

SFRA AI Value Statement

The SFRA kindly asks its members and contributors to refrain from the deliberate usage of GenAI in SFRA conference presentations and publications. An exception can be made for critical engagement with AI for the purpose of academic investigation of AI itself; however, this usage should be made clear in the initial proposal and to the audience at the time of the presentation.

As a scholarly organisation, the SFRA sees the commitment to ‘encourage and assist scholarship’ as central to its mission (SFRA, ‘About the SFRA: Our Mission’). The SFRA therefore advocates for the academic values listed below, and moreover requests that they be reflected in presentations held at SFRA events as well as in contributions to SFRA publications. The SFRA also believes that these values are largely at odds with the use of generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in its current form (as of 2025).

The SFRA’s academic values and their relationship to GenAI usage are as follows:

- **Originality of scholarship.** The SFRA values and honors originality of scholarship in the work of its contributors. This is fundamentally incompatible with the presentation of GenAI material as one’s own work, especially due to the modus operandi of GenAI: to indiscriminately appropriate online materials as training data, the origins of which are no longer discernable in the final product (see Carson, 2025).
- **Academic accuracy and rigor.** The SFRA encourages and relies upon academic accuracy and rigor in the work of its contributors, which includes finding appropriate sources, engaging with them meaningfully and transparently, and referencing them appropriately. This is at odds with a reliance on GenAI since large language models cannot meaningfully understand language (as argued by Bender and Koller, 2020) and are indifferent to the truth of their outputs (as argued by Hicks, Humphries, and Slater, 2024). They instead function as word or sentence prediction models, approximating what a desired answer might look like (see Collins, 2023). GenAI output has moreover been described as containing ‘hallucinations’ (Weise and Metz, 2023), with chatbots frequently making up sources and providing incorrect answers to over 60% of queries, according to a recent study (Jaźwińska and Chandrasekar, 2025). In addition, GenAI reproduces human bias, for example regarding gender and race (Nicoletti and Bass, 2023) or political affiliation (Heikkilä, 2023), which further skews the truth value of its output. Academic accuracy and rigor are thus impeded in various ways by reliance on GenAI.
- **Critical contextualization.** The SFRA values and advocates for contributors’ ability to engage critically with texts *and* their contexts: this includes, for example, the identity of the creator; the social, political, and economic circumstances of production and reception; the creator’s intentions; and the intended audience. Due to its undiscerning amalgamation of sources, indifferent reproduction of materials as algorithmic prediction, and reproduction of bias (see above), GenAI obscures these various contexts and inhibits users’ critical engagement with them. The academic contribution of work containing GenAI materials may thus be significantly impaired.
- **Ethical scholarship.** The SFRA practices and promotes ethical scholarship as far as possible. This covers fairness, integrity and accountability in engagement with fellow scholars, including through academic honesty and appropriate citation of others’ work. Using GenAI materials significantly complicates ethical scholarship due to its indiscriminate appropriation and reconstruction of academic material, including that produced by other SFRA members. Possible issues related to this include concerns with privacy (see Center for AI and Digital Policy, 2023), plagiarism (see Gecker, 2023) and copyright (see David, 2023). Moreover, the use of GenAI deprives contributors of the opportunity to actively support the SFRA academic community through appropriate citation.
- **Ethical environmental engagement.** Finally, the SFRA strives for an ethical engagement with the environment, particularly in this period of global environmental catastrophe. GenAI servers expend vast amounts of water for each search query and in training, as well as consuming and polluting water through related hardware production; this threatens to drown out any positive environmental contributions AI models may generate (as argued by Gupta, Bosch and van Vliet, 2024).

References:

- Bender, Emily M. and Alexander Koller, ‘[Climbing towards NLU: On Meaning, Form, and Understanding in the Age of Data](#)’, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (July 2020), 5185-5198.
- Carson, David, ‘Theft is not Fair Use: Artificial Intelligence Companies Have a Copyright Problem, and they Know it’, *Medium*, April 22, 2025, <https://jskfellows.stanford.edu/theft-is-not-fair-use-474e11f0d063> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Center for AI and Digital Policy, ‘In the Matter of Open AI (Federal Trade Commission 2023)’, <https://www.caidp.org/cases/openai/> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Collins, Keith, ‘How ChatGPT Could Embed a “Watermark” in the Text it Generates’, *The New York Times*, February 17, 2023, <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/02/17/business/ai-text-detection.html> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- David, Emilia, ‘AI Companies Would be Required to Disclose Copyrighted Training Data under New Bill: the AI Foundation Model Transparency Act Aims to Make it Clear if AI Models Used Copyright Data for Training’, *The Verge*, December 22, 2023, <https://www.theverge.com/2023/12/22/24012757/ai-foundation-model-transparency-act-bill-copyright-regulation> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Gecker, Jocelyn, ‘Paper Exams, Chatbot Bans: Colleges Seek to “ChatGPT-Proof” Assignments’, *Associated Press*, August 10, 2023, <https://apnews.com/article/chatgpt-cheating-ai-college-1b654b44de2d0dfa4e50bf0186137fc1> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Gupta, Joyeeta, Hilmer Bosch and Luc van Vliet, ‘AI’s Excessive Water Consumption Threatens to Drown out its Environmental Contributions’, *The Conversation*, March 21, 2024, <https://theconversation.com/ais-excessive-water-consumption-threatens-to-drown-out-its-environmental-contributions-225854> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Heikkilä, Melissa, ‘AI Language Models are Rife with Different Political Biases: New Research Explains you’ll get more Right- or Left-Wing Answers, Depending on which AI Model you Ask’, *MIT Technology Review*, August 7, 2023, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/08/07/1077324/ai-language-models-are-rife-with-political-biases> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Jaźwińska, Klaudia and Aisvarya Chandrasekar, ‘AI Search Has A Citation Problem: We Compared Eight AI Search Engines. They’re All Bad at Citing News.’, *Columbia Journalism Review*, March 6, 2025, https://www.cjr.org/tow_center/we-compared-eight-ai-search-engines-theyre-all-bad-at-citing-news.php [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Nicoletti, Leonardo and Dina Bass, ‘Humans are Biased. Generative AI is Even Worse: Stable Diffusion’s Text-to-Image Model Amplifies Stereotypes about Race and Gender — Here’s why that Matters’, *Bloomberg*, June 9, 2023, <https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2023-generative-ai-bias/> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Quach, Katyanna. “MIT apologizes, permanently pulls offline huge dataset that taught AI systems to use racist, misogynistic slurs,” https://www.theregister.com/2020/07/01/mit_dataset_removed/ [accessed 3 September 2025].
- SFRA, ‘About the SFRA: Our Mission’, <https://sfra.org/about-the-sfra/> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Townsen Hicks, Michael, James Humphries and Joe Slater, ‘[ChatGPT is Bullshit](#)’, *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26, 38 (2024).
- Weise, Karen and Cade Metz, ‘When A.I. Chatbots Hallucinate’, *The New York Times*, May 1, 2023, <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/01/business/ai-chatbots-hallucination.html> [accessed 1 September 2025].
- Wenting, Zhao et al. “WildHallucinations: Evaluating Long-form Factuality in LLMs with Real-World Entity Queries” <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.17468> [accessed 3 September 2025].