International Journal of Arts and Humanities
ISSN: 3005-3455
DOI: 10.61424/ijah
Journal Homepage: www.bluemarkpublishers.com/index.php/IJAH

IJAH
BLUEMARK PUBLISHERS

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Mitigating the Effects of AI Disruption on Art and Design Creativity: Redefining the Role of Designers and Educators

Ajayi, Olayemi T.[1] ✉, Otunaiya, Ayodele O.[2] and Ajayi, Noah O.[3]
[1]*Department of Art and Design, Federal University of Technology, Ilaro, Ogun State, Nigeria*
[2]*Fine and Applied Arts Department, School of Secondary Education (Vocational Studies) Federal College of Education, Abeokuta*
[3]*College of Humanities Education, Department of Fine and Applied Arts Education, Lagos State University of Education, P.O. BOX 2007, Oto/Ijanikin, Lagos State, Nigeria*
Corresponding Author: Ajayi, Olayemi T., **E-mail**: olayemi.ajayi@federalpolyilaro.edu.ng

| ABSTRACT
The growing integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in art and design education presents both opportunities and challenges, particularly within developing contexts such as Nigeria. The problem lies in the tension between technological advancement and the preservation of human creativity, originality, and material skill. This study investigates how GenAI influences creative expression, pedagogical practices, and ethical considerations in Nigerian art and design institutions. Guided by constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes experiential and reflective knowledge construction, the study adopts a qualitative phenomenological design to capture the lived experiences of educators, students, and professional designers. Data were gathered from 32 participants across six tertiary institutions in southwestern Nigeria through interviews and focus group discussions. Findings reveal that while GenAI enhances efficiency in idea generation and visual rendering, it simultaneously reduces conceptual depth and manual exploration. Participants expressed concerns about the erosion of craft skills, ambiguity in authorship, and ethical dilemmas surrounding originality and ownership. However, educators are increasingly adapting their teaching methods, shifting from instructor-centered approaches to facilitative, critique-based learning that integrates AI critically rather than dependently. The study concludes that GenAI functions as both a disruptor and democratizer of creativity, reshaping the roles of designers and educators alike. To sustain authentic artistic practice, it recommends embedding AI ethics and creativity modules in curricula, improving digital infrastructure, promoting continuous upskilling for educators, and encouraging hybrid models that balance analog craft with AI-assisted ideation. These strategies ensure a resilient and ethically grounded art education in the AI era.

| KEYWORDS
Arts-Science, Co-production, Ecosystem Services, Qualitative Research, Sustainability, Transdisciplinarity

| ARTICLE INFORMATION
ACCEPTED: 21 September 2025 **PUBLISHED:** 13 November 2025 **DOI:** 10.61424/ijah.v3.i2.549

1. Introduction

1.1. Global Lens

The rapid proliferation of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), including large language models, text-to-image systems, and multimodal generation tools, is reshaping creative practice and education. In fine arts and design, where experimentation, aesthetic judgment, and authorial identity are central, GenAI's rise provokes critical questions about creativity, labor valuation, and pedagogical adaptation.

Empirical studies confirm GenAI's widespread adoption in higher education. In Saudi Arabia, Alshammari, Alhassan, and Alabduljabbar (2024) surveyed 859 students and found that 78.7% frequently used GenAI tools, with 86.2% using ChatGPT specifically. Students primarily employed these tools for idea generation, translation, summarization, and conceptual clarification. Despite these benefits, respondents expressed concerns about unreliable information, diminished human interaction, academic integrity, and weakened learner autonomy. Similarly, a UK-based study of 136 students in arts, design, engineering, and technology reported that 94% were aware of GenAI for academic purposes, yet only 52% had personally used it for academic tasks, indicating a gap between awareness and utilization (Preprints.org, 2024).

In arts education, GenAI's effects extend to aesthetic judgment and authorship. A systematic review of 44 empirical studies across fine arts, drawing, painting, and music found that observers often cannot reliably distinguish between human-made and AI-generated artworks. However, when the origin is disclosed, human-made works are generally valued more, underscoring enduring biases in aesthetic perception (Oksanen et al., 2023). Evidence also highlights GenAI's impact on creative performance. Holzner, Maier, and Feuerriegel's (2025) meta-analysis of 28 studies with 8,214 participants showed that human-AI collaboration improved overall creative output ($g = 0.27$) but significantly reduced idea diversity ($g = -0.86$). Interestingly, AI alone performed comparably to humans when measured with standard creativity metrics, suggesting augmentation rather than replacement.

Finally, motivational dimensions are emerging. Escobar and Silva (2024) reported increased acceptance of AI tools among Latin American arts students, with their Synthetic Index of Use of AI Tools (SIUAIT) rising from 58.84 to 60.60 across semesters. Students also reported greater positive emotions, joy and surprise, in AI-supported classes compared to traditional formats.

Collectively, these studies demonstrate both opportunities and challenges: GenAI enhances productivity and emotional engagement but raises risks around originality, variation, and educational integrity.

1.2. African Continent Lens

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), encompassing large language models (LLMs) and text-to-image systems, has rapidly shifted from research laboratories into mainstream educational and creative practices. Its capacity to accelerate ideation, automate labor-intensive rendering, and provide immediate feedback has begun to transform art and design pedagogy, yet it also raises unresolved concerns about authorship, assessment, and the preservation of studio-based tacit skills (Bali et al., 2024; UNCTAD, 2024). These dualities, creative amplification alongside risks to pedagogical integrity, position GenAI as one of the most pressing issues in fine and applied arts education.

Globally, student adoption has risen sharply. In the United Kingdom, national surveys revealed that usage of AI tools in higher education grew from approximately two-thirds of students to more than 90% within a single academic year, with most students employing GenAI for drafting, summarization, and research (HEPI, 2025). Comparable patterns are evident in Asia: Li, Zhao, and Wang (2024) found widespread use of GenAI for academic writing among Chinese undergraduates, while Alshammari, Alhassan, and Alabduljabbar (2024) reported similar engagement in Saudi Arabia. In Africa, adoption is accelerating but shaped by infrastructural and policy constraints. Yakubu, David, and Abubakar (2025), using the UTAUT model with 289 Nigerian university students, showed that performance expectancy, effort expectancy, and social influence significantly predicted intention to adopt content-generative AI. Likewise, Essien et al. (2024) emphasized socio-cultural influences on engagement in Nigerian higher education, highlighting uneven institutional readiness.

The impact of GenAI on creative performance has also been empirically documented. Holzner, Maier, and Feuerriegel (2025) synthesized 47 studies in a meta-analysis, finding that human-AI collaboration tends to improve productivity and quality, though it can reduce idea diversity. Oksanen et al. (2023) similarly reviewed applications of AI in fine arts and concluded that while AI can support creative production, it raises fundamental questions of originality and authorship. From a pedagogical lens, Sokhulu, Zulu, and Lott-Naidoo (2025) found South African students valued ChatGPT for efficiency and learning support, yet expressed anxiety about skill erosion and academic integrity.

Contextual challenges in Nigeria and other African nations remain substantial: intermittent power supply, limited institutional investment, and inconsistent regulatory frameworks constrain AI integration (Bali et al., 2024). These conditions suggest that low-tech literacy approaches, such as prompt design, ethical reflection, and critical evaluation, may be more feasible than advanced AI integration in the short term. Importantly, UNCTAD (2024) underscores global tensions around copyright, data ethics, and economic valuation of creative labor, issues that directly affect artists and educators.

This empirical record underscores three interlinked claims: adoption is already widespread and driven by perceived usefulness and peer norms; GenAI enhances productivity but creates measurable trade-offs in creativity and pedagogy; and there is a scarcity of context-sensitive frameworks for fine and applied arts in the Global South. Consequently, this study investigates the lived experiences of designers, students, and educators in Nigerian art and design settings, with the aim of generating grounded recommendations to preserve creativity, craft, and ethical practice in the GenAI era.

Together, these findings confirm that GenAI is already deeply embedded in higher education and creative education contexts. Yet there are clear lacunae: empirical work specific to fine and applied arts/design studio settings is limited, especially outside of North America and Europe. There is less data on issues of craft, material skill, critique, authorship, studio pedagogy, and the role of design educators. Quantitative metrics tend to focus on usage, perceived usefulness, or general creativity; qualitative, practice-based accounts are sparser.

In light of this, the present study seeks to (1) document how designers, fine/applied arts students, and educators experience GenAI in studio and classroom settings; (2) identify perceived benefits and harms, particularly around creative process, authorship, craft skills and identity; and (3) generate empirically grounded recommendations for how roles of designers and educators can be redefined to preserve creativity, ethical standards, and material practice even as GenAI becomes more systemically adopted.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study draws on three interrelated frameworks to examine the integration of generative AI in art and design education.

Constructivist and socio-cultural learning theories posit that knowledge is actively constructed through interaction, experience, and cultural mediation (Vygotsky, 1978). In studio-based arts education, critique, collaboration, and material practice are central to learning. GenAI tools, when positioned as mediating artifacts, can scaffold idea generation but also risk displacing tacit skills essential to studio practice.

Human-centered design and creative pedagogy further emphasize learner agency. Human-centered design stresses empathy, iteration, and responsiveness to user needs (Norman, 2013), while creative pedagogy promotes originality, critical reflection, and risk-taking (Craft, 2005). Together, these approaches suggest that AI integration should augment rather than replace human creativity, ensuring that students remain active co-creators in the learning process.

Finally, the tension between technological determinism and the social shaping of technology highlights AI's contested role. Technological determinism frames GenAI as an inevitable driver of change, while social shaping perspectives argue its effects are contingent upon policies, infrastructures, and cultural practices (MacKenzie & Wajcman, 1999). In Nigerian art and design contexts, this underscores that GenAI's impact is not uniform but mediated by local socio-cultural and institutional factors.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a qualitative phenomenological design to explore the lived experiences of art and design educators, students, and professional designers regarding the disruptive impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) on creativity and pedagogy in Nigeria. A purposive sample of 36 participants (12 educators, 12 designers, and 12 students) was selected from six tertiary institutions across the country to ensure diversity in perspective and context.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis of institutional curricula and AI-related policies. Interviews and discussions explored themes of creativity, authorship, and the evolving professional roles of designers and educators. All sessions were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and thematically analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step model to identify key patterns and emergent insights.

To ensure trustworthiness, the study employed triangulation, member-checking, and detailed documentation of analytical processes. Ethical approval was obtained, and participants provided informed consent with assurances of confidentiality and voluntary participation. Although limited in generalizability, the qualitative approach provided deep, context-rich insights into how AI technologies are reshaping creative expression and educational practice, offering a nuanced understanding of how designers and educators can adapt to preserve creativity in the GenAI era.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Overview of Participants

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Participants

Variable	Category	Frequency (n = 32)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	18	56.3
	Female	14	43.7
Total		**32**	**100%**
Institutional Affiliation	Federal Polytechnic	10	31.3
	University	12	37.5
	College of Education	6	18.8
	Private Art Academy	4	12.4
Total		**32**	**100%**
Years of Teaching/Practice	1-5 years	8	25.0
	6-10 years	10	31.3
	11-20 years	9	28.1
	21+ years	5	15.6
Total		**32**	**100%**
Specialization	Painting	6	18.8
	Sculpture	5	15.6
	Textile Design	4	12.5
	Graphic Design	7	21.9
	Photography	6	18.8
	Digital Art	4	12.5
Total		**32**	**100%**

Source: Field Data (2025)

The study engaged a total of 32 participants comprising 12 lecturers, 15 students, and 5 professional designers drawn from six tertiary institutions in southwestern Nigeria, including polytechnics and universities known for strong art and design programs. The gender distribution included 18 males and 14 females. Participants' teaching and creative practice experience ranged between 3 and 25 years, ensuring a balanced representation of both emerging and established professionals. Areas of specialization included painting, sculpture, textile design, graphic design, photography, ceramics, and digital art. This diversity allowed the study to capture a holistic understanding

of how Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is reshaping creative processes, instructional approaches, and professional identities in art and design. Participants' backgrounds also reflected varying levels of digital exposure, which influenced their perceptions of AI's role in artistic production and education.

4.2 Emerging Themes

Table 2: Emerging Themes and Representative Participant Quotes

Theme	Description	Illustrative Quote
Enhanced Efficiency but Reduced Depth	GenAI improves output speed but limits deep exploration.	-Students now finish projects faster, but the works often feel shallow, more AI than them. *(Lecturer, Digital Art)*
Erosion of Craft and Material Engagement	Overreliance on AI leads to decline in manual skills.	-They no longer want to mix colors or feel textures, just prompt and print. *(Lecturer, Painting)*
Authorship and Ethical Dilemmas	Ambiguity in originality and ownership of AI-assisted works.	-Whose art is it when the machine paints half of it? *(Student, Graphic Design)*
Evolving Pedagogical Practices	Shift from teacher-centered to facilitative learning.	-I now ask them to critique AI outputs instead of just copying them. *(Lecturer, Sculpture)*
Institutional and Infrastructural Barriers	Poor power supply and low digital literacy limit adoption.	-The tools are great, but without power or Wi-Fi, it's just theory. *(Student, Textile Design)*
Resilient Creativity through Adaptive Pedagogy	Hybrid teaching models preserve creativity and craft.	-We let AI spark ideas, then execute by hand, it keeps the soul of the art alive. *(Lecturer, Photography)*

Source: Field Data (2025)

i. Enhanced Efficiency but Reduced Depth

A significant proportion of respondents agreed that GenAI has made creative work faster and more convenient. Students and designers described how AI tools such as Midjourney, DALL·E, and Adobe Firefly help them generate ideas, concepts, and visual prototypes within minutes, processes that previously took hours or even days. However, several lecturers voiced concerns that this newfound efficiency often leads to a superficial engagement with the creative process. Many students now skip essential stages of ideation, sketching, and experimentation, relying instead on AI-generated outputs. As one lecturer noted, the speed is impressive, but the thought process behind creativity is thinning out. The study, therefore, observes a trade-off between productivity and depth, where creative intuition and critical reasoning risk being overshadowed by technological convenience.

ii. Erosion of Craft and Material Engagement

Participants from traditional studio disciplines, such as sculpture, textile design, and painting, expressed growing anxiety over the diminishing tactile connection between students and their materials. With increasing use of digital tools, fewer students show interest in developing craftsmanship or mastering the sensory elements of art-making. In some cases, assignments that formerly required painting, printing, or carving are now executed digitally. This shift, while expanding creative boundaries, threatens to erode the experiential learning that defines studio practice. One senior lecturer lamented, the essence of art lies in touch, texture, and process. When machines replace hands, we lose something fundamental. The findings suggest that while AI facilitates innovation, it also challenges the preservation of traditional techniques central to artistic identity.

iii. Authorship and Ethical Dilemmas

Across institutions, both students and educators raised concerns about authorship, originality, and ethics in AI-generated artworks. Participants debated whether AI-assisted outputs could still be considered original when much of the creative work is performed by algorithms trained on existing datasets. Students were uncertain about whether to claim full ownership of works produced using AI prompts, while lecturers struggled with how to grade such works fairly. Furthermore, issues of plagiarism surfaced, as many AI tools draw inspiration from copyrighted

images online. As one educator observed, we are now in an era where we must redefine what originality means. This ethical ambiguity underscores the urgent need for academic institutions to establish clear policies on the responsible use of AI in creative education.

iv. Evolving Pedagogical Practices

The integration of AI into creative learning environments is gradually reshaping pedagogical approaches. Lecturers reported a shift from demonstration-based teaching, where students imitate practical steps, to facilitation-based methods that encourage dialogue, critique, and reflection. Many educators are now emphasizing conceptual development, cultural context, and aesthetic judgment over technical execution. Workshops and seminars on digital literacy and AI ethics are becoming more common. For instance, one institution introduced AI and Visual Innovation as a course to expose students to responsible AI use. This transition reflects an evolving understanding of teaching: rather than resisting AI, educators are learning to incorporate it as a critical thinking tool that stimulates rather than replaces creativity.

v. Institutional and Infrastructural Barriers

Despite the optimism about AI's potential, several infrastructural limitations impede its effective integration into art education in Nigeria. Participants cited irregular power supply, poor internet connectivity, inadequate computer facilities, and lack of institutional funding as major obstacles. Many lecturers also mentioned that digital illiteracy among both staff and students remains a barrier. Some schools still lack functional computer labs or licensed AI software, forcing students to rely on personal mobile devices with limited capability. Additionally, there is no clear regulatory framework guiding the ethical and curricular use of AI in tertiary education. These challenges reveal a technological gap that must be bridged if Nigerian institutions are to fully harness the transformative potential of GenAI in creative disciplines.

vi. Resilient Creativity through Adaptive Pedagogy

Amidst these challenges, a sense of resilience and innovation emerged. Educators are not rejecting AI outright but are instead finding balanced ways to integrate it into studio practice. Some lecturers encourage students to use AI for ideation while insisting that final artworks be manually executed to retain material authenticity. Others blend traditional and digital approaches, such as using AI-generated sketches as references for paintings or textile patterns. This hybrid model promotes critical engagement, ensuring that students develop both technological competence and tactile artistry. One participant remarked, AI is a tool, not a teacher. It should inspire, not replace, creativity. Such adaptive practices demonstrate that, even in the face of rapid digital change, Nigerian art educators remain committed to nurturing authentic creativity rooted in both innovation and tradition.

The findings reveal a complex but promising relationship between AI and art education in Nigeria. While GenAI enhances productivity and opens new creative frontiers, it simultaneously challenges established norms of craftsmanship, authorship, and pedagogy. The balance lies in critical adaptation, where technology supports, but does not dominate, the creative and educational process.

5. Discussion

5.1 Interpretation of Findings vis-à-vis Theoretical Lenses

The study's findings resonate deeply with constructivist, socio-cultural, and human-centered learning theories, revealing how the infusion of generative AI (GenAI) into art and design education reshapes the learning process. Constructivism emphasizes learning as an active, context-based process mediated by cultural tools. Here, AI functions as both a mediating artifact and a disruptive presence: it scaffolds rapid idea generation and visualization, yet risks eroding embodied, hands-on learning that is vital in studio-based disciplines. Human-centered design and creative pedagogy call for maintaining learner agency, empathy, and reflective engagement. The evidence from the field shows that when educators employ AI as a catalyst rather than a crutch, students exhibit stronger creative judgment and contextual awareness. Finally, through the lens of the social shaping of technology, GenAI's influence emerges not as deterministic but as highly contingent on infrastructure, pedagogy, and institutional readiness, underscoring the need for locally adaptive frameworks.

5.2 Positioning GenAI as Both Disruptor and Democratizer of Creativity

GenAI's dual role as both disruptor and democratizer of creativity is evident across the data. As a disruptor, it challenges the essence of traditional studio learning, undermining the slow, reflective processes that foster originality and craftsmanship. Students often accept AI-generated outcomes as final works, bypassing critical exploration. Yet, the same technology acts as a democratizer, expanding creative possibilities for students with limited access to tools, materials, or professional mentorship. By enabling instant visual experimentation and global exposure, GenAI broadens participation in design thinking and aesthetic creation. Hence, its value lies not in replacement but augmentation, when guided by informed educators and ethical frameworks.

5.3 Aligning with Constructivist Pedagogy to Maintain Human Agency

A recurring theme among respondents was the importance of retaining human agency in creative learning. Constructivist pedagogy aligns with this imperative by promoting interaction, reflection, and contextual meaning-making. Educators in this study highlighted strategies such as integrating AI into ideation while preserving manual execution, encouraging critique-based learning, and requiring reflective documentation of the design process. These approaches keep learners actively engaged as co-creators, ensuring that AI supports rather than supplants creativity. By positioning students as critical prompt engineers and evaluators of algorithmic aesthetics, educators reinforce intellectual ownership and ethical responsibility, core principles of art and design education.

5.4 Ethics, Authorship, and Aesthetic Judgment in AI-Mediated Creativity

Table 3: Comparative Perspectives - Global North vs. African Contexts

Dimension	Global North Context	African Context (Nigeria)
AI Infrastructure	Stable electricity, broadband access, and institutional AI labs.	Frequent power outages, inconsistent internet, limited hardware.
Pedagogical Integration	Structured policies and AI literacy embedded in curriculum.	Ad-hoc adoption; limited institutional guidelines.
Faculty Digital Literacy	Generally high; regular AI workshops and research grants.	Varied; many lecturers self-train or rely on informal learning.
Cultural Orientation to Craft	Increasing digitalization; less focus on manual methods.	Strong tradition of tactile, material-based creativity.
Ethical/Legal Frameworks	Emerging copyright and data regulation.	Weak or non-existent regulatory support.
Dominant Perception of AI	Innovation enabler, creative accelerator.	Efficiency tool but potential threat to authenticity.

Source: Field Data (2025)

The ethical dimension of AI in art education remains one of the most contentious issues identified in the study. Questions of originality, intellectual property, and authorship are increasingly blurred when machines contribute significantly to creative output. The constructivist approach demands that students not only produce but also interpret and justify their creative processes, thus reinstating moral and intellectual accountability. Aesthetic judgment, therefore, must evolve from evaluating technical proficiency to assessing conceptual engagement, contextual awareness, and ethical responsibility.

In sum, GenAI's presence in art and design education embodies a paradox: it is both a catalyst for innovation and a challenge to authenticity. Its successful integration depends on maintaining a pedagogical equilibrium that values both technological literacy and human creativity. Nigerian art educators, through adaptive pedagogy and ethical

awareness, are carving a distinct path, one that reaffirms the human essence of art even within an increasingly algorithmic world.

5.5. Critical Reflection on Ethics, Authorship, and Aesthetic Judgment

Ethical ambiguity and blurred authorship emerged as major concerns among participants. Many questioned who the true creator is when AI contributes significantly to visual outcomes. The absence of institutional policies on intellectual property and disclosure of AI use amplifies this tension. Additionally, AI's reliance on training data from predominantly Western sources risks reinforcing stylistic homogenization and cultural bias. Participants emphasized the need to cultivate aesthetic discernment, training students to evaluate AI-generated works critically, not merely for their visual appeal but for their conceptual integrity and cultural sensitivity. Ethical literacy, transparency, and critical evaluation must thus become central components of art and design pedagogy in the AI era.

6. Redefining the Roles of Designers and Educators

6.1 The Designer as Curator and Critical Thinker

In the GenAI era, designers are no longer mere producers of visual artifacts but curators of meaning and mediators between human imagination and algorithmic generation. The designer's creative agency now lies in prompt design, conceptual framing, and ethical authorship. Field data suggest that successful designers treat AI not as a replacement for creativity but as an extension of it, selecting, editing, and contextualizing outputs within human narratives and cultural values. This redefinition demands heightened critical thinking, an understanding of data ethics, and a reflective awareness of the cultural and environmental implications of digital creation.

6.2 The Educator as Facilitator and Ethical Guide

Educators are evolving from traditional demonstrators of technique to facilitators of ethical, interdisciplinary, and digitally informed learning. The study found growing acknowledgment among art lecturers that mentorship now involves guiding students in responsible AI use, fostering digital literacy, and embedding ethical critique into design projects. The modern art educator must, therefore, integrate AI literacy, prompt engineering, data awareness, and copyright education into the curriculum. Through dialogic critique and reflective assignments, educators can model ethical creativity, ensuring that students use AI responsibly and transparently.

6.3 Collaborative Co-Creation Models

An emerging frontier is collaborative co-creation, where human and AI capabilities converge within interdisciplinary projects that unite art, technology, and social innovation. Participants proposed frameworks in which designers, coders, and educators collaborate to explore new forms of visual storytelling, sustainability design, and cultural preservation. Such models foster human-AI symbiosis, where originality, craft, and conceptual rigor coexist. By embedding co-creation studios, hackathons, and collaborative research into academic programs, institutions can cultivate adaptive creativity suited to the demands of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusion

The findings affirm that Generative AI (GenAI) is redefining the landscape of art and design education in Nigeria, with broader implications that resonate globally. Within the Nigerian context, GenAI enhances productivity, broadens creative access, and stimulates innovation among students and educators. However, it simultaneously poses challenges to artistic depth, authorship, and the tactile engagement central to traditional studio practice. The study underscores that the future of art and design education in Nigeria lies not in resisting AI, but in strategically redefining human roles within its evolving framework. By repositioning designers as critical thinkers and educators as ethical facilitators, art and design education can sustain creativity, authenticity, and cultural identity, ensuring Nigeria's creative sector remains relevant and adaptive within the global digital ecosystem.

7.2 Recommendations

To ensure a balanced and ethical integration of Artificial Intelligence in art and design education, several measures are recommended. Institutions should begin by embedding AI ethics and creativity modules into their curricula. These courses should cover areas such as AI literacy, prompt design, and creative ethics, enabling students to engage responsibly with emerging technologies. Additionally, it is essential to develop institutional guidelines that

define policies on the ethical use, disclosure, and authorship of AI-assisted works. This will help maintain academic integrity and uphold originality in creative outputs.

Continuous professional development should also be prioritized. Institutions ought to promote regular digital upskilling for educators, ensuring they remain conversant with evolving AI tools and methodologies relevant to teaching and practice. A hybrid approach is equally important, balancing AI-assisted ideation with traditional, hands-on craftsmanship to preserve the tactile and material dimensions of art-making.

Moreover, cross-disciplinary collaboration should be encouraged. Partnerships among artists, designers, technologists, and educators can foster innovative and context-sensitive applications of AI in creative practice. Sustainable integration further depends on infrastructural support; therefore, institutions must invest in robust digital infrastructure, including reliable power supply and internet connectivity, to ensure equitable access to AI-enhanced learning.

Finally, it is crucial to institutionalize research on AI in the arts by supporting empirical and practice-based investigations into the evolving intersections between AI, creativity, and pedagogy. Such research will not only expand theoretical understanding but also inform ethical and practical frameworks for future applications.

Funding: This research received no external funding
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
ORCID IDs: Ajayi Olayemi https://orcid.org/0000-00020865-3490; Ajayi Noah: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1938-648x

References

[1] Alshammari, S., Alhassan, A., & Alabduljabbar, S. (2024). University students' perceptions of using generative artificial intelligence tools in higher education: A cross-sectional study in Saudi Arabia. Education and Information Technologies, 29(12), 13925□13945. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13267-w
[2] Bali, M., McArthur, J. A., Bond, M., Bulger, M., Cronin, C., Czerniewicz, L., Stewart, B. (2024). AI and education: Critical questions and pathways forward. International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10609620
[3] Craft, A. (2005). Creativity in schools: Tensions and dilemmas. Routledge.
[4] Essien, A., Salami, A., Ajala, O., Adebisi, B., Shodiya, A., & Essien, G. (2024). Exploring socio-cultural influences on generative AI engagement in Nigerian higher education: An activity theory analysis. Smart Learning Environments, 11(1), 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00352-3
[5] Ge, Y., & Fan, W. (2024). Artificial intelligence in design education: A systematic review. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 34(3), 651□673. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-023-09845-6
[6] Higher Education Policy Institute. (2025). Students and AI: Usage, attitudes and training (HEPI Report 173). https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2025/01/16/students-and-ai-usage-attitudes-and-training
[7] Holzner, C., Maier, M., & Feuerriegel, S. (2025). Human□AI collaboration in creative tasks: A meta-analysis. Computers in Human Behavior, 152, 108223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108223
[8] Li, J., Zhao, X., & Wang, H. (2024). University students' use of generative artificial intelligence tools in academic writing: Evidence from China. Frontiers in Psychology, 15, 1372329. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1372329
[9] MacKenzie, D., & Wajcman, J. (Eds.). (1999). The social shaping of technology (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
[10] Norman, D. A. (2013). The design of everyday things: Revised and expanded edition. Basic Books.
[11] Oksanen, A., Cvetkovic, B., Akin, H., Latikka, R., Bergdahl, E., Chen, L., & Savela, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence in fine arts: A systematic review of empirical research. Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000593
[12] Sokhulu, L. H., Zulu, M. W., & Lott-Naidoo, D. (2025). Artificial intelligence in higher education South Africa: The role of ChatGPT in students' learning. Journal of Education, 99, Article a08. https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i99a08
[13] United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2024). Generative AI and the creative economy. UNCTAD. https://unctad.org/publication/generative-ai-and-creative-economy
[14] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
[15] Yakubu, A., David, M., & Abubakar, S. (2025). Students' behavioural intention to use content generative AI for learning and research: A UTAUT theoretical perspective. Education and Information Technologies. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13441-8