GenAI in scholarly communication in light of interviews with humanists, theologians, and artists in the early stages of their careers in 2023 and 2024[1]

Marzena Świgoń
ORCID: 0000-0003-3600-8349
Institute of Journalism and Social Communication
Faculty of Humanities
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

Abstract

Purpose: This paper presents opinions on the impact of GenAI on various aspects of scholarly communication in light of interviews with Polish representatives in three fields: humanities, theology, and arts.
Methods: The longitudinal interviews were conducted in two rounds, in the spring of 2023 and 2024 (National Science Centre project No 2022/45/B/HS2/00041), with early career researchers in disciplines such as linguistics, literary studies, history, archeology, philosophy, polish language studies, science of culture and religion, art sciences, theology, music, film, and fine arts.
Results: A significant difference was found between the two rounds of interviews concerning Polish respondents' experience using GenAI. Although the interest in GenAI increased during the year, it only involved preliminary exploration.
Value: The results can be used in future comparative analyses, both time-related and among respondents in various fields and countries. The extract of results from the Polish interviews described here also contributes to the international analysis of Harbingers 3.

Keywords

ChatGPT. Early career researchers. GenAI. Generative artificial intelligence. Harbingers. Humanists. Scholarly communication. Scientists-artists. Theologians.

Text received on 1st of July 2024.

[1] This research was funded in whole or in part by the National Science Centre in Poland, grant number 2022/45/B/HS2/00041. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

1. Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) denotes a set of AI tools that generate text, images, and video from prompts. Their development was made possible by improving deep neural networks, including LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS (LLM). Technology companies like OpenAI, Microsoft, and Google are developing their own GenAI models: ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Midjourney, and DALL-E.

Although GenAI has been in development for several decades, it was not until ChatGPT was made available in the autumn of 2022 that interest increased in the changes that such tools could induce in scholarly communication, i.e. in activities taken by researchers at various stages of their work – from seeking information through using it to publishing and sharing.

The state of the art on this issue is changing dynamically with the development of technology and its increasing use by users. The following is only an outline of the literature review, as there are already in-depth works on the subject (e.g., Herman et al., 2024).

It is still not known what changes GenAI can bring about in these activities from seeking to sharing, as few empirical studies have been conducted in this field, and literature reviews dominate among those publications (Herman et al., 2024; Conroy, 2023; Imran & Almusharraf, 2023; Hosseini et al., 2023; Van Noorden & Perkel, 2023). Publications in information science, including on the ethics of AI, are also worth noting (Floridi, 2023; Capurro, 2020).

The international team of the "Harbingers of Change" projects has observed signs of changes in scholarly communication for nearly ten years, first in the context of open science and popularising social media (Harbingers 1 – 2016–2019), then in the context of the pandemic (2020–2022), and now following the popularisation of GenAI (2023).

What is the potential of GenAI, and will it play a significant role in research and teaching? Is GenAI going to change the scholarly communication system, and if it is, in what areas? Literature on the subject (Herman et al., 2024) mentions possible applications of AI at practically every stage of creative work. They are called, for example, copilots, co-researchers, co-authors or assistants (Ansari, Ahmad, & Bhutta, 2023; Conroy, 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023; Imran & Almusharraf, 2023; Zielinski et al., 2023), and the number of their users is increasing fast, for example ChatGPT currently has over 180 million users (Duarte, 2024).

At the same time, studies of GenAI use in the academic environment showed both the advantages and disadvantages of these modern tools (Van Noorden & Perkel, 2023; Jie et al., 2023; Fui-Hoon Nah et al., 2023; Susarla et al., 2023; Salah et al., 2023; Nordling, 2023; European Research Council, 2023). Some features included boosting creative processes, helping write and edit texts, formulating thoughts and refining text, minimising language barriers, and – possibly – reviewing. Particular

hopes were pinned on help in monotonous, tedious work done by scientists, e.g., in analysing large data sets and literature reviews. On the other hand, the threat of the ChatGPT output unreliability, its so-called "hallucinations," has been reported. Instant responses and a set of references on a prescribed topic must be verified by humans, which takes time and effort. Scientists around the world are now testing GenAI tools.

One should look for signs of changes in scholarly communication by observing beginner researchers in various fields and countries open to technological changes. That is the object of the latest Harbingers 3 project. The Polish study conducted among humanists, theologians, and artists-scientists as part of the NCN project (no. 2022/45/B/HS2/00041), initiated as the Polish continuation of earlier Harbingers 1 and 2 projects (Świgoń, Nicholas, 2023), is currently also an essential part of the international Harbingers 3 analysis (Nicholas et al., 2024).

2. The aim, research questions, methods, and organisation of the study

This paper aims to show the respondents' initial experience and contact with AI and present their opinions on the impact of artificial intelligence development on scholarly communication. Due to the novelty of the subject matter, this was an explorative study (the first interviews were conducted three months after open access to ChatGPT was provided).

The interviewees' responses on AI are part of the output of longitudinal interviews with representatives of three fields, humanities, theology, and arts, on scholarly communication, which were conducted within a project financed by NCN. This paper describes the results of interviews conducted by the author in spring 2023 and spring 2024.

The respondents were at the early stages of their careers, i.e., they were either preparing their doctoral dissertations or they had already obtained the title of doctor – not later, however, than seven years before (they did not have the title of doctor habilitated at the start of the project). Twenty-five humanists (14 representatives of literary studies, linguistics, philosophy, history, Polish language studies, arts, culture and religion studies, and archaeology), theologians (5), and artists-scientists (6 representatives of music, fine arts, and conservation of works of art, as well as film and theatre) took part in the first round of interviews. Twenty-two people were included in the second round.

The study methodology is similar in all Harbingers projects (Świgoń, Nicholas, 2023). The interviews are recorded, and their transcripts are subsequently prepared and supplemented by email. The respondents' statements were analysed qualitatively (Gioia, 2022; Gioia, 2023; Marying, 2000). Although the methodology

has already been described in two articles on the ZIN (Świgoń 2023ab) pages, it is worth repeating a few details. The interviews lasted about an hour and a half and were conducted via Skype. Respondents were able to complete their statements by email. Both transcription and coding were carried out manually. The analysis results were illustrated with quotations; all answers given to questions analysed in this study are deposited in an open data repository RepOD.

The first questionnaire for interviews conducted with Polish humanists and artists in spring 2023 (under the NCN grant) contained one general (open-ended) question about AI as one of the external factors impacting scientists' work. However, the 2024 questionnaire contained a whole set of questions. The questions had been prepared in cooperation with an international team of researchers and based on the latest literature on the subject. In this way, the Polish project concerning humanists and artists became an essential part of the international comparative analysis Harbingers 3, as it was the first time that researchers in these fields had been taken into consideration in Harbingers' projects, focused on natural and mathematical sciences (Świgoń, Nicholas, 2023; Nicholas et al., 2024). Since the Polish humanists, theologians, and artists were grouped as Arts&Humanities in Harbingers 3, their opinions had to be presented in greater detail than in the international analysis.

The research questions in this analysis were formed as:

- What is the difference between the respondents' opinions on the role of AI in scholarly communication in spring 2023 and spring 2024?
- How do the respondents perceive the impact of AI on various components of scholarly communication, from information search through its evaluation to sharing, in light of the responses given in spring 2024?

3. Results

3.1. Results of the 2023 interviews

In spring 2023, i.e., several months after ChatGPT was launched (November 2022), a great majority of the respondents (18 out of 25) claimed that maybe in the future, but "for now," neither ChatGPT nor any other AI tool had an impact on their scientific, teaching or artistic activity. This subject did not attract much interest during the interviews that focused on other external factors that impacted scholarly communication, e.g., ministerial reforms, the pandemic, or the outbreak of the war in Ukraine (Świgoń 2023a, 2023b).

Several respondents with some experience using ChatGPT (and/or other tools) emphasised the opportunities and threats arising from the development of artificial intelligence. They saw opportunities in preparing literature reviews, searching for

information, and linguistic verification. The threats they saw included chat abuse by students, which is why they announced that they would replace written tests with oral tests as a form of students obtaining credits. They also predicted AI to be less creative than humans. The following quotes illustrate these opinions.

> *AI development is valuable and reasonable as long as it makes searching for source information easier; this applies to all tools for searching online journals. I find any significant interference by artificial intelligence in my discipline harmful.* [history]

> *I believe it is a great tool, maybe not in writing papers, but obviously not in philosophy. It is a good tool for quick proofreading.* [philosophy]

> *(...) I see a threat that practising science may lose its „flavour." We will talk to a computer rather than another person (...). AI does not pose any threat in my field. It cannot conclude or formulate thoughts with potential for development.* [theology]

> *(...) I worry about students, and I think there is a risk of them switching off the thinking process. Because when you treat this tool as a mental process assistant, it will definitely make research work more efficient. For now, I am analysing artificial intelligence from the moral theology perspective and thinking about the moral aspects I can deal with in this context.* [theology]

Scientists-artists working with students expressed interesting opinions about ChatGPT and the tools used to create graphics and videos.

> *A lecturer must make students aware that AI generates random images, and one must change their thinking. Creativity requires a different approach now, seeking new ways, which is the only method for making an artist competitive in AI. Artificial intelligence is a professional threat to artists as it is great for generating images in simple fields of art, e.g., in making illustrations. (...) I teach my students how to protect their work against AI (...).* [fine arts]

> *(...) Although I used to fight plagiarism, the student's contribution is now impossible to determine – written papers prepared to win them credit have lost any sense. It is similar to giving students assignments that involve taking a series of photographs (...). It is only a matter of time before artificial intelligence's contribution to generating a photo-realistic image becomes unrecognisable. As a filmmaker, I am not afraid of artificial intelligence yet. The mechanism of filmmaking is largely conservative (...). Artificial intelligence will not revolutionise work on a film set as dynamically as in other fields.* [film]

To conclude this section, one should mention a linguist respondent involved in research projects related to artificial intelligence, which concerned *(...) its practical use: (...) I used my philological knowledge (of the Polish language), and (...) I developed complex linguistic rules for machine processing.*

3.2. Results of the 2024 interviews

One year after the first interviews, no respondents were without contacts, even sporadic or individual, with ChatGPT or other GenAI tools. The responses are characterised below in the same order as in the interview questionnaire.

The first part of the questions concerned general **experience or contact with AI** in their private life and at work.

The extensive descriptive responses, which included the names of applications, programs, and tools, indicated that the respondents understood the concept of GenAI.

ChatGPT appeared in every response as a specific "initiator" of the whole phenomenon and one of the prompts in the interview. Frequent mentions of the name testified to the young scientists' curiosity, although the extent of the phenomenon exploration varied within the group – from an individual attempt to systematic use. As far as the latter is concerned, it was not about writing scientific texts but official letters, social media posts, or editing grant applications.

Regarding texts, Polish humanists, theologians, and artists often mentioned the names of various translators, including Google and DeepL, as well as programs for checking spelling and style, e.g., Grammarly, Jasnopis or an umbrella name of LLM (Large Language Models). They also mentioned the names of various GenAI tools, including those used for working with images, e.g., Midjourney, DALL-E, Adobe, Photoshop, Runaway, Google Genie, and Canva. They provided assistants' names in popular search engines: Google Bard and Microsoft Copilot. Only some admitted to buying a subscription when asked about paid versions of various programs. In general, they used free versions.

The rapid development of AI is perceived as a positive thing by this respondent group, although with little enthusiasm. Hope was expressed for such an improvement of those tools that would result in workload reduction, although this was not the case at this stage – in light of responses given in spring 2024. Apart from individual mentions of text editions – casual rather than purely scientific – the respondents saw a specific obligation to learn new programs. The respondents mention learning new tools during classes together with students.

The respondents also expressed their concerns associated with distrust and the need to verify the responses generated by AI, which requires extra effort and time. A possible increase in the number of cases of plagiarism was also mentioned. It was suggested that the standards and legislative solutions applicable to AI use in various areas of life and work should be altered to eliminate fraud threats and protect personal data. Generally, nearly all respondents were more or less concerned about the unknown role that AI may play in the future.

The differences in perception of the AI development dynamics between spring 2023 and spring 2024 are appropriately illustrated by what an artist said:

> *A year ago, we were not aware of the potential of AI. Many technology startups have been established since then. Vast amounts of money have been invested in them. When I last wrote about it, I pointed out that AI coped very well with photographs and images. However, it had problems with video, as it disregarded multiple aspects before and after a frame, which is why the resulting film was of low resolution and full of artefacts. Interestingly, the paper is still in print, and its topicality has been lost.* [film]

When asked whether their opinions were typical of their professional and private circles, they generally responded that they were. However, there were extreme individual responses, both more enthusiastic than their friends and indicative of more considerable resistance against technology novelties.

Only one artificial intelligence researcher was among the respondents in the first round of interviews, but several in the second round mentioned including this subject matter in their research.

The following are the responses to the other questions concerning AI from the interview questionnaire, which were more detailed compared to the initial part of the interview.

The respondents were asked about AI's impact on research **reputation** and its positive (enhanced productivity) and negative (lack of transparency) implications. [Does AI have any implications for research reputation? It may include positive (e.g., enhanced productivity) and negative implications (lack of transparency).] Most respondents pointed to various implications, and six (out of 22) had no opinion.

Among the positive implications, the respondents mentioned more effective detection of plagiarism, reduction of tedious work, more attractive classes with students, acceleration of research processes, extending the scope of research, more effective verification of information, support in obtaining and analysing data and minimising any research errors.

Negative implications included: verification of the text originality is more complex, lack of possibility of verifying the actual extent to which AI supported the researcher's work, a decrease in reliability of scientific research, an increase in the number of publications at the expense of their quality, relaxing of minds and weakening of critical thinking, creating works of art and science with no individual style or character, the risk of work on unreliable data from AI, lack of procedures and control of AI use in scientific research, unauthorised use of accomplishments of other researchers and artists, text unification as a result of machine translations.

The impact of an **AI function in search engines** on the results was relatively small in this group of respondents. A majority (18 out of 22) responded that either they did not see any significant changes compared to the first interview of spring 2023 or they knew nothing of search support by AI tools. One person said that she had switched off the AI function in Bing. There were only four comments with positive reflections. These respondents described the search engines' work as "much faster" and "more intuitive" and AI's suggestions concerning publications on a prescribed topic as "useful." Artists mentioned the fast development of graphic programs during the year between the interviews.

> *It is now much faster to search for information via search engines with AI and built-in chat features than a year ago. (...) Adobe databases also have their graphics support browsers. I feel that the cosmic difference compared to when we first spoke, especially about Photoshop, filling in backgrounds, and various other elements, is now a potent, time-saving tool.* [fine arts]

Another question concerned the impact of AI on **sharing** research results and presenting them in a more accessible form [Does AI have any implications for connecting and/or research sharing? For instance, summarising/translating research

into more accessible formats]. Unfortunately, most respondents had no opinion about it, probably due to insufficient experience. Those who answered this question pointed to the benefits of automatic translation of texts in foreign languages, i.e., the advantages of various translators and spellcheckers. Some respondents mentioned text abstracts with AI tools and identifying keywords.

There was a question in the questionnaire about **identifying** the AI contribution to text generation [What would make them suspect that published material was AI generated?] Nearly all the respondents (20 out of 22) answered it. Apart from hints/prompts, such as inconsistent writing style, lack of personalisation, content too good to be true, and inaccurate/lack of proper citations, the respondents also mentioned the following: repeating information within one issue, errors concerning the essence of an issue (or explanations provided in a way it is done in encyclopedias, without using the terminology usually used by experts); disordered style; verbosity (formally correct texts, but without any sense); superficiality (too general, insufficiently nuanced considerations); no traces of the author's personality; inconsistent or contradictory citations; wrong paraphrasing (can be recognised if one knows the original text); proper content, but generalised and presenting the same conclusions in a loop.

Moreover, respondents-artists pointed to features of images that could suggest the use of AI, such as uneven texture, incorrect lighting, lack of natural defects and random elements, images that are too perfect, or the opposite-ones with apparent errors.

Other questions were also associated with the quality of information. They are concerned about the risk of **text "production,"** even whole periodicals of a low scientific value [Do they believe that the AI-associated potential for rapid production of low-quality scientific articles brings about a decline in the overall quality of research output, indeed, facilitated the growth of predatory journals and papermills?]. Nearly all respondents in the three fields admitted that the risk was real. However, their responses were like forecasts rather than an account of their experience because many had not encountered the issue in their field. Individual responses to the opposite effect suggested that AI capabilities were overrated, for example, in generating philosophical or high value scientific texts.

The respondents (representatives of various disciplines, not only of arts) brought up the issue of fake texts, images, and videos. They talked about "animating" images, replacing voice, and generating photographs in a specific style. One of the artists said that *we will either learn to conduct multi-step verification or trust what we see because once it is posted online, its verification will not be possible*. A respondent from culture and religion studies mentioned the need *for proper self-education and for teaching it in student classes*.

These considerations were supplemented with a question about other risks associated with AI use in the context of **ethics** [Do they think AI is raising any

other issues of integrity and ethics?]. Here, the respondents focused on examples provided in the question, i.e., deepfakes, job displacement, and autonomous systems. They pointed to the need for introducing new legislation for state-controlled procedures for data verification and counteracting fake information. They suggested education at all levels (children, adolescents, and adults). It was also proposed that perpetrators of AI-related abuse should be punished.

The issue of publishing in science started with a question about changing the policy concerning publication **authorship** associated with AI development [Are these policies – authorship and publishing – changing because of 'AI' becoming (sort of) another author?]. The Polish respondents in the three fields admitted that nothing had changed in this regard and/or that they had heard nothing about it. Some respondents even argued that AI could not and would not be regarded as a text co-author.

The next question was about AI's help in **publishing productivity** [Has 'AI' helped publishing productivity? For instance, has 'AI' been used to expedite and/or make more efficient and/or improve the writing process of grant proposals and/or publications? Has 'AI' been used to locate suitable journals to publish in according to the manuscript's title or abstract?]. All responses but one were negative. Although they disagreed with the term "productivity" in the humanities context, they admitted that their experience with using AI tools was insufficient to give an opinion on such help. One person admitted to preparing article abstracts using AI. Several respondents talked about the systematic use of translators and programs to check spelling and style.

The question about AI for **summarising** articles [Used 'AI' as a tool for summarising scientific articles/extracting critical information from complex texts to facilitate a literature review] was also answered negatively in most cases, with only three respondents admitting to using ChatGPT for this purpose. However, they believe these tools are unreliable as they leave out key points. In other words, in light of the spring 2024 responses, the AI capabilities in summarising texts were overrated or insufficiently explored in the group under study.

Humanists did not have much experience in AI to formulate research questions or hypotheses [Used 'AI' to detect gaps in knowledge to locate a topic for new research and to construct hypotheses]. Only one person mentioned AI being used to *determine work directions (...) to bring some order to further steps*, which did not give the expected results.

According to earlier Harbingers' studies, when looking for **journals to publish their findings**, the respondents considered factors such as IF, prestige in the discipline, time needed for publication, open access, and indexation in international databases. The present question was whether AI changed these factors in any way [Will 'AI' change their relative ratings or introduce any new factors?]. It turned out that it did not – none of the respondents mentioned any new circumstances. Therefore, these choice factors remain the most important. According to one of

the respondents, some editorial boards and institutions have asked for some time for certificates that a text was not generated with AI.

The interview questionnaire also brought up the issue of the impact of AI on **reviewing** [What do you think an AI-based peer-review should be capable of doing if it is to replace the current system? For instance, speeding up a review, using an automated reviewer, or a post-publication peer review?]. The respondents admitted, in general, that they had not thought about it as they had not had to face this problem. Some of them thought that reviewers should not use AI in any way as it cannot replace a human. On the other hand, others thought it would be possible if AI tools were improved, and a human would make the final decision. Those respondents who predicted that AI would be used for preparing reviews in the future mentioned potential advantages such as a quick review, better ability to recognise plagiarism, more insight, help in editing a review text, and increased objectivity of a text evaluation. A respondent from philosophy added: In this exploitation-based system of reviewing articles for very expensive periodicals for free, I *favour replacing humans with AI tools.*

The question about using AI to propagate scientific research [Is 'AI' capable of facilitating/enhancing their outreach activities?] brought only answers in the categories of "I do not know" and "I have no experience in this regard." One person mentioned using ChatGPT to write posts on social media, which was adapted to various user age groups.

The penultimate question in the interview questionnaire concerned AI as a transformational force in the scholarly communication system [Will AI be a transformational force? If so, in what ways? What will be the advantages and disadvantages of the transformations that will take place?] Most responders gave an affirmative answer (only 5 out of 22 people gave a negative one or were unsure). The advantages of such transformation included better and more in-depth analyses compared to human abilities, making work easier by analysing large bodies of data and performing other automatic activities, quick and effective text translation, quicker information circulation, expanding the information range, quicker information selection, reducing the size of student groups, the emergence of new scientific disciplines. Its disadvantages included the unreliability of AI-generated content, lack of responsibility for errors, data theft, violation of privacy and other abuses, information quality deterioration due to fake news and disinformation, the abundance of low-quality papers, lulling researchers into a sense of security and making them indolent, and the need for greater regulation and reform in science.

The following statement illustrates the predicted appreciation of human skills:

> *Most people will buy cheap, low-quality books for children, written and illustrated by AI and published in many copies. However, a minority will buy expensive books written and illustrated by original and high-quality artists. That is a rhetorical question: Which children benefit more from reading their books? However, this applies only to humanities and arts* [Polish language studies]

The last question in the 2024 interview concerned a deepening inequality in access to AI tools [Will the use of AI exacerbate existing disparities and inequalities, with people with access to AI-based tools speeding up their publication processes]. As in the previous question, the respondents likely agreed with this hypothesis (7 out of the 22 answered *no/I do not know*). It was pointed out that individuals with higher technical capabilities and access to paid AI tools can gain an advantage, be more productive, write better texts, and achieve their goals with less effort. Some humanists did not expect inequalities arising from GenAI use in their speciality to deepen because it was based on sources that have yet to be digitised. Consequently, it requires traditional work methods.

4. Conclusion

This paper presents the first experiences and opinions of beginner humanists, theologians, and artists-scientists on the impact of GenAI on scholarly communication. It was one of the first studies in these disciplines worldwide.

A considerable difference was observed in perception of the subject matter between the first and the second rounds of the longitudinal interviews. Only several respondents in the spring 2023 interviews admitted that such programs as ChatGPT and other AI tools had an impact on scientific, artistic, and teaching activities, and a majority of the respondents (out of 25 individuals in three fields) claimed to not see such an impact. Most respondents talked about the absence of any impact, or they added "for now," i.e., predicting that this could change. The situation was different after a year, i.e., in spring 2024, when all the respondents in all three disciplines had had contact with this issue, although to a various extent. Several specific questions (based on the literature of the subject analysis) related to the impact of AI on various aspects of scholarly communication were answered in a way that indicated on one hand curiosity – but not excitation – about the subject matter, but on the other – an initial phase of recognising and exploring new tools. Of the topics proposed for discussion, the most significant response was obtained about AI's impact on a researcher's reputation and so-called "productivity," described in the context of opportunities and threats. The other aspects of scholarly communication, such as authorship, searching, or sharing/propagation, provoked several responses indicative of the lack of knowledge and experience among the group of humanists, theologians, and artists-scientists under study.

Despite the significant changes in the GenAI between spring 2023 and spring 2024 and, consequently, potential changes in opinions soon, one can still hope that this study provided interesting comparative material for future analyses, including comparisons as part of the international Harbingers 3 project in various fields and countries and future studies concerning scholarly communication.

Open Data

Świgoń, M.(2024). *Polscy badacze na wczesnym etapie kariery w humanistyce, teologii i sztuce – o generatywnej sztucznej inteligencji w komunikacji naukowej* [Data set]. RepOD. https://doi.org/10.18150/MLUX8U.

Funding

This research was funded in whole or in part by the National Science Centre in Poland, grant number 2022/45/B/HS2/00041. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

References

Ansari, A.N., Ahmad, S. & Bhutta, S.M. (2023). Mapping the global evidence around the use of ChatGPT in higher education: A systematic scoping review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 11281–11321. doi: 10.1007/s10639-023-12223-4.

Capurro, R. (2020). The age of Artificial Intelligences: A personal reflection. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 28.

Conroy, G. (2023). Scientists used ChatGPT to generate an entire paper from scratch — but is it any good? *Nature*, 619, 443–444. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-02218-z

Duarte, F. (2024). Number of ChatGPT users (June 2024) [online]. *Exploding Topics*. Retrieved from: https://explodingtopics.com/blog/chatgpt-users.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., ... & Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *71*, 1026242. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642.

European Research Council (2023). *Foresight: Use and impact of Artificial Intelligence in the scientific process* [online]. https://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2023-12/AI_in_science.pdf.

Floridi, L. (2023). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: principles, challenges, and opportunities*. Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198883098.001.0001.

Fui-Hoon Nah, F., Zheng, R., Cai, J., Siau, K., & Chen, L. (2023). Generative AI and ChatGPT: Applications, challenges, and AI-human collaboration. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 25(3), 277–304. doi: 10.1080/15228053.2023.2233814.

Gioia, D. (2021). A systematic methodology for doing qualitative research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *57*(1), 20–29.

Herman, E., Nicholas, D., Abrizah, A., Revez, J., Rodríguez Bravo, B., Swigon, M., Clark, D., Xu, J., Watkinson, A. (2024). The impact of AI on the post-pandemic generation of early career researchers: What we know or can predict from the published literature. *Learned Publishing*, *37*(4), e1623. doi: 10.1002/leap.1623.

Hosseini, M., Gao, C. A., Liebovitz, D. M., Carvalho, A. M., Ahmad, F. S., Luo, Y., MacDonald, N., Holmes, K.L. & Kho, A. (2023). An exploratory survey about using ChatGPT in education, healthcare, and research. *Plos One*, *18*(10), e0292216. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0292216.

Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2023). Analysing the role of ChatGPT as a writing assistant at higher education level: A systematic review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(4), ep464. doi: 10.30935/cedtech/13605.

Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y.J., Madotto, A. & Fung, P. (2023). Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, *55*(12), 1–38. doi: 10.1145/3571730.

Magnani, G. & Gioia, D. (2023). Using the Gioia Methodology in international business and entrepreneurship research. *International Business Review*, *32*(2), 102097.

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis [28 paragraphs]. *Forum QualitativeSozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *1*(2), Art. 20, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0002204.

Nicholas, D., Swigon, M., Clark, D., Abrizah, A., Revez, J., Herman, E., Rodrigues-Bravo, B., Xu, J., Watkinson, A. (2024). The impact of generative AI on the scholarly communications of early career researchers: An international, multi-disciplinary study. *Learned Publishing*, *37*(4), e1628. doi: 10.1002/leap.1628.

Nordling, L. (2023). How ChatGPT is transforming the postdoc experience. *Nature*, *622*, 655–657. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-03235-8.

Salah, M., Al Halbusi, H., & Abdelfattah, F. (2023). May the force of text data analysis be with you: Unleashing the power of generative AI for social psychology research. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, *1*(2). doi: 10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100006.

Susarla, A., Gopal, R., Thatcher, J. B., & Sarker, S. (2023). The Janus effect of Generative AI: Charting the path for responsible conduct of scholarly activities in information systems. *Information Systems Research*, *34*(2), 399–408. doi: 10.1287/isre.2023.ed.v34.n2.

Świgoń, M. (2023a). Early career researchers in art, humanities and theology at the time of external crises – in light of the first round of longitudinal interviews of spring 2023. *Zagadnienia Informacji Naukowej*, *61*(1), 52–70.

Świgoń, M. (2023b). How do early career researchers perceive success in their fields? – report on interviews with humanists, theologians and scientists-artists in Poland. *Zagadnienia Informacji Naukowej*, *61*(2), 32–49. doi: 10.36702/zin2023.02.02.

Świgoń, M., Nicholas, D. (2023). Scholarly communication of early career researchers – organisation of international research with the participation of Poles and its Polish follow-up. *Media – Kultura – Komunikacja społeczna*, *19*, 133–148. doi: 10.31648/mkks.8595.7008.

Van Noorden, R., & Perkel, J. M. (2023). AI and science: What 1,600 researchers think. *Nature*, *621*, 672–675. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-02980-0.

Zielinski, C., Winker, M.A., Aggarwal, R., Ferris, L.E., Heinemann, M., Lapeña, J.F., Pai, S.A., Ing, E., Citrome, L., Alam, M., Voight, M., Habibzadeh, F. (2023). *Chatbots, Generative AI, and scholarly manuscripts. WAME recommendations on Chatbots and Generative Artificial Intelligence in relation to scholarly publications* [online]. WAME. [May 31, 2023]. Retrieved from: https://wame.org/page3.php?id=106.

Generatywna sztuczna inteligencja w komunikacji naukowej w świetle wywiadów z humanistami, teologami i artystami na wczesnym etapie kariery w 2023 i 2024 roku

Cel: W artykule przedstawiono opinie na temat wpływu GenAI na różne aspekty komunikacji naukowej w świetle wywiadów z przedstawicielami trzech dziedzin: humanistyki, teologii oraz dziedziny sztuki.
Metody: Wywiady podłużne odbyły się w dwóch turach – wiosną 2023 i 2024 roku (projekt NCN nr 2022/45/B/HS2/00041) z badaczami z następujących dyscyplin: lingwistyka, literaturoznawstwo, historia, archeologia, filozofia, polonistyka, nauki o kulturze i religii, nauki o sztuce, teologia, sztuki muzyczne, sztuki filmowe oraz plastyczne.
Rezultaty: Stwierdzono dużą różnicę w doświadczeniach w korzystaniu z GenAI przez polskich respondentów pomiędzy dwiema turami wywiadów; chociaż po roku wzrosło zainteresowanie GenAI, nadal było to raczej dopiero rozpoznawanie i wstępna eksploracja zjawiska.
Wartość: Wyniki mogą być wykorzystane do przyszłych analiz porównawczych, zarówno w czasie, jak i wśród respondentów z różnych dziedzin oraz krajów. Opisany tu fragment wyników z polskich wywiadów jest także wkładem do międzynarodowej analizy Harbingers 3.

Słowa kluczowe

ChatGPT. GenAI. Generatywna sztuczna inteligencja. Humaniści. Komunikacja naukowa. Naukowcy-artyści. Początkujący naukowcy. Sygnały zmian. Teologowie.

MARZENA ŚWIGOŃ, Profesor nauk społecznych, dyrektor Instytutu Dziennikarstwa i Komunikacji Społecznej Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego w Olsztynie, redaktor naczelna czasopisma „Media-Kultura-Komunikacja Społeczna" (Wydaw. UWM); członkini Komitetu Naukoznawstwa Polskiej Akademii Nauk; publikacje: M. Świgoń (2015). Dzielenie się wiedzą i informacją (Wydaw. UWM); M. Świgoń (2013). Personal Knowledge and Information Management – conception and exemplification. "Journal of Information Science", 39(6); M. Świgoń (2012). Zarządzanie wiedzą i informacją. (Wydaw. UWM).

Contact details:
marzena.swigon@uwm.edu.pl
Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie
Instytut Dziennikarstwa i Komunikacji Społecznej
ul. Kurta Obitza 1, 10-725 Olsztyn