both Da Vinci and Beethoven exemplify how meeting foundational needs enables us to reach our full creative potential and leaving lasting impacts on the world. But is this kind of creativity found in all of us? This question leads us to consider the different types of creativity that exist. Building upon the proposition by Güss et al. (2021) that creativity lies at the core of human intelligence and is universally accessible (p. 1195), Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) have further refined this concept by distinguishing between different forms of creativity.

According to Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cuncha (2021), creativity can be understood through a spectrum of types, each capturing different levels of impact, recognition, and personal meaning. *Big C creativity* refers to cultural creativity, where the interaction involves a person, a social system, and a cultural aspect (Csikszentmihalyi, 1998). *High C* and *He-creativity* are closely related, denoting highly significant and field-changing contributions, reserved for unique geniuses or historical personalities (Morelock & Feldman, 1999; Glaveanu, 2010). *Pro-C creativity* represents professional-level expertise and innovation within a domain, typically achieved through years of training and expertise (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009), while *Middle C* and *Low-c* can be seen as original transformation in small products, thoughts, or expressions, resulting in skills, master of technical forms, and success in achieving a goal (Morelock & Feldman, 1999). On a more personal scale, *Small-c*, *Mini-c* and *Little-c* reflects everyday creative acts and are found in daily life, such as cooking, journaling, or problem-solving (Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009). While *Tiny-c* represents everyday creative digital expressions, such as customizing playlists or editing photos (Gardner & Weinstein, 2018), *I-creativity* represent the idea that everyone can be creative (Glaveanu, 2010). Lastly, *H-creative idea* refers to ideas that are novel with respect to the human history, and *P-creative idea* are ideas that are novel with respect to the individual mind who had the idea (Boden, 2004) (p. 674). To refine our focus, we turn to

Kaufman and Beghetto's (2009) model, the Four C Model of Creativity, which serves as an effective framework for this analysis.

The Four C Model of Creativity enhances the traditional distinction between everyday creativity (little-c) and eminent creativity (Big-C) by introducing two additional levels: *mini-c* and *Pro-C*. Mini-c refers to creativity in the learning process, characterized by novel and personal interpretation into new experiences (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p. 2; Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p.673). This level is essential for recognizing inherent creative potential, especially in children. Little-c involves everyday innovations like creative cooking, painting, and social media content creation, highlighting creativity's broad accessibility and its importance in education and work setting (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p.2; Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha,2021, p.673). This is what this research further will refer to as *everyday creativity*. On the other hand, Pro-C represents professional expertise in a creative domain, achieved through formal training and accomplishment over time, while Big-C denotes prominent contributions with lasting impacts that includes remarkable or unique achievements that can transform a field or create a new one (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p. 4- 5; Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p. 673). The Four C model of Creativity suggest that individuals start with mini-c and can progress to higher level through practice and formal training (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p.4). This last remark aligns with the statement from Güss et al. (2021), stating that all individuals possess the potential for creativity (p.1184), particularly in the forms of mini-c and little-c, which can develop into Pro-C or even Big-C creativity.

1.2 Everyday Creativity

Previous research has often focused on examining extraordinary creativity (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009). Extraordinary creativity is characterized by the ability to produce novel, high-quality work that revolutionizes a field through breakthrough ideas (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p. 673). Notable examples include Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity from 1915 (Williams, 2022), Leonardo da Vinci's visionary concept such as the flying machine from 1485 (Güss et al., 2021, p. 1185), as well as more recent innovations like Steve Jobs' introduction of the iPhone in 2007, which sparked a digital revolution (Jain, 2024), and Elon Musk's development of reusable rocket technology with SpaceX (Hapgood et al., 2022). However, Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) leaned towards exploring everyday creativity which, unlike extraordinary creativity, is a shared human asset affecting all of us to a greater extent and occurs in many different contexts (p. 673).

Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) highlight the ongoing challenge of establishing a comprehensive definition of everyday creativity, largely due to the lack of a unified approach to the evaluation of everyday creativity outcomes (p. 673). In examining various approaches, the authors identify two main perspectives. The first is an *individualistic approach*, which focuses on the personal meaning and novelty of creativity for the creator, independent of social recognition, which can be understood in relation to intrinsic motivation (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611). The second is a *sociocultural approach*, emphasizing that creative

results must be communicated to and assessed by society (p. 674), thus extrinsic motivation, fueled by external factors such as recognition (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611). Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) advocate for the integration of the two approaches to achieve a more holistic understanding of everyday creativity. They further assert that the evaluation criteria for everyday creativity should simultaneously consider both individualistic and sociocultural perspectives (p. 675). Thus, a novel definition proposed by Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021), describes everyday creativity as "*a phenomenon in which a person habitually responds to daily tasks in an original and meaningful way*" (p. 691). With this proposed definition, the authors make it suitable for the two different approaches of individualistic and sociocultural perspective.

Everyday creativity can therefore be understood as creative activities taking place in one's leisure time, that is the time off work and free from necessities like eating, hygiene, or household chores, and which involves creative activities of personal significance rather than publicly recognized accomplishments (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 610). Everyday creativity involves people's hobbies and passion, such as cooking without a recipe, writing poems and painting portraits, which in other words can be described as "*the production of something original and meaningful*" (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p. 673), and is characterized by openness, flexibility, autonomy, playfulness, humor, willingness to take risks, and perseverance (Cropley, 1990, p. 167).

Further on, everyday creativity encourages individuals to acquire new knowledge and self-awareness while facilitating daily problem-solving. This, in turn, enables them to shape their future paths, enhance their achievements, shift their paradigms, and adapt flexibly to ever-changing environments (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p. 674). By engaging in creative activities, individuals both foster personal growth and develop the ability to adapt and think innovatively, which can benefit various aspects of their lives, both privately and at work. In work situations, everyday creativity is associated with solving a conflict with a colleague or boss, writing a report, or planning an ad campaign (p. 673).

According to Hertel and Wicmandy (2021), everyday creativity at work is closely aligned with and reflective of mini-c creativity (p. 17), which refers to creativity in the learning process and personal interpretation into new experienced (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p. 2; Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p.673). With everyday creativity being so widespread in professional and personal contexts, it is interesting to examine how often individuals actually take part in these creative endeavors. A study conducted by Silvia et al. (2014) found that, during a week in which participants were surveyed eight times a day, individuals engaged in creative activities approximately 22% of the time (p. 187). Their findings further indicate that, on average, young adults display a moderate level of creativity every day (p.188), but what motivates us to participate in creative activities?

1.3 Motivation

Motivation is defined as the "*all the processes that lead people to behave as they do*" which is driven by motivational strength, described as "*the magnitude of the tension that the need creates, which in turn determines the urgency that the person feel to either satisfy the need, either to eliminate it*" (Solomon, 2013).

Thus, motivation serves as the driving force behind behavior, action, and persistence. We can differentiate between *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* motivation. Intrinsically motivated behaviors are enjoyable and rewarding in itself, while extrinsically motivated behaviors are influenced by external factors such as money, evaluation, or the need to meet a deadline (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611).

In marketing and consumer behavior, the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is essential for understanding why consumers engage with brands, products, or campaigns. Intrinsic motivation drives action that are rewarding for the consumer, such as enjoyment or personal satisfaction, while extrinsic motivation is linked to external benefits such as discounts, rewards, or social recognition (Benedek et al., 2020). Research demonstrates that both types of motivation play significant roles in shaping consumer attitudes and behaviors, with intrinsic motivation often leading to deeper engagement and brand loyalty (Arghashi & Arsun Yuksel, 2023, p. 160 - 163). This perspective is consistent with broader findings in creativity research, where creativity is often linked to intrinsic motivation, suggesting that participating in creative activities is engaging and fulfilling (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611).

Neçka (1990) suggested that creative behaviors can be driven by five categories of motivation: *intrinsic*, *playful*, *expressive*, *instrumental* and *control* motives. Building on this, Bruckdorfer (2017) revealed a total of nine motives relevant for everyday creativity, based on a comprehensive review of the literature in motivation, creativity, and leisure, including: *enjoyment*, *expression*, *challenge*, *coping*, *social*, *prosocial*, *recognition*, *material*, and *duty* (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611). The motive for creativity involves both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that drive individuals to engage in creative activities, whether for personal fulfillment (enjoyment, expression, challenge, coping, duty), social connection (social, prosocial, duty), or external recognition (recognition, material). Understanding these divers of motivation helps us shed light on both the complexity of creativity and provides valuable insights for fostering creative expressions in various contexts, both in everyday life, education and work life.

Benedek et al. (2020) further developed a scale, based on Bruckdorfer's (2017) findings, to assess key motivational factors in the context of everyday creativity, named the Motives for Creativity Scale (hereafter, MoCS). Based on a comprehensive review of theoretical and empirical literature, MoCS's results showed that *enjoyment* is the motive that scores higher for everyday creativity (p. 610), highlighting that the primary reason individuals engage in creative activities is to gain pleasure and satisfaction from the activity. This suggests that individuals are driven to engage in creative activities primarily because these activities are essentially enjoyable, strengthening the notion that creativity is closely tied to intrinsic motivation (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611). However, how will these results change when technological tools are incorporated in the creativity process?

To engage in creative behaviors, individuals need to process three key psychological elements: (a) specific *competence and skills* related to their fields, for instance, a writer must know how to construct word into sentences; (b) a special *creativity facilitating ability*, which include the potential to generate new ideas, notice the unexpected, and combine concept in innovative ways, and (c) a willingness to put in the *effort*

necessary to create something, reflecting motivation (Cropley, 1990, p. 171). The author argues that "*freely developing creativity*" only occurs when all three of these elements are present. Additionally, the author cites Neçka (1986) to provide examples where one or more of these psychological elements are missing, leading to what can be described as "incomplete" forms of creativity. For instance, when motivation is lacking, we have *abandoned creativity*. If technical skills are insufficient, an individual may want to paint creatively and have many original ideas, but their lack of design skills or understanding of brush techniques results in what is termed *juvenile creativity*. Particularly relevant in this context is when an individual has high technique skills but lacks the ability to generate new ideas or see things from a different perspective. This situation is referred to as *frustrated creativity* (Cropley, 1990, p. 171) and may occur when advanced technology reduces our capacity and motivation for creative thinking.

Creativity is an essential component for innovative solutions in marketing, enabling brands to develop unique approaches that resonates with target audience and create engaging, personalized campaigns, offerings, and experiences (Pagani & Wind, 2025, p. 3). Creativity has the potential to drive consumer response, increase brand recall, and enhance product evaluation (Lehnert et al., 2014, p. 274), while creating a unique market position for the company (Pagani & Wind, 2025, p. 3). Darley and Lim (2023) define advertising creativity as "*original, divergent, or novel and appropriate, meaningful, or relevant*" (p. 101). This definition highlights that for creativity in marketing to be effective, it must not only be novel but also relevant and meaningful to consumers. If an advertisement is perceived as irrelevant or disconnected form the customers, it is unlikely to be considered truly creative, regardless of its originality (Lehnert et al., 2014, p. 274). Given creativity's central role in marketing, it has been identified as the future of marketing (Ameen et al., 2021 p. 1802). However, with the rapid rise of artificial intelligence, it is uncertain how perceptions of creativity's importance in marketing will transform over time.

1.4 Artificial Intelligence

In the rapidly evolving technological landscape of today, artificial intelligence (hereafter, AI) presents both extensive challenges and exciting opportunities for both individuals and organizations. AI is commonly defined as "*a system's ability to interpret external data correctly, to learn from such data, and to use those learnings to achieve specific goals and tasks through flexible adaptation*" (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2019, p. 5). As AI technologies advances, their adoption within our daily lives and in organizations is accelerating rapidly, forcing managers to make crucial decisions regarding technological integrations. In recent years, the concept of Generative AI (hereafter, GenAI) has gained significant attention. This form of AI, exemplified by generative technologies such as ChatGPT, is characterized by its ability to produce novel content such as audio, code, images, text, simulations, and videos (McKinsey & Company, 2024). This aligns with the description from Feuerriegel et al. (2024), stating that GenAI refers to technologies that can generate seemingly new, meaningful content such as text, images and

audio from trained data (p. 111). However, this raises the question: what truly sets GenAI apart from the traditional AI system we have recently come to understand?

According to McKinsey and Company (2024), AI is the overarching concept that involves enabling machines to replicate human intelligence and perform tasks, a technology commonly experienced through voice assistants like Apple's Siri and Google's Alexa, as well as customer service chatbots. GenAI, on the other hand, specifically utilizes advanced algorithms to create original content. A subset of AI, machine learning (hereafter, ML), empowers GenAI by allowing models to recognize and learn from data patterns independently, thereby expanding AI's potential to handle complex and large volumes of data without explicit human intervention (McKinsey and Company,2024).

According to another report by McKinsey and Company (2023), GenAI has the potential to revolutionize productivity and economics on a global scale, with the ability to contribute between $2.6 trillion to $4.4 trillion annually across various fields, such as customer operation, marketing, sales, research and development (McKinsey and Company,2023). We are constantly seeking new sources of productivity in both our work and personal lives, making GenAI a valuable tool for enhancing our hectic work-life balance. We utilize GenAI for a wide range of purposes, including seeking recommendations for new recipes when we lack the motivation to construct a creative meal ourselves, as well as obtaining assistance in crafting out emails in a more formal manner when communication with potential new clients. However, is it possible that the accessibility of GenAI makes us less likely to tap into our own creative potential?

GenAI is projected to evolve rapidly over the next years, enabling it to automate an increasing number of creative tasks that have historically been the domain of humans, creating substantial economic value in the future (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 1). The involvement of GenAI in content creation has sparked significant debate regarding its influence on creative endeavors. Despite the numerous challenges associated with this technology, AI offers an unparalleled and instant means of generating creative works. In such a landscape, anyone can create a painting similar to Van Gogh's style within moments, compose music like Beethoven's symphonies, or write poetry in the voice of Shakespeare.

Text-to-image GenAI has emerged as a system that automates elements of humans' creative process in producing high-quality digital artworks (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 1). Text-to-image generation AI tools create visuals from written input by integrating natural language processing with computer vision, producing coherent and contextually relevant images (Ye et al., 2025, p. 3). These tools, like DALL-E 3, Midjourney and Stable Diffusion, are both time saving, user friendly, and highly accessible, making it a popular tool in creative content creation (p. 3). Research done by Zhou and Lee (2024) shows that utilizing a dataset of over 4 million artworks from more than 50.000 unique users, over time, text-to-image AI significantly enhances human creative productivity by 25% and increases the value as measured by the likelihood of receiving a favorite peer view by 50% (p. 1). The authors further shows that text-to-image GenAI can help individuals produce nearly double the volume of creative pieces which is

also evaluated 50% more favorably by peers over time (p. 6), due to the combination of human ideation, selective evaluation, and AI technology that leads to higher quality (p. 7). Given that we now can produce Van Gogh-inspired images in just a few seconds, and studies indicate that AI-generated works are consistently rated 50% higher by peers, why invest time and resources in traditional artistic methods, which some might consider the "old way"?

In an article by Tsao and Nogues (2024), the authors explore how GenAI fundamentally reshapes perceptions of creativity and authorship, positioning AI as a catalyst in the creative process (p. 1). Their study offers an exploration of how university students engage with GenAI tools in creative writing, revealing that such technology can facilitate new forms of authorship, intellectual emancipation, and collaborative creativity. The authors suggest that integration of GenAI into creative practices, particularly in educational settings, could be a promising approach to promote critical independence in learning, while also nurturing both creative and critical thinking skills (Tsao & Nogues, 2024). Further on, they discuss how GenAI tools, such as large language models (hereafter, LLM) and image generation software, generate text, images, audio, and video based on human interactions, utilizing advanced ML techniques to identify patterns in large datasets and produce original content. The growing accessibility of these tools has sparked widespread experimentation among non-experts and fueled ongoing debates about their educational impact (p.1).

A key finding of Tsao and Nogues's (2024) study is that students increasingly see GenAI as a creative catalyst, leading to decentralization of authorship (p. 1). In other words, students are beginning to view GenAI as a significant driver of creativity through collaboration across both human and AI, and not just as a tool. Specifically, students use GenAI as a springboard to spark their own creative ideas, especially during instance of writer's block, acknowledging that AI-generated first drafts often require further human intervention for satisfactory quality (p. 5-6). Thus, while GenAI serves as a valuable starting point, it ultimately requires students to engage their own intelligence to refine and develop their work. The study conducted by Tsao and Nogues (2024) provided valuable insight into the current state of AI in education in relation to creativity. While AI has not yet completely overthrown creative endeavors, it raises relevant questions regarding the originality of AI-generated content and to which extent it may replace human creativity, which many consider a unique characteristic for humans.

1.5 Generative AI and Art Creation

In a recent interview with McKinsey & Company's Senior Partner Lareina Yee, digital artist Refik Anadol highlighted how AI is redefining creative boundaries (McKinsey & Company, 2025). Anadol, known for his innovative use of AI, integrates technologies like text-to-video, sound-to-video, and custom AI models to craft unique exhibits. He views GenAI as a creative tool, considering data as a form of memory that can transform into any shape, form, or color. For Anadol, this exemplifies the joy of creativity, as it leads to unexpected discoveries and new realms of imagination. He advocates for a

collaborative interplay between humans and machines, proposing that AI will not replace human input but will instead empower extraordinary achievements through synergy (McKinsey & Company, 2025). This is consistent with Zhou and Lee's (2024) findings, suggesting that GenAI promotes a more equal distribution of popular works among users on platforms, indicating a shift towards a more democratized and inclusive creative space where artists are empowered by AI tools (p. 6).

As AI and data technology continually evolves, Anadol envisions a renaissance in art driven by these innovations. He encourages artists to harness AI creatively, suggesting they collect their own data and train their own models, thereby maintaining ownership of their narrative (McKinsey & Company, 2025). Anadol's perspective further aligns with the research by Zhou & Lee (2024), which shows that AI-assisted artists who can successfully explore more novel ideas, regardless of their prior originality, may produce artwork that their peers evaluate more favorably (p.1). However, when an artwork created by Midjourney, which was established in July 2022 and has acquired over 16 million users within one year (Tsao & Nogues, 2024, p. 2), outperformed a human artist in an art competition (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 1), how will human artists compete against this in the years to come, especially when GenAI is projected to become more and more advanced?

As the potential of GenAI continues to expand, questions arise not only about competition but also about the psychological impact on creators. Creative achievements have been shown as a primary source of personal fulfillment and social recognition, illustrated by the dual framework of individualistic and sociocultural perspectives (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021). According to Karakowsky et al. (2021), possessing high status empower individuals with the confidence, freedom, and flexibility to enhance their creative performance (p. 723). Similarly, Krems et al. (2017) observed that people often associate the pursuit of status-seeking with their expectation for self-actualization (p.1349). Given this, the value associated with creativity seem to be connected to our sense of identity and goals.

If creativity and status are so closely related to our sense of self-worth, the growing role of AI in creative activities may challenge traditional notions of what it means to be a creator. So, if AI is behind our work, how will that affect our feeling of authorship and self-actualization? In a related study, Tsao and Nogues (2024) found that students tend to attribute greater authorship to GenAI in image generations, compared to other creative processes (text, audio, and video generation), due to the perceived quality and intuitive interpretation of prompts (p. 5). This suggest that as AI's creative contributions become more notable, our understanding of authorship and personal achievements may need to evolve.

GenAI models, such as OpenAI's ChatGPT, are built on deep learning, a subtype of ML that utilizes "*neural networks*" inspired by the human brain to process information at various complexity levels. This enables AI to detect simple patterns as well as recognize and learn from more complex ones, drawing from vast amount of data (Buick, 2024, p.184). However, this process raises copyright concerns, as AI typically encodes patterns into numerical parameters rather than storing all trained data, occasionally leading to "*memorization*", which can be described as "*the recreation of nearly identical*

copies" (p. 184). This issue is worsened by the demands of GenAI, which requires massive quantities of data, including millions of pre-existing text documents, images, audio samples, and other content forms (p. 183). Although much of this material is protected by copyright, there are instances where these protections are not upheld, prompting ethical considerations regarding the use of AI in art creation and everyday creativity.

1.6 Ethical Considerations

GenAI has the remarkable ability to create new "*original*" work in response to user "*prompts*". A prompt can be defined as "*a question, command, statement, code sample, or other form of text*" (Sheldon, 2024), which is the input you submit to an LLM, such as ChatGPT or Copilot. This technology learns from vast amounts of data, and through this process, predicts and forms associations between user inputs and its gathered knowledge. Essentially, the more comprehensive the training of the AI, the more refined and original its output will be according to user guidelines (European Union Intellectual Property Office, 2024). This capability is particularly beneficial in creative fields, as AI serves as a cost-effective and efficient tool that can enhance the creative style and capabilities of human artists. However, the introduction of this technology raises significant legal questions regarding copyright.

According to the European Commission, there are two main concerns: first, whether developers of GenAI might infringe on copyright by using protected materials to train their algorithms, often gathered through "*data mining*", which is, according to Holdsworth (2024) "*the use of machine learning and statistical analysis to uncover patterns and other valuable information from large data sets*". Second, there is the issue of determining if creations made by, or with, GenAI are eligible for copyright protection, and if so, who owns this copyright? (European Union Intellectual Property Office, 2024). Although, a recent 2025 report from the Center for Art Law states that copyright protections are denied for works solely generated by AI, as copyright law only protect "*original works of authorship*" created by humans (Mathur, 2025), there remain concerns about the potential for others to "steal" artists ideas through AI prompting. As GenAI becomes more integrated into creative industries and our day-to-day life, how do we navigate these complex legal landscapes?

The AI Act, adopted by the European Union (hereafter, EU) parliament, introduces a comprehensive framework for governing the development and use of AI tools. Specifically designed to facilitate the enforcement of the widely criticized right to "opt-out" of text and data mining, the AI Act aims to enhance transparency (Buick, 2024, p. 182). EU's AI Act is set to be fully applicable by 2026, yet there remain instances where these transparency measures fall short in addressing concerns related to AI tools. For instance, when OpenAI launched GPT-3, the company disclosed its primary data sources to the public, establishing itself as a transparent AI developer. However, with the release of GPT-4, OpenAI only stated that the data was sourced from a mix of "publicly available data" and data licensed from third-party providers (OpenAI, 2023, p.2). This shift reflects a step back from the level of

transparency OpenAI has previously demonstrated (Buick, 2024, p. 184). The Hiroshima AI Process Principle, established by the G7 nations in 2023, is also a crucial framework for ensuring transparency regarding training data and advocates for the implementation of appropriate measures to protect personal data and intellectual property (p. 183). Importantly, the EU's AI Act and the Hiroshima AI Process Principle is primarily focused on a business perspective, so how does this affect our daily lives, especially concerning everyday creativity?

The research conducted by Tsao and Nogues (2024) investigates how university students interact with GenAI in the realms of creative writing and graphic storytelling. Their findings indicated that students discovered novel linguistic and non-linguistic techniques that often led to more original outcomes (p. 6). However, the study also brings important ethical considerations to light, particularly regarding originality and authorship. By acknowledging that GenAI often produces cliché content due to its reliance on pre-existing data, students became increasingly aware of the necessity for precise prompts and transparent communication with AI. This process of trial and error requires students to navigate the delicate balance between cliché and "unreasonably creative ideas (Tsao & Nogues, 2024, p.7), highlighting the ethical responsibility of the user in shaping AI output. The authors conclude that collaboration with GenAI in creative education not only fosters intellectual emancipation but also reinforces the significance of transparency in creative processes. Students' experiences revealed their development of logical adaptability, contextual awareness, and the ability for idea recombination (Tsao & Nogues, 2024, p.10). Crucially, these findings underscore the need for ongoing human intervention to inject "directness and flair" into AI-generated content, suggesting that ethical creative practice with GenAI depends on active human participation and clear attribution. In this way, transparency in creativity is not just a tool, but a moral duty, ensuring that the contributions of both human and machine are recognized, and that the integrity of creative work is maintained (Tsao & Nogues, 2024, p.8).

As we delve deeper into the implications of AI in the realm of creativity, it becomes increasingly clear that while technology offers exciting possibilities, it also brings forth substantial challenges. The potential for AI to disrupt traditional artistic processes raises critical questions about what it means to be creative in an area dominated by machine-generated outputs. We must consider the balance between embracing innovative tools and preserving the essence of human creativity. Just as photography transformed the way we perceived and create art, so too might AI redefine our artistic expressions. This transformation prompts us to reflect: Will AI enhance our creativity, allowing for greater expressions, or will it undermine the fundamental essence of what we define as art?

The existing literature has accomplished notable improvements in understanding creativity, particularly in distinguishing between everyday and professional creative behaviors. Benedek et al. (2020) and Ilha Villanova and Pina e Chunca (2021), expanded upon previous research by focusing specifically on everyday creativity during leisure time, rather than the workplace context (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 612). Their finding highlighted enjoyment as the strongest motive driving everyday creativity

(Benedek et al., 2020, p. 610), but underscored the need for further investigation into how different motives, including mission and vision, might influence both everyday and professional creativity (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 622). Similarly, the study conducted by Ilha Villanova and Pina e Chunca (2021) has provided significant insights into the field of creativity by offering a comprehensive review that aims to clearly define everyday creativity. Based on their work, there remains an opportunity to explore how everyday creativity emerges and how it manifests across diverse contexts, including everyday life, education, and work environments (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Chunca, 2021, p. 692).

Despite these contributions, scholars devoted limited attention to the nuanced differences in motivation and expression between everyday creativity and professional creativity. This gap presents a promising direction for further research, particularly in exploring the implications of technological advancements on creative practices. In a world where individuals can effortlessly produce art using AI, such as poetry, paintings, and writings, understanding the motivations that lead individuals to engage in traditional, more time-consuming artistic methods become increasingly relevant. Exploring this dynamic can provide valuable insights into how motivations for creativity are evolving amid the rise of digital tools and what this shift signifies for the ongoing value of traditional creative processes.

Chapter 2: Analysis of the Chosen Phenomena

Throughout a thorough literature review, we have looked at the evolution of creativity from a trait once believed to belong to exceptional individuals to a universal human capacity, deeply woven into everyday life and motivated by intrinsic factors such as curiosity, self-expression, and personal growth. The review also highlighted the range of creative expressions, from everyday acts (mini-c and little-c creativity) to professional and eminent achievements (Pro-C and Big-C), emphasizing that everyone possesses creative potential that can be nurtured and develop over time (Güss et al., 2021, p. 1184).

Building on this, we explored how the rapid advancement and accessibility of AI are transforming creative practices. The literature reveals that while AI democratizes access to creative tools and can act as a collaborator, it also highlights some concerns about originality, authorship, and the authenticity of AI-generated work (Buick, 2024, p.183; Tsao & Nogues, 2024, p. 5). This raises the question about the value of traditional, effortful creative processes in an age where technology can produce art in seconds. While GenAI is primarily used to source ideas that are later evaluated by humans (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 6), it nevertheless leaves an imprint on our authentic creativity and our willingness to generate novel concepts.

The integration of GenAI technologies into creative processes is an emerging trend that significantly shapes the landscape of human creativity. As GenAI tools become more and more advanced (McKinsey & Company, 2023), understanding this influence on everyday creativity is vital. The rise of AI presents both opportunities and challenges that could have a bigger impact on our daily lives, education, and professional environments, in ways that might exceed our current perceptions. Everyday creativity can

both be a cause and a consequence of positive affect and mental well-being (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 621), so how will these result change when AI is incorporated in the creativity process?

GenAI is here to stay, and while the digital artist Refik Anadol is an advocate for using AI in art creation (McKinsey & Company, 2025), which aligns with previously discussed findings from Zhou & Lee (2024), there are cases where people are more skeptical to this integration. Opgenhaffen et al. (2021) conducted research on archaeological creative practices, where the increasing availability of computer power tools became an important theme. The rapid and often uncritical adoption of such technology, particularly in commercially driven heritage visualization, raised concerns among experienced scholars in the field (p. 1650-1651). The study found that while earlier guidelines aimed to standardize digital visualizations practices, many practitioners now view these rules as too generic or restrictive for current creative and technological landscape. As a result, there is a growing movement towards developing shared, flexible practices that supports both innovation and transparency, reflecting the need for updated frameworks with the continuous evolution of digital technology (Opgenhaffen et al., 2021, 1655).

To address these concerns, there were established guidelines to foster greater critical awareness within the archaeological and heritage community regarding essential issues such as data transparency and sustainability (Opgenhaffen et al., 2021, p. 1651). These are increasingly relevant in digital practices, and as previously discussed, the establishment of EU's AI act (Buick, 2024, p. 182) and the Hiroshima AI Process Principle (p. 183) emerged a result of the rapid implementation of AI in our everyday practices. However, the use of AI tools trained on pre-existing works raises significant ethical concerns, particularly around copyright in an area increasingly shaped by algorithms (Evans, 2025).

While the Copyright Act does not explicitly define the term "author", it still requires authorship as one of the three criteria for copyright registration (Caldwell, 2023, p. 413). When it comes to art created or co-created with AI, three potential authors emerge: *The AI developer*, *the AI itself,* or *the end user* (Caldwell, 2023, p. 432). This is especially concerning for the artist Hayao Miyazaki, who experiences a growing trend of people using his distinctive style of Studio Ghibli in their AI-art creations (Evans, 2025). For example, when someone prompts an AI to create art in the "Studio Ghibli aesthetic", the resulting work may be authored to either the developer of that AI-tool, the AI itself, or the person providing the prompt, according to a wealth of legal scholarship (Caldwell, 2023, p. 432). Notably, Hayao Miyazaki, the founder of the original style, are not considered to be the author. This scenario underscores the complex questions of authorship, originality, and ownership in the age of AI.

When considering the Four C Model of Creativity proposed by Kaufman and Beghetto (2009), everyday creativity is classified as little-c creativity, encompassing activities such as painting, creative cooking and content creation (p. 3). When engaging in diverse creative activities, individuals are stimulating their ability for critical thinking, problem-solving, and creative expression, which again results in development of these skills over time. This lays the groundwork for future professional or even eminent creative achievements, denoted as Pro-C and Big-C. However, creative achievements are understood as multifactorial outcomes

influenced by various factors, including *personality*, *ability*, *expertise*, *motivation*, and *environmental conditions* (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 622). Thus, the development of creative potential depends on one's abilities, effort, and competence, ultimately enabling creativity to unfold freely (Cropley, 1990, p. 171). When these conditions are met, individuals are more likely to progress from everyday creativity to higher levels of creativity. Consequently, when we opt for the "easy way out" by allowing GenAI to assist us, or even take over our creative tasks, we risk undermining the development of these skills and our ability to achieve higher levels of creativity.

Currently, there are numerous examples of individuals who choose to maintain authenticity in their creative pursuits by abstaining from AI assistance. These individuals have the potential to nurture their little-c creativity into Pro-C creativity, which represents a higher level of creative achievements attained through sustained effort over time and formal training (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p. 4). As we look ahead to the next decade, we must consider the implication for skill development: how many individuals will genuinely reach the level of Pro-C creativity? Are we willing to accept a future where the next generation is predominantly characterized by little-c creativity?

Recent data underscores this concern. As of 2024, 79% of U.S. teens report being aware of ChatGPT, marking a 12-percentage point increase from 2023. Moreover, 26% of teens report to have adopted AI tools, particularly ChatGPT, in their schoolwork, which is double the share from previous year (Sidoti et al., 2025). Research by Tsao and Nogues (2024) further confirm that teens are increasingly turning to AI for academic assistance. Notably, they find it more acceptable to use ChatGPT for researching new topics than for solving math problems or writing essays (Sidoti et al., 2025), which underscores findings from Tsao and Nogues (2024) showcasing that students use GenAI as a springboard to spark their own creative ideas.

With this growing adoption of AI tools among young people, there is a real risk that reliance on technology may hinder the development of their deeper creative skills. If this trend continues, we may face a future where most creative engagements remain at the little-c level, limiting the progression toward higher creative achievement. While current research shows that individuals, when assisted by GenAI tools, significantly increase productivity in coding, written assignments, and ideation, there is a raising concern regarding disinformation and stagnation of knowledge creation (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 6). This is, according to Burtch et al. (2023), due to our growing dependence on AI for information, which might diminish our capacity for independent learning, exploration, and critical thinking (p. 21), negatively impacting our skill-development.

Our creative leisure is characterized by releasing our personal thoughts, feelings, and needs of our existence. Neither leisure nor creativity alone do implicate this powerful nature (Hegarty, 2009, p. 13). Benedek et al. (2020) found that creative activities are predominantly motivated by intrinsic motives such as enjoyment, and the expression and development of one's potential. Creative activities make people feel good, or in the context of coping with stress, feel better (p. 621). This aligns with existing research on intrinsic motivation, which is when behaviors are driven by being enjoyable and rewarding in itself (p. 611). How will

the integration of AI affect our mental well-being and the enjoyment we get by participating in and perform creative activities? While Wong et al. (2024), found that most creators reported greater happiness and improved mental well-being as a result of spending time on content creation and sharing their self-expression on social media (p.1517), it invites to further exploration into the underlying factors of what motivates us to engage in everyday creativity and what contribute to these benefits.

A simple Google search using the keywords "AI art" yielded approximately 8.380.000 results, underlining its relevance. Back in 2023, the German artist Boris Eldagsen won the Sony World Photography Award 2023 for his AI-generated photography but choose to refuse his prize after revealing that his work was generated by AI (Glynn, 2023). This real-life example underscores the remarkable advancements in AI-generated art, as the judges faced difficulties distinguishing between a genuine photograph, and one created by AI. The responses to Eldagsen winning the price were met with concerns and understanding by other photographers in community. They did not blame him personally, but instead acknowledging that his action effectively highlighted the urgent need for clearer distinctions between AI-generated and traditional photography in competitions (Glynn, 2023).

While opinions vary on whether art produced collaboratively with AI or solely by AI is classified as "art", French-American artist Marcel Duchamp suggested that anything can be considered art, emphasizing that it is ultimately the artist who determines (Baxter, 2024). However, this open definition is not without debate, especially as AI-generates work have become so advanced that they can mimic the unique styles of artists and studios. For instance, the recent trend of AI tools replicating Studio Ghibli's iconic animation has sparked debate within the creative community (Evans, 2025). Hayao Miyazaki, Studio Ghibli's founder, has been a critic of AI in art, arguing that such technology lacks the empathy and respect for life, stating "*Whoever creates this stuff has no idea what pain is whatsoever. I am utterly disgusted… I strongly feel that this is an insult to life itself*." (Evans, 2025). This underscores the tension surrounding AI's integration into the art world.

In 2019, Aidan Meller introduced Ai-Da, the world's first humanoid robot artist (Ai-Da robot, n.d.; Baxter, 2024). Ai-Da is a performance artist, designer and poet, and creates art using cameras in her eyes, AI-algorithms, and a robotic arm (Enclave Films, 2024). This is reshaping how we understand the boundaries between creator and co-creator in relation to AI. While Wong et al. (2024) emphasizes AI's role as a creative tool or collaborator that enhances human creativity without fully replacing the uniquely human aspects of artistic expression (p. 1517), Aidan Meller's introduction of Ai-Da challenges this view by presenting AI as an autonomous creator. Meller claims that Ai-Da is not like DALL-E 3 and MidJourney, because she generates art based on her own visual observation rather than "stealing" work for other artist (Enclave Films, 2024, 1:46-1:56). This position Ai-Da as a true creator of her art, where Meller implies that algorithms can make their own creative decisions (Enclave Films, 2024). This responds to the concerns stated by Wong et al. (2024) regarding the issues concerning privacy, accountability, and irresponsible use of AI-generated content (p.1518), as Ai-Da herself is the creator and base her ideas on her observations, instead of previous data.

According to Ai-Da herself, her artwork "*encourages reflections on the relationship between humans, machines, and creativity, offering a new lens through which to think about art*" (AI v The Mind: Meet the world's first artist robot, 2:33-2:45). So, while some may argue that AI-generated art does not qualify as "art" due to the absence of human creativity, others hold a differing viewpoint. Margaret Boden, a cognitive science researcher, views creativity as the capacity to generate ideas that are new, valuable, and surprising (Baxter, 2024). This perspective is consistent with the AI assist in the creative process.

While many artist leverage AI tools to expand their own creative boundaries (Baxter, 2024), there are also many artists and photographers in the field of art creation that accuse AI of unfairly exploiting the works of hundreds of thousands human creator on which the system is trained on (Glynn, 2023), while others, like Aiden Meller (Enclave Films, 2024) and Refik Anadol (McKinsey & Company, 2025), among others, encourage it. Artist James Lewis believes that as much as AI art will develop and get better, it will never capture the true human essence and creativity that we have as humans (Hutchinson & John, 2023). The digital artist Greg Rutowski has a different view on that situation. He has been struggling with the copyright issue, stating that his name has been used as a prompt in AI-tools more than Pablo Picasso and Leonardo da Vinci, but without his consent. His work has been used in popular videogames like Dungeons and Dragon, but with the growth of AI-tools, he is concerned for his future work, as he has problems distinguishing his own work from AI-generated work on the internet that people have copied (Hutchinson & John, 2023). This aligns with Hayao Miyazaki criticism towards others potential of copying his artist trait in AI-generated work (Evans, 2025).

Artists Holly Hendon and Mat Dryhurst have co-founded the tool Spawning AI, which is aimed at empowering human creators to both prohibit AI from using their work and to find if work they already have done is references in AI generated work (Baxter, 2024). This tool is great in the eyes of plagiarism, copyright and intellectual property rights. To deal with the possibility of "memorization", which can be described as the AI recreation of nearly identical copies, based on training data (Buick, 2024, p. 184), the rise of a new powerful algorithm called Creative Adversarial Networks (hereafter, CAN) has come through. CAN is designed to create something that goes against the patterns in the training data (Chen et al., 2020, p. 650-657), minimizing the risk of memorization and copyright. But we also do face some concerns regarding bias, especially racial bias and ableism (Hutchinson & John, 2023). For AI to learn, it must learn from us, and humans are hardly bias-free, so if the data AI is trained on has bias against race or gender, it has the potential to spew out inaccurate and offensive stereotypes (Fisher, 2023).

How is the landscape of artistic careers expected to evolve? When AI is capable of winning prestigious competitions (Glynn, 2023) and generate paintings that sell for as much as $432.500 (Wong et al., 2024, p. 1516), it raises questions about AI replacing human craftmanship. A photography student expressed concerns about whether his career would still exist in a few years (Glynn, 2023), which is evident in several fields after the introduction of GenAI, particularly when OpenAI's ChatGPT, which took the world by storm back in 2022 (Coursera Staff, 2025). While AI has the potential to enhance efficiency through content customization,

process automation, and data analysis, there is concerns surrounding AI's potential to take over jobs in the marketing field as well (Pagani & Wind, 2025, p. 1). Research shown that individuals that utilize GenAI as an assistant in exploring novel ideas can push the boundaries of creativity and produce more meaningful content (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 6). This aligns with Wong et al. (2024), placing AI as a tool to inspire and assist in creations, which is democratizing and transforming the creative landscape (p. 1517).

This synergy between human creativity and AI technology indicates a promising future for artistic expression, where traditional forms of art will coexist alongside the evolving landscape of AI-generated artwork. According to Eva Jäger, the creative AI lead and arts technologies curator at the Serpentine Gallery in London, both traditional and AI-generated art will continue to flourish, each contributing uniquely to the cultural narrative (Baxter, 2024). Yet, this transition raises another critical question. How will the public adapt to this shift, where traditional and AI-generated art will coexist? And can AI-generated art truly replicate the emotional depth and express the same messages as human-made art? Is AI-art the end of everyday creativity or the start of a new movement?

The primary audience for this study consists of artist and creators who are actively engaging with the challenges and opportunities presented by AI in their creative practices. This research is also highly relevant for educators and students, as the integration of AI is reshaping traditional approaches to teaching, learning, and skill development. Furthermore, individuals who participate in creative activities for both leisure and professional purposes will find valuable insight in this study, as it explores how AI is influencing everyday creativity and the broader landscape of artistic expression.

The study aims to closely examine how the rise of AI influences both creativity and everyday creativity, our perceptions of traditional art, and our ability to adapt to these changes while preserving the unique creative skills often associated with humanity. Furthermore, the research highlights the importance of fostering authenticity and navigating the complexities of originality and authorship. Therefore, a question that needs to be addressed is the following:

In a world in which everyone can produce a piece of art with AI (e.g., poetry, paintings, drawings, writing) in seconds, why should someone make art in the traditional, more effort and time consuming, way?

Chapter 3: Methodology

To address the proposed research question, I adopted a complementary methodological approach that integrates qualitive in-depth interviews with a survey designed to elicit qualitative insights. Specifically on this end, I employed an open-ended qualitative survey, encouraging participation to provide elaborate responses. This strategy was intended to preserve the richness and depth of qualitative data, thereby maximizing the potential for meaningful insights.

3.1 Study 1

3.1.1 Method

This study had a qualitative constructive approach, with semi-structured in-depth interviews with informants selected because of their frequent engagement in an everyday creative activity, such as writing, music production, video editing and photography, aiming to provide new knowledge and insight into an area with limited research. Such a design enables me as a researcher to explore and understand deeply, through co-creation with the participants. Semi-structured interviews have demonstrated their versatility and flexibility, which allows for both individual and group formats. While interview questions are based on prior knowledge using an interview guide that outlines key topics, the semi-structured approach allows for flexibility which is essential to encourage a deeper exploration of the subject matter (Kallio et al., 2016, p. 2955; McCracken & McCracken, 1988).

The study adopts a constructivist epistemological approach, recognizing that knowledge about creativity and the role of AI is co-constructed by individuals withing their social and cultural context (Cassell, Cunliffe, & Grandy, 2018). As an interviewer, I approached participants with openness and curiosity, aiming to understand their unique experiences and perspectives.

3.1.2 Participants and Recruitment

The participants were recruited through purposive sampling (Spiggle, 1994), focusing on individuals who either work in a creative field or actively engage in creative activities during their leisure time. I specifically chose four participants based on personal connections established through academic, professional, or social networks, ensuring they had relevant experiences and insights related to the research topic.

Each participant was approached directly and invited to join the study. All four individuals willingly volunteered for the qualitative study, representing diverse age groups from 23 to 45 years and coming from various creative backgrounds including writing, photography, music and video production. Prior to data collection, all participants were informed about the study's purpose and procedures, with informed consent obtained prior to the interviews. To ensure the privacy of the participants, all data will be anonymized, and identifying information will not be disclosed. Throughout the study, participants will be referred to as R1, R2, R3, and R4. Table 1 provides a summary of the recruited participants.

Table 1: *Description of the participants*

Participant	***Demographic***	***Creative activity***	***Occupation***	***Gender***
R1	Netherlands	Video Editor and Music Producer	Freelancer	Male

R2	Norway	Music Producer	Economics	Male
R3	Norway	Photography	Photographer	Male
R4	Norway	Writing	Author	Male

3.1.3 Data Collection

Data collection was conducted by the researcher and took place between April 2025 – May 2025. Each interview lasted from 35 to 53 min. All interviews were conducted over a video call. Open-ended questions were used in a semi-structured interview. The interview guide covered the following themes: *Introduction*, *Motivation and Inspiration*, *Creative Process and Experience*, *Influence of AI and Technology*, and *Reflection and Future Aspiration*. A detailed explanation of each theme, along with a sample question, is presented in Table 2. The full interview guide is provided in Appendix 1.

Table 2: *Overview of Interview Themes and Example Questions*

Theme	***Description***	***Example Question***
Introduction	Explores the participant's personal and creative background, setting the context for their creative journey and experiences.	Can you tell me about your background and how you first were introduced to **given creative activity**?
Motivation and Inspiration	Investigates what drives and inspire the participant to engage in their given creative activity, revealing intrinsic and extrinsic motivators.	What do you find the most enjoyable about engaging in creative activities? Can you describe the feeling or experience that keeps you coming back to these pursuits?
Creative Process and Experience	Examines the participant's typical approach, methods, and routines in their given creative activity, as well as challenges and learning moments.	Can you walk me through your typical creative process? What steps do you take when working on a new project?
Influence of AI and Technology	Looks at how AI and technology have impacted the participant's creative practices, skill development, and decision-making,	Do you feel that reliance on AI for creative tasks has affected your skill development in any way? If so, in what manner?

Reflection and Future Aspiration	Encourages the participants to reflect on the broader impact of creativity in their life and to share future goals or aspirations.	Do you feel that engaging in creativity has influenced other areas of your life (e.g., career, relationship, personal goals)?

During the interviews, the participants were encouraged to speak freely about their experiences and were given the opportunity to reflect on each theme. I encouraged a co-creation, meaning that, when necessary, I asked follow-up questions for clarification. The interviews were audio-taped and transcript by the researcher. Participants gave their consent to be recorded, and interviews were transcribed for collecting meaningful information and verbatim. Consistently with previous research (Monteverde et al., 2025), three of the interviews (R2, R3, and R4) were conducted and transcribed in Norwegian, and subsequently translated in English, while the interview with R1 was conducted in English. To preserve the original meaning and nuanced connotations, I employed an iterative translation process, to rigorously mitigate potential translation loss (Marschan-Piekkari & Reis, 2004). All transcripts can be found in Appendix (2-5).

As the interviewer, I was focused on understanding the situations deeply and making thoughtful decisions, rather than just following the strict, universal ethical rules. Instead of relying on general principles that may not fit in every situation, I wanted to think, and act based on the specific context (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2005, p.160).

3.1.4 Data Analysis

The interviews were analyzed using a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method allows me to identify and interpret patterns or themes in my dataset, which leads to new insight and understanding (Naeem et al., 2023, p. 2). The unit of analysis in this study is the four different in-depth interviews (Appendix 2 - 5). The data analysis will follow thematic analysis process proposed by Naeem et al. (2023), consisting of six different steps. First, (1) *Transcription*, *Familiarization with the data, and selection of Quotations*, involves thoroughly reading the interview transcripts to identify important sections and illustrative quotes. Secondly, (2) *Selection of Keywords*, focuses on identifying recurring patterns, terms, or elements that capture the essence of participants' responses. (3) *Coding*, which involves transforming the complex textual data into manageable units by assessing short labels or codes to relevant segments. (4) *Theme development* entails grouping related codes together to identify broader patterns and relationships within the data. (5) *Conceptualization through Interpretation of Keywords, Codes, and Themes* involves understanding and defining concepts form the data, and finally, (6) *Development of Conceptual model,* which combines the findings into a coherent framework that addresses the research question (p. 2-5). The thematic analysis will be inductive, where theories are developed from the data (Naeem et al., 2023, p. 2).

3.1.5 Ethics

All four participants received both written and oral information regarding the study and their involvement. To ensure informed consent, informants were asked to confirm their written agreement before participating and to give oral confirmation again during the recording of the interview. Participants were clearly informed about how their anonymous data would be handled and were made aware of their right to withdraw from the study at any point throughout the research process.

3.1.6 Rigor

To minimize the influence of the researcher's preconceived notions on data collection and interpretation during the interviews, follow-up questions were employed to confirm that the interviewee's insights were accurately understood. For instance, the researcher asked clarifying questions as, "*Have I understood you correctly that you…?"* whenever reassurance was needed regarding a specific topic. This practice aligns with seminal studies on how to conduct in-depth interviews (McCracken & McCracken, 1988).

3.2 Study 2

3.2.1 Method

To further address the research question, I engaged in a qualitative survey from a larger and more diverse sample of participants. The survey was administered online using Nettskjema.no, which enabled efficient distribution and collection of responses. This survey methodology complements the in-depth qualitative insights gathered from Study 1 by providing greater breadth and generalizability. The responses from the survey will be analyzed to identify patterns and trends that can support and expand upon the thematic analysis conducted in Study 1, thereby strengthening the overall validity and depth of the research findings (Oberio, 2024).

3.2.2 Participants and Recruitment

As the researcher, I used both a convenience sampling approach, as well as a snowball sampling approach, to capture a range of individuals who had experience with AI tools in either their work life, educational settings or leisure time. The survey was distributed to 63 participants ($52.4\%\ Female, 47.6\%\ Male, M_{age} = 25-34$) through the researchers' network, online platforms such as LinkedIn, AI-Art community and university students. The participants did not receive compensation for participating. Together, the participants provided a cross-section of users from different countries, academic and career fields, and age groups.

The sample size includes a diverse range of study/employment fields, including 1 participant in the field of Education ($M_{age} = 55-64, 100\%\ male$), 25 participants in the field of Marketing and Business

Management ($M_{age} = 25-34, 64\%\ female$), 5 participants in Human Resources ($M_{age} = 35-44. 60\%\ female$), 2 in Retail and Customer Service ($M_{age} = 25-34, 100\%\ female$), 10 in Science and Health ($M_{age} = 35-44,\ 70\%\ female$), 9 respondents' in Informational Technology and Engineering ($M_{age} = 35-44,\ 78\%\ male$), 5 participants in the field of Economics and Finance ($M_{age} = 25-34,\ 100\%\ male$), 3 in a Creative Field $(M_{age} = 35-44,\ 67\%\ male)$, and 3 participants in the Military and other fields $(M_{age} = 35-44,\ 67\%\ female)$.

To check whether the participants had previous experience with AI tools, I initially inquired whether they had utilized such tools within their creative activities at the beginning of the survey. Notably, 28.6% of respondents indicated that they lacked experience with AI tools. Upon further reflection, it became apparent that the question phrasing inadequately distinguished between relevant and non-relevant respondents, as it encompassed the board term "*creative activities*". This limitation is elaborated upon in Chapter 4. Consequently, all respondents were included in further data analysis.

3.2.3 Data Collection

The data collection was conducted in the time span from 27 of April 2025 until 12 of May 2025. The survey participation was voluntary, and participants were required to indicate their informed consent to proceed with the survey. They were assured that the data collection would be treated with confidentiality, with their responses analyzed anonymously and collectively, in compliance with GDPR regulations and ethical research guidelines. The respondents were encouraged to contact me if they had any questions or feedback regarding the survey. To ensure confidentiality, the data will be stored in the Norwegian data collection program Nettskjema, and after a period of six months without any responses, personal information will be deleted from the system (Universitetet i Oslo, n.d.).

3.2.4 Survey Items

The survey items were developed based on the research question, to gain insight on the topic. The qualitative survey was structured into four distinct sections: *everyday creativity in leisure time*, *experience with AI tools*, *perception of art,* and *Demographic Information*. It incorporated both open-ended and predefined closed-ended questions to facilitate comprehensive data collection and quantification of responses. Each section included both open-ended questions aimed at eliciting in-depth responses and a selection of close-ended items requiring participants to indicate applicable responses by checking relevant options (Appendix 6).

In the *first section*, respondents' were asked to contemplate their personal understanding of everyday creativity through questions such as: " *How do you define everyday creativity in your life?*", "*How do you think using AI influences your creativity*?", "*Do you feel that relying on AI for creative tasks limits your originality*?", and "*In your opinion, what role should AI play in creative activities?*".

The *second section* focused on participants' engagement with AI tools, prompting responses to questions like: "*Which AI tools have you used?", "For which activity or purpose do you find AI tools most helpful?*", "*How has the use of AI tools impacted your efficiency or productivity in your work, studies, or leisure activities?*", "*Do you believe that AI tools can enhance your creativity?*", and "*How do you feel about the collaboration between you and AI in your studies, work or leisure time?*".

The *final section* addressed perceptions of art, with open-ended inquiries including: "*Based on your perception of art, would you categorize the image shown above as art?*", "*How does knowing that this artwork was created by AI affect your perception of it?*", "*What factors influenced your opinion on whether this is art?*", "*Do you think AI-generated art can evoke emotions or messages similar to those created by human artists?",* and "*Would you consider displaying or purchasing AI-generated art?*".

The structured approach to survey design aimed to encourage in-depth participant reflection on creativity, AI tools, and art, thereby enriching the understanding of these interconnected domains. The survey also included demographic measures, including gender, age-group, education, and field of study/employment, which is not analyzed further in the paper.

3.3 Triangulation

Triangulation refers to the use of multiple methods or data sources in qualitative research to develop a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena (Carter et al., 2014). By combining data from in-depth interviews and qualitative survey, I am conducting a data triangulation where I cross-check my findings and ensure that they are well-supported. By combining and contrasting data from the in-depth interview and the survey, I can identify consistent patterns and themes. The process of looking at the research from different angles can help enhance the credibility and validity of the results (Oberio, 2024). Also, triangulation is a valuable tool to ensure the research contribution to the literature, whether incremental or disruptive (Prayag, 2010).

3.4 Coding

Following the data collection, both from the qualitative survey and the in-depth interviews, the participants' responses were analyzed, and specific statements and quotations (*verbatim*) were picked out to form keywords, codes, and overall themes. Table 3 illustrates the coding of the data, with a complete overview of all codes are provided in Appendix 7.

Table 3: *Example of ow the data was coded*

Participant	*Statement/Quotation*	*Keyword*	*Code*	*Theme*
R1	"I think the most *enjoyable part* is that you can like *drown in your own thoughts*. So, you *quite everything you are doing*, and I'm in this *hyper focus for a while*. So, my concentration in general is really bad, normally, but when I make music, it's like *I forget all of my surroundings* and I'm hyper focused for like five hours straight and suddenly the *time has flown by*."	"Enjoyable part" "Drown in your own thoughts" "Quite everything you are doing" "Hyperfocus for a while" "I forget all of my surroundings" "Time has flown by"	Enjoyment The creative space Therapeutic effect	**Motivation, Joy, and the Therapeutic Effect**
R2	"*I don't think so*. I mean, I don't know how people have done it, but I have heard a lot of *AI songs*, where, well, I don't know how advanced AI is when it comes to *making a whole song from scratch.* I know *AI is able to copy like the voices* of Drake and Travis, but I don't know like how AI is on making beat and etc. But yeah, if *everything is AI*, then it's like, It *could be a win-win situation* for like Drake, because if *AI uses his voice*, he might *get the credit for it*, so maybe he will get some money out of it as well, or at least fame, but yeah *I would not consider it to be original*."	"I don't think so" "AI songs" "Making a whole song from scratch" "AI is able to copy like the voices" "Everything is AI" "Could be a win-win situation" "AI uses his voice" "Get the credit for it" "I would not consider it to be original"	Originality The current state of AI Use of AI AI generated work	**Originality and Ownership**

R3	"So then I use this, it's a fairly simple integrated AI software that works like this: I've *uploaded 5.000 photos* that *I've edited myself*, so it can *learn the kind of settings I usually use*, the kind of look I'm aiming *for*…" "Yeah, exactly! Okey, so say I've been on a shoot and there are a *crazy number of photos*. The *client needs the pictures quickly*, etc. Okey, then *I upload the photos into the software*, get them *back after 10 minutes*, and then they're all fully edited" "Yeah, but, it's *not a 100%"* "I'd rather say it's *about 90*%, so I still *have to go through everything just to give it a quick check*"	"Uploaded 5.000 photos" "I've edited myself" "Learn the kind of settings I usually use" "Crazy number of photos" "Client needs the pictures quickly" "I upload the photos into the software" "Back after 10 minutes" "Not a 100%" "About 90%" "I still have to go through everything just to give it a quick check"	Use of AI Training data Difficulties in the creative pursuits Effect and efficiency of AI The current state of AI	**Use of AI tools in the Creative Process**
R4	"I feel *like my opinion on that keeps changing all the time.* But *as things stand right now*, I think *crime fiction could be replaced*, and a lot of *conceptual poetry* as well. But Chat and AI. *I feel like they are responders, they answer*." "«I want something conceptually poetic, this and that» and then AI sets parameters and gives an	"As things stand right now" "Crime fiction could be replaced" "Conceptual poetry" "They are responders, they answer"	The current state of AI Perception of the future of AI Perception of AI	**Artificial Intelligence's Impact on Creative Industry and Future Roles**

answer. But *that fundamental sense of wonder*, *that questioning approach,* this thing where humans have *created a kind of oracle through AI*, it doesn't reflect that wonder and that *deeply inquisitive approach to being human*. That, I think that lives in what I consider interesting literature; the classics, the great literary works, and also a lot of lesser-known authors who still carry that power and that *unmistakably human approach*. Yeah, no, I really *don't think AI stands a chance* when it comes to that part of literature." "Humans can't become transparent to themselves. *AI is, after all, created by humans.* There's this kind of blind spot there, something that only the act of questioning can touch. That sense of wonder. *AI won't be able to see that in itself*"	"That fundamental sense of wonder, that questioning approach" "Created a kind of oracle through AI" "Deeply inquisitive approach to being human" "Unmistakably human approach" "Don't think AI stands a chance" "AI is, after all, created by humans" "AI won't be able to see that in itself"	Tool Humanity AI generated work

The selection of keywords plays an essential role in coding, as they form the backbone of the analysis (Naeem et al., 2023, p. 4). Furthermore, codes and themes were developed. Each theme is developed based on in-depth interviews and backed up with statements and data from the qualitative survey (Appendix 8). The thematic analysis left us with seven themes, which offer insight into the research questions in their separate way. To support these themes, I manually coded the data, identifying 40 unique codes that were categorized under the seven themes. These themes will be presented and then discussed in the next paragraphs, including the codes and the qualitative survey data to link the research question to the data.

3.4.1 Everyday Creativity and the Creative Process

This theme explores how participants engage in creative activities in their everyday lives, focusing on the traditional creative process regardless of AI involvement. The theme is structured around several key codes: *Introduction to creativity*, *Inspiration and support*, *Creative pursuit*, *the learning process*, and *Creative blocks*. Together, these codes capture the journey from inspiration and motivation, through the practical pursuit and learning involved in creative endeavors, to the challenges and obstacles encountered along the way.

To provide a comprehensive understanding, this theme draws on both the in-depth interview data and responses to specific survey questions: "*How do you define everyday creativity in your life?*" and "*How often do you engage in creative activities during your leisure time?".* By integrating these insights, the theme aims to illustrate the diverse ways creativity is experienced, defined, and practiced by individuals in their daily routines.

3.4.2 Motivation, Joy, and the Therapeutic Effect

This theme examines the motivation that drives individuals to engage in creative activities during their leisure time. It highlights how creativity is experienced as a source of enjoyment, emotional benefit, and personal fulfillment, as well as the ways in which creative pursuits can offer therapeutic effects and a space for self-expression. The codes included in this theme are: *Enjoyment*, *Motivation*, *The creative space*, *Emotional benefits*, *Therapeutic effect*, *Feedback*, *Engaging in creative activities,* and *Self-expression*.

To complement the insights from the interviews, this theme also includes responses to the survey question: "*What motivates you to engage in creative activities during your leisure time?"* By integrating these perspectives, the theme aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the diverse factors that inspire and sustain creative engagement.

3.4.3 Use of AI Tools in the Creative Process

This theme investigates the various ways in which AI tools are integrated into creative activities and examines their perceived influence on the creative process. It encompasses the codes: *Use of AI*, *Effect and efficiency of AI*, and *AI's effect on creativity*. This focus is on understanding both the practical context in which AI is utilized and the broader implication for creativity.

To provide a comprehensive perspective, this theme draws on responses to several survey questions: "*Have you used AI tools in your creative activities*?", "*If yes, how do you think using AI influences your creativity?*", "*Which AI tools have you used?",* "*Have you used AI tools in any of these following contexts?*", and, "*For which activity or purpose do you find AI tools most helpful?*". By integrating these insights, the theme aims to explore how both interviewees and survey participants experience the evolving role of AI in their creative activities.

3.4.4 Perspectives on AI: Tool or Partnership?

This theme analyses how individuals perceive the role of AI in their creative activities, specifically whether they view AI as a tool that supports their process or as a collaborative partner. It encompasses the codes: *Dependence on AI*, *Tool*, *Partnership*, *The role of AI in creativity*, *Perception of AI*, and *Efficiency*. The focus is on understanding participants' attitude towards AI, the degree of reliance on AI, and the importance of maintaining human intention in creative work.

To explore these perspectives, the draws on responses to the survey questions: "*How do you feel about the collaboration between you and AI in your studies, work, or leisure time?", "In your opinion, what role should AI play in creative activities?"* and *"What motivated you to use AI in your work, studies, or leisure time?*". By integrating these questions with the interview data, the theme aims to provide insight into the evolving relationship between humans and AI in creative contexts.

3.4.5 Originality and Ownership

This theme addresses the complex issues of originality and ownership in the context of AI-generated creative content. It examines participants' perspectives on what constitutes authentic and original art, as well as the implication of AI involvement for copyright, intellectual property rights, and ethical considerations. The codes included within this theme is: *Independence*, *Training data, Originality, Ownership, intellectual property rights and ethics,* and *AI-generated work*.

Following survey questions is included to support the in-depth interview data: "*Do you feel that relying on AI for creative tasks limits your originality?",* "*Based on your perception of art, would you categorize the image shown above as art?", "Do you believe this artwork is original?",* and, *"How does knowing this artwork was created by AI affect your perception of it?".* By integrating these insights, the theme seeks to understand how individuals negotiate questions of authorship, authenticity, and creative value in an era of rapidly advancing AI technology.

3.4.6 Artificial Intelligence's Impact on Creative Industry and Future Roles

This theme explores participants' perceptions of how AI technologies are shaping the creative industry today and how they may influence creative roles in the future. It encompasses the codes: *The current state of AI* and *Perception of the future of AI*. The focus is on understanding both the effects of AI on efficiency, productivity, and creative practices, as well as attitudes toward the evolving presence of AI-generated content in professional contexts.

To support the analysis, this theme draws on responses to the survey questions: "*How has the use of AI tools impacted your efficiency or productivity in your work, studies, or leisure activities*?" and "*Would you consider displaying or purchasing AI-generated art*?". By integrating these perspectives, the theme aims to

provide insight into how individuals experience and anticipate the ongoing transformation of creative industries.

3.4.7 Value of Human Expression, Subjectivity, and Craftmanship

This theme explores how participants perceive the unique qualities that distinguishes human-created art from AI-generated works, focusing on the importance of emotional expression, subjectivity, and craftmanship. It encompasses the codes: *Consequences of using AI*, *Humanity*, *Subjectivity*, *Authenticity*, *Skepticism towards AI* and *Craftmanship*. The theme considers how these factors shape attitudes towards authenticity and emotional resonance in creative work, as well as the skepticism some individuals feel regarding the capacity of AI to replicate the depth and nuance of human artistry.

To support the analysis, the theme draws on responses to the survey questions: "*What factors influenced your opinion on whether this is art or not?"* and "*Do you think AI-generated art can evoke emotions or messages similar to those created by human artists?".* By integrating these perspectives, the theme aims to illustrate the value placed on human creativity and the qualities that many believes set it apart in an AI-influenced creative landscape.

Having outlined the seven key themes that emerged from the analysis, the following sections will delve deeper into each theme, illustrating how they collectively address the research question. In presenting the themes, I will draw on both the qualitative in-depth interview data and the supporting insights from the survey, thereby triangulating the findings to ensure a robust and nuanced understanding (Oberio, 2024). Furthermore, each theme will be discussed in relation to the existing literature, allowing for a critical comparison between findings and established theoretical perspectives. This approach not only enhances the credibility of the analysis, but also situates the results within the broader academic discourse on everyday creativity and AI.

Chapter 4: Discussion of Insights

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Everyday Creativity and the Creative Process

Everyday creativity has received little attention as a concept of creativity in literature. According to Benedek et al. (2020), everyday creativity can be understood as creative activities taking place in one's leisure time, that is the time off work and free from necessities like eating, hygiene, or household chores, and which involves creative activities of personal significance rather than publicly recognized accomplishments. Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) have tried to comprehensively define the term, and to build further on their research, I asked the respondents to explore their own definition and understanding of *everyday creativity.* An overview of the participants distribution of everyday creativity are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: *Distribution of Everyday Creativity Themes Among Participants*

Creative Activity	***Frequency of Mention***	***Quote***	***Examples***
Cooking and Food-Related Activities	Most frequently mentioned	*"Cooking food. Trying out and exploring new recipes and combinations."*	Cooking new recipes Making meals without recipes Food decoration and meal planning
Artistic activities	Frequently Mentioned	*"To be creative is to use your mind and imagination to create something. For example, by painting, drawing, creating music, playing an instrument."*	Painting Knitting Drawing and other visual arts Music-related activities (playing instruments, singing)
Problem-Solving and Practical Solutions	Frequently Mentioned	*"Finding practical and fun solutions in daily life as a full-time mom"*	Creative solutions for everyday tasks Home organization and routine management Challenges in managing time and activities
Personal Expression and Self-Discovery	Moderately Mentioned	*"I define everyday creativity as finding small ways to express myself or solve problems in daily life"*	Using creative activities for individuality Unique dressing and personal journaling
Learning and Development	Moderately Mentioned	"*Engaging in activities that requires me to use my fantasy*"	Exploring new skills and hobbies Adapting to new situations

Social Interactions and Collaboration	Moderately Mentioned	*"*[…] *planning social gatherings with my friends"*	Planning social gatherings Engaging in creative activities with friends and family
Integration of Creativity into Daily Life	Less Frequently Mentioned	*"Everyday creativity can be as simple as finding creative ways to solve various tasks throughout the day…"*	Applying creative thinking to everyday tasks Engaging in non-artistic activities creatively
Professional and Structured Creativity	Less Frequently Mentioned	*"*[…] *when I find new ways to communicate complex information to clients, design tailored presentations, or brainstorm campaign strategies that fit their specific needs"*	Creativity in academic and work settings Professional communication and problem-solving

Everyday creativity is a multifaceted concept that includes a wide range of activities individuals engage with to express themselves, solve problems, and enrich their daily lives. Based on participants' responses, it is evident that everyday creativity manifests in numerous forms, including cooking, artistic pursuits like painting and knitting, and practical problem-solving in everyday situations, something that can be understood in relation to little-c creativity (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009, p. 3). Many respondents highlighted how these activities not only provide personal fulfillment but also serve as a method for self-discovery and learning, like one respondent stated: "*I define it as something that makes me express myself in ways that was not led by someone else*". This can be interpreted in relation to how engaging in creative activities allows individuals to explore new ways to express themselves, and to gain deeper insight into what matters for them, driven by a curiosity. By doing so, they can understand themselves better and grow personally, which aligns with Maslow's (1943) concept of self-actualization: "*the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything one is capable of becoming*" (Maslow, 1943, p. 10).

The exploration of everyday creativity through the qualitative survey emphasizes its significance as a domain of creative activities that occur during leisure time, which is distinct from work and essential daily tasks (Benedek et al., 2020 p. 610). Participants defined everyday creativity through personal and meaningful pursuits, and the findings from this study aligns well with the definition given by Ilha Villanova & Pina e

Cunha (2021), including cooking without recipes, writing poetry, and painting, thereby emphasizing the production of original work (p. 673).

Creativity is often integrated into social interactions, whether through "*planning social gathering with my friends*" or *"find new ways to communicate complex information to clients*", reinforcing the sociocultural approach of the Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha's (2021) definition of everyday creativity (p.674). Ultimately, everyday creativity emerges as an expression of individuality and imagination, turning routine task into meaningful and enriching experiences that enhance one's quality of life, such as "*doing something different from my "A4" life*.".

From the survey, it occurs that there is a relatively high interest in creative activities among the participants, where 49.2% has a *frequent engagement* (daily or several times a week), 36.5% has a *moderate engagement* (once a week or occasionally) and 14.3% has a *low engagement* (rarely or never) (Appendix 8). These findings align with the study conducted by Silvia et al. (2014), indicating that during a week, in which participants were surveyed eight times a day, individuals engaged in creative activities approximately 22% of the time (p. 187).

From the in-depth interviews, I gained valuable insight into the creative pursuits of the four participants and how their creative processes enhance their everyday lives. R1 (music and video creation), R3 (photography), and R4 (writing) engage in their creative activity daily, whereas R2's (music) involvement varies from week to week. All participants were introduced to their respective creative pursuits at an early age and have since developed professional expertise in their fields. According to Kaufman and Beghetto (2009), this form of creativity is categorized as Pro-C creativity, which is characterized by formal training and accomplishment over time (p. 4-5).

To gain further insight into the various informants' creative process, I asked them to walk me through a typical approach when starting a new project. For R1 and R2, both of whom are involved in music, this process can range from identifying a specific note they want to build upon on, to starting a project from scratch. In contrast, for R3 and R4, who work respectively as photographer and writer, the process is much more complex and evolves organically. In particular, R3 describes it as a "*path you take and gradually realize what you want*", while R4 compares the creative process to vegetative growth, beginning as a seed that multiplies and branches out. He notes that it is constantly evolving and requires ongoing refinement, where at the end he must accept that what is written is written.

A notable theme across all interviews is the ongoing learning process embedded in informants' creative routines. Each participant described how engaging in their craft, whether music, video edition, photography, or writing, continually exposes them to new techniques, challenges, and opportunities for growth. This experiential learning aligns closely with the concept of mini-c creativity from Kaufman and Beghetto's (2009) Four C Model, which emphasizes the personal and developmental insights gained through creative exploration. For these artists, creativity is not only about producing works but also about the learning and self-discovery that occurs along the way, reinforcing the idea that everyday creativity is a dynamic process of

growth. This further emphasizes the significance of skill development in creativity, as it emerges as an important component of the creative practices. While there are growing concerns about our ability to independently enhance our creativity, especially as studies show that an increasingly number of teens turn to AI for assistance (Sidoti et al., 2025; Tsao & Noges, 2024), the artists highlight the importance of continually expose themselves to new opportunities for growth and maintaining authentic.

This process of growth, however, does not come without its obstacles. Another common theme all of the artists agree upon is their occasional experience of creative blocks. They collectively agree that a helpful strategy is to "*leave it for a while*", to engage in other activities before attempting to return to the original project. R4 further emphasizes that rest can be beneficial, as it is not possible to force creativity. Interestingly, none of them mentioned AI tools as a resource to overcome the creative block, despite their active usage of the technology. This contrasts with findings by Tsao and Nogues (2024), who observed that students often use GenAI to spark new ideas during writer's block (p. 5-6). Together, these insights highlight that for people who actively engage with creative activities in their everyday lives, the learning process is ongoing and deeply personal, shaped by both challenges and the strategies they use to navigate them. This further illustrates the individualized and developmental nature of everyday creativity.

While AI can serve as a creative tool that inspires new forms of expressions, it cannot, and should not, replace the personal, social, and developmental aspects of everyday creativity, that are highly valued by both survey participants and artists. Despite the efficiency and accessibility that AI can provide us with, participants seem to value the traditional process of creation in their everyday creativity.

4.1.2 Motivation, Joy, and the Therapeutic Effect

Benedek et al. (2020) identify nine central motives as key motivational factors in everyday creativity, which include *enjoyment*, *expression*, *challenge*, *coping*, *prosocial*, *social*, *material*, *recognition*, and *duty* (p. 612) The motive for creativity involves both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that drive individuals to engage in creative activities, whether for personal fulfillment (enjoyment, expression, challenge, coping, duty), social connection (social, prosocial, duty), or external recognition (recognition, material) (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611). I further aimed to explore both what motivates artists to engage in their creative practices, and what encourages individuals more broadly to participate in everyday creative activities. Based on data collection through both interviews and survey responses, several interesting motivational patterns emerged.

In the qualitative survey, respondents were asked specifically about their motivation for engaging in everyday creativity. They were presented with a predefined list of motivational factors and were allowed to select multiple options that best reflected their own motivations. A total of 168 responses were collected from 63 participants, with each respondent selecting an average of 2.7 option (Appendix 8). To facilitate analysis, the proportion of each motivation factor has been calculated as a percentage of the total number of responses. The distribution of the creative motivation responses is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: *Distribution of Creative Motivation Responses*

Motivation	***Responses***	***% of Total Responses***
Relaxation	41	24.4%
Self-Expression	38	22.6%
Skill Development	37	22.0%
Social Interaction	27	16.1%
Problem Solving	25	14.9%

**n = 168*

Relaxation is the motivational factor which scores the highest among the survey participants, with 24.4% of total responses. On the same end, R1 view music creation as a way to escape the stresses of everyday life, and a way to express his emotions. Both R2 and R3 have a similar view, where R3 shared that photography allows him to articulate his feelings and is effectively therapeutic for him. R2 describes the immersive experience of music-making as resembling the experience of entering an unbreakable bubble where "*it's only me, myself, and my music*". This relaxational and therapeutic effect that creativity holds on individuals emphasizes that fulfilling one's creative potential can lead to deeper satisfaction and emotional well-being, reinforcing the notion that intrinsic value of creativity lies in the self-expressive process rather than merely its outcomes (Benedek et al., 2020, p. 611).

Consistent with Hegarty's (2009) assertion that *self-expression* is an important aspect of creative behavior (p.11), 22.6% of total responses in the survey indicated that self-expression serves as a primary driver of everyday creativity. When R4 began his writing journey, he described it as an experience beyond his control, stating, "*I've never felt anything as self-effacing, or "ego-effacing", as writing*". He characterized this process as a "*great relief to be able to let go of myself*", highlighting the meaningful impact that self-expression has on his creative practice. R1 explains that interacting with music is a way for him to transfer his emotion and find his intension, similarly to R3's reflection about photography being a way for him to express himself and give vent to his emotion.

According to the survey participants, *skill development* is nearly as important as self-expression, with 22% of the total responses citing it as a key motivator for engaging in everyday creativity. This can be viewed in relation to the respondents' definition of creativity, where the category "*learning and development*" received a moderate response rate. These findings show that the pursuit of creative activities is not solely about immediate self-expression or emotional release, but also about the intrinsic satisfaction that stems from acquiring new skills and competencies. This aligns with Cropley's (1990) claiming that the development of domain-specific knowledge and skill is a fundamental psychological element of creativity, enabling

individuals to transform their ideas into tangible outcomes. Moreover, the emphasis on skill development supports the mini-c and little-c levels in Kaufman and Beghetto's (2009) Four C Model of Creativity, where creativity is closely tied to personal growth, learning and the everyday application of new abilities.

The motivational factors *Social Interaction* and *Problem Solving* received scores of 16.1% and 14.9%, respectively. Respondent R3 highlights the significance of social interactions in his work, emphasizing that collaborating with other creative individuals who share a common vision plays a vital role in his motivation. He notes that these interactions can have a dual effect. If the project he engages in and the social dynamics surrounding him are negative in nature, it can lead to a decline in his motivation, which echoes Neçka's (1986) idea of *abandoned creativity*, that is, creativity is incomplete when motivation is lacking. This suggests that the quality of social interactions is essential not only for inspiration but also for sustaining overall motivation in his creative endeavors.

Problem Solving received the lowest score, accounting for 14.9% of the total responses. This relatively low score may suggest that respondents do not perceive a direct connection between creativity and problem-solving, even though everyday creativity encourage individuals to acquire new knowledge and self- awareness while facilitating daily problem-solving (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p. 674). However, R4 provides valuable reflections on the subject:

> *"I just have to leave it for a while, and it shows up again when it shows up. [...] I think it has something to do with rhythm. [...]we eat, we consume, and we create. It's a principle that applies to all life. It has to consume other life in order to create and sustain its own. So if writing is about creativity, then I also need to take something else in [...] and that can for example be rest. Just like with everything else"* (R4).

This quote illustrates how R4 actively addresses the issue of writer's block by recognizing the need for rest and replenishment rather than forcing himself through a creative blockage. He employs a biological understanding of creativity, suggesting that one must consume in order to produce, which represents a reflective approach to problem-solving.

According to Benedek et al. (2020), enjoyment is the motive that scores highest for everyday creativity, and highlights that the primary reason for individuals to engage in creative activities is to gain pleasure and satisfaction from the activity (p. 610). This is evident from the in-depth interviews, where the artists identify a common thread relating to their satisfaction and enjoyment of being creative through their respective artistic activity, R1, for example, describes music-making using a metaphor of a *sanctuary*, stating that "*the most enjoyable part is that you can drown in your own thoughts [...] I forget all of my surroundings. It's like a distraction but also a way to transfer my emotions".* This serves as a medium through which he can express his feelings and experience an emotional release, a notion consistent with data gathered from the survey, where 24.4% of total responses also refer to *relaxation* and escape from reality as significant motivators for engaging in everyday creativity. This supports Benedek et al. (2020), who found that enjoyment is central to intrinsic

motivation in creativity. Building on this idea, R2 also highlights his involvement in music creation as an escape from daily pressure, characterizing the experience like "*It's like there is nothing else that is happening".*

Feedback emerges as a significant factor influencing the motivation of all four interviewees to continue engaging in their creative activities. R1 and R2 described how receiving positive comments from friends and family on their music provided a sense of validation and encouraged them to experiment further. R3 emphasized the motivational boost that came from sharing creative work in group settings, noting that both recognition and the exchange of ideas fostered a sense of belonging and inspired continued participation. In contrast, R4 pointed out that even minimal feedback was enough to bolster his commitment, underscoring the importance of social connections in creative pursuits. These experiences resonate with the sociocultural perspective outlined by Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021), which emphasizes that creative outcomes are often evaluated and validates within social context. Furthermore, the findings align with Benedek et al.s' (2020) Motives for Creative Scale, where social and recognition motives are central drives for everyday creativity. Collectively, the interviewees' viewpoints illustrate that feedback not only enhances motivation but also contributes to a cycle of continues creative engagement and personal growth.

By participating in creative activities, the respondents experience both self-expression and enjoyment, which provides essential motivation to persist in their artistic endeavors. This aligns with the findings of Benedek et al. (2020), who argues that individuals strove for self-expression and often turn to creative activities, particularly in the realms of art, literature, and music (p. 622).

Among the motivational factors presented, AI has the potential to support individuals particularly in the areas of social interaction and problem-solving, which interestingly were the two least selected motivational factors among respondents (Table 5). Integrating AI into these domains, especially through the growing trend of conversational AI companions, could offer valuable emotional support and help reduce feelings of loneliness or isolations for some users (BBC News, 2024). While such tools are not substitutes for genuine human connections, they can help users feel heard and less alone. However, the survey results indicate that participants are most motivated to engage in creative activities for relaxation, self-expression, and skill development, which are areas where AI currently plays a limited role. This suggest that, for many, the core value of engaging in creativity remains rooted in personal fulfillment and growth, rather than functions that AI might enhance. These findings highlight the importance of recognizing the boundaries of AI's contribution to creativity and underscores the significance of intrinsically motivated creative experiences.

4.1.3 Use of AI Tools in the Creative Process

The survey aimed to explore the use of AI tools in participants' creative activities and how these tools influence their creativity. Among the respondents, 71.4% reported having utilized AI tools in their creative pursuits, while 18 respondents indicated that they have not used AI tools during their creative activities (Appendix 8). These results suggest that the use of AI tools in creative practices is widespread among participants.

Additionally, the four artists interviewed in-depth confirmed their use of AI tools in their creative processes, although the extent to which AI is integrated into their work varies among the different artists.

Respondents R1 and R3 share a common perspective on AI tools to enhance efficiency. R1 utilizes AI for scriptwriting and music production, seeking advice on sound adjustments and background noise reduction to achieve professional quality. AI can supplement technical skills, supporting Cropley's (1990) view that skill is foundational for creative expression. R1 adds that he tries to neglect it exists, showcasing that he still wants to remain authentic in his music production, thus implying an inherent inauthenticity in the exploration of AI for creative purposes. Likewise, R3 employs AI in his photo editing and social media management, using it to streamline his process and save time, which boosts his overall productivity. This aligns with the Pro-C creativity level, where expertise and formal training are enhanced by active human-AI collaboration (Zhou & Lee, 2024).

On the other hand, R2 stands out with his extensive reliance on AI tool, employing it regularly to create "a cappella" tracks by extracting vocals and as a lyric creation tool. While R2 integrates AI a lot in his music creation, R4 adopts a more focused approach by using AI as a research tool to gather information rather than text generation. This supports Güss et al. (2021), who describes the *preparation stage* as a conscious effort to collect ideas and data. He started out being very skeptical towards AI technology, but over time he has "*created a sort of relationship between me and something that gives me good answers*". He now views AI as an "*a brilliant, absolutely fantastic tool*". This shift denotes how the integration of AI has become more adopted in our daily lives and reflects our evolving attitudes toward this emerging technology.

Among the survey participants, 71.4% indicated that they utilize AI tools in their creative processes, but how will this affect their creative abilities? Drawing on Cropley's (1990) definition of "*frustrated creativity*", which refers to the context in which an individual possesses high technical skills but struggles to generate new ideas or see things from another perspective (p. 171), which may occur when technology reduces our capacity and motivation for creative thinking. Building on this idea, I set out to explore whether participants perceive AI tools as enhancements or detractors of their creative abilities.

The question yielded varying responses from the survey participants. Approximately 51% expressed positive views on AI, perceiving it as a way to enhance creativity: "*Using AI enhances my creativity. It gives me new ideas, saves me time, and helps me see things from different angels*". AI tools can help users gain confidence and social connections, which democratize and lowers barriers for beginners to try new hobbies, addressing esteem and belonging needs (Maslow, 1943), as well as the sociocultural perspective of everyday creativity (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021, p. 674). On the other side, about 16% held negative attitudes toward AI, with comments such as, "*Using AI detracts from creativity. It relies too much on patterns and data, which limits original thought. Creativity comes from human intuition and experience, not algorithms*." Others were saying that "*I think it detracts. I notice that my ability to think new and think outside the box gets compromised by AI because it thinks for me*", which exemplifies what Corpley (1990) referred to as frustrated

creativity and describes individuals who struggle to generate new ideas or see things from another perspective, despite their high technical skills (Corpley, 1990, p. 171).

Interestingly, approximately 21% of respondents maintained a neutral perspective on AI, indicating that they felt it could both enhance and detract from creativity or that they had no specific opinions to suggest otherwise. Some participants also voiced concerns about the use of AI in creative activities, emphasizing that creativity stems from human effort. One respondent noted, "*There is a saying ´learning by doing´, and with AI, I'm afraid many will stop trying them self and just rely on the AI answers that may be given to many thousands of people, so we will all end up copy each other's solutions*". This concern reflects the increasing reliance of young people on AI for assistance (Sidoti et al., 2025; Tsao & Noges, 2024), alongside a noted concern about stagnation in knowledge creation due to AI (Zhou & Lee, 2024). Such trends may hinder the development of essential skills and diminish opportunities for "learning by doing", as AI are increasingly "doing" it for us.

The questions regarding AI's influence on creativity were also extensively and vertically discussed with the artists in the interviews, revealing divided opinions. R4 expressed concerns about the potential negative effects of AI, stating that AI "*affect my creativity for the worse. […] I shut down the wonder and the creative energy I usually have, and it doesn't get to unfold itself*". Similarly, R1 believes that AI can influence his creativity negatively, feeling that he might become overly reliant on it. However, he also emphasizes that "*you cannot create blank ideas from AI, they are not good enough*".

On the other hand, R3 holds a positive view of AI, believing that it contributes to the development of his creativity. R3 claims that AI has made him more creative, because the output is better than what we would have produced by himself, though he clarified that this applies to his role as a social media manager rather than to his photography, where he does not perceive any impact of AI on his creative process other than streamlining it. R2 adopts a somewhat neutral position regarding AI's influence on creativity, indicating that it has not yet significantly affected him. Nevertheless, he conveyed the belief that, should AI eventually influence his creativity, it is likely to have a positive effect.

AI is expected to evolve rapidly in the coming years, yet its widespread adoption is already evident, with 71.4% of survey respondents reporting their use of AI. Technology manifests in various forms and is utilized in both educational settings, workplace, and daily life. This is further supported by data collection, where participants were asked to specify the context in which they employed AI tools. They were provided with a predefined list of contexts and allowed to select multiple options. A total of 141 responses were gathered from 63 participants, with each respondent selecting an average of 2.2 options (Appendix 8). To facilitate analysis, the proportion of each context has been calculated as a percentage of the total number of responses. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: *Distribution of AI tools in different contexts*

Context	***Responses***	***% of Total Responses***
Work	48	34.04%
Education	46	32.62%
Leisure Time	43	30.50%
I have not used AI tools	4	2.84%

**n = 141*

Remarkably, the data indicate a relatively consistent distribution of AI tool usage across education, work, and leisure time, with percentages ranging from 30.5% to 34.04%. This finding further supports the widespread adoption of AI that is already evident. Interestingly, only four participants (2.84%) reported that they do not use AI tools, which contrasts significantly with the 18 respondents who previously indicated that they do not use AI tools. This discrepancy may be attributed to the earlier question specifically asking about AI tools used in creative activities, rather than on a general basis.

Respondents were then asked to specify which AI tools they used and in what context. Educational settings were reported most frequently, with a total of 37 different AI tools mentioned across all three contexts. The most popular AI tool was undoubtedly OpenAI's ChatGPT, cited 56 times out of 63, aligning with the increasingly awareness around that specific AI tool (Sidoti et al., 2025). Additionally, tools such as Canva, Copilot, and Perplexity were categorized in the high-frequence group, each being mentioned seven times. A comprehensive list of the various AI tools reported by the respondents is provided in Table 7, where they are grouped according to their frequency of occurrence.

Table 7: *Mentioned AI Tools Categorized by Frequency of Occurrence*

Frequency Category	***Tools and* N*umber of* T*imes* M*entioned***
High frequence (7+ mentions)	ChatGPT (56), Canva (7), Copilot (7), and Perplexity (7).
Moderate frequence (4-6 mentions)	DALL-E (6), NootebookLM (6), Grammarly (5), Deepseek (4), Gemini (5), Claude (6), and AI integrated programs at work (4).
Low frequency (2-3 mentions)	Deepl (2), Photoshop (2), ChatPDF (2), Grok (2), Midjourney (2), and Suno (2).
Singular occurrence	Shazam, Spotify, Snapchat AI, GeoGPT, Replit, Blaze, LeonardAI, Metashape, Prome-AI, Sora, ChatJPG, Krea, Anthropic, Kling, Runway, LLAMA, Consensus, Open Evidence, Cursor Editor, and ChatUIO.

When participants were asked for which activity or purpose they find AI tools to be most helpful, they identified several key areas where AI provides significant value. Many respondents highlighted AI's functionality for information gathering and research, noting its efficiency in getting data and providing quick answers to complex questions. Other respondents emphasized AI's role in content creation and editing, particularly for writing tasks such as drafting emails, reports, and creative text. A notable portion of respondents valued AI for its ability to generate ideas and overcome creative blocks, serving as a source of inspiration when starting new projects, which aligns with Tsao and Nogues's (2024) findings stating similar insights, while contrasting from the artists way of overcoming creative blocks, who turn to distraction instead of AI. Some participants also mentioned AI's helpfulness for learning and skill development, using it to explain concepts or practice new techniques. These findings align with Cropley's (1990) framework for creativity, where AI appears to primarily support the knowledge and skill component, while the motivation element remains distinctly human.

Together with the data collected from the survey and interviews, the findings suggest a significant trend in the use of AI tools in creative processes, both withing professional creative fields and among individuals in their daily lives. While AI is increasingly valued as a practical assistant for specific creative tasks, participants still view the core motivational drive and creative vision as fundamentally human contributions to the creative process. Regarding attitudes towards AI's influence on creativity, there are mixed opinions evident across the data. While most participants express positive views, highlighting AI tools as an enhancement of their creativity, the analysis also reveals a substantial number of neutral and negative perspectives, underscoring that opinions are multifaceted and nuanced in nature with complex and novel phenomena. This complexity underscores the nature of the topic, a trend that is also reflected in the existing literature.

4.1.4 Perspectives on AI: Tool or Partnership?

The discussion surrounding the role of AI in the creative process reveals varied perspectives on whether it functions primarily as a tool or as a partner. We now know that both the participants in the survey and the interviewees have a nuanced view on the use of AI in creativity, but should it be used as a tool or a partnership? The respondents were asked to specify which role they perceived their collaboration with AI to be in their study, work, or leisure time.

The results revealed that a significant majority, totaling of 54%, viewed AI primarily as a collaborative tool. Many respondents noted that they had their own ideas and thoughts in advance and used AI to enhance their work, emphasizing with Wong et al.'s (2024) perspective of AI's role as a creative tool that enhances human creativity without fully replacing the uniquely human aspect of artistic expressions (p. 1517). Several participants also emphasized the effectiveness of AI, highlighting its ability to help solve problems. One respondent to the survey in particular articulated this sentiment, stating, "*It is a tool. I usually always have the ideas and thoughts made beforehand and then I feed those ideas and concepts into the AI to improve the quality of it. It is the same way I view a calculator. I already know how to calculate mathematical by*

myself, but a calculator fool-proofs it and is way more effective". This perspective highlights how AI can help, as a co-creator, to improve existing ideas without replacing the creative process itself, thus not affecting the feeling of ownership to the same extent, as one participant mentioned as a disadvantage.

This resonates closely with R1's perspective on AI, as he considers it to be a tool that enables greater efficiency and saves time. He underscores the importance of not relying too heavily on AI, primarily because it is not yet capable of generating ideas that can be fully trusted. By relying on instant AI suggestions, users are skipping the incubation stage in Wallas's Four-Stage Model of Creativity (Güss et al., 2021). Specifically, AI may transform traditional incubation, raising questions about the depth of creative insight. Furthermore, R1 points out that there is a risk of spending excessive time engaging with AI when one has essentially completed the work independently, emphasizing the need to trust in yourself in a creative process. R3 also recognizes the efficiency benefits of using AI, particularly in photography. He asserts "*AI is a tool. It's not a brain that can function in the way that the human brain does, and it never will*", which emphasizes the necessity of combining AI's assistance with established artistic skills and human creativity.

Tsao and Nogues (2024) found that students often view AI as a partnership, which differs from the findings from this study. Only 15.9% of the survey respondents view collaboration with AI as a partnership. The participants who viewed AI as a partner brought attention to the collaboration sides of the process where one stated "*It feels more like a partnership - I guide the process, but AI helps shape and improve my ideas*". It is important to highlight that the specific context in which respondents perceived this collaboration has not been defined. This lack of specification may account for the lower percentage observation in this study compared to the findings of Tsao and Nogues (2024), which were conducted within an educational setting. Interestingly, a larger proportion of respondents (23.8%) perceived AI as both a partnership and a tool rather than solely a partnership. This distinction often reflects the way respondents utilize AI in their processes. When used excessively, AI is viewed as a partnership, but when used "appropriately", it is regarded as a tool. One participant described this relationship by stating, "*It is both a partnership and a tool I would say. It gives me a path, and I follow it. I trust it as a partner and use it as a tool while I navigate my activities, especially in studies*". This respondent resonates with the findings of Tsao and Nogues (2024), who discovered that students increasingly view AI as a creative catalyst, contributing to the decentralization of authorship (p.1). While R3 acknowledges that AI can streamline tasks and inspire ideas, he warns that overly relying on technology could undermine an artist's individuality. He notes "*If someone uses AI just to take a shortcut, it's likely to show in the results".* This sentiment underscores the broader concern shared by both R1 and R2 that an over-reliance on AI could weaken the unique qualities that define individual artistic expression.

But how did we reach a point where we need to discuss whether technology is a tool or a partner in our creative pursuits? To further explore what drives individuals to utilize AI extensively in their daily lives, workplace, and studies, I asked the participants in the survey to indicate their motivations for using AI. They were given the option to select all choices that apply to them. A total of 255 responses were collected from the

63 respondents, with each participant averaging approximately 4 selections (Appendix 8). The distribution of these responses is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: *Distribution of AI Tools in Different Contexts*

Motivation	***Responses***	***% of Total Responses***
Convenience	39	15.3%
Efficiency	54	21.2%
Inspiration	28	11.0%
Enhance learning or productivity	31	12.2%
Access to information and resource	35	13.7%
Collaboration support	15	5.9%
Time-saving	53	20.8%

**n = 255*

The most significant factors driving people to use AI tools are *efficiency* and *time-saving*, with respective percentages of 21.2% and 20.8%. These trends have been a consistent theme throughout the data gathered so far, with both artists and multiple survey respondents frequently stating these drives as a key reason for using AI tools. We are continually seeking new ways to streamline our daily lives, particularly in work and academic setting. AI has the potential to reduce workload and enhance various processes, which resonates as a key motivator for respondents and interviewees alike. A percentage of 15.3% for *convenience* can also be seen in relation to streamline processes. Interestingly, *collaboration support* receives the lowest score at just 5.9%. This may be attributed to individuals' reluctance to admit they use AI as a collaborative tool, as they might not want to decentralize authorship or may feel a sense of loss regarding originality when AI is involved in all or part of the creative process.

The findings shows that the co-creative potential of AI is becoming more widely accepted, suggesting that AI may be most effective when used collaboratively by humans to explore new creative ideas, rather than replacing human authorship entirely.

4.1.5 Originality and Ownership

Discussions surrounding art produced solely or partially by AI have become increasingly debatable, particularly considering the advancements in GenAI that have enabled individuals to secure first place in art competitions with their AI-generated creations (Glynn, 2023). This raises critical questions regarding the nature of art, the definition of originality, and the determination of ownership in these contexts. I aimed to examine these issues more closely, so, while French American artist Marcel Duchamp posited that anything

could be considered art, highlighting that the designation ultimately resides with the artist (Baxter, 2024), I was particularly interested in further exploring the perspectives of the respondents on this complex matter.

In the survey, I included an AI-generated image that I prompted to resemble a work of art akin to what Michelangelo produced in his time (Appendix 9). Within 10 seconds, I received the completed image, and without informing the respondents that it was AI-generated, I asked them to categorize the image as art or not, based on their perception of art. A total of 87.3% of respondents define the image as art, justifying their decision with reasons such as the fact that it provoked thought, it resembled a piece that could be found in a museum, and it showcased something mythical while being visually engaging. Once respondent even aligned with Marcel Duchamp's interpretation that anything can be considered art, where the respondent stated, "*Yes, I guess. Art can be everything and some things are always art for someone. Art is supposed to make people feel something, not just be pretty*".

On the other hand, 7.9% of respondents believed that the image did not qualify as art. All five of these respondents recognized that the image was AI-generated and reasoned that it lacked the effort and knowledge of a human creator necessary for it to be considered art. One respondent stated, "*I would not categorize this as art because it lacks originality. The threshold for when something becomes too generic to be classified as art is difficult to establish, but I believe most work created by AI would struggle to fit into that category*". This reflects a skepticism towards AI's potential role in future art. In total, 17.5% of respondents were able to identify that the image was produced by AI, and while five of them rejected it as art, the remaining six continued to be open to considering it art. One respondent noted, "*It was probably made by AI, but it is still an interpretation of life, thus art*", showcasing that art has various forms of interpretations, which several respondents mentioned. This statement reflects an openness towards AI within the art world. Although the participant did not express strong opinions about the image itself, it remains a noteworthy finding. Attitudes towards the development of AI int the arts are important to examine, as they help determine the factors that influence whether individuals should still choose to continue engaging in traditional artistic practices or not.

The primary purpose of including the AI-generated image was to assess the respondents' reactions regarding originality. On the next section of the survey, the participants were informed that the image had been generated in just 10 seconds using OpenAI's DALL-E image generation model. I then asked the respondents whether they considered the image to be original now that they were aware it was AI-generated. As expected, several respondents changed their opinion. A total of 61.9% indicated that they did not consider the image to be original, while 17.5% believed it was original, and 20.6% expressed uncertainty (Appendix 8). To delve deeper into what caused individuals to change their opinions after learning that the image was AI-generated, they were asked to express whether this information affected their perception of the image, which sparked a great discussion and good insight to this research.

Although more than half of the respondents' indicated that they did not consider the image to be original, one participant highlighted the notion that "*It can still be called art even if it's not original art*". This statement is noteworthy, as the question of originality itself is complex and multifaceted. But when it comes

to whether AI influences perceptions of the image, the responses were notably divided. In fact, 50.8% of the respondents' felt that the information regarding its AI origin did affect their perception.

Several participants expressed opinions that reflected a sense of artificiality, stating that they perceived the image as "*fake*" since it was based on pre-existing trained data. Comments such as "*Now it's just something the algorithm has made based on the prompt*" illustrate the belief that the creative process lacks authenticity. Many respondents argued that, because the image was not created by a human, they did not consider it as art. Some noted that it felt "*less meaningful*" and "*less genuine*", as it did not embody the emotional depth or personal experience typically associated with human-made art. Respondents' expressed a feeling of being misled, as one person stated, "*It doesn't affect me emotionally as much as if I knew it was made of an artist".* These reflections underscore the debate about AI's role in art and its impact on originality, emotionality, and the value of human creativity and craftmanship.

On the other hand, 44.4% of the respondents' reported no change in their perception after learning that the image was AI-generated. Many of these individuals interpreted the image positively, reflecting an optimistic perceptive on AI's role in the art world. One participant stated, "*I still believe it is art, really. It is beautiful to look at, and I believe it can be characterized as "art"*". Another respondent acknowledged the absence of traditional craftmanship in the work but still found value in it, remarking "*Yes, it is not a painting and takes no craftmanship, but it is still interesting to look at*". Additionally, some respondents acknowledged that AI is a big part of everyday life and states "*AI will take over the art industry soon*". These positive viewpoints on AI-generated art align with the research done by Zhou and Lee (2024). Their research revealed that, over time, text-to-image AI significantly boost human creative productivity by 25%, while also increasing the likelihood of receiving favorable peer evaluations by 50% (p.1). This can explain the survey participants' highly favorable reception of the AI-generated image.

While some expressed concerns about the implications for human artist, arguing that AI "*ruins*" the achievements of those who genuinely possess artistic skills and commitment, others were stunned over how big possibilities AI has to make great art. One respondent remarked that "*it makes me view it as a noteworthy technical achievement, but it also raises questions about authorship and emotional depth compared to human-made art*". Another respondent agreed, stating that "*It prompts me to think about creativity and authorship differently*". To gain better insight on this topic, I aimed to engage more deeply with the artists during the interviews. I wanted to hear their thoughts on AI-generated songs, images, and texts, and to examine how they perceive potential shifts in market competition should competitors be releasing AI-generated work.

The artists shared the same divided opinions as the survey participants when it comes to the view of originality in AI-generated work. R2 expressed that artist who rely on AI are taking shortcuts, expressing disappointment that it is unfortunate that people stop being creative and let AI do the heavy lifting. He linked this practice to "*cheating*", suggesting that it undermines the artistic process, and found it somewhat embarrassing for those who publish entirely AI-generated pieces. While R3 was supportive of individuals' choice in publishing AI-generated work, he had somewhat similar sentiments regarding authenticity, noting

that such creations may not yield long-term value, as they lack genuine originality. He emphasized the importance of ownership in the creative process, stating that while AI can assist, the artist's role in decision-making during post-processing still matters, emphasizing a co-creation role.

In contrast, R4 presented a more nuanced perspective, acknowledging the intriguing linguistic phenomena AI represents. He questioned the originality of AI-produced work, claiming that while AI can generate content, it lacks the unique emotional depth and power that only human authors can convey. These insight shows that both originality and meaningfulness are important variables in the creative approach, which Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) also recognize in their novel definition of everyday creativity, which they define as "*a phenomenon in which a person habitually responds to daily tasks in an original and meaningful way*" (p. 691).

When the survey respondents were asked if they feel that relying on AI for creative tasks limits their originality, 46% said yes and argued that using AI can narrow their thinking and reduce the effort they put into problem-solving, as it is often easier to turn to AI then to engage their own creativity, reflecting the notion that AI may contribute to the stagnation of knowledge creation (Zhou & Lee, 2024). Many expressed concerns that over-reliance on AI diminishes their ability to challenge themselves intellectually and hinders their capacity for self-reflection and critical thinking. However, there was little distinction among those who disagreed and believed that AI does not limit their originality. A significant 35.5% felt that "*AI can contribute to making original ideas more generic*". Others also emphasized that it serves as a supplement and that AI is a tool that supports rather than replaces creative ideas, helping them think outside the box and enhancing their creative flow, which ultimately boosts their creativity. One participant even began to rethink their approach to creativity, noting that "*it just enables us to be creative in a different way than conventional methods*", showcasing a new perspective regarding the widely discussed and broad term of creativity.

Notably, a significant 12.7% of survey participants believed that AI could both limit and enhance originality in their work, emphasizing that it depends on how it is used. One participant stated, "*It makes me think less, but at the same time it makes it easier to adjust and improve my already-existing ideas*". Another participant highlighted, "*I think AI can cause some of the originality to be lost, but used in the right way I think it will be able to inspire and improve efficiency*". R1 expressed a somewhat similar belief, arguing that the impact of AI depends largely on how it is applied, specifically noting, "*It depends on what you train it with*". He placed significant emphasis on the idea that if AI is trained on works from other artists, it's not genuine. He also brought up the issue regarding copyright, leading him to perceive it as non-original. Overall, participants in the survey shared similar opinions, pointing out that AI's contributions consist of generating ideas based on previously existing work, which can further compromise originality: "*Because AI is trained on previous work, it is not able to be original*".

As previously discussed, the growth of AI presents significant legal questions regarding copyright. The European Commission has also acknowledged concerns about determining whether creations made by or with AI are eligible for copyright protections, and if so, who owns that copyright (European Union Intellectual

Property Office, 2024). R1 holds strong opinions on the matter of copyright and intellectual property rights in relation to AI-generated works and originality, asserting that the current system is insufficient. He states, "*What's now necessary, it's maybe simple to say, but I think the property rights must be changed a little bit*". The AI Act introduces a comprehensive framework for governing the development and use of AI tools, but it is not expected to be fully applicable until 2026, highlighting that this issue is a part of a broader legal challenge that the EU Parliament is addressing. Although a recent report from the Center for Art Law states that copyright law now only protects "original works of authorship" created by humans, while denying protections for work solely generated by AI (Mathur, 2025), it is still a complex landscape. Regarding these regulations, they are more applicable to artists who publish their own work and must follow these laws, compared to individuals' engaging in their everyday creativity pursuits. However, research indicates that students have become increasingly aware of these issues in the context of their studies (Tsao & Nogues, 2024, p. 7), emphasizing the importance of transparency in communication with AI.

The findings show that 87.3% of participants initially classified an AI-generated image as "art", indicating that AI can successfully generate creative outputs capable of evoking emotional and aesthetic responses. This openness suggests a shift towards a broader definition of art that includes AI-generated content, particularly when the output is aesthetically compelling or engaging. However, despite this acceptance, participants' expressed skepticism about AI's ability to produce truly original work due to its reliance on pre-existing data. These results highlight that, while public perceptions of art are evolving to encompass AI-generated creations, concerns about authenticity and originality remains central to the ongoing debate.

4.1.6 Artificial Intelligence's Impact on Creative Industry and Future Roles

Based on the data collected so far, there is a significant disagreement among participants regarding the integration of AI into the creative world. A substantial portion of the participants is positive about AI, its use in creative processes, and AI-generated art, while the other half expresses greater concerns about the current development we are experiencing and the impact it will have on humanity. AI is here to stay, as R3 interestingly linking it to a new industrial revolution:

"It' quite similar to the Industrial Revolution. Back then, people got new tools, but it didn't mean they had to be afraid to use them. It's the same thing here with AI. Take agriculture, for instance. Suddenly, people started using tractors to make farming more efficient. But that didn't mean the job was done worse, or that humans were replaced by machines. It just meant that someone still had to operate those machines. The tractors couldn't run the field by themselves. And it's the same way with AI. AI is a tool, it's not a brain that can function in the way that the human brain does, it never will"

Although AI has quickly transformed the world and sparked fears about its future implications, R3 holds that, similar to the concerns surrounding the introduction of the tractor, AI is a tool that can enhance productivity

but lacks the cognitive functions of the human brain. R3's perspective embraces technological advancements while emphasizing the continues necessity of human oversight and creativity in any field where AI is utilized, similarly to the Industrial Revolution. He underscores this by stating, "*replacing me with AI in the areas where I have deep expertise? That benefits no one!".*

The majority of survey participants (93.65%) reported using AI tools (Table 6). Despite some divided opinions regarding originality and the impact of these tools on creativity, there is a generally positive response concerning the use of AI in their education, work, and leisure activities. The respondents were previously asked to specify why they chose to use AI tools, where *efficiency* and *productivity* had relatively high scores among participants compared to all the opinions provided, with a score of 21.2% and 12.2%, respectively (Table 8). Furthermore, the participants were asked to specify how AI tools had impacted their efficiency or productivity in work, studies, or leisure activities, where the results showed that respondents noted significant improvement in their ability to work more efficiently across all contexts. Some respondents noted that using AI has made them more productive and improved the quality of their output by providing better text structure and clearer phrasing. When individuals express such a positive response to the utilization of AI, it suggests that significant resistance would be required to discontinue its usage. For many, AI appears to enhance everyday efficiency and simplify various tasks. Nevertheless, how will this increase reliance on AI influence creative professions in the future?

The concern about GenAI, which is projected to rapidly evolve over the next years and automate an increasing number of creative tasks that have historically been the domain of humans (Zhou & Lee, 2024, p. 1), is an increasingly concerns among both students and workers in the creative fields, who is worried that their career won't exist in a few years (Glynn, 2023; Pagani & Wind, 2025). To assess whether this is also reflected by artists with established experience in their respective professions, I aimed to gather further insights from the informants.

R1 was expressing his ambivalence towards AI-generated music during the interview. While he acknowledges technology as a valuable tool that enhances productivity and streamlines processes, he is concern of its implications for job security within the industry. He outlines a concern that AI is being adopted primarily for passive income opportunities, which he believes reduces the essence of authentic creativity. R1 emphasizes that even with AI's assistance, the mastery of one's craft remains essential, suggesting a split where only the most skilled artist will keep their jobs. This sentiment resonates with R2, who shares R1's concern about the potential for AI to silence human creativity. R2 thinks that the reliance on AI for "hard work" neglects the intrinsic value of the creative process, which echoes Neçka's (1986) concept of *abandoned creativity*, when motivation is undermined by over-automation. R2 explains that he finds it difficult to distinguish AI songs from human-created songs, which he finds "scary". Both R1 and R2 express that people might post AI-generated songs to earn "passive money", which aligns with the extrinsic motives in the MoCS (Benedek et al., 2020), were recognition and material reward drive creativity. Despite his concerns, R2

believes that the ultimate impact of AI on the music industry will be limited, highlighting an acceptance that while AI may simplify tasks, its ability to produce genuine originality remains uncertain.

Conversely, R3 offers a more optimistic viewpoint, particularly regarding photography. He does not feel threatened by AI, arguing that the subjective nature of photography, which is rooted in human insights, cannot be replicated by machines. By framing AI as a complementary tool rather than a replacement, R3 highlights the potential for AI to enhance its workflow and skill set. He anticipates that the audience will grow more observant about AI-generated content, which could lead to a clearer distinction between authentic works and automated creations. R3's perspective diverges from R1 and R2's fear, as he maintains that AI lacks the qualitative depth necessary for true artistic expression, particularly in the visual domain.

Finally, R4 thinks that literature, particularly genres like crime fiction and conceptual poetry, could be more vulnerable to being replaced by AI. However, he insists that literature requiring a fundamental sense of wonder, and a questioning approach cannot be replicated by machines, underscoring a fundamental difference in the human experience of creativity. R4's standpoint compliments R3's view by reinforcing the notion that certain aspects of creativity, especially those involving deep emotional or philosophical engagement, resist AI replication. This aligns with the study conducted by Zhou and Lee (2024), stating that GenAI seems to facilitate a more equitable distribution of popular works, indicating a shift towards a more democratized and inclusive creative space where artists are empowered by AI tools (p. 6).

In general, the artists are optimistic that AI will not replace them in the future. However, they believe that the approach to how they perform their work will increasingly involve AI. This collaboration between AI and human creativity will be crucial for navigating the creative landscape in the future, which aligns with Zhou & Lee's (2024) findings showing that AI-assisted artist who successfully can explore more novel ideas, regardless of their prior originality, may produce artwork that their peers evaluate more favorably (p. 1). That said, for us who purchase art, read books, and listen to music, this raises interesting questions about if we choose to buy AI-generated products, or if we support artists who remains authentic. The survey participants were asked whether they would consider displaying or purchasing AI-generated art, which yielded interesting results.

Initially, I assumed that a larger portion than what emerged from the data were not open to the idea, but people seem to be divided. Although the majority of 54% said they would not consider buying or displaying AI-generated art, as many as 33.3% said they would, 9.5% were open to the idea in the future, while 3.2% gave invalid answers. This indicates that people are more open to AI and its creations than what I initially expected before the data collection began. Although many remain skeptical, pointing out that they can create the same art themselves with AI, that AI-generated art lacks the artist's personality, and that they prefer human-made art while supporting artists who work the "*old way*", there are still several respondents who holds interesting views about AI art. Those who were open to purchasing AI-generated art emphasized that their decisions were primarily based on whether they found it beautiful, inspiring, or even satisfying their curiosity. Others noted that they were indifferent to whether the artwork was created by AI or by a human artist.

Respondents' opinions on AI-generated art are mixed, with a majority preferring human-made works for their authenticity. While I initially assumed there would be a greater concern regarding job security, the data shows that AI is seen as supplement rather than replacing human creativity, which remains essential due to its emotional and subjective depth. Overall, the future of creativity is likely to involve co-creation between humans and AI, balancing efficiency with unique human artistic expressions. In lights of this, what drives our preference for artists who produce art in the traditional, more effort and time-consuming way, rather than works generated by AI in a fraction of that time and effort? The findings indicate that a majority of 54%, opt not to purchase AI-generated products. Thus, what factors contribute to these decisions?

4.1.7 Value of Human Expression, Subjectivity and Craftmanshift

We now recognize that the integration of AI into the creative realm is here to stay, as evidenced by the introduction of Ai-Da, the world's first humanoid robot artist (Ai-Da robot, n.d.; Baxter, 2024). It has become apparent that participants are more accepting of AI than initially assumed, not only viewing it as a tool that enhances their daily efficiency but also in the context of AI-generated art. While just over half remain skeptical, believing that AI-generated works lack originality and expressing their unwillingness to purchase such art, there seems to be a trend towards a more accepting audience: one that is either enthusiastic about AI or open to the concept. To delve deeper into what motivates the continued creation of art through traditional, more effort and time-consuming way, I have asked the survey respondents to specify what influences their opinion on whether the AI-generated image included in the survey constitutes art.

The results indicate that people generally value art that conveys emotional depth, personal expression, and aesthetic quality. Key aspects include the story and intention behind the work, the perceived effort and time invested, the presence of craftmanship and skill, and the belief that the piece was created by a genuinely creative individual. Authenticity, emotional impact, and traditional artistic qualities also play a central role in how art is evaluated by the participants. From the previous results we know that these are elements that people overall don't compare with AI. But will AI-generated art evoke similar emotions or messages if compared to art created by humans?

Based on the responses from the survey, perceptions of AI-generated art evoking the same emotions and messages as art created by humans appear divided, yet nuanced. A majority of participants (58.7%) believed that AI-generated art can evoke the same emotions and messages, whereas 28.8% disagreed, and 17.5% remained uncertain/neutral (Appendix 8). This again shows that there is a general openness towards the emotional potential of AI art.

Many respondents emphasized that visual appeal and personal interpretation are crucial in determining emotional impact, regardless of whether the creator is human or artificial. Several noted that if the viewer is unaware of the art's origin, AI-generated images can evoke emotional responses similar to traditional art, which is evident in Boris Eldagsen winning the Sony World Photography Award in 2023, without revealing that it was AI-generated before after the competition (Glynn, 2023). This also raises questions about the

definition of Big-C creativity in the context of human-AI co-creation (Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021). However, a substantial number expressed skepticism, arguing that the absence of human experience, intentionality, and effort undermines the authenticity and emotional depth of AI-produced works. These participants highlighted that awareness of AI authorship reduces the viewer engagement, as the creation lacks personal expression or the "*struggle*" inherent in traditional artistic processes.

The interviewees consistently highlighted that, even in a world where AI can generate art in seconds, the value of traditional artistic creation lies in the deeply human elements of expression, subjectivity, and craftmanship. R1 and R3 both emphasized the importance of personal narrative and emotional authenticity, describing how the process of creating authentically allows for unique self-expression and the communication of lived experience, which AI cannot replicate. This sentiment is supported by Hayao Miyazaki, Studio Ghibli's founder, who argue that such technology lacks the empathy and respect for life, stating "*Whoever creates this stuff has no idea what pain is whatsoever. I am utterly disgusted… I strongly feel that this is an insult to life itself*." (Evans, 2025). R2 and R4 supported this, focusing on satisfaction and the meaning stems from overcoming creative challenges. For them, the effort and imperfection essential in traditional art are not weaknesses, but essential aspects that make the creative journey rewarding and therapeutic. These perspectives reinforce the literature's emphasis on intrinsic motivation, self-actualization, and the pursuit of mastery (Maslow, 1943; Benedek et al., 2020), which understates why people should continue to choose traditional, time-consuming art because it offers a sense of authenticity, emotional depth, and personal fulfillment that, for many, remains uniquely human and irreplicable by AI.

The integration of AI into the creative domain is increasingly accepted and considered irreversible. The findings reveal that traditional artistic value, characterized by emotional depth, personal expression, craftmanship, and perceived effort, remains central to how art is evaluated. Although a majority believe AI-generated art can evoke comparable emotions and massages to human-created work, considerable concerns remain about AI's lack of lived experience and intentionality. Thus, the lasting importance of human authenticity and lived experience remains central to what is considered meaningful art.

4.2 General discussion

The present study set out to explore how everyday creativity is experienced, motivated, and evaluated in a world where AI is increasingly accessible as a creative tool. By combining survey data and in-depth interviews, this research provides insight into the evolving relationship between human creativity and AI, and addresses the central research question: *In a world where anyone can produce a piece of art with AI (e.g., poetry, paintings, drawings, writings) in seconds, why should someone make art in the traditional, more effort and time consuming, way?*

Consistent with the literature (Benedek et al., 2020; Ilha Villanova & Pina e Cunha, 2021), the findings confirm that everyday creativity is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, well ingrained in leisure activities and personal routines. Informants to both in-depth interviews and to the survey administrated described a wide

range of creative pursuits, inducing cooking, music, photography and writing, thus emphasizing that creativity is not limited to extraordinary achievements but is a vital aspect of daily life.

The work of Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021), which provides a comprehensive definition of the term everyday creativity, has greatly benefitted this study. Their contribution is especially important for distinguishing between extraordinary creativity and everyday creativity. Building on the Four C Model (Kaufman & Berghetto, 2009), the most participants' creative activities align with the mini-c and little-c levels, where personal growth, learning, and self-expression are central, while professional artists resonate more with the Pro-C level.

The findings further show that there is a high engagement in everyday creativity among the participants, where its values are found in both personal fulfillment, self-discovery, and learning, driven by motivation and the desire for self-expression. Everyone has creative potential and engages in creative thinking in everyday life, thus creativity is not limited to geniuses or professionals. Everyday creativity is vital for personal well-being and growth for the respondents, which requires a combination of knowledge, ability, and motivation (Cropley, 1990).

A key driver of everyday creativity is intrinsic motivation. Participants highlighted *relaxation*, *self-expression*, and *skill development* as primary motives for engaging in creative activities, echoing the individualistic approach described by Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021). This approach focuses on personal meaning and novelty for the creator, regardless of external recognition, and aligns with Maslow's (1943) view that self-expression and fulfillment are central to creative engagement. Thus, everyday creativity is not only about producing something new, but also about experiencing joy, coping with stress, and fostering personal well-being.

A central and somewhat unexpected finding is that participants generally view AI as a powerful tool or collaborator, rather than a threat to human creativity. While some skepticism remains, most respondents' express openness to AI's potential, recognizing its ability to facilitate creative expression. AI is often seen as a new medium that enables individuals to explore ideas more efficiently and overcome technical barriers that might otherwise limit their creativity. Need for efficiency and saving time are the most frequently cited motivations for using AI tools, highlighting its practical advantages. However, participants also acknowledge that AI cannot replicate the deeply personal, emotional, and experiential dimensions of art rooted in human intention and lived experience. This view positions AI as less of a competitor and more of a complementary tool.

As AI becomes more integrated into creative workflows, the boundaries between human-generated and AI-assisted creativity are increasingly blurred. Many participants expressed uncertainty about whether works produced solely with AI assistance can be considered truly original. This suggests that our understanding of originality and authorship is evolving. While AI can generate novel outputs, both creators and audiences continue to value subjectivity, authenticity, and human craftmanship. These findings highlight the importance of integrating both individualistic and sociocultural perspectives when assessing creative work in the digital

age, which aligns with Ilha Villanova and Pina e Cunha (2021) understanding of important factors for everyday creativity.

While AI can inspire new forms of expression, there is concerns that over-reliance on AI may diminish opportunities for learning, technical mastery, and the commitment involved in progressing from little-c to Pro-C creativity. However, the study also reveals that most artists do not fear being replaced by AI. Instead, they emphasize that subjectivity, authenticity, and human craftmanship remain at the core of artistic value, implying appreciation for the unique contributions of human creators. This suggests that, even in the future where AI has evolved, the core of artistic values remains rooted in human subjectivity and authenticity

In summary, the seven themes explored in this thesis are interconnected rather than existing in isolation. Together, they create a dynamic system in which motivation, technology, authenticity, and human values are constantly negotiating the boundaries of creativity. While AI can lower barriers and inspire new forms of creative expression, it also challenges traditional beliefs of skill, ownership, and originality. The future of creativity will likely depend on our ability to balance the benefits of AI with intrinsic motivation and the unique qualities of human expression.

Even in a world where AI can generate art in seconds, the traditional, effortful process of making art remains vital because it encourages personal growth, authentic self-expression, skill development, and emotional well-being. It is not only about the final product, but about the transformative journey and the meaning rooted in the act of creation itself. The findings suggest that the human-centered values are irreplaceable and will continue to motivate people to create art the traditional way, regardless of technological advancements.

4.3 Theoretical Implications

Traditionally, the Four C Model of Creativity (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009) suggests that individuals evolve from little-c (everyday creativity) to Pro-C (professional-level creativity) through effort, formal training and skill development. This process typically involves practice, overcoming creative challenges, and building expertise in the domain over time. However, the integration of AI into creative processes can both promote inclusivity in access to creative expression, and potentially reduce individuals' motivation to engage deeply with their craft.

On one hand, AI democratizes access to creative expressions by lowering technical barriers and automating complex processes. This democratization enables more people to participate in everyday creative activities who might otherwise be discouraged by skill limitation, which illustrates what Neçka (1986) refers to as *juvenile creativity*. For examples, individuals with limited drawing abilities can now produce visually appealing images using GenAI, potentially developing greater interest in visual art and encouraging creative exploration across previously unavailable domains.

On the other hand, the simplicity of creating may change the motivation and effort required for skill development. When AI tools can instantly generate high-quality output, individuals may experience reduced motivation to invest in the challenging, often frustrated process of developing technical mastery through their own effort. This shift is particularly concerning because, as Cropley (1990) emphasizes, "*freely developing creativity*" requires not only knowledge and skills but also the motivation to put in necessary effort; all three elements must be present for authentic creative development.

In the long term, this may result in a split between different forms of creative development. While more people may engage in little-c creativity, fewer might develop the depth of skill, resilience, and originality historically associated with Pro-C achievements. Over time, thy may affect the development of creative skills and the number of individuals who achieve Pro-C level of expertise. These findings suggest that existing models of creativity may need to be revisited to account for the dual impact of AI.

Regarding skill development, prior theories emphasize that developing creativity requires knowledge, creative ability, and motivation (Cropley, 1990). The findings from my study raise questions about whether reliance on AI tools might reduce opportunities for experiential learning and creative problem-solving. This implies that theories of skill development in creativity should be updated to account for the role of technology.

4.4 Managerial Implications

Managers should recognize that while AI tools can enhance efficiency and support ideas, employees will value effortful creative processes. Although there is often a desire to complete tasks in the most efficient and least time-consuming way, it is still important to acknowledge that employees would benefit from a mixed approach. This approach allows them to utilize AI tools while also having the opportunity to express themselves through genuine creativity. Such a balance is essential for fostering employee motivation, satisfaction, and skill development.

Concerns regarding over-reliance on AI and the "right way" to use it have been repeatedly highlighted throughout the data set, both by participants in the survey and by artists in the in-depth interviews. Managers should, therefore, encourage skill development in these areas, providing employees with comprehensive training on how to effectively use AI while also maintaining a critical perspective on the output they receive. This approach will help ensure that AI does not generate misinformation that could potentially harm the organization.

It is also essential for managers to stay up to date with changes in legislation related to AI, intellectual property rights, and copyright. Establishing clear internal guidelines that aligns with current laws will help ensure compliance and reduce legal risks. When employees use AI tools to create content, rules regarding authorship and ownership must be strictly followed, as well as transparency in the use of AI. Failing to comply with these regulations could result in significant costs and reputational damage for the organization. To address

this, compliance and ethical considerations should be integrated into employee training programs, ensuring everyone understands the responsibilities that come with their use.

Lastly, managers should stay informed about the evolving impact of AI on the creative industry. As AI technologies advance, our understanding of their influence on creativity and the value placed on human expression may shift accordingly. It is therefore essential for managers to regularly update job roles and ensure employees are informed about new developments: not only in terms for required skills, but also regarding transparency about changing responsibilities and future career paths. Given the growing concerns that AI may increasingly automate roles traditionally performed by humans, maintaining open communication and supporting employees through these transitions is vital for fostering adaptability, trust, and long-term organizational resilience.

The increasing accessibility of AI has the potential to reshape how individuals approach the development of their creative skills. Take art schools for example, especially writing programs. Now that AI has the possibilities to generate creative content and text efficiently, why should we invest time, money, and resources into formal education? As AI has become more common among young people (Sidoti et al., 2025), creative schools may face declining enrollment, and the society might face a decline in Pro-C achievements. To stay relevant, these institutions should emphasize the unique personal satisfaction and growth that comes from hands-on creative work, which AI cannot fully replace. My research suggests that schools can benefit by integrating AI as a collaborative tool, focusing on the creative process rather than just the final product, and emphasizing co-creation and the unique value of human input. This approach can help students progress in their creative development while preparing for a future were human creativity and AI work jointly.

4.5 Limitations and Further Research

While this study provides valuable insight, it is not without limitations. Firstly, the study did not consider age as a variable, which may influence perceptions of AI's impact on creativity and the perception of AI-generated art. Further research should incorporate age into the analysis to provide a clearer understanding of how perceptions may vary across different age groups.

Secondly, the analysis and interpretation of data are influenced by the researcher's perspective, as with all qualitative research, which can introduce bias despite efforts to maintain objectivity. A potential bias is the interviewer bias, where the researcher's beliefs or opinions may sway the direction of the interview or influence how the participants responses are interpreted (Critical Appraisal Skills Programme, n.d.).

Another limitation of this study stems from the formulation of the survey question, "*Have you used AI tools in creative activities*?". The intention behind this question was to determine respondents' general familiarity with AI, in order to exclude those without relevant experience from the analysis. However, through framing the question specifically within a "*creativity*" context, it did not effectively filter out participants unfamiliar with AI overall. This became evident when a subsequent question asked about the contexts in which AI tools had been used, and four respondents indicated they had not used AI tools at all. This unclarity may

have influenced the interpretation of the other responses. There was also a limitation related to similarity between questions; "*Do you believe that AI enhances your creativity?"* and "*If yes, how do you feel AI influences your creativity? Does it enhance or detract from it?".* This overlap in questions may have led to potentially limiting the depth and variety of insights gathered regarding participants' perceptions.

Lastly, given the rapid advancement of AI technologies, perceptions and practices regarding AI in creative contexts are likely to change over time. This means that the findings of this study could become outdated as new tools and applications emerge. Further research should therefore explore how attitudes towards AI in creativity change over time and examine the long-term impact of AI on the development of creative skills and identities.

Future research should investigate how the increasing reliance on AI tools in creative processes affects individuals' progression from little-c to Pro-C creativity. While current findings indicate that AI assistance boost productivity in tasks such as coding, ideation, and writing, there are concerns about the long-term impact on authentic skill development and the motivation to pursue higher levels of creative achievement (Zhou & Lee, 2024). Research should examine whether a future dominated by AI-assisted little-c creativity could lead to stagnation in the formation of Pro-C creativity, and what this might mean for the overall landscape of creative innovation.

Another interesting approach for future research would be to investigate whether there is a correlation between individuals' frequency of engagement in creative activities and their openness to applying AI tools in their creative processes. While this study explored both creative engagement and attitudes towards AI, it did not statistically analyze the relationship between these variables. Understanding whether those who are more actively involved in creative pursuits are more (or less) receptive to integrating AI could provide valuable insights into how technology adoption interacts with motivation.

As the AI Act is set to be fully applicable by 2026, further research is needed to address unresolved questions about copyright, intellectual property rights, and ethical considerations in creative industries.

Conclusion

This thesis set out to explore the role and value of everyday creativity in a world where artificial intelligence is rapidly transforming creative processes. Through a triangulation of survey data and in-depth interviews, the research reveals that, despite AI's growing capabilities and accessibility, human creativity remains fundamentally intrinsic and personally meaningful. People are motivated to engage in creative activities not only for external recognition or achievement, but for the enjoyment, self-expression, and sense of fulfillment that arise from the creative process itself.

AI is widely seen as a powerful and democratizing tool, offering new opportunities for inspiration, collaboration, and skill development. However, concerns about originality and authenticity remains, and most individuals do not view AI as a replacement for human creativity, but rather as a complement that can enhance it. The findings support the idea that creativity is a universal human capacity, present in everyday life and accessible to all, and that nurturing this capacity is essential for personal growth and well-being.

As technology continues to evolve, the challenge for creative individuals, educators, and institutions is to embrace AI as a co-creator in the creative journey, leveraging its strength while preserving the deeply human elements of curiosity, experimentation, and emotional connection. By focusing on the process of creation and fostering environments that support intrinsic motivation, we can ensure that creativity not only survives but thrives in the age of AI.

Ultimately, this research suggests that the future of creativity is not defined by a choice between human and AI, but by the new possibilities that emerges when both works together. In this way, the rise of AI marks not the end of creativity, but the beginning of a new, more inclusive and collaborative creative movement.

References

Academic Sources

Ameen, N., Sharma, G. D., Tarba, S., Rao, A., & Chopra, R. (2022). Toward advancing theory on creativity in marketing and artificial intelligence. *Psychology & Marketing*, *39*(9), 1802–1825. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21699

Arghashi, V., & Arsun Yuksel, C. (2023). Customer brand engagement behaviors: the role of cognitive values, intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and self-brand connection. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *31*(2), 146–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2021.2018936

Benedek, M., Bruckdorfer, R., & Jauk, E. (2020). Motives for creativity: Exploring the what and why of everyday creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *54*(3), 610-625. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.396

Bingley, W. J., Curtis, C., Lockey, S., Bialkowski, A., Gillespie, N., Haslam, S. A., Ko, R. K. L., Steffens, N., Wiles, J., & Worthy, P. (2023). Where is the human in human-centered AI? Insights from developer priorities and user experiences. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *141*, 107617. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107617

Boden, M.A. (2004). *The Creative Mind: Myths and mechanisms* (2nd edn). London: Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2005). Confronting the Ethics of Qualitative Research. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18(2), 157-181. https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.bi.no/10.1080/10720530590914789

Bruckdorfer, R. (2017). Challenge, joy, or health– the common artist's wealth? *Unpublished master thesis*. University of Graz, Austria

Buick, A. (2024). Copyright and AI training data—transparency to the rescue? *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpae102

Burtch, G., Lee, D., & Chen, Z. (2023). *The Consequences of Generative AI for UGC and Online Community Engagement.* SSRN. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4521754

Caldwell, M. (2023). *What is an "Author"? Copyright Authorship of AI Art Through a Philosophical Lens.* Huston Law Review, 61(2), 411-454. https://houstonlawreview.org/article/92132-what-is-an-author-copyright-authorship-of-ai-art-through-a-philosophical-lens

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology nursing forum*, *41*(5), 545–547. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547

Cassell, C., Cunliffe, A. L., & Grandy, G. (Eds.). (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative business and management research methods: methods and challenges* (pp. xx, 521). SAGE.

Chen, H., Zhao, L., Qiu, L., Wang, Z., Zhang, H., Xing, W. and Lu, D. (2020), Creative and diverse artwork generation using adversarial networks. *IET Comput*. Vis., 14: 650-

657. https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-cvi.2020.0014

Crandall, A., Powell, E. A., Bradford, G. C., Magnusson, B. M., Hanson, C. L., Barnes, M. D., Novilla, M. L. B., & Bean, R. A. (2020). Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs as a Framework for Understanding Adolescent Depressive Symptoms Over Time. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *29*(2), 273–281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01577-4

Cropley, A. J. (1990). Creativity and mental health in everyday life. *Creativity Research Journal*, *13*(3), 167-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419009534351

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1998). Reflections on the field. *Roeper Review: A Journal on Gifted Education*, 21, 80–81.

Darley, W. K., & Lim, J.-S. (2023). Advertising creativity and its effects: a meta-analysis of the moderating role of modality. *Marketing Letters*, *34*(1), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-022-09627-6

Feuerriegel, S., Hartmann, J., Janiesch, C., & Zschech, P. (2024). Generative AI. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, *66*(1), 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00834-7

Gardner, H., & Weinstein, E. (2018). *Creativity: The view from Big C and the introduction of tiny c. In R. Sternberg & J. Kaufman* (Eds.), The nature of human creativity (pp. 94–109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glaveanu, V.P. (2010). Creativity in context: The ecology of creativity evaluations and practices in an artistic craft. *Psychological Studies*, 55, 339–350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-010-0056-8.

Güss, C. D., Ahmed, S., & Dörner, D. (2021). From da Vinci's Flying Machines to a Theory of the Creative Process. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *16*(6), 1184–1197. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620966790

Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. (2019). A Brief History of Artificial Intelligence: On the Past, Present, and Future of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review*, *61*(4), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925

Hapgood, M., Liu, H., & Lugaz, N. (2022). SpaceX—Sailing Close to the Space Weather? *Space Weather*, *20*(3), n/a-n/a. https://doi.org/10.1029/2022SW003074

Hegarty, C. B. (2009). The Value and Meaning of Creative Leisure. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *3*(1), 10–13. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014879

Hertel, F., & Wicmandy, M. (2021). Metaphorical creativity: an aspect of everyday creativity cleans-up a work-based problem. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, *35*(5), 15–18. https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-09-2020-0200

Ilha Villanova, A. L., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2021). Everyday creativity: A systematic literature review. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 55*(3), 673-695. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.481

Jain, R. (2024). Steve Jobs' iPhone Vision: iPod-Like Flip Design With Clickwheel Turned Into Slick, Glass Slab In Less Than 2 Years. In *Benzinga Newswires*. Accretive Capital LLC d/b/a Benzinga.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *72*(12), 2954–2965. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Karakowsky, L., Kotlyar, I., & Good, J. (2021). Identifying the Double-Edged Sword of Stardom: High-Status and Creativity in the Context of Status Instability. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *55*(3), 723–737. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.486

Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond Big and Little: The Four C Model of Creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, *13*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688

Koltko-Rivera, M. E. (2006). Rediscovering the Later Version of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: Self-Transcendence and Opportunities for Theory, Research, and Unification. *Review of General Psychology*, *10*(4), 302–317. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.10.4.302

Krems, J. A., Kenrick, D. T., & Neel, R. (2017). Individual Perceptions of Self-Actualization: What Functional Motives Are Linked to Fulfilling One's Full Potential? *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(9), 1337–1352. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672177

Lehnert, K., Till, B. D., & Ospina, J. M. (2014). Advertising Creativity: The Role of Divergence Versus Meaningfulness. *Journal of Advertising*, *43*(3), 274–285. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2013.851630

Litman, J. A. (2005). Curiosity and the pleasures of learning: Wanting and liking new information. *Cognition and Emotion, 19,* 793-814. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930541000101

Marschan-Piekkari, R., & Reis, C. (2004). *Language and languages in cross-cultural interviewing*. In R. Piekkari & C. Welch (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research methods for international business (pp. 224–243). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

McCracken, G. D., & McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview* (Vol. 13). Sage.

Monteverde, G., Cammarota, A., Serafini, L., & Quadri, M. (2025). Are we human or are we voice assistants? Revealing the interplay between anthropomorphism and consumer concerns. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *41*(1-2), 200-235. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2025.2475231

Morelock, M., & Feldman, D. (1999). Prodigies. In M.A. Runco & S.R. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of creativity* (Vol. 2, pp. 449–532). San Diego: Academic Press.

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *22*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789

Opgenhaffen, L., Lami, M. R., & Mickleburgh, H. (2021). Art, Creativity and Automation. From Charters to Shared 3D Visualization Practices. *Open Archaeology (Berlin, Germany)*, *7*(1), 1648–1659. https://doi.org/10.1515/opar-2020-0162

Pagani, M., & Wind, Y. (2025). Unlocking Marketing Creativity Using Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *60*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/10949968241265855

Prayag, G. (2010). Exploring the politics of place marketing-The case of South Africa. *International Journal of Tourism and Travel*, *3*(1), 37.

Silvia, P. J., Beaty, R. E., Nusbaum, E. C., Eddington, K. M., Levin-Aspenson, H., & Kwapil, T. R. (2014). Everyday Creativity in Daily Life: An Experience-Sampling Study of "Little c" Creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *8*(2), 183–188. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035722

Solomon, M. R. (2013). *Consumer behavior: buying, having, and being* (10th ed., Global ed., p. 639). Pearson.

Spiggle, S. (1994). Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, *21*(3), 491–503. https://doi.org/10.1086/209413

Steindal, S. A., Österlind, J., Halvorsen, K., Schjelderup, T., Kive, E., Sørbye, L. W., & Dihle, A. (2017). A qualitative study of women's experiences of living with COPD. *Nursing Open*, *4*(4), 200–208. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.86

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(10), 837–851. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121

Tsao, J., & Nogues, C. (2024). Beyond the author: Artificial intelligence, creative writing and intellectual emancipation. *Poetics (Amsterdam), 102*, 101865. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2024.101865

Wong, L.-W., Tan, G. W.-H., Ooi, K.-B., Hew, J.-J., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2024). Editorial: Generative artificial intelligence in the creator economy. *Online Information Review*, *48*(7), 1515–1521. https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-11-2024-694

Ye, X., Huang, T., Song, Y., Li, X., Newman, G., Wu, D. J., & Zeng, Y. (2025). Generating conceptual landscape design via text-to-image generative AI model. *Environment and Planning. B, Urban Analytics and City Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23998083251316064

Zhou, E., & Lee, D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *PNAS Nexus*, *3*(3), pgae052–pgae052. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae052

Online Sources

Ai-Da Robot. (n.d.). *Ai-Da: The world's first humanoid robot artist*. Retrieved April 6, 2025, from: https://www.ai-darobot.com

Baxter, C. (2024, October 21). *AI art: The end of creativity or the start of a new movement?* BBC. https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20241018-ai-art-the-end-of-creativity-or-a-new-movement

BBC News. (2024, February 8). The AI companions you can have conversations with. https://www.bbc.com/news/business-68165762

Critical Appraisal Skill Programme. (n.d.). *Different types of research bias*. Retrieved May 24, 2025 from: https://casp-uk.net/news/different-types-of-research-bias/

Coursera Staff. (2025, March 21). *The history of AI.* Coursera. Retrieved, April 6, 2025, from: https://www.coursera.org/articles/history-of-ai

Enclave Films. (2024, October 18). *AI v the mind: Meet the world's first artist robot* [Video]. BBC. https://www.bbc.com/reel/video/p0jylq65/ai-v-the-mind-meet-the-world-s-first-artist-robot

European Union Intellectual Property Office. (2024, July 16). *Artificial intelligence and copyright: use of generative AI tools to develop new content.* Intellectual Property Helpdesk. https://intellectual-property-helpdesk.ec.europa.eu/news-events/news/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright-use-generative-ai-tools-develop-new-content-2024-07-16-0_en

Evans, G. (2025, March 28). *Hayao Miyazaki's 'disgusted' thoughts on AI resurface following Studio Ghibli trend*. Independent. Retrieved from: https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/news/hayao-miyazaki-studio-ghibli-ai-trend-b2723358.html

Fisher, R. (2023, July 18). *The A-Z of AI: 30 term you need to understand artificial intelligence.* BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20230717-what-you-should-know-about-artificial-intelligence-from-a-z

Glynn, P. (2023, April 18). *Sony World Photography Award 2023: Winner refuses award after revealing AI creation.* BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-65296763

Holdsworth, J. (2024, June 28). *Data mining: Definition, history, elements, applications and advantages.* IBM. https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/data-mining

Hutchinson, C., & John, P. (2023, July 20*). AI: Digital artist's work copied more times than Picasso.* BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-wales-66099850

Mathur, A. (2025, March 4). Recent Development in AI, Art & Copyright: Copyright Office Report & New Registrations. Center for art law. https://itsartlaw.org/2025/03/04/recent-developments-in-ai-art-copyright-copyright-office-report-new-registrations/

McKinsey & Company. (2023, June 14). *The economic potential of generative AI: The next productivity frontier.* https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/the-economic-potential-of-generative-ai-the-next-productivity-frontier

McKinsey & Company. (2025, January 31*). Using AI and data to make immersive art. McKinsey & Company*. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/using-ai-and-data-to-make-immersive-art

McKinsey & Company (2024, March 21,). *What is artificial general intelligence (AGI)?*

McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-artificial-general-intelligence-agi

McKinsey & Company (2024, April 2). *What is generative AI?* McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-generative-ai

Oberio, K. (2024, May 22). *Triangulation in qualitative research: A comprehensive guide.* Looppanel. https://www.looppanel.com/blog/triangulation-in-qualitative-research

*OpenAI. (2025). ChatGPT (31.march version) [Big language model]. https://chat.openai.com/

OpenAI. (2023). *GPT-4 Technical Report*. OpenAI. https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf

Sheldon, R. (2024, November). *What is an AI prompt?* TechTarget. https://www.techtarget.com/searchenterpriseai/definition/AI-prompt

Sidoti, O., Park, E., & Gottfried, J. (2025, January 15). *About a quarter of U.S. teens have used ChatGPT for schoolwork - double the share in 2023*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/01/15/about-a-quarter-of-us-teens-have-used-chatgpt-for-schoolwork-double-the-share-in-2023/

Singla, A., Sukharevsky, A., Yee, L., Chui, M., & Hall, B. (2024). The state of AI. *McKinsey & Company*. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai#/

Universitetet i Oslo. (n.d.). Personvern i nettskjema. Retrieved May 14, 2025, from https://www.uio.no/tjenester/it/adm-app/nettskjema/hjelp/personvern-i-nettskjema.html

Williams, M. (2022, January 28). *What is Einstein's Theory of Relativity?* Universe Today. https://www.universetoday.com/articles/einsteins-theory-of-relativity-1

** AI technology is employed as a tool for translation and refinement.*

Appendix

Appendix 1

In-depth Interview protocol

Section 1: Introduction

1. Can you tell me about your background and how you were first introduced to creative activities?
2. What were some of your early experiences with creativity growing up? Did anyone in your family or community influence your interest in creative pursuits?
3. What specific creative activities do you currently engage in? (e.g., painting, writing, music, crafting, cooking)
4. How often do you participate in these activities, and how much time do you typically dedicate to them each week?

Section 2: Motivation and Inspiration

1. What initially motivated you to start engaging in * *the given creative activity**? Was there a specific event or inspiration that sparked your interest?
2. What motivated you to continue or return to the creative activities you engaged in during your childhood or teenage years?
3. What do you find most enjoyable about engaging in creative activities? Can you describe the feeling or experience that keep you coming back to these pursuits?
4. How does participating in **given creative activity** impact your mood or mental well-being? Can you give an example of a time when it helped you cope with stress or challenges?

Section 3: Creative process and experience

1. Can you walk me through your typical creative process? What steps do you take when working on a new project?
2. Do you have a specific routine or environment that you find conductive to your creativity? What does that look like?
3. Have you ever experienced creative blocks or difficulties in your creative pursuits? If so, how do you overcome them?
4. How do you handle feedback or criticism of your work? Does it affect your motivation to continue creating?

Introduction to the growth of AI, especially in creative processes

Section 4: Influence of AI and Technology

1. Have you ever started using any AI tools or technology in your creative processes? If yes, how has this changed your approach?
2. Do you believe that a piece of art created with AI can be considered “original”? Why or why not?
3. Do you think that reliance on AI for creative tasks has affected your skill development in any way? If so, in what manner?
4. What do you feel about other **given creative activity** (e.g., authors, music producers, etc.) use AI technology in their work? Do you define that as authorship in the context of using AI-generated content?
5. In what ways do you believe AI influences your creativity for better or worse? Can you share specific examples?
6. How do you think the growth of AI will influence your creative work in years to come?

Section 5: Reflection and Future aspirations

1. How have your creative activities contributed to your personal growth or self-discovery?
2. Do you feel that engaging in creativity has influenced other areas of your life (e.g., career, relationships, personal goals)?
3. What future goals do you have for your creative pursuits? Are there specific areas you’d like to explore further or skills you want to develop?
4. If you could offer advice to someone just starting their creative journey, what would that be?

Appendix 2

Interviewee: R1
Format: Video Call
Language: English
Length: 42 minutes

Introduction to the interview and how it is structured. Warm-up questions

Interviewer: Can you tell me about the background and how you first were introduced to making music?

R1: I was *introduced to music* around the age of, ehm *when I was born* immediately.

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: But the process in *making music* was uh when I was uh four or something, and then I went on *piano lessons*

Interviewer: Ah

R1: But I did not want to take piano, so then I stated *playing guitar*

Interviewer: Ah Okey

R1: And I always had that till my, till I was around 17 I think

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: and then I just kept *playing everyday*

Interviewer: And you are still playing?

R1: Yes, yes, but it's a little bit, well it *depends on the week* you know.

Interviewer: Yeah, I understand

R1: So, I try to *play an hour every day*, but it's sometimes hard

Interviewer: Okey, I see, and you also make music, right?

R1: Yes, *I record music*. So, I do some recordings sometimes for… *compositions for movies or for documentary*. I made a, I made a piece

Interviewer: Oh that's so cool

R1: Yeah, so *every week I try to compose something*, but *the most hard thing is to finish something*. So that's where AI sometimes eeh… I think in the future, maybe, *AI can help*.

Interviewer: And let's get back to the introduction of the music, did anyone of your family or someone in your community influence you to start doing music?

R1: Yes, actually *my father was always playing guitar around me*, already in the belly, like some reggae and some hard rock, so I was always eh Yeah, *fascinated by music*.

Interviewer: I see

R1: But he always, or *my parents* always said to me; Okey, it's permitted that you *have to play piano* ahah

Interviewer: hahah

R1: but then *I changed up to guitar,* but I always found them *motivating me to buy a new guitar* or my father said, okey, you have to *look into this artist.* So yes, he kind of *pushed me and motivated me into this direction*.

Interviewer: Yes, it's nice having someone to support you and motivate you in that direction

R1: Yes indeed, and also *my grandfather* actually. I was *on television last week* exactly about this topic, because *my grandfather also motivated me towards music*, so now I'm looking into *starting a new band*

Interviewer: Oh, starting a band?

R1: ahah yes

Interviewer: Oh cool, that's amazing! And what do you find the most enjoyable about making music?

R1: I think, eeh, *the most enjoyable part* is eh that you can like *drown in your own thoughts, it's like a sanctuary*. So you *quite everything you are doing*, and I'm in this *hyper focus for a while*. So my concentration in general is really bad, normally, but when I make music, it's *like I forget all of my surroundings* and *I'm hyper focused for like five hours straight* and suddenly the *time has flown by*.

Interviewer: I see, so it's kind of like an distraction form the "world"

R1: Exactly, it's like this *huge distraction* but also a way to *transfer my emotions*

Interviewer: Ah, so does it impact your emotions or mood in any way when you are engaging in this creative activity?

R1: Yeah, I mean, *if I'm feeling down or something*, and then I start making some music I'm really into, then it's amazing. But it's often, well I don't want to think about the theory behind it, but *I really get in a good mood and it's impacting my emotions*, and I would say that is *the best part of engaging in making music*.

Interviewer: So, if I get this right, it could help you cope with stress and other things when you get into this "music making bubble"?

R1: Yes, it makes you just *forget all the stressful things you have on your shoulders*, because it's something that you *find interesting* or what helps you *find your intension*.

Interviewer: Ah okey

R1: that's at least how *I experience it*. But also, with the other things I'm doing, like the *videos I'm creating* – it's *the same thing*.

Interviewer: Interesting, is there any other specific creative activities you engage in, other than making music and videos?

R1: Normally *I work for companies where I edit and make videos*, because I notice that I get *more engagement around the videos*. So normally *I make videos and direct them*, which I find also *very interesting*.

Interviewer: Yeah definitely

R1: So, *I made this short movie*, *I directed a lot of videos*. So, when you are in this *creative process*, as follows, you *think of a concept*, then you *work on the script* which you then *transferee to a shot list*, which is writing down all the shots you want to make, like low angle, high angle, the cameras moving, the camera flying, etc.

Interviewer: Aah

R1: Well, it depends on the budget. Then *I'm drawing all of it so that I can visualize the day I'm on set,* so that nobody has to wait on me thinking, because everything has to be clear. Then *I'm directing the camera guy and the actresses*

Interviewer: Aah okey, so that's like your typical creative process

R1: Yeah, that's usually how it goes, and then I have to *edit it*, but I think that is the *most time consuming, as it requires a lot of technical skills,* so that's where I always *hire someone else to do it.*

Interviewer: I see, do you have any specific routines or environments that you find yourself the most creative in?

R1: Yes, I usually *put my phone off*, and I think that's when you can *get into the most creative part*, when you are *not surrounded by the noise of the world*. *When my phone is off, I get into this hyper focus phase* as I mentioned. But

Interviewer: I get that, we get easily distracted when our phone is on and you receive all of the different notifications, or noise.

R1: Yes really. But yeah, when I'm in my most creative phase. So, my process often starts with *creating a raw product*, that's what you always hear. When someone is writing a script, you always want first draft, you know

Interviewer: yes

R1: And that's what I am using. I have to learn from a… because I am reading a book about this. I have to learn from myself, so that *I crate a whole song that's not finished yet*, instead of creating just an intro and spending two days on it. So, I would say my routine is just *creating a raw product*, *creating a whole edit* and then you go into the transition stuff, for example.

Interviewer: Well, okey, interesting. And have you ever experienced creative blocks or difficulties when you're producing

R1: Yes, *a lot*

Interviewer: Yesh? And how do you overcome those difficulties?

R1: So, yeah, I overcome them to just *not look at it in the perfectionistic way*, so… so, just what you make is sometimes *starting over again* is sometime also good. But sometimes it great to just uh yeah, just have focus and *do something completely else*, and then *go back to work* with what you were doing, you know?

Interviewer: I see, like distracting yourself from the profess and then go back?

R1: yes, exactly!

Interviewer: And how about feedback? How do you handle getting feedback or criticism on your work? Does it affect your motivation to continue doing music?

R1: Yes, but *I am not good at handling feedback*

Interviewer: No?

R1: That's what *I'm trying to learn*

Interviewer: Ah okey, I understand.

R1: But the feedback is, well, *I kind of depend on it sometimes*, because *I need someone else to tell me if it's good or not*

Interviewer: Like gaining someone else's perspective on your work?

R1: yes, especially when *someone's perspective* is from *another person that does not know anything about it*, then *I don't take it that serious*, but sometimes it's great *gather information form a bunch of different people*.

Interviewer: Who do you usually go to for feedback then?

R1: *Always my dad*, especially with videos, because he is a director

Interviewer: that must be great

R1: yes, but also just uh *my roommates, friends*. Because they can *look at it in a not perfectionistic way*.

Interviewer: That's true

R1: They just look at it *as normal citizen*

Interviewer: Definitely. So, when you get negative feedback or criticism on your work that you don't like, does it affect your motivation to continue?

R1: *Sometimes yes*. *You become insecure*, yeah

Interviewer: I see

R1: But I mean, sometimes you can also *get motivation out of it*

Interviewer: That's good. Well now that we have talked a bit about you and how you first started doing music and video production, we are moving onwards to AI. As you might have notices, AI has had a huge growth these last couple of years and are affecting us in different fields and areas of life. I'm very interested in seeing how AI can affect our creativity processes, so my next question to you is, have you ever started using AI tools or technology in your creative processes?

R1: Ehm, there is *two things,* so, okey let's say this day I use eh to *generate ideas*. I just *put everything I have in my mind in ChatGPT* and then it *gives me an outcome*

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: That's for videos, *writing scripts,* and *making it better*. But *for music, I'm not using AI*.

Interviewer: No?

R1: No, well only maybe *for asking*, well let's say after a whole track I want to mix everything, *then I might ask it for implementing the different volumes*, *what should be the volumes on the trumpet*, *what should be the volume of the guitar*, you know?

Interviewer: Oh, okey

R1: Yeah, so I just *ask it for outputs*, but for video editing, I also *use ChatGPT, the function that generate pictures, that also generate logos and pictures.* But *for music, I only use this free sound plug in*, and it *blocks the sounds around the recording*. So it's help me *wipe out the background noise*, so that is sounds like it was recorded in a normal studio.

Interviewer: Ah okey, and do you feel like, while using AI, do you feel like it helps your creativity or that it detracts from it? Like, are you relying on AI?

R1: Yes, sometimes I, well, let say we are talking about just creating ideas

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: Then *I'm sometimes too dependent on AI*, but what is most important is, or what I have noticed that work, is *looking for ideas*. *You have the idea yourself*, or, or maybe multiple option ideas, and then *AI sometime just adapt that idea to something even better*

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: That's the thing, but *you don't want to create the blank ideas from AI*, they are *not good enough* yes.

Interviewer: You mean the ideas that AI generate itself without your input?

R1: Yes, that *lacks humanity*

Interviewer: Interesting, so my next question is if you believe that a piece of art, or something that is created directly from AI can be considered original?

R1: Eeehm, well. I saw some pictures, someone that really prompted AI, and it was like, *it looked completely real*. So, I don't, I don't know if that's the thing. If selling that, like if you are *selling AI generated music, it depends on what you train it with*.

Interviewer: Yes, exactly

R1: So, it's *not genuine if it is trained with music from other people*, so that's the question about *rights*.

Interviewer: Yes, that's the thing, like *copyright*…

R1: Yes *copyright*, I think *it's not original* then

Interviewer: Yeah, it's based on trained data.

R1: Yes exactly. I think you can *use it as a help resource*, but *not as a complete, like generate everything with it*. I think that when I'm *looking on Instagram these days, every video is AI generated*

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: And I think you lose, *you lose the humanity*

Interviewer: So, you consider the use of AI to be more of a tool than a partnership?

R1: *Both* I think

Interviewer: Yeah?

R1: Both a *tool to work more efficient*, which *saves you time a little bit*, but sometimes it *doesn't save your time because you are stuck, just talking with AI while you already have done the work without it*

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: But it's also a compartment that, I mean, uh, five years ago you had to call someone to give you great feedback, and now *AI can give you feedback*

Interviewer: That's true! Ehm, and do you think that the reliance of AI for these creative tasks affects your *skill development* in any way?

R1: Ehm, *a little bit*, yeah.

Interviewer: Yeah?

R1: I think so yes!

Interviewer: So, do you feel it's for the worse or better?

R1: Let's say, I think you have to… It's ehm, also with studying or something, but it's also, it *affects a little bit your ehm way of generating ideas yourself*, you know?

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: Or *being critic to yourself*

Interviewer: I see, and how do you feel about other people making music or producing videos, and using AI technology in their work?

R1: Oh okey, well what I think is, okey so let's say there is *a lot of AI generated songs on Spotify*, and they are labeled as "The best Bossa Nova songs of 2025"

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: But they are *just fake*! I think that they *create a noise in the system*, so *people are earning like passive money on it*.

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: I think *it's a great tool to help*, and also in the future, it's a *great tool with photography or with film,* because you can just, everything is *just with one click*. And I think that *everyone who will used AI, you have to still be good at your own profession*, because many jobs will ehm, in this way, *many jobs will get lost*.

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: Like once just like art, you know?

Interviewer: Yeah, I believe it will affect a lot of different fields in the time to come. Ehm, so how do you think the growth of AI will influence your work field in the years to come?

R1: I think it will ehm take like, like I said, *many jobs will take over*. Okey, let's say, you have a music stage, you have many phases, you know?

Interviewer: Yes

R1: So, first writing, *AI can help in the writing stage. It can help in the recording stage*. Then in the stage of mixing, *it can take over the whole mixing process probably*, because it can just be *based on that other people like the most, it can generate a whole mix*. But also, then the mastery bar can be influenced.

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: So, they have already five stages that can be influences, and the videos, *it's a shame*. Probably *editing can be done without a person*.

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: And the only thing it is that okey let's say you have to make a quick commercial, free project, but you don't have any money, then you can just t*ake the picture of the product and put it in and prompt it with, yeah, "we can do this and this", and create a movie with it.* So, I think, normally for example, okey let's say you have a luxury product, ehm, a nice expensive cream or something

Interviewer: mhm

R1: Ehm… when you first want to promote that, normally it's like a thousand bucks to create a video in the studio somewhere expensive, but *now it can look the same with AI*. It will definitely *take over many stages in the video process* as well.

Interviewer: Yeah, it will probably affect a lot of different processes

R1: But also, it can, so that means that *only the best probably will stand, or the people that know a lot about everything.* And then people that, that were *not experienced enough looses their jobs*

Interviewer: Yeah, but do you feel like it's how you corporate with AI in the future that will depend on whether or not you will keep your job?

R1: Ehm, I don't really know, but I think *you have to know a little bit, even if you can talk with ChatGPT about it, I think it can help*, you know?

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: So, you don't have to, well it's always the thing, *I always want to neglect it's existence*, but it's necessary to, yeah, I do not know. I think everyone should take a course in it at least

Interviewer: Yeah, to get some more knowledge of AI you mean?

R1: Yeah, while I'm still skipping the course though ahahha

Interviewer: ahahha yeah, I see. But you were also talking about like the ownership of the things that you produce…

R1: Yeah

Interviewer: How would you define a piece of ehm... either music or a video produced with the help of AI? Who would be the author or the owner of that song or video?

R1: I think that what's now necessary, it's maybe simple to say, but I think *the property right must be changed a little bit*. So, it's the data, the data it's train with, ehm, sometimes give you a completely, that's the thing, it's generative AI, so it gives you a new output

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: But if you hear that it sounds like the data that it's trained with, or it looks like it, then I think *it should be ehm from the ones from the original work*, you know?

Interviewer: Yes

R1: But if it's, if it's *completely random I that then the author is just the one that trained it*

Interviewer: Yeah, so do you think….

R1: This is a great discussion! *It's also ethical discussion*

Interviewer: Mhm, and it definitely effect both the ethical sides and the property law, so I think it's interesting with your ideas around how the property law need some changes, because how it is today it's a undefined question…

R1: Yeah

Interviewer: and AI is taking more and more over...

R1: Yes, and what I have heard from the company I worked at, they told me that the most money they put ehm, *the most money they hand out goes to lawyers*

Interviewer: Oh really?

R1: Yeah, just for *fixing these problems*

Interviewer: Yeah, I think there is a lot of problems that can occurs when it comes to stating the ownership of AI pieces.

R1: Exactly

Interviewer: Well good! Well now that we have had a good discussion around AI and how it affects both creativity and the fields in years to come, I was just a bit curious, do you have any future goals for your creativity pursuits? You were talking a bit earlier about it…

R1: Yeah, I mean, *being more efficient and putting out more work*, just ehm *finishing stuff*.

Interviewer: Aah

R1: That's the most hard part, because *you have many ideas all day*, you know...

Interviewer: Yeah!

R1: But you have to finish them…

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: and also, it's about *just putting out a lot of stuff*, and then in the beginning, it's not good and then *you learn from it.* So that's where my ehm, that's where my deficiency this day's lays

Interviewer: right! And are there any specific areas that you would like to explore further or skills you want to develop?

R1: Yeah, there is skills like mixing and music

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: I want to follow a course about it…

Interviewer: Interesting

R1: But also, ehm, so I'm still choosing whether to peruse the move side or the ehm.

Interviewer: Music?

R1: Yeah, the music side. It can be a management thing in between… uh … but also, ehm I don't know, ehm *feeling more valuable* ehm that thing *and just learning one thing really good*, you know?

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: So let's say mixing, *I would like to learn recording really good that it's without problems*

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: and *working better with computers*. I mean that's when you can work really good with a computer and then maybe… and also my computer is full or something. And it takes me a whole day to reprogram the whole computer, to make it empty

Interviewer: haha yeah. And then how do you feel like engaging in this activity is influencing the other areas of your life? Because you have also school and your personal life. So how do you feel engaging in creative tasks influences the rest…

R1: well AI you mean?

Interviewer: No just like you being creative. How do you feel like that impact the other areas of your life, like leisure time, personal life, etc.

R1: I mean it works. You have a *lot of ideas all day and it can get a bit chaotic in you head*

Interviewer: yeah, I see

R1: *Sometimes I wish it was more easy* to have, ehm… I think *to be more simple person* you know?

Interviewer: Yeah

R1: I mean, when *you want to be creative all day*, it's like I need to find a way, and I think it will take me a while still, but to *find a way that you do one thing a day, so not everything at once*

Interviewer: Yeah, so you mean like structuring your days a bit better?

R1: Yes, because *now it's too chaotic* and then *you don't get anything done in the end*, you know?

Interviewer: Yeah, I see…

R1: Also, it's your social life. But this is what you always see – *creative people are always chaotic*

Interviewer: hahah It's a lot of great ideas in there, you know?

R1: Yes

Interviewer: and, if you could offer any advice to someone who want to start their creative journey, what would that be?

R1: Eeehm, I think just *find something you want to be good at and try to generate new things that aren't there already*

Interviewer: Mhm

R1: That's my…. Always, well, *find something you find really cool* and then *try to create it yourself, but in a different way*

Interviewer: Yeah, so like stand a bit out from the crowd?

R1: Yes… Yes!

Interviewer: Yeah, I agree! Well that's it for today! Thank you so much for answering all of these questions…

R1: Yes ofc!!

Interviewer: and for participating in my interview! It's been a great talk, and I really like how you resonate around the different topics

R1: Ofc, it's been very interesting, and I wish you the best of luck on your thesis!

Interviewer: Thank you, and the best of luck with both your music and video production. And maybe you and your future band will take over the music industry?

R1: ahahha thank you! Yeah let's see about that! Goodbye!

Appendix 3

Interviewee: R2
Format: Video Call
Language: Norwegian (translated and transcript in English)
Length: 35 minutes

Introduction to the interview and how it is structured. Warm-up questions

Interviewer: Okey, so can you tell me a bit about the background and how you first got introduced for making music?

R2: *I stated making music*… It is the history you want?

Interviewer: Yeah, I mean, what got you started on this journey?

R2: Ah okey, well then it was ehm, actually *my friend who showed me a program*, as me and him *used to listen a lot to Avicii*

Interviewer: Oh, yes?

R2: So, it was like all the *way back to like 2013* I think

Interviewer: Mhm

R2: And then *he said "everybody uses this program, so download it" and then it kind of stated there*. And to say it like that, it was very ehm… *I did not know anything before* like, ehm, well like maybe 18-19. It wasn't before then *things began to change*.

Interviewer: Ah, I see

R2: Before that, it was just like *"what is this?"* if that makes sense?

Interviewer: Yeah ofc! So, if I get it right, you were influenced by your friend to start making music?

R2: Yeah definitely

Interviewer: Ehm, and do you engage in any other creative activities besides making music? Like painting, writing, cooking, and other creative activities, or is it like the music that has your full attention?

R2: I would say *it's the most creative things I'm spending time on*… But I mean, it *might be other stuff as well*, but not that I can think of right now.

Interviewer: I see, and how often do you engage in making music? Let's say during a week, how many hours do you spend on a regular basic?

R2: Well, *it could be weeks where I don't engage in making music*, but let's take last week… Then *I was really into it*, so *last week I spent like maybe ehm… let's say like 20 hours in total*

Interviewer: Ah okey, and would you say that you spend a lot of time thinking about music, like on a daily basis, or is it just when you sit down and produce? Would you take me through the process around it?

R2: Oh yes, I *definitely think about it a lot more then when I actually make it*. It could just *pop into my head*, like *at any time*…

Interviewer: And would you say it changes from week to week, or is it like that all the time?

R2: I mean, it's hard to say, but I was *sitting on the train* the other day, on my way home from work, ehm… and then I was just listening to the... ehm, do you know the Yosemite by Travis Scott… I don't know if you are familiar with that song?

Interviewer: Yeah, I know that one

R2: yeah, and that song has a really cool like… cool part, where he sings like "I Feel like I'm chosen covered in gold" …

Interviewer: Yes

R2: yeah, and that part, you know, so I just took… well *I used AI*…

Interviewer: yeah

R2: *to like make an acapella out of that*…

Interviewer: Interesting

R2: and then I just *cut out that chorus* there

Interviewer: Mhm

R2: and then *I made it into a bit more like summer vibe house type music*, so yeah

Interviewer: Interesting! And this was all from hearing that song on the train ride home from work?

R2: Yes exactly!

Interviewer: Ah, nice! And would you say there is anything specific that triggers this creativity? Or is it like coincidences?

R2: I would say is a *bit coincidence*…

Interviewer: Okey

R2: I mean, when it has been a long and hard period of work, then *my head is not in the most creative path*, so then I'm *not able to fulfill my creativity in the way I might want*

Interviewer: I see, so what when would you say that your creativity truly blossoms?

R2: It's mostly *the day's that I'm off from work* and like if I *listen to a new song* or something like that, then it just… like a song I truly like... then I could just *get a very inspirational kick out of it*, and *I'm back in my little bubble*.

Interviewer: Oh interesting. And what would you say is the most motivating and enjoyable thing about engaging in this creative activity, which in this case in making music?

R2: That's a good question! Ehm… Ehm… I feel like, when I am making music, then it's just like *there is nothing else that is happening at that moment*

Interviewer: Ah, like a break from your everyday life?

R2: Yeah, like *a break from everything*. And it's also like *very satisfying when you are on a good flow*, and you *find it truly enjoyable*... It's like, *you can make whatever you want*! You can *be creative, and nobody can stop you*. So, if it's like something you really want to… I mean, sometimes it's *not necessary that I make songs*, but just like *changing up sounds*, just like those small stuff as well, it's *all a part of this little unbreakable bubble*, you know? I'm there *truly believing that I can make something on my own*. I find it quite hard to explain it I notice, ahahah

Interviewer: ahah no but this is great, it can of course be hard to put words on these things. But when we still are talking about this "bubble", do you feel like it can help you cope with stress and other problems that may occur in your everyday life? Like, do you feel that you find yourself returing to the creative activities when things get though?

R2: Yes, *yes definitely*! I look at it like *an escape from reality*. It's *just me, myself, and my music*!

Interviewer: ahaha I see, and could you walk me through the process, like from the start, on how you make music?

R2: Like?

Interviewer: Like if you are starting on a new project, or like when you sit on the train and hear this cool chorus from Travis Scott – how does the rest of the process look like, until you get this "finished product"?

R2: Oh yeah, I mean do you want it in details? ahahaha

Interviewer: ahah well, that's totally up to you, I'm just interested in how you go through this process

R2: Well, you see… Sometimes … I either try to *make something from scratch* that is *100% mine*… or I might *use vocals from another song, and make a remix out of it* basically

Interviewer: I see

R2: Sometimes… *previous vocals can make me more creative*, like the melody and everything

Interviewer: Oh interesting

R2: Yeah, and then I can just *remove the vocals, and make something out of the melody myself*, and try to *change it so that it becomes my own*, if you get what I mean?

Interviewer: Yes, so you are like building further on a song, vocal or melody from another artist to make it into a new piece, that is yours?

R2: Yes, bur like when I start, then I usually start with like… cords

Interviewer: Mhm

R2: Like a *piano melody*…. Then *I add the bass,* to see if that also *feels "nice*" … and then I just *build upon that*. I mean, you can change things up so much, from just a piano melody from another song.

Interviewer: Okey, I see. And is there like any specific routines or environments you need to get started on the creative process of making these songs? Like if there is anything in particular that makes your creativity blossom?

R2: hahaha well I'm just *in the studio when I make music*, so I haven't notice anything specific except from that. But I mean, then I'm *in an environment for making music*, so I feel like I *automatically enter that stage of creativity when I enter the studio*, if you get what I mean?

Interviewer: Yeah, it sounds like the studio could be an underling motivation for your creativity then

R2: ahah yes, I have just never thought about it like that before.

Interviewer: ahhah, and have you ever experienced creative blocks or difficulties in your creative pursuits?

R2: Yes, *more than I can imagine*

Interviewer: and how do you overcome them?

R2: You just have to *take a break.* There is *not so much more to do*. You *just have to accept that today is not the day*. Maybe you are better tomorrow, or I mean, *it could be in phases* too...

Interviewer: Okey

R2: But that's why it is good to *try out something else*, like *try to make something out of songs that already exists*.

Interviewer: Ah okey

R2: But yeah, *it happens a lot and there is unfortunately not that much to do about it*. You *can't just flip the switch on the creativity*. That would be amazing. It is *very situational*.

Interviewer: And how about feedback and criticism on your work, how do you handle that?

R2: Well, it's *not that often that I send my songs to people to get feedback*, but yeah, I usually get *a lot of positive feedback*

Interviewer: That's good

R2: Sometimes, yeah… I try to get people to give me *proper criticism*

Interviewer: Like seeking constructive criticism?

R2: Yeah, and I just *take everything in a positive manner*

Interviewer: And say that you receive bad feedback on your work, does it affect your motivation to continue making songs?

R2: Yeah, but again *in a positive manner*.

Interviewer: That's amazing, so you *get a boost out of it*

R2: Exactly

Interviewer: That's good to hear! Well now that we have talked a bit about your background and how your pursuit music, we are going to discuss the topic around AI. As you might have noticed, AI has had a rapid growth these past years, and is estimated to continue this way. It has already affected us in various fields in our everyday life, so my question to you is, have you ever started using any AI tools or technology in your creative processes?

R2: If I use it or how I use it?

Interviewer: It would be lovely if you could explain both!

R2: Yeah of course! Well, *I do use AI*, like I could *use AI when I want to make a cappella*, like when I am just *taking out the vocals from a previous song*

Interviewer: Ah

R2: so, I can use it in that scenario, ehm... and also *if I want to write lyrics, then I can use AI*. Those are the two things *I use AI for when making music*

Interviewer: Do you feel like that has changes your approach in making music? Like after AI tools were introduced and became easily accessible?

R2: At least the vocal remover… like the one I use so I can get the vocals.

Interviewer: Ah okey. Do you use it often or is it like in some circumstances?

R2: I mean yes, *I use it all the time*.

Interviewer: ah okey. Okey so let's imagine that AI has made a song, would you say that the song could be categorized as "original"?

R2: If AI makes a song from scratch?

Interviewer: Yes

R2: *ehm*…

Interviewer: I mean, also if it takes a big part of the production of the song. Do you consider that to be original?

R2: ehm… *I don't think so*. I mean… I don't know how people have done it, but I have heard a *lot of AI songs*, where ... well … I don't know how advanced AI is when it comes to *making a whole song from scratch...* I know *AI is able to copy like the voices* of Drake and Travis, but I don't know like how AI is on making beat and etc. But yeah, if *everything is AI*, then it's like… It *could be a win-win situation* for like Drake ahahah because *if AI uses his voice*, he might *get the credit for it*, so maybe he will get some money out of it as well, or at least fame, but yeah, *I would not consider it to be original*.

Interviewer: No?

R2: *No not really*

Interviewer: And after you started using these AI tools in your music production, do you feel like that has changed your skill development in any way? Like do you feel like you are learning more with AI or do you feel like you rely too much on it?

R2: *I don't rely on it*, I would not say that, but I still *don't think that I learn more with the help from AI*… It's more like when *I am doing the research*

Interviewer: So, do you consider it to be more of a tool than a partnership?

R2: ehm…. Well in the production I would say it's *more of a tool*, but *I would consider it to be both, it's just how you use it*.

Interviewer: Interesting. Okey well let's say that another music producer is releasing new song, solely based on AI. How is that affecting the competition out there?

R2: Well, they are definitely *taking the easy way out*. I mean it's more *embarrassing for them*…

Interviewer: Ah

R2: Okey, *maybe not embarrassing, but*…

Interviewer: Like circling back to what we talked about regarding originality

R2: exactly, it's *not original if AI made it* you know, so I would say *it's a bit of a shame that people stop being creative themselves and let AI do the hard work for them*. It just *shows that you don't know music*, if you get what I mean.

Interviewer: So, you feel like it could affect the competition in the music industry?

R2: Ehm… Yes, *I would say so*. I mean, *people could earn money on it*, and if I would be more interested in that, I could have done the same, but then you are *losing the whole point of being creative and making something yourself*.

Interviewer: Yeah, and you mentioned that you have heard some AI songs previously, are you able to catch that it's AI generated, or is it labeled like that?

R2: I *would not notice that the song is AI generated if it was not labeled it*, and that is the *scary part*. It could definitely *change the way we do music in the future*.

Interviewer: And regarding the ownership of those songs, what do you think if an artist or producer takes a song that AI has made and label it as their own. I mean AI is built upon trained data, so it's based on the music we already have out there

R2: I mean *if they use another person's voice, then It's not okay*...

Interviewer: No?

R2: But if you have prompted… well I don't know how it's done, but let's say it's *a melody that is based on something else, then I would say it's the person who prompted it to AI who is the author*.

Interviewer: interesting! We talked briefly about this earlier, but do you feel that AI affects your creativity in any ways, especially regarding making songs?

R2: No, I won't say that it has affected my in any kind of ways yet, but if I will, *I think it will affect my creativity in a positive way*.

Interviewer: I see, yeah because you mentioned that you were able to distract yourself from AI and don't see yourself as relying heavily on it during your music production, right?

R2: Yeah, that's right

Interviewer: And now that AI is constantly evolving, how do you think that will affect your occupation in the future, do you think AI will replace people who work with it?

R2: *I don't think it's going to have that much of an effect, either positive or negative*, but *things are just going to be easier to do*.

Interviewer: Okey

R2: It's like *shortcuts for making a song*, but *how original that will be, remains to be seen*.

Interviewer: Yes, that's a good question

R2: I feel like you a *cheating* in a kind of way *when you use it,*

Interviewer: Yeah, when you take these shortcuts

R2: mhm

Interviewer: And how about your future, do you have any specific goals you want to pursuits, or any areas you'd like to explore further or skills you want to develop, when it comes to producing music?

R2: No, not really

Interviewer: No?

R2: I just *want to be better*

Interviewer: Yeah

R2: I want to be *better at vocals*, that's an *area of improvement*, like mixing vocals

Interviewer: I see! And as a final point, if you could offer any advice to someone just starting their creative journey, what would that be?

R2: Well, there is a lot of advanced programs out there, so just start by *learning them by watching tutorials*, at least that was what I did, and get started from there, and *believe in yourself*.

Interviewer: That's amazing, thank you! Now I just also want to thank you for taking the time to answers these questions. It's been nice learning a bit more of you and your creative pursuits. I wish you the best of luck with the music!

R2: And thank you, this was really fun! Goodbye!

Interviewer: Goodbye!

Appendix 4

Interviewee: R3
Format: Video Call
Language: Norwegian (translated and transcript in English)
Length: 53 minutes

Introduction to the interview and how it is structured. Warm-up questions

Interviewer: Okey, well let's get into it! Do you want to start telling me a bit about your background and how you first were introduced to photography?

R3: Ehm yes, well it was *initially an hobby from my childhood*

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: I got *introduced to it through my* mother who were very interested in taking photos. I remember I got *my first camera* when I was, ehm… *7 years* or something.

Interviewer: Ah

R3: Like this *disposable camera* that I went around *taking pictures of my flowers and things like that* ahhaha

Interviewer: ahahah oh I remember those cameras

R3: ahah ehm and after that it just *evolved*… I don't know, it has just *become a huge part of me growing up*. It has always been a.. I don't know… *A way to, not express myself but like a way to get some sort of, like give vent to my emotions*, if you get what I mean.

Interviewer: Yeah, I get that

R3: Yeah, it's like a… ehm… it's some sense of satisfaction around it…

Interviewer: Aah okey, so like some way to expressing emotions in the form of images?

R3: Yes, sort of, even though *it's not necessary something I do instead of expressing myself with words,* if you get what I mean.

Interviewer: Yeah, I see

R3: But yes, kind of a *therapeutic activity*

Interviewer: Interesting, that's some good reflections around it! And except from taking pictures, do you find yourself engaging in other creative activities, like painting, writing, and so on, during your leisure time?

R3: If I do it?

Interviewer: Yes

R3: No, not really ahahha. Well, I mean, as a form of hobby, then *I don't have any other specific activity that I engage actively in*, but maybe if *working out could be something creative*?

Interviewer: Yes, like setting up a plan for the workout session you mean?

R3: Yes, and I'm also a group instructor, so *I make workout classes*, and that *requires some sort of creativity* I guess

Interviewer: Yes, absolutely!

R3: Now that I work as a *fulltime photographer*, then I'm in this sort of *unique position where I get to work with what I used to have as a hobby*

Interviewer: Yeah, that's true

R3: Yes, so I sort of *combine my hobby in my work life*

Interviewer: Yeah true! But after you started working with it, has the enjoyment of photography changed? You mentioned earlier that it's a form of therapy, does it feel the same way now that you do it as a living?

R3: I mean, sort of. Before when it was *just a hobby,* I might have been using it more to *"get lost" in my own creative world*, but now that *I am working more commercial*, it depends on the job

Interviewer: In what way?

R3: When I get a *job that requires a long list of pre-defined things*, *then I don't get to express myself in the same matter as I usually would o*f, but when *I get free rein to be creative, then I get more of the therapeutic feeling* I was talking about

Interviewer: Ah okey

R3: But that is *a part of the job*, so I just have to except it

Interviewer: so, what do you find the most enjoyable about taking photos, like what motivates you to continue with it?

R3: For me, it's *the way of being able to do something and see the result so quickly*.

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: and that it gives some sort of *satisfaction* about it

Interviewer: Yeah

R3: and that I am able to be *creative without it affecting one's patience*, if you get what I mean

Interviewer: Yes, sort of, but feel free to elaborate

R3: Okey, so if we compare it with painting and other creative fields, like writing for example.

Interviewer: Yeah

R3: Those are processes are way longer than the photography process. *In photography, you get it visual right away, and that is what makes it enjoyable for me,* because I might not me the most patient one, and then it *suits my personality way better* than for example writing and painting.

Interviewer: And you were briefly mentioning this earlier, but when you do photography, do you feel like it helps you cope with stress or other problems that may occur in your everyday life? Like is it kind of an escape from the real world?

R3: Yes, kind of! It was a kind of *change when I started working with it full time*, when the hobby became work. So, when I work on different commissions, then it's a *part of my everyday life*. But before, when it was just an hobby, I felt it *was a kind of escape*, yes

Interviewer: Yeah

R3: But now I *have started working a bit on my own projects, like starting a gallery*, and then I can *notice the feeling* you are mentioning now. Then I'm *doing things on my own terms*, and then *my creativity let loose in a whole different way* than when I am working commercial with different brands. Then *I'm doing what I like and what I want to do*.

Interviewer: Yeah, I see

R3: But it's of course a bit of a *risk of starting projects on your own*, without taking commissions from clients, but *it's about going back to this therapeutic feeling and letting my creativity blossom*.

Interviewer: Yes

R3: and I also combine it with *traveling*, which is also an *important part of letting my creativity blossom*

Interviewer: Yeah

R3: so, the *combination of photography and traveling* is what makes me *the most creative and keeps me motivated to continue on this journey*

Interviewer: Interesting! I was meaning to ask you about that, because my next question is if there is some specific environment or routines you engage in to get you in this creativity zone?

R3: Yes definitely, it's about *doing that research in advance and thinking about what I want to gain from*, yeah let's say this trip… ehm.. haha sorry what was the question again?

Interviewer: haha no worries, I was just wondering if you have any specific routines or environments that you notice are helping you becoming more creative? And you did mention the traveling part, so I was just interested in hearing more about that relation

R3: Yes there is absolutely a relations there. I think that it's *two things that has a relation* there.

Interviewer: Yes?

R3: I think it's both the thing with *travel*, where it is a lot of *new impressions and new destinations*, and the other thing is that *I am above-average social, so when I am working around people* who has the same goal as me, I notice that *I get more creative*.

Interviewer: Interesting

R3: It's *giving me energy and creativity*, and of course, that rely on the people you surround yourself with, but typically, men you're hired in to do a job, you *are surrounded by other creative people* who has the *same vision* and want to do their best with me to get the results we want.

Interviewer: Yes right

R3: When *other people are engaged*, it's like a *domino effect*, so I would say that is also a part of the relation to *becoming more creative*

Interviewer: That's good. And you also mentioned that your creative process might differ from the creative processes of authors and painters. Do you want to walk me through a typical creative process of yours, for example when you start up a new project?

R3: Well, ehm… that's hard to say. I am very *bad at sitting down and writing a strategy*, so everything is *happening inside my head*, especially *right before I go to bed* ahah

Interviewer: hahaha that's so typical

R3: ahahh yes, so how it happens, well… It's *a longer process* I would say, and its hard putting words on it. And I think that might also make photography differ from painting etc.

Interviewer: In what way?

R3: Like they also have a long process, but *my process is about the journey I take* when, for example, I want to do a *new gallery*. So, it's from beginning the *thought process about starting a gallery, to figuring out which vibe I want to have, where I should take the pictures, what kind of expression I want to show,* and so on.

Interviewer: Yes, until you stand there with the physical results in the gallery?

R3: Yes. The pictures I had in my last gallery were from all the way back from 2018 until now, so then you get some sort of idea on *how long this process actually is*.

Interviewer: Ah, interesting.

R3: Yes, *the path you take and gradually realizing what you want*… that's probably *the core of my creative process.* It's not something very planned, in a way, which makes it hard to put into concrete words

Interviewer: I see, well thank you for taking me through it. And what about getting feedback or criticism on your work, how do you handle that?

R3: *I don't like that* ahaha

Interviewer: ahha no?

R3: ahahha no I do. That' s actually *very important* when you do what I do. You *have to be able to handle feedback and criticism.*

Interviewer: mhm

R3: and ehm… you must... or, the *art of separating crisis from constructive criticism*

Interviewer: absolutely

R3: because… and I notice that, well I *don't get that much criticism,* but of course, when you get *honest feedback,* you have to take it, and this is something you *learn through experience*

Interviewer: that's true

R3: I mean, when I started doing what I do, *I was not as good at is as I am now.* Now I'm more like, okey *this is for helping me getting better*. But when I receive some feedback, I *need it to be specific*. I can't have people saying like "Ehm no, it's not the vibe"

Interviewer: Yes totally

R3: *My job is very technically*, so you have to *clearly define the roles* when you are *working on projects with other companies*. Because, if they just expect me to be this magician that can just fix things easily and just do what they want without them telling me, then their expectations are going to be ruined. This is very important that my clients are aware of.

Interviewer: Yes, absolutely

R3: I mean, most of them are, but there are some clients that are a bit delusional about it

Interviewer: hahaha I see. Okey but let's say you receive some critics, do that affect your motivation to continue taking photos?

R3: Yes, 100%! It has a *big impact on my motivation.* I am *driven by the motivation*

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: That might also be a thing differing my occupation from other occupations. *I don't have the security that you might have in a employment work*, as I am *self-employed*. I am *depending on having that motivation* all the time to continue

Interviewer: Yes

R3: Because *if not, you can't make a living out of it*.

Interviewer: Yes, it's definitely an important driver

R3: so, both the *motivation* and the *feedback plays a huge role in my occupation*. So if I receive a *nice feedback from my client*, it definitely *helps my motivation to continue*.

Interviewer: yes

R3: And I'm left with these *good feelings* connected to it, and I want to *keep doing a good job*

Interviewer: I see

R3: but if I receive *bad feedback*, then it of course *affects my motivation negatively*. It actually happened once last year.

Interviewer: Oh, do you want to elaborate?

R3: well, ahahha, I usually work with *fashion photography* and do a lot in retail and that industry. It's a *very creative field.* But then I was on a shoot for a company that makes wheelchairs, where I was filling in for another photographer I know. They had brought me in, and I realized it was a very technical shoot, which focused on *product photos*, which *doesn't really require the same level of creativity that I'm used to*.

Interviewer: I see

R3: and yeah, I mean, I did my job, but the way I got the *feedback*…. It was just… I was *completely taken aback*!

Interviewer: Oh, in what way?

R3: I got these *incredible nitpicky comments*, like "that tone is a bit off there", "you need to change this, and this", "I'm not happy with this at all". It was said in this kind of tone…. And when you get feedback like that, I could really feel it just *draining my energy*, and I thought: *this is not something I want to keep doing*!

Interviewer: Ah okey, I get that

R3: This is a client I will never work with again, to say it like that. I *can't work on projects that will drain my energy* in that way, because who knows how long I will keep holding on in that past?

Interviewer: I totally get that,

R3: But it's important to have that back in mind all the time, because *you don't let one person throw you off*, right?

Interviewer: right!

R3: but if this keeps happening over and over again, it definitely *affects your motivation*, and then it kind of depends on how you… I don't know... how *mentally strong* you are, maybe?

Interviewer: Yes, that could be a factor

R3: You kind of *need to have thick skin* in this industry

Interviewer: Yes, I can imagine

R3: You *can't take things personally*, because it's very easy to do so

Interviewer: Yes

R3: you also need to *set your own boundaries*, and I think that *comes more with the age and experience*

Interviewer: yes definitely! Moving on, AI has taken a huge role in today's society and are evolving as we speak. So, my question to you is, have you ever stated using any of these AI tools or technology in photography?

R3: *Yes, a lot*

Interviewer: Oh really, well do you feel like that has changed your approach?

R3: For me, it's kind of like… I mean, I can feel my self getting, ehm… *getting a bit frustrated by it*. Because when I see ads on social media saying you can now design your own AI profile pictures, that "*photographers are doomed*", etc. – *it gets to me*. I see ads for both portrait photography and retail, which are my clients, you know…

Interviewer: Yeah of course

R3: but I also know that *I'm never going to see any of my clients using an AI program to create ads*

Interviewer: okey

R3: Yeh, no that's not going to happen! *Not at the level it's at now*. Of course, moving forward… *you never know what it'll be like*

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: but of course, it's definitely something that *gives you a lot to think about*

Interviewer: Yes

R3: but as of now, *you can definitely use AI*. I mean, *I use it a lot*… ehm, I *use it in two different ways*

Interviewer: Ah okey, and what are those ways?

R3: one is, um, I use a *software called Imagine*. I *don't use it every time* I take pictures, but I *use it if I have large amounts of photos*. For example, if it's a wedding, or if it's, ehm, a shoot where I have taken thousands of pictures

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: *sitting and editing every single photo*… I often edit many, because I have clients who require lots of pictures. You have to *work smart to avoid wearing yourself out*

Interviewer: Absolutely

R3: You have to try to *streamline as much as possible*, which is also *worth it for me*

Interviewer: mhm

R3: So, then I use this… it's a fairly simple integrated AI software that works like this: I've *uploaded 5.000 photos* that *I've edited myself*, so it can *learn the kind of settings I usually use*, the kind of look I'm aiming for…

Interviewer: Interesting

R3: Yeah, exactly! Okey, so say I've been on a shoot and there are a *crazy number of photos*. The *client needs the pictures quickly*, etc. Okey, then *I upload the photos into the software*, get them *back after 10 minutes*, and then they're all *fully edited*

Interviewer: Oh really?

R3: Yeah, but… it's *not a 100%*

Interviewer: no

R3: I'd rather say it's *about 90%,* so *I still have to go through everything just to give it a quick check*

Interviewer: I see

R3: and there are many where *I need to make some adjustments*

Interviewer: ah okey

R3: but it *saves me an incredible amount of time*

Interviewer: I can imagine

R3: It still *doesn't mean I lose ownership of it*, not at all

Interviewer: Exactly, because you *go through them yourself after using the AI feature* to double-check that these are *products you can deliver*

R3: Yes, I do, and as long as I understand what it's doing, *the results are ones I stand behind*. It's just that *I've streamlined the process*

Interviewer: Exactly. And you have trained the software based on your previous work

R3: Yes, that's it! I imagine you can *quickly tell the difference between a professional photographer and someone who knows a bit*, but hasn't done it much who just takes some photos with their camera and throws them into the software *hoping it will fix everything*

Interviewer: Yeah, so you can tell?

R3: yeah absolutely. So, the reason I use this is simply *to save time*, *not to make my photos better*

Interviewer: I see

R3: yeah, so that's one way I use AI… another way is actually all *the AI features that are integrated into the editing program* I use, especially *Photoshop and lightroom*. And all the *Adobe programs* in general have gotten *really good AI tools over the past years...*

Interviewer: Oh

R3: where I can, for example, *change the background*. And things like *retouching* have become *so much easier now*…

Interviewer: yeah

R3: and it *saves the photographers an incredible amount of time*. It's not like I do a lot of retouching, because I'm not allowed to when working commercially unless I label the images with the retouching icon

Interviewer: I see

R3: so those are the two main ways I use it, and then there's also another software that does culling, meaning it *selects the photos after a shoot*, and it can *automatically recognize which images are good and which ones aren't*

Interviewer: Okey

R3: I've tried it. It *works really poorly*, because that's *a subjective matter*

Interviewer: Yes exactly

R3: it's *not something I can just hand over to a computer*

Interviewer: No right, that's kind of where you really notice the difference between human and machine

R3: Yeah, you definitely do, so I fell that in my profession, *I'm not threatened by AI*, precisely *because of this*

Interviewer: right

R3: but it's a *great tool that I'll definitely keep using*

Interviewer: yes and regarding that, my next question was actually; do you consider AI to be more of a partner or a tool?

R3: it's *definitely a tool*, no doubt about that

Interviewer: and you touched on this a bit, since you don't feel your profession is threatened, what do you think about another photographer primarily using AI when publishing their photos? Do you feel that affects the competition in the market? And do you consider it to be original?

R3: No, I mean… um… I think *people should be free to do whatever they want*, but honestly, I believe it *quickly shows through*, and clients who actually pay can *see it in the results*

Interviewer: ah okey

R3: yeah, you can take a *cheap shortcut*, but it *doesn't pay off in the long run*. I also think that *audiences and target groups will become more aware of AI use in the coming times*, and then it becomes *easy to see what's authentic and what's not*

Interviewer: absolutely

R3: I've noticed it myself that *I've become much more aware of it just in the past year*, and now I can often *easily tell whether something is AI-generated or no*t

Interviewer: right

R3: So, I would say whether that person should take ownership of it or not, well *of course they should*, because *they're the one who took the photo*, and that's really *the main job* here. And it's also them who *make the decisions throughout the post-processing*

Interviewer: right

R3: and if somethings end up being AI-generated… *be my guest*, but I think you kind of end up *facing yourself in the end if you choose to do that*

Interviewer: do you think what will set photographers apart in the future is how skilled they are in the craft, on how well they collaborate with AI?

R3: 100% - but it's about *learning how to use AI the right way*, because that's what I feel and believe is what… ehm... we can call it a *generational gap maybe*

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: it's kind of between us who grew up with computers and the generations before us who maybe *don't see it as clearly themselves*. They might get a bit *blind to it and think "oh, this looks nice"*, but it still has to be *authentic*

Interviewer: yes

R3: and I also work a bit as a *social media manager* at a hotel, and there *I use AI for everything*. I *use ChatGPT all the time*. For example, *when I write captions for Instagram* posts. But it's *not about blindly trusting AI*, because we have a *branded tone we need to stick to*, and *AI won't fully understand that*. So, *I still play a central role, even though I use AI* much more there than I do in photography

Interviewer: I see

R3: Even though I use AI and ChatGPT, *I still have to work* through a few rounds with it to *get the result I want*

Interviewer: In the form of prompting, right?

R3: Yes, and I'd *say the final results I get from ChatGPT is way better than what I'd manage on my own*, because I'm not a writer. But in the end, *I trust myself working together with AI*, *not AI alone,* so here, I'd say it's *more of a partnership than just a tool*.

Interviewer: exactly

R3: and with all these roles I have, like social media manager, photo editor, photographer, directing, there are so many hats to wear. *AI is there to help me get better at my job*, but *replacing me with AI in the areas where I have deep expertise? That benefits no one*.

Interviewer: I totally agree

R3: But using it both as a *tool in processes* and for extra tasks you have around, like *quickly answering emails*. That's *incredible timesaving*! I honestly *don't remember how we managed all those tasks on our own before*

Interviewer: Yes it's truly timesaving and efficient

R3: that's exactly what it's about; *saving time and having a more efficient workday*

Interviewer: you mentioned that you use AI when writing captions and so on, but more generally, do you feel that AI has impacted your creativity in a positive or negative way?

R3: I actually think it's *made me more creative*

Interviewer: Mhm

R3: especially when it comes to *being a social media manager* and that side of things

Interviewer: mhm

R3: because when it come to *photography* specifically, *AI is purely timesaving*. I *don't feel like it makes me more creative,* it just *saves me an incredible amount of time*. It *doesn't really impact my creativity in any way,* to be honest

Interviewer: right

R3: but when it comes to *writing*, and actually *setting up social media plans* and things like that... it's an *amazing tool that gives me ideas*

Interviewer: Right, it helps in the creative process

R3: yeah, but I think you have to *be a bit careful about where and how you use AI*

Interviewer: right

R3: it's a *sparring partner to develop ideas*, and it's important to *make sure the result doesn't feel AI-generated*

Interviewer: Right, and that in itself require a certain level of creativity too

R3: exactly, it might sound simple, but it really does! It's not like I can just snap my fingers and come up with tones of creative ideas, so *saving that time staring at a blank page by using AI makes totally sense*

Interviewer: right

R3: but it *takes some practice to work with AI as a tool the right way*. You can *never just follow everything it says blindly*

Interviewer: that's an important point right there!

R3: exactly. The point is that you have to *work your way through AI*. You can *see it as a shortcut, but if the shortcut is too short, it usually isn't good enough*.

Interviewer: Very good! You mentioned that you can tell when images are AI-generated right? And even though you have the eyes for it, do you believe other people who might not have the same sight as you would see it?

R3: yeah, *you can easily tell when an image is AI-generated, 100%, no doubt about it*, even today. And *I believe that will be the case for a long time to come*, so it's definitely a huge ongoing process

Interviewer: Ah

R3: I think it'll take a really l*ong time before AI-generated images become fully seamless or indistinguishable*, but then again, the *development is happening insanely fast*

Interviewer: yes indeed

R3: you never know what's around the corner, so I can't be too certain about it either, because I just don't know. But for now, *I don't feel threatened by it*

Interviewer: That's good

R3: It's kind of like it's *some sort of revolution*, right? *It's like an industrial revolution*

Interviewer: interesting interpretation right there

R3: yes, it' quite similar to the Industrial Revolution. Back then, people got new tools, but it didn't mean they had to be afraid to use them. It's the same thing here with AI. Take agriculture, for instance. Suddenly, people started using tractors to make farming more efficient. But that didn't mean the job was done worse, or that humans were replaced by machines. It just meant that someone still had to operate those machines. The tractors couldn't run the field by themselves

Interviewer: exactly

R3: and it's the same way with AI. *AI is a tool*. *It's not a brain that can function in the way that the human brain does, and it never will*

Interviewer: I totally agree! It has been very interesting hearing your thoughts around AI and creativity. So, moving on to kind of wrap things up. What future goals do you have for your creative pursuits? Are there any specific areas you'd like to explore further or skills you want to develop?

R3: Yeah, for me it will probably be a lot about *focusing even more on my own projects and developing my creativity further*, getting that ball rolling a bit more.

Interviewer: right

R3: and *to be creative on my own terms*. It's *important to enjoy the job* you have, to get a *sense of fulfillment and to be satisfied with your own projects*...

Interviewer: That's amazing! And if you could offer any advice to someone just starting their creative journey, what would that be?

R3: That would be, ehm, I'm going to sound so cliché ahha

Interviewer: ahahha no that's fine

R3: but yeah, it's really about *trusting yourself*. *Trust your creativity* and *don't care too much about what everyone else says*. This applied to me even when I studied photography, because some people are incredibly good at the technical stuff or have tons of references and have studied every famous photographer throughout history. And it's important *not to let yourself be intimidated by that*. You shouldn't care too much about it, and instead, *focus on you*

Interviewer: those are some really good advice!

R3: and I also want to add that it's *important not to underestimate all the theoretical and technical aspects of it*, because you're definitely *going to need them* at some point

Interviewer: right

R3: even if you're creative, *you still need to educate yourself and learn the techniques*

Interviewer: absolutely

R3: so, to sum up; *be humble and believe in yourself!*

Interviewer: That's amazing! And with that, we've come to the end of this interview. I think we've had a really grat conversation about AI, how it affects different creative processes, and what it might look like in the future. I want to thank you for your time and wish you the best of luck with all your projects ahead!

R3: Thank you so much and thank you for this nice interview! It's been great! Goodbye

Interviewer: Goodbye!

Appendix 5

Interviewee: R4
Format: Video Call
Language: Norwegian (Translated and transcript to English)
Length: 39 minutes

Introduction to the interview and how it is structured. Warm-up questions

Interviewer: Do you want to start with telling me a bit about how you started your writing journey and how you found that interest?

R4: It basically *started with a very simple task*, where I had to *write freely for 10 minutes without stopping*. I was supposed to write continuously

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: That's how I *discovered* that *my language is like light*, almost like sunlight in a way, *it reveals something specific in the world*. And what I revealed, it was as if *I had no control over it*…

Interviewer: Okey

R4: so, what is it then… it's like *it's not me showing something to someone, but rather that the language is showing me something*. And through that, I discovered that, fundamentally, *it's the language that uses me more than I use the language*. *I am a medium for the language*

Interviewer: Ah I see, exciting! And was there anything beyond that, like someone in your local community who influenced you to start writing, or did you discover it on your own through these writing sessions you talked about?

R4: *I was skeptical about the assignment at first*. It was in a school context. But when we discussed it afterward, it became… It's really *about what I have to say*, or *what I experience*. There's a *very biographical orientation in literature and writing*. But at the same time, it's not so much me who has something to tell, but rather *what the language has to tell*. I've *never felt anything as self-effacing, or "ego-effacing", as writing*. Now, it feels *like a great relief to be able to let go of myself*

Interviewer: Interesting! Is it like you enter a little bubble and forget about time and place?

R4: I would say it's like that in the exact moment I'm writing, or… You know when you're *lost in your own thoughts* and then encounter another person, suddenly you exist in relation to that person; everything you think, everything you say, becomes shaped by that that encounter. In the same way, that's *how it feels for me when I'm writing*.

Interviewer: Interesting comparison! And how often do you write? Do you have any estimate of how much your write in a week?

R4: It's *every day,* up *until the point when I feel full of myself*, when I *need a break*, when *the source*, in a way, *feels empty*

Interviewer: Right, and what is it that motivates you to start writing? Are there certain environments or routines that help you get going, or is it simply a thought that sparks the impulse to write freely?

R4: There has to be a *hunger* there

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: *Like with everything else*. A hunger for people, a hunger for food, *a hunger to write*

Interviewer: I see

R4: When I feel that I have *a creative surplus*, something I believe we are, a creative surplus, in the same way that the sun is a kind of creative surplus, shining and warming the earth.

Interviewer: Okey, and what do you take away from writing? What kind of feelings do you associate with it, and what is it that keeps drawing you back to this creative activity?

R4: It's really about *what I've been shown.* It *starts with a blank page*, and I never know what's going to come. I might *have an idea*, and most of the time, that idea deceived me by *transforming along the way and becoming something else*. And what that something else reveals to me, that's what I'm left with. *It feels like I've gone through a journey of recognition, of realization.* I've come to understand this and that… so what do I do with it? Well, I continue, to see *what more it wants to show me*. Because the next time I open the same document, say I let it sit for a month and then return to it, and *I re-experience what the language showed me, I can see that it has grown*. It's like a seed, or some other form of vegetative growth.

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: I kind of *have to tidy it up*. It has multiplied and branched out, so the text becomes… that's the tricky part where I am now with the writing. I *just have to keep moving forward because the text is never finished*. It's constantly transforming. It's always in motion, so at some point, I just have to let it be and *accept that what's written is written*.

Interviewer: I see. And apropos what you said about reaching a saturation point and then stopping after writing for a while, do you experience writers block? If so, how do you handle it?

R4: When it comes to a standstill?

Interviewer: yes, when the creativity isn't working with you, in a way

R4: Yes, then I just have to *leave it for a while*, and it shows up again when it shows up.

Interviewer: And is there something specific you do to bring it back, or do you simply wait for it to arrive on its own?

R4: I think it has something to do with *rhythm*. I know… I mean, we eat, we consume, and we create. It's a principle that applies to all life. It has to consume other life in order to create and sustain its own. So if *writing is about creativity, then I also need to take something else in*

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: and that can for example be *rest*. *Just like with everything else*

Interviewer: And how do you handle feedback and criticism of your work? Do you send your texts to someone to get feedback on your work?

R4: When I attended *writing scholarly*, there was a lot of feedback from authors and instructors. I handled it… well, in the beginning, you realize you *haven't been exposed to that kind of thing before*. It's like you've always walked around wearing clothes, and suddenly, you're expected to stand there naked. You're being evaluated, and it becomes a bit like « Tell me who I am" It feels very exposing, even when you're not writing about yourself.

Interviewer: I see

R4: It's hard at first, but then you *get used to it*, and now *I've come to understand that it's something that needs help to grow*. It needs multiple caretakers; I can't raise it on my own. I feel like these readers help my text flourish. They understand what I'm trying to… they understand what the language reveals. They see it. They want to help me bring it further into the light and give it more space. And linguistically, it's incredible valuable to have a couple of people like that.

Interviewer: Definitely, and do you feel that this affects your motivation, either in a positive or negative way?

R4: hmm… when it's a clear «yes, yes, yes, we're with you on this», it's like a voice echoing in my head, and then it's just *full speed ahead*.

Interviewer: ahahah exactly! That kind of positive feedback really fuels the fire, right?

R4: ahah yes. But when it stalls and it's more like «no, this and that», then I have to *let it rest again*. I can't just jump right back into it. I need to let it sink and come back to it later.

Interviewer: I see. It's been great hearing more about you and your creative process! I'm really interested in exploring if and how creativity can be influenced by AI. Now that AI has come into the spotlight and become such a current topic, how do you think it will affect our creativity? I'd also love to hear, have you started using AI tools in connection with your writing?

R4: I've basically *used AI just as a source of answers*. For really simple questions. I'm curious about a lot of things around the sun, what the Earth is made of, and much of what science can reveal… *AI can explain quite well how many things work*. It can't say what electricity is or what the sun really is - no one can, really - but when it comes to how they function, science is very strong. And *I see AI basically as a kind of materialization of scientific knowledge as an answer*. I *don't need to consult an expert or go anywhere*. *The scientific foundational knowledge is inside ChatGPT*, and it can answer people's questions about what they're curious about.

Interviewer: I see, so you're using AI more like a tool for research then, if I understood you correctly?

R4: *Yes, exactly*. And for a lot of Greek words, *word explanations*, the etymology of terms I'm not familiar with. It's just *a brilliant, absolutely fantastic tool.*

Interviewer: How would you say your approach has changed since you discovered that ChatGPT is such a fantastic tool?

R4: *My approach has actually changed a lot* based on what others have said. It's not necessarily something that's come entirely from me. Especially my friends who are more involved with AI and that world, particularly in their academic lived. Universities are much more connected to that approach than I am, and that's something that *keeps evolving*. So, I've been told by them that I shouldn't just… well, they talk about *this way of using AI that makes me feel like an innocent user*. It's like they can tell when it works and when it doesn't, and when it tells the truth and when it doesn't.

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: I mean, I feel like *I'm asking it the simple questions,* but yes, it has changed… They've made me a *bit more critical of the answers I get*

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: but the answers are delivered in such *precise and confident way*, so you're inclined to think it's telling the truth. Then my friend tells me that it often just answers that you ask. *It's kind of a people-pleaser*.

Interviewer: ahahah yes indeed, I understand what you mean. So, would you say that you perhaps trusted AI a bit more blindly before you got that feedback from your friends?

R4: Yes, you could say that. *At first, I didn't trust it at all*, but then *I started getting good answers*, and that *created a sort of relationship between me and something that gives me good answers*

Interviewer: Did I understand you correctly when you said that you were a bit more skeptical in the beginning?

R4: Yes, I was really, *terribly skeptical* back then

Interviewer: I underpants, it tend to change the more you use it, and AI just keeps getting more advanced over time, and able to more and more. But there are also any people engaged in creative activities, like writing, who tend to use AI to a greater extent, and for example publish a text that is entirely AI-generated. What do you think about the originality surrounding this.

R4: Ah, um… whether it's original or not… *I find that really difficult to answer, honestly*. I think *it's very interesting as a kind of linguistic phenomenon* - like, *language no longer needs to be expressed through humans*, but rather through this third thing, this human-created AI program, which is now *expressing itself linguistically*. It's like, *language is going completely wild*. How many ways can something even be linguistically expressed? One thing is the reproduction of scientific language, a very recognizable kind of *language that's built on certain premises and assumptions*, like research, and you have to know all of that to be able to call something the truth and blah blah blah

Interviewer: ahhaha

R4: ahah, but when they *give the same software the freedom to be a poetry machine too*, then *my brain kind of short-circuits a bit*!

Interviewer: Yeah, I mean, it's a really complex question when it comes to the originality of AI-produced work! Going back a bit to the idea of another author publishing something entirely AI-generated. How do you think that will affect competition and the market in the future?

R4: I feel like my opinion on that keeps changing all the time. But *as things stand right now*, I think *crime fiction could be replaced*, and a lot of *conceptual poetry* as well. But Chat and AI… *I feel like they are responders, they answer*.

Interviewer: Mhm

R4: «I want something conceptually poetic, this and that» and then AI sets parameters and gives an answer. But *that fundamental sense of wonder, that questioning approach,* this think where *humans have created a kind of oracle through AI,* it *doesn't reflect that wonder and that deeply inquisitive approach to being human*. That, I think… *that lives in what I consider interesting literature*; the classics, the great literary works, and also a lot of lesser-known authors who still carry *that power and that unmistakably human approach*. Um… yeah, no, *I really don't think AI stands a change when it comes to that part of literature*.

Interviewer: Interesting

R4: *Humans can't become transparent to themselves*. AI is, after all, created by humans. There's this kind of blind spot there, something that only *the act of questioning* can touch. That sense of wonder… *AI won't be able to see that in itself*

Interviewer: Exactly, well resonated! So, in other words, you don't think it will affect your profession in the future to the extent that humans are replaced by AI? And that it will mainly be used as a tool, like you mentioned earlier in the research process?

R4: *Yeah*, I *don't think AI is going to replace humans*

Interviewer: That's good! But when you use AI, do you feel it affects your creativity to some extent?

R4: No, it's really *just to get answers to my questions*, and sometimes it can actually *affect my creativity for the worse*. Because that's when *I shut down the wonder and the creative energy I usually* have and It *doesn't get to unfold itself*. I start thinking «Ah, *I need answers to this, and I need it right now*»

Interviewer: Exactly, we tend to get a bit more impatient when we know AI can find the answers to what we're wondering about in just a few seconds.

R4: Yes, absolutely

Interviewer: And just to wrap up, what future goals do you have for your creative pursuits? Are there specific areas you'd like to explore further or skills you want to develop?

R4: It's about finishing… l*etting myself be, letting what I've written stand*. Then rewriting, *trying as best as possible to figure out what life on earth really* is, after how the sun and language reveal themselves. I try to *follow what feels most obvious for me*. The sun lights up the world, it gives warmth, and from the art, stems and bones emerge.

Interviewer: Yeah, right! And if you could give advice to someone who wants to start writing, what would it be?

R4: Remember, it's not you who write

Interviewer: ah, would you like to elaborate on that?

R4: the language is alive, the language is very much alive

Interviewer: Ah okey! Well, thank you so much! We've now gone through all the questions. It's been incredibly exciting to hear more about you, your creative journey, and your thoughts on AI and the future of writing. I want to wish you the best of luck moving forward with your writing and have a great day ahead.

R4: Thank you so much for an enlightening and interesting interview! Have a great day!

Appendix 6

Section 1 – Background and Consent

Hi!
I am writing my master's thesis in Marketing at LUISS University and I want to investigate how generative artificial intelligence (AI) affects everyday creativity and individual perceptions of creativity. This is a qualitative study, which means that the questions are open-ended and focus on your own thoughts and experiences. There are therefore no right or wrong answers.

The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. All responses will be treated anonymously and collectively, in accordance with GDPR and ethical research guidelines.

Thank you so much for your contribution!

Consent *

I hereby consent to the use of my anonymous responses in a master's thesis at LUISS University

- ◯ Yes

Section 2 – Everyday Creativity in Leisure Time

How often do you engage in creative activities during your leisure time? *

(Please select one)

- ◯ Daily
- ◯ Several times a week
- ◯ Once a week
- ◯ Occasionally
- ◯ Rarely
- ◯ Never

How do you define everyday creativity in your life? *

What activities fit into this definition?

What motivates you to engage in creative activities during your leisure time? *

(Select all that apply)

- [ ] Relaxation
- [ ] Self-expression
- [ ] Skill development
- [ ] Social interaction
- [ ] Problem-solving

Other (please specify)

Have you used AI tools in your creative activities? *

(Please select one)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If yes, how do you think using AI influences your creativity? *

Does it enhance or detract from it? Please explain your thoughts.

Do you feel that relying on AI for creative tasks limits your originality? *

Why or why not?

In your opinion, what role should AI play in creative activities? *

Section 3: Experience with AI Tools

Have you used AI tools in any of the following contexts? *

(Select all that apply)

- [ ] Work
- [ ] Education
- [ ] Leisure time
- [ ] I have not used AI tools

Other (please specify)

Where did you first learn about AI tools? *

(Select one)

- ○ School/University
- ○ Workplace
- ○ Online resources/Social media
- ○ Friends/Family

Which AI tools have you used? *

Please specify the tools and the context in which you used them (e.g., work, education, leisure).

For which activity or purpose do you find AI tools most helpful? *

Please explain why.

How has the use of AI tools impacted your efficiency or productivity in your work, studies, or leisure activities? *

Do you believe that AI tools can enhance your creativity? *

Why or why not?

How do you feel about the collaboration between you and AI in your studies, work or leisure time? *

Is it more of a partnership or a tool?

What motivated you to use AI in your work, studies, or leisure activities? *

(Select all that apply)

- [ ] Convenience
- [ ] Efficiency
- [ ] Inspiration
- [ ] Enhanced learning or productivity
- [ ] Access to information and resources
- [ ] Collaboration support
- [ ] Time-saving

Other (please specify)

Section 4: Perceptions of Art

(Image attracted in Appendix 9)

Based on your perception of art, would you categorize the image shown above as art? *

Why or why not?

Section 4: Perceptions of Art

What if I told you that this artwork was created by an AI in under 10 seconds using DALL-E – OpenAI's advanced image generation model? This innovative technology allows for the rapid generation of artwork based on specific prompts, blending creativity and technology in new ways.

Taking this into consideration, how has your evaluation of this image changed?

Do you believe this artwork is original? *

(Select one)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Unsure

How does knowing that this artwork was created by AI affect your perception of it? *

What factors influenced your opinion on whether this is art? *

Do you think AI-generated art can evoke emotions or messages similar to those created by human artists? *

(Select one)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Unsure

*

Please explain your answer

Would you consider displaying or purchasing AI-generated art? *

Why or why not?

Section 5: Demographic Information

Gender? *

- ◯ Female
- ◯ Male
- ◯ Prefer not to say

Age? *

- ◯ Under 18
- ◯ 18 - 24
- ◯ 25 - 34
- ◯ 35 - 44
- ◯ 45 - 54
- ◯ 55 - 64
- ◯ 65 and over

What is your highest level of education completed? *

- ◯ High school diploma or equivalent
- ◯ Some college
- ◯ Bachelor's degree
- ◯ Graduate degree (master, doctor, etc.)
- ◯ Prefer not to say

Field of study/employment? *

Appendix 7

1. **Everyday Creativity and the Creative Process:**
- *Introduction to creativity*
- *Inspiration and support*
- *Creative Pursuit*
- *The learning process*
- *Difficulties in the creative pursuits*
- *Creative block*

2. **Motivation, Joy, and the Therapeutic Effect**
- *Enjoyment*
- *Motivation*
- *The creative space*
- *Emotional benefits*
- *Rituals and environment*
- *Therapeutic effect*
- Feedback
- *Engaging in creative activity*
- *Self-Expressing*

3. **Use of AI tools in the Creative Process**
- *Use of AI*
- *Effect and efficiency of AI*
- *AI's effect on creativity*
- *Approach when using AI*

4. **Perspectives on AI: Tool or Partnership?**
- *Dependence on AI*
- *Tool*
- *Partnership*

- *The role of AI in creativity*
- *Perception of AI*
- *Efficiency*

5. **Originality and Ownership**

- *Independence*
- *Training data*
- *Originality*
- *Ownership*
- *Intellectual property right and ethics*
- *AI generated work*

6. **Artificial Intelligence's Impact on Creative Industry and Future Roles**

- *The current state of AI*
- *Perception of the future of AI*

7. **Value of Human Expression, Subjectivity, and Craftmanship**

- *Consequences of AI*
- *Humanity*
- Subjectivity
- Authenticity
- Skepticism towards AI
- Craftmanship
- Skill development

Appendix 8

NETTSKJEMA

Master Thesis Survey: Everyday Creativity and Artificial Intelligence

How often do you engage in creative activities during your leisure time?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Daily	12	19%	19%
Several times a week	19	30.2%	30.2%
Once a week	7	11.1%	11.1%
Occasionally	16	25.4%	25.4%
Rarely	9	14.3%	14.3%
Never	0	0%	0%

What motivates you to engage in creative activities during your leisure time?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Relaxation	41	65.1%	65.1%
Self-expression	38	60.3%	60.3%
Skill development	37	58.7%	58.7%
Social interaction	27	42.9%	42.9%
Problem-solving	25	39.7%	39.7%

Have you used AI tools in your creative activities?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Yes	45	71.4%	71.4%
No	18	28.6%	28.6%

Have you used AI tools in any of the following contexts?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Work	48	76.2%	76.2%
Education	46	73%	73%
Leisure time	43	68.3%	68.3%
I have not used AI tools	4	6.3%	6.3%

Where did you first learn about AI tools?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
School/University	21	33.3%	33.3%
Workplace	11	17.5%	17.5%
Online resources /Social media	17	27%	27%
Friends/Family	14	22.2%	22.2%

What motivated you to use AI in your work, studies, or leisure activities?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Convenience	39	61.9%	61.9%
Efficiency	54	85.7%	85.7%
Inspiration	28	44.4%	44.4%
Enhanced learning or productivity	31	49.2%	49.2%
Access to information and resources	35	55.6%	55.6%
Collaboration support	15	23.8%	23.8%
Time-saving	53	84.1%	84.1%

Do you believe this artwork is original?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Yes	11	17.5%	17.5%
No	39	61.9%	61.9%
Unsure	13	20.6%	20.6%

Do you think AI-generated art can evoke emotions or messages similar to those created by human artists?

Antall svar: **63**

Svar	Antall	% av svar	Diagram
Yes	37	58.7%	58.7%
No	15	23.8%	23.8%
Unsure	11	17.5%	17.5%

Appendix 9

The photo was generated in Dall-E with the prompt: "*Generate an artwork in the style of Michelangelo, capturing the grandeur and emotional intensity characteristic of his masterpieces. The piece should depict a heroic figure in a dynamic pose, showcasing muscular anatomy and a dramatic expression. Incorporate elements of religious or mythological themes, and use a muted color palette with strong contrasts of light and shadow, reminiscent of Michelangelo's frescoes and sculptures*"

The photo generated by OpenAI's DALL-E that were included in the survey for the participants to evaluate.