



Ethical Implications of Generative AI in Content Creation

Saurabh Rauthan • Y.P. Raiwani

Department of Computer science & Engineering, H.N.B. Garhwal Central University, Srinagar – 246174, India.

*Corresponding Author's Email Id: saurabh.rauthan7@gmail.com

Received: 24.02.2025; Revised: 22.1.2026; Accepted: 23.1.2026

©Society for Himalayan Action Research and Development

Abstract: The rapid advancement of generative AI has revolutionized content creation, enabling the production of high-quality text, images, videos, and music with minimal human intervention. However, this innovation raises significant ethical concerns. This research explores the implications of generative AI in content creation, focusing on issues such as plagiarism, copyright infringement, and the authenticity of creative works. Additionally, it examines the potential for misuse in generating deepfakes, spreading misinformation, and perpetuating biases encoded in AI models. The study investigates the balance between leveraging generative AI for enhancing creativity and maintaining ethical standards to protect intellectual property and societal trust. By analyzing existing regulations and proposing frameworks for responsible AI deployment, this research aims to provide insights into mitigating the risks associated with generative AI while maximizing its benefits. The findings will contribute to shaping policies that promote ethical AI usage in content creation and beyond.

Keywords: Content Creation • Ethical Concerns • Plagiarism • Copyright Infringement • Intellectual Property • Authenticity • Deepfakes • Misinformation.

Introduction

The escalation of AI resources for automated text generation (ATG) has opened the doors to many challenges allied to it. These resources have the capability to create very fine content that seems more like a human which is why their use has become more common at various levels in educational and business organizations and created various social ramifications: What would the situation be if we silence the human voice? And what is the possible way to regulate its use for responsible deployment in public discussion? Through an examination of discussed advancements in AI technologies for ATG, these questions are addressed.

Three main challenges are identified in this paper are as follows

- (1) This hasn't been decided yet which AI is good and which ATG is bad.
- (2) Being a new concept no social media platform has developed policies on ATG.
- (3) The prevailing policies do not cater the need of regulation sufficiently with risks allied

to ATG.

It summarizes that further research is a need of time according to the varying nature of text generated by AI agents prior to the establishment of any universal rules regarding the valid use of AI. Moreover, it discusses that social media organizations are required to form policies about acceptable uses of these agents, and the governments must revisit the legislation that deals with the use of AI.

GPT-3 is 'a third-generation, autoregressive language model that uses deep learning to produce human-like text' acquired by Microsoft recently and accessible for the use of any company and individuals to generate text on higher scales GPT-3 APIs at the cost of approx. \$0.06 per token. Text created by GPT-3's not only mimicked human-written text, but it is also not easy to differentiate it from human-written text. Though traditional bots can be easily recognized by individuals as fake. Besides this anecdotal proof, recent (Marcua and Davis 2019) defined the art creativity, authorship, AI's impact on visual



arts and culture, ethical implications, post humanist values, cognitive aspects, and the integration of AI art into culture. These works collectively contribute to a comprehensive exploration of AI art within broader societal and cultural contexts (Miller 2020).

This Paper highlights the importance of examining AI art within a broader cultural, societal, and technological context. It emphasizes the need to analyze AI art not only for its creative attributes but also for its ethical implications and socio-political impact. The paper advocates for a comprehensive examination of AI art that doesn't just celebrate its creative potential but critically evaluates its ethical dimensions, recognizing its role in shaping cultural values and norms within society.

In this paper, first, we will go into the development of AIs and also the emergence of the moral dilemmas they raise. Secondly, we talk about the new ethical problems that AI agents have brought the paper will shed some light on the problems related to AI art and design. The ethical ramifications of our study are then discussed, along with useful recommendations for handling them in the business and societal spheres and future research objectives.

Material and Methods

Artificial Intelligence rise with sources of their ethical issues

AI has expanded significantly over the past 10 years, demonstrating enormous promise for a variety of sectors and businesses. Some of the main streams of the rise of AI and the sources are discussed below:

Commoditization of user data: An AI agent is created by giving it vast amounts of unstructured data, from which it extracts trends buried in the data and uses a machine learning method to repeat them. For example, when an AI agent is given a lot of discussions from a football fan club, it will learn the common topics of debate in this group and will likely talk about how unjust the past week's match outcome was the AI agent cannot distinguish between good and poor

topics, likely, the talks it has will likely likewise mirror the stereotypes that are frequently present in the material it has been given. The primary thing to remember is that the AI agent will reflect the material that is given to it; therefore, the more content there is, the more subjects it can debate. Because of this reliance on data, a whole industry has emerged to gather and profit from the data that consumers share through their electronic activities. Few authors assert that a new type of capitalism known as surveillance capitalism, which transforms 'data into a core commodity of the internet age' because they are unable to manage the information that is shared about them that people's privacy is at risk.

Algorithmic amplification of biases:

Machine learning techniques are required to convert the ingested data into meaningful input for an AI agent to produce an output. There are two primary categories: supervised approaches, where the algorithm is fed with labelled data, and the second one is unsupervised techniques. In both scenarios, there are ethical concerns if the algorithm reproduces biases in the ingested data due to pre-filtering by the data scientist or from the data itself, and amplifies them. Even in supervised learning bias still exists while it contains a labelling process that frequently includes data pre-filtering. The decision is likely to reflect the data curator's view of reality, which may over-represent some categories in favor of others, reinforcing bias against minorities based on gender, race, and other factors (West et al. 2019). AI agents are assumed to replicate an algorithm that used race as one of its features which flagged black defendants falsely for committing future offenses (at a higher risk) the white defendants were marked at low risk twice.

Dense responsibility for artificial intelligence agents and its outputs:

The primary goal of an AI agent is to get better gradually by optimization of redundant parameters (Burrell 2016; Martin 2019), because it is beyond human capabilities to



comprehend the AI agents converge that came in result from multiple functions. However, opacity in AI is not just from complex machine learning. Shared responsibility across many people involved in design also obscures accountability. When an AI output is unacceptable, it may be unclear who is at fault. Networks of humans, computer programs, and collaborative groups using software blur contributed to an AI agent's creation. The distributed nature of developing these systems complicates determining shared social standards for ethical conduct. Some believe more accountability rests with corporations and designers. As one scholar wrote, companies producing tools with the agency must ensure proper functioning aligned with intentions (Martin 2019). When generating AI systems aimed at addressing social justice, cultural, and individual needs, several ethical considerations come to the forefront as describe Fig 1.

A critical framework for AI art and media

History of AI art and media: Over the years, artists have engaged with AI, starting from the 1970s with pioneers like (Cohen 1970; Elsenaar, and Scha 1994; Cope 1992; Beyls 1985 and Tosa 2005). The period also saw a decline in AI research funding and interest, known as the AI "winters."

In the 1990s and 2000s, advancements in AI research provided artists with more accessible tools to explore human and mechanic behavior. Artists such as (Feingold 1998; Rinaldo 2002; Philippe and Demers; 2007, and Tresset 2012) created robotic works questioning agency, creativity, and expression, laying the groundwork for contemporary AI art's themes.

From the 2000s onwards, artists like (DuBois 2009; Lavigne 2015; Grba 2022), and others delved into generative and interactive works that intersected with AI technologies. They employed NLP, pattern recognition, CV algorithms, and interfaced human experiential learning with ML, exploring human perception and cognitive traits.

Contemporary AI art: Contemporary AI art encompasses diverse creative approaches and technical involvements with ML. Its topics, methodologies, and implications intersect with various disciplines engaged in AI research, facing challenges related to AI's epistemic uncertainties, ethical dilemmas, and socio-political issues. AI art has a complex relationship with the mainstream contemporary art world, experiencing to compromise their artistic values for commercial viability and ownership within the art market.




Fig 1. Ethical issues of ChatGPT.



Critical Framework: The paper delves into the critical framework required for the appreciation of AI art, emphasizing the need for a sophisticated spectatorship attuned to the demands of AI artworks. It draws attention to (Wilson 1995), which recognized the broader implications of artists' engagement with AI beyond technical aspects, exploring themes related to humanity, intelligence, machine limitations, and our role as creators. The approach seeks to assess the main values of AI artworks by acknowledging both strengths and weaknesses, intending a respectful evaluation of creative endeavors while recognizing potential interpretational challenges that could arise from a critical stance. Particularly AI, the framework leverages understanding around the production, presentation, and reception of AI art. This critical platform aims to objectively engage with the discourse of AI art.

New ethic AI challenges created by the use of Artificial Intelligence: Discourse on AI ethics is active as challenges surrounding privacy, bias, and accountability in machine outputs continue seeking solutions, and new considerations have emerged alongside advances for autonomous technologies such as language models. (Floridi et al., 2018) has argued on

- 1) Machines enabling widespread deception and misinformation at scale
- 2) AI aiding the mass generation of low-quality yet plausible content, and
- 3) Technology lessening direct engagement between involved parties.

Disinformation and mass manipulation from AI agents:

It is evident from research that during all these events disinformation was spread mainly by AI bots (Scorici et al 2024). To analyze the AI art approach style transfer, deep fakers, miscellaneous, text and music has been used as components to get students response. The graph shows the students responses that were created by AI. Fig 2 also shows that students can easily recognize art AI compare to deep fakers, text and music.




Fig 2: Student responses to Created by AI or Not activity

(Source: Ali et al (2021))

Given the capacity that these AI agents have to generate texts that argue with the same ease, the ability to prepare an agenda via disinformation and false narrative building increases. Such as an organization can utilize AI agents to make people believe made-up

stories about the positivity of their CSR by advertising their products as green and also the same agents are used by hostile organizations to run a negative campaign about competitors. **AI as an agents of massive low-quality but credible content production:**



AI agents are able to create write-ups, stories, and short essays, or imitate a different writing style (Elkins and Chun 2020), which looks like well-crafted, and balanced content. While the same content if examined by an expert can turn out as inaccurate and of low quality. It occurs when AI text agents are trained to utilize large documents which are considered equally important, learn from the most frequent patterns in the data, and repeat them based on quantity rather than quality. Just a specialist in business ethics would comprehend that the content is of poor quality, while another reader may be dazzled by the great composing look and feel, despite the bad quality argument. For instance, assuming that an AI agent was to compose a very elegantly composed piece, referring to a hypothesis and calculated system misattributed to a creator, just a specialist in business ethics who is familiar with that hypothesis and structure would see the misattribution.

Diminishing role of direct communication between stakeholders:

As a consequence of this phenomenon of the generation of text by AI agents, it is assumed that the internal communication and trust of stakeholders will be diminished which is necessary at many phases. The quantity of work and simplification of the process will make it too direct that the communication of stakeholders for the creation of text might be outsourced, without considering the genuineness of the information and accountability. Recent research has proved that as AI agents become more ubiquitous and autonomous, there may be more chances of opacity of accountability between computers and humans. Similarly, AI text agents may make it ambiguous about the originator of the text. However, GPT-3 and some other AI agents are more than just conduits for communication between humans (Orr and Davis 2020), they are swiftly changing the text generated utilizing our inputs. Another perception about human-machine communication that may not be discussed

vastly is that the intentionality and responsibilities of a given action will so far stay in human hands (Murray et al 2020).

There is another situation where the corporation uses an AI agent for its CSR communication. Thus, an indirect communication that took place earlier becomes a direct communication for which the text is generated by an AI agent. This is referred to as a 'mediation problem', and may have two aspects to create ethical problems in the business world. First, the chances of misunderstanding increase. Second, a decline in trust between stakeholders. The human voice gets restrained as AI agents create the response automatically and carry on the communication (Illia 2022). This ultimately demands extending the current discourse on the ways AI bots take their part in shaping social realities (Wexler 2017), specifically, when it comes to the media landscape nowadays through selective exposure of information and perception building, it increases polarization and populist discourse.

Result and Discussion

This is one approach that the developers of AI agents might pursue; it might prove as the first step to partially resolve false agendas. AI agents can successfully restrict polarizing and radicalize communication, at the very least. (Zuboff 2019) refers to 'surveillance capitalism', where online search firms can accumulate the personal information of their users (Morgan 2018). People perceptions could be easily manipulated through the discussion of polarization on social media and the risk of radicalization of political discussions. This concept is evident from different researchers also (Morgan 2018).

However, there are more than one approach to integrating honesty with the AI agents. This might not solve the whole problem but at least minimize the issue. This might also lead the art and media into a right direction. A right direction and a path would be given to the children in the field of Art and the Media.



School curriculum must be regulated that help in solving these concerns particularly in the field of Art and the media.

Recommendations and Future research

The paper highlights the intricate relationship between ethical integrity and professional success for artists engaged in AI art. It underscores how AI art reflects artists' ethical decisions within a landscape shaped by the convergence of art, science/technology, cultural trends, and socio-political influences. As the content used by AI agents is hard to identify as being highly sophisticated (Niazi 2025), It will not be an easy task to manage by a single organization (i.e. government) at a specific platform. These issues will require a combination of actions and regulating multiple organizations and platforms as discussed in the paper.

References

- Ali S, Di Paola D, Lee I, Sindato V, Kim G, Blumofe R & Breazeal C (2021). Children as creators, thinkers and citizens in an AI-driven future. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, 100040
- Beyls P (1985). Creativity and computation. Tracing attitudes and motives. *FISEA 93 Proceedings*.
- Burrell J (2016). *How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms*. *Big Data & Society*, 3(1), 1–12.
- Cohen H (1970). *The further exploits of AARON, painter*. Stanford University AI Lab Memo.
- Cope D (1992). On algorithmic representation of musical style. In *Understanding music with AI: perspectives on music cognition* (pp. 355-363).
- DuBois P (2009). *Playground (Algorithmic Video Installation)* [Art installation]. Exhibited at bitforms gallery, New York, NY.
- Elkins K & Chun J (2020). Can GPT-3 pass a writer's Turing test?. *Journal of Cultural Analytics*, 5(2).
- Elsenaar, A., & Scha, R. (1994). *Electric Body Manipulation as Performance Art: A Historical Perspective*. *Leonardo Music Journal*, 4, 17–22.
- Feingold K (1998). *Head* [Interactive robotic installation]. In *Ken Feingold: Artificial Selves*. Retrieved from <http://www.kenfeingold.com/>.
- Floridi L, Cowls J, Beltrametti M, Chatila R, Chazerand P, Dignum V, ... & Vayena E (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and machines*, 28(4), 689-707.
- Grba D (2022). Deep else: A critical framework for ai art. *Digital*, 2(1), 1-32.
- Illia L (2022). *AI-mediated communication and the ethics of automation in organizational contexts*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(3), 685–698.
- Lavigne J (2015). *The Aesthetics of Machine Learning Art*. *Leonardo*, 48(3), 245–252.
- Marcua A & Davis J (2019). *Artificial Intelligence and the Arts: Toward Computational Creativity and Cultural Integration*. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 18(3), 310–328.
- Martin K (2019). *Designing ethical algorithms*. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 18(2), 129–142.
- Miller A I (2020). *The Artist in the Machine: The World of AI-Powered Creativity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Morgan J (2018). *The impact of social media algorithms on political polarization and radicalization*. *Journal of Media Ethics*, 33(4), 187–200.
- Murray Ross (2020) "The Perceived Ethics of Artificial Intelligence," *Markets, Globalization & Development Review*: Vol. 5: No. 2, Article 3.
- Niazi M (2025). How Do Current AI Regulations Shape the Global Governance Framework?.



- Orr W & Davis J L (2020). Attributions of ethical responsibility by Artificial Intelligence practitioners. *Information, Communication & Society*, 23(5), 719-735.
- Philippe F & Demers L (2007). *The Blind Robot* [Interactive robotic artwork]. Presented at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, Montreal, Canada.
- Rinaldo K (2002). *Autopoiesis* [Interactive robotic sculpture]. In *Art and Artificial Life International Exhibition*, Kiasma Museum of Contemporary Art, Helsinki.
- Scorici G, Schultz M D & Seele P (2024). Anthropomorphization and beyond: conceptualizing humanwashing of AI-enabled machines. *AI & society*, 39(2), 789-795.
- Tosa N, Matsuoka S, Ellis B, Ueda H & Nakatsu R (2005). Cultural computing with context-aware application: ZENetic computer. In *International Conference on Entertainment Computing* (pp. 13-23). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Heidelberg.
https://doi.org/10.1007/11558651_2.
- Tresset P (2012). *Paul the Robot: A Portrait Drawing System*. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Creativity and Cognition* (pp. 361–362).
- West S M, Whittaker M & Crawford K (2019). *Discriminating systems: Gender, race and power in AI*. AI Now Institute, New York University. Retrieved from <https://ainowinstitute.org/discriminating-systems.html>.
- Wexler R (2017). *When a computer program keeps you in jail: How computers are harming criminal justice*. *Yale Law Journal Forum*, 127, 134–145.
- Wilson S (1995). Artificial intelligence research as art. *Stanford Humanities Review*, 4(2), 171-186.
- Zuboff S (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.