

Empirical evidence of Large Language Model’s influence on human spoken communication

Hiromu Yakura^{*†a}, Ezequiel Lopez-Lopez^{†b}, Levin Brinkmann^{†a}, Ignacio Serna^a, Prateek Gupta^a, and Iyad Rahwan^a

^a*Center for Humans and Machines, Max-Planck Institute for Human Development, Germany*

^a*Center for Adaptive Rationality, Max-Planck Institute for Human Development, Germany*

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) agents now interact with billions of humans in natural language, thanks to advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT. This raises the question of whether AI has the potential to shape a fundamental aspect of human culture: the way we speak. Recent analyses revealed that scientific publications already exhibit evidence of AI-specific language. But this evidence is inconclusive, since scientists may simply be using AI to copy-edit their writing. To explore whether AI has influenced human spoken communication, we transcribed and analyzed about 280,000 English-language videos of presentations, talks, and speeches from more than 20,000 YouTube channels of academic institutions. We find a significant shift in the trend of word usage specific to words distinctively associated with ChatGPT following its release. These findings provide the first empirical evidence that humans increasingly imitate LLMs in their spoken language. Our results raise societal and policy-relevant concerns about the potential of AI to unintentionally reduce linguistic diversity, or to be deliberately misused for mass manipulation. They also highlight the need for further investigation into the feedback loop between machine behavior and human culture.

Keywords: large language models | cultural evolution | spoken communication

1 Introduction

Language, as a social phenomenon, is constantly evolving through iterative processes of perception, internalization, and reproduction [1]. Individuals unconsciously adjust their language to align with their social environment, aiding in maintaining mutual understanding, reducing social distance, and assimilating into social groups [2–4]. These linguistic changes contribute to cultural evolution—a process long influenced by media and emerging technologies, which shape the transmission of spoken and written language and, consequently, how we speak [5].

Our digital environment now incorporates a new actor: Large Language Models (LLMs). LLM-based applications, such as ChatGPT, have become a part of our daily activities, particularly in the academic context [6], where they are widely used for writing (e.g., polishing, summarizing, rephrasing, and proof-reading content), bridging the gap between initial drafts and polished formal communication. Recent studies on preprint abstracts [7–10] have shown a marked increase in the usage of specific words like *delve*, *underscore*, *realm*, and *intricate*, suggesting a shift in linguistic preferences directly attributed to the use of ChatGPT. This phenomenon raises the intriguing possibility that our spoken communication might also be evolving under the influence of these models, either through direct use for text editing or by indirect exposure to LLM-generated content. If confirmed, this would highlight the role of LLMs not only as tools for producing text but also as sources of influence from which humans learn and adapt their language.

*Corresponding author: yakura@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

While previous research has focused on how LLMs internalize and replicate human language patterns and biases [11, 12], our study turns the lens in the opposite direction, posing the following questions: *Do humans, in their interaction with these AI systems, internalize and subsequently reproduce the linguistic patterns introduced by these models?* Specifically, following the aforementioned findings from ChatGPT-influenced preprint abstracts, *Does exposure to specific AI systems lead to significant shifts in academic spoken communication?* This research explores whether the loop of human-machine cultural transmission [13] is indeed closing, with humans adopting the language patterns generated by AI and vice versa.

To address this, we analyzed approximately 280,000 video transcriptions from over 20,000 academic YouTube channels, focusing on (i) changing trends in word frequency following the introduction of ChatGPT, and (ii) the correlation between the trend changes and word usage by ChatGPT. We show that, following the release of ChatGPT, word frequencies in human spoken communication began to shift, exemplifying the transformative impact of AI systems on human culture.

2 Results

2.1 Changing trend in word frequencies

Fig. 1 shows the prevalence of videos containing words that previous studies have identified as distinctive of ChatGPT-edited texts [8, 10]. We modeled the temporal evolution of this frequency, y_w , as the following continuous piecewise linear regression:

$$\log(y_w) = \alpha + \beta_{w,\text{natural}} \times t + \beta_{w,\text{GPT}} \times t_{\text{post}} + \epsilon \quad (1)$$

$$\text{where } t_{\text{post}} = \begin{cases} t - T_{\text{event}} & \text{if } t > T_{\text{event}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } t \in [T_{\text{start}}, T_{\text{end}}]$$

Thereby, the coefficient $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ captures the change in trend observed at T_{event} (marked by a red line; in Fig. 1A, corresponding to the release of ChatGPT in November 2022). We set T_{end} at 18 months after T_{event} , reflecting the extent of the available data after ChatGPT’s release (as of May 2024), and T_{start} at 36 months prior. The posterior medians (95% highest density interval in brackets) for the trend changes ($\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$) following $T_{\text{event}} = 2022-11-30$ are 0.11 [0.04, 0.18] for ‘delve’, 0.09 [0.03, 0.14] for ‘realm’, 0.10 [0.02, 0.17] for ‘meticulous’, and 0.12 [0.02, 0.22] for ‘adept’, all indicating accelerated adoption post-ChatGPT. This suggest an increase of 48%, 35%, 40% and 51%, respectively, over the 18 months observed since ChatGPT’s introduction.

In Fig. 1B and C, we report models with alternative change points set one and two years prior to ChatGPT’s release, demonstrating no comparable trend change, thereby indicating that such an increase is not commonly observed.

2.2 Relationship between ChatGPT’s word preferences and human adoption

To extrapolate the previous analysis to a wider spectrum of words used in the collected videos, we examined the magnitude of trend changes associated with words peculiar to ChatGPT’s output (*GPT words*). To this end, we use the dataset provided by Liang et al. [8], which comprises 10,000 human-written abstracts of preprint papers and their corresponding ChatGPT-edited versions. We assessed the distinctiveness of each word in ChatGPT-edited abstracts by calculating the relative log-frequency of its usage by ChatGPT compared to its usage by humans, $\log(\frac{P_{w,\text{GPT}}}{P_{w,\text{human}}})$. Based on this metric, we identified the top N words as *GPT words* and calculated the mean of their $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ across varying N , as shown in Fig. 2. The results indicate a significant association of the words most distinctive to ChatGPT and an accelerated adoption of these words by humans. As N increases, the trend changes following ChatGPT’s release become less pronounced, suggesting that ChatGPT’s influence is not uniform across all words. In contrast, when selecting the bottom N words as *control words* for comparison, no substantial trend changes with a large magnitude of $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ were observed, suggesting the specificity of this effect to *GPT words*.

Fig. 3A presents a scatter plot of the 20 words identified as most distinctive to ChatGPT-edited texts. The plot reveals a correlation between the distinctiveness of these words to ChatGPT and a greater acceleration in




Figure 1: Prevalence of videos containing words associated with ChatGPT. Dots represent monthly aggregated frequencies, while the black line depicts a linear regression with a change point marked by the red dashed line. The shaded regions represent the 95% posterior predictive interval. (A) The log frequency trend shows a noticeable surge when the release date of ChatGPT is used as a change point. (B, C) Comparisons with alternative change points indicate that this surge is not commonly observed.




Figure 2: Magnitude of trend changes of the top N words most and least peculiar to ChatGPT-edited texts (*GPT words* and *control words*, respectively). The shaded regions represent the 95% confidence interval, indicating a significant acceleration in the usage of, for example, the top 20 *GPT words* in spoken communication. In contrast, no significant trend change was observed for the control words.

their usage in spoken communication over time. Consistent with Fig. 2, Fig. 3B indicates that this relationship is most pronounced when considering the top 20 words, suggesting a specific effect on those words most characteristic of ChatGPT. In addition, Fig. 3C shows that the trend change became significant only after several months had passed since the release of ChatGPT.

3 Discussion

Our findings show that the widespread use of LLMs like ChatGPT is influencing human linguistic patterns, with humans increasingly adopting the language favored by these models. While intensive research focuses on machines' alignment with human behavior, our study suggests that the reverse may also be occurring.




Figure 3: **(A)** Correlation analysis between the specificity of words to ChatGPT-edited texts (x -axis) and the magnitude of changes in their frequency trends (y -axis). The shaded regions represent the 95% confidence interval of a linear fit, and the bars represent the standard deviation of the posterior distribution. Focusing on the top 20 words most peculiar to ChatGPT-edited texts (*i.e.*, the most right side of the inset chart), a significant correlation is observed between two parameters ($r = 0.63$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that words more strongly associated with ChatGPT have a greater influence on our spoken language. It is noteworthy that these parameters are derived from entirely different sources (*i.e.*, x -axis is based on written abstracts [8], while y -axis is derived from verbal communication on YouTube). **(B)** The robustness of the correlation was examined by varying the number of top words N , showing that the correlation peaks around $N = 20$. **(C)** The specificity of the correlation was further analyzed by adjusting the change points, revealing that it emerged only when a sufficient amount of data originating after ChatGPT’s release (November 2022) was included in the observation window, which closes at T_{event} .

This mirrors previous findings where humans adopt strategies in games like chess and Go from machines [14], indicating that machines may now be taking on the role of cultural models in an increasing number of domains.

Our study is focused on academic communication, yet we anticipate that similar patterns may extend to other communicative contexts. The mechanisms driving the accelerated adoption of certain words remain an open question for future research. A qualitative analysis of videos featuring the word ‘delve’ suggests its usage occurs both in spontaneous conversations and during the reading of prepared manuscripts (details in Appendix D). While we observe a strong correlation between the specificity of certain words to ChatGPT and their accelerated usage, this trend is not universal. For example, words like ‘groundbreaking’ and ‘underscore’ are common in written abstracts edited by ChatGPT but did not significantly accelerate in usage in spoken language. This variability indicates that multiple factors may influence the adoption process, warranting further investigation.

This study illustrates how AI systems can, within a relatively short period of time, influence key aspects of human culture, such as language. Researchers have examined the challenges posed by training future LLMs on the outputs of current models, with particular concern over the potential decline in cultural diversity [15]. If the effects observed in this work continue, especially with the growing use of LLMs in education, our findings challenge the notion that humans can continue to provide unbiased, novel data to counteract this decline. Instead, our study suggests that humans themselves may face a reduction in linguistic diversity, emphasizing the complex, bidirectional relationship in which humans and machines influence each other within a shared cultural environment.

4 Methods

We constructed a dataset of YouTube videos released by academic institutions and obtained 280,000 transcripts in a systematic manner. We modeled the frequency trend of individual words and analyzed its changes following the release of ChatGPT as well as the correlation between the trend changes and the prominence of each word in ChatGPT-generated texts. See Appendix A to D for more details.

Acknowledgements

E.L.-L. (Ezequiel Lopez-Lopez) was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), project number 458366841 (POLTOOLS - Assisting behavioral science and evidence-based policy making using online machine tools).

References

- [1] Martin J. Pickering and Simon Garrod. Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27(2), 2004.
- [2] Cindy Gallois, Tania Ogay, and Howard Giles. Communication accommodation theory. In *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication*, pages 121–148. Sage, Thousand Oaks, USA, 2005.
- [3] Penelope Eckert. *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Blackwell, Oxford, UK, 2000.
- [4] Nick Chater and Morten H Christiansen. Language acquisition meets language evolution. *Cognitive Science*, 34(7):1131–1157, 2010.
- [5] David Crystal. *The language revolution*. Polity, Cambridge, UK, 2004.
- [6] Chris Stokel-Walker. ChatGPT listed as author on research papers. *Nature*, 613(7945):620–621, 2023.
- [7] Pablo Picazo-Sanchez and Lara Ortiz-Martin. Analysing the impact of ChatGPT in research. *Applied Intelligence*, 54(5):4172–4188, 2024.
- [8] Weixin Liang, Yaohui Zhang, Zhengxuan Wu, Haley Lepp, Wenlong Ji, Xuandong Zhao, Hancheng Cao, Sheng Liu, Siyu He, Zhi Huang, Diyi Yang, Christopher Potts, Christopher D Manning, and James Y. Zou. Mapping the increasing use of LLMs in scientific papers. In *Proc. CoLM*, pages 1–27, Amherst, USA, 2024. OpenReview.
- [9] Mingmeng Geng and Roberto Trotta. Is ChatGPT transforming academics’ writing style? In *Proc. ICML NextGenAISafety Workshop*, pages 1–14, Amherst, USA, 2024. OpenReview.
- [10] Dmitry Kobak, Rita González Márquez, Emöke-Ágnes Horvát, and Jan Lause. Delving into ChatGPT usage in academic writing through excess vocabulary. *arXiv*, 2406.07016:1–13, 2024.
- [11] Nikhil Garg, Londa Schiebinger, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. Word embeddings quantify 100 years of gender and ethnic stereotypes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(16):E3635–E3644, 2018.
- [12] Alberto Acerbi and Joseph M Stubbersfield. Large language models show human-like content biases in transmission chain experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(44):e2313790120, 2023.
- [13] Levin Brinkmann, Fabian Baumann, Jean-François Bonnefon, Maxime Derex, Thomas F. Müller, Anne-Marie Nussberger, Agnieszka Czaplicka, Alberto Acerbi, Thomas L. Griffiths, Joseph Henrich, Joel Z. Leibo, Richard McElreath, Pierre-Yves Oudeyer, Jonathan Stray, and Iyad Rahwan. Machine culture. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(11):1855–1868, 2023.

- [14] Minkyu Shin, Jin Kim, Bas van Opheusden, and Thomas L. Griffiths. Superhuman artificial intelligence can improve human decision-making by increasing novelty. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(12):e2214840120, 2023.
- [15] Yanzhu Guo, Guokan Shang, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Chloé Clavel. The curious decline of linguistic diversity. In *Findings of ACL NAACL*, pages 3589–3604, Kerrville, USA, 2024. ACL.
- [16] Research Organization Registry. ROR Data, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11186879>.
- [17] Shuyo Nakatani. Language detection library for Java, 2010. <https://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/language-detection-library-for-java/6014274> (Accessed on July 31, 2024).
- [18] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, Christine McLeavey, and Ilya Sutskever. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. *arXiv*, 2212.04356:1–28, 2022.
- [19] M. F. Porter. An algorithm for suffix stripping. *Program*, 14(3):130–137, 1980.
- [20] Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. *Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2008.
- [21] R. Harald Baayen. *Word Frequency Distributions*, volume 18 of *Text, Speech and Language Technology*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 2001.

A Dataset construction

We first cataloged 20,622 research institutes from the Research Organization Registry [16] as of May 13, 2024. Institutes not identified as active educational entities were omitted to minimize the inclusion of non-educational content, such as videos from corporate or inactive channels. Subsequently, we queried the YouTube API¹ with each institute name and its country name to list relevant channels and provided the results to gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 as input to pick the most plausible channel using the prompt presented in Fig. 4. The channels identified were then used to compile a list of 2,958,103 videos through a subsequent YouTube API query. From these, we retained 1,613,839 videos, recognized as having an English title by a language detection library [17], for further analysis, excluding those less likely to have a conversation in English. Additionally, 1,248,913 videos under 20 minutes² were removed, as they tend to feature content other than lecture or presentation videos, such as promotional materials. Furthermore, we excluded videos exceeding the duration of the 99th percentile (3h07'16") among the remaining 364,916 videos, noting that excessively long videos often diverge from academic discourse, exemplified by a 5-hour graduation ceremony broadcast. This exclusion was strategic to avoid both data noise and unnecessary GPU usage for transcription. Also, we encountered several errors while downloading (e.g., videos deleted during the dataset construction), resulting in a dataset of 360,445 videos (Fig. 5).

The transcription of the collected data was performed using the large-v3 model of *whisper* [18]. Here, we opted to run the transcription process ourselves rather than using the pre-existing transcription data from YouTube due to the possibility that YouTube has switched transcription models across different videos. Specifically, we found an unnatural increase in the frequency of the filler word “um” starting around May 2020, which we found difficult to attribute to an actual increase in speakers’ usage of the word. It is more plausible that YouTube switched to a transcription model that transcribes fillers verbatim, and thus, we conducted the transcription process to avoid a potential source of bias. We then applied the language detection library [17] again to the transcriptions to filter out those from videos that were judged as non-English by whisper, resulting in the transcript data from 279,480 videos. The final dataset of word occurrence was obtained by applying the Porter stemmer preprocessing [19] to the transcripts.

Given the above, we acknowledge that our dataset is not all-encompassing. Here, the data collection procedure was designed to construct a dataset that can capture the influence of large language models on spoken language within the academic context in a systematic manner. While recognizing the potential presence

¹Youtube API URL: <https://developers.google.com/youtube/v3/docs/search/list>

²This threshold was set based on the YouTube API’s categorization of videos under 20 minutes as short.

```

System prompt:
You are a great research assistant who is asked to analyze YouTube data. You
will be provided a list of YouTube channels as well as a target information.
Please select the best channel that seems to be owned by the target.
Importantly, please do not add explanations or comments other than the selected
channel name. If there is no appropriate channel, please return N/A.

Example input prompt:
# Institution

Name: Max Planck Institute for Human Development
Address: Berlin, Germany

# Candidates

Title: Max Planck Institute for Human Development
Description: The Max Planck Institute for Human Development (MPIB), which was
founded in 1963, is dedicated to the study of human ...
---
Title: IMPRS LIFE
Description: The International Max Planck Research School on the Life Course
(LIFE) is a joint international PhD Program of the Max Planck ...
---
Title: Behavioral Insights Bicocca
Description: BIB-Behavioral Insights Bicocca is a new research center focused on
the behavioral analysis of public policies and public ...

```

Figure 4: Prompt provided to gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 to pick the most plausible channel among query results from Youtube API.

of lecture or conference videos outside the dataset, we believe that the dataset is sufficiently comprehensive to represent the phenomena without introducing bias.

B Linear regression model analysis

We employed a hierarchical Bayesian Gaussian regression to model the frequency transition of videos containing a specific word in their transcriptions. The model is represented in Eqn. 2. In this model, $\log(y_w)$ represents the log frequency of videos containing the word in a specific time period t (sampled on a monthly basis). We used log frequency with Laplace smoothing [20] because word frequency is empirically known to follow a long-tail, exponential (*Zipfian*) distribution [21]. Here, α is the intercept, $\beta_{w,\text{natural}}$ is the coefficient for the natural transition across all time periods from T_{start} to T_{end} , and $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ is the coefficient for the transition observed between T_{event} and T_{end} . Note that t is normalized such that $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}} = 1$ indicates the corresponding word increased its frequency by 10 times over a year after T_{event} . Also, while we set T_{end} to be 18 months after T_{event} , T_{start} was designated to be 36 months prior due to the relatively low number of videos uploaded in the earlier years. For example, the number of videos uploaded in 2015 in our dataset is less than half of those uploaded in 2023. The error term ϵ is normally distributed with a mean of zero and variance σ . We used a half-Cauchy prior for σ while using normal distribution priors for all other parameters. Sampling was conducted across four chains using STAN’s no-U-turn sampler, with 1,000 samples per chain.




Figure 5: Flow diagram of our data collection procedure.

C Relationship between ChatGPT’s word preferences and human adoption

C.1 Selection of *GPT words*

We selected a set of *GPT words* based on the dataset by Liang et al. [8], which consists of 10,000 human-written abstracts from preprint papers (denoted as D_{human}) and their ChatGPT-edited versions (D_{GPT}). For each word presented in both D_{human} and D_{GPT} , we calculated the occurrence frequencies $P_{w,\text{human}}$ and $P_{w,\text{GPT}}$, respectively. Here, our goal was to identify *GPT words* that are prominent in texts generated by ChatGPT but less common in human-written texts. To achieve this, we ranked the words based on the difference $\log\left(\frac{P_{w,\text{GPT}}}{P_{w,\text{human}}}\right)$, selecting the top N words as *GPT word*. In contrast, we selected the bottom N words with $\log\left(\frac{P_{w,\text{GPT}}}{P_{w,\text{human}}}\right)$ as *control words* for Fig. 2.

C.2 Sensitivity analysis of the correlation

For the correlation analysis, we also performed a sensitivity analysis by varying N , the number of words included into *GPT words* and *control words*, and T_{event} , the change point for fitting $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$. Note that, when we set T_{event} one year prior to the release of ChatGPT, $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ is still influenced by the trend change following ChatGPT’s release because we set T_{end} at 18 months subsequent to T_{event} , meaning that $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ captures data from 6 months post-release. Conversely, if T_{end} is before the release of ChatGPT, then $\beta_{w,\text{GPT}}$ (and the correlation coefficient r) are unaffected by data following the release. To clarify this point, we have employed T_{end} for the X -axis of Fig. 3C.

D Manual analysis of videos containing ‘delve’

We conducted a manual review of a random sample of 50 YouTube videos, focusing on instances where the word “delve” was mentioned. Our review aimed to identify various setups and presentation styles in which these mentions of “delve” occurred. The analysis revealed that 32% of the videos involved potential signs of reading, indicating that the speaker may have been following a script or prepared notes. Conversely, 58% of the videos showed no signs of reading, suggesting a more spontaneous or conversational style. About 30% of the videos featured multiple speakers, often in a Q&A format or dialogue. Given the noticeable increase in the use of “delve” as discussed in the main text, this finding suggests that the adoption of certain linguistic patterns—potentially influenced by tools like ChatGPT—extends beyond scripted speech.