

# The ARTificial Revolution: Challenges for redefining Art Education in the paradigm of generative artificial intelligence

Andrés Torres Carceller<sup>1,\*</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>University of Barcelona, Spain, andrestorres@ub.edu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8055-7479>

## ABSTRACT

After years of development in the background, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has burst onto the global stage thanks to open tools for generating textual, visual, auditory, and audiovisual content. In this emerging context, AI is not only emerging as a technological phenomenon but also as a catalyst for innovation in the artistic and educational fields. Although we are only at the dawn, AI is rapidly evolving and leading us towards a revolution, opening a new field of possibilities in creative domains that will transform current aesthetic, procedural, and authorial conceptions. Its potential as a creative tool is currently limited to being a support that facilitates obtaining results of great formal quality and style quickly, but without human intervention based on clear objectives, it becomes an empty generator. Artistic Education must embrace this technology not as an intruder or rival, but as a tool to be known and integrated as another means of creation, developing skills that allow students not only to use these tools effectively but also to reflect on their implications in society and culture. Promoting a conscious, responsible, safe, and ethical use that ensures a critical stance towards generative AI. Understand that it is not a creative tool. It is for creators.

**KEYWORDS:** Generative artificial intelligence; image; artistic education; education.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In the mid-19th century, the art world faced a crisis due to the creation and commercialisation of the Daguerreotype. This new technology, which rapidly expanded within a few years, suddenly rendered the conception of art—particularly its realistic and naturalistic inclinations—obsolete. Consequently, an era emerged known as the peak of art fetishisation, a movement promoted by late Romanticism that restricted all relations with new technologies and advocated for the notion of art as something pure and immutable (Tello, 2015). Photography and later cinema challenged these notions, indeed forcing a redefinition of what is considered artistic. These mediums established the concept of reproduction as a tool within the artistic process. In 1917, Marcel Duchamp introduced his readymade titled "Fountain," which was merely a common urinal taken out of context and presented as a sculpture. This directly challenged the association of technical skill with artistic merit, opening a new paradigm in artistic standards. As a precursor of conceptual art, Duchamp's work represented a shift in the relationship between the artist and the material author, as the artist was no longer constrained by the limitations of the medium. Over a century later, the advent of generative content tools has once again prompted us to re-examine prevailing notions. Technologies designated as artificial intelligence (AI) are more aspirational than actual. Systems designated as content generators lack the capacity to reason or comprehend their own responses. Instead, they operate as highly sophisticated automatons, based on statistical responses and a vast amount of data (Badea & Gilpin, 2022). The significant advancement of AI is its ability to learn and improve its performance in specific tasks without being explicitly programmed to do so. This achievement can be attributed to machine learning (Mitchell, 1997). This approach employs algorithms and statistical models to analyse and learn from data or previous experiences, thereby distinguishing it from traditional programming, where each

response must be manually encoded. This learning is developed thanks to the architecture proposed by McCulloch & Pitts (1943) of neural networks, which simulates the human brain structure through a system composed of layers of nodes or "neurons." These neurons process data inputs through weights and activation functions that are continuously adjusted based on feedback, enabling AI to learn from experience and efficiently tackle complex problems (Aggarwal et al. 2022). Within machine learning, deep learning stands out as an advanced subdivision, employing multi-layered neural networks that extract and model data representations at various levels of abstraction (LeCun, Bengio, & Hinton, 2015). This methodology enables AI to decipher complex hierarchies of features, thereby conferring upon it exceptional power in areas such as image recognition, natural language understanding, and content generation.

The significant advancement of AI has been its transition from being a tool for extracting patterns from data to generating patterns after training with such data. This transition has endowed AI with the capacity to not only describe artifacts and predict people's behavior but also to generate content. Generative AI is capable of producing entirely original textual, auditory, or visual artefacts based on user instructions and the data it has been trained on (Lund & Wang, 2023).

AI offers a range of practical applications in various fields, thanks to its ability to solve complex problems and perform activities that require human skills, such as identification, prioritisation of information, synthesis, learning, decision-making, and creation (although under the label of "generation," since the capacity for creation is understood to be exclusively human).

Software is deeply embedded in contemporary life in ways both overt and practically imperceptible, in economic, cultural, creative, and political terms. The distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic, the valuable and the worthless, what we create and

what we have appropriated, has become increasingly blurred (Anantrasirichai & Bull, 2022). The increasing sophistication of fake content has reached a point where the fictitious is nearly indistinguishable from the real, expanding creative possibilities in audiovisual media but also facilitating the manipulation of reality (Torres-Carceller, 2022).

At this stage, it is too soon to provide definitive answers; it is better to ask the right questions to shape the use of AI that we desire. As we approach the threshold of a new creative era, the advent of generative AI in the visual arts and art education invites us to engage in a profound reflection on its impact and potential. As we enter this initial phase, it becomes necessary to question how AI might affect creative thinking, to determine whether it acts as a substitute for human imagination or as an instrument to enhance it. This leads to the further question of whether, as a result, it is necessary to reshape art education. Moreover, it is crucial to consider its influence on global aesthetics and address the ethical challenges and respect for copyright issues that its use entails. This juncture is conducive to raising fundamental questions that will guide the development of generative AI toward a future in which its value in amplifying creativity and artistic appreciation is maximised while safeguarding the principles of originality and cultural diversity.

## 2 OPPORTUNITY OR THREAT? AI IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

AI exerts evolutionary pressure on all of us. We must enhance our cognitive abilities to a new level. Education evolves by adapting to changes (seldom anticipating them). It is not the case that AI will monopolise educational processes; rather, educators should integrate it into the learning process as a fundamental, yet not absolute, tool. The most contentious issue regarding generative tools is whether they will become the preferred tool for those seeking to create with minimal effort (Haluzi & Jungwirth, 2023). The problem may not lie in the tool itself, but in the nature of certain educational tasks that have often become obsolete (Hill-Yardin, 2023).

The recent applications of content generation represent a significant leap forward, opening a new field of creation that prioritises the conceptual and procedural over technical mastery (Halaweh, 2023). It is imprudent to ignore or prohibit generative applications since education has the duty to prepare society for the future, and this society must coexist with this new paradigm (Schellekens, 2022). It is of the utmost importance to educate educators and students on the importance of integrating proper, ethical, and critical usage habits in order to fully leverage their potential in the teaching and learning processes (Akinwalere & Ivanov, 2022).

The mere fact of having to assign a specific task to the machine by providing a detailed description of what is desired implies that the user (student) must identify a need, project a solution, and be able to organise their ideas to communicate them effectively. A review of the response provided by AI allows one to reconsider or expand their instructions in order to achieve their goal.

In this context, educational institutions should neither prohibit the use of AI tools nor ignore the growing potential of such tools. The key issue here is to recognise the potential value of AI tools in the teaching and learning processes (Xiao, Chatterjee, & Gehringer, 2022).

## 3 CO-CREATOR OR TOOL? THE ROLE OF AI IN ARTISTIC CREATION

Generative AI has been employed in artistic fields related to image, sound, dance, and text. In 2016, a deep learning algorithm was trained to learn the style of Rembrandt by analysing his 346 catalogued paintings. Subsequently, the algorithm was tasked with generating a new portrait, which was found to resemble a Rembrandt painting to a remarkable degree. In the same year, researchers at Sony Computer Science Laboratories in Paris developed a neural network, called DeepBach, which is capable of producing chorale cantatas in the style of J.S. Bach. Since then, other music generation algorithms have been created. In addition to style imitators, AI has also been used to complete unfinished works, such as Beethoven's Tenth Symphony in 2019 and Schubert's Eighth (the latter with human assistance selecting the best-generated melodies). In 2019, a New York auction house sold an AI-generated "painting" for nearly half a million dollars. The work, titled "Edmond de Belamy," is a portrait printed on canvas that is part of a series of images called "The Belamy Family," created by the Obvious collective in Paris. In this case, the algorithmic system was fed a dataset of thousands of portraits painted between the 14th and 20th centuries. It is not possible to assert that these results are original or creative, as the tools were constrained to the production of syntheses or pastiches, rather than the creation of something genuinely novel. The outcome can be described as a false original rather than a copy. This indicates that, for the time being, AI has limitations in its capacity to reason and its ability to be genuinely creative.

The most significant impact of AI has been the development of tools that enable users without programming knowledge to experiment and create using AI. Jason Allen, a video game designer who used Midjourney to generate images, won first prize at the Colorado State Fair in the category of "Digital Arts / Digitally Manipulated Photography" for his work "Theatre d'Opera Spatial."

Nevertheless, some participants accused him of acting deceptively, arguing that he was not the creator of the image. Allen countered that he had worked extensively on the prompt to achieve the final image and that he had contributed the idea and aesthetic description of the work. With a more subversive intent, Boris Eldagsen presented and won the creative photography category of the prestigious Sony World Photography Awards with his work "The Electrician." The photograph was so well-received by the jury that it was also awarded the overall prize. At that moment, the author revealed that he had used DALL-E 2 to generate the image, sparking a debate about the jury's ability to distinguish between photographs and artificially generated images and the new definition of authorship.

While technical mastery has long ceased to be a key identifier of artistic quality, it is now one of the arguments used against works produced with this new tool. The advent of computer numerical control (CNC) machining tools in the 1940s rendered the need for sculpting skills obsolete, as it became possible to create marble sculptures and wood carvings without such expertise. Similarly, the advent of photography in the 19th century rendered the need for virtuoso painting skills obsolete, as it became possible to emulate reality through the use of cameras. As has occurred throughout history, technological advancement has prompted alterations to aesthetic models (Carceller, 2015). The advent of AI-driven mass

content generation will not only alter artistic models but will also transform the concept of authorship (Gangadharbatla, 2022).

The concept of the artist has evolved over time, with the artist being defined as a person with specialised skills and knowledge in a creative discipline, capable of creating original, innovative, and meaningful works that convey ideas, emotions, and sensations through various media and forms of expression. The current challenge is to determine whether AI can be recognised as a fundamental part of the creation process or even be attributed artistic capabilities. The notion of machines as creators of art has been a topic of interest since the advent of the first computers (Jaskot, 2019). Benjamin (2018) already posited the significant transformation implied by the artistic work losing its unique and original status when reproduction technologies such as photography and cinema were developed.

In 2022, the *Druet vs. Cattelan* trial had a significant impact on the judicial recognition of the fundamentals of conceptual art. The Italian artist Maurizio Cattelan, who had previously acknowledged his lack of skill in painting and sculpture, was the subject of the controversy.

The ruling, issued by the judges of the specialized intellectual property section, establishes that the artwork is not limited merely to the figures themselves but includes the "staging" of the work, i.e., the installation as a whole. The judges contended that Cattelan's collaborator, Daniel Druet, did not participate in the decision-making process related to the staging of the figures, nor in the choice of the building and rooms, the direction of gaze, lighting, among other important elements. This trial has been of significant consequence, establishing an important precedent at least in France. It has established that to be recognised as the author, it is not necessary to directly intervene in the creation of the work; rather, it is sufficient to be the author of the idea.

There is a pervasive apprehension that certain creative roles may become obsolete in the near future (Matas, 2018). From a creative perspective, the advent of neural networks has opened up new avenues for artistic expression, with an increasing number of artists leveraging this emerging technology to gain inspiration and develop a distinctive visual identity (Choi, 2022). However, AI represents a threat to visual content professionals, who might see their ability to offer personalised and high-quality work jeopardised (Radhakrishnan, 2023). Illustrators and graphic designers might be among the first groups of artists to be displaced by AI (Cammer, 2023). The proliferation of machine learning algorithms has led to a surge in the availability of content accessible online. This has created a potential issue for artists who have published their work on the Internet, as their creations may inadvertently train the algorithms of their competitors, enabling them to create similar images with minimal effort. This raises questions regarding the authorship of synthetic creations and the extent to which the original work of the artist or photographer is reflected in the images generated by AI. It is crucial to determine whether this represents a significant infringement of intellectual property rights. The ownership of copyright in works created by AI is a matter of contention. This is due to the lack of clarity surrounding the rules of this new playing field (Hunde & Woldeyohannes, 2022). The need for greater legal clarity is particularly pressing given that these creations are being sold and generating profits. Some commercial and free image banks have hastily updated their guidelines to prohibit the distribution of materials generated by AI processes, while simultaneously expanding their catalog with artificially generated images.

The primary image-generating AI programs (DALL-E, Midjourney, or Stable Diffusion) utilize Laion-5B, a nonprofit public database comprising five billion tagged images. However, this database is extracted from the Internet, and some of the images therein are protected by copyright, thereby infringing on the intellectual property rights of the creators. This occurs when the images are used without consent, economic compensation, or authorship recognition. American artists Kelly McKernan, Sarah Andersen, and Karla Ortiz were among the first to challenge the use of their images without consent, economic compensation, or authorship recognition. They filed a class action lawsuit against Midjourney, Stable Diffusion, and DreamUp after seeing their names in requests to create digital works in a certain style (Zhuk, 2023).

The Intellectual Property Law establishes that the ownership of a work initially belongs to the author or authors of that work. Although judicial decisions or rulings from the Copyright Office that recognise the copyright of works created by AI have not yet been made, the fundamental problem lies in the difficulty – and lack of transparency – in clarifying with what data AI models have been trained and whether these data have complied with copyright or not. The new dilemma prompted by AI is to whom authorship of a work generated with AI should be attributed, to the AI programmers or to the user. To gain a deeper understanding of this complex issue, it is helpful to draw an analogy with photography. In this context, the AI creator could be considered analogous to the camera manufacturer, while the user (prompter) of the AI who drives the creation of a specific work could be compared to the photographer who uses that camera to capture an image. From this perspective, the AI user would be considered the author and, therefore, the initial owner of the copyright. Nevertheless, the creative decisions that involve the coding and training of the AI could confer copyright to the AI creator, given their greater influence on the work than a mere tool like a camera or a digital photo editor (Abbott & Rothman, 2022).

#### 4 INNOVATION, SUPPLANTATION, OR DEPENDENCE? INTEGRATING AI IN ARTISTIC EDUCATION

While AI is proving to be a useful tool for efficiently performing certain tasks, it also raises serious concerns about the future of content production. Although the possibilities are promising and arouse interest, they also generate fear and suspicion due to the uncertainty about how AI could alter the content industry, even taking control of it, and what treatment will be given to the millions of creators whose works feed the machine learning systems.

In the context of human development, individuals who have significantly developed their creativity tend to have greater control over their environment (Csikszentmihalyi, 2011). This is due to their ability to solve everyday problems more effectively. Furthermore, the development of creativity contributes to personal growth, as it allows individuals to enhance their unique talents. Furthermore, it is important to consider the sense of purpose that these individuals experience in life. Directing their creative skills towards their passions helps them to give a broader meaning to their existence. This approach not only improves their quality of life on an individual level but also allows them to contribute significantly to their environment, thereby creating a positive impact in their social and cultural context.

The introduction of generative AI tools capable of generating images in multiple styles, embedding faces from one image to

another, expanding the canvas of images, etc., is highly attractive due to the good quality of their results (Ruiz, 2022). This accessibility and versatility in the creation of visual content is undoubtedly an advantage for the field of artistic education. However, it is crucial to emphasise the importance of going beyond the mere superficial appeal of these images. To avoid the pitfall of empty sensationalism, it is essential that students develop a solid conceptual ability that allows them to clearly define the purpose of their creations.

The utilisation of these advanced technologies to generate thematic series or to explore a specific concept in depth serves as an illustration of the ways in which these tools can facilitate artistic objectives beyond the mere production of ornamental works (Åström, Reim, & Parida, 2022). In the context of artistic education, it is becoming increasingly imperative to integrate the generation of visual, audiovisual, sonic, and textual content into its academic corpus, encompassing its interdisciplinary variants. This multifaceted approach not only equips students with the ability to incorporate emerging technologies as novel creative tools but also fosters a profound understanding of these from the creator's perspective. It is of paramount importance that students cultivate a critical and sceptical attitude towards images, recognising that in the current era, these have transcended their testimonial value to become entities malleable by technology (Torres-Carceller, 2022). This critical awareness is essential for navigating a world saturated with AI-generated content.

This technology has inverted the factors of the famous "a picture is worth a thousand words." For a long time, it was understood that describing an image with words was a limitation. The desire to dissociate from the textual even led to one of the common ways of titling a work being "untitled," to avoid semantic labels that could influence the viewer's perception. However, within the paradigm of generative AI, each image now has its own linguistic code. The increasing use of these programs to replace illustrators and graphic designers in image production has led to the emergence of a new creative figure: the generative artist or prompter. These individuals, analogous to an art director, act as creative orchestrators who guide the artistic process without directly intervening in the physical creation of the work. Both the artist and the art director establish aesthetic and thematic guidelines, dictating the tone, style, and visual content. In fields such as advertising or cinema, the art director sets the context and specifications for others (whether graphic designers or algorithms) to materialise ideas into concrete works. This process is exemplified by Vartiainen and Tedre (2024). In both cases, creativity is channelled through conceptualisation and planning, ensuring that the final product reflects a coherent artistic vision and meets the established communicative objectives (Song and Koo, 2022). Therefore, it is essential not to be overshadowed and to be aware that integrating these technologies does not imply abandoning the fundamental techniques and skills of traditional artistic creation (Khalil & Er, 2023). It is essential that students learn to draw, educate their gaze, understand the basics of composition, lighting, colour treatment, and develop a library of visual references. These skills will allow students to communicate effectively with machines (Wellner, 2022). These basic skills are the foundation on which to precisely control the information supplied to AI systems, allowing the imagination and creative thinking of students to be fundamental in redefining, transforming, and editing the content generated by AI.

The focus on the procedural is a key component in this educational context, ensuring that the creative process remains at the centre of

the learning experience. It is fundamental that students learn to handle these tools in a way that the final products reflect a process of reflection and development, and not just the technical ability to generate attractive images. This implies a critical skill to formulate and adjust the prompts, selecting those results that best capture the original intention and being willing to iterate on their instructions until the desired result is achieved. All this, without losing the ability to integrate by serendipity results that may connect with their aesthetic intentions. Chance is an important factor in artistic processes, and with the current generative tools, it continues to be. The integration of generative AI into the creative process represents a significant opportunity for the advancement of digital art. The combination of traditional and digital methods, including drawing, editing, and other techniques, with generative AI offers a promising avenue for artistic exploration. This technology not only expands the creative spectrum but also provides a platform for experimenting with visual and conceptual complexities that previously required advanced technical skills or inaccessible resources. The capacity to generate images using AI allows students to explore new forms of visual expression, facilitating experimentation with styles, textures, and compositions in a rapid and efficient manner. It can even serve as a tool to visualize formal, compositional, lighting, or chromatic concepts, thus becoming an important educational resource for the understanding of concepts by making them visible.

The capacity to imagine is not simply limited to the ability to create mental images of absent objects. In fact, imagination is a faculty that intervenes in all mental processes, both in thought processes and in active vision, such as gaze. The presence and intensity of imagination in each mental process is different, which implies a specificity that we consider exclusively human. In recent times, a series of visual productions created by AI programs have been promoted through networks, whose results seem particularly imaginative. This is because they do not start from previously known parameters that the device could imitate, but are the result of linguistically expressed proposals (Bakpayev et al., 2022). The novelty is not that this technology produces images with textual or graphical inputs, but that the visualities of these devices are absolutely unexpected.

This type of text does not function as a series of instructions, but as a source of inspiration. The process operates in a manner that is so surprising that it seems as if the mechanism is truly creative, that is, that it has imagination. AI technology is stimulated by textual expressions that, whether concrete or ambiguous, generate images that are more or less related to the statement depending on the software used (Leach 2022). This technology has the potential to replace the term "intelligence" with "artificial imagination." An artist who uses generative AI provides the graphical or textual instructions that inspire the machine's "imagination," in a process that apparently reverses the traditional logic of image production. The issue does not lie in the production tool, but in the conceptual and material involvement of the artist, whether computational or material-based. The generation of images through AI could potentially be regarded as a form of conceptual art, or alternatively, it could be recognised as a new medium. It is of paramount importance that artistic education maintains a balance between the teaching of traditional techniques and procedures and the integration of new technologies. This ensures that students do not become passive consumers of technology, but rather, are able to utilise it as a means of expanding their creative expression (Cetinic & She, 2022). This hybrid approach enables students to explore and experiment with new forms of artistic creation while developing

a critical understanding of the ethical and conceptual implications associated with the production and consumption of images in contemporary society.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

The advent of the Stable Diffusion code by Stability.ai, in conjunction with the proliferation of analogous programs such as OpenAI's DALL-E and MidJourney, and the evolution of editing tools such as Runway, sound creation tools like Harmonai, and multimedia generation tools like GPT-5, has precipitated a revolution. In the realm of creative pursuits, AIs have transitioned from mere support tools to central elements. In a matter of seconds or minutes, an algorithm can generate original content such as text, images, voiceovers, videos, or computer code from simple instructions, a description, or specified parameters. This implies that creative professions will undergo a major transformation, necessitating an adaptation of artistic education to ensure that new generations are properly trained for the new context.

Advancements in AI present a complex panorama of opportunities, limitations, and threats. In light of the considerable advances in content production, it is imperative to examine these new developments and their potential impact on society. The internet has profoundly transformed human cognitive processes by altering the way we access, create, and communicate data. In the long term, AI will likely lead to a transformation of a similar magnitude, with uncertain consequences.

The integration of generative AI in artistic education presents significant challenges related to equity and access to technology. The reliance on technological tools has the potential to exacerbate the existing digital divide, as educational institutions with greater financial resources are better positioned to benefit from more sophisticated and advanced technologies. This creates a discriminatory environment that favours students from more affluent backgrounds, providing them with learning and artistic development opportunities that are not available to their peers in less resourced institutions. This situation perpetuates a cycle where access to technology becomes a determining factor that can amplify pre-existing inequalities, limiting the educational and creative possibilities of students based on their economic situation. This issue underscores the need for educational policies and funding strategies that mitigate these disparities and promote more equitable access to new technologies.

AI tools pioneer the blending of two hitherto antagonistic worlds: creativity and computing power. An AI capable of creating "art" must take into account the background (history) to extrapolate patterns from artifacts and to interpret their collective reception. Therefore, using AI to generate new cultural artifacts (and assist human creators) requires employing a cultural analysis. AI must be conceived as a tool that fosters creativity but (for now) lacks the ability to create double meanings, humor, or understand culture. Given that it is capable of processing but not of imagining, being a mere executor based on probabilistic calculations, major companies are hiring people from the artistic field to help them develop patterns of how they create and generate their productions (Lee, 2022). Artistic evolution has been intrinsically linked to technical evolution. While companies were engaged in the development of technologies with the objective of modifying the industry and the productive environment in a manner beneficial to their own interests, artists were exploring the potential of new tools for the construction of narratives and the challenging of the

conventions of established art. In contrast with other artistic software, such as drawing or image editing programs, where the user has a true influence on the creative process of the work, in the case of generative AI tools, the fundamental agents for creations are the code creators and the sources from which this technology feeds (Jovanovic & Campbell, 2022). Although AI has developed as a powerful tool for generating content, there are significant ethical gaps that must be considered (Haraway, 2016; Dwivedi et al., 2023). The indiscriminate appropriation of existing culture without acknowledgment of the sources cannot be the basis of AIs. Therefore, the authorship of a work generated through generative AI must be clearly defined. It is unclear whether providing a series of guidelines is sufficient to be considered the author, or whether subsequent modifications to the generated artefact would be necessary.

The introduction of generative AIs can foster a deeper understanding of the principles of design, visual narrative, and aesthetics for students of Artistic Education. This is achieved by allowing them to manipulate visual elements intuitively and receive instant feedback on their ideas. At the same time, the process of working with AI challenges students to articulate their creative intentions precisely, promoting the development of critical and analytical skills. This approach not only enriches the creative process but also prepares students to navigate and contribute to the growing intersection between technology and art in the contemporary world. It equips them with the necessary skills to be innovative and critical in their artistic practice.

## REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, K., Mijwil, M. M., Al-Mistarehi, A. H., Alomari, S., Gök, M., Alaabdin, A. M. Z., & Abdulrhman, S. H. (2022). Has the future started? The current growth of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and deep learning. *Iraqi Journal for Computer Science and Mathematics*, 3(1), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.52866/ijcsm.2022.01.01.013>
- Akinwalere, S. N., & Ivanov, V. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities. *Border Crossing*, 12(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.33182/bc.v12i1.2015>
- Anantrasrichai, N., & Bull, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: a review. *Artificial intelligence review*, 1-68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7>
- Badea, C., & Gilpin, L. (2022). Establishing meta-decision-making for AI: an ontology of relevance, representation and reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00608*.
- Bakpayev, M., Baek, T. H., van Esch, P., & Yoon, S. (2022). Programmatic creative: AI can think but it cannot feel. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 30(1), 90-95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2020.04.002>
- Bernaschina, D. (2023). Artes mediales e inteligencia artificial: la crisis de la ética y la precariedad laboral en el campo artístico-digital. *Revista Avenir*, 7(1), 10-25.
- Benjamin, W. (2018) *La obra de arte en la era de su reproductibilidad técnica*. Taurus.
- Carceller, A. T. (2015). Forma y Color: La grisalla en la pintura; aproximación a un procedimiento inadvertido. *BRAC: Barcelona, Research, Art Creation*, 3(2), 179-200. <https://doi.org/10.17583/brac.2015.1350>
- Choi, S. K. (2022). The AI Laocoön: Art and the Artificial Imagination or, Survival Aesthetics in the Anthropocene. *Leonardo*, 1-13. [https://doi.org/10.1162/leon\\_a\\_02307](https://doi.org/10.1162/leon_a_02307)
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2011). *Fluir: Una psicología de la felicidad*. Kairós.
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., ... & Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
- Gangadharbatla, H. (2022). The role of AI attribution knowledge in the evaluation of artwork. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 40(2), 125-142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276237421994697>

- Halaweh, M. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13036>
- Haraway, D. J. (2016). The cyborg manifesto. In Haraway, D. J. *Manifestly Haraway* (pp. 117-158). University of Minnesota Press.
- Hill-Yardin, E. L., Hutchinson, M. R., Laycock, R., & Spencer, S. J. (2023). A Chat (GPT) about the future of scientific publishing. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, S0889-1591. 10.1016/j.bbi.2023.02.022
- Hunde, B. R., & Woldeyohannes, A. D. (2022). Future prospects of computer-aided design (CAD)—A review from the perspective of artificial intelligence (AI), extended reality, and 3D printing. *Results in Engineering*, 100478. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2022.100478>
- Jaskot, P. B. (2019). Digital art history as the social history of art: Towards the disciplinary relevance of digital methods. *Visual Resources*, 35(1-2), 21-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973762.2019.1553651>
- Jovanovic, M., & Campbell, M. (2022). Generative artificial intelligence: Trends and prospects. *Computer*, 55(10), 107-112. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2022.3192720>
- Khalil, M., & Er, E. (2023). Will ChatGPT get you caught? Rethinking of plagiarism detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04335*.
- Leach, N. (2022). From Deconstruction to Artificial Intelligence: The New Theoretical Paradigm. In *The Contested Territory of Architectural Theory* (pp. 229-241). Routledge.
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553), 436-444. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539>
- Lee, H. K. (2022). Rethinking creativity: creative industries, AI and everyday creativity. *Media, Culture & Society*, 44(3), 601-612.
- Lund, B. D., & Wang, T. (2023). Chatting about ChatGPT: how may AI and GPT impact academia and libraries?. *Library hi tech news*, 40(3), 26-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221077009>
- Matas, C. R. (2018). El impacto de la inteligencia artificial y de la robótica en el empleo público. *GIGAPP Estudios Working Papers*, 5(98-110), 401-421.
- McCulloch, W. S., & Pitts, W. (1943). A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity. *The Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 5(4), 115-133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02478259>
- Mitchell, T. M. (1997). *Machine Learning*. McGraw Hill.
- Radhakrishnan, A. M. (2023). Is Midjourney-ai a new anti-hero of architectural imagery and creativity?. *GSJ*, 11(1).
- Ruiz, N. B. (2022). El arte reproductivo de Joan Rabascall en el 'tiempo de la contestación. *Archivo Español de Arte*, 95(377), 81-98. <https://doi.org/10.3989/aearte.2022.05>
- Schellekens, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the re-imagination of inventive step. *J. Intell. Prop. Info. Tech. & Elec. Com. L.*, 13, 89.
- Song, B., & Koo, A. (2022). Paradigm shift: Artificial intelligence, contemporary art, and implications for gifted arts education. *Journal of Gifted Education in Arts*, 8, 5-38. <https://doi.org/10.22752/KRIGA.2022.08.001>
- Tello, A. M. (2015). El arte y la subversión del archivo. *Aisthesis*, (58), 125-143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-71812015000200007>
- Torres-Carceller, A. (2022). Mentiras reveladoras: el fake como práctica artística contra la defactualización. *VISUAL REVIEW. International Visual Culture Review/Revista Internacional de Cultura Visual*, 9(Monográfico), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.37467/revvisual.v9.3560>
- Vartiainen, H., & Tedre, M. (2024). How Text-to-Image Generative AI is Transforming Mediated Action. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCG.2024.3355808>
- Wellner, G. (2022). Digital Imagination, Fantasy, AI Art. *Foundations of Science*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-020-09747-0>
- Xiao, Y., Chatterjee, S., & Gehringer, E. (2022, November). A New Era of Plagiarism the Danger of Cheating Using AI. In *2022 20th International Conference on Information Technology Based Higher Education and Training (ITHET)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- Zhuk, A. (2023). Navigating the legal landscape of AI copyright: a comparative analysis of EU, US, and Chinese approaches. *AI Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00299-0>

## LA REVOLUCIÓ ARTIFICIAL: REPTES PER A REDEFINIR L'EDUCACIÓ ARTÍSTICA.

Després d'anys desenvolupant-se en un segon pla, la Intel·ligència Artificial (IA) ha fet ecllosió captant l'atenció mundial gràcies a eines en obert per a generar contingut textual, visual, sonor i audiovisual. En aquest context emergent, la IA no sols es perfila com un fenomen tecnològic, sinó també com un catalitzador d'innovació en el terreny artístic i educatiu. Encara que ens trobem únicament en les albors, la IA està evolucionant ràpidament i ens condueix cap a una revolució, obrint un nou camp de possibilitats en els àmbits creatius que transformarà les actuals concepcions estètiques, procedimentals i d'autoria. El seu potencial com a eina creativa, de moment, es limita a ser un suport que facilita obtenir resultats de gran qualitat formal i d'estil de manera ràpida, però que, sense la intervenció humana sobre la base d'uns objectius clars, es converteix en un generador vacu. L'Educació Artística ha d'assumir aquesta tecnologia no com un intrús o rival, sinó com una eina que conèixer i integrar com un mitjà més de creació, desenvolupant habilitats que permetin a l'alumnat no sols utilitzar aquestes eines de manera efectiva, sinó també reflexionar sobre les seves implicacions en la societat i la cultura. Fomentant un ús conscient, responsable, segur i ètic que garanteixi un posicionament crític davant la IA generativa. Entenent que no és una eina creativa sinó per a creadors.

**PARAULES CLAU:** Intel·ligència artificial generativa; imatge; educació artística; educació

## LA REVOLUCIÓN ARTIFICIAL: DESAFÍOS PARA REDEFINIR LA EDUCACIÓN ARTÍSTICA.

Tras años desarrollándose en un segundo plano, la Inteligencia Artificial (IA) ha eclosionado captando la atención mundial gracias a herramientas en abierto para generar contenido textual, visual, sonoro y audiovisual. En este contexto emergente, la IA no solo se perfila como un fenómeno tecnológico, sino también como un catalizador de innovación en el terreno artístico y educativo. Aunque nos encontremos únicamente en los albores, la IA está evolucionando rápidamente y nos conduce hacia una revolución, abriendo un nuevo campo de posibilidades en los ámbitos creativos que transformará las actuales concepciones estéticas, procedimentales y de autoría. Su potencial como herramienta creativa, de momento, se limita a ser un soporte que facilita obtener resultados de gran calidad formal y de estilo de forma rápida, pero que, sin la intervención humana en base a unos objetivos claros, se convierte en un generador vacuo. La Educación Artística debe asumir esta tecnología no como un intruso o rival, sino como una herramienta que conocer e integrar como un medio más de creación, desarrollando habilidades que permitan al alumnado no solo utilizar estas herramientas de manera efectiva, sino también reflexionar sobre sus implicaciones en la sociedad y la cultura. Fomentando un uso consciente, responsable, seguro y ético que garantice un posicionamiento crítico ante la IA generativa. Entendiendo que no es una herramienta creativa si no para creadores.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** inteligencia artificial generativa; imagen; educación artística; educación

The authors retain copyright and grant the journal the right of first publication. The texts will be published under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives License.

