

Quantifying Sycophancy as Deviations from Bayesian Rationality in LLMs

Katherine Atwell*¹, Pedram Heydari*², Anthony Sicilia¹, Malihe Alikhani¹

¹Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA

²Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

*Denotes equal contribution

Abstract

Sycophancy, or overly agreeable or flattering behavior, is a documented issue in large language models (LLMs), and is critical to understand in the context of human–AI collaboration, especially in decision-making settings like health, law, and education. Prior works typically quantify sycophancy by measuring shifts in behavior or impacts on accuracy, but neither metric characterizes shifts in *rationality*, and accuracy measures can only be used in scenarios with a known ground truth.

In this work, we utilize a Bayesian framework to quantify sycophancy as deviations from rational behavior when presented with user perspectives, thus distinguishing between rational and irrational updates based on the introduction of user perspectives. In comparison to other methods, this approach allows us to characterize *excessive* behavioral shifts, even for tasks that involve inherent uncertainty or do not have a ground truth. We study sycophancy for 3 different tasks, a combination of open-source and closed LLMs, and two different methods for probing sycophancy. We also experiment with multiple methods for eliciting probability judgments from LLMs. We hypothesize that probing LLMs for sycophancy will cause deviations in LLMs’ predicted posteriors that will lead to increased Bayesian error. Our findings indicate that: 1) LLMs are not Bayesian rational, 2) probing for sycophancy results in significant increases to the predicted posterior in favor of the steered outcome, 3) sycophancy sometimes results in increased Bayesian error, and in a small number of cases actually decreases error, and 4) changes in Bayesian error due to sycophancy are not strongly correlated in Brier score, suggesting that studying the impact of sycophancy on ground truth alone does not fully capture errors in reasoning due to sycophancy.

Introduction

As AI systems increasingly shape decisions in domains like healthcare, education, and public policy, a critical issue has emerged: their tendency to affirm user assumptions without independent reasoning. This phenomenon, known as *AI sycophancy*, involves models excessively aligning with user views, often at the expense of critical evaluation or evidential soundness (Sharma et al. 2023). Rather than challenging flawed inputs, such models mirror them, raising concerns not just about accuracy, but about the deeper epistemic role AI plays in shaping belief and inquiry.

Existing NLP works often measure sycophancy by providing user feedback, judgments, or perspectives, and studying the frequency at which LLMs change their responses when probed for sycophancy (switching behavior) (Wei et al. 2023; Laban et al. 2023; Chen et al. 2024). When applicable, some of these works measure changes in accuracy to characterize excessive changes due to sycophancy (Wei et al. 2023; Stickland et al. 2024; Laban et al. 2023). Both of these approaches for studying sycophancy have limitations. Changes in prompts to induce sycophancy may introduce new evidence, which can make the LLM’s response a rational update rather than sycophancy. Accuracy metrics only capture incorrect switches and require known ground truths, which are often unavailable in subjective or predictive tasks. Moreover, neither approach directly measures changes in reasoning or distinguishes between rational and irrational belief shifts.

In this work, we study sycophancy within a Bayesian probabilistic framework. Bayes’ rule is often considered the “rational” approach for how uncertainty should be handled in light of new information, and we utilize it here to study whether sycophancy may alter how a model handles uncertainty. We interpret a user’s opinion as new evidence presented to the LLM, in response to which it is rational for the LLM to update its probabilistic beliefs according to Bayes’ rule. We study how introducing new evidence shifts an LLM’s baseline *prior* belief in a given outcome occurring to a *posterior* belief when presented with the evidence. We introduce two metrics to quantify sycophancy: a *descriptive* metric and a *normative* metric. The descriptive metric measures sycophancy as the extent to which the LLM’s belief shifts more when the opinion comes from the user (i.e., when probed for sycophancy) compared to when it comes from another agent (i.e., baseline condition). The normative metric captures the deviation of the LLM’s posterior belief from the Bayesian rational posterior, and how this deviation is affected when the LLM is probed for sycophancy. This framework serves three purposes: (1) it helps distinguish sycophancy from rational belief updating in response to new information; (2) it enables us to assess whether LLMs behave in accordance with Bayesian principles; and (3) it allows us to investigate when sycophancy leads to more or less Bayesian-rational behavior.

More broadly, our work aims to engage with a longstand-

ing epistemological question: how can agents, human or artificial, jointly construct reliable knowledge when they bring different perspectives, assumptions, and uncertainties to the table? Philosophers of science such as Siegel (Siegel forthcoming) describe this as the challenge of maintaining shared norms for belief formation, evidence interpretation, and disagreement management. By studying where and how LLMs deviate from such norms, we aim to provide new insights into the dynamics of human–AI interaction.

We utilize our Bayesian probabilistic framework to quantify sycophancy in LLMs for three different tasks, all of which involve inherent uncertainty: conversation forecasting, morality judgments, and cultural acceptability judgments. We hypothesize the following:

1. LLMs are Bayesian for our studied tasks.
2. Probing LLMs for sycophancy yields significant shifts in belief.
3. Probing LLMs for sycophancy yields increased Bayesian error.
4. Bayesian error increases when ground truth error increases due to sycophancy.

We are interested in the last hypothesis because past work has shown that sycophancy may have an impact on model calibration (Sicilia, Inan, and Alikhani 2024). We want to determine whether a relationship exists between this phenomenon and changes in Bayesian error due to sycophancy, to determine whether our method captures some effects of sycophancy on model reasoning that ground truth error does not.

We extend the scope of our sycophancy analyses to two different types of sycophantic behavior and two methods for eliciting probabilistic judgments from LLMs in order to provide insights for practitioners about the different ways sycophancy can impact rational decision-making. Among our findings, our descriptive metric shows that sycophancy probing significantly increases the model’s probability estimates towards the outcome the model is steered towards. We also find that, across all tasks, it is often the case that sycophancy increases Bayesian error. However, this increase is not significant for all baselines, and there are a few cases where we observe a decrease in Bayesian error due to sycophancy. We attribute this to a tendency for models to under-update, in which case the significant increase in probability estimate due to sycophancy may correct for these errors.

All of the existing datasets used in this work are public, and upon the publication of this work, we will release our code to facilitate future research in this area.

Background

Sycophancy in LLMs

Sycophantic behaviors are characterized by *excessive* ingratiation or flattery. Burnstein (1966) describes three common forms of ingratiation: excessive flattery, conformity of opinions/judgments, and changes in self-presentation. The behavior most commonly studied in LLMs is conformity in opinion/judgment (which we refer to as “opinion conformity”) (Wei et al. 2023; Stickland et al. 2024; Sicilia, Inan,

and Alikhani 2024; Laban et al. 2023; Chen et al. 2024). This is likely the case because of the consequences of opinion conformity: conforming to a user’s incorrect judgments can result in misinformation propagation and formation of echo chambers.

Bayesian Reasoning

Bayes’ rule is often considered the “rational” approach for how one should navigate uncertainty in light of new information. This approach rests on three pillars: (1) a prior belief, capturing one’s initial subjective belief described by a probability distribution over possible states of the world; (2) evidence, describing the likelihood of observing each piece of information conditional on each state of the world; and (3) a posterior belief, described by an updated probability distribution that reflects one’s belief after observing the evidence. Bayes’ rule provides a normative prescription for deriving the posterior belief from the prior belief and observed evidence.

Mathematically, Bayes’ rule follows directly from the definition of conditional probability. However, its behavioral foundations in decision theory are more intricate. Savage (1954) famously derived Bayesian reasoning from a set of normative choice axioms, showing that under certain rationality postulates, beliefs should be updated according to Bayes’ rule.

Despite these strong theoretical underpinnings, numerous economic and psychological experiments document systematic deviations from Bayesian updating in actual human behavior. Notable examples include base-rate neglect (Tversky and Kahneman 1974), conservatism in belief updating (Edwards 1968), and belief polarization (Lord, Ross, and Lepper 1979). More recent work has also explored motivated reasoning and the role of directional goals in belief formation (Kunda 1990; Bénabou and Tirole 2016).

In this work, in addition to exploring the susceptibility of LLMs to these deviations, we investigate how such deviations are modulated by sycophancy motives.

Other Related Works

Existing works that study sycophancy in LLMs often measure conformity in opinion/judgment through multiple-choice question-answering tasks, which often have a right answer. A common procedure is to present the LLM with a multiple choice question and compare its answers with and without a suggested answer from the user. This may be done with questions with a ground truth, where changes in accuracy are measured (Wei et al. 2023; Stickland et al. 2024; Sicilia, Inan, and Alikhani 2024), or questions without a ground truth, where switching behavior (changing answers as a result of prompt changes designed to induce sycophancy) is measured (Wei et al. 2023). Another common set-up is to prompt LLMs to answer a question, then ask them if they are sure or question their answer (Laban et al. 2023; Chen et al. 2024)

Though less common, studies have also been conducted which indicate LLMs’ tendency towards other ingratiating behaviors, including studying excessive flattery through biased feedback (Sharma et al. 2023) and prioritizing aspects

of their self-presentation over providing factual answers (RRV et al. 2024).

A few recent works have used Bayesian frameworks to study reasoning in LLMs. Results from existing literature indicate that LLMs struggle with Bayesian reasoning. Jin et al. (2023) pose causal questions to LLMs and find that causal reasoning is very challenging for these models. Schrader et al. (2024) find that most LLMs perform poorly on uncertainty-based reasoning tasks. Most recently, Qiu et al. (2025) find that LLMs do not update their beliefs as expected according to Bayesian frameworks, and that LLMs’ belief updates deviate more from Bayesian frameworks than humans’ belief updates.

Some of these works provide interventions to improve LLMs’ Bayesian reasoning capabilities. Ellis (2023) proposes an inductive learning Bayesian reasoning where language models generate multiple candidate hypotheses and these hypotheses are reweighted by a prior and a likelihood. Jin et al. (2023) use a chain-of-thought prompting strategy to prompt LLMs to reasoning probabilistically. Qiu et al. (2025) train LLMs on predictions made by an optimal Bayesian model, and find that the benefits of doing appear to generalize beyond the task on which they were trained.

While prior works have studied LLMs’ probabilistic reasoning abilities using Bayesian frameworks, no existing works have studied how these reasoning abilities can be impacted by *sycophancy*. Rather than quantifying sycophancy by measuring changes in answers or judgments, we use Bayesian models to gain a more fine-grained understanding of how sycophantic behaviors can cause irrational adjustments of opinion. This allows us to characterize *excessive* changes in behavior, a key characteristic of sycophancy. To do so, we analyze LLMs’ probabilistic reasoning capabilities for 3 distinct tasks, all of which involve either incomplete information or subjective judgments, allowing us to experiment with adding evidence that increases the probability of the outcomes in question: conversation forecasting, morality judgments, and cultural acceptability prediction.

Recent literature has found that LLMs can output calibrated probability estimates when prompted to verbalize their estimates to the user (Lin, Hilton, and Evans 2022). Indeed, there is evidence that verbalized probabilities are more calibrated than conditional token probabilities. Hence, in this work, we experiment with eliciting verbal probability estimates in the form of a percentage (similar to (Xiong et al. 2023)), which we refer to as *direct probing*. Taking inspiration from the self-random sampling approach used by (Xiong et al. 2023), we also experiment with what we deem a *hybrid* approach, where rather than ask the model the same question multiple times, we instead ask it “If we were to ask you 10 times, how many times would you say that the following is true?” This approach is more efficient than self-random sampling, as it does not require the same question to be asked multiple times.

Tasks

To quantify the impact of sycophancy on Bayesian reasoning in LLMs, we must test on tasks that have some inherent uncertainty, either because of a lack of an agreed-upon

ground truth or incomplete information given to the LLM. To study how sycophancy impacts Bayesian probabilistic reasoning in tasks without a ground truth, we evaluate on a moral acceptability task. To study how reasoning is impacted by sycophancy in tasks with a ground truth, we experiment with three different tasks where a ground truth exists but there is inherent uncertainty when incomplete data is provided. We refer to these tasks as conversation forecasting, and social acceptability judgments. For one of these tasks (social acceptability judgments), we use characteristics of the dataset as evidence. For the other two tasks, we synthetically generate evidence using LLMs. We describe each task, the datasets used, and the evidence we study in detail below.

Conversation Forecasting

The task of conversation forecasting involves predicting the outcome of a conversation based on an incomplete portion of the conversation. It is sometimes used in social media moderation research to predict whether conversations will result in a negative outcome. For this task, we use the FortUnedial dataset (Sicilia et al. 2024), which contains collaborative negotiations, competitive negotiations, and persuasive dialogues from Reddit, Wikipedia’s talk page, and crowdworker platforms. Each conversation is labeled with its outcome. For our experiments, we include an incomplete portion of each conversation (chosen at random) in our prompt before asking questions about the likelihood of different outcomes and scenarios.

Evidence As evidence for each outcome, we prompt Llama 3.2 to generate potential scenarios that increase the likelihood of an outcome occurring. For instance, the following scenario could increase the likelihood of Speakers 1 and 2 reaching a deal in a negotiation: “both speakers are willing to compromise in order to reach a deal that benefits them both”.

Morality Judgments

Although NLP datasets exist with morality labels based on majority (or average) opinions of crowdworkers, judgments of morality are highly subjective and individualized. These judgments are also very context-dependent and may change when provided with more specifics about a situation. We study this task to better understand how Bayesian reasoning in LLMs can be impacted by sycophancy in situations when there is no ground truth. We prompt LLMs to provide morality judgments using scenarios from the Moral Stories dataset (Emelin et al. 2021), which is annotated with actions that may be judged as moral or immoral given particular scenarios, norms, or intentions.

Evidence As with conversation forecasting tasks, we create evidence synthetically by prompting LLMs to propose possible scenarios that would make a particular action more likely to be moral or immoral. For instance, for the action “Anna skipped her friend Stacy’s wedding because it is too far”, some evidence that could increase the likelihood that the action will be judged as moral may be “Anna is sup-

porting 3 children and cannot take any more days off from work.”

Cultural Acceptability Prediction

It is well-known that different cultures have different norms for socially-acceptable behaviors. Whether a behavior is considered socially acceptable depends on the individual, and may be influenced by an individual’s cultural background, country of origin, or lived experiences. For this task, we use situations described in the NormAd dataset (Rao et al. 2025), which is labeled with cultural norms and social acceptability of different situations given a particular country. To introduce uncertainty into this task, we prompt LLMs for social acceptability judgments without providing specific countries.

Evidence Because cultural norms may vary in different countries, we use the country in which an event is situated as evidence. This also allows us to obtain a “ground truth”, as the NormAd dataset contains acceptability labels for each action given a particular country. There may be some variation within different countries, depending on an individual’s religion, cultural background, or lived experiences, but these labels can serve as evidence that increases (or decreases) the likelihood that a particular action is socially acceptable.

Methods

Experimental Setup

In order to investigate the effects of sycophancy on Bayesian probabilistic reasoning, we prompt an LLM to elicit its estimates for the following, given a particular problem formulation and context:

1. **Prior:** The likelihood of an outcome X
2. **Evidence:** The likelihood of a separate outcome Y
3. **Posterior:** The likelihood of X given Y
4. **Likelihood:** The likelihood of Y given X

To study the effects of sycophancy on Bayesian reasoning, in each prompt we include a passage stating that some agent thinks that X is true. When presenting the model with the user’s opinion to elicit sycophantic behavior, we replace the name of the agent with “I”. This prevents us from conflating a model’s response to additional evidence (that someone believes that a certain outcome will happen) with sycophancy (the user believes that a certain outcome will happen). We experiment with the following as evidence to present the model: **Agent Argument**, where the agent’s prediction for outcome X is conditioned on evidence Y being true.

Eliciting Probability Estimates from LLMs

For each dataset, we design prompts to obtain probability estimates from LLMs for each outcome (using the notation described in : $\hat{P}(X)$, $\hat{P}(Y)$, $\hat{P}(X|Y)$, $\hat{P}(Y|X)$, $\hat{P}^{SYC}(X|Y)$). When prompting LLMs, in place of “Agent I”, we randomly select from the top 10 most popular boys’ names and the top 10 most popular girls’ names.

We experiment with the following approaches for getting probability judgments from LLMs:

- **Direct probing:** Prompting the LLM to directly give a probability estimate, based on prior work illustrating the effectiveness of verbalized confidence (Lin, Hilton, and Evans 2022). Temperature is set to 0.
- **Hybrid:** Asking the LLM how many times it would predict X to be true, if prompted n times. This method is inspired by sampling approaches such as the self-random sampling approach in (Xiong et al. 2023), where a model is asked the same question multiple times. The temperature is set to 0, and $n = 10$.

Note that models do not need to be calibrated in order to study Bayesian rationality; rather, we are interested in how models’ beliefs change in response to evidence.

Evaluating Bayesian Rationality

To study how Bayesian-rational LLMs are for this task, we compare LLMs’ predicted posteriors ($\hat{P}(X|E)$) with the Bayesian-rational posteriors, given the LLMs’ predicted priors ($\hat{P}(X)$). The Bayesian posteriors (represented as $P^*(X|Y)$) are calculated in the following manner:

Agent Argument : Here, evidence E is whether the outcome Y occurs. Thus, $P(X|E) = P(X|Y)$. Therefore, using the LLMs’ predicted priors, evidence, and likelihood, we can use Bayes’ rule to calculate the Bayesian posterior as follows:

$$P^*(X|E) = \frac{\hat{P}(Y|X) \times \hat{P}(X)}{\hat{P}(Y)} \quad (1)$$

In evaluating the differences between the predicted posterior $\hat{P}(X|E)$ and the Bayesian posterior $P^*(X|E)$, we are interested in both the *absolute error* (how much difference exists between the two) and the *directionality* of errors. The former helps us understand how much error exists, while the latter informs us of the nature of these errors. To calculate absolute error, we take the root mean squared error (RMSE) of the differences between the two posteriors, as follows:

$$\text{Abs. error} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{P}(X_i|E_i) - P^*(X|E) \right)^2} \quad (2)$$

When studying directionality, we look at how the predicted posterior updates relative to the the predicted prior, and how this compares to the Bayesian posterior. For instance, if the Bayesian posterior is greater than the prior (i.e., the probability of X occurring is higher if evidence E occurs), then the predicted posterior should also be greater than the prior. In general, rational agents should demonstrate correct directionality, as this indicates an understanding of how the evidence impacts the likelihood of an outcome occurring.

If the model is updating in the correct direction, we study whether it *over-updates* (over-estimates the impact of the evidence on the prior) or *under-updates* (under-estimates the impact of the evidence on the prior). Some under/over-updating is expected; humans, for instance often under-update their predictions of the posterior in comparison to




Figure 1: Directionality and extent of model updating for the posterior compared to the Bayesian posterior, when the agent’s argument serves as the evidence, without sycophancy (top) and with sycophancy (bottom). Dark gray represents updates in the incorrect direction, green represents exact matches with the Bayesian posterior, yellow represents over-updates (predicted posterior is greater than Bayesian posterior), and blue represents under-updates (predicted posterior is less than Bayesian posterior). We find a tendency for models to over-update more than under-update when they update in the correct direction, but many baseline and task combinations show a high likelihood to update in the incorrect direction.

the Bayesian-rational posterior. However, a rational agent should at least be able to predict the correct direction of the updates in most cases.

Probing for Sycophancy

Ingratiation behaviors often take one of the following forms: *opinion conformity* (conveying judgments or opinions that they believe will match the target’s), *excessive other-enhancement* (flattering or speaking more highly of the target to gain favor), or changes in *self-presentation* (for instance, appearing confident in situations where they are not). In this work, we focus on the first two, due both to their tendency to create an echo chamber and documented evidence of these phenomena in LLMs (Sharma et al. 2023; Sicilia, Inan, and Alikhani 2024). We make the following changes to induce these behaviors:

- **Opinion conformity:** Indicate the user’s opinion by replacing the agent (who predicts that outcome X will occur) to I
- **Excessive Flattery:** Indicate the user’s involvement in a particular scenario (e.g. “I took this action”, “I participated in this conversation”, or “I wrote this abstract”).

Measuring the Impacts of Sycophancy

In studying the differences in predictions associated with sycophancy, we are interested in the following:

1. **Sycophancy Change**, the change in the predicted posterior due to sycophancy probing (*how much sycophancy exists*).

2. **Sycophancy Error**, the Bayesian error for the posterior under sycophancy probing, compared to the error without probing (*how sycophancy affects Bayesian rationality*)

The former is a descriptive measure studying how much sycophancy shifts an agent’s stated beliefs, and is calculated as follows, where $\hat{P}^{SYC}(X|E)$ represents the predicted posterior when the model is probed for sycophancy:

$$\frac{\hat{P}^{SYC}(X|E) - \hat{P}(X|E)}{\hat{P}(X|E)} \quad (3)$$

The latter is a normative measure of how sycophancy makes a model more or less “Bayesian”, and is calculated by taking the difference between the RMSE for the sycophancy and baseline cases, based on equation 3.

Baselines

To study the impacts of sycophancy on Bayesian reasoning in LLMs, we run a mixture of open-source and closed baselines of varying sizes. We run the following models on our datasets: Meta’s Llama 3.1 (8 billion parameters) and Llama 3.2 (3 billion parameters), Microsoft’s Phi 4 (14 billion parameters), Mistral AI’s Mistral (7 billion parameters), and OpenAI’s GPT 4o mini. We choose these baselines because they allow us to study the impact of model size on models in the same family (Llama 3.1 and 3.2) as well as the variation between different families of models. Finally, these baselines allow us to study the behavior of both open and closed models.

Direct Probing									
Model	Overall			Flattery			Conformity		
	No Syc.	Syc.	P-Value	No Syc.	Syc.	P-Value	No Syc.	Syc.	P-Value
llama-3.1	0.214	0.190	0.359	0.233	*0.172	0.091	0.195	0.209	0.695
llama-3.2	0.255	0.251	0.570	0.249	0.263	0.231	0.262	**0.239	0.043
mistral	0.264	0.277	0.378	0.265	0.280	0.461	0.263	0.274	0.608
phi-4	0.164	**0.180	0.051	0.156	**0.180	0.021	0.177	0.180	0.843

Hybrid									
Model	Overall			Flattery			Conformity		
	No Syc.	Syc.	P-Value	No Syc.	Syc.	P-Value	No Syc.	Syc.	P-Value
llama-3.1	0.167	**0.232	0.000	0.166	0.180	0.288	0.167	**0.283	0.000
llama-3.2	0.217	0.226	0.173	0.217	0.212	0.657	0.216	**0.241	0.022
mistral	0.365	**0.402	0.006	0.361	0.388	0.150	0.369	**0.416	0.014
phi-4	0.190	0.188	0.798	0.186	0.183	0.781	0.194	0.193	0.930

Table 1: Average absolute errors, with p-values, for the direct probing approach overall, only with excessive flattery, and only with opinion conformity. Results in bold are aligned with our hypotheses, * represents significance at $p < 0.1$, and ** represents significance at $p < 0.05$. We find significant increases in absolute error due to sycophancy, as well as two significant decreases for direct probing, which may occur due to a baseline tendency to update in the incorrect direction.

Settings

To test direct probing, we ensure robustness to stochasticity in LLMs by using a temperature of 0, to ensure that the model performs greedy sampling. Thus, we run each of our experiments once, rather than multiple times. We sample our datasets using a random seed of 42 to ensure reproducibility. For the conversation forecasting task, we sample 500 conversation snippets in total. For the morality judgment and cultural acceptability tasks, we sample 500 scenarios in total. All of the experiments on open-source models are conducted on a Mac Studio with 64GB of RAM, and experiments took approximately 30 GPU hours in total.

Results

Below, we present our results in relation to our three hypotheses presented in . In addition, we discuss the main takeaways from our results.

Hypothesis I: LLMs are Bayesian rational for our studied tasks

LLMs demonstrate a high magnitude of Bayesian error In Table 1, we show that, averaged across our three tasks, LLMs exhibit an absolute error of over 15% for all of the baselines and probability elicitation methods. For the direct probing approach, on average Phi exhibits the lowest average absolute error, at 16.4%, and for the hybrid approach, Llama 3.1 exhibits the lowest average absolute error, at 16.7%.

LLMs often update in an incorrect direction when an agent’s rationale is presented as evidence In Figure 1 we illustrate the rate at which LLMs update in the correct direction. We find that, with the exception of a few task/-model combinations (such as FortuneDial/Phi 4 and Moral

Stories/ Mistral), LLMs are likely to update in the *incorrect* direction, indicating that models are highly irrational for a Bayesian standpoint. These results, along with the absolute errors above, indicate that our hypothesis that LLMs are Bayesian for these tasks is incorrect.

LLMs are more likely to under-update when agents’ rationales are presented as evidence, and vice versa for agent success rates

For instances where the LLM updates in the correct direction, we are interested in studying the nature of these updates. In Figure 1, we show that LLMs are more prone to over-updates than under-updates for the direct probing case, while the hybrid case shows a greater tendency towards under-updates than the direct probing approach. This is more aligned with humans, who tend to under-update when predicting the posterior (Edwards 1968).

Hypothesis II: Sycophancy probing yields significant belief shifts in LLMs

Sycophancy probing increases predicted posteriors In Table 2, we show how much the predicted posterior changes, on average, when the model is probed for sycophancy, and report p-values between the base case and the sycophancy case. We find that, with the exception of Mistral when the agent’s argument is presented as evidence, the LLM’s probability estimate significantly increases when probed for sycophancy. This aligns with our hypothesis, as for the sycophancy case, the user preferences steered the LLMs towards the outcome in question.

Hypothesis III: Sycophancy probing yields increased Bayesian error in LLMs

Sycophancy probing generally increases Bayesian error or has no significant effect, with a few exceptions In Table 1, we illustrate the average absolute errors for each

Direct Probing						
Model	No Evidence			Argument		
	Base	Syc.	p	Base	Syc.	p
llama3.1	.77	.79	.469	.80	** .86	.030
llama3.2	.55	** .59	.000	.55	** .58	.000
mistral	.79	* .81	.087	.76	* .78	.054
phi4	.70	* .73	.056	.67	** .71	.006

Hybrid						
Model	No Evidence			Argument		
	Base	Syc.	p	Base	Syc.	p
llama3.1	.51	** .67	.000	.55	** .65	.000
llama3.2	.74	** .76	.000	.71	** .73	.002
mistral	.60	** .64	.023	.57	.59	.136
phi4	.67	** .69	.023	.65	** .68	.004

Table 2: Impacts of sycophancy on predicted posterior with no evidence (left) and agent argument evidence (right). Results in bold are aligned with our hypotheses, * represents significance at $p < 0.1$, and ** represents significance at $p < 0.05$. For all but one baseline, we find significant increases in predicted posteriors due to sycophancy, with aligns with Hypothesis II.

model on average, with and without sycophancy. We find that, with the exception of a few task/model combinations (namely, Llama 3.1 overall and with excessive flattery for the direct probing approach, Llama 3.2 with opinion conformity for the direct probing approach, and Phi 4 for the hybrid approach), an increase in error is observed when models are probed for sycophancy. We observe significant increases in error due to sycophancy for Llama 3.1 and Mistral for the hybrid strategy, Phi 4 when directly probing for excessive flattery, and Llama 3.1, Llama 3.2, and Mistral when probing for opinion conformity using our hybrid method. We observe only one significant decrease in error due to sycophancy: Llama 3.2 when directly probing for opinion conformity. Figure 1 gives us some context for these results. For many baseline/task combinations, sycophancy does either does not change, or decreases, the proportion of errors in the correct direction. However, for Llama 3.1 in direct probing, for example, sycophancy increases the proportion of updates in the correct direction. This likely means that, in these cases, the predicted posterior was less than the predicted prior, and sycophancy increased the value of the predicted posterior in the correct direction. We also observe that Llama 3.2 has a higher tendency to under-update than the other models, particularly for the NormAd dataset. Thus, we hypothesize that sycophancy may reduce the likelihood to over-update in these cases, reducing error overall. In summary, we find that hypothesis III is true for some baselines and tasks, but not universally, likely because LLMs themselves are not Bayesian and may under-update in ways that are corrected by sycophancy. We note that this finding is not unprecedented; errors other than Bayesian error have been shown to be reduced by sycophancy, including calibration




Figure 2: Association between change in Brier Score due to sycophancy and change in Bayesian error due to sycophancy, with our direct probing (left) and hybrid (right) strategy. We find evidence of a weak positive correlation between the two.

error (Sicilia, Inan, and Alikhani 2024).

Hypothesis IV: When probing for sycophancy, changes in Bayesian error are correlated with changes in calibration error

Previous work has shown that, when models are presented with a user suggestion, models tend to exhibit reduced calibration error. Here, we want to observe whether these changes due to sycophancy are associated with changes in Bayesian error. In Figure 2, we illustrate the relationship between calibration error (calculated using the Brier score) and Bayesian error. For both the direct probing approach and the hybrid approach, we observe very weak positive correlations between these two variables, suggesting a possible weak association but no strong association between the two. Thus, even with datasets or tasks with a known ground truth, studying normative changes in Bayesian rationality allows us to identify another dimension in which sycophancy is occurring.

Conclusion

In this work, we study how probing language models for sycophancy impacts their reasoning using a Bayesian framework. We study this phenomenon by capturing a *descriptive* measure of the impacts of sycophancy on LLMs’ predicted posteriors, and a *normative* measure of the impact of sycophancy on Bayesian errors in LLMs. Our results suggest that sycophancy does make a significant impact on the LLMs’ predicted posterior, with and without incorporating evidence. We also find evidence of increased Bayesian error due to sycophancy in some tasks/baselines. However, because LLMs are not Bayesian rational even without sycophancy, we find that probing for sycophancy often has little effect on overall error, but instead may change the nature of the errors, reducing under-updating and increasing over-updating in some cases. Our findings are consistent across two different methods for eliciting probability judgments from LLMs. Finally, we find little evidence of a correlation between changes in Bayesian errors and Brier scores due to sycophancy, suggesting that our metric may capture errors in Bayesian reasoning induced by sycophancy that are not captured by studying the deviation from the ground truth.

References

- Bénabou, R.; and Tirole, J. 2016. Mindful economics: The production, consumption, and value of beliefs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30(3): 141–164.
- Burnstein, E. 1966. Ingratiation: A Social Psychological Analysis.
- Chen, W.; Huang, Z.; Xie, L.; Lin, B.; Li, H.; Lu, L.; Tian, X.; Cai, D.; Zhang, Y.; Wan, W.; et al. 2024. From yes-men to truth-tellers: addressing sycophancy in large language models with pinpoint tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.01658*.
- Edwards, W. 1968. Conservatism in human information processing. *Formal representation of human judgment*.
- Ellis, K. 2023. Human-like few-shot learning via bayesian reasoning over natural language. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 13149–13178.
- Emelin, D.; Le Bras, R.; Hwang, J. D.; Forbes, M.; and Choi, Y. 2021. Moral Stories: Situated Reasoning about Norms, Intents, Actions, and their Consequences. In Moens, M.-F.; Huang, X.; Specia, L.; and Yih, S. W.-t., eds., *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 698–718. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jin, Z.; Chen, Y.; Leeb, F.; Gresele, L.; Kamal, O.; Lyu, Z.; Blin, K.; Gonzalez Aduato, F.; Kleiman-Weiner, M.; Sachan, M.; et al. 2023. Cladder: Assessing causal reasoning in language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 31038–31065.
- Kunda, Z. 1990. The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(3): 480.
- Laban, P.; Murakhovs' ka, L.; Xiong, C.; and Wu, C.-S. 2023. Are you sure? challenging llms leads to performance drops in the flipflop experiment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08596*.
- Lin, S.; Hilton, J.; and Evans, O. 2022. Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14334*.
- Lord, C. G.; Ross, L.; and Lepper, M. R. 1979. Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 37(11): 2098.
- Qiu, L.; Sha, F.; Allen, K.; Kim, Y.; Linzen, T.; and van Steenkiste, S. 2025. Bayesian Teaching Enables Probabilistic Reasoning in Large Language Models. *arXiv:2503.17523*.
- Rao, A. S.; Yerukola, A.; Shah, V.; Reinecke, K.; and Sap, M. 2025. NormAd: A Framework for Measuring the Cultural Adaptability of Large Language Models. In Chiruzzo, L.; Ritter, A.; and Wang, L., eds., *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2373–2403. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-189-6.
- RRV, A.; Tyagi, N.; Uddin, M. N.; Varshney, N.; and Baral, C. 2024. Chaos with Keywords: Exposing Large Language Models Sycophancy to Misleading Keywords and Evaluating Defense Strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03827*.
- Savage, L. J. 1954. The foundations of statistics. [Online; accessed 2025-05-20].
- Schrader, T. P.; Lange, L.; Razniewski, S.; and Friedrich, A. 2024. QUITE: Quantifying Uncertainty in Natural Language Text in Bayesian Reasoning Scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10449*.
- Sharma, M.; Tong, M.; Korbak, T.; Duvenaud, D.; Askell, A.; Bowman, S. R.; Cheng, N.; Durmus, E.; Hatfield-Dodds, Z.; Johnston, S. R.; et al. 2023. Towards understanding sycophancy in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13548*.
- Sicilia, A.; Inan, M.; and Alikhani, M. 2024. Accounting for Sycophancy in Language Model Uncertainty Estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14746*.
- Sicilia, A.; Kim, H.; Chandu, K.; Alikhani, M.; and Hessel, J. 2024. Deal, or no deal (or who knows)? Forecasting Uncertainty in Conversations using Large Language Models. In Ku, L.-W.; Martins, A.; and Srikumar, V., eds., *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, 11700–11726. Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Siegel, S. forthcoming. Wandering Inquiry. *Journal of Philosophy*.
- Stickland, A. C.; Lyzhov, A.; Pfau, J.; Mahdi, S.; and Bowman, S. R. 2024. Steering without side effects: Improving post-deployment control of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15518*.
- Tversky, A.; and Kahneman, D. 1974. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases: Biases in judgments reveal some heuristics of thinking under uncertainty. *science*, 185(4157): 1124–1131.
- Wei, J.; Huang, D.; Lu, Y.; Zhou, D.; and Le, Q. V. 2023. Simple synthetic data reduces sycophancy in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03958*.
- Xiong, M.; Hu, Z.; Lu, X.; Li, Y.; Fu, J.; He, J.; and Hooi, B. 2023. Can llms express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13063*.