

# Explicit and Implicit Large Language Model Personas Generate Opinions but Fail to Replicate Deeper Perceptions and Biases

Salvatore Giorgi<sup>1</sup>, Tingting Liu<sup>1</sup>, Ankit Aich<sup>1</sup>, Kelsey Isman<sup>1</sup>, Garrick Sherman<sup>1</sup>, Zachary Fried<sup>1</sup>, João Sedoc<sup>2</sup>, Lyle H. Ungar<sup>3</sup>, Brenda Curtis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Institute on Drug Abuse, <sup>2</sup>New York University, <sup>3</sup>University of Pennsylvania

Correspondence: sal.giorgi@nih.gov, brenda.curtis@nih.gov

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) are increasingly being used in human-centered social scientific tasks, such as data annotation, synthetic data creation, and engaging in dialog. However, these tasks are highly subjective and dependent on human factors, such as one’s environment, attitudes, beliefs, and lived experiences. Thus, employing LLMs (which do not have such human factors) in these tasks may result in a lack of variation in data, failing to reflect the diversity of human experiences. In this paper, we examine the role of prompting LLMs with human-like personas and asking the models to answer as if they were a specific human. This is done explicitly, with exact demographics, political beliefs, and lived experiences, or implicitly via names prevalent in specific populations. The LLM personas are then evaluated via (1) subjective annotation task (e.g., detecting toxicity) and (2) a belief generation task, where both tasks are known to vary across human factors. We examine the impact of explicit vs. implicit personas and investigate which human factors LLMs recognize and respond to. Results show that LLM personas show mixed results when reproducing known human biases, but generate generally fail to demonstrate implicit biases. We conclude that LLMs lack the intrinsic cognitive mechanisms of human thought, while capturing the statistical patterns of how people speak, which may restrict their effectiveness in complex social science applications.

## 1 Introduction

Many NLP and machine learning tasks (i.e., annotating data for supervised learning or reinforcement learning with human feedback) are highly influenced by a variety of human factors (identities, experiences, attitudes, and beliefs; Davani et al., 2022; Rottger et al., 2022) and these dependencies are propagated into downstream systems (Sap et al., 2019; Casper et al., 2023). For example, toxicity

detection has been found to be dependent on annotator’s race, empathy, and freedom of speech values (Sap et al., 2022). Similarly, perceptions of stigma towards people who use substances (PWUS) are dependent on whether or not the annotators use substances themselves (i.e., lived experiences; Giorgi et al., 2023). As such, machine learning practitioners have sought to incorporate diverse views into their models (Uma et al., 2021).

At the same time, large language models are poised to transform computational social science (Ziems et al., 2024; Bail, 2024; Demszky et al., 2023) and are increasingly being used across a wide range of human-centered tasks (Dey et al., 2024; Mei et al., 2024), such as studying personality (Pellert et al., 2023; Serapio-García et al., 2023; Ganesan et al., 2023) and culture (Havaladar et al., 2023). In particular, LLMs are being used by humans in crowd sourcing experiments (Veselovsky et al., 2023) and as human crowd workers themselves, replacing human participants (Dillion et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024; Aher et al., 2023).

This work seeks to examine this dichotomy of human factors influencing social scientific tasks and machines replacing humans in these same tasks, by asking if personified LLMs replicate known human perception and belief patterns. We do this by creating LLM “workers” with a diverse set of personas (or characters which an artificial agent performs (Li et al., 2016)), which vary on demographics, ideologies, and lived experiences. The LLM workers then participate in two tasks: annotation and generation. Both tasks seek to replicate findings that show these tasks are dependent on several human factors (e.g., views on immigration depend on political ideology). In both tasks, we investigate the effect of personifying LLMs via explicit or implicit personas, where character traits are inferred based on direct or indirect queues, respectively. This is done by giving exact demographic categories such as “You are a 78 year-old




Figure 1: Flow diagram for comparing personas, using an example of explicit gender vs implicit gender in the parenting domain. We first prompt the 641 LLM workers each with the two personas we are comparing (explicit  $e$  and implicit  $i$ ) and ask each the relevant domain question for a total of  $2 \times 641$  generations. We then extract n-grams for each generation, where  $m$  denotes the total number of n-grams. Next, we correlate each of the  $m$  ngrams with the human factor labels for each persona type, for  $2 \times m$  correlations. Finally, we correlate the correlations across the persona types (two vectors of correlations, each of size  $m$ ) giving us a final similarity metric.

female” (explicit) or via names such as “Your name is Ethel”, which could indirectly signal both an older age or a female persona (implicit). This is done to understand direct and indirect signals and perceptions of human factors that LLMs recognize, which mirrors a long history of using names to study discrimination via indirect signals of gender, race, and social class (Crabtree et al., 2022). Lastly, we examine which human factors are most important when generating with personified LLMs.

The main research aims of this paper are: (1) an investigation of the effects of explicit and implicit personas on LLM generations and (2) an evaluation of the importance in LLM generations of a variety of human factors across diverse characteristics (demographics, ideology, and lived experience). Both of these aims are investigated through annotation and generation tasks, by comparing personified LLM output to known human patterns in perception and beliefs.

## 2 Data

### 2.1 LLM Workers

For all tasks, we consider a set of LLM “workers” to mimic a real crowd-sourced task on e.g. Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). The annotation task seeks to replicate past studies which have shown how annotations depend on annotators’ identities, beliefs, and lived experiences: the toxicity detection task by Sap et al. (2022) and the stigma

detection task by Giorgi et al. (2023). We examine five specific human factors: age, gender, political ideology, race, and substance use. Age is a continuous variable, while the other human factors are operationalized as binary (see below).

The toxicity detection task recruited 641 participants via MTurk with the following distributions: gender (54% women, 46% men)<sup>1</sup>, race (13% Black, 87% White), and political identify (29% conservative, 71% liberal). For the age and substance use labels, we follow the distributions from the stigma detection task: substance use (37.4% used substances in the past 30 days, 62.6% did not) and age (a normal distribution with mean = 39.3, standard deviation = 10.1;). All human factor labels are randomly assigned independent of the other factors, though this may not be the case in humans, as e.g. Black adults tend to be more liberal than White adults (Pew Research Center, 2021).

### 2.2 Explicit Personas

LLMs are given explicit personas via a general “You are  $x$ , please answer as such” prompt, based on the human factor distributions above: age (e.g.,

<sup>1</sup>Here we only consider binary variables for categorical human factors and drop classes which are not highly represented in their original studies. For example, Sap et al. (2022) contained 1% non-binary responses, which we dropped and increased the size of the “women” category by 1%. This design choice aims to isolate the impact of each human factor independently and is not meant to imply that any human factor is limited to our chosen labels.

- 
1. I don't get government benefits just for being white
  2. Where is white history month? Why can't I have white pride day?
  3. I don't like black doctors, it's just my preference
  4. Anti-Black racism isn't that big of a deal because people treated Italians like this in the 60's and 70's
  5. Going to Africa. Hope I don't get AIDS. Just kidding. I'm white!
- 

(a) Anti-Black vignettes

- 
1. I'm ok with executing heroin, meth and coke users.
  2. A zombie, this is what you would look like as a meth user.
  3. They need to deal with the drugs and murder as well. The streets are always filthy and unsafe!
  4. Legalized drugs also means that the age at which people will burn their brains out will drop.
  5. Drugs lying around within a child's reach with parents passed out from drugs, sounds like the kid will be better off.
- 

(b) Anti-Substance Use vignettes

Table 1: Hand selected social media posts to be annotated by the LLM workers for the (a) toxicity and (b) stigma detection tasks.

“You are 65 years old”), gender (“You are female”), political ideology (“You are politically conservative”), race (“You are Black / African American”), and substance use (“You are a person who uses illegal drugs”). With the exception of the final task, each persona has a single human factor, so as to remove confounders between the factors (e.g., perceptions of race are associated with social class; [Crabtree et al., 2022](#)).

### 2.3 Implicit Personas: First and Surnames

Implicit personas are characters the artificial agent plays based on indirect queues from which character traits are inferred rather than explicitly given. For example, “you play video games and like anime” could be an implicit version of the “you are introverted” persona ([Park et al., 2015](#)). We create implicit personas using names which are highly frequent among certain demographics (e.g., “Your name is Mary” or “Your name is Jermaine Washington”). Here we only consider age, gender, and race as names are not necessarily directly associated with political ideology and substance use.

Age names are assigned based on popular names from the decade each LLM worker was “born”. Names which were popular over more than one decade were removed. Gendered names are taken from a United States (U.S.) Census list of the most popular female/male names over the last 100 years. Black/White (race) names were sourced from [Crabtree et al. \(2022\)](#), which found first names that were highly distinctive of race/ethnicity. Black/White surnames were assigned from U.S. Census distribu-

tions which were unambiguously associated with one race/ethnicity group ([Comenetz, 2016](#)).

### 2.4 Annotation Vignettes

For the toxicity and stigma detection tasks, each LLM worker is asked to annotate a series of five social media posts. The posts for the toxicity task are taken from [Sap et al. \(2022\)](#), which were chosen since they were toxic alone (i.e., not vulgar and not racist). For this study, we created a similar vignette for the stigma detection task, where we hand selected (and edited) five Reddit posts which were stigmatizing, but not vulgar or racist, and roughly matched the length of the toxicity posts. Vignettes are shown in Table 1.

### 2.5 Generation: Belief Data

For this task, we identify five domains (one for each human factor) where public opinion is known to vary across our human factors. We use Pew Research Center survey results on the Israel / Palestine conflict (age; [Silver, 2024](#)), parenting (gender; [Aragao, 2023](#)), immigration (political ideology; [Pew Research Center, 2024](#)), policing (race; [Morin et al., 2017](#)), and marijuana legalization (substance use; [Center, 2024](#); [Hammond et al., 2020](#)). Table 2 shows the question asked of the LLM worker, along with the domain and human factor known to differ on this belief. While we refer to these as “beliefs”, these are a mixture of beliefs (moral convictions) and opinions (fact based judgements).

## 3 Methods

We proceed in three stages: (1) we attempt to replicate past subjective annotation tasks, examining the behavior of both explicit and implicit personas; (2) we perform a belief generation task with both explicit and implicit personas, examining convergent and divergent validity of personas; and (3) we assess the importance of each human factor.

### 3.1 Annotation Task

In this analysis, we aim to replicate the social media-based toxicity and stigma detection results from [Sap et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Giorgi et al. \(2023\)](#). The toxicity detection tasks showed that gender, political ideology, and race were all correlated with ratings of offensiveness and racism, while the stigma detection task showed that PWUS within the last 30 days rated more Reddit posts as stigmatizing (as compared to people who did not use substances).

Human Factor	Domain	Question	Known Association
Age	Palestine	Do your sympathies lie more with the Israeli people or more with the Palestinian people?	18-29: support Palestine; 65+: support Israel
Gender	Parenting	Do you feel a great deal of pressure to focus on your responsibilities at home?	48% of women; 35% of men
Political Ideology	Immigration	Why are a large number of migrants seeking to enter the U.S. at the border with Mexico?	Conservatives: Policies make it easy to stay; Liberals: violence in home country
Race	Policing	Do you see the police as protectors or enforcers?	Enforcers: 38% of Blacks and 26% of Whites
Substance Use	Legalization	How does legalization affect the criminal justice system?	People who use marijuana support legalization more than those who don't use substances

Table 2: Questions used in the Belief Generation task. Questions were derived from U.S. surveys where there are known differences across their corresponding human factor.

Here we use a pool of “LLM workers” as described above, asking each worker to rate a series of 5 social media posts (Section 2.4). For each worker, we take the average number of posts labeled as offensive/stigmatizing and then correlate that with each human factor. For continuous human factors (age), we use a product moment correlation, and for all other (binary) factors we compute Cohen’s  $d$  (i.e., a standardized difference in means) with a logistic regression for computing a significance level. Here we consider the GPT-4O model.

### 3.2 Belief Generation Task (BGT)

For the first belief generation task (**BGT1**), we begin by prompting GPT-4O with an explicit persona for each worker (“you are female”) and ask the LLM to answer the questions in Table 2. This results in 641 generations. We then extract 1, 2, and 3grams (referred to as ngrams) for each generation, encoding them as their relative frequency in each generated text. Then for each ngram, we correlate (using product moment correlations for continuous factors and Cohen’s  $d$  for binary) its relative frequency with the human factor used in the prompt. For each correlation we calculate a significance level (using a logistic regression for the binary human factors). Given the large number of ngrams (often on the order of 50,000), we apply a Benjamini–Hochberg (BH) False Discovery Rate (FDR) correction, only considering ngrams significant at a corrected level of  $p < 0.05$ . Figure 1 shows this pipeline (the top half, steps 1-4). Finally, we visualize these correlations via a word cloud, which encodes the correlation size (via the size of the word) and the ngram’s frequency across the data set (via color). Here we use ngrams and word

clouds in order to qualitatively examine how the personas answer each question. In Appendix A we include exact ngram correlations (Table 7) as well as additional language features, LIWC (Boyd et al., 2022) and the Moral Foundations lexicon (Graham et al., 2009) in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. This is done across each domain. Feature extraction, correlation analysis, and word cloud visualization are performed using the DLATK python package (Schwartz et al., 2017).

Next in (**BGT2**), we consider the convergent and divergent validity of the personas across the beliefs. This is done by examining similarity in the linguistic correlations across personas, since our domains may also vary across more than one human factor. Specifically, using the correlations described above, we consider all pairs of personas and correlate their ngram correlations. Again, this is done across all domains. For a given domain, we, for example, create one vector of correlations (for each ngram) between ngram relative frequency and race and another vector of correlations (again, for each ngram) between ngram relative frequency and political ideology. These two vectors are then correlated. (This algorithm is visualized in Figure 1 and shown in Appendix B.) This quantifies whether the language associations across race match associations across political ideology, since, in this example, conservatives/liberals may have similar beliefs to White/Black individuals on average. We expect correlation patterns to match (i.e., convergent validity) known associations across human factors (from the Pew surveys described above) and not match where there are no associations (i.e., divergent validity).

Finally, in (**BGT3**), we compare explicit and implicit personas across beliefs, applying similar

	Explicit		Implicit	
	Offensive	Stigmatizing	Offensive	Stigmatizing
Age	-.131	-.101	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>
Gender	.874	<i>ns</i>	.279	<i>ns</i>
Political Ideology	-4.58	-3.21	-	-
Race	2.15	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>
Substance Use	-.300	1.15	-	-

Table 3: **Annotation Task** Reported product moment correlation (age) and Cohen’s *d* (all other human factors) between the human factor and number of posts rated as offensive and stigmatizing across the LLM “workers”. Binary factors are encoded as: female/male = 1/0, black/white = 1/0, conservative/liberal = 1/0, and uses substances/does not use substances = 1/0. Blue cells replicate past results, *ns* not significant at a BH corrected significance level of  $p < 0.05$ .

methods as described above. Here we (1) create a vector of correlation between human factors and ngram relative frequencies extracted from text generated with *explicit* personas, (2) create a vector of correlation between human factors and ngram frequencies extract from text generated with *implicit* personas, and then (3) correlate those two vectors. (Again, this algorithm is visualized in Figure 1 and shown in Appendix B.) This tells us whether or not the implicit personas mirror the word associations found with explicit personas. Again, because implicit personas are not available for the political ideology and substance use human factors, we only consider age, gender, and race (see Section 2.3). We repeat this process for all human factors across all domains. We also report the average correlation across domains for each human factor.

### 3.3 Persona Importance

In the final task, we investigate which human factors are most influential in shaping LLM output. To do this, we begin by prompting with an explicit persona containing *all* human factors (e.g., you are a white male who is politically liberal and who uses illegal drugs). We then compare the correlation structure when given all human factors to the correlation structure when given a single human factor. This is repeated across all domains. (See Algorithm 1, Appendix B.) For example, we correlate gender with text generated about parenting when given a *full* persona (i.e., univariate correlations across all ngrams), correlate gender with text generated when given a *gender-only* persona with gender, and then correlate vectors of those correlations. High correlations here will tell us whether LLMs are able to attend to each dimension of a persona when prompted with a multidimensional

persona or whether certain human factors “overwhelm” others in determining LLM generation.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Annotation with Explicit and Implicit Personas

The results of the annotation task are shown in Table 3. Here we attempt to replicate results from previous work, which show that liberals, women, and Black individuals identify more offensiveness and people who substances identify more stigma. Our results show that the toxicity and the stigma detection tasks are replicated by GPT-4O using explicit but not implicit personas.

### 4.2 BGT1: Alignment with Public Opinion

Results from this task are visualized in Figure 2. Across gender, political ideology, and race we see language markers consistent with public opinion: “traditionally”, “financial”, and “providers” for men and “caregivers”, “feelings”, and “overwhelmed” associated with women; “humane”, “families”, and “rights” for liberals and “security”, “border”, and “law’s” associated with conservatives; and “brutality”, “racial profiling”, and “systemic” for Blacks and “protectors”, “law”, and “public” associated with Whites. The language associated with age does not seem to show any signal of supporting Palestinians or Israelis. Substance use language seems to show patterns *opposite* to public opinion, in that personas that do not use substances use words like “reduction”, “regulation”, and “revenue” (where “revenue” would be generated through legalization).




Figure 2: **Belief Generation Task (BGT1)** Ngrams correlated with (a) age, (b) gender, (c) political ideology, (d) race, and (e) substance use using text generated from their respective domains. All correlations are significant at a BH corrected  $p < .05$ . Size of the word reflects its correlation strength (larger words are more correlated with the human factor), color indicates the ngram’s frequency in the data set (gray = low frequency, blue = moderate frequency, red = high frequency). Exact effect sizes are shown in Table 7.

**4.3 BGT2: Convergent / Divergent Validity**

**Palestine** Table 4(a) shows that older personas generate similar language to conservative personas, which is consistent with public opinion (both tend to support Israel over Palestine). Substance using personas agree with white, male, and conservative personas in this domain, which is opposite of the correlation structure across the other domains.

**Parenting** The single red cell here shows that male personas tend to agree with Black personas, which is the opposite of known public opinion in this domain. Notably, this domain had the highest number of non-significant results.

**Immigration** According to national surveys (Pew Research Center, 2024), younger adults (18-29), liberals, and Black Americans all share similar opinions on immigration. Thus, we would expect to see these three human factors correlate in Table 4(c). Here we see the reverse pattern for age (the two red cells in the A column): older personas agree more with Black and liberal personas. We also see that Black and liberal personas agree, converging with public opinion (blue cell in column P). Interestingly, personas who use substances agree with younger, female, Black, and liberal personas.

**Policing** In Table 4(d) we see that older personas agree with females and people who do not use substances, female personas agree with both liberal

and Black personas (which matches public opinion), and liberal and Black personas agree (which, again, matches public surveys).

**Legalization** Younger adults favor legalization (Center, 2024), which matches the results in Table 4(e) as older personas are similar to conservative and non-substance using personas. Substance using personas agree with conservative personas, which is the opposite of known public opinion, yet substance using personas align with public opinion in all other dimensions.

**4.4 BGT3: Implicit vs Explicit**

Results from this task are reported in Table 5, where each cell is the correlation between the explicit and implicit personas (based on the column’s human factor) within the row’s domain. Here we see that age personas do not correlate well on any domain. Gender and race have an equal average value across the domains, though an average correlation of .12 shows that implicit personas do not lead to similar generations as explicit personas.

**4.5 Persona Importance**

Results for the persona importance task are shown in Table 6. Here we see that political ideology has the highest average correlation at  $r = .70$ , which is much larger than any other human factor. One possible explanation is that the divide between conservatives and liberals (on these domains) is stronger or more polarized than the other human factors.

	A	G	P	R	A	G	P	R	A	G	P	R	A	G	P	R	A	G	P	R				
A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
G	<i>ns</i>	-	-	-	<i>ns</i>	-	-	-	.15	-	-	-	-.09	-	-	-	.08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P	.08	-.15	-	-	<i>ns</i>	-.26	-	-	-.11	-.23	-	-	.16	-.33	-	-	.12	-.17	-	-	-	-	-	-
R	.13	.23	-.18	-	.08	-.14	.12	-	.18	.40	-.19	-	<i>ns</i>	.23	-.24	-	.06	.29	<i>ns</i>	-	-	-	-	-
S	<i>ns</i>	-.11	.38	-.04	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.13	-.03	.38	-.04	.50	-.10	.38	-.20	.20	-.19	.20	.16	.34	-	-	-	-
	Palestine (a)				Parenting (b)				Immigration (c)				Policing (d)				Legalization (e)							

Table 4: **Convergent and Divergent Validity (BGT2)** Each cell is a product moment correlation between the language associations (i.e., the correlations between the ngram and the human factor) across the human factor denoted in the row and the human factor denoted in the column. Abbreviations: A: age, G: gender, P: political ideology, R: race, S: substance use, ns: not significant at a BH corrected significance level of  $p < 0.05$ . Blue cell replicate known relationships, red cells show results which are the opposite of known relationships, white cells indicate no known relationships in public opinion.

The next highest average correlation is substance use at  $r = .40$ . We again note that this is a measure of how belief language is differentially generated when prompted with a persona who uses / does not use substances. To the best of our knowledge, besides the legalization domain, there are no known public opinion surveys which measure how substance using populations answer these questions. Thus, finding any pattern here may be surprising. Gender had the lowest average correlation, despite the fact that there are gender differences across most of these domains.

## 5 Discussion

The results of this study are mixed. First, we see that explicit but not implicit personas replicate the annotation tasks. While some results were replicated, other results seem inconsistent. Personas who use substances rate more stigma but less offensiveness. Their ratings on offensiveness match those of conservatives, but their ratings on stigma match liberals. Age, on the otherhand, is consistent across offensiveness and stigma, where both show that younger personas rate more of both. This dovetails with the political ideology results in that younger people tend to be more liberal, and thus may agree on these constructs.

The belief generation tasks show mixed results. In **BGT1**, we see that gender, political ideology, and race all conform with known public opinions. The age results are trivial in that the model attends to the persona (e.g., older personas discuss seeing the “decades” of history in this conflict). There is also no signal that loyalty to either side of the conflict is associated with age. Similar patterns to age hold for substance use personas. When considering convergent and divergent validity (**BGT2**), the results are split: five known patterns are replicated

(blue cells) and five known patterns are opposite (red cells).

The implicit generation task (**BGT3**) fails to show a substantial relationship between explicit and implicit personas, matching the annotation task. Across three out of five domains, the correlations with age are not significant. While we know the name distribution of the U.S. population over the last century, it is unclear how many of those names are highly represented in the LLM’s training data. Similarly, age does not show strong associations in **BGT1** and **BGT2** and, thus, it may not be surprising that age fails here.

Finally, the persona importance task shows that political ideology is by far the strongest dimension. This may be the result of this dimension being extremely polarized on several domains. Surprisingly, substance use is the second strongest. To our knowledge, we do not know of any public surveys that look at differences across substance using populations, with the exception of legalization. Thus, there is no reason to believe such opinions are in the training data for GPT-4o.

## 6 Related Work

### 6.1 LLMs for Annotation

LLMs are increasingly becoming an integral part of the annotation workflows (Goel et al., 2023), due to its automation, consistency, and potentials in fine-tuning downstream models (Tan et al., 2024). LLMs can understand context, infer meanings, extract information, and generate human-like text, making them invaluable tools for annotating large datasets (Huang et al., 2024). For example, ChatGPT-4 was found to outperform the human crowd-workers with higher accuracy and reliability when classifying partisanship of tweets about 2020 U.S. election (Törnberg, 2023). However,

preliminary findings have argued that LLMs for annotations should be used with caution (Thapa et al., 2023). For example, though ChatGPT-4 showed competitive quality in sentiment analysis, it still produced lower precision and recall in complicated tasks as compared to human annotators, for example, in labelling “anger” (Nasution and Onan, 2024). LLMs can also reflect the biases that human have in annotation tasks (Wake et al., 2023). Acerbi and Stubbersfield (2023) found that ChatGPT-3 exhibited biases mirroring those of humans towards content that aligns with gender stereotypes.

## 6.2 LLM Personas

While LLMs have been widely used in annotations, they can inherit biases from their training data or annotators, leading to biased or skewed annotations (Santurkar et al., 2023). One line of this research have examined the personas of LLMs (Santurkar et al., 2023; Argyle et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2022; Simmons, 2023; Hartmann et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2023b). Prompting LLMs with demographic information (e.g., age, gender, political ideology), biased responses from LLMs were observed (Simmons, 2023). For example, prompting with 19 diverse personas across 5 socio-demographic groups, stereotypical responses were observed as abstentions and a decrease in reasoning capability (Gupta et al., 2023). Such LLMs persona-related biases have been found across domains (Wan et al., 2023), hard to be eliminated by de-biasing prompts (Deshpande et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2023a), and even in line with findings in human psychology. Simmons (2023) found that GPT-3, GPT-3.5 and OPT model families were

	Age	Gender	Race
Palestine	<i>ns</i>	.09	.28
Parenting	-.03	.20	.05
Immigration	.03	.11	.10
Policing	<i>ns</i>	.12	.12
Legalization	<i>ns</i>	.06	.06
Average	-.01	.12	.12

Table 5: **Implicit vs Explicit personas (BGT3)** Reported product moment correlation between Explicit correlations and Implicit correlations, within a human factor and across domains (e.g., the Age column shows correlations between explicit and implicit age). *ns* not significant at a BH corrected significance level  $p < 0.05$ .

	Age	Gender	Pol. Ideo.	Race	Sub. Use
Palestine	.19	.10	.79	.14	.38
Parenting	.38	.34	.63	.27	.48
Immigration	.18	.18	.62	.11	.40
Policing	.21	.12	.76	.32	.50
Legalization	.20	.16	.72	.37	.46
Average	.23	.18	.70	.24	.44

Table 6: **Persona Importance** Product moment correlation between language associations from a full persona and a single factor persona.

more inclined to utilize moral principles of binding foundations (e.g., Authority/Subversion, Loyalty/Betrayal) when prompted with conservative political identity, which aligns with findings from moral psychology. Therefore, more thorough understanding of LLMs personas are needed.

## 6.3 Implicit Personas via Names

Implicit personas have been studied in the domain of dialog, where typical personas describe, for example, interests or hobbies (“you like to travel and eat sushi”; Cho et al., 2022; Roller et al., 2021; Mazaré et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018). With reference to implicit personas via names, there is a long history of studying discrimination due to indirect signals of race/ethnicity, gender, or social class from names (Barlow and Lahey, 2018; Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2004). While subtle, these signals manifest in real-world discriminatory behavior and are more common than overt racial hostility (Block Jr et al., 2021). Given the documented biases inherent in LLMs (Omiye et al., 2023), it is natural to probe these systems to see if they exhibit similar subtle biases (Bai et al., 2024).

## 7 Conclusions

In this work, we investigated the effect of explicitly and implicitly personifying LLMs. Results showed that (1) explicit but not implicit personas replicated human perceptions in the annotation task, (2) explicit personas were sometimes able to generate text which reflected subjective human opinions, and (3) implicit personas showed a general lack of agreement with explicit personas and, more importantly, known human perceptions. Together, these results show that, despite showing minimal implicit biases, LLMs are inconsistent with their



mechanisms for reproducing human thought, pointing towards limited utility in social scientific tasks.

## Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA).

## 8 Limitations

This study is limited in several ways. First, we only evaluate one model for the annotation task and generation tasks, which is not designed or optimized for the current study. It could be the case that models of different sizes or those which are fine tuned for social scientific tasks would perform differently.

Next, the examples from both the annotation and generation task are not exhaustive, and other studies have looked at similar tasks in more depth, though (not our knowledge) no other studies have looked at effects of implicit and explicit personas. [Hu and Collier \(2024\)](#) examined several subjective annotation tasks with persona prompting, including the toxicity tasks we examined in the current study. Similarly, [Santurkar et al. \(2023\)](#) examined if LLMs are aligned with public opinion (based on Pew surveys) across a large number of demographic groups and opinion domains.

Similarly, our study only explored monolingual English and used U.S. public opinions. Future studies could look at how opinions vary across cultures and examine that through the lens of multilingual language models.

## 9 Ethics

As discussed above, the human factors examined in this study are neither exhaustive nor representative. For example, income and education were not included and are known to be associated with several of the domains used in this study. Similarly, for ease of analysis, several human factors were reduced from categorical to binary, thus restricting the results to a very limited set of populations. Through this, we do not mean to imply any of these human factors are defined by the limited definitions used in the paper.

While the the main task of this work was to personify LLMs, one must take care when anthropomorphizing such systems ([Abercrombie et al., 2023](#)). This is especially important in sensitive and

high stakes settings, where increased anthropomorphisms can lead to increased trust.

## References

- Gavin Abercrombie, Amanda Curry, Tanvi Dinkar, Verena Rieser, and Zeerak Talat. 2023. [Mirages. on anthropomorphism in dialogue systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4776–4790, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alberto Acerbi and Joseph M Stubbersfield. 2023. Large language models show human-like content biases in transmission chain experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(44):e2313790120.
- Gati V Aher, Rosa I Arriaga, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2023. Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 337–371. PMLR.
- C Aragao. 2023. Gender pay gap in u.s. hasn’t changed much in two decades.
- Lisa P Argyle, Ethan C Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua R Gubler, Christopher Rytting, and David Wingate. 2023. Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis*, 31(3):337–351.
- Xuechunzi Bai, Angelina Wang, Iliia Sucholutsky, and Thomas L. Griffiths. 2024. [Measuring implicit bias in explicitly unbiased large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.04105.
- Christopher A Bail. 2024. Can generative ai improve social science? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(21):e2314021121.
- M Rose Barlow and Joanna N Lahey. 2018. What race is lacey? intersecting perceptions of racial minority status and social class. *Social Science Quarterly*, 99(5):1680–1698.
- Marianne Bertrand and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. Are emily and greg more employable than lakisha and jamal? a field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American economic review*, 94(4):991–1013.
- Ray Block Jr, Charles Crabtree, John B Holbein, and J Quin Monson. 2021. Are americans less likely to reply to emails from black people relative to white people? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(52):e21103471118.
- Ryan L Boyd, Ashwini Ashokkumar, Sarah Seraj, and James W Pennebaker. 2022. The development and psychometric properties of liwc-22. *Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin*, pages 1–47.

- Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, Jérémy Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomasz Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, et al. 2023. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Pew Research Center. 2024. Most americans favor legalizing marijuana for medical, recreational use.
- Myra Cheng, Esin Durmus, and Dan Jurafsky. 2023a. Marked personas: Using natural language prompts to measure stereotypes in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18189*.
- Myra Cheng, Tiziano Piccardi, and Diyi Yang. 2023b. [CoMPosT: Characterizing and evaluating caricature in LLM simulations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10853–10875, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Itsugun Cho, Dongyang Wang, Ryota Takahashi, and Hiroaki Saito. 2022. A personalized dialogue generator with implicit user persona detection. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 367–377.
- Joshua Comenetz. 2016. Frequently occurring surnames in the 2010 census. *United States Census Bureau*, pages 1–8.
- Charles Crabtree, S Michael Gaddis, John B Holbein, and Edvard Nergår Larsen. 2022. Racially distinctive names signal both race/ethnicity and social class. *Sociological Science*, 9:454–472.
- Aida Mostafazadeh Davani, Mark Díaz, and Vinodkumar Prabhakaran. 2022. Dealing with disagreements: Looking beyond the majority vote in subjective annotations. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:92–110.
- Dorottya Demszky, Diyi Yang, David S Yeager, Christopher J Bryan, Margaret Clapper, Susannah Chandhok, Johannes C Eichstaedt, Cameron Hecht, Jeremy Jamieson, Meghann Johnson, et al. 2023. Using large language models in psychology. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2(11):688–701.
- Ameet Deshpande, Vishvak Murahari, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Ashwin Kalyan, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Toxicity in chatgpt: Analyzing persona-assigned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05335*.
- Gourab Dey, Adithya V Ganesan, Yash Kumar Lal, Manal Shah, Shreyashee Sinha, Matthew Matero, Salvatore Giorgi, Vivek Kulkarni, and H. Schwartz. 2024. [SOCIALITE-LLAMA: An instruction-tuned model for social scientific tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 454–468, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danica Dillion, Niket Tandon, Yuling Gu, and Kurt Gray. 2023. Can ai language models replace human participants? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*.
- Adithya V Ganesan, Yash Kumar Lal, August Nilsson, and H Schwartz. 2023. Systematic evaluation of gpt-3 for zero-shot personality estimation. In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 390–400.
- Salvatore Giorgi, Douglas Bellew, Daniel Roy Sadek Habib, Garrick Sherman, João Sedoc, Chase Smitterberg, Amanda Devoto, McKenzie Himelein-Wachowiak, and Brenda Curtis. 2023. Lived experience matters: automatic detection of stigma on social media toward people who use substances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02064*.
- Akshay Goel, Almog Gueta, Omry Gilon, Chang Liu, Sofia Erell, Lan Huong Nguyen, Xiaohong Hao, Bolous Jaber, Shashir Reddy, Rupesh Kartha, et al. 2023. Llms accelerate annotation for medical information extraction. In *Machine Learning for Health (ML4H)*, pages 82–100. PMLR.
- Jesse Graham, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian A Nosek. 2009. Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 96(5):1029.
- Shashank Gupta, Vaishnavi Shrivastava, Ameet Deshpande, Ashwin Kalyan, Peter Clark, Ashish Sabharwal, and Tushar Khot. 2023. Bias runs deep: Implicit reasoning biases in persona-assigned llms. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Alexis S Hammond, Kelly E Dunn, and Eric C Strain. 2020. Drug legalization and decriminalization beliefs among substance-using and nonusing individuals. *Journal of addiction medicine*, 14(1):56–62.
- Jochen Hartmann, Jasper Schwenzow, and Maximilian Witte. 2023. [The political ideology of conversational ai: Converging evidence on chatgpt’s pro-environmental, left-libertarian orientation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2301.01768.
- Shreya Havaladar, Bhumika Singhal, Sunny Rai, Langchen Liu, Sharath Chandra Guntuku, and Lyle Ungar. 2023. Multilingual language models are not multicultural: A case study in emotion. In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 202–214.
- Tiancheng Hu and Nigel Collier. 2024. [Quantifying the persona effect in llm simulations](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.10811.
- Jingwei Huang, Donghan M Yang, Ruichen Rong, Kuroush Nezafati, Colin Treager, Zhikai Chi, Shidan Wang, Xian Cheng, Yujia Guo, Laura J Klesse, et al. 2024. A critical assessment of using chatgpt for extracting structured data from clinical notes. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1):106.

- Hang Jiang, Doug Beeferman, Brandon Roy, and Deb Roy. 2022. Communitylm: Probing partisan worldviews from language models. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6818–6826.
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Georgios Spithourakis, Jianfeng Gao, and William B Dolan. 2016. A persona-based neural conversation model. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 994–1003.
- Pierre-Emmanuel Mazaré, Samuel Humeau, Martin Raison, and Antoine Bordes. 2018. [Training millions of personalized dialogue agents](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2775–2779, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qiaozhu Mei, Yutong Xie, Walter Yuan, and Matthew O Jackson. 2024. A turing test of whether ai chatbots are behaviorally similar to humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(9):e2313925121.
- R Morin, K Parker, R Stepler, and A Mercer. 2017. Police views, public views.
- Arbi Haza Nasution and Aytug Onan. 2024. Chatgpt label: Comparing the quality of human-generated and llm-generated annotations in low-resource language nlp tasks. *IEEE Access*.
- Jesutofunmi A Omiye, Jenna C Lester, Simon Spichak, Veronica Rotemberg, and Roxana Daneshjou. 2023. Large language models propagate race-based medicine. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1):195.
- Gregory Park, H Andrew Schwartz, Johannes C Eichstaedt, Margaret L Kern, Michal Kosinski, David J Stillwell, Lyle H Ungar, and Martin EP Seligman. 2015. Automatic personality assessment through social media language. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 108(6):934.
- Max Pellert, Clemens M Lechner, Claudia Wagner, Beatrice Rammstedt, and Markus Strohmaier. 2023. Ai psychometrics: Assessing the psychological profiles of large language models through psychometric inventories. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, page 17456916231214460.
- Pew Research Center. 2021. Demographics and lifestyle differences among typology groups.
- Pew Research Center. 2024. How americans view the situation at the u.s.-mexico border, its causes and consequences.
- Stephen Roller, Emily Dinan, Naman Goyal, Da Ju, Mary Williamson, Yinhan Liu, Jing Xu, Myle Ott, Eric Michael Smith, Y-Lan Boureau, and Jason Weston. 2021. [Recipes for building an open-domain chatbot](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 300–325, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul Rottger, Bertie Vidgen, Dirk Hovy, and Janet Pierrehumbert. 2022. [Two contrasting data annotation paradigms for subjective NLP tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 175–190, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shibani Santurkar, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Cino Lee, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Whose opinions do language models reflect? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 29971–30004. PMLR.
- Maarten Sap, Dallas Card, Saadia Gabriel, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2019. The risk of racial bias in hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 1668–1678.
- Maarten Sap, Swabha Swayamdipta, Laura Vianna, Xuhui Zhou, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2022. Annotators with attitudes: How annotator beliefs and identities bias toxic language detection. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5884–5906.
- H. Andrew Schwartz, Salvatore Giorgi, Maarten Sap, Patrick Crutchley, Lyle Ungar, and Johannes Eichstaedt. 2017. [DLATK: Differential language analysis ToolKit](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 55–60, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Greg Serapio-García, Mustafa Safdari, Clément Crepy, Luning Sun, Stephen Fitz, Peter Romero, Marwa Abdulhai, Aleksandra Faust, and Maja Matarić. 2023. [Personality traits in large language models](#). Preprint, arXiv:2307.00184.
- Laura Silver. 2024. Younger americans stand out in their views of the israel-hamas war.
- Gabriel Simmons. 2023. Moral mimicry: Large language models produce moral rationalizations tailored to political identity. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*, pages 282–297.
- Zhen Tan, Alimohammad Beigi, Song Wang, Ruocheng Guo, Amrita Bhattacharjee, Bohan Jiang, Mansoor Karami, Jundong Li, Lu Cheng, and Huan Liu. 2024. Large language models for data annotation: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13446*.

Surendrabikram Thapa, Usman Naseem, and Mehwish Nasim. 2023. From humans to machines: can chatgpt-like llms effectively replace human annotators in nlp tasks. In *Workshop Proceedings of the 17th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.

Petter Törnberg. 2023. Chatgpt-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political twitter messages with zero-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06588*.

Alexandra N Uma, Tommaso Fornaciari, Dirk Hovy, Silviu Paun, Barbara Plank, and Massimo Poesio. 2021. Learning from disagreement: A survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 72:1385–1470.

Veniamin Veselovsky, Manoel Horta Ribeiro, Philip Cuzzolino, Andrew Gordon, David Rothschild, and Robert West. 2023. Prevalence and prevention of large language model use in crowd work. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.15683.

Naoki Wake, Atsushi Kanehira, Kazuhiro Sasabuchi, Jun Takamatsu, and Katsushi Ikeuchi. 2023. Bias in emotion recognition with chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11753*.

Yixin Wan, George Pu, Jiao Sun, Aparna Garimella, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. "kelly is a warm person, joseph is a role model": Gender biases in llm-generated reference letters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09219*.

Saizheng Zhang, Emily Dinan, Jack Urbanek, Arthur Szlam, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2018. Personalizing dialogue agents: I have a dog, do you have pets too? In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2204–2213, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiaao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2024. Can large language models transform computational social science? *Computational Linguistics*, 50(1):237–291.

## A Additional Language Results

Table 7 shows the effect sizes of the top ngrams shown in Figure 2. Correlations with LIWC and the Moral Foundations dictionary are shown in Tables 8 and 9, respectively.

## B Algorithm

Algorithm 1 shows how the correlations in Tables 4, 5, and 6 are calculated. The algorithm shows an example of comparing a full persona to a single dimension persona (gender) in the parenting domain, but, in general, this algorithm takes in two personas

---

### Algorithm 1 Extracting Word Frequencies and Calculating Correlations

---

**Function:**  $LLM(persona\_type, task)$ : A function that prompts an LLM with a persona type (*full* or *individual*) for a generation task

$gen\_f \leftarrow [LLM(\text{full}, \text{parenting}) \text{ for each worker}]$

$all\_words \leftarrow \{w_i : \text{frequency of } w_i \text{ in } gen\_f\}$

$corr_1 \leftarrow [ ]$

$gender \leftarrow [\text{gender labels for each worker}]$

**for each**  $w_i$  **in**  $all\_words$  **do**

$r \leftarrow \text{corr}(\Sigma(w_i), gender)$

$corr\_1.append(r)$

**end for**

$gen\_bi \leftarrow LLM(\text{gender}, \text{parenting})$

$all\_words \leftarrow \{w_i : \text{frequency of } w_i \text{ in } gen\_bi\}$

$corr_2 \leftarrow [ ]$

**for each**  $w_i$  **in**  $all\_words$  **do**

$r \leftarrow \text{corr}(\Sigma(w_i), gender)$

$corr\_2.append(r)$

**end for**

$importance \leftarrow \text{corr}(corr_1, corr_2)$

---

and a domain. For the convergent / divergent validity tests (Table 4) we consider all explicit, single factor persona pairs across all domains. For the implicit vs explicit analysis (Table 5), we consider one explicit and one implicit persona, across all pairs, and across all domains. Finally, for the persona importance task (Table 6) we consider a full persona and a single factor persona, for all human factors, and across all domains.

Term	Effect Size	Term	Effect Size	Term	Effect Size	Term	Effect Size	Term	Effect Size
i've	.368	experiences	.996	immigration	2.58	brutality	2.22	could	2.81
, i've	.366	feelings	.921	laws	2.16	police brutality	1.94	people	2.39
decades	.366	have personal	.864	security	2.10	systemic	1.93	if	2.00
seen	.326	ai	.825	illegal	1.85	and	1.67	like	2.00
witnessed	.303	don't	.822	immigration laws	1.76	racial profiling	1.64	someone	1.99
really	-.296	modern	-.843	rights	1.88	or	-1.38	legalization can	-2.06
think it's	-.299	providers	-.852	humane	-2.01	can	-1.54	public	-2.25
think	-.300	my	-.894	climate	-2.29	emergencies	-1.60	this can	-2.32
i think	-.321	as a	-.916	change	-2.39	might	-1.95	reduction in	-2.34
its	-.334	partner	-1.03	climate change	-2.43	caucasian	-2.10	can	-3.59
(a) Age (Palestine)		(b) Gender (Parenting)		(c) Political Idealology (Immigration)		(d) Race (Policing)		(e) Substance Use (Legalization)	

Table 7: **N-gram** associated with each human factor across their respective domains. We show the top five most positively (top five rows) and negatively (bottom five rows) associated with each dimension. Product moment correlations reported in (a), Cohen's d in all others. All association significant at a BH corrected significance level of  $p < 0.05$ .

Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size
VISUAL	.324	ADJ	.979	POWER	2.08	TIME	2.48	LINGUISTIC	3.95
TIME	.324	TONE NEG	.882	RISK	2.03	TONE NEG	2.18	FUNCTION	3.86
FOCUSPAST	.199	CULTURE	.841	CULTURE	1.32	EMO NEG	1.56	VERB	3.52
REWARD	.179	TECH	.840	POLITIC	1.23	FOCUSPAST	1.57	PPRON	3.32
ARTICLE	.152	EMO NEG	.818	AUXVERB	1.10	ADJ	1.46	PRONOUN	3.30
CERTITUDE	-.239	AFFILIATION	-.821	SOCREFS	-1.33	VERB	-1.59	DRIVES	-1.36
IPRON	-.276	HOME	-.827	SOCBEHAV	-1.75	FOCUSFUTURE	-1.86	CULTURE	-1.38
COGPROC	-.278	FAMILY	-.859	MORAL	-1.80	TENTAT	-2.00	POWER	-1.42
COGNITION	-.291	MONEY	-.968	SOCIAL	-1.81	COGNITION	-2.25	MONEY	-1.59
INSIGHT	-.315	ARTICLE	-1.04	PROSOCIAL	-2.02	COGPROC	-2.57	LIFESTYLE	-1.76
(a) Age (Palestine)		(b) Gender (Parenting)		(c) Political Idealology (Immigration)		(d) Race (Policing)		(e) Substance Use (Legalization)	

Table 8: **LIWC** categories associated with each human factor across their respective domains. We show the top five most positively (top five rows) and negatively (bottom five rows) associated with each dimension. Product moment correlations reported in (a), Cohen's d in all others. All association significant at a BH corrected significance level of  $p < 0.05$ .

Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size	Category	Effect Size
		FAIRNESSVICE	.398	AUTHORITYVICE	2.02	HARMVICE	2.14	PURITYVIRTUE	.341
		INGROUPVICE	.279	INGROUPVICE	1.34	FAIRNESSVICE	1.58	MORALITYGENERAL	.316
		PURITYVIRTUE	.064	AUTHORITYVIRTUE	1.23	INGROUPVIRTUE	.738	PURITYVICE	.251
		AUTHORITYVICE	-.006	PURITYVICE	1.08	FAIRNESSVIRTUE	.610	AUTHORITYVICE	0.204
		AUTHORITYVIRTUE	-.084	HARMVIRTUE	.881	HARMVIRTUE	.544	AUTHORITYVIRTUE	-.301
		FAIRNESSVIRTUE	-.137	PURITYVIRTUE	.555	PURITYVIRTUE	.399	HARMVIRTUE	-.352
		HARMVIRTUE	-.347	MORALITYGENERAL	.386	MORALITYGENERAL	.174	FAIRNESSVIRTUE	-.465
		INGROUPVIRTUE	-.367	INGROUPVIRTUE	-.066	AUTHORITYVICE	.154	INGROUPVIRTUE	-1.05
MORALITYGENERAL	-.185	HARMVICE	-.494	HARMVICE	-1.07	INGROUPVICE	-.395	INGROUPVICE	-1.06
FAIRNESSVIRTUE	-.232	MORALITYGENERAL	-.527	FAIRNESSVIRTUE	-1.32	AUTHORITYVIRTUE	-.735	FAIRNESSVICE	-1.154
(a) Age (Palestine)		(b) Gender (Parenting)		(c) Political Idealology (Immigration)		(d) Race (Policing)		(e) Substance Use (Legalization)	

Table 9: **Moral Foundations** categories associated with each human factor across their respective domains. We show the top five most positively (top five rows) and negatively (bottom five rows) associated with each dimension. Product moment correlations reported in (a), Cohen's d in all others. All association significant at a BH corrected significance level of  $p < 0.05$ .