Audio Engineering Society

Conference Paper 9

Presented at the AES International Conference on Machine Learning
and Artificial Intelligence for Audio
2025 September 8-10, London, UK

This paper was peer-reviewed as a complete manuscript for presentation at this conference. This paper is available in the AES E-Library (http://www.aes.org/e-lib), all rights reserved. Reproduction of this paper, or any portion thereof, is not permitted without direct permission from the Journal of the Audio Engineering Society.

Perceptions of an Artificial Intelligence Musical Collaborator

Becky Allen[1], Ronald Mo[1,]

[1]University of Sunderland

Correspondence should be addressed to Becky Allen (Becky.Allen@sunderland.ac.uk)

ABSTRACT

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has the potential to change the landscape of music creativity through new creative practices and tools to assist in all aspects of music making. However, the acceleration of this technology has also prompted concerns relating to a range of ethical issues. Discourse surrounding AI within music has included limited consultation with creative practitioners surrounding potential disruption to working practices. This study centres the concept of 'musicking' to identify participants to gather data pertaining to views of Generative AI within music. Findings indicate that some musicians are already incorporating AI within their practice as a creative assistant. However, a clear mental model of how AI works and how this can be ethically implemented within practice is lacking, potentially exacerbating concerns around AI adoption. Embedding a human-centred AI approach to the development of AI music tools, through stakeholder engagement and alignment with existing music technology may harness the positive potential of AI without devaluing musicianship.

1 Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is at the forefront of development within AI and has been a main driver pertaining to the awareness of this technology. Advances such as ChatGPT [1] have brought discourse surrounding this technology firmly into the public domain when in 2022 it was made widely available. GenAI utilises deep learning to generate artifacts using existing content including video, images, audio and text by analysing examples in the training dataset and learning their distribution and patterns [2]. GenAI is gaining traction within audio generation, for example AIVA [3] is an AI music generation assistant allowing users to generate compositions encompassing a range of genres. Other examples of this technology include AudioCraft which generates audio based on user text input [4], MuseNet [5] and Suno [6]. These systems often operate on either a text-to-music-based system or through the selection of pre-specified criteria such as genre. The ability to customise or augment the output is currently limited.

The focus on generative audio/ music by big tech corporations such as Meta and OpenAI (e.g. AudioCraft, MuseNet) demonstrates commercial viability in such technology. However, the impact the ubiquity of such technology may have on the creative community if wider adoption is enacted may be far-reaching. Implications of the cultural impact and potential ethical issues are relatively unexplored, as are the views of both creatives and music consumers.

Determining perceptions of this technology is key to gaining an understanding of its infiltration within the music community and potential misconceptions of AI. Understanding concerns relating to the inclusion of AI within music is crucial to examining how this technology can be made more equitable. A human-centred approach to AI (HCAI) is gaining prominence as a potential way to embed a more ethical approach.

This approach endeavours to build "intelligent systems that are designed with social responsibility in mind," encompassing an understanding of humans and assisting humans in understanding AI [7]. Therefore, to be able to adopt a HCAI approach, an understanding of individuals' thoughts on this technology is essential.

The perspectives of both musicians and music enthusiasts are core to this research to determine any heterogeneity in opinion. For the purpose of clarity we define a musician as "a person talented in the art of music" [8]. This definition encompasses professionals who may undertake this as a job role as well as individuals who play instruments and compose as a hobby. We define a music enthusiast as a person who "pursues an activity or objective with passion or zeal" [9]. Both of these terms encompass 'musicking'[10] and will be used throughout the paper. The study aims to address the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the perceptions of an AI musical collaborator from the perspective of both musicians and enthusiasts of music?
RQ2: What are the main concerns regarding the integration of AI within a creative musical context?
RQ3: Does the inclusion of AI within the composition process affect musician's and enthusiast's perceptions of the music?

To address the questions, a rigorous methodology has been implemented to ensure a consistent approach to knowledge discovery. Determining existing research relating to these questions is core to appreciate the current state of the art relating to this domain.

2 Background

2.1 Existing Generative AI Systems

GenAI models can create high-quality artefacts based on their training data [11], including images, text and audio. It can be identified as a subdomain of deep learning due to foundational algorithms such as Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [12] and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) [13]. Diffusion models, transformers and riffusion have also demonstrated promise in relation to symbolic and structured music generation [14], [15], [16].

There are a range of existing commercial GenAI music options, including MusicGen [4], MuseNet [5], Loudly [17] and Soundraw [18]. These tools have limited marketisation towards musicians, mainly for users who require functional music to accompany their content (e.g. games, social media, etc). Most systems generate the composition based on text input from the user outlining the required genre and other high level descriptive aspects such as tempo. There are limited genre options, which may have adverse implications for the diversity of music being produced. Specific plug-ins are also readily available for integration into a user's digital audio workstation (DAW), examples include Magenta Studio [19] and Orb Producer [20]. These provide users with greater control and editability of the generated material, for example Drumify within Magenta Studio can "create grooves based on the rhythm of any input" [19], assisting the musician in composition if they do not have the pre-requisite skills.

This technology presents both positive and negative challenges from a societal and ethical perspective [21]. Current approaches to the development of GenAI often fail to recognise the inherent human activity of music making which encompasses "sociological, historical and physio-psychological dimensions" [22]. There is a need to embed a more sociotechnical approach, potentially through integration of stakeholder engagement which is currently lacking [22], [23]. Through stakeholder engagement, comprehension of the artistic process can be understood by system developers. Co-creation can assist musicians in developing a cognitive model of AI, which has been shown to engender trust and encourage integration into creative practice [23], [24]. If GenAI is used critically by musicians, they may hone a specific craft in applying AI to music, creating a shared "creative musicking intelligence" [24].

2.2 Current Use of AI by Musicians

Determining the extent to which musicians currently use AI is core to comprehend the acceptance level. A study by Ditto Music surveyed 1299 artists who were actively producing and releasing music to determine the extent to which they employed AI [25]. 59.5% of respondents already use AI within their music, most commonly for production and mastering purposes. 11% of respondents used this for songwriting. From the artists surveyed who currently do not use AI, 47.1% said they would use it for songwriting, 61.5% said they would use it for production and 66% for mastering. Only 28.5% of participants responded that they would never use AI. Artists disclosed they were dissuaded from using this technology through a lack of access to AI tools and the lack of creativity [25]. This survey indicates that some artists are already

employing AI within their creative process and those that currently aren't may be open to its inclusion. Issues raised pertaining to AI access and perceived lack of creativity of these technologies pose interesting questions relating to the level of awareness and understanding of AI.

A survey of 1141 artists from across the UK, US and Germany discovered a growing embrace of AI [26]. However, this study revealed that a proportion of musicians who use AI within the creative process would be concerned about disclosing this to their audience for fear of the perception of a "loss of authenticity" [26]. Participants were asked at which stage of their practice AI was the most useful, responses included "songwriting & composition" with participants describing it as a "jumping off point" [26].

2.3 Human-Centered AI

Concomitant to the increase in AI system use is the rise in the frequency of misuse [27]. Poor ethical practices not only erode trust in this technology but lead to discriminatory outcomes through the perpetuation of bias. To attempt to mitigate against unethical practices, a HCAI approach to this technology has been proposed, centring the context of social responsibility and value-guided approaches, alongside core computational approaches [28].

Data ethics is a core concern within GenAI, particularly issues around copyright. Music publishers including Universal Music sued Anthropic, accusing the tech firm of misusing copyrighted song lyrics to train its chatbot [29]. Major record companies have also sued AI music start-ups Suno and Udio for training their systems using the labels' recordings without permission [30]. Some artists, however, have embraced this technology. The Beatles utilised AI to work on previously unheard material, resulting in the release of Now and Then [31]. AI was used to clean and enhance John Lennon's voice to achieve "a cleaner and more refined sound" [32]. The use of this technology as a tool to assist in the achievement of artistic outcomes emphasises the benefits of AI when utilised for a specific purpose.

HCAI systems designed for co-creativity within music have highlighted the role of AI as a musical collaborator, users personified AI as a "second person" to bounce ideas off [23] and assisted in the development of new ideas [33]. However, adoption into practice can be difficult with some users becoming overwhelmed by the amount of content generated and the non-deterministic nature of this output [34]. However, other musicians appreciate this as it allows them to "generate a large repository of content to remix" [23]. This juxtaposition of views reflects the personal process of composition and the importance of a co-creative approach ensuring the musician can utilise AI to suit their practice.

3 Methodology

To answer the research questions, interviews and focus groups were conducted with participants. A core set of questions were asked in both methodologies to ensure consistency in approach. Ethical approval was certified by authors institution.

3.1 Geographical Context

The study is situated within the North-East of England consisting of Tyne and Wear, County Durham, Northumberland and Tees Valley. The region has undergone extensive culture-led regeneration through major investment in music and performance venues [35],[36]. The musical landscape within the North-East has a rich heritage from border ballads and progressive folk music to modern day rock and indie bands. A range of music making activities and formal educational courses are offered in both music and music technology at varying educational institutes in the region. The city of Sunderland has recently been awarded Music City status in recognition of its transformative impact [37].

3.2 Participant Recruitment

Participation in the study is limited to individuals situated within the North-East who are either music enthusiasts or professional musicians. Encompassing this approach is the concept of musicking. The term 'musicking' or '*to music'* describes the action of participating in any capacity, in a music performance, either by performing, listening or composing [10]. Gathering the opinions of musicians and music enthusiasts is core to building an understanding of a range of views. Purposive sampling was used to recruit participants for interview; self-selection sampling was used for the focus groups. Financial incentives were not provided. Participants were requested to complete a questionnaire pertaining to demographic information, including age and gender (categories included female, male and prefer to self-describe). Participants were also asked whether they play a musical instrument, their years of experience and whether they compose music. A factsheet was

provided to all participants to enable a baseline understanding of AI.

3.3 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were deemed the most applicable format as they are based around a set of topics or pre-set questions, however, sequencing is participant led [38] with scope for additional discussion. The interview guide enabled a clear structure, ensuring that the questioning aligned with the research aim. Ensuring that the interview guide had similarity with the focus group guide (see section 3.4) enabled parity in terms of consistency of approach. Interviews lasted approximately one hour. The interview commenced with a question to determine the participant's overarching view of AI. Questioning turned to participant's views of the use of AI within music, including whether they have ever used it. More specific questions were then asked regarding an AI musical collaborator and whether participants would use this and within what context. For participants who are not musicians, questioning included whether an AI musical collaborator would encourage them to attempt music making. All participants were asked whether the use of AI within music composition would alter their opinion of the product and if they had any overarching concerns.

3.4 Focus Group

To widen participation in the study, two focus groups were completed, lasting approximately 90 minutes, enabling individuals often excluded from academic research to participate. A guide for the focus groups ensured that the discussion remained pertinent to the research questions whilst also allowing exploration of topics of interest. Pre-prepared questions mirror those within the interviews to ensure a consistent approach.

3.5 Analysis

Transcription of all audio recordings were completed. Thematic analysis used a reflexive approach [39] and included iterative independent coding to identify patterns of shared meaning and initial themes which were then subjected to inter-rater reliability analysis. This compared the themes generated by each author to determine the percentage agreement around thematic generation.

4 Results

Fourteen individuals participated in the research, consisting of 7 interview participants and 7 focus group participants. Focus group 1 consisted of 4 participants and focus group 2 had 3 participants. Table 1 contains participant demographics. Participants 4, 13 and 14 did not complete the demographic questionnaire. Based on the 11 participants who provided demographic information, 7 identified as male and 3 as female (1 participant did not answer). Nine respondents play a musical instrument and 10 compose their own music. The results will be presented based on the themes generated from both interviews and focus groups. Due to the use of a subject guide for both data collection methods, the results have been collated by theme. The inter-rater reliability analysis score between authors was 95.3%.

Participant (P)	Gender	Age	Play Musical Instrument?	Which Instrument?	Years of Experience?	Compose Music?
1	M	64	Y	Trumpet, Piano	50	Y
2	F	54	Y	Keyboard, Vocals	"Since childhood"	Y
3	-	-	Y	Piano, Bass Guitar	33	Y
5	F	39	Y	Vocals, Piano, Guitar	25	Y
6	F	34	N	-	-	N
7	M	37	Y	DJ, Music Production	20	Y
8	M	29	Y	DJ, Music Technology	11	Y
9	M	24	N	-	7	Y
10	M	54	Y	Guitar	10	Y
11	M	-	Y	Piano, Drum Machine	23	Y
12	M	46	Y	Guitar, Keyboard, Drums	35	Y

Table 1. Participant Demographics

4.1 AI Literacy

Six out of the 14 participants made a comment aligned with a lack of AI literacy and how this affected their feelings towards AI. P1 stated that they were not *"massively informed*", P4 stated that they had "*limited interaction*" and P14 advised that they were "*new to it all*". Two participants reserved overall judgement on AI as they felt they didn't fully understand "*its capabilities*" (P5), or what constitutes AI due to the wealth of tools /plugins that are available within DAWs (P9). P7 raised the wider need for AI literacy, highlighting the need to demonstrate how these tools can be used in a positive way.

4.2 Opinions on AI

Overarching views of AI were mixed. Participants noted that they were "*excited by it*" (P7), "*very positive*" (P10) and they thought it was "*quite good*" (P9). P14 stated that "*in terms of the creative sides of AI I think it's cool*". Not all participants were positive, P2 stated that they thought it was "*impressive, scary*" and P8 advised that they thought it was "*about accepting it*". This passivity and feeling of

inevitability was mirrored around concerns relating to the control and regulation of AI (see section 4.4). Three participants had used AI within their practice; the majority had not. P13 advised that they would not use AI as it did not match their musical "*aesthetic,*" mirrored in a similar response by P14 in that they would not use it for recording or live performance as they'd rather "*have it done by a person*." This viewpoint aligns with other participants in terms of perceived authenticity (see section 4.7).

Three participants expressed negative opinions, 2 of these related to the loss of skills due to the potential ease of music composition. P5 advised that this could lead to missed opportunities in learning especially as "*experimenting brings the joy*". P11 expressed concerns around devaluing musicians and diversity of skills, "*specific instruments have specific methods of playing and it would be sad to see them go*." Along a similar vein P14 surmised that AI in music may be the "*death of originality*" due to the lost nuance of human skills and experience.

4.3 Economic Concerns

Relating to RQ2, one main concern from participants was the economic impact AI may have on musicians, particularly the exploitation of small artists (P6), loss of jobs (P14, P6, P7) and overall shift in the economics of music (P1). P1 discussed how AI may "*yield alternative and different forms of economics*." Concerns were also raised around how the music industry may adopt AI to the detriment of artists: "*some people are just focused on the money so they would not care about the quality of the music*" (P11).

4.4 AI Ethics

A variety of concerns were raised concomitant to common ethical issues, including algorithmic explainability, bias, diversity and the requirement for greater regulation. Relating to explainability, AI was described by P2 as "*powerful systems that we don't really understand*", tying to issues around AI literacy. Bias and diversity were raised by 5 participants. P5 and P6 both raised concerns around the lack of diverse datasets used to train AI algorithms, particularly concerns relating to "*appropriation, the cultural sensitivities*" associated with specific genres and how AI may not be attuned to this sensitivity. P2 was worried that AI would reduce "*the diversity we have in music*" as a consequence of generic datasets. P6 was concerned not only with the impact of musicians within a geographical area but the ecology of that location due to how intrinsic music is to the cultural identity of a city. On a wider scale, P5 discussed the broader cultural shift in the value of music and how they feel AI may accelerate this trajectory of devaluing both music and musicianship "*in education and culturally*" (P5).

Concerns were raised around the balance of control between humans and AI "*so that you still feel relevant"* as a musician (P3). A HCAI approach with intrinsic stakeholder engagement may mitigate this concern if musicians see the benefit of AI to their craft. Concerns around regulation were raised, particularly how technology has progressed faster than "*humans have been able to put parameters around*" (P6). Control of music "*ownership*" (P5) and the lack of acknowledgment for artists whose work has been featured within GenAI training datasets and replication of their work (P6, P7) were also raised.

4.5 Historical Context of Music Technology

Six participants contextualised their perceptions of AI in music by discussing the broader context of music technology. Examples provided of technological developments which were initially perceived negatively included synthesizers (P1, P2), sampling (P14) and studio advancements including Pro Tools [40] (P4, P3). Respondents discussed how there has generally been "*scaremongering around new technology or new forms of music*" (P7) however, innovation has not always been the "*threat to authenticity that it's purported to be"* (P1) often leading to innovative forms of creativity.

4.6 Accessibility

AI was thought of positively in terms of increasing accessibility to music making with 7 participants highlighting their enthusiasm for this use case. P14 was particularly effusive around the potential for AI to "*democratise music making*", making it easier for someone to "*find their creative voice and express themselves"* a view echoed by P5, P6 and P9 who advised that AI "*opens your mind to new things*". These participants discussed the benefits of AI for young people to see themselves "*as musical humans*" (P6), allowing them to make an informed choice about the kind of music they might want to make and lowering the skills barrier to participation. Two participants (P2, P14) working in youth music discussed how technology such as GarageBand [41] had assisted people to "*create a tune in half an hour using the presets*" assisting them to express themselves creatively. P14 was positive about how they have already engaged with AI in their practice helping them to overcome deficits in their skills. They discussed using the piano player in Logic [42],

inputting chords they can't play on guitar and "*the AI piano player will generate a chord progression for me*" opening up a range of musical possibilities. This participant discussed how AI had inspired them to "*create something new and original, something that might have been out of reach to me a few years ago."* Although accessibility was identified as a positive benefit of GenAI, respondents P9, and P14 advised that it should be used as a tool to widen participation and should not be solely relied upon.

4.6.1 Efficiency

Seven participants discussed how they had integrated AI into their workflow, highlighting that it has "*helped them to do things*" (P4), reduced their workload (P9) and are happy for AI to "*make my life easier*" (P6). From the respondents' experiences the main motivating factor for AI use was as a time-saving tool, making tasks such as mixing easier. Four participants (P9, P13, P4, P3) discussed the use of AI in providing creative inspiration, for example, using ChatGPT [1] to assist with lyric writing (P4) or helping with melody generation (P4, P13).

4.7 Authenticity

Relating to RQ3, 13 out of 14 participants expressed concerns relating to the authenticity of music created with AI. P9 discussed the importance of imperfections within music advising that "*something that's created by AI would be too robotic to have that human feel.*" Music as an inherently human experience was raised by 4 participants, who discussed how important musicians' "*own lived experience*" was to the connection with the listener (P1). A lack of "*feel*" and "*nuance*" within AI-generated music was also raised restricting emotional connection (P13, P4, P14). P2 had stronger views in that they believe "*it's only humans who can create*". P2, P6 and P13 discussed the importance of collaboration with other musicians and how this is a core part of their process which they felt AI would not be able to replicate, advising "*having music in common is special*," cultivating the "*golden thread of connection*" (P13) between musicians and listener. Four participants highlighted the importance of a HCAI approach to music. P10 advised that human input is required to capture the essence of music and "*not everything should be 100% AI*", this was also discussed by P3 and P9 who felt the technology was acceptable for creative use if blended with human input. P6 discussed that they would not use AI for aspects of their composition process as it depended on "*where you put the value in the creative"* and they feel like the "*nuance is lost when you take it away from the human*." P5 anthropomorphised AI as a "*well-read human*" and aligned AI outputs to that of humans in that everything we create is a product of what we consume, drawing parallels to how GenAI algorithms work.

The impact AI may have on devaluing musicianship was discussed by 4 participants (P5, P3, P12, P14). This issue centred around concerns that people may become "*lazy*" (P5) and use AI-based tools to develop songs instead of gaining new skills and incorporating it into their practice. This is juxtaposed against discussions in section 4.6 around AI democratising music making.

4.8 Innovation to Creative Practice

Five participants (P1, P6, P9, P13, P14) advised that they thought AI could help them innovate within their practice. P1 discussed how they would be interested in combining human and AI-generated voices to explore potential "*friction*" between the two. P13 and P14 advised that they would be happy to use AI if it suggested different creative directions. P6 was intrigued by the idea of AI as a collaborator and how this would support musicians to collaborate differently. P14 already uses AI and discussed how it allowed them to explore ideas outside of their regular lexicon. P7 raised the idea that "*AI might create new forms of music*" as it allows musicians to diversify their practice.

4.9 AI as a Tool

The use of AI as a tool to assist with specific aspects of music composition was discussed by 9 participants (P1, P4, P9, P10, P13, P3, P12, P6, P2). P1 aligned this with other forms of music technology (see section 4.5), that new tools often "*present challenges but they seem to add a dimension to creative practice rather than subtracting*." P4 advised that they saw AI the same as "*any sound creation or manipulation tool*" in that it is something to create and experiment with. Three of the participants (P9, P10, P12) highlighted the importance of the use of "*elements*" of AI (P9), using it as a "*helpful suggester*" to which the musician can add their own personal input (P12). P6 and P2 highlighted the importance of AI literacy, advising that people need to understand how to use AI as a tool and "*not as a replacement*" (P6), assisting people to understand AI's limitations (P2).

5 Discussion

Determining perceptions of an AI musical collaborator is fundamental to understanding how this

technology may be designed and adopted within creative practice. This study endeavoured to initiate this conversation within a specific geographical location to determine views from a cohort of music enthusiasts. Although participant numbers were not as high as desired, the research methodology elicited a rich source of data in which to commence this form of inquiry. Although demographic information was collected, due to the number of respondents, the data was too limited to determine any differences of views in consideration of gender, age or musicianship.

5.1 RQ1: Perceptions of an AI Musical Collaborator

AI literacy appeared to be a large determinant of participants' views of AI, with respondents not feeling informed enough to make a definitive judgement. A lack of an accurate mental model of AI can also impact propensity for experimentation and user-self efficacy [34]. Therefore, transparency and intuitive interfaces may encourage more people to interact with such technology.

Views of AI in music were mixed. Passive or neutral opinions were determined by particular use cases. However, some participants were positive and keen to explore this further, highlighting that there are particular creative tasks musicians feel comfortable integrating AI [23]. Negative opinions related to concerns around diversity, economic impact, devaluing of musicianship and the 'quality' of music. Six of the participants contextualised their views of AI in music to other forms of music technology such as synthesizers, sampling and recording advances. Within this context P7 discussed how there were often negative views or "*scaremongering*" around these innovations, however these advances led to new forms of creativity. Accessibility was raised as a positive use case for AI in music regarding the potential democratisation of music making, lowering the skills entry barrier and widening participation.

Only 3 participants had specifically used AI within their practice, mainly to increase efficiency within the production process or to extend their current abilities. Four participants discussed how they may use it to provide inspiration for lyric and melody generation. These use cases align with existing research discussed in Section 2.2 in that musicians commonly use AI for production and as a starting point for composition. Seven participants discussed how the main motivating factor for AI use was efficiency or assistance, freeing musicians to focus on the larger creative tasks [43]. Antithetical to the concerns around loss of skills raised in section 4.7, were the points raised by 5 participants who advised that they thought AI may allow them to innovate within their creative practice. Examples included playing with the combination of human and AI voices to explore the juxtaposition (P1), to suggesting new creative directions through exploration of ideas outside of their usual style.

Use of AI as a tool was a recurring theme. Respondents aligned AI with the use of other music technologies such as sound creation or manipulation tools. However, this line of thinking came alongside the caveat that the musician should still have overall creative control, and AI should not be used as a replacement for human skills. Therefore a HCAI approach to a AI musical collaborator is core, with stakeholder engagement embedded throughout the design process, ensuring that musicians preferred methods of AI interaction fit their expectations [44].

5.2 RQ2: Concerns Regarding Integration of AI within Music

AI ethics was a central theme, core concerns such as explainability, bias and control were raised aligning with common AI concerns [45]. The cultural impact of AI in music was discussed, including the omission of cultural sensitivities inherent within specific genres. Discussion around AI advancing a wider cultural shift in the value of music in terms of economic concerns for both musicians and local economies and educational opportunities was raised. As Katz (2022) advises "in the relationship between music and technology, culture always matters" [46]. Therefore, awareness of the cultural entanglements between music, musicians and listeners [47] is key to ethical and human-centred integration of AI within music.

Authenticity and the inherently human activity of musicking was raised by all but one participant. The importance of human input and control was raised as a core requirement, aligning with existing literature [23], [33]. The personal aspect of composition was raised throughout, from the importance of nuance in styles of playing, to composition being led by musicians own lived experiences. This is tied to the core concerns around AI adoption of devaluing musicianship, loss of skills and lack of potential for experimentation. To address concerns, AI collaborative systems should ensure high user autonomy, with AI potentially acting as a "second person" to bounce ideas off [23], or as a muse,

generating ideas which users can incorporate within their creative vision.

5.3 RQ3: Perceptions Affected by AI in Music

Only 4 participants gave a clear yes/no response to whether the use of AI within music composition alters perceptions. Two participants (P2, P13) advised that it would give them a negative perception due to a lack of "substance" and authenticity (P13). The two 'no' respondents said that it would not change their perception as they viewed it as another creative tool. The additional 10 respondents had a more nuanced view, aligned with their previous responses and depended on particular use cases and the extent of AI integration. A HCAI approach may provide confidence that this technology can be embedded within creative practice, that AI can be shaped by musicians and their own creativity and sits within the broader technological scope as intrinsic to all musical activity [46]. Consumers may also have greater acceptance of AI within music if used as a creative tool similar to existing forms of music technology.

6 Limitations

Research limitations include potential participant bias due to the self-selecting aspects of the study. Participant numbers and geographical localisation also restrict some aspects of the result generalisability. However, hyper-localisation of the findings, particularly within a region consisting of a city with Music City status enabled context rich data which is of relevance to the AI music community.

7 Conclusions

This research provides insights into the views of musicians and music enthusiasts on the use of GenAI as a musical collaborator. Findings align with existing studies pertaining to AI use cases, particularly in assisting with production tasks and idea generation. The importance of AI literacy has been highlighted in this study, particularly how this may affect the uptake of AI. Aligning AI with existing music technology may assist musicians in accepting AI by providing a clearer mental model. Through stakeholder engagement, a HCAI approach should be embedded within the development of AI music tools to align with musicians existing practice and to allay the concerns raised by participants. Further work is needed to determine perceptions on a wider scale to map a clear approach to the development of HCAI music tools.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all research participants for their valuable insights.

References

[1] OpenAI, "Introducing ChatGPT." Accessed: Sep. 18, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt

[2] D. Baidoo-Anu and L. Ansah, "Education in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the Potential Benefits of ChatGPT in Promoting Teaching and Learning," *Journal of AI*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 52–62, 2023.

[3] Aiva Technologies, "AIVA: Your personal AI musical generation assistant." Accessed: Feb. 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.aiva.ai/

[4] Meta, "Generative AI for Audio." Accessed: Feb. 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://ai.meta.com/resources/models-and-libraries/audiocraft/

[5] OpenAI, "MuseNet." Accessed: Feb. 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://openai.com/research/musenet

[6] Suno Inc, "Suno." Accessed: Jun. 10, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://suno.com/home

[7] M. Riedl, "Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning," *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2018, doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.117.

[8] Oxford English Dictionary, "Musician." Accessed: Feb. 20, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=musician

[9] Oxford English Dictionary, "Enthusiast." Accessed: Feb. 20, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=enthusiast&tl=true

[10] C. Small, *Musicking*. Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1998.

[11] K. Martineau, "What is generative AI?," IBM. Accessed: Feb. 23, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://research.ibm.com/blog/what-is-generative-AI

[12] I. J. Goodfellow *et al.*, "Generative Adversarial Networks," Jun. 10, 2014, *arXiv*: arXiv:1406.2661. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1406.2661.

[13] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes," Dec. 10, 2022, *arXiv*: arXiv:1312.6114. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1312.6114.

[14] Z. Evans, J. Parker, C. Carr, Z. Zukowski, J. Taylor, and J. Pons, "Stable Audio Open," in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Hyderabad, India: IEEE, 2025.

[15] C.-Z. A. Huang *et al.*, "Music Transformer: Generating Music With Long-Term Structure," in *ICLR 2019*, New Orleans, 2019.

[16] Q. Huang *et al.*, "Noise2Music: Text-conditioned Music Generation with Diffusion Models," Mar. 06, 2023, *arXiv*: arXiv:2302.03917. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.03917.

[17] Loudly, "AI Music For Your Creative Universe." Accessed: Feb. 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.loudly.com/

[18] Soundraw Inc, "Welcome to the AI Music Generation." Accessed: Feb. 28, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://soundraw.io/

[19] Google AI, "Magenta Studio." Accessed: Jan. 03, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://magenta.tensorflow.org/studio

[20] Orb Plugins, "Orb Producer Suite 3." Accessed: Jan. 03, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.orbplugins.com/orb-producer-suite/

[21] K.-B. Ooi *et al.*, "The Potential of Generative Artificial Intelligence Across Disciplines: Perspectives and Future Directions," *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, pp. 1–32, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1080/08874417.2023.2261010.

[22] A. Holzapfel, B. L. Sturm, and M. Coeckelbergh, "Ethical Dimensions of Music Information Retrieval Technology," *Transactions of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 44–55, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.5334/tismir.13.

[23] M. Newman, L. Morris, and J. H. Lee, "Human-AI Music Creation: Understanding the Perceptions and Experiences of Music Creators for Ethical and Productive Collaboration," in *Proceedings of the 24th ISMIR Conference*, Milan, Italy, 2023.

[24] P. Dahlstedt, "Musicking with Algorithms: Thoughts on Artificial Intelligence, Creativity, and Agency," in *Handbook of Artificial Intelligence for Music: Foundations, Advanced Approaches, and Developments for Creativity*, New York: Springer, 2021.

[25] Ditto Music, "60% of musicians are already using AI to make music," Music Industry Research. [Online]. Available: https://press.dittomusic.com/60-of-musicians-are-already-using-ai-to-make-music

[26] Pirate.com, "Over Half of Musicians Will Conceal AI Use." Accessed: Jan. 03, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://pirate.com/en/blog/over-half-of-musicians-will-conceal-ai-use/#:~:text=Notably%2C%2055%25%20of%20artists%20are,challenges%20surrounding%20AI%20in%20music.

[27] Institute for Human Centred AI, "The AI Index Report," Stanford University, 2023. Accessed: Jun. 14, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://aiindex.stanford.edu/report/

[28] C. Aragon, *Human-Centered Data Science*. London: MIT Press, 2022.

[29] B. Montgomery, "Music publishers sue Amazon-backed AI company over song lyrics," The Guardian. Accessed: Apr. 03, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/oct/19/music-lawsuit-ai-song-lyrics-anthropic

[30] D. Tencer, "As Suno and Udio Admit Training AI With Unlicensed Music, Record Industry Says: 'There's Nothing Fair About Stealing An Artist's Life's Work,'" Music Business Worldwide. Accessed: Jun. 19, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.musicbusinessworldwide.com/

as-suno-and-udio-admit-training-ai-with-unlicensed-music-record-industry-says-theres-nothing-fair-about-stealing-an-artists-lifes-work/

[31] The Beatles, *Now and Then*. United Kingdom: Apple, 2023.

[32] H. McIntyre, "The Beatles Are Using AI To Release One Last Song - Why Aren't More Musicians Doing The Same?," Forbes. Accessed: May 03, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.forbes.com/sites/hughmcintyre/2023/10/09/the-beatles-are-using-ai-to-release-one-last-songwhy-arent-more-musicians-doing-the-same/?sh=5dca8e8929b2

[33] O. Ben-Tal, M. T. Harris, and B. L. T. Sturm, "How Music AI Is Useful: Engagements with Composers, Performers and Audiences," *Leonardo*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 510–516, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1162/leon_a_01959.

[34] R. Louie, A. Coenen, C. Z. Huang, M. Terry, and C. J. Cai, "Novice-AI Music Co-Creation via AI-Steering Tools for Deep Generative Models," in *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Honolulu HI USA: ACM, Apr. 2020, pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376739.

[35] The Glasshouse, "The Glasshouse: International Centre for Music." Accessed: Mar. 28, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://theglasshouseicm.org/?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjwqpSwBhClARIsADlZ_TlK3ilOJzoxr1NLV-7ACeIfIGdxvnujZg0yvpe9JMpnh48mTcC0yNoaAjz8EALw_wcB

[36] The Fire Station, "The Fire Station: Sunderland's premier live music and performance venue." Accessed: Mar. 28, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.thefirestation.org.uk/

[37] P. Bilalova and A. Watson, "City to join international music network," BBC News. Accessed: Jun. 20, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c4g370wjg3go

[38] K. Roulston and M. Choi, "Qualitative Interviews," in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection*, New York: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2018.

[39] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis," *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 589–597, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806.

[40] *Pro Tools*. (2025). Avid Technology Inc. [Online]. Available: https://www.avid.com/pro-tools

[41] *GarageBand*. (2025). Apple Inc. [Online]. Available: https://apps.apple.com/us/app/garageband/id408709785

[42] *Logic Pro*. (2025). Apple Inc. [Online]. Available: https://www.apple.com/uk/logic-pro/

[43] D. Buschek, L. Mecke, F. Lehmann, and H. Dang, "Nine Potential Pitfalls when Designing Human-AI Co-Creative Systems," *Joint Proceedings of the ACM IUI 2021 Workshop.*, 2021, doi: arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.00358.

[44] J. B. Smith and J. Freeman, "Effects of Visual Explanation on Perceived Creative Autonomy in an AI-Based Generative Music System," in *28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, Sydney NSW Australia: ACM, Mar. 2023, pp. 25–28. doi: 10.1145/3581754.3584123.

[45] C. Huang, Z. Zhang, B. Mao, and X. Yao, "An Overview of Artificial Intelligence Ethics," *IEEE Trans. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 799–819, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TAI.2022.3194503.

[46] M. Katz, *Music and Technology: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.

[47] P. Martin, *Sounds and Society: Themes in the Sociology of Music*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.