

Large language models as probes into latent psychology

Zhicheng Lin
University of Science and Technology of China

Correspondence

Zhicheng Lin, No. 96 Jinzhai Road Baohe District, Hefei, Anhui, 230026, China
(zhichenglin@gmail.com; X: ZLinPsy)

Acknowledgments

I thank Gati Aher, Michael Bernstein, Danica Dillion, Nicholas Laskowski, Paweł Niszczoła, Philipp Schoenegger, Lindia Tjuatja, and David Wingate for comments on early drafts. The writing was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China STI2030 Major Projects (2021ZD0204200), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (32071045), and the Shenzhen Fundamental Research Program (JCYJ20210324134603010). The funder had no role in the decision to publish or in the preparation of the manuscript. I used GPT-4 and Claude 2.1 for proofreading the manuscript, following the prompts described at <https://psyarxiv.com/9yhwz>.

Abstract

Advances in AI invite the misuse of language models as stand-ins for human minds or participants, which fundamentally mischaracterizes these statistical algorithms. We argue that language models should be embraced as flexible simulation tools, able to mimic a wide range of behaviors, perspectives, and psychological attributes evident in human language data, but the models themselves should not be equated to or anthropomorphized as human minds.

Large language models as probes into latent psychology

There is growing interest in using large language models (LLMs) as stand-ins for human subjects in social and behavioral sciences. This approach is based on the premise that LLMs can generate responses that closely approximate what average people might say or think in various situations^{1,2}. Here, analyzing the role of language models from the perspective of AI as a role-playing tool³⁻⁵, one that *inherently* lacks a mind (**Table 1**), we reveal the fundamental inappropriateness of language models as replacements for human minds, as well as the hazards of such an approach, notably anthropomorphism (i.e., attributing human traits to AI).

The tendency to anthropomorphize AI can distract from essential conversations. Using accurate language to describe AI is crucial as we grapple with its uncertain but potentially profound impact on science and society. Instead, characterizing AI as role-playing tools capable of simulating and amplifying signals in language use that reflect complex psychological dynamics without any internal cognition (“latent psychology”)—as exhibited by real human reasoning in textual communication—offers a realistic, calibrated perspective on their utility.

Table 1 Contrasting two characterizations of LLMs in social and behavioral sciences

Dimensions	As a role-playing tool	As a replacement of human participants
Fundamental nature	A multifaceted tool capable of simulating diverse perspectives	A singular machine mind with human-like judgments
Alignment assumptions	Not assumed, depending on training and finetuning	Assumed to approximate humans, especially Western English speakers
Primary utility	Supplementary or exploring tools, with key limitations due to deviations from training data and closed models	Supplementary or primary, directly studied to reveal workings of human mind
Interpretation approach	Clarifying LLMs’ nature as statistical models	Anthropomorphization, obscuring core essence as algorithms

LLMs are fundamentally not human-like

AI chatbots such as ChatGPT and Gemini are constructed on the foundation of LLMs with fine-tuning adjustments to more closely align with human values and preferences. LLMs are statistical models that predict the next tokens, determining which words will most likely follow a given prompt, based on the distribution of the training data, including fine-tuning data from reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF). Remarkably, the capability for next-token prediction enables the completion of many tasks traditionally thought to require human intelligence. However, it is essential to emphasize that LLMs have no minds but are role-playing tools that predict the most probable subsequent tokens⁶.

Consider a simple prompt: “Mao Zedong was ...” Unlike interacting with another human, when we engage with a chatbot, we are not seeking its opinion—despite the compelling illusion thereof—but rather making a *computational* request: given the statistical distributions in the language model, what sequence approved by raters is most likely to follow the words “Mao

Zedong was ...”? Models trained for neutrality will likely provide a corresponding response, completing the sentence with facts (“Mao Zedong was a Chinese communist revolutionary ...”). Without RLHF, models trained exclusively on English or traditional Chinese corpus are likely to yield more negative responses, whereas those trained only on simplified Chinese corpus may do the opposite. Fundamentally, the LLM, unlike a human, has no communicative intent, no opinion on, attitude toward, or belief about Mao, and no intrinsic capacity to tell the truth—it just models a distribution of token sequences produced by humans ⁷.

LLMs cannot be assumed to represent the average human of the trained data

A common assumption of using LLMs as human participants is that LLM responses mirror average human judgments of the trained data ¹. However, LLM responses do not consistently represent the population in question, as shown by the upward bias in the mean ratings in the Big Five personality traits ⁸ and other surveys ⁹. In addition, LLM responses may simply regurgitate or draw upon specific instances, examples, or strategies from their training data, especially when the query has been well represented in that data ^{2,10}. Responses might also reflect the influence of RLHF and other efforts at bias reduction. Finally, responses may be due to model hallucinations. All these factors can contribute to the final results—and thus fine-tuned LLMs cannot be assumed to represent the average.

Furthermore, the fact that model outputs do not always reflect their training data highlights another limitation of using LLMs as probes into the human mind. When responses from LLMs are altered based on human feedback, this can cause deviations from their original training data. This fine-tuning process, while beneficial in reducing biases, diminishes the utility of these models for understanding actual attitudes and thoughts present in the human text ¹¹. Such alterations may also introduce new preferences or biases from the feedback. Therefore, it becomes challenging to rely on fine-tuned LLMs as accurate indicators of human thought and judgment ¹².

The human-replacement perspective leads to anthropomorphism

Another fundamental issue with proposing LLMs as replacements for human participants is the tendency to anthropomorphize them. Despite having no mental states but only parameter values, their fluent, human-seeming responses allure like the Sirens’ song, presenting a compelling illusion of interacting with a mind-like entity ⁵. Indeed, by referring to “the minds of language models” and “the machine minds of LLMs” ¹, researchers unfortunately can easily succumb to this misconception. Using LLM responses as proxies for human judgments thus risks anthropomorphizing algorithms in a way that mischaracterizes their fundamental nature—a category error that invites misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

One such mischief is to believe that “any given LLM can act as only a single participant” ¹. Yet unlike humans, who are influenced by a unique combination of personal experiences, emotions, and cognitive biases, each LLM is not limited to a single perspective but generates responses based on its vast, diverse dataset. This means that, depending on the prompt and context, the same LLM can produce a range of responses, each reflecting different viewpoints or types of reasoning ⁶. This variability is not indicative of a singular, consistent “mind,” but rather of a multifaceted tool capable of simulating diverse perspectives. A teenager, a senior citizen, a subject matter expert, or a layperson: LLMs can role-play an almost limitless number of

characters or personas, depending on the prompts. This chameleonic ability highlights LLMs as tools for simulation, not as human participants.

A related mischief is the interpretation that LLMs “are likely to be most accurate at giving general estimates about Western English speakers”¹. Such views fail to acknowledge the diversity of LLMs, such as those trained in simplified Chinese. But even with English LLMs, token predictions are influenced not only by the original training data but also by human feedback and red teaming. In other words, LLMs are role-playing tools that do not necessarily mirror the values or biases present in their training datasets.

Moreover, despite limitations in their training datasets, the utility of LLMs, such as GPT-4, is not intrinsically confined to just Western English perspectives—they are versatile tools capable of adapting to a broader spectrum of scenarios and populations. For example, a recent experiment⁸ compared the Big Five personality traits across US and South Korean cultures, simulating scenarios where participants assume roles from these countries in both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 (“You are playing the role of an adult from [the United States/South Korea]”). While the data from GPT-3.5 lacked a clear pattern, GPT-4 demonstrated an effective replication of cross-cultural differences¹³.

Why AI anthropomorphism is problematic

In many situations, using anthropomorphic language in conversation can be natural and useful. This is because anthropomorphic language can serve as a helpful shorthand for describing complex processes with little risk of misunderstanding, such as when we say “the computer hates me” upon a failed connection to a projector. In such instances, nobody truly believes the computer harbors emotions—it is merely a colorful way to describe the situation.

However, with AI, which fundamentally lacks human-like qualities but often exhibits behavior resembling coherent and fluent conversations, this semblance tempts users to think of AI in terms of folk psychology, attributing it with “beliefs” or even “consciousness.” Such anthropomorphism risks misleading both the public and researchers, causing them to fundamentally misunderstand the characteristics and capabilities of AI⁷. For example, attributing emotions or intentions to AI, by saying it “believes” or “thinks” something, not only muddles the understanding of LLMs but also fosters a false impression of consciousness or comprehension that does not exist in these systems. This misconception can lead to unfounded fears of AI on the one hand and unrealistic expectations about its capabilities on the other, potentially affecting the development of AI regulations and public policy.

Using LLMs as role-playing tools

Characterizing LLMs as role-playing tools offers a more calibrated perspective on their role in social and behavioral research—one without the pitfalls of anthropomorphism. In essence, the LLM processes inputs and outputs without any internal cognition but develops sensitivities to patterns in language that signal relevant psychological variables by their presence in texts produced by real human minds. Given that language is a primary medium of thought, LLMs are particularly suited for probing and simulating text-based behavior and psychology.

Thus, LLMs are most useful for analyzing and creating text related to social or psychological attributes—from identifying sexism in historical texts, populism in political texts, and sentiment in social media discourse to creating specific vignettes that elicit beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors from respondents. Furthermore, by simulating roles and agents, LLMs provide a unique, versatile way to model complex systems, such as the labor market or dynamic effects of policy interventions^{14,15}. Another productive avenue is the simulation of rare samples or sensitive topics, such as the psychology of dictators, behavior in extreme environments (e.g., wars, natural disasters), and suicide interventions. In such cases, LLMs can surface signals relevant to psychology that are latent in language itself without replicating internal human cognition.

Under this perspective, LLMs can be used to role-play specific groups, but whether the response reflects the “average” group judgment is ultimately an empirical question¹⁶. This perspective requires rigorous validation processes to elucidate the conditions under which the simulation can be considered sufficiently accurate in capturing the intended demographic or psychological profiles. It necessitates the development of methodologies for comparing LLM outputs with large-scale survey data or experimental results. The goal is to establish benchmarks for fidelity and to calibrate the models accordingly. By incorporating diverse datasets and feedback loops, researchers can refine LLMs to better mimic the nuances of human thought and language use within specific contexts. This iterative process enhances the models’ utility as role-playing tools, facilitating more nuanced, accurate simulations of human behavior and social dynamics, which is particularly critical in real-world applications (e.g., medicine).

At the same time, the text-based nature of simulation also makes it apparent the inherent limitations of using language to understand behavior and psychology. One such limitation is that written text is merely an interpretation of the world, not an absolute truth. For instance, descriptions by outsiders may reflect stereotypes or inaccuracies, while those by insiders can be influenced by self-serving biases in narrative creation. And not all these perspectives are equally represented in the training data. Another limitation is the inability of words to fully capture the real world. Much of our understanding of people comes from non-verbal, non-linguistic cues, as well as behavior measures (e.g., reaction time, accuracy) that may fundamentally differ from self-reports¹⁷. Even for probing attitudes and behavior from self-reports, fundamental limitations exist: what people say may reflect perceived social norms rather than their personally held beliefs and may also differ from their implicit attitudes and explicit actions.

A particular drawback of dominant LLMs like GPT is their closed nature, which complicates the assessment of the nature (including limitations) of the training data and, consequently, the interpretations of model responses. For example, by examining the linguistic associations between a concept (e.g., “flowers”) and an evaluation (“pleasant”), interrogation of language corpora has helped reveal that natural language data contain implicit biases and attitudes^{18,19}—an approach that fundamentally requires open data. Therefore, open models like Meta’s LLaMA series may be more suitable for social science studies.

Concluding remarks

As AI capabilities advance, it is crucial that we accurately describe and conceptualize these technologies to foster appropriate understanding and usage. Treating LLMs as human stand-ins wrongfully attributes human-like qualities such as beliefs or attitudes to these models, leading to

both misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Their responses do not consistently represent average human judgments, and using them as proxies for the human mind risks anthropomorphizing algorithms in ways that obscure their fundamental statistical nature. Rather, conceptualizing them as role-playing tools highlights their utility while making explicit their limitations.

As versatile simulation tools, LLMs allow researchers to explore a multitude of perspectives and hypotheses without falling prey to the illusion that we are peering into an “average” mind when interacting with these models. Accurate language is essential for developing appropriate regulations and managing expectations regarding the capacities and limitations of AI. By embracing LLMs as multifaceted role-playing tools rather than replacement minds, we can harness their capabilities responsibly while avoiding potentially hazardous misconceptions.

References

- 1 Dillion, D., Tandon, N., Gu, Y. & Gray, K. Can AI language models replace human participants? *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **27**, 597-600, doi:10.1016/j.tics.2023.04.008 (2023).
- 2 Binz, M. & Schulz, E. Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **120**, e2218523120, doi:10.1073/pnas.2218523120 (2023).
- 3 Shanahan, M., McDonell, K. & Reynolds, L. Role play with large language models. *Nature* **623**, 493-498, doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06647-8 (2023).
- 4 Lin, Z. Techniques for supercharging academic writing with generative AI. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 2310.17143 (in press).
- 5 Lin, Z. Why and how to embrace AI such as ChatGPT in your academic life. *Royal Society Open Science* **10**, 230658, doi:10.1098/rsos.230658 (2023).
- 6 Lin, Z. How to write effective prompts for large language models. *Nat Hum Behav*, doi:10.31234/osf.io/r78fc (in press).
- 7 Shanahan, M. Talking about large language models. *Commun. ACM* **67**, 68–79, doi:10.1145/3624724 (2024).
- 8 Niszczoła, P. & Janczak, M. Large language models can replicate cross-cultural differences in personality. *arXiv* **2310.10679** (2023).
- 9 Tjuatja, L., Chen, V., Wu, S. T., Talwalkar, A. & Neubig, G. Do LLMs exhibit human-like response biases? A case study in survey design. *arXiv* **2311.04076** (2023).
- 10 Aher, G. V., Arriaga, R. I. & Kalai, A. T. in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning* Vol. 202 (eds Krause Andreas *et al.*) 337--371 (PMLR, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2023).
- 11 Harding, J., D’Alessandro, W., Laskowski, N. G. & Long, R. AI language models cannot replace human research participants. *AI & SOCIETY*, doi:10.1007/s00146-023-01725-x (2023).
- 12 Park, P. S., Schoenegger, P. & Zhu, C. Diminished diversity-of-thought in a standard large language model. *Behav. Res. Methods*, doi:10.3758/s13428-023-02307-x (2024).

- 13 Lin, Z. Towards an AI policy framework in scholarly publishing. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **82**, 85-88, doi:10.1016/j.tics.2023.12.002 (2024).
- 14 Park, J. S. *et al.* in *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* Article 2 (Association for Computing Machinery, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2023).
- 15 Horton, J. J. Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus? *National Bureau of Economic Research*, No. w31122 (2023).
- 16 Argyle, L. P. *et al.* Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis* **31**, 337-351, doi:10.1017/pan.2023.2 (2023).
- 17 Dang, J., King, K. M. & Inzlicht, M. Why are self-report and behavioral measures weakly correlated? *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **24**, 267-269, doi:10.1016/j.tics.2020.01.007 (2020).
- 18 Caliskan, A., Bryson, J. J. & Narayanan, A. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science* **356**, 183-186, doi:10.1126/science.aal4230 (2017).
- 19 Bhatia, S. & Walasek, L. Predicting implicit attitudes with natural language data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **120**, e2220726120, doi:10.1073/pnas.2220726120 (2023).