THESIS

MEDIA PORTRAYAL OF AI-GENERATED ART AS POSSESSING OR LACKING CULTURAL CAPITAL

Submitted by

Anatoly Samsonov

Department of Journalism and Media Communication

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Science

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer, 2024

Master's Committee:

Advisor: David Wolfgang

Rosa Mikeal Martey

Thomas R. Dunn

ABSTRACT

MEDIA PORTRAYAL OF AI-GENERATED ART AS POSSESSING OR LACKING CULTURAL CAPITAL

This study explores the media portrayal of AI-generated art through the conceptual frameworks of Pierre Bourdieu's cultural capital and framing theory within communication studies. By conducting a qualitative textual analysis of media articles, the thesis seeks to understand the discourse surrounding AI-generated art and its perceived cultural value. Focusing on significant media reactions to pivotal AI-generated artworks sold at high-profile auctions and awarded in competitions, the research investigates how these artworks are framed in terms of possessing or lacking cultural capital. The study shows that in the media texts, art created by generative AI is presented as possessing aspects of each of Bourdieu's forms of cultural capital – institutionalized, objectified, and embodied – as well as economic capital. However, the possession of each form of capital is contested, which provides an equal representation of the opinions of supporters and opponents of AI-generated art, alongside the absence of the dominant perspective in the texts studied. The study aims to contribute to broader discussions on the integration of technology into societal frameworks, addressing the implications on legal, ethical, and cultural perceptions and the development of AI technologies in the art world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies, especially in the last few years, has raised concerns among policy makers, academics and the general public. Understanding the place of technology in society, its opportunities, threats and prospects will enable the development of legal and ethical frameworks that will enable the safe and ethical development and use of AI technologies. Concerns about AI are related to the potential loss of jobs, unequal competition, and revaluation of human labor (AbuMusab, 2023).

AI is a branch of computer science that aims to create systems that can perform tasks that normally require human intelligence, such as learning, reasoning, problem solving, perception and language comprehension. AI technology is based on the principle of mimicking human cognitive processes using algorithms and data. Machine learning is used for this purpose, where systems learn and improve based on experience without being explicitly programmed. Advanced AI systems use deep learning, a subset of machine learning, that uses multi-layer neural networks to analyze vast amounts of data, allowing these systems to perform complex tasks such as image and speech recognition, natural language processing, and decision-making (Russell & Norvig, 2010).

The specific interest for this study is the rhetoric around AI image generation as a particular technology. In this study, the term AI generated art applies to images created in whole or in part using any AI image generators that employ a sophisticated machine learning algorithm called artificial neural networks (ANN) to create new images. Text-to-image generative frameworks allow users to generate images based on text. These frameworks utilize deep learning models that have been pre-trained on large magnitudes of data (Liu et al., 2022). This project considers the materials about images created in whole or in part using such forms of

generative AI. The word "art" is applied here in the context where these AI generated images are presented alongside other human-made artworks, for example in competitions and awards, and are also involved in the activities of institutions and organizations whose activities are related to various forms of art, such as museums, galleries, and auctions.

Members of the creative communities are demanding an ethical and legal framework for the development and use of generative AI technologies. Several lawsuits, as well as fundraising to protect the interests of the creative community, striking screenwriters (2023 Writers Guild of America strike) and actors (2023 SAG-AFTRA strike), show the demand for social change brought about by generative AI. As a result of the changes initiated, regulations such as the Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence (OMB, 2023) are already emerging to provide security controls and ethical frameworks for AI technologies under development.

The researcher, who is a photographer and graphic designer, but at the same time explores the possibilities of generative AI image creation, understands the concerns of the members of the artistic field. However, for the benefit of this study, he tries to minimize the impact of his biases and preferences in order to try to better understand the place of generative AI in the artistic field and its role in social structures.

While we can see news about millions of generated images that were published, AI-generated artworks are sold at auctions and receive prestigious awards, the value of generated content and the technology itself for creativity remains uncertain. The audience is forced to look for reference points and understand whether the work created by generative AI has some cultural weight, whether it is significant and worthy of attention, in other words, whether it possesses cultural capital.

The concept of cultural capital by Pierre Bourdieu explains how accumulated labor, skills and knowledge are standardized and legitimized in society through institutionalization. Cultural capital has the same properties as economic capital - it can be accumulated, transferred, and transformed into economic capital in the form of money or property rights (Bourdieu, 2018). Bourdieu sought to determine what constitutes art by delving deep into the sociological mechanisms that govern the art world. His approach was fundamentally rooted in his theories of fields, capital, and habitus. Bourdieu argued that art cannot be understood solely through its intrinsic qualities but must be viewed within the context of the cultural field that confers upon it value and meaning. He posited that what is considered art is determined by the structures of power and authority within this field, which includes artists, institutions, galleries, critics, and consumers. These agents and institutions compete for cultural capital and thereby influence what is recognized and legitimized as art. Undoubtedly, the question of what constitutes art is rhetorical, and it is impossible to define clear criteria for whether or not a piece is art. This project uses the notion of cultural capital and its presence or absence as a measure to seek to understand better whether AI-generated art could be categorized as "art."

Thus, in order to understand how the audience evaluate AI-generated art's cultural value, it is necessary to refer to the processes by which media shapes public opinion. This is where the framing theory comes in, which posits that the way that information is reported can significantly influence how the audience perceives it (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). Based on this, we assume that when the media shapes perceptions of AI technologies, it begins to act as an institution that determines whether AI-generated artworks possess cultural capital.

This led to the research question: How does media framing depict AI-generated art as either possessing or lacking cultural capital?

The aim of the project is to analyze the discourse of media articles and understand how they define the place of AI-generated art in culture and society. As material for the study, the project use articles about key events with AI generated art such as the first sales of AI generated art at Christie's "The Portrait of Edmond Belamy" in 2018 and Sotheby's "Memories of Passersby I" in 2019, the award winning AI-generated artwork "Theatre D'opera Spatial" at the Colorado State Fair in 2022, the accretion of "Pseudomnesia: The Electrician." with Sony World Photography Award in 2023 and subsequent events such as the inability to register a copyright for these art pieces and rejection of the award as well as articles discussing the phenomenon of AI image generation technology and its possible implications on the art industry in general. Since the topic is on the border of art and technology some thematic media are considered alongside national and local media. A total of 65 articles from 14 media were selected: New York Times, The Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, CNN, USA Today, ABC News, The Guardian, Bloomberg, The Denver Post, ArsTechnica, Wired, ArtNews, ArtNet, and The Art Newspaper.

This study conducted a qualitative textual analysis on texts of these articles to define the language used to describe AI-generated artworks and the technology itself, and it’s framing effect on shaping the image of AI-generated art. The ability of textual analysis to look beyond manifest content and include analysis of subtext, context, and assumptions (Fursich, 2009) gives the opportunity for elucidating the role of these texts in the broader process of meaning-making and construction of the discourse of generative AI.

The significance of the project lies in a better understanding of the role of technology in society, taking into account the perspectives and concerns of all parties involved, that can lead to a more ethical use and development of artificial intelligence technologies. Given the

interdisciplinary nature of the topic, the research can contribute insights to multiple fields, including media studies, art history, cultural studies, and computer science. It can foster cross-disciplinary dialogues and collaborations. In addition, this study can add to the growing body of empirical data on the perception and appreciation of art created by generative AI. These data are of value to researchers wishing to understand the broader implications of generative AI in creative fields.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) in art has sparked intense debates and discussions. While AI's capabilities to mimic and, at times, innovate upon human creativity have been demonstrated, there remains palpable skepticism and nervousness among audiences (Gray & Wegner, 2012). Questions arise about generative AI's genuine ability to create its role in domains traditionally reserved for human expression (Hong, 2018) and the ethical implications of its involvement in such areas (Lima et al., 2021). These reservations and prejudices, as research suggests, might stem from a myriad of sources: a fundamental misunderstanding of generative AI's nature and capabilities, a lack of comprehensive information about its workings, or even the context and language used when presenting AI-generated content (Ragot et al., 2020).

Public understanding of AI is primarily shaped by mass media. For this project, the choice of specific media for the analysis was driven by a strategic focus on mainstream media publications due to their authority and power of persuasion. Meanwhile, it is necessary to acknowledge that public understanding of AI technologies is also significantly shaped by people's use of it, especially on social media, which is out of the project's scope. However, mainstream publications were selected for the study because they target a broad and diverse audience, unlike social media, which often targets segmented audiences with already established biases or specialized interests. This broad reach is critical to understanding how art created by artificial intelligence is perceived by different segments of society, including those who may not have an active interest in the latest technological trends in the arts.

Although news coverage plays a significant role in informing the public about AI's entails, capabilities, and implications for society, there has been a notable lack of research

focusing on how media discourse contributes to the formation of public concepts of AI. Concurrently, media narratives tend to fluctuate dramatically between two extremes: on one end, an idealistic vision of a future marked by unparalleled convenience and immortality, and on the other, a dystopian scenario featuring a rebellion of robots and the apocalypse (Cave & ÓhÉigeartaigh, 2019).

While the benefits of AI are clear, significant uncertainty and debate persist around its role, encompassing both its potential societal impact and the approaches for regulating and advancing AI systems. News coverage plays a significant role in fostering a dynamic and essential public dialogue about this evolving issue (Jensen et al., 2017). Consequently, there is a pressing need to deepen our understanding of how AI is discussed in the news: this includes examining public narratives, as well as the hopes, expectations, and fears surrounding AI.

Numerous high-profile events around generative AI technologies form a discourse and influence the perception and development of the technology. The first sale of a generated image at Christie's for nearly 45 times its high estimate (Christie's, 2018), an open letter from tech leaders and researchers asking all AI labs to stop research for at least six months to prepare legal and ethical frameworks (Future of Life Institute, 2023), and the creation of the President Biden's Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence (OMB, 2023) create a certain informational background, often related to concerns about the potential impact of AI on societal change. As with other new technologies and phenomena, there is a violation of the discourse around this topic. Despite the fact that many experts note the overblown and overestimated importance of AI technologies currently in existence (Leaver & Srdarov, 2023), the narratives found in the media are becoming increasingly extreme and even compare the danger of AI to nuclear weapons (Bohannon, 2015).

In terms of the potential risk associated with AI in the context of image generation technologies, we consider the concerns of professional artists and illustrators. However, the disruption caused by AI technology in general may spread to a wider audience, because among the potential risks from the widespread use of AI the replacement of human labor by machine labor and the consequent emergence of a large number of unemployed are mentioned first of all (Korinek & Stiglitz, 2018).

Members of the creative communities are demanding an ethical and legal framework for the development and use of AI technologies. Several lawsuits, as well as fundraising to protect the interests of the creative community, striking screenwriters and actors, show the demand for social change brought about by generative AI. As a result of the changes initiated, regulations such as the Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence are already emerging to provide security controls and ethical frameworks for AI technologies under development. However, the value of AI-generated content and the technology itself for creativity remains uncertain.

Perception of AI-generated content

Various experiments have been conducted to understand the human perception of AI-generated art and the biases associated with it. Hong (2018) explored the biases in the perception of art produced by artificial intelligence. The results indicated that while participants could appreciate the aesthetic qualities of AI-generated art, they were hesitant to label it as "art" in the traditional sense, often questioning its authenticity and originality. Moruzzi (2020) delved into the perception of creative AI, and the study highlighted that participants acknowledged AI's potential in the creative domain but felt that AI "can" be creative but perhaps "shouldn't" be. This sentiment emphasized concerns about AI's role in traditionally human domains.

Gangadharbatla (2022) found that participants often struggled to accurately pinpoint AI-generated artwork, frequently associating representational art with human creators and abstract renditions with machines. Moreover, the study identified a significant interaction between attribution knowledge and the nature of the artwork (be it representational or abstract) which influenced overall artwork evaluations.

Of particular interest is the research on the influence of AI on the perception of art. Focusing on anthropomorphic perception of AI systems researchers emphasize the narrative constructed around AI-generated art, where AI is often imbued with human-like characteristics (Epstein et al., 2020). For instance, Obvious's press release and Christie's promotional materials frequently used anthropomorphic language, suggesting that the AI "created" the art and emphasizing its autonomy and agency. Such framing underscores the paper's central theme: how the narrative constructed around AI-generated art influences perceptions of credit and responsibility. The anthropomorphic framing of AI, as suggested by the paper, plays a crucial role in shaping public discourse and perceptions about AI's capabilities and the boundaries of human and machine collaboration in creative domains.

These experiments collectively underscore the multifaceted nature of human perception when confronted with AI-generated art, revealing a complex interplay of appreciation, skepticism, and ethical considerations. In the literature reviewed, a diverse array of theoretical frameworks has been employed to understand the human perception of AI-generated art. These frameworks, ranging from cognitive to sociocultural, have provided valuable insights into the multifaceted nature of how AI-generated art is received and evaluated. However, a notable gap persists in the exploration of the impact of language and the framing of AI-generated art. The

way AI-generated art is presented, described, and contextualized can significantly influence its perception, yet this aspect remains largely uncharted in existing studies.

Extant research has mainly focused on human – AI moral relations and biases towards AI capability to produce art and their implications on AI-generated images perception. While it has shown that a relationship certainly exists, it has not robustly shown how language framing affected human perception of AI-generated content and what kind of stimuli elicit an emotional response from the audience.

The study of the rhetoric around the topic of artificial intelligence is most relevant due to the development of this technology in recent years and the consequent multiple increase in the number of published materials (Fast & Horvitz, 2017). Quantitative language studies show the distribution and development of the main themes found in descriptions of AI technologies such as: an imagination, a commercial product and a field of scientific research, while negative reports expressed ethical concerns towards AI (Zhai et al., 2020).

In general, the research considers AI technologies broadly, while we want to focus on perception of AI image generating technologies. As described earlier, human perception of AI-generated art is a complex interplay of appreciation, skepticism, and ethical concerns. As AI's capabilities in generating visually compelling images become increasingly evident, the human perception of such creations remains a topic of intense debate and introspection. While often observers can't tell if the artwork was created by humans or by AI (Ragot et al., 2020; Gangadharbatla, 2022), they recognize and even admire the aesthetic qualities of AI-generated images. However, there is a palpable hesitancy in acknowledging these creations as "art" in the classical sense (Hong, 2018). This reluctance is not merely a matter of semantics but delves deeper into our understanding of what constitutes creativity, originality, and artistic intent.

In the absence of the ability to distinguish between AI-generated content and human-generated content, the audience is forced to look for reference points and understand whether the work created by AI has some cultural weight, whether it is significant and worthy of attention, in other words, whether it possesses cultural capital.

Cultural capital

Pierre Bourdieu argues that it is impossible to explain the structure and functioning of the social world, unless we turn again to capital in all its forms, not just the one recognized by economic theory (Bourdieu, 2018). The concept of capital, its preservation and accumulation, explain the principles of preservation and reproduction of the regularities of the social world. Bourdieu equates capital and power, the different forms of which change into one another.

According to Bourdieu (2018) depending on its operational context and subject to various transformations that are necessary for its effectiveness in a specific field, capital can manifest in three primary forms: as economic capital, which can be readily and directly converted into money and may be institutionalized through property rights; as cultural capital, which under certain conditions can be transformed into economic capital and may be institutionalized through academic qualifications; and as social capital, consisting of social networks and connections, which, in certain situations, can be converted into economic capital and may be institutionalized through titles of nobility.

Cultural capital is the non-financial social assets agents possess, which promote social mobility beyond economic means. It can exist in three forms: in the embodied state, in the form of the accumulation of valuable knowledge, attitudes, and skills possessed by an agent; in the objectified state, in the form of cultural goods (pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.), which are the trace or realization of theories or critiques of these theories,

problematics, etc.; and in the institutionalized state, a form of the societal recognition and validation of cultural competencies and knowledge (Bourdieu, 2018). This form of capital is crucial for legitimizing an individual's embodied cultural capital, such as skills and knowledge, thereby acknowledging their cultural competencies within social and institutional contexts. Such legitimization is particularly significant in societies where formal educational qualifications frequently dictate access to higher social positions. Moreover, institutionalized cultural capital can often be directly converted into economic capital, thereby contributing to the perpetuation of social inequalities. Additionally, by institutionalizing cultural capital, societies create standardized measures of cultural competencies. This standardization allows for the comparability of qualifications across different individuals and institutions. Bourdieu also highlighted that this form of cultural capital plays a pivotal role in the reproduction of social structures, often reinforcing existing social inequalities due to the more accessible acquisition of prestigious educational qualifications by those from privileged backgrounds (Bourdieu, 2018).

Bourdieu views the cultural capital of art objects as being generated by elites and contributing to their class cohesion, however, subsequent studies have noted that this relationship works differently – the presence of elites as direct participants and creators of art makes it valuable and elitist (Ostrower, 1998). Based on this statement, we can assume that the exclusion of traditional representatives of the art world from the creative process and its democratization through the use of generative AI technologies causes a reassessment of the importance of the generated content and technology in general, debates about whether they possess cultural capital and how this capital will now be formed.

Since AI technology is new, the "experts" are not yet defined, and various institutions such as museums, media, journalists, artists, auctions, prizes, etc. act as determinants of the

presence or absence of cultural capital. The rhetoric of these institutions varies considerably, showing the range of descriptions of AI image generating technologies from a convenient tool for creativity, to an art-destroying, unethical technology trained on millions of copyrighted images used without permission.

The value of cultural capital lies in its ability to empower individuals to navigate social contexts more effectively, thereby enhancing their capacity to influence and accrue benefits within a particular social structure. Pursuing cultural capital is valuable as it enables one to gain a competitive advantage in social and professional arenas. It often leads to better social positioning and can be crucial for career advancement, particularly in fields where social networks and cultural knowledge are key (Prieur & Savage, 2013).

For the creator or owner of something that embodies cultural capital, the value extends beyond mere economic benefits. It includes prestige, recognition, and the power to influence cultural tastes and norms. This influence can further perpetuate the social and economic advantages associated with high cultural capital, thereby reinforcing social hierarchies and power dynamics. Therefore, cultural capital is not just an asset for individual mobility; it also plays a crucial role in the perpetuation and evolution of cultural hierarchies and societal norms (Bourdieu, 2018).

Prestigious awards and institutions like auction houses such as Christie’s and Sotheby’s are pivotal in the realm of art, including AI-generated art, for several reasons related to cultural capital. Awards play a significant role in the accumulation and recognition of cultural capital. They serve as public affirmations of the value and quality of an individual's or an entity's work within a cultural field. Winning a prestigious award not only brings recognition and prestige to the recipient but also often leads to wider visibility and increased opportunities. In the context of

cultural capital, these awards are symbolic tokens that validate an individual's or a group's cultural contributions, effectively enhancing their status and influence within the cultural and social hierarchy. They act as markers of distinction, setting apart the recipients as noteworthy and influential within their domain (English, 2002).

Auction houses such as Christie's and Sotheby's are established authorities in the art world, and their endorsement or involvement in the sale or exhibition of artwork confers legitimacy and value. Additionally, these institutions act as gatekeepers, determining what is considered valuable and worthy of attention in the art world (Throsby, 1994; Eller, 2006). Their appraisal and presentation of AI-generated art can play a crucial role in shaping the narrative around this new medium, potentially elevating it to a status comparable to traditional art forms. The involvement of these institutions in the sale and exhibition of AI-generated art can directly impact the market value and desirability of such pieces, thereby influencing the economic aspect of cultural capital associated with this emerging genre.

Thus, we can now observe a process where different institutions will determine the presence or absence of cultural capital and cultural legitimacy of generative AI art through their statements. This project aims to add to the existing literature with a qualitative study of how media framing will determine the presence or absence of cultural capital and cultural legitimacy in generative AI art.

Perception of generative AI as a technology

In the realm of understanding audience perceptions of AI image generation technologies, a foundational step is to delve into the perception of Artificial Intelligence as a technology. The way AI is presented, described, and contextualized plays a pivotal role in shaping how audiences perceive not just the content it produces, but the very essence of the technology itself. Central to

this is the concept of framing theory, which posits that the manner in which information is packaged and presented can profoundly influence how it is interpreted and understood (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). The term "framing" for that research imply both (a) cognitive processes of information filtering and interpretation that help individuals make sense of cues in complex environments, and (b) social processes where actors purposefully use language to influence others' interpretation of objects and events, and ultimately change their behavior (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014).

Frames shape the news context, provide content, and suggest what the story is about through selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration. Frames in the media manifest themselves as the presence or absence of keywords, common phrases, images, sources of information and links between them, and sentences that are grouped together to reinforce certain themes (Entman, 1993). Frames emphasize the importance of particular pieces of information by including certain elements of text, placing them, or repeating them (Entman, 1993). For example, recent research on the effects of message structure and content in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic found that gain-framed messages (messages that emphasize the benefits or the positive outcomes that are accrued through adopting the behavior) were more effective in generating motivation to engage in self-care behaviors while loss-framed messages (messages that pointing at the negative consequences or costs incurred by not adopting the recommended behavior) might be more effective in increasing risk perception (Gantiva et al., 2021).

Another illustrative example of the influence of framing on audience perceptions and attitudes is the study by Nisbet (2009) that discusses how framing climate change as a public health issue, rather than solely an environmental or scientific issue, can influence public support

for climate policies. This framing makes the issue more relatable and urgent by highlighting the direct impact on human health.

Framing theory has been widely used to study the role of media as a social construction of issues in society. Several studies of the impact of media framing have shown a strong correlation between how news is reported and how audiences react to the issues being framed. A study by Merolla et al. (2013) shows how news framing that emphasizes the economic implications of immigration can lead to different attitudes compared to frames that emphasize cultural or legal aspects. This difference in framing can sway public opinion towards more restrictive or more welcoming immigration policies.

In broader context, framing interacts with ideological and structural processes that are influenced by journalists, their news organizations, and sources (Gitlin, 2003). Meanwhile, news sources have a significant influence on news production (Berkowitz 1992). Political, social, and commercial organizations influence the creation of news and consciously use resources to shape frames. Gamson (1988) refers to this with the term "frame sponsorship". As a result of this process, framing occurs through the combined influence of the medium, in other words the framers, and other stakeholders. For instance, Gamson and Modigliani's (1989) research on media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power showed how heavy media attention to the Three Mile Island events caused a decline in support for nuclear power and a subsequent rebound when media interest in the topic waned. At the same time, Entman and Rojecki (1993) showed how media support for the government's nuclear program and criticism of the anti-nuclear movement reduced the movement's pressure on the ruling elites and reduced the influx of new protesters.

The direct mentioning of actors in frames, also has an impact on information perception. An interesting observation regarding the perception of nanotechnology risks depending on the use of frames referring to actors involved in the process of risk creation. Participants in an experiment conducted by Schütz and Wiedemann (2008) who received messages containing a frame referring to large multinational enterprises rated the likelihood of nanotechnology risks higher than participants who received messages with the frame "small or medium-sized enterprises". Thus, frames containing social characteristics of these actors may influence risk perceptions and judgments, although these characteristics are not directly related to risk.

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of using framing as a theoretical framework to investigate the impact of technology description on audience perception. Previous studies reason that people learn about certain technologies that cannot be directly experienced and observed and interpret and construct their opinions mainly based on information from the media, which in turn is based on certain frames used to describe the technology (Donk et al., 2012; Einsiedel, 1992). Frames significantly influenced the psychological importance of adopters attached to specific attributes of the technology. This suggests that subtle changes in content framing can significantly alter technology perceptions and influence its adoption rate over time (Vishwanath, 2009). Past research has demonstrated that an actor's personal interests heavily influence framing, and it achieves the greatest impact when the presentation aligns with the audience's perspectives and feelings (Garud & Rappa, 1994; Kaplan, 2008).

Given the influential role of framing in shaping perceptions of complex technologies, as noted in previous studies, it serves as a critical theoretical framework for examining audience understanding of AI. The framing allows a more nuanced exploration of how AI is presented and

contextualized, directly affecting audience acceptance and attitudes toward this emerging technology.

The project aims to analyze the discourse of articles and understand how they define the place of AI-generated art in culture and society to answer the research question:

RQ: How does media framing depict AI-generated art as either possessing or lacking cultural capital?

CHAPTER 3. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative textual analysis methodology to examine selected texts to identify and understand the discourse surrounding the cultural capital of AI-generated art. This approach involves a detailed examination of language patterns, thematic elements, and descriptive terms used in various publications to articulate the presence or absence of cultural capital in AI-generated art. By focusing on the nuances of frames in the selected texts, this method allows for an in-depth exploration of how different media perceive and value AI-generated art.

In the context of this project, the choice of specific media outlets to analyze was driven by a strategic focus on mainstream media publications; this choice was primarily due to their authority and power of persuasion. Unlike social media, which often targets segmented audiences with already established biases or specialized interests, mainstream media targets a broad and diverse audience. This broad reach is critical to understanding how art created by artificial intelligence is perceived by different segments of society, including those who may not have an active interest in the latest technological trends in the arts.

Mainstream media tend to approach content more rigorously, analyzing it in depth and often adhering to higher journalistic standards. This gives their content a level of authority that can significantly influence public opinion and political debate - factors that are very important when considering the impact of AI on cultural norms and values.

It is important to note that the selected media are likely to be accessed by agents of the art sector, such as curators, artists, art critics, and representatives of key cultural institutions such as museums, galleries, and auction houses. These agents play a crucial role in the distribution and recognition of cultural capital in the art world. By interacting with the content of authoritative

mainstream publications, these stakeholders encounter and react to AI art narratives, which can influence their decisions and actions regarding the acceptance and integration of AI-created works into established artistic structures, endowing or depriving them of cultural capital.

Thus, focusing on mainstream media allows the project to capture a more representative and influential discourse around AI-created art and gain insight into how this new form is potentially reshaping the cultural landscape and how it is being integrated into canonical standards governed by significant art institutions.

The primary texts chosen for study were articles about specific AI-generated images sold at auction or that won prestigious awards. Thus, seven key art pieces or projects created using AI, as well as lawsuits against AI companies and events related to them, were selected.

The first is an AI-generated image, "A Recent Entrance to Paradise," created in 2012 by computer scientist Stephen Thaler. The U.S. copyright office denied two applications for registration on the basis that the work lacked the necessary human authorship to support a copyright claim. Later, in 2023, a court shot down the latest attempt to copyright the artwork (Brodkin, 2023).

Two other cases are the first sales of AI-generated art: at Christie's, "The Portrait of Edmond Belamy" created by Paris-based arts collective Obvious in 2018, and Sotheby's "Memories of Passersby I" by Mario Klingemann in 2019.

The fourth case is the award-winning AI-generated artwork by Jason Michael Allen "Theatre D'opera Spatial" at the Colorado State Fair in 2022. The piece's win caused multiple controversies and also led to the denial of copyright registration in 2023 (Schrader, 2023).

The fifth case is the accretion of "Pseudomnesia: The Electrician." by German artist Boris Eldagsen with the Sony World Photography Award in 2023. The author submitted the piece to

the contest as a joke to test the jury's attention. However, the jury decided to award the image despite its generated nature. News related to the case included subsequent events, such as the author's rejection of the award.

The sixth case is a famous modern artist Damien Hirst's project of AI-generated works, "The Beautiful Paintings." In a nine-day sale that ended on April 10, 2023 Hirst sold 5,508 paintings (5,109 physical artworks and 399 NFTs) and generated $20.9 million in revenue.

The last seventh case is a class-action lawsuit filed against AI companies, including Midjourney, DeviantArt, Runway, and Stability AI, by three visual artists – Sarah Anderson, Kelly McKernan, and Karla Ortiz. The court dismissed the first attempt in October 2023, and in the amended complaint filed in November 2023, the original defendants are joined by seven additional artists. The complaint notes that AI companies would have to upload actual images to train their models, thus making "unauthorized copies."

The selection of specific artworks and related events made it possible to focus on media publications at different levels. In the key case of Colorado's piece "Theatre D'opera Spatial," articles were selected according to the principle of large national and local media and because the topic is on the border of art and technology of thematic art and tech media. Then, all publications that published articles on the key case were selected for the collection of text on the other seven cases. Not all publications have articles on all seven cases, but at least three of the cases were covered in texts from each source.

While articles about specific art pieces form the central core of the study, articles discussing the phenomenon of AI image generation technology and its possible implications on the art industry, in general, were selected. A total of 65 articles published between October 2018 and January 2024 (since "The Portrait of Edmond Belamy" was sold in 2018 till the most recent

articles on AI art in 2024) from 14 media were selected: New York Times, The Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, CNN, USA Today, ABC News, The Guardian, Bloomberg, The Denver Post, ArsTechnica, Wired, ArtNews, ArtNet, and The Art Newspaper.

The texts and publications were chosen not for the purpose of comparative analysis, but to get an idea of how different media describe events related to the emergence of AI-generated art and how they explain the images themselves, the technology of their creation and the ideas of the authors.

This study conducted a qualitative textual analysis on selected texts, looking for patterns and particular language that describe and define the presence or absence of cultural capital in AI-generated art. According to McKee (2003, p.1) textual analysis is a method "to gather information about how other human beings make sense of the world. It is methodology, a data gathering process for those researchers who want to understand the ways in which members of the various cultures and subcultures make sense of who they are and how they fit into the world in which they live."

It should be noted that the texts considered do not directly use Bourdieu's concepts and terms of cultural capital theory. Still, we can interpret them based on textual analysis, vocabulary, and frames used in the articles.

Textual analysis is generally a type of qualitative analysis that, beyond the manifest content of media, focuses on the underlying ideological and cultural assumptions of the text. Text is understood as a complex set of discursive strategies that is situated in a special cultural context (Barthes, 1972). This type of analysis involves a prolonged engagement of the chosen text using semiotic, narrative, genre or rhetorical approaches to qualitative analysis. This approach typically results in a strategic selection and presentation of analyzed text as the

evidence for the overall argument. It is crucial for the project that textual analysis has the ability to look beyond manifest content and include analysis of subtext, context, and assumptions (Fursich, 2009).

Cultural media scholars frequently opt for textual analysis as a method to address the typical constraints of traditional quantitative content analysis, which often restricts itself to manifest content and quantifiable categories. Textual analysis enables researchers to uncover not only the latent meanings within a text but also its implicit patterns, assumptions, and what it omits. In this context, 'text' is interpreted in a broader, poststructural sense, encompassing any cultural practice or object that can be subject to interpretation or "reading."

The approach here, therefore, was to look for similarities and recurring language structures that describe AI-generated art, inductively building categories following grounded theory methods (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). While reading along with "pre-coding" (Layder, 1998), in every article about the key case of the award-winning AI-generated piece "Theatre D'opera Spatial," preliminary codes and annotations were developed. These notes were synthesized into more focused systematic memos that later were developed into integrative memos that seek to clarify and link analytic themes and categories (Emerson et al., 2011). These memos were transformed into initial codes, signifying some of the patterns already observed in the text about the key case, and then all other articles were read. Once the preliminary codes and notes have been analyzed, codes were developed for subsequent second and third readings of the texts and inserted into the codebook. Initial codes that emerged during the first cycle of coding, including Grammatical, Elemental, Affective, Literary and Language, Exploratory, and Procedural coding processes (Saldaña, 2016), were meticulously examined to uncover recurring patterns and trends that were synthesized into themes. Those themes during the second cycle of

coding, which involves categorizing and conceptualizing the set of codes obtained and pairing the coding results with a theoretical framework (Saldaña, 2016), became the basis for identifying the frames used within the texts.

Using textual analysis, this study aims to gain insight into the framing of coverage of AI technologies, the authors' descriptive approaches, and the audiences' attitudes toward these technologies. Studying specific features of frames, such as mention of prestigious awards and attention from famous artists, museums, and galleries used for coverage of the topic of AI art, will allow us to get insight into endowing AI-generated pieces with cultural capital.

This method allows for a comprehensive study of these phenomena and makes a valuable contribution to understanding how the language used in publications shapes perceptions, fears and expectations of AI-generated art, as well as understanding how to avoid moral panics when describing processes and technologies that are feared to cause social change.

Trustworthiness

No single analysis of a text can encompass everything that might be said about it; a complete and definitive analysis is an unattainable goal. Textual analysis can significantly enhance our scientific understanding, yet it remains inherently incomplete. This incompleteness is partly due to the selective nature of research, where specific questions and topics are chosen, inevitably leaving out other potential themes that could offer alternative insights into the texts. Our comprehension of texts is, therefore, always partial and subject to further development. Continuous reflection and extension of our understanding are essential. Moreover, a critical reflection on the analysis is vital, particularly in acknowledging the social positioning and background of the researcher, which invariably influences their approach to the research

(Fairclough, 2003). To increase the trustworthiness of this study, the researcher reported on the stages of data collection and analysis, and identified and tried to minimize possible biases.

Positionality statement

In this project, the researcher positions himself as a multifaceted visual arts specialist, embodying the roles of photographer, graphic designer and exploring the fundamentals of generative AI. His engagement with the visual arts encompasses traditional methods and extends into the innovative realm of generative AI. This dual exposure has given him a unique vantage point to observe and analyze the evolving intersection of technology and art.

Despite his deep involvement and personal interest in traditional and AI-enabled visual art forms, he approaches this research with a commitment to scientific rigor and objectivity. Recognizing the possibility of personal bias due to his professional experience and artistic preferences, he strives to approach the material critically in an attempt to overcome his subjective views. His goal is to explore and analyze the cultural and artistic implications of art created by artificial intelligence from a detached perspective, seeking to offer insights based on empirical data and theoretical analysis rather than personal experience or preference.

This positionality statement serves to clarify the researcher's background and biases as he navigates the complex discourse surrounding artificial intelligence in the arts. He seeks to emphasize his intention to contribute to this discourse from an insider's perspective in the art community and as a scholar seeking to understand the broader cultural dynamics and shifts brought about by technological advances in art production.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

This research aims to find out how media framing depicts AI-generated art as either possessing or lacking cultural capital and to answer the research question: How does media framing depict AI-generated art as possessing or lacking cultural capital?

Despite the different information occasions (from the sale of AI-generated images at auctions to artists' lawsuits against AI companies), the time of publication of the texts (from 2018 to 2024), the different media focus (technical, news, art media), the analysis revealed common themes that were used to cover AI-generated images. Using inductive codes obtained from the first reading cycle, at least one or more common themes were identified in each text under consideration. These themes examine the phenomenon of generative AI from different perspectives, including from the point of view of the audience, the authors, and the institutions involved in the comprehension and dissemination of the generated images. The main themes that emerged from the first coding cycle: Generative AI is a new artistic tool, Concerns about generative AI, The economic value of AI-generated art, Ethical concerns about generative AI, Fear of the consequences of using generative AI, Condemnation and finger-pointing, Questions about the nature of art, creativity and authorship, Historical or technological parallels, Recognition of the artistic value of AI-generated art, Recognition of generative AI capabilities, Recognition of human contribution in the process of creating AI-generated art, Request for recognition, Unpreparedness for generative AI.

These themes formed the basis of the frames that determine how texts are presented to the audience. It is important to note that most articles present the opinions of supporters and opponents of AI-generated art relatively equally, so they use combinations of frames. The following is a detailed explanation of the frames.

Generative AI as unethical theft

This frame combines common themes such as Ethical concerns about generative AI, Fundamental questions, Request for recognition, and Unpreparedness for generative AI. This frame reflects deep concerns about the development and practice of generative AI technologies that generate artworks from existing images, often borrowed without permission or remuneration. Critics argue that these artificial intelligence systems frequently use artists' work without their consent, effectively copying their unique style and creative expression, which can be seen as plagiarism and intellectual property theft. Discussions on this issue often use emotionally charged language that describes generative AI as "theft," "fraud," and "plagiarism" (Wenzel, 2023a; Escalante-De Mattei, 2023; Chen, 2023). Because this use of generative AI is seen as a kind of infringement, this frame is used in texts about lawsuits filed in court, as well as in articles about cases involving the use of AI for image creation, as an example of the controversial nature of the technology. "Artists Kelly McKernan, Sarah Andersen and Karla Ortiz in January filed a class action lawsuit in San Francisco against the AI program that Allen used – Midjourney – and its peers, Stable Diffusion and DreamUp, for stealing their original, copyrighted work for “collage” purposes in AI engines" (Wenzel, 2023b).

AI artists such as Allen, creator of the Colorado State Fair-winning piece "Theatre D'opera Spatial," have been called "digital opportunists" and "thieves" (Wenzel, 2023b) which shows artists using AI, companies, and the technology itself as expropriators.

In some cases, using AI in the creative process is considered unethical. Some critics argue that submitting AI-generated art pieces to compete with works created by human artists is unfair and dishonest, and the authors deliberately take this step, taking advantage of the absence of established restrictions. “His creative process was a cheat, relegated only to a few keyboard

clicks" (Wenzel, 2023a). According to critics, AI-generated images require disproportionately less effort than human artists who put their labor into creating an art piece. Thus, the victory of an AI-generated piece looks like the theft of recognition from the human artist as a result of unfair competition.

One of the indicative features in the study of texts was the use or absence of the word art about works created with the participation of AI. This attribute was manifested differently in different frames. Still, in the case of the unethical frame, the works were often referred to as simply images, fake photos, or collages: "Boris Eldagsen, whose fake photo duped the Sony judges, hits back" (Williams, 2023). In detailing the work, the author only uses the words 'work' and 'image' without using synonyms such as 'piece' or 'artwork'. However, the word 'portrait' is used once in the descriptive part. Even with that somehow limited naming for the work, the article's author describes Eldagesn as an 'artist' and 'photographer' and explains in detail his creative style and biographical details, revealing why his AI piece turned out so expressive. The more obvious contrast is with another article (Diehl, 2023), where Eldagsen is only mentioned by name and not even referred to as an 'artist' or 'photographer'. His work is insistently referred to as an image, even twice in a row in the same sentence, and emphasizes features that could be considered flaws in such a short description: An award-winning image, this AI-generated image of two women seems to be vintage and contains three hands. Later, speaking about this work, the author of the article also calls it and similar works fantasies, devoid of innovation: There's nothing in Eldagsen's or Miller's fantasies that couldn't have been made by maquettes, models, even trusty photoshop — 10, 20, 50 years ago (Diehl, 2023).

Unethical practices associated with AI in the creative field are highlighted as the most egregious flaw in generative AI, involving the collection of artistic content without consent to

train AI systems. These systems then create works that strongly resemble the styles of the original artists, raising questions about the legality and moral implications of violating artists' rights. So, the texts cite formulation of Getty's claim against Stable Diffusion as "brazen copyright infringement" (Ashby, 2023) related to the alleged theft of millions of images, which not only illustrates the content owners' demand for protection of their intellectual property but also a sharp indictment of the AI developers.

Criticism is not limited to legal battles but extends to public and peer reactions. Descriptions of AI-created artworks that contain "recognizable imagery from existing paintings and photographs" (Wenzel, 2023a) emphasize the perception of AI as a technology that not only copies, but potentially blurs the line between inspired influence and outright theft. These comments reflect broader disapproval in the art community, highlighting the lack of originality and ethical purity in AI-created art.

The use of "charged" vocabulary when discussing these issues not only conveys an emotional impact on the artists but also creates a certain connotation for the perception of the topic: "people who claim these apps are essentially a high-tech form of plagiarism" (Roose, 2022), words such as "theft" and "plagiarism" are strong, evoking a sense of injustice and prompting a critical reassessment of the ethical basis for using AI technologies in creative fields. This frame, by focusing on ethical violations and the emotional reactions they provoke, plays an essential role in shaping public and professional discourse on the role of AI in the arts, forcing AI proponents to reflect not only on its technical possibilities but also on the moral and legal implications of its use in the creative industries.

Generative AI as an artistic tool

The frame is based on the common themes of using AI as an artistic tool, recognizing

human contribution in the process of creating AI art, Historical or technological parallels, Fundamental questions on definitions of art and authorship.

This frame positions AI as a legitimate and innovative extension of traditional artistic methods. Through the lens of this frame, AI is shown not as a threat but as an enriching tool that enhances creativity and opens up new possibilities for artistic expression. The language used to describe AI in this context is generally positive and benevolent, emphasizing its role as a facilitator of artistic innovation rather than a destroyer of traditional art forms. This frame is also characterized by restrained statements describing AI as not as significant and controversial as it may seem. "...echoes others in the art and design worlds who have come to see AI as a tool rather than a threat. " (Wenzel, 2023a). It is essential to note that quotes with the term 'tool' refer to authorities, "Judge Beryl Howell did acknowledge that humanity is 'approaching new frontiers in copyright' where artists will use AI as a tool to create new work" (Helmore, 2023), which may indicate that the view of AI as a legitimate creative tool will soon be developed, possibly enshrined in legislation, at least we can already see that there is a demand for such legal innovations.

For this frame, the use of the word "tool" in relation to AI and the description of the technology as an assistant and partner of the artist in creating the image is characteristic. One of the determinants was the presence of a code recognizing human participation. Thus, in contrast to frame AI as unethical theft, in which the technology itself is responsible for the creation of the image, in this frame the author is most often understood as a human artist. "When I enter prompts into Midjourney, and re-enter them until I get what I want, it's true I'm not drawing, but I am crafting an image using a tool" (Helmore, 2023). The description of the creative process, the amount of effort expended, and the details of the author's biography create in this frame the

image of a human agent standing behind AI and directly participating in and directing the process of creating an art piece. "Obviously, using any kind of tool, whether it's a brush or a computer program, it's all creative and all directed by a human agent" (Helmore, 2023). The recognition of the role of the human agent serves to legitimize both the artwork itself and the work of the artist who uses AI to express their creative thought.

Another important topic that the frame discusses is the democratization of art – a move away from elitism and inaccessibility of art through publicly available technology. "I think there's a lot involved in this piece, and I think the AI technology may give more opportunities to people who may not find themselves artists in the conventional way" (Metz, 2022). Statements like this set the tone for a discussion about who can be considered an artist and what can be considered art.

Quotes from art experts who see AI generative systems as another tool similar to past artistic innovations emphasize the role of AI in facilitating artistic creativity rather than diminishing human creativity. Also, quotes from experts, such as the Colorado state fair art competition jury representative who called an AI-generated piece "a beautiful piece" (Harwell, 2022) underscore the growing recognition of the role of AI in the artistic context.

Combining the above perspectives, this frame collectively defines AI as a dynamic tool that complements human creativity. This concept refutes fears that AI can replace human creativity by emphasizing AI's role in enhancing and expanding the creative possibilities available to artists. Instead, it positions AI as a catalyst that frees artists from traditional constraints and allows them to explore new creative landscapes. This framing of AI reframes the conversation about AI and art by emphasizing potential and innovation rather than displacement or ethical dilemmas.

Unpreparedness for generative AI

The frame reflects a pervasive sense of uncertainty and reactivity in societal, institutional, and legal contexts as they confront the rapid development of AI technologies. This frame is reinforced by the language and expressions used in the media quotations, which vividly illustrate the difficulties of the artistic and legal communities in adapting to these technological shifts.

The texts give examples of how the rules of art competitions provide loopholes for AI-generated pieces to be submitted to competitions with works created by human artists or that the judges have no idea how the technology creates images. "Our art show has been around for a century and didn't used to include digital art at all," Stoller said. "AI art has only been (at the fair) for two years, and digital art for a couple decades. Who knows what's next?" (Wenzel, 2023b). Statements such as this indicate that there is a demand for the integration of AI-generated art, but at the same time, there is uncertainty about how this integration should be accomplished. Stakeholders are not moving toward confrontation with AI, but only want the rules governing its participation in competitions to be logical and consistent.

The artists themselves also indicate the unpreparedness for the emergence of AI-generated art, the texts' protagonists. The calls for open discussion and the development of new policies and definitions voiced by photographer Eldagsen, who submitted his AI-generated piece "as a cheeky monkey" to test the jury's vigilance and won the Sony World Photography Award (Grierson, 2023; Kolirin, 2023), demonstrate an active recognition of these gaps. Eldagsen's proactive approach to challenging existing frameworks by submitting AI-generated images to competitions and subsequent calls for structured discussions points to a pressing need to change how AI art is recognized and regulated. His use of terms such as "promptography" to describe

AI-generated works suggests concrete steps toward establishing new standards that can help bridge existing gaps in understanding and regulation.

An illustrative example of unpreparedness is that an expert at an auction house where an expensive AI-generated lot was successfully sold has a very superficial knowledge of the technology and learning about the image creators' project by reading a news item on the Internet. "The head of the prints and multiples department told The Art Newspaper that he is hardly an AI expert – in fact, he only learned about Obvious after reading an article on artnet News about a collector's purchase of one of their works for around €10,000 ($12,000)" (Kinsella, 2018). Mentions of such situations reflect not only individual gaps in understanding, but also indicate broader institutional unpreparedness. Critics argue that auction houses, galleries, and museums' interest in new technology is linked to a desire to capitalize on the hype surrounding it rather than a real interest in exploring the artistic value of works and integrating the technology into the art world (Luke, 2018).

This frame describes how society grapples with the implications of rapidly evolving AI technologies. It reveals a landscape in which stakeholders are forced to question and revise long-held assumptions about art, creativity, and the role of human ability in the face of technological advances. The frame highlights the urgent need for comprehensive dialogue, policy revisions, and educational efforts to better prepare for the integration of AI into these creative fields. Texts using this frame do not argue about current shortcomings and reactive positions but about potential pathways to a more informed and thoughtful integration of AI technologies.

Existential Fear

Combining themes of Concerns about AI, Fear of the consequences of using AI, Fundamental questions, and Unpreparedness for AI, this frame manifests itself in language that

emphasizes AI technologies' uncertainty, risk, and potentially radical consequences, creating a general tone of apprehension in some media articles. This fear is expressed in direct statements about the dangers of AI and, more subtly, in language that implies a twisted concern about the impact of AI on human creativity, employment, and authenticity. "Some commenters think human artistry is doomed thanks to AI and that all artists are destined to be replaced by machines" (Edwards, 2022), "AI had left many photographers feeling "threatened and afraid that they are going to lose their jobs, which will happen" (Kolirin, 2023).

One of the essential elements of the texts is quotes from industry experts. They play a special role in this frame, as they provide the opinions of people directly related to AI. "Google's chief executive, Sundar Pichai, said concerns about AI had kept him awake at night and warned that the technology could be "very harmful" if incorrectly deployed" (Grierson, 2023). Such statements indicate a high-level recognition of the significant risks associated with AI technologies and emphasize that even those at the forefront of developing these technologies "keep him awake at night" because of their potential dangers. This expression of concern by significant figures in the technology industry confirms and reinforces public fears about the safety and ethical implications of AI.

Within this frame also runs the theme that AI is frighteningly close to human consciousness. "It's an immensely evocative scene, conjuring so much about the human condition and its timelessness - hell, that's probably why it won in the first place" (Williams, 2023). The disturbing nature of AI's capabilities is vividly described in reactions to AI-created art that is virtually indistinguishable from human-created art. For example, describing an AI-created scene as "extremely expressive" but "disturbing" because a machine did it emphasizes

the deep discomfort with the idea that machines can replicate or even surpass human artistic expression, eliciting an emotional response.

The other side of this phenomenon mentioned is that created by humans, AI has inherited human flaws as well. "Don't be afraid of the future. It will just be more obvious that our mind has always created the world that makes it suffer" (Greenberger, 2023). Thus, one of the most serious concerns about AI ethics and trust is that, trained on tons of information containing biases, AI has inherited them and will now recreate them. Finding and eradicating such biases is a complex task that, given the pace of development and proliferation of AI technologies, must be addressed immediately.

The existential anxiety associated with AI is further dramatized through reflections on its impact on traditional art forms. Comments that "human artistry is doomed" and that artists are "doomed to be replaced by machines" reflect fears of obsolescence and irrelevance in a future dominated by technological advances. Such formulations reflect not only the fear of economic displacement, but also the deeper cultural problem of the loss of human uniqueness in creative expression. "Just as photography replaced painting in the reproduction of reality, AI will replace photography," Eldagsen wrote in a description (Greenberger, 2023).

A nuanced discussion of the role of AI in shaping perceptions of reality describes AI's capabilities as leading to a mixture of truth, "hallucinations," and willful untruths, which can lead to the suppression of traditional methods of understanding reality. Williams (2023) provides an revealing quote from Mick Gordon, studying for a PhD in AI at Queen Mary's in Belfast:

> The panic is, ultimately, you're going to have the truth, and you're going to have reality, and reality's going to be a mixture of truth, hallucinations - that's what they call it when the machine does something weird - and deliberate non-truth. Propaganda used to

deliver a singular message to the exclusion of other messaging. Now propaganda will just deluge you with everything.

This portrayal of AI raises existential questions about the nature of truth and reality in a world where AI plays a significant role and consequently fears losing control over AI technology and perceived reality. This frame presents AI as a potent force that challenges fundamental human concepts like creativity, authenticity, and truth. The language used across these citations reflects a deep-seated unease about AI's role in society, emphasizing the need for careful consideration, ethical deployment, and clear guidelines to mitigate its potentially disruptive impacts. The studied texts applying this frame refer us to the idea that even in the relatively quiet field of art, the impact of AI can be pretty serious, if not catastrophic, which leads us to think about the dangers of AI in the fields of health, politics, and defense. These potential dangers are even more frightening given the pace at which AI technologies are spreading and being adopted, with legislation failing to keep pace and ethical norms for society's interaction with AI only beginning to be discussed.

Historical and Technological Parallelism

The frame draws on analogies to past technological innovations, and society's response to them, to contextualize and perhaps normalize the controversies caused by AI in creative fields. This frame uses historical comparisons to illustrate that the controversies and fears associated with new technologies are not unique to AI but recur throughout the history of technology. It's worth noting that the invention of the camera in the 1800s prompted similar criticism related to the medium of photography, since the camera seemingly did all the work compared to an artist who labored to craft an artwork by hand with a brush or pencil. Some feared that painters would forever become obsolete with the advent of color photography. In some applications,

photography replaced more laborious illustration methods (such as engraving), but human fine art painters are still around today (Edwards, 2022). The analogy between photography and AI highlights a recurring theme of initial resistance followed by eventual acceptance and integration into the cultural fabric. For example, the early critique of photography, which argued that "the camera simply mechanically captures images of whatever it is pointed at" (Lee, 2023) mirrors contemporary arguments against AI, where the technology is often seen as a mere copying of reality without true creativity. This comparison is used to suggest that, like photography, the role of AI in art may be initially misunderstood but may later be recognized as a legitimate artistic medium. Controversy over new art-making technologies is nothing new. Roose (2022) recalls that many painters initially resisted the advent of photography, viewing it as undermining traditional human artistry and citing Charles Baudelaire, the renowned 19th-century French poet and art critic, who referred to photography as "art's most mortal enemy." The article emphasizes that, similarly, in the 20th century, digital editing tools and computer-assisted design programs faced criticism from traditionalists who argued that these technologies diminished the skill required by their human users. Raising again the question of human contribution in the process of creation this frame considers AI as an assistant for the human artist and asks a counter question about the degree of human involvement necessary for the right to be considered as the author. “Spellcheck is an application of A.I., for instance – will that have to be disclosed? How many words can be misspelled and corrected by spellcheck before the human did not actually write the piece?” (Schrader, 2023)

Historical parallelism is used not only to show that once new and controversial technologies are now an integral part of art production, but have also led to the development and emergence of new trends in the arts, suggesting that AI may also become a standard tool for

artistic creation and a catalyst for development. This historical perspective provides evidence that art not only survives through technological innovation, but often thrives because of it. It took a while, but photography was eventually recognized as its own artistic medium. Moreover, it catalyzed the modern art movement by forcing artists to stop placing realism on a pedestal. Because they could never match the realism of the camera, they needed to figure out a way to create works that no mere machine could replicate (Hertzmann, 2019).

The commentary on the use of technologies such as 3D printing and Photoshop, as well as artificial intelligence in the creation of artworks, reflects how each technological leap first seemed revolutionary but soon became normalized. This process of normalization is hinted at by new AI technologies such as DALL-E, which, despite the unprecedentedly rapid creation of artworks, are seen as part of a continuum in the evolution of artistic tools (Metz, 2022b).

At the same time, parallels with other instruments or genres are also used as criticism. Thus the perception of some artworks as trivial or unskilled is transferred to AI-generated images such as these. These criticisms reflect past concerns about other technological tools and art genres, where the artist's skill and authenticity were questioned, such as some forms of contemporary art and recent NFT. "This is the literal definition of 'pressed a few buttons to make a digital art piece,'" another Tweeted. "AI artwork is the 'banana taped to the wall' of the digital world now" (Harwell, 2022). AI is not the only innovation troubling the art world. An analysis of a related area – NFTs, or non-fungible tokens – according to the website dappGambl, found that 95% of more than 73,000 studied are now of "no practical use or value," two years after the market peaked at $22bn (£18bn) in 2021. "This daunting reality should serve as a sobering check on the euphoria" (Helmore, 2023).

Discussions around AI in the arts, likening it to past technological disruptions in artistic creation, such as the controversy surrounding the advent of the camera or the emergence of digital editing tools, contextualize AI as the latest in a series of technological evolutions that challenge traditional notions of creativity and artistry. These historical parallels serve to mitigate concerns by suggesting that, like previous technologies, AI will find its place in the art world without eradicating traditional forms and practices. This frame uses the past as a lens to look at the present, suggesting that the controversy and debate surrounding AI is part of a broader historical pattern of innovation in the arts. By drawing these parallels, the discourse encourages a more measured response to AI, suggesting that the integration of new technologies into the arts, while initially disruptive, often leads to creative empowerment and eventually becomes part of the artistic norm.

Lack of necessary human contribution in AI-generated artworks

This frame emphasizes the significant anthropocentric view that the value of artworks is inextricably linked to human participation. Discussions around AI-generated art are dominated by skepticism or outright rejection of the legitimacy of such art as "real" if it is not sufficiently created by human hands. This view is shaped by legal and cultural systems that value human creativity and authorship as central to the definition of art. It is noteworthy that in the discussion of the absence of human input in the creative process with generative AI, there is a use of vocabulary that humanizes the AI itself. The language used in this frame anthropomorphizes generative AI and talks about it as an independent phenomenon – "AI wins state fair art contest, annoys humans" (Edwards, 2022), as if AI not only created the work but also received the award on its own.

One of the codes that underlies the definition of this frame, as in the case of the adverse application of the frame of historical and technical analogies, is the denial of human contribution to the creation of images. Arguments against AI-generated art sound familiar: "There's no skill involved, you've only pushed a button." Arguments that dismiss AI art as lacking "skill" because humans "only pushed a button" reflect a larger picture that devalues AI contributions as mechanical and lacking the human touch traditionally associated with creativity. Critics argue that without human contribution, AI cannot create anything new and decent. "Granted, AI imaging programs aren't good at making new things. By design, they can only play "exquisite corpse" with huge collections of what they've been told are faces, or animals, or tintype portraits" (Diehl, 2023). These sentiments echo historical reactions to other technologies that initially diminish human skill, such as photography or digital art tools.

Texts using this frame raise questions of image authorship and often appeal to the institutions and precedents that define copyright. The decision, delivered by the US copyright office review board, found that Théâtre d'Opéra Spatial, an AI-generated image that won first place at the 2022 Colorado state fair annual art competition, was not eligible because copyright protection "excludes works produced by non-humans" (Helmore, 2023). Numerous references (Schrader, 2023; Lee, 2023; Hertzmann, 2019) to laws that assign authorship only to humans emphasize the problematic nature of AI works where traditional authorship is blurred "… an image created by an AI computer system owned by Stephen Thaler could not be copyrighted because human beings are an "essential part of a valid copyright claim" (Helmore, 2023). The examples cited point to a deeply entrenched legal framework that excludes non-human creators, emphasizing the anthropocentric bias in copyright rules. Here, unlike the Unpreparedness for generative AI frame, which somehow addresses the issue of revising requirements and

regulations to accommodate new technology, this frame focuses on following existing laws, thus failing to recognize the legitimacy of generative AI as a creator of works of art.

The legal decisions that work of art such as the Théâtre d'Opéra Spatial cannot be copyrighted because they are not the result of sufficient human labor underscore this point. These decisions are based on the idea that if a machine creates the 'traditional elements of authorship' of a work of art, it lacks the human authorship necessary for copyright protection. Such decisions reinforce the view that artificial intelligence, with its immense potential, cannot independently create works of art that meet the legal standards of authorship deeply rooted in human involvement.

Discussions often call for a clear distinction between human-created and AI-generated content, and systems for labeling works according to their origin have been proposed (Williams, 2023). However, these proposals underscore the ongoing struggle of the legal and artistic communities to adapt to a world in which AI plays an increasingly prominent role in creative processes. The contributions of the neural network model and the other users of the site are all inseparable from the result. No one contributor seems to be "the artist" (Hertzmann, 2019).

Thus, the frame "Lack of necessary human contribution in AI artworks" creates a narrative in which the role of AI in art is scrutinized and often delegitimized due to a perceived lack of essential human contribution. This discourse contributes to an evaluation system in which AI-created images are not only usually denied the right to be called "works of art" but are also denied copyright protection and official recognition in traditional exhibitions and competitions, reflecting broader resistance to redefining authorship and artistic value in the AI era.

Economic value of AI-generated artworks

This frame highlights the significance of the monetary value attributed to AI-created art as a tangible metric for assessing its position in the social and economic system. It operates within a discourse that not only recognizes but also emphasizes the substantial market value of AI-created artworks as a reflection of their recognition and affirmation in the art world.

In this frame, monetary payments, such as, for example, the remuneration received with a prestigious prize or the cash equivalent of that prize, as well as the amount paid for the sale of the work, are an indicator of the materiality and legitimacy of the artwork, as well as an evaluation of the creative work done by the author. His winning image, titled “Théâtre D’opéra Spatial” (French for “Space Opera Theater”), was made with Midjourney – an artificial intelligence system that can produce detailed images when fed written prompts. A $300 prize accompanied his win (Metz, 2022).

On the other hand, the economic potential of AI-generated images makes human artists anxious, as a technological competitor can now take away the money that potential buyers could previously only spend on human-created works. These apps have made many human artists understandably nervous about their own futures - why would anyone pay for art, they wonder, when they could generate it themselves? (Roose, 2022).

The opportunity to create artwork, previously unique to artists, becomes available to an unlimited number of individuals, creating unfair competition and unbalancing the labor market. This shift could also lead to a significant change in how art is valued financially. If anyone can make art using artificial intelligence tools, the unique value attributed to human-made art – often associated with the artist's personal touch, skill, and creative process – could be undermined.

This can drive down prices and make it more difficult for artists to support themselves financially through their work.

Mentions of the significant proceeds from Damien Hirst's project, which raised $20 million in just nine days (Whiddington, 2023; Jebb, 2023), strongly demonstrate the market's willingness to invest heavily in AI artworks. This case highlights that AI-created art can generate significant economic returns, putting it on par with traditional art in terms of financial value. This case not only highlights the acceptance of AI art by collectors but also its ability to attract significant investments, positioning AI as a lucrative component of the contemporary art market.

Similarly, this frame describes the sale of the first portrait created by artificial intelligence at auction for $432,500, well above its original estimate, marking a significant impact of AI art on the market. This event is noteworthy because the portrait fetched 43 times its estimate, indicating strong and possibly speculative interest from collectors. The first "painting" produced by artificial intelligence to sell at a major auction house fetched nearly half a million dollars on Thursday (Youn, 2018). The portrait of Edmond De Belamy sold for $432,500, or 43.5 times the upper range of the estimated price, Christie's said in a statement (Alleyne, 2018). Rounding off the final price, such as "nearly half a million dollars" or "in brisk trading," carries a specific emotional charge that can cause admiration and show the significance of the moment and the value of the work.

This presentation reflects the dynamics of a market in which AI art is not just a novelty but a serious investment, echoing historical moments when new art forms emerged and captured the imagination and wallets of collectors. "The auction was inspired by a sale earlier this year (2018), in which the French collector Nicolas Laugero Lasserre bought a portrait directly from the collective for about 10,000 euros, or about $11,400" (Cohn, 2018).

The auctioning of AI works by renowned houses such as Christie's and Sothbey's further legitimizes AI art in the economic sphere, putting AI-created works on par with those of recognized artists such as Andy Warhol and Roy Lichtenstein (Cohn, 2018) and compared in price with Picasso (Youn, 2018). The fact that works created by artificial intelligence can be priced comparable to those of such famous artists says a lot about the changing values and tastes in the art market.

Economic discussions about AI often go beyond just sales, touching on broader debates about the role of AI in future commercial rights and revenue models. For example, using AI to create images that are then sold or distributed without proper labeling raises complex questions about revenue distribution and intellectual property, highlighting the need for new models to account for the collaborative and often anonymous nature of AI-generated content. Nonetheless, this open sharing challenges the ways we think about art. Christie's sale of the image "Edmond de Belamy, from La Famille de Belamy" in November 2018 for nearly US$500,000 indicated that something was awry (Hertzmann, 2019).

Youn (2018) provides a revealing quote by painter and professor of the Royal Academy of Arts Jonathan Huxley "There's no financial expert or analyst in the world that can tell me my income for the next 10 years… There's no way to price art, any art dealer will tell you, especially contemporary art. It's alchemy". Thus, the interest in AI-generated art is likely to develop non-linearly, with bursts of interest and its possible complete absence being characteristic of the period of determining the place of AI-generated art in the field of art.

The frame "Economic value of AI-created artworks" is characterized by discourse that neutrally or positively evaluates the impact of AI art on the art market. The growing recognition of AI artworks not only affirms their recognition and desirability, but also helps define their

evolving status in broader social and economic systems. This economic framing serves as a powerful counterpoint to more skeptical views of AI art, suggesting that whatever the philosophical or aesthetic reservations, the market for AI-created art is vibrant and growing, reassuring the art enthusiasts and professionals about its acceptance in the art world.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to examine how media frame AI-generated art as either possessing or lacking cultural capital. The analysis of the texts revealed seven main frames used to cover the topic of AI-generated art: Generative AI is unethical theft, Generative AI is an artistic tool, Unpreparedness for generative AI, Existential fear of AI, Historical and technological parallelism, Lack of necessary human contribution in AI-generated artworks, Economic value of AI-generated artworks.

Although the texts under consideration do not directly reference Pierre Bourdieu's concepts or terminology associated with cultural capital theory, they lend themselves to interpretation through such a lens based on the language and framing explored in the articles. Textual analysis reveals key themes and constructs consistent with Bourdieu's theory, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of AI-generated art's potential and cultural capital.

To increase our understanding of media depiction of AI-generated art's cultural capital, each section of this chapter will cover one of the forms of capital according to Bourdieu: Institutionalized, Embodied, and Objectified cultural capital along with Economic capital that are all interconnected and potentially can be transformed from one form to another (Bourdieu, 2018).

Institutionalized cultural capital of AI-generated art

This form of cultural capital refers to recognizing and legitimizing knowledge or skills through formal mechanisms such as educational qualifications or awards. According to the texts studied, there is a broad demand for forms of recognition that can be attributed to Institutionalized Cultural Capital from both proponents and opponents of AI-generated art. In debates about the value and legitimacy of AI-generated artworks, the parties refer to this form of

cultural capital as the defining technology in the art field. Due to the novelty of the AI-generated art phenomenon, institutions that are traditional sources of professional expertise in the field of art, such as museums, galleries, auction houses, prestigious awards, and legal representatives, such as the US Copyright Office and the Copyright Claims Board, do not have a consensus on what place AI-generated art can occupy in today's art world.

The courts and the US copyright office have been the principal battlegrounds for acquiring institutionalized cultural capital. Since AI has not been legally regulated until recently, remembering that President Biden's important Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence was issued in November 2023 (OMB, 2023), copyright registration is complicated by the lack of precedents. US Copyright Office decisions rejecting copyrights for AI-created artworks because they do not assume human authorship illustrate AI art's institutional challenges in gaining legitimacy. Currently, institutional frameworks maintain a clear boundary between human-created and AI-generated works, which calls into question the latter's ability to possess institutionalized cultural capital according to existing definitions. Official authorities do not recognize AI as an author, as by law, only humans can be considered the creator of a work. However, a fascinating process of anthropomorphizing AI can be observed both in the texts under study and, for example, in the accompanying commentaries on AI-generated artworks (Christie's, 2018). As noted in previous studies, perceived anthropomorphicity can be actively manipulated depending on how the generative AI is described, and different degrees of anthropomorphicity impact the responsibility attributed to humans behind the AI, such as creators of the particular artwork or developers of the AI itself, in different ways (Epstein et al., 2020).

It is noteworthy that in the texts studied, frames support both the idea that generative AI should not be considered an author and, as a consequence, should not be copyrighted – "because human beings are an "essential part of a valid copyright claim" (Helmore, 2023), as well as arguments implicitly stating that relying on the experience of previous technologies around which similar disputes have arisen, as in the case of photography, copyright law will eventually meet the integration of the new technology into the legal. These ideas are reflected in the phrase Lack of necessary human contribution of AI-generated art discovered as a result of analyzing the texts studied. The denial of the creative efforts of the authors of AI-generated artworks and their skills in working with generative AI to produce outstanding images calls into question the value of these works and their possession of cultural capital. On the other hand, a more positive vision of essence is reflected in the frame of Historical and Technological Parallelism. In texts using this frame, the current situation with the denial of human authorship in AI-generated art is compared to, for example, photography, which for so long has not been recognized as art because of the lack of involvement of the photographer, who only "presses the button" and the image itself only mechanically reflects reality. By analogy with photography, this frame raises the prospect of further recognition of AI-generated art by the artistic community and the bureaucracy represented by the US Copyright Office, as it presented, for example, in the article by Lee (2023):

> The Copyright Office concluded that using AI to generate art was a "merely mechanical" process with "no place for novelty, invention, or originality"-and hence not worthy of copyright protection. But I don't think this makes sense given how copyright law has treated photographs over the last 130 years.

The reviewed texts also describe the demand for institutional protection of cultural capital, which comes from the other side - from human artists and rights holders, whose works have been used without demand and compensation and are possibly still used to train generative AI. It should be noted that references to lawsuits by large companies and class action lawsuits by artists are found not only in the studied texts related directly to these cases but also cross-referenced as examples of generative AI controversies and ethical imperfections in articles on AI-generated artworks. Such texts are characterized by the application of frame Generative AI as unethical theft. However, in cases where generative AI is the defendant, the law also rejects lawsuits because in AI-generated images, "there is no substantial similarity [between the images by the artists and images created by the AI image generators]" (Mattei, 2023b), and it is not possible to judge plagiarism based on the similarity of visual style. This will encourage the artists and their lawyers to try to establish copyright over style, something that has never before been legally protected (Mattei, 2023a). At this point, the situation described by the media seems very uncertain, but the rhetoric is that change is inevitable. However, in the Thaler case, Judge Beryl Howell acknowledged that humanity is "approaching new frontiers in copyright," where artists will use generative AI as a tool to create new work (Helmore, 2023).

While in the legal field, both supporters and opponents of AI have been denied recognition of their cultural capital; other authoritative institutions are flexible about AI-generated art. Auction houses, galleries, museums, and prestigious art awards, traditionally considered experts in art appreciation, are one after another paying attention to and honoring AI artworks and artists integrating generative technologies into their creative process. Texts that use an optimistic frame of Generative AI as an artistic tool are characterized by quotes from people

in the art field who are loyal to generative AI and see it as a creative assistant and an additional tool for the artistic process.

Based on previous research that even images generated by AI a few years ago, when the technology was at a much less advanced level, are almost indistinguishable from the works of human artists (Gangadharbatla, 2022), aesthetic evaluation is not an absolute criterion for judging the value of AI-generated art. The audience acknowledged AI's potential in the creative domain but felt that AI "can" be creative but perhaps "shouldn't" be (Moruzzi, 2020). In the face of such uncertainty, experts' opinions on the place of AI in the art world become even more critical. Some experts note the aesthetic features of AI-generated pieces and, in contrast to the frame about the absence of human contribution, on the contrary, note the personal contribution of artists who used AI and how their professional skills affect the quality of the generated works. Thus, a frequently occurring inductive code - Recognition of human contribution - was identified during the coding process. Cases of awards and successful sales at auctions suggest that the institutions responsible for this, through their authority, endow AI-generated artworks and their creators with cultural capital. In the considered texts, AI-generated pieces are neighboring with the works of renowned masters whose cultural capital is undoubted, which means that at this stage, they may be "impostors", but they are still on the same platforms and enjoy the interest of the public and collectors. Especially here, we can see the interconnection with the economic value of AI-generated pieces as an indicator of some importance of AI-generated art, which will be discussed in more detail below in the section on economic capital. The authors of the texts repeatedly refer to traditional art being on the same platform as AI-generated artworks and appeal to the comparison of the economic capital of both "A Picasso print in the same auction sold for the same price but was estimated to go for $200,000 to 300,000" (Youn, 2018).

Comparisons such as these can be seen as comparisons of both the economic and cultural capitals of traditional and AI-generated artworks and their authors as presented in Cohn (2018):

> Last Friday, a portrait produced by artificial intelligence was hanging at Christie's New York opposite an Andy Warhol print and beside a bronze work by Roy Lichtenstein. On Thursday, it sold for well over double the price realized by both those pieces combined.

The fact that works created by artificial intelligence can be priced comparable to those of such famous artists says a lot about changing values and tastes in the art market.

Such steps towards AI-generated art cannot but find opponents. The main argument of critics of these processes is that specialists do not understand what they are dealing with or want to gain profit. Loopholes in the rules explain the victories of AI-generated pieces at competitions, ignorance of the jury and what the image generation process with AI helps, or the authors' conscious desire to deceive the experts. This rhetoric is particularly emphasized in frame Unpreparedness to generative AI and in the form of latent and expressed anxiety about the fate of art and human artists in frame Existential fear. Thus, the cultural capital acquired by AI-generated art through institutions such as auction houses, museums, art galleries, and awards is questioned and gives rise to debates about the legitimacy of such art, as well as challenging the authority of the institutions mentioned above in the field of generative AI.

Fight for the illusion

In no field is the clash between positions and dispositions more constant and more uncertain than in the literary and artistic field (Bourdieu, 1996). According to Bourdieu, position refers to an individual's place within the social structure and in a specific field such as art, education, law, etc. Each field has its rules, roles, and authorities, and individuals occupy positions within these fields based on the amount and types of capital they possess. Positions

determine agents' power and influence within the field, affecting their access to resources and opportunities. The perception of the space of possible positions and trajectories and the appreciation of the value that each one receives from its place in this space depend on the agents' dispositions. However, since the positions it offers are not very institutionalized, never legally guaranteed, and thus are very vulnerable to symbolic contestation and are non-hereditary, the field of cultural production constitutes the terrain of struggles for the redefinition of the 'post' (Bourdieu, 1996).

Bourdieu himself questions what makes a piece of art and concludes that it is only in its acceptance within the 'institution' of art that it can be consecrated as such. It is, therefore, an illusion – illusio – to attribute any value to it other than as a social construction (Grenfell & Hardy, 2007). Bourdieu (1996) argues that the struggle for the monopoly of determining the mode of legitimate cultural production contributes to the constant reproduction of the belief in play, illusio, the product of which is also a struggle. Each field produces its specific form of illusio, in the sense of investment in play, which brings agents out of a state of indifference, inclines and predisposes them to make distinctions appropriate to the logic of the field, to emphasize what is important. The basis of the game's functioning is the commitment to the game, the belief in the game, and the value of its stakes that make it worth playing. The joint agreement of agents in illusio is the root of the competition that pits them against each other, making the game itself a game. This interested participation in the game is established in the conjunctural relationship between a habitus and a field (Bourdieu, 1996). A consequent symbolic valuing saturates the generating logic of any individual habitus, and it is unlikely that the logic and value will not be recognized by others (Grenfell & Hardy, 2007).

Observations from the analysis show that such characteristic processes described by Bourdieu are taking place in the art field regarding AI-generated art, which means that it has already been accepted into the game and supports illusio with its demand for cultural capital. Based on current observations about AI cultural capital, we can assume that AI art will either stay in the game and be institutionalized through participation in auctions, exhibitions in museums and galleries, inclusion in educational programs for art students, or it will occupy an external niche similar to applied arts which usually do not claim the same level of recognition as having cultural capital as fine arts. However, if, despite the pressure of the conservative dispositions of the agents of the art field not allowing AI art to become part of the habitus, authors are persistent in their demand for cultural capital, an exciting backlash of the autonomization of AI-created art is possible.

Autonomy

Bourdieu sees the field of cultural production as a space that consistently achieves independence from economics and politics. The endpoints of this space are the positions of the "pure" writer, artist, and "intellectual" - Bourdieu calls them institutions of freedom built on resistance against the market, the bourgeoisie, and state bureaucracies. In other words, against the possessors of economic, embodied, and institutionalized cultural capitals, respectively. Such emancipation, however, requires risk-taking and profit-indifferent agents, and their collective endeavors that produce the work of the writer and artist must always begin anew. However, the institutionalization of past inventions and the recognition that the activity of producing culture, which is its own goal, and the desire for liberation it entails, is increasingly gaining, are gradually reducing the costs of this constant reinvention. The further the process of autonomization progresses, the more possible it becomes to assume the "pure" producer position

without possessing the properties necessary to create this position. In this case, the most striking example of establishing such a position is photography, which has gone from being wholly rejected as an art to taking its place alongside other fine arts forms.

The processes that, according to Bourdieu, precede autonomization can be observed today concerning AI art. The interest of viewers and collectors endows AI art pieces with value, while institutionalization by the state bureaucracy moves very slowly or does not occur at all. In such a case, a kind of internal institutionalization may begin to take shape. According to Bourdieu, the logic of the field means that even using the resources offered by a group or institution, it is possible to produce products that are more or less independent of the interests and values of that group or institution. Thus, when a high degree of autonomy is achieved, the unique positions that emerge in the field express the intention to exist only at the lowest degree of institutionalization. Bourdieu speculates on the formation of anti-institutionalized institutions, whose paradigm might be a “Salon des Refusés” or a small avant-garde magazine, and competitive mechanisms that can provide incentives and rewards that make efforts at liberation and subversion conceivable. In such structures, freedom from institutions is inscribed in those institutions.

Referring to Haskell's (1980) work on the relations between Italian art and society in the Age of the Baroque, Bourdieu cites the gradual formation of an artistic field subject to its own norms and the emergence of a socially distinct category of professional artists who were less and less inclined to recognize any rules other than those of a specific tradition inherited from their predecessors, and more and more able to free their production from any external slavery, be it moral censorship and the aesthetic programs of the Church, or the academic coo Thus, one of the vectors of AI art structurization may be autonomization, combining both certain freedom of

creativity and recognition by various institutions and groups, like-minded people within the field, which is not connected with the possession of institutionalized capital in full, as in the absence of copyright recognition by the state bureaucracy.

Embodied cultural capital of AI-generated art

Embodied cultural capital refers to the aptitudes, knowledge, and skills an individual possesses, which in the context of the arts are typically related to the craft and creative process of the artist. AI complicates this notion because the "skills" or "creative processes" are not embedded in the human artist but in algorithms and data sets programmed by humans. The reasoning characteristic of the frame Lack of necessary human contribution in AI artworks is partly due to an incomplete understanding of the process of image generation, selection, and editing and the perception of a human being only as someone who "pushes a button," forms the image of AI-generated art created without embodied cultural capital, and therefore lacking it, which means that AI-generated art lacks genuine creative expression and personal involvement traditionally associated with embodied cultural capital. This view is reinforced by the criticism that AI-generated art simply copies or remixes existing human-generated content without a genuine creative process, thus devaluing its embodied cultural capital in the eyes of traditional art critics and the general public.

Moreover, taking into account the imputed use by AI without permission of other artist's works, this process can be seen as a form of appropriation of cultural capital, where AI systems absorb and reconfigure the skills, styles, and creative outputs that constitute the embodied and objectified cultural capital of human artists. For instance, when AI programs use the works of contemporary artists to train their algorithms, they are essentially harnessing the artists' cultural capital-comprising their unique styles, techniques, and artistic decisions without contributing to

its development or compensating the artists. This problematization is reflected in texts using the frame AI as unethical theft. As noted in Hong's (2018) research, questions are broadly raised about AI's genuine ability to create its role in domains traditionally reserved for human expression. The uncontrolled absorption and reuse of artists' cultural capital by artificial intelligence raises legal and ethical issues and questions the traditional valuation and recognition of human creativity. Embodied cultural capital accumulated by artists over years of practice and public recognition is co-opted by AI, potentially blurring the connection between original works and their creators. This situation also leads to debates about the authenticity and originality of AI-created artworks, as they may copy or evoke associations with the style of human artists without the same depth of creative engagement or conceptual development.

Given the interconnections between forms of cultural and economic capital, the economic implications are also significant. If AI-created artworks are marketed and celebrated, potentially eclipsing the work of the human artists from whom these styles were borrowed, this could lead to a redistribution of economic capital from human artists to those who own and operate AI technologies. This shift will affect not only individual artists but the entire cultural industry, which is built on the principles of creativity and original authorship.

However, we can also observe the opposite process, when the embodied cultural capital of an established artist and recognized professional who consciously decided to use AI for the creative process is transferred to AI-generated artworks. Such examples among the texts reviewed are "The Beautiful Paintings" by Damien Hirst, "Memories of Passersby I" by Mario Klingemann, and "Pseudomnesia: The Electrician." by Boris Eldagsen. In the case of these projects, the cultural capital of the works was not in doubt, they were sold to collectors, received a prestigious award, and were sold at a prominent auction. We can assume that professional

artistic skills combined with the ability to use AI tools and the reputation of established artists allowed them to create outstanding works. In all these cases, the creative process does not align with conventional human-centric practices. However, when viewed as a tool, AI can be seen as extending the artist's capabilities, allowing for new forms of expression and creativity. This perspective reflected in frame AI as an artistic tool shows AI not as replacing human artists but as augmenting their ability to realize complex artistic visions, thereby contributing to a new form of embodied cultural capital that integrates human and machine collaboration. We are probably at a point where AI skills become an essential part of Embodied Cultural Capital and other creative skills.

Here, it is worth referring again to the process of anthropomorphization of AI, as described by Epstein et al. (2020). Anthropomorphic qualities influence how responsibilities and credits are assigned to create AI-generated art. This anthropomorphism can affect how the public and institutions appraise AI's 'creative' contributions, complicating how cultural and economic capital are assessed and attributed in the context of AI-generated artworks. To a large extent, this applies to embodied cultural capital as traditionally associated with the human artists traits that are not available to AI, as a result of this 'humanizing' framing can be attributed to AI as well, especially if there is a nexus of the cultural capital of the artists and an AI that has been trained on their artworks.

A work without an author

Embodied cultural capital is perhaps the most controversial form of capital concerning AI-generated art. Bourdieu's theory speaks of the possession of skills, tastes, and connections embodied in a person or a group. But in the AI situation, we do not have a person to whom this cultural capital is addressed and from whom it is expected. Hence, historically and probably

culturally, the main barrier to the registration of copyright is formed absolutely anthropocentrically and requires human participation in the process of creation to recognize something as a work of art. However, Bourdieu's discussion of the fetishism of the author opens up exciting possibilities for interpreting the position of the AI in the structure of the cultural field as not being an author in the traditional sense, but nevertheless producing a certain cultural product. Bourdieu argues that the producer of the value of the work of art is not the artist but the field of production as a universe of belief that produces the value of the work of art as a fetish by producing the belief in the creative power of the artist (Bourdieu, 1996). The producer of the value of the work of art is not the artist but the sphere of production as a universe of belief that produces the value of the work of art as a fetish by producing the belief in the creative power of the artist. It is not by chance that Bourdieu directly refers to the 'fetishism of the name of the master' described by Walter Benjamin. Given that a work of art does not exist as a symbolic object endowed with value unless it is known and recognized - that is, socially institutionalized as a work of art by viewers endowed with the aesthetic predisposition and competence necessary to know and recognize it as such - it is essential to consider as an object not only the material production of the work but also the production of the value of the work, in other words, the belief in the value of the work.

According to Bourdieu (1996), when considering the formation of the value of a work of art, it is necessary to focus not only on the direct producer - the artist - but also on the set of agents and institutions that participate in the production of the value of the work - critics, art critics, gallery directors, dealers, museum curators, patrons of the arts, collectors, members of consecrated bodies such as academies, salons, juries of prestigious awards, etc., as well as the whole set of political and administrative bodies competent in matters of the arts.

From this complex structure of the formation of the value of art, it can be seen that the author is undoubtedly important, but far from being the only producer of the value of the work of art, but only part of the mechanism which, through collective labor and the circulation of countless acts of credit exchanged by all the agents mentioned above engaged in the field of art, creates the belief in the game (illusio). This very illusio and the belief in the sacred value of its stakes is both a prerequisite and a product of the very functioning of the game; it is fundamental to the power of initiation, allowing initiated artists to represent specific products through the miracle of their signature (or brand name), as sacred objects. The most radical and illustrative example here is the 'Fountain' sculpture by Marcel Duchamp, which is actually an inverted urinal, signed by the author and still recognized as a work of art, like other works of the same genre - readymade. And if the agents of the cultural field form the value under the influence of illusio and fetishization of the 'creator,' then at a particular moment, the work acquires cultural capital in isolation from the author, and this moment is seen as a space for the acquisition of embodied cultural capital AI art. Thus, even in the absence of human participation, AI works can claim to be recognized and acquire cultural capital. If we take into account the fact that many people recognize a human artist who creates AI-generated art as an author, if not a full-fledged author, then at least a co-author, this allows us to talk more freely about acquiring cultural capital and taking a certain position in the field of art as creators who use cooperation with AI as well as technologies on their own.

The most significant barrier and contradiction about the embodied cultural capital of AI-generated art is that in its training, AI has absorbed the work of human artists and thus appropriated their embodied cultural capital, developed styles, personal artistic methods, and techniques. The discourse of the texts studied suggests a demand for fair remuneration by the

artists whose work has been appropriated but no desire to prohibit AI from creating. In the rush to develop the technology as quickly as possible, one of the first steps was a violation of ethical norms, theft, and appropriation. However, it does not seem that this mistake cannot be corrected. It is conceivable that if the companies involved in the creation of AI meet the artists, pay compensation, exclude those works whose authors demand it, and re-train the systems using material obtained with permission and legally and ethically, the barrier to the recognition of embodied cultural capital and the legitimate position of AI-generated art in the artistic field can be overcome.

The most significant barrier and contradiction about the embodied cultural capital of AI-generated art is that in its training, AI has absorbed the work of human artists and thus appropriated their embodied cultural capital, developed styles, personal artistic methods, and techniques. The discourse of the texts studied suggests a demand for fair remuneration by the artists whose work has been appropriated but no desire to prohibit AI from creating. In the rush to develop the technology as quickly as possible, one of the first steps was a violation of ethical norms, theft, and appropriation. However, it does not seem that this mistake cannot be corrected. It is conceivable that if the companies involved in the creation of AI meet the artists, pay compensation, exclude those works whose authors demand it, and re-train the systems using material obtained with permission and legally and ethically, the barrier to the recognition of embodied cultural capital and the legitimate position of AI-generated art in the artistic field can be overcome.

Objectified cultural capital of AI-generated art

This form of cultural capital includes physical objects and media, including works of art, that can be owned or transferred. This form of cultural capital is most closely linked to the

artwork's monetary value. Despite its digital origin, AI-generated art often materializes in physical forms – whether as prints, installations, or interactive digital displays – that can be bought, sold, and collected. This ability to be commodified and exchanged in the art market contributes to its objectified cultural capital. The economic success of specific AI artworks, selling for substantial sums at auctions, further bolsters this form of capital, positioning AI art as a valuable asset within the art market. These economic validations not only enhance the objectified cultural capital of AI art but also influence its broader acceptance and prestige within the cultural sector.

The most intriguing aspect of objectified cultural capital in the texts considered was the demand for the objectification of AI-generated artworks. For instance, "The Portrait of Edmond Belamy" sold at auction, despite being printed and signed by the algorithm as the author's signature, had a gilded decorated frame, similar to those that frame paintings in museums. The series of AI-generated pieces "The Beautiful Paintings" by Damien Hirst could be bought printed on canvas, either square or round, which buyers preferred - physical works were more popular than digital ones - only under 10 percent of the works created were sold as NFTs (Whiddington, 2023). Jason Allen printed his piece "Theatre D'opera Spatial" to submit it to the Colorado State Fair art competition. This suggests that not only the audience but also the artists themselves are eager to translate AI-generated art into physical form. It can be assumed that by formalizing AI-generated art in the image of traditional human-made art, the authors consciously or subconsciously appeal to the cultural capital of traditional art forms. As previous studies show, viewers' perceptions of AI-generated artworks are influenced by their awareness of whether technology is involved in the creative process (Hong, 2018; Ragot et al., 2020; Gangadharbatla, 2022). Perhaps presenting AI-generated pieces in a familiar form characteristic of painting

mitigates this effect, and the mention of the human artist complements the perception of AI as a creative tool.

Based on the articles analyzed, art created by AI, despite its disputed authorship, possesses objectified cultural capital to the extent that it can be bought, sold, and collected. The high-profile sales of AI-created artworks suggest that these works have tangible economic value, which contributes to their objectified cultural capital.

According to Bourdieu(2018) the importance of possessing objectified cultural capital lies in its ability to confer prestige and influence within a social space, acting as a tangible indicator of cultural authority and socioeconomic status. This form of capital can be directly translated into economic capital through sale or exchange but also serves as a marker of cultural sophistication and competence that can enhance position in the field.

The uniqueness of objectified cultural capital concerning AI-generated art is that it is necessary to acquire other forms of cultural and economic capital. As can be seen from the texts studied, to date, institutions and individuals are only ready to engage with AI-generated art if they manifest it in physical form. The objectified form, be it a print or a canvas with an applied image, is necessary for AI art to be exhibited in a museum, sold, and symbolically transfer ownership of the work to a collector. In this way, objectified cultural capital becomes a conduit of appreciation and recognition, and consequently, AI art interacts with the agents of the field in object form. By enabling AI art to participate in traditional practices of display, sale, and collection, objectified cultural capital gives AI-generated works the opportunity not just to be seen and appreciated as novel or innovative but also to be recognized as legitimate players in the cultural economy.

Physical manifestations of AI art address the habitus of the art field participants – collectors, curators, and the viewing public – whose perceptions and tastes are often deeply ingrained and oriented towards traditional art forms. Habitus-based perceptions of art forms are likely to change slowly, as evidenced by the current demand for physical embodiments of AI art pieces, as more understandable for perception and at least partially similar to the traditional forms of artworks. This slow adaptation of the habitus reflects Bourdieu's view that social agents' dispositions are shaped by their past and present conditions, and they evolve as they interact with the changing conditions of their fields and therefore objectified cultural capital, at least in the near future, will play a key role in determining the position of AI pieces in the art field.

However, the alleged unethical origins of these works - stemming from their creation through potentially unauthorized use of existing artworks - cast a shadow over their cultural legitimacy. This ethical shadow can complicate the perception of their value, suggesting that while AI art can be objectified and marketed, its cultural authenticity and originality remain in question.

Economic capital of AI-generated art

According to Bourdieu (2018), all forms of cultural capital are interconnected, and economic capital can be transformed from one form to another. For AI-generated art, economic capital seems to be the most accessible to obtain, with sales of AI art pieces attracting both auction houses and collectors. As noted in the texts, this may be due to both purely mercantile interests and the desire to get to know the emerging phenomenon better and try, if not to fully integrate it, at least to define its place in the art world. Since economic capital has some equivalent to cultural capital and, according to Bourdieu, can be transformed into various forms of cultural capital, economic value is currently the source of cultural capital with the most

significant potential for AI-generated artworks. Against the backdrop of ongoing legislative disputes, lawsuits from rights holders, and the lack of precise regulation and labeling of AI-generated images, such works sell, are in demand, and accumulate economic and related forms of cultural capital.

The possession of economic capital, as described above, promotes the autonomy of agents and greater freedom of creative expression. The possibility of obtaining material benefits from the creation of a cultural product through generative AI can attract new talented artists and non-professionals whose creative expression would previously have been impossible or extremely difficult without the possession of certain artistic skills. This democratization of art production, and consequently art consumption, can benefit the art field.

What is also essential is that economic capital with a proper degree of legal regulation can serve as a guarantor of the responsible use and development of AI-generated art technologies. In other words, if companies design and develop generative AI, individuals and groups using such technologies have something to lose; they will be more attentive to preserving accumulated economic capital and compliance with established ethical and legal norms. By redistributing the economic capital, the beneficiaries can pay rewards to the artists whose works were used to train the generative AI, and thus resolve the most crucial ethical conflict on which today the further development of the technology and the definition of its position not only in the artistic field in particular but also more broadly in the structure of society may depend.

One should not underestimate the potential harm the inflow of economic capital to AI-generated art may cause. The economic capital driving generative AI art could lead to a stratification within the art world, where traditional forms of art that require more manual effort and skill are undervalued, affecting the livelihoods and recognition of traditional artists. This

could widen the gap between technologically enhanced art forms and conventional methodologies, potentially devaluing the cultural significance and historical importance of traditional artistic practices. It is worth mentioning that such threats will probably not affect the so-called ‘high’ art, because the agents of this area of the artistic field are protected by their capital, but the mass of artists who are not well known and recognized are in tangible danger.

The economic success of AI-generated artworks, as evidenced by their sale prices, suggests a form of capital validation and conversion, where economic capital potentially influences the perception of cultural capital. However, this relationship is fraught with tension, as economic valuation does not necessarily provide cultural legitimacy or recognition in the traditional art world, and the situation can change at any moment, especially with the emergence of copyright precedents from legal authorities.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

AI image generation technologies that have recently gained popularity are developing rapidly in an environment that is not ready for this phenomenon. The lack of legal and ethical standards of application and development of technologies causes fear on the part of representatives of the spheres that may be in danger from the use of these technologies, such as actors, photographers, illustrators, and artists. At the same time, works created with the help of generative AI win prizes and prestigious awards and are shown at exhibitions in galleries and museums. The opinion about the new technology is forged in the audience under the influence of media. Analyzing the discourse and framing of generative AI will help to understand the place of the technology in the media and cultural space, what fears or expectations that may affect the further application and development of the technology may arise among the audience when they get acquainted with media publications.

The presence of cultural capital in AI-generated artworks will largely determine their place in society, as well as the possible social consequences of the application and development of the technology. Media are currently determinants of the presence of cultural capital in AI-generated artworks and can equally grant it or take it away from such images. The project used framing theory and textual analysis methodology to answer the following research question: How does media framing depict AI-generated art in the context of possessing or lacking cultural capital?

Inferences

The study shows that in the media texts, art created by generative AI is presented as possessing aspects of each of Bourdieu's forms of cultural capital – institutionalized, objectified, and embodied – as well as economic capital. Since this project applied cultural capital as a

measure of whether a specific work can be considered art, based on the results, we can conclude that AI-generated art is presented in the media studied as art with the caveat that it is art in the same way as other works with forms of cultural capital, exhibited in museums and galleries, sold at auctions and held by collectors.

However, the possession of each form of capital is contested, reflecting the ongoing controversy surrounding AI-generated art. In the texts studied, the opinions of supporters and opponents, as well as those who refrain from taking sides, are presented relatively equally. In the absence of a dominant perspective, this dichotomy indicates that while AI art is gaining economic and some objectified cultural capital through sales and exhibitions, its full recognition, which includes embodied and institutionalized capital, is still intensely debated. Anxious views emphasize fears of ethical erosion and the undermining of traditional artistic values, hinting at potential resistance against the full integration of AI art into established cultural sectors. Conversely, optimistic views often celebrate the new possibilities of AI art for creative expression, suggesting a gradual shift towards acceptance.

Based on the results of the analysis, we can conclude that the presence of such frames as Existential fear and Unpreparedness for generative AI indicates the art field's unwillingness to integrate AI-generated art unconditionally. However, based on the language and general themes of the articles studied, we can conclude that this reluctance to include AI-generated art in the artistic field and endow it with cultural capital is not because of the lack of artistic value of the works but because there are currently problems with the regulation of this field. Thus, it appears that AI, without having institutionalized cultural capital, is outside the scope of state laws and the rules by which the artistic field and the market function. Consequently, a kind of feedback loop emerges, where in the absence of institutionalization, AI-generated art continues to develop

without reliance on ethical and legal norms, which further cyclically distances it from recognition by significant institutions. This situation is most clearly reflected in the perspective presented by the Generative AI as unethical theft movement, which maintains that AI-generated art cannot be endowed with cultural capital because its "skills" are appropriated from artists who did not give permission to use their artworks as training materials for generative AI systems and were not compensated for it, which makes it unethical and does not allow to recognize its legitimacy in the artistic field. At the same time, the most significant barrier to recognizing authorship and the subsequent endowment of institutionalized cultural capital is the absence of a human author in the creative process. The perspective of the fame Lack of necessary human contribution in AI-generated artworks is based on the fact that generative AI cannot be an author, and its works, as a result, cannot possess institutionalized and related cultural capital. At the same time, the Historical and Technological Parallelism frame describes the prospect of likely future recognition and institutionalization of AI-generated art by analogy with photography. In turn, the presence of the frames of Generative AI as an artistic tool and the Economic value of AI-generated artworks testifies to the fact that generative AI art receives some forms of recognition and, consequently, cultural capital bypassing institutions.

These findings allow us to conclude that AI-generated art, to use Bourdieu's terminology, is already in the game and will continue to participate in it, whether it possesses all forms of recognition and cultural capital or only some limited forms of capital. Economic demand and some monetary value, as well as the interest of some museums and galleries, give generative AI the opportunity to act as a free, anti-institutionalized agent of the field. This means that generative AI is not bound by traditional institutional structures and can operate independently.

At the same time, the prospect of integration and institutionalization of AI-generated art remains, at least based on historical analogies in the form of photography.

While generative AI art exhibits objectified cultural capital through its ability to be sold and collected and hints at institutionalized capital through participation in exhibitions and discussions within academic and artistic communities, its claim to embodied cultural capital remains highly contentious due to the perceived lack of direct human creativity and intuition in the creative process. Also, due to the absence of significant human participation, legislative bodies do not recognize the authorship of generative AI, limiting it in the right to possess institutionalized cultural capital. Similarly, although generative AI art can achieve significant economic returns, the legitimacy of these earnings in terms of traditional artistic value is debated. Overall, there is a consensus in the studied texts that while AI-generated art can exhibit attributes of these various forms of capital, its unequivocal right to possess them is not universally acknowledged.

The sometimes opposing points of view – restrained support and interest in the new form of artistic expression on the one hand, and the expression of severe concerns up to open confrontation and accusations of violations of ethical and legal norms - create a bizarre equilibrium in the coverage of AI-generated art in studied texts. It is probably possible to attribute the intensity of intense feelings of all interested parties to the tectonic processes of public opinion formation and determination of the place of technology in the social structure, which are just beginning to manifest themselves and are subject to emotions, fears, and feelings of uncertainty. This nuanced portrayal underscores ongoing debates about the role and recognition of generative AI in the art world, indicating a complex interplay between technological innovation and traditional cultural values.

The presence of cultural capital in AI-generated images may change the procedure for recognizing copyrights, training representatives of artistic specialties, the work of museums and galleries, participation in competitions and prizes, and the value of such works not only on the art market but in the culture in general. Not only institutions such as government and museums but the media have the power to determine the presence (or absence) of cultural capital and, accordingly, to endow or deprive AI-generated artwork. The perceived value of AI-generated art among audiences could be influenced by journalistic interpretations suggesting its cultural significance (or lack thereof).

Understanding the place of technology in society, taking into account the interests and concerns of all stakeholders, can help make the use and development of technology more ethical. Understanding the rhetoric around technology can prevent moral panic and total or partial bans on the use of technology. AI is being applied to more and more fields, including the media itself, education, business, etc., so we can ask the same questions and apply similar methods to other forms of AI technologies.

The idea of appropriation or deprivation of institutionalized cultural capital opens interesting perspectives for looking at the media as a kind of "experts" evaluating various forms of art and other cultural and/or social phenomena and influencing their perception and place in society. Such media influence can manifest itself both in the role of analytical and thoughtful reflection on the phenomenon, and in a radical form of moral panic, leading to society's enmity with the phenomenon, its abolition and prohibition (Cohen, 2011).

Critical Analysis of Project

It is important to note that the limitations of the project include the fact that the media are not the only source of institutionalized cultural capital. Artists, scholars, museums, galleries,

awards and other forms of institutions and experts also distribute cultural capital, and their influence is probably more significant than media. The very process of endowing or depriving capital depends not only on discourse but also from other forms of engagement with phenomenon, for instance, the fact of publication itself can identify that if any media paying attention to the phenomenon, it has some value (cultural capital). Thus, only analyzing the discourse of publications is a limitation and could not be enough to understand the impact of publication on the possession of cultural capital. However, this analysis method gives a specific, albeit limited, understanding of the general mood of the publications and the attitude of the authors in particular and the media in general, as broadcast to the audience. Nowadays, the way the media place cultural capital on AI-generated art is probably of great importance because, given the novelty of the issue and the likelihood that a large part of the audience is not directly informed about the topic by institutions such as museums, galleries or prestigious awards, journalism is probably one of the primary sources of the mass audience's introduction to the issue.

Data Sampling and Analysis Limitations

The idea of the project was to analyze news and analytical articles about the event in different national, local, art and tech-oriented media. However, this approach has some limitations. First, selected media outlets may have inherent biases based on their target audience and editorial policy. For instance, a technical media may view generative AI art more positively because of its pro-technology stance, while an arts newspaper may be more critical, emphasizing traditional artistic values. These biases may skew the results of the study. Second, choosing only news media imposes certain limitations. Generative AI technologies are actively discussed in

social media, such as X (ex-Twitter), Instagram, many materials are published as videos or podcasts on YouTube - such materials remain out of the scope of the project.

This sample is basically related to specific artworks and events connected to them. The description and response to these events, however, does not reflect the whole rhetoric around AI image generation technologies. Meanwhile, there are lawsuits and petitions against technology and its unethical methods. On the other hand, works like this one are also being honored with prestigious awards and so on. So, data sampling has limitations, but this event is still unique and the first of its kind, so it is rational to take it as a starting point for research.

The environment in which artificial intelligence technologies are used is dynamic and perceptions of the technology may change significantly in the very near future. However, despite the temporal nature of the results obtained, they may be of value as a snapshot of current frameworks and perceptions at the dawn of an emerging technology.

Future Projects

Future research could significantly add to the findings of this project and deepen the understanding of the influence of media on the endowment of AI-created artworks with cultural capital. Aspects such as cultural and geographical differences, viewer perception and future changes in discourse around generative AI are of research interest.

One future project could be a comparative analysis of the coverage of AI-generated artworks in international media. The study of cultural and geographical features of the discourse around the topic can help to shed light on cultural and geographical differences and provide a global perspective on the description and perception of AI-generated art.

In addition, analyzing earlier texts and future publications can add to the picture of the development of media discourse. Looking for these publications will provide insight into how

public perceptions and media narratives about generative AI art have changed, given temporal factors and the evolving nature of generative AI technology and public opinion.

Finally, the study of social media discourse is of particular interest and can complement the findings of our study with a viewer perspective. This project could examine audience perceptions of media materials, and original user postings using social media as a data source. Such a project would address the limitation of the current project's focus on published material by incorporating audience perspectives and the influence of digital media.

Each of these projects will contribute to a fuller understanding of the role of media in shaping perceptions of AI-generated art. By integrating different perspectives, the research will offer a more nuanced and holistic view of how AI-generated artworks are framed and perceived in society.

REFERENCES

AbuMusab, S. (2023). Generative AI and human labor: who is replaceable?. AI & SOCIETY, 1-3.

Alleyne, A. (2018, October 25) *A sign of things to come? AI-produced artwork sells for $433K, smashing expectations.* CNN. https://www.cnn.com/style/article/obvious-ai-art-christies-auction-smart-creativity/

Ashby, M. (2023, April 25) The Andy Warhol Copyright Case That Could Transform Generative AI. Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/andy-warhol-fair-use-prince-generative-ai/

Barthes, R. (1972). Mythologies. 1957. Trans. Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang, 302-06.

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021, March). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? 🦜. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency* (pp. 610-623).

Berkowitz, D. (1992). Who sets the media agenda? The ability of policymakers to determine news decisions. *Public opinion, the press, and public policy*, *2*, 81-102.

Bohannon, J. (2015), "Fears of an AI pioneer", Science, Vol. 349 No. 6245, pp. 252-252 c. The forms of capital. In *The sociology of economic life* (pp. 78-92). Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field.* Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2018). The forms of capital. In *The sociology of economic life* (pp. 78-92). Routledge.

Brodkin, J. (2023, August 21). *US judge: Art created solely by artificial intelligence cannot be copyrighted*. Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2023/08/us-judge-art-created-solely-by-artificial-intelligence-cannot-be-copyrighted/

Cave, S., & ÓhÉigeartaigh, S. S. (2019). Bridging near-and long-term concerns about AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, *1*(1), 5-6.

Charmaz, K. (2006) Constructing Grounded Theory. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Chen, M. (2023, January 12) *A Scientist Has Filed Suit Against the U.S. Copyright Office, Arguing His A.I.-Generated Art Should Be Granted Protections.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/ai-art-intellectual-property-lawsuit-stephen-thaler-2242031

Christie's (2018, December 18). *The first piece of AI-generated art to come to auction*. https://www.christies.com/en/stories/a-collaboration-between-two-artists-one-human-one-a-machine-0cd01f4e232f4279a525a446d60d4cd1

Cohen, S. (2011). *Folk devils and moral panics*. Routledge.

Cohn, G. (2018, October 25) *AI Art at Christie's Sells for $432,500*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/25/arts/design/ai-art-sold-christies.html

Cornelissen, J. P., & Werner, M. D. (2014). Putting framing in perspective: A review of framing and frame analysis across the management and organizational literature. Academy of Management Annals, 8(1), 181-235.

Diehl, T. (2023, May 3) *Mimicking the 19th Century in the Age of A.I.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/03/arts/design/ai-makes-nostalgic-images.html

Donk, A., Metag, J., Kohring, M., & Marcinkowski, F. (2012). Framing emerging technologies: risk perceptions of nanotechnology in the German press. Science Communication, 34(1), 5-29.

Edwards, B. (2022, August 31). *AI wins state fair art contest, annoys humans*. Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2022/08/ai-wins-state-fair-art-contest-annoys-humans/

Einsiedel, E. F. (1992). Framing science and technology in the Canadian press. Public understanding of science, 1(1), 89.

Eller, E. E. (2006). A legitimate space for the consumption of art: how Sotheby's, London sells a cultural experience through fine art auctions.

Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (2011). Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing. In R. Emerson, R. Fretz, & L. Shaw (Eds.), *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (pp. 171-199). University of Chicago Press.

English, J. F. (2002). Winning the culture game: Prizes, awards, and the rules of art. *New Literary History*, *33*(1), 109-135.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, *43*(4), 51-58.

Entman, R. M., & Rojecki, A. (1993). Freezing out the public: Elite and media framing of the US anti-nuclear movement.

Epstein, Z., Levine, S., Rand, D. G., & Rahwan, I. (2020). Who gets credit for AI-generated art? Iscience, 23(9).

Escalante-De Mattei, S. (2023, May 5) *Artists Are Suing Artificial Intelligence Companies and the Lawsuit Could Upend Legal Precedents Around Art.* ARTnews.

https://www.artnews.com/art-in-america/features/midjourney-ai-art-image-generators-lawsuit-1234665579/

Escalante-De Mattei, S. (2023, July 21) *Judge Appears Likely to Dismiss AI Class Action Lawsuit by Artists.* ARTnews. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/ai-class-action-lawsuit-dismissal-hearing-stabilityai-midjourney-deviantart-1234675071/

Fast, E., & Horvitz, E. (2017, February). Long-term trends in the public perception of artificial intelligence. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence* (Vol. 31, No. 1).

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* Routledge.

Fursich, E. (2009). In defense of textual analysis. *Journalism studies*, *10*(2), 238-252.

Future of Life Institute. "Pause Giant AI Experiments: An Open Letter." Future of Life Institute, 22 Mar. 2023. <https://futureoflife.org/open-letter/pause-giant-ai-experiments/>.

Gamson, W. A. 1988. The 1987 distinguished lecture: A constructionist approach to mass media and public opinion. Symbolic Interaction 11 (2): 161-74.

Gamson, W., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. The American Journal of Sociology, 95(1), 1–37.

Gangadharbatla, H. (2022). The role of AI attribution knowledge in the evaluation of artwork. Empirical Studies of the Arts, 40(2), 125-142.

Gantiva, C., Jiménez-Leal, W., & Urriago-Rayo, J. (2021). Framing messages to deal with the COVID-19 crisis: the role of loss/gain frames and content. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 568212.

Garud, R., & Rappa, M. A. (1994). A socio-cognitive model of technology evolution: The case of cochlear implants. Organization science, 5(3), 344-362.

Gitlin, T. (2003). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Univ of California Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (2017). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge.

Gray, K., & Wegner, D. M. (2012). Feeling robots and human zombies: Mind perception and the uncanny valley. Cognition, 125(1), 125-130.

Greenberger, A. (2023, April 17) Artist Wins Photography Contest After Submitting AI-Generated Image, Then Forfeits Prize. ARTnews. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/ai-generated-image-world-photography-organization-contest-artist-declines-award-1234664549/

Grenfell, M., & Hardy, C. (2007). *Art rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the visual arts*. Berg.

Grierson, J. (2023, April 17) *Photographer admits prize-winning image was AI-generated.* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/apr/17/photographer-admits-prize-winning-image-was-ai-generated

Harwell, D. (2022, September 2). *He used AI to win a fine-arts competition. Was it cheating?* The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/09/02/midjourney-artificial-intelligence-state-fair-colorado/

Haskell, F. (1980). *Patrons and Painters: A Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque*. Yale University Press.

Helmore, E. (2023, September 24) *An old master? No, it's an image AI just knocked up … and it can't be copyrighted*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/sep/24/an-old-master-no-its-an-image-ai-just-knocked-up-and-it-cant-be-copyrighted

Hertzmann, A. (2019, April 3) *Who should get the credit for AI art?* CNN. https://www.cnn.com/style/article/ai-art-who-should-get-credit-conversation/index.html

Hong, J. W. (2018). Bias in perception of art produced by artificial intelligence. In Human-Computer Interaction. Interaction in Context: 20th International Conference, HCI International 2018, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 15–20, 2018, Proceedings, Part II 20 (pp. 290-303). Springer International Publishing.

Jebb, L. (2023, March 31) *The revolution may be randomised: new Damien Hirst project lets buyers generate their own 'Spin' NFTs.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/03/31/damien-hirst-randomised-spin-paintings-nfts-heni-gallery

Jensen, J. D., Pokharel, M., Scherr, C. L., King, A. J., Brown, N., & Jones, C. (2017). Communicating uncertain science to the public: How amount and source of uncertainty impact fatalism, backlash, and overload. *Risk Analysis*, *37*(1), 40-51.

Kaplan, S. (2008). Framing contests: Strategy making under uncertainty. Organization science, 19(5), 729-752.

Kinsella, E. (2018, October 25) *The First AI-Generated Portrait Ever Sold at Auction Shatters Expectations, Fetching $432,500 —43 Times Its Estimate.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/market/first-ever-artificial-intelligence-portrait-painting-sells-at-christies-1379902

Kolirin, L. (2023, April 18) *Artist rejects photo prize after AI-generated image wins award.* CNN. https://www.cnn.com/style/article/ai-photo-win-sony-scli-intl/

Korinek, A., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2018). Artificial intelligence and its implications for income distribution and unemployment. In The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda (pp. 349-390). University of Chicago Press.

Laor, T., Rosenberg, H., & Steinfeld, N. (2022). Oh, no, Pokémon GO! Media panic and fear of mobility in news coverage of an augmented reality phenomenon. Mobile Media & Communication, 10(3), 365-386.

Layder, D. (1998). Sociological practice: Linking theory and research. London: Sage

Leaver, T., & Srdarov, S. (2023). ChatGPT Isn't Magic: The Hype and Hypocrisy of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Rhetoric. M/C Journal, 26(5).

Lee, T. B. (2023, September 22) *Opinion: The Copyright Office is making a mistake on AI-generated art.* Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2023/09/opinion-dont-exclude-ai-generated-art-from-copyright/

Lima, G., Zhunis, A., Manovich, L., & Cha, M. (2021). On the social-relational moral standing of AI: An Empirical study using AI-generated art. Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 8, 719944.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2017). Qualitative communication research methods. Sage publications.

Liu, V., Qiao, H., & Chilton, L. (2022, October). Opal: Multimodal image generation for news illustration. *In Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (pp. 1-17).

Luke, B. (2018, December 17) *We must not let the art market hoodwink us in the AI debate.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2018/12/17/we-must-not-let-the-art-market-hoodwink-us-in-the-ai-debate

Marwick, A. E. (2008). To catch a predator? The MySpace moral panic. First Monday.

McKee, A. (2003). Textual analysis: A beginner's guide. Textual analysis, 1-160.

Merolla, J., Ramakrishnan, S. K., & Haynes, C. (2013). “Illegal,” “undocumented,” or “unauthorized”: Equivalency frames, issue frames, and public opinion on immigration. *Perspectives on Politics*, *11*(3), 789-807.

Metz, R. (2022, September 3) *AI won an art contest, and artists are furious.* CNN Business. https://www.cnn.com/2022/09/03/tech/ai-art-fair-winner-controversy/index.html

Metz, R. (2022, November 20) *Is AI art really art? This California gallery says yes.* CNN Business. https://www.cnn.com/2022/11/20/tech/ai-art-exhibit-ctpg/index.html

Moruzzi, C. (2020). Should Human Artists Fear AI?: A Report on the Perception of Creative AI.

Nisbet, M. C. (2009). Communicating climate change: Why frames matter for public engagement. *Environment: Science and policy for sustainable development*, *51*(2), 12-23.

OMB (2023, November 7). OMB releases implementation guidance following president Biden's Executive Order on Artificial Intelligence. The White House. https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/briefing-room/2023/11/01/omb-releases-implementation-guidance-following-president-bidens-executive-order-on-artificial-intelligence/

Ostrower, F. (1998). The arts as cultural capital among elites: Bourdieu's theory reconsidered. Poetics, 26(1), 43-53.

Prieur, A., & Savage, M. (2013). Emerging forms of cultural capital. *European societies*, 15(2), 246-267.

Ragot, M., Martin, N., & Cojean, S. (2020, April). AI-generated vs. human artworks. A perception bias towards artificial intelligence? In Extended abstracts of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1–10).

Richardson, J. G. (1986). Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. *(No Title)*.

Roose, K. (2022, September 2). *An A.I.-Generated Picture Won qn Art Prize. Artists Aren't Happy.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/02/technology/ai-artificial-intelligence-artists.html

Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2010). *Artificial intelligence a modern approach*. London.

Saldaña, J. (2016). An Introduction to Codes and Coding. In J. Saldaña (Ed.), *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (pp. 1-42). Sage Publications.

Schrader, A. (2023, September 26). *Another A.I.-generated artwork was denied copyright protection, adding a new knot to the complexities of creative ownership*. Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/ai-art-copyright-2367590

Schütz, H., & Wiedemann, P. M. (2008). Framing effects on risk perception of nanotechnology. *Public Understanding of Science*, *17*(3), 369-379.

Throsby, D. (1994). The production and consumption of the arts: A view of cultural economics. *Journal of economic literature*, *32*(1), 1-29.

Vishwanath, A. (2009). From belief-importance to intention: The impact of framing on technology adoption. Communication Monographs, 76(2), 177-206.

Wenzel, J. (2023, March 21). *A copyright battle over AI-generated art will begin in Colorado*. The Denver Post. https://www.denverpost.com/2023/03/21/artificial-intelligence-ai-art-trademark-fight-jason-allen-colorado/

Wenzel, J. (2023, September 1) *Global controversy after AI art-win prompts rule changes at Colorado State Fair.* The Denver Post. https://www.denverpost.com/2023/09/01/ai-art-colorado-state-fair-2023-rule-changes-global-controversy/

Whiddington, R. (2023, April 21) *Damien Hirst's New A.I. Project, Which Asked Collectors to Generate Their Own Paintings, Earned Him $20 Million in Nine Days.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/market/hirst-beautiful-paintings-sale-20-million-9-days-2289386

Williams, Z. (2023, April 18) '*AI isn't a threat*' *– Boris Eldagsen, whose fake photo duped the Sony judges, hits back.* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2023/apr/18/ai-threat-boris-eldagsen-fake-photo-duped-sony-judges-hits-back

Youn, S. (2018, October 26) *Christie's auctions the first AI-produced art, and the gavel price was staggering.* ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Business/christies-sells-ai-produced-art-half-million-dollars/story?id=58749667

Zhai, Y., Yan, J., Zhang, H., & Lu, W. (2020). Tracing the evolution of AI: Conceptualization of artificial intelligence in mass media discourse. Information Discovery and Delivery, 48 (3), 137–149.

APPENDIX A: Sample references

Alleyne, A. (2018, October 25) *A sign of things to come? AI-produced artwork sells for $433K, smashing expectations.* CNN. https://www.cnn.com/style/article/obvious-ai-art-christies-auction-smart-creativity/

Ashby, M. (2023, April 25) The Andy Warhol Copyright Case That Could Transform Generative AI. Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/andy-warhol-fair-use-prince-generative-ai/

Bainbridge, S. (2024, May 3) *Photography or 'promptography': a year on from the Sony Awards AI furore, what is the nuanced view?* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2024/05/03/photography-or-promptography-a-year-on-from-the-sony-awards-ai-furore-what-is-the-nuanced-view

Batycka, D. (2022, September 1). *An A.I.-Generated Artwork Won First Prize at a Colorado State Fair. Human Artists Are Infuriated.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/colorado-artists-mad-ai-art-competition-2168495

Bedingfield, W. (2023, August 31) *The Inventor Behind a Rush of AI Copyright Suits Is Trying to Show His Bot Is Sentient.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/the-inventor-behind-a-rush-of-ai-copyright-suits-is-trying-to-show-his-bot-is-sentient/

Belanger, A. (2023, October 31) *Two artists suing AI image makers never registered works with Copyright Office.* Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2023/10/two-artists-suing-ai-image-makers-never-copyrighted-their-works/

Brodkin, J. (2023, August 21) *US judge: Art created solely by artificial intelligence cannot be copyrighted.* Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2023/08/us-judge-art-created-solely-by-artificial-intelligence-cannot-be-copyrighted/

Bush, L. (2023, April 20) *'AI photography is here to stay—here's why we should be worried'* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/04/20/are-ai-photographs-actually-photographs

Carrigan, M. (2018, October 22) *Will the market for artificial intelligence art take off?* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2018/10/22/will-the-market-for-artificial-intelligence-art-take-off

Chen, M. (2023, January 12) *A Scientist Has Filed Suit Against the U.S. Copyright Office, Arguing His A.I.-Generated Art Should Be Granted Protections.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/ai-art-intellectual-property-lawsuit-stephen-thaler-2242031

Cohn, G. (2018, October 25) *AI Art at Christie's Sells for $432,500*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/25/arts/design/ai-art-sold-christies.html

Diehl, T. (2023, May 3) *Mimicking the 19th Century in the Age of A.I.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/03/arts/design/ai-makes-nostalgic-images.html

Edwards, B. (2022, August 31). *AI wins state fair art contest, annoys humans*. Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2022/08/ai-wins-state-fair-art-contest-annoys-humans/

Edwards, B. (2023, January 16) *Artists file class-action lawsuit against AI image generator companies.* Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/01/artists-file-class-action-lawsuit-against-ai-image-generator-companies/

Edwards, B. (2023, September 11). *US rejects AI copyright for famous state fair-winning Midjourney Art*. Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/09/us-rejects-ai-copyright-for-famous-state-fair-winning-midjourney-art/

Escalante-De Mattei, S. (2022, September 1). *AI-generated Artwork Goes Viral after Winning Award at State Fair*. ARTnews. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/colorado-state-fair-ai-generated-artwork-controversy-1234638022/

Escalante-De Mattei, S. (2023, May 5) *Artists Are Suing Artificial Intelligence Companies and the Lawsuit Could Upend Legal Precedents Around Art.* ARTnews. https://www.artnews.com/art-in-america/features/midjourney-ai-art-image-generators-lawsuit-1234665579/

Escalante-De Mattei, S. (2023, July 21) *Judge Appears Likely to Dismiss AI Class Action Lawsuit by Artists.* ARTnews. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/ai-class-action-lawsuit-dismissal-hearing-stabilityai-midjourney-deviantart-1234675071/

Greenberger, A. (2023, April 17) *Artist Wins Photography Contest After Submitting AI-Generated Image, Then Forfeits Prize.* ARTnews. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/ai-generated-image-world-photography-organization-contest-artist-declines-award-1234664549/

Grierson, J. (2023, April 17) *Photographer admits prize-winning image was AI-generated.* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/apr/17/photographer-admits-prize-winning-image-was-ai-generated

Harwell, D. (2022, September 2). *He used AI to win a fine-arts competition. Was it cheating?*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/09/02/midjourney-artificial-intelligence-state-fair-colorado/

Helmore, E. (2023, September 24) *An old master? No, it's an image AI just knocked up … and it can't be copyrighted*. The Guardian.

https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/sep/24/an-old-master-no-its-an-image-ai-just-knocked-up-and-it-cant-be-copyrighted

Hertzmann, A. (2019, April 3) *Who should get the credit for AI art?* CNN. https://www.cnn.com/style/article/ai-art-who-should-get-credit-conversation/index.html

Hill, K. (2023, February 13) *This Tool Could Protect Artists From A.I.-Generated Art That Steals Their Style*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/13/technology/ai-art-generator-lensa-stable-diffusion.html

Jebb, L. (2023, March 31) *The revolution may be randomised: new Damien Hirst project lets buyers generate their own 'Spin' NFTs.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/03/31/damien-hirst-randomised-spin-paintings-nfts-heni-gallery

Jones, J. (2018, October 26) *A portrait created by AI just sold for $432,000. But is it really art?* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/shortcuts/2018/oct/26/call-that-art-can-a-computer-be-a-painter

Kelly, K. (2022, November 17) *What AI-Generated Art Really Means For Human Creativity.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/picture-limitless-creativity-ai-image-generators/

Kinsella, E. (2018, October 25) *The First AI-Generated Portrait Ever Sold at Auction Shatters Expectations, Fetching $432,500 —43 Times Its Estimate.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/market/first-ever-artificial-intelligence-portrait-painting-sells-at-christies-1379902

Kinsella, E. (2023, August 21) *A Court Shot Down a Computer Scientist's Latest Attempt to Copyright an A.I.-Created Artwork in a Case That Has Big Implications for A.I. Artists*. Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/court-shot-down-ai-art-copyright-again-2352452

Knibbs, K. (2023, September 6) *Why This Award-Winning Piece of AI Art Can't Be Copyrighted.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/ai-art-copyright-matthew-allen/

Knight, C., McNulty, C., & Swed, M. (2018, November 2) *Times critics reflect on how the Great Recession affected theater, music and the arts.* Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/theater/reviews/la-et-cm-2008-reflection-theater-art-music-20181102-htmlstory.html

Knight, W. (2022, November 21) *This Copyright Lawsuit Could Shape the Future of Generative AI.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/this-copyright-lawsuit-could-shape-the-future-of-generative-ai/

Kolirin, L. (2023, April 18) *Artist rejects photo prize after AI-generated image wins award.* CNN. https://www.cnn.com/style/article/ai-photo-win-sony-scli-intl/

Lee, T. B. (2023, September 22) *Opinion: The Copyright Office is making a mistake on AI-generated art.* Ars Technica. https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2023/09/opinion-dont-exclude-ai-generated-art-from-copyright/

Luke, B. (2018, December 17) *We must not let the art market hoodwink us in the AI debate.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2018/12/17/we-must-not-let-the-art-market-hoodwink-us-in-the-ai-debate

Manjoo, F. (2023, August 25) *A Creator (Me) Made a Masterpiece With A.I.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/25/opinion/ai-art-intellectual-property.html

Martin , S. (2023, April 18) *Artist wins Sony World Photography contest, declines award because image was AI-generated.* USA Today. https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2023/04/18/sony-photography-award-ai-generated-image/11686577002/

Metz, R. (2022, November 20) *Is AI art really art? This California gallery says yes.* CNN Business. https://www.cnn.com/2022/11/20/tech/ai-art-exhibit-ctpg/index.html

Metz, R. (2022, September 3) *AI won an art contest, and artists are furious.* CNN Business. https://www.cnn.com/2022/09/03/tech/ai-art-fair-winner-controversy/index.html

Miller, A. (2019, March 4) *Can machines be more creative than humans?* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/mar/04/can-machines-be-more-creative-than-humans

Millière, R. (2022, July 17) *AI Art Is Challenging the Boundaries of Curation.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/dalle-art-curation-artificial-intelligence/

Molina, B. (2018, October 25) *Christie's sells painting created by artificial intelligence for $432,500.* USA Today. https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2018/10/25/painting-created-ai-going-auction-block-christies/1759967002/

Muller, T. (2019, February 9) *This Art Has Been Created by AI. Will Collectors Want It?* Bloomberg. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-09/ai-art-from-mario-klingemann-memories-of-passersby-to-sell

Naughton, J. (2023, August 26) *Can AI-generated art be copyrighted? A US judge says not, but it's just a matter of time.* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/aug/26/ai-generated-art-copyright-law-recent-entrance-paradise-creativity-machine

Poritz, I. (2023, August 24) *AI Art Copyright Ruling Invites Future Battles Over Human Inputs*. Bloomberg. https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ai-art-copyright-ruling-invites-future-battles-over-human-inputs

Porterfield, C. (2023, October 31) *Judge dismisses most of artists' copyright lawsuit against AI image generators.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/10/31/california-judge-dismisses-most-of-artists-ai-copyright-lawsuit

Rea, N. (2019, March 6) *Sotheby's First Auction of an AI Artwork Fails to Incite a Robo-Frenzy, Fetching a Modest $51,000.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/market/artificial-intelligence-sothebys-1481590

Rizzo, J. (2022, June 23) *Generative Art Is Challenging What It Means to Be Human.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/generative-art-intellectual-property-law/

Roose, K. (2022, September 2). *An A.I.-Generated Picture Won qn Art Prize. Artists Aren't Happy.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/02/technology/ai-artificial-intelligence-artists.html

Schneider, T. & Rea, N. (2018, September 25) *Has Artificial Intelligence Given Us the Next Great Art Movement? Experts Say Slow Down, the 'Field Is in Its Infancy'.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/ai-art-comes-to-market-is-it-worth-the-hype-1352011

Schrader, A. (2023, September 26). *Another A.I.-Generated Artwork Was Denied Copyright Protection, Adding a New Knot to the Complexities of Creative Ownership* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/ai-art-copyright-2367590

Seymour, T. (2023, April 18) *The camera never lies? Creator of AI image rejects prestigious photo award.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/04/18/the-camera-never-lies-creator-of-ai-image-rejects-prestigious-photo-award

Simonite, T. (2018, November 20) *How a Teenager's Code Spawned a $432,500 Piece of Art.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/teenagers-code-spawned-dollar-432500-piece-of-art/

Small, Z. (2023, April 21) *As Fight Over A.I. Artwork Unfolds, Judge Rejects Copyright Claim.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/21/arts/design/copyright-ai-artwork.html

Vargas, S. (2022, September 21) *How AI-generated art is changing the concept of art itself.* Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/projects/artificial-intelligence-generated-art-ownership-bias-dall-e-midjourney/

Wenzel, J. (2023, March 21). *A copyright battle over AI-generated art will begin in Colorado*. The Denver Post. https://www.denverpost.com/2023/03/21/artificial-intelligence-ai-art-trademark-fight-jason-allen-colorado/

Wenzel, J. (2023, September 1) *Global controversy after AI art-win prompts rule changes at Colorado State Fair.* The Denver Post. https://www.denverpost.com/2023/09/01/ai-art-colorado-state-fair-2023-rule-changes-global-controversy/

Whiddington, R. (2023, April 17) *A Photographer Submitted an A.I.-Generated Image to a Prestigious Art Competition to Be 'Cheeky.' It Won a Top Prize Anyway.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/art-world/boris-eldagsen-photography-award-sony-ai-generated-images-dall-e-2286622

Whiddington, R. (2023, April 21) *Damien Hirst's New A.I. Project, Which Asked Collectors to Generate Their Own Paintings, Earned Him $20 Million in Nine Days.* Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/market/hirst-beautiful-paintings-sale-20-million-9-days-2289386

Whiddington, R. (2023, April 3) Damien Hirst Is No Longer Making His Signature Spin Paintings. Instead, He's Unveiled a New A.I. Generator So You Can Make Them Yourself. Artnet News. https://news.artnet.com/market/damien-hirst-the-beautiful-paintings-generative-art-heni-2279522

Williams, Z. (2023, April 18) '*AI isn't a threat' – Boris Eldagsen, whose fake photo duped the Sony judges, hits back.* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2023/apr/18/ai-threat-boris-eldagsen-fake-photo-duped-sony-judges-hits-back

Willingham, AJ. (2020, April 30) *Artificial Intelligence can't technically invent things, says patent office.* CNN https://www.cnn.com/2020/04/30/us/artificial-intelligence-inventing-patent-office-trnd/index.html

Yavuz, S. K. (2023, September 1) *What the latest US court ruling means for AI-generated art's copyright status.* The Art Newspaper. https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/09/02/artificial-intelligence-lawsuit-decision-us-copyright-law

Youn, S. (2018, October 23) *Christie's auctions 1st piece of art created by artificial intelligence.* ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Business/christies-auctions-1st-piece-art-created-artificial-intelligence/story?id=58662493

Youn, S. (2018, October 26) *Christie's auctions the first AI-produced art, and the gavel price was staggering.* ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Business/christies-sells-ai-produced-art-half-million-dollars/story?id=58749667