
Secret Keepers: The Impact of LLMs on Linguistic Markers of Personal Traits

Zhivar Sourati[◊], Meltem Ozcan[†], Colin McDaniel[†], Alireza Ziabari[◊],
Nuan Wen[◊], Ala Tak[◊], Fred Morstatter[◊], & Morteza Dehghani^{◊†}

[◊]Department of Computer Science, University of Southern California,

[†]Department of Psychology, University of Southern California,
Los Angeles, CA, USA

{souratih,ozcan,cbmcdani,salkhord,
nuanwen,nekouvag,morstatt,mdehghan}@usc.edu

Abstract

Prior research has established associations between individuals' language usage and their personal traits; our linguistic patterns reveal information about our personalities, emotional states, and beliefs. However, with the increasing adoption of Large Language Models (LLMs) as writing assistants in everyday writing, a critical question emerges: are authors' linguistic patterns still predictive of their personal traits when LLMs are involved in the writing process? We investigate the impact of LLMs on the linguistic markers of demographic and psychological traits, specifically examining three LLMs — GPT3.5, Llama 2, and Gemini — across six different traits: gender, age, political affiliation, personality, empathy, and morality. Our findings indicate that although the use of LLMs slightly reduces the predictive power of linguistic patterns over authors' personal traits, the significant changes are infrequent, and the use of LLMs does not fully diminish the predictive power of authors' linguistic patterns over their personal traits. We also note that some theoretically established lexical-based linguistic markers lose their reliability as predictors when LLMs are used in the writing process. Our findings have important implications for the study of linguistic markers of personal traits in the age of LLMs.

1 Introduction

Linguistic patterns, such as semantic, lexical, and stylistic features of natural language, carry meaningful information about their authors (Pennebaker, 2011). For instance, Pennebaker & King (1999) gathered essays written by 1,203 psychology students and captured their personality traits separately using questionnaires. By studying the link between linguistic patterns in the essays and the authors' personalities, they found associations such as a positive correlation between neuroticism and the use of negative emotion words. Similar linguistic markers that are predictive of authors' personal traits have been found for other psychological constructs and demographic attributes (e.g., Oberlander & Gill, 2006; Moreno et al., 2021; Mairesse et al., 2007; Schwartz et al., 2013). It is noteworthy that these markers are often difficult to consciously conceal, making them valuable tools for psychological analysis and inferring otherwise private information from linguistic patterns.

More recently, Large Language Models (LLMs), especially those with easy-to-use public interfaces, have emerged to assist in a wide range of writing tasks, including composing emails, social media posts, or essays, leading individuals to increasingly rely on them as writing assistants in their daily lives (Sakirin & Said, 2023; AlAfnan et al., 2023; Haynes, 2023). Such interactions between LLMs and their users have spurred researchers to emphasize the necessity for gaining a deeper understanding of the inner characteristics of LLMs (Safdari et al., 2023; Caron & Srivastava, 2023; Abdulhai et al., 2023) and the social consequences of their rapid adoption (Wu et al., 2023). However, to our knowledge, no existing research has investigated the impact of LLMs on the linguistic patterns of authors, and the information

embedded in these patterns about authors’ personal traits, when LLMs are involved in the writing process.

In this study, we aim to address this gap in the literature and, more concretely, answer the question *do LLMs preserve linguistic markers of authors’ attributes?* We rely on data sources that contain authors’ written texts alongside certain demographic and psychological attributes about authors through self-reports (see Section 3.1). Specifically, we focus on three psychological constructs on which individuals differ, i.e., personality, dispositional empathy, and moral values, and three demographic attributes, i.e., gender, age group, and political affiliation. We then ask LLMs to generate variations of the original texts, covering three LLMs: GPT3.5 (OpenAI, 2022), Llama 2 (Touvron et al., 2023), and Gemini (Team et al., 2023), allowing us to compare their impacts (see Section 3.2). In Section 3.3, first, we assess the predictive power of linguistic patterns regarding authors’ attributes inherent in the original texts and compare them with the texts generated by LLMs. We then ground our analysis in established fine-grained linguistic markers of personal traits and explore the impact of LLMs on these theoretically grounded markers.

Our results suggest that, overall, there is a slight decrease in the predictive power of authors’ linguistic patterns over their personal traits when LLMs are involved in the writing process. However, significant declines across all possible choices of classifiers, LLMs, and prompts are infrequent. Further, our investigations demonstrate that the fine-grained lexical-based markers of authors’ attributes are altered in some cases between authors’ original texts and LLM-generated texts. The observed changes in these fine-grained linguistic markers partially explain the aforementioned decline in predictive power, prompting questions about the reliability of specific linguistic markers of personal traits in the age of LLMs.

2 Related Work

Linguistic markers of demographic and psychological constructs. Numerous studies have demonstrated that authors’ linguistic patterns provide information about their characteristics such as personality (e.g., Pennebaker & King, 1999; Sun et al., 2018), dispositional empathy (e.g., Buechel et al., 2018; Barriere et al., 2023) morality (e.g., Kennedy et al., 2021; Ziabari et al., 2024), gender (e.g., Cheng et al., 2011; Peersman et al., 2011), and political affiliation (e.g., Santurkar et al., 2023; Baly et al., 2020). Inquiries into the relationship between language use and author attributes can be grouped into two approaches, each serving a different purpose (Kennedy et al., 2022): bottom-up approaches and top-down approaches. Bottom-up approaches support data-driven discovery of linguistic features for the purpose of predicting authors’ attributes by finding any informative signal in people’s speech or written text (e.g., Peersman et al., 2011). Meanwhile, top-down approaches study the hypothesized fine-grained linguistic markers of authors’ attributes using well-curated lexicons and statistical modeling with the goal of facilitating inference (e.g., Mairesse et al., 2007). This study aims to determine if established associations between language usage and authors’ attributes remain meaningful when LLMs are used in writing.

LLMs & social psychological research. Recent advancements in LLMs have opened new avenues in social psychological research. LLMs, renowned for their ability to generate human-like text (Herbold et al., 2023), offer unique tools for studying social interactions and provide valuable insights into human behavior and social dynamics (e.g., Park et al., 2023). For instance, Rao et al. (2023) apply LLMs to detect personality traits from input text, while Safdari et al. (2023) provide personality measurements for LLM-generated text. Other works explore the demographic-related and psychological features of LLMs themselves, such as personality (e.g., Miotto et al., 2022), world views and beliefs (e.g., He et al., 2024), creativity (e.g., Uludag, 2023), and ability to empathize (e.g., Belkhir & Sadat, 2023). While the human-like qualities of LLMs have garnered praise, numerous studies have highlighted significant limitations and biases in these models (e.g., Abdurahman et al., 2023; Messeri & Crockett, 2024). Nevertheless, to our knowledge, the influence of LLMs on the linguistic markers of individuals’ private attributes is yet to be explored. We aim to address this gap in the present study.

3 Experimental Setup

To study the influence of LLMs on the linguistic markers of authors’ personal traits when LLMs are involved in writing, we first delve deeper into the particular personal traits we investigate, in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2, we provide the details of how we use LLMs to generate variations of authors’ original texts. Finally, in Section 3.3, we discuss how the authors’ linguistic patterns that are predictive of their personal traits are studied and compared between authors’ original and LLM-generated texts.

3.1 Author Attributes

For our investigation, we choose six well-researched demographic and psychological constructs: gender, age, political affiliation, personality, dispositional empathy, and morality. For each of these attributes, we use a dataset containing written text as well as the corresponding value of the attribute from the texts’ respective author. Authors’ demographic attributes were gathered using external sources (e.g. Wikipedia), while other psychological attributes were compiled using validated self-report questionnaires. Crucially, the texts and the individuals’ demographic/psychological attributes were collected independently (i.e., author attributes were not annotated based on the written text).

Demographic attributes. Among different demographic attributes, we consider age, gender, and political affiliation. As our data source, we use the United States Congressional Records (Gentzkow et al., 2018), which contains congressional floor speeches along with the speakers’ demographic details (Silver & Mehta, 2014). The dataset contains data from 8,520 speakers from the 43rd to the 114th Congress, having between 1 to 21,142 speeches with varying word lengths. As a filtering step, we begin with the speakers’ longest utterances, selecting enough to reach a total of 4,000 words for each speaker. This is to remove short, uninformative utterances and to take into account the computational limits on the processed maximum number of tokens. We then sample the largest possible subset of speakers that would have a balanced number of males/females (due to the binary scheme of the data), Republicans/Democrats, and age groups of (27-40), (41-55), (56-70), and (over 70), totaling 710 speakers.

Personality. To study personality, we choose the widely accepted Big Five personality model (Goldberg, 2013; 1990), which describes five fundamental dimensions of personality: openness (OPN), conscientiousness (CON), extraversion (EXT), agreeableness (AGR), and neuroticism (NEU). We use the extended Essays dataset (Pennebaker & King, 1999) that contains 2,348 essays, each from a unique author, and the authors’ scores on the 44-item Big-5 Personality Inventory (John et al., 1991). Similar to Celli et al. (2013), the labels are nominal classes with a median split (low/high) that are converted from z-scores of the actual numerical self-assessments. The authors were tasked with writing an essay using a stream-of-consciousness approach, encouraging them to think freely and record whatever thoughts came to mind. The authors then completed the personality assessment.

Dispositional empathy. We use the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis et al., 1980), which is one of the most common ways to assess individual differences in this construct. The IRI is a 28-item self-report questionnaire designed to measure empathy in adults, consisting of four dimensions: perspective-taking (PT), fantasy (FS), empathetic concern (EC), and personal distress (PD). For the purposes of our investigation, we use the Empathetic Conversations dataset (Omitaomu et al., 2022), previously used in the WASSA 2023 shared task (Barriere et al., 2023), which contains essays written in response to news articles and IRI scores for the authors. Similar to the process employed for the Essays dataset, labels are nominal classes indicating the low/high level of each IRI dimension. After cleaning and preprocessing, the dataset contains data from 57 authors who wrote between 1 and 72 reaction essays, resulting in a total of 711 essays. To have an aggregated picture, we focus on concatenated essays from each author. Additionally, we explore how considering each essay as an independent observation, ignoring that certain texts are from the same author, impacts findings compared to the concatenated approach.

Morality. One of the most common theoretical frameworks of morality is Moral Foundation Theory (MFT; Graham et al., 2013; Haidt & Joseph, 2004; Atari et al., 2023), which proposes five innate and universally available psychological systems that people use to process moral matters: care/harm, fairness/cheating, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and purity/degradation. We use the YourMorals dataset (Kennedy et al., 2021) that contains 107,798 Facebook posts from 2,691 users alongside the authors’ scores on the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham et al., 2008). Similar to the process employed for the Essays dataset, labels are nominal classes indicating the low/high level of each MFT dimension. Also, similar to the Empathetic Conversations dataset, we focus on the concatenated posts from each author.

3.2 LLMs’ Variations of Authors’ Texts

To gather the LLMs’ variations of authors’ original texts, we employ a natural procedure that people might realistically engage in when utilizing LLMs, by prompting LLMs to rewrite a piece of text without pointing out any particular characteristic that the author might have or might want to integrate into the text. We chose the following two neutral prompts, one that limits changes to a bare minimum of syntactical revisions, and another that allows LLMs to freely make changes to the text:

- Syntax_Grammar (SG): ‘Rewrite the following text using the best syntax and grammar and other revisions that are necessary: {TEXT}’
- Rephrase (R): ‘Rephrase the following text: {TEXT}’

We utilize GPT3.5 (OpenAI, 2022), Llama 2 70B (Touvron et al., 2023), and Gemini pro (Team et al., 2023) with a deterministic generation setting (Temperature = 0) for our experiments. We focus on these three LLMs due to their popularity and easy-to-use public interfaces that enable the general public to use them without needing any expertise, as opposed to other LLMs, which might be more suitable for academic audiences.

3.3 Predicting Authors’ Personal Attributes with Linguistic Patterns

In this section, we discuss two approaches for predicting author attributes using their linguistic patterns, and further discuss how we compare these linguistic patterns between the authors’ original and LLM-generated texts. Similar to the categorization done by Kennedy et al. (2022), we study authors’ linguistic patterns predictive of their personal traits in two ways: 1. **Bottom-up** (data-driven) approach that relies on data-driven methodology to find linguistic cues that are predictive of the authors’ attributes; 2. **Top-down** (theory-driven) approach that is grounded in psychological theory and focuses on fine-grained associations between predetermined lexical cues and authors’ characteristics.

Bottom-up (data-driven) analysis. In this approach, we train classifiers that predict authors’ attributes given their original texts. We then compare the predictive power of classifiers on the original and their corresponding LLM-generated held-out test splits. However, different classifiers with different architectures may capture different features and achieve varying predictive powers, making them incomparable to one another. Since the primary question is whether the predictive power is preserved when an LLM is involved in the writing process, regardless of the family of classifier being utilized, we adopt an aggregated point of view and focus on the ratio of unchanged performances across different classifiers and featurization techniques. As classifiers, we use four different families of classifiers, i.e., Support Vector Machines (SVMs), Logistic Regression, Random Forest, and Gradient Boosting, on top of two featurization techniques (TF-IDF, and OpenAI text-embedding-ada-002 embeddings). We also include Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020), a Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017) suitable for processing the long documents in our datasets. This way, we cover both traditional, conventional, as well as state-of-the-art methods. We separate the data into train, validation, and test splits with 5-fold cross-validation for training the models and track F_1 -macro scores. The comparison between models’ performance on original and LLM-generated data is done across 40 runs with different random seeds to ensure

the robustness of the results. Focusing only on the runs with above random performance on original texts, we filtered out models for which there were fewer than 20 runs. In all the analyses, given that we perform multiple comparisons across classifiers, prompts, and LLMs, significance thresholds were adjusted using a Bonferroni correction (Bonferroni, 1936).

Top-down (theory-driven) analysis. In the top-down analysis, we adopt a more granular approach and examine the LLMs’ impact on associations previously demonstrated in the literature between lexical cues and demographic/psychological attributes. This approach allows us to glean which specific linguistic cues were affected by LLMs and helps us explain changes in predictive power in the bottom-up approach. More concretely, we: 1. choose psychologically validated dictionaries of words associated with authors’ traits (or traits’ dimension) of interest; 2. for each dictionary category, calculate the ratio of the number of words belonging to that category in authors’ texts (i.e., word frequency) to the total number of words in the texts as a standardized score; 3. for continuous author traits (i.e., age, personality, empathy, morality), compute the Pearson correlation (r) between these standardized word frequencies and the z -scores of the traits of interest, and for categorical traits (i.e., gender and political affiliation), conduct a t -test to determine significant differences of scores across groups; and 4. perform Bonferroni corrections to account for multiple comparisons across dimensions (for psychological constructs) and dictionary categories (i.e., dividing the significance threshold of 0.05 by the number of dimensions in the psychological construct and by the number of dictionary categories, e.g., for personality, which has five dimensions and 24 dictionary categories examined, the threshold is $0.05 / (5 \cdot 24) = 0.000417$).

As a general-purpose dictionary, we use the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC; version 22 and 07, merged; Pennebaker et al., 2022), which covers various psychological and topical categories and social, cognitive, and affective processes. We select a collection of LIWC features for each author attribute based on theoretically backed hypotheses regarding which features would correlate best with the demographic/psychological trait of interest. In addition, we use content-specific dictionaries to conduct a more targeted investigation of the linguistic cues associated with specific psychological traits. Namely, we use the 10-category NRC Emotion Lexicon (Mohammad & Turney, 2013; 2010) for associations with personality, the lexicon gathered by Sedoc et al. (2019), median split into high- and low-empathy and distress words (four categories) for associations with dispositional empathy, and the Moral Foundations Dictionary 2 (MFD2; Frimer et al., 2019) for associations with moral foundations, which we test within each moral foundation (two categories per foundation).

4 Results

4.1 Do LLMs Change the Semantics in People’s Writings?




Figure 1: Semantic similarity between original and LLM-generated texts (with Rephrase and Syntax_Grammar prompts) across different data sources and utilized LLMs.

Texts generated by LLMs can differ from authors’ original texts in terms of various syntactic and semantic linguistic patterns. We expected that LLMs would not change the meaning of original texts when neutral prompts are used in the rewriting process. Figure 1 demonstrates

the semantic similarity between original and LLM-generated texts, computed as the cosine similarity between OpenAI text-embedding-ada-002 embeddings of the two text pieces.

Aligned with our expectations, the semantic similarity between original and LLM-generated texts across all data sources, LLMs, and prompts was high (75% of scores were above 0.94; see Table 3 in Appendix for descriptive statistics). A Kruskal-Wallis (H) test, a non-parametric alternative to ANOVA,¹ was performed to compare similarity scores across LLMs and datasets, while a Mann-Whitney (U) test was used to compare the similarities across two prompts. Our results indicated that computed similarities were significantly different across LLMs ($H = 2718, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.08$ [moderate effect size]), two prompt conditions ($U = 92224114, p < .001, r = 0.32$ [medium effect size]), as well as datasets ($H = 1758.5, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.05$ [small effect size]).

Pairwise post-hoc Dunn’s tests (Dunn, 1961)² with Benjamini-Hochberg corrections for multiple comparisons showed significant differences between all LLM pairs ($p < .001$; see Table 4 in Appendix), with GPT3.5 being the most preservative LLM and Llama 2 being the least preservative LLM in terms of the level of semantic preservation when rewriting. With a similar post-hoc analysis, comparing the two prompt conditions, the Syntax_Grammar prompt was more preservative than the Rephrase prompt with median similarity values of 0.97 and 0.96, respectively (see Table 1 for an example of the original and LLM-generated texts). Finally, underscoring the role of context when studying LLMs’ impact on authors’ texts, our pairwise post-hoc tests showed significant differences between all dataset pairs aside from YourMorals vs. Empathetic Conversations (see Table 5 in Appendix), which showed the highest level of semantic preservation for the Congress dataset and the least level of preservation for the YourMorals dataset.

Prompt	Text
Original	it has been raining for the past 10 days and I guess that has a lot to do with everyone’s attitudes. I feel a little relieved and tired though I had my first test of the semester this morning. I feel tired because I spent the majority part of the weekend partying rather than studying like I should have . . .
Rephrase	It has been raining continuously, which seems to be affecting everyone’s attitudes. Despite feeling relieved, I am also tired because I had my first test of the semester this morning. Unfortunately, I spent most of the weekend partying instead of studying, so . . .
Syntax Grammar	It has been raining for the past few days, and I believe this weather has had a significant impact on everyone’s attitudes. Personally, I feel a mixture of relief and fatigue, as I had my first test of the semester this morning. The tiredness stems from the fact that I spent the majority of the weekend partying instead of studying, as I . . .

Table 1: Variations of a sample text from the Essays dataset.

4.2 Do LLMs Wash Away Linguistic Markers of Author Attributes?

Regardless of how LLMs change the style or meaning of authors’ written text, the core question is whether LLMs preserve the linguistic patterns of authors that are predictive of the authors’ characteristics. We observed that the performance of classifiers predicting authors’ personal traits, on the LLM-generated texts was significantly lower compared to the performance on the original texts, across different constructs ($p < .001$; [small] Cohen’s d effect size, using a paired t -test; see Table 6 in Appendix). Although we observed a 6% decline in the absolute F_1 score of classifiers on average, the classifiers’ performance did not go below random performance. Further, comparing the classifiers’ performance on original and LLM-generated data, across all possible LLMs, prompts, or used classifiers, our results suggested that significant performance declines are infrequent. Figure 2-left shows the ratio of classifiers with unchanged predictive power (using a paired t -test and a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons) after LLM rewrites, across different author attributes. With this more precise analysis that tries to address the main question of this study, we found that the predictive power of authors’ linguistic patterns over their personal

¹The Fligner-Killeen’s test, which is robust against non-normality and large sample sizes, revealed that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated ($F = 5532.7, p < .001$).

²Dunn’s tests are conventionally used for pairwise comparisons after a Kruskal-Wallis test is rejected.

traits, although slightly reduced, is not fully diminished. LLMs’ impact on the predictive power of linguistic markers of gender and dispositional empathy was higher, where the predictive power of 31% and 25% of classifiers decreased, respectively. The few occurrences where the predictive power of classifiers significantly changed were mostly using logistic regression and TF-IDF as classifiers.




Figure 2: The ratio of classifiers with unchanged predictive power after LLM rewrites across different author attributes. The left plot shows the aggregated view and the right plot shows the variability across two prompts: Rephrase and Syntax Grammar.

Upon closer investigation, predictive power was more often reduced rather than increased, with the exception of the Care dimension of morality, where the involvement of LLMs amplified the predictive power of linguistic patterns in predicting the level of the authors’ Care, which we conjecture to be a byproduct of the reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) stage of LLMs’ fine-tuning, promoting certain behaviors. See Figure 6 in Appendix for a more fine-grained illustration of the changes in the predictive power per dimension of authors’ personal traits.

LLMs having different training pipelines, the impact of different LLMs on the predictive power of linguistic patterns over author attributes might differ. Figure 3 demonstrates the ratio of classifiers with unchanged predictive power across different LLMs. Although jointly across all author attributes, we did not find a significant difference in impact between LLMs, when we only focused on the demographic attributes (i.e., gender, age, and political affiliation), the difference between LLMs’ impact was significant (Cochran’s Q test with $\chi^2 = 12.6, p = .001$). We found that the level of preserved predictive power by Gemini was lower than GPT3.5 (McNemar’s $\chi^2 = 9.0, p = 0.01$, Odds ratio = 0.14 [large effect size]) and Llama 2 ($\chi^2 = 8.89, p = 0.01$; Odds ratio = 0.18 [large effect size]), while the impact of Llama 2 and GPT3.5 was not significantly different.

Moreover, our results suggested that SG prompt is more preservative than the R prompt (McNemar’s $\chi^2 = 3.76, p = 0.05$, Odds ratio = 0.58 [small effect size]) in keeping the same predictive power of linguistic patterns over author attributes, which underscores the role of prompts in the LLMs’ impact on linguistic markers of personal traits (see Figure 2-right), with stronger effects in the case of gender, age group, and political affiliation prediction.




Figure 3: The ratio of models with unchanged predictive power after LLM rewrites, across different author attributes and different LLMs.

Motivated by research identifying specific human-like traits of LLMs (e.g., whether an LLM is introverted or extroverted; Santurkar et al., 2023; Miotto et al., 2022), we analyzed the direction in which LLMs change the predictions of the classifiers, which can be a proxy for what LLMs promote in the generated text. Figure 4 demonstrates the ratio of predictions




Figure 4: Ratios of correct author attribute predictions on original texts that had different predicted labels on LLM-generated texts, grouped by the direction of change in predictions.

Personality	Original	Rephrase			Syntax-Grammar			Original	Rephrase			Syntax-Grammar		
		Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2		Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2
OPN	drives	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Morality	pronoun	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	swear	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		religion	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	BigWords	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Loyalty	affiliation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CON	anger emo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		family	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	swear	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		prosocial	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
EXT	Social	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Authority	affect	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	pos emo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		religion	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
AGR	anger emo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Social	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	swear	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Purity	family	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
NEU	I pronoun	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		religion	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	affect	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Care	Social	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	neg emo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		affiliation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	anger emo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Empathy						
Demographics								PD	affect	✓			✓	
gender	article	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		differ					
	anx emo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	EC	we	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Social	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		cogproc	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
age	we	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		pronoun	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
affiliation	adverb	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	PT	we	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
									pronoun	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
									cogproc	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 2: Highlighted correlations between LIWC categories and author attributes (see Appendix D for exact values and additional categories) on original and LLM-generated texts. ✓ indicates significant correlations. IRI-fantasy is not displayed as it was not correlated with any dictionary categories.

that changed from correct to incorrect, grouped by the direction of this change across different author attributes and LLMs. Reflected by more changes in the ‘higher to lower’ direction, our results suggested that LLM-generated text had levels of empathy that are associated with authors having lower levels of empathy compared to the actual authors ($t(6698) = 20.18, p < .001, \text{Cohen's } d = 0.35$ [small effect size]; using a paired t -test). With a similar reasoning, LLM-generated text was associated with authors having higher levels of morality ($t(3051) = 21.25, p < .001, d = 0.61$ [medium effect size]) and higher age groups ($t(597) = 16.84, p < .001, d = 1.09$ [large effect size]) compared to the actual authors. LLM-generated text confused classifiers to incorrectly predict authors as being Democrats more often than confusing them the other way around ($t(867) = 24.89, p < .001, d = 1.35$ [large effect size]). Finally, Gemini and GPT3.5 involvement was accompanied by more ‘Female to Male’ prediction changes ($t(613) = 5.68, p < .001, d = 0.37$ [small effect size]), while Llama 2 involvement changed gender predictions partially equally in both directions. For a more detailed discussion, refer to Appendix E.

4.3 Do LLMs Change Fine-Grained Associations Between Lexical Cues and Authors’ Attributes?

Adopting a theoretically grounded approach, Table 2 contains a simplified illustration of some important associations between lexical categories and various dimensions of author attributes in authors’ original and LLM-generated texts (see Appendix D for the exact correlation coefficients). Focusing on the authors’ original texts, we successfully replicated

associations that have been previously established across different author attributes, e.g., males used a significantly smaller number of social and anxiety-related words than females (Ishikawa, 2015), higher EXT was significantly associated with greater use of positive emotions and social words (Chen et al., 2020), and higher Loyalty was associated with greater usage of family-related words (Li & Tomasello, 2021).

Switching to the LLM-generated texts, we observed that few associations were preserved across all utilized LLMs and prompts, such as the association between NEU and negative emotion words, Purity and religion-related words, or number of article words and gender. We also noticed occurrences where LLMs washed away linguistic markers of authors’ characteristics initially present in the original texts, such as the association between OPN and BigWords, Fairness and religion-related words, and gender and anxiety-related words. Surprisingly, in a few occurrences, expected associations that were not observed in the original texts emerged in LLM-generated texts, such as the association between age and first-person plural words, NEU and affect-related words, and Loyalty and prosocial words. Overall, our results demonstrated that LLM involvement in writing can preserve some theoretically grounded associations while removing others, and in some cases, even add previously established associations that were not observed in the original text. For the complete list of correlations, refer to Appendix D.

4.4 Sensitivity to Data Size

The reliability of inferences about authors’ personal traits can depend on the amount of text available on authors. We ask if LLMs’ impact on the predictive power of linguistic cues is sensitive to the amount of available data. Since the Empathetic Conversations dataset associated with dispositional empathy contains multiple reaction essays from the same authors, we compared the LLMs’ influence on both the version of the dataset with essays grouped by authors and the version that treats each essay as an individual observation. Figure 5 demonstrates the ratio of classifiers with unchanged predictive power on dispositional empathy for both data versions after LLM rewrites. We found that classifiers trained on aggregated texts of authors were less affected by LLMs, as indicated by the ratio of classifiers with unchanged performance (McNemar’s $\chi^2 = 91.0, p < .001$, Odds ratio (OR) = 0.01 [large effect size]).




Figure 5: The ratio of unchanged predictive powers for two versions of the Empathetic Conversations dataset, one with aggregated essays per author and one containing all essays from the same author as individual observations.

5 Conclusion

Previous research links individuals’ linguistic patterns with their personal traits, but it’s unclear if these links remain unchanged when LLMs are involved in the writing process. Adopting a data-driven approach, our results suggested that LLMs’ involvement in writing can slightly reduce the predictive power of linguistic patterns over personal traits, and this significant decline happens infrequently. Additionally, we found that the context in which LLMs are used, the choice of LLM, and the adopted prompt can amplify or rectify the impact of LLMs on the predictive power of linguistic patterns over personal traits. Further fine-grained analysis on lexical-based, theoretically established, linguistic markers of personal traits indicated that LLMs wash away certain linguistic markers, such as the link between fairness and religion-related words or extraversion and social words, while retaining others, such as neuroticism and negative emotion words. Our findings carry significant implications for research on linguistic markers of personal traits in the

age of LLMs as they render certain linguistic indicators unreliable, which might prompt reconsideration of utilized methodologies in this area of research.

6 Limitations

Although we have tried to cover various contexts, personal traits, LLMs, and prompts, future work could improve the generalizability of this research by including a wider variety of datasets and contexts for each construct of interest, as well as expanding these analyses to additional personal traits. This could help capture the variability of information about personal traits in individuals' linguistic patterns across different contexts, such as Facebook posts, school homework, or formal writing. Future work could also investigate the particular reasons for LLMs' differential effects across various demographic and psychological constructs. Moreover, individuals from diverse cultures or backgrounds may exhibit varying degrees of expressiveness in their language use, and different psychological constructs may be more or less apparent in the language of individuals from different cultures, potentially resulting in variability in the linguistic markers' predictive power. Future work should consider the cultural background of the authors, to reduce unaccounted variability and paint a clearer picture of LLMs' impact on linguistic patterns that are predictive of individuals' personal traits. Although we utilized semantic similarity measurements to ensure that LLMs do not change the meaning of authors' original texts, the interplay between different types of similarity between the original and LLM-generated texts, such as semantic similarity and lexical similarity, can provide valuable insights into the overall impact of LLMs on individuals' linguistic patterns, especially in cases where LLMs might alter both meaning and style in writings.

7 Ethics Statement

As our research pertains to the identification of private information about authors, we recognize the ethical concerns related to potential misuse, particularly in determining private attributes of authors without their consent. However, the purpose of this study is to enhance our understanding of the impacts of LLMs on this sensitive field of study, and further to contribute to the privacy of the users of these LLMs. It is also noteworthy that the personality, empathy and morality data used in this study were completely anonymized with proper elicitation of consent from authors upon gathering their personal information in the respective studies that gathered this data. The other data source we used for demographic attributes is publicly available.

8 Acknowledgements

This research was supported, in part, by the Army Research Laboratory under contract W911NF-23-2-0183 and by DARPA INCAS HR001121C0165. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of DARPA or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright annotation therein. We also thank James W. Pennebaker for their support and invaluable insights throughout the research process.

References

- Marwa Abdulhai, Gregory Serapio-Garcia, Clément Crepy, Daria Valter, John Canny, and Natasha Jaques. Moral foundations of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15337*, 2023.
- Suhaib Abdurahman, Mohammad Atari, Farzan Karimi-Malekabadi, Mona J Xue, Jackson Trager, Peter S Park, Preni Golazizian, Ali Omrani, and Morteza Dehghani. Perils and opportunities in using large language models in psychological research. *PsyArXiv*. URL: <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/d695y>, 2023.

-
- Mohammad Awad AlAfnan, Samira Dishari, Marina Jovic, and Koba Lomidze. Chatgpt as an educational tool: Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations for communication, business writing, and composition courses. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology*, 3(2):60–68, 2023.
- Mohammad Atari, Jonathan Haidt, Jesse Graham, Sena Koleva, Sean T Stevens, and Morteza Dehghani. Morality beyond the weird: How the nomological network of morality varies across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2023.
- J.L. Baddeley and J.A. Singer. Telling losses: Personality correlates and functions of bereavement narratives. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(2):421–438, 2008. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.07.006>.
- Ramy Baly, Giovanni Da San Martino, James Glass, and Preslav Nakov. We can detect your bias: Predicting the political ideology of news articles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05338*, 2020.
- Valentin Barriere, João Sedoc, Shabnam Tafreshi, and Salvatore Giorgi. Findings of wassa 2023 shared task on empathy, emotion and personality detection in conversation and reactions to news articles. In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pp. 511–525, 2023.
- Ahmed Belkhir and Fatiha Sadat. Beyond information: Is ChatGPT empathetic enough? In Ruslan Mitkov and Galia Angelova (eds.), *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 159–169, Varna, Bulgaria, September 2023. INCOMA Ltd., Shoumen, Bulgaria. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.ranlp-1.18>.
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- Carlo Bonferroni. Teoria statistica delle classi e calcolo delle probabilita. *Pubblicazioni del R Istituto Superiore di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali di Firenze*, 8:3–62, 1936.
- Sven Buechel, Anneke Buffone, Barry Slaff, Lyle Ungar, and Joao Sedoc. Modeling empathy and distress in reaction to news stories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.10399*, 2018.
- Graham Caron and Shashank Srivastava. Manipulating the perceived personality traits of language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 2370–2386, 2023.
- Fabio Celli, Fabio Pianesi, David Stillwell, and Michal Kosinski. Workshop on computational personality recognition: Shared task. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 7, pp. 2–5, 2013.
- Jiayu Chen, Lin Qiu, and Moon-Ho Ringo Ho. A meta-analysis of linguistic markers of extraversion: Positive emotion and social process words. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 89:104035, 2020.
- Na Cheng, Rajarathnam Chandramouli, and KP Subbalakshmi. Author gender identification from text. *Digital investigation*, 8(1):78–88, 2011.
- J. Cohen. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1):155–159, 1992. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155>.
- Mark H Davis et al. A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. 1980.
- Jean Olive Dunn. Multiple comparisons among means. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 56(293):52–64, 1961. doi: DOI:10.1080/01621459.1961.10482090.
- Jeremy A Frimer, Reihane Boghrati, Jonathan Haidt, Jesse Graham, and Morteza Dehghani. Moral foundations dictionary for linguistic analyses 2.0. *Unpublished manuscript*, 2019.

-
- Matthew Gentzkow, Jesse M Shapiro, and Matt Taddy. Congressional record for the 43rd-114th congresses: Parsed speeches and phrase counts. In URL: <https://data.stanford.edu/congress text>, 2018.
- Lewis R Goldberg. An alternative “description of personality”: The big-five factor structure. In *Personality and Personality Disorders*, pp. 34–47. Routledge, 2013.
- LR Goldberg. Standard markers of the big-five structure. *Unpublished manuscript, Oregon Research Institute at Oregon*, 1990.
- Jesse Graham, Brian A Nosek, Jonathan Haidt, Ravi Iyer, Koleva Spassena, and Peter H Ditto. Moral foundations questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2008.
- Jesse Graham, Jonathan Haidt, Sena Koleva, Matt Motyl, Ravi Iyer, Sean P Wojcik, and Peter H Ditto. Moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*, volume 47, pp. 55–130. Elsevier, 2013.
- Jonathan Haidt and Craig Joseph. Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus*, 133(4):55–66, 2004.
- Emily Haynes. A new fundraising assistant: Chatgpt: The ai technology can take a first stab at writing grant applications, social-media posts, and thank-you notes to donors. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 35(8):16–19, 2023.
- Zihao He, Siyi Guo, Ashwin Rao, and Kristina Lerman. Whose emotions and moral sentiments do language models reflect? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11114*, 2024.
- Steffen Herbold, Annette Hautli-Janisz, Ute Heuer, Zlata Kikteva, and Alexander Trautsch. A large-scale comparison of human-written versus chatgpt-generated essays. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):18617, 2023.
- Jacob B Hirsh and Jordan B Peterson. Personality and language use in self-narratives. *Journal of research in personality*, 43(3):524–527, 2009.
- Yuka Ishikawa. Gender differences in vocabulary use in essay writing by university students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192:593–600, 2015.
- Oliver P John, Eileen M Donahue, and Robert L Kentle. Big five inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1991.
- Brendan Kennedy, Mohammad Atari, Aida Mostafazadeh Davani, Joe Hoover, Ali Omrani, Jesse Graham, and Morteza Dehghani. Moral concerns are differentially observable in language. *Cognition*, 212:104696, 2021.
- Brendan Kennedy, Ashwini Ashokkumar, Ryan L Boyd, and Morteza Dehghani. Text analysis for psychology: Methods, principles, and practices. In Morteza Dehghani and Ryan L Boyd (eds.), *Handbook of Language Analysis in Psychology*. Guilford Publications, 2022.
- Li and Tomasello. On the moral functions of language. *Social Cognition*, 39(1), 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2021.39.1.99>.
- François Mairesse, Marilyn A Walker, Matthias R Mehl, and Roger K Moore. Using linguistic cues for the automatic recognition of personality in conversation and text. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 30:457–500, 2007.
- Lisa Messeri and MJ Crockett. Artificial intelligence and illusions of understanding in scientific research. *Nature*, 627(8002):49–58, 2024.
- Marilù Miotto, Nicola Rossberg, and Bennett Kleinberg. Who is gpt-3? an exploration of personality, values and demographics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14338*, 2022.

-
- Saif Mohammad and Peter Turney. Emotions evoked by common words and phrases: Using Mechanical Turk to create an emotion lexicon. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 Workshop on Computational Approaches to Analysis and Generation of Emotion in Text*, pp. 26–34, Los Angeles, CA, June 2010. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W10-0204>.
- Saif M. Mohammad and Peter D. Turney. Crowdsourcing a word-emotion association lexicon. *Computational Intelligence*, 29(3):436–465, 2013.
- José David Moreno, Jose A Martinez-Huertas, Ricardo Olmos, Guillermo Jorge-Botana, and Juan Botella. Can personality traits be measured analyzing written language? a meta-analytic study on computational methods. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 177: 110818, 2021.
- Jon Oberlander and Alastair J Gill. Language with character: A stratified corpus comparison of individual differences in e-mail communication. *Discourse processes*, 42(3):239–270, 2006.
- Okdie and Rempala. Brief textual indicators of political orientation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(1):106–125, 2019. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X18762973>.
- Damilola Omitaomu, Shabnam Tafreshi, Tingting Liu, Sven Buechel, Chris Callison-Burch, Johannes Eichstaedt, Lyle Ungar, and João Sedoc. Empathic conversations: A multi-level dataset of contextualized conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12698*, 2022.
- OpenAI. Chatgpt. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2022. Accessed: April 30, 2023.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 1–22, 2023.
- Claudia Peersman, Walter Daelemans, and Leona Van Vaerenbergh. Predicting age and gender in online social networks. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international workshop on Search and mining user-generated contents*, pp. 37–44, 2011.
- James W Pennebaker. The secret life of pronouns. *New Scientist*, 211(2828):42–45, 2011.
- James W Pennebaker and Laura A King. Linguistic styles: language use as an individual difference. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 77(6):1296, 1999.
- James W Pennebaker, Martha E Francis, and Roger J Booth. Linguistic inquiry and word count: Liwc 2001. *Mahway: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*, 71(2001):2001, 2001.
- JW Pennebaker, RL Boyd, RJ Booth, A Ashokkumar, and ME Francis. Linguistic inquiry and word count: Liwc-22. pennebaker conglomerates, 2022.
- Haocong Rao, Cyril Leung, and Chunyan Miao. Can chatgpt assess human personalities? a general evaluation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01248*, 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.
- Tam Sakirin and Rachid Ben Said. User preferences for chatgpt-powered conversational interfaces versus traditional methods. *Mesopotamian Journal of Computer Science*, 2023: 24–31, 2023.
- 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.

-
- H Andrew Schwartz, Johannes C Eichstaedt, Margaret L Kern, Lukasz Dziurzynski, Stephanie M Ramones, Megha Agrawal, Achal Shah, Michal Kosinski, David Stillwell, Martin EP Seligman, et al. Personality, gender, and age in the language of social media: The open-vocabulary approach. *PloS one*, 8(9):e73791, 2013.
- João Sedoc, Sven Buechel, Yehonathan Nachmany, Anneke Buffone, and Lyle Ungar. Learning word ratings for empathy and distress from document-level user responses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01079*, 2019.
- Nate Silver and Dhruvil Mehta. Both republicans and democrats have an age problem, 2014. URL <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/both-republicans-and-democrats-have-an-age-problem/>. Accessed: September 11, 2023.
- Xiangguo Sun, Bo Liu, Jiuxin Cao, Junzhou Luo, and Xiaojun Shen. Who am i? personality detection based on deep learning for texts. In *2018 IEEE international conference on communications (ICC)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2018.
- Allison M Tackman, Erica N Baranski, Alexander F Danvers, David A Sbarra, Charles L Raison, Suzanne A Moseley, Angelina J Polsinelli, and Matthias R Mehl. ‘personality in its natural habitat’ revisited: A pooled, multi-sample examination of the relationships between the big five personality traits and daily behaviour and language use. *European Journal of Personality*, 34(5):753–776, 2020.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Kadir Uludag. Testing creativity of chatgpt in psychology: Interview with chatgpt. *Available at SSRN 4390872*, 2023.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Tianyu Wu, Shizhu He, Jingping Liu, Siqi Sun, Kang Liu, Qing-Long Han, and Yang Tang. A brief overview of chatgpt: The history, status quo and potential future development. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 10(5):1122–1136, 2023.
- Alireza S. Ziabari, Ali Omrani, Parsa Hejabi, Prenti Golazizian, Brendan Kennedy, Payam Piray, and Morteza Dehghani. Reinforced multiple instance selection for speaker attribute prediction. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*, 2024.

A LIWC and Construct-specific Lexicons

In this section, we present the details of the word categories that were used from LIWC or other construct-specific lexicons in Section 4.3.

A.1 LIWC (Pennebaker et al., 2001)

The LIWC dictionary is a collection of words categorized into different psychological and linguistic dimensions. It is the backbone of the LIWC software that analyzes text by counting occurrences of words in specific categories, offering insights into the involved emotions, cognition, social interactions, and other linguistic styles. The LIWC categories that we used in this study are as follows:

- **Affect:** The Affect category is a measure of the emotional tone as well as emotion content of text such as 'happy', 'hate', 'love', and 'wrong'.
- **emotion:** Emotion words represent a broad category of emotional expressions referring to specific emotional states, such as 'good', 'love', 'happy', 'hope'.
- **emo_neg:** Negative emotion words express negative affective states, including terms like 'bad', 'hate', 'hurt', 'tired'.
- **emo_pos:** Positive emotion words convey positive emotions, including terms like 'happy', 'excited', and 'grateful'.
- **emo_anger:** Anger words express anger or frustration, including terms like 'hate', 'mad', and 'angry'.
- **emo_sad:** Emotionally sad words convey feelings of sadness or melancholy, including terms like ':(', 'sad', and 'disappoint'.
- **swear:** Swear words consist of profane or vulgar language used to express strong emotions or taboo subjects, such as 'damn', 'f***', and 'sh*t'.
- **affiliation:** Affiliation words indicate a sense of belonging or connection to others, including terms like 'friend', 'community', and 'support'.
- **socrefs:** Social referents encompass words that relate to social interactions, like 'we', 'you', or 'he', as well as words related to family and friends (e.g., 'parent', 'mother', 'girlfriend').
- **family:** Family words relate to familial relationships or members, such as 'mother', 'father', 'sibling', and 'cousin'.
- **friend:** Friend words relate to friendship or friendly interactions, including terms like 'friend', 'buddy', 'dude', and 'girlfriend'.
- **pronoun:** Pronouns are words used to replace nouns indicating individuals or groups, such as 'I', 'you', 'he', 'she', 'we', and 'they'.
- **we:** This category refers to words indicating group membership or inclusion, such as 'we', 'us', and 'our'.
- **you:** Second-person pronouns, such as 'you' and 'your'.
- **shehe:** Third-person pronouns refer to individuals such as 'he', 'she', 'him', and 'her'.
- **i:** First-person singular pronouns refer to the speaker or author, such as 'I', 'me', 'myself', and 'mine'.
- **differ:** Differentiation words express contrast or distinction between entities or ideas, including terms like 'but', 'not', 'or', and 'if'.
- **tentat:** Tentative words express uncertainty or hesitation, including terms like 'maybe', 'if', and 'something'.
- **cogproc:** Cognitive processing words indicate intellectual or cognitive engagement, including terms like 'think', 'understand', 'analyze', and 'consider'.

-
- prosocial: Prosocial words denote behaviors or attitudes that benefit others or society, such as 'help', 'care', 'thank', and 'please'.
 - BigWords: Big words are words with complex structures (7 letters or longer) that may indicate intellectual complexity or formality, such as 'procrastination', 'circumstantial', and 'phenomenon'.
 - Drives: Drive words refer to motivational or goal-oriented language, encompassing affiliation (e.g., 'we', 'our', 'us', 'help'), achievement (e.g., 'work', 'better', 'best'), and power (e.g., 'own', 'order', 'allow').
 - Social: The Social category stands for social processes, and encompasses words pertain to various types of social behavior ('love', 'care', 'please', 'good morning', 'attack', 'deserve', 'judge') and social referents as defined above.
 - achieve: Achievement words denote actions or concepts related to accomplishment or success, such as 'work', 'bonus', 'beat', and 'overcome'.
 - inhib: The inhibition category refers to words related to restraint, suppression, and inhibition, such as 'block' and 'constrain'.
 - religion: Religion words pertain to religious concepts, practices, or institutions, such as 'God', 'hell', and 'church'.

A.2 NRC Emotion Lexicon (Mohammad & Turney, 2013; 2010)

- nrc.positive: Words that have a positive sentiment, such as 'acceptable', 'boon', and 'civil'.
- nrc.negative: Words that have a negative sentiment, such as 'aberrant', 'abort', and 'begging'.
- nrc.anger: Words that relate to the emotion of anger, such as 'arguments', 'confront', and 'friction'.
- nrc.disgust: Words that relate to the emotion of disgust, such as 'barf', 'decompose', and 'gut'.
- nrc.sadness: Words that relate to the emotion of sadness, such as 'blue', 'cloudy', and 'emptiness'.
- nrc.anticipation: Words that relate to the emotion of anticipation, such as 'accelerate', 'announcement', and 'approaching'.
- nrc.trust: Words that relate to the emotion of trust, such as 'adhering', 'advice', and 'collaborator'.
- nrc.joy: Words that relate to the emotion of joy, such as 'whimsical', 'beach', and 'doll'.

A.3 Distress and Empathy Lexicon (Sedoc et al., 2019)

- empathy.low: Low-empathy words from the empathy lexicon (based on a median split from lexicon weights), such as 'joke', 'bizarre', and 'stupidest'.
- empathy.high: High-empathy words from the empathy lexicon (based on a median split from lexicon weights), such as 'healing', 'grieve', and 'heartbreaking'. This category did not significantly correlate with any dimension of dispositional empathy.
- distress.low: Low-distress words from the distress lexicon (based on a median split from lexicon weights), such as 'dunno', 'guessing', and 'anyhow'.
- distress.high: High-distress words from the distress lexicon (based on a median split from lexicon weights), such as 'inhumane', 'dehumanizes', and 'mistreating'. This category did not significantly correlate with any dimension of dispositional empathy.

A.4 Moral Foundations Dictionary 2 (MFD2; Frimer et al., 2019)

- mfd.authority.virtue: Words related to the "virtue" dimension of the moral foundation of Authority, such as 'respect', 'obey', and 'honor'.
- mfd.authority.vice: Words related to the "vice" dimension of the moral foundation of Authority, such as 'disrespect', 'disobey', and 'chaos'.
- mfd.care.virtue: Words related to the "virtue" dimension of the moral foundation of Care, such as 'compassion', 'generosity', and 'pity'.
- mfd.care.vice: Words related to the "vice" dimension of the moral foundation of Care, such as 'harm', 'threatens', and 'injured'. This category did not significantly correlate with the Care foundation.
- mfd.purity.virtue: Words related to the "virtue" dimension of the moral foundation of Purity, such as 'sacred', 'wholesome', and 'divine'.
- mfd.purity.vice: Words related to the "vice" dimension of the moral foundation of Purity, such as 'sin', 'defiled', and 'contaminate'.
- mfd.loyalty.virtue: Words related to the "virtue" dimension of the moral foundation of Loyalty, such as 'loyalty', 'allegiance', and 'follower'. This category did not significantly correlate with the Loyalty foundation.
- mfd.loyalty.vice: Words related to the "vice" dimension of the moral foundation of Loyalty, such as 'disloyal', 'treason', and 'enemy'. This category did not significantly correlate with the Loyalty foundation.
- mfd.fairness.virtue: Words related to the "virtue" dimension of the moral foundation of Fairness, such as 'fairness', 'justice', and 'equality'. This category did not significantly correlate with the Fairness foundation.
- mfd.fairness.vice: Words related to the "vice" dimension of the moral foundation of Fairness, such as 'cheat', 'unjust', and 'unequal'. This category did not significantly correlate with the Fairness foundation.

B Semantic Similarities

Dataset	LLM	Median	Mean	SD
Essays	Gemini	0.955	0.941	0.046
	GPT3.5	0.978	0.976	0.015
	Llama 2	0.951	0.944	0.036
YourMorals	Gemini	0.962	0.955	0.028
	GPT3.5	0.963	0.956	0.027
	Llama 2	0.927	0.921	0.037
Congress	Gemini	0.971	0.967	0.022
	GPT3.5	0.977	0.976	0.010
	Llama 2	0.969	0.965	0.020
Empathetic Conversations	Gemini	0.959	0.955	0.026
	GPT3.5	0.966	0.964	0.014
	Llama 2	0.934	0.928	0.031

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for semantic similarity between the original and LLM-generated texts across different datasets and LLMs.

The descriptive statistics for the semantic similarity between original and LLM-generated texts across different datasets and LLMs is demonstrated in Table 3.

Analysis of the pairwise comparison between different LLMs and different datasets, based on the semantic similarity between original and LLM-generated texts, are demonstrated in Table 4 and Table 5, respectively.

Dataset	LLM 1	LLM 2	z	Adjusted p-value
Essays	Gemini	GPT3.5	40.610	0.000
	Gemini	Llama 2	-5.614	0.000
	GPT3.5	Llama 2	-47.728	0.000
YourMorals	Gemini	GPT3.5	0.123	0.902
	Gemini	Llama 2	-41.870	0.000
	GPT3.5	Llama 2	-41.955	0.000
Congress	Gemini	GPT3.5	8.915	0.000
	Gemini	Llama 2	-4.506	0.000
	GPT3.5	Llama 2	-13.421	0.000
Empathetic Conversations	Gemini	GPT3.5	2.637	0.008
	Gemini	Llama 2	-6.883	0.000
	GPT3.5	Llama 2	-9.597	0.000

Table 4: Pairwise comparisons between different LLMs, based on the semantic similarity computed between the original and LLM-generated texts in each dataset, with Dunn’s test and Benjamini-Hochberg adjustments for multiple comparisons.

Dataset1	Dataset2	z	Adjusted p-value
Essays	yourMorals	-25.314	0.000
Essays	Congress	21.479	0.000
Essays	Empathetic.	-7.138	0.000
yourMorals	Congress	39.110	0.000
yourMorals	Empathetic.	-1.842	0.065
Congress	Empathetic.	-13.589	0.000

Table 5: Pairwise comparisons between different datasets, based on the semantic similarity computed between the original and LLM-generated texts in each dataset, with Dunn’s test and Benjamini-Hochberg adjustments for multiple comparisons.

C Predictive Powers

The difference between classifiers’ F_1 scores on the original text and LLM-generated texts, on average, across different psychological and demographic attributes of authors are demonstrated in Table 6.

	Mean $F_{1\text{original}}$	Mean $F_{1\text{LLM}}$	Mean difference	CI	SE	t	df	p	d	N_{original}	N_{LLM}	magnitude
Age group	0.351	0.260	0.091	[0.079, 0.102]	0.006	15.397	804	0	0.543	805	805	moderate
Empathy	0.657	0.603	0.054	[0.050, 0.057]	0.002	32.158	6556	0	0.397	6557	6557	small
Personality	0.658	0.602	0.056	[0.052, 0.060]	0.002	30.046	7652	0	0.343	7653	7653	small
Gender	0.694	0.623	0.072	[0.063, 0.080]	0.004	15.965	1371	0	0.431	1372	1372	small
Morality	0.664	0.591	0.062	[0.057, 0.066]	0.002	25.601	5195	0	0.355	5196	5196	small
Affiliation	0.640	0.578	0.073	[0.064, 0.082]	0.005	15.691	1313	0	0.433	1314	1314	small

Table 6: Paired t -tests for testing the difference in predictive powers (F_1) of classifiers on the original and LLM-generated texts, for each personal trait and Cohen’s d effect sizes for the magnitude of these differences ($|d| < 0.2$: negligible, $|d| < 0.5$: small, $|d| < 0.8$: moderate; Cohen, 1992).

The impact of LLMs on the predictive power of linguistic patterns over authors’ personal traits, focusing on different dimensions of investigated psychological and demographic attributes, is shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: The ratio of models with unchanged, reduced, and enhanced predictive powers after LLM rewrite across granular dimensions of author attributes, using three LLMs and two prompts: Rephrase and Syntax_Grammar.

D Top-down Analyses

		Original	Rephrase			Syntax-Grammar		
			Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2
OPN	i	-0.13	-0.07	-0.11	-0.07	-0.14	-0.12	-0.09
	affiliation	-0.06	-0.10	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	-0.08	-0.06
	achieve	-0.05	-0.08	-0.08	-0.03	-0.04	-0.08	-0.07
	drives	-0.04	-0.10	-0.07	-0.04	-0.05	-0.07	-0.05
	swear	0.09	0.04	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.09
	BigWords	0.09	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.07	-0.01	0.03
	nrc.anticipation	-0.04	-0.04	-0.08	-0.01	-0.04	-0.08	-0.04
	nrc.disgust	0.09	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.07
nrc.trust	-0.05	-0.03	-0.08	0.00	-0.05	-0.07	-0.03	
CON	emo.anger	-0.12	-0.12	-0.11	-0.04	-0.06	-0.12	-0.08
	swear	-0.11	-0.01	-0.07	-0.03	-0.05	-0.09	-0.08
	nrc.disgust	-0.08	-0.07	-0.08	-0.03	0.00	-0.07	-0.04
	nrc.sadness	-0.07	-0.03	-0.07	-0.04	0.02	-0.05	-0.03
EXT	affiliation	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.13
	drives	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.10
	social	0.07	0.01	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.07
	affect	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06
	emotion	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.07
	emo_pos	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.09
	nrc.positive	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.05
	nrc.joy	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.09	0.08
nrc.trust	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.02	0.06	0.02	
AGR	affiliation	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07
	emo.anger	-0.09	-0.08	-0.11	-0.08	-0.10	-0.08	-0.10
	swear	-0.12	-0.03	-0.06	-0.03	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
	nrc.negative	-0.10	-0.04	-0.05	-0.06	-0.08	-0.07	-0.07
	nrc.anticipation	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07
nrc.disgust	-0.08	-0.06	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.07	-0.05	
NEU	i	0.15	-0.02	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.12
	pronoun	0.12	0.01	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10
	affect	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.03
	emotion	0.10	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.07
	emo_neg	0.19	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.15	0.21	0.18
	emo_anger	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.06
	emo_sad	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.05
	nrc.positive	-0.07	-0.02	-0.06	-0.08	-0.04	-0.04	-0.09
	nrc.negative	0.05	0.11	0.09	0.15	0.05	0.08	0.07
	nrc.anger	0.08	0.14	0.12	0.15	0.07	0.10	0.08
nrc.disgust	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.05	

Table 7: Pearson correlations between LIWC and NRC dictionary word frequencies, and the Big Five personality dimensions, on the authors’ original texts and LLM-generated texts, across different utilized LLMs and prompts. Significant correlations are **boldfaced**.

For personality, using the original texts, we replicated previously known associations in the literature (e.g., Baddeley & Singer, 2008; Hirsh & Peterson, 2009; Tackman et al., 2020). Namely, higher OPN was significantly associated with more complex language usage (BigWords) and swear words, higher CON was significantly associated with fewer swear and negative emotion words, higher EXT was significantly associated with greater use of positive emotion and social words, higher AGR was significantly associated with fewer swear and negative emotion words, and higher NEU was significantly associated with greater use of negative emotion words and pronouns. In general, expected associations appear to mostly have been preserved with the involvement of GPT3.5 and Gemini, while Llama 2 appears to have preserved fewer of these associations. Certain associations present in the original texts were retained regardless of the LLM involved or prompt used (e.g., EXT and affiliation-related words; AGR and anger emotion words and NEU and negative emotion words). Other associations disappeared, regardless of the specific LLM or prompt (OPN and BigWords, and NEU and anger emotion words). Overall, these results suggest

that the fine-grained lexical cues that allow for personality detection using theoretically grounded approaches might not be reliable when LLMs are involved in the writing process, and might be somewhat dependent on which LLM users choose to utilize and the personality dimension of interest.

		Original	Rephrase			Syntax-Grammar		
			Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2
Fairness	pronoun	-0.05	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.06	-0.02	-0.02
	religion	-0.06	-0.03	-0.05	-0.01	-0.05	-0.06	-0.02
Loyalty	i	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.10	0.04	0.05	0.11
	you	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.09	0.10	0.12
	pronoun	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.14	0.05	0.08	0.09
	affiliation	0.06	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.07
	social	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.17	0.10	0.11	0.12
	prosocial	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.15	0.06	0.07	0.11
	religion	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.11
	affect	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.11
	socrefs	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.10	0.09
	family	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.10
friend	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	
Authority	i	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.07	0.11
	you	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.19	0.11	0.09	0.14
	pronoun	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.18	0.13	0.12	0.12
	affiliation	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.09	0.10
	Social	0.16	0.14	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.12	0.14
	prosocial	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.13	0.07	0.06	0.12
	religion	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.06	0.16	0.16	0.09
	affect	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.25	0.16	0.13	0.15
	socrefs	0.16	0.15	0.14	0.19	0.16	0.13	0.12
	family	0.16	0.15	0.17	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.14
	friend	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.07
	mfd.authority.virtue	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.03
mfd.authority.vice	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.02	
Purity	i	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.11	0.05	0.06	0.11
	you	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.17	0.13	0.12	0.15
	we	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.02
	pronoun	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.17	0.13	0.14	0.11
	affiliation	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.10
	social	0.19	0.20	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.18	0.16
	prosocial	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.13
	religion	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.11	0.21	0.22	0.16
	affect	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.20	0.15	0.11	0.12
	socrefs	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.13
	family	0.15	0.15	0.17	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.10
	friend	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.10
	mfd.purity.virtue	0.21	0.19	0.22	0.11	0.21	0.22	0.18
mfd.purity.vice	-0.06	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.02	-0.05	
Care	we	0.03	0.06	0.05	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.04
	pronoun	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.06
	affiliation	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.07
	social	0.05	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.08
	socrefs	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.07
	family	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.08
	friend	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.05
	mfd.care.virtue	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.02	0.07	0.09	0.08

Table 8: Pearson correlations between relevant dictionary categories and the moral foundations of Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, Purity, and Care before and after LLM (Gemini, GPT3.5, Llama 2) rewrite. Significant correlations are **boldfaced**.

In line with evolutionary accounts of morality linking the development of moral values to the necessity of cooperation and interdependence (Li & Tomasello, 2021), we found expected significant associations between MFT dimensions and social and affiliation-related words (e.g., between Loyalty and family-related words), and between foundations such as Purity and Authority and word categories such as religion-related words. We found fewer hypothesized associations in the Fairness and Care foundation. In general, most of the hypothesized associations across all foundations were preserved with LLM involvement

and were even amplified for the Care foundation, specifically using Gemini and GPT3.5. Nevertheless, some associations present in the original texts were washed away after LLM involvement, primarily with Llama 2 (e.g., between Purity and family-related words, Authority and religion-related words). These results are aligned with our observations in Section 4.2, underscoring Gemini and GPT3.5 as more preservative of lexical cues predictive of authors’ moral values, than Llama 2, and also associations between Care and people’s language being enhanced when LLMs are involved in the writing process.

		Original	Rephrase			Syntax-Grammar		
			Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2
PD	affect	0.13	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.12
	differ	0.09	0.11	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.09	0.08
EC	we	-0.22	-0.13	-0.20	-0.17	-0.21	-0.11	-0.15
	she,he	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.07	0.13
	pronoun	-0.15	0.00	-0.07	-0.13	-0.11	0.00	-0.05
	emo_neg	0.13	0.07	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.11
	cogproc	-0.13	-0.12	-0.13	-0.14	-0.13	-0.12	-0.07
	tentat	-0.13	-0.12	-0.13	-0.16	-0.17	-0.02	-0.10
	differ	-0.10	-0.07	-0.08	-0.14	-0.13	-0.09	-0.11
	empathy.low	-0.04	-0.09	-0.04	-0.10	-0.03	-0.02	-0.14
distress.low	-0.09	-0.09	-0.04	-0.11	-0.05	-0.03	-0.16	
PT	we	-0.22	-0.17	-0.19	-0.17	-0.22	-0.13	-0.18
	pronoun	-0.22	-0.06	-0.14	-0.20	-0.17	-0.03	-0.07
	cogproc	-0.12	-0.14	-0.13	-0.18	-0.14	-0.10	-0.08
	distress.low	0.07	-0.05	-0.02	-0.12	0.05	0.01	-0.14

Table 9: Pearson correlations between word frequencies of LIWC categories and personal distress (PD), empathetic concern (EC), and perspective-taking (PT) before and after LLM (Gemini, GPT3.5, Llama 2) rewrites. Significant correlations are **boldfaced**. The fourth dimension of the IRI, Fantasy, is not displayed as no LIWC or empathy/distress lexicon categories were significantly correlated with this dimension.

For dimensions of dispositional empathy, we expected and found significant associations with the use of pronouns, emotion words, and words related to cognitive processes (i.e., cogproc), as well as with words from the empathy and distress lexicons. Hypothesized associations were present in the original text for three subdimensions of IRI (e.g., between PD and affect-related words, EC and pronouns, as well as tentative-related words (tentat), and PT and pronouns). The significant negative association of IRI dimensions PT and EC with first-person plural words (we) was the only association that retained its significance across almost all LLM rewrite conditions. An expected association between PT and cogproc-related words, which had not been present in the original text, emerged after involving Gemini and Llama 2. Among different LLMs and prompts, involving Llama 2 with a Rephrase prompt in writing retained the most significant correlations, similar to the trend observed in Figure 2 (e.g., EC with cogproc-related words and pronouns), and also created more additional correlations (e.g., between PD and words showing differentiation; differ for short). No categories significantly correlated with the FS dimension in the original or in the LLM-generated text.

	Original		Rephrase						Syntax-Grammar					
			Gemini		GPT3.5		Llama 2		Gemini		GPT3.5		Llama 2	
	M_D	M_R	M_D	M_R	M_D	M_R	M_D	M_R	M_D	M_R	M_D	M_R	M_D	M_R
emo_anx	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06
adverb	3.41	3.71	1.98	2.07	2.22	2.35	2.31	2.45	3.06	3.28	2.38	2.52	2.82	3.04
conj	5.75	5.69	5.48	5.25	5.37	5.15	6.11	5.95	5.60	5.51	5.24	5.04	5.75	5.64

Table 10: Average word frequencies (Mean) for relevant LIWC categories in two political affiliations (Democrat or Republican) before and after LLM (Gemini, GPT3.5, Llama 2) rewrites. Significant t-tests are **boldfaced**.

	Rephrase								Syntax-Grammar					
	Original		Gemini		GPT3.5		Llama 2		Gemini		GPT3.5		Llama 2	
	M_M	M_F	M_M	M_F	M_M	M_F	M_M	M_F	M_M	M_F	M_M	M_F	M_M	M_F
article	8.52	8.01	8.72	8.20	8.45	7.99	8.98	8.41	8.60	8.01	8.79	8.31	8.75	8.17
social	10.8	11.5	11.1	11.9	11.0	11.6	12.0	12.5	10.9	11.7	10.4	10.9	11.3	12.0
emo_anx	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.07

Table 11: Average word frequencies (Mean) for relevant LIWC categories in two investigated categories of gender (Male and Female) before and after LLM (Gemini, GPT3.5, Llama 2) rewrites. Significant t-tests are **boldfaced**.

	Rephrase (R)				Syntax-Grammar (SG)		
	Original	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2	Gemini	GPT3.5	Llama 2
	we	-0.07	-0.16	-0.10	-0.12	-0.06	-0.12
cogproc	-0.06	-0.13	-0.11	-0.11	-0.08	-0.15	-0.10

Table 12: Pearson correlations between LIWC categories and age before and after LLM (Gemini, GPT3.5, Llama 2) rewrites. Significant correlations are **boldfaced**.

For demographic variables, we found several expected significant differences in the usage of lexical cues across political affiliations (we did not find hypothesized differences across political affiliation in language use related to inhibition and reaction to threats, e.g., negative emotion words; Okdie & Rempala, 2019) and genders. Namely, we found that Republicans used a significantly greater number of adverbs than Democrats, and males used a significantly greater number of articles and a significantly smaller number of social and anxiety-related words than females (Ishikawa, 2015). We did not find any hypothesized associations with age. After the LLM rewrites, some previously expected associations for political affiliation retained significance, while others were washed away. The linguistic cues for gender were generally preserved for article and social word usage, but only Gemini using a Rephrase prompt, preserved the linguistic cues for anxiety-related words. Interestingly, after LLM rewrite, we found that some hypothesized correlations with age appeared; namely, first-person plural words and words related to cognitive processes (e.g., but, not, if, or, know) significantly correlated with age after LLM rewrite in some conditions. In general, it seems as though Gemini and Llama 2 amplified these correlations using a Rephrase prompt, and GPT3.5 amplified these correlations using a Syntax-Grammar prompt.

E What Author Attributes Do LLMs Promote?

In Section 4.2, utilizing the direction of prediction changes, we iterated on the characteristics that LLMs promote in their own version of authors’ texts. Expanding on that, in this section, we tried to provide a more fine-grained analysis for the investigated psychological constructs (i.e., personality, dispositional empathy, and morality) to contextualize our findings better with respect to the dimensions covered in each construct. Figure 7 demonstrates the ratio of predictions that changed from correct to incorrect, grouped by the direction of this change across different LLMs for personality, dispositional empathy, and morality dimensions. We only report on the trends with a Cohen’s d effect size higher than negligible ($|d| < 0.2$).

In the case of specific characteristics related to personality, we observed that LLM-generated text is associated with people with higher levels of openness ($t(1074) = 6.50, p < .001, d = 0.21$ [small effect size]), agreeableness ($t(1005) = 9.05, p < .001, d = 0.27$ [small effect size]), and lower levels of extraversion ($t(1054) = 15.14, p < .001, d = 0.52$ [medium effect size]) compared to the actual authors.

In the case of specific characteristics related to dispositional empathy, we observed that LLM-generated text is associated with people with higher levels of personal distress ($t(319) = 3.90, p < .001, d = 0.36$ [small effect size]), and lower levels of empathetic concern ($t(1945) = 10.6, p < .001, d = 0.35$ [small effect size]), perspective-taking ($t(2341) = 14.17, p < .001, d =$




Figure 7: Ratios of correct author attribute predictions on original texts that had different predicted labels on LLM-generated texts, grouped by the direction of change in predictions, broken down for different dimensions of investigated psychological constructs (i.e. personality, dispositional empathy, and morality).

0.42 [small effect size]), and fantasy ($t(2090) = 14.00, p < .001, d = 0.42$ [small effect size]) compared to the actual authors.

Finally, in the case of specific characteristics related to morality, we observed that LLM-generated text is associated with people with higher levels of fairness ($t(158) = 4.34, p < .001, d = 0.53$ [medium effect size]), care ($t(734) = 25.44, p < .001, d = 1.54$ [large effect size]), purity ($t(711) = 9.90, p < .001, d = 0.59$ [medium effect size]), and loyalty ($t(752) = 5.51, p < .001, d = 0.29$ [small effect size]) compared to the actual authors.