

Creative Labour Critical Futures: A Way to Think Through AI Challenges

In response to: the UN OCHR [Call for contributions on artificial intelligence and creativity](#).

Contributors:

Mary Elizabeth Luka, Associate Professor
Rafael Grohmann, Assistant Professor, and
Daphne Idiz, Postdoctoral Fellow

[Creative Labour and Critical Futures](#) Cluster of Scholarly Prominence
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

May 5, 2025

Main Challenges

1. What are the main challenges posed by AI to human creativity (understood as encompassing artistic creativity but also all other types of creativity)

A multi-disciplinary approach is required to address urgent needs arising from the sprawling, often exploitative digital worlds where we live and work. The environments, working conditions, and ways of working in these worlds usually intensify rather than mitigate social inequities. Examples include: how and why media artists are underpaid on digital platforms and in academia (**Luka et al 2023a**), what platform workers' experiences of dishonest and uncertain algorithmic practices means for other workers, including in Brazil as elsewhere (**Grohmann et al 2022**), ways in which Black Hip Hop musicians may be absent from mainstream music archives but fully present in community and digital contexts (**Campbell & Forman 2023**), dystopian visions of futures without humans (**Mazinani 2021**), and how systems of cultural production and distribution inevitably privilege capital over creative workers (**Luka et al 2023a**; Poell, **Nieborg & Duffy 2021**). We need a set of critical ethical approaches to digital research in the wake of challenges posed by Artificial Intelligence (AI) - the latest in a series of technological transformations to society itself, including culture sectors and creative industries, but also the ways in which creativity moves across society in a whole series of functions. In our current research, we are examining and activating how to imagine and design critical and creative futures for workers and work environments alike, while considering this latest AI context. More generally, what is required is to build and share viable creative responses, interventions, and alternatives to the current inequities of ubiquitous digital and AI impacts in society. While the research we are involved in at the Creative Labour Critical Futures Cluster of Scholarly

Prominence at University of Toronto will connect research in Canada, the United States, Brazil, Argentina, China, Malaysia, Hong Kong, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy, New Zealand, and Australia, we see the need to build a series of networks of scholars, artists, and activists thinking through the implications on multiple fronts at once.

Research on data work—or the labor performed by workers who annotate data for AI through various tasks—has made significant progress in understanding working conditions, different typologies, and the specific forms of data work in Latin America (e.g., Tubaro et al., 2025; Grohmann & Araujo, 2021; Braz, 2021; Posada, 2022; Miceli, 2023), including gender inequalities in the sector (Grohmann et al., 2022a). In terms of typologies (Muldoon et al., 2024), we know that data work in countries like Brazil is predominantly conducted through digital labor platforms, whereas business process outsourcing firms play a more central role in countries like Argentina. However, we still lack a clear view of how these data workers are integrated into global AI production networks (Ferrari, 2023), AI value chains (Anwar, 2024), or AI supply chains (Valdivia, 2024). Understanding these connections requires more than a dualist perspective connecting Latin American data workers—as downstream nodes—to the companies that request their services or manage their labor in the Global North (e.g. the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom)—as upstream nodes. Instead, a multidimensional approach is needed to fully map global AI production networks and value chains.

First, there is no singular “AI industry” (Steinhoff, 2023); instead, AI services are deployed across various sectors, including automotive and healthcare, while also reshaping media and social media industries (Poell et al., 2021). Second, these networks involve multiple intermediaries, such as subcontracted firms and workers operating between lead firms (Coe & Young, 2019), as well as skill makers (Soriano & Panaligan, 2019). Furthermore, AI infrastructures (e.g. data centers, cloud computing, and submarine cables) are controlled by specific firms that play a pivotal role in shaping data work ecosystems (Anwar, 2024; Valdivia, 2024). If mapping global production networks in traditional sectors like manufacturing was already a huge challenge, tracing AI global production networks is even more complex given the intricate relationships between commercial, industrial, and subcontracting entities in AI ecosystems.

At present, what we have are (digital and non-digital) traces that serve as critical entry points for research. Following these traces is essential for mapping and understanding the global production networks of AI. Additionally, collaborations between research networks and interdisciplinary partnerships—notably between scholars and investigative journalists—are crucial for shedding light on these complex dynamics. For example, reporting by journalist Paulo Victor Ribeiro (Intercept, 2021) revealed that ByteDance outsourced transcription work to a Pakistani company, which, in turn, subcontracted Brazilian workers to transcribe TikTok videos at a rate of \$0.70 per hour. Similarly, investigative work by Isabel Harari (Repórter Brasil, 2024) and Paulo Victor Ribeiro and Pedro Nakamura (Núcleo, 2025) uncovered how the Chinese company Kwai has been recruiting outsourced video editors in both Zambia and Brazil, including cases where children and teenagers were involved in digital labor. However, despite

these revelations, there is still very little research on the specific relationships between Brazil and China in the context of data work, particularly concerning Brazilian subcontracted workers in the global AI production networks of Chinese companies.

What is Creativity?

2. How do we understand the notion of creativity?

Creativity is often interpreted or viewed through the lens of creative labour, which may be paid or unpaid work. Creative labour may be undertaken by anyone in society - just as anyone in society wears clothes that speak to their own style, or invents a more efficient and pleasing way to assemble the objects they intend to use or sell, or researches a new vaccine in ways that require creative leaps of understanding. Creative labour is also closely associated with the terms “cultural industries” and “creative industries” as these emerged in policy discourses of the late 1990s in the Northern hemisphere, defining a range of economic activities responsible for creating and distributing cultural goods and services (Cunningham 2011; Newbigin 2019; McRobbie 2016). These related concepts promote and integrate different segments of the cultural sector writ large, embracing a wide range of workers, including creative professionals and culturally rooted businesses, generally based on the management and commercialization of intellectual property (IP). Previous literature points out that the notion of “creative industries” was coined to compel labour to become more productive through, for example, design-thinking environments, connecting to the playful or creative “spirit” of contemporary capitalism (Bulut 2018; Huws 2014; Neff, Wissinger & Zukin, 2005; Ross 2003; Turner 2009). Even today, creative labour is positioned as fun and engaging, and so, when work hours expand into the evenings and weekends, vacations, and sick days, and when equity-deserving groups are consistently excluded, even the most privileged creative workers are expected to deliver work outputs through increased productivity. Viewing creativity through the lens of privilege and power points to instantiations of contestation, identity, and representation in contemporary societies (**Cowan and Rault**, 2018; **Luka** 2022; McRobbie 2016; **Roderique** 2020). Creating conditions for change in this context means mobilizing a critical perspective that recognizes how workers in this sector have faced precarious work conditions for many decades, with unstable contracts, low wages, flexible arrangements and lack of social protections and that policies are needed to address this issue (Cohen 2012; Figaro, Nonato & **Grohmann** 2013). Perhaps most importantly, we understand creativity in this context as leading towards collective and socially just values rather than solely individual benefits (Banks 2007; Constanza-Chock 2020; Mould 2018).

AI Products Are/Not Originals

3. Can AI generated products be considered “originals”, and if so, what are the consequences? What is artistic integrity in relation to AI use?

The answer, unsurprisingly, is “it depends.” The extractive experience of how creative labour is purveyed across society, including the ways in which AI systems scrape, organize, and re-use intellectual property without permission, is neither sustainable nor fair in a world where access to a living wage and development goals involving climate change mitigation, food precarity, and affordable housing, among other issues, are priorities. Equally, centuries-long practices of borrowing, sampling, remixing, referring, repeating, and collaging cultural outputs are longstanding modes of artistic and creative approaches to generating new ways of seeing and operating within our worlds. Language itself evolves this way. One key measure for evaluating what is original and what holds artistic integrity is to examine whether the system or people involved are acknowledging and properly compensating predecessors or others for their previously existing labour. This means that most AI softwares systematically violate artistic integrity as a result of the way they have been designed to scoop up and spit out others’ works in mostly derivative or imitative forms.

Policies and Practices: Threats and Protections

4. Which measures have been taken to protect human creativity from threats posed by AI? What measure(s) would best achieve this aim?

More generally, the labour management and future-proofing systems that we have employed for centuries have proven to be only partially unsuccessful. This has clearly set the stage for the exploitative nature of the AI environment, even now in its earliest stages. In our work, we use a critical worldmaking framework (Alcoff 2020; Howard 2022; Saglier 2022) to explore the power and potential of creative labour involvement in imagining and working towards a more equitable set of critical futures where these goals might be met within the AI context. This approach is grounded in trans-feminist queer, Black, Indigenous, anti-racist and anti-colonial research, creation, and activism to foster the many creative and critical strategies that creative workers develop for survival, thriving and survivance (Sedgwick 2003; Tuck 2009; Vizenor 2008). It is an “enterprise driven by a vision of another world, another way of living” (Nakayama & Morris 2015), which “fights for a more equitable future” (Johnstone 2021), and a practice of building worlds based not only on what exists, but on what we might bring into existence. This prioritizes the role of imagination (Benjamin 2024; Siles, Gomez-Cruz & Ricaurte 2022) not as fantasy, but as a set of concrete possibilities to act and transform the world. We seek to examine “real utopias” (Wright 2010), to envision prefigurative projects (Sandoval 2016), in the sense of building today the futures we want for tomorrow and to “re-future creative economies” (Banks 2022). CLCF is geared toward action as well as research and creation, including critical pedagogies, to imagine critical futures that benefit creative workers in the burgeoning AI and always-present digital contexts.

Policies and Practices: Good AI Practices

5. Please provide examples of good practices to promote human creativity through AI.

CLCF works within a methodological framework of critical, compassionate, collaborative approaches and “critical generosity [as a] strategy for dialogue” (Dolan, 2013). We interrogate questions about how we study as much as what we study (e.g., **Grohmann 2023; Luka & Millette 2018**). As some of our cluster members put it, in the Feminist Data ManifestNo, we do not research *about* people, but *with* them, in meaningful and non- extractive relationships: “We refuse work about minoritized people. We commit to mobilizing data so that we are working with and for minoritized people in ways that are consensual, reciprocal, and that understand data as always co-constituted” (Cifor *et al* 2019). This ethical approach to creative labour in technological contexts, such as AI, deeply informs the cluster.

Policies and Practices: Implications for Education

6. Does, or should, education and artistic education include teaching of AI tools and their usage?

Yes, in short. But proceed with caution. As researchers, we are also teachers and curriculum developers at the post-secondary level. In our department alone, we train and nurture students in arts and media management, theatre, music, cultural production, studio arts, media and social media studies, journalism, and cross-disciplinary work. We also work with graduate students who are investigating how broadcast media, sound, music, museums, creative industries workplaces, and many other environments are affected by or provided opportunities through the advent of AI. Here, we consider the purpose of AI, how and when it is used, whether there is provenance that we can identify, and--very often--we simply ask “where did this come from? Who has the right to use this material”? These everyday questions lead to considerations of intellectual property but also of traditional rights and practices in both present-day creative and material production and cultural heritage.

Policies and Practices: Legal Frameworks

7. How do laws protect the rights of artists and other creators regarding content used by AI? What are the rights of authors in AI generated creation? Please provide examples.

Again, this depends on every single territory and cultural production environment under consideration. Legislation and regulation (including copyright acts, but also labour laws) shape the structures of the digital economy and how production and circulation are organized today including in light of AI advances. The key in each situation is to find the right questions to ask rather than to assume that legislation or regulation or current practices will be able to equitably

address specific uses or circumstances (e.g., see **Cowan & Rault 2024; Fairwork 2023; Luka & Millette 2018**). For example, who has the right to use and benefit from AI-generated movies, when the original artist whose work is used as the foundation is not compensated, nor have they consented to the use of this material? This is why a consideration of all levels of policy are necessary: legislative and regulatory frameworks; systems of cultural production and distribution; organizational policies and terms of work; association and union agreements, rules, and practices; and artist/creative worker ways of being and doing (e.g., see **Luka et al 2023a** [Fair Play] for an example of how this could be navigated in the independent media arts sector).

In recent years, strong critiques of platform capitalism have emerged, including by Rafael Grohmann and David Nieborg (**Grohmann & Qiu 2020; Karppi & Nieborg 2021**), each of whom demonstrates that digital platforms play a central role but do not fundamentally alter exploitative industrial production elements from the past. Such research builds on debates about digital labour, including concepts such as the “platformization of labour” (Casilli & Posada 2019). Jarrett (2022, p. 36) offers a useful definition of digital labour as “the work of users, platform-mediated workers, and formal employees that generates value within the digital media industries.” How value is shared (or not) is a key area to look at in every situation. Poell, Nieborg & Duffy (2021) have helped stimulate renewed discussions about the political economies of creative labour through examinations of digital cultural production on platforms through a theoretical lens involving both institutional (markets, infrastructure, governance) and cultural (labour, democracy, creativity) approaches. These ideas may be taken into consideration for revising a wide range of legislative and regulatory work.

Ideas about digital or data colonialism reveal how such global political economics result in data extractivism and datafication in the creative industries and performing arts, even while devaluing the contributions of creative workers, shining a light on ways in which this could be mitigated. Examples include the work of **Mark Campbell** on Afrosonics (2022), **ME Luka** on creative hubs (2022), **Hadiya Roderique** in journalism (2020), and **Daphne Idiz** on the screen industries (2024); connecting with international scholarship (e.g., Couldry & Mejias 2019; Crawford *et al* 2019; Ricourte 2019). Luka’s examinations of the inventive ways that creative workers operate within arts service organizations, cultural districts, creative hubs, and in media industries to secure professional support for their endeavours illustrate the linked networks of advocacy and shared knowledge needed for addressing AI systematically (**Luka et al 2023a; Luka et al, 2023b [2020]**). **Laura Risk** and collaborators examine how artists and musicians develop their practices in the face of obstacles such as the integration of AI and precarious working conditions, in music and community-engaged performance environments (**Risk 2021; Janes et al 2023**). **Hadiya Roderique** (2020) studies and advocates for more equitable hiring and advancement protocols and processes for BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Colour) journalists, including examining the relevant legislative frameworks in the media and culture context. Researching the impact of data-driven global streaming services in Europe and Canada, **Daphne Idiz** has highlighted how streaming services contributed to a weakening of IP rights and residual arrangements for creators (**Idiz 2024; Idiz & Poell 2024**), a challenge which is only being complicated by generative AI tools scraping copyrighted works without consent of compensation. Furthermore, in film and television, the regulatory responses to generative AI are often directly tied to streaming regulations. For instance, definitions of local content used by

media authorities to implement cultural diversity measures for streaming services (Idiz et al. 2024; Idiz 2025) are now central to discussions around defining (human versus AI) authorship, updating copyright directives, and protecting IP rights.

Here, we see that legislative regimes, platform policies, creative production and distribution processes and barriers, can be adjusted towards fairer working conditions and compensations by working with community partners and companies in the field. This is important locally (e.g., in Canada, or in Toronto) but also globally: a co-ordinated pluralistic international approach is needed to address “platform capitalisms and platform cultures” (Steinberg, Zhang & Mukherjee 2023), which means understanding the different global political economies involved in creative labour at local levels as well as internationally.

Policies and Practices: Building Towards Good Information Practices

8. What are the practices regarding information on AI generated content? What would be the best practices?

Please see #7 above for an extensive list of best practices needed to address AI generated content. To conclude our submission, we offer one noteworthy exemplar that deviates from the more common practice of data scraping used by tech giants like OpenAI and Anthropic. Moonvalley is a Toronto-based research startup which has created a video generation model called “Marey” which it claims to be “clean” AI (Schomer 2025). According to Moonvalley, Marey was trained only on “ethically sourced” (Schomer 2025) and fully licensed data and creators are compensated for its use (Talukdar & Malinowski 2025). It is too soon to say how effective this alternative model will be or whether it can compete with the tech giants, but developing specialized tools by and for creative workers will be critical to ensuring that generative AI is mobilized to take on sustainable roles and responsibilities in the creative industries.

Works Cited:

- Alcoff, Linda Martín (2020). Lugones's World-Making. *Critical Philosophy of Race* 8 (1-2):199-211.
- Banks, M. (2022) Re-futuring creative economies: beyond bad dreams and the banal imagination. In: Comunian, R., Faggian, A., Heinonen, J. and Wilson, N. (eds.) *A Modern Guide to Creative Economies*. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, pp. 216-227. ISBN 9781789905489.
- Banks, M. (2007). *The Politics of Cultural Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benjamin, R. (2024). *Imagination: a manifest*. W. W. Norton and Company.
- Bulut, E. (2018). One-Dimensional Creativity: A Marcusean Critique of Work and Play in the Video Game Industry. *TripleC*, 16(2), 757–771. <https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v16i2.930>

- Campbell, M. & Forman (2023). *Hip Hop Archives: The Politics and Poetics of Knowledge Production*. Intellect.
- Campbell, M. (2022). *Afrosonic Life*. Bloomsbury.
- Casilli, A. & Posada J. (2019). The Platformization Of Labor and Society, in M. Graham & W. H. Dutton (eds.), *Society and the Internet; How Networks of Information and Communication are Changing Our Lives*, (2nd edition), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cifor, M., Garcia, P., Cowan, T.L., Rault, J., Sutherland, T., Chan, A., Rode, J., Hoffmann, A.L., Salehi, N., Nakamura, L. (2019). *Feminist Data Manifest-No*. Retrieved from: <https://www.manifestno.com/>.
- Cohen, N. S. (2012). Cultural work as a site of struggle: freelancers and exploitation. *TripleC, Communication, Capitalism & Critique*. 10(2), 141–155. <https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v10i2.384>
- Constanza-Chock, S. (2020) *Design Justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Couldry, N. & Mejias U. A. (2019). Data colonialism: Rethinking big data's relation to the contemporary subject. *Television & New Media*, 20(4), 336-349.
- Cowan, T.L., & J. Rault (2018) Onlining queer acts: Digital research ethics and caring for risky archives. *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory*, 28:2, 121-142, DOI: 10.1080/0740770X.2018.1473985
- Cowan, T.L. & J. Rault. (2024). *Heavy Processing*. Punctum.
- Cunningham, S. (2011). Developments in measuring the “creative” workforce. *Cultural Trends*, 20(1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2011.540810>
- Dolan, Jill (2013) ‘Critical generosity’, in Jan Cohen-Cruz (ed.) *Linked Fates and Futures: Communities and Campuses as Equitable Partners?*, Volume 1, Issue 1+2 of Public: A Journal of Imagining America
- Fairwork. (2023). *Fairwork Annual Report 2023: State of the Global Platform Economy*. <https://fair.work/en/fw/publications/fairwork-annual-report-2023-state-of-the-global-platform-economy/>
- Figaro, R., Nonato, C., & Grohmann, R. (2013). *As mudanças no mundo do trabalho do jornalista*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Grohmann, R. (2025). Labor-atories of Digital Economies: Latin America as a Site of Struggles and Experimentation. *Weizenbaum Journal of the Digital Society*, 5(1).

- Grohmann, R. (2023). Not just platform, nor cooperatives: worker-owned technologies from below, *Communication, Culture and Critique*, Volume 16, Issue 4, December 2023, 274–282, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcad036>
- Grohmann, R., & Qiu J. (2020). Contextualizing platform labor. *Contracampo*, 22(1), 1–15.
- Huws, U. (2014). *Labor in the global digital economy: The Cybertariat Comes of Age*. NYU Press.
- Idiz, D. R. (2025) Legislating “Cultural Diversity” for Global Streamers: Unpacking Policy Challenges from the European Union and Canada. *CRTC-CCA Prize for Excellence in Policy Research*, Postdoctoral category: Winning paper.
- Idiz, D. R. (2024). Local Production for Global Streamers: How Netflix Shapes European Production Cultures. *International Journal of Communication* 18(2024), 2129-2148. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/21881>
- Idiz, D. R., Irion, K., Ebbers, J., & Vliegthart, R. (2024). European audiovisual media policy in the age of global video on demand services: A case study of Netflix in the Netherlands. *Journal of Digital Media & Policy* 12(3), 425-449. https://doi.org/10.1386/jdmp_00070_1
- Idiz, D. R., & Poell, T. (2024). Dependence in the online screen industry. *Media, Culture & Society*, 47(2), 375-393. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437241286725>
- Janes, H., A. Berry, E. Lyonblum, L. Risk, N. Niknafs. (2023). Imagining a Post-Pandemic Reality through an Arts-based Methodological Framework. *Culture and Local Governance*, vol. 8, no. 1. <https://doi.org/10.18192/clg-cgl.v8i1.7003>
- Jarrett, K. (2022). *Digital Labor*. New York: Polity.
- Karppi, T., & Nieborg, D. B. (2021). Facebook confessions: Corporate abdication and Silicon Valley dystopianism. *New Media & Society*, 23(9), 2634-2649. <https://doi-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.1177/1461444820933549>
- Luka, M.E., Bourcheix-Laporte, M., & Sicondolfo, C. (2023a). *Fair Play: Remuneration, Intellectual Property Management and Accessibility in the Independent Media Arts Sector Today*. Critical Digital Methods Institute. <https://criticaldigitalmethods.ca/2023/09/22/fair-play/>
- Luka, M.E., Alexander, C., Barber-Pin, R., Ilona-Harris, K., Klimek, C., Singania, S., Wallace, J., Zinger, M.. Graphic design by J.P. King. Web design and database management by Jermaine Williams. (2023b [2020]). *Creative Hubs and Networks Database and Dashboard Dictionary*. <https://criticaldigitalmethods.ca/creative-hubs-and-networks-database/>

- Luka, M.E. (2022). Creative Hubs: Sites of Community and Creative Work. In *Creative Industries in Canada*. Eds., Miranda Campbell and Cheryl Thompson, pp. 157-179. Toronto: Canadian Scholars.
- Luka, M.E. (2018). Assembling collaboration in the debris field: from psychogeography to choreographies of assembly. *Canadian Theatre Review* 176, pp. 41-47.
- Luka, M.E., & Millette, M. (2018). (Re)framing Big Data: Activating Situated Knowledges and a Feminist Ethics of Care in Social Media Research. *Social Media + Society*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118768297>
- Mazinani, S. (2020). *All That Melts: Notes from the Future-Past*. (curated by Diana Freundl), Vancouver Art Gallery: <https://www.sanazmazinani.com/all-that-melts>
- McRobbie, A. (2016). *Be Creative: Making a Living in the New Culture Industries*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Talukdar, N. & Malinowski, M. (2025). Our Vision for Generated Video. *Moonvalley*. Retrieved from: <https://www.moonvalley.com/beyondtheframe/our-vision-for-generative-video>
- Mould, O. (2018). *Against Creativity*. London: Verso.
- Nakayama, T.K., & Morris, C.E., III (2015). *Worldmaking and Everyday Interventions*. QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking 2(1), v-viii. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/575372>.
- Neff, G., Wissinger, E., & Zukin, S. (2005). Entrepreneurial Labor among Cultural Producers: 'Cool' Jobs in 'Hot' Industries. *Social Semiotics*, 15 (3), 307-34.
- Newbigin, J. (2019). The Creative Economy—Where Did It Come From and Where Is It Going? In S. Cunningham & T. Flew (Eds.), *A Research Agenda for the Creative Industries*, pp. 21–26. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Poell, T., Nieborg, D., Duffy, B.E. (2021) *Platforms and Cultural Production*. Polity.
- Ricaurte Quijano, P. (2019). Data Epistemologies, The Coloniality of Power, and Resistance. *Television & New Media*, 20(4), 350–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419831640>
- Risk, L. (2021). Imperfections and Intimacies: Trebling Effects and the Improvisational Aesthetics of Pandemic-Era Livestreaming. *Critical Studies in Improvisation / Études critiques en improvisation* vol. 14, no. 1, 2021. <https://www.criticalimprov.com/index.php/csieci/article/view/6471/6103>
- Roderique, Hadiya. (2020). *The Workplace Social Networks of Professional Parents*. Doctoral Dissertation. Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto.
- Ross, A. (2003). *No-Collar: The Humane Workplace and Its Hidden Costs*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Sandoval, M. (2016). What would Rosa do? Co-operatives and radical politics. *Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture*, 63(63).
- Saglier, V. (2022) Decolonization, Disenchantment, and Arab Feminist Genealogies of Worldmaking. *Feminist Media Histories* 1 January 2022; 8 (1): 72–101. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1525/fmh.2022.8.1.72>
- Schomer, A. (2025). 'Clean' AI Video Model to Launch in Early 2025 Targeting Hollywood Clients (EXCLUSIVE). *Variety*. Retrieved from: <https://variety.com/2024/digital/news/clean-ai-video-model-to-launch-in-early-2025-target-hollywood-clients-exclusive-1236250537/>
- Sedgwick, E. K. (2003). *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Duke University Press.
- Siles, I., Gómez-Cruz, E. & Ricaurte, P. (2022). Toward a Popular Theory of Algorithms. *Popular Communication*. Online First. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2022.2103140>
- Steinberg, M., Zhang, L., & Mukherjee, R. (2024). Platform capitalisms and platform cultures. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 0(0). <https://doi-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/10.1177/13678779231223544>
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409–427. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>
- Turner, F. (2009). Burning Man at Google: a cultural infrastructure for new media production. *New Media & Society*, 11(1–2), 73–94.
- Vizenor, G. (2008). *Survivance: Narratives of native presence*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London: Verso.