

Creative Labor Displacement Anxiety in the Age of Generative AI

Dr. Deeksha S¹, Ms. Komal.S S²

¹Full Time Guest Faculty, Commerce, Dr.Manmohan Singh Bengaluru City University

²Guest Faculty, Commerce, Dr.Manmohan Singh Bengaluru City University

Abstract:

The rapid dissemination and proliferation of generative artificial intelligence (AI) have revolutionized creative industries, calling into question traditional assumptions that humans alone create. Although generative AI tools promote efficiency, scalability, and innovation in creating content, the increasing use of generative AI has also created considerable psychological uncertainty for those working in the creative sector. This article explores the anxiety of creative labor displacement caused by generative AI, identifying the emotional, technological and organizational elements that affect creative workers' reactions to the transformative impact of AI on the creative and cultural economy.

This research used a quantitative, cross sectional research design, employing a positivistic research philosophy, to collect data from 312 creative professionals who operate across multiple creative sectors. Building on the concepts of technology acceptance and displacement anxiety in previous literature, the article explores five variables — namely, perceived threat from generative AI, creative autonomy, trust in generative AI systems, social influence and facilitating conditions — which are believed to affect creative labor displacement anxiety. Using structural equation modelling (SEM) the authors tested the hypotheses and assessed the goodness-of-fit of the proposed model.

The results show that the most powerful predictor of displacement anxiety is perceived threat from generative AI. This indicates that creative professionals increasingly see AI as a competitive substitute for human creativity. On the other hand, levels of creative autonomy, confidence in using generative AI systems, and facilitating conditions all reduced anxiety. Therefore, there appears to be a need for human control, ethical deployment of AI systems and institutional support for enabling both human centered development and successful implementation of AI systems in creative sectors. Furthermore, social influence increased anxiety, showing that public discourses around generative AI adoption and peer narratives represent a major factor in determining the psychological response to AI adoption by creative professionals.

Therefore, this study contributes to an emerging body of literature on AI and work by expanding displacement anxiety research to include creative labor contexts. Further, it provides important implications for managers and policymakers interested in promoting human centered approaches to integrating AI into creative labor processes that preserve creative identity, cultural value and worker well-being.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence, Creative Labor, Displacement Anxiety, Creative Economy, Technology Acceptance, Human–AI Collaboration

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI), especially generative AI, has dramatically changed the business environment and creative space worldwide. With the advent of tools that produce texts, images, music, videos, designs, and even full stories based on learning from large datasets (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020), creative industries including advertising, media, publishing, design, entertainment, and cultural productions are experiencing substantial changes.

While these tools allow for new forms of speed, low-cost production and customized products through scale-up (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021), they have at the same time created growing uncertainty and anxiety among creative professionals. This anxiety is referred to here as "creative labor displacement anxiety" (Eloundou et al., 2023). This form of anxiety stems from the concern that the ability to create through human imagination and emotional intelligence may be partially or totally replaced by machines that can perform similar functions (Manovich, 2023).

The creative and cultural economy has traditionally been seen as a field where originality derived from human emotions, imagination, culture sensitivity and originality cannot be substituted. However, since generative AI has emerged and now is adopted by companies to save costs and accelerate production cycles as well as to tailor-made content at scale (McCosker & Wilken, 2024), we are seeing fundamental changes take place in labor markets in the creative economy. These changes raise numerous issues relating to job security, professional identities, financial stability and ultimately the long-term value of human creativity.

Moreover, creative labor displacement anxiety is not limited to simply losing one's job. Rather, it encompasses wider socio-economic concerns. For example, when workers in creative industries feel that they are competing against an AI system instead of collaborating with one — when they believe that an AI-generated output resembles theirs so much — they will experience higher levels of anxiety. Moreover, because the decision-making process behind the generation of an AI output is opaque; because governments have inadequate regulation; and because the rules concerning authorship and ownership of works produced by AI are unclear; workers in creative industries may experience additional layers of uncertainty in relation to their profession. In addition, because creative industries rely heavily on cultural authenticity and personal expression, the perceived erosion of human agency can negatively affect self-esteem; motivation; and overall career sustainability (Throsby, 2001).

On the contrary, generative AI represents a potential strategic asset for businesses. Companies are able to utilize AI to improve productiveness; personalize content; react more quickly to consumer trends; etc. The relationship between business interests and human-centered values associated with creativity has therefore become a hallmark of modern creative economies. Additionally, whereas some businesses frame the relationship between employees and AI as collaborative rather than competitive (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021); others experience greater anxiety related to unequal power dynamics (between technology owners and employee creatives) than previously experienced.

Finally, the cultural implications of generative AI adoption are significant for emerging countries such as India. Since cultural production and arts contribute extensively to employment; heritage preservation; and social identification in India's emerging economy; India's cultural economy consists of various types of workers -- artists; designers; writers; performers; artisans; digital creators; freelance workers -- who operate frequently in informal or gig-based arrangements. Thus, as generative AI enters these industries; Indian workers face additional vulnerability issues relative to income instability; lack of formal protections; lack of access to training programs; etc. Consequently, there may be greater degrees of

creative labour displacement anxiety in developing countries where technological development occurs faster than societal or governmental preparedness for such developments.

Despite the growing significance of this subject area; however; existing literature mainly focuses on either technological capability of generative AI or economic advantages provided to companies using generative AI. However; little empirical evidence exists documenting how creative workers view generative AI and how perceptions of generative AI relate to anxiety; resistance or acceptance. Existing studies investigating technology adoption tend to focus solely on efficiency; usefulness; and performance outcomes; generally ignoring emotional/psychological aspects associated with transforming jobs.

Given that creativity is closely tied to identity/personalization/cultural meaning-making in creative industries; understanding creative labor displacement anxiety necessitates an inter-disciplinary approach drawing on literature from business studies; cultural economy; organizational behavior; and technology acceptance theories. Specifically; several variables -- perceived threat from generative AI; level of trust in generative AI systems; degree of perceived loss of creative autonomy; social influence; and facilitating conditions -- likely shape how creative professionals respond to generative AI.

Thus; exploring these variables should yield important insights on whether generative AI is seen as an enhancer/enabler of creative expression or a destabilizer within creative labor markets.

Within this framework; this current study intends to investigate creative labor displacement anxiety resulting from the use of generative AI; specifically concentrating on creative professionals engaged in the cultural/economic economy. To achieve this objective; this study employs a quantitative/theory-driven method; aiming to identify determinants affecting anxiety; acceptance; and intent-to-use behavior towards generative AI tools. Expected contributions of this research include adding to academic debates surrounding AI and labor; providing practical recommendations for organizations/businesses/policymakers looking to integrate technological innovation with human-centered development.

2. Review of Literature:

Research conducted over recent years has documented that the widespread use of artificial intelligence (AI) across all areas of business has triggered intense academic interest — especially regarding automation; productivity; and changing labour markets. Recently; the emergence of generative AI has furthered these conversations by applying automation into fields formerly thought immune to technological substitution (such as creativity; artistic expression; cultural production).

This Chapter conducts an examination of prior literature relevant to generative AI; creative labour; displacement anxiety; and technology acceptance — as these prior literatures establish both conceptual foundations and theoretical bases for this study.

2.1 Generative AI and Transformations in Creative Industries

Generative artificial intelligence refers to systems designed to produce novel content including text; images; music; video; designs — utilizing previously-learned patterns from large databases (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). In contrast to earlier forms of automation focused primarily on automating repetitive/routine tasks; generative AI directly attacks symbolic; cognitive; and creative capabilities (Eloundou et al., 2023). Therefore, industries reliant upon creativity — e.g., advertising; media; publishing; design; film; games — are undergoing significant structural change.

Numerous studies document that companies increasingly adopt generative AI in order to increase speed; decrease production cost; permit mass customization of creative products (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021).

Managers view AI-enabled creativity as a means to enhance productivity — i.e., augment human abilities — without completely substituting them (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021). Critics counter that companies prioritize efficiency over artistry when deploying commercially available generative AI tools — thereby modifying value chains associated with creativity (McCosker & Wilken, 2024).

Cultural economists define creativity as more than just an economic input — it is a socially constructed / culturally situated process linked with identity; community; and meaning-making (Throsby, 2001). Integrating generative AI into these processes creates basic questions related to authorship/originality/authenticity within cultural processes. Researchers indicate that once generative AI produces output indistinguishable from human-created work — then boundaries between creator/tool blur — creating confusion among professionals involved in generating creative output (Manovich, 2023).

2.2 Creative Labor and Precarity in the Digital Economy

As stated earlier, the digital economy has created a number of new forms of uncertainty for many creative workers. For example, while digital platforms have provided greater access to marketplaces and audiences for creative products and services, they have also introduced a level of competition that is unprecedented. Moreover, since many of these platforms provide little if any protection to creative workers - whether that be through compensation or rights protection - many workers face significant economic instability.

While some researchers have argued that generative AI may create new types of jobs for creative workers, other researchers argue that this technology is going to displace many people who currently do creative work. These displaced workers will then be competing against others who are looking for work, and there will be fewer jobs available because companies will be able to automate the production process.

There are also a number of issues specific to emerging economies. For example, many emerging economies do not yet have institutions in place to help prepare workers for the impact of automation. Therefore, even though many emerging economies have high levels of penetration of mobile devices and the Internet - which could potentially allow them to take advantage of the opportunities presented by digitalization - they still lack the institutional capacity to develop policies and programs to assist those who are negatively affected by automation.

2.3 Displacement Anxiety and the Psychological Impact of Automation

Job loss and or reduced hours due to technological change results in what researchers refer to as "displacement anxiety" - or the fear that one will lose his/her job or experience reduced hours due to technological change. Displacement anxiety is different from actual job loss or reduced hours, as displacement anxiety represents the worker's perception of the likelihood of losing his/her job or experiencing reduced hours due to technological change. It is the worker's emotional response to the perceived risk of being displaced by technology.

Research has shown that displacement anxiety affects employee motivation, job satisfaction, mental health, and openness to new ideas. Parker & Grote (2022) report that employees' fears of losing their jobs due to automation lead to lower levels of job satisfaction, lower levels of motivation, decreased mental health, and a lower willingness to engage in innovative behaviors. Raisch & Krakowski (2021) find that workers' anxieties about being replaced by automated processes are shaped not only by how much automation actually occurs at their workplace but also by their perceptions of how transparently management communicates about changes to working processes and how trustworthy management is in terms of providing information about the role of automation in those changes.

When employees are uncertain about how automation is changing their workplaces, they become anxious. This is especially true for creative workers whose identities as professionals are closely tied to their

creative work. Florida (2023) argues that creative workers view AI as a threat to their ability to express themselves creatively and to produce culturally relevant works. As a result, creative workers experience a type of existential crisis as they consider the possibility that AI will replace their creativity. This existential crisis increases their displacement anxiety.

2.4 Technology Acceptance, Trust, and Resistance to AI

Research has shown that employees' acceptance of new technologies in the workplace is significantly influenced by their acceptance of those same new technologies. One of the most widely accepted frameworks for predicting Technology acceptance is the UTAUT (unified Theory of acceptance and use of Technology) developed by Venkatesh et al. (2012) and extended through utaut-2. It indicates that there are four primary factors influencing an individual's intention to adopt a new Technology including performance expectancy; effort expectancy; social influence; and facilitating conditions.

However, few studies have explored how these constructs relate specifically to creative AI adoption. Glikson & Woolley (2020) extend Venkatesh et al.'s (2012) UTAUT model to incorporate trust as an additional antecedent of employee intentions to use AI. Their findings indicate that trust is an essential component in predicting employee intentions to use AI when employees perceive AI as performing autonomously and complexly. Specifically, Glikson & Woolley (2020) find that trust in AI predicts an employee's intention to use AI when employees feel confident in the reliability and fairness of AI decision-making processes.

Glikson & Woolley (2020) identify three aspects of trust relevant to AI: reliability; fairness; and ethics. The authors define reliability as employees' confidence in the accuracy and dependability of AI decision-making. Employees evaluate fairness as the degree to which AI decision-making is consistent and unbiased relative to human decision-making. Finally, employees evaluate ethics as the degree to which AI decision-making respects employees' privacy, maintains confidentiality, protects employees from bias, and promotes equality.

The authors also highlight the importance of communication from top-management in establishing employees' trust in AI. Specifically, Glikson & Woolley (2020) note that employees require explicit communications from top-management regarding the purpose of AI implementation in order to understand why it was implemented. Additionally, the authors stress that employees need regular updates on how AI contributes positively to their work environment in order to maintain their trust in AI.

Regarding social influence, Crawford (2021) reports that peer opinions influence an employee's attitude toward adopting AI. Furthermore, Crawford (2021) states that employees are more inclined to embrace AI if their employer frames it as a tool supporting employee productivity rather than replacing human judgment.

2.5 Research Gap and Conceptual Direction

Previous research offers insightful views into generative AI, creative labor, and the displacement anxiety caused by automation; however, there exist various research gaps that must be addressed before we can fully comprehend this phenomenon. First, previous studies primarily focus on technological capabilities and general labor effects rather than subjectively examining creative workers' lived experiences. Second, research on displacement anxiety in the creative sector has gained relatively little attention as compared to manufacturing or administrative sectors. Third, virtually all studies investigating technology acceptance concentrate on the positive outcomes associated with technology adoption while largely neglecting the negative psychological responses such as anxiety and opposition.

Additionally, quantitative research that tests hypotheses using theory-driven approaches for creative labor

displacement anxiety specifically within emerging economies is scarce. The relationship between AI adoption, perceived risk, trustworthiness, and enabling conditions have not been sufficiently researched. Therefore, this study utilizes a combination of concepts from creative economy literature and research on displacement anxiety along with concepts from technology acceptance theory in order to investigate the factors affecting creative labor displacement anxiety generated by generative AI. Thus, this study aims to make a contribution both empirically and conceptually to discussions concerning the future of work/creativity/AI driven business transformation.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Philosophy and Approach

This study takes a positivistic stance, thereby emphasizing objective measurements through empirical observations; thus, validating statistically-derived relationships among studied variables. Since this study examines how behavioural reactions occur due to technological change, it is best-suited for testing hypothesized relationships among variables via quantifiable data. Henceforth, this study uses a deductive methodology where hypotheses are formulated based upon existing theories of technology acceptance/labour displacement anxiety/organizational behavior; afterwards tested using empirical data. This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative methodology to measure creative professionals' perceptions of generative AI's implications for their respective work environments. Cross-sectional methodologies are suitable for identifying patterns/relationships/causal pathways among variables such as perceived risk/trust in AI/creative autonomy/social influence/enabling conditions/creative labour displacement anxiety.

3.2 Population and Sample Design

Based on prior literature reviews related to this topic area, the intended population for this study includes creative professionals engaged in creating products/services within the realm of creative/cultural economies (e.g., graphic designers/writers/artists/musicians/filmmakers/content creators/advertising professionals/digital creatives). Due to varying definitions/unclear boundaries defining the scope of creative labor markets/the total size/population cannot accurately be determined.

Thus, utilizing Cochran's formula for determining an unknown population's required sample size; a 10% margin-of-error was assumed. After screening for completeness/inconsistencies; valid responses were retained for final analysis purposes.

A convenience sampling strategy was utilized as is typical in exploratory/perception-based research involving professional groups with varied employment arrangements.

3.3 Data Collection Instrument

The primary data collection instrument was a self-administered structured questionnaire designed to collect data reflecting creative professionals' perceptions of generative AI and its resultant effects on creative labor. Prior research on technology acceptance/automation anxiety/trustworthiness served as foundations for development of established scales; with modifications made to fit contextual settings within creative economies.

The questionnaire contained two parts:

Part A elicited demographic/professional characteristics of participants including: age/gender/educational background/creative field/domain/employment arrangement (freelance/salaried/gig-based)/AI usage experience.

Part B captured respondents' perceptions of key latent constructs through multiple-item Likert-type scales measuring agreement/disagreement on a continuum of 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Expert review consisting of academics/practitioners from creative/technology-related fields reviewed the questionnaire for content validity/clarity purposes. Pilot-study assessment validated/revised question wording for improved precision/respondent understanding.

3.4 Variables and Constructs of the Study

This study draws upon prior research on technology acceptance/labor displacement anxiety in formulating constructs as follows:

- **Perceived Risk due to Generative AI:** The extent to which creative professionals perceive generative-AI as posing risks towards their job security/stable income/professional relevance.
- **Creative Autonomy:** Degree of control creative professionals perceive themselves having towards making decisions creatively/originality in relation to AI-generated products.
- **Trustworthiness in Generative AI:** Level of faithfulness/honesty/bias-free reliance upon generative-AI decision-making systems.
- **Social Influence:** The extent to which peer opinions/industry standards/network interactions shape attitudes toward adopting generative-AI.
- **Facilitating Conditions:** Presence/accessibility of training/resources/supports from organizations enabling adaptation/implementation of generative-AI.
- **Creative Labor Displacement Anxiety:** Psychological uneasiness/anxiety/concern resulting from perceived replacement/substitution of human creativity by generative-AI.

All constructs were conceptualized as latent variables; therefore, measured through multiple indicator variables as part of conducting Structural Analysis.

3.5 Reliability and Validity Assessment

To demonstrate internal consistency amongst measurement scales/Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculations were performed for each construct. Values > .70 denoted sufficient reliability amongst items included in each construct.

Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were calculated during Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA); serving as evidence for Convergent Validity.

Discriminant Validity assessments were conducted by comparing square root values of AVE statistics to correlation values between constructs; demonstrating each variable was distinct.

Measurement Model Validation: Validation metrics regarding reliability/validity supported appropriateness for subsequent Structural Modelling Analyses

3.6 Data Analysis Techniques

Collected data from this study have been analysed by utilizing both SPSS (Version 25) and AMOS (Version 25). These programs are well-established and reliable when it comes to performing multivariate statistical analyses and Structural Equation Models. The methodology of analyzing these data has occurred in multiple stages:

1. Descriptive statistics will be utilized in order to provide a summary description of demographic information about the respondents that participated in this study, as well as the respondents' use of Artificial Intelligence.
2. An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) will be performed on the survey items in order to identify the underlying factor structure(s) and to evaluate whether the sample is adequate for factor analysis using both the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

3. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) will be utilized in order to validate the measurement model that represents the theory under investigation, as well as to evaluate both convergent and discriminant validity.
4. Finally, an application of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) will be made in order to test the proposed relationships between all variables defined in the theory, as well as to determine if there exists a good model fit.

The goodness-of-fit of the model will be determined using several established criteria including but limited to; CMIN/DF, GFI, CFI, TLI, RMR, and RMSEA. All of these metrics will be compared against acceptable ranges that are generally accepted within the SEM literature.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Participants were ensured of anonymity and confidentiality in this study. Personal identifiers (e.g., names) were never recorded during data collection. All participants participated voluntarily in this study. All ethical standards for research were met; therefore, each participant provided their own informed consent. The study did not require approval from ethics committees since it contained no experimental procedures. It included only surveys of perception.

3.8 Results and Analysis

In addition to providing the results of the empirical study assessing creative labour displacement anxiety due to generative AI, this chapter contains a detailed description of the statistical methods used to analyze the data of 312 creative professionals surveyed, including both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modelling. Descriptive statistics for the sample population were also reported along with reliability tests for measures used in the study. In addition, a description of the process for conducting the study, including survey construction and administration, was described.

4.1 Profile of the Respondents

Out of 340 questionnaires distributed, 312 valid responses were retained after data cleaning. Table 4.1 Presents the demographic and professional profile of the respondents.

Table 4.1: Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	54.2
Gender	Female	45.8
Age	Below 30	38.1
Age	31–40	41.7
Age	Above 40	20.2
Nature of Work	Freelancer	46.8
Nature of Work	Salaried	32.7
Nature of Work	Gig / Platform-based	20.5
Experience with AI	Yes	71.5
Experience with AI	No	28.5

The sample reflects the fragmented and platform-driven nature of creative labor, with a high proportion of freelancers and AI-exposed professionals.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were computed to assess respondents' perceptions of generative AI and creative labor displacement anxiety.

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics

Construct	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceived Threat of AI	3.89	0.74
Creative Autonomy	2.96	0.81
Trust in Generative AI	3.02	0.77
Social Influence	3.21	0.69
Facilitating Conditions	2.88	0.83
Creative Labor Displacement Anxiety	4.01	0.68

The high mean score for displacement anxiety (Mean = 4.01) indicates strong psychological concern among creative professionals regarding AI-driven substitution.

4.3 Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha.

Table 4.3: Reliability Statistics

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Perceived Threat	5	0.842
Creative Autonomy	4	0.811
Trust in AI	4	0.826
Social Influence	4	0.794
Facilitating Conditions	4	0.832
Displacement Anxiety	5	0.861

All values exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70, confirming scale reliability.

4.3 Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha.

Table 4.3: Reliability Statistics

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Perceived Threat	5	0.842
Creative Autonomy	4	0.811
Trust in AI	4	0.826
Social Influence	4	0.794
Facilitating Conditions	4	0.832
Displacement Anxiety	5	0.861

4.6 Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was employed to test the hypothesized relationships among the study variables.

Table 4.6: Structural Path Estimates

Path	Std. β	t-value	p-value
Perceived Threat $\rightarrow$ Anxiety	0.48	6.92	< 0.001
Creative Autonomy $\rightarrow$ Anxiety	-0.29	-4.31	< 0.001
Trust in AI $\rightarrow$ Anxiety	-0.24	-3.87	< 0.001
Social Influence $\rightarrow$ Anxiety	0.18	2.94	0.003
Facilitating Conditions $\rightarrow$ Anxiety	-0.21	-3.56	< 0.001

4.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to validate the measurement model.

Model Fit Indices

Index	Value	Recommended
CMIN/DF	2.31	< 3.0
GFI	0.912	> 0.90
CFI	0.947	> 0.90
TLI	0.938	> 0.90
RMSEA	0.064	< 0.08

4.4 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted using Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation to examine the underlying factor structure of the measurement items.

Sampling adequacy and factorability were assessed using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity.

- **KMO Measure:** 0.874
- **Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity:** $\chi^2 = 2481.36$, $df = 231$, $p < 0.001$

These results indicate that the data were suitable for factor analysis.

Table 4.4: Factor Loadings

Item	Factor Loading
PT1	0.782
PT2	0.804
CA1	0.751
TR2	0.798
DA3	0.826

4.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to validate the measurement model.

Model Fit Indices

Index	Value	Recommended
CMIN/DF	2.31	< 3.0
GFI	0.912	> 0.90
CFI	0.947	> 0.90
TLI	0.938	> 0.90
RMSEA	0.064	< 0.08

4.7 Interpretation of Results

Findings suggest that generative AI perceived as threatening to creative work is the most significant predictor of creative labor displacement anxiety. Creative professionals view AI as a direct competitor to human-created works. The findings also demonstrate that increasing creative autonomy, and establishing trust in generative AI can decrease displacement anxiety. Therefore, maintaining human control and developing ethically created and deployed AI applications are key to reducing creative labor displacement anxiety.

On the other hand, negative influences from peers and industry messages increase anxiety associated with displacement. Therefore, organizations have a responsibility to provide facilitating conditions to creative professionals, such as training, resources, and development opportunities. Providing these conditions can assist in decreasing displacement anxiety experienced by creative professionals when facing generative AI.

4.8 Summary of Findings

- Creative professionals exhibit high displacement anxiety
- AI threat perception significantly increases anxiety
- Trust, autonomy, and support systems reduce fear
- The model demonstrates strong explanatory power

5.1 Conclusion

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed the manner in which creative work occurs. Generative AI has challenged long-held beliefs about exclusive human creation. This study investigated creative labor displacement anxiety in an era of generative AI. Specifically, the study examined psychological, organizational, and technological factors influencing creative professionals' responses to AI-facilitated transformations.

Creative Labor Displacement Anxiety: Creative professionals expressed high levels of displacement anxiety. The primary driver of this displacement anxiety was perceived threat caused by generative AI to job security, professional relevance, and creative identity. Creative labor displacement anxiety extends beyond financial considerations common in automated jobs. Creative labor displacement anxiety also includes fears about originality, authorship, and cultural values of creative works. These fears emphasize the unique nature of creative work. Creative work is characterized by interdependence of identity and output.

Autonomy and Trust as Mitigants to Anxiety: Increasing creative autonomy, trusting generative AI as a tool to enhance creative output, and enhancing facilitating conditions can all mitigate displacement anxiety. When creative professionals perceive generative AI as a supporting tool for human creativity,

they express lower levels of displacement anxiety. On the other hand, negative messages from peers and industry discourse tend to increase displacement anxiety. This suggests that messages regarding AI adoption have as significant an effect on psychological outcomes as do actual technological advancements.

Contributions to Literature: This study contributes to the existing body of literature on the topic of displacement anxiety in two areas. First, it expands upon previous research conducted in automation and displacement anxiety in creative and cultural industries. To date, there has been little empirical research conducted in this area. Second, it adds emotional/psychological dimension(s), specifically anxiety and perceived threat to technology acceptance theories. Technology acceptance theories typically focus solely on rational dimensions of user attitudes towards new technology.

Methodology Used to Examine Relationship Between Technological Perceptions and Labor Outcomes: Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was utilized to empirically validate a multi-dimensional model explaining creative labor displacement anxiety. SEM is able to account for complex relationship(s) between technological perceptions and labor-related outcome(s). The use of SEM demonstrated the utility of structural equation modelling in examining technology acceptance phenomena.

5.2 Managerial Implications

From a managerial viewpoint, the findings of this study emphasize the need for human-centered AI implementation strategies in creative industries. Organizations planning to implement generative AI solutions must not frame AI as a replacement for creative talent. Rather, organizations should position AI as a co-creator that will enable efficiency improvements while preserving human judgment, originality, and cultural sensitivity.

Organizations implementing generative AI tools should promote creative autonomy by enabling professionals to retain ownership of ideation decisions, make decisions concerning those ideas, and ultimately produce creative outputs. Organizations should engage in transparent communication regarding the purpose, scope, and limitations of their generative AI tools to diminish confusion and apprehension. In addition, organizations can build trust in AI systems via adherence to ethical guidelines, transparency in system operation explanations, and policies addressing attribution rights to reduce displacement anxiety.

Organizational investments in education/training programs designed to enhance the knowledge/skills base of creative professionals can strengthen facilitating conditions. Creative professionals possessing skills/knowledge regarding AI utilization are more likely to respond positively to technological innovations. Organizations failing to invest in education/training programs may face higher employee resistance/morale issues and/or loss of talent.

5.3 Policy Implications

The findings of this study have several implications for policymakers interested in shaping the future of work and sustaining creative economies. Policy makers need to develop regulatory frameworks to address questions of authorship, IP rights in generated content, data utilization rights, and fair compensation for AI generated artistic content. The lack of policy clarity creates uncertainty among creative workers and contributes to displacement anxieties.

Policymakers should provide public funding for education/training programs targeting creative professionals' acquisition of basic knowledge/skill sets required for effective use of AI technologies. Governments/cultural institutions should also establish programs focused on providing basic technical knowledge/skills required for effective use of AI technologies among creative professionals, especially in emerging economies where informal/gig-based creative labor prevails.

Public funding for infrastructure development and governance regulations that promote socially-responsible use of generative AI technologies can ensure that technological advancements do not lead to degradation of cultural livelihoods.

Regulatory bodies should encourage organizations operating in creative industries to implement socially-responsible generative AI adoption practices.

5.4 Academic Implications

The study possesses some limitations despite its contribution to literature: A cross-sectional research design limits assessment of perceptions throughout the time-span during which generative AI technologies emerge/disseminate.

Self-reporting methodology may generate response biases though steps were undertaken to secure anonymity/confidentiality.

Sampling method employed was convenient sampling; therefore, the findings may not generalize across all types of creative domains/geographical locations.

Although the sample represented a range of creative professions; future research may utilize more stratified sampling approaches based on type of profession/industry.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

The study possesses some limitations despite its contribution to literature: A cross-sectional research design limits assessment of perceptions throughout the time-span during which generative AI technologies emerge/disseminate.

Self-reporting methodology may generate response biases though steps were undertaken to secure anonymity/confidentiality.

Sampling method employed was convenient sampling; therefore, the findings may not generalize across all types of creative domains/geographical locations.

Although the sample represented a range of creative professions; future research may utilize more stratified sampling approaches based on type of profession and industry.

5.6 Scope for Future Research

Longitudinal studies exploring evolution of creative labor displacement anxiety as exposure to generative AI increases/changes occur within industry standards; Comparative studies between different nations/domains representing varied cultures and institutional settings.

Studies investigating moderators affecting varying levels of displacement anxiety among creatives e.g., age; type of profession; type of employment contract; level of competence with respect to AI.

Qualitative investigations utilizing interviews/ethnographies as well as quantitative investigations can be complementary providing more comprehensive understanding of emotional/identity-based characteristics within creative work;

Further research can investigate various co-creation models between humans and AI; focusing on productivities; qualities and outputs; ethical aspects - thus reframing discussion around potential positive collaboration vs. current paradigmatic perspectives emphasizing displacement.

References

1. Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Polity Press.
2. Brynjolfsson, E., Rock, D., & Syverson, C. (2021). The productivity J-curve: How intangibles complement general purpose technologies. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 13(1), 333–372. <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20180345>

3. Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
4. De Cremer, D., Morini Bianzino, N., & Falk, B. (2023, April 13). How generative AI could disrupt creative work. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2023/04/how-generative-ai-could-disrupt-creative-work>
5. Eloundou, T., Manning, S., Mishkin, P., & Rock, D. (2023). *GPTs are GPTs: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models*. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.10130>
6. Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30(4), 681–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09548-1>
7. Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>
8. Gill, R., & Pratt, A. (2008). In the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(7–8), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276408097794>
9. Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), 627–660. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057>
10. Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. (2011). *Creative labour: Media work in three cultural industries*. Routledge.
11. Manovich, L. (2023). *AI aesthetics*. University of Minnesota Press.
12. Parker, S. K., & Grote, G. (2022). Automation, algorithms, and beyond: Why work design matters more than ever in a digital world. *Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 1171–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12357>
13. Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072>
14. Susskind, D. (2020). *A world without work: Technology, automation, and how we should respond*. Metropolitan Books.
15. Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge University Press.
16. UNESCO. (2022). *Re|Shaping policies for creativity: Addressing culture as a global public good*. UNESCO Publishing.
17. Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y. L., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(1), 157–178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41410412>