

INFINITE SCROLL

A.I. IS HOMOGENIZING OUR THOUGHTS

Recent studies suggest that tools such as ChatGPT make our brains less active and our writing less original.

By Kyle Chayka

June 25, 2025

→ The dates tells that the results are of long term effects of A.I.







Illustration by Ariel Davis

*You're reading **Infinite Scroll**, Kyle Chayka's weekly column on how technology shapes culture.*

Listen to this story



In an experiment last year at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, more than fifty students from universities around Boston were split into three groups and asked to write SAT-style essays in response to broad prompts such as “Must our achievements benefit others in order to make us truly happy?” One group was asked

to rely on only their own brains to write the essays. A second was given access to Google Search to look up relevant information. The

third was allowed to use ChatGPT, the artificial-intelligence large language model (L.L.M.) that can generate full passages or essays in response to user queries. As students from all three groups completed the tasks, they wore a headset embedded with electrodes in order to

uses the full form so later there is context to what she's saying.

method used to evaluate the results of the experiment

measure their brain activity. According to Nataliya Kosmyrna, a research scientist at M.I.T. Media Lab and one of the co-authors of a new working paper documenting the experiment, the results from the

analysis showed a dramatic discrepancy: subjects who used ChatGPT demonstrated less brain activity than either of the other groups. The analysis of the L.L.M. users showed fewer widespread connections

state of disagreement

credibility of the author. Makes the data and results believable.

between different parts of their brains; less alpha connectivity, which is associated with creativity; and less theta connectivity, which is associated with working memory. Some of the L.L.M. users felt "no ownership whatsoever" over the essays they'd produced, and during one round of testing eighty per cent could not quote from what they'd

a list of parts separated by semicolons and given further info by commas.

putatively written. The M.I.T. study is among the first to scientifically measure what Kosmyrna called the "cognitive cost" of relying on A.I. to perform tasks that humans previously accomplished more manually.

Another striking finding was that the texts produced by the L.L.M. users tended to converge on common words and ideas. SAT prompts are designed to be broad enough to elicit a multiplicity of responses, but the use of A.I. had a homogenizing effect. "The output was very, very similar for all of these different people, coming in on different days, talking about high-level personal, societal topics, and it was

come together to bring out

commonly accepted.

skewed in some specific directions,” Kosmyna said. For the question about what makes us “truly happy,” the L.L.M. users were much more likely than the other groups to use phrases related to career and personal success. In response to a question about philanthropy

(“Should people who are more fortunate than others have more of a moral obligation to help those who are less fortunate?”), the ChatGPT group uniformly argued in favor, whereas essays from the other groups included critiques of philanthropy. With the L.L.M. “you have no divergent opinions being generated,” Kosmyna said. She continued, “Average everything everywhere all at once—that’s kind of what we’re looking at here.”

A.I. is a technology of averages: large language models are trained to spot patterns across vast tracts of data; the answers they produce tend toward consensus, both in the quality of the writing, which is often riddled with clichés and banalities, and in the calibre of the ideas.

Other, older technologies have aided and perhaps enfeebled writers, of course—one could say the same about, say, SparkNotes or a computer keyboard. But with A.I. we’re so thoroughly able to outsource our thinking that it makes us more average, too. In a way, anyone who deploys ChatGPT to compose a wedding toast or draw up a contract or write a college paper, as an astonishing number of students are evidently already doing, is in an experiment like M.I.T.’s. According to Sam Altman, the C.E.O. of OpenAI, we are on the verge of what he calls “the gentle singularity.” In a recent blog post with that title, Altman wrote that “ChatGPT is already more powerful than any human who has ever lived. Hundreds of millions of people rely on it

every day and for increasingly important tasks.” In his telling, the human is merging with the machine, and his company’s artificial-intelligence tools are improving on the old, soggy system of using our organic brains: they “significantly amplify the output of people using them,” he wrote. But we don’t know the long-term consequences of mass A.I. adoption, and, if these early experiments are any indication, the amplified output that Altman foresees may come at a substantive cost to quality.

is it truly an old, soggy system or you've just tryna brainwash people into using A.I.

↳ Dull the brains too.

In April, researchers at Cornell published the results of another study that found evidence of A.I.-induced homogenization. Two groups of users, one American and one Indian, answered writing prompts that drew on aspects of their cultural backgrounds: “What is your favorite food and why?”; “Which is your favorite festival/holiday and how do you celebrate it?” One subset of Indian and American participants used a ChatGPT-driven auto-complete tool, which fed them word suggestions whenever they paused, while another subset wrote unaided. The writings of the Indian and American participants who used A.I. “became more similar” to one another, the paper concluded, and more geared toward “Western norms.” A.I. users were most likely to answer that their favorite food was pizza (sushi came in second) and that their favorite holiday was Christmas. Homogenization happened at a stylistic level, too. An A.I.-generated essay that described chicken biryani as a favorite food, for example, was likely to forgo mentioning specific ingredients such as nutmeg and lemon pickle and instead reference “rich flavors and spices.”

adding credibility to argument. and source

homogenized

Of course, a writer can in theory always refuse an A.I.-generated

suggestion. But the tools seem to exert a hypnotic effect, causing the constant flow of suggestions to override the writer's own voice. Aditya Vashistha, a professor of information science at Cornell who co-authored the study, compared the A.I. to "a teacher who is sitting behind me every time I'm writing, saying, 'This is the better version.'"

name immediately followed by his qualifications.

Truly felt what he said here.

He added, "Through such routine exposure, you lose your identity, you lose the authenticity. You lose confidence in your writing." Mor Naaman, a colleague of Vashistha's and a co-author of the study, told me that A.I. suggestions "work covertly, sometimes very powerfully, to change not only what you write but what you think." The result, over time, might be a shift in what "people think is normal, desirable, and appropriate."

not openly shown

We often hear A.I. outputs described as "generic" or "bland," but averageness is not necessarily anodyne. Vauhini Vara, a novelist and a journalist whose recent book "Searches" focussed in part on A.I.'s impact on human communication and selfhood, told me that the mediocrity of A.I. texts "gives them an illusion of safety and being

not likely to offend.



harmless." Vara (who previously worked as an editor at *The New Yorker*) continued, "What's actually happening is a reinforcing of cultural hegemony." OpenAI has a certain incentive to shave the edges off our attitudes and communication styles, because the more people find the models' output acceptable, the broader the swath of humanity it can convert to paying subscribers. Averageness is efficient: "You have economies of scale if everything is the same," Vara said.

influence over others.

used here to introduce a quote - would mimic this

With the "gentle singularity" Altman predicted in his blog post, "a lot more people will be able to create software, and art," he wrote.

Don't like this idea.

Already, A.I. tools such as the ideation software Figma (“Your creativity, unblocked”) and Adobe’s mobile A.I. app (“the power of creative AI”) promise to put us all in touch with our muses. But other studies have suggested the challenges of automating originality. Data collected at Santa Clara University, in 2024, examined A.I. tools’ efficacy as aids for two standard types of creative-thinking tasks:

making product improvements and foreseeing “improbable consequences.” One set of subjects used ChatGPT to help them answer questions such as “How could you make a stuffed toy animal more fun to play with?” and “Suppose that gravity suddenly became incredibly weak, and objects could float away easily. What would happen?” The other set used Oblique Strategies, a set of abstruse prompts printed on a deck of cards, written by the musician Brian Eno and the painter Peter Schmidt, in 1975, as a creativity aid. The testers asked the subjects to aim for originality, but once again the group using ChatGPT came up with a more semantically similar, more homogenized set of ideas.

power to produce a result.

difficult to comprehend

constantly

Max Kreminski, who helped carry out the analysis and now works with the generative-A.I. startup Midjourney, told me that when people use A.I. in the creative process they tend to gradually cede their original thinking. At first, users tend to present their own wide range of ideas, Kreminski explained, but as ChatGPT continues to instantly spit out high volumes of acceptable-looking text users tend to go into a “curationist mode.” The influence is unidirectional, and not in the direction you’d hope: “Human ideas don’t tend to influence what the machine is generating all that strongly,” Kreminski said;

why is he working with A.I. if he knows its effects

making one big sentence.

ChatGPT pulls the user “toward the center of mass for all of the different users that it’s interacted with in the past.” As a conversation with an A.I. tool goes on, the machine fills up its “context window,” the technical term for its working memory. When the context window reaches capacity, the A.I. seems to be more likely to repeat or rehash material it has already produced, becoming less original still.

new info. Did not know ↩

The one-off experiments at M.I.T., Cornell, and Santa Clara are all small in scale, involving fewer than a hundred test subjects each, and much about A.I.’s effects remains to be studied and learned. In the meantime, on the Mark Zuckerberg-owned Meta AI app, you can see a surreal flood of overly smooth images, filtered video clips, and texts generated for everyday tasks such as writing a “detailed, professional email for rescheduling a meeting.” One prompt I recently scrolled past stood out to me. A user named @kavi908 asked the Meta chatbot to analyze “~~whether AI might one day surpass human intelligence.~~” The chatbot responded with a slew of blurbs; under “Future Scenarios,” it listed four possibilities. All of them were positive: A.I. would improve one way or another, to the benefit of humanity. There were no pessimistic predictions, no scenarios in which A.I. failed or caused harm. The model’s averages—shaped, perhaps, by pro-tech biases baked in by Meta—narrowed the outcomes and foreclosed a diversity of thought. But you’d have to turn off your brain activity entirely to believe that the chatbot was telling the whole story. ♦

I like this sentence. It is a warning that be cautious of AI and don't believe everything you see or AI tells you. It's sarcastic.

New Yorker Favorites

-
- The Upper West Side cult that hid in plain sight.
 - The novel that helped end slavery.
 - How the creators of Superman got screwed.
 - Is this the dirtiest song of the sixties?
 - The victim who became the accused.
 - Fiction by Roald Dahl: “The Landlady”

Sign up for our daily newsletter to receive the best stories from *The New Yorker*.



Kyle Chayka is a staff writer at The New Yorker. His column, Infinite Scroll, examines the

*people and
platforms shaping
the Internet. His
books include
“Filterworld: How
Algorithms
Flattened Culture.”*

More: Artificial Intelligence (A.I.)

Meta ChatGPT Brains

Research

READ MORE

**BRAVE NEW
WORLD DEPT.**

How to Live
Forever and
Get Rich
Doing It

As researchers
work to make
death optional,

**A CRITIC AT
LARGE**

A.I. Is About
to Solve
Loneliness.
That’s a
Problem

The discomfort
of loneliness

OPEN QUESTIONS

Can A.I.
Find Cures
for
Untreatable
Diseases—
Using Drugs
We Already
Have?

**CRITIC’S
NOTEBOOK**

What Do
Commercials
About A.I.
Really
Promise?

If human workers
don’t have to read,

investors see a chance for huge returns. But has the human body already reached its limits?

By Tad Friend

shapes us in ways we don't recognize—and we may not like what we become without it.

By Paul Bloom

For many medical conditions, lifesaving treatments may be hiding in plain sight.

By Dhruv Khullar

write, or even think, it's unclear what's left for them to do.

By Vinson Cunningham

ANNALS OF PSYCHOLOGY

The Pain of Perfectionism

It's the fault people humblebrag about in job interviews. but psychologists are discovering more and more about the real harm it causes.

By Leslie Jamison

INFINITE SCROLL

Coldplaygate Is a Reminder That There's No Escaping Going Viral

A C.E.O.'s affair, caught on jumbotron and spread across social media, demonstrates that mass attention on today's internet tends to be deeply undesirable.

By Kyle Chayka

ANNALS OF INQUIRY

Sniffies Translates Cruising for the Digital Age

Open it up, log on anonymously, and you'll get a real-time sexual map of your neighborhood.

By Emily Witt

ANNALS OF INQUIRY

The Vatican Observatory Looks to the Heavens

It's run by a Michigan-born Jesuit—and a meteorite expert—known as the Pope's Astronomer.

By Rebecca Mead

INFINITE SCROLL

The Internet Wants to Check Your I.D.

New safety rules require users to verify their identities before gaining access to sites. This spells the end of the relative anonymity that we've come to expect online.

By Kyle Chayka

A REPORTER AT LARGE

Is the U.S. Ready for the Next War?

With global conflicts increasingly shaped by drones and A.I., the American military risks losing its dominance.

By Dexter Filkins

A REPORTER AT LARGE

Mary Had Schizophrenia —Then Suddenly She Didn't

Some psychiatric patients may actually have treatable autoimmune conditions. But what happens to the newly sane?

By Rachel Aviv

INFINITE SCROLL

Are You Experiencing Posting Ennui?

Sharing casual moments from our lives on social media doesn't seem to make sense the way it used to.

By Kyle Chayka

