

New Horizons in English Studies 9/2024

## CULTURE & MEDIA



Helga Szabó

UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED, HUNGARY  
SZ.HELGA4@GMAIL.COM  
[HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0009-0006-1148-5287](https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1148-5287)

---

# The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Film Criticism: Balancing Advancement and Human Expertise

**Abstract.** The advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has had a significant influence on diverse domains, including the discipline of film criticism. In recent times, advanced artificial intelligence models have demonstrated the capacity to scrutinize vast quantities of film-related data, encompassing evaluations, and appraisals, as well as audience attitudes and reception. Therefore, the utilization of AI in this regard can offer more advantages to both critics and audiences through the implementation of automated analysis, summarization, and recommendation systems, which provide valuable further insights into the world of movies and thus enhance a more global comprehension of films. In addition, critics can employ AI as a valuable instrument that reduces the processing time of current film criticism. However, the emergence of AI in the realm of film criticism has also prompted apprehensions regarding the possible deprivation of human intuition and creativity, the very subjective analysis, and the emotional involvement that is integral to a traditional critic's expertise. The ongoing challenge today lies in balancing the benefits of AI-driven analysis and the irreplaceable human touch. The objective of this article is to investigate the correlation between AI and current American film criticism. Specifically, the article centers on how democratization and AI augmentation might impact the domain of conventional film criticism, leading to both a possible crisis in the field and an unprecedented advancement in the same area. It also presents and examines a new form of film analysis: automated criticism. To shed light on the topic, the present paper will engage with media and cultural studies focused, but not limited to, Lev Manovich's theories on new media and artificial intelligence, Henry Jenkins's concept of convergence culture, and Marshall McLuhan's perspective on the influence of the medium on the message.

**Key Words:** artificial intelligence, film criticism, automated criticism, online platforms, online participation

## 1. Introduction

The concept of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has long inspired fascination, given its ambition to endow machines with capabilities once considered the sole purview of human cognition. From its inception in the 1950s, AI has steadily evolved, transcending its early goals of problem-solving and language interpretation to become an integral, pervasive force in everyday life. Today, AI is nearly ubiquitous, appearing in everything from personalized online shopping recommendations to social media filters and even the generation of creative content, including music and film scripts. As such, AI is no longer merely a tool; it is a cultural phenomenon that is reshaping numerous domains, including film criticism, in profound and multifaceted ways.

Historically, film criticism has served as a bridge between audiences and filmmakers, offering both interpretation and evaluation of cinematic works. With the rise of AI, however, the role of the critic is transforming, as AI now serves not only as a medium for distributing film criticism but as a participant in generating it. This technological shift offers undeniable benefits: AI models can rapidly analyze vast collections of film-related data, synthesizing critical evaluations, audience reactions, and market trends. This capacity enables critics and audiences to gain insights that would be otherwise unattainable, enriching the interpretative process and expanding the reach of film criticism.

Yet, as with any transformative technology, the integration of AI into film criticism has ignited debate. Some fear that AI-driven assessments may lack the human intuition, subjective nuance, and emotional resonance that critics bring to their work, potentially sidelining the human voice in favor of machine-generated perspectives. Can AI capture the subtleties of cinematic themes, historical context, and cultural significance in the same way a human critic can? Or does it instead risk reducing film criticism to a series of data points, missing the essence of what makes a film resonate emotionally and intellectually?

In examining these questions, this article will explore the dual impact of AI on film criticism, with particular attention to how democratized, data-driven platforms are shaping the field. Drawing on Lev Manovich's theories of new media and artificial intelligence, Henry Jenkins' concept of convergence culture, and Marshall McLuhan's insights into the medium shapes the message, this paper will introduce and analyze a new category of film criticism: automated film criticism. By examining the synergies and tensions between traditional critical approaches and AI-driven analysis, this article aims to illuminate the complexities AI introduces to the domain of film criticism, revealing both the promises and challenges AI presents to the field's future.

## 2. Pixels to Perspectives: The AI Evolution in Film Criticism

### 2.1. The Origins and Definitions of Artificial Intelligence

As previously mentioned, AI is not a recent phenomenon; it has existed since the 1950s, albeit with advancements that differ significantly from those of contemporary phases. The term “AI” was first introduced by Marvin Lee Minsky, an American cognitive and computer scientist who defined it as the “science of making machines do things that would require intelligence if done by men” (Minsky qtd. in Britannica). This foundational definition underscores AI’s capacity to replicate human cognition, a premise central to its applications in film criticism. Additionally, Minsky’s perspective on AI prompts questions about the nature of intelligence and its boundaries. The notion here suggests that a machine’s ability to perform tasks requiring cognitive abilities, if executed by humans, could be considered an indicator of intelligence. This concept broadens the definition of intelligence beyond an anthropocentric viewpoint, recognizing the possibility of artificial systems demonstrating intelligent behavior. However, the topic of machine intelligence remains controversial, as machines are programmed and therefore limited by human-provided knowledge. Thus, the likelihood of independent thinking in machines has historically seemed improbable—until now.

In the ongoing discourse on AI’s level of intelligence, John Searle, an American philosopher, distinguished between two types of AI: “weak AI” and “strong AI” (Searle 1987). Weak AI, according to Searle, suggests that a computer’s primary advantage in studying the mind lies in its immense capability as a tool (Searle 1987, 417), whereas strong AI contends that

the computer is not merely a tool in the study of the mind; rather, the appropriately programmed computer really is a mind, in the sense that computers given the right programs can be literally said to *understand* and have other cognitive states. In strong AI, because the programmed computer has cognitive states, the programs are not mere tools that enable us to test psychological explanations; rather, the programs are themselves the explanations. (Searle 1987, 417)

Searle asserts that weak AI functions merely as a tool aiding human problem-solving and lacks autonomy in decision-making. Strong AI, by contrast, can engage in activities similar to those humans perform, possessing cognitive abilities. Put differently, weak AI might be viewed as a simulation that relies on human-provided knowledge, while strong AI can develop solutions by understanding the problem itself.

Over the years, scholars have discussed weak and strong AI, with varied responses emerging before and after the advent of Web 2.0. David Miller argued in 1990 that machines are unlikely to emulate the human mind because “[...] the processes by which the human mind functions are unknown [...]” (Miller 1990, 7), challenging the idea of weak AI. Conversely, strong AI represents “the attempt to implement intelligence with-

in a machine [...]” without attempting to replicate human reasoning (Miller 1990, 8). While skepticism about such capabilities has persisted, the evolution of AI in the 21st century challenges these early frameworks, particularly as AI systems increasingly participate in creative and analytical tasks.

## 2.2. Skepticism and Limitations of Machine Intelligence

Notwithstanding the proposition of strong AI, which posits the capacity of machines to engage in genuine thinking, both Searle and Miller decline to agree with this postulate. Furthermore, as a form of reflection on the concept of strong AI, Miller posits that “to be called intelligent, a machine would not only have to produce intelligible responses but would have to communicate those responses in such a way that the machine could be said to be intelligent” (Miller 1990, 14). Both Searle and Miller argue that it is unlikely that a machine, no matter whether it utilizes notions of weak AI or strong AI, will become intelligent. Yet, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the concept of AI has gone beyond the mere discussion of whether machines can become human-like. Although some still share Searle’s and Miller’s idea that intelligence cannot be implied into a machine, today’s AI systems are debatably beginning to threaten certain professions, including film criticism. Still, in the 2000s, when social media websites were not as popular as today, the concept of AI and the idea that a machine can become intelligent met with disagreements.

In 2006, *The Washington Times* discussed the phenomenon called “AI effect,” which means that “when we know how a machine does something ‘intelligent,’ it ceases to be regarded as intelligent” (2006). *The Washington Times* suggested that familiarity with the internal workings of artificial intelligence systems may diminish their perceived level of intelligence. This is because human intelligence is often associated with enigmatic qualities such as creativity and consciousness, whereas a machine’s functioning is explicable through algorithms. Consequently, the initial sense of awe and wonder surrounding the capabilities of AI can diminish. While said article shares some aspects of Searle’s and Miller’s assertions, given the fact that it does not call AI machines intelligent, it does not discuss the potential for any AI system to take over certain tasks done by humans, and, more importantly, the article does not emphasize the potential AI has in the online sphere.

In his book *The Language of New Media*, published in 2001, Lev Manovich already discussed the concept of AI; however, at the time, he did not anticipate the full extent of its potential. In 2018, Manovich expounds on the increasing prevalence of artificial intelligence in diverse computer-related domains in his concise publication titled “AI Aesthetics” and argues that AI is a ubiquitous tool for media consumers, spanning various domains such as photography and film, which reflects a gradual shift towards the automation of aesthetic decisions, whether partially or entirely (Manovich 2018, 5). Consequently, recommendation engines gained popularity, providing guidance to the general public on what to consume in terms of media, literature, fashion, and more.

Manovich raised concerns regarding the potential for aesthetic diversity in the future, given the increasing prevalence of AI in contemporary culture and the consequent growth of automation. However, he does not entirely discount the possibility of such diversity. Instead, he proposes several categories of diversity, positing that aesthetic diversity can be evaluated across a range of media and cultural domains, including but not limited to fashion and film (Manovich 2018, 7). In this context, Manovich elucidates the concept of the “diversity of content” (Manovich 2018, 7) and the “diversity in users’ choices” (Manovich 2018, 7) as a means of characterizing the utilization of AI-generated content in contemporary society, assertions that, in fact, also significant in the context of modern society’s utilization of diverse online platforms, given the fact that such utilizations lead further diversity in users’ choices, as they are presented with numerous opportunities to select from a wide range of film criticism pieces.

Manovich’s perspective on the variability of users’ preferences serves as a pertinent illustration of the impact of artificial search engines on film criticism. The author employs an analogy from the fashion sector to demonstrate the discrepancy between production and consumption, which can also be extended to the manner in which the audience selectively processes online film criticisms. ‘The options consumers can choose from are significantly more limited than the full range of available products.’ (Manovich 2018, 7). Therefore, when contemplating the impact of the audience on the proliferation of artificial intelligence, the diversity of perspectives is evident, with some advocating for human-generated content while others favor that which is produced by AI.

Regarding the assumption that supposes that AI is replacing cultural, professional creators, Manovich asserts that “today AI gives us the option to automate our aesthetic choices [...], but in the future, it will play a larger part in cultural production” (Manovich 2018, 8). Notwithstanding the potential that AI possesses, Manovich posits that:

currently, human experts usually make the final decisions or do actual production based on ideas and media generated by AI [...] since we can only talk about fully AI- driven culture where AI will be allowed to create the finished design and media from beginning to end. (Manovich 2018, 8)

Undoubtedly, although AI exerts a significant impact on numerous facets of human life, the ultimate decision-making power remains in human hands. The salient issue with regard to the intersection of AI and film criticism does not necessarily pertain to the ultimate arbiter of decision-making but rather to the authorship of the content that is subject to such decisions. Therefore, the growing prominence of AI generated film criticism content can pose new challenges regarding the authority of critics.

One of the most prominent reasons why AI is becoming more and more popular culturally is related to the active public engagement in content creation online. According to Henry Jenkins, this phenomenon can be attributed to convergence culture, which is a new cultural dynamic that resulted in the migration of media content to

online platforms, which also brought about a change in the public's mindset, leading them to exhibit migratory behavior in their quest for desired content (Jenkins 2006a, 2). Furthermore, convergence culture posits that media consumption and production underwent a significant change, leading to the blurring of traditional distinctions between various forms of media, including television, movies, music, and video games (Jenkins 2006a, 2). Thus, the blurring of boundaries between different forms of film criticism may suggest the emergence of new modes of evaluation, as contemporary film critics can disseminate their opinions through diverse mediums such as video essays, podcasts, numerical assessments, and social media reviews. In convergence culture, participatory culture also plays a key role, encouraging a collaborative process in which producers and consumers work together to create content that may challenge traditional media norms (Jenkins 2006b). AI can be considered an extension of this participatory culture, providing audiences with novel tools for producing and sharing film-related content at unprecedented speeds. Through AI algorithms, which rapidly analyze data and produce insights, and criticisms, technology is positioned to reshape what it means to be a participant in the media landscape. With such capabilities, AI transforms participatory culture by offering users—film critics and audiences alike—the power to generate and personalize content instantly, reflecting their preferences and needs.

The increasing prominence of the platform in the creation and dissemination of AI-generated content online brought renewed significance to the theory put forth by Marshall McLuhan, a Canadian philosopher and media theorist, regarding the influence of the medium on the message, as this theory gives an adequate frame to how AI technology shapes online content given that since it is capable to alter and reshape content, it is also capable of shaping the message it conveys. According to McLuhan, in his collaborative work with illustrator Quentin Fiore titled *The Medium is the Massage* (1967), the medium holds the power to shape the message rather than the message influencing the medium (McLuhan 1967, 1). McLuhan's assertion is that "the environment that man creates becomes his medium for defining his role in it," and this invention is either linear or sequential (McLuhan 1967, 83). In the year 1992, McLuhan collaborated with his son, Eric McLuhan, to produce a book titled *Laws of Media: The New Science*, in which the authors undertook an analysis of the societal ramifications of media by employing a tetrad framework, which encompasses four distinct categories: enhancement, reversal, retrieval, and obsolescence, all of which describe the various effects that a medium can have (McLuhan 1992, 83-88).

As McLuhan emphasized, the medium through which content is conveyed possesses the capacity to bring about transformative effects, and AI is able to modify and reconfigure online content, as AI algorithms can produce, curate, and alter information across multiple mediums, including text, photos, and videos. Therefore, the alteration of the content structure can potentially affect how the message is framed and delivered. Furthermore, according to McLuhan's theory, it can be inferred that the medium influences how the message is perceived and comprehended by the recipients. Consequent-

ly, the medium of AI technology not only influences the transmission of information but also impacts the message itself.

McLuhan's theory further emphasizes that each medium has distinct values and underlying assumptions. AI algorithms are developed by human beings and rely on data that may potentially incorporate societal biases. Incorporating biases into AI-generated material might occur unintentionally, affecting the implicit messages and values delivered. Therefore, the media used has a direct impact on the user's experience, thus shaping the perception of the message conveyed. Hence, the utilization of AI in personalization techniques enables the customization of material to suit the unique preferences and characteristics of individual users. This process has a profound impact on how users engage with the content, ultimately influencing their comprehension and interpretation of the conveyed message.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that the involvement of AI in participatory culture extends beyond film criticism exclusively. The concept encompasses a wide range of elements within the realm of media and culture, covering activities such as content creation, remixing, and collaborative endeavors. Therefore, AI has the potential to augment participatory culture through the provision of novel channels for engagement and the broadening of opportunities for individuals to actively contribute to and influence the media environment.

### **2.3. ChatGPT and the Emergence of Automated Film Criticism**

Although professionally created content cannot be compared to those made by AI yet, the launch of a website seems to alter the previous presumptions about AI's influence on the film criticism sector, among many others. The website is ChatGPT, an artificial intelligence chatbot created by OpenAI, a research laboratory focused on artificial intelligence in the United States, that provides users with support on various aspects of life. Following its launch in November 2022, ChatGPT gained widespread popularity as a chatbot capable of generating essays, letters, and critiques for its users. Although the website is currently in the development stage and has its limitations, it has sparked debates among scholars, given that the chatbot has the potential to effectively streamline the tasks of various individuals, such as journalists, tertiary-level scholars, and even those within the academic community. Conversely, individuals can utilize the aforementioned software to resolve their predicaments, resulting in a shortage of originality, an abandonment of independent thoughts, and potentially serving as an instrument of academic fraud among scholars. Regardless, ChatGPT's appeal is growing and is reaching film critics as well.

Many critics and journalists are admittedly seeking ChatGPT's help before sharing an article online. One prominent example is Patrick von Sychowski, cinema journalist and critic, who claims that currently, he is mostly fascinated by the capabilities of ChatGPT, and has already utilized them to aid (rather than replace) his writing, asserting that "chances are that you didn't even notice" (Sychowski 2023). Sychowski's con-

cluding remarks indicate his strong affinity for the notion that AI will have the capacity to significantly assist the endeavors of cinema journalists in the future:

It lacks personality, but then analysis should have little of that. Or is that what the likes of writers such as myself bring to the proverbial table? What if ChatGPT had been able to access all the latest information? Would we still feel so superior? You can feed [ChatGPT] examples of your writing and with even just a few articles it is enough to capture your tone. I have not dared to do that yet. Remember, from here on it will only get better. (Sychowski 2023)

The advent of AI technology, exemplified by platforms like ChatGPT, has led to a paradigm shift in film criticism, enabling the generation of such criticisms in an online setting. Thus, a new film criticism type emerges, that is, hence, called automated criticism, which differentiates itself from conventional forms of film criticism generated by humans. It emphasizes the ability of technology to generate content that was previously considered the domain of human expertise. Nevertheless, the integration of automated criticism does not necessitate the total eradication of human involvement, as it remains open to potential adjustments and evaluation by a non-artificial intelligence entity. Therefore, it can be posited that there exist multiple iterations of automated criticism. The World Wide Web provides a multitude of websites that employ AI to assist critics, thus employing various automated forms of criticism. For example, one can consider websites that serve as writing aids, such as PaperPal or Grammarly, which are artificial intelligence grammar checkers and paraphrasing tools that offer assistance to improve one's writing. Users simply need to input the text they wish to improve, and these websites perform the necessary tasks on their behalf.

Regarding citing sources, web-based platforms such as Zotero and Mendeley serve as exemplary resources for obtaining assistance with the citation process. Moreover, akin to ChatGPT, online writing aids like Binge, WordTune, or Bard are readily available to users. These websites are valuable resources for film critics who struggle to articulate their thoughts effectively, thereby bridging the gap between academic rigor and accessible public criticism. Therefore, said websites offer useful tools to users, making them potential platforms for developing automated criticism. However, in grammar checkers and writing assistants, ChatGPT and Binge stand out as the sole AI-based web applications available for use without any cost.

One can observe different types of automated criticism based on the various services such websites offer. Firstly, there is the type that can be generated by utilizing chatbots, such as the one provided by ChatGPT. In such instances, the AI has the capability to furnish individuals seeking film reviews with excerpts of pre-existing analyses available in the online domain. The aforementioned procedure can be characterized as a novel manifestation of Jenkins' convergence culture, whereby ChatGPT assimilates fragments from diverse film criticisms accessible on various online platforms and subsequently amalgamates and rephrases them into a unified review. In this particular

scenario, AI functions solely as a mechanism for locating film criticisms rather than as a means of generating reviews intended for consumption by the audience.

Furthermore, in such instances, it is feasible to present the identities of the main writers of the criticisms, considering that the focus lies on the procedure that compiles multiple evaluations of the identical cinematic creation. Consequently, the reader is spared the effort of scouring the Internet to locate said authors. The presence of such automated criticism poses a potential risk to the popularity – and to the authority- of various publishing platforms, as audiences may opt to utilize chatbots instead to gather reviews from websites, thereby avoiding the need to personally access these platforms. Moreover, by sourcing content from across the web, AI pulls from a diverse array of perspectives, but it risks misrepresenting the original intent of the human authors. As such, platforms like ChatGPT blur the line between curation and original analysis, possibly challenging traditional norms in criticism where individual voice and subjective interpretation have always been pivotal.

The second classification of automated criticism pertains to evaluations authored by humans but enhanced by artificial intelligence. This is demonstrated by grammar checkers and grammar improvement websites such as Grammarly, Paperpal, Binge, and ChatGPT. In such scenarios, individuals engage in authoring their written works and increasing their overall quality through utilizing the aforementioned online platforms. AI-enhanced writing tools not only assist in polishing grammar but also enable critics to rephrase sentences for clarity, adopt a specific tone, and even restructure arguments, allowing novices to achieve a more professional style. This practice has the potential to exacerbate the already ambiguous distinction between amateur and professional film criticism, particularly in relation to writing style, as these websites can refine both the linguistic expression and structural organization of any given text that is submitted to them.

The third type of automated criticism is not currently in a fully established form, as it requires artificial intelligence to generate comprehensive film criticisms solely based on the movie's title. Chatbots like ChatGPT can generate reviews using a limited set of keywords or a given title. This process involves the system gathering data from existing reviews available on the Internet, which it then collects and restructures to create a new criticism. Consequently, the generation process does not produce a completely novel review; rather, it requires some degree of prior human involvement. As AI continues to evolve, it could eventually generate new interpretations of films, drawing connections with other films, themes, or societal trends. Such developments could mark a profound shift, where AI not only replicates but contributes to the discourse, raising questions about the role of human intuition and cultural sensitivity that traditional critics have historically provided.

Currently, AI excels at analyzing data, identifying patterns, and generating insights based on predefined parameters. However, creativity, intuition, and originality—the hallmarks of compelling film criticism—are areas where human critics currently hold an advantage. AI's limitations in providing fresh perspectives highlight an important

distinction: while it can mimic analytical processes, it lacks the capacity for emotional insight, cultural sensitivity, and the distinctiveness of individual voice that film audiences value. As such, AI-based criticism may continue to struggle to replace nuanced human-driven reviews that draw on personal experiences or ethical viewpoints. Therefore, this third type can be called the future of automated criticism that might or might not occur in the near future.

It is certain that the task of composing a film review can be a challenging undertaking and may not always proceed seamlessly, as the reviewer is required to view the film prior to commencing the evaluation; at least, this has been the customary practice in the realm of film criticism for several decades. Moreover, without seeking input from a trusted individual or group, critics have limited resources to verify their evaluations before disseminating them to the public. Whereas ChatGPT employs AI to assist film critics in various aspects, thereby eliminating the pre-existing limitations of writing film reviews.

#### **2.4 Cost-Effectiveness, Quality Concerns, and the Future of Employment in Film Criticism**

In contrast to human-generated content, AI-generated content can be a more cost-effective solution for numerous newspapers, magazines, and journals, whether in digital or print format. This is primarily due to the relatively lower costs of employing AI systems for multiple projects and articles than hiring individuals. However, Amanda Hetler argues that “AI-generated content may be better suited for simpler content than articles needing expertise and authority” (Hetler 2023) since websites incorporating AI may not be able to generate content that matches the quality of expert-written material in the respective field. Nevertheless, websites that employ AI technology have the potential to enhance textual content, allowing AI-generated material to encompass more intricate forms of writing, such as academic articles. However, it should be noted that this improvement does not eliminate the need for human involvement. In addition to the existing content that is provided for enhancement, human people must review the results to prevent plagiarism or writing mistakes.

However, due to its cost-efficiency and limitless capacity for content generation, the use of AI in producing written material possesses the capacity to pose a significant threat to employment opportunities within the film industry in the next few years. According to screenwriter Marc Guggenheim, ChatGPT has the potential to become even more utilized soon:

Who’s to say that ChatGPT won’t be ready in very short order to do a pass on a script, revisions on a script? They could even say: ‘Do a set of revisions in the style of Aaron Sorkin.’ If you were to ask me what do I think we’re going to see sooner rather than later it’s that, rather crafting an entire script from a blank page. (Guggenheim qtd. in *The Guardian* 2023)

While Guggenheim's example still does not entirely cover the third type of automated criticism, it presents an illustrative instance of what can happen in the near future. Furthermore, his perspective offers a glimpse into how AI is not only a tool for replicating past works but could one day function as a collaborator that shapes new narratives. For film criticism, this prospect would fundamentally redefine the role of the critic, positioning AI as both a competitor and a partner in the creative process.

#### 4. Conclusion

The emergence of AI-generated film criticism invites a reimagining of the future landscape of film criticism. As AI's capabilities deepen, it is increasingly challenging to distinguish between human-authored and AI-generated content, and this blurred boundary opens up new theoretical territory. Could a generalized model of AI-driven film criticism, one that unites both machine efficiency and human creativity, redefine critical authority and authorship? While AI excels in producing rapid, data-driven criticism, the subjectivity, contextual sensitivity, and cultural insight unique to human critics remain unmatched. The prospect of dedicated platforms exclusively showcasing AI-generated criticism points to a future where human and machine perspectives co-exist but may also compete, reshaping critical authority and prompting us to reconsider the function and relevance of the human critic in an AI-influenced world.

This shift not only disrupts traditional criticism but signals a deeper cultural transition, one that extends beyond film to influence wider notions of creativity and authorship. As AI-generated content proliferates, we must confront regulatory and ethical questions around intellectual property, copyright, and fair use, establishing frameworks that clarify ownership, attribution, and compensation in a landscape where human and machine creativity increasingly converge.

Furthermore, the audience's trust in AI-driven criticism remains uncertain, despite the internet's tendency toward anonymity and objectivity. Audiences may continue to seek the irreplaceable human qualities of empathy, intuition, and cultural resonance that AI struggles to replicate. Thus, while AI can offer efficient and objective analysis, its contributions will likely be most powerful when balanced with human criticism, emphasizing that a collaborative model rather than a replacement paradigm may be most sustainable.

In this light, the rise of AI in film criticism might lead to a new theory of "hybrid criticism," where the strengths of both human and machine are harnessed to enhance the critical landscape, reshaping not only film criticism but also the broader cultural discourse surrounding art and media. Ultimately, the advancement of AI in this domain repositions the critic not as a sole arbiter of taste but as part of a dynamic, evolving dialogue that bridges human and machine intelligence. This evolving paradigm carries implications for the future of cultural discourse, suggesting that the synergy between human and AI-driven criticism could drive a more nuanced, multifaceted approach to understanding art in the digital age.

## References

- Britannica. "Marvin Lee Minsky." *Britannica*. Accessed October 22, 2023. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Marvin-Lee-Minsky>
- Smith, David. 2023. "Of Course It's Disturbing: Will AI Change Hollywood Forever?" *The Guardian*. Accessed October 24, 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2023/mar/23/ai-change-Hollywood-film-industry-concern>
- Hetler, Amanda. 2023. "How AI and Marketing Will Influence Our Future." *TechTarget*. Accessed October 24, 2023. <https://www.techtarget.com/whatis/feature/How-AI-and-marketing-will-influence-our-future>
- Jenkins, Henry. 2006a. "Welcome to Convergence Culture." *Henry Jenkins*. Accessed September 28, 2023. [http://henryjenkins.org/blog/2006/06/welcome\\_to\\_convergence\\_culture.html](http://henryjenkins.org/blog/2006/06/welcome_to_convergence_culture.html)
- , 2006b. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Manovich, Lev. 2001. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press Ltd.
- , 2018. *AI Aesthetics*. Strelka Press.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore. 1967. *The Medium is the Massage. An Inventory of Effects*. Berkeley: Gingko Press.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Eric McLuhan. 1992. *Laws of Media: The New Science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Miller, David. 1990. "A Philosophical Critique of Artificial Intelligence." Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects. Paper 201. [http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu\\_hon\\_theses/201](http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses/201)
- Searle, John R. 1987. "Minds, Brains, and Programs." In *Artificial Intelligence: The Case Against*, edited by Rainer Born, 18-40. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Sychowski, Patrick von. 2023. "Can ChatGPT Write an Accurate Analysis of the Cinema Market?" *Celluloid Junkie*. Accessed December 12, 2023. <https://celluloidjunkie.com/2023/06/06/can-chatgpt-write-an-accurate-analysis-of-the-cinema-market/>
- The Washington Times. 2006. "Promise of AI Not So Bright." *The Washington Times*. Accessed October 3, 2023. <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2006/apr/13/20060413-105217-7645r/>