

---

# PREDICTIONS FROM LANGUAGE MODELS FOR MULTIPLE-CHOICE TASKS ARE NOT ROBUST UNDER VARIATION OF SCORING METHODS

---

Polina Tsvilodub\*<sup>†</sup>, Hening Wang<sup>†</sup>, Sharon Grosch, Michael Franke  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Tübingen

## ABSTRACT

This paper systematically compares different methods of deriving item-level predictions of language models for multiple-choice tasks. It compares scoring methods for answer options based on free generation of responses, various probability-based scores, a Likert-scale style rating method, and embedding similarity. In a case study on pragmatic language interpretation, we find that LLM predictions are not robust under variation of method choice, both within a single LLM and across different LLMs. As this variability entails pronounced researcher degrees of freedom in reporting results, knowledge of the variability is crucial to secure robustness of results and research integrity.

## 1 Introduction

Recent Large Language Models (LLMs) show impressive performance on various tasks (e.g., T. Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023), leading to discussions about LLMs' status in comparison to human reasoning capabilities or as models of human language (e.g., Bommasani et al., 2021; Binz and Schulz, 2023; Bubeck et al., 2023; Hagendorff, 2023; Katzir, 2023; Piantadosi, 2023; Shiffrin and Mitchell, 2023). These discussions are fuelled by results suggesting excellent model performance, e.g., on large benchmark datasets with multiple-choice answers (e.g., A. Wang et al., 2019; Srivastava et al., 2022). It has been recognized that a more holistic assessment of the performance of LLMs is necessary, which goes beyond mere accuracy and also comprises metrics like bias, efficiency and robustness (Liang et al., 2023). Similarly, work on calibration of LLM-internal multiple choice answer probabilities with respect to accuracy of factual knowledge highlights the importance of careful assessment of robustness of LLMs (e.g., Kadavath et al., 2022; Mielke et al., 2022). However, comparatively little work directly compares different methods for deriving LLM predictions for benchmark testing or in relation to human behavior (but see, e.g., Poliak et al., 2018; Holtzman et al., 2021; Hu and R. Levy, 2023; Tedeschi et al., 2023).

This paper contributes to previous work on robustness, by exploring possible variance at the level of an LLM's prediction for a *single item* of a multiple choice task. The focus is on a pragmatic language-understanding task (Hu, Floyd, et al., 2023), so as to confine the investigation to a single domain in which language models should, arguably, show high performance. Indeed, experimental work on human language understanding shows that different *task types*, i.e., ways of asking a question, can lead to qualitatively different patterns in human responses (e.g., Geurts and Pouscoulous, 2009; Chemla and Spector, 2011), thereby stressing the importance of investigating different *linking functions*, which map model-internal information to aspects of human data (Degen and Goodman, 2014; Franke, 2016; Jasbi, Waldon, and Degen, 2019). Taking inspiration from this literature, we formulate a range of methods for retrieving LLM answers in multiple-choice tasks, both for accuracy scoring and for assessing human-likeness of LLMs' predictions. In particular, we build on three methods commonly used in psycholinguistic experiments: free production of answers, forced choice answer selection, and Likert-scale rating of answers. Additionally, we consider link-functions based on embedding similarity.<sup>2</sup>

---

\*Corresponding author: polina.tsvilodub@uni-tuebingen.de. <sup>†</sup>: equal contributions, listed alphabetically.

<sup>2</sup>All materials can be found under <https://tinyurl.com/4czu7mbu>.

## 2 Related work

Recent like-minded work has analysed the human-likeness of LLMs’ linguistic performance, e.g., testing language models on different syntactic phenomena (Wilcox, R. Levy, et al., 2018; Wilcox, Gauthier, et al., 2020; Futrell et al., 2019; Arehalli, Dillon, and Linzen, 2022). Human-likeness of LLM performance has also been assessed on other domains like semantic judgements (e.g., J. P. Levy, Bullinaria, and McCormick, 2017; Kauf, A. A. Ivanova, et al., 2022). Other work has focused on comparing variability of texts generated by LLMs to human production variability (e.g., Meister and Cotterell, 2021; Giulianelli et al., 2023). Most relevantly to the present study, recent work has looked at the human-likeness of LLM performance on subtle pragmatic phenomena like irony or compliance with Gricean maxims (Hu, Floyd, et al., 2023; Tsvilodub et al., 2023; di San Pietro et al., 2023). However, these comparisons typically assess human-likeness based on one particular LLM answer scoring method (i.e., one linking function).

Akin to variability in human experimental work, different methods of retrieving LLM predictions are common. There are abundant approaches to generating answers from LLMs by many sophisticated prompting strategies (e.g., Nye et al., 2021; Wei et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2023, among many others). Next to directly sampling answers from the LLMs, surprisals or log probabilities of tokens are widely used (e.g., Wilcox, Gauthier, et al., 2020; Futrell et al., 2019; Kauf, A. A. Ivanova, et al., 2022; Hu, Floyd, et al., 2023), which are often aggregated in different ways (Holtzman et al., 2021). Further, cosine similarity is commonly applied in NLP; it has also been used to relate distributional word representations to human performance in lexical priming studies (Günther, Dudschig, and Kaup (2016), but see Zhou et al. (2022) for a critical discussion).

However, these methods used in different studies (oriented towards comparison to human performance or NLP-typical computation of aggregated performance measures) have not often been compared on the same task, or for different models. Therefore, the present study systematically compares different methods used in previous work in a controlled setting, highlighting parallels to psycholinguistic experiments and comparison of LLM performance to human behavior.

## 3 Experimental Set-up

### 3.1 Materials, Notation & Models

We use the material and human data from a forced-choice experiment on pragmatic language interpretation provided by Hu, Floyd, et al. (2023). Seven experimental conditions were tested, targeting different phenomena of interest: coherence, humor, deceit, irony, indirect speech, Gricean maxims and metaphors. There are 20 to 40 items per condition. Each item consists of a context and a trigger sentence. Human participants indicated their interpretation of the trigger by selecting a multiple-choice answer option. Each vignette had two, four or five options, one of which is the *target option* representing a pragmatic, non-literal interpretation.

Our experimental material was derived from that of Hu, Floyd, et al. (2023) as follows. All items of the same condition shared the task description  $T$  and question  $Q$  (see Figure 1, left). Instructions and prompts differed slightly between phenomena (e.g., the coherence condition asked to decide whether a pair of sentences was coherent; the maxims condition asked what the speaker of the sentence was trying to convey). Each experimental item  $i$  consisted of a context description  $C_i$ , including the trigger sentence, and  $k_i$  answer options  $\langle o_{ij} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq k_i}$ , with  $o_{ij} = \langle w_{ijl} \rangle_{1 \leq l \leq |o_{ij}|}$  being a sequence of words.

We used four LLMs for text generating and probability assignment to text: GPT-3.5-turbo-instruct and text-davinci-002 models (175B parameters) (T. Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022), LLaMA-2 (7B parameters) (Touvron et al., 2023), and FLAN-T5-XL (3B parameters) (Chung et al., 2022). To retrieve token probabilities from FLAN-T5-XL, which is an encoder-decoder model partially pretrained with a denoising objective, we used the pseudo-likelihood computation (Salazar et al., 2020). That is, we created inputs consisting of the  $T$ ,  $Q$ ,  $C_i$  and  $\langle w_{ij1}, w_{ij2}, \dots, w_{ijk-1}, w_{ijk+1}, \dots, w_{ijl} \rangle$  where the answer option word  $w_{ijk}$  was masked with the special token  $\langle \text{extra\_id\_0} \rangle$ . We created outputs of the form  $\langle \text{extra\_id\_0} \rangle w_{ijk} \langle \text{extra\_id\_1} \rangle$  and summed the retrieved log probabilities of the tokens corresponding to  $w_{ijk}$  (with only one mask for sentence-initial and final tokens).<sup>3</sup> We also used text-embedding-ada-002 for the embedding similarity method (Greene et al., 2022).

<sup>3</sup>At each scoring step we masked tokens corresponding to an entire word. This is closely related to work by Kauf and A. Ivanova (2023). Exploratory work masking single (subword) tokens revealed worse performance under string scoring and, therefore, is not reported.




Figure 1: **Left:** example of stimulus material (irony condition) for different methods. Sequences for which scores are retrieved are underlined. The trigger sentence is in boldface.  $T$ ,  $C_i$  and  $Q$  are included in all methods’ input prompts  $I_i$ . Colors indicate the text which is additionally used for the respective method. **Right:** set of all relevant scores.

### 3.2 Methods of Answer Selection

We compare five different methods of determining an LLM’s answer choice: (i) free generation, (ii) string scoring, (iii) label scoring, (iv) rating aggregation, and (v) embedding similarity. All methods, except for free generation, select the answer with the highest numerical score. For some methods (string and label scoring), several candidate scores are compared. Figure 1 (right) lists all scores used.

#### 3.2.1 Free Generation

The free-generation method prompts an LLM to generate continuations, which were then manually classified as correct (corresponding to the target option) or not by the authors. The input prompt  $I_i$  for item  $i$  can be seen in Figure 1 (left). Generations of at most 50 tokens were obtained by sampling temperatures  $\tau = 0.1$  and  $\tau = 0.9$ , with five random seeds, respectively. There were no qualitative differences between the results obtained with different parameters parameters, so only results generated with  $\tau = 0.1$  are reported.

#### 3.2.2 String Scoring

The string-scoring method assigns a numerical score to each answer option  $o_{ij}$  of item  $i$ . We compute the *option probability*, i.e., the conditional probability of  $o_{ij}$  given  $I_i$  (Fig. 1, right, (1)). Following common practice (e.g., Bommasani et al., 2021), we also consider length-corrected measures, *average option probability* (2) and *average negative surprisal* (3). Finally, to compensate for different baseline probabilities of different options, we compute a *prior corrected option probability* (4), where  $I_{i0}$  is like  $I_i$  but without  $C_i$  and  $Q$  (cf., Poliak et al., 2018; Holtzman et al., 2021). For symmetry, we also compute the *surprisal reduction factor* (5), a prior correction for surprisals.

#### 3.2.3 Label Scoring

While the string-scoring method presented each option  $o_{ij}$  individually for scoring, the label-scoring method presents all options with a uniquely identifying label in the input prompt, and computes scores from the probability assigned to the labels (see Figure 1, left). Let  $\langle l_{ij} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq k_i}$  be a set of ordered answer labels (e.g., A, B, ... or 1, 2, ...) for the  $k_i$  options of item  $i$ . We consider the *label probability*  $P(l_{ij} | I_i)$  as the analogon of score (1). Since the analogues of length-corrected scores (2) and (3) for labels are equivalent to (1), we only consider scores of type (1), (4) and (5) for labels.




Figure 2: Task accuracy for different methods and models, separately for different conditions. Bars show accuracy scores, which are averages over different versions of each method (e.g., random seeds or different scores). Horizontal bar shows accuracy expected from random guessing in each condition.

### 3.2.4 Rating Aggregation

The rating-aggregation method computes a score via a procedure akin to Likert-scale rating tasks in human experiments. For each answer option  $o_{ij}$ , the LLM is asked to select a rating from a five-point scale with labels  $r_1, \dots, r_5$ , which are internally treated as a number,  $1, \dots, 5$ . The *rating aggregation* score assigned to option  $o_{ij}$  is the probability-weighted average of the rating (see Figure 1, right, (6)). The experiments used rating scales based on randomly chosen concepts: “likely”, “appropriate”, “plausible”, “possible”. Reported results are based on the best-performing scale for each model.

### 3.2.5 Embedding Similarity

Finally, motivated by the common use of information extracted from embeddings, the embedding-similarity method compares options based on an *embedding similarity score* (7) between input prompt embeddings  $E(I_i)$  and embeddings  $E(o_{ij})$  of each answer option  $o_{ij}$ . The input prompt  $I_i$  for item  $i$  is constant and identical to the string score inputs (see Figure 1, left). For LLaMA-2, we use the last hidden representation of the last sequence token as input and answer option representations, respectively. For FLAN-T5, we use the last hidden representation of the last token of the encoder as the input embedding, and the last hidden representation of the decoder conditioned on the input for the answer option embedding (cf. Ni et al., 2022). For the OpenAI models, we use sequence embeddings by Greene et al. (2022).

## 4 Results

Figure 2 shows accuracy (proportion of target choices) for different models, methods and conditions. Accuracy is averaged over different scoring functions, except where indicated otherwise in the description of the methods in Section 3.2. Though human accuracy (dark gray bars) is consistently high, the performance of models and methods varies considerably, even qualitatively, across different conditions: for example, for GTP-davinci string-scoring, label-scoring and generation-based methods take turns outperforming each other across conditions.

Figure 3 shows, for each model, method, and, if applicable, score, the accuracy, as well as a measure of goodness-of-fit to human data (i.e., log-likelihood of human data), averaged over conditions. The log-likelihood of human data is the sum of log-probabilities, assuming the obvious binomial likelihood function, under an LLM-based point-valued, probabilistic prediction  $p$  for each phenomenon, model and score in the data set. The target rate  $p$  is the proportion of target choices for any given triple of phenomenon, model and metric.

We observe that accuracy and likelihood of data are fairly correlated. This is not logically necessarily, but explainable in the present case, as there is no model-method pair which outperforms human accuracy in all conditions (see Figure 2). This correlation permits occasional glossing over differences between accuracy and likelihood.

There are pronounced performance differences between different models. LLaMA-7B performed rather poorly, especially for free-generation and string-scoring methods. Models from the GPT-family performed best. GPT-instruct with free-generation achieved the highest accuracy and likelihood across all models, methods and scores.




Figure 3: Results of methods comparison, based on accuracy (proportion of target choices) and goodness-of-fit to the human data. Different scores are displayed on the x-axis. For ease of visual comparison, goodness-of-fit is shown as difference in log-likelihood of the human data under the LLM predictor, compared against one of the worst performing models (higher is better).

There is no strong evidence for a single method delivering supreme results for all models. Label scoring worked best for all models except for GPT-instruct, where free generation achieves slightly higher accuracy and likelihood and where even string-scoring outperforms label-scoring. Judging from visual inspection, the choice of method (and score) seems to matter more for models which overall perform worse than for the best performing models. This is unlikely a mere ceiling effect for the well-performing models, since accuracy is far from ceiling even for the best performing model.

Based on the obtained results, we can recommend *not* using rating approaches, because they are more expensive to compute with no obvious payback in performance or goodness-of-fit. The embedding-based method also performed generally worse. Free generation gave excellent results for GPT-instruct, which may be due to the fact that it is highly optimized to give coherent generation, thus leading to fewer off-topic responses. The improvement under free generation over scoring for GPT-instruct, which was fine-tuned with RLHF, could also be because log-probability calibration might deteriorate upon fine-tuning (cf. OpenAI, 2023).

## 5 Discussion and Conclusion

We presented a case study comparing different methods of assessing performance of LLMs, both in terms of accuracy (matching a gold-standard) and goodness-of-fit to human data. Methods we considered were standard from the previous literature and/or inspired by different task types for assessing human decisions in multiple-choice contexts. Best and most stable results were achieved with label scoring, in line with previous results (cf. Hu and R. Levy, 2023). We found that different methods of assessing model performance give different results for different models and conditions. This calls for attention to variability in performance assessment.

Awareness of variability in performance assessment is important for good practices in reporting and building on results. Variability of this kind provides researcher degrees of freedom, which can lead to accumulation of false or overstated results and biased reporting, even in the absence of misleading intentions (Ioannidis, 2005; Chambers, 2017). To reduce researcher degrees of freedom and to build more robust and reproducible research practices (Wieling, Rawee, and Noord, 2018), preregistered analyses are an option (Munafò et al., 2017).

The present investigation has a narrow empirical scope, by focusing on a single data set from a single domain. Strictly speaking, this is not detrimental to the demonstration of the general point that results suffer from non-robustness under available researcher degrees of freedom in determining an assessment method. Nevertheless, future like-minded comparisons of methods should extend to other multiple-choice datasets and tasks where human performance results are available, to tokenizer architectures other than BPE, and other LLM configurations like different decoding schemes for free generation. Additionally, future work should go beyond choice of a single target option and address full distributional predictions for the whole set of options. Assessment of distributional predictions matters to understand

the tail-behavior of generation, e.g., when sampling with non-zero temperature. Finally, to better understand the sources of variability across methods, effects of factors like LLM size, architecture, and training data could be investigated.

## 6 Limitations

The reproducibility of results under closed-source models like GPT-3.5-turbo-instruct and text-davinci-002 is limited because the respective API endpoints were disabled by OpenAI after this work was completed. Furthermore, these results are limited to a small set of manually created experimental items from prior work (Hu, Floyd, et al., 2023). The items are only in English, and test pragmatic phenomena in a way which is specific to Western social norms and culture (Rubio-Fernandez and Jara-Ettinger, 2020). Future work should extend such evaluations to other languages. Finally, many of the tested pragmatic phenomena and items might be confounded with effects of politeness, so future work could extend to testing LLM performance on politeness datasets directly (e.g., Yoon et al., 2020; Carcassi and Franke, 2023).

## 7 Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge support by the state of Baden-Württemberg, Germany, through the computing resources provided by bwHPC and the German Research Foundation (DFG) through grant INST 35/1597-1 FUGG. Michael Franke is a member of the Machine Learning Cluster of Excellence, EXC number 2064/1 – Project number 39072764.

## References

- Arehalli, Suhas, Brian Dillon, and Tal Linzen (Dec. 2022). “Syntactic Surprisal From Neural Models Predicts, But Underestimates, Human Processing Difficulty From Syntactic Ambiguities”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid): Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 301–313.
- Binz, Marcel and Eric Schulz (2023). “Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120.6, e2218523120.
- Bommasani, Rishi et al. (2021). “On the opportunities and risks of foundation models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*.
- Brown, Tom et al. (2020). “Language Models are Few-Shot Learners”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by H. Larochelle et al. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 1877–1901.
- Bubeck, Sébastien et al. (2023). “Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Carcassi, Fausto and Michael Franke (2023). “How to handle the truth: A model of politeness as strategic truth-stretching”. In: *Proceedings of the 45th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Cognitive Science Society.
- Chambers, Chris (2017). *The Seven Deadly Sins of Psychology*. Princeton University Press.
- Chemla, Emmanuel and Benjamin Spector (2011). “Experimental Evidence for Embedded Scalar Implicatures”. In: *Journal of Semantics* 28, pp. 359–400.
- Chowdhery, Aakanksha et al. (2022). “Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- Chung, Hyung Won et al. (2022). “Scaling instruction-finetuned language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Degen, Judith and Noah D. Goodman (2014). “Lost your Marbles? The Puzzle of Dependent Measures in Experimental Pragmatics”. In: *Proceedings of CogSci*. Ed. by Paul Bello et al. Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.
- Franke, Michael (2016). “Task types, link functions & probabilistic modeling in experimental pragmatics”. In: *Proceedings of Trends in Experimental Pragmatics*. Ed. by Fabienne Salfner and Uli Sauerland, pp. 56–63.
- Futrell, Richard et al. (June 2019). “Neural language models as psycholinguistic subjects: Representations of syntactic state”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 32–42.
- Geurts, Bart and Nausicaa Pouscoulous (2009). “Embedded Implicatures?!?” In: *Semantics & Pragmatics* 2.4, pp. 1–34.
- Giulianelli, Mario et al. (2023). *What Comes Next? Evaluating Uncertainty in Neural Text Generators Against Human Production Variability*. arXiv: 2305.11707 [cs.CL].
- Greene, Ryan et al. (Dec. 2022). *New and improved embedding model*.

- Günther, Fritz, Carolin Dudschig, and Barbara Kaup (2016). “Latent semantic analysis cosines as a cognitive similarity measure: Evidence from priming studies”. In: *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 69.4. PMID: 25952009, pp. 626–653. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2015.1038280>.
- Hagendorff, Thilo (2023). *Machine Psychology: Investigating Emergent Capabilities and Behavior in Large Language Models Using Psychological Methods*.
- Holtzman, Ari et al. (Nov. 2021). “Surface Form Competition: Why the Highest Probability Answer Isn’t Always Right”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 7038–7051.
- Hu, Jennifer, Sammy Floyd, et al. (July 2023). “A fine-grained comparison of pragmatic language understanding in humans and language models”. In: *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 4194–4213.
- Hu, Jennifer and Roger Levy (2023). “Prompt-based methods may underestimate large language models’ linguistic generalizations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13264*.
- Ioannidis, John P. A. (2005). “Why Most Published Research Findings Are False”. In: *PLoS Medicine* 2.8, e124.
- Jasbi, Masoud, Brandon Waldon, and Judith Degen (2019). “Linking Hypothesis and Number of Response Options Modulate Inferred Scalar Implicature Rate”. In: *Frontiers in Psychology* 10.
- Kadavath, Saurav et al. (2022). *Language Models (Mostly) Know What They Know*. arXiv: 2207.05221 [cs.CL].
- Katzir, Roni (2023). “Why large language models are poor theories of human linguistic cognition. A reply to Piantadosi (2023).” In: *Manuscript, Tel Aviv University*. url: <https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/007190>.
- Kauf, Carina and Anna Ivanova (July 2023). “A Better Way to Do Masked Language Model Scoring”. In: *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 925–935.
- Kauf, Carina, Anna A Ivanova, et al. (2022). “Event knowledge in large language models: the gap between the impossible and the unlikely”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.01488*.
- Levy, Joseph Patrick, John Bullinaria, and Samantha McCormick (2017). “Semantic vector evaluation and human performance on a new vocabulary MCQ test”. In: *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society: CogSci 2017 London: “Computational Foundations of Cognition”*. Cognitive Science Society.
- Liang, Percy et al. (2023). “Holistic Evaluation of Language Models”. In: *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Meister, Clara and Ryan Cotterell (Aug. 2021). “Language Model Evaluation Beyond Perplexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 5328–5339.
- Mielke, Sabrina J. et al. (Aug. 2022). “Reducing Conversational Agents’ Overconfidence Through Linguistic Calibration”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10, pp. 857–872. ISSN: 2307-387X.
- Munafò, Marcus R. et al. (2017). “A manifesto for reproducible science”. In: *Nature Human Behaviour* 1.1. ISSN: 2397-3374.
- Ni, Jianmo et al. (May 2022). “Sentence-T5: Scalable Sentence Encoders from Pre-trained Text-to-Text Models”. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 1864–1874.
- Nye, Maxwell et al. (2021). “Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00114*.
- OpenAI (2023). *GPT-4 Technical Report*. arXiv: 2303.08774 [cs.CL].
- Ouyang, Long et al. (2022). *Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback*. arXiv: 2203.02155 [cs.CL].
- Piantadosi, Steven (2023). “Modern language models refute Chomsky’s approach to language”. In: *Lingbuzz Preprint, lingbuzz* 7180.
- Poliak, Adam et al. (2018). “Hypothesis Only Baselines in Natural Language Inference”. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 180–191.
- Rubio-Fernandez, Paula and Julian Jara-Ettinger (2020). “Incrementality and efficiency shape pragmatics across languages”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117.24, pp. 13399–13404.
- Salazar, Julian et al. (July 2020). “Masked Language Model Scoring”. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 2699–2712.
- di San Pietro, Chiara Barattieri et al. (2023). “The pragmatic profile of ChatGPT: assessing the pragmatic skills of a conversational agent”. In.
- Shiffrin, Richard and Melanie Mitchell (2023). “Probing the psychology of AI models”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120.10, e2300963120.
- Srivastava, Aarohi et al. (2022). “Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*.

- Tedeschi, Simone et al. (July 2023). “What’s the Meaning of Superhuman Performance in Today’s NLU?” In: *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 12471–12491.
- Touvron, Hugo et al. (2023). “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Tsvilodub, Polina et al. (2023). “Overinformative Question Answering by Humans and Machines”. In: *Proceedings of the 45th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Cognitive Science Society.
- Wang, Alex et al. (2019). “Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32.
- Wei, Jason et al. (2022). “Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*.
- Wieling, Martijn, Josine Rawee, and Gertjan van Noord (Dec. 2018). “Reproducibility in Computational Linguistics: Are We Willing to Share?” In: *Computational Linguistics* 44.4, pp. 641–649.
- Wilcox, Ethan, Jon Gauthier, et al. (2020). “On the Predictive Power of Neural Language Models for Human Real-Time Comprehension Behavior”. In: *CoRR* abs/2006.01912. arXiv: 2006.01912.
- Wilcox, Ethan, Roger Levy, et al. (2018). “What do RNN Language Models Learn about Filler-Gap Dependencies?” In: *CoRR* abs/1809.00042. arXiv: 1809.00042.
- Yao, Shunyu et al. (2023). “Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601*.
- Yoon, Erica J et al. (2020). “Polite speech emerges from competing social goals”. In: *Open Mind* 4, pp. 71–87.
- Zhou, Kaitlyn et al. (May 2022). “Problems with Cosine as a Measure of Embedding Similarity for High Frequency Words”. In: *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 401–423.