

This is a translated transcript of the following podcast episode:

[Aflevering 2: Christine Moser – Moeten studenten nog wel leren schrijven? - Nooit meer schrijven? | Podcast on Spotify](#)

In keeping with the theme of this podcast series – AI tools in education – we've used AI tools to create the transcripts and translations. The Dutch transcript was created using Amberscript. This transcript was in turn translated into English using DeepL. We've done a minimal edit of both the Dutch and English transcript to remove some errors and clarify really unclear passages.

00:00:00

*Gea:* Welcome to "Never Write Again?", a podcast about artificial intelligence and writing skills. Thanks for listening. My name is Gea Dreschler. I am assistant professor of English linguistics and academic director of the Academic Language Program, or the ALP, part of the humanities faculty. In each episode of this podcast, I talk to someone who is involved in some way with the topic of ChatGPT and AI tools. The conversations are about how these tools actually work, what they can (and cannot) do, and most importantly, what we should do with them in education. Ban them, test students differently, don't let students write any more? Together with the guests, I examine the subject from all angles.

00:00:56

*Gea:* Today's guest is Christine Moser, associate professor of organisational studies at SBE here at the VU. I talk to Christine about what to do with ChatGPT in education, and especially what to do with writing assignments, now that it seems difficult to test by writing assignment. And are writing assignments actually such a good way to test? And what should our students actually be able to do?

00:01:20

*Gea:* Welcome, Christine. As every time, I'll start with a few questions about yourself as a writer and the first question: are you a Mozart or a Beethoven, so do you think out your entire text and then write it down in one go or do you write a draft and then keep scraping endlessly.

00:01:41

*Christine:* I keep scraping because I believe a text is a creative [process], something you do. And I also believe that the final product of a text gets better when you look at it several times. I also believe that you can incorporate insights you gain from writing one section back into earlier versions. And besides, I very often start with a title only, and then the idea comes and then the idea is really developed during the writing.

00:02:16

*Gea:* Okay, so it really grows while writing. And for you, what is the best place to write?

00:02:21

*Christine:* The best place to write is actually at home and also at VU actually. If there's no one in the office, I really enjoy it.

00:02:32

*Gea:* And does it have to be quiet, or do you like to have music on?

00:02:35

*Christine:* Yes, no, I definitely don't have music on. I also find in a coffee shop I can't write very well. A lot of people do that; nothing for me. I sometimes listen to Beethoven or a piano concerto; No lyrics, just very quiet music. But preferably nature sounds, so on the beach I could also write.

00:02:59

*Gea:* I can actually relate, except with sand in your laptop. Do you use AI tools yourself when you're writing?

00:03:07

*Christine:* No.

00:03:08

*Gea:* Yes, and do you use other.... so, paper dictionaries or online dictionaries or a game check or whatever?

00:03:17

*Christine:* Yes definitely the spell check, it's just in Word and that's very nice. I use dictionaries, all kinds of online resources, I use a bibliography software, [online] ways to share files and versions, but I don't use, for example, ChatGPT to write my own text. I don't think that's good enough actually.

00:03:39

*Gea:* Okay.

00:03:39

*Christine:* Yes.

00:03:39

*Gea:* Going to talk about it/ And when it comes to AI tools in education, should we ban it or embrace it?

00:03:48

*Christine:* Don't know. That's a fascinating discussion that of course has only just started. In my faculty at SBE, that discussion is in full swing. There are different initiatives, different opinions and views and experiences, and we are really busy testing out are different courses where pilots are being run to apply it or not. And behind that, there is actually a broader discussion of: what are actually the skills we want students to take away from our courses?

00:04:21

*Gea:* Well, I'm sure we'll come back to that in a moment. I asked you today because you gave a workshop at an education workshop event on ChatGPT. But what do you actually do when you are not doing ChatGPT?

00:04:36

*Christine:* I don't spend that much time on ChatGPT. Mostly I do other things. I teach,

obviously on various topics, including academic skills, organising in a digital age, sustainability and well, organisation theory in general. I do research on those topics as well, so on sustainability, especially food/food waste, and especially at the moment on technology in how we organise. And then particularly the application of machine learning algorithms, so specific AI models in organisations and organisational processes and what that actually means and does to us.

00:05:21

*Gea:* Okay, so you've actually been working with AI as a theme for longer too. So much longer than ChatGPT has been in the news.

00:05:29

*Christine:* I have been working on it before that and also in education. Of course, we have been dealing with digital technology in education for a long time, even before COVID. I was working on that as well. So, e.g. in what ways can you make education, for example, more accessible or just interesting for students to engage with the material? And I'm also really excited to look at blended forms, so what is better to do on site? So on campus? What's better to do online? We really need students to interact with lecturer. And where is that better not to do? Of course, that's been in the covid period, say, on edge; interesting developments and throughout that time, I've also published on that and so also researched AI applications in, well, in in organisations and organisational processes.

00:06:26

*Gea:* And what kind of tools or or programmes should I think of, because that, that's not necessarily [only] ChatGPT. For many people now AI is ChatGPT, but it's obviously much more.

00:06:41

*Christine:* Well, of course it depends on what kind of AI; because it is quite a catch-all term that doesn't mean anything else. It actually refers to the underlying models being applied. And models is actually an expensive word to describe how that software actually works, because mostly it's... it's always software. In education, we basically make little use so far of real machine learning AI models like the ones behind ChatGPT. That often involves quite simple algorithms, and algorithms are actually flattened recipes, so just like a cookbook. You have a recipe and that there is then executed. And well, there are very fine applications for that.

00:07:25

*Christine:* So what's new is that machine learning AI... which, by the way, is also not that new at all, but that's what colleague Vossen has talked about extensively of course; but what is new is that that's increasing in really the application of it, the breadth in which it's being applied. Also the number of applications where... and what I myself have been looking at in the research, for example, is to an algorithm that fills the shelves in the supermarket automatically. I actually came up with that in a longer project on food waste in supermarkets. I worked a lot with students on that. At one point, interviews with supermarket managers increasingly showed that they actually find it annoying sometimes and don't trust the algorithm at all, because then you can't manually actually adjust or adjust anymore. Of course it goes wrong occasionally, because AI is also just a machine, of course, and it sometimes does strange things. So that's where the thought actually started for me, like: what is that, why do they

think it's so weird? And why that trust with an algorithm? Surely that's not something you should be able to trust or not trust at all. Why not? And so I kind of got into that. I'm currently working on a project to find out how the Tax and Customs Administration used an algorithm in the child benefits affair. Because that's actually where the whole drama started, that the Tax Administration used an algorithm: the machine learning algorithm and yes, that was real, that was at the beginning of everything that went wrong after that.

00:09:04

*Gea:* We've already gone all the way into detail, but I'll go back to the context of education for a moment. Perhaps to start at the beginning: why are writing skills important to train for students? Why do students need to learn to write in their science education?

00:09:25

*Christine:* well, so that's the question. Do they have to do that at all? I think the courses we have and (...) the research groups and the teaching groups that they should think about that very carefully. Well, is that actually a skill that students should learn in our courses? In my own programme(s) - and that's the Bachelor of Business Administration, for example - I do think it's important that students learn to write themselves, and that's because, I think, that's how I experience it myself. That getting thoughts on paper, or well, getting them on the screen, does something to those thoughts. What we want at university, actually, is for students to learn to think analytically, for example, to recognise broader patterns, to be able to describe them, to be critical of them, and thus get further into: What would I do in an organisation? And writing down thoughts that are in your head.

00:10:26

*Christine:* That's not so easy, and very often when you write things down that are in your head, you see that they come out differently. So you don't manage to write it down properly. And that process, well, then you have to repeat what I said earlier. It's really a process of learning and gaining insights and discovering flaws or things that are still missing in such a text. And that in turn helps sharpen the thinking. So I think being able to write well, being able to get thoughts down on paper well is exactly what students in my course at university should be able to learn. So then when I think about where students end up in an organisation, I would want them to be able to look at a problem or be able to critically analyse a project on that, and then write that down concisely and powerfully.

00:11:17

*Gea:* So for a very large part it's not necessarily about what gets on paper, but actually the process of how it gets there to write, to write it as a way of thinking.

00:11:33

*Christine:* Right, well, in the end it's also very important what comes on paper, but in my experience that just goes together. So the sharper you can get things on paper, the sharper your thought process and your idea behind it will be as well. And if it's neat and sharp and clear on paper, well then you can share it with others. That, of course, is the point of writing things down, that we can share it with others. And the better it is written down, the better others can understand it yes.

00:12:01

*Gea:* And so then you actually already have three different aspects of writing skills: the writing, the thinking process of the writer, being able to share the information with a reader or lots of readers, and then also the technical aspect actually of writing how: how is the text put together? Or what words do you use?

00:12:22

*Christine:* Yes right and I also think those three things are really very much related. For example, the last technical aspect. That's often forgotten a bit, but it's very important in how exactly you make, for example, an argument, so a coherent whole to the argument, how to knit that together. And you do that by using certain words, and that matters a lot in what comes out in the end. Sometimes you see a sentence and a word is just wrong, and then that sentence actually means something very different from what someone had meant. And so that's also what you learn, that you can write down your thoughts correctly that actually reflect what you actually want to say.

00:13:04

*Gea:* To what extent do you think students look at a writing assignment this way? And maybe also for teachers; I think that often we tend to look at it only in terms of the product and maybe a little less in terms of the process of thinking and sharing information, that it is still seen as a kind of technical skill.

00:13:25

*Christine:* I can't speak for colleagues, but I do know many examples of where the very process is paid attention to, so for example in an undergraduate subject. And then the whole time they try to help students discover how to write a good text. I do think that in many places this could be taught a bit more clearly and a bit better, perhaps, but well, we teachers have freedom in that, of course and rightly so.

00:13:50

*Gea:* Because then that might also be tested based on intermediate product rather than at the end.

00:13:58

*Christine:* And indeed that's also one of the things that's kind of coming up everywhere now. So that you pay much more attention to the process. So in an undergraduate thesis, for example, which I now supervise, it's very clear: No, as a tutor you have to be able to see intermediate products, so that you can actually be sure that the students have worked on this themselves, and that you can see that they have taken up feedback and how, so that they don't end up with a thesis that is handed in, where you have no idea where it came from. This has happened before, of course, even before ChatGPT.

00:14:29

*Gea:* In an undergraduate thesis, it might be a bit easier to see that it's really about the process than maybe in an average eight-week course, where a paper has to be written at the end. There, it's also harder, I think, to pay attention to that process, but actually maybe it should be.

00:14:46

*Christine:* I think it can definitely be done. It's just different. Look, before, you very

often saw: you have a subject, at the end you write an essay and submit it. But of course you can also build in intermediate steps here, that students have to submit a research question in the first week, for example, or part of it. There are also software tools that allow you to follow this very closely. So actually, for example, every week you have an intermediate assignment at the end you actually have. Well, in the whole then becomes your final assignment and a kind of portfolio it can certainly, it's different from what we did before, but maybe it's such a good idea to look critically at what we used to do, because maybe that wasn't always always the best way to teach.

00:15:35

*Gea:* Yes, in a way, maybe the whole ChatGPT story can be compared to the lockdown where suddenly we all had to teach online and record videos, which was suddenly a very rapid development, which may have been necessary in some way or would have taken us much longer otherwise. And yes, it also means, of course, that we have to start looking at writing assignments differently. For you, what is the biggest threat? Or maybe it's actually an opportunity that ChatGPT means for writing skills.

00:16:11

*Christine:* I think a real threat is that people handle such a tool too easily, precisely because it is not clear and not obvious what exactly the limitations of the tool are. But there certainly are. But yes, it all looks very nice and neat and slick. It's also. if you take it when you get a text, from ChatGPT, and you look at it, it's often something that sounds pretty convincing. But, what it all isn't, that's just not obvious, so he really has to put a lot of actual effort into discovering that. What a tool can't do. Or indeed what goes really wrong and what is really not right at all, really wrong and of course people don't do that easily, because why would you do that?

00:16:54

*Gea:* Can you give an example of that, what goes wrong?

00:16:57

*Christine:* Well, that it can't, which it can't. For example, while ChatGPT is named as "generative AI", that's not a "generation of new ideas" at all. It's just rehashing what's already there. That's how technology works, so there is no creativity in that thing. And that is very often confused with a it being "generative", i.e. generating new ideas. You can't do that, but people think that, so then people say: Well, yes, I use ChatGPT to get ideas and to get inspiration. Okay, but be aware that those ideas are not new. So that's all out there somewhere. That's also a problem, that somewhere, we really don't know at all where [it is]. So nobody knows where that information - or at least we don't - we can't figure out where the information comes from that that thing spits out. And I find that quite problematic. If you... Well, if you just use it as a sort of archive function, so "ChatGPT tell me what is the year of birth of Gea Dreschler"

00:17:59

*Gea:* He doesn't know that, I checked, I don't exist.

00:18:01

*Christine:* That's just a very simple question. Then you could also go to Wikipedia,

which is probably the source for you at that point. But some more complex questions, so we don't know about that at all, How.... How come you get that answer, not another answer, so we don't know if it's correct either.

00:18:20

*Gea:* And you can also ask yourself in that kind of assignment of to get ideas, or "what is there for information about this?" or "what is there for definition?" Yes, then you might as well Google, and then (...) at least you know where the information comes from.

00:18:36

*Christine:* Yes right

00:18:36

*Gea:* And indeed, with such a ChatGPT assignment, then it sounds like a logical text, but you don't know what the source is.

00:18:43

*Christine:* No.

00:18:44

*Gea:* And maybe on some topics that's not such a problem at all; Don't really know. Maybe.

00:18:48

*Christine:* maybe. Well, look, if you're a marketer and you have to create another new slogan for a washing powder, I guess it will. For assignments at university, you really have to be very careful with it, because you really do want to know that someone said something about this, where you can verify who it was, where it was, why and that others can find out the same way.

00:19:13

*Gea:* Of course, we talk a lot about threats from ChatGPT and and maybe people say, "Oh well, then we won't be able to actually use our standard assignments in subjects". But, do you also see opportunities in these developments?

00:19:28

*Christine:* Yes, definitely, I think a very big opportunity is that now we actually need to reflect very well on what we are doing at university, in education. So ChatGPT (...) forces us to face the facts that we are applying a certain teaching model and what might actually need an update anyway. For example... Well, if you look at really big papers, essays or theses well, we've known that for years that the wrong things happen with them, that there's fraud. Sometimes we discover that, but I think really that we don't discover a lot of fraud. Maybe we can't; but now the chances just increase that that the tests and the and the assignments that we give to the students actually no longer measure at all, or yes or chart, what those students have actually learned themselves, or at least it's very difficult to find out. Well, that actually means we have to think very carefully. What do we actually want students to take away and learn here? And then afterwards? So if we know that for sure, then we can think about: how are we going to teach that or discover that together with those students, well? And finally, of course, how are we going to map or test that? Because that's important to establish, have we actually done our job and can the students do what we write on their diploma that they can? Well and the latter, that's certainly going to

be interesting. There are already several teachers working on going back to the examination hall, for example. So just no phone, no internet, nothing at all, just your head and your knowledge of the material you've read and learned, and so your (...) skills to write that knowledge down. (Another way) that is now more common again is, for example, defending your thesis. So that you do hand in a piece but then have to talk about it in a room in front of a committee about it and be able to answer questions. So yes, so you actually see that there almost a complete rethinking like: What are we actually doing? What are we testing? What are these skills and how should we deal with them here in the future? And I think that is a very good development, so that we are really actually getting better at this.

00:21:53

*Gea:* I read someone somewhere who said of yes, a one, an assignment of "write three pages on topic x" was never a good writing assignment.

00:22:02

*Christine:* True. Well, look, an assignment like this can be part of a larger assignment. Because of course, if you have to write a thesis, you also have to be able to write down three pages on "topic x". And these are then, for example, precisely these things that some colleagues say: Well, dear student, you can let your ChatGPT do this, but be very transparent about it. You then mention that in your paper. So you cannot go and do it for all parts of your paper. You also have to learn very well how to do it. So how do you properly extract information from that thing so that it actually does what you want it to do?

00:22:40

*Gea:* Are there as far as you are concerned any things that indeed, if you look at all these different things that a student has to be able to do to write a text or say an undergraduate thesis, are there things that ChatGPT could do or indeed that you say: yes, it's not actually a big deal if students use ChatGPT for that?

00:23:00

*Christine:* Well, at least that's what's being tried out a bit now by different teachers, also depends, of course. What is your writing assignment, for example. I know of several teachers who use GPT and also have their students use it for code retrieval, so for statistical software for example, so that's kind of an archive function that you look up what do I have to do to calculate a regression on this kind of thing? For my own education, I actually don't think I see much point in that. Sure, you can say of "ChatGPT, give me 1000 words on topic x", but student will still have to check up and actually I think of, if you're already doing that, you might as well try to write it down yourself. Do your best, try to develop that skill, discover your own thought process in that, because ultimately also summarising existing works of existing knowledge is very valuable. First of all because you then take in that knowledge, not just a summary of it; but also because you have to decide for yourself which elements of a larger article, for instance, what do I summarise: what do I include in my summary and what not, and that is ultimately a judgement call, I could say. That is also part of the scientific process, that in distilling the information you have at your disposal - in extracting discovering the essence at that moment, for your paper - that is part of the thought process and because the summary can be outsourced, yes, it is really a shortcut that maybe you shouldn't want.



00:24:40

*Gea:* I am reminded of studies that show that students who take notes on their laptops remember less of them than those who take notes by hand, because in doing so they are already making a selection of; what is important, what is less important? And that's actually how you remember it rather than having all the information. Which is maybe actually a problem of our time anyway that we have all the information, but maybe can't distinguish well in or don't train much and distinguish between: What is important? What is less important?

00:25:14

*Christine:* Well I don't know if we have all the information, because it just depends on what you use. If you're using a platform that has an algorithm on it, then you definitely don't have all the information. Then you basically have the information that's in your Echo Chamber, in your bubble. But suppose you have all the information: Again, that is not possible, because as humans we are not capable of processing all the information. So there's already a filter on it, but it's certainly valuable practice: How can I turn a large amount of information into something smaller? What do I summarise? And I personally - but that's really my personal opinion - think that outsourcing is just not such a good idea. For that reason, I don't use it myself, because the time I need to check whether ChatGPT displays it like that because I like it or it's right for me, yes, I can do it myself. And I still need to read what's behind this. I can't write in my own articles about things that GPT spits out but that I haven't looked at myself. You can't.

00:26:12

*Gea:* What do you actually think of ChatGPT's texts, in terms of text; looking at the technical product?

00:26:18

*Christine:* Yeah, no, not that impressed; (...) I can do better. But then again, I practised it for a while, of course. But we have a colleague at our faculty who uses ChatGPT, among other things, and he sent out a survey among lecturers and asked of well, what are those experiences with it? And a few lecturers have already had experience with ChatGPT in teaching, in writing instruction, and the consensus was actually: Well, it's okay, a sixes student. And then I think: It's possible, because I have to be honest that most student essays are not particularly brilliant. But should we be satisfied with sixes students? I actually don't think so.

00:27:08

*Gea:* Do you think there will be a also a shift in the in the in the assessment? That's something that we do see in our course, for example, where it's really about technical writing skills, where maybe we put higher demands on the difficult or the more complex skills. And not, indeed, thinking "Yeah, well, the text doesn't have too many grammar mistakes, so okay", whereas maybe 20 years ago - with the idea that students were all actually doing it themselves - that was enough.

00:27:38

*Christine:* Well, actually, I think that in writing assignments - and then certainly in master's teaching - we should actually look at the more complex learning objectives for example in that anyway. That's obviously more difficult. And of course it is also annoying to say to a student: Well very nicely written, but really doesn't make sense.

But yes, that is actually what we have to do. So the writing assignments... They should be a means to enable students to show that they can analyse, that they can make something out of complex information. And maybe again, I really see an opportunity here that we look back: Did we actually do that? Or were we perhaps easily and quickly satisfied with something that looks nice, but which is actually of little consequence?

00:28:28

*Gea:* I think it is indeed a very interesting opportunity to look at: What are you actually testing, with a writing assignment. Because yes, as you just said, there are a lot of different skills involved and actually you test a lot of them quite indirectly in a text. And so maybe a final assignment is indeed not the right tool. But it's harder to test the intermediate products. Or at least, you have to think harder, probably, and then that's the invitation we have [as teachers].

00:29:00

*Christine:* It's all a bit more work, true, but it's harder to do nothing with this. Well, and that's just an existing problem and it's not going to get any less, I think, in the near future. Also because there is a lot of workload and really good guidance [on writing skills] just takes a lot of time. Not only for the students, who often find it annoying, but also for our teachers, because you also want to give feedback and be able to look at those texts properly.

00:29:24

*Gea:* Do you actually think that (...) in education there should be attention [to AI] for students as well? Like this is how you handle AI tools; very explicit instruction. What can these tools do, what can you do with them? What are you allowed to do with them? What should you especially not do with them? Or what is just nonsense? That that really as kind of a separate part of academic skills maybe?

00:29:47

*Christine:* Yes, I think that's really very important and ultimately, look; whatever do you want to think about that from a university perspective? That students need to do something with this, I think there's no question about that. I mean, I already have students working in companies now, where they are using ChatGPT and other kinds of Generative AI every day, so actually we can't make it that we pretend it doesn't exist, here at the university, and then students come into that work and then they don't know how and what. So yes, sharing knowledge with students about what it is, and also especially for which purposes you can use these kinds of tools well and for which you should especially not do it. That seems crucial to me both in education, but also in simply saying: well, this is a very important thing to take into your working life.

00:30:39

*Gea:* And that might actually be, to go all the way back to banning or embracing also a very good argument for not following the line of "we're banning it", because (...) students will also turn to this after their education...

00:30:54

*Christine:* It's just not realistic to ban it, I think. I do think it's important to ban it for certain purposes. So indeed, writing the master thesis you shouldn't want that to be outsourced to an AI. So banning it in that sense, yes, definitely, but it's just yes, it's

there now, it doesn't look like it's going to die out, indeed, (...) - that whole development - it's going very fast. It would be very foolish, actually, of us not to have the students here well about to discover together. What are the limits here, also in terms of on an ethical level?

00:31:33

*Gea:* Do you actually have an impression of whether students indeed use it a lot already? I do sometimes hear students say: yes, I can do that much better, (ChatGPT is) a very stupid tool actually. So there are also students who are very aware that it can be fraud, that they, yes, that it can't do everything either, because what is your impression of that?

00:31:55

*Christine:* I think we have a very diverse student population here at VU, so the students you describe: I can do better, those are definitely there, but that's also definitely a minority. Then you have a very large group. Those are (all) fine with it, they are also quite capable of writing the piece themselves, but the moment they can save time, they will definitely do so. And then you have the students who spend a lot of time not doing assignments, but who come up with all kinds of ways not to have to do it themselves. And of course I don't know that for sure, because as a teacher, if you ask the students: 'Gosh, did you write that yourself? Yeah, you're bound to hear that they did. And don't actually have a good way of knowing whether that's true what they say. But I really did hear, well, from several students through four years or across other courses that they definitely do use these kinds of tools a lot.

00:32:47

*Gea:* If we look ahead, ten years from now, will students still be writing essays? Will they still be doing anything with writing or will we have very different kinds of curriculum and different kinds of assignments?

00:33:01

*Christine:* No idea, I do hope we still write, because it's a very beautiful profession and brings a lot of fun and is also a way of celebrating, well, the fact that we are human, I guess, and not machines and robots.

00:33:15

*Gea:* And what are the developments? What are you going to keep an eye on especially in the coming period? What are you curious about how this, how this continues, how this goes?

00:33:23

*Christine:* Well, initially, I'm curious about how those, how Big Tech, say the big technology companies are dealing with their own pieces. Because well, recently it came out that several of those (...) companies are actually getting a bit of a wake-up call themselves that they might be speeding up and not having a grip on those developments themselves at all.

00:33:49

*Gea:* Do you believe that? Or is that some kind of trick?

00:33:52

*Christine:* I don't know that, whether I believe it, and I obviously don't know those people. I can only know what's in the papers, but that several people, including

scientists and developers are concerned. That is widely shared, so I really do believe that. That goes as far as doomsday scenarios: I don't know, whether I should necessarily believe in that. But so there is a very broad discussion. We also know, there is, well, there is legislation in the making of legislation, we know. That always lags behind developments and they go so fast in AI that exciting also from an organisational perspective, which is my profession. I am also curious to see how we as VU deal with this, so what we as VU think about this in ten years' time, because I think it is important that we as a community find a yes, something about this together and discover how we can deal with this in education. And finally for my own research, I am very curious to see how companies will use AI applications in the future. Because the way I see it; in the beginning, when machine learning algorithms became a bit more normal, that companies just thought "oh hearty fine, saves money, less manpower and so on". Now, a few years later, we know that's not so easy. Things go wrong so often. [Some] things have become easier, but others more difficult. Or lots of things go terribly wrong, much worse actually than before so, well, as a scientist I'm just very curious to see how that will develop. And also to see what we as scientists can do about it.

00:35:27

*Gea:* Well, there is plenty to keep an eye on indeed, maybe just in the next year already, but certainly if we think about or a ten-year period. Super nice that you were here Christine, thank you.

00:35:42

*Gea:* I was able to make this podcast thanks to a grant from the Centre for Teaching and Learning's BKO SKO alumni fund.

00:35:59

*Gea:* Also contributing to this podcast were: Jens Branum, Abby Gambrel, Joost Canters, Megan van der Vorst and a host of AI tools.