

Gladkova, I., Galytska, O., Kudrevych, V., & Kaniuk, K. (2026). Lawful use of copyright objects in student design projects in the context of digitalization and artificial intelligence development. *Actual Issues of Modern Science. European Scientific e-Journal*, 42, 77–87. Ostrava.

DOI: 10.47451/esej-cul-08

Article metadata are deposited, archived and/or discoverable through the journal's indexing, repository and metadata dissemination services listed on the Indexing and Abstracting page.



Iryna Gladkova, Senior Lecturer, Department of Fashion Graphic Design and Style, Faculty of Humanitarian Technologies, Cherkasy State Technological University. Cherkasy, Ukraine.

E-mail: i.gladkova@chdtu.edu.ua

ORCID 0009-0000-6684-831X

Olena Galytska, Senior Lecturer, Department of Fashion Graphic Design and Style, Faculty of Humanitarian Technologies, Cherkasy State Technological University. Cherkasy, Ukraine.

E-mail: o.galytska@chdtu.edu.ua

ORCID 0009-0009-5451-9178

Viktoriia Kudrevych, Lecturer, Department of Fashion Graphic Design and Style, Faculty of Humanitarian Technologies, Cherkasy State Technological University. Cherkasy, Ukraine.

E-mail: v.kudrevych@chdtu.edu.ua

ORCID 0009-0003-7453-868X

Kateryna Kaniuk, Lecturer, Department of Fashion Graphic Design and Style, Faculty of Humanitarian Technologies, Cherkasy State Technological University. Cherkasy, Ukraine.

E-mail: k.kaniuk@chdtu.edu.ua

ORCID 0009-0009-9053-1932

Article history:

Received: May 5, 2026

Revised: June 7, 2026

Accepted: June 15, 2026

Published: July 4, 2026

Lawful Use of Copyright Objects in Student Design Projects in the Context of Digitalization and Artificial Intelligence Development

Abstract: The article examines current issues of copyright compliance in the development and presentation of student design projects under conditions of the total digitalisation of the educational environment and the rapid expansion of artificial intelligence technologies. The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that student design projects increasingly go beyond the limits of internal academic assignments: they are published in open portfolios, submitted to professional competitions, and may become the basis for commercial start-ups. This creates legal, ethical, and reputational risks when visual content, fonts, illustrations, generative AI outputs, or other copyright-protected materials are used without proper authorisation. The article analyses the distinction between lawful conceptual inspiration and unlawful appropriation of visual content. Particular attention is paid to the challenges arising from the use of generative AI models, including Midjourney, DALL·E, and Stable Diffusion, in educational and creative practice. The study considers the legal status of AI-generated objects, licensing limitations of digital platforms, commercial risks for clients, and the need to develop legal awareness among future designers. The methodological basis of the research includes a systematic approach, logical analysis, legal and comparative analysis, and the use of the “Process book” as an evidentiary tool for documenting the stages

of project development. The article proposes practical measures for ensuring academic integrity in higher art and design education: updating syllabi, regulating the permissible use of generative AI, introducing visual anti-plagiarism tools, maintaining a “Process book”, conducting patent research, and developing students’ competence in working with open licences. It is concluded that knowledge of copyright law and responsible use of artificial intelligence must become an integral component of the professional competence of contemporary designers.

Keywords: copyright, graphic design, artificial intelligence, generative AI, neural networks, academic integrity, visual content, digitalisation, Process book, patent research, visual anti-plagiarism.

Introduction

The contemporary stage of development of the creative industries is characterised by unprecedented rates of technological transformation. The digitalisation of the educational environment and the emergence of new tools for generating visual content are fundamentally changing the methodology of training future specialists in graphic design. In this context, a student design project ceases to be exclusively an internal educational exercise. It acquires the status of a full-fledged object of intellectual property, which may be published in open portfolios, participate in international competitions, and often become the basis for commercial start-ups.

At the same time, the openness of global network resources creates among students the illusion of the “general availability” of any digital content. This leads to unconscious copyright infringements that not only reduce the quality of professional training, but also create serious reputational and legal risks for the student, the higher education institution, and future employers. The problem becomes especially acute in the context of the rapid spread of generative artificial intelligence, since students increasingly use visual materials created or modified by neural networks without understanding their legal status, licensing restrictions, or limits of lawful use.

The relevance of this study lies in the need to develop a clear methodological, legal, and ethical framework for the use of copyright objects in student design projects. In contemporary design education, the future specialist must master not only visual composition, typography, branding, illustration, and digital technologies, but also the principles of lawful work with intellectual property. Legal culture is therefore becoming an essential part of professional competence in graphic design.

The research problem is determined by the contradiction between the active use of open digital resources and generative AI tools in student design practice, on the one hand, and the insufficient methodological regulation of such use in higher education institutions, on the other. Although Ukraine has an updated Law “On Copyright and Related Rights” (*On Copyright and Related Rights, 2022*), several unresolved issues remain in the pedagogical practice of art and design departments. These include the lack of a unified methodology for assessing the student’s independent creative contribution in projects created with the involvement of generative AI; the absence of effective algorithms for identifying and preventing visual plagiarism; and the insufficient standardisation of syllabi regarding the limits of AI use by students.

The object of the study is the current issues of compliance with copyright norms in the process of developing and presenting student design projects under conditions of the total digitalisation of the educational environment and the challenges arising for higher education institutions due to the massive introduction of generative artificial intelligence models into creative practice.

The subject of the study is the legal, ethical, technological, and methodological aspects of the lawful use of copyright objects, digital visual content, fonts, generative AI outputs, and other intellectual property elements in student design projects.

The aim of this article is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the legal, ethical, and technological aspects of the lawful use of copyright objects in student design projects and to develop practical recommendations and methodological tools for ensuring academic integrity under conditions of artificial intelligence expansion.

To achieve this aim, the study addresses the following objectives:

- to analyse the main copyright risks that arise in student design projects in the context of digitalisation;
- to define the distinction between conceptual inspiration, moodboarding, lawful reference use, and direct visual plagiarism;
- to examine the legal and ethical challenges connected with the use of generative AI models in design education;
- to determine the risks associated with the commercial use of AI-generated visual content;
- to justify the need to update syllabi and introduce clear rules for the use of AI in student projects;
- to consider the “Process book” as a tool for documenting authorship and the stages of project development;
- to substantiate the importance of patent research, visual anti-plagiarism systems, and open licensing literacy in the professional training of designers.

The scientific novelty of the study consists in considering the lawful use of copyright objects in student design projects not only as a legal issue, but also as a methodological and pedagogical problem of contemporary design education. The article connects copyright compliance, academic integrity, AI regulation, project documentation, and the formation of professional legal culture within one educational framework.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in clarifying the conceptual boundaries between inspiration, reference, borrowing, plagiarism, and AI-assisted generation in design education. The practical significance lies in the proposed tools that may be used by art and design departments: updated syllabi, mandatory documentation of the design process, requirements for AI labelling, visual anti-plagiarism procedures, and basic patent research. These measures may help reduce legal and reputational risks and improve the quality of professional training for future designers.

Methods

The study is based on a qualitative, interdisciplinary methodology that combines legal analysis, pedagogical analysis, design methodology, and the study of digital creative practices. The choice of methods is determined by the complex nature of the research object, since the lawful use of copyright objects in student design projects is simultaneously a legal, ethical, educational, technological, and professional issue.

The systematic approach was used as the principal general scientific method. It made it possible to consider the object of research as a complex system of interconnected elements: copyright law, academic integrity, digital visual culture, generative artificial intelligence, design

education, project documentation, patent research, and professional responsibility. This approach is important because copyright violations in student design projects cannot be reduced to isolated cases of unlawful borrowing. They are connected with the broader structure of educational practice, the availability of digital content, the lack of legal literacy, and insufficient regulation of AI tools in curricula.

The logical method was applied to study the object of research in its internal sequence. It allowed the analysis to move from the general legal principles of copyright protection to specific problems of student design practice. The logical structure of the study includes the following stages: identification of protected copyright objects; differentiation between ideas and forms of expression; analysis of lawful and unlawful use of visual content; examination of AI-generated objects; identification of commercial and reputational risks; and development of practical methodological recommendations.

The legal analysis method was used to interpret the main provisions of Ukrainian copyright legislation and to determine their relevance for student design projects. Particular attention was paid to the principle according to which copyright protection applies to the form of expression of a work, but not to ideas, processes, methods, concepts, or stylistic directions as such (*On Copyright and Related Rights, 2022*). This method made it possible to clarify the boundary between lawful inspiration and unlawful appropriation of protected visual form.

The comparative method was applied to examine the differences between traditional copyright objects created by human authors and objects generated by artificial intelligence systems. It was also used to compare the legal status of AI-generated outputs, licensing restrictions of digital platforms, and the practical needs of design education. The comparative perspective is necessary because the legal status of AI-generated content is still developing and is not interpreted uniformly across different jurisdictions (*Shtefan, 2023; Tarasenko, 2024; Yavorska, 2017; Yushyna, 2023*).

The method of content analysis was used to examine educational and professional materials related to the use of digital content in design projects. This included the analysis of project documentation practices, syllabus requirements, licensing conditions, visual references, moodboards, and process-based evidence of authorship. This method helped identify the practical points at which copyright risks most often arise: image selection, use of fonts, use of third-party illustrations, generation of visual content by AI, and presentation of final projects.

The methodological tool of the “Process book” was considered as a specialised method for documenting the development of a design project. The “Process book” makes it possible to obtain a general understanding of the project under development and to record all stages of the design process: preliminary research, references, sketches, drafts, intermediate iterations, compositional solutions, AI prompts if used, and final layout decisions (*Endo, n.d.*). In the context of this study, the “Process book” is interpreted not only as a design education tool, but also as an evidentiary base for confirming the student’s authorship and independent creative contribution.

The method of patent research was included as a practical research procedure relevant to the training of future designers. Patent research allows students to check whether a proposed visual solution, sign, logo, industrial design, or other element of a project is novel and does not infringe existing rights. The methodological basis for this component is provided by the State Standard of Ukraine on patent research, which defines the general provisions, procedure, and reporting form for such studies (*National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, n.d.*).

The study also used a pedagogical modelling method. It made it possible to formulate recommendations for improving educational practice in design departments. These recommendations include updating syllabi, introducing mandatory rules for AI use and labelling, requiring students to document the design process, integrating visual anti-plagiarism systems, and developing students' competence in open licences and font licensing.

The limitation of the study is that it is theoretical and methodological in nature. It does not include empirical measurement of the effectiveness of the proposed tools in specific educational programmes. Further research may include the testing of updated syllabi, "Process book" requirements, AI-use declarations, and visual anti-plagiarism procedures in real design education contexts.

Literature Review

Issues of legal regulation of intellectual property in the digital age are at the centre of attention of many Ukrainian and international researchers. The fundamental principles of copyright protection in Ukraine are presented in the works of Androshchuk (2023), Kharytonova (2023), and Popova et al. (2021). Androshchuk (2023) examines the legal aspects of regulating artificial intelligence technologies, their influence on scientific and inventive activity, and the role of intellectual property protection, including patent and copyright law, in ensuring a balance between competing interests. The author also identifies a number of current legal problems connected with the development and application of AI technologies.

Kharytonova (2023) analyses the concept, essence, and role of legal prohibition in intellectual property. This approach is important for the present study because student design practice requires not only knowledge of permitted forms of use, but also clear understanding of prohibited actions, including unlawful copying, appropriation, modification of protected works without authorisation, and commercial use of materials obtained from unreliable sources. Popova et al. (2021) reveal the role and importance of developing intellectual creative activity and commercialising its results for the effective functioning and development of business entities and the state as a whole. Their work makes it possible to consider student design projects not only as academic tasks, but also as potential economic and commercial products.

The specific protection of copyright directly in graphic design and visual communications, as well as under the conditions of the information society, has been studied by Leheza (2024) and Soroka (2019). Leheza (2024) focuses on copyright protection in graphic design under conditions of digitalisation and emphasises the legal vulnerability of visual works that circulate in digital environments. Soroka (2019) analyses copyright and related rights in the information society and draws attention to the European experience of regulating digital content. These studies are relevant because contemporary student design projects often exist simultaneously as academic works, digital portfolio items, competition submissions, and potential commercial products.

International experience, case law, and the legal status of generated objects, including issues of IT law and *sui generis* rights, have been studied by Shtefan (2023), Tarasenko (2024), Yavorska (2017), and Yushyna (2023). These researchers note that modern law is still in the process of forming unified approaches to assessing the results of machine creativity. Shtefan (2023) examines the first global experiences of legal protection for objects generated by computer programmes or artificial intelligence without direct human participation. Tarasenko (2024) analyses the main trends

and changes in copyright in the digital age. Yavorska (2017) considers the broader field of IT law, while Yushyna (2023) focuses on the question of who owns copyright and property rights in the context of artificial intelligence and *sui generis* regulation. These works are especially important for understanding why AI-generated visual objects cannot be automatically treated as ordinary copyright works created by a human author.

The methodological aspect of the design process is represented by the work of Endo (*n.d.*), who examines the possibilities of improving a designer's creative abilities through the step-by-step implementation of the design process. The key stages of design creation help define the problem, divide it into manageable parts, develop practical solutions, and achieve the best possible results. In the context of the present article, this approach is connected with the concept of the "Process book", which may serve not only as a creative and methodological instrument, but also as evidence of the student's independent contribution and authorship.

The State Standard of Ukraine "Patent Research" establishes the basic provisions, procedure, and report form for conducting patent research (*National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, n.d.*). This source is significant because student design projects may include logos, visual identity systems, packaging, printed products, industrial design elements, and other objects that require preliminary verification for novelty and possible legal conflicts. Therefore, patent research should be considered part of the professional training of future designers.

The analysed literature shows that the problem of lawful use of copyright objects in student design projects is interdisciplinary. It combines copyright law, AI regulation, design methodology, digital ethics, academic integrity, visual communication, and professional responsibility. However, the reviewed sources also reveal a research gap: while legal aspects of copyright and AI-generated objects are widely discussed, there is still an insufficiently developed pedagogical methodology for applying these principles directly in higher design education. This determines the relevance of the present study, which focuses on practical instruments for preventing visual plagiarism and ensuring lawful design practice among students.

Results

Understanding the boundaries of the lawful use of another person's content begins with a basic awareness of what exactly is protected by law. In the student environment, the so-called "Pinterest syndrome" is widespread: the false idea that any image found through search engines or on aggregator platforms has no author and may be freely used in one's own layouts.

According to the Law of Ukraine "On Copyright and Related Rights", legal protection applies exclusively to the form of expression of a work (*On Copyright and Related Rights, 2022*). The law directly states that copyright does not extend to ideas, processes, methods of activity, mathematical concepts, or stylistic directions as such. For a student designer, this means the need to clearly distinguish between the concepts of "conceptual inspiration" or moodboarding and "direct borrowing" or plagiarism. For example, the use of the aesthetics of Swiss minimalism of the 1950s or the idea of dividing a poster into modular grids is lawful inspiration. By contrast, vectorising another person's illustration, using a unique authorial pattern, or redrawing a logo with minimal changes constitutes a direct infringement of the property rights of the author of the original work.

A separate and extremely complex challenge for the educational process has been the mass availability of generative artificial intelligence models, such as Midjourney, DALL·E, and Stable

Diffusion. The speed with which high-quality images can be generated creates a temptation for students to replace their own creative work with an automated result, namely prompt engineering.

From a legal point of view, the use of artificial intelligence creates a deep legal vacuum. Contemporary global legal practice tends towards the position that objects generated by artificial intelligence without substantial human creative contribution are not subject to registration as copyright objects. A representative precedent is the widely discussed case concerning the graphic novel *Zarya of the Dawn*. The United States Copyright Office cancelled the previously issued copyright registration certificate for images generated by the artist Kris Kashtanova with the help of Midjourney, arguing that prompt engineering, that is, writing textual prompts, does not constitute sufficient human creative contribution for recognition of authorship. In Ukraine, legislation introduces the concept of a special type of right, or *sui generis* right, for non-original objects generated by a computer programme; however, such a result is not recognised as a fully-fledged authorial work (*On Copyright and Related Rights, 2022; Shtefan, 2023; Yushyna, 2023*).

This creates serious commercial risks in the development of real projects, which is a common practice for diploma works. If a student generates a logo, corporate identity, or key visual for a client entirely with the help of a neural network, the client may later be unable to register this visual image as a trademark, or a sign for goods and services. Thus, ignoring the legal status of generated objects directly places the client's business at risk.

In addition, students often ignore the terms of licensing agreements, or Terms of Service, of the platforms themselves. For example, the rules for using the free versions of many generators directly prohibit the use of the resulting images for commercial purposes. The lawful way to use artificial intelligence in the educational process is to position it exclusively as an auxiliary tool: at the stage of searching for concepts, generating complex background textures, or creating draft sketches. At the same time, the generated material must undergo mandatory and substantial creative reworking. Concealing the fact that artificial intelligence has been used and presenting a "raw" generated image as one's own authorial illustration constitutes intellectual fraud.

To solve these problems, higher education institutions need to implement new approaches to project assessment. Taking the above into account, there is an urgent need at the level of design departments to update the working programmes of academic disciplines, or syllabi. These documents should clearly regulate the rules for using generative artificial intelligence: the permissible percentage of automated content, the rules for its mandatory labelling when submitting course or diploma projects, and the sanctions for concealing the fact of generation.

The most effective methodology for confirming authorship that should be introduced in departments is the mandatory maintenance of a "Process book", or development journal. This is a documented history of the creation of a design product, which includes initial hand sketches, moodboards, a description of the prompts used if artificial intelligence was applied, intermediate iterations of the project, and screenshots of the working process with open Layers panels in graphic editors. The presence of such a journal makes it impossible to pass off generated work as one's own and serves as irrefutable evidence of authorship (*Endo, n.d.*).

At the level of technical support in higher education institutions, the need to introduce visual anti-plagiarism systems is becoming increasingly relevant. These algorithms are based on computer vision methods and are capable of analysing colour histograms, compositional descriptors, digital

fingerprints of images, and identifying specific digital noise, or artefacts, characteristic of diffusion models of artificial intelligence.

An important element in developing the legal awareness of future designers is teaching them to work with open licences, including Creative Commons, and font licences, including the SIL Open Font License. The use of commercial typefaces downloaded from pirated resources forms an extremely harmful professional habit that must be eradicated at the stage of university training.

Discussion

The digitalisation of the educational environment has fundamentally changed the methodology of training future specialists in graphic design. Students now work with open visual databases, stock platforms, social networks, AI image generators, font libraries, online portfolios, and digital design tools. This creates a new educational situation in which the ability to use visual materials lawfully becomes as important as the ability to create an aesthetically convincing composition. Therefore, copyright literacy should not be treated as a secondary legal topic, but as an essential component of professional design competence.

The first major issue concerns the boundary between inspiration and infringement. In design education, students often use moodboards, references, stylistic analogues, and examples of existing visual solutions. Such practices are normal and even necessary in the early stages of design research. However, they become problematic when the student moves from conceptual inspiration to direct borrowing of protected visual form. For this reason, teachers should help students understand that copyright does not protect an abstract idea or stylistic direction, but it does protect the concrete form of expression. The use of Swiss minimalism, modular grids, or general visual principles may be lawful, while copying a specific illustration, pattern, logo, or typographic composition without permission may constitute infringement.

The so-called “Pinterest syndrome” is one of the most visible manifestations of this problem. Many students perceive images found online as anonymous, ownerless, and freely available for reuse. This misconception is intensified by the visual logic of digital platforms, where authorship, licences, and source information are often hidden or ignored. As a result, students may unintentionally reproduce protected visual content in course projects, diploma works, portfolios, or commercial proposals. The educational response to this problem should include systematic work with source attribution, licence verification, and the distinction between reference, adaptation, transformation, and plagiarism.

The second major issue is connected with generative artificial intelligence. AI systems such as Midjourney, DALL·E, and Stable Diffusion radically accelerate the production of visual content and create the illusion that a complete design solution can be obtained through prompt engineering. This situation challenges traditional concepts of authorship, originality, and creative labour. If a student presents a raw AI-generated image as their own original illustration, the problem is not only legal, but also ethical and pedagogical. Such practice undermines academic integrity because it conceals the actual mechanism of production and misrepresents the student’s creative contribution.

At the same time, the use of AI should not be prohibited entirely. Generative AI may be useful at the stage of searching for concepts, generating background textures, testing visual directions, or creating rough drafts. The key condition is transparency and substantial human creative processing. The student must be able to show how the AI-generated material was transformed, reinterpreted,

edited, combined with original sketches, and integrated into the final design. In this regard, AI should be positioned as an auxiliary tool, not as a substitute for authorship.

The third issue concerns the commercial risks of AI-generated visual content. A student design project may later become part of a real business identity, advertising campaign, packaging system, start-up presentation, or brand strategy. If the core visual element of such a project is fully generated by a neural network and lacks sufficient human creative contribution, the client may face difficulties in registering it as a trademark or protecting it as an object of intellectual property. This means that an insufficiently regulated educational practice may later create real economic risks for businesses. Design departments must therefore teach students to consider not only the visual quality of a project, but also its legal usability and commercial safety.

The fourth issue is the documentation of authorship. In the context of digitalisation and AI, the final image alone is no longer sufficient to evaluate the originality of a student's work. It is necessary to see the process: preliminary research, sketches, unsuccessful attempts, revisions, compositional searches, prompts, image edits, layer structures, and final decisions. The "Process book" is therefore one of the most effective instruments for confirming authorship and independent contribution. It changes the logic of assessment: the teacher evaluates not only the finished project, but also the student's path towards the result.

The "Process book" also has pedagogical value. It disciplines the student, develops reflective thinking, and teaches the logic of project documentation. In professional design practice, the ability to explain and justify one's decisions is as important as the ability to create a visually attractive product. Therefore, the introduction of mandatory process documentation may strengthen both academic integrity and professional readiness.

The fifth issue concerns institutional regulation. Syllabi must clearly define what forms of AI use are permitted, what must be declared, what percentage or type of automated content is acceptable, and what sanctions apply in cases of concealment or misrepresentation. Without such regulation, each teacher may interpret the use of AI differently, which creates uncertainty for students and weakens academic standards. Unified departmental rules would make assessment more transparent and reduce conflicts between students and teachers.

Visual anti-plagiarism systems may also become an important part of institutional practice. Traditional text-based plagiarism detection tools are not sufficient for design education because visual plagiarism has a different structure. It may involve copying composition, colour schemes, vector forms, illustration fragments, type arrangements, patterns, or image structure. Computer vision tools can help detect visual similarity, image reuse, digital artefacts, and possible AI-generation traces. However, such tools should support expert assessment, not replace it. The final decision must remain with the teacher or academic commission, since visual similarity may sometimes be caused by shared style, genre conventions, or legitimate reference use.

Another important component is work with open licences and font licences. Students often underestimate the legal significance of typography and downloaded assets. The use of pirated commercial fonts, unlicensed illustrations, or unclear stock images forms a harmful professional habit that may later lead to legal claims in real practice. Training students to work with Creative Commons licences, SIL Open Font License, stock licences, and platform Terms of Service should therefore become a regular part of design education.

The discussion shows that lawful use of copyright objects in student design projects requires a comprehensive educational strategy. It is not enough to warn students that plagiarism is prohibited. They must be taught how to work lawfully: how to search for licensed materials, how to document sources, how to transform references, how to declare AI use, how to maintain a “Process book”, how to conduct preliminary patent searches, and how to assess the commercial safety of a visual solution. Only such an integrated approach can form the legal culture of future designers.

The limitation of the present study is that it proposes a theoretical and methodological framework without empirical testing in a specific educational programme. Further research should evaluate the effectiveness of updated syllabi, “Process book” requirements, AI-use declarations, and visual anti-plagiarism systems in real design education. It would also be useful to compare students’ legal awareness before and after the implementation of these tools.

Thus, the development of copyright literacy in design education should be understood as part of the broader transformation of professional training under conditions of digitalisation and artificial intelligence. The future designer must be not only creative and technologically competent, but also legally responsible.

Conclusion

Under the conditions of the information society and the rapid development of artificial intelligence technologies, knowledge of copyright law is no longer an optional skill. It is becoming a critically important component of the professional competence of the contemporary designer. A competitive specialist must understand the legal nature of every element of their project and be aware of responsibility to future clients, employers, educational institutions, and the professional community.

Artificial intelligence opens enormous opportunities for expanding the creative horizon, accelerating the search for visual concepts, and experimenting with form, texture, style, and composition. However, it cannot replace the human being as the subject of copyright. AI-generated materials may be useful in the educational process only when their use is transparent, properly documented, and accompanied by substantial human creative contribution. Concealing the use of AI or presenting raw generated content as one’s own original work should be regarded as a violation of academic integrity.

The study shows that higher education institutions training designers need to update their methodological and regulatory framework. Syllabi should clearly define the permissible limits of using generative AI, the requirements for declaring automated content, and the sanctions for concealing such use. The “Process book” methodology should be introduced as an obligatory tool for documenting the stages of project development and confirming the student’s independent contribution. Patent research and visual anti-plagiarism tools should become part of the educational process, especially in projects connected with branding, logos, packaging, printed products, and commercial visual communication.

The formation of legal culture among future designers must also include systematic work with open licences, font licences, stock resources, and platform Terms of Service. Students should understand that visual quality alone is not sufficient for professional design practice. A design project must also be lawful, ethically created, properly documented, and commercially safe.

Thus, only the synergy of free creative search and a deep understanding of ethical and legal norms will allow future specialists to create high-quality, lawful, and commercially reliable visual content. The lawful use of copyright objects should therefore be regarded as an integral part of academic integrity, design methodology, and the professional identity of the contemporary graphic designer.

Funding

No external funding was received.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements:

Not applicable.

References:

- Androshchuk, H. O. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence: legal regulation, intellectual property, ethics*. Kyiv: Interservis. (In Ukr.)
- Endo, D. (n.d.). *Process book*. Daisuke Endo. <https://daisukeendo.com/process-book>
- Endo, D. (n.d.). *Process book*. <https://daisukeendo.com/process-book>
- Kharytonova, O. I. (2023). *Intellectual property law*. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter. (In Ukr.)
- Khramova-Baranova, O. L., Hladkova, I. P., Derkach, S. P., & Kudrevych, V. V. (2025). Conceptual design of printed products for representing the architectural heritage of V. Horodetskyi in the Cherkasy region. *Bulletin of Humanities*, 5. (In Ukr.). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15151747>
- Khramova-Baranova, O., Kudrevych, V., Baranov, H., & Zvonkova, H. (2023). Emergence and evolution of computer design in Ukraine and the world. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Information and Telecommunication Technologies and Radio Electronics (UkrMiCo)* (pp. 364–368). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/UkrMiCo61577.2023.10380346>
- Leheza, Yu. O. (2024). Protection of copyright in the field of graphic design in the conditions of digitalization. *Juridical Scientific Electronic Journal*, 2, 11–14. (In Ukr.)
- National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. (n.d.). *State standard of Ukraine patent research*. (In Ukr.). https://ipr.nas.gov.ua/?page_id=298
- On Copyright and Related Rights. (2022). Law of Ukraine, No. 2811-IX. (In Ukr.). <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2811-20>
- Popova, L. M., Khromov, A. V., & Shuba, I. V. (2021). *Intellectual property*. Kharkiv: Fedorko. (In Ukr.)
- Shtefan, A. S. (2023). Objects generated by a computer program (artificial intelligence) without direct human participation: The first world experience of legal protection. *Theory and Practice of Intellectual Property*, 1, 78–85. (In Ukr.)
- Soroka, N. Ye. (2019). *Copyright and related rights in the information society: European experience*. Kharkiv: Pravo. (In Ukr.)
- Tarasenko, L. (2024). Copyright in the digital age: main trends and changes. *Bulletin of the Lviv University. Series Law*, 78, 132–140. (In Ukr.)
- Yavorska, O. S. (Ed.). (2017). *IT law*. Lviv: Levada. (In Ukr.)
- Yushyna, A. (2023). *Artificial intelligence: who owns copyright and property rights*. Legal Gazette online. (In Ukr.). <https://yur-gazeta.com/publications/practice/informaciyne-pravo-telekomunikaciyi/pravo-sui-generis-yak-shtuchniy-intelekt-adaptue-pid-sebe-avtorske-pravo.html>