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**“How will ChatGPT change the way we think and work? Stanford scholar examines”**

<https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2023/02/will-chatgpt-change-way-think-work>

**My summary**

This article discusses Jeff Hancock, a Stanford scholar, and his fears surrounding the ethical and social impacts of AI. He specifically worries about the effect they would have on personal relationships and human authenticity. Trust and deception are extremely vulnerable over the internet and with the addition of ChatGPT, these problems are worse. Some specific worries he had are in the use of it in dating profiles or other social profiles. He believes that with the use of AI, these profiles will have blurred boundary lines since at that point, is it yours or the robot’s profile? Another massive issue is misinformation. By using AI platforms, one can efficiently and effectively make fake posts or fake comments to change people’s mind on certain topics. Overall, Hancock reviews the ethics behind the usage of LLMs in general.

**ChatGPT Summary**

Jeff Hancock, a communication scholar at Stanford, is deeply concerned about the ethical and social impacts of AI, particularly in how AI-mediated communication affects interpersonal relationships and human authenticity. As AI-powered tools like ChatGPT increasingly mimic human language, the boundaries between human and machine communication blur, creating ethical dilemmas in areas such as trust, deception, and authenticity.

Hancock suggests that AI can serve as a valuable tool—akin to a calculator in math—allowing individuals to leverage its capabilities for greater productivity and support, especially in professional settings. For instance, AI could assist coaches and therapists by handling initial client interactions, synthesizing data, and enabling more personalized care. However, he stresses that without proper training on ethical use, the deployment of such tools could risk harm, as users may unintentionally cause misinformation or dependency on AI responses.

In terms of communication, Hancock’s research reveals that even passive interaction with AI, such as using “smart replies” in emails, subtly influences user behavior, making their messages shorter, simpler, and more positive. This effect illustrates AI's subtle power to alter communication patterns, even if users don’t actively choose AI-generated suggestions.

The issue of trust and authenticity is particularly problematic when AI assists users in crafting personal content, like dating profiles. Hancock notes that while AI can create profiles that align with users’ self-images, this blurs personal boundaries, as receivers may not distinguish between the user’s authentic personality and the AI's crafted persona.

Looking ahead, Hancock points to the potential dangers of AI in mass misinformation campaigns, as bad actors could exploit these systems to produce and disseminate false information more effectively and cheaply. He advocates for research into methods of authenticating AI-generated communication, though he acknowledges the challenges, as users tend to perceive AI-assisted communication as less sincere. This highlights a tension: disclose AI involvement and risk being seen as inauthentic, or withhold it and potentially deceive the audience.

In summary, Hancock’s insights underscore the critical need for ethical AI design, user education, and further research to understand AI’s impact on human interaction, as well as proactive measures to mitigate misuse in an increasingly AI-mediated world.

**My issues with the AI summary**

The LLM made its summary way too long in my opinion. I believe that a summary should be a taste of the article, not all the information. Summaries should help readers decide if they want to read the articles themselves. It should be a support beam of the article. Also, it sounds like a robot.

**Importance of the topic**

This topic is important since AI is in almost all online services. Some of these services are in their infancy, so we need to take steps to keep it under control. The mistakes that can be made from LLMs are endless, and many have already occurred. Now is the time that we can and have to change these programs.

**Questions**

At what point will the personality of LLMs be like humans?

Do people need to undergo further education surrounding LLMs to not be fooled by them?

Should warnings be put into place when AI generated content is present?