

**Will Chat GPT take our jobs? Discourse analysis on generative AI
from the moral panic perspective**

*Czy Chat GPT zabierze nam pracę? Analiza dyskursu o generatywnych SI
w perspektywie paniki moralnej*

Marta Sobiech-Buzala¹

Abstract: This article presents the results of discourse analysis conducted on three language corpora, *Polish Trends*, corpus of press texts, and corpus of tweets, exploring the topic of generative artificial intelligence, particularly ChatGPT. The aim of the investigation was to verify whether the Polish online discourse on AI could be characterised as a moral panic and whether the premises present in the discourse indicate active societal reflection on issues of trust in the technology itself and the content it generates. The analysis revealed that the discourse on AI involves moderate anxiety, which is reasonable – authors of the analysed articles and statements reflect on the real consequences of the popularisation of generative AI, including the issue of lack of adequate digital competencies to have a sense of control over it. This article emphasises the need to extend expert and academic reflections to a societal perspective, including awareness of the main threads and societal concerns raised at the level of discourse. This analysis gives a voice to society, underscoring the role of ordinary users in the assumptions of Trustworthy AI and building trust in new technologies, referring to Michael Foucault’s concept of knowledge-power and Shoshana Zuboff’s surveillance.

Streszczenie: Niniejszy artykuł prezentuje wyniki analizy dyskursu przeprowadzonej na trzech korpusach językowych – *Polish Trends*, korpusie tekstów prasowych i korpusie tweetów – eksplorując temat generatywnej sztucznej inteligencji, w szczególności Chatu GPT. Celem badania była weryfikacja, czy polski dyskurs internetowy na temat SI może być określany jako panika moralna, a także czy obecne w nim przesłanki wskazują na aktywną refleksję społeczną nad kwestiami zaufania wobec samej technologii, jak i wytwarzanych przez nią treści. Analiza wykazała, że w dyskursie o SI mamy do czynienia z umiarkowanym niepokojem, któremu nie brakuje podstaw – autorzy analizowanych artykułów oraz wypowiedzi zastanawiają się nad realnymi konsekwencjami popularyzacji generatywnych SI, w tym kwestią braku odpowiednich kompetencji cyfrowych, aby mieć nad nią poczucie kontroli. Artykuł ten akcentuje potrzebę rozszerzenia refleksji eksperckich i akademickich o perspektywę społeczną,

¹ Uniwersytet Warszawski, e-mail m.sobiech7@student.uw.edu.pl, ORCID: 0009-0009-1332-8367.

w tym świadomość głównych wątków i obaw społecznych podnoszonych na poziomie dyskursu. Niniejsza analiza oddaje głos społeczeństwu, podkreślając rolę zwykłych użytkowników przy założeniach idei Trustworthy AI oraz w budowaniu zaufania do nowych technologii, odnosząc się do koncepcji wiedzy–władzy Michaela Foucault oraz kapitalizmu nadzoru Shoshany Zuboff.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, trust, moral panic, discourse analysis, corpus analysis

Słowa kluczowe: sztuczna inteligencja, zaufanie, panika moralna, analiza dyskursu, analiza korpusowa

1. Introduction

It is not difficult to notice that Artificial Intelligence (AI) is becoming increasingly popular and of interest both in the scientific and business communities, as well as in the perception of society at large. Conceptions of its operation, purpose, and potential are often the result of individual observations during interactions with AI-based software, deep reflection on technological transformations, or prevailing societal beliefs based on myths about AI constructed over several decades. It is easy to see that AI is spoken about differently and according to different criteria in universities, corporate environments, or everyday situations – differently expressed by technologists, programmers, sociologists, doctors, and even representatives of various age groups or generations, although these discourses may have their common narratives and repeatedly reproduced imaginings. Therefore, reflection on the discourse orientated around Artificial Intelligence cannot be limited solely to the scientific community, where within various disciplines issues of potential and risk associated with AI development are raised, neglecting how society or popular media construct the narrative about said technology – and whether they perceive it through a similar lens.

Although artificial intelligence might seem like a fresh topic, not broadly discussed until recently, the discourse regarding its usefulness and implementation dates back decades. In particular, in 1956, during the Dartmouth conference, McCarthy first coined the term artificial intelligence, aiming to define and establish a conceptual framework for discussing the implications and applications of this technology. At this conference, the LT programme, developed by Allen Newell, John Clifford Shaw, and Herbert Simon, was presented. This

programme had the capability to formulate proofs for logical theorems, indicating the potential integration of computer machinery with human-like intelligence². According to McCarthy, AI involves the creation of intelligent computer programmes and machines designed to fulfil objectives in the real world³. However, it raises the question of whether the goals achieved or envisioned through AI are beneficial for society, in terms of both the end results and the methods employed. Research findings, particularly those concerning the widely-discussed ChatGPT, suggest that while AI has the potential to contribute to numerous commendable initiatives, it falls short in several fundamental aspects. A report by Polish researchers titled *ChatGPT: Jack of all trades, master of none* highlights how Chat GPT struggles with false information provided by users, often presuming its accuracy. The authors even tested the model's ability to detect irony and humour, finding instances where Chat GPT generated politically incorrect responses⁴. Other scholarly articles have criticised Chat GPT for making errors, fabricating bibliographies⁵, or disseminating incorrect information about reality through various hallucinations⁶, which are somewhat emblematic of large language models, based on unfounded responses⁷.

Researchers Sonia Sousa, Jose Carvino and Paulo Martins highlight that recent waves of technological innovation, along with the dispersion of data and the appeal of behaviour prediction, have led to the rapid spread of AI-based software, generating outcomes in an automated and unpredictable manner, including not guaranteeing the truthfulness of the content, forecasts, or recommendations provided⁸. Furthermore, the researchers suggest that such models might prompt humanity to make incorrect decisions and to use them for malicious surveillance practices or disinformation. According to the researchers, the abundance of freely available generative AIs contributes particularly to initiating discussions among experts and

² B. G Buchanan, *A (Very) Brief History of Artificial Intelligence*, "AI Magazine" 2005 (4), p. 57.

³ J. McCarthy, *What is Artificial Intelligence?*, Stanford 2007, <https://www-formal.stanford.edu/jmc/whatisai.pdf> (on-line 31.01.2024)

⁴ J. Kocoń, I. Cichecki, O. Kaszyca, M. Kochanek, D. Szydło, J. Baran *et al.*, *ChatGPT: Jack of all trades, master of none*, "Information Fusion" 2023 (99), pp. 15–16.

⁵ W. H. Walters, E. I. Wilder, *Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT*, "Scientific Reports" 2023 (13), p. 4.

⁶ Z. Li, *The Dark Side of ChatGPT: Legal and Ethical Challenges from Stochastic Parrots and Hallucination*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.14347> (on-line 31.01.2024)

⁷ Z. Ji, D. Su, Y. Xu, A. Madotto, P. Fung *et al.*, *Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation*, "ACM Computing Surveys" 2022 (1), p. 5.

⁸ S. Sousa, J. Cravino, P. Martins, *Challenges and Trends in User Trust Discourse in AI Popularity*, "Multimodal Technologies and Interaction" 2023 (13), pp. 2–4.

legal professionals about trust in AI, raising the issue of regulations aimed at reducing user concerns and ensuring trust in the development of these technologies. One example of such software, also widely popular in Poland, is Chat GPT. Sousa, Carvino, and Martins emphasise the need to cultivate societal trust in artificial intelligence by promoting the concept of ‘trustworthy AI’. Nevertheless, they also observe that European Union initiatives and legal debates primarily focus on countering excessive corporate surveillance and the emerging datafication. Thus, they aim to address issues related to AI itself, but not necessarily focusing adequately on understanding the impact of user trust on the use of these technologies and the consequent implications. It seems necessary, therefore, to pay attention to the users themselves, their attitudes and opinions on the use of open-source AI tools, including the issue of trust in the knowledge generated and the technology itself.

2. Ideas and definitions

Michel Foucault, a French philosopher and sociologist, developed a concept linking knowledge with power, arguing that they do not exist separately but together form a unity reflected in various social processes⁹. Knowledge-power is exercised within different institutions, being legitimised and reproduced through discourses that determine what is accepted as truth and what is rejected as false. Simultaneously, to wield power, one must understand the knowledge and control its truthfulness. This becomes particularly problematic in the context of the rapid development of surveillance capitalism, which Shoshana Zuboff describes as unprecedented¹⁰. This means that humanity, in response to such swift technological advancement, is unable to proactively prepare for its consequences, as it lacks experience with similar transformations and cannot refer to existing precedents – it lacks the knowledge that would enable control.

The discourse, as defined by Teun van Dijk, among others, is nothing but text in context, a certain form of language use behind which lie specific intentions and goals, the presentation of certain ideas¹¹. Just as important as what is said (or written) is who speaks or writes down the content¹². Paweł Śpiewak, in his ironic dictionary of trendy and untrendy

⁹ M. Foucault, *Porządek dyskursu*, transl. M. Kozłowski, Gdańsk 2002.

¹⁰ S. Zuboff, *Wiek kapitalizmu inwigilacji. Walka o przyszłość ludzkości na nowej granicy władzy*, trans. A. Unterschuetz, Poznań 2020.

¹¹ *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces*, T. van Dijk (ed.), Warszawa 2001, pp. 9–28.

¹² *Ibidem*.

words, describes discourse as “perhaps the most important word in common humanities”¹³ noting that everyone is somehow participating in some discourse. The presence of new actors in the form of generative AIs in open access, responsive to posed questions and generating content, as well as the multitude of discussions about data flow, knowledge production, and trust, indicates the formation of new, complex digital dependencies and new challenges related to control, production, and interpretation of information. These dilemmas are faced not only by software creators and the academic community but also by ordinary people, users who talk with AI and also discuss AI. However, does the discourse generated by society consider the issue of knowledge and its veracity? Do technological innovations currently provoke a social stir?

The concept of moral panic was described in 1972 by Stanley Cohen in the book *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*¹⁴. Cohen focuses on the mutual influence of the media and the public in response to previously unknown events or behaviours. Although the term moral panic refers to a sudden outbreak of discrimination and attributing all the worst to representatives of certain subcultures, this concept can be applied in the analysis of discourse on any new phenomenon that provokes social unrest and implies reactions. Cohen states that the cause of a moral panic can be conditions, episodes, individuals, or groups identified as a threat to societal values and interests. Furthermore, the components of a moral panic include: (1) simplification and stereotyping of individuals or the issue by the mass media, (2) the involvement of ‘right-thinking’ individuals (e.g., politicians, clergy, editors) in the defence of moral values, (3) the issuance of expertise and solutions by socially recognised experts, and (4) the development of solutions and ways to deal with the problem by society. A panic can pass and be forgotten or lead to serious and lasting consequences, including “changes in law and social policy or even in the way society perceives itself”, which is definitely the case when addressing the issue of artificial intelligence¹⁵.

The purpose of this article is to present the results of a study on the discourse of internet users and the press discourse centred around the topic of artificial intelligence, particularly ChatGPT itself, using corpus analysis. In the context of the reflections presented here, the research objective is to verify whether the Polish Internet discourse on AI can be described as

¹³ P. Śpiewak, *Słowniczek słów modnych i niemodnych (w humanistyce)*, “ResPublica Nowa” 2002 (10), http://niniwa22.cba.pl/spiewak_slowniczek_slow_modnych_i_niemodnych.html (on-line 31.01.2024)

¹⁴ S. Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*, London 1972.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

moral panic and whether the premises present indicate an active reflection by users on issues of trust in AI itself, as well as the content it generates, verification of data truthfulness, and reflections related to the use of this technology – the risks and threats stemming from its open-source dimension. For these purposes, three language corpora were analysed, which are described in more detail in the methodological section. The results were then interpreted using Stanley Cohen’s theory of moral panic, Michael Foucault’s power-knowledge, and Shoshana Zuboff’s surveillance capitalism, which enabled contextualisation and deepening of the answers to the research questions asked.

3. Research questions and adopted research methods

To adequately address the discussed issues, the following research questions were adopted:

1. Can the Polish Internet discourse on AI be characterised as a moral panic in the sense of Stanley Cohen?
2. Do Polish Internet users actively engage in the topic of AI trust, both in terms of the credibility of the data it presents and the safety of its use?

To answer these research questions, a corpus analysis of online texts was employed. The choice of this research method allows consideration of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the analysis. Through quantitative analysis, statistical relationships between individual words are observed, while qualitative analysis focuses on the observation of discourse elements in their context. In this study, the Sketch Engine tool was used, enabling a clear analysis of language corpora¹⁶. This platform also provides access to the Polish Trends language corpus, characterised by a significant word resource, which was originally planned to be analysed as the most representative of the Internet discourse. However, due to the size of the corpus, it would not allow a comprehensive and detailed answer to the research questions, which is why two additional corpora were created to enable comparative analysis. The final list of corpora analysed in this study is as follows:

1. The *Polish Trends* corpus (available through Sketch Engine) – a daily updated monitoring corpus containing press articles or other sources that are regularly updated from their RSS feeds (*newsfeeds*). Systematic updates allow for the use of diachronic

¹⁶ *What is Sketch Engine?*, Sketch Engine, <https://www.sketchengine.eu> (on-line 31.01.2024)

analysis tools and the study of changes in word usage¹⁷. At the time of analysis, the Polish Trends Corpus consisted of 263,811,493 unique words.

2. The press texts corpus – created for the study, containing press articles published on the websites of online magazines such as Gazeta Wyborcza, Dziennik Gazeta Prawna, Newsweek, Onet, Wirtualna Polska, tagged with the phrase “Chat GPT” or “artificial intelligence”, published from 1 January 2023 to 24 October 2023. The Press Texts Corpus consists of 30,895 unique words.
3. The tweet corpus – created for the study, consisting of Polish tweets containing the phrase “Chat GPT”, published on the platform X (formerly Twitter) from 8 May 2023 to 24 October 2023. The Tweets corpus consists of 3,664 unique words. Corpus analysis proceeded in 4 stages, which were: (1) building auxiliary corpora for comparative analysis, (2) identification of topoi and adjectives related to AI in the individual language corpora, (3) observation of topoi and adjectives in the context of their occurrence, (4) determination of concordances with selected words, (5) determination of 2 and 3-grams, if there are justified reasons for this, (6) comparative analysis of corpora.

4. Analysis results

After preparing the data for analysis, a specific number of topics, verbs, and adjectives that occur the most frequently were identified, from which those that appeared to be most significant from the perspective of the research questions were selected. For the Polish Trends corpus, this was a list of 1,000 words, for the Press Texts corpus 500, and for the tweets corpus 100. Words that could indicate an interest in artificial intelligence were sought.

4.1. The *Polish Trends* corpus

Regarding the Polish Trends corpus, among the 1,000 most popular nouns (keywords) related to the research questions, topics such as “inteligencja” (“intelligence”, 514th place in the ranking, 37,241 occurrences) and “AI” (753rd place in the ranking, 25,592 occurrences) were observed. Interestingly, the word “Putin” occupied the 513th position in the ranking, which constitutes an interesting reference point for the analysis, considering that the Russian

¹⁷ *Polish Trends: a daily-updated monitor corpus of news articles*, Sketch Engine, <https://www.sketchengine.eu/polish-trends-corpus/> (on-line 31.01.2024)

aggression in Ukraine is one of the most mediatically resonant topics in Poland.

Among the adjectives that occur most frequently in the *Polish Trends* corpus, the word “sztuczny” (“artificial”, 111th place in the ranking, 43,957 occurrences) appeared. Given that “sztuczna inteligencja” (“artificial intelligence”) naturally occurs as a two-word chain, and one of the identified topics turned out to be the term “inteligencja” itself, an analysis of 2-grams related to the concept of intelligence was also carried out to examine whether the high positioning of this topic and adjective results mainly from numerous mentions of artificial intelligence or from other, related terms, such as “inteligencja emocjonalna”, “iloraz inteligencji” or “poziom inteligencji” (“emotional intelligence”, “intelligence quotient”, “intelligence level”). The analysis showed that the 2-gram “sztuczna inteligencja” occurs in the *Polish Trends* corpus 34,055 times, while other double sequences related to intelligence appeared significantly less frequently – “inteligencja emocjonalna” only 200 times, “iloraz inteligencji” 100 times, “poziom inteligencji” 96 times. Thus, there is a clear predominance of interest in topics related to artificial intelligence over those dedicated to other aspects of intelligence. Furthermore, if the sequence “sztuczna inteligencja” and the acronym “AI” were treated as identical and their frequency of occurrence in the Polish Trends corpus were summed up, we would obtain a number of 59,647 occurrences in the corpus, which compared to the occurrence of the word “Putin” (37,115) also prompts reflection.

4.2. The press text corpus

In analysing the Press Texts Corpus, which consisted of texts tagged with “Chat GPT” or “artificial intelligence”, the primary focus was on identifying the adjectives that occur the most frequently in the corpus to observe the reactions provoked by this type of open-source software in social discourse. An analysis of topoi from the perspective of texts deliberately chosen for the sample would have been less effective here. Therefore, particular attention was focused on adjectives describing Chat GPT.

The adjectives in the *wordlist* “nowy” (“new”, 103), “inny” (“different”, 74), “ludzki” (“human”, 42), “prawny” (“legal”, 39), “polski” (“Polish”, 34), “ogromny” (“enormous”, 30), “ważny” (“important”, 24), “dobry” (“good”, 24), “amerykański” (“American”, 23), and “osobowy” (“personal”, 20) stand out for their frequent use. To more accurately answer the research questions after observing the most frequently occurring adjectives in the corpus, it was decided to examine their concordances, which allowed for understanding the context of

each word's occurrence. The adjective “nowy” typically refers to the ongoing technological revolution, updates to the Chat GPT version, but also to the new market for digital services and jobs. However, there were also mentions of “nowy autorytaryzm” (“new authoritarianism”) which can be enforced through artificial intelligence, or “nowe bańki technologiczne” (“new technology bubbles”) leading to social polarisation, as well as “nowe regulacje” (“new regulations”) and necessary laws. Regarding the adjective “different”, it usually refers to comparing Chat GPT with other generative AIs. The discourse here revolves around the possible applications of this type of technology. “Ogromny” generally concerns how Chat GPT operates, the data on which it was tested, but also its application in the business sector (“ogromna szansa dla firm”, “huge opportunity for companies”), or “ogromna władza” (“huge power”). The adjective “ważny” usually refers to AI decision-making, the credibility of its proposed solutions. With the adjective “dobry”, issues such as comparing human abilities and artificial intelligence or discussions about who ‘better’ managed specific tasks are discussed. The adjective “polski” refers to the use of Chat GPT in Polish universities, with references to the government, Polish companies, startups, platforms, and foundations. There is also talk of Polish awareness, Polish analytical circles, and Polish IT specialists. “Amerykański” usually appears in reference to the media, or the situation of American companies, job markets. Essentially, these adjectives relate to the job market situation related to Chat GPT, or possibly to the governmental and media situation in given countries. The adjective “ludzki” garners interest as it relates to comparing AI with humans, but also touches on issues such as human morality, human competencies, human nature, human effort, imagination, or knowledge. It addresses the human mind, consciousness, and also biological matters such as the human brain. This adjective also appears when discussing everyday life, interpersonal contacts, and even a longing for them (for example, reminiscing about the times when medical receptionists were not replaced by chatbots). “Osobowy” is used exclusively in the context of personal data processing. Meanwhile, “prawny” accompanies the debate on whether Chat GPT can be treated as a legal entity, also raising issues of legal risk associated with using such technology, as well as matters of its regulation.

To further deepen the collected conclusions, it was decided to also identify the verbs most commonly associated with the sequence "Chat GPT". A frequent personification of Chat GPT was observed, described as one that “przejrzał”, “pomylił”, “zastępuje”, „pracuje” (“reviewed”, “mistook”, “replaces”, “works”).

4.3. The tweet corpus

Tweets corpus containing the sequence “Chat GPT” proved to be highly diverse in terms of the occurrence of unique words. It is also a relatively small corpus in terms of its number, but it is important to remember that tweets are generally a short form of text. In this context, the significantly greater range of topics compared to other corpora is particularly interesting. Among the 100 most common themes, words such as “człowiek” (“human” 15), “praca” (“work”, 10), “programista” (“programmer”, 9), “osoba” (“person”, 9) appeared. There were also individual words related to the work environment such as “branża” (“industry”), „zwolnienie” (“layoff”), “money” (“pieniądz”), “biznes” (“business) and mentions of the future (3 instances), as well as negatively charged vocabulary such as solitary swear words, and “głupota” (“stupidity”), “idiota” (“idiot”), “idiotyzm” (“idiocy”), “kretynizm” (“cretinism”), “afera” (“scandal”).

Regarding the context of the occurrence of the most frequent themes, the concordances of the word “człowiek” indicate its use in both singular and plural (“ludzie, “people”) in contexts of replacing humanity in various work settings. Here, the issue of replacing humans in creative work appears, comparing the abilities of a chatbot with human capabilities (“a real human cannot draw conclusions from something in 3 seconds”). In the context of the ‘person’ topos, there was an aspect of using Chat GPT to manipulate less intelligent individuals who might not be able to distinguish Chat GPT utterances from human ones. Among the 3-grams in this corpus, it is worth noting “Chat GPT can”, “Chat GPT writes”, “Chat GPT will change transport”, “Chat GPT said”. Observing these 3-grams in context leads to the conclusion that users of the X platform feel satisfied when AI appears incapable of something or makes a mistake.

5. Corpus comparison and conclusions

Analysing three such varied corpora seemed essential from the perspective of the research questions and their specificity. The Polish Trends corpus is the largest of the examined corpora, which, due to its size, best meets the criteria of representativeness, although it does not contain texts other than those found in RSS feeds. In such a large corpus, it should be noted that the topic of AI appears more frequently than the surname Vladimir Putin, and the sequence

“artificial intelligence” turns out to be significantly more popular than other 2-grams related to intelligence, such as emotional intelligence. This indicates that this topic is frequently discussed within RSS feeds. Compared to the corpus of purpose-built press texts, which contains only articles tagged with the phrases “Chat GPT” and “artificial intelligence”, the *Polish Trends* corpus provides only partial knowledge of AI placement in discourse.

In the press texts corpus, several particularly significant threads were observed from the perspective of research questions, such as reflections on the place of AI in society and its legal subjectivity, as well as the issue of similarity to humans or the encroachment of AI in areas identified as human, e.g. with respect to creativity or interpersonal relationships. Here, a certain type of social unease can be discerned, related to the discomfort that technology imitates human behaviours, yet does not understand things like morality or human effort. AI is identified within the press discourse as both an opportunity and a threat to the job market. The theme of new positions intertwines with those suggesting greater efficiency of AI, and at the same time, a danger for less specialised and less efficient people. Very often in this discourse, business area issues are raised: perspectives of using AI and its possibilities. The discourse on AI in press texts also includes the theme raised by Sousa, Carvino, and Martins¹⁸, which is the concern about the reliability of the information provided and the validity of decisions made by artificial intelligences. There is also the question of knowledge and its construction, and even the impossibility of verifying its truthfulness by average users, which can be attempted to be linked with Michael Foucault’s theory¹⁹. This discourse also includes themes related to the governing potential of using AI, isolated suggestions of the danger of the so-called new authoritarianism based on strict control and predictions, fitting into Shoshana Zuboff’s theory of surveillance capitalism²⁰, and even Stanley Cohen’s idea of moral panic²¹.

The tweet corpus, being a complement in this analysis but also the closest to authenticity, carries similar conclusions. Tweets containing the sequence “Chat GPT”, as press texts, consisted of numerous references related to the job market and the consequences of technological changes. This corpus proved to be the most emotionally charged due to the content of vocabulary suggesting annoyance and irritation. Similarly to the corpus of press texts, the issue of the similarity of AI with humans was raised, even to the extent of AI traits

¹⁸ S. Sousa, J. Cravino, P. Martins, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–4.

¹⁹ M. Foucault, *op. cit.*

²⁰ S. Zuboff, *op. cit.*

²¹ S. Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

that deviate from known human norms. Thus, a disruption of certain kinds of habit and the existing balance is visible, which would also fit Stanley Cohen's assumptions of moral panic.

After analysing the research material, it can be observed that the issues presented in the Polish press discourse and in user discussions themselves fit into the concept of moral panic and the issue of knowledge-power in Foucault's terms, sometimes also highlighting problems similar to those in Shoshana Zuboff's theory of surveillance capitalism. However, the frequency of the mentioned themes turned out to be relatively low and interspersed rather with a rational, albeit exciting, discussion about the observed technological changes. AI is often presented as a possible reason for job loss, technology provoking reflection on what falls within the sphere of human competencies or typically human attributes, but these issues did not appear in the analysed discourses in an evident and obvious way, nor were they unequivocally dominating. Responding to the first of the adopted research questions, it should be stated that the Polish discourse about AI consists of threads causing unease, but it is not so focused on them as to fully define it as moral panic. To consider that a given topic causes moral panic, there must be a high level of threat perception and disturbance of existing norms along with exaggeration and attribution of responsibility for caused or possible harms to someone or something. In the analysis material, possible consequences of the proliferation of AI were discussed, especially in the context of the job market, but there was no reference to large corporations or specific persons who wanted to use AI to take over the world. AI itself, although often personified, was not habitually demonised. Although the issue of new authoritarianism appeared, it was a niche topic in the context of the entire corpus. Moral issues were raised in the context of comparing AI's capabilities with humans, from which concerns about potential consequences could be distinguished, but this still occurred in the dimension of discussion rather than panic. It is also worth noting that, according to Cohen's claims, moral panic is the result of an exaggerated interpretation of threat and an outbreak of emotion. In the discourse about AI, we deal with moderate unease, which is not without basis: the authors of the analysed articles and statements ponder the real consequences, also raised by experts, including the topic of the reliability of content generated by generative AIs, legal issues, and pondering the implications of this technology. Thus, this is an answer to the second research question.

The conducted analysis identified key elements of the discourse on artificial intelligence, manifesting itself in both press texts and internet users' statements. Corpus data suggest that society engages in an active discussion about the role of AI and its place in social

reality. On the other hand, corpus data do not provide sufficient evidence to determine whether AI is spoken predominantly in a positive or negative way. Perhaps constructing a representative corpus dedicated to this issue and using quantitative sentiment analysis and thematic analysis would obtain such an answer. A more in-depth, qualitative discourse analysis on this issue is also recommended, motivated by the belief that combining two types of analysis, quantitative and qualitative, can provide fuller and more precise conclusions.

Bibliography

1. Buchanan B. G, *A (Very) Brief History of Artificial Intelligence*, “AI Magazine” 2005 (4), pp. 53–60.
2. Cohen S., *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*, London 1972.
3. *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces*, T. van Dijk (ed.), Warszawa 2001.
4. Foucault M., *Porządek dyskursu*, transl. M. Kozłowski, Gdańsk 2002.
5. Ji Z., Su D., Xu Y., Madotto A., Fung P Fung *et al.*, *Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation*, “ACM Computing Surveys” 2022 (1), pp. 1–47.
6. Kocoń J., Cichecki I., Kaszyca O., Kochanek M., Szydło D., Baran J. *et al.*, *ChatGPT: Jack of all trades, master of none*, “Information Fusion” 2023 (99), pp. 1–37.
7. Li Z., *The Dark Side of ChatGPT: Legal and Ethical Challenges from Stochastic Parrots and Hallucination*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.14347> (on-line 31.01.2024)
8. McCarthy J., *What is Artificial Intelligence?*, Stanford 2007, <https://www-formal.stanford.edu/jmc/whatisai.pdf> (on-line 31.01.2024)
9. *Polish Trends: a daily-updated monitor corpus of news articles*, Sketch Engine, <https://www.sketchengine.eu/polish-trends-corpus/> (on-line 31.01.2024)
10. Sousa S., Cravino J., Martins P., *Challenges and Trends in User Trust Discourse in AI Popularity*, “Multimodal Technologies and Interaction” 2023 (13), pp. 1–13.
11. Śpiewak P., *Słowniczek słów modnych i niemodnych (w humanistyce)*, “ResPublica Nowa” 2002 (10), http://niniwa22.cba.pl/spiewak_slowniczek_slow_modnych_i_niemodnych.html (on-line 31.01.2024)
12. Walters W. H., Wilder E. I., *Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT*, “Scientific Reports” 2023 (13), pp. 1–8.

13. *What is Sketch Engine?*, Sketch Engine, <https://www.sketchengine.eu> (on-line 31.01.2024)
14. Zuboff S., *Wiek kapitalizmu inwigilacji. Walka o przyszłość ludzkości na nowej granicy władzy*, trans. A. Unterschuetz, Poznań 2020.



Zezwala się na korzystanie z *Will Chat GPT take our jobs? Discourse analysis on generative AI from the moral panic perspective* na warunkach licencji Creative Commons Uznanie autorstwa 4.0 (znanej również jako CC-BY), dostępnej pod adresem <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.pl> lub innej wersji językowej tej licencji lub którejkolwiek późniejszej wersji tej licencji, opublikowanej przez organizację Creative Commons