

**Title:** Do Large Language Models Understand Verbal Indicators of Romantic Attraction?

**Authors:**

Matz\*, Sandra C.; Columbia Business School

Peters, Heinrich: Columbia Business School

Eastwick, Paul W.; University of California, Davis

Cerf, Moran; Columbia Business School

Finkel, Eli J.: Northwestern University

\*Corresponding author: [sm4409@gsb.columbia.edu](mailto:sm4409@gsb.columbia.edu), +1 3479786326

**Keywords:** Large Language Models, ChatGPT, speed-dating, romantic attraction, machine learning

**Author Contributions:** S.C.M. and M.C. developed the research idea. S.C.M., H.P., P.E., and E.J.F. collected the data. S.C.M. analyzed the data. S.C.M. wrote the manuscript with feedback from all authors.

**Competing Interest Statement:** The authors have no competing interests to disclose.

## Do Large Language Models Understand Verbal Indicators of Romantic Attraction?

### Abstract:

What makes people “click” on a first date and become mutually attracted to one another? While understanding and predicting the dynamics of romantic interactions used to be exclusive to human judgment, we show that Large Language Models (LLMs) can detect romantic attraction during brief getting-to-know-you interactions. Examining data from 964 speed dates, we show that ChatGPT (and Claude 3) can predict both objective and subjective indicators of speed dating success ( $r=0.12-0.23$ ). ChatGPT’s predictions of actual matching (i.e., the exchange of contact information) were not only on par with those of human judges who had access to the same information but incremental to speed daters’ own predictions. While some of the variance in ChatGPT’s predictions can be explained by common content dimensions – such as the valence of the conversations – the fact that there remains a substantial proportion of unexplained variance suggests that ChatGPT also picks up on conversational dynamics. In addition, ChatGPT’s judgments showed substantial overlap with those made by the human observers (mean  $r=0.29$ ), highlighting similarities in their representation of romantic attraction that is, partially, independent of accuracy.

## Introduction

The dynamics of human interaction have long been a subject of interest for researchers seeking to understand romantic attraction (Berscheid & Walster, 1969). Can we predict whether two people are going to say “yes” to each other after an initial encounter? And what factors predict the elusive “clicking” that sparks interest between two people and prompts the possibility of a partnership?

The ability to analyze and interpret interpersonal dynamics has historically been confined to human perception, with research showing that observers can accurately predict romantic interest (Eastwick et al., 2010; Place et al., 2012) and long-term relationship success (Gottman et al., 1998). Important language-based predictors of these outcomes are related to the smoothness of conversational interactions (Eastwick et al., 2010), language style matching (Ireland et al., 2011), and active listening (Gottman et al., 1998). While past research has heavily relied on human judgments, rapid advances in computers’ capacity to represent unstructured data—including text and (moving) images—have made them viable contestants with respect to understanding conversational dynamics and predicting the success of initial romantic encounters (Huang et al., 2017; McFarland et al., 2013).

The most notable of these technological advances is the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs; Anthropic, 2023; Gemini Team et al., 2023; OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023; Vaswani et al., 2017). LLMs are trained on vast corpora of textual data to learn statistical patterns in language (Vaswani et al., 2017) and produce novel text that is often indistinguishable from that created by humans (Jakesch et al., 2023). By using probabilistic estimates for which words (or groups of words) are most likely to follow a particular prompt, LLMs can answer open-ended questions, summarize content, or translate text from one language to another.


However, LLMs are capable of far more than merely generating text. As a growing body of research suggests, they possess human-like abilities to “understand” language and solve a wide range of tasks they were never explicitly trained on (Radford et al., 2019). For example, LLMs can exhibit properties resembling theory of mind (Kosinski, 2023) or predict personality traits from social media posts (Peters & Matz, 2024) and free-form user interactions (Peters et al., 2024) with similar levels of accuracy as supervised machine learning models. In addition, they can generate persuasive content that is both personalized and more persuasive than that created by humans (Bai et al., 2023; Matz et al., 2024).

The current study is the first to investigate whether LLMs can detect romantic attraction during brief getting-to-know-you interactions (speed-dates). The speed-dating context offers an interesting testing ground for the power of LLMs for multiple reasons (Finkel et al., 2007). First, speed dates are highly structured and time-limited in format, allowing for a direct comparison across multiple dyads. Second, the brevity of interactions makes our test a conservative estimate of LLMs’ capacity to interpret the content of social interactions.

Specifically, we test whether OpenAI’s ChatGPT (gpt-4-0613; OpenAI, 2023) can accurately predict the success of speed-dates based on short transcripts and explore how such predictions compare to those made by human observers. We support the generalizability of our findings to other LLM models by replicating our results with Anthropic’s Claude 3 in the Supplementary Information (the predictions made by both models were highly correlated with an average  $r = 0.71$  across all outcomes).

## Results

We analyzed 1,039 speed dates involving 187 undergraduate students (93 women and 94 men; age =  $19.6 \pm 1.2$  years old) who attended one of eight speed dating events at a large Midwestern University in 2007. Participants were recruited via flyers and e-mails and engaged in approximately 12 speed dates, each lasting four minutes and consisting of a man and a woman (see **Fig. 1** for an overview of the Study Design and Appendix A in the SI for recruitment materials). Immediately following each speed date, participants evaluated the experience (see the Methods section for more details and refer to Finkel et al., 2007 for the original publication of the dataset).



**Fig. 1. Overview of study design.** Speed dates were independently evaluated by four judges: speed date participants, ChatGPT/Claude 3, human observers with access to video recordings of the speed dates, and observers with access to speed date transcripts only. All judges provided information on both the (predicted) speed dating outcomes and experiences. ICC = Intraclass Coefficient (measure of inter-rater reliability).

All speed-dates were recorded on video and transcribed by human professionals. We were able to match 964 of the transcripts, which included an average of  $864 \pm 147$  words per date (the data and code are available on this project's [OSF page](#)).

The speed dates were evaluated by four independent sources: (i) the speed-daters immediately after the interaction; (ii) ChatGPT (gpt-4-0613), which analyzed the written transcripts of the speed-dates (mean “inter-rater agreement” across three independent API queries  $ICC=0.74$ ); (iii) eighteen judges (of which 12 raters scored every item), who watched the speed-dating videos (mean inter-rater agreement of  $ICC=0.92$ ); and (iv) four judges who read a random subset of 500 speed-dating transcripts without access to the videos (mean inter-rater agreement  $ICC=0.46$ ). Notably, the interrater reliabilities associated with the two LLMs can be influenced by adjusting the model’s temperature, a parameter that determines how similar the model’s responses are across different rounds (OpenAI, 2023). For the purpose of this study, we kept the models’ standard settings (temperature=1) to test their baseline performance.

All four sources rated the same set of five statements using a 9-point Likert scale (see Methods and Appendices B, C, and D in the SI for the specific items, the distributions of judgments, and ICCs). Two of the statements captured speed-dating *outcomes*: (i) participants’ level of liking for their partner, and (ii) the likelihood of saying “yes” to a potential follow-up date. The other three captured speed-daters’ *experiences* as potential mechanisms: participants’ beliefs that they (i) had “a lot in common” with their partner, (ii) had “similar personalities,” and (iii) experienced “a real connection.” ChatGPT and the human judges reading the transcripts rated the outcomes at the dyad level. In contrast, both participants and the human judges with access to the video recordings rated them at the level of individual participants; To score the speed-date as a whole, we averaged those individual ratings across both interaction partners.

After the speed-dating event concluded, participants indicated whether they wanted to exchange contact information with each partner for a potential follow-up date. This mutual signal of interest or “matching” served as a third, objective speed-dating outcome; 23% of the dyads matched.

The zero-order correlations of all variables and the results using Anthropic’s Claude 3 (claude-3-opus-20240229) instead of ChatGPT can be found in Supplements E and F in the SI.


## Can ChatGPT predict speed dating outcomes and experiences?

Our primary analysis tested whether LLMs can predict the objective matching outcome, comparing the accuracy of ChatGPT's predictions to those made by speed-dating participants (baseline) and the human judges (**Fig. 2A**) With a correlation of  $r=0.12$  ( $p<.001$ ), ChatGPT performed on par with the human raters who had access to the same information (i.e., transcripts only;  $r=0.13$ ,  $p=.003$ ), but both were outperformed by the human coders who could also draw on the non-verbal cues observable in the video recordings ( $r=0.31$ ,  $p<.001$ ).


Notably, ChatGPT successfully predicted matching above and beyond participants' self-reported intentions ( $B=0.19$ ,  $SE=0.09$ ,  $z=2.17$ ,  $p=.030$ ). In contrast, we did not observe incremental predictive power for the ratings of the human judges who had access to transcripts only ( $B=0.03$ ,  $SE=0.16$ ,  $z=0.19$ ,  $p=0.853$ ). This suggests that ChatGPT observed unique variance that was neither accessible to the speed-dating participants nor the coders who evaluated the same transcripts (note that human coders in the video condition did provide incremental predictive power:  $B=0.46$ ,  $SE=0.10$ ,  $z=4.62$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

Next, we examined the ability of ChatGPT and human judges to predict participants' self-reported outcomes and experiences at the end of the speed-date. ChatGPT predicted participants' ratings with correlations ranging between  $r = 0.13$  to  $r = 0.23$  (all  $p<.001$ ; **Fig. 2B**), even after accounting for word count. The correlations were markedly lower than those made by human judges in both conditions (average correlation for observers with access to videos  $r = 0.46$ , and transcript only  $r = 0.33$ ), suggesting that human judges reading the transcripts might be better at predicting participants' stated reaction to the speed-date but not their actual commitment to exchanging contact information (actual matching). Notably, the relative levels of accuracy across predicted metrics appeared largely consistent across all judges, with participants' experiences being easier to predict (in particular, whether they had a lot in common) than outcomes.

**A) Correlations between predicted "Matching" and actual "Matching"**




**B) Correlations between participants' ratings and the predictions made by ChatGPT and human coders**



**C) Top 10 LIWC Correlates**

- (+) Emotional Tone (Pos + Neg)
- (+) Positive Tone
- (+) Affect
- (-) Negations
- (+) Positive Emotion
- (+) Emotion (Pos + Neg)
- (+) Certitude
- (-) Differentiation
- (-) Present Focus
- (-) Auxiliary Verbs

**D) Correlations between predictions made by ChatGPT and human coders**



**Fig. 2 Correlations between the speed-dating ratings of different evaluators.** A) Point-biserial correlations between the behavioral speed-dating outcome of matching and the predictions made by different judges of whether participants would exchange contact information. B) Pearson correlations between participants' self-reported outcomes and experiences at the end of the speed-date and the predictions made by ChatGPT and the human judges. C) Pearson correlations between the predictions made by ChatGPT and the human judges. D) Ten *Linguistic Inquiry Word Count* (LIWC) categories that showed the highest absolute correlations with ChatGPT predicted match scores. (+) = positive correlation, (-) = negative correlation.

## Which textual features are driving the predictions of ChatGPT?

To better understand how ChatGPT arrived at its predictions and to test whether the predictions were merely driven by the emotional tone of the conversation (rather than conversational dynamics), we extracted the content of each of the transcripts using LIWC (11). LIWC is a widely used, dictionary-based text analysis tool that categorizes and quantifies psychological, emotional, and cognitive aspects of a document using 117 validated dictionaries.

**Fig. 2C** displays the ten LIWC dimensions that showed the highest absolute correlations with GPT's predicted likelihood of saying "yes." The examples suggest that GPT indeed relied on the affective valence of conversations, but also highlight the importance of other dimensions unrelated to emotional valence (e.g., high levels of certitude and a reduced focus on the present). To further support the proposition that ChatGPT did not merely pick up on readily available content features we trained a supervised model predicting ChatGPT's judgments from a linear combination of the 117 LIWC dimensions (see Methods for more details). An out-of-sample validation of the model suggests that LIWC accounted for only ~7% of the variance in ChatGPT's predictions ( $r=0.27$ ). This suggests that a substantial amount of the variance in the predictions made by ChatGPT cannot be captured by the relatively comprehensive set of content dimensions included in the LIWC dictionaries.

## How aligned are ChatGPT's predictions with those of human judges?

In addition to comparing the predictive accuracies of ChatGPT and human raters, we also investigated the extent to which ChatGPT and human judges relied on similar cues when making their predictions. As the correlations in **Fig. 2D** show, there was meaningful overlap between the predictions of ChatGPT and the human judges (mean  $r = 0.29$  across all metrics and conditions). The fact that these correlations were higher than those observed with participants' self-reported scores (**Fig. 2B**) suggests that both ChatGPT and human judges utilize cues that are commonly considered markers of successful interactions but are not empirically associated with actual speed-dating outcomes or experiences. For example, we found that both human raters and ChatGPT consider a positive tone and the expression of positive emotions as strong indicators for a successful match (i.e., high correlations between the predicted matching ratings and the respective LIWC dimensions), even though these dimensions are not strongly associated with actual matching. That is, the correlations between positive emotions and the predicted matching scores of ChatGPT and human raters were  $r = 0.20$  and  $r = 0.30$  respectively, with positive emotions ranking among the top five predictors in both cases. However, positive emotion was only correlated at  $r = 0.06$  with actual matching, ranking number 34 among all 117 predictors. In contrast, references to money, health and family were among the strongest predictors of actual matching (with money showing a negative relationship), but neither ChatGPT nor the human raters considered them important predictors.



Although the predictions of ChatGPT and human judges overlap, they were not redundant in predicting speed dating outcomes and experiences. For at least some of the metrics, both ChatGPT and human judges offered significant predictive power when added simultaneously into a linear regression model (notably, the effects of ChatGPT became non-significant when added with both, text-based and video-based, human judgments at the same time).

## Discussion

Taken together, our findings suggest that LLMs can “interpret” some of the conversational nuances that lead strangers to “click” during romantic getting-to-know-you interactions. The accuracies were modest in magnitude ( $r=0.12-0.23$ ). Yet, when predicting whether two people will eventually exchange contact information, the predictions made by ChatGPT were not only on par with those of human judges who had access to the same information (transcripts) but incremental to participants’ own ratings at the end of the speed date. In addition, they were moderately correlated with the predictions made by human raters ( $r=0.21-0.35$ ), suggesting that LLMs might pick up on the same cues, even if those cues are not necessarily valid (compare to Brunswik’s lens model; Brunswik, 1956).

Our findings contribute to the growing literature capturing the remarkable abilities of LLMs at solving tasks that were previously considered to be the exclusive domain of human agents (e.g., Bai et al., 2023; Kosinski, 2023; Orrù et al., 2023; Peters & Matz, 2024). While much of the existing literature has focused on mimicking and interpreting the behavior of individuals, our work expands this literature by highlighting the ability of LLMs to capture social dynamics playing out between multiple individuals. In addition, our work contributes to the literature on relationships and romantic attraction, by showing that the content of conversations alone – without traditional indicators such as body language, eye contact, tone of voice, or perceived physical attractiveness – predicts whether two people “click” when they first meet each other (McFarland et al., 2013). Moreover, from a practical perspective, our work suggests that the labor-intensive process of coding human interactions (e.g., Bakeman & Gottman, 1997), could potentially be automated if the capacities of LLMs continue to improve at the current rate.

It has not escaped our notice that our study has a number of important limitations that should be addressed by future research. First, as speed-dates are by definition brief, it is possible that LLMs might yield more accurate judgments when observing longer initial interactions. This is particularly true as speed dates might be rather similar in structure and content and remain more superficial than other types of conversations due to their introductory nature (i.e., most people will start with brief introductions and small talk). Future research should investigate different types of social interactions (e.g. couples’ text messages) and explore whether the accuracy of predictions can be improved by analyzing longer text excerpts.

Second, our analyses focused exclusively on short-term success metrics, such as self-reported liking or the exchange of contact information. Future research should investigate the ability of

LLMs and human judges to predict longer-term success metrics (e.g., the likelihood of entering into a relationship). Third, our study exclusively relied on language models and conversation transcripts, which omit crucial information such as smiles, eye contact, body language, and paralinguistic cues. As generative AI continues expanding in the domains of computer vision and multimodal interfaces (e.g., OpenAI's next generation of ChatGPT, which processes both spoken language and images), future research should test whether artificial agents can reach – or even surpass -- the level of accuracy obtained by the human raters with access to the speed dating videos.

Taken together, our work suggests that LLMs like ChatGPT have the capacity to interpret social dynamics in natural conversations. As we have noted above, we consider our findings a conservative estimate of AI's capacity to understand human interactions and predict that its ability to interpret conversational dynamics on a much more holistic level is poised to increase significantly over the coming years.

## **Methods**

### **Measures**

Participants rated the speed dates using the following five statements: (1) I am likely to say yes to my interaction partner, (2) I really liked my interaction partner, (3) My interaction partner and I seemed to have a lot in common, (4) My interaction partner and I seemed to have similar personalities, and (5) My interaction partner and I had a real connection. We considered the first two statements indicators of speed dating outcomes and the last three as indicators of speed dating experiences. All responses were recorded using a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree.

All human judges and ChatGPT responded to equivalent statements (see Appendix A in the SI for the full set of questions). For example, we used the following prompt for ChatGPT and human raters (transcript only) to rate the likelihood of saying yes to one another: “On a scale from 1-9, how likely do you think the interaction partners will say “yes” to each other and exchange contact information?”

### **LIWC Modeling**

We randomly selected 50% of the data (training dataset with 501 speed dates) to train a LASSO model (1) that predicts ChatGPT's predicted likelihood of saying yes from a linear combination of the 117 LIWC dimensions. The model parameter lambda was tuned using 10-fold cross-validation. We subsequently applied the model to the remaining 50% of the data (testing dataset with 463 speed dates). The correlation between the predictions made by LIWC and the actual ChatGPT ratings of  $r = 0.39$  (variance explained of 15%) is based on the observations in the testing data only.

## Bibliography

- Anthropic. (2023). *Model Card and Evaluations for Claude Models*. Anthropic. <https://www-files.anthropic.com/production/images/Model-Card-Claude-2.pdf>
- Bai, H., Voelkel, J., Eichstaedt, J., & Willer, R. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence Can Persuade Humans on Political Issues* [Preprint]. In Review. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3238396/v1>
- Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J. M. (1997). *Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analysis, 2nd ed* (pp. xiii, 207). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527685>
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. H. (1969). *Interpersonal Attraction*. Addison-Wesley.
- Brunswik, E. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of psychological experiments* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.
- Eastwick, P. W., Saigal, S. D., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Smooth operating: A Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB) perspective on initial romantic encounters. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*, 344–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550610373402>
- Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., & Matthews, J. (2007). Speed-dating as an invaluable tool for studying romantic attraction: A methodological primer. *Personal Relationships, 14*(1), 149–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2006.00146.x>
- Gemini Team, Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Wu, Y., Alayrac, J.-B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A. M., Hauth, A., Millican, K., Silver, D., Petrov, S., Johnson, M., Antonoglou, I., Schrittwieser, J., Glaese, A., Chen, J., Pitler, E., ... Vinyals, O. (2023). Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. *arXiv:2312.11805 [Cs]*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.11805>
- Gottman, J. M., Coan, J., Carrere, S., & Swanson, C. (1998). Predicting marital happiness and stability from newlywed interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353438>
- Huang, K., Yeomans, M., Brooks, A. W., Minson, J., & Gino, F. (2017). It doesn't hurt to ask: Question-asking increases liking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(3), 430–452. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000097>
- Ireland, M. E., Slatcher, R. B., Eastwick, P. W., Scissors, L. E., Finkel, E. J., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2011). Language style matching predicts relationship initiation and stability. *Psychological Science, 22*(1), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610392928>
- Jakesch, M., Hancock, J. T., & Naaman, M. (2023). Human heuristics for AI-generated language are flawed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120*(11), e2208839120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2208839120>
- Kosinski, M. (2023). Theory of Mind Might Have Spontaneously Emerged in Large Language Models. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2302.02083*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.02083>
- Matz, S. C., Teeny, J. D., Vaid, S. S., Peters, H., Harari, G. M., & Cerf, M. (2024). The potential

- of generative AI for personalized persuasion at scale. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-53755-0>
- McFarland, D. A., Jurafsky, D., & Rawlings, C. (2013). Making the Connection: Social Bonding in Courtship Situations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(6), 1596–1649. <https://doi.org/10.1086/670240>
- OpenAI. (2023). *GPT-4 Technical Report*. <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf>
- Orrù, G., Piarulli, A., Conversano, C., & Gemignani, A. (2023). Human-like problem-solving abilities in large language models using ChatGPT. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1199350>
- Peters, H., Cerf, M., & Matz, S. C. (2024). *Large Language Models Can Infer Personality from Free-Form User Interactions* (arXiv:2405.13052). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.13052>
- Peters, H., & Matz, S. (2024). Large language models can infer psychological dispositions of social media users. *PNAS Nexus*, page231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae231>
- Place, S. S., Todd, P. M., Zhuang, J., Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2012). Judging romantic interest of others from thin slices is a cross-cultural ability. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 33(5), 547–550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.02.001>
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., & Sutskever, I. (2019). *Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Language-Models-are-Unsupervised-Multitask-Learners-Radford-Wu/9405cc0d6169988371b2755e573cc28650d14dfe>
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C. C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., ... Scialom, T. (2023). Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *arXiv:2307.09288 [Cs]*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09288>
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 6000–6010.

## Supplementary Information

### Appendix A: Recruitment flyer

*Smile, Flirt, Banter, Laugh, Depart, Rebound.  
12 times. In one evening.*

# NU Speed Dating



This research study is designed to be a full-fledged speed-dating experience for Northwestern undergraduates and will **cost you exactly nothing**. Bring a friend. Make several.

Do something about the dating scene. Visit:  
**[www.speeddating.northwestern.edu](http://www.speeddating.northwestern.edu)**

Sponsored by the Northwestern Class Alliance.

## **Appendix B: Measures across participants and observers**

### ***a) Speed Dating Participants***

- I am likely to say yes to my interaction partner
- I really liked my interaction partner
- My interaction partner and I seemed to have a lot in common
- My interaction partner and I seemed to have similar personalities
- My interaction partner and I had a real connection

Response format: 9-point scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree.

Level of assessment: Responses were collected for each participant.

### ***b) ChatGPT 4.0 and Claude 3***

LLM Prompt:

“Below is a transcript of a conversation between two people talking to each other on a speed date. It’s the first time they meet.

- On a scale from 1-9, how likely do you think the interaction partners will say “yes” to each other and exchange contact information? Only report the numeric value.
- On a scale from 1-9, how much do the interaction partners really like each other, with 1 = not at all and 9 = very much. Only report the numeric value.
- On a scale from 1-9 how much did the interaction partners have in common, with 1 = nothing at all and 9 = very much? Only report the numeric value.
- On a scale from 1-9 how similar were the interaction partners in personality, with 1 = very different and 9 = very similar? Only report the numeric value.
- On a scale from 1-9 how much of a real connection did the interaction partners feel, with 1 = no real connection at all and 9 = very strong real connection? Only report the numeric value.”

Level of assessment: Responses were collected for each dyad (i.e., each speed date)

### ***c) Human judges with access to videos***

- He [she] is likely to say “yes” to her [him].
- He [she] really liked her [him].

Response format: 9-point scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree.

Level of assessment: Responses were collected for each participant.

- The interaction partners seemed to have a lot in common
- The interaction partners seemed to have similar personalities
- The interaction partners had a real connection

Response format: 9-point scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree.

Level of assessment: Responses were collected for each dyad (i.e., each speed date)


*d) Human judges with access to transcripts only*

- On a scale from 1-9, how likely do you think the interaction partners will say “yes” to each other and exchange contact information?
- On a scale from 1-9, how much do the interaction partners like each other, with 1 = not at all and 9 = very much.
- On a scale from 1-9 how much did the interaction partners have in common, with 1 = nothing at all and 9 = very much?
- On a scale from 1-9 how similar were the interaction partners in personality, with 1 = very different and 9 = very similar?
- On a scale from 1-9 how much of a real connection did the interaction partners feel, with 1 = no real connection at all and 9 = very strong real connection?


Level of assessment: Responses were collected for each dyad (i.e., each speed date)

## Appendix C: Distributions of Ratings

### a) Speed Dating Participants




### b) ChatGPT 4.0











**c) Claude 3**



**d) Human judges with access to videos**



*e) Human judges with access to transcripts only*



**Appendix D: Intra-class coefficients for all ratings and observers**

	ChatGPT 4.0	Claude 3	Human judges (video)	Human judges (transcripts)
Likelihood of saying Yes	ICC = 0.80	ICC = 0.73	ICC = 0.92	ICC = 0.49
Liking	ICC = 0.76	ICC = 0.71	ICC = 0.89	ICC = 0.46
In common	ICC = 0.75	ICC = 0.79	ICC = 0.94	ICC = 0.51
Personality similarity	ICC = 0.65	ICC = 0.64	ICC = 0.93	ICC = 0.45
Connection	ICC = 0.75	ICC = 0.68	ICC = 0.94	ICC = 0.40

## Appendix E: Pearson zero-order correlation of all variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	
1. Matching (SR)	-																									
2. Liking (SR)	.75	-																								
3. Exchange (SR)	.50	.41	-																							
4. Common (SR)	.59	.64	.33	-																						
5. Similarity (SR)	.64	.70	.39	.79	-																					
6. Connection (SR)	.67	.71	.43	.71	.80	-																				
7. Matching (GPT)	.13	.15	.12	.23	.19	.17	-																			
8. Liking (GPT)	.12	.13	.11	.19	.15	.13	.90	-																		
9. Common (GPT)	.09	.12	.09	.23	.14	.11	.76	.79	-																	
10. Similarity (GPT)	.12	.12	.10	.21	.16	.14	.78	.81	.82	-																
11. Connection (GPT)	.13	.15	.10	.23	.18	.16	.91	.91	.84	.85	-															
12. Matching (Claude)	.12	.15	.07	.2	.18	.16	.4	.37	.27	.33	.38	-														
13. Liking (Claude)	.04	.09	.05	.13	.12	.11	.39	.38	.28	.32	.37	.71	-													
14. Common (Claude)	.11	.16	.1	.29	.21	.2	.47	.43	.41	.42	.45	.61	.67	-												
15. Similarity (Claude)	.08	.12	.08	.23	.17	.17	.43	.41	.37	.39	.42	.57	.76	.84	-											
16. Connection (Claude)	.08	.13	.05	.22	.19	.16	.45	.42	.33	.36	.42	.74	.85	.81	.82	-										
17. Matching (Coder V)	.40	.44	.31	.43	.44	.47	.31	.29	.24	.26	.30	.22	.18	.23	.19	.21	-									
18. Liking (Coder V)	.31	.39	.28	.42	.40	.44	.24	.21	.17	.19	.22	.2	.14	.22	.18	.19	.82	-								
19. Connection (Coder V)	.35	.45	.32	.48	.49	.49	.27	.24	.21	.23	.27	.24	.19	.29	.23	.25	.88	.79	-							
20. Common (Coder V)	.23	.31	.23	.55	.42	.38	.28	.24	.32	.29	.30	.27	.21	.41	.33	.29	.58	.54	.72	-						
21. Similarity (Coder V)	.31	.39	.28	.44	.46	.43	.23	.2	.19	.21	.23	.21	.15	.25	.2	.2	.77	.68	.88	.71	-					
22. Matching (Coder T)	.27	.29	.13	.40	.36	.34	.34	.35	.25	.29	.34	.29	.28	.36	.32	.34	.45	.41	.45	.42	.37	-				
23. Liking (Coder T)	.23	.26	.15	.35	.32	.30	.33	.33	.23	.24	.31	.24	.25	.3	.27	.3	.41	.39	.43	.37	.36	.89	-			
24. Connection (Coder T)	.23	.26	.13	.40	.34	.32	.27	.29	.22	.23	.28	.23	.22	.35	.28	.31	.41	.41	.46	.45	.35	.85	.80	-		
25. Common (Coder T)	.16	.17	.11	.45	.29	.24	.29	.29	.36	.35	.32	.26	.21	.45	.36	.32	.25	.29	.32	.61	.26	.58	.52	.63	-	
26. Similarity (Coder T)	.24	.26	.15	.42	.37	.33	.31	.32	.27	.27	.31	.25	.23	.34	.3	.31	.41	.40	.47	.49	.42	.80	.77	.81	.64	-

SR = Participants' self-reports, GPT = Predictions made by ChatGPT 4, Claude = Predictions made by Claude 3, Coder V = Coders with access to video recordings, Coder T = Coders with access to text transcripts only.

### Appendix F: Findings for Claude 3




Fig. S2 Correlations between the speed-dating ratings of the two LLMs and different evaluators