

Chapter 7

Augmenting human creativity with responsible and ethical use of generative AI

Seyedahmad Rahimi¹, Chris Dede², Salah Esmaeilgoujar¹ and Maryam Babaee¹

¹*University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States;* ²*Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, United States*

The rapid rise of generative AI has introduced both opportunities and challenges in how humans use these powerful systems. Irresponsible use of AI—such as delegating creative tasks to AI without applying human judgment—can lead to a decline in human creativity (Vinchon et al., 2023). This misuse also raises ethical concerns, including issues such as plagiarism and the perpetuation of biases. However, responsible use of AI offers a unique potential: enabling the creation of ideas, solutions, and products that neither humans nor AI could achieve alone. Beyond individual usage, it is crucial to democratize AI by designing systems that are accessible, equitable, and free of bias. If AI systems are not available to all, are trained on unrepresentative data, or produce biased and opaque outputs, creative applications of AI risk exacerbating social inequities and generating unintended consequences.

Creativity, defined as the ability to transcend conventional ideas to create novel and valuable outputs (Amabile, 1983; Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009; Piffer, 2012; Plucker et al., 2004), is a cornerstone of human progress. It is considered a critical skill for the 21st century by organizations such as the Partnership for 21st Century Learning (2019) and the World Economic Forum (2023). Creativity drives innovation and addresses global challenges, advances industries, and is essential for overall societal progress (Craft, 2010; Florida, 2004; Glăveanu et al., 2020; Hennessey & Amabile, 2010; Shaheen, 2010; World Economic Forum, 2023).

Generative AI offers a powerful avenue to enhance creativity. Human creativity can be amplified through collaboration with AI systems, a process sometimes referred to as human-AI “co-creativity” (Vinchon et al., 2023;

Wingstrom, Hautala, & Lundman, 2023). Yet, such collaboration must be designed thoughtfully to avoid unethical or plagiaristic outcomes. To fully harness the potential of generative AI, it is critical to train individuals—both in corporate and educational settings—on how to collaborate responsibly and effectively with AI. As documented in the resources developed by the TeachAI coalition (TeachAI, n.d.), responsible use of AI includes building skills in bias awareness, prompt engineering, and ethical decision-making. By equipping users with these competencies, organizations and schools can ensure AI is used responsibly to enhance creativity rather than diminish it.

In this chapter, we explore two critical frameworks for using generative AI responsibly and effectively. The first is Intelligence Augmentation (IA; Dede et al., 2021), or as we term it here, creativity augmentation (CA). This approach highlights how humans and AI can collaborate to achieve outcomes beyond the reach of either alone. AI systems are exceptionally skilled at computational tasks such as prediction, calculation, and generating multi-modal content; however, not all humans possess the same level of expertise in these areas. Humans, in contrast, bring essential capabilities, including ethical reasoning, empathy, and situational awareness to decision-making processes. While AI continues to improve in areas traditionally dominated by humans, it is crucial that humans remain actively involved in shaping this collaboration. By maintaining human agency, creativity augmentation ensures that ethical considerations and context-sensitive insights guide AI-driven creativity. This collaboration, when properly balanced, has the potential to create solutions that surpass what either humans or AI could achieve independently. However, the optimal balance remains uncertain and may vary by context. A responsible use approach allows humans to define and maintain this balance.

The second framework addresses the ethical challenges of AI through the lens of cyclical effects, as articulated by Dieterle et al. (2022). The authors describe five interconnected divides that hinder equitable and ethical AI use: access, representation, algorithmic, interpretation, and citizenship. The access divide reflects disparities in the availability of hardware, software, and connectivity needed to utilize AI tools. The representation divide arises when AI training data excludes marginalized groups, leading to biased outputs. The algorithmic divide highlights the inherent biases encoded in AI models that perpetuate systemic discrimination. The interpretation divide underscores the challenges users face in understanding and appropriately applying AI-generated outputs. It is crucial to recognize and mitigate both the biases embedded in AI algorithms and the new biases that may emerge as humans interpret AI-generated outputs. Finally, the citizenship divide encapsulates the broader societal impacts of these issues, where inequitable access and biased AI design reinforce civic and socio-economic disparities.

These five divides are not isolated challenges but are deeply interconnected. For example, a lack of access to AI tools exacerbates the representation divide, as underrepresented groups are excluded from the data that

informs AI models. This, in turn, reinforces algorithmic biases and hampers equitable decision-making. Addressing these divides requires a holistic approach, including investments in infrastructure, inclusive data practices, and transparent algorithmic design. Together, these divides can create a “vicious cycle” of inequity; the hope is that with thoughtful interventions, they can be transformed into a “virtuous cycle” that fosters diversity, equity, and inclusion (Dieterle et al., 2022).

It is crucial to recognize that the digital divide encompasses not only access to technology but also the ability to utilize it effectively (van Deursen & Helsper, 2015). Disparities in digital skills and usage can lead to unequal outcomes, as individuals may lack the proficiency to leverage technology to its full potential (Scheerder et al., 2017). Moreover, digital resilience—built through active engagement with technology, education, and support—plays a critical role in mitigating these disparities (Graafland, 2018). Therefore, interventions should focus not only on providing access but also on enhancing digital literacy—specifically AI literacy in the context of this chapter—to ensure equitable utilization of AI technologies (Sun & Metros, 2011).

In this chapter, we illustrate the potential of generative AI by presenting two cases: one in a corporate setting and another in education. In corporate settings, organizations typically operate with large budgets, command-and-control authority, and the formation of specialized teams. These capabilities enable companies to combine multiple AI models for optimal performance. For example, companies can integrate small language models (SLMs) for specific tasks alongside powerful proprietary large language models (LLMs) for broader capabilities. Some companies also fund extensive research and development, continuously improving model performance and bias mitigation. Conversely, in educational settings, limited budgets and resource constraints necessitate more strategic approaches. Schools may lack dedicated AI teams, which makes professional development essential. Educators must be trained in bias awareness, prompt engineering, and adaptive AI use. By equipping teachers and students with these skills, schools can ensure that AI technologies serve educational goals despite resource limitations.

In recent years, advancements in computing power, data accessibility, and the development of LLMs and foundational models similar to ChatGPT have placed generative AI in the hands of millions. This trend is likely to continue, with generative AI increasingly applied to tasks requiring creativity. In particular, AI-powered learning environments will offer promising avenues to enhance human judgment and creativity. These tools can play a pivotal role in equipping individuals to collaborate with AI in creative and ethical ways. The two case examples highlight how the frameworks of creativity augmentation and ethical AI use can support and enhance human creativity while addressing the ethical challenges posed by AI. We begin with the corporate case. Note that the names for people and other entities we used below are pseudonyms, and the two cases are illustrative, fictional vignettes.

Corporate case: An AI assistant in architecture called WIsE

Mia Anderson, a 40-year-old architect from Seattle, believes spaces should inspire, tell stories, and bring people together. After designing various community-focused projects, she founded HarmonIA Design Studio, a team of 45 designers, engineers, and experts known for creating inclusive spaces (e.g., museums and wellness centers). One of the studio's standout projects, PlaySpace—a proposed playground for New York City—set a new standard for community-focused design by combining technology and creativity with input from families and educators. PlaySpace won a \$1 million national competition, driven by Mia's passion for innovation. Central to its development was WIsE, an AI assistant created by HarmonIA to advance architectural design. WIsE supported the design process by generating, testing, and evaluating ideas, uncovering possibilities often overlooked through traditional methods. By integrating AI with a human-centered design approach, WIsE demonstrated how technology can enhance creativity without replacing human input (De Peuter et al., 2023). The following sections detail how WIsE was designed to promote responsible AI use among architects, fostering creativity augmentation, and how the five cyclical ethical considerations in AI use were addressed during its development.

Creativity augmentation using WIsE AI assistance

WIsE was born out of frustration with repetitive technical tasks that hinder architects from focusing on creativity and meaningful designs. Since WIsE relies on pretrained knowledge, its suggestions might not always be accurate. Therefore, WIsE operates through three components: the ChatGPT API, the Midjourney API, and a Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) layer (i.e., a system that integrates real-time, domain-specific data into generative AI outputs, which ensures accuracy and contextual relevance). ChatGPT assists in brainstorming, answers questions, inspires new ideas, challenges traditional approaches, and encourages architects to explore innovative solutions. Midjourney transforms descriptions into visuals and allows architects to experiment with different styles, materials, and spatial compositions. Also, Midjourney can rapidly generate multiple design variations, which accelerates the creative process and helps architects refine their vision, compare alternatives, and iterate on ideas in a way that would be time-consuming manually. Finally, the RAG layer used in WIsE connects to real-time databases with domain-specific data, such as local information, building codes, climate conditions, and sustainability guidelines, to ensure that architects can push creative boundaries while staying practical and aligned with professional standards.

Moreover, WIsE augments architects' creativity by supporting architects in areas where human intelligence excels and AI may fall short, particularly through Embodied Experiential Knowing (EEK), Collective Cultural Knowing (CCK), and Personal Performative Knowing (PPK) as described by Dede et al.

(2021). WIsE helps architects integrate sensory and spatial awareness into designs (i.e., EEK), something AI still lacks. For example, WIsE can analyze climate data to suggest cooling solutions, but only architects can intuitively assess comfort based on lived experience. Additionally, WIsE ensures that designs respect cultural identity and local traditions (i.e., CCK). While WIsE retrieves historical and architectural data, architects interpret cultural meaning and ensure its relevance. Finally, WIsE empowers architects to make ethical and value-driven design choices. While WIsE provides practical recommendations, architects must align these with societal values and moral considerations (i.e., PPK). This type of collaboration between WIsE and architects fosters a creative process that enables architects to push boundaries, i.e., augment their creativity.

HarmonIA developed the first prototype of WIsE with the help of architects through an iterative and collaborative process. The team believed users' participation helped them to better understand WIsE's strengths and limitations. Architects observed firsthand how WIsE sometimes generated biased or inaccurate suggestions, such as playground designs that overlooked accessibility. These instances sparked discussions on responsible use of AI. Each incident was shared on the company's website, explaining WIsE's errors to promote users' critical thinking. By this method, architects were trained to cautiously evaluate AI suggestions. Additionally, architects were introduced to prompt engineering techniques so they could refine inputs and understand AI's limitations in ethical decision-making. To support new users, HarmonIA created tutorials that explained WIsE's functions, provided examples of AI mistakes, and demonstrated how to address them. These efforts aimed to promote critical thinking skills, transparency, and responsible use of AI.

Application of the five ethical frameworks for WIsE

HarmonIA addressed the five ethical divides (i.e., access, representation, algorithmic bias, interpretation, and citizenship) during the process of designing WIsE. Specifically, HarmonIA designed WIsE to be cloud-based and lightweight, which is compatible with offline use in areas with low-bandwidth connectivity. The team made sure that WIsE could be used without powerful hardware or software to make it accessible to a wider audience, especially for marginalized groups. In this way, HarmonIA made sure that a cycle of inclusion and inequity that affects ethical and inclusive design did not negatively affect WIsE. HarmonIA also ensured the platform is user-friendly and straightforward, so individuals with different levels of technical skills could work with it effectively. Additionally, HarmonIA collected feedback from different users to ensure that WIsE is accessible for anyone.

To address the representation divide, HarmonIA ensured that WIsE considers diverse cultural, racial, and environmental needs. Using the RAG layer, the team modified WIsE's responses with datasets that reflected various

communities, including their unique traditions, values, and social contexts. For example, WIsE was updated to suggest playground designs inspired by traditional art and natural elements for communities that value cultural heritage, while also considering materials suitable for extreme weather conditions in other areas. Other features included ramps and sensory play equipment for children with disabilities and areas designed for toddlers. The team collaborated with cultural experts, architects, and community representatives to evaluate WIsE's output and to ensure WIsE provides suggestions that respect and reflect the needs and values of all users.

Addressing the algorithmic bias divide was challenging since WIsE uses OpenAI's API. It is difficult or impossible for people outside of the AI companies to modify these models' algorithms and address the algorithmic bias divide. However, HarmonIA ensured WIsE's suggestions were tailored to specific needs and real-world contexts rather than relying on general assumptions. For example, WIsE initially suggested large, open play areas without shade or seats and prioritized maximum space usage, but overlooked the summer heat and the needs of caregivers who supervise children. HarmonIA initiated regular audits of WIsE's responses to uncover biases in its recommendations. The company assembled a diverse group of architects to review the AI-generated designs and incorporated perspectives from urban and rural communities, as well as feedback from parents, educators, and children. This iterative process helped refine WIsE's responses through heavy prompt engineering to ensure it accounted for real-world priorities and diverse user needs. In the long term, HarmonIA could create an SLM tailored to WIsE to enable more precise and context-specific responses.

To address the interpretation divide, HarmonIA made WIsE's output easier to understand. For example, WIsE flagged a design with a "water inefficiency" issue but did not explain the cause. To solve this issue, the team added visual and interactive features such as 3D models and simulations. For instance, a water flow simulation showed areas of excessive runoff and suggested ways to fix it. Moreover, tutorials and tooltips were also added to the system to help users better understand the outputs and think critically about them. These features allowed users to not only follow the WIsE's suggestions but also improve and question them when needed.

Finally, to address the citizenship divide, HarmonIA made sure all community members, both young and old, could share their ideas. Some people from lower-income areas could not participate due to limited internet access or low digital skills. This created a risk of only hearing from tech-savvy groups. Therefore, HarmonIA held workshops in these areas and showed printed versions of WIsE's outputs. The team collected handwritten and recorded feedback from different people and improved WIsE based on their insights.

HarmonIA's commitment to ethically augmenting architects' creativity evolves alongside advancements in AI models. This iterative and ongoing process ensures that as WIsE is used by architects globally, it becomes

increasingly accurate, ethical, and supportive of creative endeavors. In the following section, we explore an educational fictional vignette.

Educational case: Creative writing and generative AI in a high school

In Mrs. Carter's 11th-grade classroom at Lunaria Grove High School in the picturesque town of Maplewood, students are deeply engaged in creating their own adventure stories. Each student works with a tablet provided by the school and selects settings such as the mystical Eryndor Forest or the ancient city of Zarathune. An AI assistant (e.g., ChatGPT or Gemini) offers creative prompts to help students build their narratives. In the following sections, we examine how the use of an AI assistant fostered students' responsible use of AI and augmented their creativity. We also examine how the five cyclical ethical considerations in AI use within education were addressed and reinforced.

Augmenting students' creative writing

The AI assistant in Mrs. Carter's 8th-grade classroom acts as an agent of creativity augmentation by complementing students' creative thinking skills. While the AI tool has the capacity to generate full stories, students are introduced to the principles of responsible use of AI and choose not to heavily rely on AI to write their stories; over-reliance on AI for creative work may hinder human creativity (Zhai et al., 2024). Instead, in this scenario, students embrace AI's role as a source of inspiration. In other words, the AI assistant does not replace students' creativity and decision-making; rather, it enhances them by broadening the scope of possibilities students can consider (Thomas & Seely, 2019). This is similar to the types of creative inspiration students gain from peer feedback in fanfiction writing communities (e.g., Cheng & Frens, 2022; Evans et al., 2017). At the end of their writing, students reflect on and declare how they used AI in the creative process. This process fosters transparency and encourages thoughtful engagement with the technology.

Drawing from a wide range of global myths and folklore, the AI offers suggestions grounded in Collective Cultural Knowing (CCK)—a nuanced understanding of social and cultural contexts that inspires students to explore diverse narratives. The National AI Institute for Engaged Learning is developing resources on this topic (EngageAI, n.d.). Students then decide how to use or modify these suggestions that reflect their Embodied Experiential Knowing (EEK)—their sensory, emotional, and imaginative interpretations of the world. This approach ensures that students maintain ownership of their creative process while also enhancing their Personal Performative Knowing (PPK) by enabling them to explore ethical dilemmas or moral lessons in their stories.

Mrs. Carter's school promotes responsible use of AI and creativity augmentation through a structured program that combines AI literacy

workshops and resources, teacher demonstrations, and reflective activities. Workshops help students and teachers understand how to use AI effectively while ensuring that human creativity remains central. Teachers demonstrate thoughtful AI use during classroom activities and show students how to critically evaluate AI suggestions, refine outputs, and address biases. Students document their creative process in portfolios where they explain how AI was used and highlight their own contributions. These efforts create an environment where the use of AI augments students' creativity while enriching their learning, fostering their critical thinking and ethical awareness.

Ethical framework for supporting creativity

In this educational scenario, ChatGPT operates within the cyclical ethical framework explained earlier (Dieterle et al., 2022) to ensure fairness, inclusivity, and effectiveness. In this scenario, tools such as ChatGPT are provided through district-level initiatives or partnerships to enable seamless classroom integration. Additionally, training sessions equip students and teachers to use AI as a collaborative tool that enhances creativity while preserving human agency and ethical practices. Also, adaptive features, such as voice-to-text, text-to-speech, and language translation, support students with disabilities and non-native speakers to ensure inclusivity.

Representation ensures that all students see their identities and cultures reflected in the narratives co-created with the AI. In this scenario, AI-generated prompts inspire creative writing by suggesting settings, characters, conflicts, or resolutions, such as "Imagine a hero from your culture embarking on a journey to find a mystical artifact." These prompts are designed to spark creativity while remaining open-ended and also allow students to adapt and personalize their stories. To further promote inclusivity, the AI assistant draws from a diverse database of global myths and folklore that ensures culturally rich and relatable suggestions. Students are also encouraged to share their unique perspectives and contribute stories from their own communities.

The algorithmic bias in this scenario highlights the challenges of using pre-built AI tools that may not fully align with educational or creative goals at hand. Mrs. Carter addresses algorithmic bias by presenting clear examples that illustrate the issue, which help students become more aware of its implications and significance. Moreover, through various workshops, teachers and students are educated on how AI generates prompts from its training data that may raise questions such as, "What assumptions might the AI be making?" Discussions on biases, such as recurring male heroes or Western-centric settings, help uncover AI limitations and promote awareness. This process guides students to refine or reject suggestions by AI tools. Prompt engineering further ensures that AI outputs are culturally diverse and contextually relevant to keep the creative process human-centered and aligned with students' needs.

The interpretation divide is addressed by guiding students to reflect on how AI suggestions influence their creative decisions to foster deep learning and self-awareness. By comparing initial drafts with AI-assisted revisions, students can identify where the AI added value and where their personal ideas prevailed. Teachers facilitate this reflective process with guiding questions such as, “Which part of the story feels most like your own?” or “How did the AI’s suggestion shape your thinking?” This practice strengthens students’ ownership of their narratives while honing their ability to evaluate and integrate external ideas. Additionally, the AI assistant supports documenting the creative process through portfolios that include early drafts, AI-enhanced versions, and reflective essays.

The citizenship divide is addressed in this educational case by emphasizing the importance of equitable participation and the broader societal implications of integrating AI into storytelling. Efforts focus on teaching students, regardless of their socio-economic background or digital skills, how to use AI responsibly while fostering collaboration and inclusivity. Students explore ethical practices such as copyright laws, intellectual property rights, and distinguishing between their ideas and AI contributions. Group-writing activities using AI-generated prompts encourage teamwork, communication, and diverse perspectives, ensuring all voices are valued. Through discussions and real-world examples, such as AI’s role in preserving endangered languages or supporting underrepresented creative industries, students gain a deeper understanding of how AI can empower communities. This approach ensures students not only learn to use AI ethically but also become active contributors to its societal applications and help bridge the citizenship divide. Further suggestions on responsible teaching with AI are described in [Cao and Dede \(2023\)](#).

By engaging with AI in the classroom, Mrs. Carter’s students are gaining valuable skills to navigate a future where AI is integrated into nearly every aspect of life, such as their professional endeavors. This experience equips them to use AI responsibly and ethically while augmenting their creativity. In the next section, we explore actionable suggestions and implications based on the two cases we discussed.

Actionable suggestions and implications

The responsible and ethical use of generative AI necessitates strategies tailored to specific contexts and resources. Two primary scenarios emerge: first, situations where it is challenging to modify the outputs of LLMs or foundational models, such as in educational settings; and second, contexts where sufficient resources and expertise enable the development of advanced AI tools, as seen in corporate environments. Each scenario requires distinct approaches to ensure generative AI serves as a force for creativity augmentation and ethical innovation.

In educational settings, where resources are often constrained, fostering AI literacy and responsible use of AI is crucial. Mrs. Carter's 11th-grade classroom provides an illustrative example of how educators can guide students to interact thoughtfully with generative AI. Rather than relying on AI to write complete stories, students used the AI assistant to inspire their narratives, critically evaluated its suggestions, and reflected on their creative processes (i. e., the balanced use of AI we discussed earlier). This approach ensured that students retained ownership of their work while benefiting from the AI's ability to spark diverse and culturally rich ideas. Moreover, educators can expand on such practices by integrating AI literacy into the curriculum. This would help students understand how AI works, its limitations, and how to interpret its outputs critically. Research underscores the importance of equipping students with the skills to collaborate effectively with AI, which fosters creativity while addressing ethical concerns ([Almatrafi et al., 2024](#)).

What is an appropriate age for students to interact with AI tools? This question is gaining attention, similar to ongoing discussions about age restrictions for social media use. While specific research on age-appropriate AI tool usage is still emerging, experts emphasize the importance of aligning AI interactions with children's developmental stages. [Prothero \(2024\)](#) highlights that children's ability to engage responsibly with AI depends on their cognitive development, digital literacy, and ethical reasoning. Educators and policy-makers must consider how AI can be introduced in age-appropriate ways to support learning while mitigating risks. Additionally, some educators argue that age-appropriate exposure to AI, when properly guided, can be beneficial ([Edutopia, 2024](#)). The debate over age restrictions is more established in the context of social media ([Auxier & Jiang, 2023](#)). Discussions around AI usage should also consider developmental readiness, digital and AI literacy, and ethical implications. As AI becomes increasingly integrated into educational environments, establishing guidelines that ensure safe and beneficial use for students of varying ages is crucial.

In contexts with sufficient resources, such as HarmonIA Design Studio's corporate use case, organizations can take more advanced measures to develop AI tools tailored to specific needs. WIsE, the AI assistant designed for architectural creativity augmentation, exemplifies how integrating advanced techniques such as RAG can address real-world challenges. WIsE not only supported architects in generating innovative designs but also incorporated real-time, domain-specific data to ensure its outputs were practical and aligned with professional standards. This capability allowed WIsE to complement human expertise effectively, particularly in areas where human judgment is indispensable, such as cultural sensitivity and ethical decision-making.

In both educational and corporate contexts, maintaining a human-centered approach is critical. Generative AI should serve as a tool to augment human creativity rather than replace it. This principle aligns with the broader goals of responsible AI practices, which emphasize transparency, accountability, and

ethical oversight (Floridi & Cowsls, 2019). In Mrs. Carter's classroom, this goal was achieved by guiding students to critically evaluate AI outputs and reflect on their creative decisions. Similarly, HarmonIA ensured architects remained in control of the design process, using WIsE as a collaborative partner rather than an autonomous decision-maker.

Organizations and institutions must also address ethical challenges proactively. Regular audits and fairness checks are essential for uncovering biases and refining AI systems over time. HarmonIA addressed algorithmic bias in WIsE by conducting iterative reviews of AI-generated designs, incorporating diverse perspectives from architects, community members, and cultural experts. This process highlighted how AI tools can unintentionally perpetuate biases, such as prioritizing efficiency over accessibility in playground designs. By engaging in prompt engineering and iterative refinements, WIsE was improved to better align with diverse user needs and values. Similarly, in educational settings, discussions on algorithmic biases—such as recurring male protagonists in AI-generated story prompts—helped students critically evaluate AI outputs and refine them to reflect diverse narratives.

Additionally, for scenarios with limited resources, public awareness and education are crucial. Schools, for example, may not have the capacity to implement automated guardrails or modify AI models directly. In such cases, fostering a deep understanding of AI's capabilities and limitations among students, teachers, and the broader community becomes even more critical. As seen in Mrs. Carter's classroom, workshops, and reflective activities encouraged students to engage with AI responsibly and think critically about its role in their creative processes. Public awareness campaigns can extend these efforts by empowering communities to advocate for responsible AI use and understand its societal implications (Dieterle et al., 2022).

In contexts where advanced AI tools can be developed, organizations like HarmonIA can leverage techniques such as fine-tuning and RAG to address ethical concerns more effectively. By training AI models on diverse datasets and connecting them to real-time, domain-specific knowledge, these tools can mitigate representation and algorithmic biases. For instance, WIsE's ability to incorporate feedback from marginalized communities ensured its designs were inclusive and reflective of diverse cultural and environmental needs.

Finally, ensuring equitable access to AI tools and resources is a foundational step toward responsible AI use. Harmonia addressed the access divide by designing WIsE to be lightweight and compatible with low-bandwidth environments, making it accessible to architects in underserved areas. Similarly, in Mrs. Carter's classroom, adaptive features such as voice-to-text and language translation supported students with disabilities and non-native speakers, ensuring inclusivity in the learning process. These efforts highlight the importance of democratizing AI to bridge societal divides and foster a culture of innovation and equity.

By implementing these measures, generative AI can be harnessed to augment human creativity in ethical and transformative ways. In educational settings, fostering AI literacy and critical engagement ensures that students learn to collaborate thoughtfully with AI while maintaining ownership of their ideas. In corporate environments, advanced techniques such as RAG, fairness audits, and iterative refinements enable organizations to develop AI tools that are fair, inclusive, and aligned with user needs. Together, these approaches pave the way for a future where generative AI enhances creativity while upholding ethical standards and societal values.

References

- Almatrafi, O., Johri, A., & Lee, H. (2024). A systematic review of AI literacy conceptualization, constructs, and implementation and assessment efforts (2019–2023). *Computers and Education Open*, Article 100173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100173>
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 357–376. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.357>.
- Auxier, B., & Jiang, J. (2023). *81% of U.S. adults versus 46% of teens favor parental consent for minors to use social media*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/10/31/81-of-us-adults-versus-46-of-teens-favor-parental-consent-for-minors-to-use-social-media/>.
- Cao, L., & Dede, C. (2023). *Navigating A world of generative AI: Suggestions for educators*. Cambridge, MA: The Next Level Lab at Harvard Graduate School of Education, President and Fellows of Harvard College. <https://nextlevellab.gse.harvard.edu/publications/>.
- Cheng, R., & Frens, J. (2022). Feedback exchange and online affinity: A case study of online fanfiction writers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW2), 1–29. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3555127>.
- Craft, A. (2010). *Creativity and education futures: Learning in a digital age*. Trentham Books.
- De Peuter, S., Oulasvirta, A., & Kaski, S. (2023). Toward AI assistants that let designers design. *AI Magazine*, 44(1), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aaai.12077>
- Dede, C., Etemadi, A., & Forshaw, T. (2021). *Intelligence augmentation: Upskilling humans to complement AI* (pp. 1–16). Next Level Lab at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Dieterle, E., Dede, C., & Walker, M. (2022). The cyclical ethical effects of using artificial intelligence in education. *AI and Society*, 37, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-02201424-w>
- Edutopia. (2024). Using AI with elementary students: Strategies for early learning. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/article/using-ai-elementary-students>.
- EngageAI. (n.d.). Transforming education with AI-driven engagement. Retrieved from <https://engageai.org/>. (8 January, 2025).
- Evans, S., Davis, K., Evans, A., Campbell, J. A., Randall, D. P., Yin, K., & Aragon, C. (2017). More than peer production: Fanfiction communities as sites of distributed mentoring. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on computer supported cooperative work and social computing* (pp. 259–272). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2998181.2998342>
- Florida, R. (2004). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community, and everyday life*. Basic Books.
- Floridi, L., & Cows, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1>

- Glăveanu, V. P., Hanson, M. H., Baer, J., Barbot, B., Clapp, E. P., Corazza, G. E., & Sternberg, R. J. (2020). Advancing creativity theory and research: A socio-cultural manifesto. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 54(3), 741–745. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.395>
- Graafland, J. H. (2018). New technologies and 21st-century children: Recent trends and outcomes. In *OECD education working papers* (Vol 179). <https://doi.org/10.1787/e071a505-en>
- Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2010). Creativity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 569–598.
- Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The four c model of creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, 13(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688>
- Partnership for 21st Century Learning. (2019). Framework for 21st century learning. Retrieved from http://static.battelleforkids.org/documents/p21/P21_Framework_Brief.pdf.
- Piffer, D. (2012). Can creativity be measured? An attempt to clarify the notion of creativity and general directions for future research. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 7(3), 258–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2012.04.009>
- Plucker, J. A., Beghetto, R. A., & Dow, G. T. (2004). Why isn't creativity more important to educational psychologists? Potentials, pitfalls, and future directions in creativity research. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985sep3902_1
- Prothero, A. (2024). What is age-appropriate use of AI? 4 developmental stages to know about. In *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/technology/what-is-age-appropriate-use-of-ai-4-developmental-stages-to-know-about/2024/02>.
- Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). Determinants of Internet skills, uses, and outcomes. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(8), 1607–1624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007>
- Shaheen, R. (2010). Creativity and education. *Creative Education*, 1(3), 166–169.
- Sun, J. C.-Y., & Metros, S. E. (2011). The digital divide and its impact on academic performance. *US-China Education Review A*, 2, 153–161.
- TeachAI. (n.d.). Empowering the next generation with AI education. Retrieved from <https://www.teachai.org/>. (8 January, 2025).
- Thomas, C., & Seely, L. (2019). *Writers in the secret garden: Fanfiction, youth, and new forms of mentoring*. MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262537803/writers-in-the-secret-garden/>.
- van Deursen, A. J. A. M., & Helsper, E. J. (2015). The third-level digital divide: Who benefits most from being online? *Communication and Information Technologies Annual*, 10, 29–52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2050-206020150000010002>
- Vinchon, F., Lubart, T., Bartolotta, S., Gironnay, V., Botella, M., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., Burkhardt, J. M., Bonnardel, N., Corazza, G. E., Glăveanu, V., & Hanchett Hanson, M. (2023). Artificial intelligence and creativity: A manifesto for collaboration. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 57(4), 472–484. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.597>
- Wingstrom, R., Hautala, J., & Lundman, R. (2023). Redefining creativity in the era of AI? Perspectives of computer scientists and new media artists. *Creativity Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2022.2107850>. Advance online publication.
- World Economic Forum. (2023). The future of jobs report 2023: Skills outlook. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/in-full/4-skills-outlook/>.
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>