

HELLO SOCIAL: INTELLECTUAL TRANSITIONS IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, GENERATIVE AI, AND SOCIETY - A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS(1972–2026*)

Prof. (Dr.) Priyanka Puri*

*Professor,

Department of Geography

Miranda House, University of Delhi,

Delhi, INDIA

Email Id: priyanka.puri@mirandahouse.ac.in

DOI:10.5958/2249-7137.2026.00039.X

ABSTRACT

*Artificial Intelligence (AI) has evolved beyond a predominantly technical field into an increasingly interdisciplinary domain with significant societal implications. This study presents a scientometric mapping of intellectual transitions in Artificial Intelligence, Generative AI and society over the period 1972–2026. Using about 29,000 bibliographic records from **Scopus and OpenAlex**, the study identifies AI publications demonstrating explicit societal relevance through the terms society, social, societal, and societies. The analysis combines quantitative text mining, text cleaning, normalisation, TF–IDF, topic modelling, network analysis and temporal trend analysis to examine the changing intellectual structure of AI–society scholarship. Titles, abstracts and keywords/concepts are used to identify dominant themes, conceptual relationships and patterns of societal engagement. Results indicate that societal AI research constitutes a relatively small component of the overall AI literature but has expanded substantially, particularly since the late 2010s and during the 2020s. Social concerns dominate the thematic structure, accompanied by ethics, public issues, policy, governance, trust, sustainability and inequality. The conceptual and disciplinary analyses reveal strong linkages among Computer Science, Artificial Intelligence, Psychology, Political Science, Sociology, Law, Engineering and Social Sciences. Generative AI emerges as an important recent inflection point in this intellectual transition. The study provides evidence-based insights into the evolving AI–society interface and its relevance to responsible AI, public policy and societal well-being.*

KEYWORDS: *Artificial Intelligence; Ai–Society; Scientometric Analysis; Generative Ai; Intellectual Transitions.*

REFERENCES:

1. Alperin, J. P., Portenoy, J., Demes, K., Larivière, V., &Haustein, S. (2024). *An analysis of the suitability of OpenAlex for bibliometric analyses.* arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.17663>
 2. Aman, V., &Gläser, J. (2025). Investigating knowledge flows in scientific communities: The potential of bibliometric methods. *Minerva*, 63, 155–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-024-09542-2>
-

3. Aria, M., Cuccurullo, C., D’Aniello, L., Misuraca, M., & Spano, M. (2024). Comparative science mapping: A novel conceptual structure analysis with metadata. *Scientometrics*, 129, 7055–7081. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05161-6>
 4. Culbert, J. H., Hobert, A., Jahn, N., Haupka, N., Schmidt, M., Donner, P., & Mayr, P. (2025). Reference coverage analysis of OpenAlex compared to Web of Science and Scopus. *Scientometrics*, 130, 2475–2492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-025-05293-3>
 5. Delgado-Quirós, L., & Ortega, J. L. (2025). Research entity information and coverage in eight free access scholarly databases. *Online Information Review*, 49(6), 1135–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-03-2024-0131>
 6. Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070>
 7. Forchino, M. V., & Torres-Salinas, D. (2026). The OpenAlex database in review: Evaluating its applications, capabilities, and limitations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 20(2), 101800. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2026.101800>
 8. Harder, R. (2024). Using Scopus and OpenAlex APIs to retrieve bibliographic data for evidence synthesis: A procedure based on Bash and SQL. *MethodsX*, 12, 102601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2024.102601>
 9. Haunschild, R., & Bornmann, L. (2024). The use of OpenAlex to produce meaningful bibliometric global overlay maps of science on the individual, institutional, and national levels. *PLOS ONE*, 19(12), e0308041. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0308041>
 10. Ishii, K., et al. (2024). Defining intelligence: Bridging the gap between human and artificial perspectives. *Intelligence*, 104, 101832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2024.101832>
 11. Lim, W. M., Kumar, S., & Donthu, N. (2024). How to combine and clean bibliometric data and use bibliometric tools synergistically: Guidelines using metaverse research. *Journal of Business Research*, 182, 114760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114760>
 12. McCarthy, J., Minsky, M. L., Rochester, N., & Shannon, C. E. (1955). *A proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v27i4.1904>
 13. National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). *Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0)* (NIST AI 100-1). U.S. Department of Commerce. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>
 14. OECD. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in Society*. OECD Publishing.
 15. OECD. (2024). *Explanatory memorandum on the updated OECD definition of an AI system*. OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers, No. 8. <https://doi.org/10.1787/623da898-en>
 16. OpenAlex. (n.d.). *OpenAlex: The open catalog to the global research system*. Retrieved January 20, 2026, from <https://openalex.org/>
 17. Öztürk, O., Kocaman, R., & Kanbach, D. K. (2024). How to design bibliometric research: An overview and a framework proposal. *Review of Managerial Science*, 18, 3333–3361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-024-00738-0>
-

18. Priem, J., Piwowar, H., & Orr, R. (2022). *OpenAlex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.01833>
19. Pritchard, A. (1969). Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics. *Journal of Documentation*, 25(4), 348–349.
20. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
21. Salton, G., & Buckley, C. (1988). Term-weighting approaches in automatic text retrieval. *Information Processing & Management*, 24(5), 513–523. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573\(88\)90021-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573(88)90021-0)
22. Tomczyk, P., Brüggemann, P., & Paul, J. (2024). Variable science mapping as literature review method. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12, 829–841. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00336-9>
23. Triguero, I., Molina, D., Poyatos, J., Del Ser, J., & Herrera, F. (2024). General purpose artificial intelligence systems (GPAIS): Properties, definition, taxonomy, societal implications and responsible governance. *Information Fusion*, 103, 102135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.102135>
24. UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. UNESCO.
25. Wu, H. C., Luk, R. W. P., Wong, K. F., & Kwok, K. L. (2008). Interpreting TF-IDF term weights as making relevance decisions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 26(3), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1361684.1361686>
26. Zupic, I., & Čater, T. (2015). Bibliometric methods in management and organization. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(3), 429–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114562629>