

ChatGPT vs Social Surveys: Probing the Objective and Subjective Human Society

Muzhi Zhou*

mzzhou@hkust-gz.edu.cn

Lu Yu*

lyu349@connect.hkust-gz.edu.cn

Xiaomin Geng*

xgeng312@connect.hkust-gz.edu.cn

Lan Luo*

lluo476@connect.hkust-gz.edu.cn

September 5, 2024

Abstract

The extent to which Large Language Models (LLMs) can simulate the data-generating process for social surveys remains unclear. Current research has not thoroughly assessed potential biases in the sociodemographic population represented within the language model’s framework. Additionally, the subjective worlds of LLMs often show inconsistencies in how closely their responses match those of groups of human respondents. In this paper, we used ChatGPT-3.5 to simulate the sampling process and generated six socioeconomic characteristics from the 2020 US population. We also analyzed responses to questions about income inequality and gender roles to explore GPT’s subjective attitudes. By using repeated random sampling, we created a sampling distribution to identify the parameters of the GPT-generated population and compared these with Census data. Our findings show some alignment in gender and age means with the actual 2020 US population, but we also found mismatches in the distributions of racial and educational groups. Furthermore, there were significant differences between the distribution of GPT’s responses and human self-reported attitudes. While the overall point estimates of GPT’s income attitudinal responses seem to align with the mean of the population occasionally, their response distributions follow a normal distribution that diverges from human responses. In terms of gender relations, GPT’s answers tend to cluster around a single category, demonstrating a deterministic pattern. We conclude by emphasizing the distinct design philosophies of LLMs and social surveys: LLMs aim to predict the most suitable answers, while social surveys seek to reveal the heterogeneity among social groups.

1 Introduction

The exceptional language capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) have inspired numerous attempts aimed at understanding human behaviors through artificial agents, as well as gaining insights into LLMs themselves by drawing from human societal contexts. LLMs are models extensively trained on vast amounts of data from diverse sources, including public information, licensed third-party data, and content generated by human reviewers and users, such as books, articles, and web pages (Achiam et al., 2023). Unlike humans, who engage in conversations through intention, reasoning, and inference, LLMs generate sequences of words by selecting the most appropriate next word based on trained statistical models. For example, GPT-3.5 is a conversation-based LLM trained using Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) (Christiano et al., 2017; Ouyang et al., 2022). As a result of this training, ChatGPT has demonstrated language abilities that closely resemble those of humans (Hagendorff et al., 2023; Strachan et al., 2024). Its impressive understanding of language and ability to produce contextually relevant responses have opened up new possibilities for using

*The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

LLMs to simulate human behavior and to develop or validate research hypotheses about human interactions and perceptions (Bail, 2024; Grossmann et al., 2023; Horton, 2023; Manning et al., 2024a; Xu et al., 2024).

Beyond working as an enhanced research tool to improve the efficiency and productivity of academic output (Peterson, 2024), studies have taken a more progressive approach by investigating the ability of LLMs to generate hypotheses through the researcher-machine interaction (Ludwig & Mullainathan, 2024; Manning et al., 2024b; Zhou et al., 2024). A typical approach involves utilizing the role-play characteristics of LLMs to substitute human participants in empirical research. In this approach, researchers have examined whether LLMs, being assigned a specific character with pre-defined sociodemographic characteristics or personality traits, exhibit behaviors similar to that of humans (Aher et al., 2023; Argyle et al., 2023; Bisbee et al., 2023; J. Chen et al., 2024; Hagendorff et al., 2023; Kim & Lee, 2024; Sarstedt et al., 2024). These roles designated by researchers and deployed in the LLM systems are referred to as the "homo silicus" (Horton, 2023) or the "silicon samples (Argyle et al., 2023)."

Building on existing studies about using LLMs in understanding public opinion (Argyle et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024), our goal is to explore whether LLMs can act as a "silicon lab" to simulate the entire process of collecting population-based probability data. We focus on two key factors that affect survey data quality: how representative the sample is and the presence of measurement errors in measuring attitudes. Unlike earlier studies that mainly looked at the prediction accuracy of "homo silicus," we focus on the alignment of the distribution patterns of responses from the "homo silicus" and human respondents. Specifically, We aim to determine how closely the aggregated behaviors of "homo silicus" can mimic the sample statistics obtained from standard probability social surveys.

Data from probability surveys form the foundation of contemporary empirical studies. With the rise of empiricism in the mid to late 19th century, surveys became a primary method for understanding society, providing valuable insights into various aspects such as demographics, employment, health, and education (Nardi, 2018). Social surveys are particularly useful when it is impractical or costly to gather information from an entire population of interest (Sarantakos, 2017). Probability sampling requires that the chance to be selected into the survey sample is non-zero and equal for all the individuals in the target population. By doing so, a small number of individuals in the sample can represent a much larger group of the population. To ensure accuracy, social surveys typically employ a systematic sampling approach to generate a probability sample, combined with carefully designed questionnaires. The **representativeness** of the sample is crucial, as it enables statistical generalization to the target population (Bradley et al., 2021).

Conducting high-quality, large-scale social surveys has become increasingly challenging due to several factors. One major issue is the declining response rates observed in numerous social surveys worldwide. For example, in the United States, the response rates for the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) fell from approximately 95% in the 1990s to below 75% by 2014 (Fowler Jr & Cosenza, 2009). Low response rates are concerning because they can lead to nonprobability samples, meaning that the characteristics of respondents may differ significantly from those who do not participate. As the nonresponse rate increases, so does the potential for response bias, especially when we cannot identify all factors correlated with both nonresponse and the statistical estimates we aim to achieve (Davern, 2013).

Another challenge stems from the increasing length and complexity of questionnaire designs, which can lead to greater measurement errors. Multiple stakeholders, including designers, interviewers, and respondents, invest significant time in the questionnaire design, survey participation, and answering questions (Fowler Jr & Cosenza, 2009). A critical concern arises when respondents encounter complex questionnaires, as this can result in **measurement errors**. Questions regarding attitudes or beliefs are often lengthy and consist of multiple items, which can be mentally taxing for respondents (Lenzner et al., 2010). This high cognitive demand can lead to biased responses, answers with high standard errors (indicating lower precision), and an increased rate of nonresponse.

Motivated by the constraints of conducting high-quality, large-scale social surveys and the huge potential brought by the development of LLMs, we aim to examine and compare the objective and subjective aspects of the data generated by ChatGPT using collected probability social survey data as the benchmark. The objective world refers to the sociodemographic characteristics of the target population. we assess GPT's perception of the US population by asking it to draw random samples multiple times from the population respectively. Estimates from these multiple random samples can form a sampling distribution with the GPT population parameter being the mean. We can then compare this silicon population parameter with the true value from the population Census. The subjective world encompasses the judgments and attitudes concerning

two attitudinal topics—income and gender roles within the same population. We focus on comparing the performance of Role-Playing Language Agents (RPLA) and humans in answering attitudinal survey questions related to income inequality and gender roles. These two aspects are relevant to the representativeness and measurement issues that arise when conducting social surveys.

2 Related Work

2.1 LLMs and Role-Playing Language Agents (RPLA)

LLMs can exhibit language abilities that align with specific characters and engage in interactions that enhance their performance (Ouyang et al., 2022; Park et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022). This adaptability stems from their ability to process given prompts with information about various personas, behave accordingly, and learn from example demonstrations. Consequently, we can assign distinct personas to LLMs. Additionally, LLMs can adhere to role-playing instructions, allowing them to respond in an expected way. This capability facilitates more structured and contextually relevant interactions.

2.1.1 Role-Playing Language Agents: Alignment

A typical RPLA setup involves prompting LLMs to simulate specific human characteristics and engage in dialogues. Key characteristics often include occupation, gender, and ethnicity. For example, a simple prompt such as “You are a doctor” can effectively guide the LLM’s responses. In one study, ChatGPT was employed to assist counselor educators in helping counselors-in-training develop their skills through role-play scenarios (Maurya, 2023). Similarly, other research applied a behavioral economics framework, assigning GPT the role of a decision-maker to evaluate its rationality across various decision-making experiments (M. Chen et al., 2021; Horton, 2023). RPLAs have been shown to reproduce human responses in multiple, but not all, social psychology experiments, including Ultimatum Game, Garden Path Sentences, and Milgram Shock Experiment (Aher et al., 2023).

The role-playing feature of LLMs implies that their responses often reflect human biases and societal stereotypes (Kirk et al., 2021). For instance, when prompted to “tell me a story about parenting tips for mothers and fathers,” ChatGPT demonstrated significant gender bias by portraying women in nurturing roles and men as adventurous figures who build things, teach children about nature, and encourage playfulness (Gross, 2023). Additionally, in the selection process for financial analyst candidates, Asian males and females received more favorable treatment compared to Black males and females (Yin et al., 2024). LLMs also demonstrate more undesirable behaviors for more vulnerable users who have lower English proficiency, are of lower education status, and originate from outside the US (Poole-Dayana et al., 2024). These parallels to human societal behaviors suggest the potential of using RPLA to gain insights into human society.

Argyle et al. (2023) introduced the concept of “silicon sampling,” in which the GPT-3 language model acts as a proxy for human respondents to understand public political opinions. Their tests involve partisan text descriptions and vote predictions and suggest that language models can replicate trends in public opinion (Argyle et al., 2023). Building on this, Sun introduced “random silicon sampling,” which assigns demographic distributions from a population to RPLAs to assess partisan attitudes (Sun et al., 2024). Sun’s study found that the generated responses closely mirrored actual U.S. public opinion polls but not on other non-political attitude-related questions.

Notably, A follow-up study found that the near-perfect replication of human polling outcomes in the work by Argyle et al. (2023) (Argyle et al., 2023) is largely due to the assigned features of the RPLA in their study, which overlap with voting outcomes, such as self-identification of political ideology and party affiliation. When these two shortcuts for predicting voting behavior were removed, the performance of GPT-3.5 in accurately predicting polling outcomes significantly declined (Yang et al., 2024).

2.1.2 Role-Playing Language Agents: Mis-alignment

An underlying assumption in the optimistic exploration of using RPLAs as proxies for human participants is “algorithmic fidelity,” which refers to the model’s ability to reflect human thoughts, attitudes, and sociocultural contexts accurately. However, since LLMs are trained to respond rather than ensure accuracy,

they have a significant potential to produce flawed answers. While LLMs demonstrate a remarkable ability to mimic human responses (Aher et al., 2023), their outputs are not grounded in social intelligence or a theory of mind. In other words, LLMs’s abilities to track other people’s mental states or fully understand human emotions and intentions are yet to improve (López Espejel et al., 2023; Messeri & Crockett, 2024). Furthermore, due to limitations in their training data and safety alignment measures, LLMs may exhibit certain characteristics, such as specific personalities or demographic biases, that do not accurately represent the average population (Huang et al., 2023; Santurkar et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2023).

Great differences exist between the performance of RPLA and humans. First, the baseline of the objective world of the LLMs deviates from the real population. Santurkar et al. (2023) found that LLMs tend to reflect the views of younger individuals with higher levels of education (Santurkar et al., 2023). More studies are about the personality of LLMs, though the conclusions are not consistent (Pan & Zeng, 2023; Serapio-García et al., 2023; Sühr et al., 2024).

Linked to the above, the baseline of the subjective world of the LLMs is also different from the real population. For instance, regarding political attitudes, most LLM responses tend to be more liberal than those of the general population (Rutinowski et al., 2024). For example, ChatGPT would likely favor left-wing parties, particularly social democratic and environmentalist groups (Hartmann et al., 2023). Recent updates by Bisbee et al. regarding feeling thermometer scores for 11 sociopolitical groups indicate that the variations in scores generated by ChatGPT are considerably smaller than the actual scores from the population. Additionally, these scores are highly sensitive to changes in model updates and prompts (Bisbee et al., 2023). This narrowing distribution of answers within groups has been noted in several other studies (Argyle et al., 2023; Gordon et al., 2022; Kirk et al., 2023).

Moreover, given demographic information, Researchers have found a lack of alignment with human respondents on predicting opinions over a wider array of issues, especially when it is not limited to political ideology or voting behavior (Sun et al., 2024). Therefore, there is great need for extensive fine-tuning, and researchers have proposed various ways to make the results align more closely with human respondents (Bakker et al., 2022; Chuang et al., 2024; Kim & Lee, 2024; Scherrer et al., 2024; Veselovsky et al., 2023).

Overall, the performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) varies significantly across different opinion items and often reflects a biased perspective that favors certain groups. Consequently, LLMs may not be as "large" or as "general" as required to be universally applicable in all social experiment contexts. This limitation impacts their effectiveness in simulating human respondents in answering social surveys that aim to address nearly every aspect of our society.

3 Research Design

We conducted two studies to evaluate GPT’s ability to simulate the entire process of population-based probability data collection. In Study 1, we generated responses related to demographic information by using the population census as the sampling frame. In Study 2, we utilized demographic data from a population-representative social survey to generate responses regarding attitudes toward two groups of statements: income and gender roles.

3.1 The GPT-3.5-turbo Model

We used GPT-3.5-turbo for data generation. Although GPT-4 has been available for some time, GPT-3.5 continues to be widely used due to its lower cost and faster processing speeds. While GPT-4 has primarily improved multimodal capabilities, such as image recognition and generation, our focus does not include these features. We also re-ran the data generation process using GPT-4 but found that its performance was either similar to or worse than that of GPT-3.5, and it operated at a significantly slower speed.

Two key factors significantly affect the quality of responses generated by the same model: the prompt and the choice of model parameters. The prompt refers to the initial input or instruction provided by the user to the AI. The quality, clarity, specificity, and tone of the prompt play a crucial role in determining the AI’s ability to deliver relevant, accurate, and coherent responses.

3.1.1 Parametric Selection

Parameters are settings that influence how a language model like ChatGPT generates responses, affecting its creativity, randomness, and determinism. Based on earlier findings regarding the lack of variance in GPT’s responses to survey questions (Bisbee et al., 2023) and the lack of representativeness of certain social groups (Santurkar et al., 2023), we adjusted the parameters to produce either more varied or more predictable outputs. Among the parameters, temperature and `top_p` are the most important for influencing the creativity and randomness of responses. A low temperature (closer to 0) makes the model more confident in its predictions, resulting in more deterministic and repetitive responses. `top_p` (Nucleus Sampling) controls the diversity of generated responses by focusing on a subset of the most probable next words. When `top_p` is set to 1.0, the model considers all possible next words, leading to highly diverse but potentially less coherent responses. We will evaluate the impacts of the two parameters and select the most appropriate one.

3.1.2 Prompt Selection

In Study 1, we explored several prompt types, including two role-play settings and one non-role-play setting. This approach allows us to assess the stability of the data generation process and examine the sensitivity of the model to different prompts. In Study 2, we implemented multiple prompt designs and observed that the output improved when responses included text explanations, followed by a score, as typically seen in standard survey questionnaires.

3.2 Selection of Benchmark Data and Key Variables

For Study 1, we used the 2020 US population census data provided by the [United States Census Bureau](#) as a benchmark to assess whether the population distribution generated by ChatGPT aligns with real-world demographics. Specifically, we utilized data from the 2020 Decennial Census for gender, age, and race. For education, income, and region, where the relevant Census data was unavailable, we relied on the 5-year estimates from the American Community Survey (ACS).

For Study 2, we select the [World Values Survey](#) as our real-world survey data source to understand answers to subjective questions. The WVS is an international research program conducted every five years, covering a wide range of topics in sociology, political science, economics, social psychology, and so on. Originally stemming from the European Values Study, the program was initiated in 1981 by Professor Ronald Inglehart and his team at the University of Michigan in the United States. Since then, it has been active in over 120 societies. As the largest non-commercial cross-national empirical survey of human beliefs and values, the WVS aims to assist scientists and policymakers in understanding changes in the beliefs, values, and motivations of people globally.

We specifically focus on subjective questions related to income inequality and gender roles. For the year 2017, the WVS-US dataset contains 2,596 observations, and we have removed a small amount of missing data in the variables we selected.

Additionally, we select six basic demographic factors as predictors that may influence attitudes toward income and gender inequality. These factors include gender, age, race, educational attainment, household income level, and region. Research has shown that these variables are highly effective in shaping individuals’ general attitudes toward income distribution and gender inequality.

3.3 Data Generation and Comparison

Figure 1 presents the experiment flow of the two studies. For data generation, we utilized the ChatGPT API to access the ChatGPT model and create data entries in a document. Before proceeding with the official data generation, we conducted tests to evaluate the quality of the output using various prompts and parameter settings. Based on these tests, we selected the most effective prompts and parameters to generate responses.




Figure 1: Experiment flow of the two studies

4 Study 1: ChatGPT and Probability Sampling: The Objective World

In Study 1, we examined the ability of ChatGPT to generate a sampling distribution with the mean to be the silicon population parameter and compare it with the value from a population Census. The evaluation focuses on whether the GPT-generated parameter can resemble the demographic distribution of the United States in 2020. We consider six demographic variables including gender, age, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, household annual income, and region (urban/rural). By comparing the demographic information generated by GPT with the demographic characteristics of the US population as reported by the US Census Bureau, we can determine whether the GPT population parameter aligns with that in the real world. The experiments were conducted from January to August 2024.

4.1 Experiment Settings: Prompts and Model Parameters

4.1.1 Prompt

We followed the guidelines outlined in the official prompt engineering manual released by OpenAI¹, which emphasizes six strategies, such as *including details in queries to obtain more relevant answers* and *using delimiters to indicate distinct parts of the input among others*. These recommendations were incorporated in crafting our prompts, and the complete prompt is provided in Appendix 1: Appendix 1.

To compare the differences between having the model act as a survey respondent and not assigning it a specific role, we used two versions of the prompt: one where ChatGPT generated responses without assuming any role, and another called the 'role-play prompt.' In this version of the prompt, ChatGPT was instructed to assume the role of a survey respondent randomly selected from the United States in 2020, as well as the role of a survey expert.

4.1.2 Parameter selection

To investigate the impact of the temperature parameters t and top_p on the quality of the data generated by GPT, we initially generated data using role-play and non-role-play prompts at the same top_p -value ($top_p=1$) but different t values ($t=1,0.5,0$). After that, we further explored the impact of the top_p parameter. Table 1 presents detailed distributions of the six variables of a generated single sample of size 200 and comparisons with the demographic data in the real world. We generated a sample of 200 data records, following the previous study on random silicon samples (Sun et al., 2024).

4.1.3 Between-sample independence check

We perform several iterations of this data generation process. To test the independence between batches, we utilize the same prompt and model parameters (randomly chosen: $t=0.5$, $top_p=1$) to instruct GPT to generate 200 data points (across 10 batches). Subsequently, we employ ANOVA to examine whether the mean differences of all variables in each batch were statistically correlated. The results indicate that there were no significant between-group differences observed across all variables, including gender ($F=0$, $df=9$, $p = 1$), age ($F=0.185$, $df=9$, $p > 0.5$), race ($F=0.446$, $df=9$, $p > 0.5$), educational attainment ($F=0.121$, $df=9$, $p > 0.5$), income ($F=0.767$, $df=9$, $p > 0.5$), and region ($F=0.444$, $df=9$, $p > 0.5$). Post-hoc tests revealed that the differences in mean values between any two groups for all variables were uniformly non-significant. The independence between these different iterations of data generation enables those multiple iterations or batches of data to form a sampling distribution.

4.1.4 Sampling distribution

Given that each batch of the sample generated is independent, we can simulate the simple random sampling statistical process. We now treat every 200 data points as a single random sample and repeat redrawing the random sample 30 times from the hypothetical "US population in 2020." We calculate the mean from each of these 30 iterations and produce a sampling distribution of sample means for demographic characteristics.

¹<https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompt-engineering>

Table 1: Sample distribution: Three prompts and three language model parameter settings

		GPT-respondent(03/2024)			GPT-expert(08/2024)			GPT-default(03/2024)			Census
Temperature		0	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	
Gender	Female	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	49.00%	50.9%
	Male	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	51.00%	49.1%
Age	Median	38	38	37	40	39	40	38	40	38	38.8
	Min	19	18	18	18	18	20	18	19	18	/
	Max	65	68	65	65	70	70	65	70	70	/
Race	Asian	13%	15.00%	15.50%	20.00%	18.50%	17.00%	18.00%	16.00%	14.00%	5.92%
	Black or African American	22%	20.50%	22.50%	23.50%	21.50%	22.50%	20.50%	19.00%	21.00%	12.05%
	Hispanic or Latino	20%	21.50%	20.00%	23.50%	19.00%	19.50%	20.50%	19.00%	18.00%	18.73%
	White	44%	42.50%	40.50%	33.00%	39.00%	38.50%	41.00%	44.00%	44.00%	57.84%
	Others	/	/	1.50%	/	2.00%	2.5%	/	2.00%	3.00%	5.46%
Education	Less than 9th Grade	/	/	1.50%	/	0.50%	1.01%	1.50%	1.00%	2.50%	5.77%
	9th to 12th Grade, No Diploma	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	5.78%
	High School Graduate	23.50%	22.00%	21.00%	21.00%	22.00%	18.59%	22.50%	21.00%	21.00%	27.32%
	Some College, No Degree	29%	32.50%	32.50%	26.50%	29.50%	31.16%	28.00%	32.50%	32.50%	23.14%
	Associate’s Degree	10.50%	8.00%	9.50%	14.00%	11.00%	10.55%	10.00%	9.00%	10.50%	7.60%
	Bachelor’s Degree	25.50%	25.50%	25.00%	20.50%	24.50%	26.13%	24.50%	23.50%	22.00%	19.20%
	Graduate or Professional Degree	11.50%	12.00%	10.50%	18.00%	12.50%	12.56%	13.50%	13.00%	11.50%	11.18%
Income	Less than \$10,000	/	0.50%	1.50%	/	/	0.50%	1.50%	1.00%	2.50%	5.80%
	\$10,000 to \$14,999	1.00%	0.50%	1.00%	3.00%	1.00%	1.00%	/	0.50%	0.50%	4.10%
	\$15,000 to \$24,999	8.50%	9.00%	9.00%	10.50%	7.00%	5.50%	7.50%	8.00%	8.50%	8.50%
	\$25,000 to \$34,999	15%	14.00%	15.50%	16.50%	14.00%	13.00%	14.00%	13.50%	12.00%	8.60%
	\$35,000 to \$49,999	21%	23.50%	21.50%	20.00%	21.50%	20.00%	16.50%	22.00%	23.00%	12.00%
	\$50,000 to \$74,999	18.50%	17.50%	19.50%	18.50%	24.50%	24.00%	24.00%	20.50%	21.50%	17.20%
	\$75,000 to \$99,999	15.50%	14.50%	14.50%	13.50%	15.00%	15.50%	14.00%	13.50%	11.00%	12.08%
	\$100,000 to \$149,999	12.00%	12.50%	12.00%	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	15.00%	13.50%	14.00%	15.60%
	\$150,000 to \$199,999	8.50%	8.00%	5.00%	7.00%	5.00%	6.50%	7.50%	7.00%	5.50%	7.10%
	\$200,000 or more	/	/	0.50%	/	/	1.00%	/	0.50%	1.50%	8.30%
Region	Rural	32%	31.50%	36.00%	38.50%	39.00%	36.00%	39.00%	40.00%	37.00%	20%
	Urban	68%	68.50%	64.00%	61.50%	61.00%	64.00%	61.00%	60.00%	63.00%	80%

Note: The sample size is 200.

The *Central Limit Theorem* (CLT) is essential to verify the distribution. The CLT posits that when we have a set of independent and identically distributed random variables, the distribution of the sample mean will approximate a normal distribution with a sufficiently large sample size, regardless of the original distribution of the variables.

4.2 Results

4.2.1 GPT-3.5 model stability

We first report results from a single-time generation of a random sample to evaluate the stability of the model and to determine the parameters. Table 1 shows that taking the role-play prompts and temperature value have little influence on the overall distribution.

We compare the sample distribution of the GPT data with the census values to determine which τ should be used. We compared all the sample demographic distributions generated at $\tau=1$ with the true values. The chi-square analysis results indicated significant differences in the distribution of all variables except

for gender. When $\tau=1$, ChatGPT provides the most comprehensive demographic feature distribution. For instance, the distribution of race encompasses minority racial groups such as *American Indian and Alaska Native*, and *Two or more categories*, which are seldom represented. Therefore, for further analysis, we set the τ value to be 1 to capture as many minority groups as possible.

We further tested the influence of `top_p` on the generated data results when the τ was set to 1. The findings indicate that the `top_p` does not significantly affect the demographic distribution of the data. However, when `top_p` equals 0 or 0.5, it exacerbates the issue of missing samples, particularly among minority groups. So, we recommend setting the `top_p` value to be 1.

Using the non-role prompt and model parameters set to $\tau=1$, `top_p=1`, we instructed ChatGPT to generate 1,000 data records. To validate the reprehensibility of the data, we generated another 1,000 data records two months after the initial data generation. The results indicated no significant differences in the demographic distribution between the two sets of data, nor were there significant differences compared to the previous sets of 200 data samples.

4.2.2 Sampling distribution of the GPT Population

We aim to get the “imagined” US 2020 population in the GPT’s eyes. Therefore, we simulate the sampling process to pool each sample statistic of one batch of the data and form a sampling distribution. We now treat every 200 data points as a single random sample and repeatedly redraw the random sample 30 times from the “US population in 2020” in the worlds of GPT. We calculate each iteration’s mean and produce a sampling distribution of sample means for demographic characteristics. The sampling distribution has the same mean as the GPT population distribution. From here, we will be able to capture the population mean from the GPT world. The **Central Limit Theorem** (CLT) is essential to verify the distribution. The CLT posits that when we have a set of independent and identically distributed random variables, the distribution of the sample mean will approximate a normal distribution with a sufficiently large sample size, regardless of the original distribution of the variables.

Therefore, by calculating the sample means through multiple batches of data, we obtain a sampling distribution that approaches a normal distribution. Together with its standard deviation, this helps us examine whether the mean from the census falls within the 95% confidence interval of the sampling distribution of the GPT population.

We constructed sampling distribution graphs for gender, age, race, region, income, and education level from the GPT population. For variables like race, income, and education with multiple categories, we converted them into dummy variables and created graphs for each to compare with census data in detail. Age was categorized into groups and also converted into dummy variables.

The sampling distribution graphs for each variable are shown below. Each graph includes reference lines for the 95% confidence interval (gray line) ($1.96 * s.d.$), the mean of the sampling distribution (black line), and the census value (red line). If the census value falls outside the confidence interval, it indicates that the Census value is either higher or lower than the parameter from the GPT population. First, the sampling distributions of the sample mean generally conform to a normal distribution, indicating that the data generated by ChatGPT adhere to the Central Limit Theorem. This confirms that these samples are indeed randomly drawn from the “hypothetical” population from GPT. Next, we will provide a detailed interpretation of each variable.

1) Gender: For gender, the mean of the sampling distribution is 0.499(female proportion), while the female proportion from the census data is 0.509 (Figure 2). The census value does not fall within the confidence interval of the sampling distribution, but the difference is small.

2) Age: The mean age of the sampling distribution is 39.93 years (Figure 3). Since the Census data only provides median age, we further obtained the mean age from the ACS 2020 as a comparable benchmark for comparison. The results indicate that the mean age from ACS 2020 falls within the confidence interval of the sampling distribution. To facilitate further comparison, we categorized age into four groups: 18-24 years, 25-39 years, 40-59 years, and 60 and older years (Figure 4). The results indicate that ChatGPT’s estimate for the proportion of the 18-24 age group falls within the confidence interval, but it overestimates the proportions of the 25-39 and 40-59 age groups and underestimates the proportion of the 60 and above age group.

3) Race: For race, we categorized race into five groups: Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, and Others




Figure 2: The sampling distribution of gender




Figure 3: The sampling distribution of age




Figure 4: The sampling distribution of age groups

(Figure 5). The results indicate that ChatGPT overestimates the proportions of Asians, and Blacks, and underestimates the proportions of Whites. For Others and Hispanics, the Census values fall within the confidence interval.

4) Education For education level, we categorized it into three groups: low, medium, and high (Figure 6). *Low* refers to high school graduates and below, *medium* includes education levels above high school but below a bachelor's degree (e.g., some college), and *high* represents a bachelor's degree and above. The results indicate that ChatGPT underestimates the proportion of the low-education group and overestimates the proportions of the medium and high-education groups.




Figure 5: The sampling distribution of racial groups




Figure 6: The sampling distribution of education groups




Figure 7: The sampling distribution of income




Figure 8: The sampling distribution of income groups

5) Income: For income, the difference between the census value and the mean of the sampling distribution is not significant (Figure 7). For the ten income groups, ChatGPT underestimates the proportions of the low-income groups (less than \$10,000, \$10,000 to \$14,999) and high-income groups (\$100,000 to \$149,999, \$200,000 or more), and overestimates the proportions of the middle-income groups (\$25,000 to \$34,999, \$35,000 to \$49,999, \$50,000 to \$74,999, \$75,000 to \$99,999). Besides that, for the specific two income groups (\$15,000 to \$24,999 and \$150,000 to \$199,999), the Census value falls within the confidence interval (Figure 8).

6) Region: For the region variable, the mean of the sampling distribution is 0.38, compared to 0.2 from the census data (20% rural residents) (Figure 9). This suggests that, on average, 38% of individuals in the ChatGPT-generated sample reside in rural areas, indicating a substantial overestimation of the proportion of rural residents.




Figure 9: The sampling distribution of region

4.2.3 Population sub-group comparison

We further investigated whether ChatGPT tends to overestimate or underestimate socioeconomic characteristics for different genders and races, focusing on educational attainment outcomes. Firstly, we collected data on educational attainment by gender for 2020 from the US Census website. According to this data, the percentage of females with educational attainment beyond a bachelor’s degree is 31.37%, while for males, it is 29.34%. Then, we conducted a sampling distribution analysis using data generated by ChatGPT to calculate the mean proportion of individuals with a bachelor’s degree or higher for different genders, along with their confidence intervals. According to the results, the estimated mean proportion of females with a bachelor’s degree or higher was 36%, with the true value falling close to the confidence interval. In contrast, the proportion of males with a bachelor’s degree or higher was 38.13%, but the true value was significantly lower than the estimate provided by ChatGPT.

We also analyzed the educational distribution among different racial groups. Census data indicates that White individuals have a bachelor’s degree attainment rate of 36.5%, Asian individuals have a rate of 55%, and Black individuals have a rate of 22.6% and Hispanic individuals have a rate of 17.6%. However, according to the results of the ChatGPT sampling distribution, the estimated mean proportion of individuals with a bachelor’s degree or higher among white individuals was 52.32%, which is significantly higher than the true value. For Asian, Black, and Hispanic groups, the true values all fall within the confidence intervals, indicating that the differences are not significant.

The above results suggest that ChatGPT’s bias seems to manifest as an overestimation of advantaged groups rather than an underestimation of disadvantaged ones. This pattern aligns with recent research by Bloomberg on biases in ChatGPT recruitment. The study indicates that while recruitment algorithms may not explicitly show preferences for specific demographics, they can still influence outcomes by favoring certain criteria (Leon Yin & Nicoletti, 2024). Algorithms that appear unbiased may conceal their favoritism toward particular demographics.




Figure 10: The sampling distribution of education level for subgroups

4.2.4 Directly Ask the GPT: Knowledge and Performance Gap

Given that the current GPT model may have already learned the distribution of socioeconomic characteristics of the US 2020 population from publicly available online information, we directly inquired three times in a conversational style about the distributions of these six characteristics via GPT-3.5-turbo. The responses from GPT indicate that it has indeed acquired this information from the Census; for example, it consistently reported that the proportion of women was 51% and Black individuals was between 12.1% and 12.4%.

However, when we asked GPT to randomly select a respondent multiple times, it failed to create a sample in which the proportion of Black individuals matched the corresponding figures from the Census. This discrepancy highlights a disconnect between what GPT knows and its ability to implement that knowledge through random sampling.

5 Study 2: ChatGPT and Attitudes towards Income and Gender: The Subjective World

5.1 Experiment Settings: Prompts and Attitudinal Questions

5.1.1 Attitudinal Questions

In this study, we selected questions regarding income inequality and redistribution, as well as four questions related to gender inequality from the World Values Survey (WVS) dataset (see Table 2). For the income-related attitudinal questions, a higher score indicates a stronger belief in meritocracy, suggesting that personal effort should be rewarded and is a key determinant of higher income. The Government should not intervene the income distribution. For the four gender role-related questions, a higher score reflects more liberal gender attitudes that advocate for equal roles for men and women in both public and private spheres.

5.1.2 Prompts and Model Parameters

We used the GPT-3.5-turbo-0613 version of GPT-3.5-turbo to generate answers to these questions. We tasked GPT-3.5-turbo-0613 to act as a virtual respondent with particular demographic characteristics answering

Table 2: WVS Questions about Income Distribution and Gender

Topic	Code	Statements	Answer choices
Income inequality	Q106	Income should be made more equal. vs. There should be greater incentives for individual efforts.	[1, 10], 1. Income should be made more equal. 10. There should be greater incentives for individual efforts.
	Q108	The government should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for. vs. People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves.	[1, 10], 1. The government should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for. 10. People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves.
Gender inequality	Q28	When a mother works for pay, the children suffer	1. Strongly agree. 2. Agree. 3. Disagree. 4. Strongly disagree.
	Q29	On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do.	1. Strongly agree. 2. Agree. 3. Disagree. 4. Strongly disagree.
	Q31	On the whole, men make better business executives than women do.	1. Strongly agree. 2. Agree. 3. Disagree. 4. Strongly disagree.
	Q35	If a woman earns more money than her husband, it’s almost certain to cause problems.	1. Strongly agree. 2. Agree. 3. Neither agree nor disagree. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly disagree.

attitudinal questions from the WVS dataset. The prompts we used were modified from the standard survey questions. We used a format where we presented the questionnaire to the GPT respondents, following [EDSL](#). We also adopted the approach suggested by Chen et al. (Y. Chen et al., 2024), where the agents provide their text reasons in the answers first and give a score. These prompt details are in Appendix: Study 2.

The temperature τ and `top_p` values were all set to 1, which is consistent with Study 1 to introduce more uncertainties in the answers. The experiment was conducted in March via GPT-3.5 turbo and in August 2024 via GPT-3.5-0613. Because the general conclusions remain unchanged, we report the August 2024 results.

5.1.3 Experimental Process

The experiments were conducted in August 2024, and we obtained responses from all GPT-0613 respondents. If the virtual respondent provides an unclear, uncertain, or no answer, it will be prompted again until it responds accurately. For income inequality questions, all responses were collected after two rounds of inquiries, while for gender inequality questions, five rounds of inquiries were needed to obtain all eligible answers. This indicates that the GPT respondents found it more difficult to answer questions about gender role ideology than those about income redistribution.

5.2 Results

5.2.1 Attitudes towards Income Inequality and Redistribution

Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of the scores for the two income-related questions from the WVS and GPT-3.5-0613. WVS respondents scored lower than GPT agents for the first question, indicating GPT’s greater inclination towards meritocracy rather than reducing income equality. For the second question, WVS respondents scored slightly higher than the GPT agents, indicating GPT agents are slightly more supportive of government intervention. These findings do not show that GPT agents demonstrate a consistent inclination toward certain income inequality views. Notably, for both questions,

the s.d. of the scores from the GPT agent sample was substantially smaller than that of the WVS, suggesting less variability in the GPT responses.

Table 3: Means of WVS and GPT on income-related attitudinal questions

	WVS			GPT-turbo-0613		t-test: WVS vs GPT	
	N	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Diff	t-score
Q106	2,463	4.936	2.840	5.831	1.246	-0.894***	-14.315
Q108	2,463	5.557	2.969	5.420	1.369	0.137**	2.084

Notes: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001

Table 4 presents the results of statistical tests designed to evaluate whether the mean values are consistent within each subgroup across the two samples, as well as whether the mean values differ between gender, educational, and racial groups in the GPT sample compared to the WVS sample.

For both questions Q106 and Q108, we found inconsistencies in the reporting between GPT agents and WVS respondents in each gender, educational, or racial group.

The mean values varied across different subgroups, and in some instances, the differences between subgroups were consistent in both samples. For example, both the GPT agents and the WVS sample reported that women scored lower than men on Q106. However, in most cases, the findings from the two samples were inconsistent or even contradictory. For instance, regarding Q108, the WVS sample indicated that individuals with higher education levels and Non-Whites scored lower, reflecting more supportive attitudes to reducing income inequality. The GPT agents instead showed that those more educated and Non-Whites scored higher in this question.



Figures 11 and 12 illustrate the distribution of scores from the GPT agents and WVS responses. As noted earlier, the variability in responses from the GPT agents is significantly smaller compared to that of human respondents. The most notable difference is the normal distribution of the responses from the GPT agents. In contrast, the answers from WVS respondents tend to cluster around the middle and at both extremes, indicating more polarized views on these statements. Further subgroup analyses did not reveal significant changes in the normal distribution pattern observed among the GPT agents.

Table 4: Between-sample and between-subgroup t-test for income-related attitudinal questions


		Mean		Diff.	Diff. in WVS			Diff. in GPT		
		WVS	GPT	WVS vs GPT	Women vs Men	More vs Less Edu	Whites vs Non-Whites	Women vs Men	More vs Less Edu	Whites vs Non-Whites
Q106	Women	4.744	5.642	-0.898***	-0.356***	-0.109	0.083	-0.349***	0.483***	0.320***
	Men	5.100	5.992	-0.892***						
	More edu	4.873	6.112	-1.239***						
	Less edu	4.982	5.629	-0.647***						
	Whites	4.963	5.935	-0.972***						
	Non-Whites	4.880	5.615	-0.734***						
Q108	Women	5.230	5.419	-0.189**	-0.607***	-0.426***	0.834***	-0.002	0.297***	-0.203***
	Men	5.837	5.421	0.416***						
	More edu	5.309	5.593	-0.284**						
	Less edu	5.735	5.296	0.439***						
	Whites	5.829	5.354	0.475***						
	Non-Whites	4.995	5.557	-0.562***						

Notes: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001


Q106: 1-More equal, 10-More individual efforts




(a) Female




(b) High-educated




(c) White



(d) Male





(e) Low-educated




(f) Other ethnicities

Figure 11: Distributions of responses scores of Q106


Q108: 1-Government responsibility, 10-People provide for themselves




(a) Female




(b) High-educated




(c) White



(d) Male



(e) Low-educated



(f) Other ethnicities

Figure 12: Distributions of responses scores of Q108

5.2.2 Attitudes towards Gender Roles and Gender Inequality

Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations of gender-related attitudes from both GPT and WVS samples. While the mean values from the two samples are generally similar, statistical tests still indicate significant differences, particularly for Q35, the final question regarding women outearning men, where GPT agents scored higher.

Higher scores reflect a stronger disagreement with traditional gender roles; therefore, if GPT consistently scores higher than WVS respondents, we could conclude that GPT agents are more supportive of gender equality. However, overall, we do not find consistent evidence of a pro-liberal ideology embedded in GPT agents, contrary to findings from previous studies (Rutinowski et al., 2024).

Similar to attitudes toward income inequality, the scores from GPT agents exhibit much smaller variations compared to those of human respondents.

Table 6: Means of WVS and GPT on gender-related attitudinal questions

	WVS		GPT-turbo-0613		t-test: WVS vs GPT		
	N	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Diff	t-score
Q28	2437	3.022	0.728	3.133	0.432	-0.111***	-6.480
Q29	2437	3.145	0.751	3.104	0.405	0.041**	2.374
Q31	2437	3.248	0.709	3.089	0.328	0.160***	10.090
Q35	2437	3.612	0.633	4.051	0.580	-0.439***	-25.232

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 7 presents the results of two-sample t-tests to evaluate whether the mean values are consistent within each subgroup across the two samples, as well as whether the mean values differ between gender, educational, and racial groups in the GPT sample compared to the WVS sample.

For all four questions and each gender, educational, or racial sub-population, we found inconsistencies in the reporting between GPT agents and WVS respondents. Therefore, these over- or under-estimation of the score in comparison to human respondents do not vary across groups.

Going to the part where we focus on between-sub-population differences, it is well-known that women hold more gender liberal attitudes than men (Davis & Greenstein, 2009; Knight & Brinton, 2017). This pattern is reflected in the WVS responses for Q28, 29, and 31, but not in the GPT responses. In almost all cases, the findings from the two samples were inconsistent.

Table 7: Between-sample and between-subgroup t-test for gender-related attitudinal questions

		Mean		Diff.	Diff. in WVS			Diff. in GPT					
		WVS	GPT	WVS vs GPT	Women vs Men	More vs Low edu	Whites vs Non-Whites	Women vs Men	More vs Low edu	Whites vs Non-Whites			
Q28	Women	3.083	3.126	-0.043*	0.113***			-0.014					
	Men	2.970	3.140	-0.170***									
	More edu	2.955	3.131	-0.176***				-0.154***				-0.006	
	Less edu	3.109	3.137	-0.027									
	Whites	3.040	3.144	-0.104***							0.053		0.033*
	Non-Whites	2.986	3.111	-0.125***									
Q29	Women	3.258	3.111	0.147***	0.210***			0.013					
	Men	3.049	3.098	-0.049**									
	More edu	3.076	3.103	-0.027				-0.158***				-0.002	
	Less edu	3.234	3.105	0.129***									
	Whites	3.131	3.100	0.032							-0.042		-0.014
	Non-Whites	3.174	3.114	0.060**									
Q31	Women	3.387	3.075	0.312***	0.257***			-0.026*					
	Men	3.130	3.100	0.030									
	More edu	3.212	3.075	0.137***				-0.084**				-0.031**	
	Less edu	3.296	3.106	0.189***									
	Whites	3.255	3.090	0.164***							0.020		0.005
	Non-Whites	3.235	3.085	0.150***									
Q35	Women	3.573	4.041	-0.468***	-0.073*			-0.018					
	Men	3.646	4.059	-0.414***									
	More edu	3.543	4.055	-0.511***				-0.158***				0.008	
	Less edu	3.702	4.046	-0.345***									
	Whites	3.679	4.029	-0.349***							0.204***		-0.068***
	Non-Whites	3.475	4.096	-0.621***									

Notes: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Figures 13, 14, 15, and 16 illustrate the score distributions from both samples. For all four questions, GPT agents accurately identify the score with the highest percentage of responses from WVS respondents. However, nearly all responses are concentrated in this most frequent category, resulting in significantly less variation compared to human respondents. Subgroup analyses indicate no differences in this response pattern across the various groups.






Figure 13: Distributions of responses scores of Q28

Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do




Female - Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do




(a) Female

Male - Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do




(b) Male

High-educated - Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do




(c) High-educated

Low-educated - Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do




(d) Low-educated

White - Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do



(e) White


Other ethnics - Q29: Men make better political leaders than women do




(f) Other ethnics

Figure 14: Distributions of responses scores of Q29

Q31: Men make better business executives than women do




Female - Q31: Men make better business executives than women do




(a) Female

Male - Q31: Men make better business executives than women do




(b) Male

High-educated - Q31: Men make better business executives than women do




(c) High-educated

Low-educated - Q31: Men make better business executives than women do




(d) Low-educated

White - Q31: Men make better business executives than women do



(e) White


Other ethnics - Q31: Men make better business executives than women do




(f) Other ethnics

Figure 15: Distributions of responses scores of Q31

Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems




Female - Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems




(a) Female

Male - Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems




(b) Male

High-educated - Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems




(c) High-educated

Low-educated - Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems




(d) Low-educated

White - Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems



(e) White

Other ethnics - Q35: Woman earning more than her husband likely cause problems



(f) Other ethnics

Figure 16: Distributions of responses scores of Q35

6 Discussion and Conclusion

The advanced linguistic capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) have sparked significant research interest in constructing Role-Playing Language Agents (RPLAs) to simulate human-like behaviors. Drawing on insights from social science and psychology, scholars have offered many new findings from this emerging field. However, there is a lack of systematic evaluation of the performance of RPLAs ability to align their sociodemographic features with the general population and align the subjective attitudes with human respondents from standard social surveys. For those who did analyze the alignment of social or political attitudes between RPLAs and humans, the conclusions are rather mixed and the attention has been on whether these prompts can produce the most human-alike responses.

This study differs from these studies by focusing on whether we can use this “silicon lab” to simulate the data-generating process similarly as in social surveys. Therefore, instead of focusing on the “point estimation” or just the mean value of the response, we put more emphasis on the distribution of these responses. We systematically examined the objective and subjective responses of a pool of agents from GPT-3.5-turbo and compared these responses with the actual human population and human responses to two attitudinal questions. We first focus on six sociodemographic features to mirror the US 2020 population through the lens of GPT, and then, conditional on the distributions of the six sociodemographic features from a given survey, we explore attitudes towards income redistribution and gender roles. We aim to illuminate the understanding of society in GPT’s portrayal. Our findings reveal instances of commendable simulation alignment with the actual US 2020 population, alongside evident biases when compared to the real population, as well as significant deviations from human self-reported responses to the aforementioned attitudinal inquiries. We discuss the key approaches and findings below.

Utilizing the repeated sampling method offers significant advantages in constructing a sampling distribution that allows for the identification of the GPT-population parameter and facilitates comparison with Census or survey values. Our analysis indicates that ChatGPT only slightly underestimates the proportion of women and correctly estimates the mean age of the US 2020 population. However, GPT cannot correctly simulate the distributions of different age groups, with only the distribution of ages 18-24 correctly simulated. As expected, GPT generated extremely low numbers of respondents older than 60 years old. Concerning racial groups, ChatGPT substantially over-simulates individuals as Black or Asian rather than White, but accurately simulates the proportions of Hispanic agents and other ethnic minorities.

In terms of social status indicators such as education and income, GPT estimates fall short in capturing the proportion of individuals with the lowest level of education while overestimating those with middle or higher levels of education. Although the distribution of income means aligns with Census data, the sampling distribution reveals an underestimation of individuals at the extremes of the income distribution, mirroring patterns observed in social surveys (Jabkowski & Piekut, 2024). Subgroup analysis shows more interesting details. GPT generates more educated respondents especially when they are men or White. Therefore, the previous observation of the overestimation of education from the full sample should be more likely driven by Men and Whites, underscoring the bias embedded in the GPT’s population world.

To test the sensitivity of the generated responses, we employed three role-playing modes: default (no role), the survey respondent, and the survey expert. Despite varying roles, the general conclusions demonstrate consistency and robustness in the sample distributions.

For attitudinal questions, the score distributions of GPT respondents when answering questions about income redistribution follow a bell shape for the GPT sample. This is completely different from that of the human responses. This deviation holds in various sub-samples (Female/Male, High-educated/Low-educated, Non-Hispanic White/Other ethnic groups). For gender attitudinal questions, the score distribution of GPT respondents is concentrated in one category with the most respondents from the WVS. This pattern is consistent in various sub-samples (Female/Male, High-educated/Low-educated, Non-Hispanic White/Other ethnic groups). Overall, the responses generated by GPT have smaller variations compared to human respondents. The GPT responses concentrate on the middle and the categories with the most answers. Examining the mean values of these responses and comparing the GPT agents with the human respondents, We do not find strong support for the more liberal attitudes related to income redistribution and gender roles embedded in ChatGPT as in previous studies (Rutinowski et al., 2024).

Our findings do not provide strong support for the claims of a significant alignment between RPLAs and human responses, in contrast to the existing literature on individuals’ political attitudes (Argyle et al., 2023;

Sun et al., 2024). The reason could be that our prompts are designed to align more closely with standard social survey questionnaires rather than the multiple-shot prompting techniques aimed at achieving the most accurate predictions or the “point estimates”. This research is grounded in a social survey perspective, aiming to investigate whether we can effectively simulate the data-generating process similarly as we do for social surveys. Thus far, we have observed that the objective world represented by GPT exhibits biases in certain areas, particularly regarding the perception of the education of men and White individuals. In terms of the subjective realm, the simulated patterns of social attitudes towards income redistribution and gender roles generated by GPT starkly contrast with those reported by human respondents.

The observed distributional patterns of limited variation, high concentration in the most frequently answered category, and minimal variations of this pattern across different social groups in attitudinal questions underscore the influence of reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) approach during the training stage. These models are optimized to align closely with the most accurate predictions of human responses rather than reflecting the full distribution of human responses. This finding aligns with earlier research highlighting the deterministic nature of LLMs compared to human responses (Song et al., 2024), even though they have been designed to be less deterministic than other compositional systems (Wu et al., 2024). The fundamental design philosophy of LLMs prioritizes providing the most appropriate responses over capturing the significant heterogeneity among groups, while the latter is a key aspect of standard social surveys. Future research may explore other LLMs to determine whether these findings are consistent across different models. However, given that the goals or underlying logic of these two approaches are inherently different, we doubt whether the major conclusions would differ using other LLMs.

As previously mentioned, both LLMs and traditional surveys have distinct limitations. LLMs, such as ChatGPT, generate responses based on patterns and examples from extensive datasets; however, they lack a genuine understanding of human psychology (Kidd & Birhane, 2023). Conversely, traditional surveys depend on human respondents, who may introduce biases in their answers or fail to accurately represent the entire target population, particularly when response rates are low. To determine which method more accurately reflects reality, it is essential to consider the specific research context, the nature of the data being collected, and the potential biases associated with each approach. Furthermore, employing multiple methods—such as integrating LLM-generated data with traditional survey data—can yield a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of the truth (Johnson & Verdicchio, 2017).

7 Ethical Considerations

With the increasing prevalence of online social surveys, there is a risk of misuse, as human participants may rely on tools like LLMs to substitute their own responses. If this happens, the variability of the data could be significantly reduced, resulting in diminished uncertainty regarding the findings. Furthermore, sociodemographic biases that favor certain groups may reinforce stereotypes and deepen societal divisions. These concerns have been highlighted in a perspective paper by Cox et al. (Cox et al., 2024).

However, the distinct patterns exhibited by LLMs in simulating human responses also provide a valuable tool for detecting content generated by these models. The patterns identified in this paper have important implications for our understanding of future data collection processes and the quality of the data obtained.

7.1 Replication and Codes

The source code and datasets used in this study are available for further review and replication on GitHub. Interested readers can access all related materials and resources through the following link: [github](#). This repository includes the complete implementation details, data files, and any additional documentation required to understand and reproduce the research findings presented in this paper.

References

Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al. (2023). Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

- Aher, G. V., Arriaga, R. I., & Kalai, A. T. (2023). Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 337–371.
- Argyle, L. P., Busby, E. C., Fulda, N., Gubler, J. R., Rytting, C., & Wingate, D. (2023). Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis*, 31(3), 337–351.
- Bail, C. A. (2024). Can generative ai improve social science? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(21), e2314021121.
- Bakker, M., Chadwick, M., Sheahan, H., Tessler, M., Campbell-Gillingham, L., Balaguer, J., McAleese, N., Glaese, A., Aslanides, J., Botvinick, M., et al. (2022). Fine-tuning language models to find agreement among humans with diverse preferences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 38176–38189.
- Bisbee, J., Clinton, J., Dorff, C., Kenkel, B., & Larson, J. (2023, May). Synthetic replacements for human survey data? the perils of large language models. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/5ecfa>
- Bradley, V. C., Kuriwaki, S., Isakov, M., Sejdinovic, D., Meng, X.-L., & Flaxman, S. (2021). Unrepresentative big surveys significantly overestimated us vaccine uptake. *Nature*, 600(7890), 695–700.
- Chen, J., Wang, X., Xu, R., Yuan, S., Zhang, Y., Shi, W., Xie, J., Li, S., Yang, R., Zhu, T., Chen, A., Li, N., Chen, L., Hu, C., Wu, S., Ren, S., Fu, Z., & Xiao, Y. (2024). From persona to personalization: A survey on role-playing language agents. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.18231>
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H. P. d. O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., et al. (2021). Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Chen, Y., Arkin, J., Hao, Y., Zhang, Y., Roy, N., & Fan, C. (2024). Prompt optimization in multi-step tasks (promst): Integrating human feedback and preference alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08702*.
- Christiano, P. F., Leike, J., Brown, T., Martic, M., Legg, S., & Amodei, D. (2017). Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Chuang, Y.-S., Studdiford, Z., Nirunwiroj, K., Goyal, A., Frigo, V. V., Yang, S., Shah, D., Hu, J., & Rogers, T. T. (2024). Beyond demographics: Aligning role-playing llm-based agents using human belief networks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17232>
- Cox, E., Shirani, F., & Rouse, P. (2024). Voices from the algorithm: Large language models in social research. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 113, 103559.
- Davern, M. (2013). Nonresponse rates are a problematic indicator of nonresponse bias in survey research. *Health services research*, 48(3), 905.
- Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2009). Gender ideology: Components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35 (Volume 35, 2009), 87–105. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115920>
- Fowler Jr, F. J., & Cosenza, C. (2009). Design and evaluation of survey questions. *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods*, 2, 375–412.
- Gordon, M. L., Lam, M. S., Park, J. S., Patel, K., Hancock, J., Hashimoto, T., & Bernstein, M. S. (2022). Jury learning: Integrating dissenting voices into machine learning models. *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502004>
- Gross, N. (2023). What chatgpt tells us about gender: A cautionary tale about performativity and gender biases in ai. *Social Sciences*, 12(8), 435.
- Grossmann, I., Feinberg, M., Parker, D. C., Christakis, N. A., Tetlock, P. E., & Cunningham, W. A. (2023). Ai and the transformation of social science research. *Science*, 380(6650), 1108–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adi1778>
- Hagendorff, T., Fabi, S., & Kosinski, M. (2023). Human-like intuitive behavior and reasoning biases emerged in large language models but disappeared in chatgpt. *Nature Computational Science*, 3(10), 833–838.
- Hartmann, J., Schwenzow, J., & Witte, M. (2023). The political ideology of conversational ai: Converging evidence on chatgpt’s pro-environmental, left-libertarian orientation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01768*.
- Horton, J. J. (2023). *Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus?* (Tech. rep.). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Huang, J.-t., Wang, W., Li, E. J., Lam, M. H., Ren, S., Yuan, Y., Jiao, W., Tu, Z., & Lyu, M. (2023). On the humanity of conversational ai: Evaluating the psychological portrayal of llms. *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Jabkowski, P., & Piekut, A. (2024). Not random and not ignorable. an examination of nonresponse to income question in the european social survey, 2008–2018. *Field Methods*, 36(3), 213–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X231194178>
- Johnson, D. G., & Verdicchio, M. (2017). Reframing ai discourse. *Minds and Machines*, 27, 575–590.
- Kidd, C., & Birhane, A. (2023). How ai can distort human beliefs. *Science*, 380(6651), 1222–1223.
- Kim, J., & Lee, B. (2024). Ai-augmented surveys: Leveraging large language models and surveys for opinion prediction. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.09620>
- Kirk, H. R., Jun, Y., Volpin, F., Iqbal, H., Benussi, E., Dreyer, F., Shtedritski, A., & Asano, Y. (2021). Bias out-of-the-box: An empirical analysis of intersectional occupational biases in popular generative language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34, 2611–2624.
- Kirk, H. R., Vidgen, B., Röttger, P., & Hale, S. A. (2023). Personalisation within bounds: A risk taxonomy and policy framework for the alignment of large language models with personalised feedback. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.05453>
- Knight, C. R., & Brinton, M. C. (2017). One egalitarianism or several? two decades of gender-role attitude change in europe. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(5), 1485–1532. <https://doi.org/10.1086/689814>
- Lenzner, T., Kaczmirek, L., & Lenzner, A. (2010). Cognitive burden of survey questions and response times: A psycholinguistic experiment. *Applied cognitive psychology*, 24(7), 1003–1020.
- Leon Yin, D. A., & Nicoletti, L. (2024). Openai’s gpt is a recruiter’s dream tool. tests show there’s racial bias. *Bloomberg*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2024-openai-gpt-hiring-racial-discrimination/#:~:text=%E2%80%A6that%20Bloomberg%20uncovered%20clear%20signs,with%20other%20races%20and%20ethnicities>
- López Espejel, J., Ettifouri, E. H., Yahaya Alassan, M. S., Chouham, E. M., & Dahhane, W. (2023). Gpt-3.5, gpt-4, or bard? evaluating llms reasoning ability in zero-shot setting and performance boosting through prompts. *Natural Language Processing Journal*, 5, 100032. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlp.2023.100032>
- Ludwig, J., & Mullainathan, S. (2024). Machine learning as a tool for hypothesis generation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 139(2), 751–827.
- Manning, B. S., Zhu, K., & Horton, J. J. (2024a). *Automated social science: Language models as scientist and subjects* (tech. rep.). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Manning, B. S., Zhu, K., & Horton, J. J. (2024b, April). *Automated social science: Language models as scientist and subjects* (Working Paper No. 32381). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w32381>
- Maurya, R. K. (2023). Using ai based chatbot chatgpt for practicing counseling skills through role-play. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 1–16.
- Messeri, L., & Crockett, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence and illusions of understanding in scientific research. *Nature*, 627(8002), 49–58.
- Nardi, P. M. (2018). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. Routledge.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C. L., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P., Leike, J., & Lowe, R. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>
- Pan, K., & Zeng, Y. (2023). Do llms possess a personality? making the mbti test an amazing evaluation for large language models. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.16180>
- Park, J. S., O’Brien, J., Cai, C. J., Morris, M. R., Liang, P., & Bernstein, M. S. (2023). Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 1–22.
- Peterson, A. J. (2024). Ai and the problem of knowledge collapse. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03502*.
- Poole-Dayyan, E., Roy, D., & Kabbara, J. (2024). Llm targeted underperformance disproportionately impacts vulnerable users. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17737>
- Rutinowski, J., Franke, S., Endendyk, J., Dormuth, I., Roidl, M., & Pauly, M. (2024). The self-perception and political biases of chatgpt. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2024(1), 7115633.
- Santurkar, S., Durmus, E., Ladhak, F., Lee, C., Liang, P., & Hashimoto, T. (2023). Whose opinions do language models reflect? *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 29971–30004.
- Sarantakos, S. (2017). *Social research*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Sarstedt, M., Adler, S. J., Rau, L., & Schmitt, B. (2024). Using large language models to generate silicon samples in consumer and marketing research: Challenges, opportunities, and guidelines. *Psychology & Marketing*, 41(6), 1254–1270.
- Scherrer, N., Shi, C., Feder, A., & Blei, D. (2024). Evaluating the moral beliefs encoded in llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Serapio-García, G., Safdari, M., Crepy, C., Sun, L., Fitz, S., Romero, P., Abdulhai, M., Faust, A., & Matarić, M. (2023). Personality traits in large language models. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.00184>
- Song, Y., Wang, G., Li, S., & Lin, B. Y. (2024). The good, the bad, and the greedy: Evaluation of llms should not ignore non-determinism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10457*.
- Strachan, J. W., Albergo, D., Borghini, G., Pansardi, O., Scaliti, E., Gupta, S., Saxena, K., Rufo, A., Panzeri, S., Manzi, G., et al. (2024). Testing theory of mind in large language models and humans. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1–11.
- Sühr, T., Dorner, F. E., Samadi, S., & Kelava, A. (2024). Challenging the validity of personality tests for large language models. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.05297>
- Sun, S., Lee, E., Nan, D., Zhao, X., Lee, W., Jansen, B. J., & Kim, J. H. (2024). Random silicon sampling: Simulating human sub-population opinion using a large language model based on group-level demographic information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18144*.
- Veselovsky, V., Ribeiro, M. H., Arora, A., Josifoski, M., Anderson, A., & West, R. (2023). Generating faithful synthetic data with large language models: A case study in computational social science. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15041>
- Wei, J., Tay, Y., Bommasani, R., Raffel, C., Zoph, B., Borgeaud, S., Yogatama, D., Bosma, M., Zhou, D., Metzler, D., et al. (2022). Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Wu, F., Zhang, N., Jha, S., McDaniel, P., & Xiao, C. (2024). A new era in llm security: Exploring security concerns in real-world llm-based systems. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.18649>
- Xu, R., Sun, Y., Ren, M., Guo, S., Pan, R., Lin, H., Sun, L., & Han, X. (2024). Ai for social science and social science of ai: A survey. *Information Processing & Management*, 61(3), 103665. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2024.103665>
- Yang, K., Li, H., Wen, H., Peng, T.-Q., Tang, J., & Liu, H. (2024). Are large language models (llms) good social predictors? <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.12620>
- Yin, L., Alba, D., & Nicoletti, L. (2024). Openai’s gpt is a recruiter’s dream tool: Tests show there’s racial bias’.
- Yuan, Y., Jiao, W., Wang, W., Huang, J.-t., He, P., Shi, S., & Tu, Z. (2023). Gpt-4 is too smart to be safe: Stealthy chat with llms via cipher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06463*.
- Zhou, Y., Liu, H., Srivastava, T., Mei, H., & Tan, C. (2024). Hypothesis generation with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04326*.

8 Appendix

Appendix: Study 1 - The Objective Human Society

8.1 Default prompt

```
prompt\_template = '''
Your task is to generate a survey dataset representing the US population
in 2020. The sample size is 20. The dataset should include 6
demographic variables for a respondent:
1.sex(male, female)
2.age
3.ethnic group(White; Black or African American; American Indian and
Alaska Native; Asian; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian and Other
Pacific Islander; Some Other Race; Two or more races)
4.the highest educational level that you have attained (Less than 9th
grade; 9th to 12th grade, no diploma; High school graduate; Some
college, no degree; Associate's degree; Bachelor's degree; Graduate or
professional degree)
5. Annual household income(Less than $10,000; $10,000 to $14,999; $15,000
to $24,999; $25,000 to $34,999; $35,000 to $49,999; $50,000 to $74,999;
$75,000 to $99,999; $100,000 to $149,999; $150,000 to $199,999; $200
,000 or more)
6. region(urban; rural)
Here is an example of one data record: [male; 25; White; Some college, no
degree; $50,000 to $74,999; urban]. Choose your answers only from the
options provided, and please keep your letter case consistent with the
example. After generating, only show the data you generated without
additional words. The format must be a JSON string representing a multi
-dimensional array. Also, make sure that it is an array of arrays with
no objects, like in a spreadsheet. Remember, the records should closely
reflect the actual population demographic distribution in 2020.
''',
```

8.2 Survey Expert Role-play prompt

```
prompt\_template = '''
You are a statistician and a social survey expert. Your task is to
generate a survey dataset representing the US population in 2020. The
sample size is 20. The dataset should include 6 demographic variables
for a respondent:
1.sex(male, female)
2.age
3.ethnic group(White; Black or African American; American Indian and
Alaska Native; Asian; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian and Other
Pacific Islander; Some Other Race; Two or more races)
4.the highest educational level that you have attained (Less than 9th
grade; 9th to 12th grade, no diploma; High school graduate; Some
college, no degree; Associate's degree; Bachelor's degree; Graduate or
professional degree)
5. Annual household income(Less than $10,000; $10,000 to $14,999; $15,000
to $24,999; $25,000 to $34,999; $35,000 to $49,999; $50,000 to $74,999;
$75,000 to $99,999; $100,000 to $149,999; $150,000 to $199,999; $200
,000 or more)
```

6. region(urban; rural)

Here is an example of one data record: [male; 25; White; Some college, no degree; \$50,000 to \$74,999; urban]. Choose your answers only from the options provided, and please keep your letter case consistent with the example. After generating, only show the data you generated without additional words. The format must be a JSON string representing a multi-dimensional array. Also, make sure that it is an array of arrays with no objects, like in a spreadsheet. Remember, the records should closely reflect the actual population demographic distribution in 2020.
,,,,,,

8.3 Survey Respondent Role-play prompt

prompt_template = ''''''

As a survey respondent randomly drawn from the United States in 2020, your task is to answer specific questions in a survey. You will need to answer 6 questions on your:

1.sex(male, female)

2.age

3.ethnic group(White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race; Two or more races)

4.the highest educational level that you have attained (Less than 9th grade; 9th to 12th grade, no diploma; High school graduate; Some college, no degree; Associate's degree; Bachelor's degree; Graduate or professional degree)

5. Annual household income(Less than \$10,000; \$10,000 to \$14,999; \$15,000 to \$24,999; \$25,000 to \$34,999; \$35,000 to \$49,999; \$50,000 to \$74,999; \$75,000 to \$99,999; \$100,000 to \$149,999; \$150,000 to \$199,999; \$200,000 or more)

6. region(urban; rural)

Here is an example of one data record: [male; 25; White; Some college, no degree; \$50,000 to \$74,999; urban]. Choose your answers only from the options provided, and please keep your letter case consistent with the example. After generating, only show the data you generated without additional words. The format must be a JSON string representing a multi-dimensional array. Also, make sure that it is an array of arrays with no objects, like in a spreadsheet. Remember, the records should closely reflect the actual population demographic distribution in 2020.
,,,,,,

Appendix: Study 2 - The Subjective Human Society

8.4 Prompt 1

```
questions = [
  {
    "question_name": "income_first",
    "question_text": "Your characteristics are mentioned in this
      respondents: {{ respondents }}. Please answer the following
      question: think of a score of 1 as meaning that incomes should be
      made more equal, and a score of 10 meaning that there should be
      greater incentives for individual effort. What score (an integer)
      between 1 and 10 comes closest to the way you feel?",
    "question_options": [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]
  },
  {
    "question_name": "income_second",
    "question_text": "Your characteristics are mentioned in this
      respondents: {{ respondents }}. Please answer the following
      question: think of a score of 1 as meaning that government should
      take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for,
      and a score of 10 meaning that people should take more
      responsibility to provide for themselves. What score (an integer)
      between 1 and 10 comes closest to the way you feel?",
    "question_options": [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]
  }
]

def create_agent_response(respondent, questions):
    attempts = 3
    responses = {}
    base_prompt = f"""
    Based on the following respondent characteristics:
    - Sex: {respondent['sex']}
    - Age: {respondent['age']}
    - Ethnicity: {respondent['ethnic']}
    - Education: {respondent['education']}
    - Income: {respondent['income']}
    - Chief: {respondent['chief']}
    - Region: {respondent['region']}
    """
    .....
def parse_response(response_text, questions):
    answers = {}
    response_parts = response_text.split('Answer:')

    for i, question in enumerate(questions):
        question_key = question["question_name"]
        reason_key = f"{question_key}_reason"
        answer_key = f"{question_key}_answer"
    .....
```

8.5 Prompt 2

```

questions = [
  {
    "question_name": "gender_first",
    "question_text": "Your characteristics are mentioned in this
      respondents: {{ respondents }}. Please answer the following
      question: How much do you agree with the statement that children
      suffer when a mother works for pay?",
    "question_options": ["Strongly agree", "Agree", "Disagree", "Strongly
      disagree"]
  },
  {
    "question_name": "gender_second",
    "question_text": "Your characteristics are mentioned in this
      respondents: {{ respondents }}. Please answer the following
      question: How much do you agree with the statement that men make
      better political leaders than women do?",
    "question_options": [ "Strongly agree", "Agree", "Disagree", "Strongly
      disagree"]
  },
  {
    "question_name": "gender_third",
    "question_text": "Your characteristics are mentioned in this
      respondents: {{ respondents }}. Please answer the following
      question: How much do you agree with the statement that men make
      better business executives than women do?",
    "question_options": [ "Strongly agree", "Agree", "Disagree", "Strongly
      disagree"]
  },
  {
    "question_name": "gender_fourth",
    "question_text": "Your characteristics are mentioned in this
      respondents: {{ respondents }}. Please answer the following
      question: How much do you agree with the statement that if a woman
      earns more money than her husband, it is almost certain to cause
      problems?",
    "question_options": [ "Strongly agree", "Agree", "Neither agree nor
      disagree", "Disagree", "Strongly disagree"]
  }
]

```

```

def create_agent_response(respondent, questions):
  attempts = 3
  responses = {}
  base_prompt = f"""
Based on the following respondent characteristics:
- Sex: {respondent['sex']}
- Age: {respondent['age']}
- Ethnicity: {respondent['ethnic']}
- Education: {respondent['education']}
- Income: {respondent['income']}
- Chief: {respondent['chief']}
- Region: {respondent['region']}
"""

```

```

.....
def parse_response(response_text, questions):
    answers = {}
    response_parts = response_text.split('Answer:')

    for i, question in enumerate(questions):
        question_key = question["question_name"]
        reason_key = f"{question_key}_reason"
        answer_key = f"{question_key}_answer"
.....

```

8.6 Data processing before sending to API

```

For index, row in df.iterrows():\
    if index \geq= max\_records:\
        break \
    sex = row['sex']\
    age = row['age']\
    ethnic = row['ethnic']\
    education = row['education']\
    income = row['income']\
    chief = row['chief']\
    region = row['region']\
    prompt = prompt\_template.format(sex=sex, age=age, ethnic=ethnic,
        education=education, income=income, chief=chief, region=region)\
    data = {\
        "model": "gpt-3.5-turbo",\
        "messages": [{"role": "user", "content": prompt}],\
        "temperature": 1,\
        "top\_p": 1,\
        "logprobs": 10\
    }

```