ASCILITE 2025

Future-Focused:

Educating in an Era of Continuous Change

Reading between the GenAl lines: Twenty authors' perceptions of GenAl-summaries of their research and the implications for learning and teaching

Kay Hammond

Auckland University of Technology

Samantha Newell

The University of Adelaide

Students trust GenAl-summaries of academic articles despite known issues of hallucinations and errors (Markowitz, 2024). Although this saves time, it costs understanding and engagement with the research findings, context, and authors. In addition, within the academic text, writers craft a credible sense of self alongside balanced representation of subject matter to create a persuasive argument (Hyland, 2005; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007). Students are increasingly relying on GenAl to provide summaries of academic articles (Newell & Dahlenburg, 2024). The changes in the way that readers (in this case, student readers) engage with scholarly knowledge is often explored from the perspective of the reader (Schmidt & Meir, 2023; Xia et al., 2025). Comparatively little attention has been paid to how authors' feel about the proliferation of GenAl-summaries of their work. As such, we explored journal article authors' perceptions of the accuracy of GenAl summaries of their work.

We conducted semi-structured interviews with 20 Australasian-resident authors to compare a summary they wrote with an Al-generated summary (ChatGPT4). Interview transcripts were analysed qualitatively through Reflexive Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021). The following research questions were posed: 1) How are Al-generated journal article summaries perceived as accurate/inaccurate by their authors? 2) How do authors feel about the author-reader relationship when readers only engage with GenAl-summaries?, and 3) What potential implications exist when using GenAl-summaries for learning and teaching?

Authors noted although the Al-summaries appeared accurate overall, they were accurate *but vague*. However, as we progressed through the interviews, authors identified inaccuracies and omissions of: context, disciplinary conventions and concepts, important findings and limitations, and connection/attribution of ideas to prior authors. Participants described how Al-summaries present author suggestions as established facts. The absence of methodological details was concerning because methods sections provide information on researchers' decisions, validity of the findings, and training for novice researchers/students. In summaries of the introduction sections, prior literature was omitted, thus misrepresenting the study as an isolated unit instead of ongoing knowledge-building conversations. Al summaries, therefore, lacked a sense of scholarly community, "no map to take readers to the key people...and further reading".

Several authors explained their sense of disconnection from the reader through the loss of their voice in the linguistically "flattened" output. This felt like losing individuality as everyone's English sounds the same. Some academic authors felt disappointed, robbed, or slapped in the face that the loss of time readers would spend engaging with their work would not be reciprocated by readers only using generated summaries.

We present a model that illustrates these issues of accuracy and writer-reader relationship for educators to use to guide students through critically evaluating AI outputs. Students can make informed choices about when to iteratively prompt, and when to consult/read the full article. This model can increase student understanding of the author, community, and previous research context from which the research has evolved.

ASCILITE 2025

Future-Focused:

Educating in an Era of Continuous Change

Keywords: Generative Al summary, author perception, author-reader relationship, learning and teaching, learning and teaching, Higher Education, qualitative

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. Sage Publications.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies,* 7(2). 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365
- Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(1-2), 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0
- Markowitz, D. M. (2024). Can generative AI infer thinking style from language? Evaluating the utility of AI as a psychological text analysis tool. *Behavior Research Methods*, *56*, 3548–3559. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-024-02344-0
- Matsuda, P. K., & Tardy, C. M. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes*, *26*(2), 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2006.10.001
- Newell, S., & Dahlenburg, S. (2024). The national student survey of GenerativeAI use among Australian university students: Preliminary findings. *ASCILITE Publications*, 431–436. https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2024.1168
- Schmidt, P. G., & Meir, A. J. (2023). Using Generative AI for literature searches and scholarly writing: Is the integrity of the scientific discourse in jeopardy? *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 71(1). https://www.ams.org/journals/notices/202401/rnoti-p93.pdf
- Xia, T., Pan, X., Cao, M., & Guo, J. (2025). An investigation of college students' acceptance of Al-assisted reading tools: An expansion of the TAM and SDT. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13491-y

Hammond, K. & Newell, S. (2025, Nov 30 – Dec 3). Reading between the GenAl lines: Twenty authors' perceptions of GenAl-summaries of their research and the implications for learning and teaching. [Poster Presentation]. Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education Conference, Adelaide, Australia. https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2025.2719

Note: All published papers are refereed, having undergone a double-blind peer-review process. The author(s) assign a Creative Commons by attribution license enabling others to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon their work, even commercially, as long as credit is given to the author(s) for the original creation.

© Hammond, K., & Newell, S. 2025