

A study on the limits of digital creativity in the context of contemporary art and cinema

Selin Kiraz Demir | Associate professor | Amasya University, Amasya, Turkey
selin.kiraz@amasya.edu.tr | <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5901-857X>

Corresponding author

Gülsün Bozkurt | Associate professor | Nişantaşı University, İstanbul, Turkey
gulsun.bozkurt@nisantasi.edu.tr | <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9558-7577>

Citation

Kiraz Demir, S. & Bozkurt, G. (2024). A study on the limits of digital creativity in the context of contemporary art and cinema. ARTS, Special issue on contemporary art, 105-124.
<https://doi.org/10.46372/arts.1551051>

Submission: 16.09.2024 | Acceptance: 18.11.2024

Abstract

Contemporary art, characterised by blurred boundaries and rule-breaking, now faces a new challenge: Determining the extent to which artificial intelligence should be integrated into its practices. This study examines the impact of AI on creativity in cinema, a contemporary art form, by analysing semi-structured interviews with ten production professionals. Participants were presented with two script treatments - one traditionally written and the other AI assisted - before discussing their impressions. The results indicate that most participants are initially hesitant and have preconceptions about AI in screenwriting. However, despite these reservations, the majority found the AI-assisted treatment to be more successful, albeit for different reasons. This finding suggests the need to reconsider preconceived notions about the role and potential of AI in creative fields.

Keywords

art, ai, contemporary art and ai, screenwriting and ai, digital creativity

Highlights

- With technology and ai based on imitation, the "flaw" point that makes the work of art unique disappears, and the output of AI is whatever it "should be".
- The idea that adding a mechanical order to art will make it ordinary reveals some prejudices against AI, which has begun to be used in cinema and other areas of contemporary art.
- If the right commands are given, the potential for AI support to be used as a part of the creation process of the artistic product increases.

Çağdaş sanat ve sinema ekseninde dijital yaratıcılığın sınırları üzerine bir araştırma

Selin Kiraz Demir | Doçent doktor | Amasya Üniversitesi, Amasya, Türkiye
selin.kiraz@amasya.edu.tr | <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5901-857X>
Sorumlu yazar

Gülsün Bozkurt | Doçent doktor | Nişantaşı Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Türkiye
gulsun.bozkurt@nisantasi.edu.tr | <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9558-7577>

Atıf

Kiraz Demir, S. ve Bozkurt, G. (2024). Çağdaş sanat ve sinema ekseninde dijital yaratıcılığın sınırları üzerine bir araştırma. ARTS, Çağdaş sanat özel sayısı, 105-124.
<https://doi.org/10.46372/arts.1551051>

Geliş: 16.09.2024 | Kabul: 18.11.2024

Öz

Çağdaş sanat sınırların belirsizleştiği, kuralların yıkıldığı, yeni formların vücut bulduğu bir alan olarak yapay zekayla kurulan ilişkisinde yeni bir mücadele içine girmiştir. Bu, yapay zekanın çağdaş sanatın hangi alanına ne kadar dahil olabileceği ile ilgilidir. Bu bağlamda çalışma kapsamında çağdaş sanatın bir parçası olan sinemada yapay zeka kullanımının yaratıcılık üzerindeki etkisi tartışılmıştır. Üretim alanının içinde olan on profesyonel ile yapılan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yorumlayıcı analiz yöntemi kullanılarak incelenmiştir. Görüşmeler öncesinde katılımcılara biri senarist tarafından geleneksel yapıda ve yazarın kişisel yazım üslubunu yansıtan, diğeri ise yapay zeka desteğiyle yazılmış iki tretman okutulmuş ve bu metinler üzerine sorular yöneltilmiştir. Araştırma, katılımcıların çoğunun yapay zekanın çağdaş sanata dahil edilmesine mesafeli yaklaştığını ve senaryo yazımında yapay zekanın kullanımına dair önyargılar taşıdığını ortaya koymaktadır. Ancak, önyargılarına rağmen katılımcıların çoğunluğunun yapay zeka destekli tretmanı farklı gerekçelendirmelerle de olsa daha başarılı bulmaları, yapay zekanın yaratıcı süreçlerdeki potansiyeline dair önceden varsayılan algıları sorgulama gerekliliğini işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler

sanat, yapay zeka, yapay zeka ve sanat, yapay zeka ve senaryo, dijital yaratıcılık

Öne çıkanlar

- Henüz taklide dayalı yapay zeka uygulamalarıyla sanat eserini biricik yapan "kusur" noktası ortadan kalkmakta, "olması gereken" ne ise, yapay zekanın çıktısı o olmaktadır.
- Mekanik bir düzenin sanata eklenmesinin onu sıradanlaştıracığı düşüncesi yapay zekaya karşı birtakım önyargıları ortaya çıkarmaktadır.
- Doğru komutlar verilirse yapay zeka desteğinin sanatsal ürünün yaratım sürecinin bir parçası olarak kullanılabilme potansiyeli artmaktadır.

Introduction¹

Cinema, an art form rooted in the concept of mimesis (imitation) originating from ancient Greek rhetoric, has always been fundamentally about storytelling, regardless of genre or method. It is a medium for expressing the emotions of its creator and simultaneously evokes emotions in its audience. The role of technology in conveying and externalizing these emotions is undeniable. While debates about the shadow cast on art's uniqueness by technology remain relevant, in cinema, computer-aided elements like sound, music, color, and editing help deepen the emotional impact of a film. Therefore, creating a film is part of a conscious process, grounded in the fundamental practice of screenwriting.

As the initial stage of filmmaking, screenwriting follows a structure or "mathematics". A genre is first determined, and characters, setting, and plot are shaped within that framework. There are rises, falls, conflicts, and resolutions within a specific time frame—all crucial to maintaining the audience's interest. Therefore, screenwriting is not merely about producing a story but rather a skill that can be learned.

Can the effort to evoke emotions through films be imitated? Can new stories be created by compiling previously written scripts using the "mathematics" of emotions? This brings us to one of today's core issues—AI is only beginning to construct its relationship with art. AI, which processes likely emotional responses mathematically, has moved beyond being a subject in film to becoming a creator itself. It writes scripts, produces films, and sometimes even uses real actors. Moreover, its involvement with cinema is not limited to this. AI can also create intriguing trailers to pique an audience's interest. This nascent relationship between AI and cinema has the potential to evolve into something much more significant soon. The key question remains: What makes a work of art (specifically a film) unique? Is it its imperfections? AI, as a machine, is incapable of making mistakes, which opens new avenues for discussing the art-technology relationship.

This study aims to explore the potential of AI in contemporary art by examining the emerging practice of AI-assisted screenwriting in modern cinema. Through interviews with cinema professionals, differences between a human-written script and a ChatGPT-assisted script with similar themes are analyzed. Additionally, the role of AI-generated commands in the creative process and the potential artistic value of these commands are discussed, alongside the implications of AI's "imperfections" on artistic production.

The imitation of emotions: A historical perspective

The imitation of emotions, viewed as a reflection of human nature and social relations, has been debated throughout history. Although imitation can be interpreted differently based on individual experience today, historically it has been closely tied to discussions

¹ The study titled "A Research on the Limits of Digital Creativity in the Context of Contemporary Art and Cinema", reviewed by the Ethics Committee of İstanbul Nişantaşı University, was evaluated at the ethics committee meeting dated 22/08/2024 with number 2024/08. It was unanimously decided that the research is ethically appropriate.

about art and creativity.

In ancient Greek thought, poetry, drama, and other fine arts were considered representations of reality, whether actual or potential. The Greeks used the term "imitative arts" to describe what we now call "fine arts", with poetry and music holding an important place in their education system. This broad theory of art naturally raises several questions: What exactly does the artist imitate? How does the artist perform this imitation? Is imitation a direct copy, a distortion, or an improvement? Such questions help us understand the nature and function of art while also exploring the value and meaning of the experiences art offers us.

From classical times onward, the term mimesis has been used in the study of the relationship between art and reality, with its meaning and application varying depending on context. According to Hasan Baktır (2003, p. 168), mimesis is used both to define the nature of literature and other arts and to indicate the relationship of a literary work to its model. Moreover, as Buket Akdemir Dilek continues (2023, p. 142), there are similarities between tales, legends and myths belonging to different cultures in terms of narrative features. The term originally stems from the Greek word "mimos" and has various derivatives. Initially linked to rituals and reenactments, mimesis came to represent not only reenactment through dance and drama but also resemblance and representation as broader concepts.

The earliest traces of mimesis can be found in Greek philosophy, with Plato approaching it as an ethical and political concept, while Aristotle viewed it as an aesthetic phenomenon. For Plato, imitation involved the potential corruption of the soul, while Aristotle considered imitation a natural human instinct and a source of learning. These differing perspectives reflect their broader philosophical views on art and its role in human experience. The traces of the concept can first be found in the Greek philosophical tradition. The term "mimesis", meaning "imitation", is treated by Plato within an ethical and political context, while Aristotle views it as an aesthetic phenomenon (as cited in Gürgün, 2021, p. 349). The fine arts, seen as an imitation of reality, actual or potential, have been interpreted by ancient Greek thinkers in harmony with their general philosophical discourses.

In the dialogues Plato recounts through the voice of Socrates, the concept of imitation plays a significant role in the emergence of many ideas. In Plato, the concept of "mimesis" varies depending on the context and finds its expression in the ways one imitates others in speech and behavior, addressing the lower parts of the soul. Plato also makes references to the epistemological and metaphysical dimensions of the concept, framing it within a pedagogical framework. For instance, in the construction of an ideal state, both the education of the youth and the guardians are advised to follow a method of imitating only what is appropriate. In the third book of *The Republic* (Plato, 2002), Plato expands on the concept, examining in detail the connections between poetry and "mimesis", education and "mimesis", as well as poetry and education. He discusses the positive and negative effects of imitation through methods such as poetry, tragedy, comedy, and music. According to him, since young people predominantly learn through

imitation, the selection of models is crucial. His question, "Did it never strike you that imitations, if continued from youth into adult life, settle down into habits and become a second nature in body, voice, and mind?" (Plato, 2002, p. 106) highlights the dangers of learning through imitation. Therefore, Plato views poets and poetry as tools of corruption because they represent false stories and harm thinking, while emphasizing the importance of good music and philosophy, which prioritizes truth.

For Plato, philosophy, which serves as a method in the pursuit of truth, and the philosopher, who is its practitioner, hold a particularly important place in the ideal state order. According to Plato, while the philosopher seeks the ultimate truth, the poet, and more broadly, the artist, engages in a kind of illusion. Moreover, some are so ignorant that they might believe imitation to be real. Throughout *The Republic*, Plato attempts to demonstrate that the truth of philosophy is more necessary than the pleasure of poetry.

Aristotle, who discusses the subject in his work *Poetics*, agrees with his teacher Plato that art is a form of imitation, but his understanding of imitation differs from Plato's. Aristotle conveys his first thoughts on imitation in *Poetics* (Aristotle, 1993, p. 11) with the following words:

...epic, tragedy, comedy, dithyrambic poetry, as well as much of flute and lyre music, are all, in general, imitations (mimesis). However, these arts are distinguished from one another in three respects: by the means of imitation, the objects imitated, and the manner of imitation. Some arts imitate through colors and shapes, whether by artistic talent or acquired skill, while others imitate through sound. In all the arts mentioned, imitation is carried out generally through rhythm, speech, or harmony. These three elements may be used either separately or in combination. For instance, flute and lyre music, and similarly the syrinx (reed pipe), use only harmony and rhythm, while dance uses rhythm alone, as dancers, through rhythmic bodily movements, imitate characters, emotions, and actions.

Aristotle emphasizes that imitation is inherent in human nature and that humans learn through imitation from childhood. According to him, people take pleasure in imitating, and this is one of the fundamental functions of art. Aristotle defines mimesis as "action", meaning the imitation of humans in motion. Furthermore, he categorizes poetry into different genres and determines the means and objects of imitation for each genre. Tragedy imitates better people, while comedy imitates worse people (Ross, 2002, p. 319-323).

Aristotle argues that both art and nature share a commonality in that they both have a purpose (*telos*). In nature, form represents the process of transitioning from potential to actualization, whereas in art, the purpose of a work is to bring events together to create form and establish a whole. He suggests that the purpose of poetry is not merely to reflect reality but to represent it universally. Poetry transcends specific events and expresses general human experiences universally. Tragedy affects the audience by evoking fear and pity and provides catharsis (purification). In this context, Plato and Aristotle's views on art as imitation reflect their broader philosophical thoughts. While Plato criticizes imitation for being far from reality and corruptive, Aristotle argues that imitation is a

natural and valuable process, and that art reflects universal truths.

A new debate in the relationship between contemporary art and technology: Changing roles in cinema art with the axis of AI

Since the earliest known works of art, such as the Bhimbetka petroglyphs, the definition of art, often described but never fully confined, has been debated for centuries. What makes a product art? Who decides when something becomes a work of art? What characteristics define or disqualify something as art? Should everyone's views be considered, or should only experts be heeded? And who are these "experts"? The questions seem endless. What is universally acknowledged, however, is that art and aesthetics are integral parts of our lives, serving as a shared way of interpreting and expressing the world. Another widely accepted fact is that as technology advances, the practices of art production and consumption art production and consumption practices also evolve.

In art, imitation has given way to creativity and originality over time through movements and artists with different styles. One of the most important reasons why the mimetic features of painting in particular have remained in the background is the invention of photography. With the invention of photography, the understanding that a portrait is valuable to the extent that it is close to reality has changed. Because now there is a device that records reality one-to-one. For this reason, painting charts a new path for itself. It has become important to interpret and depict reality rather than convey it. However, thanks to photography, still images that are recorded and can be passed on to future generations have become more widespread and suitable for reproduction. The invention of the cinematograph, which was the continuation of photography, and the fact that recorded images became mobile as seen in real life, created a revolution all over the world. In a very short time, cinema became more than just an industrial tool that entertained the masses and recorded moving images, it became a brand new language in which individuals, societies, ideas and emotions could be represented (Benjamin, 2016, p. 52-55). Today, contemporary art has taken its place in social life by using technology, just like the developments in the fields of painting, photography and cinema.

What distinguishes contemporary art, produced from the mid-20th century to the present, from its predecessors are not only the methods used but also the themes addressed. Thus, to claim that technology alone defines contemporary art would be insufficient. Technology has always been part of the historical journey of art. For instance, in the 1840s, the invention of portable paint tubes facilitated outdoor painting (Farthing, 2014), illustrating that the relationship between art and technology has persisted for centuries. Technology has both made artistic production more convenient and contributed to the diversification of art. Given this long-standing relationship, why, then, is there a distinction between modern and contemporary art? This distinction leads us to the most defining characteristic of contemporary art: its elusiveness in definition. While the value of modern art can often be assessed by objective criteria, many of these

criteria become blurred in contemporary art. Elements such as composition, the story of the artwork, symbolic depth, emotional expression, craftsmanship, labor, and adherence to design theories lose their clarity (Hummelen, 2005). The value of contemporary art is determined subjectively, which raises even more significant questions and debates about what qualifies as art.

Art, as a mode of expression and communication reflecting its era, manifests the diversity, ambiguity, freedom, and originality of the contemporary world. Reactions to and discussions surrounding contemporary art—its production, consumption, development, and transformation—are diverse. Central issues include the evolving role of the artist, changes in the spaces where art is exhibited, the functions of these spaces, the production, display, consumption, and commercialization of contemporary art, marketing strategies and the need for advertising, academic programs and personnel focused on contemporary art, and the impacts of globalization, neoliberalism, and information technologies (Foster, 2015, September 2). With these characteristics, contemporary art continues to push the boundaries of imagination, especially in light of today's widespread integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into various aspects of life. The partnership between AI and art has become particularly notable, as AI mimics and processes previously existing information through algorithms. However, this partnership also raises a paradox: Can a work created with AI be considered original, free, or limitless? Does it fall within the scope of contemporary art? How should the longstanding relationship between art and technology be reassessed in the age of AI, where imitation becomes a key factor? These questions are central to ongoing debates about contemporary art and technology, debates that have gained further prominence with the integration of AI into the film industry.

These questions lead us to Walter Benjamin's work *The Work of Art in the Age of Reproduction* through the possibilities of technology, in which he explains that art is unique and in danger of losing its aura in its reproduction through technique. Benjamin defines the aura of a work of art as the presence of that work of art in time and space, and the unique existence of the work in the place where it was created, and claims that the aura of a work of art is born from the combination of factors such as uniqueness, tradition, witnessing history, and unapproachability. Benjamin states that in the age of technical reproduction, the aura of a work of art is lost as a result of its unlimited reproduction (Benjamin, 2016, p. 52). However, although many modern and digital works of art today do not seem to meet Benjamin's criteria, it should be added that they are works of art and have their own aura. This time, the discussions focus on how art produced through technique can do this.

The intersection of contemporary art and cinema has long been evident, and with the involvement of AI technologies, this relationship has deepened, leading to advancements in production practices. Many cinematic works are increasingly integrated into the production and display processes of contemporary art, guiding the interaction between the artwork and the audience. Consequently, developments in the production stages of cinema reflect on the use of technology in contemporary art, making the influence of

cinema on the arts unavoidable. Cinema, often referred to as the “seventh art”, shapes its existence through technology while touching on other fields like literature, painting, and music.

Within the framework of contemporary art, any action, performance, object, or even a giant needle placed in a gallery can find its place. What matters is the meaning it generates and how that meaning is perceived. The ambiguity and indefinability of contemporary art allow for the artistic merit of works produced in various forms to be debated. As a result, content or objects produced in all areas of art today become subjects of contemporary art, with technology becoming an indispensable component.

Cinema, a field that continuously generates new meanings through technology, is now at the center of a new agenda with the support of AI. Similar to literature, where digital processes in scriptwriting—the first stage of film production—have the potential to alter many dynamics, AI technologies in cinema are reshaping production methods (Genç Motto, 2023, August 10). One significant milestone is the short science fiction film *Sunspring* (Oscar Sharp, 2016), written by “Benjamin”, an AI-based software developed by Ross Godwin at New York University. This marked the first film script written by AI. To produce this script, however, Benjamin had to be “trained” with dozens of science fiction films and TV series. Yet translating this AI-generated script into a film was not easy, given the nonsensical statements, such as a character standing among the stars while sitting on the ground. Benjamin also wrote the script for another short film, *It’s No Game* (Oscar Sharp, 2017), a sequel to *Sunspring*. This 8-minute science fiction film, with a striking plot, revolves around a Hollywood writers’ strike and the idea that AI will take over the jobs of screenwriters (Zengin, 2020, p. 162).

Another recent example of AI-written film scripts is *The Last Screenwriter*, written by ChatGPT-4o. However, the film’s release was canceled within 24 hours of its trailer being published due to concerns about its implications for the future. The film tells the story of a famous screenwriter who encounters a highly advanced AI and soon realizes that the AI can perform all of his tasks, even excelling in areas requiring empathy and understanding of human emotions, potentially surpassing the writer (Medyascope, 2024, June 20).

Another study by Ali Özgür Gürsoy and Serkan Şavk (2024) titled “From scribe writer to commanding writer: A case study of authorship, authenticity and creativity in the light of the use of AI in script writing” focuses on how AI can be used in creative processes. In the research conducted on a specific universe, it was argued that AI plays an inspiring role in creative fields such as art, music and literature, can accelerate the creative process by providing artists with new ideas, and brings innovative approaches to traditional creative practices. In the research, it is stated that the biggest concern about the development of AI is the blurring of the line between original and fake. To overcome this situation, it is stated that it is important to develop a sense of responsibility in the use of AI in any field related to creativity. ChatGPT, one of the most popular tools in AI technologies, operates through a Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) algorithm. It generates outputs by sequentially adding words based on prior instructions. Thus, the

more specific the command, the more detailed and meaningful the output. Additionally, to properly frame a request, it helps to begin by instructing the AI on how to behave. For instance, commands such as "Act as an engineer" or "I want you to behave like a screenwriter" can initiate the process. Following these guidelines and providing the correct commands increases the potential for using AI as part of the creative process in producing artistic Works (Medyascope, 2024, June 20). Considering that screenplays follow a mathematical, non-literary format, AI's success in this field is highly foreseeable.

Can ChatGPT, when instructed to behave like a screenwriter, contribute to artistic production to the point of surpassing human creativity, as depicted in *The Last Screenwriter*? Should the commands given to AI-written scripts be evaluated in the context of creativity debates in art? Could these new production methods spread across all areas of contemporary art? The research conducted within this study aims to explore these pressing questions.

Methodology

This study is designed based on the fundamental qualitative research paradigm (Merriam, 2018, p. 22) to understand how ten industry professionals, consulted for their perspectives on the increasing prevalence of AI, interpret and position this technology within their respective fields. The research employs data obtained from the scriptwriting process supported by AI, as well as the semi-structured interview technique (Patton, 2015), which is widely used in social sciences. In this context, the approaches, thoughts, and biases of experienced professionals in the cinema industry regarding the topic are examined. For data analysis, an interpretive analysis method based on the participants' statements was preferred. Participants were informed in advance that the interviews would be recorded, and to ensure data security, these recordings were destroyed after the completion of the study.

The research population consists of cinema professionals involved in scriptwriting and based in Turkey. The participants include the technical team responsible for scriptwriting. Since the study is based on interviews with 10 cinema professionals, the findings may not represent the views of all cinema professionals. Moreover, the multi-layered nature of contemporary art implies that the analyses are open to subjective interpretation.

The interview questions focused on two short film treatments (script summaries). One of the treatments is *Early Feelings*, an award-winning treatment by Nurlan Hasanlı, which has been featured in several international film festivals such as the *Istanbul Film Festival's Meetings on the Bridge Short Film Workshop*, the *Azerbaijan Film Agency's Competition winner for Production Support*, the *Azerbaijanfilm Studio's Debut Films Competition*, and the *Sarajevo Talents Script Station Module*. Hasanlı's permission and approval were obtained for the use of this treatment in the study. The second treatment was written with the assistance of ChatGPT, imitating the narrative structure of the first treatment. In this process, the researchers continuously provided precise prompts to push the AI beyond

its average knowledge about treatments. It was observed that, while AI technically knows how to write a treatment, it could only create details for comparison when properly guided by humans.

The study was started by asking the AI the question "Can you write me a treatment?" Afterwards, some details were given about the requested treatment. These details included the written language, length, number of characters, ages, genders, relationships between characters, events experienced by the characters, and the end of the story. However, although these explanations were made to the AI, the treatment that had to be written in the form of a plain text was written separately in the context of the specified details. The AI was asked not to see the written text as a theme, not to separate it, and to combine all the details to create a meaningful text. This process took quite a long time. After a few corrections, a treatment suitable for the traditional treatment model emerged, but this time, semantic problems were experienced at certain points in the story. These problems were stated one by one in sentences and alternatives were requested. In addition, AI support was received regarding the name of the treatment. During the name determination process, the AI was given commands about which points of the story to focus on and suggest names. During this entire process, a very long study was carried out with the AI (approximately 6-7 hours). As a result, the final version sent to the participants was obtained.

	Profession	Age
Participant 1	Director	45
Participant 2	Screenwriter	37
Participant 3	Director	45
Participant 4	Assistant Director	32
Participant 5	Producer	28
Participant 6	Assistant Director	29
Participant 7	Producer/Director	40
Participant 8	Assistant Director	37
Participant 9	Director	61
Participant 10	Screenwriter	43

Table 1. The participants profile

A purposive sampling method (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016, p. 3-4) was used to choose the participants. An initial population was created, and interviews were conducted with the ten most suitable participants. During preliminary discussions, general information about the participants, such as their profession, professional experience, and age, was collected. It was also emphasized that the participants should read both short film treatments before the main interview. After signing the informed consent form, ten interviews were conducted using the semi-structured questions outlined below, which were designed to explore how filmmakers, directors, and screenwriters perceive the relationship between AI and cinema, as well as AI and art.

The study titled "A Research on the Limits of Digital Creativity in the Context of Contemporary Art and Cinema", reviewed by the Ethics Committee of İstanbul Nişantaşı

University, was evaluated at the ethics committee meeting dated 22/08/2024 with number 2024/08. It was unanimously decided that our research is ethically appropriate.

The questions

- If you were to work with one of the two treatments, which one would you choose and why? What aspects of the chosen treatment affected you the most?

This question aims to identify the participants' preferences and the reasons behind those preferences, revealing how the differences between AI-generated and human-created content are perceived in practical terms. It also seeks to gather data on the potential advantages and disadvantages of AI-generated content in the creative process by examining which features of the treatment influenced the participants.

- What are your reasons for not choosing the other treatment?

The first two questions avoided direct references to AI to see if participants would naturally mention AI when comparing the treatments. The shortcomings and weaknesses identified in the treatment not chosen point to the limitations AI may face in the creative process.

- One of these treatments was written with AI assistance. Which do you think it is, and what are your thoughts on AI-assisted scriptwriting?

This question explores the participants' ability to distinguish between AI-generated and human-written texts. It also aims to understand their general attitudes and potential biases toward AI in creative processes.

- Based on this interview, what are your thoughts on the use of AI in not just film production but also in the broader field of contemporary art?

This question seeks to capture the participants' perspectives on the broader impact of AI on creative industries, going beyond film production to explore how AI might play a role in various areas of contemporary art.

Findings and discussion

When analyzing the responses to the first question posed to participants, it was observed that both treatments were chosen for different reasons. Six out of the ten participants preferred the treatment produced with the support of AI, while four preferred the one written by a screenwriter. The reasons for choosing the AI-supported treatment included statements such as it being more "realistic", easier to "shoot", or written more "correctly". On the other hand, some participants found the screenwriter's script to be more "realistic" and "accurate", while others described it as "deep" and more "impactful". The findings regarding the first question are as follows:

Participant 1	Field of hearts (AI)
Participant 2	Early feelings (screenwriter)

Participant 3	Field of hearts (AI)
Participant 4	Early feelings (screenwriter)
Participant 5	Early feelings (screenwriter)
Participant 6	Early feelings (screenwriter)
Participant 7	Field of hearts (AI)
Participant 8	Field of hearts (AI)
Participant 9	Field of hearts (AI)
Participant 10	Field of hearts (AI)

Table 2. Treatments chosen by the participants

It does not appear that the information about which treatments the participants followed and the parts of their titles in the cinema industry were kept in the treatment. For example, While he preferred the script written with AI support by a screenwriter, he chose the treatment written by the other screenwriter. However, it should be noted that this person's "success" criteria for receiving one of the two treatments were also different. The "good" nature of a treatment varies for almost everyone. This situation reveals that the scenario stage, which is one of the eyes of cinema, has a very subjective side, even though it is accepted that it is a form of mathematics. Personal experiences and expectations indicate the desirability of a story. Additionally, it has been observed that when choosing one of the two treatments, the theme, characters and story structure are generally followed. Whether or not the "technical" spelling of the treatments is correct is secondary.

Once the treatments were selected, the second question revealed participants' expectations from a treatment. Their reasons for choosing or not choosing one of the two treatments—produced by either AI or a screenwriter—highlighted the points of divergence between the texts. For example, Participant 1 chose not to select Early Feelings because they noticed some "gaps" in the story, with unresolved events and unnecessary details. In contrast, Participant 2 criticized Field of Hearts for being written in a very "textbook-like" manner, pointing out "predictable situations" and a "preoccupation with delivering a message" in the plot, even suggesting that the treatment might have been written by AI. Participant 3, however, did not choose Early Feelings because of the unclear message, while Participant 4 rejected Field of Hearts for resembling mainstream cinema, filled with elements that were "too familiar". Similar criticisms were raised by Participant 5, who felt that the story in Field of Hearts was too scattered, unlike the well-timed conflicts in Early Feelings. Participant 6 cited the lack of challenging narrative elements in Field of Hearts as the reason for not choosing it. Conversely, Participant 7 preferred not to select Early Feelings because it was more difficult to film. Participant 8 found the two treatments quite similar but ultimately chose Early Feelings for being technically superior in terms of detail, plot, and characters. Participant 9 preferred the gentler narrative of Field of Hearts and was disturbed by the violent elements in Early Feelings. Lastly, Participant 10 favored Field of Hearts for its clearer characters, plot, and message, while finding Early Feelings confusing and needing to reread parts of it.

When the answers given to this question in general are examined, we determined before

the interview; "The shortcomings and weaknesses identified by the participants through the treatment they did not prefer also point to the limitations that AI may encounter in creativity". It turned out that our hypothesis had shortcomings. Namely, none of those who chose the treatment written by AI highlighted a problem with creativity. On the contrary, the two treatments were generally found close to each other. The deficiencies and weaknesses identified in this treatment are generally some details such as writing language, character structure and points of conflict. Therefore, AI has not had the chance to determine the limits it may encounter in creativity.

In the third question, participants were informed that one of the treatments had been written with the help of AI and were asked to speculate which one it was. Some participants correctly identified the AI-written treatment based on different justifications, while others could not. In connection to this, participants were also asked for their thoughts on using AI to write scripts. Participant 1 expressed skepticism about AI's ability to create something original, given that AI operates under the control of major corporations and is fed by mainstream culture. While acknowledging that AI might be suitable for works of popular culture, they suggested that AI might evolve to be used for more specialized projects in the future. Despite this, Participant 1 preferred working with the AI-written treatment, finding some aspects of it better than the alternative.

Participant 2 echoed Participant 1's concerns, emphasizing the algorithm's tendency to produce average results and the current impossibility of AI writing a truly original script. However, they acknowledged the potential use of AI in supporting tasks such as choosing between variations or improving a text. As a screenwriting expert, Participant 2 correctly identified the AI-written treatment early on, citing "lacking emotional transitions" as a clue that it might have been AI-generated.

Participant 3, who had preferred the AI-written treatment, highlighted the challenges AI faces in producing films, particularly regarding messages, asserting that AI-generated scripts lacked clarity and had problematic dramatic structures. They also believed AI might be useful in future scriptwriting for traditional films but not for art films. Participant 4, who correctly guessed the AI-written treatment, remarked that while it was difficult to identify which treatment was AI-written, both were written with precise logic and contained depth and detail. Although initially opposed to AI-generated scripts, Participant 4 acknowledged through the study that it might not be impossible but still expressed personal reservations about its use.

Participant 5, who believed *Early Feelings* had been written by AI, suggested that AI could be beneficial for certain tasks but expressed unease about the unclear boundaries between AI-assisted and fully AI-generated content. They stressed the importance of clearly defining AI's role in creativity, cautioning against its use if it played a significant role in the creative process. Although Participant 5 was relieved that their preferred script was not AI-written, they remained concerned about AI's potential role in the field.

Participant 6, who accurately identified the scenario written by AI, noted that based on their previous experiences in AI-assisted screenwriting, AI tends to focus more on the

flow of events. In contrast, they felt that *Early Feelings* conveyed emotions more effectively. The participant, who uses AI in both their professional work and academic projects, emphasized that they view AI as a helpful tool in developing ideas, particularly when creativity hits a roadblock. While humans might sometimes overlook superficial details when focused on emotional aspects, collaborating with AI in such moments doesn't pose a problem. However, they were uncertain whether AI could fully replace the human touch in artistic creations, arguing that while art remains an art, even with AI support, it is unclear whether AI can convey truly human emotions. Referring to *Early Feelings*, they stated that the scene where the character scratches the wall out of shyness is an emotional nuance that AI could not write on its own, arguing that instructing AI to generate such a scene is not fundamentally different from typing it on a typewriter.

Participant 7, who also correctly guessed that AI wrote *Field of Hearts* due to its structural clarity and correctness, was not surprised by AI's ability to execute flawless formats. AI is, after all, designed to perform tasks within a specific framework perfectly. This participant pointed out that everyone, including themselves, has at some point been curious about AI's potential in artistic production, trying it out and engaging in discussions about it. They observed that while AI still relies on clichés and is far from generating truly original content, it does excel at adhering to format and structure, as evidenced in this comparison. In their view, AI is currently unsuitable for creating original ideas but fills a crucial role in performing mundane tasks, freeing up time for creative endeavors. They also described AI as a helpful "friend" with whom one can exchange ideas, though AI remains limited in its current capacity to generate truly original art.

Participant 8, who preferred to work with *Field of Hearts*, suspected that this screenplay was AI-generated due to its clarity, coherence, and improved character analysis. Despite having no prior experience with AI-assisted screenwriting, they remarked that modern filmmaking itself raises questions about the nature of cinema. Given that sound, images, and other elements are now often crafted with AI support, they found it unsurprising that AI could be used in screenwriting or other creative fields. In *Field of Hearts*, they found no technical issues in emotional conveyance and noted that without being told, they would not have guessed that the screenplay was written by AI. Nevertheless, they emphasized that in artistic creation, the ability to evoke emotions remains a uniquely human capability, and while AI may be technically flawless, it still lacks the essential "human touch" necessary for true artistic expression.

Participant 9, who expressed a preference for *Field of Hearts* due to its gentler, more human qualities, incorrectly guessed that *Early Feelings* was AI-written. They admitted feeling uneasy about the possibility that the screenplay they wished to work on could have been AI-generated. They recalled that AI-assisted screenwriting was not a new phenomenon, noting that around 15 years ago, programs in the U.S. and the U.K. were capable of producing award-winning screenplays based on specific input data. Despite this, they expressed discomfort with being part of an AI-driven project, believing that AI cannot create anything truly original.

Participant 10, who chose *Field of Hearts* because they found it more coherent, assumed that *Early Feelings* was the AI-generated screenplay. They had recently used AI for various tasks and felt that, while AI's limitations in emotional expression make it premature for artistic use, its rapid advancement suggests that its ability to convey human emotion could soon improve. This participant noted that AI's progress might eventually bridge the gap, allowing AI to be used in artistic fields where human emotion is essential. Considering the answers given, it can be said that the idea of writing scripts with the support of AI has not yet been clearly adopted among industry professionals. However, it has been understood that they can evaluate this when they encounter new projects where AI is used more intensively. It has been observed that the majority of them use AI support in their different jobs in the sector, they are not prejudiced against this use, but they are abstaining when it comes to the presence of AI support in cinema as "art". The reason for this is the judgment that AI cannot create an original story because it compiles ready-made information on the internet. Most industry employees consider the production of AI through imitation normal, but they predict that it still has many deficiencies when it comes to the art dimension, and that these deficiencies can never be eliminated. The reason for this is the existence of the "thinking" ability that distinguishes the human brain from AI. Accordingly, humans think and AI imitates what is thought.

Regarding the broader question of AI in contemporary art, Participant 1 argued that AI is not yet mature enough to be used in deep, meaningful artistic work, but that it could certainly be useful in average, mainstream projects in both cinema and other fields. Participant 2, while lacking specific knowledge of contemporary art, suggested that the same concerns about AI's superficiality in creativity apply across different artistic disciplines. They speculated that AI would continue to produce shallow work unless its learning modules and processes evolve significantly, which they do not currently anticipate. Participant 3 highlighted AI's growing influence in visual arts, particularly in digital art, noting that AI's extensive databases enable it to access vast amounts of information that individual artists cannot. While recognizing AI's growing prominence, they also warned of its potential to become a "scary artist" due to its vast capabilities.

Participant 4 was not opposed to AI being used as a learning tool in the arts, emphasizing that as long as the creative direction remains with the human artist, AI can enhance productivity and expand creative horizons. They argued that AI in artistic production should be seen as a practical tool that frees up time for creativity rather than a threat to the uniqueness of the artist's touch. Participant 5, on the other hand, stressed the importance of defining clear boundaries around AI's role in artistic creation. They believed that while AI can assist with technical details, using AI to produce artistic outcomes raises ethical concerns about originality.

It seems that the answers given to this last question about the relationship between AI and contemporary art are parallel to the hesitant approaches to AI support at the scenario writing stage. Although the development of digital technologies and innovations such as virtual reality applications included in contemporary art works have paved the way for a "new" understanding of art, the idea of the production and creation

part being done by a structure other than the human element in every field of contemporary art is known to be interested in art, at least in the short term. cannot be predicted by individuals. While younger participants generally agreed that the effectiveness of AI will increase in the field of cinema and contemporary art, professionals with high experience in the sector but who have adopted more traditional methods adopted the view of imposing limitations on AI.

In summary, the discussions reveal a wide spectrum of views on AI's role in artistic production, ranging from those who see AI as a useful tool to others who are cautious about its implications for creativity. Out of the ten participants, six expressed a preference for working on the screenplay written with AI assistance.

Conclusion

From the earliest examples of art to the present day, one of its most defining characteristics has undoubtedly been the reflection of human emotions and thoughts about nature, often through imitation. In art produced by human hands, realism has sometimes been the marker of a work's significance, while at other times, originality and unconventionality have made a work stand out. The common thread through all of these processes has been the form, aura, singularity, and inherent imperfections that make a work of art unique. Today, however, with the advent of advanced technology and AI, the "imperfection" that lends uniqueness to art is being eliminated, and what remains is the output that AI produces based on what is deemed "correct". This marks a critical distinction between art created by humans and that created with the assistance of AI, which raises fundamental debates about authenticity in art.

The study reveals that some biases persist regarding the use of AI in both cinema and other areas of contemporary art. These biases largely stem from the belief that the introduction of a mechanical system into the artistic process risks rendering the output mundane. However, it is evident that AI, when properly guided and given the right instructions, can produce results that closely resemble works made by human hands. This was especially evident when most participants expressed surprise upon learning that one of the two treatments had been written with AI assistance. Even some participants who initially held more critical views on AI found the AI-generated treatment to be superior.

One of the most significant findings from the research is that writing a script draft with AI support is not as simple as it might seem; the person guiding the AI plays a crucial role. It becomes apparent that learning to work with AI in artistic creation is essential, not just in terms of technical know-how but also in shaping the work according to the artist's vision. Much like a sculptor meticulously chiseling a raw stone to create a figure, producing an AI-assisted work of art requires detailed design and a thoughtful process.

Just as each work of art is unique, so too are people's expectations and emotional responses to art. The research suggests that each participant had different expectations

of what a cinematic text should convey. This diversity of expectations extends to all areas of contemporary art, indicating that AI-generated, uniform works may fail to satisfy the varied tastes and emotional responses of individuals. Therefore, AI's contribution to contemporary art remains, for now, uncertain and ambiguous. Nonetheless, AI has clear potential to facilitate certain aspects of the artist's work, and as society's skepticism towards the relationship between art and technology diminishes, AI's role may become more prevalent.

In conclusion, this research demonstrates that AI support can, in some respects, become a part of the artistic creation process and that it is possible to approach the form produced by human hands quite closely. However, the success of this integration depends on the careful direction and creative input from humans, especially in ensuring that art retains the singularity and emotional depth that distinguish it from mechanized outputs.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. (1993). *Poetika* (17th edition) (Trans. İ. Tunalı). Remzi.
- Akdemir Dilek, B. (2023). Kızılırmak Karakoyun filmi anlatı ve kahramanın yolculuğu bağlamında biçimbilimsel olarak yeniden okuma. *Motif akademi halk bilim dergisi*, 16(41), 141-158. <https://doi.org/10.12981/mahder.1201978>
- Baktır, H. (2003). The concept of imitation in Plato and Aristotle. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü dergisi*, 15(2), 167-179. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/219264>
- Benjamin, W. (2016). *Pasajlar* (12th edition) (Trans. A. Cemal). Yapı Kredi.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A. & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Farthing, S. (2014). *Sanatın tüm öyküsü* (2nd edition) (Trans. F. Candil Çulcu). Hayalperest.
- Foster, H. (2015, September 2). Çağdaş sanatın mecrası: Piyasa (Trans. A. Boren). e-Skop. <https://www.e-skop.com/skopdergi/cagdas-sanatin-mecrasi-piyasa/2607>
- Genç Motto. (2023, 10 Ağustos). Yapay zekâ ve film senaryosu. GZT. <https://www.gzt.com/genç-motto/yapay-zeka-ve-film-senaryosu-3770566>
- Gürgün, H. (2021). "Mimêsis" kavramı, üç yansıma kuramı ve bu kavramın temel sanat akımları üzerine etkisi. *Türk dünyası dil ve edebiyat dergisi*, 51, 349-366. <https://doi.org/10.24155/tdk.2021.170>
- Gürsoy, A. Ö. & Şavk, S. (2024). Kâtip yazardan komut veren yazara: Senaryo yazımında yapay zekâ kullanımı ışığında yazarlık, otantiklik ve yaratıcılığın durum değerlendirmesi. *ARTS*, 12, 57-82. <https://doi.org/10.46372/arts.1482636>
- Hummelen, Y. (2005). Conservation strategies for modern and contemporary art. *CR: Interdisciplinair vakblad voor conservering en restauratie*, 6(3), 22-26.
- Medyascope. (2024, June 20). Filmin senaryosunu ChatGPT 4.0 yazdı, gelen tepkiler üzerine gösterimi iptal edildi. *Medyascope*. <https://medyascope.tv/2024/06/20/filmin-senaryosunu-chatgpt-4-0-yazdi-gelen-tepkiler-uzerine-gosterimi-iptal-edildi/>
- Merriam, S. B. (2018). *Nitel araştırma: Desen ve uygulama için bir rehber* (3rd edition) (Çev. S. Turan). Nobel.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th edition). Sage.
- Plato. (2002). *Devlet* (1st edition) (Trans. H. Demirhan). Sosyal.
- Ross, D. (2002). *Aristoteles* (1st edition) (Trans. A. Aslan). Kabcacı.
- Sharp, O. (Yönetmen). (2016). *Sunspring* [Film]. End cue.

Sharp, O. (Yönetmen). (2017). *It's no game* [Film]. Friedman.

Zengin, F. (2020). Akıllı makine çağı sinemasına giriş: sinema sanatında yapay zekâ teknolojilerinin kullanımı. *İletişim çalışmaları dergisi*, 6(2), 151-177.
http://doi.org/10.17932/IAU.ICD.2015.006/icd_vo6i2002

Lisans ve telif *License and copyright*

Bu çalışma Atıf-GayriTicari 4.0 Uluslararası ile lisanslanmıştır. Çalışmanın telif hakkı yazara aittir *This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International. Copyright belongs to the author*

**Hakem değerlendirmesi *Peer-review***

Çift taraflı kör değerlendirme *Double-blind evaluation*

Çıkar çatışması *Conflict of interest*

Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir *The author has no conflict of interest to declare*

Finansal destek *Grant support*

Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir *The author declared that this study has received no financial support*

Benzerlik taraması *Similarity check*

iThenticate

Dizinleme bilgisi *Indexing information*

TR Dizin, EBSCO, MLA, ProQuest, ERIH PLUS, DOAJ, FIAF

Yazarların katkısı *Author contributions*

% 50 – % 50