



## **Authenticity, Ethics, and Public Acceptance in AI-Generated Music: An Integrative Review**

**\*Ahmad Budi**

**Sulistioyuwono**

Universitas Komputer Indonesia,  
Indonesia

**Umi Narimawati**

Universitas Komputer Indonesia,  
Indonesia

**Bobi Kurniawan**

Universitas Komputer Indonesia,  
Indonesia

---

**\*Corresponding author:**

Ahmad Budi Sulistioyuwono, Universitas  
Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia.

✉ [ahmad.75425012@mahasiswa.unikom.ac.id](mailto:ahmad.75425012@mahasiswa.unikom.ac.id)

---

**Article Info:**

**Article history:**

Received: June 11, 2026

Revised: July 24, 2026

Accepted: July 26, 2026

---

**Keywords:**

AI-Generated Music; Authenticity;  
Ethics; Integrative Review; Public  
Acceptance

---

**Abstract**

**Background:** The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) in music creation has intensified debates regarding artistic authenticity, ethical risks, and the legitimacy of algorithmically generated works within the global creative ecosystem.

**Objective:** This study aims to map how current literature conceptualizes authenticity in AI-generated music, identify key ethical risks, and examine the interrelationship between authenticity perceptions, ethical legitimacy, and public acceptance.

**Methods:** An integrative literature review was conducted following Snyder guidelines, analyzing publications from 2020–2025 sourced from Scopus, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect. A total of 20 primary sources were selected based on relevance to three predetermined themes: authenticity, ethical risks, and public acceptance. Thematic analysis was applied to synthesize arguments across these themes.

**Results:** Findings reveal that authenticity concerns center on emotional depth, creative originality, and listener perception bias against AI-labeled works. The main ethical risks include copyright infringement through unauthorized dataset use, ambiguous authorship attribution, unfair compensation structures, disruption of creative labor markets, cultural bias in training datasets, and insufficient transparency in generative processes. These issues directly affect how audiences and industry stakeholders evaluate the legitimacy and acceptance of AI-generated music.

**Conclusion:** Public acceptance of AI-generated music depends on addressing authenticity challenges and ensuring ethical, accountable practices. This study contributes a conceptual synthesis linking perceived authenticity, ethical legitimacy, and public acceptance, emphasizing the need for regulatory frameworks that enable AI to complement rather than displace human creativity.

---

**To cite this article:** Sulistioyuwono, A. B., Narimawati, U., & Kurniawan, B. (2026). *Authenticity, ethics, and public acceptance in AI-generated music: An integrative review*. *INKUBIS: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 8(2), xx–xx. <https://doi.org/10.59261/inkubis.v8i2.356>

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) in music creation has sparked increasingly intense discussions among academics, the creative industry, and the tech community (Briot et al., 2019; Herremans et al., 2018; Yang, 2025; Xu, 2024). The development of generative models such as Suno, AIVA, Jukebox, and Jammable allows for a fast, inexpensive, and highly flexible music creation process, thus presenting new opportunities for artistic experimentation as well as human–machine collaboration. The scale of this transformation is substantial: the global AI music market was valued at approximately USD 2.9 billion in 2024 and is projected to reach USD 38.7 billion by 2033 (CAGR 25.8%), while approximately 60 million users employed AI software to

create music in 2024 alone (IMS Business Report, 2025). However, this ability also raises fundamental questions regarding the extent to which AI-generated music can be considered authentic work, especially when the algorithm lacks the emotional experiences or cultural context typically inherent in human works.

This debate about authenticity is getting stronger because some generative systems work primarily as style imitators that replicate patterns without creating new meanings. At the same time, ethical concerns arise involving copyright infringement, unauthorized use of licensed datasets, voice plagiarism, as well as the moral implications of simulating certain artists' styles without consent. Survey across eight countries (n=9,000) found that 97% of listeners could not distinguish AI-generated tracks from human compositions, yet over 80% stated they value human-made music more highly, and 81.5% demanded clear labeling of AI-generated content (BPI & AudienceNet, 2025).

In the midst of this rapid growth, issues of authenticity and ethics play an important role in determining the extent to which AI music can be accepted as part of the global creative ecosystem (Bagratuni et al., 2025; de Berardinis et al., 2025; Rigole et al., 2025; Yang, 2025). Recent literature shows that listeners' perceptions of authenticity often influence their acceptance of AI works, even when the technical quality of the music is on par with that of humans. These findings are in line with research on anthropomorphism in technology, which suggests that human-like expressive qualities affect user trust and acceptance levels. In addition, debates regarding ethical risks, ranging from the fairness of benefit distribution to threats to the sustainability of creative work, illustrate the need for a more adaptive and comprehensive regulatory framework.

Several key studies have addressed these issues from different angles, yet each has notable limitations. Bagratuni et al. (2025) conducted an empirical investigation of user acceptance of AI music using a technology acceptance model, but focused exclusively on listener perception without addressing ethical or regulatory dimensions. Yang (2025) explored the philosophical implications of authenticity through Baudrillard's hyperreality framework, yet did not integrate empirical evidence on public acceptance. De Berardinis et al. (2025) proposed a comprehensive trustworthy AI framework for music, emphasizing transparency and fairness, but their analysis primarily targeted system design rather than the interplay between authenticity perceptions and public acceptance. Meanwhile, Rigole et al. (2025) surveyed university students on AI music perceptions but limited their scope to identification accuracy without connecting findings to broader ethical debates. These studies, while valuable individually, have largely treated authenticity, ethics, and public acceptance as separate domains rather than as interconnected dimensions of a single phenomenon.

The existing literature reveals a significant gap: while individual studies have examined authenticity perceptions, ethical risks, and public attitudes toward AI music, there remains no integrative synthesis that explains how these three dimensions interact and mutually influence one another. Most reviews address either the technical-aesthetic aspect of AI music or the legal-ethical aspect in isolation, leaving the conceptual linkage between perceived authenticity, ethical legitimacy, and acceptance unexplored. This fragmentation limits both theoretical development and practical guidance for stakeholders navigating the AI music landscape.

The novelty of this study lies in its integrative approach that synthesizes the interrelationship among perceived authenticity, ethical risks, and public acceptance into a coherent conceptual mapping. Unlike previous studies that examine these dimensions separately, this review develops a conceptual synthesis demonstrating that perceived authenticity serves as a precondition for ethical legitimacy, which in turn mediates public acceptance of AI-generated music. This conceptual contribution provides a unified analytical lens through which the dynamics of AI music can be understood more comprehensively.

This paper seeks to: (1) examine how previous literature has conceptualized authenticity in AI music; (2) identify the ethical risks that arise from AI-based music production; and (3) analyze how these two issues shape the academic and public discourse on the acceptance of AI-generated music. Theoretically, this study contributes to the field of AI studies and creative industries by providing an integrated conceptual framework linking authenticity, ethics, and acceptance. Practically, the findings offer implications for musicians seeking to navigate AI

collaboration, AI developers designing ethical generative systems, music platform operators establishing content policies, and policymakers developing regulatory frameworks for AI-generated creative content.

## METHOD

This study used the integrative literature review method, which is a research approach that relied on the collection, reading, and critical synthesis of various written sources without collecting empirical data. This approach was chosen because the topic of authenticity and ethical risks in AI-generated music was an emerging field that required cross-disciplinary conceptual mapping. In accordance with the guidelines presented by Snyder (2019), this type of literature study focused on thematic analysis, literature selection based on relevance, and the development of theoretical synthesis to understand the direction of academic debates. Thus, this method enabled the researchers to explore various perspectives, arguments, and empirical findings presented across relevant publications.

The literature sources in this study were obtained from international journal articles, digital music industry reports, legal publications related to AI technology, and policy documents concerning generative content. The literature search was conducted through three main databases, namely Google Scholar, Scopus, and ScienceDirect, using keywords such as AI-generated music, music authenticity, AI ethics, copyright dataset, and voice cloning. The selection criteria included: (a) relevance to at least one of the three core themes (authenticity, ethical risks, or public acceptance of AI music); (b) publication in peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, or recognized industry reports; (c) availability of full-text access; and (d) substantive engagement with conceptual or empirical analysis rather than brief commentaries.

The literature selection did not follow a systematic screening process, such as PRISMA, but was based on an assessment of relevance as previously described. This approach was consistent with the characteristics of integrative reviews described by Snyder (2019), which prioritized breadth of understanding and exploration of arguments rather than systematic quantification. While PRISMA-based systematic reviews emphasize exhaustiveness and reproducibility through strict inclusion and exclusion protocols, integrative reviews are designed to synthesize diverse perspectives from heterogeneous literature sources, making PRISMA protocols neither mandatory nor entirely suitable for this methodology (Torraco, 2005). The primary publication period was set from 2020 to 2025 to represent the era of development of modern generative models such as Suno, Jammable, and Vocalist AI. However, seminal works published before 2020, specifically Briot et al. (2019) were included as foundational references that established key taxonomies and conceptual frameworks for understanding AI music generation. These earlier studies were not considered part of the primary analytical corpus but served as theoretical foundations for contextualizing more recent literature.

The literature analysis was conducted using thematic analysis techniques, which included the identification of core ideas, patterns of argumentation, and recurring themes across each source. Following an in-depth reading process, the literature was categorized into three main themes: (1) the authenticity of AI-generated music, (2) ethical and copyright risks, and (3) public acceptance and artistic legitimacy. This process followed Snyder's (2019) recommendation regarding the importance of thematic synthesis in producing coherent conceptual mappings within integrative literature studies. Each theme was subsequently compared and linked to examine how aesthetic and ethical considerations interacted in shaping public attitudes toward generative music. This analytical approach produced a comprehensive overview of the evolving intellectual dynamics within the literature and demonstrated the theoretical positioning of these issues in contemporary academic discourse.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Authenticity in AI-Generated Music

The debate over authenticity is one of the most frequent themes in research on music produced by artificial intelligence. Many studies describe authenticity as a quality that goes beyond the technical aspects of composition, since it contains emotional expressions, life

experiences, and cultural values that are usually associated with human works. A number of authors emphasize that although generative models are capable of producing neat and consistent musical structures, they do not necessarily guarantee the same expressive depth as music born of human experience. This is where many academics have their doubts: whether machines without affective experience can really deliver music that feels "sincere" to its listeners. Similar observations were also made, showing that although deep learning increases generative capacity, most models still work as patterns imitators, rather than as generators of new artistic meaning.

From the perspective of originality, literature presents a picture that is no less complex. AI's ability to learn millions of examples of music makes it superior at mimicking certain styles, but this ability also raises the question of whether the end result can truly be called "new". classify most generative music systems as style-simulation systems, i.e. algorithms that are tasked with capturing the characteristics of a style without having to create an autonomous artistic identity. This view reinforces the arguments of artists such as those who question the aesthetic legitimacy of AI music that mimics the sound of a particular artist very closely, even to the point of resembling stylistic plagiarism. In this context, authenticity is not only concerned with the purity of expression, but also with the ethics of appropriation: to what extent a simulation is considered merely inspiration, and when it turns into a takeover of artistic identity (Kinzer 2025).

The listener's perception factor further confirms that authenticity is not an objective phenomenon, but a context-influenced social construct. Research shows that listeners often give lower ratings to works they know are derived from AI, even though the musical quality is the same as human composition. In Moura (2024) Maw's experiment, simply by changing the creator's label, the listener's affective response and consumption interest decreased significantly. Findings like these open up a new discussion about transparency: while some listeners are demanding clear labeling of AI-based works, they also react negatively when they learn they weren't created by humans. This phenomenon shows the paradox of technological acceptance, where the demand for openness actually reduces the perceptual value of the work (Gutter et al., 2025).

As generative sophistication increases, a number of academics are beginning to see authenticity as an increasingly fluid concept. Borrowing Baudrillard's idea of hyperreality, Yang (2025) argues that AI music marks an era when simulations no longer simply mimic reality, but create new versions that are just as convincing. On the other hand, studies of anthropomorphism in synthetic vocal systems show that AI sounds can be perceived as "emotional" when their expressive traits sufficiently resemble human performance. Research by Agres and colleagues (2023) reinforces these findings by showing that computational models are capable of reproducing musical patterns associated with certain emotions. However, the authors also assert that this system remains unintentional; The expression that emerges is simply a statistical reproduction, not an authentic emotional impulse (Bagratuni et al., 2025).

Overall, the literature review confirms that authenticity in AI music is a construction that is being renegotiated in the digital ecosystem. Some researchers still hold the view that the absence of affective experience makes it impossible for AI to achieve true authenticity. Others see an opportunity to redefine authenticity, especially when listeners begin to judge music based on its emotional impact, rather than the identity of its creator. Amid these differences of view, the main challenge remains around how AI music can deliver convincing originality, consistent emotional depth, and a more human connection with its listeners. The latest literature agrees that these three dimensions are critical points in assessing the authenticity of AI-generated music.

## **Risks in Music with AI Development**

### ***Copyright Infringement and Plagiarism***

The issue of copyright has emerged as one of the most consistent ethical issues in the literature on AI-based music. Because generative models are trained using datasets that contain thousands of licensed works, the chance of reproduction of melodies, harmonies, or vocal styles that are very similar to the original works becomes inevitable. The case of "Heart on My Sleeve" (2023) shows how Drake and The Weeknd's voice simulation can trigger legal conflicts and expose regulatory loopholes related to the unauthorized use of datasets. The RIAA in a lawsuit against Suno in 2024 asserts that the practice of training models on commercial works without authorization has exceeded the limits of conventional fair use. Recognizing this complexity, recent

studies propose a comprehensive revision of the fair use framework to anticipate the scale of generative model training, so that the moral rights of human creators remain adequately protected (Singh, 2025; Xu, 2024; Zhou & Rahman, 2024).

### ***The Crisis of Authorship and Ownership of Works***

The question of who deserves to be called a creator in AI-driven music marks a fundamental shift in the discourse of digital creativity. When algorithms act as the main actors in the composition process, the boundaries between the role of humans as creators and machines as tools become blurred, thus breaking down traditional assumptions about authorship. The legal literature confirms that the current copyright framework does not recognize algorithms as legal subjects, resulting in a gap in attribution of ownership that could potentially create future copyright disputes. In this situation, a number of academics are calling for a new regulatory approach that is able to accommodate human-AI collaborative models in the process of creating digital works. Global reform is even proposed to reframe the concepts of originality and creativity in the context of generative music (Abbott & Shubov, 2022).

### ***Credit Loss and Unfair Compensation for Artists***

The compensation issue arises when an AI model derives economic benefits from the work on which it is trained without providing recognition or royalties to the original creator. The literature calls this phenomenon distributional injustice because AI models monetize learned works without a reciprocal contribution to the musicians whose data is used. These concerns are even more relevant as AI music begins to play an economic substitution that shifts the income of human creators. Related studies affirm the importance of designing compensation mechanisms that ensure that the contributions of human creators are not lost amid the increasingly dominant production of automated music. In addition, the latest report emphasizes that the growing AI industry has the potential to create a new economic structure that further marginalizes independent artists (Adebiyi & Squirt, 2025).

### ***Disruption to Creative Workers and Livelihood Structures***

The automation of composition through AI has fueled concerns about the future of creative work, particularly as AI-generated music can be produced quickly, inexpensively, and at scale. The literature predicts a shift in roles between human musicians and generative systems, whereby compositional tasks for advertising, games, and digital content could potentially be replaced by algorithms (de Berardinis et al., 2025). This development has socio-economic implications for the sustainability of the music profession, particularly within creative industry segments that are highly sensitive to production costs. Huang (2025) noted that the automation of creativity not only threatens artists' income but also transforms public perceptions of the value of creative work itself. Piskopani et al. (2023) further argued that the proliferation of AI-generated content could diminish the cultural value attributed to human-created artworks, potentially leading to a phenomenon of long-term creative devaluation.

### ***Dataset Bias and the Erosion of Cultural Diversity***

The inherent bias in training datasets is of particular concern because generative models are often built from Western-oriented music collections. As a result, the representation of traditional music from non-dominant regions becomes minimal, creating a tendency for aesthetic homogenization that erodes cultural diversity. Research shows that generative models tend to reproduce the musical styles that appear most frequently in the dataset, potentially systematically marginalizing minority musical styles. Bryan-Kinns and Li (2024) assert that this bias is not only technical, but also has political implications for cultural identity. Yang (2025) warns that the condition could develop into a "cultural erasure" if AI training practices are not balanced by more inclusive representation policies (Bryan-Kinns & Li, 2024).

### ***Emotional Depth and Artistic Integrity***

Beyond legal and cultural issues, a number of authors highlight aesthetic issues as part of the AI music ethics spectrum. AI has been criticized for producing music that is structurally

consistent but poor in emotional intentionality, thereby reducing the value of human creative experience. These concerns are heightened when technology can simulate the voices of certain artists, including legendary musicians or those who have died, creating potentially misleading representations. Such practices obscure the artistic integrity of the work because the music produced no longer reflects the original creator's experiences, history, or intentions. In this context, the literature states that the use of AI to simulate an artist's vocal identity can be seen as a form of exploitation that breaks the ethical boundaries of digital music production.

### **Transparency, Accountability, and Misinformation Risk**

The lack of transparency in AI's generative processes deepens ethical issues, especially since users can't trace the origins of the musical patterns that the system produces. Generative models often operate as "black boxes", making it difficult to determine whether a particular musical element is the result of new creativity or a hidden reproduction of an existing work ([de Berardinis et al., 2025](#)). This lack of accountability poses challenges in determining responsibility when there is copyright infringement or misrepresentation of vocal identity. [proposed a MusGO framework to map transparency standards on music AI models to strengthen public trust. In addition, the research confirms that AI-generated content detection is crucial to prevent misinformation, manipulation of artistic identity, and loss of trust in the digital music ecosystem Batlle-Roca et al. \(2025\); Afchar et al. \(2025\).](#)

Various risks such as those found in the results of the study show that the development of AI music cannot be separated from moral and regulatory considerations. The researchers emphasized the need for ethical guidelines and a specific legal framework for these technologies so that innovation can take place without sacrificing the fundamental values of art and the rights of industry players. The two issues being discussed, namely authenticity and ethics, occupy important positions in the academic debate about the extent to which AI music can be accepted as part of the creative ecosystem. Acceptance here includes the attitude of the public, artists, and institutions towards music created by algorithms.

Several previous studies have shown that concerns over authenticity and ethics have a direct impact on the willingness to accept AI music. As mentioned earlier in the study, listeners tend to be skeptical or less appreciative of music if they know the work is AI-made. This indicates that the issue of authenticity (whether the music is considered authentic and artistically valuable) greatly influences aesthetic judgment and intent to enjoy AI music ([Bagratuni et al., 2025](#)).

The academic debate also asks: should this assessment be changed? Some researchers argue that the negative bias towards AI music is a form of technophobia or cultural skepticism that may diminish as people become accustomed to AI's work. However, the bias is also rooted in the view that musical creativity is a typical domain of humans. Therefore, the work of AI is lifeless. From that perspective, authenticity is seen as a condition for acceptance: if AI music can convince listeners of the depth of their emotions, then public resistance tends to decline. On the other hand, if the public continues to view AI music as just a soulless imitation, widespread acceptance will be hampered.

Ethical issues also play a crucial role in the admissions debate. Academics and industry agree that without proper ethical handling, large-scale adoption of AI music could lead to rejection. For example, legal and moral controversies such as the case of AI imitating famous singers provoked a backlash from the music community, which certainly influenced the industry's willingness to accept the technology openly. Stakeholder trust needs to be built by ensuring fairness and accountability: copyright infringement, exploitation of artist data, or public fraud by AI music will damage the reputation of this technology in the eyes of the public. Therefore, many academics are pushing the principle of responsible AI in music as a prerequisite for admission. This approach refers to designing generative systems that are transparent, fair, and maintain artistic integrity, so that trust between AI, musicians, and listeners can be formed.

In academic discourse, there are two tendencies of view. The first view is relatively critical: the group emphasizes the need to maintain the value of humanistic art. They argue that AI music should not be allowed to erode the existence of human artists, both in terms of economics and creativity philosophy. Proponents of this view usually demand strict regulation and an ethical framework before AI music is widely integrated, as well as highlighting the aspect of authenticity

as irreplaceable. The second view is more progressive and constructive towards AI: instead of rejecting, they advocate a redefinition of the concept of creators and new collaborations. (Bagratuni et al., 2025)

For example, a survey by Ali Balighi (2025) concluded that in the age of AI, we could "redefine authorship as something collaborative, distributed, and evolving" rather than exclusively owned by humans. This view sees AI as an inviting partner to post-human concepts in music, where human composers switch roles to become curators or mediators between code and sound. With a note, collaborations like this must still be based on ethical design, cultural responsibility, and technological transparency. The collaborative approach is also agreed by many musicians who are beginning to explore AI as a creative tool, rather than a direct threat. The survey results show that the younger generation also tends to be open to music from human-AI collaboration, as long as it is clear that their respective roles and the emotional quality of the music are maintained.

The pros and cons of authenticity and ethics meet at one point: the importance of addressing the issues of authenticity and ethics for the future of widely accepted AI music. Even researchers who are optimistic about AI assert that without ethical oversight, these innovations could lose their social legitimacy. Similarly, those who are skeptical generally do not reject technology outright, but rather ask for assurances that human values in music are upheld when AI is involved. In other words, the acceptance of AI music in academia and the public realm depends largely on the extent to which we can answer the question: Can AI music be valued as authentic art? Can we trust and control AI so that its use remains ethical.

The results of previous studies show that authenticity and ethics are two key issues that are inseparable in AI music discourse. Authenticity concerns the artistic and emotional validity of machine-generated works, while ethics encompasses the legal, social, and moral impacts of their use. Both directly affect the acceptance of AI music by the public and the creative community. Academics agree that amid rapid innovation, parallel efforts are needed to develop a strong theoretical framework and ethical guidance. At the same time, initiatives such as the Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI in Europe have begun to be adapted specifically for the field of generative music, confirming the importance of responsible AI design from an early age. Therefore, the literature emphasizes the need for balance: AI innovation in music must be balanced with the preservation of artistic integrity and the sustainability of human roles. Acceptance of AI music will grow as authenticity concerns are answered through improving the quality of AI expression, as well as addressing ethical issues through regulation and mutual awareness. Thus, it is hoped that AI music can develop as a complement that enriches the realm of music, without sacrificing the values of creativity, authenticity, and ethics that have long been the soul of the art of music itself.

## Discussion

The results of the study show that the development of artificial intelligence-based music not only presents technical innovations in the process of creating music, but also raises in-depth debates regarding authenticity, ethics, authorship, and public acceptance. Key findings show that AI-generated music is still ambivalently positioned: on the one hand it is considered a form of creative technological advancement, but on the other hand its artistic, emotional, and moral value is questioned. This reinforces the view that AI music is not just a technological phenomenon, but also a socio-cultural phenomenon that challenges traditional boundaries between humans, machines, creativity, and artwork.

Based on the synthesis of findings across the three thematic areas, this study proposes a conceptual linkage in which perceived authenticity functions as a precondition for ethical legitimacy, which in turn mediates the public acceptance of AI-generated music. When listeners perceive AI music as lacking emotional depth or creative originality, they are more likely to question the ethical legitimacy of the technology and resist its integration into the creative ecosystem. Conversely, when AI music demonstrates convincing expressiveness and transparent ethical practices—including proper attribution, fair compensation, and cultural sensitivity—public acceptance tends to increase. This triadic relationship (authenticity → ethical legitimacy → acceptance) provides a conceptual framework for understanding the interdependencies among

the issues identified in the literature and offers a basis for future empirical testing.

One of the most prominent issues in the research results is the issue of authenticity. Music has historically been understood as a subjective expression of human beings born from the emotional experiences, cultural backgrounds, and creative intentions of its creators. Therefore, when AI is able to produce music that technically sounds neat, harmonious, and resembles a human style, the fundamental question is no longer whether AI is capable of creating music, but rather whether it can be called an authentic work. The results show that AI basically works through the recognition and reproduction of patterns from existing music datasets. Thus, AI-generated works tend to be understood as the result of a simulation of style, rather than an artistic expression born from the inner experience of the creator.

This finding is important because authenticity in music is determined not only by the quality of the sound or the structure of the composition, but also by the listener's perception of who or what created the piece. Listeners can enjoy AI music when they don't know the origins of its creator, but their judgment can change when they learn that the work was created by a machine. This phenomenon shows that the value of music is not entirely objective, but rather influenced by the narrative of creation, the identity of the creator, and the listener's belief about the authenticity of the work. In other words, AI music faces barriers to acceptance not only because of its quality, but because society still associates art with human experience.

In addition, the results of the study show that originality is a very complex issue in AI music. AI has the ability to learn millions of musical patterns and generate new compositions based on that combination of data. However, this ability also creates the risk that the resulting work is too close to the style, melody, harmony, or vocal identity of a particular artist. In this context, the line between inspiration, imitation, and plagiarism becomes increasingly blurred. AI music may look new on the surface, but it still substantially relies on the human works it trains on. Therefore, the originality of AI music needs to be understood carefully, especially when generative systems are trained using licensed works without explicit permissions.

The issue of copyright is one of the most serious consequences of this problem. The results of the study confirm that the use of licensed music datasets in AI model training opens up opportunities for copyright infringement and injustice to original creators. When AI generates works that resemble the music or voice of a particular artist, questions arise about who is responsible for the results: the AI developer, the user, the owner of the platform, or the AI system itself. The conventional legal framework is not fully ready to answer this problem, because copyright law is generally still centered on humans as the creator's subjects. Thus, the development of AI music demands regulatory reforms that are able to regulate the use of data, attribution, moral rights, and compensation mechanisms for human creators.

The discussion of authorship is also an important aspect in the results of the research. In the art tradition, a creator is understood as an individual who has intentions, experiences, and responsibilities for the work he or she creates. However, in AI music, the creation process becomes more distributed. There are roles of algorithm developers, dataset providers, users who enter prompts, as well as AI systems that generate outputs. This condition makes the concept of authorship no longer singular. AI music challenges the long-held notion that artwork always has a clear human creator. Therefore, the concept of authorship in the AI era needs to be directed towards a collaborative model, namely humans remain the main ethical and creative actors, while AI plays the role of a tool or technological partner.

The findings of the study also show that there is a risk of unfair compensation for artists and musicians. AI models can benefit economically from works used as training data, but original creators don't necessarily get recognition or royalties. This has the potential to create new inequalities in the music industry, especially for independent musicians whose work can be used in datasets without a strong bargaining position. If left unregulated, AI music can speed up the process of commercializing works without providing fair protection for human creators. Therefore, compensation mechanisms, dataset licensing, and data source transparency are becoming urgent needs in the development of responsible AI music.

From a socio-economic perspective, the results of the study show that AI has the potential to disrupt the livelihood structure of creative workers. AI music can be produced in a short time, low cost, and on a large scale, making it attractive to the advertising, gaming, digital content, and

social media industries. However, these efficiencies can suppress demand for human composers, arrangers, backing singers, or music producers, especially on commercial and repetitive creative work. This risk does not mean AI should be rejected completely, but it does point to the need for adaptation strategies so that creative workers are not left out. Musicians need to be placed not only as affected parties, but also as actors who can leverage AI to expand creativity, productivity, and new forms of collaboration.

Another aspect that is also important is the bias of the dataset and the erosion of cultural diversity. If the AI model is trained more using Western popular music or a certain dominant genre, then the resulting music is likely to replicate the same aesthetic pattern. This can narrow musical diversity and marginalize local, ethnic, or minority musical traditions. In the long run, AI can reinforce cultural homogenization if it is not designed with the principle of inclusivity in mind. Therefore, AI music development needs to pay attention to more diverse representations of datasets, including traditional music, regional music, and non-dominant forms of cultural expression. For the Indonesian context, this issue is particularly relevant because Indonesia has a great wealth of traditional music, but it is not necessarily adequately represented in global datasets.

The issue of emotional depth is also a strong point of debate. The results show that AI can reproduce musical patterns associated with certain emotions, but do not have the emotional experiences of humans. This means that AI can create music that sounds sad, happy, romantic, or dramatic, but that expression comes from statistical calculations, not from affective experiences. This raises a philosophical question: does the emotion in music have to come from the creator, or is it enough to be felt by the listener? If the primary measure is the listener's response, then AI music may be acceptable as an emotional work. However, if authenticity requires the inner experience of the creator, then AI music still has fundamental limitations.

In the context of public acceptance, the results of the study show that transparency has a paradoxical position. On the one hand, the public needs clear information that a work is created or assisted by AI. Transparency is necessary to maintain trust, avoid manipulation of the artist's identity, and prevent aesthetic fraud. However, on the other hand, when listeners learn that the music was created by AI, the perceptual value of the work can decrease. This suggests that AI labeling needs to be done carefully. Transparency is still important, but it must be accompanied by public education so that the public does not automatically underestimate AI works, especially if they are the result of human and machine collaboration.

Based on the overall results of the study, it can be understood that the acceptance of AI music is highly dependent on two main factors, namely the success of building convincing authenticity and the success of managing ethical risks. AI music will be more acceptable if it doesn't just mimic the human style, but can be a collaborative tool that expands creative possibilities. Conversely, if AI is used to mimic artists' voices without permission, exploit licensed datasets, strip creators' credit, or unfairly replace creatives, then public and industry resistance will only get stronger.

Thus, the development of AI music needs to be directed towards the principle of responsible AI. These principles include transparency of the creation process, clarity of attribution, copyright protection, fair compensation, diversity of datasets, and oversight of abuse of vocal identities. AI should not be positioned as a full replacement for human creativity, but rather as a supporting technology that can help with the exploration of ideas, sound experimentation, early production, or music personalization. This approach allows AI to contribute to the music industry without eliminating the human value that is the foundation of art.

Academically, the results of this study strengthen the argument that AI music is in the negotiation space between innovation and legitimacy. Technological innovations allow for faster and wider music creation, but its social legitimacy can only be built if issues of authenticity and ethics are taken seriously. Therefore, the future of AI music is not only determined by the sophistication of algorithms, but rather by the ability of humans to design rules, norms, and fair use practices. AI music can be part of the creative ecosystem of the future, but its acceptance depends on the extent to which the technology is able to respect human rights, identities, emotions, and contributions in the music arts.

Ultimately, this discussion shows that AI in music not only presents the question of "what can machines create", but also "what humans still want to maintain in art". Authenticity, authorship, copyright, compensation, cultural diversity, and artistic integrity are important elements that should not be ignored. If all of these aspects are managed properly, AI music has the potential to be a complement that enriches human creativity. However, if left unregulated and ethically conscious, AI music can actually threaten the basic values that have shaped the meaning of musical art.

The findings of this study carry specific implications for multiple stakeholders. For music platforms, the results underscore the necessity of implementing AI content labeling systems and developing detection tools to maintain user trust and content integrity. For AI developers, the study highlights the importance of designing generative systems with built-in transparency mechanisms, diverse training datasets, and attribution protocols. For policymakers and copyright agencies, the findings call for regulatory reforms that address the unique challenges of AI-generated creative content, including revised fair use frameworks, data licensing requirements, and compensation models for original creators. For the creative industries, the results suggest that adaptation strategies, such as positioning AI as a collaborative tool rather than a replacement, can mitigate displacement risks while expanding creative possibilities. For musicians and artists, the study affirms the importance of active engagement in shaping AI governance to protect artistic rights and ensure equitable participation in the evolving digital music ecosystem.

### CONCLUSION

This integrative literature review demonstrates that authenticity and ethics are two interconnected and mutually reinforcing issues that fundamentally shape the acceptance of AI-generated music. The synthesis reveals that perceived authenticity—encompassing emotional depth, creative originality, and listener perception—functions as a precondition for ethical legitimacy, which in turn mediates public acceptance. The literature consistently shows that AI music faces a dual barrier: the absence of affective experience undermines authenticity claims, while ethical risks including copyright infringement, ambiguous authorship, unfair compensation, cultural bias, and insufficient transparency erode public and institutional trust.

These findings confirm that the future of AI-based music depends not only on technological advancements but also on the ability to develop regulatory frameworks, ethical guidelines, and compensation mechanisms that ensure innovation proceeds in alignment with principles of justice, artistic integrity, and respect for human creativity. The conceptual contribution of this study lies in synthesizing these dimensions into an integrated framework that demonstrates the pathway from perceived authenticity through ethical legitimacy to public acceptance, offering a foundation for future research and policy development.

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, as an integrative review, the literature selection is based on thematic relevance rather than systematic screening protocols, which may introduce selection bias. Second, the analysis is limited to English-language publications, potentially excluding relevant perspectives from non-English academic traditions. Third, the rapidly evolving nature of AI technology means that some findings may require updating as new developments emerge. Future research should pursue empirical validation of the proposed conceptual linkage between perceived authenticity, ethical legitimacy, and public acceptance through quantitative survey instruments or experimental designs. Cross-cultural studies examining how different cultural contexts shape perceptions of AI music authenticity would also be valuable. Additionally, longitudinal research tracking changes in public attitudes as AI music technology matures could provide insights into the dynamics of acceptance over time. Finally, applied research on the effectiveness of specific regulatory interventions and compensation models in the AI music industry would contribute to evidence-based policy development.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express their gratitude to the reviewers and editors of INKUBIS: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis for their constructive feedback and guidance throughout the review process.

### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

All authors contributed equally to the conceptualization, literature search, analysis, and writing of this manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

### REFERENCES

- Abbott, R., & Shubov, E. (2022). The Revolution Has Arrived: AI Authorship and Copyright Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4185327>
- Adebiyi, O. I., & Adeusi, O. C. (2025). Examining legal and ethical frameworks for protecting intellectual property rights in AI-generated content across creative industries. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.3.2239>
- Afchar, D., Meseguer-Brocal, G., Akesbi, K., & Hennequin, R. (2025). A Fourier Explanation of AI-music Artifacts. *ArXiv, abs/2506.19108*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2506.19108>
- Agres, K. R., Herremans, D., Bigo, L., & Conklin, D. (2023). Harmonic structure predicts the enjoyment of uplifting trance music. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1063846. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1063846>
- Ali Balighi, S. (2025). Redefining authorship in the age of AI: A post-human perspective on music creation. *Journal of Creative Industries and Cultural Studies, 3*(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcics.2025.01.003>
- Bagratiuni, M., Müller, P., & Planing, P. (2025). Innovation in Tune: An Empirical Investigation of User Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence-Generated Music. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 18*, 100660. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2025.100660>
- Batlle-Roca, R., Ibáñez-Martínez, L., Serra, X., Gómez, E., & Rocamora, M. (2025). MusGO: A Community-Driven Framework For Assessing Openness in Music-Generative AI. *ArXiv, abs/2507.03599*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2507.03599>
- Briot, J.-P., Hadjeres, G., & Pachet, F.-D. (2019a). *Deep Learning Techniques for Music Generation -- A Survey*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.01620>
- Briot, J.-P., Hadjeres, G., & Pachet, F.-D. (2019b). *Deep Learning Techniques for Music Generation -- A Survey*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.01620>
- Bryan-Kinns, N., & Li, Z. (2024). Reducing Barriers to the Use of Marginalised Music Genres in AI. *ArXiv, abs/2407.13439*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2407.13439>
- de Berardinis, J., Porcaro, L., Meroño-Peñuela, A., Cangelosi, A., & Buckley, T. (2025). *Towards Responsible AI Music: an Investigation of Trustworthy Features for Creative Systems*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.18814>
- Gutter, K., Levy, M., & Barkan, O. (2025). The effect of AI disclosure on music perception and consumption intention. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 19*(2), 178–193. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000612>
- Herremans, D., Chuan, C. H., & Chew, E. (2018). A functional taxonomy of music generation systems. *ACM Computing Surveys, 50*(5). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3108242>
- Huang, Y. (2025). Innovations and Ethical Issues in AI Music Creation. *The Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Business*. <https://doi.org/10.71460/rvxi7945>
- Kinzer, L. C. (2025). *The Disappearance of the Popular Song: Authenticity in the age of AI Generated Music* (Vol. 2024).
- Moura, F., & Maw, C. (2024). Labeling effects on listener perception of AI-generated music: An experimental study. *Computers in Human Behavior, 152*, 108045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108045>
- Piskopani, A.-M., Chamberlain, A., & Holter, T. (2023). Responsible AI and the Arts: The Ethical and Legal Implications of AI in the Arts and Creative Industries. *Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Trustworthy Autonomous Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597512.3597528>
- Rigole, N. J., Sandoval, Z. V., Beasley, S., & Lingelbach, K. (2025). Perceptions of AI-generated and co-created music among university students and social media users. *Issues In Information Systems*. [https://doi.org/10.48009/4\\_iis\\_2025\\_110](https://doi.org/10.48009/4_iis_2025_110)
- Singh, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence and copyright: navigating limitations and unlocking challenges. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i02.39671>

- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- Xu, L. (2024). A Study on the Fair Use Principles of Artificial Intelligence Generated Music. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/34/20231932>
- Yang, S. (2025). The Illusion of “Authenticity”: Ethical Dilemmas and Aesthetic Imagination in Pop Music Creation in the Age of AI. *Journal of Contemporary Art Criticism*, 1, 28–31. <https://doi.org/10.71113/JCAC.v1i1.302>
- Zhou, T., & Rahman, M. R. A. (2024). Legal Perspective on the Risk of Copyright Infringement by AI-Generated Contents in China. *JURNAL UNDANG-UNDANG DAN MASYARAKAT*. <https://doi.org/10.17576/juum-2024-3402-10>