Journal of Marketing & Social Research

ISSN (Online): 3008-0711

Volume: 02 | Issue 09 | 2025

Journal homepage: https://jmsr-online.com/

Research Article

From Copyright to Culture: Fair Use Doctrine's Influence on Creative Labor and Content Diversity in the Digital Age

Rashi Makhija[1], Yamini Chandra Prabha[2], Mr. Vaibhav Kumar[3] and Praneeta Jha[4]

[1]Research Scholar, University School of Law and Legal Studies, GGSIPU, Delhi.

[2]Research Scholar, Alliance University.

[3]Assistant Professor, TMCLLS, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad.

[4]Independent Researcher

Received: 15/09/2025; Revision: 30/09/2025; Accepted: 25/10/2025; Published: 15/11/2025

Corresponding author: Rashi Makhija *(rashimakhija369@gmail.com)

Abstract: The complex implications of fair use doctrine on creative work and subsequent universality of content in the dynamic digital landscapes are addressed in the paper below. Specifically, it examines how the deliberative latitude of the fair use doctrine can influence the dynamics of digital content generation by copyrighted creator and the comparative affordability of local goods in various jurisdictions. It also deals with the jurisdiction nuances of the comparison of the broad fair use doctrine in the United States with its more reputed counterparts in other nations to understand how the jurisdiction nuances would be differently applied to the creative expression and production cost. The critique analysis is on the adequacy of the current frameworks of fair use rules to realize the right of the original creator of content and the potential of the user-generated and generative artificial intelligence to revolutionize the content contrary to all expectations particularly in view of the disruptive nature of these technologies to the traditional creative industries. The paper will also continue to explore the possible impacts that generative artificial intelligence has on copyright law, including whether or not AI generated content is considered a derivative work and the strength with which the creation of AI models utilizing copyrighted content is covered under fair use. This inquiry will critically assess the question of the compatibility of the principles of fair use to generative AI models and most especially to their training stages with the classic arguments of the very existence of copyright legislation, of stimulating the advancement of science and arts, or it will confer an unparalleled, potentially unfair, privilege to AI over humans in art.

Keywords: - Fair Use, Copyright Law, Digital Age, Generative AI, Creative Labor, Content Diversity.

INTRODUCTION

The digital era has dramatically changed the world of creative production and distribution and requires the issue of simplification of copyright law, especially the doctrine of fair use to become the subject of a critical analysis. It is an important doctrine in that it allows users of the internet to engage in a read/write culture in which the everyday internet user changes into an active producer of a work of art. This paradigm shift, in which people are finding it very easy to produce and share original or derivative cultural pieces, is a direct threat to the older, and traditionally defined, approach to cultural artifact production and consumption, in which information flow was strictly read-only. This shift in momentum reveals the complex nature of fair use as academic and other kinds of creative endeavor as it involves a trade-off between the rights of the original generation on the one hand and the social interest in promoting innovation and cultural exchange on the other. The rapid advancement in the development of generative artificial intelligence also makes this balancing more difficult and introduces new challenges in such dimensions toward the time-old copyright convictions with questions of whether AI-generated output is a copyrightable work and how one should consider AI-generated works. Though most has been said about the problem that generative AI can mark on existing copyright doctrines, the implication of generative AI on the emancipator force of copyright over individual creators is something that would require further delineation. The hypothesis put forward by the paper is that treating human cultural representatives and sophisticated AI systems equally according to the fair use rules should be considered, and the concept of the absence of GenAI exceptionalism in the system of copyright is to put forward. The idea of genAI special consideration on the scan and structure of fair uses has a potential threat on the research principles of copyright law that has always aimed to foster human creativity and support cultural improvement. So what is peculiar to the fair use applied to the sphere of generative AI is key to the preservation of a stable ecosystem that will not only spur the further advancement of technology but also guarantee the further flourishing of human artistic expression. This paper thus explores the role the fair use doctrine plays in the delicate balance involving human creativity, technological advancement and the laws enacted to safeguard and shield the same. Namely, this discussion will examine whether the existing use of fair use can appropriately overcome the issues of generative AI, which tends to use copyrighted content to train its algorithms, and whether this usage suits the purpose of copyright to facilitate science and arts. This question also aims to establish whether the excessively broad conception of fair use applied to AI training might unintentionally

suppress human creativity by diminishing originality or even making human artists disadvantaged.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This paper thus outlines a conceptual map of how to perceive fair use in the context of a digital ecosystem, and how it is different to apply to human-created derivative works, as opposed to how it is now applied to training data and outputs of AI.

2.1. Defining Creative Labor

This framework will be a critical examination of the impact of various interpretations of fair use among jurisdictions on the financial sustainability and creative incentive of human artists and content creators in the digital world. It will also consider the implications of these differences to content variety and to cultural exchange and deliberate whether repressive copyrighting regimes have the undesirable outcome of limiting the expressive capacity and the availability of creative works via the Web. Moreover, this part will consider the manner in which economic viability of creative labour is technically linked to robust yet damp intellectual property systems that considers joint and reuse nature of digital creativity, in most instances made possible by the fair use. This concerns examining whether the current compensation systems offer a strong enough incentive to the creators of the work being presented on more expansive digital items, particularly as generative AI increasingly relies on large datasets to train it.

2.2. Understanding Content Diversity

The given paradigm will also focus on the potential impact that the diffusion of AI-generated content can have, especially in the area of domesticity of wanting attribution systems on the overall diversification of the content that can be compared to consumers and the capacity of human creators to distinguish their work. It includes an analysis of the manner in which the current system of licensing, such as the Creative Commons, attempts to navigate these complexities by illustrating the desires of the creators in reference to the use of their work by generative AI models. Additionally, it will assess how the existing legal and ethical practices are oriented to the financial side of human creators in situations when their material is entered into AI models without their direct permission or decent compensation. This question is necessary to ensure that, as AI technology advances in an unprecedented rate, it does not subvert with unintended consequences the very foundations of intellectual property law which was established with intent to facilitate the way to human creativity and to convey their culture. Thus there must exist a compromise between the disruptive power of AI and the need to protect and profit (in money) human art and creative action.

2.3. The Nexus of Copyright, Fair Use, and Creativity

This chapter will be looking at the history of copyright and fair use and the conceptual foundation of the law and how the two laws have worked towards facilitating creative practices and fighting the negative backlash of up and coming technology at the same time. It will more specifically elaborate how fair use is a crucial mechanism of ensuring that the rights of persons or persons holding copyrights to ensure that there is a balancing action of establishing the interests of the populace to gain access to, and contribute to the existing works, in consideration promoting increased innovation and cultural discussions. Introducing AI generated systems, however, introduces new dimensions on this balance, with the systems being frequently trained on large volumes of copyrighted material, and causes complex considerations of what then constitutes fair use when the system in question is being used. Fair use is particularly a complex issue when it comes to AI-mediated work, where attributing and ownership is particularly challenging due to the general nature of losing creative input of the authors behind the algorithms. It also has serious economic implications on human creators, since AI models, produced by mainstream technology companies are making it straightforward to utilize copyrightable material without remuneration that is sure to crowd out human creative output in the market. It leads to the necessity of critical evaluation of the legal frameworks currently in place to determine whether they are equipped to adequately safeguard the interest of such human artists and to be able to exercise the transformative capabilities of AI.

3. Historical Evolution of Fair Use

This part follows the fair use doctrine to its common law origins up to the passage into statutory law, with particular consideration of several prominent court interpretations and legislative amendments, which have influenced the fair use doctrine as applied over the years. This historical view indicates the manner in which fair use has always been changing with the changes in technology, beginning with the printing press up to digital reproduction, in order to keep a precarious balanced position between the incentives of the creators and the openness to the public. The recent rise of generative artificial Intelligences systems, however, has brought about new challenges the likes of which have not been seen before within this status quo, and as such, it requires a stringent review of the principles of fair use. Particularly, the fact that AI models are trained on large data sets of copyrighted content without their apparent approval has sparked a heated discussion concerning the relevance and scope of the doctrine in the digital era. As an example, the size and type of data consumed by generative AI models e.g., the LAION 5-B a dataset with billions of images and text captions are vastly different than the technological achievements of the past, which necessitates new interpretations of the law. This will require a further look into how existing legal frameworks, specifically those that identify fair use, can be adjusted to acknowledge the transformative quality of AI training and at the same time respect the rights of the original content creators. This re-assessment should take into account whether the existing four-factor fair use test, as outlined in the section 17 U.S.C. SS107, is sufficient to handle the non-consumptive use typical of the training of AI models, in particular in terms of market influence and the transformative quality of AI-generated results. In the past, university researchers have the history of using large and varied data including copyrighted data to train AI models, under the understanding that data-scaling greatly increases AI

performance. The historical context plays an essential role in comprehending how AI training can be considered in terms of fair use or not, especially with reference to its intended use in promoting technological development.

FAIR USE AND CREATIVE LABOR

4.1. Impact on Artists and Creators

The mass usage of copyrighted material by AI systems to train them has caused much controversy regarding what it means to the economic livelihood of human authors and whether it will be replacing them in the market. Certain AI corporations do not compensate creative positions with the vast sums of copyrighted published material that they are training their models on, thus putting the livelihoods of artists in jeopardy as well as disrupting the knowledge economy. It is performed through massive datasets, including collections like Common Pool with 12.8 billion pictures and captions or LAION 5-B with 5 billion pictures, which exposes hundreds of artists to an existential threat of AI systems copying their work, even though such materials seemingly imitate a style of artists and defy labels like original, replicas, or fakes. Though AI companies are likely to justify such mass reproduction and say that it is a fair use of that data, the argument that AI actually only learns data that cannot be copyrighted is a hotly contested issue. The practice contributes to the complexity of agency and responsibility in the case of potential infringement because determining who triggers the process of copying, the AI researchers, the people training the models, or those making use of the results is complicated. This also complicates the issue of deciding on liability especially where the generated AI works have a high level of similarity to the already existing copyrighted materials. Moreover, the perceived lack of transparency in most AI training datasets contributes to these problems, as the creators are not even able to determine whether and how their work has been used. Such opaqueness now hinders the ability of creators to exercise their rights and claim compensation, leading to a situation where the output of their creative output can be commercialized without having a clear legal means of action.

4.2. Monetization and Compensation Challenges

This mass-level, frequently unpaid, use of creative work to train generative AI models is fundamentally disruptive to proven monetization courses and conventional artist and creator compensation models. The legal recounts that follow highlight how unclear the issue of intellectual property rights become when AI systems create material that resembles an existing style or includes the features of the copyrighted materials. The legal issues are also complicated by the fact that it is hard to pin responsibility on infringement as it is not yet clear on who should be held responsible in case AI-generated material infringes on existing copyrights, who does the AI researchers or the model trainers, or the end-users? Also, although the fair use doctrine applied currently in the United States allows such training to be done provided that measures are taken to mitigate the occurrence of substantively similar output this does not mean that this interpretation is universally settled and differs among other jurisdictions. Indicatively, several cases against generative AI models presupose that the training on copyrighted information amounts to the violation of intellectual property rights and, therefore, IP owners are entitled to receive compensations.

4.3. Innovation and Derivative Works

This dispute underscores the existence of a debate of vital conflict between nurturing technological advancement and protecting the creative workforce, particularly because the copyright legislation was initially established to integrate art and enterprise. Technology companies are in the 21st century using this framework to monetize digitized and online editions of human creativity by consuming large datasets of human creativity, e.g. LAION 5-B and Common Pool en masse, without authorization, and using the data to train their AI. These problems are further complicated by the unanswered legal questions related to the issue of copyright infringement in the context of AI-generated work: who bears responsibility in case of an infringement is created by an AI? The litigation will have to deal with studying how to attribute agency and responsibility.

5. Fair Use and Content Diversity

The result of AI is far-reaching on the diversity of content, as the generative models have the ability to generate vast amounts of media never before seen, which may result in a redundancy of derivative work, making the media of origin less visible and less economically viable. Threats of flooding the market are associated with the homogenization of cultural narratives and an unsustainable overrepresentation of diverse creative voices because the content AI generated might copy dominant styles and themes because it uses existing datasets.

5.1. Promoting Access to Knowledge

The concept of enhancing access to knowledge can frequently be seen as a crucial element in the argument of fair use whereby the establishment of AI models can be viewed as a transformative use, comparable to such interfaces as search engines or online libraries. It is argued in this school of thought that an act of consuming copyrighted content to train AI, even at enormous sizes, does not contravene the public interest as it is a method of innovation and is an opportunity to invent new avenues of information retrieval and creative expression. Nevertheless, the argument tends to ignore the negative effect on original authors whose compositions are consumed without their knowledge or license, and ethical issues of copyright and financial equity are brought to the fore. Furthermore, although scanning books to generate an index of searchable texts was considered a fair use case in the Google Books case, the legal application of this case to generative AI training, which generates original content, is a questionable legal area.

5.2. Fostering Cultural Expression

This difference is essential because the process of generative AI systems is not limited in such a way as due to indexing: new works emerge, usually after copying or stylisticating an already existing work, making the law and ethics of cultural production more complex. This dilemma is topped further by the fact that the fair use as interpreted by jurisdictions particularly the recent years that have seen

the rise of generative AI means that this ought to bring it to a head that a concerted global protection of intellectual property is required in the digital age. It would be an ideal balance between innovation potential of AI and the necessity to protect the interests of creators and the possibility of human artistic activity in the future. Consequently, the discussion about the subject of fair training, and indeed a fair use notion, to the training of AI, is central to the discussion in combating these problematic matters, where the supporters of the viewpoint that AI is transformative and the opponents that AI is robbing intellectual property get in the fray. Nonetheless, more copyright holders and their supporters claim that using copyrighted content in AI training data amount to misappropriation of intellectual property and that it should not be considered fair use.

5.3. Addressing Bias and Representation

The generative AI models require mass datasets, which are often collected on the internet through scraping without direct permission, posing serious problems with bias and representation in the generated material. This undiscouraged potential society to be transparent in gathering data and training their models, potentially continuing and even contributing to existing biases in society, creating unrepresentative and discriminative AI outputs. Moreover, these prejudices might result in the absence of diversity in the field of creative work as one will fail to produce new ideas and forms of expression based on different cultural viewpoints. The most critical step in reducing these risks and encouraging equitable and accommodative content generation is therefore to ensure that the training data is diverse and representative. Designers of large setting models are therefore posed with the difficult challenge of interpreting with our varied stakeholders, such as third-party researchers, policymakers, and end-users to make sure the design practices possess participatory and context-aware processes involves, especially in light of the obscurity around massive processes of data scraping and its potential to marginalize specific voices.

6. Challenges and Controversies

The fast development of the generative AI technology has presented a multifaceted web of issues, especially in the field of intellectual property law, artistic work, and the question of morality. At the center of them is the controversial legality of using copyrighted materials to train large language models, and multiple developers are citing fair use doctrines to explain the ingestion of large volumes of data without explicit licensing or compensation. Such practice has become the subject of heated debate among creators and copyright holders who believe that this unlicensed usage interrupts their economic rights and undermines the value of their work, which results in constant lawsuits and demands new legal systems to address all the new concerns. Furthermore, the prospect of generative AI to create works that are highly similar, even to an extent, copy-cat and copycat-like can bring even more issues, as the two creative forms merge. Such developments have also brought up the issue of the likelihood of biased judgment, disadvantages, and discrimination with generative AI models being susceptible to the same biases as their discriminative counterparts due to introduction of bias during the training stages of the models by inaccurate datasets and unrepresentative selection of samples. This, therefore, necessitates the creation of moral codes of conduct and regulatory systems that would aid in the responsible application and use of these potent technologies. Moreover, the lack of transparency of the training materials and approaches used by AI developers only contributes to these anxieties, contributing to the fact that it is hard to gauge the robustness and safety of AI systems, and the analysis of extreme AI risks is complicated further.

CONCLUSION

This thoughtful review has explored the multifaceted discussion of the interconnections between the doctrine of fair use and creative work, as well as content diversity in the rapidly evolving world of generative AI. It has demonstrated the inherent ethical issues, including discrimination, privacy, fake news, and patenting, that need to be addressed strictly and develop effective reduce tactics. Quantitatively expanding opportunities offered by generative AI, in particular, the application of deep learning models and large language models, also opens up new unparalleled opportunities in the exhibition of innovations to the audience, at the same time, increasing the drying out of the discourse of the necessity to introduce mass regulation to limit potential misuse and bias, as well as other issues of this kind. It is a highly emerging issue that has made it apparent that there are some dire requirements to put in place clear ethical standards and effective regulatory tools to make sure that such powerful technologies are being developed and put to practice in a responsible manner. Specifically, model training and data provenance transparency are essential to identify a remedy to ethical consequences and risks of generative AI, which in most instances are significantly different than those of (non-generative) discriminative machine learning. These distinct ethical profiles must be understood in detail in order to have tailored risk analysis and risk management instruments. These frameworks need to take into account not only the technical package of AI but also other societal norms or professional standards that are not identical by sector so that the population and the society are benefited in an equal manner and that the harms of such practices are alleviated. This would require an interdisciplinary method, combining legal, ethical, and technological experience to develop dynamic rules that might successfully deal with the fast-changing AI development and maintain the values and rights of society. Furthermore, the necessity to mitigate bias and implement privacy in the generative AI system cannot be a secondary concern, and thus total data audits and fairness-mindful generative models must be established to ensure fair representation of a diverse range of demographics. The artificial discontinuity of the research and inconsistency of the ethical frameworks is now a major obstacle on the way to these aims and require that the ethical AI development have a unified approach as well.

REFERENCES

1. Akhtar, Z. B. (2024). Unveiling the evolution of generative AI (GAI): a comprehensive and investigative analysis toward LLM models (2021–2024) and beyond. *Journal of Electrical Systems and Information Technology*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43067-024-00145-1
2. Alipour, P., & Gallegos, E. (2024). Leveraging Generative AI Synthetic and Social Media Data for Content Generalizability to Overcome Data Constraints in Vision Deep Learning. *Research Square (Research Square)*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5423676/v1
3. Al-kfairy, M., Mustafa, D., Kshetri, N., Insiew, M., & Alfandi, O. (2024b). Ethical Challenges and Solutions of Generative AI: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. *Informatics*, *11*(3), 58. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics11030058
4. Ananny, M. (2023). Make AI a Public Problem. *Issues in Science and Technology*, *40*(2), 88. https://doi.org/10.58875/ehny5426
5. Andrejevic, M. (2023). Protect Information Systems to Preserve Attention. *Issues in Science and Technology*, *40*(2), 82. https://doi.org/10.58875/bzht8695
6. Anthis, J. R., Lum, K., Ekstrand, M., Feller, A., D'Amour, A., & Tan, C. (2024). The Impossibility of Fair LLMs. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.03198
7. Atkinson, D. (2024). *Unfair Learning: GenAI Exceptionalism and Copyright Law*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4975857
8. Banh, L., & Strobel, G. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence. *Electronic Markets*, *33*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-023-00680-1
9. Bodiford, J. (2017). Sharing Sounds: Musical Innovation, Collaboration, and Ideological Expression in the Chilean Netlabel Movement. *Deep Blue (University of Michigan)*. https://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/136959
10. Dubey, M. B. (2025). Chapter-4 FEDERALISM IN INDIA: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS. *CONTOURS OF CONTEMPORARY LEGAL RESEARCH: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE: Volume 1: FOUNDATIONS AND FRONTIERS OF PUBLIC LAW*, 29.
11. Batar, S. (2021). System of legal education in india. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *11*(11), 239-244.
12. Dubey, M. B. (2025). MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE AND LEGAL REMEDIES. *CONTOURS OF CONTEMPORARY LEGAL RESEARCH: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE-VOLUME 3: CRIMINAL JUSTICE, FORENSICS, AND EMERGING LEGAL PARADIGMS*, 186.
13. Batar, S. (2021). A socio-legal study of police atrocities. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, *10*(12), 624-630.
14. Dubey, M. B. (2025). CRIMINOLOGY AND SOCIAL CONTROL THEORIES. *CONTOURS OF CONTEMPORARY LEGAL RESEARCH: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE-VOLUME 3: CRIMINAL JUSTICE, FORENSICS, AND EMERGING LEGAL PARADIGMS*, 73.
15. Batar, S. (2021). A review on abortion. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, *10*(11), 472-478.
16. Chaudhary, A., Asudani, V. H., Mishra, A., Deshpande, A., & Batar, S. (2023). NRI MARRIAGES–WOMEN VICTIMS AND SCAPEGOAT FAMILIES. *Russian Law Journal*, *11*(5S), 132-136.
17. Batar, S. (1992). A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP UNDER THE US, UK AND INDIA. *INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS*, 7.
18. Ducru, P., Raiman, J., Lemos, R., Garner, C., He, G., Balcha, H., Souto, G., Branco, S., & Bottino, C. (2024a). *AI Royalties -- an IP Framework to Compensate Artists & IP Holders for AI-Generated Content*. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2406.11857
19. Ducru, P., Raiman, J., Lemos, R., Garner, C., He, G., Balcha, H., Souto, G., Branco, S., & Bottino, C. (2024b). AI Royalties -- an IP Framework to Compensate Artists & IP Holders for AI-Generated Content. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.11857
20. Geiger, C. (2023). Elaborating a Human Rights friendly Copyright Framework for Generative AI. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4634992
21. Geiger, C. (2024). Elaborating a Human Rights-Friendly Copyright Framework for Generative AI. *Deleted Journal*, *55*(7), 1129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-024-01481-5
22. Gentelet, K. (2023). Get Citizens' Input on AI Deployments. *Issues in Science and Technology*, *40*(2), 83. https://doi.org/10.58875/puph1340
23. Hagendorff, T. (2024). Mapping the Ethics of Generative AI: A Comprehensive Scoping Review. *Minds and Machines*, *34*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-024-09694-w
24. He, L., Huang, Y., Shi, W., Xie, T., Liu, H., Wang, Y., Zettlemoyer, L., Zhang, C., Chen, D., & Henderson, P. (2024). Fantastic Copyrighted Beasts and How (Not) to Generate Them. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.14526
25. Huang, Y., Arora, C., Huong, W. C., Kanij, T., Madulgalla, A., & Grundy, J. (2025). *Ethical Concerns of Generative AI and Mitigation Strategies: A Systematic Mapping Study*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202501.2003.v1
26. Jaton, F. (2023). Ground Truths Are Human Constructions. *Issues in Science and Technology*, *40*(2), 85. https://doi.org/10.58875/lxwc2075
27. Matias, C. F. F. (2024). Generative AI, Copyright and Emancipation: The Case of Digital Art. *Law Technology and Humans*. https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.3567

28. Matsiola, M., Lappas, G., & Yannacopoulou, A. (2024). Generative AI in Education: Assessing Usability, Ethical Implications, and Communication Effectiveness. *Societies*, *14*(12), 267. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14120267
29. Mei, Y. (2024). Prompting the E-Brushes: Users as Authors in Generative AI. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.11844
30. Pasquale, F., & Sun, H. (2024). Consent and Compensation: Resolving Generative AI's Copyright Crisis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4826695
31. Rettberg, J. W. (2023). How Generative AI Endangers Cultural Narratives. *Issues in Science and Technology*, *40*(2), 77. https://doi.org/10.58875/rqjd7538
32. Sag, M. (2023). Copyright Safety for Generative AI. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4438593
33. Soni, T. (2024). Impact of AI on IPR Framework. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4831898
34. Suriyakumar, V. M., Alur, R., Menell, P. S., Hadfield-Menell, D., & Wilson, A. (2024). *Impact of Generative AI on the Creative Economy*. https://doi.org/10.21428/e4baedd9.d11fa125