

9gozu15z

# The Cognitive Style of Chat GPT

Aeneas Stankowski

I. p. 223, Chunk 1: Dear ChatGPT, wie sieht die...

Chunk 1

In November 2022, within a few days, millions of individuals had logged on to ChatGPT, eager to glimpse what was heralded as the future of human-computer interaction. Through a familiar chat interface, hundreds of thousands of pages of homework, emails, and relationship advice materialized with an ease that seemed to announce a new era in human productivity.

I. p. 9, Chunk 1: Projektvorstellung

Chunk 2

While predictions about artificial intelligence had circulated for years, accompanied by speculations on its transformative impact, few of these developments had been accessible to the general public in such an immediate, tangible way.

II. p. 203, Chunk 8: Shaping Human-AI Relationships

I. p. 194, Chunk 7: Unpacking the Language of...

Chunk 3

The sensation was profound, yet difficult to categorize. As users experimented with increasingly complex prompts, the system responded with an uncanny mix of confidence and occasional confusion that felt almost human-like. Researchers and critics struggled to contextualize this moment, to project the societal shifts such technology might facilitate. But early studies emerged that took the form of controlled studies, comparing human and machine performance across various metrics, searching for quantifiable measures of this qualitative shift in machine capabilities.

Throughout 2023, as researchers worked to understand these systems' capabilities, most studies focused on clearly defined, quantifiable tasks: language translation, mathematical problem-solving, or coding challenges. These comparisons, while valuable, often failed to capture the more nuanced aspects of human cognitive processes like creativity and strategic thinking that had long been considered uniquely human domains.

The landscape of academic literature around artificial intelligence has historically been characterized by a certain predictability in its approaches. Researchers would identify specific, measurable tasks, create controlled environments for testing, and produce results that, while technically precise, often felt removed from the messier realities of real-world application.

II. p. 30, Chunk 7: Offenbach

II. p. 205, Chunk 17: Shaping Human-AI Relationships

II. p. 30, Chunk 7: Offenbach

Chunk 4

But as these systems evolved, so too did the research questions that have to be asked.

In one of the first experiments<sup>1</sup> to model real-world creative tasks at scale, a team of researchers from the

1: Girotra, K., Meincke, L., Terwiesch, C., & Ulrich, K. T. (2023). Ideas are Dimes a Dozen: Large Language Models for Idea Generation in Innovation. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4526071>

Wharton School of Business ventured into largely uncharted territory. Their study, which would later gain significant attention in both academic circles and popular media, took an unusually direct approach: they pitted students from an elite design and innovation program against ChatGPT in an ideation task.

The experiment's design offers a clear, quantifiable setup to compare human and artificial intelligence in a domain that had long been considered safely human. The students, drawn from a prestigious program known for fostering innovation, would compete against various configurations of the AI system in generating product ideas according to a clear briefing. These ideas would then be evaluated by human judges from the target audience - potential consumers from the target demographic.

The findings are impressive: The student group performed significantly worse not only against sophisticated prompting techniques but also against the unedited model responses. Of the top 40 generated ideas - representing the top 10% - student ideation appeared on only three occasions, with none breaking into the top 10. In a minor consolation, on the quality metric, the few best student ideas lost by only a thin margin against both primitive and more sophisticated prompted versions of GPT-4.

The findings seem to validate certain anxieties about artificial intelligence while raising new questions about the nature of creativity and innovation in our increasingly automated world.

Chunk 5 Beneath the surface of these clear-cut results lay a web of assumptions and methodological choices that deserve closer examination. As the study gained attention, it began to serve as a mirror, reflecting not just the capabilities of artificial intelligence, but our own changing relationship with ideas, creativity, and the structure of media and information consumption.

The study's approach centers on a creative challenge within carefully defined parameters. Participants were asked to envision products for college students, constrained by a \$50 price ceiling. The structure followed established innovation methodologies: generate ideas, pool them together, let potential users evaluate their merit.

Chunk 6 When examining the highest-rated concepts, we find a compact printer that achieved a 0.76 purchase intent score. A solar-powered gadget charger followed at 0.75, alongside a mini vacuum cleaner at the same rating. The proposals continue: reusable food storage containers, portable closet organizers, sound-dampening panels for dorm walls.

Chunk 7 Each description reads with a kind of polished pragmatism, speaking to the everyday frictions of student life with measured confidence.

The highest-rated concepts reflect an intimate understanding of their context. They identify clear needs within the physical and social constraints of dormitory living. They acknowledge budget limitations and space constraints.

Chunk 8 They address the delicate balance of academic demands and personal maintenance. From an evaluative standpoint, their success seems undeniable - these are products students say they would buy.

And here lies an unexpected revelation: they already can.

Chunk 9 These products exist not just as concepts but as tangible items, readily available through multiple retail channels. They populate Amazon's recommendation algorithms, fill back-to-school aisles, appear in countless "Dorm

Essentials" guides across the web. The AI hasn't so much invented as it has re-constructed – assembling from its training data a catalog of proven market successes.

Chunk 10 This realization reframes our understanding of the evaluation metric itself. Purchase intent – the likelihood that a student would buy this product if it existed – becomes less a measure of innovation and more an indicator of effective market research. The very framing of the challenge contains within it a bias toward the proven and already successful.

Chunk 11 Our metric for success inadvertently rewards familiarity. While human participants might have felt the implicit pressure to demonstrate originality – to justify their role in a creative task by pushing beyond the obvious – the AI operated free from such constraints. It efficiently identified and articulated products that its training data suggested would succeed, unencumbered by the social and professional expectations that often shape human creative processes.

Chunk 12 Each generation of technology arrives with its own cognitive style, its own way of structuring thought and validating success. What begins as a tool gradually becomes a lens through which we view the world, invisibly reshaping our criteria for what constitutes value, innovation, or understanding itself.

The evaluation metrics in our study – immediate purchase intent from potential consumers – represent more than just a methodology. They embody a particular way of knowing, one that privileges immediate recognition over gradual revelation, familiar comfort over productive discomfort.

Chunk 13 This is also a defining characteristic and success driver of language models.

Chunk 14 In this framework, success becomes a matter of statistical likelihood.

Chunk 15 This pattern of evaluation carries its own hidden curriculum. Just as certain presentation tools taught us to equate hierarchical bullet points with clear thinking, the current metrics may be teaching us to mistake pattern matching for quality. The very structure of how we assess ideas begins to shape the ideas we can conceive.

Chunk 16 What makes this shift particularly subtle is how it aligns with our evolving relationship to information itself. We have grown accustomed to interfaces that present complex systems as simplified choices, to tools that trade depth of understanding for ease of use. The same cognitive style that makes us comfortable navigating opaque technological systems may now be shaping how we navigate the landscape of ideas.

The assertiveness with which the results are presented in the study, and thus quickly shared by hundreds on social media, is in keeping with our current information climate, where vast amounts of information can only be consumed quickly if accuracy is sacrificed.

The human participants in our study brought with them the weight of creative tradition – the implicit understanding that innovation requires pushing beyond the familiar, challenging existing paradigms, venturing into uncertain territory. Yet in our contemporary information environment, this traditional approach to creativity may have become a kind of productive inefficiency, valued more for its process than its outcomes.

The AI's success in generating "purchasable" concepts reveals something profound about our current moment. It excels not because it thinks more creatively than humans, but because it thinks more consistently with how we have come to evaluate creativity.

II. p. 149, Chunk 15:

Making (Non)Sense

II. p. 205, Chunk 18:

Shaping Human-AI

Relationships

I. p. 37, Chunk 8: autoLab

(HS Mainz)

The true challenge may not be in competing with artificial intelligence, but in maintaining our capacity to think in ways that transcend our own metrics. Its advantage lies not in revolutionary insight but in its perfect alignment with our evolved metrics of success and norms and structure of information consumption. Do we even want to compete in a race for superficial clarity.

**Chunk 17** This alignment raises questions that extend beyond product design. As we develop ever more sophisticated tools for generating and evaluating ideas, we must consider how these tools are simultaneously generating and evaluating us – shaping not just what we think, but how we think about thinking itself. Even our methods of studying and documenting these phenomena reflect this shift: we generate compelling narratives of technological supremacy while the underlying data might tell a more nuanced story.

What begins as a simple comparison between human and artificial creativity thus opens into a deeper examination of how technological environments shape cognitive possibilities. The metrics that guide our evaluations – whether of product concepts or research findings – increasingly favor immediate plausibility over sustained scrutiny. The very title of this study, proclaiming ideas to be "dimes a dozen," might itself deserve more careful examination than our current information climate typically encourages.

The interplay between human and artificial approaches to creativity illuminates a broader transformation in our intellectual landscape. Just as we've grown accustomed to navigating complex systems through simplified interfaces, we engage with ideas through layers of abstraction that prioritize immediate comprehension.

**Chunk 18** This shift manifests also in how we generate concepts, study, document, and validate knowledge itself.

What emerges is a subtle cycle of validation. Tools and metrics designed to streamline evaluation end up shaping the very nature of what we consider worthy of evaluation. Research papers, product concepts, and analytical frameworks begin to exhibit similar characteristics: they present as authoritative through their structure rather than their substance and align with existing patterns of understanding, they offer clarity that may be more apparent than real.

**Chunk 19**

*This article is separately published as ↗ [10.25358/openscience-11834](https://doi.org/10.25358/openscience-11834).*

I. p. 90, Chunk 9:  
(dis-)embodied minds -  
creativity...  
II. p. 80, Chunk 9:  
Editorial  
I. p. 90, Chunk 7:  
(dis-)embodied minds -  
creativity...

II. p. 105, Chunk 11:  
Infinite Boredom  
I. p. 184, Chunk 8:  
Algorithmic Culture...  
III. p. 182, Chunk 11: I  
Think He's Got a  
Helicopter...