Reflections on the use of AI for aspects of the qualitative research workflow, at the end of Day 2 of the CARMA course.

	Worksheet 1 General (N=9)	Worksheet 2 Ideation (N=8)	Worksheet 3 Data (N=12)	Worksheet 5 Literature (N=10)
Why use AI	Program Evaluation I am thinking about using AI to serve as a peer coder and potentially interpreter – as a bias check or to identify my blindspots when generating insights or identifying what is in the data. To improve evaluation methods and products -Speed for summarizing qualitative data of all sorts (!!!) -Checking codes against human insights -Systematic analysis across interviews (limitations of human insight)	Similar to unblocking writers' block, AI can be "generative" in that sense. Also, it can facilitate the editing process (e.g., refining interview questions), advancing the speed of completion for data collection tools. I think if I have a broad idea or half-baked idea, that I can use the AI to help me narrow my focus, get an idea for what has been done and maybe what hasn't, and different/unique ways to build out or extend my thinking. To expand on my own ideas or refine processes. Broaden or expand on for example research questions. -Especially when it's a new area that I'm not very familiar with -Hypothetical differences, e.g., gender differences	Always being mindful to frame it as an "assistant", I would use it to ease the constraints (e.g., time and cost) of research and evaluation. I don't think I would for most of my work because it doesn't fit my purpose. However, if I was interested in comparing AI and human data, or perhaps in looking for potential problems with AI data, I could see doing that. To reach participants across the state to engage in surveying. Survey to text option. I typically use ChatGPT exclusively. I use it because I may not be deeply familiar with an area or a method. I use it to help me understand errors in modelling, as well.	AI platforms seem to do a better job of systematically gathering literature than I do. Ethical concerns/questions notwithstanding, I'll use any tool that helps me accomplish my task in a timely manner. "Time" as a converted commodity in the context of the neoliberal academy remains a central factor for me. If it saved me time or would help me consider/find literature from different fields that I don't normally consult. Saving hours sorting through articles that are not exactly what is needed. I think this is one area where I'd be the most useful where I think I'd be able to defend my choice to use it (unlike using it for synthetic data, at least right now). Because I would simultaneously be checking the

	Speeding up analyses; getting a handle on initial insights about very large datasets	-Theoretical frameworks/perspectives that would be relevant (that I might not be familiar with) -Just as a thought partner -Feedback on current thinking, visualization of possibilities, wow codebooks!!!	Using it to collect data feels much more practical and defensible. In which case, I'd consider using Yazi or something like that.	validity of its inferences, it'd be as helpful as a grad student in getting annotated papers.
	To get a fast start on analyzing qualitative data for a pilot study.		-I think I might generate example interview transcripts just to get an idea of what's out there from a probabilistic standpoint; maybe as a thought experiment; it might jog some new connections that could then be used to generate additional follow up questions	-To familiarize myself with unfamiliar literatures and adjacent literatures -Scite was fun to use!
	As a consulting firm we deal with a lot of projects with a large volume of data and interviews. Projects often have a short timeline and we are pursuing ways to make the approach more efficient and less time consuming	If I'm not familiar with a topic or content or context area, and would like to get a broad understanding of where things stand on that topic/content in the field. Probably CGPT or Gemini		AI can capture a wide range of literatures within and outside of my field. I like Elicit but am also enjoying Scite. The Deep Research tool with ChatGPT was ok
	To support projects in terms of progress help with the workload this creates.	It's a nice jumpstart for when I feel dull/rusty/overwhelmed by a lot of literature/ideas/data. So far, ChatGPT has been very helpful	I don't think that I would AI to create synthetic data. I might use it for training/teaching purposes, however. I may use interviewing tools for large-scale studies, or studies that are not tied to a particular context/location of interest, or diary-based studies.	SciSpace
	Thinking about using AI to extend and deepen qualitative projects How can we use its strengths to take us to new depths of understanding about the world around us?	To identify gaps in existing research – areas, questions, study populations. To get a overview of what has been done.	Re: data collection. I like the idea of using AI for scalability/efficiency with scarce resources. Re: data generation. I'm unsure about "why" given my research	AI could be very helpful for a quick scoping review and for a wider scan and more importantly in doing a rapid review of a big set of studies and to classify them quickly. I can see regular chatbots being useful enough for this task but the integration feature with citation software sounds useful for bespoke tools like Scite.

How can we use its reach and accessibility to learn more than we already know?		focus, but I think the idea of objectifying research artifacts for deeper examination of positionality is an interesting one.	To get a an overview of the relevant literature even from other literature – perplexity looked ok, deep research in gemini was ok too. Needs good prompting.
		Collecting data yes; creating … I need to understand this better first.	
		To compare control versus control to see if my control group is actually biased in some ways despite the randomization due to some parameters beyond the control of the study. Might help create some validity checks.	Why? It would allow a broader scope of literature. I cannot even imagine using AI for literature reviews I have conducted in the past, particularly for my dissertation work. Chat GBT, Perplexity, Gemini, and SCITE (paid versions) appears to have the best outcomes. Using it to summarize articles. While I couldn't really see the depth that is offered because I was on a trial, it was remarkable how quickly Perplexity and Scite pulled together literature, some of which I had not seen despite being immersed in it right now as I write up my literature review!
		It seem useful for maybe starting a project – what does a 75 year old say about x and then see whether this is the case. Maybe useful at aggregated level. Less so about actually human experiences? Good way to test the bias of AI systems	

	W1 General (N=9)	W2 Ideation (N=8)	W3 Data (N=12)	W5 Literature (N=10)
When useful to use AI	For next Program Evaluation	Useful for program evaluation and descriptive or explanatory qualitative research. Not so useful for theory generation or critical research.	It would be useful if I have to operate according to a funder's terms.	Useful in any context with the exception of intentionally entering a research space devoid of any exposure to the research topic.
	I have a project now that I am thinking of using it for.		I like the idea of creating personas for training new qualitative researchers. Or generating a corpus for students to practice coding or different forms of analysis.	
	Throughout the reporting process	I think I would use it at the very beginning – maybe when I'm thinking about "what's next" or when I hear about something interesting that I'm not familiar with. I'm not sure I would use it to refine my ideas – I think my refining process (inside my head/with colleagues) is much more sophisticated and able to be more creative.		I think it would be useful if you're trying to do interdisciplinary work and need exposure to literature from fields less familiar. I think it is generally useful if it saves time and helps curate relevant resources faster.
	-Board interview project… today!!!		I find it useful at the early stages to get a sense of my text data.	
	When are you thinking of using AI?		I also use it to better understand theory, especially theory I may not know.	I can't think of an instance where it would not be useful.
		To design research model on a specific topic. To interview human subjects, I think of AI as a tool but not a replacement to a human researcher.		
	When I deal with routine tasks; When I deal with novel tasks where AI might provide some guidance.		At present, I don't think it'd be appropriate to use it to build models based on text. But it could be useful, as John Paul, said to look at how, in the population of the training data, ideas are understood.	-I can imagine at the start to identify what's already been done; and also figuring out gaps
	As soon as possible and incrementally engage more and more.	-Especially at the start -BUT, I'm worried about how it might create pre-conceived		Certainly helpful at outset of research project, to help plan research focus. Also useful for iterating between data

		notions/expectations prior to actually talking to someone -It's so good, so I'm worried about where it stops and where my thinking/theorizing starts -How to be transparent about this in the publication process	-I feel like the bot would probably be more engaging than a typical survey, especially when capturing open-ended responses -Might also be a deterrent to people using AI to respond to surveys (haha!) -Not useful anywhere you are trying to build a relationship and really going into depth enabled only by trust	and theory during data collection and analysis, as you follow your nose on different paths/topics.
During the execution of the project				
	Good question! I am curious about the recruitment process – how might AI support in reaching hard to reach populations? While confidentiality is an issue with AI, does the anonymity for participant participation? Transcription for sure! Representing my thoughts in different ways – visually? Reading my brainstorm back to me? I wonder how AI can strengthen my analysis by presenting my own thoughts in a way that may allow me to hear them or internalize them differently	See above. Not useful or appropriate when I am doing deeply context-driven or ethnographic research. New graduate students can use this but then they should follow up with a deeper dive. Often left out leading research in my field in favour of scholarship (real?) from other disciplines.	See above. I don't believe I would use it to create data, unless the target participant is incredibly hard to reach or is emotionally scarred and therefore unable/unwilling to talk. But even there, there is a risk of generalization and stereotyping, because of the bias in the training data and public discourse used for such tools.	I think it would be useful for "a first cut." Not useful perhaps when dealing with a particular school of qualitative research …? When a subject area relies heavily on cultural understanding and interpretation or relies on non-English text. I would also be careful not to use AI in the context of sensitive information.
		I can see how it would be useful at the outset, to give you leads on different data, which then prompt deeper dives. I can also see it useful after data collection, to point you to different theoretical paths.		Useful to get a good overview – maybe as a starting point to start writing Not to write a whole literature review
			I could imagine with the hundreds of trades on a project, or hundreds of nurses in a hospital, sending something to their phones and getting quick responses could be useful. Similar to diary sampling. Still unclear on when else it would useful to generate data. Maybe – with sufficient acknowledgement of	
		It might be useful when you are already a subject matter expert and have a fair understanding of the		

		existing research in the area and the key questions driving the field. It can also be helpful in getting s quick high level understanding of a subject that is not your primary area of work where you are collaborating across disciplines. But it can give you a false sense of knowledge and preparedness if you are leading the research on your own rather than supporting a subject matter expert in the field.	potential biases – it could be a nice jump start for you to imagine (theory building as disciplined imagination) potential responses to your questions, helping to finesse them. I think as a supplemental analysis, it might be useful but not as the main analysis (unless your outlet is technical in nature … at least for now).	
		To get an understanding whether something is novel To bring and bridge things across different aspect of a project. It did not seem to be quite up to date with the academic discussion.	Creating personas and aggregating demographics and choices can make sense in some instances – say market research, but experiences are not set in stone and they can change at a more rapid rate than some of the demographic or other "attributes." So creating data on experiences feels unethical and detrimental to human progress and change. I can see examples of how some creative qualitative longitudinal studies can be done. For example, how would have American women in the 1920s responded to the idea of universal childcare?	

			Initially I thought that using AI as a diary entry alternative may be effective. In a recent project I used daily diaries alongside interviews, and I found the data that came from the diaries lacked detail and depth. My experience as a person being interviews Ailyze felt that it could be effective for eliciting deeper responses than a survey. However, in the context of other work, peers in the class brought up some important considerations and problems with reinforcing stereotypes, conditioning and creating synthetic qualitative data. I still wonder if it's used alongside in person interviews, if it could create be useful for providing participants different ways of expressing themselves and if it would reduce participant angst about sharing.	
	W1 General (N=9)	**W2 Ideation (N=8)**	**W3 Data (N=12)**	**W5 Literature (N=10)**
How use AI Effectively	QUALITATIVELY + quantitatively

I was going to just do some topic modelling to see what the LLM came up with compared to me, but I'm curious if there are generative AI techniques that can also do this | I increasingly value the significance of "prompt engineering".

Ask specific prompts and build prompts from one to another – scaffolding the prompts to drill down to the thing I really want. | Use it to help design interview protocols and/or surveys, as well as to retrieve relevant literature

How would you use AI tools to most effectively collect/create data for qualitative projects? | Gathering and reading summaries or abstracts from legitimate sources.

I think I would use it maybe after I had done some initial reviewing to get a sense of the space. I think it would be most useful for augmenting my search rather than doing it for |

for me. I have also already used auto-transcription (via Zoom).			me. I might also use it to do some quick summaries of articles that I'm not sure I want to read in-depth to get an idea if they are worth reading further.
To develop questions, produce data visualizations, report writing	Very specifically, by providing clear instructions and details the hope is the tool will produce the desired output.	A guided exploratory search for information, or to analyse my data.	
-Transcription of audio -Assignment of codes -Summarize themes -Inquire interpretation	Write detailed prompts to specify the topics of focus… specify disciplines and/or theories to get more relevant information	I am not entirely sure. I need to think about it more. Not sure	I don't think I'd ask it to actually do the literature review for me, but instead to help me understand the lineage and nuance of theories.
For now, as a means of finding connections across multiple pieces of data collected across multiple projects/sites. Eventually, it may help with coding in both broad and focused ways, but I don't know yet.	Today I enjoyed asking for help in identifying and sort best and least understood topics under umbrella topic. I can then do deeper dives into sub-topics and see which ones align with my extant work or propel new work	It can help in instrument testing and make it more economical. It could help me increase my sample and test my results with primary data against the synthetic data. It can help question hypothesis in a more rigorous manner than qual studies usually allow. In some ways it will perhaps move the qual research to the top right quadrant more and more.	It seems that AI tools don't automatically suss out what we subjectively treat as "top" journals, which still matters for the field. It helps to identify what you think the most trusted sources are, import key sources and then use the search to see what is being corroborated or not by other top sources (and NOT corroborated) as well as popular press for relatable examples.
For lit review; For data coding / preliminary analysis	Use prompts to tailor research project to meet specific objectives. It can also hep expand my existing portfolio of work identifying how I can build expertise in a specific area by identifying gaps in my experience and matching it to the gaps in research out there.	The chatbots seem to be useful for some sort of studies (diary studies?)	Not different from other (e.g., quantitative) research: a) brainstorm; b) get "lay of the land"
In a range of tasks, particularly in literature scans etc., identifying good case studies, doing analysis			

of interview data, and help in structuring and organizing reports. To support transcription and get analysis started (summarising transcripts)	To chat about ideas to see their potential viability		Identify what is coming up – whose research (which parts of the world, what kinds of Universities, funders) and what research (study population, location, methods, timelines, sampling size, and frame) is garnering attention, whose isn't. It can be a helpful way to identify marginalized voices in their absence and then amplify them. Work out a detailed prompt so that and then engage with the bot
	W1 General (N=9)	**W2 Ideation (N=8)**	**W3 Data (N=12)**	**W5 Literature (N=10)**
What AI Contributes	Building evidence base for community-based programming for vulnerable populations I think it will serve as a check on me and my co-authors – help us see things we may not see or confirm things we are seeing to increase our credibility and potentially make us aware of biases (either in ourselves or in the AI)	The use of time and cost of operation(s). I think it could potentially help me identify areas to consider that I had not – especially if I'm trying to find an interdisciplinary angle. I think it helps uncover potential blind spots. -Identifying gaps in the existing research literature that this question	The benefits of time and money I don't see a use in this vein for any of my current projects. Maybe it could help collect data for a future project to help save time if the aim was to mostly help participants refine or deepen their responses? In some projects it helps	Time and cost. A wider/more diverse set of perspectives/findings on my topic. Could allow for more frequent use of scholarly articles in my research and reporting.

Speed up analysis, maybe even help organize information; force me to deidentify my data	addresses (HUGE for writing the introduction) -Validating hunches re: contribution	It might help collect more data at scale. Building language models requires a lot of data, and it is hard to get.	It would probably help me find the seminal articles more quickly.
Speeding analysis up; Offering some insights; Helping with quantifying qualitative data	New ideas and questions; faster framing of the argument and questions for proposals. Checklist for making sure my draft is effective; ask for suggestions on how to improve rather than giving it a blanket instruction on improving.	Using AI for data collection: faster data collection, and more "human" or personalized experience for research participants as opposed to typing responses in an app. I am leaning toward a "no" about gaining from synthetic data.	-Supporting the set up and argumentation for the theoretical limitations of existing work that could be filled with qualitative research Casting a wider net
Reduce time and increase efficiency.	It would help me narrow down foci within a vast dataset		It can help avoid going through paywalls where possible. It can condense time in the first step of literature review and can help the researcher focus time and energy on relevant resources.
Hopefully help with progression the project as planned.		A jumpstart on thinking of how questions might be responded to A check on potential biases	
It will allow for more thinking – if we can have AI carry out tedious tasks that may not contribute as much in terms of knowledge translation – this may allow for more thinking, analysing, likelihood of taking on more complex projects. Literature review – saving time collating relevant literature Research design- help to brainstorm research designs. I did not appreciate that this could be	It can help expand my skillset by pointing out research methods and analysis approaches that I may not be familiar with but might serve the project well. This capability would be in the area of learning rather than AI doing for you. To give a structure to the project.	Speed; convenience; something "new" à better participant engagement Reduce time and labor.	Pointing you to literature in field you would not normally look – though it might not be relevant.

	done with AI until our class today and was astounded by ChatGBT's suggestion my study – suggested ideas for mixed methods that I hadn't thought about.			
	W1 General (N=9)	**W2 Ideation (N=8)**	**W3 Data (N=12)**	**W5 Literature (N=10)**
Match Study Perspective	Yes, given that we intend to use a mixed-methods approach	For the most part, as an "assistant", yes. To the notion of co-constructing knowledge, AI can function as a participant in knowledge production.	It DEFINITELY depends on the research purpose (e.g., program evaluation vs critical exploration)	Depends on the research purpose.
	It does and it doesn't. I think it matches the general principles, but I can see purist reviewers having a problem since we are doing grounded theory, which is typically a purist method done in purist communities.	I'm not really sure what this means. I don't need help generating or refining ideas for my current studies. I do think it can help me think about new studies, and I don't know the perspectives of those studies yet. Maybe it would shape my future study perspective…and I'm not sure how I feel about that.	No. I am interested in real people and real data at present. Hypothetical perspectives don't help answer any of my research questions at present. Maybe in the future – I could see myself looking at gendered responding to AI bots in organizational contexts.	I don't think it doesn't match it…but I'm not sure it really fully matches either. My project uses literature review to set the stage and help build theory, but the primary aims are to develop theory from the collected data, so I'm not sure it matters too much how I come to the literature included for review.
	-Dunno…		I am sorry—I may have missed this part about study perspective.	Hmmm…in terms of facilitating iteration between theory and data for theory construction, yes!
		Broadly, yes		
	My study perspective is ethnographic, phenomenological and relational. AI (specifically a chatbot) can help me identify behavioral patterns that meaningfully illustrate processes, experiences and concepts of interest.	Yes. For this portion of the qual research, it works more in the form of a research assistant rather than "doing the work" for you. You can query it and run ideas as you would	Creating data using AI is something I struggle with philosophically and ethically. My gut reaction says that it is not data because it does not come from real people and do justice to their lived experiences. Yet, I also	yes

I think reviewing literature is one area in qualitative research where I feel |

	I think so

Not in all instances. Policy research is often exploratory and descriptive and not led by a tight hypothesis.

Another good question – I think it does. My research is grounded in subjectivities, participant voices, interpretation, meaning making and lived experiences. Can AI offer me new entryways into hearing others' experiences | with a colleague who has knowledge in the space but it will still be up to you to check the feasibility and the validity of these approaches.

Not really | realize that we live in the postmodern age of simulation and simulacra. If observable and experienced data itself is only an approximation of reality, then perhaps it is not too far-fetched to say that simulated data is the same?

Not really, at least not initially. Ethnography is about understanding what is meaningful for a certain group of people.

Collecting: yes; creating: not sure

Mostly no. | most comfortable using AI. The traditional processes for literature review are more adhoc and can be very siloed depending on the time and interest a researcher spends on it. AI can help provide directionality to your search process very early on |
| | **W1 General   (N=9)** | **W2 Ideation   (N=8)** | **W3 Data   (N=12)** | **W5 Literature   (N=10)** |
| **Gain** | Practical knowledge, time, and (maybe a) power balance

I think a more comprehensive picture and insurance policy to make our work more credible | Time, in a global and institutional capitalist context.

Maybe some ideas for other theories, concepts, research to consider as I develop my idea. It can help me save | A broadened way of looking at my evaluation study or research project. Time and money

Potentially time in collection. Free (ish) data – though again, not sure | Time (there it is again) and cost.

Maybe some new perspectives/findings from different fields I had not considered or had not been exposed to. Perhaps that could |

	Improved productivity and outputs	time in focusing my initial investigative work when coming up with a topic or research question.	the quality would meet my standard or that such data would meet any of my purpose. Insight into how AI works and what it can and can't do.	help produce some additional theoretical insights or integrations that are novel.
	-Speed, accuracy, knowledge of the data	Funding and time is limited in the non-profit world, AI is the assistant I don't have funding to support.	Potential to gain more data by reaching more participants in a defined time period.	Quickly pulling facts from articles to information reports/presentations.
	I'll learn more of the processual roots of AI and related technology (e.g., ML, NLP). I'll also learn more about integrating human interpretation with more algorithmic (?) processes.	New ideas and questions; faster framing of the argument and questions for proposals. Checklist for making sure my draft is effective; ask for suggestions on how to improve rather than giving it a blanket instruction on improving.	New information and new knowledge. Perhaps gaining more high-quality data.	Efficiency Speed! Also points me to paths and sources I may not have thought of on my own (due to training, research focus, etc.
	Speed; Accuracy; Less bias	Quick organization of thoughts and ideas to focus on what is most important for you.	-Stretches my imagination because "intuition" is not simply only based on my own perspective	Potentially more comprehensive than relying on other, traditional sources
	Helps me cross check the path I have adopted and ensure the reliability of the data I am using	A quicker understanding of a field of study	Speed; convenience; something "new" à better participant engagement (for now); perhaps being able to implement more complex study designs	It can help you conceptualize and assimilate literature much more quickly since it presents it in a curated form. You don't have to expend too much time and thinking into understanding how a certain research study fits into your project.

	Ideally more time to focus on interpreting and thinking about the data of the project I think that AI is the future – it will be a means to an end as time goes on. By not using AI do we create larger gaps between research and practice? By resisting AI, do we risk simplifying or constricting knowledge?		Save time and resources and feel more confident in the research design and the appropriateness of the methods and tools used. More general insights – this is what the average person would say?	Breath
	W1 General (N=9)	**W2 Ideation (N=8)**	**W3 Data (N=12)**	**W5 Literature (N=10)**
Lose	Possibly, we'll sacrifice our intuition (feeling as knowledge) Potentially outlets for publication – folks may not want to publish work with AI assist. It could also potentially feed us garbage…if it is no good and tells us something is there that is not…how would we know? -Really knowing the details of each transcript	It depends; for now, nothing comes to mind. Maybe my claim to the intellectual property? I worry whether or not these ideas are really mine or if they aren't. Does it matter if the AI helped me come up with my idea? Do I need to share authorship with the AI? Will my peers think that my work is less than if I don't do EVERYTHING completely on my own or acknowledge that I used AI?	I don't know I think integrity of the data. Generalizability to the larger population (though this is difficult in qual regardless). In some ways, control over an interview and interaction with informants (potentially could damage quality of data…but might also enhance it). Human connection and prompts related to data collection, may only gather surface level data or miss key	Deep engagement with the literature. Maybe time. It could just be an exercise in wasting time finding irrelevant sources or sources I already have/use. Perhaps going down rabbit holes only to yield nothing useful. Lose the opportunity to find what you do not know, the element of exploration.

		Not entirely sure yet.	information entirely as the bot may not know which follow up questions to ask.	I might not have the chance to get lost in the literature. Those rabbit holes can be really fun!
	I may lose deeper knowledge about ALL my data. However, this may be an oxymoron. I inevitably need to have focused analyses to effectively communicate some knowledge, so figuring out what to focus on will be ultimately helped by AI.	Autonomy. Not really gaining fundamentally new ways of thinking about the issues, but it could depend on user experience.	I could become over-reliant on the tool.	-May not be entirely comprehensive but still an excellent starting point
	Accuracy: How can I know what the AI did? Bias: potentially introduce new ones of which I might be unaware / which I cannot grasp or express; Serendipity?	It can create a false sense of security about having a full grasp of the subject area in question. It may sometimes drive toward popular articles or streams or work rather than those most relevant to your idea that may not have as much visibility.	We could lose representation in our research. If we create synthetic data from models that are not built on representative data, then research based on the data is not generalizable to the population. Because we don't know the exact distribution of the training data, we might not be able to adequately communicate who that research generalizes to.	Maybe the deep knowledge from directly reading papers and crafting my own notes! Serendipity?
	Perspectives that are often less widely known and documented. Might lose some agency on controlling the use of data and how it is interpreted. Might lose some of the team engagement and creative thinking that takes place in analyzing findings.	Really focusing on something novel that has never been done before – i.e. blue sky research and ideas	-You might believe what you get, which is dangerous since it is not an actual person responding My soul? :D Jokes aside, I can see how using bots to collect data can be useful in certain cases, described above, especially those which are	The contextual "feel" one gets from browsing and looking up things is perhaps lost when you rely on AI. The backend absorption your brain is doing even as you decide something is irrelevant for your study and don't save it for further reading will no longer happen. I guess it makes a researcher more specialized and at the same time lose some of the "generalist" skills.

Nuanced understanding of some of the interview transcripts. Might make more conceptual labelling more challenging Total engagement and immersion into data & CONTROL		already far-flung from the researcher. Using them may also make sense in conjunction with an orientation and exit interviews with the researcher, for a diary study, to build and retain rapport. I am torn about the pros and cons of using these bots to collect data from/with vulnerable and marginalized participants. The "soul" joke is primarily regarding the creation of synthetic data. Despite my philosophical ruminations about the nature of "data," I remain ethically troubled by the idea of publishing research based on synthetic data, although I see no problem in using it for training/teaching purposes. Losing the deep touch with other human's direct experience Experience of interacting with research subjects themselves à inklings, feelings, intuitions Unless there is an ongoing and continuous effort to collect primary data as more and more research uses synthetic data, I think we will	With so much information – it might make depth difficult to achieve in particular for academic publication. Also does it interpret the articles in the way you would Of course my worries revolve around what is and is not appropriate. If I use AI to scope literature, and then reference articles in my own words, is that okay? Currently the use of AI is looked down upon in my department and very much thought about as an issue of academic integrity.

			lose longitudinal representation of ongoing change. The human interaction and individual experiences and stories. Nuance of feeling and reactions to questions.	