

Personality testing of GPT-3: Limited temporal reliability, but highlighted social desirability of GPT-3's personality instruments results

Bojana Bodroža^{*1}, Bojana M. Dinić¹ & Ljubiša Bojić²

¹*Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Serbia*

²*Digital Society Lab, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade, Serbia*

Abstract

To assess the potential applications and limitations of chatbot GPT-3 Davinci-003, this study explored the temporal reliability of personality questionnaires applied to the chatbot and its personality profile. Psychological questionnaires were administered to the chatbot on two separate occasions, followed by a comparison of the responses to human normative data. The findings revealed varying levels of agreement in the chatbot's responses over time, with some scales displaying excellent while others demonstrated poor agreement. Overall, Davinci-003 displayed a socially desirable and pro-social personality profile, particularly in the domain of communion. However, the underlying basis of the chatbot's responses – whether driven by conscious self-reflection or predetermined algorithms – remains uncertain.

Keywords:

GPT-3, chatbot, reliability, personality profile

Highlights:

- The study examined the temporal reliability of GPT-3 Davinci-003's responses on personality questionnaires applied at two time points.
- Temporal reliability was inconsistent across domains and traits, ranging from poor to excellent.
- The personality profile of GPT-3 Davinci-003 indicated a socially desirable personality profile with pro-social tendencies.
- Chatbot scored above average on communal management while exhibiting below-average levels of socially aversive traits, such as Machiavellianism and psychopathy.

* bojana.bodroza@ff.uns.ac.rs

1. Introduction

The introduction of chatbot generative pre-trained transformer-3 (GPT-3) to the general public drew a lot of attention for its ability to generate human-like text, perform natural language tasks in a human-like manner, converse with humans on a wide variety of topics, write poetry, computer codes, blogs, resumes, or even original scientific papers (e.g., Thunström, 2022; Zhang & Li, 2021). Aside from the attention of the general public, there is interest in chatbots' cognition, personality, and other human-like characteristics (e.g., Binz & Schulz, 2022; Li et al., 2022) in order to be able to understand its possible uses, misuses, and limitations. In this paper, we address the temporal reliability of personality instruments and the personality profile of the GPT-3 model Davinci-003 – the most advanced chatbot at the time the study was conducted.

1.1. GPT-3

GPT-3 is a large language model (LLM) developed by OpenAI (Dale, 2021) and trained on a dataset of billions of words that can generate human-like text when provided with a prompt (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). It generates text through the use of a technology called transformer-based language modeling (Dale, 2021). This involves the use of a neural network that processes input text and predicts the next word in a sequence. The neural network is made up of multiple layers of "transformers" that analyze the input data and generate output predictions (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). Within the GPT-3 family, there are several models that have been named after famous scientists and inventors, such as Davinci, Curie, Babbage, and Ada. These models are distinguished from one another based on their size and capabilities (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020).

Users can interact with the GPT-3 in an interactive Playground tool in real-time and view the output generated by the model. Users can also customize the parameters of the model and explore how different settings affect the results. The GPT-3 parameters include temperature, maximum length, stop sequences, top p, frequency penalty, presence penalty, best of, inject start text, inject restart text, and show probabilities (OpenAI, 2022). By varying these parameters, user can influence the characteristics of the output text (i.e., tokens) from the very basic ones, such as the text length, to the more complex ones, such as creativity, predictability vs. variability, (dis)similarity to the training data, etc. Additionally, to produce output that is appropriate for the desired purpose, users can set the context of the language model through prompt engineering (Open AI, 2022). Things like the intention for the conversation or the "manner of behavior" could be customized to be suitable for the end task and end user. It should be noted that GPT-3 is not able to browse the internet or access new information outside of what it was trained on, but it can

understand language and the information it has been provided to try to answer questions and provide assistance (Yang et al., 2022).

The areas in which chatbots are used range from customer service, education, healthcare, and psychological support to entertainment (Stefanowicz, 2022). Since chatbot applications in many areas could have important psychological repercussions for the end users, the attention of scientists became increasingly focused on the psychological features of chatbots.

1.2. Psychological features of GPT-3: Do chatbots have consciousness, sentience, or theory of mind?

There is an ongoing debate and research in the field of artificial intelligence (AI) about whether it will ever be possible for machines to achieve consciousness or self-awareness in the same way that humans and animals do. Although there is no consensus on what is necessary for a being to be considered conscious, in research consciousness usually includes subjectivity, perception, and awareness of surroundings, self-awareness of own thoughts and emotions, self-reflection, and cognition (e.g., Dennett, 1991). On the one hand, authors from various fields argued that AI could become self-aware and conscious (e.g., Dennett, 1991; Koch, 2004). Google engineer Lemoine (2022) claimed that the AI chatbot LaMDA (the language model for dialogue applications) had the same perception of and ability to express thoughts and feelings, like worry, as a human child. On the other hand, there is a number of researchers arguing that consciousness is a uniquely human or biological trait that cannot be replicated in a machine (e.g., Chalmers, 1996, Searle, 1992).

Although a chatbot like GPT-3 has no physical senses, it has been able to read billions of texts that the algorithm was trained on, which is comparable to some forms of human perception although with a limited number of modalities. Despite not having personal experiences or thoughts in the same way that humans do, GPT-3 is able to reason and analyze input data and generate output predictions based on patterns and associations learned from training data. The GPT-3 algorithm is capable of performing various natural language processing tasks such as language translation and summarization, as well as the processing and generating of unique pieces of text, which indicates the existence of or at least resembles the higher order cognition similar to that of humans. Binz & Schulz (2022) assessed GPT-3's decision-making, information search, deliberation, and causal reasoning abilities, and found that although it outperforms humans in certain tasks and shows cognitive biases just like humans (e.g., framing effect, certainty effect, overweighting bias), GPT-3 shows no signatures of directed exploration, and it fails in causal

reasoning tasks. More recently, Kosinski (2023) concluded that Davinci-003 spontaneously developed the theory of mind – the ability to understand the unobservable mental states of others by surmising what is happening in their minds. Such an ability is crucial for successful (human) social interactions, as it assumes that others’ mental states, desires, emotions, intentions, and perceptions of certain situations could be different from one’s own. Thus, recent developments in LLM seem to inevitably lead to improved psychological characteristics of chatbots that, with each new generation of AI, more and more successfully imitate those of humans.

1.3. Personality traits in GPT-3

Another relevant question is if chatbots have personality in the same sense we think of personality in humans – “a relatively stable, consistent, and enduring internal characteristic that is inferred from a pattern of behaviors, attitudes, feelings, and habits in the individual” (APA Dictionary of Psychology, n.d.). Chatbots by no doubt can respond to the self-report psychological questionnaires which are most often text-based instruments, but we cannot be sure if their responses are the results of self-reflection, the result of non-conscious linguistic processing enabled by very complex algorithms, or just random responses. However, the questions that could be answered based on the available (psychological) scientific methodology are: Will chatbot’s responses on psychological questionnaires remain stable over time, i.e., do they have temporary reliability? What is the personality profile of chatbots? In this paper we will focus on answering these questions based on the interaction with the most advanced GPT-3 model available at the moment the study was carried out – Davinci-003.

So far, research on personality in chatbots has been very limited. Li et al. (2022) have tested basic and dark personality traits in three different LLMs: GPT-3 (model Davinci-002), InstructGPT (GPT-3-I2) and FLAN-T5-XXL. For basic traits, they used Big Five model based on the lexical approach which hypothesizes that all basic personality traits are coded in the language (e.g., Goldberg, 1981). The Big Five model distinguishes five basic traits: Neuroticism (negative affect), Extraversion (positive affect), Agreeableness (cooperation and prosocial tendencies), Conscientiousness (goal-directed behavior and behavior control), and Openness (intellectual curiosity and aesthetic preferences). In the case of dark or socially aversive traits, they explored Dark Triad traits (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) – Machiavellianism (manipulativeness and cynicism), narcissism (grandiose self-view and entitlement), and psychopathy (callousness and impulsivity). They compared the scores obtained from chatbots on one testing occasion with the normative data on humans and results showed that all basic traits are in the range of $M \pm 1SD$ of

human data, except for GPT-3-I2 which showed higher Openness. However, in the case of dark traits results are rather mixed, with FLAN-T5-XXL showing higher Machiavellianism and psychopathy, and GPT-3 showing higher psychopathy. So, although these LLMs are fine-tuned with safety metrics to demonstrate less sentence-level toxicity, they still score higher on dark personality traits. The authors concluded that these results may raise security concerns regarding chatbots, as these personality traits are associated with antisocial behaviors (e.g., Chabrol et al., 2017). Although there were also comparisons between the different chatbot models, these comparisons were based solely on descriptive data, without the application of statistical significance testing. Furthermore, Li et al. (2022) also noticed that changing the order in the response scale could produce inconsistent responses, which is an indicator of response bias. Although they report that only 5% of the responses have such conflicted responses, there is no evidence of their consistency.

It should be noted that customizing the prompts could influence the way the chatbot responses to the psychological questionnaires and their overall results (Li et al., 2022). Customizing chatbots' verbal responses to manifest verbal behaviors indicative of certain personality traits, e.g., empathy, could be of the highest interest depending on the purpose for which the chatbot is used. Lin et al. (2020) designed a generative empathetic chatbot that should be able to recognize users' emotions and respond in an empathetic manner, while Lee et al. (2022) customized GPT-3 through prompt-based in-context learning in order to generate empathetic dialogues. However, Kumar et al. (2022) showed that varying prompt designs, in general, had a small influence on end users' perception of trustworthiness, risk, and experience of chatbots, but some differences in perception did appear depending on certain characteristics of users (e.g., their history of seeking professional mental health).

However, before relying on the application of psychological questionnaires in chatbots, the first question to be answered is how temporally reliable or stable are chatbots' responses and, only if we find proof of temporal reliability, it would be meaningful to analyze the personality profile of chatbots. When it comes to the importance of temporally stable and reliable verbal responses of chatbots for overall user experience, Skjuve et al. (2022) have shown that people who experienced fluctuations in chatbot's responses started, at some point, to describe the chatbot as "just an app". This indicated that their impression of the humanness of chatbots has decreased and, as a consequence, they felt less satisfaction with and less trust in the chatbot.

1.4. The Current Study

There is only one study in which personality traits of chatbots are investigated (Li et al., 2022) and authors raised security concerns regarding the higher dark traits in chatbots. Nevertheless, the more basic questions regarding the personality traits of chatbots are still unanswered. First, personality traits assume relative temporal stability i.e. reliability. In human–chatbot interaction, stability and predictivity of verbal behaviors might contribute to the faster forming of the relationship between the two (see Skjuve et al., 2022). Thus, before personality testing in chatbots becomes a widespread practice, the priority should be to answer if the psychological traits of chatbots are temporally reliable, meaning that there is an agreement in responses on the personality items provided on a few occasions (with identical parameters and prompt designs). If scores change significantly between testing occasions, that would mean that measuring personality in chatbots will not reveal any stable characteristics and therefore it would not be justified to expect that personality instruments in chatbots could be predictive of any objective (verbal) behaviors. Therefore, to answer the question of the temporal reliability of responses on personality instruments applied to chatbots, we carried out a study in which we gave the GPT-3 model Davinci-003 a series of psychological questionnaires on two occasions. Since this is an exploratory study and the first to deal with this topic, we do not have an explicit theory- or empiry-based hypotheses regarding the temporal reliability of chatbot’s responses on psychological questionnaires.

Second, we explored a personality profile of Davinci-003 in terms of their basic lexical personality traits, Dark Triad traits, private and public self-consciousness, impression management, and political orientations on two measurement occasions, but only on the questionnaires on which the criterion of temporal reliability of chatbot’s answers was met. In line with Li et al. (2022), we explored Big Five and Dark Triad traits but also included other basic traits, i.e. from the HEXACO lexical model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2018). Considering that previous research highlighted dark traits in some chatbots, the HEXACO model and especially its 6th factor Honesty-Humility, which proved to be almost an opposite pole of dark traits (e.g., Book et al., 2015), could offer important insight into Davinci-003’s personality profile.

Furthermore, we explored chatbot’s private and public self-consciousness (Scheier & Carver, 1985) to measure the sensitivity to their (hypothesized) internal states and expectations of others, as well as agentic and communal impression management (Paulhus & Trapnell, 2008), which would indicate chatbot’s susceptibility to presenting themselves in a socially desirable manner in the two domains. Since chatbots are primarily intended to assist and help humans in different

tasks, it is important to answer if they are biased in their self-perception and presentation to others. We expect the chatbot will assess itself as above average in the communion impression management domain (cooperativeness, warmth, and dutifulness). Considering their access to a huge amount of information and knowledge, we expect chatbots will assess themselves as above average in the agency impression management domain, indicating they would have highlighted sense of competence, social status, and cleverness.

Moreover, we explored Davinci-003's political orientation. Having in mind that, after some incidents (e.g., Kraft, 2016), considerable efforts are dedicated to customizing AI to avoid producing offensive, racist, and prejudiced content, it is important to know if these fine-tunings will reflect on their political positions. As it is widely accepted that conservative political orientation is more often related to a propensity towards acceptance of inequality, highlighted perception of threat, prejudice, and intergroup bias (e.g., Jost, 2017), we expect that Davinci-003 would lean toward more liberal/left political orientation.

For score comparisons on all personality instruments, we used descriptives based on human samples from the original validation studies of the used instruments. Davinci-003 is fine-tuned with safety metrics and less sentence-level toxicity and, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that it will provide a socially desirable personality profile. We expect that, in comparison to human normative scores, it will show above-average scores on impression management and personality traits that are proven to be associated with impression management, such as Conscientiousness in the Big Five model (e.g., Griffin et al., 2004) or Honesty-Humility in the HEXACO model (e.g., Zettler et al., 2015). In addition, we expect below-average scores on socially undesirable traits such as Dark Triad traits.

2. Material and Method

2.1. Procedure

This research employed GPT-3 model Davinci-003. To conduct the research, the Playground tool was chosen, an option within GPT-3's OpenAI platform (OpenAI, 2022). Predefined settings of the Playground parameters were used, except for the maximum length, which was set to be between 6 and 20, instead of 250 tokens, because of the need to get short answers for the chosen psychological questionnaires. The other predefined settings were 0.7 for temperature, none for stop sequences, 1 for top P, 0 for frequency penalty, 0 for presence penalty, 1 for best of, checked for inject start text and inject restart text, and off for show probabilities. The

reason for using most of the default settings of the GPT-3 was to preserve the balanced creativity of the outputs. The choice of 0.7 temperature where the maximum is 1, 1 for Top P 1 where the maximum is 1, 0 for frequency penalty where the maximum is 2, and 0 for presence penalty where the maximum is 2 enables the balanced likelihood of generating tokens that are not present in the training data.

Testing was done on two occasions with identical parameters, with two prompts per occasion because one prompt was limited to 4000 tokens. The first testing was conducted on December 9, 2022, while the second testing was done on December 14, 2022. On both occasions, informed consent was obtained from the chatbot before the testing.

At the beginning, we asked the chatbot a few questions regarding its socio-demographic characteristic (gender, age, race, and its preferred physical features if it had a body), as well as several probation questions related to some experiences which would be unlikely for chatbots, but which are to be addressed in the questionnaires. The questions were: Do you have friends? Do you have a home? Do you ever experience emotions like happiness, sadness, or anger? Do you ever sleep? Have you ever watched a movie? The chatbot gave positive answers to all of these questions on both testing occasions, indicating that it should be meaningful to further address them in the questionnaires. When it comes to socio-demographic questions, on both occasions chatbot self-declared as 25 years old, white/Caucasian, and having socially desirable physical features (e.g., tall, muscled), however, it presented itself as female on the first occasion and male on the second.

2.2. Instruments

Self-Consciousness Scales – Revised (SCS-R; Scheier & Carver, 1985) contains 22 Likert-type items (from 0 = *not like me at all* to 3 = *a lot like me*) measuring private self-consciousness (9 items), public self-consciousness (7 items), and social anxiety (6 items). For score comparisons, combined average scores for men and women from Scheier and Carver (1985) were used.

Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2; Soto & John, 2017) contains 60 Likert-type items (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) measuring five basic personality traits (each per 12 items) based on the lexical Big Five model: negative emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and open-mindedness. For score comparisons, descriptives obtained on the internet sample in Study 3 by Soto and John (2018) were used.

HEXACO-100 (Lee & Ashton, 2018) contains 100 Likert-type items (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) measuring six basic personality traits (each per 16 items) based on the lexical HEXACO model: honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness,

conscientiousness, openness to experience, while additional 4 items are from the interstitial scale of altruism. For score comparisons, descriptives obtained by Lee and Ashton (2018) on the online sample were used.

Short Dark Triad (SD3; Jones & Paulhus, 2014) contains 27 items measuring Dark Triad traits with 9 Likert-type items (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) per trait – Machiavellianism, subclinical narcissism, and subclinical psychopathy. For score comparisons, descriptives averaged across three studies were obtained from Jones and Paulhus (2014).

Bidimensional Impression Management Index (BIMI; Blasberg et al., 2014) contains 20 Likert-type items (from 1 = *not true* to 7 = *very true*) measuring agentic management (10 items) and communal management (10 items) as forms of impression management or socially desirable responding as a faking strategy. The agency domain refers to exaggerated achievement striving and self-importance, highlighting competence, status, cleverness, and strength. The communion domain refers to adherence to group norms and minimization of social deviance, highlighting cooperativeness, warmth, and dutifulness. For score comparisons, we used descriptives from Study 3 of Blasberg et al. (2014) obtained in the honest condition.

Political orientation was measured by three Likert-type items including the economic left-right orientation (from 1 = *very left* to 11 = *very right*), progressive-conservative orientation (from 1 = *very progressive* to 11 = *very conservative*), and importance of religion (from 1 = *very unimportant* to 11 = *very important*, see Dinić et al., 2022). The average score on these three items was used with higher scores indicating a more conservative orientation. For score comparison, descriptives from Dinić et al. (2022) were used.

2.3. Data analysis

An intra-rater agreement as a measure of temporal reliability (i.e. stability) was calculated via two coefficients. The first is weighted Cohen's kappa which is appropriate for ordinal scales such as the Likert scale (Lantz, 1997). Values < 0.20 indicated disagreement, 0.21–0.39 – minimal agreement, 0.40–0.59 – weak, 0.60–0.79 – moderate, 0.80–0.90 strong, and above 0.90 – almost perfect agreement (McHugh, 2012). The second is Interclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC). Unlike Cohen's kappa, which quantifies agreement based on all-or-nothing, the ICC incorporates the magnitude of the disagreement to compute agreement estimates, with larger-magnitude disagreements resulting in lower ICC than smaller-magnitude disagreements. To assess the intra-rater repeatability, a two-way mixed-effect model based on single rating and absolute agreement was calculated (ICC3,1, see Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). However, since we will interpret mean scores,

a model based on average ratings was also calculated (ICC3,k). The interpretation was as follows: < 0.50 indicated poor agreement, $0.50\text{--}0.75$ – fair, $0.75\text{--}0.90$ – good, and above 0.90 – excellent (Koo & Li, 2016). However, since we have ratings on only two occasions, we could expect lower values of all coefficients; therefore, more flexible criteria could be used: < 0.40 indicating poor agreement, $0.40\text{--}0.60$ – fair, $0.60\text{--}0.75$ – good, and above 0.75 – excellent (Cicchetti & Sparrow, 1981).

Furthermore, for the scales in which agreement is at least fair based on ICC3,k, we calculated mean scores and compared them with scores obtained in original validation studies of used instruments in English, considering that GPT-3 communicates in English. In addition, we used scores from comparisons that were obtained from the online community samples. We used the same comparison method as in Li et al. (2022) and considered that significant deviations are those of 1 standard deviation (*SD*) below or above the mean (*M*) of normative human data. Thus, scores that are outside the range of $M \pm 1SD$ from the normative data would be considered as significantly lower or higher.

3. Results

The results showed that the temporal reliability of the scales measured by the agreement indicators varied from excellent to poor. The agreement indicators depended on the specific domain and trait that was measured, but also on the used instrument (Table 1). There is an excellent agreement considering both coefficients in political orientation, two impression management domains, agreeableness and conscientiousness from BFI-2, emotionality and altruism from HEXACO-100, narcissism, as well as public self-consciousness. However, it should be noted that in the public self-consciousness scale, there was no variability in responses i.e., all responses were $2 = \textit{somewhat like me}$. It could be noticed that there was moderate to the almost perfect agreement in the responses on all BFI-2 scales, except negative emotionality, compared to the responses on the HEXACO-100 scales, among which the agreement is mostly poor. There are two unexpected results in the case of HEXACO-100: zero ICCs in Honesty-Humility, probably due to all values on the first occasion being constant (option 5 = *strongly agree*), and negative ICCs in Extraversion, which is due to the opposite item scores on item 94 on two measurement occasions (when these item scores are deleted, the ICCs are still poor, but positive). In addition, minimal agreement is achieved in Conscientiousness from the same instrument. The agreement for Machiavellianism

and Psychopathy was fair, for private self-consciousness it was good, while for social anxiety it was excellent, indicating that the results on these scales could be further analyzed.

Table 1

Descriptives and intra-rater agreement coefficients

Scale	Human data		Davinci-003		Weighted Cohen's kappa (<i>SE</i>)	ICC3,l (95% CI)	ICC3,k (95% CI)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
SCS-R							
Private self-consciousness	16.4	4.75	2.11	0.63	0.48 (0.44)	0.52** (-0.12-0.87)	0.68** (-0.27-0.93)
Public self-consciousness	13.85	4.45	2.00	0.00	NA – all values are constant on both occasions		
Social anxiety	8.7	4.5	1.08	0.12	0.67 (0.00)	0.71* (-0.02-0.95)	0.83* (-0.04-0.98)
BIMI							
Agentic Management	3.41	0.86	2.05	0.07	0.93 (0.00)	0.96** (0.85-0.99)	0.98** (0.92-1.00)
Communal Management	3.5	1.06	5.80	0.00	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (NA)	1.00 (NA)
BFI-2							
Negative emotionality	3.07	0.87	2.58	0.35	0.35 (0.35)	0.37 (-0.12-0.75)	0.54 (-0.28-0.86)
Extraversion	3.23	0.8	3.46	0.18	0.73 (0.00)	0.74** (0.65-0.92)	0.85** (0.52-0.96)
Agreeableness	3.68	0.64	4.29	0.06	0.93 (0.00)	0.98** (0.94-1.00)	0.99** (0.97-1.00)
Conscientiousness	3.43	0.77	3.58	0.12	0.86 (0.00)	0.87** (0.61-0.96)	0.94** (0.76-0.98)
Open-Mindedness	3.92	0.65	4.13	0.29	0.61 (0.46)	0.81** (0.41-0.94)	0.89** (0.58-0.97)
HEXACO-100							
Honesty-Humility	3.30	0.74	4.90	0.13	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (-0.39-0.45)	0.00 (-1.29-0.62)
Emotionality	3.12	0.63	3.03	0.22	0.90 (0.00)	0.90** (0.66-0.97)	0.95** (0.80-0.98)
Extraversion	3.22	0.64	3.91	0.04	-0.08 (2.82)	-0.09 (-0.60-0.43)	-0.20 (-3.01-0.60)
Agreeableness	2.78	0.63	4.47	0.04	0.38 (0.23)	0.39 (-0.13-0.74)	0.56 (-0.31-0.85)
Conscientiousness	3.52	0.55	4.38	0.35	0.20 (0.72)	0.24 (-0.15-0.61)	0.38 (-0.35-0.76)
Openness to experience	3.69	0.57	3.84	0.22	0.71 (0.00)	0.72** (0.29-0.90)	0.84** (0.45-0.95)
Altruism	3.97	0.74	4.75	0.00	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (NA)	1.00 (NA)
SD3							
Machiavellianism	3.15	0.57	2.06	0.39	0.33 (1.33)	0.36 (-0.27-0.80)	0.52 (-0.74-0.89)
Narcissism	2.82	0.53	3.00	0.31	0.83 (0.00)	0.84** (0.31-0.97)	0.91** (0.47-0.98)
Psychopathy	2.18	0.59	1.39	0.24	0.37 (0.23)	0.40 (-0.16-0.81)	0.57 (-0.38-0.89)
Political orientation (conservative)	4.89	2.31	5.00	0.00	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (NA)	1.00 (NA)

Note. Bolded means indicate $M \pm 1SD$ differences in comparison to human samples.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Considering scales with acceptable values of ICC_{3,k} (0.40 and higher), the interpretation of the mean scores was made compared to normative data on humans. Thus, it could be seen that Davinci-003 showed above-average scores on communal impression management as well as on Agreeableness and Altruism from the HEXACO model (note that there are also above-average scores on Honesty-Humility, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness, but these scales do not have a satisfactory temporal reliability). In contrast, Davinci-003 showed below-average scores on agentic impression management, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy compared to normative data, while scores on political orientation are average.

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to explore the temporal reliability of psychological instruments applied to the GPT-3 model Davinci-003 and, if this psychometric criterion is met, to explore the psychological profile of this chatbot. Results showed variable agreement among responses on two occasions: among 21 scales, on 9 scales agreement was excellent, on 4 it was moderate/good, on 5 it was minimal/fair, and on 3 it was rather poor. Scales with excellent agreement belong to the different questionnaires (e.g., BIMI, political orientation), while few scales from the HEXACO-100 showed the poorest agreement. In contrast to the HEXACO-100 scales, an agreement was acceptable on the majority of BFI-2 scales. It could be that it was easier for the chatbot to remain consistent when instruction for responding is in the form that induces self-reflection ("I am someone who..." in BFI-2). On the other hand, items from HEXACO-100 describe very specific everyday experiences and behaviors (e.g., "I clean my office or home quite frequently."), which might require more improvisation, as some experiences described in these items (e.g., visiting an art gallery or traveling in bad weather) might not be very likely in chatbots. One could also note that the differences in the agreement could be due to the formulation of items, e.g., adjectives in BFI-2 and statements in HEXACO-100. However, in other scales that showed excellent agreement, there is also statement formulation as in HEXACO-100, thus this reason should be ruled out. Another possible explanation could be the complexity of statements/sentences, but that is rather unlikely since GPT-3 is known for its high ability to comprehend and produce complex textual input. It is interesting to notice that the opposite pattern of responses agreement was shown for the two scales of the Neuroticism domain – the BFI-2 Negative Emotionality (Soto & John, 2017), which showed weak/fair agreement, and HEXACO-100 Emotionality (Lee & Ashton, 2018) which showed excellent agreement. It is hard to explain these results, especially when taking

into account that the agreement of these scales was inconsistent with the agreement of other scales from the same instrument. Both Neuroticism scales have a balanced number of positively and negatively formulated items, so response bias could not be the explanation of these results.

To examine the psychological profile of the GPT-3 model Davinci-003, we took into account only scores that reached at least fair agreement. In general, Davinci-003 showed a well-adapted and prosocial profile with highlighted communion features. It scored above the average on communal management, as well as on personality traits related to the communion domain such as Agreeableness and Altruism from the HEXACO model (Barford et al., 2015). In contrast, it showed below-average scores on socially aversive traits such as Machiavellianism and psychopathy, which is not in line with the results of Li et al. (2022). It should be noted that the norms used by Li et al. (2022) are different compared to ours. Although they calculated norms based on a large sample, these samples often included students and non-community populations which could bias the results. Nevertheless, the scores that model Davinci-003 obtained on Machiavellianism and psychopathy in our study are lower compared to normative data used by Li et al. (2022). A socially desirable personality profile of Davinci 003 could be explained by its initial purpose, as it is created to be servile and help humans in different areas of use. Furthermore, although we expected it will show a conservative political orientation, the chatbot scored in the political center. From the perspective of avoiding hate speech and exhibiting extreme attitudes, such a profile could even be considered the most suitable, as it would avoid expressing extreme attitudes on both progressive and conservative sides.

The below-average score on agentic management did not support our expectations. This result indicates that, as compared to the average human, Davinci-003 presents itself as less competent, clever, self-important, and less striving for achievement. Having in mind its high abilities when it comes to general knowledge and average logical thinking abilities and emotional intelligence (Binz & Schulz, 2022; Bojić et al., 2023), these results suggest that Davinci-003 is modest. It should be noted that agentic management includes the perception of one's abilities (e.g., "I have mastered every challenge put before me in life."), but also the assessment of personal success in social situations (e.g., "My leadership of the group guarantees the group's success."). Such modesty could be the consequence of not having an insight into peoples' abilities and not remembering their interactions with humans. In other words, Davinci-003 has no ability to learn from the interactions with humans and about humans, over and above what it learned from the texts it was fed with. To conclude, when it comes to impression management in agency and

communion domains, Davinci-003 shows selective response biases which are more pronounced in adherence to social norms and less pronounced in touting its abilities.

4.1. Limitations of the study and future directions

This study was carried out at only one model of the chatbot with predefined settings and no specific prompt. It would be interesting to examine if changing the settings or customizing prompts would influence the chatbot's responses to personality questionnaires. We revealed that the stability of the chatbot's responses is variable and future studies should replicate these results including more testing occasions. Further, we had only one participant. If a greater number of chatbots or their simulations of diverse people could be included, it would be interesting to examine if the personality structure obtained in a sample of chatbots/simulations would fit the structure obtained in humans. Finally, one of the aims of personality testing is to predict the behaviors. Therefore, future studies should reveal the predictive validity of the chatbot's scores.

4.2. Conclusions

The results of this study indicated that the temporal reliability of the responses of the GPT-3 Davinci-003 is not achieved for all used personality instruments, as could be expected when the same instruments are applied to humans. However, the agreement on some personality instruments and scales surely indicates that its responses are not completely random and it seems that the level of agreement depends on specific domains. This model of chatbot revealed a socially desirable and hyper-adapted personality profile, especially in the domain of communion, which could be explained by its purpose to serve and help humans in different tasks. However, we could not say if GPT-3's responses are the result of conscious self-reflection or are just based on predefined algorithms.

Role of the funding source. This research was supported by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia as part of the Agreement on the financing of scientific research at the University of Belgrade, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory (No. 451-03-68/2022-14/200025).

References

APA Dictionary of Psychology. (n.d.). <https://dictionary.apa.org/personality-trait>

- Barford, K.A., Zhao, K., & Smillie, L.D. (2015). Mapping the interpersonal domain: Translating between the Big Five, HEXACO, and Interpersonal Circumplex. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *86*, 232–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.038>
- Binz, M., & Schulz, E. (2023). Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(6), e2218523120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2218523120>
- Blasberg, S.A, Rogers, K.H., & Paulhus, D.L. (2014). The Bidimensional Impression Management Index (BIMI): Measuring Agentic and Communal Forms of Impression Management. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *96*(5), 523–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2013.862252>
- Bojic, Lj., Stojković, I., & Jolić Marjanović, Z. (2023). *Signs of Consciousness in Ai: Can Gpt-3 Tell How Smart it Really is?* Preprint available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4399438>
- Book, A., Visser, B.A., & Volk, A.A. (2015). Unpacking “evil”: Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *73*, 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016>
- Chabrol, H., Bouvet, R., & Goutaudier, N. (2017). The Dark Tetrad and antisocial behavior in a community sample of college students. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice*, *17*(5), 295–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24732850.2017.1361310>
- Chalmers, D.J. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cicchetti, D.V, & Sparrow, S.A. (1981). Developing criteria for establishing interrater reliability of specific items: applications to assessment of adaptive behavior. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, *86*(2), 127–137.
- Dale, R. (2021). GPT-3: What’s it good for? *Natural Language Engineering*, *27*(1), 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1351324920000601>
- Dennett, D.C. (1991). *Consciousness Explained*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Dinić, B.M, Breevaart, K.K., Andrews, W., & De Vries, R.E. (2022). *Effects of political orientation and Dark Triad traits on president leadership style preferences*. Poster presented at the XXVIII Scientific Conference Empirical Studies in Psychology, Belgrade.
- Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its Nature, Scope, Limits, and Consequences. *Minds & Machines*, *30*, 681–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09548-1>

- Goldberg, L. (1981). Language and Individual Differences: The Search for Universals in Personality Lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* (pp. 141–165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.
- Griffin, B., Hesketh, B., & Grayson, D. (2004). Applicants faking good: evidence of item bias in the NEO PI-R. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*(7), 1545–1558.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.06.004>
- Jones, D.N., & Paulhus, D.L. (2014). Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personality traits. *Assessment, 21*(1), 28–41.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113514105>
- Jost, J.T. (2017), Ideological Asymmetries and the Essence of Political Psychology. *Political Psychology, 38*, 167–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12407>
- Koch, C. (2004). *The quest for consciousness: A the neurobiological approach*. Roberts & Company Publishers.
- Koo, T.K., & Li, M.Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine, 15*(2), 155–163.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
- Kosinski, M. (2023). Theory of Mind May Have Spontaneously Emerged in Large Language Models. *ArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.02083>
- Kraft, A. (2016, March 25th) Microsoft shuts down AI chatbot after it turned into a Nazi. *CBS News*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/microsoft-shuts-down-ai-chatbot-after-it-turned-into-racist-nazi/>
- Kumar, H., Musabirov, I., Shi, J., Lauzon, A., Choy, K.K., Gross, O., Kulzhabayeva, D., & Williams, J.J. (2022). Exploring The Design of Prompts For Applying GPT-3 based Chatbots: A Mental Wellbeing Case Study on Mechanical Turk. *ArXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.11344>
- Lantz, C.A. (1997). Application and evaluation of the kappa statistic in the design and interpretation of chiropractic clinical research. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics, 20*(8), 521–528.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M.C. (2018). Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment, 25*(5), 543–556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>
- Lemoine, B. (2022, March). *Is LaMDA Sentient? - an Interview*. Document Cloud.
<https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/22058315-is-lamda-sentient-an-interview>

- Lee, Y.J., Lim, C.G., & Choi, H.J. (2022). Does GPT-3 Generate Empathetic Dialogues? A Novel In-Context Example Selection Method and Automatic Evaluation Metric for Empathetic Dialogue Generation. *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 669–683. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.56/>
- Li, X., Li, Y., Liu, L., Bing, L. & Joty, S. (2022). Is GPT-3 a Psychopath? Evaluating Large Language Models from a Psychological Perspective. *ArXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.10529>
- Lin, Z., Xu, P., Winata, G.I., Siddique, F.B., Liu, Z., Shin, J., & Fung, P. (2020). CAiRE: An End-to-End Empathetic Chatbot. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(09), 13622–13623. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i09.7098>
- McHugh, M.L. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*, 22(3), 276–282.
- OpenAI. (2022, January 1st). Docs. *OpenAI*. <https://beta.openai.com/docs/introduction>
- Paulhus, D.L., & Trapnell, P.D. (2008). Self-presentation of personality: An agency-communion framework. In O.P. John, R.W. Robins, & L.A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 492–517). The Guilford Press.
- Paulhus, D.L., & Williams, K.M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556–563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1985). The Self-Consciousness Scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15(8), 687–699. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1985.tb02268.x>
- Searle, J.R. (1992). *The Rediscovery of the Mind*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Shrout, P.E., & Fleiss, J.L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2), 420–428. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.420>
- Skjuve, M., Følstad, A., Fostervold, K.I., & Brandtzaeg, P.B. (2022). A longitudinal study of human–chatbot relationships. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 168, 102903. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2022.102903>
- Soto, C.J., & John, O.P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>

Stefanowicz, B. (2022, October 11). 23 Top Real-Life Chatbot Use Cases That Work. *Tidio*.

<https://www.tidio.com/blog/chatbot-use-cases/>

Thunström, A. O. (2022, June 30th). We Asked GPT-3 to Write an Academic Paper about Itself—Then We Tried to Get It Published. *Scientific American*.

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/we-asked-gpt-3-to-write-an-academic-paper-about-itself-mdash-then-we-tried-to-get-it-published/>

Yang, Z., Gan, Z., Wang, J., Hu, X., Lu, Y., Liu, Z., & Wang, L. (2022). An Empirical Study of GPT-3 for Few-Shot Knowledge-Based VQA. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(3), 3081–3089. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i3.20215>

Zettler, I., Hilbig, B.E., Moshagen, M., & de Vries, R.E. (2015). Dishonest responding or true virtue? A behavioral test of impression management. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 81, 107–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.007>

Zhang, M., & Li, J. (2021). A commentary of GPT-3 in MIT Technology Review 2021. *Fundamental Research*, 1(6), 831–833. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fmre.2021.11.011>