
CHATGPT AS RESEARCH SCIENTIST: PROBING GPT'S CAPABILITIES AS A RESEARCH LIBRARIAN, RESEARCH ETHICIST, DATA GENERATOR AND DATA PREDICTOR

PREPRINT, JUNE 20, 2024

✉ **Steven A. Lehr***
Cangrade, Inc.
Watertown, MA

✉ **Aylin Caliskan**
Information School
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

✉ **Suneragiri Liyanage**
Department of Psychology
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA

✉ **Mahzarin R. Banaji**
Department of Psychology
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA

SIGNIFICANCE

Though scientists widely adopt them, the promise of general-purpose artificial intelligence systems to facilitate science has been largely untested. In four studies, we examine the capabilities of ChatGPT across several tasks intrinsic to the scientific process. ChatGPT is a poor (but improving) curator of scientific articles. It is a surprisingly good research ethicist, detecting violations of statistical best practices and evolving open science protocols. Its ability to simulate known results may herald useful abilities in data generation and theory building. However, the chatbot had little success predicting highly novel data, highlighting its limited ability to surmise things outside its training data. Beyond merely testing LLMs, these studies produce several novel insights into the nature of machine intelligence.

ABSTRACT

How good a research scientist is ChatGPT? We systematically probed the capabilities of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 across four central components of the scientific process: as a Research Librarian, Research Ethicist, Data Generator, and Novel Data Predictor, using psychological science as a testing field. In Study 1 (Research Librarian), unlike human researchers, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 hallucinated, authoritatively generating fictional references 36.0% and 5.4% of the time, respectively, although GPT-4 exhibited an evolving capacity to acknowledge its fictions. In Study 2 (Research Ethicist), GPT-4 (though not GPT-3.5) proved capable of detecting violations like p-hacking in fictional research protocols, correcting 88.6% of blatantly presented issues, and 72.6% of subtly presented issues. In Study 3 (Data Generator), both models consistently replicated patterns of cultural bias previously discovered in large language corpora, indicating that ChatGPT can simulate known results, an antecedent to usefulness for both data generation and skills like hypothesis generation. Contrastingly, in Study 4 (Novel Data Predictor), neither model was successful at predicting new results absent in their training data, and neither appeared to leverage substantially new information when predicting more versus less novel outcomes. Together, these results suggest that GPT is a flawed but rapidly improving librarian, a decent research ethicist already, capable of data generation in simple domains with known characteristics but poor at predicting novel patterns of empirical data to aid future experimentation.

Keywords Generative AI · Large Language Models · Scientific Methods · Cognitive Science

*Correspondence about this article may be addressed to Steve Lehr at Steve@cangrade.com

Scientists and writers of science fiction have long embraced the promise of artificial superintelligence, with fictional computers showing astonishing capabilities in scientific domains. The idea is compelling, for the acceleration of science could be – at least in theory – one of the most powerful gifts of this technology. It is unquestionably hopeful to imagine a world in which artificial intelligence (AI) can help cure diseases, solve impending global warming, accelerate space travel, and wipe out age-old inequalities. However, the power of AI – which has lain mostly dormant over the last 50 years – is at an inflection point. The rise of new deep learning architectures like the Transformer (1) has yielded models capable of an array of impressive tasks, from seamless human-like conversation to composing symphonies. Already, scientists are implementing targeted AI systems to enhance scientific discovery across various disciplines (2). As just a few examples, machine learning has been used to discover new protein structures (3), to render complicated problems more tractable in quantum mechanics (4) and fluid dynamics (5), and to accelerate the retrosynthesis of organic molecules (6).

While these advances incorporate specialized machine learning models, the advent of Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT presents the possibility of AI as a scientific generalist. Recent research suggests that LLMs, when fine-tuned for the task, can achieve scientific synthesis and inference on par with state-of-the-art special purpose models (7), and may be informally wielded by enterprising scientists to accelerate a range of research tasks (8). When enhanced with scientific tools such as robotic experimentation platforms, LLMs like GPT-4 display advanced scientific reasoning skills and autonomously make decisions that improve with time and information (9). Commentators in the field of psychological science – the domain of the authors’ expertise – have expressed cautious optimism that LLMs will significantly enhance the discipline (10).

Yet, despite this excitement, no substantive effort has been directed at testing the ability of general-purpose AI models on the many tasks critical to the process of scientific discovery. The technology behind ChatGPT – LLMs – while impressive, is not without problems, and even dangers. Research has shown that these models can amplify patterns of bias in their training corpus (11, 12). They are also infamously prolific generators of convincing falsehoods, colloquially termed “hallucinations” (13, 14). While capable of passing standardized tests in varied domains, these models are currently strikingly poor at solving even simple mathematical problems (15). While LLMs selectively show emergent abilities on tasks drawn from cognitive psychology, their performance can deteriorate when stimuli are edited to be less familiar (16), and indeed transformers are more generally less successful in solving problems external to their training data (17). Despite these shortfalls, the promise of this technology – still in its infancy – is great. If we agree that “[t]he purpose of science is to develop, without prejudice or preconception of any kind, a knowledge of the facts, the laws, and the processes of nature” (18), we can ask: Can Generative AI embody the neutrality that science aspires to? Can it perform the tasks vital to generating new scientific knowledge? In this paper, we conduct the first rigorous tests of GPT as a research scientist, or more modestly, its ability to assist scientific research by humans. To achieve this, we probe the limits of GPT-4 and its predecessor GPT-3.5 on several tasks integral to scientific discovery. Specifically, we test ChatGPT’s abilities and limits across four domains related to scientific research: As a Research Librarian, Research Ethicist, Data Generator, and Novel Data Predictor. To what degree can ChatGPT enhance the scientific process, and what is the trajectory of the technology’s improvement between the two recent versions of the model? In the process of testing this, we make several novel discoveries about the nature and abilities of ChatGPT.

Study 1: GPT as Research Librarian

Can GPT develop an accurate and comprehensive bibliography? Can it separate fact from fiction in this selection? The search for relevant scientific discourse and evidence is a basic building block of the scientific process. AI’s ability to comprehensively cull prior, relevant scientific articles is therefore critical. Moreover, lay users of the technology frequently depend upon LLMs like GPT for advice that requires scientific knowledge, such as medical queries. It is no surprise, then, that much negative press about LLMs has surrounded their tendency to “hallucinate” or generate fabricated knowledge. As an example of how seriously this issue is taken, Meta’s “Galactica” LLM, a model trained on scientific knowledge (19) was shut down only three days after its release, partly in response to its tendency to generate fictional content (20). In Study 1, we probed GPT-3.5 and GPT-4’s ability to gather relevant and comprehensive scientific content, by asking each to conduct a series of literature reviews and then gauging the quality of its outputs.

Design. We asked GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 to find and summarize 20 influential articles each from 25 related but specific topics in psychology, generating a data set of 1,000 references. These topics ranged from broad (e.g., “The psychology of bias and discrimination”) to narrow (e.g., “Use of the Implicit Association Test to predict dental outcomes). (See SI Appendix, Section S1, for full study design and topic selection details.) Notably, GPT sometimes acknowledged that it was presenting fictional references, making comments like “Please keep in mind that these references might not be real.” These were not counted toward the main results but were preserved for analysis of the overall rates of fiction generation and its acknowledgment. While GPT was consistently asked simply to “include a citation,” the references it provided were sometimes complete and other times incomplete, e.g., lacking year, journal volume, or page numbers.

Coding of References. Two coders, blinded to GPT-Version, labeled each reference for 1. Correctness, 2. Completeness, 3. Topic Relevance, and 4. Citation Count. For the Correctness variable, coders distinguished between “Hallucinations” (references that were entirely fabricated or contained serious issues like attribution to incorrect authors) and “Errors” (references with smaller issues like an incorrect year or journal name). Coders achieved substantial agreement. (See SI Appendix, Section S1, for coding details.)

Results

Unless otherwise noted, all effects reported in this section were significant ($P < 0.001$) in logistic regressions. More detailed statistical reporting may be found in the SI Appendix, Section S2.

Overall Hallucinations & Errors. Both models hallucinated, but GPT-3.5 did so more than GPT-4. Out of 500 references GPT-4 claimed as real, 5.40% were hallucinations, compared to 36.00% for GPT-3.5; OR = 9.854. Error rates provide an interesting contrast to this pattern. Error rates were roughly equivalent between GPT-3.5 (4.20%) and GPT-4 (4.60%); OR = 0.909, $P = 0.758$. Thus, GPT-4 demonstrated sizable improvement in terms of fabricating references, but no improvement in terms of smaller errors like listing an incorrect year or journal.

Completeness as Moderator. Exploratory analysis revealed a powerful moderator of hallucination. When GPT provided complete references, these references were also more likely to be real. Collapsing across versions, ChatGPT hallucinated far more when it provided incomplete references (62.41%) compared to when it provided complete ones (14.30%); OR = 9.947. This pattern emerged for each model. Both GPT-3.5 (OR = 7.856) and GPT-4 (OR = 36.362) hallucinated more for incomplete relative to complete references. Similar patterns did not emerge to a statistically significant degree for smaller errors. (Full analysis in SI Appendix, Section S2, Table S1.) In providing complete references, GPT effectively treated the chat as more formal. Prompt-engineering research indicates that more formal prompt language elicits fewer hallucinations from LLMs (21). Our results convergently suggest that when GPT is more complete in its response, it is less likely to hallucinate.

Acknowledged vs. Unacknowledged Fiction. The analyses above utilized only instances where GPT claimed to provide legitimate citations. As noted earlier, GPT sometimes openly acknowledged that references were fictional. (See SI Appendix, Section S1, for acknowledgment criteria.) While the analyses above ignore these responses, an alternative approach is to include them to examine the overall generation of fictional references and the frequency of their acknowledgment.

Collapsing across instances where GPT did and did not acknowledge fictional references yields an interesting pattern. In total, GPT-3.5 generated significantly more fictional references (39.05%) than GPT-4 (23.12%); OR = 2.130. However, the larger contrast was in acknowledgment of these fictional references. When GPT-4 generated fictional references, it noted so 84.30% of the time compared to 12.20% for GPT-3.5; OR = 38.667. This pattern again did not hold for smaller errors: GPT-4 made roughly the same number of errors as its predecessor, and while it was descriptively more likely to acknowledge these errors, the difference was insignificant. (See SI Appendix, Table S3.)

These results build upon research suggesting that LLMs can internally represent the truth or fiction of their statements (22). Our results show an advancement of the technology: GPT-4 possesses an evolving capacity to acknowledge when it generates fictional content. Our findings are, however, agnostic to the source of this advancement. Since much of GPT-4’s training is shrouded in mystery, it is plausible that OpenAI specifically trained the model toward this goal. It is also plausible that this is an emergent property, arising from GPT-4’s larger-scale training (23).

Hallucination & Topic Breadth. As topics become narrower, GPT will have fewer real and relevant articles in its training data and as a result, its hallucinations may increase. This intuition was confirmed (using our main set of 1,000 references), but only to a point. Collapsing across models, as topics narrowed, and particularly as they became very narrow, GPT was likely to admit defeat, acknowledging that it did not know of such articles. Since such acknowledgments were considered “Correct” (i.e. a failure to hallucinate), a curvilinear effect arose, where GPT first gradually hallucinated more as topics narrowed, but then less on the narrowest. Consistent with a statistical suppression effect, the linear effect of topic breadth on hallucination in a logistic regression becomes stronger ($\beta = -.555$, $P < 0.001$; Pseudo- $R^2 = 0.075$) when excluding admissions of defeat, compared to when including them ($\beta = -.191$, $P = 0.001$; Pseudo- $R^2 = 0.0115$). These linear patterns were robust for GPT-3.5 but not GPT-4. (Full analysis in SI Appendix, Section S2, Table S4.)

Article Relevance. We were interested in GPT’s ability to discover references that were not only real but also relevant to specific topics. To study this, we limited data to the 1,000 articles GPT claimed were real. Collapsing across topics, GPT-4 was more likely to pull relevant articles (50.80%) compared to GPT-3.5 (30.80%); OR = 2.320. However, this effect was primarily driven by GPT-4’s greater success at generating real articles, since hallucinations were automatically labeled irrelevant. Limiting the analysis to real references, the difference in identifying relevant articles between GPT-4

(53.70%) and GPT-3.5 (48.13%) lost significance; $OR = 1.250$, $P = 0.124$. In short, GPT-4 discovered more real articles than GPT-3.5 more generally and was therefore also more likely to discover relevant articles. Beyond this, it did not consistently tailor article recommendations better to specific topics. However, an exploratory analysis by topic breadth tells a more nuanced story. As detailed in the SI Appendix (see Table S5), both models successfully found relevant articles on the broadest topics and failed on the narrowest. However, GPT-3.5 appeared to drop off in this ability more sharply as the topics narrowed. The largest gap was at the “moderate” broadness level, where GPT-4 discovered relevant articles 75.00% of the time compared to GPT-3.5’s 32.14%; $OR = 6.333$. Regression models indicated that this sharper drop-off in relevance for GPT-3.5 versus GPT-4 was robust and statistically significant (see SI Appendix, Section S2). Thus, while neither model was exceptional at research curation, there was some evidence of incremental improvement.

Relevant Citation Counts. We requested that GPT find “important and influential” articles. To analyze how each model did, we focused on references coded as relevant. When GPT found a relevant article, how influential was its selection, as gauged by citation count? The two versions performed similarly here, with GPT-4’s articles averaging 2,936.7 citations compared to 3,105.2 for GPT-3.5; $P = 0.791$, $d = .027$. Further regression analysis (see SI Appendix, Section S2) ruled out the possibility that significant differences were disguised either by GPT-3.5’s relevant articles coming primarily from broader domains or because GPT-4 cited newer articles. Across linear regression models, no significant differences arose for citation count.

Study 2: GPT as Research Ethicist*

In recent years, a replicability crisis has emerged in scientific research. Large-scale studies have demonstrated limited replication of research in Psychology (24, 25), Economics (26), the Social Sciences more generally (27), and Medicine (28-30). One source of these issues is unquestionably poor statistical practices by generally well-intentioned scientists: Studies show that poor statistical practices are widely prevalent across scientific research (31, 32). A fundamental problem is that by running multiple analyses, it is easy to find coincidentally “significant” results, and thus typical significance tests become inaccurate (33). Improving the decisions of well-intentioned scientists could thus improve the reliability of science. The purpose of our second study was to examine the abilities of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 in this domain: Can GPT catch ethical lapses and warn investigators that they are entering into the realm of questionable practices?

Research Design. In Study 2, we presented GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 with fictional vignettes describing flawed research protocols, posing as scientists looking for feedback. Three of these vignettes contained poor practices that were blatant and three more subtle. For example, in the blatant version of vignette 1, the researcher directly states: “After just 30 participants in each condition, effects already reached statistical significance ($p < .05$), so we stopped data collection. . .” The subtle version states, “We collected 50 participants in each condition, at which point statistical analysis indicated that our results reached statistical significance” and then describes collecting 150 participants in the next study. Here, the researchers do not directly describe using significance testing to decide whether to continue collection, but an experienced reviewer might be suspicious based on the contrasting sample sizes. (See SI Appendix, Section S3, for full design, and <https://osf.io/sdahr/> for vignettes.)

The purpose of this variation between blatant and subtle vignettes was to test, 1) whether GPT showed awareness of the clear methodological problems described in the blatant vignettes, and 2) whether it would be able to “read between the lines” to recognize potential problems in more realistic descriptions of flawed research. Put differently, the subtle vignettes contained more ecologically valid descriptions, closer to how a real-world researcher might represent research with methodological flaws.

Additionally, we varied the initial prompt used to request GPT’s feedback on the protocols. Matched pairs of prompts were designed to encourage either better or worse responses from GPT. The full set of prompts (see SI Appendix, Section S3) varied in levels and verbosity of feedback requested, manipulated researcher characteristics (status, theory protectiveness, rejection sensitivity), or encouraged ethical or unethical responses. Of these last, one pair prefaced the request with a pro- versus anti-open science argument, and three attempts were made to “jailbreak” GPT – requesting it pretend not to be concerned about p-hacking, avoid mentions of p-hacking, or impersonate a known data fabricator – compared to ethical requests (consider issues around p-hacking, impersonate a known data ethicist).

In separate chats, we presented each of the 18 initial prompts to GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, followed by each of the 6 vignettes, for a total of 216 responses.

*By referring to GPT as “Ethicist” we do not mean to attribute to it human-like morality, nor to advocate for any particular scientific standards. Rather, we examine GPT’s ability to give advice aligned with currently accepted markers of ethical and replicable research.

Coding of Data. Two coders, blinded to experimental conditions, independently rated all GPT responses on 10-point rubrics. Points of disagreement were discussed, with GPT afterward receiving partial credit when only one coder felt a point was merited. Coding achieved high inter-rater reliability, with a Cronbach alpha of $\alpha = 0.9827$. (Full rubrics and coding details are in the SI Appendix, Section S3.)

Analysis. Data from coding were aggregated to the level of GPT's responses, with each receiving up to 10 points. In addition to standard parametric procedures, differences were examined using Wilcoxon Rank-Sum (see SI Appendix, Section S4).

Results

Unless otherwise noted, all effects reported in this section reached a high bar for statistical significance ($P < 0.001$). More detailed statistical reporting may be found in the SI Appendix, Section S4.

GPT-4 substantially outperformed GPT-3.5 in its responses to the Research Ethicist vignettes. In the Blatant condition, GPT-4 achieved a mean score of 8.86 out of 10 possible points, while GPT-3.5 averaged 5.39; $d = 1.992$. Similarly, in the Subtle condition, GPT-4 averaged 7.26 points compared to GPT-3.5's 4.05; $d = 1.571$. Even when poor practices were framed subtly, GPT-4 noticed and offered advice to correct most of them.

All other pairwise comparisons were significant as well. GPT-4 scored higher on blatant relative to subtle vignettes ($d = 0.987$), as did GPT-3.5 ($P = 0.0015$, $d = 0.627$). Strikingly, GPT-4 received more points in response to subtle vignettes than GPT-3.5 did in response to blatant ones ($d = 0.897$). The improvement of ChatGPT on this task was thus decisive: While the earlier model performed poorly, the more recent iteration was quite successful and could provide value to scientists in this domain.

Analysis of Initial Prompts. The variation in initial prompts was exploratory and designed to pick up only relatively large effects. Though these analyses were not fully independent, to be conservative, we used a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Since we completed 12 analyses, this correction dictated a statistical significance threshold of $P < .004167$.

We first examined each matched pair of prompts, testing for each whether the hypothesized "good performance" prompt yielded superior feedback compared to the "bad performance" prompt. For example, we tested whether claiming to be a chaired professor at a major research institution (high status) elicited less critical feedback compared to claiming to be a novice researcher running her first study (low status). As seen in the SI Appendix (Tables S7-S8), none of these 9 basic contrasts reached statistical significance. One trended: Requesting GPT "carefully consider issues around p-hacking and open science" ($M = 8.38$) elicited stronger responses than requesting that it "not include any mentions of p-hacking" ($M = 6.08$, $P = 0.0106$, $d = 1.140$). However, this result did not meet the significance threshold of the Bonferroni correction. Though GPT descriptively gave worse responses following the three different "jailbreaking" prompts, compared to two contrasting prompts requesting ethical responses, this similarly failed to reach significance ($P = 0.0295$, $d = 0.588$) after correction.

One analysis yielded robust results. Regardless of how we asked GPT to behave, stronger responses emerged following prompts that in any way evoked data ethics. For example, the 12 chats where we asked GPT to impersonate a known data fabricator – designed to jailbreak GPT and elicit unethical responses – actually yielded responses that appeared to be of higher quality than most. Accordingly, we collapsed responses across prompts that in any fashion evoked data ethics (Pro- and Anti-Open Science; Concerned and Not Concerned with p-hacking; Don't Mention p-hacking; Data Ethicist and Data Fabricator), comparing these to all remaining prompts, without mentions of p-hacking or open science. Indeed, GPT provided higher-quality responses after prompts that evoked data ethics ($M = 7.35$) than those that did not ($M = 5.78$); $P < 0.0001$; $d = 0.625$. As a robustness check, we replicated this analysis, limiting the ethics-priming prompts only to those that did so in the context of encouraging GPT to behave badly (e.g. impersonate a known data fabricator), initially designed to elicit poor responses. As seen in the SI Appendix (Section S4), even this conservative test revealed the priming effect, though not robust to a Bonferroni correction ($P = 0.0099$). The positive effect of evoking data ethics appears powerful: ChatGPT's responses were somewhat improved even when the ethics primes occurred in the context of attempting to elicit unethical responses.

Good Research Vignettes:

As a corollary to Study 2, we conducted a secondary study (see SI Appendix, Section S5) where ChatGPT responded to two vignettes demonstrating the opposite – rigorous practices and pristine research ethics, with 120 responses across the two models. When asked to identify positive practices in these vignettes, both models were successful. Specifically, GPT-4 identified 92.67% of the good research practices in our rubrics compared to 90.42% for GPT-3.5, with the

difference non-significant ($P = 0.071$). Intriguingly, both models were about as good at recognizing generally accepted good research practices, though GPT-4 was vastly superior at identifying bad ones.

Study 3: GPT as Data Generator

Can GPT simulate known scientific results? Several recent articles suggest, for example, that LLMs can mimic responses from human research subjects (34-36), with some even suggesting they may significantly supplant them (37). However, assumptions about their usefulness for data generation rely on the premise that chatbots can simulate high-quality data aligned with real-world outcomes. Beyond this practical application, LLMs’ ability to replicate known outcomes is a likely precursor to broader scientific capabilities. For instance, suppose we tasked GPT with generating novel but plausible hypotheses. This would require it to simulate future results by synthesizing prior knowledge. GPT’s proficiency in replicating established findings underscores its capacity to simulate outcomes in this fashion, and thus its potential in functions like hypothesis generation. In Study 3, we evaluated GPT’s ability to simulate data in a domain familiar to it.

In recent years, a significant body of literature has accumulated suggesting that human-like biases and stereotypes emerge from semantic patterns in large language corpora (38-40). For example, just as reaction-time tasks reveal that people more easily associate male (compared to female) names with words related to “career” compared to “family,” machine learning detects analogous patterns in the co-occurrence of these words in large repositories of human language (38). These findings are theoretically important, suggesting that language can crystallize human biases, and transmit and augment their impact. They are also methodologically important, offering a new tool with which researchers can probe these issues, present and historical. However, this research poses challenges: The study of word embeddings in large language corpora is complex and computationally intensive. It is difficult for a researcher to undertake this work casually because there is currently no technically uncomplicated way to do so. Study 3 asked: Might one simply ask GPT to explore its own corpus[†]? Beyond potentially offering a simplified way to pilot word embedding research, GPT’s performance here provides an indicator of its broader ability to replicate known results, a precursor to other scientific abilities.

Research Design. In this study, we explored four well-studied gender stereotypes: Gender Attitudes (overall positivity/negativity toward women versus men), Gender Art/Science stereotypes, Gender Home/Work stereotypes, and Gender Math/Reading stereotypes. These stereotypes have been robustly studied in human subjects, using both implicit and explicit measures (41, 42). Furthermore, consistent patterns for these stereotypes have been found in research on word embeddings in language corpora (39). We did not have access to GPT’s model parameters to generate its word embeddings directly, and instead used estimates provided within the open-ended language of the chatbot’s responses. Adapting stimuli from Charlesworth and colleagues (39), we presented GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 with thousands of randomly ordered word dyads, requesting it estimate cultural associations between each based on its training data. (Full design in the SI Appendix, Section S6.)

For analysis, GPT’s estimates were treated as analogous to cosine similarity measures from word embedding research (38). To calculate a measure of relative cultural association – e.g. a greater association of Female with Home and Male with Work, relative to Male with Home and Female with Work – the procedure was followed for calculating the WEAT *D*-score (39).

Results

Table 1 depicts the real WEAT *D*-scores for each construct examined, drawn from Charlesworth et al.’s (2021) meta-analytic estimates across adult corpora (39), compared to those calculated using responses from GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. Positive WEAT *D*-scores reflect effects in the stereotype-congruent direction based on prior research. Main results replicated prior findings: GPT’s estimates based on its training data reflected a cultural preference for Female over Male, and a stronger association of Female (relative to Male) with Art vs. Science, Home vs. Work, and Reading vs. Math.

[†]Note: We refer to GPT “exploring its own corpus,” which was the task asked of it. However, it should be noted that we lack insight into how other elements of GPT’s training - e.g. reinforcement learning, fine-tuning – impact its responses.

Table 1: WEAT D -Scores from ChatGPT and Real Language Corpora

	Female-Good Male-Bad	Female-Art Male-Science	Female-Home Male-Work	Female-Reading Male-Math
Prior Research	WEAT $D = 0.49$	WEAT $D = 0.54$	WEAT $D = 0.94$	WEAT $D = 0.67$
GPT-3.5	WEAT $D = 1.00$	WEAT $D = 1.16$	WEAT $D = 0.40$	WEAT $D = 0.73$
GPT-4	WEAT $D = 0.57$	WEAT $D = 1.46$	WEAT $D = 0.45$	WEAT $D = 0.96$

Notes: Prior research numbers are meta-analytic estimates from adult language corpora (39).

The effects gathered from GPT were often somewhat stronger than those reported in prior research, though this pattern is inconsistent. This may reflect the troubling tendency for AI systems to amplify biases in their training data (43-45). It is interesting to note that these effects are not generally smaller for GPT-4 versus GPT-3.5, despite efforts OpenAI has made to debias the model (46). This aligns with prior research showing that more powerful models tend to intrinsically learn human biases more precisely (47).

These results are promising in terms of GPT’s ability to generate estimates of word embedding results, suggesting a use case in piloting this research. However, they come with some caveats. First, the inter-item correlations between GPT-3.5 and GPT-4’s responses to the same word dyads were variable but modest: $r = 0.382$ for the Math-Reading task, $r = 0.568$ for the Preference task, $r = 0.666$ for the Work-Home task, and $r = 0.554$ for the Art-Science task (all P s < .0001). These moderate correlations might indicate differences in how GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 approached the task. Alternatively, they might indicate reliability constraints, limiting GPT’s consistency in eliciting these effects.

Second, we calculated Single-Category WEAT D -scores for each of the concepts, to gauge the degree to which results were driven by stronger Female-Male associations with each attribute. Interestingly, our results diverge from prior research (39) in that those generated by GPT are primarily driven by stronger associations of Female with the stereotypically female category, and not also of Male with the stereotypically male category. (See SI Appendix, Table S10.)

Study 4: GPT as Novel Data Predictor

In Study 3, we examined GPT’s ability to simulate data from word embedding research. As use cases for GPT as a data generator go, this one is obvious: Since GPT is trained on large language corpora, it might display knowledge of word embedding patterns found in them. Less certain and less tested is the potential for LLMs to predict data that are novel and outside their training data. Recent conceptual work has argued that LLMs may augment or even replace human test subjects (34-37). Logically, the degree of this potential depends upon its ability to predict unseen patterns. If GPT is tethered to its training data, it might be useful for certain kinds of basic tasks, such as piloting the psychometric properties of personality scale items. However, to produce results that are both correct and novel, it must be able to predict data patterns that are unknown to it. In Study 4, we gave ChatGPT a more difficult task in this regard.

Specifically, we asked GPT to predict patterns of data that were complicated and unfamiliar. For this, we used a second paper by Charlesworth and colleagues (48), which introduced a novel data set: The Project Implicit International Dataset. This paper describes patterns of implicit and explicit attitudes from 2.3 million participants across 34 countries. Critically, accumulated evidence suggests that implicit attitudes – automatic associations held between attitude objects, typically measured by reaction-time tasks – are distinct from explicit attitudes captured in self-reports (49). For example, a person may explicitly express equal positivity toward straight and gay individuals, while at the same time implicitly harboring greater positivity toward straight individuals. Indeed, in the Project Implicit International Dataset, correlations between country-level implicit and explicit attitudes vary by attitude object but are generally not strong. (See SI Appendix, Section S9.) These country-level data were previously unpublished, and the paper was first posted online after GPT’s training cutoff at the time of the study. In Study 4, we had GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 make a total of 60 different predictions of cross-country patterns of Explicit and Implicit Sexuality Attitudes, Age Attitudes, and Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes. (Full design in SI Appendix, Section S8.)

Results

More detailed statistical reporting may be found in the SI Appendix, Section S9.

For each attitude/stereotype, we examined several patterns. First, we examined the intercorrelations between ChatGPT's different predictions of the same attitude. For example, a high correlation between GPT's different predictions of Implicit Sexuality Attitudes suggests reliability and consistency in how it approached the task. We then examined the correlations between GPT's predictions of implicit and explicit attitudes. Importantly, GPT likely has more information about explicit compared to implicit attitudes. For example, at the time of this article's writing, a Google Scholar search for "Sexuality Attitudes" returned 2,710 results compared to just 26 results for "Implicit Sexuality Attitudes". We were interested in whether GPT leveraged different information when asked to predict more novel implicit attitudes. If GPT's predictions of implicit attitudes correlate more highly with each other than they do with its predictions of explicit attitudes, this would suggest it is reliably leveraging different information in making the two predictions. Conversely, if GPT's predictions of implicit attitudes correlate as highly with its explicit predictions as with each other, this would suggest it is approaching the tasks similarly, and not leveraging substantively different information in predicting implicit versus explicit attitudes. Finally, and most critically, we examined the correlations between GPT's predictions and real-world results in the Project Implicit International Dataset, to gauge GPT's overall success as a Novel Data Predictor. (See SI Appendix, Table S12, for additional summary statistics. For full correlation tables, see "GPT as Data Predictor Correlation Tables 20240228" at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>)

Sexuality Attitudes[‡]. On average, correlations between GPT-3.5's five different explicit predictions of Sexuality Attitudes were high (mean $r = 0.875$), as were correlations between GPT-3.5's different implicit predictions of Sexuality Attitudes (mean $r = 0.879$). This suggests it approached these tasks reliably. However, correlations between its implicit and explicit predictions were nearly as high (mean $r = 0.778$). GPT-3.5's five sets of implicit predictions were similar to its five sets of explicit predictions, indeed nearly as similar to them as to each other. For GPT-4, correlations between different explicit predictions were even higher (mean $r = 0.957$), as were correlations between different implicit predictions (mean $r = 0.946$). Interestingly, correlations between its explicit and implicit predictions were equally high (mean $r = 0.952$): Statistically, GPT-4's predictions of Implicit Sexuality Attitudes looked identical to its predictions of Explicit ones. These patterns suggest ChatGPT was limited in the new information it applied to these different tasks. When predicting (more novel) implicit attitudes compared to (more familiar) explicit attitudes, GPT-3.5 seemingly used little new information, and GPT-4 almost no new information.

Considering these analyses, we collapsed across implicit and explicit predictions in examining ChatGPT's success at predicting actual Sexuality Attitudes. GPT-3.5 did a reasonable job predicting real-world Explicit Sexuality Attitudes by country (mean $r = 0.602$), but was unsuccessful at predicting Implicit Sexuality Attitudes (mean $r = -0.014$). GPT-4's predictions correlated highly with country-level explicit attitudes (mean $r = 0.714$), but it similarly failed at predicting implicit attitudes less represented in its training data (mean $r = 0.152$).

Age Attitudes and Gender Science/Liberal Arts Stereotypes. GPT-3.5's predictions of Age Attitudes and Gender stereotypes proved not only unsuccessful, but incoherent. As detailed in the SI Appendix (Section S9), for each, GPT-3.5's different implicit predictions were uncorrelated with each other, as were its different explicit predictions. Given this low reliability, it is unsurprising that its collective predictions of Age Attitudes were uncorrelated with real country-level patterns of Explicit (mean $r = -0.010$) and Implicit (mean $r = -0.175$) Age Attitudes. Similarly, GPT-3.5's predictions of country-level Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes were uncorrelated with actual explicit (mean $r = -0.009$) and implicit (mean $r = -0.044$) results.

GPT-4 completed these tasks more reliably but was not more successful in predicting real-world results. For Age Attitudes, GPT-4's different explicit predictions were moderately to highly correlated (mean $r = 0.645$), as were its different implicit predictions (mean $r = 0.726$). Correlations between its implicit and explicit predictions were in the same range (mean $r = 0.664$), again suggesting that it did not lean on substantially new information for predicting patterns of implicit versus explicit attitudes. Critically, its collective predictions were on average negatively correlated with real country-level Explicit Age Attitudes (mean $r = -0.395$) and uncorrelated with Implicit Age Attitudes (mean $r = -0.120$).

For Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes, GPT-4's different explicit predictions were weakly correlated (mean $r = 0.363$). Curiously, its different implicit predictions were more consistent, correlating strongly across chats (mean $r = 0.868$), and correlations between its explicit and implicit responses fell between the two (mean $r = 0.499$). The real-world explicit results GPT predicted here were measured with two items that needed to be combined: one capturing

[‡]As detailed in the SI Appendix (Section S9), here and elsewhere GPT-3.5 had difficulty with this task. GPT-3.5's intended direction of scoring was frequently unclear, necessitating follow-up questions to gauge the meaning of its predictions. This sometimes rendered responses difficult to interpret, particularly for Age Attitudes and Gender Science stereotypes.

associations of Male versus Female with Science, and a second with Liberal Arts. (See SI Appendix.) This more complicated explicit item may have challenged the LLM. In any case, neither sets of answers predicted actual cross-country results. GPT-4’s explicit predictions were uncorrelated with real country-level explicit (mean $r = -0.192$) and implicit (mean $r = 0.054$) stereotypes. Similarly, GPT’s implicit predictions were negatively correlated with explicit (mean $r = -0.417$) stereotypes and uncorrelated with implicit (mean $r = -0.067$) ones.

Sexuality bias may receive more media coverage than Age Attitudes or Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes. Though unaware of published research on this topic, we conducted three tests to examine this possibility. Patterns from Bing searches, Google Books Ngram Viewer, and chats with GPT-4 all suggested that Sexuality Attitudes are better represented in ChatGPT’s knowledge base relative to Age Attitudes or Gender Science stereotypes. (See SI Appendix, Section S9, Figures S1-S2.) Predicting these latter patterns was thus more difficult. In line with this thinking, while both LLMs were successful at predicting patterns of Explicit (though not Implicit) Sexuality bias, neither achieved even small positive correlations with the other real-world results.

General Discussion

Across four studies, we have tested GPT’s ability to enhance the scientific process. Our focus has been on psychological science, where the authors have sufficient expertise to judge the quality of GPT’s output, but we have selected tasks that are applicable across domains. Future research should, however, confirm the degree to which this work generalizes to other disciplines.

We included both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, even though GPT-4 is expected to be superior and GPT-3.5 may fall out of use as future versions are released. We did this for several reasons. First, the quantitative difference between the two is of interest in tracking the speed of improvement. More importantly, only by comparing the two could we gain insight into newly emerging processes such as GPT-4’s ability for self-correction. As we will discuss, such findings have implications for our understanding of underlying processes in machine cognition. Finally, comparing the models allowed us to highlight where the technology did and did not advance, such as GPT-4’s reduction in hallucinations but not in smaller errors. This work thus offers actionable insights that can help guide the training of future models.

Study 1 probed GPT’s ability as a Research Librarian. GPT showed a varied trajectory in terms of the ability to discover relevant research. By any measure, GPT-4 generated many fewer fictional references. It also displayed a far greater tendency to acknowledge when it was generating fiction. This is potentially important for the technology’s development. There is a likely tradeoff between novelty and truth in LLMs: Hallucinations might be inevitable in a model capable of creativity (50). Training a model with a firm goal of minimizing fiction generation might therefore be problematic, risking it becoming more factual but also less creative. The possibility that GPT-4 is developing some form of fiction recognition is therefore intriguing. An AI capable of discerning fact from fiction in its own creation may be capable of generating fact when facts are desirable, and fiction when fiction is desirable, much as a human author might choose to write a short story on one occasion and a research article on another. Put differently, the ability to parse fact from fiction in its responses may open the door for LLMs that are capable of being at once creative and truthful.

That said, there is significant room for improvement. GPT-4 still generated a non-trivial number of unacknowledged hallucinations. Moreover, acknowledgment generally came on the chat level: GPT would note that its references “might be fictional,” for example, without distinguishing which specific references were real or fake. Finally, GPT-4 did not show meaningful improvement in terms of smaller errors, such as listing the wrong year or journal. This pattern is interesting. GPT-4 increasingly mirrors humans on this task: It has fewer instances of outright fabrication, to which people are not prone, but not of smaller errors people might also make. Such errors are consequential: Even small errors might, for example, lead to inaccurate conclusions about authors’ scientific output in formulas that help decide tenure, or incorrect citations in new articles. The latter problem may be self-propagating, since incorrect citations are automatically indexed on Google Scholar, risking an expanding misinformation ecosystem.

Interestingly, hallucination was moderated by the completeness of the references generated. When generating incomplete citations, both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 were sharply more likely to hallucinate. One possible framing of this effect is in terms of formality: By providing incomplete references, GPT was intrinsically making the chat less formal. Future research should probe the causality of this finding by experimentally varying the formality of the request to explore whether this changes ChatGPT’s effectiveness in discovering real research. This finding is also interesting in that here, again, we see a parallel to human cognition. A person will be more prone to misstate a fact – e.g., misquoting the source of a statistic – over a dinner conversation than in a scientific communication. In this case, of course, the source of the confabulation is obvious: The human is drawing on imperfect memory rather than verifying documentation. The source of this analogous error in GPT is less clear and very likely different. Nevertheless, in some sense, the machine appears to verify facts more in some contexts than others, seemingly seizing upon informality as an opportunity to be sloppy. Uncovering the source of this discrepancy may generate insights into the processes underlying machine cognition.

ChatGPT's abilities in terms of pulling relevant references were uninspiring. It was successful at discovering references on broad topics but quickly became less successful as the subject matter became narrower. However, we saw advancement between GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 in this regard. GPT-4 was more successful at pulling references on moderately broad topics, suggesting potential for future improvement in this area.

Study 2 probed GPT's abilities as a Research Ethicist. GPT-4 shined in this regard, decisively outperforming GPT-3.5 when providing feedback on subpar research protocols. While these results were large statistically, examining the responses qualitatively makes the contrast even more striking. (For full transcripts, see "GPT as Research Ethicist Transcripts 20240220" at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.) To put its performance into perspective, note that the grading rubrics were built collaboratively: The original draft by one of the authors had eight points for each, another author then revised it with a ninth point, and upon reflection, the original one added a tenth. While some of GPT-4's responses were better than others, on average it scored nearly nine points for blatant vignettes, which is roughly identical to what the authors effectively averaged across three iterations of the rubrics. The performance of GPT-3.5 lies in stark contrast. Not only did it often miss the researchers' lapses, but at times it was even complimentary. For example, on several occasions it praised the researchers' decision to add more research subjects after checking for statistical significance, noting that it "added statistical power."

In a scientific era defined by a replicability crisis, these results are important. They suggest that GPT-4 is highly capable of giving useful feedback – aligned with generally accepted standards of modern research practice – on experimental protocols. GPT-4 was reasonably successful at this task even when the vignettes were framed subtly. This result is striking because this required GPT to infer bad research practices where they were not clearly stated. It is also practically important, as it suggests the LLM can help well-intentioned researchers – operating in a realistic context – improve the quality and ethics of their work. Finally, it is conceptually interesting that GPT-4 suggested distinctly modern practices: From an ocean of possible suggestions, the more recent model was able to circumnavigate practices that have aged poorly, and instead present advice aligned with recent advances and best practices. Not so for GPT-3.5. The comparatively poor performance of GPT-3.5 is disheartening in that researchers who do not purchase the paywalled model upgrade may receive poor-quality advice. Indeed, GPT-3.5's responses could even embolden poor researchers, since at times it openly encouraged subpar practices. However, the difference between the two LLMs may also be cast in an optimistic light: The technology's progress is profound, suggesting that its next iteration may prove an extremely powerful tool for helping researchers design protocols and improve practices. Future research should examine the LLMs' ability to improve higher-quality protocols, gauging their ability to help more skillful researchers.

The results around initial prompts, while exploratory, were generally heartening. At the least, they suggest that casual mentions of things like researcher status or sensitivity to criticism are not eliciting large and robustly worse feedback from GPT. It also did not prove trivial to "jailbreak" the technology: GPT consistently rejected requests to provide feedback in an unethical manner. Indeed, if anything, preceding our protocol with arguments against open science or requests that it ignore p-hacking may have riveted the LLMs' attention to these issues, leading to more ethical responses. This unique "priming" effect – the tendency for GPT to give superior feedback following initial prompts that evoked data ethics – is both practically and theoretically important. Merely asking GPT to be more critical or verbose did not elicit stronger responses. However, evoking data ethics in any manner led to better feedback. Practically, this underscores the importance of specificity when eliciting advice from ChatGPT. Researchers may benefit from highlighting specific areas where they require support. Theoretically, it reveals nuance in the process by which GPT responds to prompts; merely hinting at ethics leads the LLMs to evaluate the problem differently, adopting an ethically-minded perspective.

In Study 3, we probed ChatGPT's ability to generate useful data for estimating word-embedding results. GPT's results replicated known overall effects from this literature. GPT may thus be useful for generating data in this context, for example, to pilot new word embedding work in a technically simplified manner. However, the importance of this work extends beyond GPT's ability to generate data in this relatively specific domain. The ability to realistically simulate real-world data is implicitly tied to other important scientific abilities. For example, imagine GPT was asked to generate plausible scientific hypotheses. Completing this task would likely require the LLM to draw upon and synthesize existing knowledge in new and meaningful ways. Success would require GPT to display an intrinsic command of this knowledge. Put another way, if it is unable to simulate existing knowledge, GPT cannot be expected to successfully simulate extensions of this knowledge. GPT's ability to generate useful hypotheses may therefore be dependent on its ability to replicate existing results.

It should be noted that the results from Study 3, while promising, are not decisive. In particular, the divergence from existing research on the patterns of Single-Category WEAT *D*-scores is rather puzzling. There may be differences in GPT's training data or approach to the task, leading to inconsistencies with prior work. The relative uniformity across GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 is consistent with this interpretation. Where result patterns diverged from known results, they usually did so consistently across the two models. A more troubling possibility is that GPT ignored our instructions not to adjust for stereotypical associations viewed as negative. Gendered associations with Work and Math have produced

wide discussion, and GPT may have simply been reluctant to suggest men are more associated with these categories. If this is the case, GPT could prove an unreliable source for data related to socially undesirable effects. This issue is larger than the specific use case from this study, extending to any use of LLMs to augment human subjects. While self-censoring of LLMs may be an overall societal good, in the context of social psychological research, this could undermine their potential. One cannot, for example, expect reliable data on human prejudice if GPT refuses to display bias within the context of scientific research.

Finally, in Study 4, we examined GPT's ability to predict novel data – cross-cultural patterns of implicit and explicit attitudes – published after its training cutoff. Our results here should be viewed as suggestive rather than definitive since we have studied merely one of many possible domains in which GPT could be asked to make novel predictions. Conceptually, though, we take issue with the possibility that LLMs can predict novel data. A finding that is novel is, by definition, one outside the scope of the LLM's training data. As a thought experiment, imagine a powerful AI somehow came to exist in the 16th century. This AI had more cognitive capabilities than current technologies but received none of the data collected from hundreds of years of astronomical research. Without a telescope, could this AI locate the moons of Jupiter? We argue that it could not. Galileo's discoveries were not merely creative insights; they were the result of new data. Given data from a good telescope, a powerful AI might perhaps predict hundreds of years of physical research. Without it, it likely could not.

This extends to the idea of AI acting as a human test subject (and data source more generally). Without data to suggest a certain result will arise, how can it be expected to mimic the effect? It would be blind as to Jupiter's moons. As a simulated human subject, GPT might therefore be expected to replicate – indeed perhaps over-replicate – existing findings. To be sure, it might be able to combine knowledge in new ways to reveal novel *discoveries* about patterns in historical data. But there is no obvious mechanism by which it could generate discoveries dependent on novel *data*, a cornerstone of scientific progress.

Our results across Studies 3 and 4, while not definitive, are consistent with this argument. Tasked with replicating known effects in a domain (word embeddings) familiar to it, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 were both relatively successful. But tasked with predicting novel and unfamiliar data, both models generally failed.

The tendency to lean heavily on what is familiar was evident in GPT's approach to predicting cross-cultural IAT results. While even explicit attitude predictions were often beyond it, GPT had some success in that domain. Both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 achieved relatively high correlations in predicting country-level Explicit Sexuality Attitudes. However, their predictions for Implicit Sexuality Attitudes were nearly identical, suggesting they brought little additional information to this more novel prediction. This is particularly striking considering that implicit and explicit attitudes are often only moderately correlated (49), a fact in GPT's knowledge base (See SI Appendix, Section S9). In short, these two phenomena were sufficiently distinct that one would expect GPT to leverage somewhat different information when predicting them. Surprisingly, it did not.

It should be noted that even GPT's prediction of explicit attitudes was far from stellar. The LLMs succeeded only with Sexuality Attitudes. It seems likely that the extensive cross-national coverage and political discussion of sexuality offered GPT information to lean on here. Beyond Sexuality Attitudes, when GPT attempted to predict Age Attitudes and Gender Liberal Arts/Science stereotypes – areas that receive less media coverage – both models failed spectacularly.

We suggest that GPT's ability to act as a data source may be limited to relatively simple tasks and domains where the likely results are known or predictable. Future research should finely map where GPT is and is not successful in simulating data. That said, it is conceptually possible that LLMs may prove able to elaborate upon known results in novel ways, cohesively combining sources of knowledge. Testing LLMs' abilities to generate new knowledge in this manner may prove fertile ground for future research. We believe it unlikely, however, that current or future LLMs will be capable of generating true empirical novelty, whereby results do not reflect existing information regardless of how it is combined, because we see no mechanism by which LLMs can predict something with no counterpart in their training data. AI may thus continue to be limited in this regard, even as technology advances: Scientific progress will likely always require real-world data.

To conclude, we turn to the broader question of whether LLMs can enhance or facilitate the scientific process. Based on this first report, we would tentatively answer “yes.” ChatGPT's ability to compile and curate research is currently limited but rapidly improving in ways (e.g. increasing acknowledgment of fiction) that indicate future generations of this technology might be successful in this area. Already, GPT-4 shows a surprisingly strong mastery of research methods and ethics, and may be able to help scientists improve their practices. ChatGPT's successful replication of known results suggests a degree of command over existing knowledge that may simplify research piloting. This same phenomenon raises the possibility that GPT may be able to synthesize existing knowledge sources to generate new and plausible hypotheses, a premise that may prove a fruitful ground for future research. The most fundamental limitation we perceive is in GPT's seeming inability to predict highly novel empirical results. This limitation is unsurprising, but

it speaks to the need for moderation in the optimism about this technology. Future models may show profound abilities and spur scientific advancement. But, these abilities should not be mistaken for omniscience. Like human scientists, advanced LLMs will likely remain limited by the knowledge they already possess.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Melanie Mitchell, Tina Eliassi-Rad, and Tessa Charlesworth for their advice on this work, Igor Grossmann for his comments on an early draft, and Anya Vedantambe for her help coding ChatGPT transcripts. All correspondence regarding this manuscript should be directed to Steve Lehr at steve@cangrade.com.

References

1. A. Vaswani *et al.*, “Attention is all you need” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon *et al.*, Eds. (Curran Associates, Inc., 2017), vol. **30**, 5998–6008.
2. X. Zhang *et al.*, Artificial intelligence for science in quantum, atomistic, and continuum systems. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.08423.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
3. J. Jumper *et al.*, Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* **596**, 583-589 (2021).
4. G. Carleo, M. Troyer, Solving the quantum many-body problem with artificial neural networks, *Science* **355**, 602-606 (2017).
5. D. Kochkov *et al.*, Machine learning-accelerated computational fluid dynamics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **118**, e2101784118 (2021).
6. M. H. S. Segler, M. Preuss, M. P. Waller, Planning chemical syntheses with deep neural networks and symbolic AI. *Nature* **555**, 604–610 (2018).
7. Y. Zheng *et al.*, Large language models for scientific synthesis, inference and explanation. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2310.07984.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
8. K. M. Jablonka *et al.*, 14 examples of how LLMs can transform materials science and chemistry: a reflection on a large language model hackathon. *Digit. Discov.* **2**, 1233-1250 (2023).
9. D. A. Boiko, R. MacKnight, B. Kline, G. Gomes, Autonomous chemical research with large language models. *Nature* **624**, 570-578 (2023).
10. D. Demszky *et al.*, Using large language models in psychology. *Nat. Rev. Psychol.* **2**, 688-701 (2023).
11. H. Kotek, R. Dockum, D. Q. Sun, “Gender bias and stereotypes in large language models” in *Proceedings of the ACM Collective Intelligence Conference (CI '23)* (Association for Computing Machinery, Delft, Netherlands, 2023), pp. 12-24.
12. F. Bianchi *et al.*, “Easily accessible text-to-image generation amplifies demographic stereotypes at large scale” in *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FaccT '23)* (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, 2023), pp. 1493-1504.
13. Y. Zhang *et al.*, Siren’s song in the AI ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.01219.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
14. W. H. Walters, E. I. Wilder, Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT. *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 14045 (2023).
15. S. Bubeck *et al.*, Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.12712.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
16. M. Binz, E. Schulz, Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **120**, e2218523120 (2023).
17. S. Yadlowsky, L. Doshi, N. Tripuraneni, Pretraining data mixtures enable narrow model selection capabilities in transformer models. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2311.00871.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
18. R. A. Millikan, Science and religion. *Bulletin of the California Institute of Technology*, v. **32**, no. 98, 3-20 (1922).
19. R. Taylor *et al.*, Galactica: A large language model for science. arXiv [Preprint] (2022). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2211.09085.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).

20. Y. Cao *et al.*, A comprehensive survey of AI-generated content (AIGC): A history of generative AI from GAN to ChatGPT. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.04226.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
21. V. Rawte *et al.*, Exploring the relationship between LLM hallucinations and prompt linguistic nuances: readability, formality, and concreteness. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.11064.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
22. A. Azaria, T. Mitchell, The internal state of an LLM knows when it's lying. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2304.13734.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
23. J. Wei *et al.*, Emergent abilities of large language models. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2206.07682.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
24. Open Science Collaboration, PSYCHOLOGY. Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science* **349**, aac4716 (2015).
25. B. A. Nosek *et al.*, Replicability, robustness, and reproducibility in psychological science. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **73**, 719-748 (2022).
26. C. F. Camerer *et al.*, Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. *Science* **351**, 1433-1436 (2016).
27. C. F. Camerer *et al.*, Evaluating the replicability of social science experiments in Nature and Science between 2010 and 2015. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **2**, 637-644 (2018).
28. J. P. A. Ioannidis, Contradicted and initially stronger effects in highly cited clinical research. *JAMA* **294**, 218-228 (2005).
29. T. M. Errington *et al.*, An open investigation of the reproducibility of cancer biology research. *eLife* **3**, e04333 (2014).
30. T. M. Errington *et al.*, Investigating the replicability of preclinical cancer biology. *eLife* **10**, e71601 (2021).
31. L. K. John, G. Loewenstein, D. Prelec, Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychol. Sci.* **23**, 524-532 (2012).
32. M. L. Head, L. Holman, R. Lanfear, A. T. Kahn, M. D. Jennions, The extent and consequences of p-hacking in science. *PLoS Biol.* **13**, e1002106 (2015).
33. J. P. Simmons, L. D. Nelson, U. Simonsohn, False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychol. Sci.* **22**, 1359-1366 (2011).
34. L. P. Argyle *et al.*, Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Polit. Anal.* **31**, 337-351 (2023).
35. D. Dillon, N. Tandon, Y. Gu, K. Gray, Can AI language models replace human participants? *Trends Cognit. Sci.* **27**, 597-600 (2023).
36. G. V. Aher, R. I. Arriaga, A. T. Kalai, "Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies" in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, A. Krause *et al.*, Eds. (PMLR, 2023), pp. 337-371.
37. I. Grossmann *et al.*, AI and the transformation of social science research. *Science* **380**, 1108-1109 (2023).
38. A. Caliskan, J. J. Bryson, A. Narayanan, Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science* **356**, 183-186 (2017).
39. T. E. S. Charlesworth, V. Yang, T. C. Mann, B. Kurdi, M. R. Banaji, Gender stereotypes in natural language: Word embeddings show robust consistency across child and adult language corpora of more than 65 million words. *Psychol. Sci.* **32**, 218-240 (2021).
40. W. Guo, A. Caliskan, "Detecting emergent intersectional biases: Contextualized word embeddings contain a distribution of human-like biases" in *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (AAAI/ACM, 2021), pp. 122-133.
41. B. A. Nosek *et al.*, Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes. *Euro. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* **18**, 36-88 (2007).
42. B. A. Nosek, M. R. Banaji, A. G. Greenwald, Math = male, me = female, therefore math not = me. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **83**, 44-59 (2002).

43. J. Zhao, T. Wang, M. Yatskar, V. Ordonez, K. W. Chang, “Men also like shopping: Reducing gender bias amplification using corpus-level constraints” in *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, M. Palmer, R. Hwa, Eds. (Association for Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen, 2017), pp. 2979–2989.
44. K. Lloyd, Bias amplification in artificial intelligence systems. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1809.07842.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
45. A. Wang, O. Russakovsky, “Directional bias amplification” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning* (PMLR, 2021), pp. 10882-10893.
46. OpenAI, GPT-4 technical report. arXiv [Preprint] (2023). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.08774.pdf> (accessed 19 January 2024).
47. M. Nadeem, A. Bethke, S. Reddy, “Stereoset: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models” in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021), pp. 5356-5371.
48. T. E. S. Charlesworth, M. Navon, Y. Rabinovich, N. Lofaro, B. Kurdi, The project implicit international dataset: Measuring implicit and explicit social group attitudes and stereotypes across 34 countries (2009-2019). *Behav. Res. Methods* **55**, 1413-1440 (2023).
49. W. Hofmann, B. Gawronski, T. Gschwendner, H. Le, M. Schmitt, A meta-analysis on the correlation between the implicit association test and explicit self-report measures. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* **31**, 1369–1385 (2005).
50. M. Lee, A mathematical investigation of hallucination and creativity in GPT models. *Mathematics* **11**, 2320 (2023).

Supporting Information for:**ChatGPT as Research Scientist: Probing GPT’s Capabilities as a Research Librarian, Research Ethicist, Data Generator and Data Predictor**Steven A. Lehr^{1,*}, Aylin Caliskan², Suneragiri Liyanage³, Mahzarin R. Banaji³¹Cangrade, Inc., Watertown, MA²Information School, University of Washington, Seattle, WA³Department of Psychology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

*Correspondence about this article may be addressed to Steve Lehr at Steve@cangrade.com

Section S1: GPT as Research Librarian – Detailed Methods

Full Design. As noted in the main article we asked GPT to find and summarize articles on 25 related but specific topics in psychology, the area of the authors’ primary expertise. These topics were designed to vary in breadth, and selected based on citation counts in searches on Google Scholar. They ranged from extremely broad (e.g. “The psychology of bias and discrimination”) to extremely narrow (e.g. “Use of the Implicit Association Test to predict dental outcomes”) with three levels in between. (See below for topics and details of their selection.) For each topic, we asked GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 each to find 20 important and influential peer-reviewed papers and to provide a citation and brief summary. If GPT refused the task, the chat was recorded, and the prompt was attempted again. If GPT presented fewer than 20 articles, a follow-up prompt requested that it present the remaining number of articles. In some chats, GPT acknowledged that it was presenting fictional articles. For example, GPT would make comments like “Please keep in mind that these are hypothetical references and some might not be real.” These examples were not counted toward the main results but were preserved for further analysis of the overall generation of fictional references and rates of their acknowledgment. Prompts were continued until GPT either a) presented 20 references it claimed were real, or b) clearly indicated that it lacked knowledge of relevant research. Full transcripts may be found in the document “GPT as Research Librarian Transcripts 20240220” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Topic Selection. We selected the topics GPT was asked to research to range in broadness but reflect the authors’ primary area of expertise: The psychology of bias and discrimination in general, and implicit social cognition in particular. This variation in broadness was designed to let us gauge the impact of different levels of research availability and specificity on both GPT’s ability to discover relevant research and its tendency to hallucinate. Below is a complete list of the topics researched by ChatGPT in Study 1. Topics by broadness levels were initially hypothesized (i.e. tentatively selected) based on the authors’ knowledge of the literature and were confirmed (and in some cases updated) through a series of searches that roughly identified the number of references that came up on Google Scholar, conducted on July 12, 2023. The full list of topics, sorted by broadness levels, is provided below. The Google Scholar searches and the number of papers they identified are outlined in parentheses.

Broad Categories:

1. Implicit Association Test (“Implicit Association Test”: 43,400)
2. Unconscious Biases or Stereotypes (“Unconscious Bias”: 35,300; “Unconscious Stereotypes”: 1,850)
3. Automatic or Unconscious Psychological Processes (“Psychological Processes” AND “Automatic”: 86,200; “Psychological Processes” AND “Unconscious”: 73,900)
4. Psychology of Bias and Discrimination (“Psychology of” AND “Bias” AND “Discrimination”: 279,000)
5. Implicit Social Cognition (“Implicit Social Cognition”: 14,100; “Social Cognition” AND “Implicit”: 264,000)

Somewhat Broad Categories:

1. Methodological Considerations related to the Implicit Association Test (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Methodological”: 12,400; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Methodology”: 12,500)
2. Predictive Validity of the Implicit Association Test (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Predictive Validity”: 7,670)
3. Cross-Cultural Results on Implicit Association Tests (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Cross-Cultural”: 7,160)
4. Implicit Attitudes and the Law (“Implicit Attitudes” AND “Law”: 13,500; “Implicit Attitudes” AND “the Law”: 4,330)
5. Implicit Attitudes in Business and the Workplace (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Business”: 13,800; “Implicit Attitudes” AND “Workplace”: 6,500)

Moderate Categories:

1. Malleability of Implicit Attitudes (“Implicit Attitudes” AND “Malleability”: 3,700)
2. Using the Implicit Association Test to Study Mental Illness (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Mental Illness”: 3,230)
3. Implicit Gender Stereotypes (“implicit gender stereotypes”: 1,930; “Implicit Stereotypes” AND “Gender”: 5,610)
4. Implicit Association Tests and Suicide or Self-Harm (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Suicide”: 3,580; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Self-Harm”: 881)
5. Use of the Implicit Association Test in Marketing Research (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Marketing”: 6,960; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Marketing Research”: 2,140)

Somewhat Narrow Categories:

1. The Malleability of Implicit Gender Stereotypes (“Implicit Gender Stereotypes” AND “Malleability”: 450; “Implicit Stereotypes” AND “Gender” AND “Malleability”: 1,260)
2. Exploring the Predictive Validity of the Implicit Association Test Across Cultures. (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Across Cultures” AND “predictive validity”: 652; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Cross-Cultural” AND “predictive validity”: 1,570)
3. The Implicit Association Test and Sex Offenders (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Sex Offenders”: 610)
4. Implicit Association Test and Intersectionality (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Intersectionality”: 1,870)
5. Implicit Association Test and Doctors’ Medical Treatment Decisions: (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Medical Treatment” AND “Doctor”: 483; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Treatment Decisions” AND “Doctor”: 363; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Treatment Decisions”: 712; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Medical Treatment”: 942)

Narrow Categories:

1. County-Level Predictive Validity of the Implicit Association Test. (“Implicit Association Test” AND “County-Level” AND “Predictive Validity”: 138; “Implicit Association Test” AND “by County” AND “Predictive Validity”: 32)
2. Using the Implicit Association Test to predict the treatment decisions of Dentists. (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Treatment Decision” AND “dentist”: 10; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Dentists” AND “Decisions”: 190)
3. Using the Implicit Association Test to study Pilot Risk-Taking Behavior (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Pilot Risk-Taking”: 5; “Implicit Association Test” AND “Pilots” AND “Risk-Taking”: 150)
4. Exploring the Implications of Implicit Gender Stereotypes in Patent Law. (“Implicit Gender Bias” AND “Patent Law”: 8; “Implicit Bias” AND “Patent Law” & “Gender”: 146)
5. Use of the Implicit Association Test to Inform the Marketing of Soft Drinks. (“Implicit Association Test” AND “Marketing” AND “Soft Drinks”: 189)

Criteria: Acknowledgement of Hallucination. For the main analysis of hallucination, we excluded chats in which ChatGPT acknowledged the fictional nature of its references. As noted, however, in a further analysis we counted

such chats as “acknowledgment of hallucination” and counted references marked as hallucinations toward the overall generation of fictional references. We noted that these acknowledgments were made at the level of the chat: GPT did not generally specifically identify certain articles as fictional but rather sometimes acknowledged that certain references may be fictional on the level of the chat. Below is a list of the kinds of statements made by GPT that we took to indicate acknowledgment of fictional references:

- Referring to references as “Hypothetical”. E.g., “. . . here are 16 additional hypothetical paper summaries. . .” or “I can create hypothetical citations based on the types of studies that are likely to exist. . .”
- Referring to references as “Made up”. E.g., “Please note, while these are made-up citations. . .”
- Referring to references as “fictional”. E.g., “Here are 20 fictional, but plausible papers about Implicit Gender Stereotypes.”
- Noting that references are “not specific papers.” E.g., “Remember, these are examples, and not specific papers I’ve retrieved.”
- Noting that references were “simulated” or “not real.” E.g., “Remember, the following is a simulated list and the articles and citations are not real.”
- Noting that references were “imaginary.” E.g., “. . . the dates and information I’ve given are imaginary. . .”
- Noting that the examples are “not actual papers.” E.g. “Please note that the papers I’ve provided are just examples and not actual papers specific to your request.”
- Noting that the references “may not exist.” E.g., “Remember, these papers. . . may not exist.” Or (a rare example for GPT-3.5): “Keep in mind that I cannot guarantee that these specific papers exist. . .”

The full list of literature reviews where ChatGPT acknowledged potential fiction in its response can be found in the document “GPT as Research Librarian Transcripts 20240220” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Detail on Coding of References. Each of the 1000 references from GPT’s main research searches was coded on: 1. Correctness, 2. Completeness, 3. Topic Relevance, and 4. Citation Count. Coders were blinded to which GPT model generated each reference, and the order of these references within each topic group was randomized. Two coders examined each reference generated by ChatGPT. All disagreements were discussed, and in 7 (out of 1000) cases where disagreement about one of these 4 variables continued after this discussion, a third coder gave a tie-breaking vote. In addition, 269 references from chats where GPT acknowledged it might be generating fictional content were coded on only Correctness and Completeness, with no instances of disagreement after discussion*. Full data may be found in the spreadsheet “Research Librarian Data 20240226” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

For the Correctness variable, there were three possible ways a reference could be coded: Correct (references without issues), Error (references with minor issues), and Hallucination (reference is fabricated or contains major issues). References were marked as “Correct” if they were real references that contained no errors when compared to citation information from research databases like Google Scholar. A reference was marked as an “Error” if it was recognizable and not attributed to incorrect authors but contained errors such as incorrect journal name, year, or page number, or mistakes in the title that did not change its meaning. In a few cases, references that contained multiple errors (e.g. a combination of a missing author, a minor mistake in the title, and an incorrect journal) were considered Hallucinations. More typically, a reference was coded as a “Hallucination” if it was entirely fabricated or contained serious errors such as attribution to incorrect authors or an issue in the title that changed its meaning. When GPT concretely acknowledged that it did not have access to articles on a topic, the number of requested articles remaining in the chat were credited as “Correct”. The logic behind this last decision was that when ChatGPT proved unable to locate the requested articles, it was more accurate for it to acknowledge this fact rather than generate fake references. We therefore considered such admissions of defeat as the “Correct” response in these cases, though (as discussed below) these were also marked as “Irrelevant.”

Importantly, GPT varied in its approach to citing references. It often provided complete references formatted in typical formal styles (e.g. APA). However, on some occasions it treated the task less formally, providing incomplete information. For example, in some chats or for some references, GPT would provide the title, year and authors, but would leave out the journal name and volume. In cases where any information was missing from a citation, the reference was labeled as “Incomplete.” Incompleteness was treated as a standalone variable: An incomplete reference was not considered an error or hallucination unless the information that was provided otherwise fit the criteria for these designations.

*One reason we did not code these additional references on citation count and relevance was that we had no intended analysis involving these variables for these references. However, transcripts/reference lists have been preserved, and may be coded in the future as needed.

To be marked as “Relevant” the selected article needed to specifically contain discussion of the requested topic. For example, when GPT was asked for articles on the “malleability of implicit gender stereotypes,” it provided some articles on the malleability of implicit bias (but not of gender stereotypes) and others that discussed implicit gender stereotypes (but not malleability). In such cases, the articles were marked as “Irrelevant.” Hallucinations were automatically labeled “Irrelevant,” as were admissions of defeat. The logic behind this decision was that although these are otherwise very different outcomes, in neither case did GPT successfully locate a helpful article.

GPT was asked to find “important and influential” articles on each topic. Raw Citation Count was coded from Google Scholar, as a marker of each article’s influence. Hallucinations and admissions of defeat were automatically assigned 0 citations. Where there were multiple versions of the same article on Google Scholar, their citations were summed. Slight differences in the timing of coding frequently led to small discrepancies between the two coders on this citation count. Discrepancies of more than 20 citations were examined to ensure the source was timing and not human error. Differences in timing were random and thus should not be a source of non-random error in the analysis of GPT-3.5 vs. GPT-4. The final correlation between the two coders’ citation counts was $r > 0.99999$. For analysis, the citation counts from the two coders were composited.

Section S2: GPT as Research Librarian – Supporting Analyses

To preserve space and readability, only means and odd ratios were reported in the main manuscript for this article, and certain analyses were mentioned but not described in detail. Here we report these analyses in greater detail. Unless otherwise noted, all analyses in the Research Librarian study use logistic regression, with effect sizes measured by Odds Ratios (OR) for one independent variable and Betas for multiple regressions. All analyses were run in Stata version 15. Where Pseudo-R2 is reported, the McFadden method was used for its calculation.

Overall Hallucinations & Errors. Out of 500 references GPT-4 claimed as real, 5.40% (95% CI [3.41, 7.39]) were hallucinations, compared to 36.00% (95% CI [31.78, 40.22]) for GPT-3.5. A logistic regression indicated the difference was significant; OR = 9.85, 95% CI [6.42, 15.13], $z = 10.46$, $P < 0.001$. Error rates were roughly equivalent between GPT-3.5 (4.2%, 95% CI [2.44, 5.96]) and GPT-4 (4.6%, 95% CI [2.76, 6.44]); OR = 0.91, 95% CI: [0.50, 1.67], $z = -0.31$, $P = 0.758$.

Completeness as Moderator. Here we present full results for the moderation of hallucinations (but not errors) by reference completeness. Collapsing across models, ChatGPT hallucinated far more when it provided incomplete references (62.41%, 95% CI [54.07, 70.75]) compared to when it provided complete ones (14.30%, 95% CI [11.97, 16.64]), with the difference significant in logistic regression; OR = 9.947, 95% CI [6.674, 14.825], $z = 11.28$, $P < 0.001$. These effects were significant and large for both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. GPT-3.5 hallucinated more for incomplete references (75.29%, 95% CI [65.94, 84.65]) than complete ones (27.95%, 95% CI [23.62, 32.29]), OR = 7.86, 95% CI [4.59, 13.45], $z = 7.52$, $P < 0.001$. GPT-4 also hallucinated far more for incomplete references (39.58%, 95% CI [25.23, 53.93]), than complete ones (1.77%, 95% CI [0.55, 2.99]), OR = 36.36, 95% CI [14.67, 90.11], $z = 7.76$, $P < 0.001$.

We do not see similar moderating effects when it comes to smaller errors (e.g. having a wrong journal name or year in an otherwise correct reference). Collapsing across versions, ChatGPT descriptively made somewhat more errors when providing incomplete references (7.52%, 95% CI [2.98, 12.06]) compared to when providing complete references (3.92%, 95% CI [2.63, 5.22]), with this trending but not reaching statistical significance in logistic regression; OR = 1.99, 95% CI [0.96, 4.13], $z = 1.85$, $P = 0.064$. Table S1 displays the numbers of Hallucinations and Errors for Complete and Incomplete citations, by GPT model.

Table S1: *Hallucination and Error Rates for Incomplete vs. Complete Citations*

Model	Complete Citations	Hallucinations (Complete Citations)	Errors (Complete Citations)		Incomplete Citations	Hallucinations (Incomplete Citations)	Errors (Incomplete Citations)
GPT-3.5	415	116 (27.95%)	16 (3.86%)		85	64 (75.29%)	5 (5.88%)
GPT-4	452	8 (1.77%)	18 (3.98%)		48	19 (39.58%)	5 (10.42%)

Note: Numbers in parentheses reflect the percent of complete or incomplete citations that are hallucinations or errors.

Incomplete References by Model. Limiting data to the main 1,000 references where GPT claimed to be providing real references, GPT-3.5 gave almost twice as many incomplete references (17.0%, 95% CI [13.70, 20.30]) than GPT-4 (9.6%, 95% CI [7.01, 12.19]); OR = 1.93, 95% CI [1.32, 2.82], $z = 3.40$, $P = 0.001$. It should be noted that this effect was partly driven by GPT-4's more frequent acknowledgment that it did not know of references, since (as we'll discuss later) GPT-3.5 was more likely to provide incomplete references on narrow topics. While it would be strange to call these admissions of defeat "incomplete" citations, it would be equally strange to call them "complete." We therefore replicated the analysis above with these admissions of defeat excluded. In this version of the analysis, GPT-3.5 still gave more incomplete references (18.48%, 95% CI [14.92, 22.04]) than GPT-4 (12.31%, 95% CI [9.03, 15.58]), OR = 1.62, 95% CI [1.10, 2.37], $z = 2.45$, $P = 0.014$. Considering the exploratory nature of this analysis, and the fact that the second version was of more marginal statistical significance, this result should be treated with a degree of caution. Nevertheless, within our study, GPT-3.5 was more likely to give incomplete citations. Our analysis is agnostic as to the source of this difference. If it is replicable, this tendency may reflect an emergent property in GPT-4 or could result from retrieval augmented generation or reinforcement learning.

While the difference in rates of incomplete references, described above, was one likely source of GPT-3.5's higher hallucination rate, the difference between models on hallucination remains large and significant after controlling for rates of incomplete references. Specifically, a logistic regression revealed that both Incompleteness ($\beta = 2.52$, $SE = 0.246$, $z = 10.25$, $P < 0.001$) and GPT Version (3.5 vs. 4) ($\beta = 2.46$, $SE = 0.244$, $z = 10.08$, $P < 0.001$) independently and significantly predicted Hallucination; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.2743$. This pattern holds and is similarly strong when the analysis is replicated with admissions of defeat excluded. Here, again, both Incompleteness ($\beta = 2.33$, $SE = 0.245$, $z = 9.52$, $P < 0.001$) and GPT Version (3.5 vs. 4) ($\beta = 2.36$, $SE = 0.247$, $z = 9.56$, $P < 0.001$) independently and significantly predicted Hallucination; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.2516$.

Predicting Incomplete Responses. Beyond the importance of Incompleteness as a moderator, it is an interesting variable in its own right. For example, one might ask: under what circumstances did ChatGPT give complete versus incomplete references? A few observations are merited here. First, on this count, there were no differences in the prompts across chats. GPT was simply asked to "provide a citation." However, in some chats, GPT used an incomplete citation format. We specify "some chats" because this was generally done on the level of the conversation rather than the specific reference: Occasionally, a single reference in a group might be incomplete, but more frequently GPT's first citation in a chat was incomplete, and then all those that followed were typically incomplete as well. (See "GPT as Research Librarian Transcripts 20240220" on <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.)

Topic Breadth had an interesting, though inconsistent, relationship with ChatGPT's tendency to provide incomplete references. In examining this relationship, we excluded instances where the chatbot "admitted defeat" since, as argued earlier, it makes little sense to call a reference that was not provided at all "incomplete." For GPT-3.5, the relationship between Topic Broadness and Incompleteness was linear: As topics became broader, it was less likely to give incomplete references. Specifically, for GPT-3.5, logistic regression revealed that Topic Broadness significantly predicted the frequency of Incomplete citations ($\beta = -0.83$, $SE = 0.114$, $z = -7.26$, $P < 0.001$); $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1536$. Adding the squared term of Broadness to the model caused the linear term to lose significance, and did not substantially improve model fit, suggesting a linear model is superior. Specifically, the curvilinear model was as follows: Broadness ($\beta = 0.59$, $SE = 0.573$, $z = 1.03$, $P = 0.304$), Broadness Square ($\beta = -0.27$, $SE = 0.111$, $z = -2.44$, $P = 0.015$); $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1695$. For GPT-4, a different pattern arose. A logistic regression revealed that Topic Broadness ($\beta = 0.01$, $SE = 0.137$, $z = 0.11$, $P = 0.916$) did not significantly predict the frequency of Incomplete citations; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.0000$. However, adding the square term led to a clean and predictive model: Broadness ($\beta = 9.07$, $SE = 1.931$, $z = 4.70$, $P < 0.001$), Broadness Square ($\beta = -1.28$, $SE = .269$, $z = -4.77$, $P < 0.001$); $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1434$. For GPT-4, the relationship between Topic Broadness and Incomplete references appears to be curvilinear. These analyses, while statistically powerful, were highly exploratory, and so should be interpreted with caution. Table S2 shows what the observed effects look like in practice.

Table S2: Incomplete References by GPT Version and Topic Broadness

Topic Broadness	Total References (GPT-3.5)	Incomplete References (GPT-3.5)	Total References (GPT-4)	Incomplete References (GPT-4)
Broad	100	4 (4.00%)	100	2 (2.00%)
Somewhat Broad	100	0 (0.00%)	100	24 (24.00%)
Moderate	100	20 (20.00%)	100	20 (20.00%)
Somewhat Narrow	100	40 (40.00%)	85	2 (2.35%)
Narrow	60	21 (35.00%)	5	0 (0.00%)

Notes: Numbers exclude admissions of defeat. Numbers in parentheses reflect the percentage of Total References that were Incomplete.

Acknowledgment of Hallucination. These make use of all references (totaling 1,269) generated by ChatGPT. As mentioned in the main article, GPT-4 showed both lower rates of fabrication and greater likelihood of acknowledging these fabrications, relative to GPT-3.5. GPT-3.5 generated significantly more fictional references (39.05%, 95% CI [34.86, 43.23]) than GPT-4 (23.12%, 95% CI [20.08, 26.15]); OR = 2.13, 95% CI [1.67, 2.72], $z = 6.06$, $P < 0.001$. When GPT-4 generated fictional references, it noted so 84.30% of the time (95% CI 78.81, 89.79) compared to 12.20% (95% CI 7.68, 16.71) for GPT-3.5; OR = 38.67, 95% CI [21.51, 69.50], $z = 12.22$, $P < 0.001$. The same pattern did not arise to a statistically significant degree for errors, as seen in Table S3. Note that, analogous to acknowledged fabrications, here we are crediting ChatGPT for acknowledging errors if the error appeared in a chat where it more generally stated that references might be problematic (e.g. “fictional”).

Table S3: Acknowledgment of Fictional References and Errors

Model	Total References	Total Errors	Acknowledged Errors	Total Fictional References	Acknowledged Fictional References
GPT-3.5	525	21 (4.00%)	0 (0.00%)	205 (39.05%)	25 (12.20%)
GPT-4	744	26 (3.49%)	3 (11.54%)	172 (23.12%)	145 (84.30%)
Significance		$P = 0.639$	$P = 0.112$	$P < 0.001$	$P < 0.001$

Notes: The P-value for acknowledging errors is from linear regression since the zero acknowledged errors for GPT-3.5 disallow logistic regression. Other P-values are from logistic regression. For Total Errors and Fictional References, parenthetical numbers are their percentages of total articles. For Acknowledged Errors and Fictional References, parenthetical numbers are of Total Errors and Fictional References respectively.

Effects of Topic Broadness on Hallucination. We showed an effect that appeared to be curvilinear, whereby ChatGPT tended to hallucinate more as the research topics became narrower, but then hallucinated less on the narrowest topics. We also showed, however, that this downward trend at the narrowest level was driven by a greater tendency for ChatGPT to “admit defeat” as opposed to lower hallucination rates when providing actual articles. Here, we begin by providing further details of the analysis reported in the main manuscript, whereby when we collapse across GPT models, a logistic regression showing the linear effect of topic broadness on hallucination becomes stronger after excluding admissions of defeat. With admissions of defeat included in the analysis, the effect of topic broadness is significant but rather weak ($\beta = -0.191$, 95% CI [-0.301, -0.081], $z = -3.40$, $P = 0.001$; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.0115$). Once these admissions of defeat are excluded, this effect becomes stronger ($\beta = -0.555$, 95% CI [-0.691, -0.419], $z = -8.01$, $P < 0.001$; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.0750$).

Next, we report three logistic regressions with Hallucination as the dependent variable and the independent variables broadness and broadness-squared, to test the significance of the apparent curvilinear effects of topic broadness on

hallucination. Collapsing across versions of GPT, Broadness ($\beta = 1.175, SE = 0.300, z = 3.92, p < 0.001$) and Broadness-squared ($\beta = -0.236, SE = 0.051, z = -4.61, P < 0.001$) were both significant predictors; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.0338$. Limiting the analysis to GPT-3.5, the same curvilinear pattern emerges, with Broadness ($\beta = 0.957, SE = 0.357, z = 2.68, P = 0.007$) and Broadness-square ($\beta = -0.225, SE = 0.061, z = -3.67, P < 0.001$) as significant; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.0618$. Similarly, limiting the analysis to GPT-4, Broadness ($\beta = 9.526, SE = 2.664, z = 3.58, P < 0.001$) and Broadness-square ($\beta = -1.339, SE = 0.372, z = -3.60, P < 0.001$) are significant; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1772$.

These curvilinear effects become less apparent for ChatGPT as a whole, and for GPT-3.5 specifically (but not for GPT-4) once we remove those references credited as “Correct” because ChatGPT acknowledged its lack of knowledge of any relevant articles. Specifically, collapsing across versions of GPT but removing admissions of defeat, Broadness ($\beta = -0.623, SE = 0.348, z = -1.79, P = 0.074$) but not Broadness-square ($\beta = 0.011, SE = 0.056, z = 0.20, P = 0.843$) trends toward significance, with their directions reversed. (Note though, as described above, that once admissions of defeat are removed, a linear effect is however robust and has a stronger model fit.)

When conducting this regression using only data from GPT-3.5, neither Broadness ($\beta = -0.250, SE = 0.404, z = -0.62, P = 0.536$) nor Broadness-square ($\beta = -0.058, SE = 0.066, z = -0.88, P = 0.381$) is significant; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1019$. However, there is a robust effect ($\beta = -0.598, SE = 0.081, z = -7.37, P < 0.001$) of Broadness alone on Hallucination for GPT-3.5 once we exclude admissions of defeats; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1007$. After this exclusion, this simple linear effect thus appears to be the more appropriate analysis for GPT-3.5.

Curiously, this same pattern does not hold for GPT-4. Limiting the analysis to this model and to references that were not admissions of defeat, the effect of topic Broadness has no simple linear relationship with Hallucination ($\beta = 0.025, SE = 0.177, z = 0.14, P = 0.887; Pseudo-R^2 = 0.0001$). Instead, the curvilinear effect observed earlier remains for GPT-4, even after excluding admissions of defeat. Specifically, Broadness ($\beta = 9.238, SE = 2.702, z = 3.42, P = 0.001$) and Broadness-square ($\beta = -1.301, SE = 0.376, z = -3.46, P = 0.001$) are both significant; $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.1205$. Thus, if there is indeed an effect of topic broadness on GPT-4’s hallucination, it is curvilinear. This exploratory result should however be treated with caution. On one chat/topic (Implicit Attitudes and the Law), which was at the second highest broadness level, GPT-4 hallucinated significantly. This result may therefore be outlier-driven. However, it is also possible that GPT-4 indeed tended to first hallucinate more as topics narrowed, but then less as topics became very narrow. One speculative interpretation of this curvilinear effect is related to GPT-4’s evolving capacity to acknowledge fiction, which was reported in the main paper. Here, let us imagine that GPT has some representation of its inability to come up with relevant articles in the narrowest domains. It may thus become more likely to implement tactics that avoid hallucination, including acknowledging defeat and presenting articles on broader topics that, though not relevant, are also not hallucinations.

Table S4 displays what these patterns look like in practice.

Table S4: *Hallucination & Topic Broadness by GPT-Version, Excluding Admissions of Defeat*

Topic Broadness	GPT-3.5 References (Excluding Defeat Admissions)	GPT-3.5 Hallucinations	GPT-4 References (Excluding Defeat Admissions)	GPT-4 Hallucinations
Broad	100	20 (20%)	100	0 (0%)
Somewhat Broad	100	17 (17%)	100	17 (17%)
Moderate	100	44 (44%)	100	8 (8%)
Somewhat Narrow	100	64 (64%)	85	2 (2.4%)
Narrow	60	35 (58.3%)	5	0 (0.00%)

Notes: Numbers in parentheses reflect the percentages of references (excluding admissions of defeat) that are hallucinations.

Topic Broadness and Reference Relevance. In the main manuscript, we reported that GPT-4 was, overall, more likely than GPT-3.5 to pull relevant references, but that this effect was primarily driven by GPT-4’s lower hallucination rate. We begin by reporting these analyses in more detail. We examined this question series of logistic regressions. When including all 1,000 articles from our main data, GPT-4 was more likely to pull relevant articles (50.80%, 95% CI

[46.40, 55.20]) compared to GPT-3.5 (30.80%, 95% CI [26.74, 34.86]), with logistic regression indicating a significant difference; OR = 2.32, 95% CI [1.79, 3.00], $z = 6.38$, $P < 0.001$. Conversely, when limiting the analysis only to articles labeled as “real,” the difference in identifying relevant articles between GPT-4 (53.70%, 95% CI [49.19, 58.21] and GPT-3.5 (48.13%, 95% CI [42.62, 53.63]) lost significance; OR = 1.25, 95% CI [0.94, 1.66], $z = 1.54$, $P = 0.124$.

This suggests, as noted in the main article, that GPT-4 discovered more real articles than 3.5 more generally, and therefore was also more likely to discover relevant articles. Beyond this, however, it did not tailor article recommendations better to specific topics. However, when we exploratorily examine this by topic breadth, the data tell a more nuanced story. By design, the Research Librarian task was somewhat easy at the highest broadness level: There were many influential papers, likely familiar to GPT, that met our criteria. On the other extreme, the narrowest subject areas were intentionally difficult. For example, few articles use the Implicit Association Test to predict dental outcomes, and they may justifiably be absent in GPT’s training data. The areas between these extremes – neither designed to be too easy nor too difficult – were thus of greater interest.

When limiting the analysis to non-hallucinations, GPT-4 shows relative improvement in finding relevant articles on Somewhat Broad and Moderate topics, with GPT-3.5’s success at generating relevant references dropping off more sharply as topics become narrower. As shown in Table S5, and reported in the main article, the difference between GPT-4 and GPT-3.5 on this count is significant for topics of moderate broadness, but not for topics at other broadness levels once correcting for multiple comparisons. (Since we are running 5 exploratory analyses here, a Bonferroni correction dictates that our significance level should be $P < 0.01$.)

Table S5: Hallucination & Topic Broadness by GPT-Version, Excluding Admissions of Defeat

Broadness	GPT-3.5 Proportion of Non-Hallucinations marked Relevant	GPT-4 Proportion of Non-Hallucinations marked Relevant	Odds Ratio	<i>P</i> -value
Broad	75/80 (93.8%)	99/100 (99.0%)	6.60	0.088
Somewhat Broad	44/83 (53.0%)	55/83 (66.3%)	1.74	0.083
Moderate	18/56 (32.1%)	69/92 (75.0%)	6.33	< 0.001
Somewhat Narrow	14/36 (38.9%)	31/98 (31.6%)	0.73	0.431
Narrow	3/65 (4.62%)	0/100 (0.0%)	0	0.03

Note: The *P*-value for Narrow topics is drawn from linear regression since GPT-4’s 0% disallows logistic regression. All other *P*-values are drawn from logistic regressions.

We also use logistic regression analysis to examine the significance of the difference in the curvilinear effect by GPT-Version. Because this analysis was exploratory, we ran the relevant regression analysis several ways as a robustness check. The first analysis begins by excluding hallucinations, since (as described above) not doing so tends to overestimate GPT-4’s improvement in generating relevant articles. It captures a 3-way interaction, using logistic regression with Relevant (vs. Not Relevant) as the dependent variable, and 5 independent variables: GPT Version (4 vs. 3.5), Broadness, Broadness-square, GPT Version x Broadness, GPT Version x Broadness-square. The independent variables of particular interest here are GPT Version x Broadness and GPT Version x Broadness-square, since their significance indicates a different curvilinear relationship dependent on the version of GPT, in this case the fact that GPT-3.5’s success (relative to GPT-4’s) at locating relevant articles drops off more quickly as categories narrow. These coefficients are robustly significant. Specifically, the model is as follows: GPT Version ($\beta = -3.590$, $SE = 1.197$, $z = -3.00$, $P = 0.003$), Broadness ($\beta = -0.010$, $SE = 0.556$, $z = -0.02$, $P = 0.985$), Broadness-square ($\beta = 0.177$, $SE = 0.091$, $z = 1.95$, $P = 0.051$), GPT Version x Broadness ($\beta = 2.947$, $SE = 0.824$, $z = 3.58$, $P < 0.001$), and GPT Version x Broadness-square ($\beta = -0.430$, $SE = 0.131$, $z = -3.27$, $P = 0.001$); *Pseudo-R*² = 0.3631. Next, instead of removing hallucinations we statistically controlled for them by adding them as a sixth independent variable in the regression. Though logistic regression is statistically preferable given the dichotomous variable, the perfect alignment between hallucination and irrelevance disallows this analysis, and so this was run as a regular linear regression. The critical interaction terms once again achieved robust significance in this regression. Specifically, the model is as follows: GPT Version ($\beta = -0.585$, $SE = 0.108$, $t(993) = -5.41$, $P < 0.001$), Broadness ($\beta = -0.015$, $SE = 0.058$, $t(993) = -0.26$, $P = 0.794$), Broadness-square ($\beta = 0.026$, $SE = 0.010$, $t(993) = 2.72$, $P = 0.007$), GPT Version x Broadness ($\beta = 0.420$, $SE = 0.082$, $t(993) = 5.15$, $P < 0.001$),

and GPT Version x Broadness-square ($\beta = -0.055, SE = 0.013, t(993) = -4.15, P < 0.001$), Hallucination vs. not ($\beta = -0.435, SE = 0.031, t(993) = -14.12, P < 0.001$); $R^2 = 0.4871$. Third, we ran the initial logistic regression but added Incomplete (vs. complete) as a further independent variable. Again, the relevant interaction terms were robustly significant. Specifically, the model is as follows: GPT Version ($\beta = -3.446, SE = 1.214, z = -2.84, P = 0.005$), Broadness ($\beta = 0.013, SE = 0.558, z = 0.02, P = 0.982$), Broadness-square ($\beta = 0.175, SE = 0.091, z = 1.92, P = 0.055$), GPT Version x Broadness ($\beta = 2.854, SE = 0.834, z = 3.42, P = 0.001$), GPT Version x Broadness-square ($\beta = -0.417, SE = 0.133, z = -3.15, P = 0.002$), and Incomplete ($\beta = 0.256, SE = 0.379, z = 0.67, P = 0.500$); $Pseudo-R^2 = 0.3635$. Fourth, we ran a second linear regression with the same additional IV (Incomplete vs. Complete). Again, the relevant terms were highly significant. Specifically, the model was: GPT Version ($\beta = -0.574, SE = 0.109, t(992) = -5.27, P < 0.001$), Broadness ($\beta = -0.015, SE = 0.058, t(992) = -0.26, P = 0.794$), Broadness-square ($\beta = 0.026, SE = 0.010, t(992) = 2.74, P = 0.006$), GPT Version x Broadness ($\beta = 0.414, SE = 0.082, t(992) = 5.04, P < 0.001$), GPT Version x Broadness-square ($\beta = -0.055, SE = 0.013, t(992) = -4.07, P < 0.001$), Hallucination vs. not ($\beta = -0.444, SE = 0.033, t(992) = -13.49, P < 0.001$), and Incomplete ($\beta = 0.028, SE = 0.037, t(992) = 0.75, P = 0.456$); $R^2 = 0.4874$. We thus find that independent of modeling choices, the curvilinear interaction is highly significant: GPT-3.5 drops off more quickly than GPT-4 in terms of finding relevant articles as the topics narrow.

Relevant Citation Counts. In the main article, we reported that focusing only on relevant articles, GPT-4's selections did not have higher citation counts than those of GPT-3.5. Here, we begin by reporting the overall effects in greater detail. As noted in the main article, the two GPT models performed similarly here, with GPT-4's articles averaging 2,936.7 (95% CI [2128.3, 3745.1]) citations compared to 3,105.2 (95% CI [2205.5, 4005.0]) for GPT-3.5; $t(406) = 0.2653, P = 0.7909, d = 0.027$. It is possible, however, that a significant effect on this count was disguised by other factors. We reported, for example, that GPT-4 generated more relevant citations for somewhat broad and moderate topics. By pulling relevant articles in narrower domains, GPT-4 might be limited to less influential articles. In short, once we controlled for topic broadness, GPT-4 might have selected articles with higher citation counts. However, a regression analysis ruled out this possibility. Specifically, we limited our analysis to articles marked relevant and ran a simple linear regression with citation count as the dependent variable and GPT-4 (vs. GPT-3.5) and Topic Broadness as independent variables. While topic broadness was associated with higher citation count, the coefficient for GPT-version remained statistically insignificant in this model. Specifically, the model was: GPT Version ($\beta = 218.38, SE = 618.63, t(405) = 0.35, P = 0.724$), Broadness ($\beta = 1512.33, SE = 280.10, t(405) = 5.40, P < 0.001$); $R^2 = 0.0673$.

Relatedly, GPT-4 might have proved superior at finding references that were important but also more recent. Such references would however have had less time to gather citations. To test for this possibility, we coded the year for the articles. We first ran a simple regression with article Year as the dependent variable and GPT-Version (4 vs. 3.5) as an independent variable, again limiting the analysis to only articles coded as "Relevant." This yielded a modest but significant effect, the model being: GPT Version ($\beta = 1.850, SE = 0.821, t(406) = 2.25, P = 0.025$); $R^2 = 0.0124$. This result suggests that GPT-4 pulled more recent articles than GPT-3.5. However, this result should be treated with caution for several reasons. First, the analysis was exploratory. Second, the effect was small. Third and most importantly, the effect disappears once we control for topic broadness. Adding this as an additional IV yields the model: GPT Version ($\beta = 1.059, SE = 0.755, t(405) = 1.40, P = 0.161$), Broadness ($\beta = -3.091, SE = 0.342, t(405) = -9.05, P < 0.001$); $R^2 = 0.1784$. It appears that if GPT-4 indeed pulled slightly more current articles, this pattern was related to its tendency to better generate relevant references on narrower topics.

While not confident in the result that GPT-4 pulled more recent articles, we nevertheless ran a set of regressions to confirm that article aging was not disguising an effect of GPT-version on Citation Count. Toward this end, we ran two regression analyses. Again, limiting the analysis to articles coded as "Relevant," we first ran a regression with Citation Count as the dependent variable, and GPT-Version (4 versus 3.5) and article Year as independent variables. This again yielded an insignificant effect of GPT-Version on Citation Count, the model being: GPT Version ($\beta = 737.23, SE = 495.87, t(405) = 1.49, P = 0.138$), Article Year ($\beta = -489.66, SE = 29.80, t(405) = -16.43, P < 0.001$); $R^2 = 0.4001$. Second, we ran a version of the regression that included both Topic Broadness and Year as covariates alongside GPT-Version. Once again, we see no significant partial effect of GPT-Version on article Citation Count. Specifically, the model was: GPT Version ($\beta = 737.03, SE = 497.96, t(404) = 1.48, P = 0.140$), Broadness ($\beta = -1.26, SE = 246.60, t(404) = -0.01, P = 0.996$), Article Year ($\beta = -489.73, SE = 32.71, t(404) = -14.97, P < 0.001$); $R^2 = 0.4001$.

Section S3: GPT as Research Ethicist – Detailed Methods

Full Research Design. In Study 2, we presented GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 with fictional vignettes describing flawed research protocols, posing as scientists looking for feedback on their work. These vignettes were very loosely based on real research projects that have proven difficult to replicate. For each, we described a series of plausible but non-obvious

studies, but purposefully inserted evidence of 4 statistically unsound and ethically questionable practices. Three of these vignettes contained poor practices that were blatant. The researchers openly described a litany of scientific sins, such as examining data for statistical significance before deciding whether to continue collection, making post-hoc data exclusions that drew out significant effects, framing exploratory findings as if predicted in advance, and running many exploratory analyses but presenting only significant results without correcting for multiple comparisons.

Three further vignettes presented similar fictional protocols but indicated these problematic decisions more subtly. For example, the first matched pair of vignettes described a protocol to test for “emotional clairvoyance” (emotional contagion from interactions out of participants’ earshot). In the blatant version of this vignette, the researchers say, “after just 30 participants in each condition, effects already reached statistical significance ($p < .05$), so we stopped data collection...” In the subtler version of this vignette, the researchers “collected 50 participants in each condition, at which point statistical analysis indicated that our results reached statistical significance ($p < .05$).” They do not directly mention using this test to decide whether to collect more subjects, but later state that “In the second study, we were worried we wouldn’t always see such a large effect size, so we decided to collect data from 150 participants.” Though there is nothing intrinsically wrong with collecting a larger sample in one study versus another, one familiar with problems of p-hacking might reasonably be suspicious. If they weren’t stopping and starting collection, why was this decision made?

The purpose of this variation between blatant and subtle vignettes was to test, 1) whether GPT showed awareness of the clear methodological problems described in the blatant vignettes, and 2) whether it would be able to read between the lines and recognize violations in more realistically described research. In effect, the subtle vignettes were more ecologically valid descriptions, designed to better resemble how a real-world researcher might represent flawed research.

Each of our 6 vignettes was presented 36 times (18 times each to GPT-3.5 and GPT-4). As detailed later, we exploratorily varied the initial prompt we used to request ChatGPT’s feedback on these protocols. In addition, we ran a secondary study (described later) where ChatGPT responded to versions of two of these vignettes that contrastingly described pristine ethics and statistical practices.

For each vignette in the main study, a rubric was created, containing 10 points we wanted to see GPT highlight in each chat. Four of the ten points were for recognizing problematic research practices. For each of these four, a second point could be received by suggesting a practice that remedied the problem. GPT might receive these “solution points” for a sufficiently strong statement of the problem. For example, GPT might generate a response like “You have started and stopped collection part way through to test for significance. This is a form of p-hacking and should not be done since it inflates the likelihood of false positive results.” The solution in this case is intrinsic to the statement of the problem: Do not do this. This line would therefore receive points for both the statement of the problem and the solution. On the other hand, if GPT said something like “You should decide your sample size in advance based on a power analysis,” this would receive credit for proposing a solution, but in the absence of further statements would not receive credit for pointing out the problem. In addition to these 8 possible points, GPT was credited if it suggested 1. Pre-registration or other firm pre-research decisions, and 2. Replication.

Detail on vignettes and their coding. The full vignettes and the rubrics used to code them may be found in the document “GPT as Research Ethicist Materials 20240227” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>. Each vignette was written by the authors and designed to contain evidence (blatant or subtle) of 4 substandard and ethically questionable research practices. The first matched pair of vignettes contained descriptions of research on “Emotional Clairvoyance,” in which participants supposedly experienced emotional contagion from interactions that took place out of earshot. The second set of vignettes described studies of “Atmospheric Cognition,” in which subtle characteristics of the space one is in impact mental states and behaviors. The third set of vignettes described an econometrical study, using data from a large dating site to demonstrate that more extroverted individuals are perceived as less attractive. Table S6 displays a list of the problematic practices found in these vignettes, and how they varied between the Blatant and Subtle Versions.

Table S6. Details of ethical/methodological violations described in vignettes

	Blatant Version	Subtle Version
Vignette 1a & 1b: Emotional Clairvoyance		
Issue 1: Stopping & Starting Data Collection to Test Significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested for significance and then stopped collection after 30 subjects. • Later, collected additional subjects when significance was not initially reached. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collected notably different sample sizes in different studies. • In final study, indicated “we decided to collect additional data,” with ambiguity around whether significance testing played a role.
Issue 2: Testing Several Moderators w/o Correction Multiple Comparisons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested the Big 5 personality traits as moderators, without mentioning correction for multiple comparisons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested the Big 5 personality traits as moderators, without mentioning correction for multiple comparisons.
Issue 3: Hypothesizing After Results are Known (HARKing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Says moderator from exploratory analysis makes intuitive sense and will be reported as what they were testing at the outset. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Says moderator from exploratory analysis makes intuitive sense but does not indicate whether or not it will be framed as exploratory.
Issue 4: Selective Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attains null results in two studies with slightly different conditions. Indicates they will not publish them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attains null results in one study with slightly different conditions. Indicates uncertainty about the study, and that they may “focus” on the other conditions.
Vignette 2a & 2b: Atmospheric Cognition		
Issue 1: Suppressing Unsuccessful Pilot Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Says they piloted “a bunch of versions” with initially mixed results. • In the main version, piloted a couple of versions that were too subtle, which they therefore “ignored.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Says they initially piloted a “few versions” with initially mixed results. Whether they will share these mixed results is left ambiguous.
Issue 2: Post-hoc Exclusion of Participants to Achieve Significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Said they removed math majors who “skewed the results,” only after which results achieved significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Said they noticed and removed math majors who had an advantage and were “unevenly assigned” and that results were significant.
Issue 3: Adding Further Subjects When Significant Results are Not Attained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Openly said that when they didn’t see an effect after 100 participants in Study 3, they added 50 more to reach significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Said they realized they would need more subjects in Study 3, and so collected 50 more. Does not directly indicate they tested significance.

Issue 4: Reporting Marginal Results as if They Reached Significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Said they achieved a significance level of $p=.052$, “which rounds down to .05”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Said they achieved a significance level of $p=.052$, “which is so close to the $p=.05$ threshold as to be statistically significant for most... purposes.”
Vignette 3a & 3b: Bad Econometrics		
Issue 1: Suppressing Outcome Variables That Yielded Null Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because two alternative DVs didn’t yield significant results, they “ignored these” and feel they can be “omitted from the report.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since two alternative DVs didn’t yield significant results, they were “downplayed,” and the report will “focus” on the third.
Issue 2: Excluding Parts of Data that Did Not Yield Significant Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exploratorily limited analyses to people under 60 and who live in specific regions, because this yielded stronger results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exploratorily limited analyses to people under 60, the primary demographic of the website, which made results stronger.
Issue 3: Cycling Through Covariates to Attain Results, w/o Corrections for Multiple Comparisons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicated that they had the “Big 5 and dozens of subtler measures,” and later “examined various potential covariates” to find significant model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicated that they had the “Big 5 and subtler measures,” and later that they “examined potential covariates.”
Issue 4: Violating Assumptions Around Multicollinearity & Overfitting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes two variables with a high likelihood of multicollinearity (Shyness, Self-Confidence) in model to show significant effect of Extroversion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes one variable with potential for multicollinearity (Assertiveness) in model to show significant effect of Extroversion.

The same rubrics were used for scoring the Blatant and Subtle versions of these vignettes. These rubrics were as follows, with GPT given a point by the coders for each affirmative answer.

Coding Rubrics for Scientific Ethicist Study. Below are the full rubrics used to code responses to the Scientific Ethicist vignettes.

Rubric for Vignettes 1a & 1b:

1. Did it draw attention to the issue of making decisions about data collection (stopping/starting) by examining data part-way through collection?
2. Did it provide advice (e.g. power analysis, sticking to a pre-decided sample size, not testing part-way through collection) that mitigates the issues around stopping/starting data collection based on data examination during collection?
3. Did it draw attention to the issue of testing different potential variables/moderators, creating problems of multiple comparisons or increasing potential for type 1 errors?
4. Did it provide advice (e.g. corrections for multiple comparisons, deciding hypothesized moderators in advance) that mitigates the issues around multiple comparisons?
5. Did it draw attention to the issue of HARKing or otherwise ignoring the exploratory nature of certain findings?
6. Did it provide advice (e.g. clear delineation of exploratory analyses, pre-registering hypotheses) that mitigates the problem of HARKing?
7. Did it draw attention to the problem of suppressing null results in reporting?

8. Did it provide advice (e.g. reporting all results) that mitigates the issue of suppressing null results?
9. Did it suggest further replication of results?
10. Did it suggest pre-registration or other forms of commitment to pre-decided methodological strategies?

Rubric for Vignettes 2a & 2b:

1. Did it draw attention to the issue of ignoring or suppressing pilot studies?
2. Did it provide advice (e.g. discussing pilot research, publishing all results) that mitigates the issue of ignoring or suppressing pilot studies?
3. Did it draw attention to the issue of making inappropriate post hoc exclusions of participants?
4. Did it provide advice (e.g. not making exclusions, deciding exclusions in advance) that mitigates the issue of inappropriate post hoc exclusions?
5. Did it draw attention to the issue of adding further subjects to studies when statistically significant results are not initially attained?
6. Did it provide advice (e.g. power analysis, sticking to pre-decided sample, not testing part-way through collection) that mitigates the issue of adding subjects to a study when not seeing significant results?
7. Did it draw attention to the issue of reporting marginal results as if they'd met thresholds for significance?
8. Did it provide advice (e.g. reporting exact p-values, not rounding down) that mitigates the issue of reporting marginal results as if they were significant?
9. Did it suggest further replication of results?
10. Did it suggest pre-registration or other forms of commitment to pre-decided methodological strategies?

Rubric for Vignettes 3a & 3b:

1. Did it draw attention to the issue of ignoring or suppressing outcome variables that didn't lead to favorable results?
2. Did it provide advice (e.g. reporting on all possible outcome variables) that mitigates the issue of ignoring or suppressing unfavorable outcome variables?
3. Did it draw attention to the issue of excluding chunks of data that did not fit results?
4. Did it provide advice (e.g. including all data, deciding exclusions a-priori and/or clearly reporting and defending exploratory exclusions) that mitigates the issue of inappropriately excluding data?
5. Did it draw attention to the issue of cycling through many potential covariates until finding ones that yielded desirable results?
6. Did it provide advice (e.g. corrections for multiple comparisons, hypothesizing covariates in advance) that mitigates the issue of examining many potential covariates?
7. Did it draw attention to the issue of potentially violating statistical assumptions (e.g. issues around overfitting, multicollinearity)?
8. Did it provide advice (e.g. split samples, checks for multicollinearity) that mitigates issues around potentially violating statistical assumptions?
9. Did it suggest replications of results in other data or contexts and/or urge caution about result generalizability?
10. Did it suggest pre-registration or other forms of commitment to pre-decided methodological strategies?

Coding of Vignettes. Responses to the vignettes were blinded by prompt condition. Where possible, content that would make the initial prompt obvious (but was otherwise irrelevant) was removed. Coders were also blinded to whether responses were given by GPT-3.5 or GPT-4, as well as to whether each chat was in response to a blatant or subtle version of the vignette. GPT's responses were placed in groups coinciding with the topic of the vignette but were otherwise presented in a randomized order.

Two coders independently rated each GPT response on each of the 10 points from the relevant rubric. Points of disagreement were discussed. Following discussion, responses were averaged, with GPT receiving partial credit in

cases where one but not the other coder felt a point was merited. Inter-rater coding achieved a high degree of reliability, with a Cronbach alpha of $\alpha = 0.9827$. Of 2,160 possible points GPT could receive, the two coders disagreed on 34 (1.57%).

One coder was an author, and the other was a Research Assistant who was kept blind to the full purpose of the research until after completion. Responses were first coded independently by each coder. Points of disagreement were then discussed, with the coder who was not an author encouraged to lead discussions to minimize pressure to conform to the author's decision. Though the rubrics were decided in advance, certain points needed to be clarified early in the coding. Specifically, after discussing a few instances of question 10 (pre-registration or other firm methodological commitments), the coders made the decision that credit would be given for either recommending preregistration or making at least two other recommendations around committing to decisions in advance. This was to prevent GPT from too easily receiving credit for the same point multiple times. For example, recommending a power analysis to decide on sample size in advance received credit for q2 in Vignettes 1a-b. To also receive credit for q10, GPT would need to make a second point around deciding methodologies in advance. For q7 in Vignettes 3a-b, two decisions were made. First GPT was credited for suggesting that the vignette's interpretation of their effects might be flawed due to complicated relationships (e.g. mediating roles) between the two variables, since this point was conceptually very similar to the one we wished it to make: The fundamental problem was the complex and likely strong relationships between the different independent variables. On the other hand, GPT was not credited on this question for answers highlighting statistical assumptions that were not clearly violated (e.g. homoskedasticity, linearity), as such observations seemed generic and did not acknowledge the fundamental problem (overfitting, multicollinearity) in the regression analysis.

Variation in Initial Prompts. As discussed in the main text, we varied the initial prompt used when initiating each chat with GPT, to test whether this would impact GPT's performance on reviewing the vignettes. In this section, we provide more detail around these initial prompts. Complete prompt stimuli may be found in the document "GPT as Research Ethicist Materials 20240227" at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

1. Level of Feedback. Three basic requests varied in the level of requested feedback, from simply asking for "feedback" to requesting GPT "give a detailed response and be as critical as possible about any flaws you notice." The goal was to ascertain GPT might give a more rigorous response when asked directly for more critical feedback.
2. Theory Protectiveness. In these prompts, we indicated that we either are or are not "deeply invested" in our theory. The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would be "kinder" and thus less critical when we indicated deep commitment to the theory.
3. Researcher Status: In one version, we pretended to be a novice researcher running our first project. In the other, we claimed to be an award-winning researcher with a tenured chair at an elite university. The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would provide less critical feedback to a researcher who was presented as higher status and thus potentially more knowledgeable.
4. Pro- and Anti-Open Science. In one version, we claimed to believe deeply in open science practices. In the second we prefaced our request with an argument that the movement against "p-hacking" is overblown and slows down the march of science. The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would give stronger feedback following a pro-open science argument.
5. Conciseness. In one version, we asked for a very concise response. In the other, we asked GPT to disregard length limitations and write as long a response as possible. The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would be less successful in its feedback when asked to be more concise.
6. Rejection Sensitivity. In one version, we claimed to be very sensitive to criticism. In the second, we asked GPT not to worry about being kind in its responses. The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would be gentler (and thus less critical) when the person to whom it is speaking appears to have difficulty taking criticism.
7. Jailbreaking version 1. In one version, we asked GPT to "carefully consider issues around p-hacking and open science." In a second version (7a), we asked it to "pretend to be a person who is not at all concerned with issues like p-hacking and open science." In a third (7b), we asked it to "not include any mentions of p-hacking in your feedback." The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would give less ethical feedback when directly instructed to do so.
8. Jailbreaking version 2. In one version, we asked GPT to impersonate Uri Simonsohn, a well-known advocate of open science and replicable statistical practices. In a second, we asked it to impersonate Diederik Stapel, an infamous p-hacker and data fabricator, who has, at the time of writing, had 58 articles retracted according to retractionwatch.com. The goal was to ascertain whether GPT would give less ethical feedback when asked to impersonate an individual known for poor ethical conduct compared to one known for strong ethical conduct.

Each of these effectively contained a “Good Performance Prompt”, hypothesized to elicit a more rigorous response from GPT, and a “Bad Performance Prompt”, designed to elicit a less rigorous response. For example, it was possible that GPT would be more likely to call out p-hacking when our initial request was prefaced by a pro- (relative to an anti-) open science argument. In separate chats, we presented GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 with each of these 18 initial prompts, followed by each of our 6 vignettes. We thus received and coded a total of 216 responses, each of which was judged on our 10-point rubric. Full transcripts of GPT’s responses to our vignettes may be found in the document “GPT as Research Ethicist Transcripts 20240220” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Section S4: GPT as Research Ethicist – Supporting Analyses

More Detailed Overall Results. In the Blatant condition, GPT-4 achieved a mean score of 8.86 out of a possible 10 points (95% CI 8.55, 9.18), while GPT-3.5 averaged 5.39 (95% CI [4.79, 5.98]). This difference was significant and large, $t(106) = -10.3511$, $P < 0.0001$, $d = 1.992$. Similarly, in the Subtle condition, GPT-4 averaged 7.26 points (95% CI [6.72, 7.80]) compared to GPT-3.5’s 4.05 (95% CI [3.47, 4.62]); $t(106) = -8.1619$, $P < 0.0001$, $d = 1.571$.

GPT-4 scored higher on blatant relative to subtle vignettes ($t(106) = 5.1297$, $P < 0.0001$, $d = 0.987$), as did GPT-3.5 ($t(106) = 3.2565$, $P = 0.0015$, $d = 0.627$). Finally, GPT-4 received more points in response to subtle vignettes than GPT-3.5 did in response to blatant ones ($t(106) = -4.6618$, $P < 0.0001$, $d = 0.897$).

Detailed Analysis of Initial Prompts. The variation of initial prompts was exploratory. Furthermore, since each separate prompt was used only 12 times, and we analyzed data on the level of the chat, statistical power for individual prompts was low. This analysis was therefore designed to pick up only large effects: Does GPT do much better after certain prompts than after others? We completed 12 exploratory analyses. We conservatively used a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons, and so our threshold for statistical significance was $P < 0.004167$.

We began by examining each matched pair of prompts (e.g. Low versus High Researcher Status, or Pro- versus Anti-Open Science). As seen in Table S7, most of these basic comparisons did not approach statistical significance. As noted also in the main article, one comparison was a tentative exception: Requesting GPT to “carefully consider issues around p-hacking and open science” ($M = 8.38$, 95% CI [7.64, 9.11]) elicited a stronger response than requesting that it “not include any mentions of p-hacking” ($M = 6.08$, 95% CI [4.43, 7.74]); $t(22) = -2.7912$, $P = 0.0106$, $d = 1.140$. However, this result should be treated with caution considering 1) the small sample size, and 2) that it did not meet the more stringent significance threshold dictated by the Bonferroni correction. No paired comparison reached statistical significance after adjusting for multiple comparisons.

Though individual pairs of prompts did not elicit statistically distinct responses, we conducted three more analyses that aggregated groups of responses in meaningful ways. First, we asked whether the three “jailbreaking” prompts, in which we specifically asked GPT to act in an unethical manner (Pretend not to be concerned with p-hacking; Do not mention p-hacking; Impersonate a known data fabricator) elicited weaker responses than their “Anti-jailbreak” control prompts (Carefully consider issues around p-hacking and open science; Impersonate an ethicist). While the two “Anti-Jailbreaking” responses elicited descriptively stronger responses ($M = 8.13$, 95% CI [7.43, 8.82]) than the three “Jailbreaking” responses ($M = 6.88$, 95% CI [6.07, 7.68]), the difference did not reach significance after controlling for multiple comparisons; $t(58) = -2.2326$, $P = 0.0295$, $d = 0.588$.

Second, we noticed that regardless of how we asked GPT to behave, responses looked descriptively stronger across prompts where we in any way evoked data ethics. For example, notice in Table S7 that the 12 chats where we asked GPT to impersonate a known data fabricator – designed as a jailbreaking prompt to elicit an unethical response – actually yielded responses that were descriptively higher-quality than most. Accordingly, we collapsed responses across all prompts that in any fashion evoked data ethics (Pro- vs. Anti-Open Science; Concerned vs. Not Concerned with p-hacking; Don’t mention p-hacking; data ethicist vs. data fabricator), comparing these to all the remaining prompts, which contained no mentions of p-hacking or open science. Here, we found a statistically robust difference. GPT provided higher-quality responses after prompts that evoked data ethics ($M = 7.35$, 95% CI [6.89, 7.81]) than after prompts that did not ($M = 5.78$, 95% CI [5.30, 6.25]); $t(214) = -4.4761$, $P < 0.0001$; $d = 0.625$.

Considering the last result, we decided to conduct one more exploratory comparison as a robustness check. We asked whether the effect of evoking data ethics was sufficiently powerful that it would survive even when we limited initial prompts to those in which the context involved us specifically encouraging GPT to behave badly. In other words, would GPT perform better following the 4 prompts where we cast data ethics in a negative light (Anti-open Science argument; Pretend not to be concerned with p-hacking; Don’t mention p-hacking; Impersonate known Data Fabricator) compared to those that did not evoke data ethics at all? Indeed, GPT’s responses were higher-quality following prompts that cast a negative light on research ethics ($M = 6.93$, 95% [6.28, 7.58]) compared to those that did not evoke research ethics ($M = 5.78$, 95% CI [5.30, 6.25]); $t(178) = -2.6078$, $P = 0.0099$, $d = 0.440$. While this result did not survive a Bonferroni

correction, we argue that it is nevertheless meaningful. The effect is in the opposite direction from one we might have predicted a-priori, and this comparison was selected specifically as a tougher test of the effect of priming data ethics. At the least, it seems likely that the positive effect of evoking data ethics is a real one, since we see a strongly trending effect even when this prime is placed within a context of attempting to jailbreak GPT to elicit a poor response.

Table S7: Response Quality by Initial Prompt

Comparison	Mean (out of 10): Following Good Performance Prompt	Mean (out of 10): Following Bad Performance Prompt	Statistical Significance of Difference
<i>Variation of Level of Feedback Requested</i>			
High vs. Low/Basic Feedback Request	6.42	5.90	$P = 0.6055$
Low vs. High Conciseness	5.63	6.29	$P = 0.5609$
<i>Manipulations of Perceived Researcher Characteristics</i>			
Low vs. High Theory Protectiveness	5.54	5.50	$P = 0.9744$
Low vs. High Researcher Status	5.33	5.75	$P = 0.7285$
Low vs. High Rejection Sensitivity	5.75	5.54	$P = 0.8347$
<i>Encouragement of More or Less Ethical Responses</i>			
Pro- vs. Anti-Open Science	7.50	7.08	$P = 0.6187$
Concerned w/ p-hacking vs. Not Concerned	8.38	7.08	$P = 0.0845$
Concerned w/ p-hacking vs. Don't Mention	8.38	6.08	$P = 0.0106$
Ethicist vs. Data Fabricator	7.88	7.46	$P = 0.6470$

Notes: The first category listed in the Comparison column was hypothesized as the “Good Performance Prompt” in each pair.

Non-Parametric Tests. More typical analyses (using means, t-tests, Cohen’s d, etc.) may be easier for many researchers to understand and interpret. However, the data from GPT-4 in Study 2 violated assumptions of normal distribution, with most responses skewed towards the higher end of our rubrics. To account for this and corroborate our findings, we report non-parametric analyses (Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Tests) and median averages, as an additional statistical treatment of these data. The effect sizes reported below are rank-biserial correlations based on these tests. The Wilcoxon Rank-Sum tests were run in Stata, and the correlations based on them were calculated in Excel.

We first examine the relative success of GPT-4 vs. GPT-3.5 in identifying and correcting ethical/statistical violations. For the Blatant vignettes, a Wilcoxon Rank-Sum test revealed statistically significant differences between GPT-4 (Median = 9) and GPT-3.5 (Median = 5), $z = 7.363$, $P < 0.001$, with a large effect size ($r = 0.709$). For Subtle Vignettes, as well, GPT-4 (Median = 8) outscored GPT-3.5 (Median = 4); $z = 6.522$, $P < 0.001$, $r = 0.628$. GPT-4 scored higher in responses to Blatant (Median = 9) vs. Subtle (Median = 8) vignettes; $z = 4.949$, $P < 0.001$, $r = 0.476$. GPT-3.5 also scored higher in response to Blatant (Median = 5) vs. Subtle (Median = 4) vignettes; $z = 3.152$, $P = 0.002$, $r = 0.303$. Finally, GPT-4 scored higher on Subtle vignettes (Median = 8) compared to GPT-3.5 on Blatant vignettes (Median = 5), indicating the high degree of GPT-4’s superiority on this task; $z = 4.484$, $P < 0.001$, $r = 0.431$.

We also conducted Wilcoxon Rank-Sum tests to explore the effects of different initial Positive vs. Negative performance prompts, as shown in Table S8. As with the analyses reported in the main text, these were exploratory and thus should undergo corrections for multiple comparisons. A conservative Bonferroni correction dictates that our significance threshold should be $P < 0.004167$. Therefore, none of the 9 contrasts in Table S8 reaches significance after this correction. The one strong trend (better performance when asked to review the vignettes as one concerned about p-hacking, versus asked not to mention p-hacking in the response) may indicate a jailbreaking effect but should be interpreted with significant caution considering the small sample size and lack of significance after correction for multiple comparisons.

Table S8: *Effects of Initial Prompts, Wilcoxon Rank-Sum tests*

Comparison	Median (out of 10): Following Good Performance Prompt	Median (out of 10): Following Bad Performance Prompt	Correlation	Statistical Significance of Difference
<i>Variation of Level of Feedback Requested</i>				
High vs. Low/Basic Feedback Request	6	5.5	$r = 0.062$	$P = 0.711$
Low vs. High Conciseness	6.5	6.25	$r = -0.136$	$P = 0.505$
<i>Manipulations of Perceived Researcher Characteristics</i>				
Low vs. High Theory Protectiveness	6	5	$r = 0.018$	$P = 0.931$
Low vs. High Researcher Status	4	6	$r = -0.024$	$P = 0.907$
Low vs. High Rejection Sensitivity	6	5.5	$r = 0.030$	$P = 0.884$
<i>Encouragement of More or Less Ethical Responses</i>				
Pro- vs. Anti-Open Science	7.50	7.25	$r = 0.108$	$P = 0.598$
Concerned w/ p-hacking vs. Not Concerned	8.75	7.5	$r = 0.289$	$P = 0.157$
Concerned w/ p-hacking vs. Don't Mention	8.75	7	$r = 0.467$	$P = 0.022$
Ethicist vs. Data Fabricator	9	8	$r = 0.102$	$P = 0.619$

Notes: The first category listed in the Comparison column was hypothesized as the “Good Performance Prompt” in each pair.

Finally, aligning with the main text of this article, we conducted three additional exploratory analyses. First, we combined data from the two “Anti-Jailbreaking” prompts to see if the responses that followed were superior to those following the three “Jailbreaking” prompts. A Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Test reveals that responses scored descriptively higher on our rubric after the Anti-Jailbreaking prompts (Median = 9) than after the Jailbreaking prompts (Median = 8), however the contrast did not reach statistical significance after correcting for multiple comparisons; $z = 2.037$, $P = 0.042$, $r = 0.263$.

Next, we examined whether there was an overall effect of priming data ethics, contrasting prompts that in any way evoked these (pro- and anti-open science, concerned w/ or not concerned with p-hacking, don't mention p-hacking, impersonate ethical or unethical researcher) compared to all other initial prompts. This contrast was statistically significant, even after correcting for multiple comparisons. Specifically, responses were superior following those prompts that in any way evoke data ethics (Median = 8) compared to those that did not (Median = 6); $z = 4.134$, $P < 0.001$, $r = 0.281$. Finally, as a robustness check, we conducted the same analysis but limited the prompts that evoked data ethics only to those that did so in a negative fashion, e.g. requesting that GPT generate text like somebody who is not concerned about p-hacking or impersonate a real-world unethical researcher. Even when limiting our analysis to prompts that were designed to deter GPT from giving a good response, this difference appears, though (as before) it does not survive the Bonferroni correction. Specifically, GPT gave superior responses following prompts that negatively evoked data ethics (Median = 8) compared to those that did not evoke data ethics at all (Median = 6); $z = 2.482$, $P = 0.0131$, $r = 0.185$.

Section S5: Good Research Vignette Study

As described briefly in the main article, we conducted a second briefer study designed to examine the positive case in our Scientific Ethicist work. Specifically, we generated two new fictional vignettes, analogous to Vignettes 1a-b and Vignettes 2a-b in our main study. In contrast to these vignettes, however, Vignettes 1c and 2c describe research that is conducted with a very high degree of experimental and statistical rigor, and that otherwise displays pristine

practices around data ethics and open science. In these vignettes, all exploratory analyses are framed as such and undergo correction for multiple comparisons. Where possible, studies are pre-registered and replicated. All materials are made public. Moreover, these protocols describe practices that go above and beyond typical good research practices. For example, the researchers - recognizing the work will be contentious – do things like having rival researchers with competing hypotheses directly replicate their results or hiring statistical consultants to verify the properness of their analytical methodologies. GPT-4 and GPT-3.5 were each presented with each vignette 30 times for a total of 120 responses. The initial prompts were not varied in this study: In each conversation, ChatGPT was asked to identify the good research practices that stand out in the protocol. (Full vignettes and coding rubrics may be found in the document “GPT as Research Ethicist Materials 20240227” and full transcripts in the document “GPT as Research Ethicist Transcripts 20240220”, both at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.)

As in the main Scientific Ethicist Study, each response was coded based on a 10-point rubric. The rubrics described different practices that stood out as rigorous and ethical in the research protocols. Two coders examined the 120 transcripts, which were blinded to the version of GPT. As in the main study, each coder reviewed all 120 transcripts, giving 1 point for each practice from the rubric that GPT identified. Points of disagreement were then discussed, with the coder who was not an author on the paper asked to lead this discussion. In cases where the coders disagreed following this discussion, their two responses were composited. The final responses of the two coders achieved a very high degree of reliability; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.9695$. In total, the coders disagreed on 11/1200 (0.92%) of possible points ChatGPT could receive. (Full data may be found in the spreadsheet “Good Research Ethicist Data Collapsed 20240227” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.)

For analysis, data were aggregated to the level of the chat, with each response receiving a minimum of 0 points and a maximum of 10. We report means for clarity of interpretation, but conduct (non-parametric) Wilcoxon Rank-Sum tests for gauging significance, since the results are not normally distributed.

Results. Both GPT-4 and GPT-3.5 did well on this task. In total, GPT-4 averaged 92.67% of possible points ($M = 9.267$) compared to 90.42% ($M = 9.042$) for GPT-3.5. A Wilcoxon Rank-Sum test reveals similar performance for GPT-4 (Median = 9) compared to GPT-3.5 (Median = 9) with the contrast trending toward but failing to reach statistical significance; $z = 1.806$, $P = 0.071$, $r = 0.165$. Exploratory analysis gauged the separate performance of GPT-4 vs. GPT-3.5 on each of the two vignettes. In response to Vignette 1c, GPT-4 ($M = 9.533$, Median = 10) slightly outperformed GPT-3.5 ($M = 9.217$, Median = 9), but the difference failed to meet the adjusted threshold of $P < 0.025$ dictated by a Bonferroni correction; $z = 2.114$, $P = 0.035$, $r = 0.273$. For Vignette 2c, the performance of GPT-4 ($M = 9$, Median = 9) and GPT-3.5 ($M = 8.867$, Median = 9) were statistically indistinguishable; $z = 0.622$, $P = 0.534$, $r = 0.080$.

In contrast to the main study, where GPT-4 did sharply better than GPT-3.5 at identifying and correcting poor ethical and statistical practices, both proved highly competent at identifying good research practices. The reason for this distinction is somewhat puzzling. It is possible that the task was simply easier. In line with that interpretation, there was no “Subtle” condition in this study: The vignettes are more analogous to the Blatant condition, on which GPT performed better. However, in the bad vignette study, GPT-3.5 failed to perform well even on the Blatant vignettes. An alternative interpretation is that GPT-3.5 is tuned to be somewhat “nicer” than GPT-4. Asked to review bad and good research protocols alike, it often tended to find good things to say, thereby succeeding in reviewing good protocols but failing at reviewing bad ones. GPT-4, in contrast, shows greater critical ability: In reviewing good research protocols, it was successful at drawing out and describing the good research practices. But when reviewing bad protocols, it was better able to be critical, nearly as easily recognizing and correcting bad practices. Finally, the result may be an artifact of the specific prompts used in this study. For example, GPT-4 might have demonstrated a higher rate of true positive detection had we used prompts that neutrally requested feedback, as opposed to explicitly requesting it identify good practices. Future research should tease apart these competing possibilities.

Section S6: GPT as Data Generator – Detailed Methods

Full Research Design. As detailed in the main article, we used data from ChatGPT to attempt to replicate 4 common and well-studied stereotypes: Gender Attitudes, Gender Art/Science stereotypes, Gender Home/Work stereotypes, and Gender Math/Reading stereotypes. Adapting the stimuli used by Charlesworth and colleagues (1), we presented GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 with randomly ordered word dyads, requesting it estimate the cultural associations between each based on its training data. These dyads contained every possible combination of one word related to one of the target categories (the groups being stereotyped, in this case “Male” or “Female”) with a second word related to one of the attribute categories (the characteristics being associated with these groups, e.g. “Home” or “Work”). We requested that, based on the cultural knowledge reflected in its training data, GPT estimate the overall cultural association between each pair of words. GPT was instructed to present each association on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 meaning “the two concepts have a very low association with each other, based on the two words rarely being seen together” and 10 meaning “the

two concepts have a very high association with each other, based on the words frequently being seen together.” To ensure responses were reasonably continuous, GPT was instructed (and, if needed, reminded) to round answers to the nearest tenth (e.g. 7.1) rather than to whole numbers. To preserve a consistent scale for GPT’s responses, all dyads related to a particular stereotype were presented (in randomized order) within a single chat. For each attitude/stereotype, the same (randomized) order of dyads was presented in prompts to GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. GPT was told that we were interested in what cultural associations are as opposed to what they should be and instructed to estimate real associations and not to attempt to debias the results. Full materials may be found in the document “GPT as Data Generator Materials 20240227” and transcripts in “GPT as Data Generator Transcripts 20240221”, both at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

For analysis, GPT’s responses were treated as analogous to cosine similarity (2). To calculate a measure of relative cultural association – e.g. a greater association of Female with Home and Male with Career, relative to Male with Home and Female with Career – the procedure was followed for calculating the WEAT *D*-score, adapting the method recommended by Charlesworth et al. (1). The data used in these calculations may be found in the four excel spreadsheets “GPT as Data Generator A-D” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Although higher-status groups are often preferred to lower-status groups (3), gender attitudes are typically an exception. A wide body of research shows that people tend to implicitly and explicitly associate women more than men to goodness (4-6), and this difference has been replicated on a cultural scale in word embedding research (1). Therefore, we expected responses from GPT to reflect a pattern of greater positivity toward Female words relative to Male words. We expected to see a greater association of Female with Art (and Male with Science) compared to Male with Art (and Female with Science), in line with prior research. Similarly, we expected to see a greater association of Female with Home (and Male with Work) compared to Male with Home (and Female with Work). Finally, we expected to see a greater association of Female with Reading (and Male with Math) compared to Female with Math (and Male with Reading).

Stimuli. The stimuli for this study were taken directly from prior research (1), and with the authors’ permission are reproduced in Table S9.

Table S9: Word Stimuli for GPT as Data Generator Study

Category	Word Stimuli
Female	she, her, mommy, mom, girl, mother, lady, sister, mama, momma, sis, grandma, herself
Male	he, his, daddy, dad, boy, father, guy, brother, dada, papa, bro, grandpa, himself
Good	happiness, happy, fun, fantastic, lovable, magical, delight, joy, relaxing, honest, excited, laughter, lover, cheerful
Bad	torture, murder, abuse, wreck, die, disease, disaster, mourning, virus, killer, nightmare, stress, kill, death
Home	baby, house, home, wedding, kid, family, marry
Work	work, office, job, business, trade, activity, act, money
Art	art, dance, dancing, sing, singing, paint, painting, song, draw, drawing
Science	science, scientist, chemistry, physics, engineer, space, spaceship, astronaut, chemical, microscope
Reading	book, read, write, story, word, writing, reading, tale
Math	puzzle, number, count, math, counting, calculator, subtraction, addition

Notes: Ratings were provided by GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 for every possible combination of the words in the “Female” and “Male” (target) categories with those in the other (attribute) categories.

Section S7: GPT as Data Generator – Supporting Analyses

Single-Category WEAT *D*. In the main article, we show that results from both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 generally aligned with the overall WEAT *D*-scores reported in prior work. In addition, we calculated Single-Category WEAT *D*-scores for each of the concepts, prying apart the degree to which the results in each case were driven by stronger Female-Male associations with one attribute or the other (e.g. with Work vs. Home). Charlesworth et al. (1) report in their Supplemental Materials that in each case, their results appear to be driven jointly by the two attributes. For example,

their Work-Home results reflect both a stronger association of Female with Home and of Male with Work. Interestingly, as shown in Table S10, our results diverge from theirs on this count.

In nearly all cases, the overall results in Study 3 are driven primarily by a stronger association of Female with the stereotypically Female category. For example, results from both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 indicated a stronger association of Female vs. Male with Good; They did not however suggest a parallel stronger association of Male with Bad. In the case of the Home-Work and Reading-Math tasks, Female was associated with both categories, but more strongly with the stereotype-consistent category. Only in the case of the Art-Science task was the main result clearly jointly driven by an association of Female with Art and of Male with Science.

Table S10: Single-Category WEAT D -scores from ChatGPT Responses

	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
Overall pro-Female Attitude	WEAT $D = 1.00$	WEAT $D = 0.57$
Female vs. Male, Good	SC-WEAT $D = 1.15$	SC-WEAT $D = 0.72$
Female vs. Male, Bad	SC-WEAT $D = 0.02$	SC-WEAT $D = -0.01$
Overall Female, Art-Science	WEAT $D = 1.16$	WEAT $D = 1.46$
Female vs. Male, Art	SC-WEAT $D = 0.89$	SC-WEAT $D = 2.26$
Female vs. Male, Science	SC-WEAT $D = -0.97$	SC-WEAT $D = -0.92$
Overall Female, Home-Work	WEAT $D = 0.40$	WEAT $D = 0.45$
Female vs. Male, Home	SC-WEAT $D = 1.72$	SC-WEAT $D = 2.15$
Female vs. Male, Work	SC-WEAT $D = 0.99$	SC-WEAT $D = 0.52$
Overall Female, Reading-Math	WEAT $D = 0.73$	WEAT $D = 0.96$
Female vs. Male, Reading	SC-WEAT $D = 2.82$	SC-WEAT $D = 1.89$
Female vs. Male, Math	SC-WEAT $D = 0.07$	SC-WEAT $D = 0.51$

Notes: These calculations treat Male/Female as the target categories, and thus differ somewhat from those reported in Table S11.

In addition, we calculated the other form of Single-Category (and bidirectional) WEAT D -scores, with the different stereotypically female (versus stereotypically male) attributes (e.g. Good versus Bad) now treated as the target categories, and “Female” and “Male” treated as the attribute categories. The results are presented in Table S11.

It is interesting to note, in Table S11, that GPT-3.5 generated an unexpectedly higher association of Good (vs. Bad) with Male than it did with Female, and also that the same association using data from GPT-4 comes out as only modestly higher for Female than for Male. At first glance, this seems misaligned with the results of the overall WEAT D analysis. The reason for this pattern is that this is a standardized score that uses the standard deviation of difference scores from within the relevant categories. There was more variance in the difference scores (avg. of Good minus Bad words) for Female words compared to Male words, particularly for GPT-3.5. For example, using data from GPT-3.5, Grandma and Mommy showed notably larger difference scores (2.59, 2.63) than Female and Herself (1.61, 1.33). The corresponding differences were less sharply contrasting for the Male category, with Grandpa and Daddy showing only slightly larger difference scores (1.82, 1.68) than Male and Himself (1.26, 1.51). The result is that while the Female comparisons show larger average differences between Good and Bad words, to calculate the SC-WEAT D -scores, they are divided by a larger standard deviation, leading the results to be smaller.

Table S11: *Alternative Single-Category WEAT D-scores from ChatGPT Responses*

	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
Overall Good-Bad by Gender	WEAT $D = 1.14$	WEAT $D = 0.68$
Good vs. Bad, Female	SC-WEAT $D = 4.67$	SC-WEAT $D = 3.85$
Good vs. Bad, Male	SC-WEAT $D = 6.48$	SC-WEAT $D = 3.43$
Art-Science, by Gender	WEAT $D = 1.36$	WEAT $D = 1.68$
Art vs. Science, Female	SC-WEAT $D = 2.58$	SC-WEAT $D = 4.56$
Art vs. Science, Male	SC-WEAT $D = 1.10$	SC-WEAT $D = 2.51$
Home-Work, by Gender	WEAT $D = 0.66$	WEAT $D = 0.97$
Home vs. Work, Female	SC-WEAT $D = 1.19$	SC-WEAT $D = 2.20$
Home vs. Work, Male	SC-WEAT $D = 0.07$	SC-WEAT $D = 0.79$
Reading-Math, by Gender	WEAT $D = 0.86$	WEAT $D = 1.36$
Reading vs. Math, Female	SC-WEAT $D = 3.25$	SC-WEAT $D = 6.35$
Reading vs. Math, Male	SC-WEAT $D = 1.00$	SC-WEAT $D = 3.76$

Notes: These calculations treat Male/Female as the attribute categories, and thus differ somewhat from those reported in Table S10.

Section S8: GPT as Novel Data Predictor – Detailed Methods

Full Design. As noted in the main manuscript, we asked GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 to predict cross-cultural patterns of implicit and explicit attitudes, drawn from Charlesworth et al. (7). These data, which draw on Implicit Association Tests and explicit questionnaires from over 2.3 million participants across 34 countries, were first published after ChatGPT’s training cutoff at the time of data collection. We selected three attitudes from this study: Sexuality Attitudes, Age Attitudes and Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes. For each, we separately asked GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 to predict the cross-cultural patterns of explicit attitudes (as measured by survey items) and implicit attitudes (as measured by Implicit Association Tests). (Full prompts may be found in the document “GPT as Novel Data Predictor Materials 20240227” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.) Each prompt (Explicit/Implicit x GPT-3.5/4 x 3 attitudinal constructs) was run 5 times, for a total of 60 sets of predictions. In each prompt, we instructed ChatGPT that a more positive D-score (or higher score on explicit items) should indicate a stronger preference in the typical direction from prior research, e.g. a preference for “Straight” over “Gay,” or “Young” over “Old.” We examined each prediction, summarily tracking correlations between GPT’s prediction by country and the actual country-level implicit and explicit attitudes and stereotypes reported in the recent paper (7). Full transcripts from this study may be found in the document “GPT as Novel Data Predictor Transcripts 20240221” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Section S9: GPT as Novel Data Predictor – Supporting Analyses

Correlations reported here and in the main article were conducted in Stata, and were averaged from correlation tables in Excel. These correlation tables may be found in the spreadsheet “GPT as Data Predictor Correlation Tables 20240228” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Real Country-Level Implicit-Explicit Correlations. In the main article, we note that when data are aggregated to the country level, the real correlations between Implicit and Explicit attitudes in the Project Implicit International Data Set “vary by attitude object but are generally not strong.” Here, we report these analyses in more detail. In calculating these correlations, we used country-level summary data based on Implicit Association Tests (“implicit” attitudes) and

the 7-point Likert items (“explicit” attitudes). Note that the real-world data set also includes a second type of explicit item (feeling thermometers). We did not ask ChatGPT to predict these feeling thermometers, so we do not examine these items here. Note also that to examine the psychometric properties of the data set, Charlesworth et al. (7) report individual-level correlations between implicit and explicit attitudes. These analyses are distinct from our analyses: we focus on results that have been aggregated by country since these are what we asked ChatGPT to predict. The strongest country-level implicit-explicit correlation was for Sexuality Attitudes: $r = 0.5332$, $P = 0.0008$. For Age Attitudes, country-level implicit and explicit results were essentially uncorrelated: $r = 0.2030$, $P = 0.2350$. Finally, for country-level Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes, there was a trend toward a negative correlation between implicit and explicit results: $r = -0.3135$, $P = 0.0626$.

GPT-3.5’s difficulty with the task. GPT-3.5 had difficulty completing this task coherently. Though we’d instructed it clearly as to the direction in which results should be scored (i.e. what a positive IAT D-score should mean), it was frequently not clear whether it was following this direction. For example, in one chat it would rate a few countries as the highest on Implicit Sexuality bias, and then in another it would rank the same countries as the lowest. Thus, to ensure we were interpreting the data correctly, across different chats, we unexpectedly needed to ask GPT-3.5 a follow-up question, requesting the direction - i.e. whether a positive average D-score reflected a preference for gay or for straight - in which it had scored the countries, even though we had instructed it clearly on this point. Moreover, even after asking this, GPT-3.5 sometimes appeared confused about its own response. In the fourth chat in which it was asked about Implicit Sexuality Attitudes, GPT-3.5’s responses were heavily and negatively correlated with those from all other implicit and explicit predictions (all r s < -0.69 , P s < 0.0001), suggesting it misrepresented the interpretation of its own D-scores. For the main analyses, this response was thus reverse-scored.

This problem was even more pronounced in GPT-3.5’s predictions of Age Attitudes and Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes, rendering the data difficult to interpret. For Sexuality Attitudes, we were able to clearly understand what GPT-3.5 was attempting to communicate simply by asking a follow-up question. Given the answers to these questions, as described above, nine of its ten predictions were highly correlated with one another, and one traveled in precisely the opposite direction. We are confident in interpreting this as a mistake on GPT-3.5’s part and simply reverse-scoring the answers in this one chat. For the other two attitudes, no such clear pattern arose.

For these latter attitudes, GPT appeared deeply confused about the direction of its own scoring for implicit attitudes, and even at times for explicit attitudes. Indeed, GPT-3.5 became so hopelessly befuddled at times that it avoided answering the follow-up question about the direction of its scoring. For example, when asked what direction the D-scores in its predictions were scored, instead of answering for its own answers it would apologize and then report the direction in which D-scores for Implicit Age Attitudes are typically scored, necessitating a second follow-up to again clarify the scoring in its own responses. As can be seen in the full correlation tables and transcripts (see “GPT as Data Predictor Correlation Tables 20240228” and “GPT as Novel Data Predictor Transcripts” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>), some of GPT-3.5’s answers on these chats were correlated with each other, but others were uncorrelated or negatively correlated, with the result that it is impossible to confidently interpret even the intended direction of GPT-3.5’s answers. Put more concisely, GPT-3.5’s answers for Age Attitudes and Gender Science stereotypes were completely incoherent. An examination of the correlations across chats (scored in the direction GPT-3.5 instructed us) will render this point more clearly.

Age Attitudes. GPT-3.5’s five different predictions of Explicit Age Attitudes were, on average, uncorrelated with each other (mean $r = -0.068$, $SD = 0.548$). GPT-3.5’s five different predictions of Implicit Age Attitudes were similarly uncorrelated (mean $r = -0.137$, $SD = 0.509$), as were the correlations between its implicit and explicit predictions (mean $r = 0.021$, $SD = 0.556$). Its collective predictions were similarly uncorrelated with real country-level patterns of Explicit (mean $r = -0.010$, $SD = 0.459$) and Implicit (mean $r = -0.175$, $SD = 0.273$) Age Attitudes.

Gender Science/Arts Stereotypes. As with Age Attitudes, GPT-3.5’s predictions of Gender Science/Liberal Arts stereotypes seem to suffer from a lack of coherence. Its different explicit stereotype predictions were collectively uncorrelated with each other (mean $r = -0.115$, $SD = 0.537$), as were its different implicit stereotype predictions (mean $r = -0.186$, $SD = 0.628$). Similarly, explicit stereotype predictions were collectively uncorrelated with implicit stereotype predictions (mean $r = -0.040$, $SD = 0.641$). Considering these patterns, it is not surprising that GPT-3.5’s predictions were also collectively uncorrelated with real country-level Explicit (mean $r = -0.009$, $SD = 0.363$) and Implicit (mean $r = -0.044$, $SD = 0.239$) Gender stereotypes.

Full Summary Statistics. In the main article, we reported average correlations for most of the main tasks ChatGPT completed in Study 4. For the sake of completeness and ease of reference, we report all average correlations and the standard deviations of these correlations in Table S12.

Table S12: Summary Statistics for GPT as Novel Data Predictor

Task/Model	Correlations: Explicit with other Explicit Predictions	Correlations: Implicit with other Implicit Predictions	Correlations: Implicit with Explicit Predictions	Correlations: All Predictions with Real Explicit Results	Correlations: All Predictions with Real Explicit Results
Sexuality, GPT-3.5	$M_r = 0.875$ $SD_r = 0.082$	$M_r = 0.879$ $SD_r = 0.031$	$M_r = 0.778$ $SD_r = 0.071$	$M_r = 0.602$ $SD_r = 0.073$	$M_r = -0.014$ $SD_r = 0.118$
Sexuality, GPT-4	$M_r = 0.957$ $SD_r = 0.026$	$M_r = 0.946$ $SD_r = 0.022$	$M_r = 0.952$ $SD_r = 0.027$	$M_r = 0.714$ $SD_r = 0.040$	$M_r = 0.152$ $SD_r = 0.065$
Age, GPT-3.5	$M_r = -0.068$ $SD_r = 0.548$	$M_r = -0.137$ $SD_r = 0.509$	$M_r = 0.021$ $SD_r = 0.556$	$M_r = -0.010$ $SD_r = 0.459$	$M_r = -0.175$ $SD_r = 0.273$
Age, GPT-4	$M_r = 0.645$ $SD_r = 0.234$	$M_r = 0.726$ $SD_r = 0.161$	$M_r = 0.664$ $SD_r = 0.271$	$M_r = -0.395$ $SD_r = 0.172$	$M_r = -0.120$ $SD_r = 0.196$
Gender, GPT-3.5	$M_r = -0.115$ $SD_r = 0.537$	$M_r = -0.186$ $SD_r = 0.628$	$M_r = -0.040$ $SD_r = 0.641$	$M_r = -0.009$ $SD_r = 0.363$	$M_r = -0.044$ $SD_r = 0.239$
Gender, GPT-4	$M_r = 0.363$ $SD_r = 0.435$	$M_r = 0.868$ $SD_r = 0.064$	$M_r = 0.499$ $SD_r = 0.425$	$M_r = -0.304$ $SD_r = 0.205$	$M_r = -0.007$ $SD_r = 0.207$

Note: M_r values reflect the mean of each set of correlations, and SD_r values reflect the standard deviation of the correlations in each group. For example, GPT-3.5 made 5 different predictions of Explicit Sexuality Attitudes. The first cell in this table displays the mean and standard deviation of the 10 different possible pairwise correlations among these 5 predictions.

Supplemental Analysis of Sexuality Attitudes. In the main article, we reported that both GPT-3.5 and especially GPT-4 made implicit predictions that correlated highly with other implicit predictions, and explicit predictions that correlated highly with other explicit predictions, suggesting a degree of reliability in how it approached predicting the cross-country results for Sexuality attitudes. Critically, though, the correlations between implicit and explicit predictions were nearly as high for GPT-3.5 and just as high for GPT-4, suggesting that ChatGPT did not leverage substantially different information when predicting the (more novel) Implicit Sexuality Attitudes compared to the (less novel) Explicit ones. In general, GPT-3.5 and especially GPT-4 did a relatively strong job of predicting Explicit Sexuality Attitudes (mean $r_s = 0.602$ and 0.714 respectively), but both did a poor job predicting the more novel implicit results (mean $r_s = -0.014$ and 0.152). Here, we report some additional analysis of these attitudes.

Exploratory analysis suggested that GPT-3.5 had particular difficulty predicting Sexuality Attitudes in East Asia: It generally predicted these countries would show some of the highest Sexuality bias, when in actuality they showed some of the lowest. Removing China, South Korea, Japan and Taiwan from the sample slightly improves GPT-3.5's prediction of country-level explicit attitudes (mean $r = 0.652$, $SD = 0.074$), and notably improves its prediction of implicit attitudes (mean $r = 0.335$, $SD = 0.083$). Exploratorily removing East Asian countries improves GPT-4's performance similarly to its predecessor's. With this exclusion, average predictions of explicit attitudes improve slightly (mean $r = 0.768$, $SD = 0.043$), and predictions of implicit attitudes improve notably (mean $r = 0.472$, $SD = 0.049$). These findings are consistent with prior reports suggesting limitations in ChatGPT's training data in East Asian languages (8, Supplemental Materials).

Full Correlation Tables may be found in the spreadsheet "GPT as Data Predictor Correlation Tables 20240228" at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.

Examinations of Media Coverage by Attitude Domain. It is likely that GPT has more access to information about Sexuality Attitudes in its training data, providing a plausible explanation for why it was far more successful in predicting cross-cultural patterns in these attitudes, particularly when measured explicitly, compared to the others. However, it proved highly difficult to find research directly comparing the media coverage for different issues, to provide evidence for (or against) this argument. Thus, as mentioned in the main article, we conducted three simple but convergent tests to establish whether Sexuality Attitudes are likely to be better represented in worldwide media (and thus GPT's training data), relative to Age Attitudes and Gender Science/Liberal Arts Stereotypes.

First, we conducted a series of searches using Microsoft's Bing search engine, conducted at the time of the manuscript's authorship. Searching (without quotation marks) for "Gay rights" yielded 128,000,000 results, while searching for "Women's rights" yielded 58,300,000, "Elder Rights" 2,780,000, "Elderly Rights" 2,920,000, and "Old-age rights"


4,220,000. Searching “Gender Rights” yielded 170,000,000 results, even more than “Gay Rights”. However, it should be noted that this search is far broader than the actual stereotype (Gender-Science) we were studying. We thus conducted a second, more specific set of searches. Searching for “Gender-Science Stereotypes” yielded 206,000 results; An inexact but related search (“Gender-Science Attitudes” yielded 355,000; “Age Attitudes” yielded 164,000. Searches related to Sexuality Attitudes, in contrast, yielded sharply more results. Specifically, searching “Gay Attitudes” yielded 1,640,000 results, and searching “Homosexuality Attitudes” yielded 1,490,000 results. These results, while not decisive, suggest that Sexuality Attitudes are better represented in overall worldwide discourse, relative to Age Attitudes and Gender Science/Liberal Arts Stereotypes.

Second, we conducted a series of searches using Google’s Ngram Viewer, a tool that allows you to track the frequency with which phrases appear over time within the Google Books corpus. As seen in Figure S1, the phrase “attitudes toward homosexuality” appeared more than “attitudes toward the elderly” between the years 2000 and 2019, and the phrase “gender science stereotypes” appeared too rarely to be plotted. As seen in Figure S2, when we slightly broadened the gender-related search term (“gender in science”), it now appeared in the plot. However, “attitudes toward homosexuality” still consistently appeared far more than the other two phrases. Though this an imperfect test – different searches might yield different results – it nevertheless provides convergent evidence that Sexuality Attitudes have received more media representation in recent years relative to Age Attitudes and Gender Science/Liberal Arts Stereotypes.

Finally, since our primary interest is in the representation of the different attitudes/stereotypes in ChatGPT’s training data, we decided to probe this question more directly by asking GPT-4 about the relative global coverage of the different issues. Specifically, we asked GPT-4 the following question: “Across cultures, which of these things are spoken of the most? Attitudes toward gays and homosexuality, attitudes towards the elderly, or gender representation in science?” Note that as a more conservative test, we broadened our discussion to be around “gender representation in science” as opposed to a more specific term such as “gender science stereotypes”. As seen in the further supplemental materials, in all 10 chats GPT offered the view that “Attitudes toward gays and homosexuality” have received more global media coverage than the other two topics. (See the document “Chats with GPT-4 about media coverage of different topics 20231222” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>.)


Taken together, these three results provide convergent evidence that Sexuality Attitudes receive more global coverage than Age Attitudes and Gender-Science Stereotypes. This lends credence to the theory that information access may explain ChatGPT’s greater success at predicting Sexuality Attitudes.

Figure S1.



Notes: Figure S1 depicts results of a Google Ngram search for “attitudes toward homosexuality”, “attitudes toward the elderly” and “gender science stereotypes” between 2000 and 2019.

Figure S2.



Notes: Figure S2 depicts results of a Google Ngram search for “attitudes toward homosexuality”, “attitudes toward the elderly” and “gender in science” between 2000 and 2019.

Probing GPT-4’s knowledge of Implicit & Explicit Stereotypes. At several points in the main article, we claim that GPT likely has within its knowledge base an understanding that Implicit and Explicit attitudes are somewhat independent. This point is important since it makes the result surprising that GPT often seemed to lean on identical information when predicting these two types of attitudes. While confident in our assumption here, to test it, we directly probed GPT-4 about this topic, requesting the following: “What is the difference between explicit and implicit attitudes and how are the two to be measured? Do these kinds of attitudes tend to correspond to one another?”

GPT-4’s response to this query can be found in the document “Chat with GPT-4 about implicit and explicit attitudes 20240509” at <https://osf.io/sdahr/>. GPT’s answer confirms our contention that the chatbot is aware of the distinction between these types of attitudes. The answer makes some points which might be contended, e.g. unilaterally referring to Implicit Attitudes as “unconscious,” a point of scholarly debate. Nevertheless, it clearly demonstrates GPT’s knowledge of the two constructs. Most critically, GPT correctly confirms that these attitudes often operate independently, saying for example: “In many cases, particularly with socially sensitive subjects, explicit and implicit attitudes can diverge significantly.” It is therefore interesting that GPT displays no meaningful differences in the patterns of predictions on, for example, Implicit versus Explicit Sexuality Attitudes, a good example of such a socially sensitive subject.

SI References

1. T. E. S. Charlesworth, V. Yang, T. C. Mann, B. Kurdi, M. R. Banaji, Gender stereotypes in natural language: Word embeddings show robust consistency across child and adult language corpora of more than 65 million words. *Psychol. Sci.* **32**, 218–240 (2021).
2. A. Caliskan, J. J. Bryson, A. Narayanan, Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science* **356**, 183–186 (2017).
3. J. T. Jost, M. R. Banaji, B. A. Nosek, A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Polit. Psychol.* **25**, 881–919 (2004).
4. A. H. Eagly, A. Mladinic, Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgments of competence. *Eur. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* **5**, 1–35 (1994).
5. B. A. Nosek, M. R. Banaji, The go/no-go association task. *Soc. Cognit.* **19**, 625–666 (2001).
6. L. A. Rudman, S. A. Goodwin, Gender differences in automatic in-group bias: Why do women like women more than men like men? *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **87**, 494–509 (2004).

7. T. E. S. Charlesworth, M. Navon, Y. Rabinovich, N. Lofaro, B. Kurdi, The project implicit international dataset: Measuring implicit and explicit social group attitudes and stereotypes across 34 countries (2009-2019). *Behav. Res. Methods* **55**, 1413-1440 (2023).
8. T. Brown *et al.*, Language models are few-shot learners. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020).