
RUNNING COGNITIVE EVALUATIONS ON LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS: THE DO'S AND THE DON'TS

A PREPRINT

Anna Ivanova

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
annaiv@mit.edu

December 5, 2023

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I describe methodological considerations for studies that aim to evaluate the cognitive capacities of large language models (LLMs) using language-based behavioral assessments. Drawing on three case studies from the literature (a commonsense knowledge benchmark, a theory of mind evaluation, and a test of syntactic agreement), I describe common pitfalls that might arise when applying a cognitive test to an LLM. I then list 10 DO'S and DON'TS that should help design high-quality cognitive evaluations for AI systems. I conclude by discussing four areas where the DO'S and DON'TS are currently under active discussion – prompt sensitivity, cultural and linguistic diversity, using LLMs as research assistants, and running evaluations on open vs. closed LLMs. Overall, the goal of the paper is to contribute to the broader discussion of best practices in the rapidly growing field of AI Psychology.

1 Introduction

Ever since the Turing test [Turing, 1950], the idea of having a dialogue with a machine to probe its cognitive abilities (“thought”) has been inextricably associated with the field of artificial intelligence (AI). In addition to its intuitive simplicity, this idea naturally aligns with everyday practice in psychology: language-based assessments are the bread and butter of many psychologists’ toolkits. If researchers want to know what is happening in the mind of a human, the easiest approach is to ask.

Today, advances in linguistic abilities of large language models (LLMs) make it possible to seamlessly test these models on language-based assessments originally designed for people. This is an unprecedented advance: to date, the only entities who could flexibly use human language were, well, humans. Now, however, we are faced with artificial systems that can process linguistic information, generate novel texts, and respond to questions. How do we assess the cognitive capabilities of these systems?

Easy access to chat-based LLM interfaces (the most famous of which is ChatGPT) makes it possible for anyone to run a “cognitive test” on an AI system. This advance has led to an explosive growth of what one might call *AI psychology* (or machine psychology; Hagendorff 2023b), with papers assessing LLMs’ personality traits [Jiang et al., 2023, Safdari et al., 2023], working memory capacity [Gong et al., 2023], logical

reasoning [Dasgupta et al., 2023, Payandeh et al., 2023], planning abilities [Valmeekam et al., 2023], social reasoning [Gandhi et al., 2023, Sap et al., 2022], creativity [Goes et al., 2023, Koivisto and Grassini, 2023], and other cognitive skills and traits [Binz and Schulz, 2023]. Although running such assessments can be fairly straightforward, interpreting the results is not. In fact, AI Psychology today is faced with a plethora of methodological questions. What factors should we consider when assessing model performance? How can we adapt our stimuli to reduce the prevalence of “hacks”, i.e., heuristics that the model might employ to achieve high task performance without using the cognitive skill being assessed? If a model passes a human test for a cognitive ability X , does it mean that it indeed possesses X ?

To begin answering these questions, I will first describe three case studies that highlight some of the caveats that need to be kept in mind when evaluating LLMs (**Section 2**). I will then provide a (non-comprehensive) list of the DO’S and the DON’TS for running cognitive assessments on language models (**Section 3**). Finally, I will highlight some areas of open discussion, in some of which the DO’S and the DON’TS are still being shaped (**Section 4**). Note that, in this paper, I will not touch on the philosophical question of whether it is at all appropriate to ascribe mental capacities to a machine [Searle, 1980]; my goal here is simply to clarify the methodological criteria that determine the inferences we can(not) make based on an LLM’s responses to a questionnaire or a cognitive test.

2 Case Studies

In theory, administering a cognitive assessment to an LLM is easy: take a set of questions or queries expressed in natural language, feed them into the model, record the model’s response, and evaluate its accuracy. In practice, however, this procedure is rife with potential confounds and factors that might make the results meaningless. Here, I discuss three case studies that highlight some of the challenges of administering cognitive assessments to LLMs.

Disclaimer: The goal of this section is not to criticize specific scientists. AI Psychology is a rapidly developing field, and we are all figuring things out along the way. Many of the limitations discussed below have come to light precisely because a particular study came under scrutiny. The process of critiquing and iterating upon existing work is a vital component of a developing science, and both the original studies and the critiques are necessary components of that process.

Case study #1: Winograd Schema Challenge

In 2012, Levesque and colleagues proposed a testing framework for diverse kinds of commonsense world knowledge [Levesque et al., 2012]. Inspired by an example in Terry Winograd’s thesis (1972), the authors suggested to use minimally different example pairs that contain pronouns whose referent can be inferred based on commonsense knowledge:

- (1) Q: The trophy doesn’t fit into the brown suitcase because it’s too small. What is too small?
A: The suitcase
- (2) Q: The trophy doesn’t fit into the brown suitcase because it’s too large. What is too large?
A: The trophy

Here, a single word replacement (small/large) leads to an interpretation change of the word “it” (suitcase/trophy) based not on linguistic cues but rather on general (commonsense) world knowledge.

A few dozen of such minimally differing sentence pairs were sourced/generated to tackle diverse world knowledge phenomena — physical properties, biology, social situations, etc. — and compiled into the Winograd Schema Challenge [WSC; Morgenstern et al., 2016]. Although initially challenging, the WSC was largely solved by 2020, with LLMs achieving over 90% accuracy [e.g., Sakaguchi et al., 2021]. However, it

turned out that this success did not reflect the models’ deep knowledge of the world but rather the flaws in the test itself.

In the original paper introducing the challenge [Levesque et al., 2012], the authors cautioned against examples that could be solved via simple heuristics. They cite two such heuristics: selectional restrictions and frequency effects. The selectional restrictions heuristics can be illustrated with the example: “The women stopped taking the pills because they were pregnant/carcinogenic”. Here, only an animate entity can be pregnant and only an inanimate entity can be carcinogenic, leading to an unambiguous association between the adjectives and the corresponding nouns without the need to tap into deeper world knowledge. The frequency heuristics can help solve cases like: “The racecar zoomed by the school bus because it was going so fast/slow”: a simple association between “racecar” and “fast” will suffice to determine the referent. Finally, the authors note that the examples need to be, in their words, *Google-proof*, i.e., not present in online text corpora used to train the models.

Despite the field’s awareness of these heuristics, constructing a heuristics-free dataset was hard. In the original WSC dataset, over 10% of the items turned out to have simple association-based solutions [Trichelair et al., 2019]. To address this issue, Sakaguchi et al. [2021] constructed a large dataset called WinoGrande, where the examples were first crowd-sourced online and then automatically filtered to reduce co-occurrence-based associations as estimated through language model embeddings (rather than human intuition). This filtering substantially reduced model performance, suggesting that the association heuristic indeed inflates LLMs accuracy.

Soon after, Elazar et al. [2021b] published a paper titled “Back to square one”, where they showed that adding even more stringent quality controls leads to significant decreases in model performance on the WSC. For instance, Elazar et al. suggested to only count instances where both sentences in the minimal pair are correct (e.g., the model can predict both that the suitcase is too small in the first case and that the trophy is too large in the second case). They also introduced two baseline cases to account for raw frequency of possible continuations: sentences with candidate referents excluded (“doesn’t fit into because it’s too large/small”) and sentences with the first half excluded (“because it’s too large/small”). The assumption is that for these reduced sentences, there should be no consistent preference for “suitcase” vs. “trophy”, and if there is, it reflects an association bias. It turned out that LLMs performed above chance on the WSC even in those baseline conditions, indicating a previously undetected association biases.

The final issue raised by the WSC story is the quality vs. quantity tradeoff in test design. The initial WSC set includes less than 300 examples, all hand-crafted by scholars. Now that these examples are freely available online and no longer Google-proof [Elazar et al., 2023], there is no easy way to generate new examples. The authors of WinoGrande used a different approach: to obtain thousands of items, they asked human workers online to come up with many different examples and then used automatic filtering techniques. This approach is more scalable but suffers from numerous quality issues, e.g. typos (“wit” instead of “with”), grammatical errors (“more brighter color”), and reliance on unwarranted assumptions (“good at math” means “likely to be a professor”). Overall, the tradeoff between result generalizability (which is harder for small datasets) and quality control (which is harder for large datasets) remains an important issue to consider in test design.

Kocijan et al. [2023] formulate several lessons from the WSC saga, the most important of which is perhaps: “We need to be careful not to rely on a perceived connection between tasks and methods”. Just because we think that a certain task requires a cognitive ability X, doesn’t mean that it actually does.

Case study #2: Theory of Mind

In early 2023, Kosinski put forth a preprint that claimed that the latest LLMs available at the time possessed theory of mind – the ability to infer the mental state of another agent – at the level of 9-year-old children.

The preprint has gained substantial popularity, with over 140 citations in the first year; however, the study had several shortcomings that left its main claim unsupported.

To test theory of mind, the study uses the so-called false belief vignettes, which describe an underlying state of the world (e.g., a bag full of popcorn) and a condition that should lead a character to infer a different state of the world (e.g., the label on the bag that says “chocolate” instead of “popcorn”). After being presented with a scenario, the reader (human or LLM) should infer both the true state of the world and the false belief. The study showed that the latest model available at that point, GPT-3.5-davinci-003, was able to successfully solve the task. The result was impressive, especially because the tested scenarios were developed specifically for the study, making them “Google-proof”.

This finding came under scrutiny for several reasons.

First, no human participants were tested on the study materials, meaning that a proper comparison with human performance — children or adult — was lacking [cf. van Duijn et al., 2023].

Second, the paper suggested that theory of mind “spontaneously emerged” in LLMs; however, the model that showed good performance has been fine-tuned on a variety of tasks using a specialized technique (reinforcement learning with human feedback, or RLHF). Importantly, the exact makeup of the tasks used for fine-tuning is unknown because the model’s creator, OpenAI, has not disclosed information about the models’ training and fine-tuning data. Given the popularity of the false belief task, it can be reasonably assumed that it was part of the fine-tuning task set and thus the ability to solve it did not emerge spontaneously.

Third, and perhaps most critically, the study was lacking important control conditions. It never tested the models on the “true belief” conditions, where the state of the world and the belief actually aligned. Ullman [2023] conducted a follow-up study where he tested the models on a variety of true belief conditions, including making the popcorn bag transparent, having a friend tell the protagonist about the bag’s true contents, and having the protagonist place the popcorn in the bag themselves beforehand. The model’s performance on belief prompts in these modified scenarios was drastically below chance. In response to critiques by Ullman and others, Kosinski [2023] incorporated true belief controls in the revised version of the manuscript; and indeed, GPT-3.5-davinci-003 performance went down from 90% to 35%.

By then, an even later model, ChatGPT-4, became available. It showed an impressive 90% performance even with the true belief controls; however, these results were no longer informative. ChatGPT-4 evaluations were conducted after the initial version of the study had been released and extensively discussed, making it likely that the model was trained directly on the study materials (and their extensions like the true belief controls by Ullman). The fact that GPT-4 is a closed model makes it impossible to determine whether it has been exposed to the task and/or vignettes in question.

Finally, several other studies showed mixed performance of the latest GPT models on a variety of different theory of mind assessments [Sap et al., 2022, Shapira et al., 2023, van Duijn et al., 2023], indicating that good performance on a single theory-of-mind test does not always generalize across testing paradigms.

Case study #3: Syntactic agreement

The previous two case studies were instances of over-attribution, showing impressive model performance that turned out to be substantially worse once relevant controls were introduced. Here, I describe an opposite example: claims of an LLM failure which may turn out to be less problematic than originally thought.

A common task used to probe syntactic knowledge in LLMs is subject-verb agreement: given a sentence context, the model should select a verb that agrees with the subject even in the presence of intervening distractor words. For instance, in the sentence “The keys that the man near the cabinets holds is/are...” the correct continuation is “are”, a plural form matching the subject “keys”.

In 2022, Lakretz et al. [2022] demonstrated that GPT-2 fails at a particular type of such sentence agreement task with two intervening distractors (here, “man” and “cabinets”). GPT-3 did not succeed either [Srivastava et al., 2022], a surprising finding in light of its other successes in the domain of formal linguistic competence [Mahowald et al., 2023].

However, a follow-up examination of the results [Lampinen, 2022] revealed that model performance can improve if model testing conditions become more similar to those of humans. The models in the original study were presented with sentences without any context; in contrast, humans received explicit task instructions and completed 40 practice trials. Moreover, humans received feedback after each response. Lampinen tested another LLM (Chinchilla) not only in the original no-prompt condition, but also in a condition with a prompt containing example sentences with syntactic structure similar to that of the test sentences. Model performance drastically improved when provided with example sentences, exceeding human performance.

Lampinen also makes a more speculative claim: the condition where LLMs perform poorly is also difficult for humans. Specifically, he argues that humans perform at chance at the beginning of the experiment and only gradually improve thereafter. Whether or not this specific claim can be supported by future evidence, his takeaway point is clear: if humans’ success depends on receiving feedback and learning throughout the experiment, models should be given a chance to learn too.

Overall, when evaluating LLM performance, the experimenter needs to make a choice: does human task performance serve as a standard for model performance? If it does, then models and humans should be evaluated under the same experimental conditions (including instructions, example problems, and feedback). If it does not, the differing standards for humans and models should be explicitly acknowledged and justified. Do we intentionally want a model to perform better than a human would? If the model fails at a task which humans fail too, does that even count as a failure? The answers to these questions may vary from study to study, but they are vital for interpreting the results.

3 The Do’s and the Don’ts

Now that we have considered specific cases where LLM evaluation had to be re-examined, we can attempt to derive some general principles to guide future studies. The principles below are based both on the case studies above and on general good science practices. For related commentary pieces, see Frank [2023] and Mitchell [2023].

When evaluating a putative capability of large language models:

1. **DO consider the shortcuts a model might use to arrive at the correct answer.** The most prominent shortcuts for LLMs include word associations based on their statistical co-occurrence (“race-car”/“fast”), although there might be many others, such as grammatical cues or more abstract structural patterns in text. Considering shortcut paths to solutions can help both design shortcut-proof items and identify edge cases where shortcut-based models are likely to fail [McCoy et al., 2023, Zhang et al., 2023b].
2. **DO design careful control conditions.** When designing a test of a particular model capability, step 1 is to identify potential alternative mechanisms by which a model might be solving the task; step 2 is to design control conditions to help reveal these alternative mechanisms. For instance: did the model choose answer a over b simply because a is more frequent? Will the model show the same preference for answer a over b even when the question is omitted?
3. **DO consider what the model might have learned about your test during training.** The two most important issues to consider are: (a) was the model directly trained on your task? (b) did the model “see” examples from your test during its training? In the worst case, a and b might occur together,

i.e., the model was trained on the task of interest using the same items as those in the current study. Jacovi et al. [2023] provide practical suggestions for reducing the possibility of test items leaking into LLM training data.

4. **DO check whether a model generalizes beyond a single test.** Even when we control for possible shortcuts, a model might still find a loophole that allows it to perform well on a particular test. However, the more diverse tests we include (and the more we control for the shortcuts in each), the harder it will be to attribute model performance to serendipitous factors. If a model does well on 20 theory of mind tasks that vary in their content and structure, it is more plausible that it possesses theory of mind than if it performs well on one such task.
5. **DO NOT rely on minor changes in the test items when generating new examples.** When you take a famous test example (such as “The trophy did not fit the suitcase because it was too small”) and make a minor change, such as replacing “trophy” with “prize”, a model might still be able to complete the test based on simple association and not on a general principle.
6. **DO NOT overly rely on crowd-sourced / automatically generated examples.** The ability of LLMs to process large amounts a queries—way more than any human—creates a temptation of evaluating their performance on thousands of test items, obtained either from online human workers or from automatic item generation scripts (or even from LLMs; see **Section 4.3**). However, if the quality of these items is not rigorously evaluated, such tests may be meaningless.
7. **DO compare model and human performance.** We often assume humans will perform well on a specific test even when we don’t have direct evidence for it. If these exact test items have not been tested on humans before, they should be. The same applies to task instructions: a particular prompt that is hard for models might or might not be hard for human participants [Webson et al., 2023].
8. **DO evaluate models under conditions similar to humans when comparing their performance.** When conducting direct model-to-human comparisons, if a human needs instructions to perform well on a test, the model should also receive those instructions. If a human performs well on a task with no in-the-moment training, a model with human-level performance would also need to perform the task with no in-context training. If divergences during evaluation occur (for either theoretical or practical reasons), they need to be justified and highlighted when presenting the results.
9. **DO NOT assume that models solve the task in the same way as humans.** Even if both humans and models do well on a particular test, it doesn’t mean that they solve it in the same way. Some approaches to evaluating the underlying mechanism include analyzing the error patterns in humans vs models and examining the models’ internal representations to establish the mechanism by which they accomplish the task.
10. **DO NOT jump to conclusions.** The discourse around LLMs has become very polarized, with both extreme enthusiasm based on a few isolated examples [e.g., Bubeck et al., 2023] and extreme skepticism based on isolated failures [e.g., Chomsky et al., 2023]. What the field needs is careful evaluation of specific LLM capabilities with a clear acknowledgement of advances and limitations.

4 Other issues and outstanding questions

The previous section provides a list of relatively uncontroversial DO’S and DON’TS for cognitive evaluations of LLMs. In this section, I discuss emerging issues in AI Psychology that might not have clear-cut answers just yet but are nevertheless important to consider.

4.1 Prompt sensitivity

There is substantial work showing that LLMs’ performance is sensitive to specific ways in which a query is worded: paraphrasing the question or the prompt might lead the model to change its answer [e.g., Elazar et al., 2021a, Ravichander et al., 2020]. Sometimes, prompt sensitivity manifests in unexpected ways: for instance, appending an emotional appeal to the prompt (“This is really important to my career”) can improve model performance [Li et al., 2023]. Another example is enhancing the prompt with the now-famous line “Let’s think step by step” [Kojima et al., 2022], which can lead the model to enter a chain-of-thought regime and, in certain cases, improve its performance. LLM’s drastic variability in performance in response to tweaks in the prompt has led to an emergence of an entire subfield known as *prompt engineering*, which aims to design prompts that maximize LLM performance on specific tasks.

What does prompt sensitivity mean for cognitive evaluations of LLMs? It depends on the claims a researcher wants to make. For instance, if the goal is to test whether a model can successfully perform on a test at all, it might be reasonable to engineer a prompt that maximizes its performance. If the goal is to test whether the model’s behavior patterns resemble those of humans, then one might systematically vary the wording of the prompts to test the extent to which such tweaks affect the performance of models vs. humans. In either case, testing how sensitive a model is to prompt variation is important for accurately framing the results of a study.

4.2 Cultural and linguistic diversity

LLMs’ ability to simulate human performance on some psychological tests has led to claims that these models can “replace human participants” in new psychological experiments [Dillion et al., 2023, Horton, 2023]. Such claims have been subject to several lines of criticism [Crockett and Messeri, 2023, Harding et al., 2023, Park et al., 2023]; the main one I will focus on here is the “Which humans?” argument by Atari et al. [2023]. The authors point out that LLMs are trained on texts that are overwhelmingly generated by WEIRD (white, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) individuals, and therefore their responses are expected to show substantial WEIRD biases [see also Rozado, 2023, Santurkar et al., 2023]. Atari et al. go on to show that LLM responses to the World Values Survey primarily reflect values of individuals from Western nations and fail to align with responses from other countries. A similar result is shown by Durmus et al. [2023], who additionally demonstrate that such Western bias can be diminished if the respondent’s country of origin is explicitly specified in the prompt. In general, customizing the prompt to include demographic and cultural background can be somewhat effective in mitigating the cultural response bias [Argyle et al., 2023], although there are cases when it is known to fail [Park et al., 2023].

What are the methodological implications of LLMs’ cultural biases on AI Psychology? Although this topic is still under active discussion, I will put forth some DO’S and DON’TS that already seem relatively clear.

- **DO NOT assume that LLM responses reflect “universal” human behavior.** Even when directly comparing LLMs and humans, it is important to be specific about which human population serves as a reference.
- **DO examine the effect of culture-specific aspects of the prompt on model behavior.** The language in which the test is presented, the dialect, the vocabulary used, and even the use of capitalization and punctuation might all affect LLM performance as it leverages these cues to mimic specific users online.
- **DO consider the effects of training data on resulting model behavior.** In many cases, to get LLMs that are good models of a person from a particular culture, a researcher might need to train or fine-tune an LLM on a culturally specific dataset — a non-trivial but important task.

4.3 Using LLMs as research assistants

Besides an interest in LLMs as artificial study participants, researchers also recognize their utility as tools. As a result, more and more studies are starting to employ LLMs as research assistants.

One such trend is to use an LLM to generate test items and then assess the performance of that and/or other LLMs on these items [e.g., Gandhi et al., 2023, Hagendorff, 2023a]. The exact procedure may vary, but a common use case is to provide a model with a template and ask it to generate a lexically diverse set of items that follow the same template. In principle, the fact that a model has generated the test items is not necessarily predictive of its ability to solve those items (i.e., generation ability does not equal understanding; West et al., 2023). However, the fact that the exact wording of the items comes from an LLM can lead to systematic biases being baked into these items: an LLM might (a) generate test items that resemble samples from the training data or, more broadly, (b) generate patterns of text that have a high likelihood under the model and might therefore facilitate its performance. The systematic assessment of such biases in LLM-generated materials remains to be done.

Another trend is to use LLMs to automatically evaluate the accuracy of the answer [e.g., Sun et al., 2023, Zhang et al., 2023a]. Here, too, the ability to generate the correct answer and the ability to determine whether a certain answer is correct are, in principle, dissociable; however, in practice they may not be independent. Even when in general LLM scoring appears to be consistent with human-based scoring [as in, e.g., Sun et al., 2023], it might be that the items that are the most challenging for an LLM to solve are also the items where LLM evaluation accuracy is the least reliable. As with item generation, the approach of using LLMs to score LLM-based outputs should be extensively validated before it can be safely used.

Thus, at the moment, I would recommend extreme caution when using LLMs as research assistants: having them generate items or score responses might lead to systematic biases that will be hard to correct in retrospect.

4.4 Testing open vs. closed LLMs

Many of the DO'S discussed above — checking the training data for contamination with test items, verifying that the model has not been fine-tuned on the exact task being tested, estimating the linguistic/cultural diversity of the training data — are essentially impossible in the case of closed models. Moreover, there are no guarantees that closed LLM'S evaluations conducted days or weeks apart are probing the same model — the model could have been substantially changed in the meantime. Thus, there is an argument to stop running AI Psychology assessments on closed models altogether, since, from a scientific perspective, the results are essentially uninterpretable and non-reproducible.

Will researchers indeed stop running cognitive tests on closed LLMs? Probably not. Although scientifically unsound, evaluating the behavior of closed state-of-the-art LLMs has important practical implications, including understanding which real-life tasks they can (and cannot) be safely used for. Thus, going forward, cognitive evaluations of AI systems might be used in two separate settings: (a) basic scientific inquiry of cognitive capacities of AI systems — which should prioritize open models, and (b) applied studies tackling questions related to model performance and user impact — which can be applied both to open and to closed models with the caveat that closed model results might not replicate or generalize.

5 Conclusion

The ability of LLMs to generate coherent, fluent responses to questions posed in natural language has made it extremely easy to administer language-based assessments to those models, leading to an explosion of AI Psychology studies. As with any rapidly growing research area, the scientific practices and norms get defined on the fly, often through trial and error. I hope that this discussion of the DO'S and DON'TS of AI

Psychology will help distill some of the lessons learned and improve the robustness and validity of future work aiming to probe the cognitive capacities of LLMs and AI systems more broadly.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the funding support from MIT Quest for Intelligence. Many thanks to Aalok Sathe, Ben Lipkin, Carina Kauf, Greta Tuckute, and Kyle Mahowald for their constructive comments.

References

- Lisa P Argyle, Ethan C Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua R Gubler, Christopher Rytting, and David Wingate. Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis*, 31(3):337–351, 2023.
- Mohammad Atari, Mona J Xue, Peter S Park, Damián Blasi, and Joseph Henrich. Which humans? *PsyArXiv*, 2023.
- Marcel Binz and Eric Schulz. Using cognitive psychology to understand gpt-3. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(6):e2218523120, 2023.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.
- Noam Chomsky, Ian Roberts, and Jeffrey Watumull. The false promise of chatgpt. *The New York Times*, 2023. URL <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/08/opinion/noam-chomsky-chatgpt-ai.html>.
- Molly Crockett and Lisa Messeri. Should large language models replace human participants? *PsyArXiv*, 2023.
- Sayantana Dasgupta, Trevor Cohn, and Timothy Baldwin. Cost-effective distillation of large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 7346–7354, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.463. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.463>.
- Danica Dillion, Niket Tandon, Yuling Gu, and Kurt Gray. Can ai language models replace human participants? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2023.
- Esin Durmus, Karina Nyugen, Thomas I Liao, Nicholas Schiefer, Amanda Askill, Anton Bakhtin, Carol Chen, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Nicholas Joseph, et al. Towards measuring the representation of subjective global opinions in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16388*, 2023.
- Yanai Elazar, Nora Kassner, Shauli Ravfogel, Abhilasha Ravichander, Eduard Hovy, Hinrich Schütze, and Yoav Goldberg. Measuring and improving consistency in pretrained language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1012–1031, 2021a. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a.00410. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.tacl-1.60>.
- Yanai Elazar, Hongming Zhang, Yoav Goldberg, and Dan Roth. Back to square one: Artifact detection, training and commonsense disentanglement in the Winograd schema. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10486–10500, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021b. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.819. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.819>.
- Yanai Elazar, Akshita Bhagia, Ian Magnusson, Abhilasha Ravichander, Dustin Schwenk, Alane Suhr, Pete Walsh, Dirk Groeneveld, Luca Soldaini, Sameer Singh, et al. What’s in my big data? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20707*, 2023.

- Michael C Frank. Baby steps in evaluating the capacities of large language models. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2(8):451–452, 2023.
- Kanishk Gandhi, Jan-Philipp Fränken, Tobias Gerstenberg, and Noah D Goodman. Understanding social reasoning in language models with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15448*, 2023.
- Fabricio Goes, Marco Volpe, Piotr Sawicki, Marek Grześ, and Jacob Watson. Pushing gpt’s creativity to its limits: Alternative uses and torrance tests. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference for Computational Creativity*, 2023.
- Dongyu Gong, Xingchen Wan, and Dingmin Wang. Working memory capacity of chatgpt: an empirical study. 2023.
- Thilo Hagendorff. Deception abilities emerged in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16513*, 2023a.
- Thilo Hagendorff. Machine psychology: Investigating emergent capabilities and behavior in large language models using psychological methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13988*, 2023b.
- Jacqueline Harding, William D’Alessandro, NG Laskowski, and Robert Long. Ai language models cannot replace human research participants. *AI & SOCIETY*, pages 1–3, 2023.
- John J Horton. Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus? Working Paper 31122, National Bureau of Economic Research, April 2023. URL <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31122>.
- Alon Jacovi, Avi Caciularu, Omer Goldman, and Yoav Goldberg. Stop uploading test data in plain text: Practical strategies for mitigating data contamination by evaluation benchmarks. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2023)*, 2023.
- Guangyuan Jiang, Manjie Xu, Song-Chun Zhu, Wenjuan Han, Chi Zhang, and Yixin Zhu. Evaluating and inducing personality in pre-trained language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Vid Kocijan, Ernest Davis, Thomas Lukasiewicz, Gary Marcus, and Leora Morgenstern. The defeat of the winograd schema challenge. *Artificial Intelligence*, page 103971, 2023.
- Mika Koivisto and Simone Grassini. Best humans still outperform artificial intelligence in a creative divergent thinking task. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):13601, 2023.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.
- Michal Kosinski. Theory of mind may have spontaneously emerged in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02083*, 2023.
- Yair Lakretz, Théo Desbordes, Dieuwke Hupkes, and Stanislas Dehaene. Can transformers process recursive nested constructions, like humans? In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3226–3232, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.285>.
- Andrew Kyle Lampinen. Can language models handle recursively nested grammatical structures? a case study on comparing models and humans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.15303*, 2022.
- Hector Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. The winograd schema challenge. In *Thirteenth international conference on the principles of knowledge representation and reasoning*, 2012.
- Cheng Li, Jindong Wang, Yixuan Zhang, Kaijie Zhu, Wenxin Hou, Jianxun Lian, Fang Luo, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. Large language models understand and can be enhanced by emotional stimuli. 2023.
- Kyle Mahowald, Anna A Ivanova, Idan A Blank, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. Dissociating language and thought in large language models: a cognitive perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.06627*, 2023.

- R Thomas McCoy, Shunyu Yao, Dan Friedman, Matthew Hardy, and Thomas L Griffiths. Embers of autoregression: Understanding large language models through the problem they are trained to solve. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13638*, 2023.
- Melanie Mitchell. How do we know how smart ai systems are?, 2023.
- Leora Morgenstern, Ernest Davis, and Charles L Ortiz. Planning, executing, and evaluating the winograd schema challenge. *AI Magazine*, 37(1):50–54, 2016.
- Peter S. Park, Philipp Schoenegger, and Chongyang Zhu. Diminished diversity-of-thought in a standard large language model. *arXiv*, 2023.
- Amirreza Payandeh, Dan Pluth, Jordan Hosier, Xuesu Xiao, and Vijay K Gurbani. How susceptible are llms to logical fallacies? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09853*, 2023.
- Abhilasha Ravichander, Eduard Hovy, Kaheer Suleman, Adam Trischler, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. On the systematicity of probing contextualized word representations: The case of hypernymy in BERT. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 88–102, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.starsem-1.10>.
- David Rozado. The political biases of chatgpt. *Social Sciences*, 12(3):148, 2023.
- Mustafa Safdari, Greg Serapio-García, Clément Crepy, Stephen Fitz, Peter Romero, Luning Sun, Marwa Abdulhai, Aleksandra Faust, and Maja Matarić. Personality traits in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00184*, 2023.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- Shibani Santurkar, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Cino Lee, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Whose opinions do language models reflect? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17548*, 2023.
- Maarten Sap, Ronan Le Bras, Daniel Fried, and Yejin Choi. Neural theory-of-mind? on the limits of social intelligence in large LMs. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3762–3780, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.248. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.248>.
- John R Searle. Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 3(3):417–424, 1980.
- Natalie Shapira, Mosh Levy, Seyed Hossein Alavi, Xuhui Zhou, Yejin Choi, Yoav Goldberg, Maarten Sap, and Vered Shwartz. Clever hans or neural theory of mind? stress testing social reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14763*, 2023.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022.
- Kai Sun, Yifan Ethan Xu, Hanwen Zha, Yue Liu, and Xin Luna Dong. Head-to-tail: How knowledgeable are large language models (llm)? aka will llms replace knowledge graphs? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10168*, 2023.
- Paul Trichelair, Ali Emami, Adam Trischler, Kaheer Suleman, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. How reasonable are common-sense reasoning tasks: A case-study on the Winograd schema challenge and SWAG. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3382–3387, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1335. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1335>.
- Alan Turing. Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 59(236):433, 1950.

- Tomer Ullman. Large language models fail on trivial alterations to theory-of-mind tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08399*, 2023.
- Karthik Valmeekam, Sarath Sreedharan, Matthew Marquez, Alberto Olmo, and Subbarao Kambhampati. On the planning abilities of large language models (a critical investigation with a proposed benchmark). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06706*, 2023.
- Max J van Duijn, Bram van Dijk, Tom Kouwenhoven, Werner de Valk, Marco R Spruit, and Peter van der Putten. Theory of mind in large language models: Examining performance of 11 state-of-the-art models vs. children aged 7-10 on advanced tests. In *Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, 2023.
- Albert Webson, Alyssa Marie Loo, Qinan Yu, and Ellie Pavlick. Are language models worse than humans at following prompts? it’s complicated. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.07085*, 2023.
- Peter West, Ximing Lu, Nouha Dziri, Faeze Brahman, Linjie Li, Jena D Hwang, Liwei Jiang, Jillian Fisher, Abhilasha Ravichander, Khyathi Chandu, et al. The generative ai paradox: “what it can create, it may not understand”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00059*, 2023.
- Terry Winograd. Understanding natural language. *Cognitive psychology*, 3(1):1–191, 1972.
- Sarah J Zhang, Samuel Florin, Ariel N Lee, Eamon Niknafs, Andrei Marginean, Annie Wang, Keith Tyser, Zad Chin, Yann Hicke, Nikhil Singh, et al. Exploring the mit mathematics and eecs curriculum using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08997*, 2023a.
- Shizhuo Dylan Zhang, Curt Tigges, Stella Biderman, Maxim Raginsky, and Talia Ringer. Can transformers learn to solve problems recursively? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14699*, 2023b.