Converging Minds
The Creative Potential of Collaborative AI

Aleksandra Przegalinska and Tamilla Triantoro

ISBN: 978-1-032-62687-1 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-65660-1 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-65661-8 (ebk)

First published 2024

Chapter 1
AI in Research, Innovation and Education

DOI: 10.1201/9781032656618-2

CRC Press
Taylor & Francis Group
Boca Raton London New York

CRC Press is an imprint of the
Taylor & Francis Group, an **informa** business

1 AI in Research, Innovation and Education

This chapter dives deep into the origins of chatbots, tracing their evolution and impact on various fields. We explore how these early conversational agents have influenced art, serving as both medium and muse for artists. In the educational sector, we examine the chatbots' role in personalized learning and student engagement. The chapter sets the stage for understanding the broader implications of AI, offering a lens through which to view its transformative potential. It serves as a foundation for the subsequent exploration of more advanced forms of human-AI collaboration.

The history of artificial intelligence is marked by many chapters, each highlighting a different capability. Among these, generative AI represents a transformative leap, not due to its technical innovation but primarily because of its capacity to augment and expand human creativity and problem-solving. Generative AI encompasses a set of technologies that can generate novel data patterns, be it in the form of text, images, music, or complex simulations. What sets it apart is its ability to produce outputs that are not explicitly programmed into it, drawing inspiration from vast datasets and, in some instances, mirroring the unpredictability of human creativity (Du Sautoy, 2020; Hageback, 2021).

In practical domains, there is a significant augmentation potential of generative AI. In design and architecture, professionals can employ generative models to quickly visualize potential designs enabling them to assess and choose options that may not have been conceived through conventional means. In music, artists can use these tools to explore unique compositions, merging traditional musical frameworks with AI-generated innovations. In the area of scientific research, generative AI can be employed to predict molecular structures, simulate environmental changes, and model the potential spread of diseases. These models can provide rapid insights, thereby accelerating the pace of innovation and discovery (Abdulkareem & Petersen, 2021; Tsigelny, 2019).

Moreover, generative models, with their capacity to rapidly analyze and predict novel outcomes, have the potential to significantly accelerate the trajectory of discoveries, bridging gaps between theoretical exploration and practical solutions.

However, as the lines between AI-generated and human-created content become more fluid, ethical and philosophical questions arise. The essence of originality, the nature of authenticity, and the definition of intellectual property are placed under scrutiny. In a world where a piece of art or a groundbreaking solution can be co-created with AI, society must grapple with the shifting sands of ownership and value attribution.

Equally pressing are the challenges posed by the unpredictable nature of generative outputs. The same capacity that enables generative AI to produce groundbreaking

DOI: 10.1201/9781032656618-2

solutions can, without careful oversight, lead to misleading and detrimental results (Yu et al., 2023). The emergence of deepfakes, which harness generative technology to create disturbingly realistic forgeries, stands as a reminder of the potential risks. But we will get back to that later.

In this part of the chapter, we venture into the heart of the dynamic intersection of generative AI in augmenting human capabilities. We will also explore the moral, ethical, and societal quandaries it presents. Through thoughtful exploration, we will look into the transformative potential of AI in augmenting human creativity, scientific inquiry, as well as reshaping content generation (Carter & Nielsen, 2017). We invite you to envision a future where AI is a partner, shaping the future of creative expression in ways we are only beginning to comprehend. Historically, creativity was seen as the exclusive domain of humans, an indication of our unique ability to imagine, innovate, and inspire. However, with the advent of advanced, generative AI systems, we are witnessing an interesting paradigm shift. AI systems, equipped with vast datasets and sophisticated algorithms, can now produce content that rivals, and in some cases surpasses, human-generated works in terms of complexity and aesthetic appeal. Rivalry, however, is not the direction. As we have underlined before, the intersection of human creativity and artificial intelligence is the exciting frontier, teeming with potential and full of possibilities. This chapter seeks to unravel the distinctive features of this union, exploring the implications of collaborative AI in the world of creative work, research, and content generation (Harris & Waggoner, 2019). But let us start with a story.

WHO OR WHAT IS CHATGPT AND WHERE DID IT COME FROM?

In the field of artificial intelligence and machine learning, there are few innovations that have had the lasting impact of chatbots. While we often consider them a product of our modern technological era, the concept of a machine capable of simulating human conversation has roots that stretch back over half a century.

So, our story begins in 1966 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), with a revolutionary program named ELIZA. Conceived by computer scientist Joseph Weizenbaum, ELIZA was a remarkable leap in natural language processing and computational linguistics. What set ELIZA apart wasn't just the ability to process user input and generate responses, but the uncanny skill it demonstrated in mimicking the back-and-forth rhythm of human conversation.

ELIZA was designed to imitate a Rogerian psychotherapist, using a technique called reflection to turn the user's statements back as questions. For instance, if a user were to tell ELIZA, "I'm feeling a bit stressed," ELIZA might respond, "Why do you say that you're feeling a bit stressed?" While this technique was relatively simple, it gave the illusion of comprehension and empathy, causing some users to believe they were conversing with a human.

The creation of ELIZA marked a shift, demonstrating the potential of computers to interact with humans in a more natural and intuitive way. However, despite the groundbreaking design, ELIZA was far from perfect. There was no understanding or awareness of the content of the conversations. Instead, the responses were entirely rules-based, reflecting the patterns programmed by its creator.

Nonetheless, ELIZA laid the groundwork for the sophisticated chatbots we see today, which employ advanced machine learning algorithms to process and understand human language with ever-increasing accuracy. As we delve deeper into this topic, we will appreciate the significant strides made since ELIZA's time and explore the exciting (and challenging) implications of the current state of chatbot technology.

Building on the foundational work initiated by ELIZA, the field of conversational AI has advanced significantly over the decades, culminating in the development of chatbots with far greater capability and sophistication.

THE RISE OF RULE-BASED SYSTEMS AND MACHINE LEARNING

Following ELIZA, the next wave of conversational systems was dominated by rule-based chatbots. These bots operated based on a set of predefined rules and decision trees. They could handle more complex interactions than ELIZA but were limited by the rules they were programmed with. Any deviation from expected inputs would often stump these systems. Further on, as computational power grew and machine learning techniques advanced, chatbots began to evolve. Instead of relying solely on hardcoded rules, they started learning from data. By analyzing large datasets of human conversations, these systems could generate responses based on patterns and probabilities. This shift marked the beginning of a new era for conversational AI, allowing for more flexibility and adaptability.

However, the true transformation in conversational systems came with the advent of deep learning. Models like ChatGPT, built on the GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformer) architecture, leveraged neural networks with millions of parameters. Trained on diverse and extensive textual data, these models could generate coherent, contextually relevant, and often indistinguishably humanlike responses. ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, represented a significant leap in this domain. Not only it could engage in fluid conversations, but it could also understand context, generate creative content, and adapt to specific user instructions. The line between human and machine communication began to blur, opening up tons of possibilities for applications ranging from customer support to creative writing assistance. Unlike ELIZA, which operated purely on rules, ChatGPT is trained on large amounts of text data, enabling it to generate contextually relevant responses and display a form of creativity. Although ChatGPT does not truly understand or have consciousness, its mimicry of humanlike conversation represents a significant advancement in natural language processing.

REFLECTING ON THE JOURNEY

From the rudimentary reflections of ELIZA to the nuanced interactions of ChatGPT, the evolution of conversational systems has been a proof of human creativity and technological advancement. These systems have transitioned from simple rule-followers to adaptive learners, mirroring the complexities of human dialogue. This progression demonstrates the evolving relationship of our society with machines. It is clear that the legacy of early conversational systems like ELIZA has blossomed into a dynamic partnership between humans and machines, reshaping the cultural narrative for the

future. We have advanced from basic conversational models to sophisticated AI collaborators, and we've also witnessed a deep impact on our cultural fabric. Culture has always been a reflection of societal advancements. As technology has evolved, so too has its influence on cultural mediums. The introduction of ELIZA in the 1960s marked a seminal moment, showcasing the potential of machines to engage in rudimentary dialogue (Weizenbaum, 1966; Weizenbaum & McCarthy, 1977). But the journey from ELIZA's basic conversational capabilities to today's generative AI models represents more than just technological progress; it signifies a transformative shift in how we collaborate with machines in the domain of culture (Monaco & Woolley, 2022).

As we underlined a couple of times, the role of AI is not to replace but to augment. It acts as a collaborator, enhancing the creative process, offering new perspectives, and opening doors to uncharted artistic territories. In the digital age, the boundaries between human creativity and machine-generated content have become increasingly blurred. With advancements in natural language processing, understanding, and generation, the next generation of chatbots might be indistinguishable from human interlocutors (Bryson et al., 2017). As we continue to push the boundaries of what's possible, the story of conversational systems serves as a reminder of how far we've come and the limitless horizons that lie ahead.

Collaborative AI, as we define it, is not about replacing the human creator but augmenting their capabilities. It's about a partnership where each entity brings its unique strengths to the table. While humans possess intuition, emotion, and rich lived experiences, AI offers enormous computational power, pattern recognition, and the ability to process and generate content at a large scale. By harnessing the strengths of both human creators and AI tools, we can achieve a synergy that elevates the creative process to unprecedented heights. From generating novel ideas and refining artistic styles to critiquing and enhancing content, collaborative AI emerges as a powerful ally in the creative journey.

THE SYNERGY OF EMOTION AND LOGIC

The synergy between human emotion and machine logic forms human-AI collaboration.While AI excels in analyzing data, identifying patterns, and generating content based on predefined parameters, it lacks the emotional depth and subjective experiences that humans have. This emotional depth, rooted in our personal experiences, cultural backgrounds, and individual perspectives, adds a layer of richness and nuance to the creative process. When combined with the precision and efficiency of AI, the result is a blend of emotion and logic, as well as intuition and analysis.

For example, in visual arts, Fink and Akdag Salah (2023) have been experimenting with AI tools to create mesmerizing artworks that blur the lines between man and machine. In one notable instance, an AI-generated artwork that we will mention later was auctioned at Christie's for a staggering sum, signaling the art world's recognition of *machine-generated creativity*. Behind this artwork, however, was not only an algorithm but also the culmination of human-artistic intent and machine precision. The artist provided the initial input, the vision, and the AI extrapolated, refined, and brought that vision to life in unexpected ways.

As with any technological shift, the rise of AI in creative work brings ethical implications. Issues of copyright, intellectual property rights, and the very essence of artistic ownership are now under the spotlight. If an artwork is co-created by an artist and an AI, who holds the rights to it? What percentage of the creation can be attributed to the machine, and what to the human? Furthermore, as AI systems become more sophisticated, there's a looming fear of machines overshadowing human creators. Will there come a day when AI-generated content is indistinguishable from human-generated content? And if so, what place will human creators hold in such a landscape?

"EDMOND DE BELAMY": THE AI-GENERATED PORTRAIT

In 2018, the art world was taken by storm with the unveiling of "Edmond de Belamy," a portrait not crafted by the hand of a human artist but generated by a machine learning algorithm. This artwork, created by the Paris-based art collective Obvious, became a symbol of the intersection of art, technology, and culture (Goenaga, 2020; Stephensen, 2019).

The portrait was produced using a generative adversarial network (GAN), a type of machine learning model that we will tell you more about in the next chapter. For now, it is important to know that GANs consist of two parts: a generator, which creates images, and a discriminator, which evaluates them. The model was trained on a dataset of 15,000 portraits painted between the 14th and 20th centuries. As the GAN processed this vast collection, it began to understand the nuances, styles, and common features of these historical portraits. The generator then started producing its own images, attempting to mimic the styles it had learned. Each generated image was critiqued by the discriminator. Through this iterative process of creation and critique, the GAN refined its outputs until it produced the final portrait of "Edmond de Belamy."

The portrait, with its blurry features and dreamlike quality, evoked a sense of mystery and intrigue. It raised questions about authorship, creativity, and the role of machines in the artistic process. When "Edmond de Belamy" was auctioned at Christie's, it fetched an astounding $432,500, *far surpassing its estimated value*. This event marked a significant moment in the art world, signaling a growing acceptance and curiosity about AI-generated art.

The artwork also sparked debates among artists, technologists, and philosophers. Some praised the innovative use of technology, seeing it as a new frontier in artistic expression. Others expressed concerns about authenticity and the potential devaluation of human creativity.

The success of "Edmond de Belamy" opened the doors for further exploration of AI in art. Artists worldwide began experimenting with GANs and other AI models, producing artworks that ranged from abstract paintings to sophisticated sculptures.

Beyond just art, the portrait's impact resonated in discussions about the broader cultural implications of AI. It became a touchstone for debates on AI's role in creative industries, from music and literature to film and theater.

SUNSPRING: THE AI-WRITTEN SCI-FI SHORT FILM

In 2016, the world of cinema witnessed a unique experiment: a short film titled *Sunspring*, where the screenplay was entirely written by an artificial intelligence. Directed by Oscar Sharp and starring Thomas Middleditch, this film showcased the potential and peculiarities of AI-driven storytelling (Cohn, 2021; Riedl et al., 2011).

The AI behind *Sunspring* was named Benjamin, a recurrent neural network trained on a multitude of sci-fi screenplays. Using this extensive training data, Benjamin was tasked with crafting a screenplay for a short film. The result was a script that, while structurally coherent, was filled with unexpected dialogues, unconventional character interactions, and a narrative that defied traditional storytelling norms. The team decided to produce the film exactly as the AI wrote it without any human edits to the script. This decision led to a film that was both intriguing and surreal, with characters uttering lines that were at times profound and at other times nonsensical. *Sunspring* was met with a mix of amusement, bewilderment, and admiration. While the narrative was undeniably disjointed, the film offered a fascinating glimpse into the AI's interpretation of human emotions, relationships, and existential dilemmas.

The film sparked discussions about the nature of creativity. Was *Sunspring* a genuine piece of art, or was it just a technological novelty? The film also raised questions about the future of the entertainment industry. Could AI one day replace human screenwriters, or would it serve as a tool to augment human creativity? Rest assured, the experiment with *Sunspring* led to further explorations of AI in filmmaking. While Benjamin's narrative was abstract and unconventional, it opened the door for filmmakers to consider AI as a collaborative partner in the creative process. This collaboration could range from brainstorming plot ideas to generating dialogues or even predicting audience reactions.

Beyond filmmaking, *Sunspring* became a point of reference in discussions about AI's role in other creative fields, such as literature, music, and theater. It served as both a cautionary tale and an inspiration, highlighting the potential and pitfalls of AI-driven creativity. *Sunspring* stands as evidence of the unpredictable and boundless nature of AI-driven art. It challenges us to reconsider our definitions of narrative, creativity, and artistry. In a world where machines can craft stories, *Sunspring* prompts us to reflect on the essence of human storytelling and the future of collaborative creation in the age of AI.

"HELLO WORLD": THE FIRST AI-COMPOSED ALBUM

In music, composers collaborate with AI to explore new melodies, rhythms, and harmonies, pushing the boundaries of existing norms. In literature, writers can use AI to brainstorm plot twists, develop characters, andcraft poetry that resonates with a global audience. Visual artists can use AI tools to experiment with styles, mediums, and techniques, creating artworks that are both innovative and evocative. In the ever-evolving landscape of music, 2017 witnessed a groundbreaking moment: the release of "Hello World", an album entirely composed by artificial intelligence. Developed by the French collective Skygge, which translates to "shadow" in Danish,

this project was a pioneering exploration of the harmonization of human and machine in musical composition (Seok, 2023).

The AI behind "Hello World" was named Flow Machines. It was developed by Sony's Computer Science Laboratories in Paris and was trained on a vast database of songs from various genres, ranging from jazz and pop to classical compositions. Using this diverse musical knowledge, Flow Machines could generate melodies, harmonies, and even intricate chord progressions. For the "Hello World" project, musicians and artists collaborated with the AI. They provided initial inputs, like a theme or a mood, and Flow Machines generated musical segments in response. These segments were then refined, arranged, and produced by human musicians to create the final tracks for the album.

"Hello World" was met with intrigue and critical acclaim. While some tracks resonated with traditional musical sensibilities, others ventured into experimental territories, offering sounds and harmonies that were fresh and unexpected. The album sparked discussions about the essence of musical creativity. Could a machine capture the emotional depth and nuance inherent in music? Or was it just replicating patterns it had learned? Moreover, "Hello World" raised questions about authorship and originality in the age of AI-driven creation.

The success of "Hello World" inspired musicians globally to experiment with AI tools. From generating background scores for films to crafting intricate beats for electronic music, AI became a new instrument in the musician's toolkit. Beyond just composition, AI tools began to be used for mastering tracks, predicting music trends, and even personalizing music experiences for listeners based on their preferences and moods.

CONTROVERSIES AND OUTLOOK

The integration of generative AI into art has sparked several controversies, reflecting deeper societal and philosophical concerns. First of all, questions of authorship, originality, and authenticity. How do we attribute value in a world where machines play a pivotal role in the creative process? When a piece of art is generated by an AI, who owns it? Is it the developer of the AI, the user who provided the input, or the AI itself? This blurring of lines challenges traditional notions of creativity and originality. What does it mean for a piece of content to be "original" when it's generated by an algorithm? And as AI systems become more adept at generating content, how do we ensure that the human touch, the essence of creativity, is not lost? One of the most debated issues is the question of authorship. For instance, the sale of "Edmond de Belamy" for a significant sum at Christie's did raise eyebrows and questions about the valuation of machine-made art. In a recent (2023) ruling by a U.S. court in Washington, D.C., artworks created solely by artificial intelligence without human involvement are ineligible for copyright protection under U.S. law. U.S. District Judge Beryl Howell emphasized that only creations with human authors can be copyrighted. This decision was in response to an application by computer scientist Stephen Thaler for his AI system, DABUS. Thaler, who has faced similar challenges in obtaining U.S. patents for inventions claimed to be created by DABUS, plans to appeal the decision. The ruling underscores the emerging intellectual

property challenges in the rapidly evolving field of generative AI. While artists are increasingly integrating AI into their creative processes, the legal landscape remains uncertain, with several lawsuits pending over the use of copyrighted works to train AI models. Judge Howell acknowledged the complexities introduced by AI in the art domain but maintained that human authorship remains a foundational principle of copyright, rooted in long-standing legal traditions.

The democratization of AI tools in the art world brings forth a complex set of economic and ethical considerations (Luce 2019; Luchs 2023). One of the most pressing concerns is the potential economic displacement of human artists. As AI becomes increasingly proficient in generating art, it can produce works at a speed and scale that human artists cannot match. This efficiency, while impressive, poses a risk of flooding the market with AI-generated art, which could be sold at a fraction of the cost of human-created pieces. The economic implications are far-reaching, affecting not just visual artists but also musicians, writers, and creators in other fields. The fear is that human artists might find it increasingly difficult to compete in a marketplace dominated by quick and inexpensive AI-generated works. *The article by Benedict Evans* explores the evolving landscape of intellectual property in the era of generative AI. It raises pertinent questions about ownership and compensation when AI mimics or generates creative works, be it in music, art, or journalism. While traditional intellectual property laws offer some guidance, the scale and capabilities of AI introduce new complexities. The article suggests that these challenges are not just legal but ethical, necessitating a reevaluation of existing frameworks. For instance, while AI doesn't store specific articles, it does rely on the aggregate of human-created content for training. This raises questions about fair compensation and "fair use" of collective human intelligence.

The article also touches on the future of AI, suggesting that as technology advances, AI models may require less data to produce the same or better results. This could potentially alleviate some intellectual property concerns. Additionally, one should emphasize that these models are tools that can be used to create both art and mundane content. It raises questions about the quality and originality of AI-generated works, especially as they become more prevalent, and how this will impact existing artists and the discovery of new, quality content.

This economic challenge is compounded by ethical questions surrounding the training data used by generative AI models. These models are often trained on vast datasets sourced from the internet, which may include copyrighted material or specific artistic styles. While the AI's output may appear original, it could inadvertently reproduce elements of existing works, raising the specter of unintentional plagiarism. This is a significant concern in the art community, where the originality of expression is highly valued. It also poses legal challenges, as artists whose work has been unintentionally replicated by AI may seek legal recourse, further complicating the landscape.

Moreover, the ethical dimension extends to the question of consent. Many artists share their work online for public viewing but not for training machine learning models. The use of such data without explicit permission raises ethical concerns about data ownership and the rights of artists to control how their work is used.

Critics also argue that art is an expression of human experience, emotion, and perspective. They believe that AI, lacking consciousness and emotion, can only

mimic styles and patterns but cannot infuse art with genuine sentiment or soul. This sentiment was also evident in reactions to "Hello World," where some felt the music lacked the depth and nuance of human-composed pieces. The concern over the potential loss of human creativity in the sphere of art due to the increasing involvement of AI is a nuanced and forward-looking argument. While AI offers a plethora of styles and techniques, its capabilities are fundamentally shaped by the data it's trained on. If this data predominantly represents mainstream or popular artistic styles, the AI's output is likely to reflect those biases, leading to a homogenization of art.

The richness of art lies in its diversity, its ability to challenge norms, and its capacity to introduce new perspectives. Art has always been a space for avant-garde movements that push boundaries and provoke thought. However, if AI-generated art becomes overly reliant on popular training data, there's a risk that these fringe or experimental art forms may be marginalized. The AI would be less likely to generate art that deviates from the norm, thus reducing the overall diversity of artistic expression.

Moreover, the use of AI in art creation could inadvertently discourage human artists from taking risks or exploring unconventional paths. Knowing that AI can quickly generate art that caters to popular taste might deter artists from investing time and emotional energy into creating something truly unique or controversial. This could lead to a creative stagnation, where both human and machine-generated art becomes increasingly formulaic and predictable.

Additionally, the algorithms themselves could become gatekeepers of what is considered "good" or "valuable" art. If AI tools are designed to optimize for certain styles or themes that are deemed commercially successful, they might neglect or even suppress artistic elements that don't align with these criteria. This could further narrow the scope of what is considered "acceptable" art, potentially stifling innovation and limiting the cultural dialogue that art is meant to inspire.

In the landscape of art and technology, the integration of AI into the creative process marks a transformative moment, echoing shifts that have characterized the relationship between humans and machines. From the rudimentary dialogues of ELIZA to the sophisticated capabilities of generative AI models such as ChatGPT, we have observed a remarkable journey of technological innovation and the complex interplay between human creativity and machine intelligence.

As we have seen, the blurring boundaries between AI-generated content and human-created outputs raise ethical and philosophical dilemmas. The capability that allows generative AI to produce novel outcomes can also be its Achilles's heel. Without careful oversight, generative systems can produce misleading and sometimes harmful outputs. Navigating the landscape of generative AI requires a judicious blend of enthusiasm for its capabilities and caution against its pitfalls.

The promise of AI in art is immense, offering new avenues for creative expression and collaboration. However, this promise comes with economic, ethical, and creative challenges. The risk of displacement of human artists, the ethical quandaries surrounding data use, and the potential for a loss of creative diversity are issues that cannot be ignored.

In essence, on the one hand, we stand at the cusp of a new creative renaissance, fueled by the symbiotic relationship between humans and machines. On the other hand, while generative AI offers exciting possibilities for art creation, it also brings forth a set of challenges and controversies that the art world, and society at large, must grapple with. As we as a society continue to explore this intersection of technology and creativity, these debates will shape the future trajectory of AI in art. While AI has the potential to be a valuable tool in the artistic process, there's a growing concern that its influence could inadvertently lead to a more homogenized and less adventurous artistic landscape. It's precisely in navigating these complexities that we find the most compelling opportunities for human-AI collaboration. By approaching AI as a tool that can augment rather than replace human creativity, we can harness its capabilities to enrich the artistic process, broaden cultural narratives, and explore new frontiers in artistic expression. As we stand at this intersection of art, technology, and society, the choices we make today will shape the future of creative endeavors.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

We live in a period of time when technological leaps are molding our reality into scenes that were reserved for science fiction. The paradigms of learning, teaching, and scholarly investigation are changing, with AI serving as both the instigator and the facilitator of this evolution in research and innovation (Crawford & Calo, 2016; Furman & Seamans, 2019).

The exponential growth of information and the rapid emergence of new fields of study have surpassed human capacity to keep up (Stevens, 2015). Educational systems, erected on historical models, face the formidable challenge of preparing students for a future job market that is speculative in nature and is reliant on nascent technologies. Similarly, the complexity of modern research, often requiring an interdisciplinary approach, calls for resources and computational capabilities that are frequently beyond what individual scholars or institutions can muster.

In this chapter, we will explore the transformative role of artificial intelligence in augmenting human capabilities in business and education. We will focus on how generative AI can act as an ally in accelerating research efforts and driving innovation. We will also examine the implications and challenges that arise as we usher in the era of human–AI collaboration.

IMPACT IN RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

As we face the Fourth Industrial Revolution, marked by rapid advancements in artificial intelligence, robotics, and other emerging technologies, the following question arises: can machines be our new collaborators in pushing the boundaries of scientific research and innovation?

The answer is a resounding "yes". Collaborative AI systems designed to work in tandem with humans are capable of accelerating scientific discoveries and driving innovation. This includes a synergistic relationship in which both humans and AI contribute their unique strengths to solve complex problems (Biswas et al., 2001).

Think of it as a high-stakes brainstorming session where your co-contributor reads millions of academic papers in seconds, identifies patterns you cannot see, and never gets tired.

High-level research has traditionally been the domain of well-funded institutions and individuals with specialized training. Collaborative AI has the potential to democratize this landscape. With intuitive interfaces and the ability to handle complex calculations, these systems can make advanced research tools accessible, leveling the playing field and fostering a more inclusive environment for innovation.

Time and resources are often the most significant barriers to scientific progress. Traditional research methods can be slow and laborious, requiring years or even decades to yield actionable insights. Traditional research is a multi-step endeavor that has been fine-tuned over centuries. It often starts with the identification of a research gap or problem, followed by an exhaustive review of existing literature to understand what is already known about the subject. Researchers then formulate hypotheses and design experiments or studies to test these hypotheses, a step that requires meticulous planning and a keen understanding of scientific methods.

The execution of the research plan is a labor-intensive process that involves data collection, which could range from conducting surveys and interviews to running lab experiments or field studies. Once the data is collected, researchers spend considerable time analyzing it, often using statistical models to interpret the results. The culmination of this rigorous process is the research publication, which undergoes peer review to ensure its validity and contribution to the field.

Research is rarely a solo endeavor; it is often carried out by teams comprising individuals with diverse skill sets. Team members contribute different perspectives and expertise, enabling a more holistic approach to problem-solving. Research, particularly in scientific and technical fields, often requires substantial financial investment for equipment, data collection, and manpower. Funding, whether from governmental agencies, private institutions, or corporate entities, is the lifeblood that sustains the research ecosystem.

Now, let's pivot to how AI can revolutionize this traditional model. While the basic steps of research might remain constant, AI can significantly accelerate each phase and add new dimensions to the research process. With previously trained AI plugins, researchers can use AI to conduct a literature review in a fraction of the time it would take a human, using natural language processing to summarize key findings and identify gaps. In the experimental design stage, AI can simulate various scenarios, helping researchers optimize their methods for cost, time, or accuracy. AI can significantly enhance R&D operations by assisting in idea generation and automating data analysis, thereby accelerating the discovery process.

When it comes to execution, AI can automate data collection processes, especially in fields of social sciences, biology, and healthcare, where large datasets are common (Steels & Brooks, 2018; Damiano & Stano, 2023; Elliott, 2021). For analysis, machine learning algorithms can identify complex patterns and relationships in the data that might be impossible for a human to discern. These capabilities make AI a collaborator capable of contributing ideas and suggesting alternative hypotheses or interpretations.

The implications for team dynamics can also be quite significant. With AI handling some of the more tedious and time-consuming tasks, human team members can focus on creative and complex aspects of research. This could lead to smaller, more agile research teams and make funding more efficient, as AI can perform many tasks more quickly and accurately, reducing the overall cost and time required for research projects. At the same time, the utilization of AI tools can streamline the management of larger teams by automating various administrative tasks and facilitating real-time, data-driven decision-making, ultimately making team management more effective and responsive.

For a solo researcher, the advent of AI technologies can be a game-changer, leveling the playing field in ways that were once the exclusive domain of well-funded research teams. By assuming the role of a multi-skilled research assistant, AI can handle a range of tasks that traditionally would have required a team of specialists. From scouring academic journals for relevant literature to running complex statistical analyses, AI can manage various stages of the research process, effectively acting as a one-stop research partner. The integration of AI into the research process thus can be a powerful augmentation of human capabilities. It may make research faster, cheaper, and possibly more innovative, allowing us to tackle complex problems with an amplified level of sophistication and efficiency.

For the modern business professional, artificial intelligence offers an array of tools that can significantly elevate the quality and impact of their work. For example, a recent study conducted by Boston Consulting Group suggests that groups that used GPT-4 while working on a variety of tasks performed 40% better than groups that didn't (Martines, 2023).

Generative AI can assist in numerous ways. It can conduct a rapid analysis of the latest industry trends, competitor strategies, and market data, providing a well-rounded view of the landscape. Let's consider using AI to assist in writing a report. Utilizing natural language generation, AI can draft a preliminary version of the report, organize it around key themes, and enrich it with relevant data points. AI can suggest rhetorical devices and storytelling elements, and even add some humor to make the report more engaging and memorable. The owner of the report can then refine the draft, adding their personal touch and expertise.

AI can perform tasks ranging from data visualization to presentation design. Plugins now allow inputting raw data and receiving back a series of professionally designed charts and graphs that display the information but also highlight key trends and insights (Triantoro, 2023). AI can suggest the optimal sequence for your presentation slides based on storytelling structures, ensuring that the presentation has a logical flow and maximum impact for the selected type of audience.

Beyond reports and presentations, AI can assist in other business tasks. For instance, if you are pitching to investors, AI can analyze past successful pitch decks and investor behavior to suggest what content to include and emphasize. It can generate financial models based on your inputs, offering projections and suggesting strategies for revenue growth or cost reduction. It can scan social media and customer reviews to provide real-time insights into brand perception, invaluable for any marketing presentation. In team settings, AI can act as a project manager, tracking progress, flagging delays, and suggesting reallocations of resources to ensure deadlines are met.

Thus, AI can dramatically enhance a business person's effectiveness by handling time-consuming tasks and offering intelligent suggestions for improvement. In addition to augmenting the individual skill sets of business professionals, AI can serve as a powerful catalyst for organizational innovation. AI can analyze market trends, consumer behavior, and emerging technologies to suggest new product features or entirely new lines of business. It can simulate a variety of scenarios to predict the success of a new venture, reducing the risk associated with innovation. Furthermore, AI can facilitate innovation sprints, to rapidly prototype and test multiple ideas, allowing companies to quickly identify the most promising avenues for development. In this way, AI extends the innovative capacity of businesses, allowing proactive disruption, capable of setting new standards and shaping consumer expectations. Essentially, AI becomes a co-creator, driving innovation with a speed and precision that sets new benchmarks for competitive advantage.

IMPACT IN EDUCATION

While the transformative impact of artificial intelligence in research and innovation is indisputable, it is important to recognize where the seeds of these transformations are sown—the area of education. Education is the bedrock to build advancements in research and innovation, and it is the place to cultivate the essential skills of students. Understanding how AI can democratize and enrich the educational experience offers a glimpse into the future of learning and provides valuable insights into how upcoming generations will interact with AI in research and innovation contexts.

AI is becoming a transformative force with the potential to democratize learning and redefine the boundaries of pedagogical practice (Ng et al. 2022). For centuries, the educational system has been a one-size-fits-all approach, standardized curricula, and a limited scope for individualized learning. Yet, in the age of AI, we see the trends that could alter the way education is conceived, delivered, and experienced.

Democratization is one of the most compelling aspects of integrating AI into education. Historically, quality education has often been a privilege of the few, limited by geographical location, socio-economic status, and access to skilled educators. AI can shatter these barriers. With platforms that can offer personalized learning experiences, a child in a remote village can have access to the same quality of education as a student in a bustling metropolis. Adaptive learning algorithms can tailor educational content to suit individual learning styles and paces, offering a customized education that is both engaging and effective. For adult learners, AI-powered platforms can provide on-demand courses, reskilling programs, and career advice, making lifelong learning a realistic and accessible goal.

AI revolutionizes the act of learning itself. Intelligent tutoring systems could assess not only what you know but also how you think. These systems can pose complex problems, encourage open-ended discussions, and offer real-world scenarios for problem-solving, fostering a deeper, more analytical mode of learning.

However, the integration of AI into education has its challenges. As some of us marvel at the capabilities of generative AI, an important question emerges: "Wow, 'we've got generative AI – should we now stop thinking?" It is a complex question

that encapsulates a genuine concern about the potential for AI to not just augment but also modify human cognitive processes.

With AI tools capable of crafting persuasive essays, solving complex mathematical problems, and generating research hypotheses, there is a temptation to lean too heavily on these technologies. Could we reach a point where students, enamored by the efficiency and accuracy of AI, become passive recipients rather than active participants in their educational journey? This can undermine the development of critical thinking and create a generation that lacks the ability to question, challenge, and innovate independently of algorithmic aid.

Let's wind the clock back a few decades to when calculators were first introduced into classrooms. The uproar was significant. Educators protested, arguing that these gadgets would erode fundamental arithmetic skills, render students lazy, and undermine the purpose of mathematics education (Hembree & Dessart, 1986; Trouche, 2005). Fast-forward to today and calculators are not just tolerated but also embraced as standard educational tools. They are seen as aids that allow students to focus on more complex problem-solving and conceptual understanding.

This trajectory of skepticism to acceptance is not unique to calculators. We have seen this pattern repeated as technology progressively integrates with various domains. It is evident in the fields of machine learning and data analytics, where computational tools are considered the gold standard (So et al. 2020). Sophisticated algorithms sift through massive datasets, perform complex analyses, and generate predictive models with a level of accuracy and efficiency that would be humanly impossible or, at the very least, incredibly time-consuming.

Interestingly, this trust in machines extends beyond acceptance; we now find ourselves trusting machines more with numbers than we trust ourselves. Why is this the case? For one, the sheer computational power of machines allows them to handle large datasets and complex equations far more quickly and accurately than a human could. The iterative and consistent nature of machine processing eradicates the chances of human errors which might result from fatigue, cognitive biases, or simple miscalculations (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015).

New York City schools banned ChatGPT technology in schools in early 2023, just to bring it back at the end of the school year (Rosenblatt, 2023). It seems history repeats itself. But how could modern generative AI systems and LLMs be different from calculators several decades back? The initial ban and subsequent reinstatement of ChatGPT technology in New York City schools reminds us that every technological advance brings with it a period of uncertainty, resistance, and ultimately, adaptation. But how do modern generative AI systems and Large Language Models differ from the calculators that faced similar scrutiny decades ago?

The capabilities of generative AI extend far beyond the computational utility of calculators. While calculators are designed for specific tasks, primarily arithmetic and basic mathematical functions, generative AI is multi-faceted tools with a broad spectrum of applications. They can draft essays, summarize complex articles, generate research questions, and engage in nuanced conversations. In essence, their utility is not confined to a single subject or skill but permeates various facets of education, from language arts to social studies and beyond.

Another point of distinction is in the level of personalization. Calculators are static tools; they perform the same functions regardless of who is using them. LLMs, on the other hand, have the potential for adaptive learning. They can tailor their interactions based on the user's needs, skill level, and learning style. Over time, they can become more effective educational aids, offering personalized feedback and resources that can significantly enrich the learning experience.

However, the most striking difference between calculators and Large Language Models is in the latter's ability to converse using words. For humans, numbers are often abstract entities; they are vital for quantification and analysis but are not the primary medium through which we experience or interpret the world. It is relatively straightforward to outsource numerical tasks to calculators because numbers, in many contexts, lack the emotional and cognitive texture that words possess. We can entrust machines with numbers because doing so does not impinge upon our understanding of ourselves or the world around us in any fundamentally human way.

Words, however, are a different matter entirely. Humans think in narratives, symbols, and meanings—all of which are constructed using words. Language is not just a tool for communication; it is the fabric of our consciousness, the framework within which we make sense of our existence. Words are magical to us, laden with history, culture, and personal experiences that give them deep, often ineffable, meanings. When machines begin to speak, to converse in words that carry the weight of human experience, they cross a threshold that is unsettling and exhilarating at the same time.

This capacity for linguistic interaction triggers anthropomorphic feelings in us; we begin to imbue these machines with human-like qualities, such as intelligence or even the capacity for understanding and empathy (Salles et al. 2020; Troshani et al. 2021). However, anthropomorphism can have both beneficial and adverse outcomes. On the one hand, it makes interactions with machines more natural and engaging, potentially enriching our educational experiences and making technology more accessible. On the other hand, it can lead to misplaced trust or ethical ambiguity. Is it appropriate, for example, for students to consult a generative AI tool for personal or ethical advice? If a machine can generate a compelling narrative, what happens to the value we place on human storytelling or creative writing?

Another critical aspect is how much trust can we, or should we, assign to AI? This is not a trivial question, especially given AI's propensity to hallucinate, or generate outputs that are factually incorrect or misleading. While it is tempting to view AI systems as oracles of wisdom and knowledge, their limitations are a sobering reminder that they are far from infallible.

The notion of trust in AI is a complex mix of accuracy, reliability, ethics, and emotional resonance. On the surface, AI models can appear remarkably accurate, generating text that is grammatically correct and contextually relevant. They can summarize research papers, answer factual questions, and engage in debates. However, this exterior of competence can sometimes mask an interior that is less reliable. AI models, for all their sophistication, can generate outputs that are factually incorrect, contextually misleading, or ethically problematic. These hallucinations are symptomatic of the AI's lack of understanding and inability to comprehend the nuance and depth of human experience and knowledge (Schank, 1987; Chivers, 2019).

This propensity for error may have significant implications for trust. For example, in a classroom setting, educators will have to verify the accuracy of an AI-generated summary of a historical event or a scientific theory. In a research context, scholars who rely on LLMs to generate hypotheses or interpret data will have to employ a significant amount of human oversight. While AI can be an incredibly powerful tool for augmenting human capabilities, it cannot yet replace the depth of understanding, the ethical reasoning, and the critical thinking that define human intelligence. Trust in AI, therefore, must be conditional and contextual. It should be seen not as a binary state, but as a spectrum that varies based on the task at hand, the stakes involved, and the limitations of the specific AI model being used.

Critically assessing trust in AI also involves acknowledging the dynamic nature of both technology and human understanding. AI is continually evolving, with newer models being trained on more extensive datasets and designed to minimize biases and errors. Similarly, our understanding of AI, its capabilities, and its limitations is also deepening. Trust is a dynamic relationship that evolves, and our trust in AI will change as our experience with AI deepens.

As we think about the role of AI in education, students, educators, and parents confront a question that is practical and timely: "What do I, as a student, actually learn if AI writes for me?" This question opens a Pandora's box of concerns that echo far beyond the classroom and reverberate through our broader understanding of education, skill development, and human cognition. The most immediate concern is: will we know how to write? If AI can draft essays, summarize articles, and generate research papers, is there a risk that students will become just spectators in their educational journey, outsourcing the hard work of thinking, synthesizing, and articulating to algorithms? The parallel with calculators is instructive but not entirely comforting. While calculators did not eliminate the need for basic arithmetic skills, they did fundamentally alter the landscape of mathematics education. Advanced calculators can perform complex functions, from calculus to statistical analysis, raising the question: how many people today, unaided by technology, can solve complex math problems? Similarly, if AI takes over the act of writing, the skill could become another casualty in the growing list of abilities that technology has made obsolete.

But the concerns do not stop at technical skills; they extend into cognitive and emotional development. Writing is not only a mechanical act of putting words on paper, but it is a deeply cognitive process that involves organizing thoughts, constructing arguments, and expressing emotions. Will we know how to express our thoughts without first consulting with AI? If the answer is no, or even maybe, then we face a crisis that goes beyond education and touches on the essence of human agency. Relying on AI to articulate our thoughts could lead to a form of cognitive outsourcing, where we risk losing the ability to reflect, reason, and express ourselves independently.

The implications of this could be deep and not only for individuals but for society at large. The ability to think critically and express oneself clearly is not just an academic skill. In a world increasingly dominated by complex issues, from climate change to social justice, the ability to articulate thoughtful opinions is crucial. If we outsource this skill to AI, do we also risk outsourcing our civic responsibility, our social consciousness, and even our humanity?

IN AI WE TRUST

As AI technologies make their way into professional life, those working their way up the career ladder are faced with a perplexing conundrum: how much can one trust the output of the advanced AI systems? This question is becoming a universal concern that spans industries and job functions. From marketing executives using AI to optimize campaigns to lawyers employing machine learning algorithms for case research, the implications of trusting AI output have far-reaching professional and ethical ramifications.

The issue of trust becomes especially thorny when one considers the phenomenon of AI hallucinations, the instances when the system generates outputs that are factually incorrect, logically flawed, or ethically dubious. While some may argue that these hallucinations are similar to human errors and can be corrected over time, it is important to recognize that the stakes are often high in professional settings. A hallucination in a financial model could lead to disastrous investment decisions, just as a factual error in a legal brief could compromise a case (Milmo, 2023). Given these risks, the uncritical acceptance of AI output could be professionally irresponsible, if not downright dangerous.

The issue of hallucinations brings up an interesting point: not all hallucinations are bad, especially when we are looking for imaginative or creative outcomes. If you are in a creative field such as advertising, design, or strategic planning, an AI that thinks outside the box could offer innovative solutions that a human might not conceive. In these scenarios, the machine's ability to deviate from the norm might actually be an asset rather than a liability. However, there are advantages and disadvantages. While AI hallucinations can be useful for brainstorming sessions, they are not always optimal for concrete outcomes that require precision, reliability, and factual accuracy.

The dichotomy between imagination and concreteness poses a challenge: how do we harness the creative potential of AI while also mitigating the risks associated with its propensity for error? The answer lies in a balanced, critical approach to AI adoption. Professionals must be trained not just to use AI tools but also to understand their limitations. Processes should be put in place to double-check AI outputs against human expertise and ethical standards. Essentially, the relationship between professionals and AI should be one of critical collaboration rather than blind reliance.

It is important to point out that the learning mechanism of generative AI tools is a process of statistical approximation rather than genuine understanding. These models are trained on massive datasets composed of text from various sources, such as books, articles, websites, and social media posts. The training process involves adjusting millions or even billions of parameters to predict the next word in a sequence based on the words that precede it (Cybellium Ltd, 2023; Anderson & Coveyduc, 2020). However, this form of learning lacks comprehension. The machine doesn't understand language, but instead it calculates probabilities. It has no sense of context beyond the dataset it was trained on, and it does not grasp the ethical, cultural, or social nuances that permeate human communication.

The source from which AI models learn human language brings its own set of challenges. Because the training data often comes from the internet, it is a mixed

bag of factual information, opinions, biases, and sometimes, outright misinformation (Paschen et al. 2020). This raises concerns about the reliability and ethical integrity of AI-generated content. Can a tool trained on such a varied dataset be considered a trustworthy source of information or advice?

This brings us to the notion of the "source of truth" in the digital age. Traditionally, encyclopedias such as Britannica served as trusted repositories of curated knowledge. With the advent of the Internet, Wikipedia emerged as a more dynamic, but less controlled, source of information (Reagle & Koerner, 2020). Now, tools like ChatGPT are entering the scene, capable of generating information on-the-fly. Each transition represents a shift not just in the medium but also in the epistemological foundations of how we define "truth." While Britannica relied on expert curation, Wikipedia introduced the concept of crowd-sourced wisdom, and ChatGPT brings algorithmic generation into the mix.

In an era where traditional gatekeepers of information are being bypassed or augmented by AI, the lines between expert opinion, crowd wisdom, and algorithmic output are increasingly blurred. This democratization of information has its merits, offering more people access to a broader array of perspectives. However, it also complicates the task of discerning the quality of information. When everyone has a voice, and algorithms can emulate those voices, how do we decide what to trust?

Critically, as we rely more on AI tools like ChatGPT for information and even decision-making, there is a risk of cognitive outsourcing. Will we become less critical consumers of information, trusting the algorithm to do the thinking for us? Moreover, the algorithm's inherent biases and limitations could propagate through our decision-making processes, leading to outcomes that are skewed or ethically questionable.

The proliferation of AI capabilities in generating creative works, be it text, music, or visual art, introduces a complex terrain of legal, ethical, and philosophical quandaries. For example, the current U.S. copyright framework is rooted in a human-centric notion of creativity, as outlined in the Guidance for Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence (U.S. Copyright Office, 2023). The term "author" explicitly refers to a human being, thereby excluding non-human entities such as AI systems. This legal stance is a reflection of longstanding cultural and philosophical views that place human creativity on a unique pedestal, inherently worthy of legal protection.

However, the boundaries between human and machine-generated creations are getting increasingly porous. In many instances, what we encounter is not purely machine-generated work but rather a hybrid, a result of human–AI collaboration. The prompt, the guiding principle, or even the fine-tuning of the AI system often comes from the human mind. In such cases, can we not argue that the final product is imbued with human creativity, thereby meriting copyright protection?

This is a compelling argument for several reasons. First, it recognizes that creativity is not a binary attribute that you either have or do not have. Creative process is a spectrum. Even in traditional artistic processes, tools and external influences play a role. A painter uses a brush, a writer uses a keyboard, and these are tools, much like an AI, that facilitate the creative process. Second, the human-generated prompt or guidance often sets the creative direction, which means that the human is still the "author" in a conceptual sense, even if the AI performs the mechanical aspects of the creation.

CONVERGING MINDS. A NEW PARADIGM

The convergence of human and machine intelligence offers a novel paradigm for addressing complex problems, from scientific research to ethical dilemmas. This paradigm, which in this book we call "Converging Minds," involves the creation of hybrid cognitive models that integrate human intuition with machine analysis. It is the future where researchers, policymakers, and artists could tap into the hybrid models to explore various scenarios, generate hypotheses, and create art. These models could serve as advanced thought laboratories, providing a space for human–machine teams to collaboratively explore the boundaries of what is possible, ethical, and beautiful.

The concept of Converging Minds serves as a turning-point moment in our evolving relationship with technology. This paradigm shift moves us from a dualistic framework, where human and machine intelligences operate in parallel but separate domains, to a more integrated, synergistic model. But what does this convergence mean, and more importantly, what are the implications of creating hybrid cognitive models that meld human intuition with machine analysis?

In the scientific domain, the benefits of such a paradigm are ambitious. Imagine a scenario where a human researcher formulates a complex question, related to climate change or medical diagnostics. Using the Converging Minds framework, the researcher could input this question into a hybrid cognitive model, which would then generate a range of hypotheses, backed by data and probabilistic reasoning. The researcher could then refine these hypotheses based on human intuition, ethical considerations, or the current scientific consensus, factors that the machine might not fully grasp. The result is a truly collaborative research methodology that leverages the strengths of both human and machine cognition.

In the area of art and creativity, the Converging Minds paradigm opens up new avenues for exploration. Artists could collaborate with AI to create new works. AI could generate the outline of a novel or the melody of a song based on certain parameters set by the artist. The human artist could then infuse these outputs with emotional depth, nuance, and cultural relevance, transforming them into something profoundly human yet technologically advanced.

At the same time, the ethical implications of Converging Minds are equally complex: machines can introduce a variety of biases into decision-making processes and pose existential questions to human creativity. Thus, the final decision should always be made by humans, who can consider factors such as empathy, social justice, and moral responsibility, which are currently beyond the machine's understanding.

In sum, the Converging Minds paradigm offers an approach to solving complex problems, fostering creativity, and making ethical decisions. This convergence is a tool that amplifies our capabilities while also magnifying our responsibilities. It challenges us to redefine the boundaries of intelligence, creativity, and ethics, forcing us to confront the limitations and biases inherent in both human and machine cognition. As we navigate this uncharted territory, our success will depend not only on technological innovation but also on our ability to integrate these advances with the wisdom, ethics, and critical thinking that define us as humans.

REFERENCES

Abdulkareem, M., & Petersen, S. E. (2021). The promise of AI in detection, diagnosis, and epidemiology for combating COVID-19: Beyond the hype. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *4*(May), 652669.

Anderson, J. L., & Coveyduc, J. L. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence for Business: A Roadmap for Getting Started with AI*. John Wiley & Sons.

Biswas, G., Schwartz, D., Bransford, J., & Vanderbilt, Teachable Agents Group at. (2001). Technology support for complex problem solving: From SAD environments to AI. In K. D. Forbus & P. J. Feltovich (Eds.), *Smart Machines in Education: The Coming Revolution in Educational Technology* (483pp, pp. 71–97, vi). The MIT Press. https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3641289

Bryson, J. J., Diamantis, M. E., & Grant, T. D. (2017). Of, for, and by the people: The legal lacuna of synthetic persons. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, *25*(3), 273–291.

Carter, S., & Nielsen, M. (2017). Using artificial intelligence to augment human intelligence. *Distill*, *2*(12). https://doi.org/10.23915/distill.00009.

Chivers, T. (2019). *The AI Does Not Hate You: The Rationalists and Their Quest to Save the World*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Cohn, J. (2021). 'The Scientist of the Holy Ghost': Sunspring and reading nonsense. *CJEM*, *60*(5), 1–21.

Crawford, K., & Calo, R. (2016). *There Is a Blind Spot in AI Research*. Nature Publishing Group UK, 13 October. https://doi.org/10.1038/538311a.

Cybellium Ltd. (2023). *Mastering AI Model Training*. Cybellium Ltd.

Damiano, L., & Stano, P. (2023). Explorative synthetic biology in AI: Criteria of relevance and a taxonomy for synthetic models of living and cognitive processes. *Artificial Life*, *29*(3), 367–387.

Du Sautoy, M. (2020). *The Creativity Code: Art and Innovation in the Age of AI*. Harvard University Press.

Elliott, A. (2021). *The Routledge Social Science Handbook of AI*. Routledge.

Fink, T., & Akdag Salah, A. A. (2023). Extending the visual arts experience: Sonifying paintings with AI. In C. Johnson, N. Rodríguez-Fernández, & S. M. Rebelo (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence in Music, Sound, Art and Design* (pp. 100–116). Springer Nature Switzerland.

Furman, J., & Seamans, R. (2019). AI and the economy. *Innovation Policy and the Economy*, 19(January), 161–191.

Goenaga, M. A. (2020). A critique of contemporary artificial intelligence art: Who is Edmond de Belamy? *AusArt*, *8*(1), 49–64.

Hageback, N. (2021). *AI for Creativity*. CRC Press.

Harris, J. D., & Waggoner, B. (2019). Decentralized and collaborative AI on blockchain. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)* (pp. 368–375). IEEE. https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.07247

Hembree, R., & Dessart, D. J. (1986). Effects of hand-held calculators in precollege mathematics education: A meta-analysis. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *17*(2), 83–99.

Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. *Science*, *349*(6245), 255–260.

Luce, L. (2019). Democratization and impacts of AI. In *Artificial Intelligence for Fashion* (pp. 185–195). Apress.

Luchs, I. (2023). AI for all? Challenging the democratization of machine learning. *A Peer-Reviewed Journal About*, *12*(1), 135–147.

Martines, D. (2023). Decoding the jagged frontier: AI, centaurs, and cyborgs, and the future of work. LinkedIn, 19 September.

Milmo, D. (2023). Two US lawyers fined for submitting fake court citations generated by ChatGPT. *The Guardian*, 23 June.

Monaco, N., & Woolley, S. (2022). *Bots*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ng, D. T. K., Luo, W., Chan, H. M. Y., & Chu, S. K. W. (2022). Using digital story writing as a pedagogy to develop AI literacy among primary students. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*(January), 100054.

Paschen, U., Pitt, C., & Kietzmann, J. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: Building blocks and an innovation typology. *Business Horizons*, *63*(2), 147–155.

Reagle, J., & Koerner, J. (2020). *Wikipedia@ 20: Stories of an Incomplete Revolution*. The MIT Press.

Riedl, M., Thue, D., & Bulitko, V. (2011). Game AI as storytelling. In P. Antonio González-Calero & M. Antonio Gómez-Martín (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence for Computer Games* (pp. 125–150). Springer New York.

Rosenblatt, K. (2023). ChatGPT ban dropped by New York City Public Schools. *NBC News*, 18 May.

Salles, A., Evers, K., & Farisco, M. (2020). Anthropomorphism in AI. *AJOB Neuroscience*, *11*(2), 88–95.

Schank, R. C. (1987). What is AI, anyway? *AI Magazine*, *8*(4), 59–59.

Seok, B. (2023). Chapter five the uncharted world of AI art: Music and AI Bongrae Seok. In *Venturing into the Uncharted World of Aesthetics*, 68.

So, A., Joseph, T. V., Thas John, R., Worsley, A., & Asare, S. (2020). *The Data Science Workshop: A New, Interactive Approach to Learning Data Science*. Packt Publishing Ltd.

Steels, L., & Brooks, R. (2018). *The Artificial Life Route to Artificial Intelligence: Building Embodied, Situated Agents*. Routledge.

Stephensen, J. L. (2019). Towards a philosophy of post-creative practices? – Reading Obvious' 'Portrait of Edmond de Belamy.' *Politics of the Machine Beirut 2019*, *2*, 21–30.

Stevens, C. (2015). *On the Acceleration of Human Evolution and Other Writings*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Triantoro, T. (2023). ChatGPT gets chatty with data: How generative AI models. LinkedIn, 31 August.

Troshani, I., Hill, S. R., Sherman, C., & Arthur, D. (2021). Do we trust in AI? Role of anthropomorphism and intelligence. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *61*(5), 481–491.

Trouche, L. (2005). Calculators in mathematics education: A rapid evolution of tools, with differential effects. In D. Guin, K. Ruthven, & L. Trouche (Eds.), *The Didactical Challenge of Symbolic Calculators: Turning a Computational Device into a Mathematical Instrument* (pp. 9–39). Springer US.

Tsigelny, I. F. (2019). Artificial intelligence in drug combination therapy. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, *20*(4), 1434–1448.

U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). Copyright registration guidance: Works containing material generated by Artificial Intelligence. https://copyright.gov/ai/ai_policy_guidance.pdf

Weizenbaum, J. (1966). ELIZA – A computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, *9*(1), 36–45.

Weizenbaum, J., & McCarthy, J. (1977). Computer power and human reason: From judgment to calculation. *AIP*. https://www.amazon.com/Computer-Power-Human-Reason-Calculation/dp/0716704633

Yu, Z., Cen, G., Zhao, L., & Zhu, C. (2023). Design of smart mistake notebook based on AI and big data. In M. M. Rodrigo, N. Matsuda, A. I. Cristea, & V. Dimitrova (Eds.), *Computer Science and Education* (pp. 18–28). Springer Nature Singapore.