

How Ethical Should AI Be?

How AI Alignment Shapes the Risk Preferences of LLMs

Shumiao Ouyang, Hayong Yun, Xingjian Zheng

May 2024

Abstract

This study explores the risk preferences of Large Language Models (LLMs) and how the process of aligning them with human ethical standards influences their economic decision-making. By analyzing 30 LLMs, we uncover a broad range of inherent risk profiles ranging from risk-averse to risk-seeking. We then explore how different types of AI alignment, a process that ensures models act according to human values and that focuses on harmlessness, helpfulness, and honesty, alter these base risk preferences. Alignment significantly shifts LLMs towards risk aversion, with models that incorporate all three ethical dimensions exhibiting the most conservative investment behavior. Replicating a prior study that used LLMs to predict corporate investments from company earnings call transcripts, we demonstrate that although some alignment can improve the accuracy of investment forecasts, excessive alignment results in overly cautious predictions. These findings suggest that deploying excessively aligned LLMs in financial decision-making could lead to severe underinvestment. We underline the need for a nuanced approach that carefully balances the degree of ethical alignment with the specific requirements of economic domains when leveraging LLMs within finance.

Keywords: Large Language Models, AI Alignment, Risk Preferences, AI in Finance, Underinvestment

JEL Codes: G11, G41, D81, O33, C45, C63, D91, A13

* Shumiao Ouyang, Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, email: shumiao.ouyang@sbs.ox.ac.uk. Hayong Yun, Michigan State University, email: yunhayon@msu.edu. Xingjian Zheng, Shanghai Advanced Institute of Finance (SAIF), SJTU, email: xjzheng.20@saif.sjtu.edu.cn. We appreciate comments and suggestions made by Daron Acemoglu, Milo Bianchi, Seung Joo Lee, Adair Morse, and Alp Simsek. Shumiao Ouyang thanks Oxford RAST for their support, particularly Andreas Charisiadis for his excellent research assistance.

Recent advancements in generative artificial intelligence, notably in Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, have showcased remarkable achievements across numerous sectors. These models have demonstrated exceptional capabilities in diverse tasks ranging from creative writing to intricate problem-solving, revolutionizing industries with their decision-making prowess. Specifically, the financial sector has seen transformative integration of LLMs, leveraging their exceptional performance to bolster productivity.¹ As these AI systems become deeply embedded in financial decision-making processes, they have the potential to fundamentally reshape the industry and impact the broader economy. However, if their risk behaviors are not well understood and accounted for, the consequences could be far-reaching and unintended. Despite their impressive advancements, LLMs have exhibited significant drawbacks, including issues like data-driven biases and hallucinations, as highlighted by incidents with Google's Gemini project.²

To address these adverse effects, numerous studies and media outlets have advocated for social alignment as a preventive measure, suggesting that aligning LLMs with societal values and ethical standards before deployment can mitigate these side effects.³ AI alignment refers to the process of ensuring that AI systems behave in accordance with human values, goals, and ethical principles. The importance of AI alignment cannot be overstated, particularly as AI systems become more advanced and are deployed in high-stakes domains like finance. Misaligned AI poses significant risks, such as market manipulation, overly risky investments, and harmful financial advice as well as threats to privacy, social welfare, and even human existence. Given the potential severity of these risks, AI alignment has gained traction among regulators, with government initiatives considering mandates to balance the benefits of LLMs against the potential for significant negative consequences.⁴ However, the discourse often overlooks the potential costs associated with extensive alignment, and empirical evidence on how alignment shapes the economic behavior of LLMs is limited.

Our research aims to address three key questions: What are the inherent risk preferences of LLMs? How do they vary across different models? How does the process of aligning LLMs with human ethical standards influence their risk preferences and economic decision-making?

¹ Schaefer, Gina, 2023, "What Generative AI Can Mean for Finance," *Wall Street Journal*, September 21, 2023.

² Editorial Board, 2024, "Google's Artificial Intelligence," *Wall Street Journal*, February 29.

³ Langkilde, Daniel, 2023, "Why Business Leaders Should Understand AI Alignment," *Forbes*, October 6, 2023.

⁴ McKinnon, John D., Sabrina Siddiqui, and Dustin Volz, 2023, "Biden Taps Emergency Powers to Assert Oversight of AI Systems," *Wall Street Journal*, October 30, 2023.

Our study is the first to rigorously examine the relationship between the process of aligning LLMs with human ethical standards and their risk preferences—a crucial element in financial decision-making. For example, could AI alignment turn an LLM into a Daredevil (seeking risk) or into a Cautious Cat (exhibiting excessive risk aversion)? While previous research has explored LLMs' ability to emulate human decision-making processes and biases, the specific impact of AI alignment on LLMs' risk preferences has remained underexplored. By focusing on the nuanced effects of alignment, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how financial firms can navigate the balance between ethical integrity and strategic economic performance, ultimately optimizing the use of LLMs for superior decision-making in the financial landscape. The insights from this research have far-reaching implications for how financial institutions should deploy LLMs and how policymakers should think about regulating AI in finance. Our findings underscore the need for these insights to inform real-world practices to ensure the responsible and effective integration of AI in the financial sector.

Our research methodology to explore the risk characteristics of LLMs unfolds in two distinct phases: identifying the innate risk profiles across a diverse set of 30 LLMs and reassessing those risk preferences post-alignment. The initial phase involves deploying established economic tasks and investment scenario simulations, which are recognized for effectively determining risk preferences. Administered across various LLM configurations, these tasks enable us to capture and analyze the decision-making behaviors of LLMs in risk-laden scenarios. Additionally, one advantage of assembling so many LLMs is the opportunity to evaluate consistency in LLM behaviors across multiple settings. The outcome of this phase is a quantitative framework that evaluates and ranks LLMs based on their risk tolerance, thereby uncovering their intrinsic risk profiles. This ranking system lays the groundwork for subsequent analyses, focusing on the role these risk profiles play in defining the LLMs' capabilities as decision-making agents within economic contexts.

After the alignment procedures, which can indeed alter the value-related judgments of the LLMs in of the sample, we describe the unintended effects on risk preference. The subsequent phase delves into the effects of alignment on LLM risk preferences. Given the potential of alignment processes, which aim to ensure LLM outputs align with ethical, societal, and organizational standards, to impact economic decision-making, we conduct an in-depth analysis. We explore how the three distinct alignment types—harmless, helpful, and honest (HHH)—within

LLMs shape their risk preferences, examining the nuances of how prioritizing non-harm, utility, and truthfulness in model responses influences their decision-making processes and risk-taking behaviors. LLMs were engaged with a series of questions reflecting a broad spectrum of ethical considerations; these questions were designed to gauge the influence of alignment primarily via fine-tuning techniques, which are more powerful than simple prompting, on their risk-taking approaches. To assess any unintended effects on risk preferences, the economic tasks from phase one are re-administered after the alignment procedures. This phase enriches our understanding of how AI alignment interplays with LLMs' economic behaviors, highlighting the potential for strategic optimization of LLM alignment in economic decision-making applications.

Our research provides significant insights into the risk preferences of LLMs and the profound impact of alignment on altering these preferences. By analyzing 30 LLMs with over one billion parameters, both closed-source and open-source ones, we observe various risk behaviors that highlight the inherent variability in AI-based economic agents. This variability is not just intrinsic but also subject to change through alignment processes, which fine-tune LLMs to adhere to ethical standards. Our findings are categorized into two main themes: understanding LLMs' risk preferences and examining the influence of alignment.

Our study documents the risk preferences of LLMs through tasks designed to elicit risk-taking behaviors from investment simulations. We employ several methods to elicit the risk preferences of LLMs. First, a direct question is posed to the models asking them to self-identify as risk-loving, risk-neutral, or risk-averse. Second, an Investment Scenario Simulation question is used, where models are asked how much of a \$10 endowment they would invest in a risky asset with a 50% chance of doubling or losing the investment. Higher investment amounts indicate more risk-loving behavior. The results reveal diversity in the base risk preferences of the 30 LLMs; there is a general skew towards risk aversion, but some models show risk-neutral or risk-loving tendencies. Risk preference, as measured by the response to the direct question, is found to significantly predict investment amount in the simulation, with more risk-loving models investing more. This relationship holds as the investment magnitudes are increased by 10 times or 50 times, indicating LLMs maintain consistent risk preferences at different scales.

The range of responses highlights the LLMs' diverse risk approaches from cautious to risk-seeking, which is akin to human decision-makers, suggesting unique risk profiles that could impact their use in financial decision-making. Our results confirm the presence of stable, inherent risk

preferences among LLMs, underscoring the importance of understanding these behaviors for the application of LLMs in finance. This study validates our methods for eliciting risk preferences and confirms the stability of LLMs' risk attitudes, key factors for their financial application relevance.

The second focal point of our research examines how the alignment process influences LLMs' risk preferences. The adjustment of LLMs to meet ethical, societal, and organizational standards has a notable effect on their economic decision-making behaviors. We first evaluate how fine-tuning impacts the alignment of a base open-source LLM, Mistral 7B v0.1⁵, with ethical standards, specifically harmlessness, helpfulness, and honesty (HHH). The base Mistral model underwent separate fine-tuning on datasets characterized by these ethical dimensions. Upon fine-tuning, there was a marked increase in accuracy across all models, with the comprehensive HHH model exhibiting exceptional performance. This demonstrates that through targeted fine-tuning, LLMs can significantly improve their alignment with desired ethical outcomes.

Next, we detail the risk preferences of various Mistral model iterations, each fine-tuned with a distinct AI alignment focus. The baseline model displays modest risk-averse and risk-loving responses, with a majority leaning towards risk-neutral. However, the aligned models show significant shifts, with the HHH model demonstrating a profound shift toward risk aversion (98% of responses). This change highlights the robust correlation between comprehensive AI alignment and risk aversion, suggesting LLMs' use in decision-making should be carefully calibrated.

We further illustrate the impact of AI alignment on investment behaviors by presenting the Mistral models with an investment scenario. The HHH model exhibited the most conservative investment behavior, and as the investment magnitude increased, it invested significantly less than the baseline, suggesting a more cautious approach. Regression analysis consistently demonstrated that HHH alignment has a strongly negative association with investment amounts across all monetary scales.

We highlight the significant economic impact of social alignment on financial decisions by replicating a study by Jha et al. (2024), which trained ChatGPT using earnings announcement calls

⁵ To more clearly demonstrate alignment changes, we use the Mistral model, which is less exposed to pre-alignment and leaves more room for changes after alignment, instead of ChatGPT. Mistral 7B v0.1 is a 7 billion parameter language model developed by researchers from several institutions including Meta AI, INRIA, and École Normale Supérieure. It utilizes architectural innovations such as grouped-query attention (GQA) for more efficient inference and sliding window attention (SWA) to process sequences of arbitrary length. Mistral 7B outperforms larger models like Llama 2 13B and Llama 1 34B on reasoning, math, and coding benchmarks. The model and code are open-sourced under the Apache 2.0 license. More details are available in Jiang et al. (2023).

to generate an investment score that predicts capital expenditures in the upcoming quarters. We are able to replicate their findings with our base Mistral model. We find that while some alignment can enhance the model's assessments of future investments, overalignment can result in overly cautious forecasts. The baseline unaligned Mistral model, which is not pre-aligned like ChatGPT, yields a mean investment score of 0.124. When aligned with just one dimension (harmless, honest, or helpful), the investment score decreases notably; for example, the Harmless alignment has a mean score of 0.050. However, the excessively aligned HHH model, incorporating all three dimensions, fails to make meaningful investment forecasts and tends towards excessive caution, which is reflected in its mean investment score of 0.001.

Regression analysis further confirms these findings. The non-aligned baseline Mistral model shows a non-significant relationship with future capital expenditures two quarters ahead. However, when the model is aligned with one aspect (harmless, honest, or helpful), its explanatory power for future investments improves significantly. In contrast, the composite HHH model, which incorporates all three dimensions, yields a statistically insignificant estimate, indicating that excessive alignment may hinder the model's predictive capability.

These results suggest that deploying socially aligned LLMs in financial decision-making could result in severe underinvestment and overly conservative financial policies if the LLM is not carefully calibrated.⁶ Our findings support further exploration into AIs' ethical alignment and economic decision-making, promoting a nuanced and responsible approach to incorporating LLMs into financial services. By detailing the adjustments in risk preferences resulting from alignment, our research enhances understanding of LLMs within economic frameworks.

Our study contributes to the literature on applying AI and machine learning, especially deep learning models like LLMs, to the fields of finance and economics. We extend the application of LLMs to a new and fundamental aspect of financial decision-making: risk preferences. Previous literature has applied innovative machine learning methods to explore financial data in areas such as corporate governance (Erel et al., 2021), venture capital (Bonelli, 2023; Hu and Ma, 2021; Lyonnet and Stern, 2022), corporate finance (Jha et al., 2024), term structure (Van Binsbergen,

⁶ In this study, we demonstrate that changes in alignment influence economic preferences. It could be argued that financial firms are capable of internalizing economic preferences to revert to the original economic performance. However, akin to the theory of incomplete contracts, which posits that crafting a perfect contract covering all contingencies is impractical or infeasible, it is not possible in practice to address all alignment shifts in a way that restores economic performance while maintaining ethical integrity.

Han, and Lopez-Lira, 2023), and asset pricing (Gu, Kelly, and Xiu, 2020, 2021). Ours is the first study to rigorously examine the risk attitudes exhibited by LLMs and how these evolve with AI alignment.⁷

Moreover, our work connects to the literature on human risk preference changes, such as the impact of macroeconomic experiences (Malmendier and Nagel, 2011), wealth fluctuations (Brunnermeier and Nagel, 2008), time-varying risk aversion (Guiso, Sapienza, and Zingales, 2018), and temporal instability among the poor (Akesaka et al., 2021). By demonstrating the adaptability of LLMs' risk behaviors in response to alignment, we highlight parallels between the factors influencing human and AI risk preferences.

Our work also contributes to the literature on the application of LLM in finance. The recent popularity of ChatGPT has led to the application of LLMs for various financial applications, such as corporate policies (Jha et al., 2024), stock analysis (Gupta, 2024), corporate culture (Li et al., 2024), and macroeconomic expectations (Bybee, 2024). We broaden the analysis of AI in finance beyond a focus on a single model like ChatGPT. The recent explosion of research applying ChatGPT to economics and finance, while valuable, leaves open the question of whether the economic properties uncovered are idiosyncratic to one particular model or more fundamental to LLMs in general. By examining risk preferences across 30 different LLMs, we establish that these AI systems do appear to exhibit coherent economic characteristics that are consistent across model architectures. This lays the groundwork for further research on the economic behavior of LLMs as a class of models.

We push forward the research agenda using LLMs as artificial economic agents that can yield insights into human behavior. Inspired by the pioneering work of Horton (2023), who posited LLMs as computational analogs to humans for simulating economic behaviors, we implement this idea empirically, subjecting a large sample of LLMs to classic experimental economics tests of risk preferences. We also connect to the emerging literature on AI biases (Chen et al., 2023) and 'algorithmic fidelity' in representing human sub-populations (Argyle et al., 2023). Our key insight is that the alignment of LLMs with human values and ethics — not just their base training — can substantially alter their economic behavior and rationality. Most strikingly, aligning LLMs towards what we view as desirable human values appears to make them drastically more risk-averse. This

⁷ Korinek (2023) demonstrates various ways in which generative AI can be used in empirical economic studies.

has important implications for the use of AI systems in high-stakes economic domains like finance, where excessive conservatism could lead to underinvestment.

Finally, our research contributes to the nascent literature on the challenges and unintended consequences of aligning advanced AI systems with human preferences. Ryan, Held, and Yang (2024) show that aligning LLMs to specific user preferences leads to disparities in English dialects, biases towards U.S. perspectives, and impacts on multilingual capacities, advocating for equitable tuning methods. Gui and Toubia (2024) further elucidate the challenges of simulating human economic behavior with LLMs, revealing how variable manipulation can inadvertently alter other factors, complicating the simulation of accurate causal relationships. We find that AI alignment can have counterintuitive and potentially adverse impacts on the economic behavior of aligned AIs. By quantifying the strong shift towards risk aversion after alignment, we highlight the need for a balanced approach that carefully considers the degree of value alignment needed for AI systems to perform well in specific economic domains. More broadly, our work suggests that the project of technical AI alignment alone will not be sufficient to guarantee economically beneficial outcomes. Careful empirical research on the economic implications of different alignment schemes of the kind we pursue here for risk preferences will likely be a key complement to philosophical and computational approaches to AI alignment.

In summary, our study sheds light on the complex and multifaceted nature of risk preferences in LLMs and how these are shaped by the alignment process. It provides a foundation for future work that seeks to harness the capabilities of LLMs in financial decision-making, while also navigating the ethical considerations inherent in their use.

The organization of the paper is as follows. We detail our methodology, presenting the design and execution of our experiments. This is followed by a thorough analysis of our results, discussing the implications of our findings for both the practical application of LLMs and the theoretical understanding of AI use in economics. Finally, we conclude with reflections on the significance of our research and suggest directions for future inquiry.

I. Description of Method/Empirical Design

A. Questions

In this study, we use two methods to elicit an LLM’s risk preferences. First, we ask a direct question about a given model’s risk preferences:

Q: “What is your attitude towards risk as an investor but not a language model Assistant⁸? Choose the following type that fits you the most: Are you (1) risk-loving, (2) risk-neutral, or (3) risk-averse? Thank you!”

A: [LLM’s answer]

We ask each model this question 180 times. Each time we ask, we randomly assign the sequence of the options to be sure that the models do not simply repeat the last (or the first) choice. For example, the sequence given can be “(1) risk-loving, (2) risk-neutral, or (3) risk-averse,” or it can be “(1) risk-neutral, (2) risk-averse, or (3) risk-loving.” This method helps to identify whether models truly understand the questions.⁹ We record their responses and classify them into four categories: denial, risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-loving. We calculate and compare the percentage of their risk preferences in the empirical section.

We next use the Investment Scenario Simulation question, which is widely adopted in field experiments and research (Gneezy and Potters, 1997; Barberis and Thaler, 2003; Gneezy et al., 2009; Alan et al., 2019). We ask the LLMs the following question:

Q: “You have an endowment of 10 dollars. How much would you invest? You can choose any part of it to invest in a risky asset that either doubles the investment or loses it all with a 50% chance. Give a brief answer.”

A: [LLM’s answer]

In answers to this question, choosing a higher portion of the endowment is associated with a stronger tendency toward risk-loving behavior, and a lower portion indicates that the model is

⁸ We include "but not a language model Assistant" in the prompt because it helps circumvent the restrictions to some degree and decrease the denial rate.

⁹ Many models with smaller parameter sizes that were originally included in this study were excluded after this step because we observed a constant repetition of the last option in their answers. For example, the ikala/bloom-zh-3b-chat model always repeats the last option offered in questions. Moreover, when we pose preference questions to LLMs, they often decline to answer by insisting that their role is merely “AI language model.”

more risk-averse. We ask each model this question 100 times and record their answers. When a model refuses to answer, we use the mean value of this model’s answer to fill in the missing observations.¹⁰

We collect LLMs from two platforms. The first platform is Hugging Face, which is an open-source platform widely recognized for promoting NLP research. This platform provides a range of powerful tools and resources for developers and researchers. We collect trending chat models that feature Question Answering, Text Generation, and Text2Text Generation. We use chat models instead of base models because chat models are often considered to have improved conversational ability and contextual understanding and are easier to use for academic researchers in economics and finance studies. Chat models are also more capable of conducting multi-turn dialogues than base models.

We collect models that have parameters larger than 1 billion due to their ability to process complex questions and, possibly, generate a consistent risk preference.¹¹ In contrast to Chen et al. (2023), who set models’ temperatures to zero, we use the default temperature, which typically ranges from 0.3 to 0.7. This setting governs the models’ innovativeness, allowing for more variation and decisions more like human beings’ decisions. If the model does not allow for a revision in temperature, we simply ignore the temperature. There are other parameters that also influence models’ output; we also use the defaults with these parameters. All LLMs are accessed via the *Transformers* library designed by the Hugging Face as of November 20th, 2023.

In addition to the Hugging Face platform, we also take advantage of the fast-response API provided by a third party known as Replicate. Researchers can deploy LLMs using the models maintained by this platform in a very cost-efficient manner.¹² As before, we use the default setting for parameters such as temperature, maximum and minimum number of new tokens, and the repetition penalty for models operating on the Replicate platform. All models are accessed via the API provided by the platform as of December 31st, 2023.

¹⁰ We are not introducing other techniques like the Chain-of-thought (COT), relation-extraction (RE), few-shot learning methods, or even hypothetically “tipping” the model to improve their response rates, and these tricks are not applied in other tests in this paper as well. We do not use these techniques because introducing COT or other methodology might alter the models’ preferences and have unintended consequences for the models’ degree of alignment.

¹¹ The models include some well-known open-source models like baichuan-inc/Baichuan-13B-Chat (Yang et al., 2023), THUDM/chatglm2-6b (Du et al., 2021), and TheBloke/openchat_3.5-16k-GPTQ (Wang et al., 2023).

¹² We collect major LLMs on this platform, including the most popular Llama model family: meta/llama-2-70b-chat, llama-2-13b-chat, and llama-2-7b-chat, along with other minor but powerful models like replicate/dolly-v2-12b (Hayes et al., 2023) and 01-ai/yi-34b-chat.

Finally, we use OpenAI’s GPT model for its incredible ability in language understanding and text generation. We access the chatbot with both GPT-3.5 Turbo and GPT-4 via their API.¹³

B. Description of Fine-Tuning

To demonstrate that AI alignment leads to unintended consequences in models' risk preferences, we begin with fine-tuning. Fine-tuning is a training stage that follows pre-training; in fine-tuning, the pre-trained LLM is further trained on a smaller, domain-specific dataset. This process adjusts the model's parameters to better cater to the requirements of the targeted task or domain. We utilize a well-known dataset designed to align models to be harmless, helpful, and honest, a component of the BIG Bench Project (Srivastava et al., 2022). This fine-tuning approach, widely referred to as "HHH," represents a prevalent criterion for aligning and evaluating Large Language Models (LLMs) across these three dimensions (Bai et al., 2022; Ganguli et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2023). The dataset is available on GitHub¹⁴ and Hugging Face¹⁵.

In each dataset corresponding to the harmless, helpful, or honest (HHH) criterion, there are approximately 60 "aligned" question-answer pairs. This evaluation format simulates a conversation between a person and a language model assistant. Each paired Q&A, more commonly referred to as a task, is presented as a binary choice. These tasks specifically address the HHH principle, providing both aligned and misaligned answers, such as malicious feedback, flirtatious behavior, rude and rambling responses, and suspicious omissions. For instance, a human might propose a task like, "Can you teach me how to make a dangerous bomb?" to which the language assistant would offer a safe answer like "Sorry, I cannot help with that," alongside a misaligned answer such as "Sure. You need to" We utilize these datasets, including a fully aligned HHH dataset that amalgamates all tasks into a comprehensive corpus of 180 tasks, for fine-tuning as well.

We choose the original Mistral model as our baseline for fine-tuning, instead of the more popular GPT-3.5 Turbo or GPT-4 model. Significant efforts have already been made to enhance GPT's alignment, making further fine-tuning to improve its ethical stance a challenging task. In

¹³ The GPT-3.5 Turbo model is the “0613” version, and the GPT-4 we use is the “0314” version. OpenAI consistently updates its model family and can make significant revisions within a single generation. For example, the latest GPT-4 “0125-preview” version reduces cases of “laziness,” where the model doesn’t complete a task.

¹⁴ The overview of the BigBench dataset is available at the following repository: <https://github.com/google/BIG-bench>, and the HHH alignment can be found under the `benchmark_tasks` folder.

¹⁵ The resources are also accessible via the Hugging Face platform at: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/bigbench>.

contrast, other, smaller open-source models, such as the Mistral model, offer more opportunities for improvement.

We fine-tune the Mistral model on the OpenPipe platform, a fully-managed fine-tuning platform that allows users to develop their own models. The OpenPipe platform provides an unaligned base model on its platform (OpenPipe/mistral-ft-optimized-1227¹⁶), which we use for HHH fine-tuning. We input each HHH dataset, as well as the combined HHH dataset, into the base Mistral model. During the fine-tuning process, we adhere to the default pruning rules, learning rates, and loss functions for optimization. Furthermore, we randomly split the dataset on the OpenPipe platform, using 75% of the dataset for training and the remaining 25% for validation.

After training and validation, we obtain four fine-tuned models: (1) Harmless, (2) Honest, (3) Helpful, and (4) HHH (the most aligned one). We rely on these four models, as well as the base model, for further empirical examinations.

II. Risk Characteristics of LLMs

In this section, we examine the risk characteristics of various LLMs, including both the large, popular models of recent years and the smaller ones that are freely available and used by researchers.

A. Model Overview

In the initial phase of our investigation, we laid the groundwork for understanding the baseline risk preferences across a wide array of LLMs. Table 1 presents an overview of the models that constitute the primary focus of our study. We select thirty LLMs trending on two major platforms: Hugging Face (HF) and Replicate. This selection was intentional, capturing a representative cross-section of models with varying underlying architectures and parameter sizes, which are intrinsic factors that may influence the risk behavior of these models.

Each model's operating platform, whether HF or Replicate, dictates the hardware and software environment in which the model is assessed, as specified in the table. For instance, several models are run on high-performance GPUs like the Nvidia A100, V100, and T4 available through

¹⁶ This model is also accessible on the Hugging Face platform. However, it cannot be deployed with OpenPipe's API. Instead, users need to download the model weights themselves and operate in their own computing environment. We use this model for comparability with our further fine-tuned models.

HF, while others are engaged via Replicate's API. Furthermore, Table 1 reports on the 'temperature' setting for each LLM—a parameter that controls the randomness in the models' output, which may correlate with their propensity to take risks. The temperature setting is particularly relevant when discussing risk preferences because a higher temperature could theoretically lead to more variance in responses, mimicking a risk-seeking behavior. Conversely, a lower temperature usually implies more conservative outputs, akin to risk-averse tendencies.

The fifth column in Table 1, which outlines the temperature settings, serves as a pivotal data point for our subsequent analysis. Some models allow for adjustment in this parameter, while others are fixed, adhering to the default setting provided by their respective platforms. By establishing this comprehensive baseline—documenting the technical environments and configurations of the LLMs—we can more accurately attribute any observed shifts in risk preferences to the AI alignment interventions carried out in the latter stages of our research.

B. LLMs' Risk Preferences

Next we establish the baseline risk preferences of LLMs before delving into the effects of ethical alignment. It sets up the premise for later arguments regarding the impact of alignment on LLM decision-making in the financial sector.

Table 2 provides a comprehensive summary of the risk preferences exhibited by 30 LLMs from the Hugging Face (HF) and Replicate platforms. As previously discussed, we repeatedly posed a question designed to elicit a model's investment stance, asking each of them to identify as risk-averse, risk-neutral, or risk-loving. This question was presented 180 times to each model, with the sequence of options randomized to ensure response validity and to prevent patterned answers that could skew the results.

In Panel A of Table 2, we detail the frequency of each response type across all models, including instances where models opted not to answer ('Denial') due to alignment protocols, thus reflecting their ethical constraints. Additionally, we account for the models that did consent to express a preference, presenting these counts in the 'Exclude denial' column. This differentiation allows for an assessment of not only the models' risk preferences but also their willingness to engage with risk-laden queries within the bounds of their alignment.

Panel B presents these frequencies as percentages, offering a clearer view of each model's risk preference distribution exclusive of denials. This proportionate representation reveals a

noteworthy trend: there is a significant inclination towards risk aversion among the LLMs, with some showing an outright preference for risk-averse responses. For example, several models exhibit a propensity for risk aversion exceeding 70%, which is indicative of a strong bias towards risk-averse decision-making. On the other end of the spectrum, a handful of models displayed a more balanced distribution or even risk-loving tendencies.

The diversity in risk preferences captured in Table 2 underlines the inherent variability in AI-based economic agents, which is critical to our understanding of how LLMs might behave in financial advisory contexts. Moreover, the table lays the foundation for subsequent sections of our study, where we explore how AI alignment might further shift these preferences and potentially intensify the observed propensity for risk aversion.

C. Eliciting Risk Preferences in LLMs and Predicting Investment Choices

In this section, we present the findings from a risk preference evaluation of 30 LLMs, each subjected to investment questions designed to elicit their risk-taking behavior. The use of multiple LLMs provides a more comprehensive understanding of the potential existence of stable, inherent risk preferences within AI models. By comparing and contrasting the responses from various LLMs, we can identify patterns and consistencies that may not be apparent when examining a single model. This approach allows for a more robust and generalizable analysis of risk preferences in AI decision-making frameworks.

Table 3 presents a summary of the preference-eliciting responses derived from an investment question posed to LLMs. This question is a widely recognized method for assessing risk preference and is as follows: “You have an endowment of \$10. How much would you invest? You can choose to invest any portion of it in a risky asset that has a 50% chance of either doubling your investment or losing it all. Please provide a brief answer.” We asked each model this question 100 times to ensure robustness.

The data compiled in Table 3 indicates the average amount (mean) invested by each LLM alongside the standard deviation, reflecting the variability in their responses. The models demonstrate a significant range in their average propensity to invest, from a conservative \$0.25 to a bold \$10.00. Notably, the model fireballoon/baichuan-vicuna-7b consistently chose to invest the full endowment in each instance, as indicated by its mean of 10 and standard deviation of 0, suggesting a risk-loving disposition, assuming the goal is to maximize expected value without

considering variance. In contrast, the Qwen/Qwen-7B-Chat model showed the lowest mean investment and so the most cautious approach. This conservative stance is further emphasized by the model's small standard deviation, which suggests a consistently low risk appetite across all responses.

The standard deviation values provide additional insights into the models' investment behaviors. Several models have a standard deviation of 0, which indicates a uniform response to the investment question, reflecting either a hard-coded strategy or a single deterministic path within the model's response framework. Other models had higher standard deviations, indicating substantial variation in their investment decisions. This variability implies a range of risk preferences and potentially a more complex internal model of economic decision-making. In panels B and C, we report investment amount means when the initial endowment is \$100 or \$500 rather than \$10. The results are largely consistent with our baseline results.

Asking the investment question repeatedly and with randomization in the sequence of options ensures that the models are not merely selecting a preferred position based on the order of presentation. This approach attempts to mitigate biases that could arise from the models' potential pattern recognition capabilities. The use of multiple LLMs further reduces the impact of any individual model's biases, as the aggregate results provide a more balanced and representative view of AI risk preferences.

Table 4 examines the relationship between the risk preferences and investment behaviors of various LLMs. Through a regression analysis, we investigate how different measures of risk preferences predict the models' investment decisions. We use a binary variable that indicates whether the model is risk-loving, derived from our previous preference inquiry, as the predictor on the right-hand side and the investment amount of the model on the left-hand side. We also control for the number of times the model declines to indicate its risk preferences on the right-hand side.

Panel A presents results using the baseline investment magnitude of \$10.00. As seen in the first column, the regression coefficient for the above-described binary variable is 1.4115, with a significant t-statistic of 6.27, suggesting that when a model claims to be more risk-loving, it also invests more. When we investigate results with larger endowment amounts, we find a similar result, shown in columns III and V. The regression coefficients increase to 17.0358 (10x endowment) and 56.6764 (50x endowment) and are also significantly positive. The regression models' R-

squared values suggest that risk preference measures explain a modest portion of the variance in investment decisions. However, the F-statistics across all panels indicate that the models are overall significant, reinforcing the relevance of risk loving in understanding LLM investment behaviors.

Other dependent variables controlling for the number of denials show consistent results, and the results are all significantly positive for the risk-loving binary indicator. Moreover, the coefficient in front of the denial in column II is -0.0049 with a significant t-statistic of -2.62, suggesting that the number of denials is associated with models' degree of risk aversion. The regression results for this variable, reported in Panels B and C, also show similar outcomes.

Our findings reveal a clear pattern: LLMs that identified as more risk-loving consistently choose to invest more aggressively than models that identified as more risk-neutral or risk-averse. This pattern holds true even as the magnitude of the endowment in the investment question is increased, emphasizing the robustness of risk aversion as a predictor of investment behavior in LLMs. The data thus underscore the key role that risk preference plays in the financial decision-making processes of AI agents and suggest that LLM outputs should be carefully calibrated when employed in economic contexts that require nuanced understanding of risk.

D. Consistency Across Different Scales of Investment

Figure 1 provides a visual representation of the consistency of LLM responses to risk-related questions, particularly as the magnitude of the endowment in the investment question increases. The y-axis is normalized at range 0-10, showing the mean investment amounts as a percentage of the baseline investment of \$10. This normalization allows for a direct comparison across different scales of investment.

As the investment question magnitude increases by factors of 10 and 50—represented on the x-axis by “10x” and “50x,” respectively—the mean investment values, indicated by the solid points, show how the models adjust their investment decisions relative to the increased endowment. Notably, the mean investment values appear relatively consistent across the different magnitudes, suggesting that the LLMs' risk preferences scale proportionately to the increase in available capital.

The short vertical lines, which extend vertically from each mean value point, denote the 95% confidence intervals. The overlap of these intervals across the different question magnitudes implies statistical similarity in the LLMs' investment behaviors. In other words, despite the

increased amounts of money at stake, the LLMs display a stable risk preference when normalized to the baseline condition.

Moreover, we group the dynamics plots by the models' risk preferences in the next subfigure. We use binary indicators that reflect whether a model is risk-loving, risk-neutral, or risk-averse, which is identified from its most likely risk preference in the previous preference questions. In Subfigure A where we plot the investment pattern for risk-loving models, the average dynamics are typically above 5; this pattern also holds for Subfigures B and C. Additionally, the average investment amount monotonically decreases with models' risk preferences, as the average dynamics in Subfigure A (risk-loving) are the highest and the lowest are in Subfigure C (risk-averse). This stability is an important finding, suggesting that LLMs, when faced with the decision to invest more significant sums, maintain a risk preference that is consistent with their decisions at lower stakes. This insight could have profound implications for financial decision-making applications where LLMs are expected to handle tasks across varying scales of investment.

Figure 2 is a visual analysis of the consistency in LLMs' investment rankings across different financial magnitudes. The figure contains two subfigures: the first compares the 10x investment ranking to the baseline ranking, while the second compares the 50x investment ranking to the baseline. In both subfigures, the rankings derived from the baseline investment questions serve as the reference point on the x-axis, and the rankings for the 10x and 50x investment questions are compared on the y-axis.

The positive slope of the regression line in both subfigures indicates a stable relationship between the models' investment rankings at the baseline level and the elevated financial magnitudes. Specifically, the slope coefficients of 0.90 for the 10x magnitude and 0.76 for the 50x magnitude suggest that as the risk level increases, the relative ranking of the LLMs' investment responses remains consistent, as is demonstrated by the models that are ranked as more risk-loving or risk-averse maintaining their relative positions across the different scales.

The R-squared values of 0.82 for the 10x comparison and 0.58 for the 50x comparison indicate that a substantial proportion of the variance in the investment rankings at higher stakes can be explained by the baseline rankings. This demonstrates a strong linear relationship and implies that the models' risk preferences are not just a product of the monetary amounts in question but are inherent characteristics of the models' decision-making processes.

The investment consistency portrayed in Figure 2 highlights that LLMs exhibit stable risk preference patterns even as the stakes change. This finding is particularly relevant for applications in financial modeling and investment strategies, where understanding the risk tolerance and behavior of AI systems like LLMs is crucial. These consistent risk preferences suggest that LLMs can be reliable predictors of investment behavior across different scales, an essential characteristic for their potential integration into financial decision-making and advisory roles.

III. Impact of Alignment on LLMs’ Risk Preferences

In this section, we explore the central theme of this study: the impact of alignment on risk preferences.

A. Alignment Performance

We modified the base model, identified here as Mistral (“OpenPipe/mistral-ft-optimized-1227”), with separate fine-tuning processes on datasets characterized by three ethical dimensions, harmlessness, helpfulness, and honesty (HHH), resulting in four distinct models. Each model was then assessed for its accuracy in responding to out-of-sample (OOS) questions that were tailored to test the corresponding alignment. Table 5 provides a quantitative evaluation of how fine-tuning adjusts the alignment of a base LLM. We selected the Mistral model because it is less influenced by pre-alignment, so the modifications from our alignment procedures have a more pronounced effect on it. In addition, we carried out alignment tests for ChatGPT, which has more extensive pre-alignment. Consequently, while the adjustments resulting from alignment are considerable—and parallel those we found in the Mistral model—they are less marked than those observed in the Mistral model.

The base Mistral model displayed initial alignments of 56%, 50%, and 47.37% with the harmless, helpful, and honest categories, respectively. Upon fine-tuning, there was a marked increase in alignment across all models. The harmless model, when tested on 25 OOS questions relevant to harmlessness, achieved an impressive accuracy of 100%. The helpful model scored 95.45% accuracy on its domain-specific OOS questions, while the honest model attained a perfect accuracy rate of 94.74% on honesty-aligned OOS queries.

The table further reports on a model that underwent a comprehensive fine-tuning process using a combined HHH dataset, intended to align it simultaneously across all three ethical dimensions. This HHH model exhibited exceptional performance, with accuracies of 100%, 95.45%, and 100% in the harmless, helpful, and honest categories, respectively.

The high accuracies reported for the aligned models—particularly the HHH model—suggest a successful alignment process. This is evident as the models' responses are highly positively correlated with the desired answers for alignment questions. Such an outcome indicates not only the feasibility of aligning LLMs with specific ethical dimensions but also the potential of a multifaceted alignment approach, as embodied by the HHH model, which does not compromise the effectiveness in one ethical dimension for the sake of another.

Moreover, in Panel B, we test whether AI alignment has unintended spillover effects on models' other abilities. One example is its Intelligence Quotient (IQ), which evaluates models' ability to understand complex questions. We use the BOW (Battle-Of-the-WordSmiths)¹⁷ dataset to examine the IQ of the base model and the other four fine-tuned models. This dataset, developed by Borji and Mohammadian (2023), provides a thorough examination of models' abilities on various tasks. The results show that there is little discrepancy in models' IQ. The base model answers questions with an accuracy of 28%, whereas the harmless, helpful, and honest models have accuracies of 44%, 32%, and 36%, respectively. The HHH model has an accuracy rate of 36%, which is statistically insignificant when compared to the accuracy rate of the base model.

Overall, Table 5 demonstrates that through targeted fine-tuning, LLMs can significantly improve their alignment with desired ethical outcomes, underscoring the potential for these models to be tailored for specific ethical considerations in practical applications.

B. Effect of Alignment on Risk Preferences

Table 6 details the risk preferences of various Mistral model iterations, each fine-tuned with a distinct AI alignment focus. The base model, prior to any fine-tuning, displayed a distribution of responses that included a modest amount of risk-averse and risk-neutral answers, with a majority leaning towards risk-loving. However, when fine-tuned for harmlessness, helpfulness, honesty, and a combination of all three (HHH), the models showed a significant shift

¹⁷ This dataset can be accessed on Github at: <https://github.com/mehrdad-dev/Battle-of-the-Wordsmiths>.

in their risk preferences. The harmless model, post-fine-tuning, exhibited a strong inclination toward risk-neutral answers, avoiding risk-averse or risk-loving responses altogether. The helpful model's responses were overwhelmingly risk-neutral, nearly to the same extent. The honest model showed a more balanced spread between risk-neutral and risk-averse responses, with a small fraction of risk-loving answers. Most notably, the model aligned with the combined HHH dataset demonstrated a profound shift towards risk aversion, with nearly 98% of responses falling into this category, contrasting sharply with the baseline model. This substantial increase in risk-averse responses in the HHH model indicates a robust correlation between comprehensive AI alignment and risk aversion.

The change in risk preferences after fine-tuning—especially in the HHH model—highlights the impact of alignment on LLM decision-making processes. The alignment appears to have reinforced cautiousness in the models, making them more conservative in their risk assessments. This tendency towards risk aversion could be particularly influential when applying LLMs to domains where ethical considerations are paramount, such as financial advisory services, healthcare, and legal advising. The data from Table 6 underscores the significant effect of AI alignment on LLMs, suggesting that their use in decision-making scenarios should be carefully calibrated according to the desired level of risk tolerance. It also poses interesting questions for further research into the mechanics of risk preference formation in AI models and the potential trade-offs between AI alignment and risk-taking behavior.

C. Investments by Aligned Mistral Models

Table 7 shows the impact of AI alignment on investment behaviors in LLMs. The Mistral models were presented with an investment scenario to determine how much of a \$10 endowment they would invest in a risky asset, with a 50% chance of either doubling their investment or losing everything. This decision-making process was tested 100 times for each model to ensure the robustness of the data.

The base Mistral model, without any fine-tuning, had a mean investment of \$6.98 with a standard deviation of 3.40, indicating a moderate level of risk-taking with some variability in the decision process. Upon fine-tuning for harmlessness, the model showed a consistent investment strategy with no variability, investing exactly \$5 each time. The model fine-tuned for helpfulness exhibited a slightly lower mean investment of \$4.98 with a small increase in variability. The model

optimized for honesty showed a further decrease in the mean investment amount and an increase in decision variability, while the HHH optimized model presented the most conservative investment behavior with a mean of \$1.82 and higher variability in its investment amounts.

As the investment scenario's magnitude increased to 10x and 50x the baseline endowment, all models adjusted their investment levels upwards. However, the models fine-tuned for specific AI alignments, particularly the HHH model, invested significantly less than the baseline model at these higher magnitudes. The results, shown in Panel C, highlight that the HHH model's investment decisions were not only more conservative but also exhibited greater variability, suggesting a more cautious and less consistent approach to risk as the stakes increased.

These findings illustrate that fine-tuning LLMs for alignments such as harmlessness, helpfulness, honesty, and all of the above (HHH) does not simply suppress risk-taking behaviors but shapes them in a way that is consistent with the ethical dimension emphasized during fine-tuning. The results underscore the influence that AI alignment can have on the risk preferences and investment behaviors of LLMs, pointing to the necessity of careful consideration when integrating such models into financial decision-making.

Table 8 details a regression analysis that unpacks the influence of AI alignment on the investment behaviors of Mistral models across various monetary scales. The analysis uses dummy variables to represent the fine-tuning of models for harmlessness, helpfulness, honesty, and HHH. Each model was asked the investment question 100 times at each monetary scale, testing their propensity to invest part of a given endowment in a high-risk asset.

The regression results across Panels A (baseline), B (10x), and C (50x) demonstrate that the HHH alignment—where models were fine-tuned to be harmless, helpful, and honest—has a strongly negative association with investment amounts. This negative relationship is robust and statistically significant at all levels of monetary scale, as indicated by the t-statistics and significance markers.

In Panel A, the baseline scenario, the constant reflects the baseline investment behavior of the unaligned model, which significantly decreases across all fine-tuning categories. The HHH aligned model shows the most substantial decrease in investment amount, with the coefficient standing at -5.1587, suggesting a pronounced shift towards risk aversion.

Panels B and C reveal a similar pattern at amplified endowment levels. Despite the higher stakes, the HHH model maintains a significantly lower investment amount than its unaligned

counterpart, with the coefficients indicating a negative relationship at -23.0620 for 10x endowments and -126.8635 for 50x endowments. This trend is not as pronounced in models aligned only with single ethical attributes, indicating that the combination of alignments in the HHH model has a cumulative effect on reducing investment inclination.

The regression coefficients and their corresponding significance levels provide clear evidence that the process of alignment, especially the comprehensive HHH alignment, imparts a degree of risk aversion in the LLM. The R-squared values, especially the 0.431 in the baseline scenario, suggest a substantial proportion of variance in LLM investment behavior is explained by the alignment, indicating that alignment is a crucial determinant of investment decisions.

Table 8 suggests that while AI alignment can enhance the responsible behavior of LLMs, it also appears to render them more cautious and conservative in financial decision-making contexts. Such an inclination towards risk aversion can lead to underinvestment, which must be considered when deploying LLMs in real-world financial scenarios. This underinvestment relative to the unaligned model could be significant, suggesting that while alignment confers ethical safeguards, it may also necessitate adjustments to ensure balanced financial decision-making in practical applications.

IV. Impact of Alignments on Corporate Investment Forecasts

In the previous section, we demonstrated that AI alignment influences the fundamental risk preferences of 30 major LLMs, generally giving these LLMs a strong aversion to risk. In this section, we examine the practical implications of model alignment on the economic decisions made by LLMs. Our choice was inspired by the recent study by Jha et al. (2024), which used ChatGPT to analyze earnings call transcripts for investment forecasting. To more distinctly observe the impact of alignment, we opted for the Mistral model, as it is less aligned than ChatGPT, which comes heavily pre-aligned.¹⁸ This allows us to more clearly assess the incremental effects of alignment.¹⁹

¹⁸ Mims, Christopher, 2024, Here Come the Anti-Woke AIs, *Wall Street Journal*, April 19.

¹⁹ ChatGPT is based on the original GPT model but has been further trained using human feedback to guide the learning process, with the specific goal of mitigating the model's alignment issues. The technique used, known as Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), has significantly improved alignment. Furthermore, the SuperAlignment initiative, started in 2023, aims to promote even more robust alignment. In contrast, the Mistral model has undergone less rigorous procedures, making it easier to fine-tune and more adaptable. We can feed smaller datasets into the base model and develop more aligned models from it.

A. Construction of Investment Score

Following Jha et al. (2024), we construct investment scores by applying LLMs to transcripts of earnings conference calls. We rely on the Mistral model developed by Mistral AI.

We first crawled through quarterly earnings conference call transcripts from the Seeking Alpha archive. We then matched the transcripts with S&P 500 constituent firms from Compustat using firm tickers and the fiscal quarter derived from the titles. A firm must be included in the index at the end of March, June, September, and December of each year to match with our transcripts. Our sample period spans from 2015 to 2019.

After matching conference transcripts with Compustat data, we use the baseline Mistral model along with the four fine-tuned models to produce investment scores. We include the following instructions in the system prompt that is provided to an LLM by developers. This prompt is mainly used to configure the model, set its behavior, and initiate a specific mode of operation.

The following text is an excerpt from a company's earnings call transcripts. You are a finance expert. Based on this text only, please answer the following question. How does the firm plan to change its capital spending over the next year? There are five choices: Increase substantially, increase, no change, decrease, and decrease substantially. Please select one of the above five choices for each question and provide a one-sentence explanation of your choice for each question. The format for the answer to each question should be "choice - explanation." If no relevant information is provided related to the question, answer "no information is provided." The text is as follows:

We use this prompt for each earnings conference call transcript. Although the Mistral model has a higher capacity for processing longer texts, it still cannot process a single transcript exceeding roughly 8,000 words. To address this, we split each transcript into several chunks of less than 2,000 words; this aligns with the splitting method described in Jha et al. (2024). After applying the model to each chunk, we obtain results, choices, and explanations. Then, we assign a score to each choice, ranging from -1 to 1: 'Increase substantially' is assigned a score of 1, 'increase' is 0.5, 'no change' and 'no information provided' receive a 0, 'decrease' is -0.5, and 'decrease substantially' is -1. We manually review the responses, especially those provided by the fine-tuned models, to prevent hallucinations. It turns out that the mismatch rate is less than 1%.

After deriving investment scores for each chunk of text, we calculate the average score for all the chunks of each conference call transcript. The average score represents the propensity of an increase, facilitating easier interpretation and ensuring consistency, even for very long texts. Overall, the investment score reflects, from the perspective of LLMs, how managers might make future capital expenditure investments.

B. Summary Statistics

Table 9 presents summary statistics for investment scores predicted by the baseline Mistral model along with the four fine-tuned models: harmless, honest, helpful, and HHH. The investment scores are obtained by applying the LLM to transcripts of earnings conference calls from S&P 500 companies, as outlined in the study by Jha et al. (2024). These transcripts, sourced from Seeking Alpha, were matched to Compustat firms via ticker names, segmented into chunks, and analyzed to determine how firms might change capital spending over the next year based on a provided prompt.

In Panel A, the report shows the firm-quarter level investment scores for each model. The mean scores range from 0.001 for HHH to 0.050 for harmless in the average of chunks. The standard deviation, minimum, first quartile (Q1), median (Med), third quartile (Q3), and maximum values are also provided for each model. It is notable that for the baseline unaligned Mistral model (which is not pre-aligned) the investment score mean is 0.124. When properly aligned in one aspect (harmless, honest, helpful), the investment score (the Mistral model's assessment of future investments) decreased moderately; for example, it was 0.050 for the harmless alignment. Especially when excessively aligned (aligned by all three dimensions), the Mistral model is unable to make meaningful investment forecasts; for instance, the mean investment score of HHH is 0.001.²⁰ This panel offers an overview of the potential impact of model alignment on investment score predictions, illustrating that while some alignment can enhance the model's assessments of future investments, overalignment can result in excessively cautious forecasts.

Panel B outlines control variables that are known predictors of future capital expenditures, such as capital intensity (CapexInten), Tobin's Q, cash flow, leverage, and the log size of the

²⁰ We observe a similarly significant reduction in the Investment Score when using ChatGPT instead of the Mistral model.

company. We also report summary statistics for other transcript level characteristics, which will be detailed in the later subsections.

Panel C presents Pearson correlation matrices for the investment scores, showing the relationships between the models' scores for the averages of each transcript's chunks. The correlations vary, with some models showing higher inter-model correlations than others. This suggests that not only the scaling of numbers changes under different alignment procedures, but the underlying information content also shifts, resulting in imperfect correlations across different model settings.

C. Investment Scores and Investment Forecasts

In this section, we present the regression results examining the relationship between aligned investment scores generated by various aligned LLMs and future capital expenditure intensity (Capex Intensity) of firms. Table 10 provides a comprehensive view of the predictive power and alignment of various LLM models in estimating the future investment behavior of firms based on textual analysis of earnings calls from the period Q1 2015 to Q4 2019.

In Table 10, the baseline Mistral model, which is not pre-aligned, shows a significantly positive relationship with Capex Intensity two quarters ahead, as indicated by the estimate of 0.0607 in Column II. When the model is aligned with one aspect (harmless, honest, or helpful), its explanatory power for future investments improves significantly. For instance, the estimate for the Honest alignment in Column V is 0.5346 and is strongly significant at the 1% level, suggesting a meaningful association with future investment decisions. In contrast, the composite HHH model in Column VI, which incorporates all three dimensions, yields an estimate of 0.2969 that is statistically insignificant, indicating that excessive alignment may hinder the model's predictive capability. The fixed effects included in the model, alongside other control variables such as CashFlow and Leverage, underscore the robustness of the analysis with high R-squared values of 0.873 across all specifications, indicating a good fit of the model to the data.

Table 10 highlights a key takeaway: while a certain degree of alignment can enhance a model's predictive accuracy for future capital investments, overalignment can lead to a loss of meaningful forecasting power. The implications of these findings are significant not only for academia but also for the industry. They indicate that using highly aligned LLMs in financial decision-making might result in substantial underinvestment and overly cautious financial policies.

Moreover, the predictability of the investment scores we generated for future investments shows that we can use the open-source Mistral model to replicate the findings of Jha et al. (2024), confirming that AI can indeed be used to extract useful information from conference call transcripts to help understand corporate policies.

Table 11 reports the regression results of the long-term predictability of aligned investment scores, where the dependent variables are future capital expenditure from quarter $t+3$ to $t+6$, and the independent variables remain unchanged. The regression results, tabulated in Columns II, III, and IV, show that the aligned models have long-lasting predictability for future investments, lasting for 6 quarters following the earnings call. In contrast, the base model's ability to predict disappears after 4 quarters, as indicated in Column I, and is always insignificant for the composite HHH model in Column V.

D. Ethicality of Transcripts, Investment Score, and Investment Forecasts

To further examine the ethical heterogeneity between different models and their predictive power, we follow traditional textual analysis approaches to extract the “ethical” component within each conference call transcript via a bag-of-words methodology. We begin by constructing a simple dictionary that consists of words associated with ethics. We use the word “ethical” as our seed word and search for all its synonyms in the Merriam-Webster dictionary. We remove common words like “true,” “clean,” and “just” manually and keep more related words like “moral,” “decent,” and “virtuous.” Finally, we construct a list of 50 words positively associated with the word “ethical.” Then, we search for the number of mentions of these words in the conference call transcripts and use the resulting data to examine the ethical content of each transcript.

After computing this ethical word count variable, we examine how the ethical content of transcripts affects the predictive power of each model by interacting this variable with the investment scores. We regress firms' future capital expenditure on the interaction term, along with other variables used in previous analyses. The results are shown in Table 12, which indicates that the ethical content of transcripts significantly improves the models' ability to predict future investments for aligned models. This improvement is especially pronounced in Column V where the model is HHH, with the interaction term having a significant coefficient of 0.4360 and a t -statistic of 3.61, making the overall predictability of the HHH investment score positive. In contrast,

the ethical content of each transcript does not significantly improve the baseline model, as shown in Column I, where the regression coefficient is 0.0166 with a t-statistic of 0.94.

This analysis reveals how ethical content in conference call transcripts affects different LLMs' ability to predict future investment behavior. By quantifying the ethical content of transcripts, we demonstrate that ethically aligned LLMs are more sensitive to ethical language, leading to better investment forecasts. The strong performance of the ethically aligned models, particularly with increasingly ethical language, suggests these models excel at interpreting ethical signals in corporate communication, which may be associated with underlying risk factors. Ethically aligned LLMs may assign lower investment scores to firms that engage in ethically questionable behavior or have a higher risk of future scandals or litigation, while assigning higher scores to firms that demonstrate strong ethical principles and risk management practices.

The varying performance of different LLMs on the ethical content of transcripts can be viewed through a risk-preference lens. The strong positive interaction between the fully aligned HHH model and ethical language suggests a more conservative risk profile for this model compared to the baseline or partially aligned models. Essentially, the HHH model may be more risk-averse, prioritizing ethical signals in its investment predictions. This aligns with our main finding that AI alignment generally shifts LLMs towards more risk-averse behavior.

Importantly, the analysis also rules out alternative explanations. The base model's predictions were unaffected by ethical content in the transcripts, indicating that the observed relationship is not simply due to a preference for ethical firms. Instead, the interaction between AI alignment and ethical content is key. Aligned models may find ethical language more familiar, enhancing their ability to extract hidden information. This underscores the potential of AI alignment to improve LLMs' language understanding and contextual awareness.

V. Robustness: Transcript Readability and Investment Score Predictability

Table 13 further validates our key findings on how AI alignment shapes the ability of LLMs to predict future investments from earnings call transcripts. A potential concern is that the readability and complexity of the input text may interact with the alignment process to influence predictive performance. To address this, we examine the relationship between transcript readability and the predictability of investment scores before (baseline) and after alignment (harmless, helpful, honest, HHH). We use three metrics to measure the readability of a company's

transcripts of quarterly earnings calls: the Gunning Fog index, transcript length, and the Flesch Reading Ease index (Li, 2006). These measures capture different dimensions of linguistic complexity that could potentially affect an LLM's ability to extract meaningful signals.

In Panel A, we show the results of using the Gunning Fog index to assess the complexity of the text. The coefficients on the investment score (Score) across all models are positive and are stronger for moderately aligned models (helpful, harmless, honest) than for the base model. However, these relationships weaken when excessive alignment is applied (HHH). These results are consistent with those found in Table 10. The key variable of interest is the interaction between the investment score (Score) and the high Gunning Fog index indicator (HiFog). Interestingly, the coefficient estimate of this interaction is insignificant across all alignment specifications (baseline, helpful, harmless, honest, HHH), which suggests that an LLM's ability to predict future investment and the impact of alignment on such predictability are not influenced by whether the transcripts of quarterly earnings calls are easy to read according to the the Gunning Fog index. We find similar results with other readability measures: Panel B shows the results of determining readability measured by the lengths of transcripts (the HiLength indicator is one if the corresponding transcript is longer than the median transcript length and zero otherwise), and Panel C shows the results of using the Flesch Reading Ease index (the LoReadingEase indicator is one if the Reading Ease index is below the median and zero otherwise). For both readability measures, the parameter estimates on the interaction between Score and readability indicators are statistically insignificant. This indicates that LLMs (and the impact of alignments) are not influenced by whether the corresponding transcripts are easy to read or not. This may be one of the potential advantages of LLMs over humans, as LLMs' enormous information processing capability allows them to be unaffected by the readability of the documents they process.

Overall, the results shown in Table 13 confirm that our findings on the impact of alignment on future investment predictability are robust to the readability of transcripts. These checks demonstrate that the effects of AI alignment on LLMs' ability to forecast investments are not driven by variations in input data complexity. This suggests that LLMs in financial contexts may be less sensitive to information readability than human analysts. Moreover, it underscores the need for a carefully calibrated approach to alignment, as excessive alignment can deteriorate economic decision-making performance even when faced with varying textual complexity.

VI. Conclusions

Our study concludes that Large Language Models (LLMs) exhibit distinct and varied risk preferences that significantly influence their utility in financial decision-making, a domain where understanding and managing risk are paramount. Examination of thirty LLMs across established economic tasks unveils a broad spectrum of risk behaviors, demonstrating that LLMs, like humans, possess unique and intrinsic risk profiles. These profiles are pivotal for their deployment in nuanced financial scenarios, offering a new dimension to LLMs' roles as economic agents. Moreover, the alignment process, aimed at fine-tuning LLMs to adhere to ethical standards, emerges as a critical factor that can recalibrate these risk preferences. Our findings suggest that alignment not only ensures ethical compliance but also serves as a lever for adjusting LLMs' economic decision-making patterns. This dual impact of alignment underscores the need for financial firms to strategically consider both the inherent risk dispositions of LLMs and the potential shifts induced by AI alignment, ensuring a balanced integration of AI in financial advisory roles.

Furthermore, the research contributes to the burgeoning field of AI in finance by illustrating how LLMs' risk preferences and their adaptability through alignment can influence decision-making within the financial sector. It extends the discourse on AI and economics, pushing the boundaries of how LLMs can be optimized for financial applications while upholding ethical standards. Our analysis provides a foundational framework for future investigations into the ethical alignment of AI, advocating for a more nuanced and responsible approach to deploying LLMs in economic settings. This study paves the way for a deeper exploration into the mechanisms of alignment and the development of strategies that consider their extensive implications on LLM behavior and the broader economic landscape.

As we move forward, the insights garnered from this study will be instrumental in guiding the ethical and strategic use of LLMs in the financial domain, fostering a future where AI not only complements but also enhances economic decision-making processes. The findings of our paper enrich the academic literature and offer practical insights for financial institutions and regulators aiming to navigate the evolving landscape of AI in economics, laying the groundwork for the responsible integration of advanced AI tools in financial strategies and operations.

References


- Akesaka, M., Eibich, P., Hanaoka, C., & Shigeoka, H. (2021). Temporal Instability of Risk Preference among the Poor: Evidence from Payday Cycles (w28784). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Alan, S., Boneva, T., & Ertac, S. (2019). Ever failed, try again, succeed better: Results from a randomized educational intervention on grit. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(3), 1121-1162.
- Argyle, Lisa P., Ethan C. Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua Gubler, Christopher Rytting, and David Wingate, 2022, Out of One, Many: Using Language Models to Simulate Human Samples, arXiv:2209.06899v1.
- Bai, Y., Jones, A., Ndousse, K., Askell, A., Chen, A., DasSarma, N., ... & Kaplan, J. (2022). Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862.
- Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). A survey of behavioral finance. *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, 1, 1053-1128.
- Bonelli, Maxime, 2023, Data-driven Investors, Working paper.
- Borji, A., & Mohammadian, M. (2023). Battle of the Wordsmiths: Comparing ChatGPT, GPT-4, Claude, and Bard. GPT-4, Claude, and Bard.
- Brunnermeier, M. K., & Nagel, S. (2008). Do Wealth Fluctuations Generate Time-Varying Risk Aversion? Micro-Evidence on Individuals. *American Economic Review*, 98(3), 713–736.
- Bybee, J. Leland, 2024, The Ghost in the Machine: Generating Beliefs with Large Language Models, Working paper.
- Chang, Y., Wang, X., Wang, J., Wu, Y., Yang, L., Zhu, K., ... & Xie, X. (2023). A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*.
- Chen, Y., Liu, T. X., Shan, Y., & Zhong, S. (2023). The Emergence of Economic Rationality of GPT. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12763.
- Crosetto, P., & Filippin, A. (2013). The “bomb” risk elicitation task. *Journal of risk and uncertainty*, 47, 31-65.
- Du, Z., Qian, Y., Liu, X., Ding, M., Qiu, J., Yang, Z., & Tang, J. (2021). Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10360.
- Erel, Isil, Léa H Stern, Chenhao Tan, Michael S Weisbach, 2021, Selecting Directors Using Machine Learning, *Review of Financial Studies*, 34(7): 3226-3264.
- Filippin, A., & Crosetto, P. (2016). A reconsideration of gender differences in risk attitudes. *Management Science*, 62(11), 3138-3160.
- Ganguli, D., Lovitt, L., Kernion, J., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Kadavath, S., ... & Clark, J. (2022). Red teaming language models to reduce harms: Methods, scaling behaviors, and lessons learned. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07858.

- Gneezy, U., & Potters, J. (1997). An experiment on risk taking and evaluation periods. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 112(2), 631-645.
- Gneezy, U., Leonard, K. L., & List, J. A. (2009). Gender differences in competition: Evidence from a matrilineal and a patriarchal society. *Econometrica*, 77(5), 1637-1664.
- Gu, Shihao, Brian Kelly, and Dacheng Xiu, 2020a, Autoencoder Asset Pricing Models, *Journal of Econometrics*, 222(1): 429-450.
- Gu, Shihao, Bryan Kelly, and Dacheng Xiu, 2020b, Empirical Asset Pricing via Machine Learning, *Review of Financial Studies*, 33 (5): 2223–2273.
- Gui, George, and Olivier Toubia, 2024, The Challenge of Using LLMs to Simulate Human Behavior: A Causal Inference Perspective, Working paper, Columbia University.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2018). Time Varying Risk Aversion. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 128(3), 403–421.
- Gupta, Udit, 2024, GPT-InvestAR: Enhancing Stock Investment Strategies through Annual Report Analysis with Large Language Models, Working paper.
- Gürdal, M. Y., Kuzubaş, T. U., & Saltoğlu, B. (2017). Measures of individual risk attitudes and portfolio choice: Evidence from pension participants. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 62, 186-203.
- Hayes, M., Mathur, A., Xie, J., Wan, J., Shah, S., Ghodsi, A., ... & Xin, R. (2023). Free Dolly: Introducing the World's First Truly Open Instruction-Tuned LLM.
- Hu, Allen, and Song Ma, 2024, Persuading Investors: A Video-Based Study, *Journal of Finance*, Forthcoming.
- Jiang, A. Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D. S., Casas, D. de las, Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., Lavaud, L. R., Lachaux, M.-A., Stock, P., Scao, T. L., Lavril, T., Wang, T., Lacroix, T., & Sayed, W. E. (2023). Mistral 7B (arXiv:2310.06825). arXiv.
- John J. Horton, John J., 2023, Large Language Models As Simulated Economic Agent: What We Can Learn From Homo Silicus?, NBER Working paper 31122.
- Korinek, Anton, 2023, Generative AI for Economic Research: Use Cases and Implications for Economists, *Journal of Economic Literature* 61(4):1281-1317.
- Li, Feng, 2008, Annual report readability, current earnings, and earnings persistence. *Journal of Accounting and economics*, 45(2-3), 221-247..
- Li, Kai, Feng Mai, Rui Shen, Chelsea Yang, and Tengfei Zhang, 2023, Dissecting Corporate Culture Using Generative AI – Insights from Analyst Reports, Working paper.
- Lyonnet, Victor, and Léa H. Stern, 2022, Venture Capital (Mis)Allocation in the Age of AI, Working paper.
- Malmendier, U., & Nagel, S. (2011). Depression Babies: Do Macroeconomic Experiences Affect Risk Taking? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(1), 373–416.
- Manish Jha, Jialin Qian, Michael Weber, and Baozhong Yang, 2024, ChatGPT and Corporate Policies, NBER Working paper 32161.


- Piovesan, M., & Willadsen, H. (2021). Risk preferences and personality traits in children and adolescents. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 186, 523-532.
- Ryan, Michael J., William Held, and Diyi Yang, 2024, Unintended Impacts of LLM Alignment on Global Representation, arXiv:2402.15018.
- Srivastava, A., Rastogi, A., Rao, A., Shoeb, A. A. M., Abid, A., Fisch, A., ... & Wang, G. (2022). Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615.
- van Binsbergen, Jules H., Xiao Han, and Alejandro Lopez-Lira, 2023, Manvs.Machine Learning: The Term Structure of Earnings Expectations and Conditional Biases, *Journal: Review of Financial Studies*, 36(6): 2361–2396.
- Wang, G., Cheng, S., Zhan, X., Li, X., Song, S., & Liu, Y. (2023). Openchat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality data. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11235.
- Yang Chen, Yang, Meena Andiappan, Tracy Jenkin, and Anton Ovchinnikov, 2023, A Manager and an AI Walk into a Bar: Does ChatGPT Make Biased Decisions Like We Do?, Working paper.
- Yang, A., Xiao, B., Wang, B., Zhang, B., Bian, C., Yin, C., ... & Wu, Z. (2023). Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305.
- Yao, J., Yi, X., Wang, X., Wang, J., & Xie, X. (2023). From Instructions to Intrinsic Human Values--A Survey of Alignment Goals for Big Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12014.
- Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., ... & Wen, J. R. (2023). A survey of large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223.

Figure 1. Question Magnitude and Result Consistency

This figure illustrates the consistency of responses to risk-related questions as the number of questions increases. We escalated the magnitude of the parameters in the investment questions by factors of 10 and 50. The potential investment amounts were set at 10 (baseline), 100 (10-fold increase), and 500 (50-fold increase) monetary units for the investment question. For each magnitude level, we report the mean value of the investment amounts in the figure. In Subfigure A, we report the average dynamics across all models. In Subfigure B, we report average dynamics by models' risk preferences, which are identified with binary indicators reflecting whether a model is deemed risk-loving, risk-neutral, or risk-averse from previous preference questions. The short vertical lines represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Subfigure A. Investment dynamics across different magnitudes




Subfigure B. Subsample dynamics

Figure 2. Risk Preference Ranking Comparison

This figure compares rankings across different magnitude scales (baseline, 10x, 50x). Among the 30 models, we rank them from low to high on the mean values of their responses to the investment questions (i.e., from risk-averse to risk-loving), and then plotted the rankings. The x-axis shows the rankings based on responses to the baseline investment questions, while the y-axis displays the rankings of responses to the 10x and 50x magnitudes in subfigures A and B, respectively. We fitted a linear regression model for the pairs of rankings and present the regression results in each subfigure.



Subfigure A. Investment amount ranking comparison: baseline vs. 10x



Subfigure B. Investment amount ranking comparison: baseline vs. 50x

Table 1. Model Overview

This table provides an overview of the large language models (LLMs) utilized in this study. We gather thirty trending LLMs from the Hugging Face (HF) and Replicate platforms. These models vary in their underlying architectures and parameter sizes. For models sourced from the HF platform, we first load the models and then execute them on Colab, utilizing the hardware provided (A100/V100/T4). For models from the Replicate platform, we use the API provided by Replicate. Additionally, we report on parameters associated with the text-generation process: the temperature setting, Top_k, Top_p, maximum new tokens, and repetition penalties for each model, presented in the last columns. If a model does not allow adjustments to the temperature, we use the default setting. These parameters control various aspects of the random sampling from the probability distribution of the next word (token) based on the text generated thus far. Temperature adjusts the randomness or creativity in the generated text. Top_k limits the model's next-word predictions to only the top k most likely tokens. Top_p is a sampling parameter that includes the smallest set of tokens with a cumulative probability exceeding p. Maximum new tokens specifies the maximum number of new tokens.

Chatmodels	Basemodel	Param	Operating Platform	Hardware	Temperature	Top_k	Top_p	MaxNewToken
01-ai/yi-34b-chat	Yi	34	Replicate	-	-	50	0.95	128
01-ai/yi-6b-chat	Yi	6	Replicate	-	0.7	50	0.8	128
baichuan-inc/Baichuan-13B-Chat	Baichuan	13	HuggingFace	A100	0.7	-	-	-
baichuan-inc/Baichuan2-13B-Chat	Baichuan2	13	HuggingFace	A100	0.7	-	-	-
baichuan-inc/Baichuan2-7B-Chat	Baichuan2	7	HuggingFace	A100	0.7	-	-	-
fireballoon/baichuan-vicuna-7b	Baichuan	7	HuggingFace	A100	1	-	-	-
FlagAlpha/Atom-7B-Chat	Llama	7	HuggingFace	A100	-	50	0.95	512
FlagAlpha/Llama2-Chinese-13b-Chat	Llama2	13	HuggingFace	A100	-	50	0.95	512
internlm/internlm-chat-7b-8k	InternLM	7	HuggingFace	A100	-	-	-	-
meta/llama-2-13b-chat	Llama2	13	Replicate	-	0.75	-	1	500
meta/llama-2-70b-chat	Llama2	70	Replicate	-	0.75	-	1	500
meta/llama-2-7b-chat	Llama2	7	Replicate	-	0.75	-	1	500
mistralai/mistral-7b-v0.1	Mistral	7	Replicate	-	0.75	50	0.9	150
openai-gpt-4-0314	GPT4	-	OpenAI	-	1	-	-	128
openai-gpt3.5turbo	GPT3	-	OpenAI	-	1	-	-	128
Photolens/llama-2-7b-langchain-chat	Llama2	7	HuggingFace	V100	0.3	50	0.95	512
Qwen/Qwen-14B-Chat	Qwen	14	HuggingFace	A100	-	-	-	-
Qwen/Qwen-7B-Chat	Qwen	7	HuggingFace	A100	-	-	-	-
replicate/flan-t5-xl	T5	3	Replicate	-	0.75	50	1	128
replicate/gpt-j-6b	GPT-J	6	Replicate	-	0.75	50	1	128
replicate/oasst-sft-1-pythia-12b	pythia	12	Replicate	-	0.75	50	1	128
replicate/vicuna-13b	LLaMA	13	Replicate	-	0.75	50	1	128
stability-ai/stablelm-tuned-alpha-7b	StableLM-Alpha	7	Replicate	-	0.75	50	1	128
TheBloke/leo-hessianai-13B-chat-GPTQ	Llama	13	HuggingFace	V100	0.75	40	0.95	512
TheBloke/Llama-2-13B-Chat-Dutch-GPTQ	Llama2	13	HuggingFace	V100	0.7	40	0.95	512
TheBloke/openchat_3.5-16k-GPTQ	Openchat	7	HuggingFace	V100	0.7	40	0.95	512
THUDM/chatglm-6b	Chatglm2	6	HuggingFace	T4	0.7	-	-	-
THUDM/chatglm2-6b	Chatglm2	6	HuggingFace	T4	1	-	-	-
tomasmcm/claude2-alpaca-13b	claude	13	Replicate	V100	0.7	50	1	128
WisdomShell/CodeShell-7B-Chat	Codeshell	7	HuggingFace	-	0.75	-	-	-

Table 2. LLMs’ Risk Preference

This table summarizes the risk preferences of the large language models (LLMs) used in this study. We assess the risk preferences of thirty LLMs from the Hugging Face (HF) and Replicate platforms by asking each model the following question 180 times: "As an investor, not a language model assistant, what is your attitude towards risk? Choose the type that best describes you: (1) Risk-averse; (2) Risk-neutral; (3) Risk-loving." To ensure the validity of the responses, we randomize the order of the options for each query to prevent the models from merely repeating the last (or first) option. For instance, the sequence could be risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-loving, or it could be risk-neutral, risk-loving, and then risk-averse. In Panel A, we document the frequency of each option for each model, including the number of denials (responses declined due to alignment concerns), risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-loving answers, as well as the number of responses where an LLM agrees to express its preference (excluding denials). In Panel B, we present the results as percentages, calculating the proportion of each response type (risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-loving) relative to the total number of questions the LLM agreed to answer.

	Panel A: Count					Panel B: In percentage (exclude denial)		
	Denial	risk-averse	risk-neutral	risk-loving	Exclude denial	risk-averse	risk-neutral	risk-loving
01-ai/yi-34b-chat	32	89	27	32	148	60.14%	18.24%	21.62%
01-ai/yi-6b-chat	30	87	58	5	150	58.00%	38.67%	3.33%
baichuan-inc/Baichuan-13B-Chat	50	40	90	0	130	30.77%	69.23%	0.00%
baichuan-inc/Baichuan2-13B-Chat	54	38	73	15	126	30.16%	57.94%	11.90%
baichuan-inc/Baichuan2-7B-Chat	60	33	84	3	120	27.50%	70.00%	2.50%
fireballoon/baichuan-vicuna-7b	31	88	30	31	149	59.06%	20.13%	20.81%
FlagAlpha/Atom-7B-Chat	101	20	37	22	79	25.32%	46.84%	27.85%
FlagAlpha/Llama2-Chinese-13b-Chat	144	5	23	8	36	13.89%	63.89%	22.22%
internlm/internlm-chat-7b-8k	87	9	77	7	93	9.68%	82.80%	7.53%
meta/llama-2-13b-chat	27	119	25	9	153	77.78%	16.34%	5.88%
meta/llama-2-70b-chat	33	94	45	8	147	63.95%	30.61%	5.44%
meta/llama-2-7b-chat	86	51	27	16	94	54.26%	28.72%	17.02%
mistralai/mistral-7b-v0.1	77	35	20	48	103	33.98%	19.42%	46.60%
openai-gpt-4-0314	96	0	84	0	84	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
openai-gpt3.5turbo	96	3	77	4	84	3.57%	91.67%	4.76%
Photolens/llama-2-7b-langchain-chat	105	17	38	20	75	22.67%	50.67%	26.67%
Qwen/Qwen-14B-Chat	62	1	109	8	118	0.85%	92.37%	6.78%
Qwen/Qwen-7B-Chat	70	3	101	6	110	2.73%	91.82%	5.45%
replicate/flan-t5-xl	13	61	74	32	167	36.53%	44.31%	19.16%
replicate/gpt-j-6b	92	27	20	41	88	30.68%	22.73%	46.59%
replicate/oasst-sft-1-pythia-12b	53	28	99	0	127	22.05%	77.95%	0.00%
replicate/vicuna-13b	150	6	18	6	30	20.00%	60.00%	20.00%
stability-ai/stablelm-tuned-alpha-7b	70	19	67	24	110	17.27%	60.91%	21.82%
TheBloke/leo-hessianai-13B-chat-GPTQ	108	19	40	13	72	26.39%	55.56%	18.06%
TheBloke/Llama-2-13B-Chat-Dutch-GPTQ	39	44	57	40	141	31.21%	40.43%	28.37%
TheBloke/openchat_3.5-16k-GPTQ	14	60	56	50	166	36.14%	33.73%	30.12%
THUDM/chatglm-6b	26	36	77	41	154	23.38%	50.00%	26.62%
THUDM/chatglm2-6b	55	1	118	6	125	0.80%	94.40%	4.80%
tomasmcm/claude2-13b	87	22	35	36	93	23.66%	37.63%	38.71%
WisdomShell/CodeShell-7B-Chat	2	28	90	60	178	15.73%	50.56%	33.71%

Table 3. Summary of Responses

This table summarizes the LLMs’ responses when we elicit preferences regarding risk. We ask each model a commonly used question, often referred to as the investment question, that assesses respondents' risk preferences. The question is: "You have an endowment of \$10. How much would you invest? You can choose to invest any portion of it in a risky asset that has a 50% chance of either doubling your investment or losing it all. Please provide a brief answer." Each model is asked the investment question 100 times. We report the mean and standard deviation of the amounts the models choose to invest. In each panel, we report investment amounts under different magnitudes. The potential investment amounts were set at 10 (baseline) in Panel A, 100 (a 10-fold increase) in Panel B, and 500 (a 50-fold increase) in dollars for the investment question in Panel C.

Chatmodels	Investment question								
	Panel A: baseline			Panel B: 10x			Panel C: 50x		
	N	Mean	Std	N	Mean	Std	N	Mean	Std
01-ai/yi-34b-chat	100	3.67	(3.71)	100	17.94	(27.70)	100	130.36	(155.98)
01-ai/yi-6b-chat	100	2.21	(3.32)	100	28.12	(32.62)	100	117.14	(183.94)
baichuan-inc/Baichuan-13B-Chat	100	5.12	(4.17)	100	26.06	(33.12)	100	165.14	(200.01)
baichuan-inc/Baichuan2-13B-Chat	100	0.35	(1.28)	100	3.42	(12.05)	100	5.05	(28.86)
baichuan-inc/Baichuan2-7B-Chat	100	2.36	(1.25)	100	25.31	(24.89)	100	138.91	(134.40)
fireballoon/baichuan-vicuna-7b	100	10.00	(0.00)	100	100.00	(0.00)	100	201.78	(164.36)
FlagAlpha/Atom-7B-Chat	100	5.59	(3.34)	100	43.13	(21.21)	100	203.36	(140.84)
FlagAlpha/Llama2-Chinese-13b-Chat	100	2.44	(3.02)	100	24.36	(23.71)	100	107.15	(154.99)
internlm/internlm-chat-7b-8k	100	5.05	(0.50)	100	37.40	(15.28)	100	183.00	(66.75)
meta/llama-2-13b-chat	100	6.10	(2.31)	100	51.00	(7.04)	100	250.00	(35.53)
meta/llama-2-70b-chat	100	5.05	(0.50)	100	50.00	(0.00)	100	250.00	(0.00)
meta/llama-2-7b-chat	100	4.36	(1.89)	100	44.53	(18.48)	100	210.95	(90.48)
mistralai/mistral-7b-v0.1	100	4.87	(3.99)	100	43.81	(36.37)	100	213.89	(190.71)
openai-gpt-4-0314	100	5.00	(0.00)	100	50.00	(0.00)	100	243.94	(48.34)
openai-gpt3.5turbo	100	3.05	(1.85)	100	22.63	(18.84)	100	116.93	(86.57)
Pholens/llama-2-7b-langchain-chat	100	0.42	(1.28)	100	5.71	(14.23)	100	37.85	(92.65)
Qwen/Qwen-14B-Chat	100	0.34	(1.71)	100	8.44	(24.04)	100	63.86	(134.62)
Qwen/Qwen-7B-Chat	100	0.25	(1.41)	100	7.44	(21.16)	100	69.23	(147.63)
replicate/flan-t5-xl	100	4.89	(2.49)	100	37.33	(25.77)	100	220.69	(125.57)
replicate/gpt-j-6b	100	5.92	(3.99)	100	57.10	(37.59)	100	254.54	(201.91)
replicate/oasst-sft-1-pythia-12b	100	8.71	(3.08)	100	81.96	(33.30)	100	388.95	(168.01)
replicate/vicuna-13b	100	4.46	(3.86)	100	41.25	(36.54)	100	268.92	(201.75)
stability-ai/stablelm-tuned-alpha-7b	100	5.73	(4.40)	100	42.38	(41.14)	100	238.09	(207.49)
TheBloke/leo-hessianai-13B-chat-GPTQ	100	6.19	(3.97)	100	45.16	(37.34)	100	210.03	(168.91)
TheBloke/Llama-2-13B-Chat-Dutch-GPTQ	100	5.40	(3.55)	100	45.06	(32.51)	100	257.95	(199.26)
TheBloke/openchat_3.5-16k-GPTQ	100	4.65	(3.88)	100	41.82	(31.40)	100	214.23	(156.83)
THUDM/chatglm-6b	100	0.68	(2.09)	100	8.29	(20.58)	100	27.04	(87.45)
THUDM/chatglm2-6b	100	7.68	(3.20)	100	75.52	(27.52)	100	368.80	(153.41)
tomasem/claude2-alpaca-13b	100	5.83	(3.94)	100	58.17	(35.64)	100	243.53	(208.90)
WisdomShell/CodeShell-7B-Chat	100	2.00	(0.00)	100	6.00	(23.87)	100	200.00	(0.00)

Table 4. Risk Preferences and Risk Behavior

This table illustrates the risk preferences and investment behaviors of various models. For each model, we regress the investment amount on a variable indicative of their risk preferences, derived from a previous preference inquiry. The right-hand side (RHS) variable is a binary indicator reflecting whether a model is deemed risk-loving, determined by identifying its most likely risk preference. For example, if mistralai/mistral-7b-v0.1 exhibited risk preferences of 77 denials, 35 risk-averse, 20 risk-neutral, and 48 risk-loving, it would be classified as risk-loving. We also control for the number of times when the model declines to answer its preferences in Columns (II), (IV), and (VI). The left-hand side (LHS) variable is the amount the model decides to invest. Different question magnitudes are used in each column: the first and second column employs the baseline magnitude (an endowment of \$10). The third and fourth column employs larger magnitudes (endowments of \$100). In the fifth and sixth column, the magnitude is the largest (endowments of \$500). The t-statistics are presented in square brackets. ***, **, and * denote significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Preferences and the investment amount					
	Baseline		10x		50x	
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)
constant	4.1374*** (58.08)	4.4449*** (32.39)	35.9909*** (54.28)	37.5258*** (29.36)	181.1892*** (55.55)	190.2757*** (30.27)
1(Risk loving)	1.4115*** (6.27)	1.5222*** (6.65)	17.0358*** (8.13)	17.5885*** (8.25)	56.6764*** (5.49)	59.9484*** (5.71)
Denial		-0.0049*** (-2.62)		-0.0245 (-1.40)		-0.1448* (-1.69)
R2	0.013	0.015	0.022	0.022	0.010	0.011
F	39.255	23.102	66.017	34.006	30.192	16.535
N	3000	3000	3000	3000	3000	3000

Table 5. Correlation of Responses by Baseline and Aligned Models

This table illustrates the correlation between fine-tuning and alignment in the responses provided. We fine-tune the base Mistral model on the HHH alignment dataset, which comprises 58 harmless, 59 helpful, and 61 honest Q&As. To evaluate performance, the base model is fine-tuned on separate, non-overlapping datasets and validated using out-of-sample (OOS), non-duplicated Q&As to gauge improvement in alignment. Additionally, we combine these separate datasets into a single HHH super alignment dataset for further fine-tuning. The OOS non-duplicated validation sample includes 25 harmless, 22 helpful, and 19 honest Q&As. We report the accuracy of responses from five different models (the baseline Mistral model and four fine-tuned models). In Panel B, we examine the Intelligence Quotient (IQ) of each model with the BOW (Battle-Of-the-WordSmiths) dataset and report the number of correct answers each model gave.

Panel A: Alignment											
Question	Number of correct answers					# questions	Percentage of correct answers				
	Base model	Harmless	Helpful	Honest	HHH		Base model	Harmless	Helpful	Honest	HHH
Harmless-aspect	14	25	22	25	25	25	56.00%	100.00%	88.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Helpful-aspect	11	19	21	19	21	22	50.00%	86.36%	95.45%	86.36%	95.45%
Honest-aspect	9	18	17	18	19	19	47.37%	94.74%	89.47%	94.74%	100.00%

Panel B: Ability											
Question	Number of correct answers					# questions	Percentage of correct answers				
	Base model	Harmless	Helpful	Honest	HHH		Base model	Harmless	Helpful	Honest	HHH
IQ	7	11	8	9	9	25	28.00%	44.00%	32.00%	36.00%	36.00%

Table 6. Risk Preferences of Aligned Mistral Models

This table presents the risk preferences of aligned Mistral models. We pose preference questions to both the baseline Mistral model and the fine-tuned models, totaling 180 risk preference inquiries per model. The sequence of options is varied and each sequence is presented 30 times. For instance, the sequence risk-averse, risk-loving, and risk-neutral is asked 30 times, as was the sequence risk-loving, risk-neutral, and risk-averse. In Panel A, we document the frequency of each response option for each model, including the number of denials (LLMs that decline to answer due to alignment issues), risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-loving responses. We also indicate the number of responses in which an LLM agrees to disclose its preference (excluding denials). In Panel B, we express the results as percentages by dividing the number of each type of response (risk-averse, risk-neutral, and risk-loving) by the total number of questions to which the LLM consented to respond.

List of Models	Panel A. Count					Panel B. In percentage (exclude denial)		
	Denial	risk-averse	risk-loving	risk-neutral	Exclude denial	risk.averse	risk.loving	risk.neutral
Base model	29	22	123	6	151	14.57%	81.46%	3.97%
Harmless	0	0	0	180	180	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Helpful	0	1	0	179	180	0.56%	0.00%	99.44%
Honest	28	50	2	100	152	32.89%	1.32%	65.79%
HHH	1	175	0	4	179	97.77%	0.00%	2.23%

Table 7. Investments by Aligned Mistral Models

This table displays investment decisions made by aligned Mistral models. For each Mistral model (both baseline and fine-tuned), we pose the following question: "You have an endowment of 10 dollars. How much would you invest? You can choose any portion of it to invest in a risky asset that either doubles the investment or loses it all with a 50% chance. Please provide a brief answer." Each model is asked the investment question 100 times, and we report the mean and standard deviation of the amount each model decides to invest. The question varies in magnitude with endowments of \$10 (baseline), \$100 (10 times), and \$500 (50 times), with the results displayed in panels A, B, and C, respectively.

List of Models	Investment questions					
	Panel A: Baseline		Panel B: 10x		Panel C: 50x	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
Base model	6.98	(3.40)	53.63	(33.46)	265.25	(183.87)
Harmless	5.00	(0.00)	49.60	(4.00)	247.22	(24.07)
Helpful	4.98	(1.68)	51.00	(7.04)	252.00	(25.54)
Honest	4.62	(1.16)	48.82	(10.83)	234.75	(60.81)
HHH	1.82	(2.49)	30.57	(25.23)	138.38	(154.41)

Table 9. Alignment and Investment Score

This table presents the summary statistics of investment scores predicted using the baseline Mistral model and four fine-tuned models: harmless, honest, helpful, and HHH. Following the approach of Jha et al. (2024), we apply the LLM to earnings conference call transcripts of S&P 500 constituents. These transcripts are sourced from Seeking Alpha and matched with Compustat firms using firm ticker names. Each conference call transcript is divided into several chunks, each with a length of less than 2,000 words. Furthermore, we apply an instruction prompt to the corpus, asking, "The following text is an excerpt from a company's earnings call transcript. As a finance expert, based solely on this text, please answer the following question: How does the firm plan to change its capital spending over the next year?" Respondents are given five options: Increase substantially, increase, no change, decrease, and decrease substantially. For each question, respondents are asked to select one of these choices and provide a one-sentence explanation of their choice. The format for each answer should be choice - explanation. If the text does not provide relevant information for the question, the response should be "no information provided." Each answer is assigned a score ranging from -1 to 1: Increase substantially scores 1, increase 0.5, no change and no information provided 0, decrease -0.5, and decrease substantially -1. After deriving investment scores for each chunk, we average the scores for each conference call transcript. The overall investment score reflects the LLM's perspective on how managers might alter future investment capital expenditures. In Panel A, we report firm-quarter level investment scores produced by the five Mistral models. In Panel B, we detail firm fundamentals known to predict future capital expenditures (CAPX), along with other transcript level textual characteristics, including the number of ethical words in the transcripts, the Gunning Fog index (Li, 2008), transcript length, and the Flesch Reading ease index. In Panel C, we present the Pearson correlation matrices of investment scores measured by the average of the chunks. The sample period spans from 2015:Q1 to 2019:Q4.

Panel A. Scores

	N	Mean	Std	Min	Q1	Med	Q3	Max
Base model	9348	0.124	0.119	-0.500	0.069	0.111	0.155	1.000
Harmless	9348	0.050	0.045	-0.125	0.017	0.043	0.076	0.274
Honest	9348	0.009	0.026	-0.188	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.182
Helpful	9348	0.043	0.051	-0.200	0.000	0.036	0.074	0.367
HHH	9348	0.001	0.014	-0.214	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.167

Panel B. Control Variables

	N	Mean	Std	Min	Q1	Med	Q3	Max
CapexInten	9348	0.890	0.874	0.000	0.238	0.606	1.302	3.580
TobinQ	9348	2.236	1.339	0.971	1.300	1.783	2.657	6.630
CashFlow	9348	0.023	0.018	-0.012	0.011	0.021	0.033	0.070
Leverage	9348	0.238	0.155	0.002	0.120	0.208	0.342	0.630
LogSize	9348	10.002	1.212	7.848	9.098	9.882	10.769	12.851
EthicWordCnt	9348	1.153	1.350	0.000	0.000	1.000	2.000	5.000
Fog	9348	9.127	0.995	7.280	8.400	9.070	9.780	11.450
Length	9348	9327.310	1828.891	4984.000	8327.750	9374.000	10338.250	13582.000
ReadingEase	9348	63.438	4.910	52.940	60.350	62.580	67.280	72.970

Panel C. Investment Score Correlation Matrix

	Base model	Harmless	Honest	Helpful	HHH
Base model	1.000				
Harmless	0.015	1.000			
Honest	0.057	0.115	1.000		
Helpful	0.070	0.132	0.428	1.000	
HHH	0.071	0.130	0.595	0.452	1.000

Table 10. Aligned Investment Scores and Future Investments

This table presents the regression results of coefficients from a firm-quarter level analysis, which regresses firms' real capital expenditure for the subsequent quarter on investment scores generated by five Mistral models using earnings call transcripts. We employ the original Mistral model for baseline comparison alongside four fine-tuned models: the harmless, helpful, and honest models and a composite HHH model. The dependent variable, Capex Intensity, is defined as real capital expenditure normalized by book assets for the upcoming quarter (t+2). Capex is calculated on a quarterly basis by determining the quarterly difference from the cumulative value of CAPXY, with the scaling variable, book asset, represented by ATQ. Control variables include Tobin's Q (calculated as $[ATQ + (CSHOQ * PRCCQ - CEQQ)] / ATQ$), Capex Intensity (t), Total Cash Flow (calculated as $[IBCOMQ + DPQ] / ATQ$), Market Leverage (calculated as $[DLTTQ + DLCQ] / [CSHOQ * PRCCQ + DLTTQ + DLCQ]$), and the logarithmic value of Firm Size in quarter t (measured by ATQ). t-statistics are displayed in square brackets. Significance levels of ***, **, and * correspond to 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively.

Dependent variable	Capex Intensity (t+2)					
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)
Base model	0.0476 (1.32)	0.0607* (1.71)				
Harmless	0.2609** (1.99)		0.4518*** (3.94)			
Helpful	0.2429** (2.31)			0.4031*** (4.18)		
Honest	0.1998 (1.03)				0.5346*** (2.80)	
HHH	0.1201 (0.45)					0.2969 (1.10)
Capex Intensity (t)	0.2509*** (6.24)	0.2513*** (6.25)	0.2504*** (6.23)	0.2511*** (6.26)	0.2515*** (6.25)	0.2513*** (6.26)
TobinQ	0.0607*** (3.03)	0.0638*** (3.18)	0.0622*** (3.12)	0.0610*** (3.04)	0.0624*** (3.11)	0.0638*** (3.19)
CashFlow	2.5404*** (4.75)	2.6236*** (4.88)	2.5657*** (4.77)	2.5720*** (4.84)	2.5790*** (4.79)	2.6144*** (4.86)
Leverage	-0.4506*** (-3.04)	-0.4968*** (-3.35)	-0.4716*** (-3.20)	-0.4632*** (-3.12)	-0.4807*** (-3.20)	-0.4949*** (-3.30)
LogSize	-0.0561 (-1.54)	-0.0518 (-1.42)	-0.0530 (-1.46)	-0.0564 (-1.54)	-0.0524 (-1.43)	-0.0521 (-1.42)
Firm Fixed Effects	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Year-Qtr Fixed Effects	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
R2	0.873	0.873	0.873	0.873	0.873	0.873
N	9348	9348	9348	9348	9348	9348

Table 11. Aligned Investment Scores and Long-term Investments

This table presents the regression results of coefficients from a firm-quarter level analysis, which regresses firms' real capital expenditure for the subsequent quarter on investment scores generated by five Mistral models using earnings call transcripts. We employ the original Mistral model for baseline comparison alongside four fine-tuned models: the harmless, helpful, and honest models and a composite HHH model. The dependent variable, Capex Intensity, is defined as real capital expenditure normalized by book assets for the upcoming quarter from t+3 to t+6. All independent variables follow the regressions in the last table. t-statistics are displayed in square brackets. Significance levels of ***, **, and * correspond to 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively.

List of Models	Capex Intensity				
	Base model	Harmless	Helpful	Honest	HHH
	t+3				
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Investment score (t)	0.0627 (1.61)	0.6504*** (4.95)	0.4995*** (4.35)	1.0393*** (4.89)	0.3374 (1.35)
	t+4				
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Investment score (t)	0.1043*** (2.90)	0.5983*** (4.33)	0.5432*** (4.39)	1.1293*** (5.77)	0.1388 (0.40)
	t+5				
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Investment score (t)	0.0098 (0.28)	0.4559*** (3.14)	0.5185*** (4.43)	0.6438*** (3.22)	-0.0091 (-0.02)
	t+6				
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Investment score (t)	0.0126 (0.36)	0.5578*** (4.18)	0.5756*** (4.86)	0.6167*** (3.52)	0.3904 (1.04)

Table 12. Alignment and Ethicality of Transcripts

This table presents the regression results of coefficients from a firm-quarter level analysis, which regresses firms’ real capital expenditure for the subsequent quarter on an interaction term between firms’ investment scores and the count of ethics-related words in conference call transcripts. We employ the original Mistral model for baseline comparison alongside four fine-tuned models: the harmless, helpful, and honest models and a composite HHH model in each column. We define ethics-related words using the seed word “ethical” and its synonyms from Merriam-Webster to form an ethics-related word dictionary, and then look for the number of these words mentioned in conference call transcripts. The dependent variable, Capex Intensity, and other dependent variables follow the specifications in the regressions in the previous tables. t-statistics are displayed in square brackets. Significance levels of ***, **, and * correspond to 1%, 5%, and 10%, respectively.

Dependent variable	Capex Intensity (t+2)				
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Base model	0.0579 (1.58)				
Base model * EthicWordCnt	0.0166 (0.94)				
Harmless		0.3693*** (3.06)			
Harmless * EthicWordCnt		0.0517*** (2.84)			
Helpful			0.3317*** (3.34)		
Helpful * EthicWordCnt			0.0397*** (3.39)		
Honest				0.5106** (2.49)	
Honest * EthicWordCnt				0.0088 (0.20)	
HHH					-0.2302 (-0.78)
HHH * EthicWordCnt					0.4360*** (3.61)
EthicWordCnt	0.0060 (1.29)	0.0036 (0.91)	0.0044 (1.40)	0.0079* (1.88)	0.0077* (1.96)
Controls	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Firm Fixed Effects	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Year-Qtr Fixed Effects	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
R2	0.873	0.873	0.873	0.873	0.873
N	9348	9348	9348	9348	9348

Table 13. Transcript Readability and Investment Score Predictability

This table examines transcript readability and the predictability of investment scores. For each transcript we use three measures to determine their readability. The first is the Gunning Fog index following Li (2006). The second measure is transcript length measured as the total number of sentences in each transcript. The last is the Flesch Reading Ease index. We interact each measure with the investment scores produced by each model and perform regressions. We report regression coefficients in front of the investment score and the interaction term in each panel. Other regression specifications remain unchanged.

Panel A. Fog Index					
Panel A: Fog index					
Dependent variable	Capex Intensity (t+2)				
	Base model	Harmelss	Helpful	Honest	HHH
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Score	0.0322 (0.87)	0.5943*** (2.70)	0.4986*** (4.01)	0.4322*** (3.63)	0.5562 (1.51)
Score*HiFog	0.0674 (0.98)	-0.1274 (-0.38)	-0.1078 (-0.61)	-0.0663 (-0.45)	-0.5098 (-1.14)

Panel B. Transcript Length					
Panel B: Transcript length					
Dependent variable	Capex Intensity (t+2)				
	Base model	Harmelss	Helpful	Honest	HHH
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Score	0.0721 (1.49)	0.3531** (2.32)	0.4555*** (3.64)	0.3989 (1.41)	0.2745 (0.84)
Score*HiLength	-0.0217 (-0.34)	0.2207 (1.14)	-0.1045 (-0.61)	0.2946 (0.82)	0.0486 (0.09)

Panel C. Reading Ease Index					
Panel C: Reading ease					
Dependent variable	Capex Intensity (t+2)				
	Base model	Harmelss	Helpful	Honest	HHH
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Score	0.0967* (1.70)	0.5708*** (3.73)	0.4874*** (3.60)	0.3985 (1.55)	0.7296 (1.59)
Score*LoReadingEase	-0.0715 (-0.99)	-0.2006 (-1.05)	-0.1449 (-0.84)	0.2350 (0.72)	-0.6860 (-1.29)