RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

When AI writes the question

Generative AI and ethical responsibility in videogame design

Eleana Pandia, Panagiotis Livadas, Elektra Vouza

Research question

How does AI-assisted videogame design shape the choices and interpretations available to players?

Background and motivation

Generative AI supports game narrative, dialogue, and design assistance, while raising questions about originality and creative control (Alharthi, 2025; Gallotta et al., 2024). In a game about AI ethics, the formulation of a question can influence which values become visible and how participants articulate their responses.

Case and implementation

Temporal Ethics and the Shifting Self is a text-based ludic experience exploring human attitudes towards AI. Participants approach ethical dilemmas through Child, Adult, or Senior Citizen roles. The team used AI to generate one question from a pool of scientific evidence on digital ethics. Individual choices inform an ethical fingerprint and collective reflection.

Proposed methodology

Treat the question as a bounded design case. Document the evidence pool, prompt, generated wording, and human revisions. Compare the question with its source material, attending to uncertainty, omitted perspectives, and assumptions about agency or responsibility. Review alternative formulations before integrating a final version into the experience.

Proposed evaluation and data

Pilot the AI-assisted question alongside a human-authored alternative based on the same evidence. Collect choices, written explanations, and interviews about comprehension and perceived framing. Review evidence fidelity and the range of interpretations each version permits. Recruitment, sample size, and the comparison protocol remain to be specified.

Contribution and expected impact

The proposed contribution is a framework for scrutinizing how AI mediates the conversion of scientific knowledge into playable ethical situations. It extends responsible AI discussion to the authorship and framing of game questions, with human accountability and transparent documentation central to the design process (Canca et al., 2024).

Limitations and next steps

This poster reports no participant findings. One generated question cannot establish effects across games or player populations. Next steps are source verification, review of alternative wording, and a pilot with consent and de-identified records. An open question is how to preserve ethical ambiguity while supporting clear, interpretable choices.

Proposed review criteria

Criterion	Review focus
Evidence fidelity	Trace factual claims and uncertainty to the source pool.
Question framing	Inspect cultural assumptions and alternative interpretations.
Human accountability	Record revisions and responsibility for the final wording.

References

Alharthi, S. A. (2025). Generative AI in game design: Enhancing creativity or constraining innovation? *Journal of Intelligence, 13*(6), Article 60. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence13060060

Canca, C., Ihle, L. H., & Schoene, A. M. (2024). Why the gaming industry needs responsible AI. *Games: Research and Practice, 2*(2), Article 17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3675803

Gallotta, R., Todd, G., Zammit, M., Earle, S., Liapis, A., Togelius, J., & Yannakakis, G. N. (2024). Large language models and games: A survey and roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Games*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1109/TG.2024.3461510

Prepared for the 2nd ACM SIGCHI CHIGreece-Cyprus Chapters Symposium 2026