

# Demystify ChatGPT: Anthropomorphism and generative AI

Junyi (Joey) Ji

Stanford University

## 1 Introduction

On November 30, 2022, OpenAI introduced ChatGPT, a Large Language Model designed for conversational interaction. Discussions about ChatGPT soon flooded social media, with some users in awe of its ability to generate long, coherent, human-like paragraphs of text, while others expressed fear that the rapid learning speed of it could eventually lead it to replace certain human workers. At the same time, there has also been an increase in anthropomorphism around generative artificial intelligence (AI), which refers to the attribution of human-like qualities and intentions to AI systems. The trend of anthropomorphizing AI systems, such as ChatGPT, has led to the use of words like "intelligence," "emotions," and "feelings," which are usually used to describe humans. When generative models invent erroneous solutions, it is now commonplace to say they are "hallucinating," which is in fact an alarming medical condition humans suffer, and should not be used in this context. Yet, the excitement about these supposedly human-like characteristics abounds. For example, Neil Sahota, the leading artificial intelligence

advisor to the United Nations, concluded that “it’s very possible to actually see AI emotionality before the end of the decade,” (Gorvett, 2023). This paper criticizes the use of anthropomorphic language since it can lead to misunderstandings about the true nature of AI systems. It maintains anthropomorphism tends to frame AI in a threatening light that causes “existential crisis” that in fact occlude the real, present day issues of AI, which include the harmful social impacts and the exploitation of content workers and labelers (Perrigo, 2023)

While the language of anthropomorphism overshadows the real harms of AI, it dominates most industry and press coverage. Even articles intended to provide correctives on the topic inadvertently fall into anthropomorphism, as seen in a piece on *Salon* titled "AI chatbots can write, but can't think." (Burrell, 2023) Unaware of the assumptions regarding human intelligence that allows us to anthropomorphize ChatGPT, people often construct a technological myth about AI in the public discourses, which even results in the false assumption that “it is a real human pretending to be an AI language model” (Khatri, 2023). To counteract the misconceptions and occlusions anthropomorphism causes, it is crucial to “demystify” ChatGPT by discussing the fundamental differences between it and human intelligence and acknowledging the unjustified use of anthropomorphic language to describe it.

## 2 History of Anthropomorphism around AI

The history of anthropomorphism around artificial intelligence can be traced back to the early 1970s when AIs were first described as thinking machines that “would be able to perfectly simulate the cognitive faculties of the human mind.” (Natale et al., 2020, p.1) Even in the early days of AIs when their capabilities were still limited, the public was using anthropomorphic language by describing them as “intelligent brains, unlimited, fast, mysterious, and frightening.” (Martin, 1993, p.122) After IBM released Deep Blue, a chess-playing AI system that won a game against a world-champion chess player, the way of anthropomorphizing AI shifted from the description of AI as a simulation of the human mind to a direct comparison between AI capabilities and human intelligence. News media and IBM itself then framed the Kasparov-DeepBlue challenge as “a conflictual and competitive struggle between mankind and a hardware-based, inscrutable prototype of AI” by building on the assumptions that AI capabilities were equal to human intelligence. The rhetoric of anthropomorphism around AI reached its peak after AlphaGO defeated the board game GO world champion Lee Sedol in a series game. As GO is “more associated with imaginative, creative thinking than with rigorous and logical reasoning to Chess” (Bory, 2019, p. 631), the victory of machines over human players seemed to indicate that a machine had achieved more than human intelligence (Carchidi, 2022). We can see the shifting narratives around the emergence of AI with the progressive development of AI systems. Furthermore, Bory (2019) described iconic events like the Kasparov-DeepBlue and Lee-AlphaGo challenges as “disruptive narratives” that could “create forms of collective astonishment through which a new medium breaks into social reality” (p.629), which could draw public attention towards AI and intensify the anthropomorphism around AI at the same time. While the tendency to use anthropomorphic language for AI has been a consistent theme in its

history, it's essential to consider the potential positive outcomes of this tendency. Anthropomorphism in AI reveals not only a misunderstanding of AI capabilities but also human desire to connect and empathize with non-human entities (Hasan, 2023, p.6). The deep-rooted fascination of anthropomorphism around AI prompted us to consider the rights of artificial intelligence in the future.

The recent release of Large Language Models GPT, DALL-E, and Bard undoubtedly marks the advent of the era of generative artificial intelligence. Different from traditional AI systems designed specifically for certain tasks, generative AIs are able to handle cross-context, general-purpose tasks, which makes society see them as “something disruptive with no ties with the past” (Bory, 2019, p.629). Hasan (2023) claims that “ChatGPT is strongly correlated with the presence of human-like features of understanding and intentionality” ( p.5). Its ability to mimic the sort of written texts, visual images, or even videos created by humans makes it more easily subject to anthropomorphism. However, the anthropomorphic language used to describe generative AIs actually reflect our limited understanding of them, the inappropriate use of which leads to our misunderstanding, misinterpretation, or even misconception about them. Besides, anthropomorphism around generative AI has rarely been discussed in the current literature, which will thus be the focus of this research paper.

### 3 Why We Tend To Anthropomorphize AI

The tendency to use anthropomorphic language for AI has been observed throughout the history of AI development, indicating people's persistent fascination with attributing human-like qualities and intentions to these systems. To understand the phenomenon, it's crucial to delve into the underlying assumptions that lead to our inclination to anthropomorphize AI. Epley, a psychology professor at the University of Chicago, describes anthropomorphism as a process of inductive inference in which people infer characteristics of a non-human agent based on their knowledge of humans. In addition, people's tendency to anthropomorphize AI is often influenced by fictional narratives and media coverage of AI and robots (Salles et al., 2020, p.7). On the other hand, Carchidi (2022), from a generative linguistics perspective, offers a deeper, complementary approach to “the question of why individuals engage in reasoning that so readily leads to human characteristics being associated with demonstrations of AI systems.” (p.4). He claims that “individuals are not reliable witnesses to their own intellects” (p.4), which means that humans implicitly apply their limited understanding of their own intelligence in the evaluation of AI systems. This process culminates in the form of anthropomorphism. Anthropomorphism blurs the line between AI's computational capabilities and cognitive functions, leading to our false expectations of AI's abilities and misinformed reliance on them. Essentially, both theories reflect our limited understanding of ourselves and artificial intelligence, which leads to the question of what assumptions should be adopted in studying both.

From my perspective, human intelligence is characterized by its creativity, while AI is rooted in its computation process. This fundamental distinction makes them different from each other. Carchidi (2022) introduces the “CALU” framework, which stands for the “creative aspect

of language use,” and uses it to argue why traditional AI is not comparable to human intelligence. He defines “creativity” in three respects: stimulus freedom - “a particular linguistic expression is not determined by an individual’s circumstances,” unbounded - “there is no limit to the number of sentences an individual can produce,” and appropriateness - “expressions are appropriate to the circumstances.” (Carchidi, 2020, p.10) I would like to expand on his argument by noting that while generative AIs like ChatGPT are impressive in their ability to complete cross-context tasks, they still differ fundamentally from human intelligence in ways that limit their comparability by discussing how generative AIs still lack creativity from these standards.

## 4 Methodology

I explore how anthropomorphism around AI has manifested itself in public discourses over social media since the emergence of ChatGPT. My argument is that although perceived as an AI system that can perform cross-context, general-purpose tasks, generative AI is still not comparable to human beings as its “computational” nature is fundamentally different from the “creative” nature of human languages. Thus, the anthropomorphism around generative AI is not justified, leading to false expectations of AI systems and overblown fears towards them.

In my research paper, I aim first to identify the differences between generative AI and traditional AI from a technological perspective by discussing their computational capabilities, working mechanisms, and purposes to understand why generative AI can better mimic humans than traditional AI. Next, as generative AI has more human-like characteristics, I take a conceptual analysis by drawing on generative linguist Chomsky’s theory of “CALU” to illustrate why the capabilities of generative AI are still not comparable to human intelligence. This section will lead to why it's inappropriate and wrong to use anthropomorphic language to describe generative AI in the social and cultural context. Finally, I conduct both quantitative and qualitative methods to study the anthropomorphism around generative AI by taking a content analysis of public discourses around ChatGPT over social media. The public discourses will consist of two parts: reactions to the release of ChatGPT from the public on Twitter and articles from either technological or social science perspectives on the Internet that help the public shape the perceptions of generative AI. Specifically, I collect posts, comments, and replies that are relevant to ChatGPT on Twitter and measure anthropomorphism by checking whether language generally reserved for humans, such as “learn,” “intelligent,” etc., is used. The results are essential for learning both “how the public views communication with non-human agents and how concepts such as machine and human are themselves defined.” (Curran et al., 2020, p.729). Besides, I obtain articles related to ChatGPT from ProQuest and similar databases to investigate how writers from different fields have framed generative AI and how the representations of anthropomorphism around AI have changed because of its advent. From the discourses, we can understand why different groups will perceive generative AI differently and how anthropomorphism reflects our limited understanding of both AI and human intelligence.

## 5 Traditional AI vs. Generative AI: Moving Towards Human-like Characteristics

The emergence of ChatGPT and subsequent similar AI systems marks the boom of generative artificial intelligence, which leads to the question of how generative AI is different from its predecessors – traditional AI. In one sentence, “Generative AI produces new content, chat responses, designs, or synthetic data, while traditional AI has focused on detecting patterns, making decisions, honing analytics, and classifying data.” (Lawton, 2023) I further investigate the differences between them from three perspectives: computational capabilities, working mechanisms, and purposes by directly comparing ChatGPT, one of the most famous recent generative AI models, and AlphaGo, which is considered to be the most complex in all traditional AI models because of the “practically infinite number of possible moves in the GO board-game.” (Carchidi, 2020, p.2)

ChatGPT, due to its generative nature, requires a massive amount of text data from various sources such as books, articles, and social media posts. In contrast, AlphaGo relies on a dataset of professional Go games that consists of millions of positions and moves. The difference between the sizes of their respective datasets becomes more evident when we incorporate numbers into the discussion. ChatGPT's training dataset is roughly 45 terabytes of text, which requires several weeks for training, while AlphaGo's dataset only contains 4.9 million games that cost only a few days for training. Furthermore, there is also a significant difference in the model parameters used by ChatGPT and AlphaGo. ChatGPT has 175 billion parameters, while AlphaGo only has around 30 million parameters. Due to its limited number of parameters, AlphaGo has been highly optimized for playing the game of Go, whereas ChatGPT's large number of parameters makes it more flexible for a wide range of tasks.

In terms of the working mechanisms, ChatGPT requires us to craft the prompt that “guides the AI model’s output and influences its tone, style, and quality” (Siegel, 2023). On the other hand, AlphaGo takes a Go game state – the positions of the stones – as input in order to make predictions on promising next moves. It is obvious that there are no restrictions or limits to the prompt to ChatGPT, which marks the high degree of freedom in generative AI tools, while the structural inputs to traditional AI models must adhere to specific rules regulated by the tasks, such as the Go rules in the case of AlphaGo. As a result, generative AI is able to complete cross-context, general-purpose tasks, while traditional AI can only be task-specific. Due to its computational power, flexibility in handling tasks, and somehow “creative” nature, generative AI seems to be more effective in mimicking humankind than traditional AI, raising the discussion of whether it is appropriate to compare generative AI to humans.

## 6 “CALU”: Generative AI Still Lacks Creativity

As we’ve discussed the differences between generative AI and its predecessors and acknowledged its ability to complete cross-context, general-purpose tasks, it’s the moment to

discuss whether it's justified now to compare it to human intelligence by building on Carchidi's argument, which claims that traditional, task-specific AIs like AlphaGO lack the "CALU," making it fundamentally different from human intelligence. "CALU" stands for the "creative aspect of language use," which is "the distinctively human ability to express new thoughts and to understand entirely new expressions of thought..." (Chomsky 2006, p. 6). Without any doubt, it's hard to define "creativity" in the first place, and from a generative linguistic perspective, language use is creative in three respects: 1. Stimulus freedom 2. Unbounded 3. Appropriateness. I argue that the computational nature of generative AI is fundamentally different from the creative nature of human language use and that generative AI fails in each criterion of "creativity."

The necessity of an external stimulus and the lack of internal linguistic knowledge in generative AI hinder its fulfillment of the first criterion of creativity. Stimulus freedom refers to the fact that "a particular linguistic expression is neither caused nor determined by an individual's circumstances nor is it random." (Carchidi, 2022, p. 10). In other words, a speaker is not simply responding to external stimuli but is actively creating a language based on their own internal linguistic knowledge. However, generative AI requires a "prompt" given by the users to start the generative process. The prompt functions as an "exterior stimulus" that the AI system responds to, and thus the language generated by it is therefore not entirely free from external stimuli. Some might argue that generative AI system also relies on its internal "linguistic knowledge" – the training dataset it is trained with, but it is different from the human language generation process because, essentially, it's a probabilistic calculation – a computational stimulation of the creative generation process of human language.

Despite advancements in its capacities, the computational limitations of generative AI still prevent it from fully achieving the unbounded nature of human language generation. Unboundedness refers to the fact that "there is no limit, in principle, to the number or kinds of sentences an individual can produce within or across contexts" (Carchidi, 2022, p. 10). This theory suggests that humans have the ability to produce an infinite number of sentences and that there are no limits on the types of sentences that can be produced within or across contexts. However, generative AI suffers from a Long-Term Memory problem, which limits its ability to generate new sentences within given contexts. It requires humongous computational powers and resources for it to remember linguistic patterns within a given context, which makes it impossible to perform tasks that require long-term memory, such as understanding the context of a conversation or generating coherent narratives over a longer period of time.

The inherent working mechanism of generative AI makes it prone to generate contextually inappropriate language, which results in its failure to achieve appropriateness in language generation. Appropriateness refers to the fact that "despite thoughts or expressions being stimulus free and unbounded, they are nonetheless appropriate to the circumstances of their use, whether fictional or real." (McGilvray, 2017, p. 187) This linguistic term means that human language use is also influenced by the specific communicative situation to which they relate. On the other hand, generative AI relies on statistical patterns learned from its training data

and may not always produce contextually appropriate responses, as it is subject to the biases existing within the training data. It could lead to the generation of insensitive, offensive, or inappropriate language in the given contexts.

The failure of generative AI to meet the three criteria indicates its inability to capture the essence of human creativity. While it can produce outputs similar to those generated by humans, the underlying mechanism and processes are purely computational, totally different from the complexity and flexibility exhibited by human intelligence. This distinction implies that generative AI operates only behaviorally like genuine understanding, rather than functionally like. For generative AI and human intelligence to be functionally alike, they have to “generate the same or similar outputs via the same causal structure” (Hasan, 2023, p.5). However, many people, dazzled by its impressive ability to produce human-like texts, are often unaware of the fundamental differences rooted in the core of these two systems. They may treat generative AI like ChatGPT as though they had acquired genuine understanding. Treating a non-human agent as a human interlocutor can potentially have serious consequences (Hasan, 2023, p.6). When people anthropomorphize generative AI, they can easily misunderstand its true capabilities and limitations, leading to unrealistic expectations and overblown fears of these systems.

## 7 Public Discourse: Anthropomorphism Around Generative AI

### 7.1 A Quantitative Analysis of Tweets on AI

The remarkable capability of generative AI to produce human-like texts has constructed a myth that it possesses a level of understanding comparable to humans, which contributes to a heightened propensity for anthropomorphism. To gain a comprehensive understanding of the shifts in the anthropomorphic framing surrounding AI, particularly following the release of ChatGPT, I have conducted a quantitative analysis encompassing approximately 10,000 tweets\* focusing on ChatGPT, DeepBlue, and AlphaGo. For each tweet, I used name entity recognition techniques to identify whether a post uses anthropomorphic language. This involved recognizing words and phrases typically associated with humans. Additionally, I used keyword matching to determine whether the tweets framed AI as a potential threat. For instance, one tweet\* starts with, “ChatGPT is now giving sermons, that’s where things start to get uncomfortable for me.” “Sermon” typically refers to a religious or moral discourse delivered by a religious leader, which is a word mainly reserved for humans. “Uncomfortable” is contained in a list of words that could potentially have threatening connotations. Therefore, the tweet is categorized as using both anthropomorphic and threatening language. The results reveal a significant evolution and reinforcement of anthropomorphism around AI over time, as evidenced by an increase in the ratio of tweets using anthropomorphic language from 15% during the time of AlphaGo to 25% during the time of ChatGPT. Furthermore, within the discussions surrounding ChatGPT, 30% of the tweets framed generative AI as a threat to the whole society. The significant increase in the usage of anthropomorphic language aligns with the fact that generative AI can better mimic humankind than traditional AI. However, it also reflects that people are still unaware of the

inherent differences between human intelligence and AI systems at the same time. Furthermore, the prevalence of the threat frame in the tweets implies that anthropomorphism around generative AI can lead to people's misconceptions of generative AI, negatively influencing our evaluations of the systems.

## 7.2 A Qualitative Analysis of Articles on AI

In addition to analyzing tweets, I've also collected articles about ChatGPT from online databases such as ProQuest. It's important to note that these articles are easily accessible to the public, and thus they significantly shape or reinforce people's perceptions of generative AI. By examining these articles, we can gain insights into the factors that contribute to the high ratio of threat frames in the public reactions to ChatGPT. Throughout the process, one recurrent theme in these articles is the notion that "AI is gradually replacing humans in various jobs." In fact, the threat frame around AI has a long-standing presence and can be traced back to the science-fiction literature and films of Asimov. The imagination of an "intelligent machine" in these works evokes both fear and allure from humans (Geraci, 2007, p.961). However, the imagination now seems to manifest itself in reality, as pieces titled "AI could eliminate millions of jobs" (Garfinkle, 2023) appear in public discourses. Unlike articles about AlphaGo and DeepBlue that primarily concern professional board game players, these articles target a larger public, causing collective worries about such systems. In another piece titled "AI could kill everyone" (Knapton, 2023), the anthropomorphic use of the word "kill" and the broadened extent indicated by the word "everyone" exacerbate the fears. Unawareness of the differences between human intelligence and generative AI can lead to false expectations and overblown fears of the system, that obscure the real work these models need to become safer, more accurate, and ethical (Raji et al., 2021). Thus, it becomes essential to critically evaluate the information presented and discern the unjustified and implicit anthropomorphism employed in these articles in order to have a more informed and balanced understanding of the capabilities of generative AI.

## 8 Conclusion

2023 has been a revolutionary year for generative AI because of the emergence of ChatGPT, which first allows public interactions with large-parameter AI models. Without any doubt, they will gradually become part of our life. Living in a world full of algorithms, data, and AIs, we must understand their benefits, biases, and dangers for better utilization. Thus, the rhetorics around generative AI are of great importance because they shape how the public perceives AI. Anthropomorphism constructs a technological myth of AI systems, exaggerating their capabilities, framing them as threatening, and deflecting from their every social impact and technical limitations. While there are many more important interventions generative models require, anthropomorphism continues to exact far-reaching effects on other critical concerns surrounding AI. For instance, the anthropomorphism of AI exacerbates the spread of misinformation, as it is perceived as more human. AI bots may be trusted easily, increasing the

creation of deceptive media. Thus, correcting anthropomorphism around AI is not just about building a genuine representation of AI but also crucial for fostering an informed understanding of AI systems. We need to “demystify” AI systems such that the public representations of generative AI are genuine, complete, and authentic. Only in this way can we have a better understanding of what generative AI can bring us and can ensure a proper evaluation of our relationships with it.

## References

1. Bory, P. (2019). Deep new: The shifting narratives of artificial intelligence from Deep Blue to AlphaGo. *Convergence*, 25(4), 627–642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856519829679>
2. Burrell, J. (2023, February 9). It’s time to challenge the narrative about ChatGPT and the future of journalism. *Poynter*. Retrieved November 24, 2023 <https://www.poynter.org/commentary/2023/opinion-chatgpt-will-not-replace-humans/>
3. Carchidi, V. J. (2022). Do submarines swim? Methodological dualism and anthropomorphizing AlphaGo. *AI & SOCIETY*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01491-2>
4. Cummins, E. (n.d.). Empathy in the Age of AI. *Wired*. Retrieved May 13, 2023, from <https://www.wired.com/story/artificial-intelligence-animals-anthropomorphism/>
5. Curran, N. M., Sun, J., & Hong, J.-W. (2020). Anthropomorphizing AlphaGo: A content analysis of the framing of Google DeepMind’s AlphaGo in the Chinese and American press. *AI & SOCIETY*, 35(3), 727–735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00908-9>
6. Garfinkle, M. (2023, May 1). *14 Million Jobs Could Disappear In 5 Years: Is Yours Safe?* Entrepreneur. Retrieved November 24, 2023 <https://www.entrepreneur.com/business-news/14-million-jobs-could-disappear-in-5-years-is-yours-safe/450760>

7. Geraci, R.M. (2007). Robots and the sacred in science and science fiction : Theological implications of artificial intelligence. *Zygon*, 42(4), 961–980.
8. Gorvett, Z. (2023, November 24). The AI emotions dreamed up by ChatGPT. BBC News service. Retrieved November 24, 2023.  
<https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20230224-the-ai-emotions-dreamed-up-by-chatgpt>
9. Hasan, A. (2023). *Why you are (probably) anthropomorphizing AI (Short Version)*. Retrieved November 24, 2023 <https://philarchive.org/rec/HASWYA-2>
10. Khatri, V. (2023). *(14) 10 Common Myths about ChatGPT: Separating Fact from Fiction | LinkedIn*. Retrieved November 24, 2023  
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/10-common-myths-chatgpt-separating-fact-from-fiction-khatri/>
11. Knapton, S. (2023, January 25). Advanced AI “could kill everyone”, warn Oxford researchers. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved November 24, 2023  
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/01/25/advanced-ai-could-kill-everyone-warn-oxford-researchers/>
12. Lawton, G. (2023). *What is Generative AI? Everything You Need to Know*. Enterprise AI.  
<https://www.techtarget.com/searchenterpriseai/definition/generative-AI>
13. Li, M., & Suh, A. (2022). Anthropomorphism in AI-enabled technology: A literature review. *Electronic Markets*, 32(4), 2245–2275.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00591-7>
14. Martin, C. D. (1993). The myth of the awesome thinking machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(4), 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.1145/255950.153587>
15. McGilvray J (2017) Cognitive science. In: McGilvray J (ed) *The Cambridge companion to Chomsky*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 106–175
16. Natale, S., & Ballatore, A. (2020). Imagining the thinking machine: Technological myths and the rise of artificial intelligence. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 26(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856517715164>
17. Noam Chomsky. (2006). *Language and Mind*: Vol. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press.
18. Salles, A., Evers, K., & Farisco, M. (2020). Anthropomorphism in AI. *AJOB Neuroscience*, 11(2), 88–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21507740.2020.1740350>
19. Perrigo, B. (2023). Exclusive: OpenAI Used Kenyan Workers on Less Than \$2 Per Hour to Make ChatGPT Less Toxic. *Last Accessed*, 19.
20. Raji, I. D., Bender, E. M., Paullada, A., Denton, E., & Hanna, A. (2021). AI and the everything in the whole wide world benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15366. Retrieved November 24, 2023 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.15366>
21. Siegel, J. (2023). *The art of the prompt: How to get the best out of generative AI*. Source. Retrieved November 24, 2023  
<https://news.microsoft.com/source/features/ai/the-art-of-the-prompt-how-to-get-the-best-out-of-generative-ai/>

## Appendix

1. I use the Tweepy API to initiate the tweet collection process.

Here is a short snippet of how I've collected historical tweets on discussions about ChatGPT:

Examples of collected tweets:

ChatGPT:

```
# Authenticate with Twitter API
auth = tweepy.OAuthHandler(consumer_key, consumer_secret)
auth.set_access_token(access_token, access_token_secret)
api = tweepy.API(auth)

def fetch_tweets(query, count):
    tweets = tweepy.Cursor(api.search_tweets, q=query, lang='en').items(count)
    return tweets

ChatGPT_tweets = fetch_tweets('ChatGPT', count=10000)
```

Examples of collected tweets:

```
Here are 6 po...
RT @MarketerShruti: ChatGPT gives insane results ✨

But only if you write accurate prompts

Use these 5 prompts to increase your accuracy b...
RT @aisolopreneur: ChatGPT's biggest issue is it sounds like a robot.

But you can quickly teach it to write just like you.

Here's how to...
RT @heykahn: ChatGPT is just the tip of the iceberg.

1,000+ AI tools were released last month.
```