

# *Writing Spaces*

## Assignments & Activities Archive

### Summaries: GAI vs. Human

*Tiffany Buckingham Barney*

This activity is a selection from the *Writing Spaces* Assignment and Activity Archive, an open access companion resource to the Writing Spaces open textbook series.

To access additional selections, visit: <http://writingspaces.org/aaa>.

Assignment and activity selections © 2024 by the respective authors. Unless otherwise stated, these works are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) and are subject to the Writing Spaces Terms of Use. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>, email [info@creativecommons.org](mailto:info@creativecommons.org), or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA. To view the Writing Spaces Terms of Use, visit <http://writingspaces.org/terms-of-use>.

All rights reserved. For permission to reprint, please contact the author(s) of the individual articles, who are the respective copyright owners.

# Summaries: GAI vs. Human

Tiffany Buckingham Barney

## Overview

As generative artificial intelligence (GAI) makes its way into academia, it is imperative that students are given time to explore its capabilities and limitations. Exploring the use of GAI for academic purposes is best done in an academic setting with guidance from instructors. Just as important as this exploration is the opportunity to discuss the importance of authorship, validity, and appropriate use.

The following summary producing activity is designed to put AI in students' hands in an open and guided situation and to facilitate these much needed conversations. By doing so, students are able to identify qualities of summaries that are both strong and weak, thus strengthening their own summarizing skills. This may meet learning outcome objectives for summary instruction in basic writing and first-year-writing courses.

## Time Commitment

Approximately 120 minutes

## Materials

- Class reading of instructor's choice (see "Further Reading" below for suggestions)
- Paper and pen/pencil –one per group
- Computers –one per group

- Several GAI chatbot accounts: ChatGPT by OpenAI, Microsoft's CoPilot, Gemini by Google (these accounts have free limited use as of 2024)
- Institution (and/or department) policy on GAI
- Whiteboard(s) and/or Chalkboard(s)

### Summaries: GAI vs. Human Process

- Students will be assigned a class reading to complete before class.
- As class begins, students are given a few minutes to (re)orient themselves with the reading.
- Students are then divided into small groups (3 or 4) where each group has at least one computer (in a computer lab if necessary).
- As a group, the students write a summary together without the assistance of computers. This will need to be handwritten so students aren't prompted with sentence completion options. (Groups need not worry about spelling or grammar concerns as these will only be used for discussion.)
- Each group selects a GAI chatbot they'd like to use (ideally different from the others). [As of mid-2024, there are several free options; the most popular include ChatGPT (OpenAI), Google Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot. Students are likely to know of the most recent versions. Some students may already have their own accounts and are likely willing to use them for this activity. The instructor should come prepared with a sharable account for each of the most popular.]

- As a group, students brainstorm, troubleshoot, and try different prompts to elicit responses from different GAI chatbots (a different one for each group if possible) to summarize the reading. If the chatbots do not recognize the reading, students may need to copy and paste the entire reading into the chatbot as part of the prompt.
- Within the groups, students analyze the chatbot summaries for accuracy and quality in comparison to the text and to their own summaries. Each group is asked to identify two things their chatbot did well and two things it could do better on. Each group is asked to do the same with their own handwritten summary.
- The class then discusses the different chatbots they've used in the groups to compare the capabilities and reliability of each and the handwritten summaries to identify if there are any ways the chatbot versions can help improve the handwritten versions and/or ways the handwritten versions are superior.
- The instructor shares the institution's (and/or department's) GAI policy as well as their own policy for using GAI on assignments with an emphasis on the need for students to find out individual instructor's policies regarding the use of GAI for their classes.
- The class then discusses the benefits and drawbacks, the usefulness and limitations, and the ethical issues surrounding the use of AI for writing in academia and society.

## Learning Outcomes

Students engaging in this activity will:

- Identify strong and weak qualities of summaries
- Become familiar with the capabilities and limitations of GAI

### chatbots

- Distinguish between the work of GAI chatbots and humans
- Recognize the need to understand GAI policies within institutions, departments, and individual class teachers
- Think critically about the use of GAI in society and education

### Learning Accommodations

- The class reading should be prepared beforehand for text-to-speech accessibility.
- Students may choose different forms of participation in this activity: a handwritten scribe, a typing scribe, a chatbot prompt generator, and/or a discussion representative.
- Text-to-speech should be available for students to hear the GAI chatbot prompts read aloud as needed.
- Various discussion ideas should be noted on a whiteboard or chalkboard to aid students in following discussion points.

### Further Reading

The following readings may be good choices for the assigned class reading for this assignment. They vary in length, complexity, and focus.

Bearman, Margaret, et al. "Discourses of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Critical Literature Review." *Higher Education*, vol. 86, no. 2, Oct. 2022, pp. 369–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>.

- Faggella, Daniel. "Examples of Artificial Intelligence in Education." *Emerj Artificial Intelligence Research*, 21 Nov. 2019, [emerj.com/ai-sector-overviews/examples-of-artificial-intelligence-in-education](https://emerj.com/ai-sector-overviews/examples-of-artificial-intelligence-in-education).
- Huang, Kalley. "Alarmed by A.I. Chatbots, Universities Start Revamping How They Teach." *The New York Times*, 16 Jan. 2023, [www.nytimes.com/2023/01/16/technology/chatgpt-artificial-intelligence-universities.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/16/technology/chatgpt-artificial-intelligence-universities.html).
- Mattei, Shanti Escalante-De. "ARTnews.com." *ARTnews.com*, 17 Jan. 2023, [www.artnews.com/art-news/news/artists-class-action-lawsuit-against-ai-image-generator-midjourney-stability-deviantart-1234653892](https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/artists-class-action-lawsuit-against-ai-image-generator-midjourney-stability-deviantart-1234653892).
- McGrath, Cormac, et al. "University Teachers' Perceptions of Responsibility and Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education - an Experimental Philosophical Study." *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 4, Jan. 2023, p. 100139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100139>.
- Murugesan, San, and Aswani Kumar Cherukuri. "The Rise of Generative Artificial Intelligence and Its Impact on Education: The Promises and Perils." *Computer*, vol. 56, no. 5, May 2023, pp. 116–21. <https://doi.org/10.1109/mc.2023.3253292>.
- Shanahan, Murray. "Talking About Large Language Models." *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 67, no. 2, Jan. 2024, pp. 68–79. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3624724>.