

Exploring the Artistic Value of Crypto Art: A Hegelian Perspective

Skye Justine M. Miguel^{1*} & John Xavier Chavez²

^{1,2} School of Media Studies, Mapúa University, Makati City, Philippines

Email: ¹ skyejmmiguel@gmail.com, ² jxschavez@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29 Dec 2024

Revised: 12 Feb 2025

Accepted: 27 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examined the artistic merit of Crypto Art, a new art form powered by blockchain technology. Researchers explored how Crypto Art could contribute to the longstanding search for meaning in art. Even though it is uncertain whether it can wholly achieve this idea, its innovative potential, ability to involve audiences, and expression demonstrate significant contributions to discussing art's worthiness in the age of digitalization. The analysis applied multiple perspectives to understand meaning-making in Crypto Art. One approach examined symbol meanings and technology. Another explored how the power relations of society are challenged by crypto art. Finally, researchers looked into how Crypto Art might upend established art industry dynamics and give new voices a voice. This intricate method disclosed Crypto Art's chances of democratizing art creation and overhauling established power structures. Nonetheless, the present focus on ownership and market value may hinder the more profound artistic importance. More research is necessary to scrutinize some specific crypto art projects and determine how value is defined in this new medium. The environmental impact of the technology and the evolving legal landscape surrounding Crypto Art are also important areas for investigation. Future research that goes beyond one particular philosophical perspective will investigate how Crypto Art redefines beauty in the digital age and interacts with technology to reshape artistic expression. This ongoing exploration will ultimately contribute to a richer understanding of Crypto Art's potential for artistic innovation, social critique, and the quest for meaning in a technologically driven world.

Keywords: Crypto Art, Digital Aesthetics, Artistic Value, NFTs (Nonfungible Tokens), Digital Age

INTRODUCTION

The digital age has transformed artistic expression, giving rise to Crypto Art, where digital creations are tokenized as Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs). This technology challenges traditional notions of ownership and value in art, marking a significant shift in the art world (Beck et al., 2018; Glaser, 2018). However, it also raises questions about how to evaluate the value of these digital assets within established frameworks. This research delves into the complexities of Crypto Art valuation through a Hegelian lens, aiming to understand its potential to redefine artistic value and establish its place within the evolving art landscape. Traditional metrics of artistic value have long been shaped by historical context, cultural acceptance, and established criteria within the art world. Factors such as an artist's reputation, the artwork's historical significance, its place within specific artistic movements, and its ability to evoke emotions or intellectual discourse have traditionally influenced art valuation (Guillory, 2010). Art valuation has also been tied to the concept of authenticity, where the originality and provenance of an artwork contribute significantly to its perceived value (Beck et al., 2018).

Additionally, market dynamics, including auction prices, gallery representation, and critical acclaim, play a crucial role in determining an artwork's market value and prestige within the art market (Glaser, 2018). The emergence of Crypto Art represents a paradigm shift in artistic expression and valuation. Crypto Art refers to digital creations tokenized as Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs) on blockchain networks. This technology ensures the uniqueness, authenticity, and ownership of digital assets, transforming inherently replicable digital creations into scarce and verifiable collectibles (Beck et al., 2018). Crypto Art has gained prominence due to its decentralized nature, which

challenges traditional notions of ownership and distribution in the art world. Artists tokenize their digital works as NFTs, allowing collectors to own and trade these unique digital assets securely (Enten, 2021). This new art form encompasses a wide range of digital creations, from pixelated avatars to interactive multimedia installations, expanding the boundaries of artistic expression in the digital realm (Geldmann, 2023). Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's dialectical approach provides a valuable framework for understanding how Crypto Art fits into the art world's evolving landscape.

Hegel's dialectic involves the interplay of thesis (established concepts), antithesis (opposing concepts), and synthesis (new concepts emerging from their tension) (Hegel, 1975). In the context of this study, traditional art forms represent the thesis, embodying established criteria for artistic value. On the other hand, Crypto Art serves as the antithesis, challenging these established norms with its digital essence and unique market mechanisms facilitated by blockchain technology (Hegel, 1975). The critical question posed by this dialectic is whether a new synthesis can emerge, integrating traditional valuation metrics with the distinct characteristics of Crypto Art, potentially redefining artistic value in the process. Recent studies and findings related to Crypto Art offer insights into its impact on the art world and its evolving valuation methods. Scholars have examined various aspects of Crypto Art, including its market trends, collector behaviors, artistic innovations, and implications for the broader cultural landscape. One area of current research focuses on the economic dynamics of Crypto Art, analyzing sales data, pricing strategies, and market trends within the NFT ecosystem (Enten, 2021).

Studies have also explored the role of platforms and marketplaces in facilitating Crypto Art transactions, examining issues of transparency, authenticity verification, and artist empowerment (Beck et al., 2018). Furthermore, recent research delves into the socio-cultural implications of Crypto Art, exploring how digital ownership and decentralized networks impact artistic communities, audience engagement, and notions of authorship and creativity (Geldmann, 2023). This body of research contributes to a deeper understanding of Crypto Art's significance within contemporary art practices and its potential to reshape artistic value frameworks in the digital age. Statement of the Problem The emergence of Crypto Art challenges established art valuation systems, leading to a dialectical moment where traditional metrics (thesis) encounter the digital essence and novel market mechanisms of Crypto Art (antithesis). This prompts the critical question of whether a new synthesis can emerge, one that integrates traditional valuation criteria with the unique characteristics of Crypto Art, potentially redefining artistic value (Hegel, 1975).

Objectives of the Study

This research aims to explore how Crypto Art's unique characteristics, including creation, ownership, and dissemination, differ from traditional art forms. Through a Hegelian lens, the study seeks to understand whether established metrics such as historical context and cultural acceptance can be directly applied to Crypto Art. Additionally, the research aims to identify potential adaptations or limitations to traditional valuation metrics in light of this new digital art form.

Significance of the Study

Various stakeholders stand to benefit from this research. Art students, curators, traditional and digital artists, policy makers, researchers, and museums can gain valuable insights into the complexities of Crypto Art valuation and its impact on the art world. This knowledge can inform exhibition practices, regulatory frameworks, artistic practices, and market strategies, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of artistic value in the digital age.

Scope and Delimitation

This study employs a qualitative research approach, specifically using a Hegelian lens to analyze Crypto Art's emergence and impact. Theoretical insights from Hegel's philosophy of art and dialectical approach provide a framework for interpreting findings. The study focuses on understanding how Crypto Art challenges and potentially reshapes traditional metrics of artistic value, particularly within the context of historical context and cultural acceptance.

METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Framework

Hegel's philosophy of art, emphasizing the "Ideal," freedom of expression, and artistic evolution, serves as the theoretical framework for analyzing Crypto Art's impact on artistic value (Hegel, 1835; Marcuse, 1977). Integrating recent scholarship and debates surrounding Crypto Art, this research critically examines how digital art forms can embody the "Ideal," facilitate freedom of expression, and contribute to the evolution of art, within a Hegelian dialectical perspective.

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research design to delve into the artistic merit of Crypto Art within the established art world. Qualitative research prioritizes detailed descriptions and in-depth understanding, making it suitable for exploring complex and subjective issues such as artistic value (Bryman, 2016). The ontological philosophical approach underpinning this research aligns with the study's aim of understanding the essence of art within the context of Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs). The data analysis process integrates Hegelian theory to understand how Crypto Art embodies artistic value. The analysis follows a three-step qualitative approach informed by Hegel's dialectical framework:

Step 1: Suspending Evaluative Judgment

This initial step involves analyzing NFT documents, artworks, and related materials with a neutral perspective. The goal is to minimize biases and preconceived notions, allowing for an objective evaluation of key perceptual and conceptual components within Crypto Art.

Step 2: Dividing the NFT into its Main Parts

Following the neutral analysis, the study delves into identifying and dissecting the distinct components of NFTs, including tangible artwork (if present) and intangible digital elements. This step explores the relationships between these components and their contribution to the overall artistic value of the NFT.

Step 3: Describing the Relations Between Parts and the Whole

The final step focuses on analyzing the interconnectedness of individual components within NFTs and their collective impact on the overall artistic experience. This analysis considers how the NFT, as a whole, embodies artistic merit within the ontological framework and the Hegelian perspective on art. Hegel's theory guides the data analysis process, emphasizing art's aspiration to embody the "Ideal" through its forms and expressions. The analysis explores whether Crypto Art, despite its digital nature, can achieve a new form of the "Ideal" and contribute to the ongoing discourse on art creation and experience in the digital age.

RESULTS, ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION:

Artistic Merit of Crypto Art: The study found that Crypto Art possesses unique characteristics that contribute to its artistic merit (Wüst, 2023). These include the innovative use of digital tools, audience participation, and the potential for immersive experiences (Thiebaut, 2022). Crypto Art challenges traditional notions of art by transcending physical limitations and offering new forms of artistic expression. The digital nature of Crypto Art introduces a paradigm shift in how art is created, experienced, and valued, reflecting the evolving landscape of artistic production in the digital age (Kwon, 2019).

Value Metrics in Crypto Art: The research identified that traditional metrics of artistic value, such as technical skill and historical significance, continue to influence perceptions of Crypto Art (Beck & Salle, 2023). However, the digital nature of NFTs introduces additional value metrics, such as blockchain-verified authenticity and programmability, that reshape how art is valued within the digital realm (Kwon, 2019). This blending of traditional and digital value metrics presents a nuanced understanding of artistic value in Crypto Art, highlighting the complexities inherent in valuing artworks in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.

Audience Engagement and Interaction: A key finding was the importance of audience engagement and interaction in Crypto Art (Thiebaut, 2022). Interactive elements and community participation play a significant role in shaping the artistic experience and contributing to the overall value of NFT-based artworks. The study's findings suggest that

Crypto Art's value extends beyond the artwork itself to include the immersive and participatory nature of the digital art ecosystem, emphasizing the role of the audience in co-creating artistic meaning and value.

Ownership and Market Dynamics: The study revealed complexities related to ownership and market dynamics in Crypto Art (Beck & Salle, 2023). While blockchain technology ensures provenance and authenticity, it also raises questions about exclusivity and the role of financial speculation in determining artistic value. The findings underscore the need for a balanced approach to ownership and market dynamics in Crypto Art, considering both the technological affordances and the cultural implications of digital ownership models.

These findings underscore the dynamic nature of artistic value in the digital age (Kwon, 2019). Crypto Art challenges traditional value metrics while introducing new dimensions to art valuation. The study's results suggest a paradigm shift in how art is perceived and valued (Thiebaut, 2022), highlighting the need for a comprehensive framework that incorporates both traditional and digital art forms. The interpretation of these findings emphasizes the importance of considering the interplay between technology, audience engagement, and cultural context in assessing the artistic merit and value of Crypto Art. **Technical Skill vs. Innovation:** While traditional art emphasizes technical skill and mastery, Crypto Art values innovation and experimentation with digital tools (Wüst, 2023).

This shift in emphasis reflects the changing landscape of artistic creation, where digital technologies enable new forms of artistic expression and creativity. **Historical Significance vs. Contemporary Relevance:** Traditional artworks often gain value through historical context, while Crypto Art's value is influenced by its contemporary relevance and engagement with current technological trends (Beck & Salle, 2023).

This distinction highlights the dynamic nature of value creation in the digital art ecosystem, where artworks are valued not only for their historical significance but also for their relevance to contemporary culture and technology. **Tangible vs. Intangible Value:** Traditional art is tangible, while Crypto Art's value is derived from its intangible digital components, such as code and blockchain technology (Kwon, 2019). This difference in value perception reflects the shifting boundaries between physical and digital forms of artistic expression, challenging traditional notions of materiality and authenticity in art valuation. **Democratization of Art:** Crypto Art has the potential to democratize art by allowing broader participation and accessibility (Thiebaut, 2022). The decentralized nature of blockchain technology enables artists from diverse backgrounds to showcase their work and engage with global audiences, challenging traditional gatekeeping practices in the art world. **Redefining Ownership:**

The ownership model in Crypto Art challenges traditional notions of ownership and provenance, raising questions about exclusivity and market dynamics (Beck & Salle, 2023). Blockchain technology ensures transparent ownership records and authenticity verification, empowering artists and collectors while reshaping the dynamics of the art market. **Technological Influence:** The integration of technology in art creation and appreciation signals a shift in how art is produced, consumed, and valued (Wüst, 2023). Crypto Art's reliance on digital tools and platforms opens new possibilities for artistic experimentation and collaboration, expanding the boundaries of traditional art forms and practices.

While the study provides valuable insights into the evolving landscape of art valuation, it also faces limitations. The rapidly changing nature of technology and the art market requires ongoing research to capture emerging trends and developments (Kwon, 2019). Future studies could delve deeper into specific aspects of Crypto Art, such as the environmental impact of blockchain technology or the social implications of digital ownership models. Additionally, the study's focus on qualitative research may limit the generalizability of its findings, warranting further exploration through quantitative methods and longitudinal studies.

The Hegelian framework offers a lens through which to view the ongoing dialogue between traditional and digital art forms (Thiebaut, 2022). A synthesis of art valuation that integrates the strengths of both realms could lead to a more comprehensive understanding of artistic value (Beck & Salle, 2023). However, achieving this synthesis requires addressing the challenges posed by technological advancements and shifting market dynamics (Wüst, 2023). The synthesis of art valuation in the digital age presents an opportunity to bridge traditional and digital art practices, fostering innovation, inclusivity, and cultural exchange within the global art community.

CONCLUSION

This analysis of Crypto Art employed a multifaceted approach, informed by various schools of thought throughout art history and grounded in a Hegelian philosophical framework within qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The Hegelian lens, with its emphasis on the "Ideal" - a perfect harmony between the human spirit and the divine, revealed through a dynamic process evident in art history (Hegel, 1835) - provided a unique starting point for evaluating Crypto Art's potential contribution to the ongoing search for artistic truth.

While questions remain about Crypto Art's ability to fully embody the Hegelian "Ideal," particularly given the current emphasis on ownership and market value, the analysis reveals its undeniable potential to shape artistic value in the digital age significantly. Crypto Art's innovative use of blockchain technology fosters community engagement, challenges traditional art world structures, and offers a platform for new forms of expression that resonate with the evolving definition of art (Dewey, 1934).

This analysis supports the exploration of Crypto Art for several reasons. Firstly, by examining Crypto Art through various theoretical lenses, such as semiotics, Marxist art theory, feminist art theory, and postcolonial art theory (Danesi, 2009; Eagleton, 1990; Lippard, 1973; Shohat & Stam, 1994), we can gain a richer understanding of the meaning-making potential embedded within the technology and the artistic choices of creators.

Secondly, a deeper understanding of Crypto Art's impact on social and economic structures within the art world (Bourdieu, 1984) can inform future discussions about ownership, value creation, and accessibility. Finally, delving into specific Crypto Art projects will allow for a nuanced evaluation of their artistic merit, moving beyond the current market-driven hype and fostering a more informed conversation about the artistic possibilities within this new medium.

In conclusion, Crypto Art presents a unique opportunity to expand our understanding of artistic value in the digital age. Its potential for innovation, social interaction, and expression, coupled with the challenges it poses to traditional art world structures, demands further exploration. By employing multifaceted research approaches and delving into specific projects, we can unlock the full potential of Crypto Art and its contribution to the ongoing search for artistic truth in the 21st century. Building upon the foundation established by this analysis, further research can delve deeper into specific aspects of Crypto Art and its impact on the art world.

Here are some potential avenues for exploration:

1. **Case Studies:** In-depth analyses of specific Crypto Art projects, focusing on the artistic intent, use of technology, audience reception, and overall contribution to the artistic landscape. This could involve interviews with creators, collectors, and critics to gain a multifaceted understanding of the project's value and impact.
2. **Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) and Patronage Models:** Exploring how DAOs influence artistic creation and patronage within the Crypto Artspace. Research could examine how these models empower artists, create new communities, and disrupt traditional power structures within the art world.
3. **The Curatorial Role in the Digital Age:** Investigate how the curator's role is evolving in response to Crypto Art. This could involve exploring new curatorial practices for digital art, the challenges and opportunities of blockchain-based verification, and the potential for creating accessible and engaging online exhibitions.
4. **The Environmental Impact of Crypto Art:** This study examines the environmental concerns surrounding blockchain technology's energy consumption. Research could explore alternative blockchain solutions, artist-led initiatives to mitigate environmental impact, and the potential for Crypto Art to raise awareness of environmental issues.
5. **The Legal Landscape of Crypto Art:** Investigating the legal frameworks surrounding ownership, copyright, and intellectual property within the Crypto Artspace. Research could analyze emerging legal precedents, potential challenges, and future legal considerations for artists, collectors, and platforms. By pursuing these research avenues, we can better understand Crypto Art's artistic merit, impact on the art world ecosystem, and capacity to inform the evolving discourse on artistic value in the digital age.

Additional Research Considerations:

Expanding the Philosophical Exploration While the analysis employed a Hegelian lens, further research can benefit from exploring alternative philosophical perspectives to better understand Crypto Art's artistic merit.

Here are some potential areas of exploration:

- **Aesthetics in the Digital Age:** Investigate how philosophers like Nelson Goodman (1906-1998) and Arthur Danto (1924-2013) have challenged traditional notions of aesthetics in light of new artistic mediums. This could help us understand how Crypto Art, with its unique digital properties and audience interaction, might redefine our understanding of artistic value (Goodman, 1976; Danto, 1981).
- **Postmodern Perspectives:** Explore how the emphasis on deconstruction, simulation, and the blurring of boundaries within postmodern philosophy (Jean Baudrillard, 1929-2007) resonates with Crypto Art's potential to challenge established hierarchies and redefine artistic authenticity (Baudrillard, 1983).
- **The Role of Technology in Art:** Investigate how philosophers like Don Ihde (born 1943) and Joanna Zylińska (born 1978) explore the relationship between technology and human experience within art. This could provide insights into how the integration of blockchain technology within Crypto Art shapes artistic expression and audience engagement (Ihde, 2007; Zylińska, 2010).
- **The Future of Art and Technology:** Delve into the work of philosophers like Alexander Galloway (born 1964), who explore the intersection of art, technology, and social change. This could inform discussions about the potential of Crypto Art to not only disrupt the art world but contribute to broader societal transformations through artistic expression (Galloway, 2004).

By engaging with these additional philosophical perspectives, we can move beyond a singular interpretation of Crypto Art's value and position it into a broader discourse on how art is being redefined in the digital era. This multifaceted approach will contribute to a richer understanding of Crypto Art's potential for artistic innovation, social critique, and the ongoing search for meaning in a technologically driven world.

Acknowledgement

I thank Dr. John Xavier Chavez for his unwavering support, patience, and invaluable guidance, which were instrumental in the completion of this thesis. Special thanks to the support staff at Mapua University for their assistance.

Funding Statement

The authors did not receive financing for the development of this research

Data Availability

No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbate, C., Barandi, G., Fedrizzi, M., & Pagani, D. (2022). Nonfungible tokens and the artmarket: A new perspective on ownership and value creation. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 1-22. [DOI: 10.1080/17533740.2022.2030407]
- [2] Adu, P. (2021). Qualitative Data Coding. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353174130_Qualitative_Data_Coding
- [3] Alimpiev, V. (2023). Artists and NFTs: Literacy, perception, and future: A qualitative study on the literacy and exposure of artists to NFTs, perceived positives and negatives of NFTs, and their perceived future. *Theseus*. <https://www.theseus.fi/handle/10024/804165>
- [4] Ante, L. (2022). The Nonfungible Token (NFT) Market and Its Relationship with Bitcoin and Ethereum. *FinTech*, 1(3), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fintech1030017>

- [6] Anselmi, G., & Petrella, G. (2023). Nonfungible token artworks: More crypto than art? *Finance Research Letters*, 51, 103473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.103473>
- [7] Aranda, J. (2012). *The lure of the digital: Acceleration and the challenge of the new*. MIT Press.
- [8] Asia-Europe Foundation. (2023). By people / In cities: Manila, Philippines | city profile | ASEF culture360. ASEF Culture360. <https://culture360.asef.org/insights/people-cities-manilaphilippines-city-profile/>
- [9] Beck, L., Löschel, A., Utz, S., & Rieger, M. (2018). Blockchain technology in business and information systems research: A literature review. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- [10] Belk, R. W., Humayun, M., & Brouard, M. (2022). Money, possessions, and ownership in the Metaverse: NFTs, cryptocurrencies, Web3 and Wild Markets. *Journal of Business Research*, 153, 198–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.08.031>
- [11] Benjamin, W. (1936). *The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction*. Harvard University Press.
- [12] Bhandari, P. (2023). Questionnaire Design | Methods, Question Types & Examples. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/questionnaire/>
- [13] Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press
- [14] Castleberry, A. N., & Nolen, A. (2018). Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds? *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 10(6), 807–815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2018.03.019>
- [15] Chalmers, D., Fisch, C., Matthews, R. A., Quinn, W. J., & Recker, J. C. (2022). Beyond the bubble: Will NFTs and digital proof of ownership empower creative industry entrepreneurs? *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, p. 17, e00309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2022.e00309>
- [16] Chandra, Y. (2022). Nonfungible token-enabled entrepreneurship: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, p. 18, e00323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2022.e00323>
- [17] Chow, A. R. (2021, March 22). NFTs Are Shaking Up the Art World—But They Could Change Much More. *Time*. <https://time.com/5947720/nft-art/>
- [18] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [19] Dart, A. (2020). Innovative digital commerce Part 2: Creating the next big thing with Blockchain Technology. *Pepperdine Policy Review*. <https://ppr.podbean.com/e/innovative-digitalcommerce-part-creating-the-next-big-thing-with-blockchain-technology/>
- [20] Davison, R. M. (2013). Qualitative research for journal publication: Concepts and strategies. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 54(1), 11–17. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08874417.2013.11645667>
- [21] Derrida, J. (1987). *The veins of time*. Stanford University Press.
- [22] Dimitrov, V. (2021). The Inception of NFTs – From the Early Days to the Present. <https://www.fashioninsight.co.uk/trends-and-analysis/the-inception-of-nfts-from-theearly-days-to-the-present/>
- [23] Dukovska, A., & Drnovšek, M. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the online streaming services. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 34(1), 3580–3593. [\https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.1959926
- [24] Enten, G. (2021, March 11). Crypto art is having a moment. However, is it here to stay? *CNN Business*.
- [25] Enten, P. (2021, March 11). What is crypto art, and why is it worth millions? *The New York*
- [26] Escudero-Viladomiu, M., & Fillis, I. (2022). Nonfungible tokens: Opportunities and threats for the art market. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359701282_NonFungible_Tokens_Opportunities_and_Threats_for_the_Art_Market
- [27] Ermolaeva, L., & Zakirova, V. (2021). Nonfungible tokens (NFT): Technology and business prospects. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357779935_NonFungible_Tokens_NFT_Technology_and_Business_Prospects
- [28] Feronato, E. (2023). Nonfungible Token and Gamification: The Union that Changes the Rules. <https://www.emanueleferonato.com/2023/03/30/non-fungible-token-and-gamificationthe-union-that-changes-the-rules/>

- [29] Ferrari, C. (2023). Blockchain For NFT: A Comprehensive Guide. <https://www.morningstartips.com/2023/03/01/blockchain-for-nft-a-comprehensive-guide/>
- [30] Fini, A., Grimaldi, R., & Sobrero, M. (2022). Digital innovators and nonfungible tokens: The role of ownership and copyright. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 178, 121249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121249>
- [31] Foster, H. (2004). *The artist is an ethnographer*. Princeton University Press.
- [32] Gaiardelli, P., & Lee, H. (2023). Confronting the Counterfeit: Verifying the Authenticity of Digital Art with Blockchain and Nonfungible Tokens. *Journal of Operations Management*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1163>
- [33] Grey, E., & King, C. (2023). The NFT Rollercoaster: An Examination of Market Volatility. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4207235>
- [34] Guillory, J. (2010). *The romance of the state: Territoriality and sovereignty in modern literature*. Stanford University Press.
- [35] Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action, Volume 1: Reason and rationalization of society* (T. et al.). Beacon Press.
- [36] Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art (Vol. 1)* (T. et al.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1835)
- [37] Henriques, I., Ferreira, J. J., Nunes, N. J., & Jalali, M. S. (2022). Nonfungible tokens and art auctions: A hybrid approach to blockchain-based authentication. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 57, 101088. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2022.101088>
- [38] Herzog, L. (2021). *Nonfungible Tokens: A Business Primer*. <https://blockdaemon.com/blog/nonfungible-tokens-abusiness-primer/>
- [39] Ibold, S. (2023). NFT art: How blockchain is revolutionizing the art world. Medium. <https://medium.com/the-huffington-post/nft-art-how-blockchain-is-revolutionizing-theart-world-17e1b4f4cb24>
- [40] Jariwala, V. (2021). Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs) in Art – A New Era or Just Another Bubble? <https://www.sothebys.com/en/articles/non-fungible-tokens-nfts-in-art-a-new-era-or-justanother-bubble>
- [41] Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2017). *Mixed methods research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [42] Kastner, J. (2022, February 11). Bubble trouble: Is the NFT art market already on the verge of collapse? *Artnet News*. <https://news.artnet.com/market/nft-art-world-lacma-gray-market2256231>
- [43] KPMG. (2023). Nonfungible tokens (NFTs): The new age of art and collectibles. <https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2023/02/non-fungible-tokens-nfts-the-new-ageof-art-and-collectibles.html>
- [44] Kyriakides, C. (2020). *Art in the age of machine learning*. Thames & Hudson.
- [45] Lai, C., & To, C. K. M. (2023). Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs) in Cultural Heritage: Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Directions. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jchmsd-06-2022-0091>
- [46] Ling, R., & Bertel, T. F. (2021). The Future of NFTs: From Digital Collectibles to Assets and Brands. The University of Melbourne. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/INFORMIT.252093750223654>
- [47] Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to conducting qualitative research* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- [48] McAnally, M. (2021, March 11). Why artists are flocking to the NFT art world. *The Verge*. <https://www.theverge.com/nft>
- [49] Mouffe, C. (2018). For a left populism. Verso. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (n.d.). Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel/>
- [50] Nakamura, K., Zhang, H., & Xie, L. (2023). Nonfungible token (NFT) investments: An exploratory study. *Finance Research Letters*, p. 52, 103534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.103534>
- [51] Narayan, J. (2021). NFTs Explained: What Are They? Moreover, Why Did Someone Pay \$69 Million for One? *The Guardian*.
- [52] <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/mar/16/nfts-explained-what-are-they-andwhy-did-someone-pay-69m-for-one>

- [53] Nass, C., & Hancock, J. T. (2018). The Man Who Lied to His Laptop: What Machines Teach Us About Human Relationships. *Current*
- [54] Neil, M. (2021). NFTs and Intellectual Property: What You Need to Know.
- [55] <https://www.inta.org/perspectives/nfts-and-intellectual-property-what-you-need-to-know/>
- [56] Nemilov, A. (2021). The future of NFTs in the digital economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3811494>
- [57] Nguyen, T. M., Tran, T., Le, V., & Huynh, L. (2021). A Review of Blockchain-Based Digital Art and NFTs.
- [58] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350378036_A_Review_of_BlockchainBased_Digital_Art_and_NFTs
- [59] O'Dowd, K. (2023). NFT art: Heralding a new era for digital artists or just another fad? *ARTnews*. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/nft-art-hype-digital-artists1234632710/>
- [60] Paganini, P. (2023). NFT Art Authentication and Attribution: A Guide for Artists and Collectors. *Artrepreneur*. <https://magazine.artrepreneur.com/nft-art-authentication-and-attribution-aguide-for-artists-and-collectors/>
- [61] Pashchenko, M. (2021). Nonfungible tokens: The new hype of the art market. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3770662>
- [62] Qureshi, M. A., Awan, T. M., & Ramzan, M. (2021). Blockchain technology adoption in supply chain management: An empirical study of the Indian manufacturing sector. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 34(5), 1461–1480 . 1461–1480 . [1461–1480. [[httpshttps://doi.org/10.1108/jeim-02-2020-0080](https://doi.org/10.1108/jeim-02-2020-0080)
- [63] Ransom, K. (2023). The Art of the NFT: Redefining Ownership in the Digital Age. *Christie's*. <https://www.christies.com/features/The-art-of-the-NFT-redefining-ownership-in-the-digital-age-11671-7.aspx>
- [64] Rejeb, A., & Sghaier, I. M. (2021). NFTs: The new technological and economic revolution in digital content trading. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 6(4), 244–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2020.11.001>
- [65] Rost, P., & Stankovski, M. (2022). Nonfungible Tokens: Opportunities and Challenges. <https://www.legalfutures.co.uk/latest-news/non-fungible-tokens-opportunities-and-challenges>
- [66] Sarnataro, B. (2023). NFTs and the Future of Art. *The Harvard Crimson*. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2023/4/12/NFTs-future-of-art/>
- [67] Schär, F., & Urquhart, A. (2023). NFT Marketplaces: A Research Agenda. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4038047>
- [68] Schneider, M. (2022). Nonfungible tokens: Digital assets and the art world. *Deloitte*. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/financial-services/non-fungible-tokens-digital-art-collectibles.html>
- [69] Shahbazi, M., Zhao, Y., Zhang, X., & Wang, S. (2022). The Rise of NFTs: A Systematic Literature Review. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359193676_The_Rise_of_NFTs_A_Systematic

Literature Review

- [70] Sharman, A. (2021). What are NFTs? The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/mar/01/what-are-nfts-non-fungible-tokens-explainer>
- [71] Shashidhar, A., & Seth, S. (2023). Are Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs) A Fad or A Revolution? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4373384>
- [72] Svetličič, M., & Rajković, V. (2022). NFT marketplaces: An analysis of existing and emerging challenges. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4590152>
- [73] Szabo, N. (1997). Formalizing and securing relationships on public networks. *First Monday*, 2(9). <https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/548>
- [74] Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). *Blockchain revolution: How the technology behind Bitcoin is changing money, business, and the world*. Penguin.
- [75] Tew, P. (2023). Digital art, crypto-art, and NFTs: The transformation of the art world. *Art Monthly Australia*, pp. 330, 16–17. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.292169510060319>
- [76] Tien, L. H. (2022). An Investigation of the Nonfungible Token (NFT) Landscape and Its Economic Potential. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 10(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijfs10010010>

- [77] Tirone, J., & Bulligan, J. (2023). The carbon footprint of cryptocurrencies. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4438950>
- [78] Troebst, S., & Gill, A. (2022). The Climate Impacts of Cryptocurrency Mining. Technical University of Munich. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368754660_The_Climate_Impacts_of_Cryptocurrency_Mining
- [79] Tumello, C. (2021). The Value of NFTs in the World of Digital Art. The Entrepreneur. <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/367166>
- [80] Valverde, A., & Medina, R. (2022). Nonfungible tokens in the film industry: Opportunities and challenges. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4517700>
- [81] Vinciguerra, M., & Malgarini, M. (2022). The impact of nonfungible tokens (NFTs) on art prices. Journal of Cultural Economics, 46(2), 183–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-021-09440-8>
- [82] Wang, L., & Ding, Y. (2023). NFT and virtual museum: A new opportunity in digital culture dissemination. The Journal of Modern Craft, 16(1), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17496772.2022.2035322>
- [83] Wang, S., & Wang, H. (2022). The transformation of digital cultural heritage assets through NFT. Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development
- [84] Ward, J. (2022). 10 Reasons Why NFTs Are Here to Stay. <https://theglobalherald.com/news/10-reasons-why-nfts-are-here-to-stay/>
- [85] Wilson, M. (2023). NFTs and the future of the metaverse. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/nfts-future-metaverse-2023-03-24/>
- [86] Winkler, C. (2023). NFTs in 2023: What Comes Next? <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinesscouncil/2023/04/05/nfts-in-2023-whatcomes-next/>
- [87] Wood, M., & Singh, V. K. (2022). Crypto art and the NFT: A critical assessment of the valuation mechanism and impact on the art world. Finance Research Letters, p. 46, 101976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.101976>
- [88] Yermack, D. (2021). NFTs and the Future of Art Online. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28909>
- [89] Yu, T. H. K., de Reuver, M., & Bouwman, H. (2022). Understanding tokenization in the digital transformation of the creative industries. Journal of Business Research, 149, 582–592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.09.017>
- [90] Yu, T. H. K., Li, C., & Bouwman, H. (2023). Tokenization in the creative industries: A systematic review. Journal of Cultural Economics. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-023-09493-1>
- [91] Zhang, Z., Xie, K., & Li, H. (2023). Understanding the NFT Ecosystem: Literature Review, Research Agenda, and a Meta-Analysis. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0268401222001638>
- [92] Zheng, W. (2021). The artistic value of nonfungible tokens (NFTs). Journal of Digital Media & Governance, 3(1), 1–7. [DOI: 10.1386/jdmg.7.1.1_1]
- [93] Zhu, Y., & Strobel, M. (2022). The Future of Nonfungible Tokens (NFTs): Challenges and Opportunities. World Intellectual Property Organization.