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# **ABSTRACT**

This research report is structured in three main parts. The first part describes the advantages of AI tools for creative work, such as helping users generate fresh ideas more easily and speeding up early drafts. The second part considers the disadvantages, including a possible loss of individual skill, more uniform outputs, and ethical issues like copyright and bias. The third part offers a concise summary of these findings. In the final section, the report provides two sets of recommendations. For future researchers, it suggests studying how long-term use of AI affects creative ability and testing simple techniques to balance human ideas with AI support. For general readers, it advises treating AI tools as a helpful supplement, always reviewing and enriching AI suggestions with your own insights and remaining aware of potential limitations such as errors or over-reliance.
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# **I.INTRODUCTION**

AI-generated content refers to any text, image, or music created by machine-learning models rather than directly by humans (Sengar, Hasan, Kumar & Carroll, 2024, p. 6). Tools such as ChatGPT for text and DALL-E for visuals are now widely accessible, enabling users to produce refined material in seconds. Such rapid access to AI assistance raises a crucial question about human creativity: can truly original ideas still emerge when reliance on AI is high? In this report, it is maintained that although AI-generated content offers certain advantages, its negative effects on creativity outweigh its positive contributions.

Today, AI applications support authors in drafting articles, allow designers to sketch novel visuals, and even compose brief musical pieces. For instance, 90 % of university students reported feeling more productive when using an AI assistant for brainstorming (Habib, Vogel, Anli & Thorne, 2024, p. 3). Yet, scholars also warn that excessive dependence on these tools may undermine users’ confidence in their own originality and lead to more homogeneous outcomes (Zhou & Lee, 2024, para. 2).

The aim of this report is to investigate how AI-generated content influences human creativity and to assess whether its benefits truly outweigh its drawbacks. Creativity remains a vital driver of innovation in fields from education to business, making it essential to understand both the risks and rewards associated with AI support (Runco, 2023, p. 2). Through a balanced examination of both perspectives, it is established that the negative effects of AI-generated content on creativity outweigh its positive contributions.

This study employs a comprehensive methodology to examine how AI-generated content influences creativity. It includes a review of recent literature, an analysis of expert insights, and evidence from current experiments (Doshi & Hauser, 2024, p. 8) that illustrate AI’s impact on creative processes. However, the scope is limited to text- and image-based AI tools, and practical constraints (such as limited time and access to certain sources) have narrowed the breadth of the research. Accordingly, the report is organized into three main parts. The first part explores the positive effects of AI-generated content on creativity, and the second part examines its potential negative effects on creative thinking. The third part offers a final evaluation and conclusion with recommendations. Ultimately, this structure supports the central argument that while AI-generated content can serve as a powerful aid to creative work, its unrestrained use may also hinder originality, underscoring the need for a balanced approach.

# **II. ADVANTAGES OF AI‑GENERATED CONTENT**

In the last few years, generative artificial intelligence (AI) systems have moved from research labs into daily life. Tools such as ChatGPT for text, DALL‑E and Midjourney for images, and Suno for music allow anyone with an internet link to type a short prompt and get paragraphs, pictures or melodies in seconds. Artificial intelligence is also used in fields that require creativity. Some people claim that artificial intelligence (AI) supports creativity and helps advance it. In this section, advantages of artificial intelligence (AI), especially, its role as a creative spark and making work easier and faster for everyone will be presented.

## **2.1 AI as a creative spark**

First, AI can break the “blank‑page” problem. Many professionals describe creativity as a two‑step cycle: idea generation stage followed by selection stage. AI makes the divergent step easier by spitting out ten or twenty quick ideas that humans can judge, combine or reject. In writing, ChatGPT can outline possible plots, suggest scene orders, or offer dialogue starters. For example, in an online experiment with thousands of writers, those who received five AI ideas wrote stories rated about 10 % more original and enjoyable than a control group (Doshi & Hauser, 2024, p. 8). Importantly, the improvement was largest in writers who said they felt stuck at the start. The AI served as a “creative spark” (Bieser, 2023, para. 5) that helped them pass the initial challenge. A similar pattern appears in product design. Two groups of engineering students were asked to sketch novel kitchen gadgets. The AI-assisted group, who could question ChatGPT, produced nearly twice as many different concepts, demonstrating that AI can boost idea generation and novelty (Filippi, 2023, p. 11). Even when none of the AI suggestions were used directly, it still created new paths for humans. To conclude, even if artificial intelligence ideas are not used directly, they can still help solve the blank-page problem and inspire new ideas.

## **2.2 Easier and faster work for everyone**

The second advantage is speed and access. Generative AI removes several technical barriers that once limited involvement in creative fields. Graphic design used to require years of Adobe‑Photoshop practice; now a small business owner can create draft logos with one prompt, then hire a pro only for the finalize the design. Writers can ask ChatGPT to rephrase dull sentences, generate alternative titles, or create a quick summary. An education study showed that students who used ChatGPT with teacher guidance produced more imaginative essays and felt less anxious about writing (Bushnell & Harrison, 2025, para. 4). Cost barriers drop as well. Getting five concept sketches from a freelance artist might cost 100 USD and take a week; a text‑to‑image AI can draft the same number in under a minute for a few cents in server fees. This does not mean AI replaces skilled artists. Instead, it changes the work flow, where fast AI drafts are followed by human selection and then professional refinement. Even established creators use the shortcut. Japanese novelist Rie Kudan stated that roughly 5 % of her prize‑winning 2024 novel began as raw ChatGPT text which she later rewrote to fit her style (Anderson, 2024, para. 2). For her, AI was a time‑saving sketch pad, not a ghostwriter. In conclusion, AI both reduces costs and speeds up the process.

# **III. DISADVANTAGES OF AI‑GENERATED CONTENT**

The same features that make AI handy also create risks. When machines supply endless ready‑made text or images, people may lose the habit of thinking creatively. Scholars warn of metacognitive laziness, a habit of accepting the first AI output without critical thought (Fan et al., 2025, p. 489). Additionally, because many users query the same popular model, their results tend to move toward the same idea, lowering overall diversity (Doshi & Hauser, 2024, p. 11). Ethical questions about bias, copyright and hidden AI use make the issue more urgent (Ahmad et al., 2023, p. 14). Three main disadvantages are focused on losing practice and skill, same-looking results and ethical and quality worries.

## **3.1 Losing practice and skill**

Creativity is like playing piano: practice matters. If writers always paste AI text instead of drafting their own, their fluency can stall. Duhaylungsod and Chavez found that university students who leaned on AI for every homework step later struggled on tests that required independent idea generation (Duhaylungsod & Chavez, 2023, para. 10). Some even reported lower confidence in their personal voice. Over time, a generation of creators could grow more reliant on machine suggestions and less willing to take original risks. Cognitive-science research says regular struggle, such as searching for ideas and revising phrases, builds neural pathways much like exercise builds muscle. When AI removes that struggle, the pathways weaken. Outside school, some marketing interns admit they now open ChatGPT before brainstorming headlines; after months, they find it harder to generate ideas without it. In conclusion, people may become increasingly dependent on AI and find it difficult to generate new ideas.

## **3.2 Same‑looking results**

Another fear is sameness. Large models learn from past data, so they often echo safe, mainstream styles. The Science Advances study showed AI‑assisted groups produced stories that were 10.7 % more similar to each other than stories written without AI (Doshi & Hauser, 2024, p. 5). In visual art, observers already joke about the “AI‑look” means bright colors, dreamy lighting, extra fingers. If every blog banner or TikTok thumbnail comes from the same model, cultural variety might decrease, just as fast‑food chains once pushed local cafés aside. Some platforms now try style-diversity filters, yet early tests suggest users still pick the familiar look because the algorithm ranks it higher. Without human guidance, AI’s convenience could slowly flatten artistic variety.

## **3.3 Ethical and quality worries**

Finally, quality and fairness issues remain. AI can copy copyrighted sentences or images because it was trained on them. It can also sound confident while giving wrong facts. When a journalist or student hides AI help, they risk misleading readers and teachers (Ahmad et al., 2023, p. 2). Photography contests have already faced criticism after AI pictures won top prizes; some events now ban AI art unless fully share openly. Until clearer laws define ownership and open sharing rules, conflicts will likely grow.

# **IV. CONCLUSION**

The report uncovers two clear advantages. First, AI acts as a creative spark: short prompts help writers craft stories about ten percent more original and let design teams double the number of fresh ideas. Second, AI makes the creative process faster and cheaper: students and professionals finish the first drafts sooner, feel less stress, and avoid high sketch or prototyping costs. However, these advantages are not enough to cover up the problems, because the disadvantages cause more serious and long-term damage. Heavy dependence weakens core skills. Users who lean on AI soon struggle to generate ideas unaided. AI output also tends to converge on the same safe patterns, so stories, images and songs begin to look alike. Finally, ethical and legal risks remain: AI can repeat copyrighted material, invent confident but wrong claims, and blur authorship, sparking lawsuits and public mistrust. While AI’s quick idea sparks and drafting speed are useful, the long-term downsides such as skill loss, cultural sameness, and unresolved legal risks carry greater weight. Generative AI should therefore remain a supporting tool, not the main engine of creative work. Human creators must stay in charge of choosing, editing, and crediting any machine-made material. In short, the disadvantages of AI-generated content outweigh its advantages unless strict human oversight keeps the technology in its proper place.

When all these findings are taken into consideration, the safest path is human in the loop: use AI to expand possibilities, then apply human judgment to filter, edit and add personal meaning. Schools can teach “AI literacy,” showing students how to question machine output and cite it correctly. Researchers should explore technical fixes, such as diverse training data or style sliders, to keep results varied. With thoughtful limits, society can enjoy AI’s speed without losing the rich originality that comes from human curiosity, emotion and lived experience.
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