Who is asking ChatGPT health questions? Analysis of a nationally representative Australian community sample

Julie Ayre[1], Erin Cvejic[2], and Kirsten J McCaffery[1]

[1] Sydney Health Literacy Lab, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

[2] Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

Corresponding author: Julie Ayre

Rm 128C Edward Ford Building, The University of Sydney, NSW

+61 2 9351 7789

Julie.ayre@sydney.edu.au

Abstract

ChatGPT and other generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools have dramatically changed the health information environment. Discussions about their benefits and risks need clear evidence about who is using them and why. This nationally representative survey estimates that one in ten Australians asked ChatGPT a health question in the past 6 months (95%CI: 8.5%□11.4%), with higher use in key priority groups: people born in a non-English speaking country, who speak a non-English language at home, and who have low health literacy. As usage increases, we need to equip community with knowledge and skills to use these tools safely.

With the launch of ChatGPT in 2022, Australians now have direct, easy access to a generative artificial intelligence (AI) model that can answer almost any health question. Though ChatGPT has capacity to vastly increase access to highly tailored health information, its errors are also well-documented, particularly for its early models, and variation in accuracy depending on the task and topic (1). As such, generative AI tools pose yet another potential challenge to health services and clinicians, in an environment already overwhelmed by misinformation (2). Discussions about potential benefits and risks of this new technology for health equity, patient engagement and safety need clear evidence about who and how many people are using ChatGPT, and the kinds of health questions they ask. This study aimed to examine ChatGPT use for health purposes in Australia.

We used the June 2024 wave of the Life in Australia™(3) panel to estimate self-reported use of ChatGPT in a nationally representative Australian sample (see eMethods). After providing consent, participants completed questions about how often they used ChatGPT for health purposes in the past 6 months, and for which health tasks. Those aware of ChatGPT but who had not used it for health purposes were asked about their intentions to do so in the next 6 months. Self-reported health literacy(4) was collected, with demographic information available through existing panel data. Social disadvantage corresponded to national quintiles for the Index of Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage(5). Scores were weighted to Australian population benchmarks using propensity scores. Associations were assessed using simple logistic regression, with p-values < .05 considered statistically significant. Unless otherwise stated, results refer to the unweighted analyses. The study was approved by the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (2024/HE000247).

Of the 2,951 invited panellists, 2,034 took part (68.9%). Sample demographics approximated those of the general population (Table 1). Most had heard of ChatGPT (weighted 84.7%, 95% confidence interval (CI): 83.0%□86.3%), with only a small proportion who had not (weighted 15.3%, 95%CI: 13.7%□17.0%). One in ten reported using ChatGPT in the last 6 months to ask health questions (weighted 9.9%, 95%CI: 8.5%□11.4%). This was more likely for participants who were younger, lived in a capital city, born in a non-English speaking country, spoke a language other than English at home, or had limited/marginal health literacy (Table 1).

Most people who used ChatGPT for health questions were fairly trusting of the tool (mean =4.39/5, standard deviation (SD)=0.88). The most common health questions related to learning about a specific health condition (89/187, 47.6%), finding what symptoms mean (70/187, 37.4%), finding out what actions to take (67/187, 35.8%), and understanding medical terms (65/187, 34.8%) (Table 2). Questions were categorised as 'lower' risk if they related to general descriptive health information, and 'higher risk' if they related to taking action that would typically require clinical advice. Three in five (115/187, 61.5%) reported asking at least one higher risk health question, and this was more likely amongst those born overseas in a mainly non-English speaking country compared to people born in Australia (odds ratio (OR)=2.62 95% CI:1.27□5.39), or who spoke another language at home compared to people who spoke English at home (OR=2.24, 95% CI: 1.16□4.32). No other associations were significant.

For those aware of ChatGPT but who had not yet used it for health purposes, 38.8% reported considering asking a health question in the next 6 months (591/1523). The most common tasks related to learning about a specific health condition (276/1523, 18.1%), understanding medical terms (256/1523, 16.8%), or finding out what symptoms mean (249/1523, 16.4%) (eTable 2). One quarter of these participants (375/1523, 24.6%) would consider asking at least one higher risk question, and this was more likely for participants with up to a Year 12 education (OR=1.76, 95%CI: 1.19□2.61) or an advanced diploma or diploma (OR=1.67, 95%CI: 1.11□2.51), compared to people with postgraduate education. No other associations were significant.

This exploratory study estimated that one in ten Australians asked ChatGPT a health question in the past 6 months, equivalent to almost 1.9 million adults(6). Given the sector's explosive growth and the availability of similar tools (7), this is likely a conservative estimate of Australian health-related use of generative AI. This number is likely to grow: two in five people who had not yet asked ChatGPT a health question were considering doing so in the next 6 months. We also found health-related use of ChatGPT was higher for important priority groups who already face significant barriers to accessing care in Australia(8), including people born in a non-English speaking country, who do not speak English at home,

and who have limited/marginal health literacy. More work is needed to understand which types of health questions pose a higher risk to community, acknowledging that this will change as the technology evolves. There is an urgent need to equip our community with new knowledge and skills to use generative AI tools safely, and to bring a strong equity lens to efforts that support this process.

References

1. Wei Q, Yao Z, Cui Y, et al. Evaluation of ChatGPT-generated medical responses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Biomed Inform. 2024;151: 104620.

2. Dunn AG, Shih I, Ayre J, Spallek H. What generative AI means for trust in health communications. J Commun Healthc. 2023;16: 385-388.

3. The Social Research Centre. Life in Australia™ methods 2024. https://srcentre.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/LinA-recruitment-sample-and-allocation-description-20241023-final.pdf. (accessed October 2024).

4. Wallace LS, Rogers ES, Roskos SE, et al. Brief Report: Screening items to identify patients with limited health literacy skills. J Gen Intern Med. 2006;21: 874-877.

5. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), Australia Canberra: Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics; 2021. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release (accessed August 2024).

6. Australian Bureau of Statistics. National, state and territory population (Reference period December 2023). Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2024. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/national-state-and-territory-population/dec-2023. (accessed August 2024).

7. Singla A, Sukharevsky A, Yee L, et al. The state of AI in early 2024: Gen AI adoption spikes and starts to generate value. McKinsey and Company, 2024. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai.] (accessed August 2024).

8. Australian Commonwealth Department of Health. National Preventive Health Strategy 2021-2030. Canberra, Australian Commonwealth Department of Health, 2021. https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/national-preventive-health-strategy-2021-2030 (accessed August 2024).

Tables

Table 1. Participant characteristics (weighted to nationally representative population)*

Characteristic	Total weighted sample	Used ChatGPT for health questions in the past 6 months	Aware of ChatGPT but have not used it for health questions in the past 6 months	P value †	Have not heard of ChatGPT	P value ‡
Participants (unweighted)	2034	187	1523		324	
Age group (years)				<0.001		<0.001
18–24	11.3%	24.3%	11.5%		2.2%	
25–34	18.7%	26.3%	19.5%		9.6%	
35–44	17.8%	23.2%	18.6%		10.4%	
45–54	15.8%	13.6%	16.2%		15.0%	
55–64	14.6%	8.7%	14.3%		19.7%	
65+	21.8%	3.9%	19.9%		43.0%	
Gender				0.377		<0.001
Man or male	50.1%	52.7%	51.7%		40.6%	
Woman or female	48.4%	43.9%	46.8%		59.4%	
Non-binary /Prefers different term	1.5%	3.4%	1.5%		0.0%	
Regionality				0.007		<0.001
Capital city	67.1%	78.9%	68.6%		52.2%	
Rest of state	32.9%	21.1%	31.4%		47.8%	
Social disadvantage of place of residence				0.966		<0.001
Quintile 1 - Most	15.2%	14.7%	14.0%		21.5%	
Quintile 2	19.2%	16.3%	18.6%		23.9%	
Quintile 3	23.0%	24.0%	23.3%		20.6%	
Quintile 4	21.9%	23.5%	22.2%		19.7%	
Quintile 5 - Least	20.7%	21.5%	21.9%		14.3%	
Education				0.132		<0.001
Year 12 or less	23.9%	20.2%	22.2%		34.6%	
Certificates I to IV	25.4%	19.3%	23.9%		37.0%	

Adv diploma/diploma	17.8%	16.1%	18.7%		14.5%	
Bachelor	18.3%	28.5%	19.1%		8.1%	
Postgraduate	14.5%	15.8%	16.0%		5.8%	
Country of birth				0.006		0.025
Australian-born	70.1%	62.2%	70.3%		74.2%	
Mainly English Speaking	11.5%	8.6%	11.5%		13.2%	
Non-English Speaking	18.4%	29.2%	18.2%		12.6%	
Language spoken at home				<0.001		0.001
English	75.8%	62.0%	76.1%		83.7%	
Other language	24.2%	38.0%	23.9%		16.3%	
Identifies as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander		0.0%	0.0%	0.218	0.0%	0.65
Yes	2.4%	4.1%	2.2%		2.0%	
No	97.6%	95.9%	97.8%		98.0%	
Health literacy				0.001		0.95
Limited/marginal health literacy	10.9%	18.4%	9.4%		13.8%	
Adequate health literacy	89.1%	81.6%	90.6%		86.2%	
Total	100.0%	9.9%	74.8%		15.3%	

*Missing data for all variables is summarised in eTable 1. Data were not included in analyses if they were missing, not stated, or if the expected count for a cell was less than 5. Column percentages are presented. Absolute numbers are not possible for weighted analyses. All weighted counts are available in eTable 1.

†Comparison between people who are aware of ChatGPT and have/have not used it for health purposes.

‡Comparison between people who are/are not aware of ChatGPT.

Table 2. Reported reasons for using ChatGPT for health in the past 6 months

ChatGPT task*	n (%)
Categorised as 'higher risk' questions	
Find out what my symptoms mean (or the symptoms of someone I know)	70/187 (37.4%)
Find out what to do about a specific health issue that I or someone I know has	67/187 (35.8%)
Find out if I or someone I know should see a doctor	23/187 (12.3%)
Interpret results from blood tests or imaging	16/187 (8.6%)
Categorised as 'lower risk' questions	
Learn about a specific health condition	89/187 (47.6%)
Understand medical terms	65/187 (34.8%)
Learn more about a medicine, test or treatment (e.g. safety, side effects or interactions)	57/187 (30.5%)
Learn about healthy lifestyles	53/187 (28.3%)
Help create a plan to improve my health (or the health of someone I know)	44/187 (23.5%)

*ChatGPT tasks were not mutually exclusive (more than 1 could be selected).