

Responsible use of books as generative training data: remedy or poison?

Yannan Li

Supervisor: Simon Rowberry & Laura Dietz



Origin:

- Following the uncovering of Books3 database feeding pirated books into ChatGPT's training dataset, many academic writers have expressed their concerns in their books being used as the training data for generative AI tools.
- The illness: insecurities around this originate from the following factors:
 - The anxiety of losing authorial power over one's own work;
 - The concerns for the 'representative harms' that generative AI could bring, as academic texts written by human authors often carry biases, which would then be fed into generative AI;
 - The pressure from academic publishing press or the university press to publish their work under OpenAccess
 - How the stylistic feature of the different academic authors in the corpus would influence the writing style of ChatGPT

Why can this be a remedy?

- By publishing more works under OpenAccess, generative AI will have a more diverse corpus, reducing representative harms
- ChatGPT has the potential to be trained as a more original author with the capability to think critically



Why can this be a poison?

- There will always be biases and prejudices, that even an updated version can not avoid
- The author would come to a second death, as ChatGPT will become the last and only author

