

# What fifty-one years of Linguistics and Artificial Intelligence research tell us about their correlation: A scientometric review

Mohammed Q. Shormani,  
Department of English Studies, Ibb University, Ibb, Yemen  
Department of English Studies, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus  
Email: [shormani.mohammed@ucy.ac.cy](mailto:shormani.mohammed@ucy.ac.cy)  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0138-4793>

## Abstract

There is a strong correlation between linguistics and artificial intelligence (AI), best manifested by deep learning language models. This study provides a thorough scientometric analysis of this correlation, synthesizing the intellectual production during 51 years, from 1974 to 2024. It involves 5750 Web of Science-indexed articles published in 2124 journals, which are written by 20835 authors belonging to 13773 research centers in 794 countries. Two powerful software, viz., CiteSpace and VOSviewer, were used to generate mapping visualizations of the intellectual landscape, trending issues and (re)emerging hotspots. The results indicate that in the 1980s and 1990s, linguistics and AI research was not robust, characterized by unstable publication over time. It has, however, witnessed a remarkable increase of publication since then, reaching 1478 articles in 2023, and 546 articles in January-March timespan in 2024, involving emerging issues and hotspots, addressing new horizons, new topics, and launching new applications and powerful deep learning language models including ChatGPT.

**Keywords:** Linguistics, artificial intelligence, correlation, scientometrics, knowledge visualizations, trending issues, hotspots

## Introduction

Linguistics is the scientific study of how language evolves, how it is acquired, perceived, computed, represented, and studied in its several modules including phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics (Shormani 2024a/b). On the other hand, AI refers to creating, modeling and/or producing (machine) intelligence similar to that of human. It is the development of computer models or machines that can perform tasks like human intelligence. These machine/computer models involve algorithms trained on large datasets to learn patterns and make predictions. These algorithms or artificial neural networks (ANNs) can learn deeply, and be trained with multiple layers to perform complex tasks (McShane and Nirenburg 2021). AI aims to simulate intelligent behavior including learning, problem-solving, perception, and even decision-making (Liao et al. 2018). These models are reported to perform tasks with considerable accuracy (Gulordava et al. 2018; Linzen and Baroni 2021).

Artificial intelligence (AI) was “born” in 1950, perhaps with Turing’s (1950) famous question “Can Machine Think?” Two influential papers by Turing (1950) and Minsky (1961) shaped the field of AI. As early as the late 1960s and well in the early 1970s, there has arisen a strong tendency to scrutinize the relationship between AI and Linguistics (AIL) (Rosenberg 1975). The tendency consists in constructing computer programs that parallel human intelligence. The aim was to “understand what intelligence is and how it can be put in computers” and no doubt that “[l]anguage is one of the most complex and unique of human activities, and understanding its structure

may lead to a better theory of how our minds work” (Winograd 1971: 15). In fact, the relationship between linguistics and AI is manifested from the very beginning of AI inception. One such manifestation results in shaping a branch of linguistics called Computation Linguistics (CL), a field comprising any work involving natural language processing (NLP).

The relationship between linguistics and AI could be seen as some sort of correlation; linguistics, with its profound analysis of phonology, syntax, and semantics, psychology, biology, provides AI with the theoretical foundations necessary for programming, training and working of language models (Medium 2023). The correlation of linguistics and AI is more than simply a juxtaposition of a linguistic research area with technology. It is rather an integrative phenomenon that unveils and enhances our understanding of how human and AI interact and the kind of prowess they come up with. Language models are computer programs that are trained on language data to generate and process human language data. This intersection of linguistics and AI is now constituting a trending theme of linguistics-AI interaction, where language, the unprecedented human characteristic, and the prowess of AI are embraced (Medium 2023; Shormani 2024a). Thus, on one extreme, linguistics provides an invaluable procedure for AI to generate, process and/or interpret human language data. On the other extreme, AI makes available new frameworks for research, uncovering new approaches, methods and tools for linguistics and linguistic inquiry. As alluded to above, the correlation of linguistics and AI results in initiating an area of study called NLP, whose developments have been continued since its inception in 1940s. It is a field of computer science and technology, the main aim of which is to make computers generate, process and interpret human language. The ideas and projects by CL/NLP and AI scientists were first crystalized in question-answering systems, machine translation, and man-machine conversation (Rosenberg 1975; Kenny 2022; Shormani 2024c).

The intersection between linguistics and AI results in constructing powerful language models. One of these language models, and perhaps the most powerful one, is ChatGPT which has been trained on massive amounts of data including books and articles, and after the training process, it can generate and/or process similar texts (Siu 2023; Sohail et al. 2023). ChatGPT can also perform other tasks such as automated tagging, summarizing, completing codes, bugging, and creating content (Kung et al. 2023; T Lee 2023; Ray 2023; Siu 2023; Shormani 2024c). ChatGPT, or other language models, including an automated machine learning models (Eldeeb et al. 2022), come to existence due to AI’s long-term goals, which have been to simulate computer to behave like human, with programs designed primarily for processing, generating and/or interpreting human language; language itself is one manifestation of human intelligence. In Generative biological approach to the study of language, it is viewed as “a structured and accessible product of the human mind” (Everaert et al. 2015: 729).

This study synthesizes AIL research during 51 years from 1974 to 2024. It provides a thorough scientometric analysis of AIL knowledge production, demarcating its landscape, trending themes, and emerging hotspots. Two powerful software, viz., CiteSpace and VOSviewer, were used to visualize and generate knowledge mappings, uncovering several types of analyses including document co-citation analysis (DCA), author co-citation analysis (ACA), word co-occurrence analysis (WCA), citations counts, clusters, burstness, betweenness centrality, Modularity Q, Silhouette and Sigma for which CiteSpace was used. Additionally, VOSviewer was used to generate knowledge visualizations of author’s keyword(s) co-occurrence, key knowledge

producers including journals, institutions, and countries. This study, thus, brings the correlation of linguistics and AI to light, emphasizing the linguistic bases underlying AI industry. It is, to the best of our knowledge, the first study to tackle this crucial aspect, specifically employing scientometric analysis.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the linguistic bases underlying AI. Section 3 spells out the study design and data analysis. Section 4 presents the study results. Section 5 discusses these results. Section 6 concludes the article, providing some further implications for future research.

## **2. Theoretical foundations**

### **2.1. literature review**

To understand how linguistic bases underly AI, it is crucial to answer two major questions: i) What are the linguistic bases in AI? And ii) How does AI apply these linguistic bases in its working mechanisms? We will tackle these questions in turn.

As for the first question, it has been, in fact, asked by a number of scholars. For example, McShane and Nirenburg (2021) asked a similar question: What is linguistics for the age of AI? They provide a valuable answer to this question, consisting of four parts: First, it is the study of linguistics in service of developing natural language understanding and generation capabilities within an integrated, comprehensive agent architecture (p. 20). Second, it is the study of linguistics in service of developing natural language understanding and generation capabilities (1) within an integrated, comprehensive agent architecture, (2) *using human inspired, explanatory modeling techniques and actionability judgments* (p. 22, emphasis in the original). Third, it is the study of linguistics in service of developing natural language understanding and generation capabilities (1) within an integrated, comprehensive agent architecture, (2) using human-inspired, explanatory modeling techniques, and (3) *leveraging insights from linguistic scholarship and, in turn, contributing to that scholarship* (p. 34). Fourth, it is the study of linguistics in service of developing natural language understanding and generation capabilities (1) within an integrated, comprehensive agent architecture, (2) using human-inspired, explanatory modeling techniques, (3) leveraging insights from linguistic scholarship and, in turn, contributing to that scholarship, and (4) *incorporating all available heuristic evidence when extracting and representing the meaning of language inputs* (p. 40).

Additionally, deep neural networks (DNNs), first occurring as ANNs, have been utilized in several and various technology applications including NLP, machine translation and reading comprehension (Edunov et al. 2018; Linzen and Baroni 2021). DNNs “are mathematical objects that compute functions from one sequence of real numbers to another sequence”, by means of “neurons”. Linguistically, DNNs “learn to encode words and sentences as vectors (sequences of real numbers); these vectors, which do not bear a transparent relationship to classic linguistic structures, are then transformed through a series of simple arithmetic operations to produce the network’s output” (Linzen and Baroni 2021: 196). DNNs dominate NLP and CL works “deriving semantic representations from word co-occurrence statistics” (Pavlick 2022: 447). There are also other types of deep learning networks, viz., recurrent neural networks (RNNs). These networks constitute a mechanism that encodes word sequences, in a left-to-right fashion, “maintaining a single vector, the so-called hidden state, which represents the first  $t$  words of the sentence” (Linzen and Baroni 2021: 197).

As for the second question, there are several studies shedding light on linguistics involvement in AI. In what follows, we will tackle and exemplify the syntactic and semantic phenomena involved in training AI learning models. Concerning syntax, there are several syntactic phenomena on which DNNs were trained such as filler-gap dependencies. Gulordava et al. (2018) have conducted an empirical study in which they train these AI learning models on how to identify the next n-gram, regardless of specifically supervising this construction. They have also trained them on a filler-gap dependency. This syntactic phenomenon could be defined as removing an NP constituent if a wh-licensor is used, thus leaving a gap, and what the AI model has to learn is to predict a gap-one of the NPs in the embedded clause (cf. Gulordava et al. 2018: 200; Shormani 2024a):

- (1) a. I know that you met your brother yesterday. (no wh-licensor, no gap)  
b. \*I know who you met your brother yesterday. (wh-licensor, no gap)

In examples (1), (1a) is syntactically well-formed while (1b) is not, and its ungrammaticality lies in the fact that using *who* entails the omission of the NP *your brother*.

Long-distance agreement (LDA) is another syntactic phenomenon in which a constituent  $\alpha$  agrees with a constituent  $\beta$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are far from each other as in (2b) (cf. also Shormani 2024a):

- (2) a. In our class, the hardworking student is Ali.  
b. In our class, the hardworking student *who liked syntax books* is/\*are Ali.

In (2a), the NP *the hardworking student* agrees with the verb *is*, and they are adjacent (not far from each other). However, though they are not adjacent in (3b), they agree also in all phi-features (person, number and gender). The verb *is* agrees with the subject *the hardworking student* though there are five words, or otherwise the embedded clause, *who wrote several syntax books*, is between both constituents. Here the words *who liked syntax books* between the head of NP *the hardworking student*, which is *students*, and the verb *is*, are called attractors because they intervene between the subject *linguists* and the verb *is* (see also Shormani 2024a).

In the literature, LDA has received much research in syntactic inquiry across languages (see e.g. Polinsky and Potsdam 2001; Chomsky 2001, 2005, 2008, Ackema et al. 2006; Koenenman and Zeijlstra 2014; Rouveret 2008; Shormani 2017, 2024a/b). It has also received much interest in AI, specifically deep learning language models (Linzen et al. 2016; Gulordava et al. 2018; Linzen and Baroni 2021; Thrush et al. 2020). In these studies, deep learning models such as DNNs, RNNs were trained on data involving LDA, and the performance of these deep learning models was considerably high, scoring high levels of accuracy, and sometimes even surpasses humans (Gulordava et al. 2018; Kung et al. 2023). In Gulordava et al.'s (2018) experiment, for example, the accuracy rate was 82%. However, the accuracy rate of DNNs changes the more attractors we introduce. For example, DNNs were unable to predict LDA beyond 5-grams.

As for semantics, several studies have tackled the semantic-AI interaction, accelerating the semantic bases in AI and how linguistics, in general, contributes to the advancement of AI. The semantic bases in AI have been tackled in relation to several semantic

phenomena. For example, Ettinger (2020) has studied how AI language models can be trained on argument structure, a semantic structure involving thematic roles such as agent and patient. In particular, Ettinger tested whether Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) can identify the argument structure and the semantic role an NP can carry in a particular sentence, differentiating between, for instance, agent and patient. Table 1 showcases an example of the argument structure data that NNAs have been trained on (Ettinger 2020, see also Shormani 2024a):

**Table 1: Examples of argument structure (from Ettinger 2020: 38)**

<b>Context 1</b>	<b>Compl</b>	<b>Context 2</b>	<b>Match</b>	<b>Mismatch</b>
<i>The restaurant owner forgot which customer the waitress had _____</i>	<i>served</i>	<i>A robin is a _____</i>	<i>bird</i>	<i>tree</i>
<i>The restaurant owner forgot which waitress the customer had _____</i>	<i>served</i>	<i>A robin is not a _____</i>	<i>bird</i>	<i>tree</i>

Ettinger (2020) utilized psycholinguistic stimuli to enhance the training process, and the performance of BERT in this experiment was good enough, i.e. 86% accuracy. Moreover, commonsense knowledge, as a semantic phenomenon, utilized in the training of neural models, was examined by Ettinger (2020). Ettinger trained BERT to recognize hyponym–hypernym relations. The prompts used include *A robin is a [MASK]*, and BERT’s performance was considerably high. For example, deciding whether *bird* or *tree* (Table 1), BERT performance was 100%. Additionally, Li et al. (2021) conducted a study, uncovering the implicit representations of meaning in neural language models. They found that dynamic representations of meaning and implicit simulation support prediction in pre-trained neural language models. The ability of BERT to identify novel verb was examined by Thrush et al. (2020). They selected a subclass of verbs based on their selectional restrictions and subcategorization restrictions and trained BERT to do certain tasks.

Neural network models have also been trained on several other semantic phenomena including compositionality, systematicity, and compositionality of negation. As for compositionality, Everaert et al. (2015: 731) state that it is a property of human language, constraining “the relation between form and meaning”. It refers to the idea that the meaning of a sentence is composed of the meaning of words involved plus the pragmatic context in which this sentence is used. Concerning systematicity, it could be defined as “the ability to produce/understand some utterances is intrinsically connected to the ability to produce/understand certain others” (Fodor and Pylyshyn 1988: 37). Thus, if an ANNs model can understand the sentence: *Ahmed respects Ali*, it is expected that it understands the sentence *Ali respects Ahmed*. NNAs have also been trained on compositionality of negation, which is another semantic notion, and part of human language. According to Everaert et al. (2018), the performance of NNAs was high after being trained on sufficient data. There are also several other semantic phenomena that ANNs have been trained on include phrase representations (Shwartz and Dagan 2019), polysemy and composition (Mandera et al. 2017), among many others.

Furthermore, AI neural models can also learn interface phenomena if they have been trained on sufficient amounts of data. These issues include syntax-semantics interface (Baroni and Lenci 2010), morphology-semantics interface (Marelli and Baroni 2015), among others (cf. also Shormani 2018). Thus, we found that the competence acquired by any language model in any syntactic or semantic phenomenon, is due to being trained on massive amounts of data of this phenomenon. The way these models learn/acquire a linguistic phenomenon is similar to a great extent the way in which humans acquire a language. In the same spirit, both these neural models and humans learn/acquire any linguistic phenomenon, again if they are exposed to sufficient and efficient linguistic input necessary for language acquisition to take place (Chomsky 1981, 1995; Shormani 2014a/b, 2016, 2023). When humans acquire language, be it L1, L2, Ln, there is also much involvement of generic architectural properties and features in the same way hierarchical structures including Tree markers or Phrase markers represent how a piece of human language is derived and computed, and the mental properties and capacities involved in processing it (Chomsky 1957, 1965, 2013; Shormani 2013, 2017, 2024a/b). All these aspects are applied in NNAs' working mechanisms.

Given our purpose, the following research questions are specifically addressed:

1. How does the actual knowledge landscape of AIL research look like in 1974-2024 timeframe in terms of scientometric indicators including DCA, Modularity Q, Silhouette, burstness, and betweenness centrality?
2. What are the (re)emerging issues and hotspots of AIL research in 2018-2024 timeframe in terms of scientometric indicators?
3. Who are the key contributors to AIL research, and what are the possible knowledge gaps in AIL research globally?

## **4. Study design**

### **4.1. Data collection**

We selected the Web of Science (WoS) as the source of data to retrieve our data from, because it is a reliable source (Chen 2003), containing more than 13600 journal databases, covering books, journal articles, conference proceedings and book chapters. We collected our data on March 2, 2024, in one day and one session because we intend to avoid the possible daily addition of articles to WoS Core Collection. For scientometric review studies, WoS provides reliable sources having all the information needed to allow for an in-depth metric analysis in terms of DCA, ACA, WCA, institutions, authors, countries, among others, which software like CiteSpace and VOSviewer are fed with.

### **4.2. Search terms**

The first thing we did to collect our data is that we set the timespan in WoS to 1974-2024. Given our purpose, the following search terms were employed in WoS search engine "Artificial intelligence AND linguistics" OR "Natural language processing AND linguistics" OR "Linguistic bases AND artificial intelligence" OR "Semantics AND artificial intelligence" OR "Syntax AND artificial intelligence" OR "Morphology AND artificial intelligence" OR "Artificial intelligence AND language study" OR "Linguistics AND ChatGPT". These search terms result in 6977 articles (Suppl Mat A1). However, CiteSpace Remove Duplicates function identified 5750 as unique records, and 1227 were duplicated articles.

## 4.2. Data refinement

After we collected the data, we performed a refinement process, excluding the irrelevant data. The excluded data contain review articles (696), meeting abstracts (4), enriched cited references (2314), book reviews (4), editorial materials (38), open publisher-invited review (10), retracted publications (2), corrections (2), letter (32) (for a full list, see (Suppl Mat A2)). In our search strategy, we excluded irrelevant data while doing one search term and then these data were automatically excluded by WoS. The refinement process was needed because after electronically screening the data, there remain also some articles that were misclassified as articles by WoS search engine, which were manually excluded. We also manually excluded articles without abstracts and years of publication. There were also articles miscategorized as articles, specifically those including the term “survey” but not “review” in their titles. This is perhaps the reason why WoS engine was not able to recognize them as reviews. These articles were eventually excluded manually.


## 4.3 Data analysis

We analyzed the data utilizing CiteSpace and VOSviewer programs. CiteSpace was used to generate clusters, calculate scientometric indicators including Modularity Q, Silhouette (S) values, and analyze DCA, citation counts, burstness, betweenness centrality. CiteSpace parameters were set to default settings, but sometimes we needed to change, as we will see later on. The Q value is set to the range 0 to 1, S value to -1 to 1, and g-index to k = 25. Q and S are indicators, unveiling the quality and reliability of the clusters created, the clusters each represent an area of research. The best values of Q and S are the nearest to 1 indicating that the generated clusters are well-defined, and homogenous (Chen 2006, 2017; Ballouk et al. 2024).

**Table 2: AIL NOP (=number of publication) and key contributors in 1974-2024 timeframe (extracted from CiteSpace 6.3.R1)**

Publications	Journals	Authors	Research centers	Countries
5750	2124	20835	13773	794

Table 2 demonstrates that there are 5750 publications in AIL research. The contributors of these publications are 2124 journals, 20835 authors, 13773 research centers and 794 countries. Figure 1 depicts AIL publications along with g-index over the timespan (extracted from CiteSpace 6.3.1R (Suppl Mat B1)).



**Figure 1: NOP and g-index in 1974-2024 timeframe**

As can be clearly seen in Figure 1, AIL publication in its early years was considerably low. It was unstable, too: some time increases and some other time decreases. The same thing applies to g-index. g-index is a bibliometric measure designed to evaluate the scientific impact of a period of publication, author, journal. It is somehow different from, but an alternative citation measure to h-index. We got these g-index values from CiteSpace. Except for 2005, the NOP was below 100 articles, upwards until 2017. We also notice that from 2018 onwards, publication increase steadily.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. 1974-2024 timeframe

In this timeframe, our intention was to provide a comprehensive picture of the intellectual knowledge of AIL research, pinpointing the trending issues and the (re)emerging hotspots. In this timeframe, the merged network consists of 427 clusters, 909 nodes, 5108 links, and 213437 citing and cited articles (Suppl Mat B2). In this timeframe, the following are the values of these indicators for the whole network: (Q= 0.8958, S= 0.9433, Density= 0.0028, Harmonic mean {Q,S} = 0.9189). Table 3 displays the cluster information of the top 10 largest clusters.

**Table 3: Cluster information of top 10 largest cluster (1974-2024 timeframe)**

ClusterID	Label (LLR)	Size	Silhouette	Average Year
0	<i>Using ChatGPT</i>	205	0.894	2023
1	<i>Interval-valued Intuitionistic Multiplicative Linguistic Preference Relation<sup>a</sup></i>	189	0.918	2017
2	<i>Making Method</i>	101	0.993	2016
3	<i>Group Decision</i>	78	0.982	2010
4	<i>Explainable Artificial Intelligence</i>	66	0.964	2017
9	<i>Speaking Skill</i>	45	0.976	2020
10	<i>Computing Word Relatedness</i>	40	0.998	2012
12	<i>Visual Cluster</i>	27	0.977	2019
25	<i>Leveraging Tweet</i>	11	0.996	2020
59	<i>Ontology-Based Design Information Extraction</i>	4	0.999	2003

<sup>a</sup>Label has been overwritten using User-Defined Cluster Label Function in CiteSpace 6.3.R1

In CiteSpace working mechanism, cluster labels represent trending issues (Chen 2003). Table 3 gives us a clear picture of the intellectual landscape of AIL research. In this timeframe, the first trending issue is *Using ChatGPT* (#0) with 205 members (Ms) and Silhouette (S) value of 0.894, emerging around 2023 (i.e. the average year). The average emerging year is also illustrative of the launch of ChatGPT by OpenAI company in 2022 (Dergaa et al. 2023). This is very important; the trending issue- the intellectual knowledge produced- took almost one year after ChatGPT's launch. ChatGPT is perhaps the most recent development of AI deep learning models. The major citing article is Sohail et al. (2023). The second cluster (#1) is *Interval-valued intuitionistic multiplicative linguistic preference relation*. It has 189 Ms and 0.918 S, initiated around 2017. Rasmy et al. (2021) is the most citing article of the members of this cluster. *Making method* (#2) is the third trend of AIL research, having 101 Ms and 0.993 S. It emerged around 2016. The major citing article of the cluster is Wu et al. (2018). The fourth cluster (#3) is *Group Decision* with (78, Ms, 0.982 S). It evolved around 2010. The most citing article in this cluster is Yixin et al. (2018). The fifth (#4) cluster is *Explainable artificial intelligence* with (66 Ms, 0.964 S), emerging around 2017.



It is clear that the first five largest clusters each include more than 50 members, which is illustrative of these trends in AIL research in 1974-2024 timeframe. The next five clusters can be grouped as below 50 members each. These are *Speaking skill* (#9, 45 Ms and 0.976 S), *Computing word relatedness* (#10, 40 Ms, and 0.998 S), *Visual Cluster* (#12, 27 Ms, and 0.977 S), *Leveraging tweet* (#25, 11 Ms, and 0.996 S) and *Ontology-based design information extraction* (#59, 4 Ms, and 0.999 S) (Suppl Mat C).

These clusters are only the largest ones out of 427 clusters identified by CiteSpace in the 1974-2024 timeframe. It is important to note that the average years are above 2003, reflecting the publication development over years (Figure 1). Figure 2 depicts the cluster view, and Figure 3 the timeline view of this timeframe.




Figure 2: AIL trending issues in 1974-2024 timeframe (generated by CiteSpace 6.3.1R)

In Figure 2, those clusters encircled in red are the strongest in burstness (#0) and those in purple (#1) indicate betweenness centrality, where the likelihood of an arbitrary shortest path in the network positioned “between” two large sub-networks is measured (Chen 2006).




Figure 3: Timeline view of AIL trends in 1974-2024 timeframe (generated by CiteSpace 6.3.1R)

Figure 4 presents the top 12 cited articles in 1974-2024 timeframe, sorted by the strongest burst. The first reference with the strongest burst is Vaswani (2017) with burst value of 54.36 starting from 2021 and ending in 2022, followed by Devlin (2018) with strongest burst of 35.91. Its burst spans between 2021-2022. The last cited article with strongest burst is Ribeiro (2016) with a burst value of 12.45, whose strength begins in 2020 and ends in 2021. CiteSpace provides a full picture for these articles in terms of burst, centrality, citation counts, degree, sigma (Suppl Mat C)

Top 12 References with the Strongest Citation Bursts					1974 - 2024
References	Year	Strength	Begin	End	
Vaswani A, 2017, ADV NEUR IN, V30, P0	2017	54.36	2021	2022	
Devlin J, 2018, BERT PRE TRAINING DE, V0, P0	2018	35.91	2020	2022	
Bojanowski P, 2017, TRANS. ASSOC. COMPUT. LINGUIST, V5, P135, DOI 10.1162/TACL. A. 00051, DOI	2017	19.83	2019	2022	
Goodfellow I, 2016, ADAPT COMPUT MACH LE, V0, P1	2016	19.88	2019	2021	
Kingma DP, 2017, ARXIV, V0, P0, DOI 10.48550/ARXIV.1412.6980, DOI	2017	18.98	2019	2022	
Kirkauer T, 2016, TRIPLEC-COMMUN CAPIT, V14, P260	2016	18.07	2017	2021	
Kiritshevsky Alex, 2017, COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM, V60, P84, DOI 10.1145/3065386, DOI	2017	16.94	2018	2022	
He KM, 2016, PROC CVPR IEEE, V0, PP770, DOI 10.1109/CVPR.2016.90, DOI	2016	15.87	2020	2021	
Baldanau D, 2016, ARXIV, V0, P0	2016	15.32	2018	2021	
Fang Q, 2016, INFORM SCIENCES, V369, P128, DOI 10.1016/j.ins.2016.06.021, DOI	2016	14.29	2018	2021	
Devlin J, 2018, ARXIV, V0, P0	2018	13.93	2020	2022	
Ribeiro MT, 2016, KDD16: PROCE .....RY AND DATA MINING, V0, PP1135, DOI	2016	12.45	2020	2021	

Figure 4: Top 12 cited articles by bursts in 1974-2024 timeframe (generated by CiteSpace 6.3.1R)

## 4.2. 2018-2024 timeframe

In 2018-2024 timeframe, we wanted to characterize the research trends, hotspots in the last 7 years. We intend in this timeframe to examine the increase of publication, where it increases noticeably crossing hundred publications annually (Figure 1), so that the intellectual knowledge production in this period is effectively measured, evaluated and analyzed, uncovering its strengths and weaknesses. To begin with, the merged network in 2018-2024 timeframe has 83 clusters, 848 nodes, 2820 links, and 184306 citing and cited references (Suppl Mat D1). In this timeframe, the values of the scientometric indicators for the whole network are as follows: (Q= 0.7399, S= 0.9051, Density=0.0095, Harmonic mean {Q,S} = 0.8142).

Table 4: Cluster information of top 11 largest clusters (2018-2024 timeframe)

ClusterID	Label (LLR)	Size	Silhouette	Average Year
0	Natural Language Processing	110	0.883	2016
1	<i>Cross-sectional Study</i>	103	0.887	2022
2	<i>Making Method</i>	98	0.962	2016
3	<i>Academic Writing</i>	85	0.864	2022
4	<i>Using Bidirectional Encoder Representation</i>	78	0.842	2019
5	<i>Explainable Artificial Intelligence</i>	50	0.939	2018
6	<i>Speaking Skill</i>	44	0.961	2020
7	<i>Novice Programmer</i>	34	0.917	2019
8	<i>Artificial Intelligence</i>	26	0.962	2016
9	<i>Prioritization</i>	7	1	2014
10	<i>Context-Based Fake News Detection Model</i>	5	0.998	2019

Compared to Table 3, Table 4 clearly illustrates the change of emerging issues, hotspots, and more importantly, the reemergent/recurrent issues and hotspots in AIL research. The first trending issue in this timeframe is *Natural Language Processing* (#0) with 110 Ms, 0.883 S, emerging around 2016. We notice that including (#0), there are 8 (newly) emergent trending issues in AIL research in 2018-2024 timeframe: *Cross-sectional Study* (#1, 103 Ms, 0.887 S), *Academic writing* (#3, 85 Ms, 0.864 S), *Using bidirectional encoder representation* (#4, 78 Ms, 0.842 S), *Novice programmer* (#7, 34 Ms, 0.917 S), *Artificial intelligence* (#8, 26 Ms, 0.962 S), *Prioritization* (#9, 7 Ms, 1 S), and *Context-based fake news detection model* (#10, 5 Ms, 0.998 S). Note that the trending issue *Using bidirectional encoder representation* (from Transformer) BERT, we have discussed so far. These newly emerging clusters each represent newly emerging research trends of AIL in 2018-2024 timeframe.

However, there are 3 reemerging trending issues which are represented by *Making method* (#2, 98 Ms, 0.962 S), *Explainable artificial intelligence* (#5, 50 Ms, 0.939 S), and *Speaking skill* (#6, 44 Ms, 0.961 S). Except *Making method* (#2), these reemerging AIL trending issues each have undergone a change of the status/rank, size of members, S, and average year in this timeframe. For example, *Explainable artificial intelligence* was the fifth cluster (#4) in 1974-2024 timeframe, but it is the 6<sup>th</sup> (#5) in 2018-2024 timeframe. The major citing articles of this timeframe include Porcel et al. (2018), Howard (2019), Zhang et al. (2019), Sohail et al. (2023), Kolides et al. (2023), Li et al. (2023), Jeon and Lee (2023), and Brinkmann et al. (2023).

Notice that in 1974-2024 timeframe, *Using ChatGPT* is the largest cluster, a purely AI trending issue, while in 2018-2024 timeframe, the largest cluster is *Natural language processing*, a purely (computational) linguistics trending issue. This in a way or another reflects the correlation of linguistics and AI (Suppl Mat D2).

Figures 5 & 6 depict the cluster view and timeline view of 2018-2024 timeframe, respectively.




Figure 5: AIL trends in 2018-2024 timeframe (generated by CiteSpace 6.3.1R)




Figure 6: Timeline view of AIL trends in 2018-2024 timeframe (generated by CiteSpace 6.3.1R)

In this timeframe, mapping visualizations of trending issues and hotspots get clearer, harmonized and well-defined (Figures 5 & 6). This is very clear from comparing Figures 2 & 3 to Figures 5 & 6.

Figure 7 presents the top 12 cited references in 2018-2024 timeframe, sorted by the strongest burst. The first reference with the strongest burst is Vaswani (2017) with burst value of 40, starting from 2021 and ending in 2022, followed by Dovlin (2018) with strongest burst of 28.42. Its burst spans between 2021-2022. The last cited article with strongest burst is Ribeiro (2016) with a burst value of 11.68, whose strength begins in 2020 and ends in 2021. For a complete description, (see Suppl Mat D2).



**Top 12 References with the Strongest Citation Bursts**

References	Year	Strength	Begin	End	2018 - 2024
Vaswani A, 2017, ADV NEUR IN, V30, P0	2017	48	2021	2022	
Devlin J, 2018, BERT PRE TRAINING DE, V0, P0	2018	28.42	2021	2022	
Goodfellow I, 2016, ADAPT COMPUT MACH LE, V0, P1	2016	17.8	2019	2021	
Bojanowski P, 2017, TRANS. ASSOC. COMPUT. LINGUIST, V5, P135, DOI 10.1162/TACL. A. 00051, DOI	2017	16.51	2020	2022	
Kingma DP, 2017, ARXIV, V0, P0, DOI 10.48550/ARXIV.1412.6980, DOI	2017	15.48	2019	2022	
He KM, 2016, PROC CVPR IEEE, V0, PP770, DOI 10.1109/CVPR.2016.90, DOI	2016	14.85	2020	2021	
Kiskauer T, 2016, TRIPLEC-COMMUN CAPIT, V14, P260	2016	14.68	2018	2021	
Bahdanau D, 2016, ARXIV, V0, P0	2016	13.76	2018	2021	
Krizhevsky Alex, 2017, COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM, V60, P84, DOI 10.1145/3065386, DOI	2017	13.26	2018	2022	
Pang Q, 2016, INFORM SCIENCES, V369, P128, DOI 10.1016/j.ins.2016.06.021, DOI	2016	12.83	2018	2021	
Devlin J, 2018, ARXIV, V0, P0	2018	11.77	2020	2022	
Ribeiro MT, 2016, KDD16: PROCE ..... RY AND DATA MINING, V0, PP1135, DOI	2016	11.66	2020	2021	

Figure 7: Top 12 cited articles by burst in 2018-2024 timeframe (generated by CiteSpace 6.3.R1)




Figure 8: Top 15 author's keywords

Note: We excluded “ai” and “NLP” because they are already there in full forms (Suppl Mat E1)

In our study, there are 15046 author’s recurrent keywords, but only 665 meet the VOSviewer’s threshold. Figure 8 showcases the top 15 keywords. These keywords are by and large consistent with our cluster/trend analysis. The keyword *Artificial intelligence*, with 1580 Freq retains the first rank. *Natural language processing* with 861 Freq occupies the second rank. The third and fourth ranks are retained by *Machine learning* and *Deep learning* with 530 and 343 frequencies, respectively. *ChatGPT* occupies the fifth rank with 320 Freq.

We have 6 keywords related to linguistics, namely: *Natural language processing* (861 Freq, second rank), *Semantics* (233 Freq, sixth rank), *Computational linguistics* (156 Freq, seventh rank), *Linguistics* (154 Freq, eighth rank), *Sentiment analysis* (145 Freq, ninth rank), and *Corpus linguistics* (64 Freq, fourteenth rank).

The rest top recurrent keywords belong to AI including *Artificial intelligence* (1580 Freq, first rank), *Machine learning* (530 Freq, third rank), *Deep learning* (343 Freq, fourth rank), *ChatGPT* (320 Freq, fifth rank), *Large language models* (114 Freq,






Figure 10: Key journal contributors to AIL intellectual production

Figure 11 presents the knowledge mapping of key journal contributors to AIL intellectual production.





Figure 11: Mapping of key journal contributors to AIL intellectual production

### 4.3.2. Top key productive research centers



**Figure 12: Key research centers contributors to AIL intellectual production**

There are 13773 institutions and research centers in our analysis Table 2. The data showcased in Figure 12 present the top 12 institutions and research centers sorted by NOP contributing to AIL research in the world. Scrutinizing Figure 12, we are likely to find a panoramic picture of contributing research institutions. University of Granada, with 201 publications and 19555 citations, enjoys the first rank. It is Spanish university located in Granada. The second rank is retained by an Arab institution, namely King Abdul Aziz university. It has 79 publications and 4699 citations, it is one of the top research centers in the Arab world. The third rank is occupied by Stanford University, which is a USA research center. The fourth research institution is Sichuan University, a Public Chinese research center located in Chengdu, China. The fifth rank is occupied by a Spanish university, namely University of Jaen. MIT, perhaps the most leading research center in linguistics and cognitive science, philosophy and AI in the world, ranks the sixth, with 46 publications and 1057 citations (Suppl Mat E3).

To summarize, among the top key institutional contributors, there are 4 Chinese universities, 3 USA universities, 2 Spanish universities, 1 Canadian university, namely University of Toronto and 1 UK research institution, namely De Montfort University, and 1 Arab University.






Figure 13: Mapping of institution contributors to AIL intellectual production

### 4.3.3 Top key productive countries

Recall that there are 794 countries contributing to AIL in our data (Table 2). In terms of country contributors, the top 12 key leading countries contributing to AIL research seem to be consistent with our analysis of research centers and universities. The data displayed in Figure 14 depict the top contributing countries to AIL research in the world. The first rank is retained by USA with 1177 publications and 21343 citations. The second rank is retained by China with 1070 publications and 15753 citations. Spain (519 publications and 23070 citations) ranks the third. All in all, there are 6 Western countries, namely Spain (549 publications, 23020 citations), England (422 publications, 12445 citations), Germany (318 publications, 3920 citations), Italy (256 publications, 4569 citations), Canada (215 publications, 3452 citations), France (210 publications, 3872 citations). There are 4 Asian countries namely China (with 1070 publications and 15753 citations), India (266 publications, 2320 citations), Saudi Arabia (223 publications, 5469 citations), and South Korea (188 publications, 1655 citations) (Suppl Mat E4).




Figure 14: Key country contributors to AIL intellectual production




Figure 15: Mapping of key country contributors to AIL intellectual production

## 5. Discussion

The link between linguistics and AI spans about a century now. It takes the shape of providing substantial bases to AI by linguistics. The result of this interaction is giving birth to computational linguistics, a field of study that could be viewed as the most contributing body to AI. With this in mind, this study traces this link or interaction in more than half a century. In our study, there are 5750 WoS-indexed articles published in 2124 journals, which are written by 20835 authors belonging to 13773 research centers in 794 countries. In this very aspect, this study encapsulates the intellectual production in AIL research, unveiling the actual knowledge landscape and pinpointing the trending frontiers and emerging research hotspots in this area of study. These

landscape, trends, and hotspots are clearly mapped and visualized. To begin with, Table 1 presents the publication development over time showing the g-index of publication by year. This give us a steady background of how AIL research develops, uncovering the fact that in its early stages, AIL research was not strong. That only one article was published in 1974 clearly reflects this fact. However, the more we advance in discovering Table 1, the publication increases until reaching its climate in 2023 with 1478 publications.

In 1974-2024 timeframe, there have appeared several and varied research trends. CiteSpace identifies 427 research trends, and 213437 citing and cited articles. The most important of these research trends are 10 (Table 3) including *Using ChatGPT*, *Interval-valued intuitionistic multiplicative linguistic preference relation*, *Making method*, *Explainable artificial intelligence*, *Speaking skill*, *Computing word relatedness*, *Visual cluster*, *Leveraging Tweet*, and *Ontology-based design information extraction*. *Using ChatGPT* is the topmost research trend, emerging around 2023 and dominating AIL research scene, with 205 research articles as members of this research trend. ChatGPT (=Chat-Generative Pre-Trained Transformer) is perhaps the latest development of AI large language models, a deep learning model the main purpose of which was translation (Jiao et al. 2023; Siu 2023; van Dis et al. 2023). In addition to translation, ChatGPT is a chatbot, designed to chat with humans, engaging in several types of conversation and for different purposes, leveraging “the power of GPT to provide interactive and dynamic responses, mimicking human-like conversation” (Sohail et al. 2023: 1, see also Shormani 2024c). It has been reported to perform competitive tasks, and sometimes surpasses human (Kung et al. 2023). Its first version is GPT-1, having 117 million parameters and has been trained on massive amounts of data (Ernst and Bavota 2022; Sohail et al. 2023). For example, Sohail et al. (2023), the major citing article, uncovers how ChatGPT is encoded, providing a detailed map of existing research, current challenges to ChatGPT working realm and how and where future trends should be directed.

The second most important trend is *Interval-valued intuitionistic multiplicative linguistic preference relation* (IIMLPR), which is somehow related to the trend *Group decision* (Wu et al. 2018; Yixin et al. 2018; Tang et al. 2019). IIMLPRs were used in relation to *Interval-valued intuitionistic multiplicative linguistic variables* (IVIMLVs) to determine the best methods for decision makers (Kitamura 2023). *Making method* is also to some extent related IIMLPR and *Group decision*. The major citing article is Wu et al. (2018). Another trending theme of AIL research is *Explainable artificial intelligence*. In this trend, Jiménez-Luna et al. (2020) is the top citing article.

Another very crucial trending frontier is *Speaking skill*. This trending issue in AIL research concerns research focusing on the use of AI models, specifically ChatGPT in education. It unveils how human teachers can use ChatGPT in the educational sphere (Fütterer et al. 2023), utilizing it to enhance language acquisition process with reference to speaking skill. In fact, this is one of the major concerns of AI and linguistics specialists, featuring AI models in enhancing classroom activities in speech recognition (Jeon and Lee 2023). An NLP trending issue is manifested by the trending theme *Computing word relatedness*. It is a semantic AI area, where Linguistics and AI are intersected (Ben Aouicha 2016). Computing word relatedness is a context-based semantic phenomenon, captured by calculating the meaning of a word depending on the words it co-occurs with. This area of research has sprouted among cognitive linguistics scientists, AI specialists, among others.

The most related research trend to our study is perhaps *Visual cluster*. Visual clustering is a technique used in data analysis and machine learning to group together similar visual elements or patterns within a dataset, including trending issues and hotspots of a specific realm of human knowledge. This is exactly what we have done in our study; CiteSpace, a software used to visualize similar article and group them together. Another area where visualization is employed is for image processing (Jiang et al. 2022).

*Leveraging tweet* constitutes one trending issue in AIL research. Leveraging tweets refers to the strategic use of Twitter and its features to achieve specific goals including increasing brand visibility, driving engagement, or spreading information. Twitter is a popular social media platform that allows users to post and interact with short messages known as tweets. Leveraging tweets can be an effective way for individuals, businesses, and organizations to reach a wide audience and make some impact (Alkhaldi et al. 2022). Alkhaldi et al. (2022) studied leveraging tweets in relation to Covid-19 pandemic, which is characterized with much stress, fear, and psychological problems including depression, hopelessness, loneliness, unknown future, specifically with lack of employment. Their study is a kind of sentiment analysis focusing on a deep learning model known as (SFODLD-SAC), analyzing and classifying COVID-19 tweets, and identifying the sentiments of people during the pandemic.

Additionally, 2018-2024 timeframe comes up with several trending and (re)merging issues and hotspots. The newly trending hotspots include *Natural language processing*, *Cross-sectional study*, *Academic Writing*, *Using Bidirectional Encoder Representation*, *Novice Programmer*, and *Context-Based Fake News Detection Model*. The reemerging issues include *Making Method*, *Explainable artificial intelligence*, and *Speaking Skill*. These reemerging frontiers in AIL research have been discussed above. However, their reemergence indicates that they are paid much attention to by the academic scholarship.

As for the newly trending research issues, *Natural language processing* retains the first rank. This research frontier did not appear in 1974-2024 timeframe, hence construing a trending hotspot in AIL research. NLP is a well-known area of human endeavor, featuring the relationship between linguistics and AI (McShane and Nirenburg 2021). It was first “born as machine translation, which developed into a high-profile scientific and technological area already in the late 1940s” (McShane and Nirenburg (2021: 22). The second trending issue is *Cross-sectional study*, which is, too, a newly trending issue. Apart from linguistics, there are varied *cross-sectional* studies, utilizing AI in several spheres including medicine and education (Fütterer et al. 2023; Weidener and Fischer 2024).

Another trending hotspot is *Academic writing*. Academic writing in AI discipline involves the creation of scholarly content related to the theory, research, applications, and advancements in AI. It comprises various forms of academic writing, including research papers, literature reviews, technical reports, conference papers, and journal articles. It could be thought of as the otherwise, i.e. using AI tools such as ChatGPT in academic writing. ChatGPT can generate high-quality academic writing, assist researchers, students, teachers. However, the problem lies in ethical issues, which continues to create hot debate and controversy within the academic community (Amer 2022; Biswas 2023; J Lee 2023; Ortega-Bolaños et al. 2024). Another trending issue in this timeframe is *Using bidirectional encoder representation*. Recall that BERT is a language model, a semantic-based language model, designed to understand the context and meaning of words in a sentence by leveraging a bidirectional approach, which

allows the model to consider both the preceding and following words of each word (see also Partee 1995).

The term *Novice programmer* refers to a person who is new to computer programming, typically in the early stages of learning programming, coding and acquiring programming skills (Brinkmann et al. 2023). It constitutes a new trending issue in AIL research for its importance and applicability. Additionally, *Context-based fake news detection model*, which refers to a language model employing contextual information to identify and classify fake news or misinformation. Context-based approaches consider the surrounding context, such as the content of the news article, its source, and external factors, to make more accurate determinations about the authenticity of the news (Amer et al. 2022).

Our second part analysis tackles the author's keyword(s) and key contributors to AIL research. The author's keyword(s) analysis provides a vivid picture of where AIL research revolves, the areas where AI scholarship should focus. It also mirrors cluster/trend analysis or DCA, uncovering almost the same trending issues unveiled in ACA. Reconsidering the leading contributors to AIL intellectual knowledge, *IEEE Access*, *Engineering Application of Artificial Intelligence* and *Artificial Intelligence Review* rank the three top productive journals in our study. As for research centers, *University of Granada*, *King Abdul Aziz University* and *Stanford University* retained the three top ranks in our study. The first is a Spanish university while the second is an Arab university. USA and China are the most leading countries in the world, contributing to AIL research during 51 years.

## **6. Conclusion and further implications**

To conclude, the correlation of linguistics and AI has been manifested through several and various horizons, the most important of which is deep learning language models, the most powerful of which is ChatGPT, with its several versions including GPT-1, GPT-2, GPT-3 and GPT-4. This study provides a comprehensive and in-depth scientometric analysis of a well-defined body of AIL research, characterized with rigorous theoretical foundations, specifically from 2018 to 2024. It synthesizes the AIL intellectual knowledge production during 51 years, from 1974 to 2024. It involves 5750 Web of Science-indexed articles published in 2124 journals, which are written by 20835 authors belonging to 13773 research centers in 794 countries. The results present several trending issues including *Using ChatGPT*, *Making method*, *Group Decision*, *Explainable artificial intelligence*, *Speaking skill*, *Computing word relatedness* and *Leveraging tweet* in the 1974-2024 timeframe, they each reflect the correlation of linguistics and AI. The most trending hotspots include *Natural language processing*, *Novice programmer*, *Artificial intelligence*, *Academic writing*, *BERT* and *Fake news detection model*, which reflect not only the AIL correlation, but also mirror the intellectual knowledge produced, unveiling new horizons, new topics, new applications, and launching powerful deep learning language models including ChatGPT and automated machine learning models (Eldeeb et al. 2022; Baratchi et al. 2024).

However, the study involves some limitations. One of these limitations concerns the source of the data. Although a reliable and high-quality source, WoS does not encompass all data compared to data from a collection of sources including Scopus, Len, and PubMed. Another limitation has to do with language; all our collected articles are written in English. Thus, future research could involve data from more than one

source for data to concretize the actual picture of the intellectual landscape, trending issues and hotspots, and possibly include more than one language.

A very crucial issue that AIL research should address in the future should center around the importance of the ethical issue of deep learning language models such as ChatGPT Ortega-Bolaños et al. (2024). ChatGPT is widely used by students, teachers, researchers, among others in different and various aspects and for several and various purposes as well. However, this wide range of people, uses and purposes cannot go without rethinking ChatGPT's advantages and disadvantages, without seeing and determining its harms. Although there has arisen collective consensus of ChatGPT's possible harms, specifically among academics, this awareness has not been produced in a scholarly pool. ChatGPT becomes a reality, a technological necessity, but it should be used in secure conditions, i.e. without affecting its users, their career and even their reputation (J Lee 2023). Thus, there is an urgent need to address this very substantial issue to put the guidelines and borders of secure future use.

There is also another issue requiring attention from Arab AI scholars. At the country level, the key contributors to AIL research include USA, China, India, Spain, England, and Germany. However, there is only one Arab country, namely Saudi Arabia, which clearly shows that there be a possible gap of knowledge production in the Arab world. This necessitates that Arab authors, research centers and even countries should immediately look for research collaboration at all levels.

#### **Declaration of Interest**

There are no competing interests to declare.

#### **Funding**

This research article did not receive any external or internal funding.

#### **Data availability statement**

This study does not involve any dataset.

#### **References**

- Ackema P, Brandt P, Schoorlemmer M, Weerman F (2006) The role of agreement in the expression of arguments. *Arguments and agreement*, 1-34.
- Amer E, Kwak K, El-Sappagh S (2022) Context-based fake news detection model relying on deep learning models. *Electronics*. 11:1255. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11081255>.
- Ballouk H, Jabeur S, Challita S, Chen C (2024) Financial Stability: A scientometric analysis and research agenda. *Res. Intern. Bus. Fin.* 70: 102294: 1-15 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2024.102294>
- Baratchi, M., Wang, C., Limmer, S. et al. (2024) Automated machine learning: past, present and future. *Artif Intell Rev* 57, 122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10726-1>
- Baroni M, Lenci A (2010) Distributional memory: a general framework for corpus-based semantics *Comput. Linguist.* 36: 673–721.
- Ben Aouicha M, Hadj Taieb M, Ben Hamadou A (2016) LWCR: Multi-layered wikipedia representation for computing word relatedness. *Neurocomputing*. 216:816-843. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2016.08.045>
- Biswas S (2023). ChatGPT and the future of medical writing. *Radiology*. 307(2), 223312. <https://doi.org/10.1148/RADIOL.223312>



- Brinkmann L, Baumann F, Bonnefon J et al. (2023) Machine culture. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* 7:1855–1868. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01742-2>.
- Chen C (2003) Mapping scientific frontiers: the quest for knowledge visualization. Springer, London.
- Chen C (2006) CiteSpace II: Detecting and visualizing emerging trends and transient patterns in scientific literature. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology.* 57(3):359–377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.20317>
- Chen C (2017) Science Mapping: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J. Data Info. Sci.* 2(2):1–40 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/Jdis-2017-0006>
- Dergaa I, Chamari K, Zmijewski P, Ben Saad H (2023) From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Biol Sport.* 40(2):615–622. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5114/biolsport.2023.125623>
- Eldeeb H, Maher M, Matsuk O et al. (2022) AutoMLBench: a comprehensive experimental evaluation of automated machine learning frameworks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.08358>.
- Ettinger A (2020) What BERT is not: lessons from a new suite of psycholinguistic diagnostics for language models. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguist.* 8: 34–48.
- Ettinger A, Elgohary A, Phillips C, Resnik P (2018) Assessing composition in sentence vector representations. *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics.* 1790–801.
- Everaert M, Huybregts M, Chomsky N, Berwick R, Bolhuis J (2015) Structures, not strings: linguistics as part of the cognitive sciences. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 19: 729–743.
- Fodor J, Pylyshyn Z (1988) Connectionism and cognitive architecture: a critical analysis,” *Cognition.* 28(1):23–71.
- Fütterer T, Fischer C, Alekseeva A et al. (2023) ChatGPT in education: global reactions to AI innovations. *Sci Rep* 13, [15310\(2023\)](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42227-6). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-42227-6>
- Gulordava K, Bojanowski P, Grave E, Linzen T, Baroni M (2018) Colorless green recurrent networks dream hierarchically. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 1195–1205.
- Howard J (2019) Artificial intelligence: Implications for the future of work. *Amer. J. Indus. Med.* 62(11): 917–926. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.23037>
- Jeon J, Lee S (2023) Large language models in education: A focus on the complementary relationship between human teachers and ChatGPT. *Educ. Inf. Technol.* 28:15873–15892. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11834-1>
- Jiang W, Zhu M, Fang Y, Shi G, Zhao X, Liu Y (2022) Visual cluster grounding for image captioning, in *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing.* 31:3920–3934. <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1109/TIP.2022.3177318>
- Jiao W, Wenxuan W, Huang J, et al. (2023) Is ChatGPT a good translator? Yes with GPT-4 as the engine. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.08745Z>.
- Jiménez-Luna J, Grisoni F, Schneider G (2020) Drug discovery with explainable artificial intelligence. *Nat Mach Intell.* 2:573–584. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-00236-4>
- Kenny D (2022) Human and machine translation. In: Kenny D (ed.), *Machine translation for everyone: Empowering users in the age of artificial intelligence*. Language Science Press, Berlin. pp. 23–49.

- Kitamura, F (2023) ChatGPT is shaping the future of medical writing but still requires human judgment. *Radiology*. 307:230171. <https://doi.org/10.1148/RADIOL.230171>
- Koeneman O, Zeijlstra H (2014) The rich agreement hypothesis rehabilitated. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 45(4), 571-615.
- Kolides A, Nawaz A, Rathor A, Beeman D, Hashmi M, Fatima S, Jararweh Y (2023) Artificial intelligence foundation and pre-trained models: fundamentals, applications, opportunities, and social impacts. *Simul. Model. Pract. Theory* 126: 02754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simpat.2023.102754>.
- Kung T, Morgan C, Arielle M et al. (2023) Performance of ChatGPT on USMLE: Potential for AI-assisted medical education using large language models. *PLoS Dig. Heal.* 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000198>
- Lee T (2023) Artificial intelligence and posthumanist translation: ChatGPT vs the translator. *Appl. Ling. Rev.* [doi: 10.1515/applirev-2023-0122](https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0122)
- Lee, J. (2023) Can an artificial intelligence chatbot be the author of a scholarly article? *J. Educ. Eval. Heal. Profess.* 20(6). <https://doi.org/10.3352/JEEHP.2023.20.6>
- Li B Z, Nye M, Andreas J (2021) Implicit representations of meaning in neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00737*.
- Li B, Nye M, Andreas J (2021) Implicit representations of meaning in neural language models. [arXiv:2106.00737v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.00737v1)
- Li D, Liu Y, Huang J Wang Z (2023) A trustworthy view on explainable artificial intelligence method evaluation, *Computer*. 56:50-60. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2022.3233806>
- Li D, Liu Y, Huang J, Wang Z (2023) A trustworthy view on explainable artificial intelligence method evaluation. *Computer*, 56(4), 50-60.
- Liao H, Xu Z, Herrera-Viedma E et al. (2018) Hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set and its application in decision making: A state-of-the-art survey. *Int. J. Fuzzy Syst.* 20: 2084–2110.
- Linzen T, Baroni M (2021) Syntactic structure from deep learning. *Ann. Rev. Ling.* 7:195-212. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-032020-051035>
- Linzen T, Dupoux E, Goldberg Y (2016) Assessing the ability of LSTMs to learn syntax-sensitive dependencies. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguist.* 4:521–535.
- Marelli M, Baroni M (2015) Affixation in semantic space: modeling morpheme meanings with compositional distributional semantics. *Psychol. Rev.* 122:485–515.
- McShane M, Nirenburg S (2021) *Linguistics for the Age of AI*. MIT Press.
- Medium (2023). Linguistics, Language Models, and Artificial Intelligence. [Online], available at: <https://medium.com/@hmsajjad/on-the-intersection-of-linguistics-language-models-and-artificial-intelligence-an-overview-d3c89c67690d>. Accessed Jan. 3, 2024.
- Ortega-Bolaños R, Bernal-Salcedo J, Germán Ortiz M, et al. (2024) Applying the ethics of AI: a systematic review of tools for developing and assessing AI-based systems. *Artif Intell Rev* 57, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10740-3>
- Partee B (1995) Lexical semantics and compositionality. In: Gleitman LR, Liberman M (eds.), *Language: An invitation to cognitive science*. The MIT Press, pp. 311-360).
- Pavlick E (2022) Semantic structure in deep learning. *Ann. Rev. Ling.* 8:447-471. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031120-122924>
- Polinsky M, Potsdam E (2001) Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 19(3), 583-646.



- Porcel C, Ching-López A, Lefranc G, Loia V, Herrera-Viedma E (2018) Sharing notes: An academic social network based on a personalized fuzzy linguistic recommender system. *Eng. Applic. Artif. Intel.* 75:1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2018.07.007>.
- Rasmy L, Xiang Y, Xie Z, Tao C, Zhi D (2021) Med-BERT: pretrained contextualized embeddings on large-scale structured electronic health records for disease prediction. *NPJ Digit. Med.* 4(86) <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00455-y>.
- Ray P P (2023) Background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems* 121-154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.04.003>
- Rouveret A (2008) Phasal agreement and reconstruction In: Freidin R, Otero C, Zubizarreta M (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 167-196.
- Rouveret A (2008) Phasal agreement and reconstruction In: Freidin R, Otero C, Zubizarreta M (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 167-196.
- Shormani M Q (2013). *An introduction to English syntax: A generative approach*. Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany.
- Shormani M Q (2014a) The nature of language acquisition: Where L1 and L2 acquisition meet? *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistic*, 4. 24-34.
- Shormani M Q (2014b) Collocability difficulty: A UG-based model for stable acquisition. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 4, 54-64.
- Shormani M Q (2016) Biolinguistics, the ‘magnetic’ mechanism of Language Faculty and language acquisition. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(01), 71-88.
- Shormani M Q (2017). SVO, (silent) topics and the interpretation of referential pro: A discourse-syntax interface approach. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 29(2), 91-159.
- Shormani M Q, Qarabesh M (2018) Vocatives: correlating the syntax and discourse at the interface. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 5(1), 1469388.
- Shormani M Q (2023). L2 acquisition of Wh-interrogatives at the syntax-discourse interface: interface hypothesis again. *F1000Research*, 12.
- Shormani M Q (2024a). Linguistics contribution to artificial intelligence. (In press).
- Shormani M Q (2024b) *Introducing minimalism: A parametric variation*. Lincom Europa Press.
- Shormani, M. Q. (2024c). Can ChatGPT capture swearing nuances? Evidence from translating Arabic oaths. (To appear, *JPSC*)
- Shwartz V, Dagan I (2019) Still a pain in the neck: evaluating text representations on lexical composition. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguist.* 7:403–419.
- Siu S C (2023) ChatGPT and GPT-4 for professional translators: exploring the potential of large language models in translation. Preprint. 1-36. Available from [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=4448091](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4448091)
- Sohail S, Farhat F, Himeur Y, Nadeem M, et al. (2023) Decoding ChatGPT: A Taxonomy of Existing Research, Current Challenges, and Possible Future Direction. [ArXiv abs/2307.14107](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.14107).
- Tang H, Shi Y, Dong P (2019) Public blockchain evaluation using entropy and TOPSIS. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 117: 204-210.
- Thrush T, Wilcox F, Levy R (2020) Investigating novel verb learning in BERT: selectional preference classes and alternation-based syntactic generalization. [arXivpreprint arXiv:2011.02417](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.02417).

- Turing AM (1950) Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind, New Series* 59(236): 433-460.1950.
- Van Dis E A, Bollen J, Zuidema W, Van Rooij R, and Bockting C L (2023) ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature*, 614(7947), 224-226.
- Weidener L, Fischer M (2024) Artificial Intelligence in Medicine: Cross-Sectional Study Among Medical Students on Application, Education, and Ethical Aspects. *JMIR medical education*. 10:e51247. <https://doi.org/10.2196/51247>
- Winograd T (1971) Procedures as a representation for data in a computer program for understanding natural language. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Wu, X, Liao H, Xu Z et al. (2018) Probabilistic linguistic MULTIMOORA: A multicriteria decision making method based on the probabilistic linguistic expectation function and the improved Borda rule. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*. 26(6): 3688-3702.
- Yixin Z, Zeshui X, Huchang L (2018) An ordinal consistency-based group decision making process with probabilistic linguistic preference relation. *Information Sciences*. 467:179-198.
- Zhang C, Yang Z He X, Deng L (2019) Multimodal intelligence: Representation learning, information fusion, and applications. [arXiv:1911.03977v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.03977v3)