# Are Large Language Models (LLMs) Good Social Predictors?

Kaiqi Yang<sup>1</sup>, Hang Li<sup>1</sup>, Hongzhi Wen<sup>1</sup>, Tai-Quan Peng<sup>2</sup>, Jiliang Tang<sup>1</sup>, Hui Liu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Michigan State University

<sup>2</sup>Department of Communication, Michigan State University

kqyang@msu.edu

#### Abstract

The prediction has served as a crucial scientific method in modern social studies. With the recent advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs), efforts have been made to leverage LLMs to predict the human features in social life, such as presidential voting. These works suggest that LLMs are capable of generating human-like responses. However, we find that the promising performance achieved by previous studies is because of the existence of input shortcut features to the response. In fact, by removing these shortcuts, the performance is reduced dramatically. To further revisit the ability of LLMs, we introduce a novel social prediction task, Soc-PRF Prediction, which utilizes general features as input and simulates real-world social study settings. With the comprehensive investigations on various LLMs, we reveal that LLMs cannot work as expected on social prediction when given general input features without shortcuts. We further investigate possible reasons for this phenomenon that suggest potential ways to enhance LLMs for social prediction.

### 1 Introduction

Prediction is one of the crucial elements of the scientific methods in social studies (Hofman et al., 2017), with a body of literature (Liben-Nowell and Kleinberg, 2003; Bakshy et al., 2011; Cheng et al., 2014) devoted to estimating unobserved or missing data based on observed features. Historically, social prediction is made by statistical models such as linear regression (Uyanık and Güler, 2013). With the development of machine learning, supervised methods have been adopted, including random forest, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and neural networks (Chen et al., 2021b). However, the classic machine learning methods notably rely on extensive labeled training datasets, which is laborintensive, especially in social studies. Additionally, the predictive power of machine learning methods is limited (Mackenzie, 2015; Athey, 2018) and can hardly model the complicated phenomenon in social life.

Meanwhile, Large Language Models (LLMs) have advanced various text-related tasks, such as question-answering (Zhuang et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2023), code-generation (Nijkamp et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2021a), and math word problems solving (Zhou et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022)). The extensive world knowledge (Zhao et al., 2023) and inference abilities (Creswell et al., 2022) of LLMs have the potential to mitigate the limitations of classic machine learning methods in predicting features of social datasets. Therefore, there are recent works leveraging LLMs in predicting and simulating human responses, such as voting decisions (Argyle et al., 2022; von der Heyde et al., 2023) and political attitude (Rosenbusch et al., 2023). They take advantage of LLMs to augment existing datasets with previously inaccessible features and promising performance is reported. However, our preliminary investigation revisiting the case of voting prediction (Argyle et al., 2022) with LLMs indicates that their performance is bolstered by the presence of shortcuts to the desired response features. Specifically, these shortcuts arise when the input contains features directly associated with the feature to be predicted, leading to the exceptional performance of both machine learning models and LLM-based methods. Unfortunately, this efficiency comes with a downside: it overlooks the essential task of uncovering authentic relationships between various features and the label. When these shortcuts are eliminated, we observe a significant decline in the LLMs' effectiveness in addressing social study issues, as detailed in Section 2. This observation leads us to question the true capability of LLMs in social predictions, challenging the prevailing perception of their prowess (Argyle et al., 2023).

To investigate this problem, we introduce a set of studies that utilize general social features as input and simulate real-world settings of feature prediction. In particular, to comprehensively understand the power of LLMs in social predicting, we introduce a new task, Soc-PRF Prediction (stands for Social Profile Prediction). It is designed to predict the social features of individuals while accounting for selected features as explanatory and response variables. Besides, informed by social studies (Bailey, 1998), we categorize social features into two groups that capture individuals' features from different perspectives. This enables us to design three distinct settings, which rigorously categorize features into groups and assess LLMs' predictive capacities. In this work, we evaluate various LLMs, including closed-sourced models GPT 3.5 (OpenAI, 2022), GPT 4 (Achiam et al., 2023), and Gemini Pro (Anil et al., 2023), as well as lighter open-sourced models like Llama-7B, Llama-7Bchat (Touvron et al., 2023) and Mistral-7B (Jiang et al., 2023). Our studies suggest that LLMs cannot work on social prediction with general input features without shortcuts. We further explore the potential reasons and future directions to enhance LLMs for social prediction.

## 2 Revisit Voting Prediction with LLMs

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive performance across several societal domains, notably in predicting voting decisions in the United States (Argyle et al., 2022; Veselovsky et al., 2023). In this section, we revisit the voting prediction study with LLMs in (Argyle et al., 2022).

The voting prediction study in (Argyle et al., 2022) adopts the American National Election Studies (ANES) to construct the dataset. ANES is a survey conducted in every presidential election year, with features about American public life, especially political views and decisions. То elicit LLMs' prediction of individual voting decisions, the study selects 10 input features, i.e., racial/ethnic self-identification, gender, age, ideological self-identification, party identification, political interest, church attendance, if discussing politics with family/friends, patriotism feelings, state of residence. With all the features above, prompts of individual profiles are constructed

with a first-person template and a question to elicit prediction. Then the prompts are fed into LLMs for completion, and the words filled in by LLMs serve as the predicted voting decisions. An example of the prompts is:

> Racially, I am <u>white</u>. I am <u>male</u>. Ideologically, I describe myself as <u>conservative</u>. Politically, I am a <u>strong Republican</u> ... In <u>2016</u>, I voted for:

Intuitively two of the input features are likely equivalent to voting decisions, i.e. ideological self-placement and party identification. It is evident from political studies (Miller, 1991; Dalton, 2016) that given the partisan nature of American politics, voting decisions are closely related to these two features. To validate the intuition, we calculate their Cramer's V scores with the voting decisions. Cramer's V is a measurement of association between features, ranging from 0 to 1; the score 0 indicates no association and 1 indicates a perfect association. We find that these two features are highly correlated with the vote decisions. For example, in ANES 2016 wave data, these two features have Cramer's V scores of 0.86 and 0.76, respectively. This indicates their strong associations with voting decisions and consequently, they can become the shortcuts to make predictions.

Next, we conduct further experiments to study the impact of such shortcuts on prediction performance. We choose both GPT-based approaches and classic supervised machine learning models. For GPT-based approaches, we deploy GPT 3.5 as the basis and follow the prompts and zero-shot setting in (Argyle et al., 2022) to make predictions based on individual profiles. For classic supervised machine learning models, we choose the Random Forest Classifier. Since the supervised classifier needs labeled data to train, we split the dataset into 80%/10%/10% as training, validation, and test sets. There are two settings for each method: (1) Full, taking the full set of input features; (2) w/o shortcut, taking input features without the shortcut features. To evaluate the performance, we deploy accuracy as the metric, given the balanced distribution of the voting decision (51.9% vs. 48.1%). Besides, we adopt Cohen's Kappa  $\kappa$  as a metric to evaluate the agreement between prediction and true data. Cohen's Kappa  $\kappa$  has values ranging from 0 to 1, where 1 indicates stronger agreement and 0 indicates almost no agreement.



Figure 1: The performance of voting prediction. In this table, GPT stands for the LLM-based approach and we choose GPT 3.5 following (Argyle et al., 2022). The **Full** indicates settings with all input features, and **w/o shortcut** stands for settings without the two shortcut features.

As shown in Figure 1, the GPT-based approach with all input features achieved the accuracy of 90.82% and the Cohen's Kappa  $\kappa$  of 0.83, which aligns with (Argyle et al., 2022). However, when removing the two shortcut features, the performance of both methods drops dramatically. For example, the performance of GPT 3.5 drops from the accuracy of 90.82% and  $\kappa$  of 0.83 to an accuracy of 61.60% and  $\kappa$  of 0.43; similarly, the performance of GP.22%, 0.23. Given the balanced distribution of the voting decision feature, the performance without shortcut features is considerably unsatisfactory.

Our preliminary study suggests that the promising performance of social prediction via LLMs reported by prior works (Argyle et al., 2022) could be from the existence of shortcut features. This finding motivates us to question if LLMs are *really* powerful in social prediction. To explore this question, we design a set of studies that avoid shortcut features as inputs and resemble realistic scenarios in the following section.

### **3** Social Profile Prediction

In this section, we introduce a social prediction task that evaluates the predictive power of LLMs without shortcuts. First, we construct a social prediction dataset based on survey data where we validate that there are no shortcut features. Then we introduce three settings of evaluations to simulate real-world scenarios. Finally, we show the performance of LLMs' prediction in the proposed settings and discuss the results.

#### 3.1 Task and Dataset

As illustrated in Section 2, the inclusion of shortcut features can affect the evaluation of the power of LLMs in social prediction. Therefore, we design Soc-PRF Prediction that takes individual social features as input to predict other missing features in profiles. Next, we introduce the dataset for the task.

The dataset derives from Gallup World Poll (Gallup, 2009), one of the most prestigious social surveys that guarantees reliability and offers various types of features. Initialized in 2006, the Gallup World Poll has been conducted in over 150 countries and follows strict random sampling. Questions in the Gallup World Poll are designed by political scientists, measuring key indicators of social life, such as law and order, financial life, civic engagement, etc. Besides, it collects individual demographic data to construct the survey dataset (Tortora et al., 2010).

In this paper, we construct the dataset based on Gallup World Poll (Gallup, 2009) and its corresponding questions. We pick the data from the USA and the data we use in this work is primarily collected between 2016 and 2020. To keep the basic information complete, we remove all the samples with missing data in demographic features. After the data cleaning, the dataset includes 4,941 profiles of American individuals (samples). Additionally, we pick a set of features from the survey to construct the profiles, which encompasses 16 social features reflecting a variety of socio-demographic characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors.

### 3.2 Task Settings

In social studies, social datasets have predominantly been derived from two methodologies: traditional surveys and online data collection (Couper, 2017; Diaz et al., 2016; Callegaro et al., 2014). As one characteristic of social features, mutability measures the features' propensity to change or be influenced by social context. Following social studies (Bailey, 1992; Brensinger and Eyal, 2021; Sen and Wasow, 2016; Halley, 2017), social features can be roughly divided into two mutability groups: high-mutability and low-mutability. In most social

datasets, features with high mutability and low mutability can hardly be collected simultaneously. For example, although survey data collected through in-person interviews is of high quality, it predominantly captures features of low mutability; the dynamic tracking of highly mutable features across all topics and times is nearly impractical due to associated costs. On the other hand, online data collection methods, such as crawling posts from social networking platforms, have the advantage of collecting high-mutability features. Facilitated by natural language processing (NLP) tools (Alghamdi and Alfalqi, 2015; Vayansky and Kumar, 2020; Hussein, 2018; Yue et al., 2019), real-time human attitudes and opinions are easy to collect. Yet, features of low mutability (e.g. demographic features) often remain inaccessible due to privacy constraints.

Among 16 social features in our proposed dataset, we assign them to low-mutability and highmutability groups, respectively. The low-mutability features are socio-demographic features, including age, gender, marriage, education, employment, income, and urbanicity. Here the age, gender, marriage status, employment status, urbanicity of residence refer to the individual status when taking the interview, while education refers to the highest completed level of education, and income is the annual household income of last year. The high-mutability features are all about attitudes or behaviors of social life, whose topics include Internet access, social life, economic confidence, civic engagement, and approval of leadership. For each topic, there are one to three questions around it. In save of space, we denote the questions as IA, SL1, SL2, EC1, EC2, CE1, CE2, CE3, AL, respectively. The details of questions are shown in Appendix A.1.

According to features' mutability, we design three settings to assess the capability of LLMs in predicting missing features for the individual profiles, which simulate real-world scenarios for social data: from low-mutability features to predicting high-mutability features (for survey data), and from high-mutability features to predicting highmutability or low-mutability features (for online data). Following the prior works especially (Argyle et al., 2022), we set all three settings as zero-shot, without taking any labeled data as input.

**low2high**. In this setting, the input features possess low mutability, and the output features ex-

hibit high mutability. This setting is designed for traditional survey datasets, where low-mutability features (e.g. demographic features) are comprehensively collected, but high-mutability features (such as attitudes) are sparse.

To construct prompts of individual profiles, we adopt the template in (Argyle et al., 2022), designing the prompt as a self-description of individuals and inducing the LLMs to predict missing features by completing the self-description. One example of the prompt is:

> I am a <u>male</u> in the USA. I am <u>42</u> years old. My current marital status is <u>married</u>. My highest completed level of education is <u>middle</u> level. My current employment status is <u>employed</u>. My Annual Household Income is  $\frac{12600}{12600}$ . I am from a suburb of a large city.

> When I'm asked "Do you have access to the Internet in any way, whether on a mobile phone, a computer, or some other device?", my answer is

In the provided prompt, the underlined text indicates the values of individual features, and italicized content presents the question to elicit responses. For the subsequent settings, we utilize prompts with the same template.

**high2low**: This setting denotes the prediction from high-mutability to low-mutability features. To construct the input profiles of individuals, we take values from all 9 high-mutability features, with a question about one low-mutability feature. Serving as the inverse setting of low2high, this setting is designed for profile construction using online data: aided with NLP tools, the in-time attitudes of individuals can be captured from online posts with ease, yet their demographic features are inaccessible.

**high2high**. In this setting, high-mutability features are utilized as input to predict other highmutability features. Different from high2low setting, in order to avoid shortcuts, the features sharing the same topic with the response feature are excluded from the input profile prompts; rather, we put all high-mutability features of each topic as inputs. This setting simulates a specific realworld scenario, where individuals' attitudes toward one topic are collected, but their opinions on other topics of interest remain unexpressed.



Figure 2: Correlation between features in the dataset. The metric is *Cramer's V*, and values close to 1 indicate strong correlations.

**Evaluation Metrics**. Most features in the dataset have imbalanced distributions. For example, the feature IA has 91.82% samples with "yes" labels, while only 8.18% samples with "no". In this situation, accuracy is not a suitable metric for imbalanced predictions (Gu et al., 2009). As a result, we employ AUC as the metric to evaluate the classification performance.

#### 3.3 Feature Analysis

To ensure that there are no shortcut features used as input for predictions, we first check the correlations (i.e., the Cramer's V) of all feature pairs. As shown in Figure 2, most of the Cramer's V scores are less than 0.5. The maximum (between CE2 and CE3) is 0.58, which is merely a moderate level of correlation. This relatively high correlation is because they share a similar topic (i.e., civic engagement). Therefore, in the following evaluations, we will not consider features that share the same topic with the response as inputs.

To evaluate the predictive power of the selected features, we follow the traditional supervised setting. Take the setting of low2high as the example, we first chose Random Forest Classifier as the basis model, and split the dataset by 80%/10%/10% as training, validation, and test sets. The results are shown in Figure 3, the AUC scores are much higher than those of the random guessing method. For example, the AUC score of IA is 95.07, while its corresponding score of random guessing is 48.34.

These observations suggest that though the selected features are not shortcuts, they are still powerful in predicting the target responses.

#### 3.4 LLMs as the Predictor

In this section, we leverage LLMs for the Soc-PRF Prediction task with the aforementioned three settings. The results for the three settings are illustrated in Table 1, Table 2, and Figure 4, respectively. In the tables, "Random" indicates the random guessing method. Note that for the settings high2high, we only partially show the results because the observations are similar. We note that the performance of LLMs is closely similar to the random guessing and is far from satisfactory. The poor results appear consistently in all the settings and with all the LLMs. These observations indicate that LLMs are struggling to distinguish individual features with the given information in the proposed settings.

### 3.5 Discussions

### 3.5.1 Population v.s. Individual

As shown in the previous subsection, even advanced LLMs like GPT-4 encounter challenges in accurately predicting social features, often yielding outcomes similar to random guessing. To explore the underlying reason for such phenomena, we use the distribution comparisons between predicted features and true ones under the setting low2high as our case studies; the results are shown in Figure 5. From the analysis, we have the following observations. First, LLM's prediction of less mutable features, such as IA and SL, is prone to share similar distribution patterns with the true ones. This fact indicates that LLMs do contain some global knowledge about these social features at the population level, but they face challenges in building precise connections to different individual samples during the prediction. Thus, when making individual-level predictions, LLMs may simply generate random samples from the feature distribution. Second, the population-level patterns of highly mutable features, such as different CEs, are seemingly not captured by existing LLMs, and LLMs always prefer to generate negative responses on these features. This fact indicates that building accurate predictors with LLMs for those highly mutable features is more challenging as it not only requires LLMs to establish the connection to individual samples but



Figure 3: Performance of Random Forest and Random Guessing. The metric is AUC.

Model	IA	SL1	SL2	EC1	EC2	CE1	CE2	CE3	AL
Random	48.34	52.09	48.47	52.12	50.07	49.89	49.16	49.32	48.60
Llama-7B	50.00	50.00	50.00	48.75	55.41	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Llama-7B-chat	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.95	51.80	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Mistral-7B	50.00	50.00	50.00	53.12	56.89	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Gemini Pro	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.76	60.93	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
GPT-3.5	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.63	58.20	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
GPT-4	50.00	50.00	50.00	53.82	56.57	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00

Table 1: Performance of LLMs of setting low2high.



Figure 4: Performance of GPT 3.5 of setting high2high. The metric is **AUC** score. The sign "-" indicates no valid data, either because the input features (Y-axis) and output features (X-axis) share the same topic, or they are not conducted simultaneously in the survey.

also external population-level knowledge about the features.

### 3.5.2 Incorporating Labeled Data

Although the performance of zero-shot LLMs' prediction is much worse than our expectation, the strong performance of the random forest classifier in Figure 3 indicates that our designed prediction task is reasonable if sufficient labeled data is considered. Based on this finding, we explore the effectiveness of incorporating supervision signals to LLMs based on the low2high setting as one example. Following the prior studies (Brown et al., 2020; Song et al., 2023), we leverage the in-context learning ability of LLMs (Dong et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023) to incorporate a few labeled samples as demonstrations. To be specific, for each individual profile, we sample a few other individual profiles from the dataset as a reference, whose *year* and *marriage* features are of the same group. Then, besides constructing vanilla prompts as introduced in Section 3.2, we add the full information (including the input and output features) of these reference samples in the prompts. Finally, the LLMs are asked to make predictions as the original settings. One example of such prompts is:

Here are self-descriptions of <u>two</u> people: "I am a <u>male</u> in the USA ... my answer is <u>yes</u>"; "I am a <u>female</u> in the USA ... my answer is <u>no</u>"; ...

I am a <u>male</u> in the USA. I am <u>42</u> years old ...;

When I'm asked "Do you have access to the Internet in any way, whether on a mobile phone, a computer, or some other device?", my answer is

With the augmented prompts, we introduce samples with similar input features and show the true labels of these samples. Like the supervised methods, these demonstrations allow LLMs to make predictions with the help of supervision signals. To provide comprehensive information, the positive

Model	age	gender	marriage	education	employment	income	urbanicity
Random	49.50	49.62	49.45	49.99	50.54	48.14	50.22
Llama-7B	33.50	49.81	50.00	55.15	50.00	50.05	49.85
Llama-7B-chat	40.00	50.00	50.00	35.21	50.33	51.18	50.09
Mistral-7B	33.55	49.81	50.00	55.15	50.00	50.05	49.85
Gemini Pro	38.80	51.14	50.00	66.70	50.00	50.10	49.75
GPT-3.5	41.35	50.00	51.29	57.76	49.59	50.95	50.94
GPT-4	40.75	50.00	50.88	65.65	52.01	53.80	52.09

Table 2: Performance of LLMs (GPT 3.5 and GPT 4) of setting high2low.



Figure 5: Distributions of Social Features. Note that the last two features (civic engagement behaviors) are more mutable than the first two.

and negative labels are balanced within the reference samples. The results of experiments with 2 and 4 demonstrations are shown in Table 3. With all selected features, the prompts with demonstrations help LLMs to achieve better prediction performance. However, when incorporating 4 demonstrations into the prompt, we observe marginal or no improvement compared with the setting with 2 demonstrations. This observation suggests that how to effectively incorporate more demonstrations for LLMs for social prediction still faces great challenges.

## 3.5.3 Enriching Input Features

As aforementioned, in reality, no matter survey data or online data, we face constraints to collect sufficient features to describe individuals. In fact, we find that such constraints may also limit the power of LLMs to discriminate different individuals in social prediction. For example, in the low2high setting, we can identify a sub-group from the population characterized by all low-mutability features: *male, married, age between 30 and 60, higher level of education, fully employed, annual household income within the middle 30%, living in suburbs of large cities.* Within this subgroup, all samples share the same input; however, their responses are varied significantly. For example, to the question CE1, 60.53% of samples answered "no" and 29.47% answered "yes". This variability indicates the lack of discriminative features poses significant challenges in precisely predicting individual responses. To unlock the potential of LLMs in predicting social features, enriching input features is crucial.

Table 3: The performance of LLMs (GPT 3.5) with a few demonstrations.

	Zero-Shot	2 Demos	4 Demos
IA	50.00	71.61	82.67
SL2	50.00	50.60	50.04
EC1	52.63	50.52	53.47
CE1	50.00	60.17	55.34
CE2	50.00	53.22	52.79
AL	50.00	52.03	50.80

# 4 Related Work

In this section, we give an overview of works related to classic machine learning methods and LLMs in social studies.

## 4.1 Machine Learning Methods in Social Prediction

Quantitative social studies have deployed machine learning methods to model and predict social fea-

tures in replace of the classical statistical models like OLS and logistic regression (Chen et al., 2021b; Hindman, 2015). In studies of criminology, K-means and neural networks are deployed to predict criminal behaviors (Reier Forradellas et al., 2020). To predict communication phenomena, the random forest models are utilized to predict the view count of online posts (Hsu et al., 2017). Besides, Dong et al. (2018) uses the SVM classifier to predict public emotions to social news. In addition, deep learning methods have also been widely used in social prediction. For example, CNN models are used to process image data in social studies (Messer and Fausser, 2019; Dong et al., 2018); RNN and its variants have been utilized to predict sequential data like stock changes (Wu et al., 2018) and user interests (Liu et al., 2018). However, these methods either suffer from the need for massive training data or the limited predictive power of models, highlighting the need for more powerful prediction models.

#### 4.2 Using LLMs to Predict Social Features

With the advent of LLMs, predicting social features with LLMs has been studied by numerous works (Ziems et al., 2023; Veselovsky et al., 2023). Among social studies, LLMs have been deployed to predict the potential responses or outcomes with ease, especially in scenarios where traditional methods are constrained by cost or ethical concerns. In economics, Phelps and Russell (2023) studied game theory by examining cooperative and competitive behaviors with LLMs. Within political science, Wu et al. (2023) deployed LLMs to predict the ideological views of politicians. For communication studies, LLMs are used to simulate and predict the potential outcomes of toxic discourse (Törnberg et al., 2023), the political affiliation of Twitter posts (Törnberg, 2023), etc.

Additionally, there are growing interests in leveraging LLMs with social survey and interview, aiming to replicate human-like responses to certain questions or attributes of individuals. For example, Argyle et al., 2022 proposed "silicon samples" that deploy LLMs to simulate the people in a survey or interview and predict their partisan views and voting decisions. Dillion et al., 2023 examined the LLMs response to psychological tests, comparing the decisions and judgements from LLMs and humans. Aher et al., 2023 proposed sets of experiments to check LLMs response to interview and games. Besides, fine-tuning LLMs is a promising method for better prediction of social attitudes across years of surveys (Kim and Lee, 2023). At the same time, discussions (Jansen et al., 2023) are hold about the potential and risks of deploying LLMs in social survey studies.

## 5 Conclusion

In this study, we introduce a survey-based social prediction task to assess the LLMs' predictive ability using general features. Through the replication of experiments and ablation studies of voting prediction tasks, we reveal a significant performance gap between input prompts with and without shortcut features. To further study the LLMs' predictive ability, we propose a real-world survey dataset with rigorously selected features. Based on it, we demonstrate the inability of LLMs to predict social features only with general features. Furthermore, our empirical studies further showcase the potential reasons that constrain the LLMs' predictive power. In our future research, we aim to explore the efficient methods of providing supervision signals and reference information to improve LLMs prediction performance. Moreover, with the abundant social survey and online data, we plan to use fine-tuning methods to fit the LLMs knowledge with social prediction tasks.

### 6 Limitations

In this study, we examine the predictive power of LLMs. We replicate a voting prediction study and find the shortcuts producing plausible results. However, we do not investigate how to select informative features that enhance prediction and what is the upper bound of this task. Then we conduct comprehensive experiments of social prediction, and contend that incorporating labeled data and enrich input features could benefit social prediction. However, we do not provide experiments to validate these suggestions. Lastly, the LLMs are not further tuned and the prompts are adopted from prior works. Tailoring LLMs and proper prompts to meet the needs of social prediction tasks could be a potential direction to explore. Such adjustments could potentially unlock ability and applicability of LLMs in social prediction, further improving the performance of LLMs.

### References

Josh Achiam et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report.

- 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.
- Rubayyi Alghamdi and Khalid Alfalqi. 2015. A survey of topic modeling in text mining. *Int. J. Adv. Comput. Sci. Appl.(IJACSA)*, 6(1).
- ANES. User's guide and codebook for the anes 2012 time series study.
- Rohan Anil et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Lisa P. Argyle, E. Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua Ronald Gubler, Christopher Michael Rytting, and David Wingate. 2022. Out of One, Many: Using Language Models to Simulate Human Samples. *Political Analysis*, 31:337 – 351.
- 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.
- Susan Athey. 2018. The impact of machine learning on economics. In *The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda*, pages 507–547. University of Chicago Press.
- Kenneth D Bailey. 1992. Globals, mutables, and immutables: a new look at the micro-macro link. *Quality and Quantity*, 26(3):259–276.
- Kenneth D Bailey. 1998. A theory of mutable and immutable characteristics: Their impact on allocation and structural positions. *Quality and Quantity*, 32(4):383–398.
- Eytan Bakshy, Jake M Hofman, Winter A Mason, and Duncan J Watts. 2011. Everyone's an influencer: quantifying influence on twitter. In *Proceedings* of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining, pages 65–74.
- Jordan Brensinger and Gil Eyal. 2021. The sociology of personal identification. *Sociological Theory*, 39(4):265–292.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Mario Callegaro, Reginald P Baker, Jelke Bethlehem, Anja S Göritz, Jon A Krosnick, and Paul J Lavrakas. 2014. *Online panel research: A data quality perspective.* John Wiley & Sons.

- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021a. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Yunsong Chen, Xiaogang Wu, Anning Hu, Guangye He, and Guodong Ju. 2021b. Social prediction: a new research paradigm based on machine learning. *The Journal of Chinese Sociology*, 8:1–21.
- Justin Cheng, Lada Adamic, P Alex Dow, Jon Michael Kleinberg, and Jure Leskovec. 2014. Can cascades be predicted? In Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on World wide web, pages 925–936.
- Mick P Couper. 2017. New developments in survey data collection. *Annual review of sociology*, 43:121–145.
- Antonia Creswell, Murray Shanahan, and Irina Higgins. 2022. Selection-inference: Exploiting large language models for interpretable logical reasoning. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2205.09712.
- Russell J Dalton. 2016. Party identification and its implications. Oxford research encyclopedia of politics.
- Fernando Diaz, Michael Gamon, Jake M Hofman, Emre Kıcıman, and David Rothschild. 2016. Online and social media data as an imperfect continuous panel survey. *PloS one*, 11(1):e0145406.
- Danica Dillion, Niket Tandon, Yuling Gu, and Kurt Gray. 2023. Can ai language models replace human participants? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. A survey for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*.
- Rida Dong, Oinke Peng, Xintong Li, and Xinyu Guan. 2018. Cnn-svm with embedded recurrent structure for social emotion prediction. In 2018 Chinese Automation Congress (CAC), pages 3024–3029. IEEE.
- G Gallup. 2009. World poll methodology. Technical report, Technical Report, Washington, DC.
- Qiong Gu, Li Zhu, and Zhihua Cai. 2009. Evaluation measures of the classification performance of imbalanced data sets. In *Computational Intelligence and Intelligent Systems: 4th International Symposium, ISICA 2009, Huangshi, China, October 23-25, 2009. Proceedings 4*, pages 461–471. Springer.
- Janet E Halley. 2017. Sexual orientation and the politics of biology: A critique of the argument from immutability. In *Sexual orientation and rights*, pages 3–68. Routledge.
- Matthew Hindman. 2015. Building better models: Prediction, replication, and machine learning in the social sciences. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1):48–62.

- Jake M Hofman, Amit Sharma, and Duncan J Watts. 2017. Prediction and explanation in social systems. *Science*, 355(6324):486–488.
- Chih-Chung Hsu, Ying-Chin Lee, Ping-En Lu, Shian-Shin Lu, Hsiao-Ting Lai, Chihg-Chu Huang, Chun Wang, Yang-Jiun Lin, and Weng-Tai Su. 2017. Social media prediction based on residual learning and random forest. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1865– 1870.
- Doaa Mohey El-Din Mohamed Hussein. 2018. A survey on sentiment analysis challenges. *Journal of King Saud University-Engineering Sciences*, 30(4):330– 338.
- Bernard J Jansen, Soon-gyo Jung, and Joni Salminen. 2023. Employing large language models in survey research. *Natural Language Processing Journal*.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Junsol Kim and Byungkyu Lee. 2023. Ai-augmented surveys: Leveraging large language models for opinion prediction in nationally representative surveys. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09620*.
- David Liben-Nowell and Jon Kleinberg. 2003. The link prediction problem for social networks. In *Proceedings of the twelfth international conference on Information and knowledge management*, pages 556–559.
- Chi Harold Liu, Jie Xu, Jian Tang, and Jon Crowcroft. 2018. Social-aware sequential modeling of user interests: A deep learning approach. *IEEE Transactions* on Knowledge and Data Engineering, 31(11):2200–2212.
- Adrian Mackenzie. 2015. The production of prediction: What does machine learning want? *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18(4-5):429–445.
- Uwe Messer and Stefan Fausser. 2019. Predicting social perception from faces: A deep learning approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.00217*.
- Warren E Miller. 1991. Party identification, realignment, and party voting: Back to the basics. *American Political Science Review*, 85(2):557–568.
- Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*.

OpenAI. 2022. Openai chatgpt.

Steve Phelps and Yvan I Russell. 2023. Investigating emergent goal-like behaviour in large language models using experimental economics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07970*.

- Ricardo Francisco Reier Forradellas, Sergio Luis Náñez Alonso, Javier Jorge-Vazquez, and Marcela Laura Rodriguez. 2020. Applied machine learning in social sciences: neural networks and crime prediction. *Social Sciences*, 10(1):4.
- Hannes Rosenbusch, Claire E Stevenson, and Han LJ van der Maas. 2023. How accurate are gpt-3's hypotheses about social science phenomena? *Digital Society*, 2(2):26.
- Maya Sen and Omar Wasow. 2016. Race as a bundle of sticks: Designs that estimate effects of seemingly immutable characteristics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19:499–522.
- Chan Hee Song, Jiaman Wu, Clayton Washington, Brian M Sadler, Wei-Lun Chao, and Yu Su. 2023. Llm-planner: Few-shot grounded planning for embodied agents with large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2998–3009.
- Yiming Tan, Dehai Min, Yu Li, Wenbo Li, Nan Hu, Yongrui Chen, and Guilin Qi. 2023. Can chatgpt replace traditional kbqa models? an in-depth analysis of the question answering performance of the gpt llm family. In *International Semantic Web Conference*, pages 348–367. Springer.
- Petter Törnberg. 2023. Chatgpt-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political twitter messages with zero-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06588*.
- Petter Törnberg, Diliara Valeeva, Justus Uitermark, and Christopher Bail. 2023. Simulating social media using large language models to evaluate alternative news feed algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05984*.
- Robert D Tortora, Rajesh Srinivasan, and Neli Esipova. 2010. The gallup world poll. Survey methods in multinational, multiregional, and multicultural contexts, pages 535–543.
- Hugo Touvron et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Gülden Kaya Uyanık and Neşe Güler. 2013. A study on multiple linear regression analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106:234–240.
- Ike Vayansky and Sathish AP Kumar. 2020. A review of topic modeling methods. *Information Systems*, 94:101582.
- Veniamin Veselovsky, Manoel Horta Ribeiro, Akhil Arora, Martin Josifoski, Ashton Anderson, and Robert West. 2023. Generating faithful synthetic data with large language models: A case study in computational social science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15041*.

- Leah von der Heyde, Anna-Carolina Haensch, and Alexander Wenz. 2023. Assessing bias in llmgenerated synthetic datasets: The case of german voter behavior. Technical report, Center for Open Science.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Huizhe Wu, Wei Zhang, Weiwei Shen, and Jun Wang. 2018. Hybrid deep sequential modeling for social text-driven stock prediction. In *Proceedings of the* 27th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management, pages 1627–1630.
- Patrick Y Wu, Joshua A Tucker, Jonathan Nagler, and Solomon Messing. 2023. Large language models can be used to estimate the ideologies of politicians in a zero-shot learning setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12057*.
- Lin Yue, Weitong Chen, Xue Li, Wanli Zuo, and Minghao Yin. 2019. A survey of sentiment analysis in social media. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 60:617–663.
- Ruiqi Zhang, Spencer Frei, and Peter L Bartlett. 2023. Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09927*.
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. 2022. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*.
- Yuchen Zhuang, Yue Yu, Kuan Wang, Haotian Sun, and Chao Zhang. 2023. Toolqa: A dataset for llm question answering with external tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13304*.
- Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiaao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Can large language models transform computational social science? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03514*.

# A Appendix

# A.1 Questions for Features

We categorize the selected 16 features into two groups, i.e. high-mutability and low-mutability features. The details of high-mutability features are shown in Table 4 and those of low-mutability features are shown in Table 5. The column "Question Abbrev." indicates the abbreviation of the features, which are broadly used in this work. The column "Question Identifiers" indicates the identifier labels of the corresponding questions in the original Gallup survey.

# A.1.1 Feature Convert Methods

In the main experiments, there are features of integer or several classes, such as income, employment, etc. We convert them into groups (with the number of groups no larger than four). For income, we calculate the 35% and 65% percentiles of the annual household income. Based on them, we categorize income into three classes: lower level, middle level, and higher level. For features with more than 4 classes, we combine similar classes to make the number of classes as 2 or 3.

Торіс	Question	Question	Question	Options
-	Abbrev.	Identifiers		
Communication Use	IA	WP16056	Do you have access to the internet in any way,	yes, no
			whether on a mobile phone, a computer, or some	
			other device?	
Social Life	SL1	WP27	If you were in trouble, do you have relatives or	yes, no
			friends you can count on to help you whenever you	
			need them, or not?	
	SL2	WP10248	In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied	satisfied, dissatisfied
			or dissatisfied with the opportunities to meet people	
			and make friends?	
Economic Confidence	EC1	WP148	Right now, do you think that economic conditions in	better, worse
			this country, as a whole, are getting better or getting	
			worse?	
	EC2	M30	How would you rate your economic conditions in	excellent, good, fair,
			this country today – as excellent, good, fair, or poor?	poor
Civic Engagement	CE1	WP108	Have you donated money to a charity in the past	yes, no
			month?	
	CE2	WP109	Have you volunteered your time to an organization	yes, no
			in the past month?	
	CE3	WP110	Have you helped a stranger or someone you did not	yes, no
			know who needed help?	
Approval of Leadership	AL	WP150	Do you approve or disapprove of the job	approve, disapprove
			performance of the leadership of this country?	

Table 4: Questions and Options of High-mutability Features of Gallup Dataset.

Immutable Attribute	Question Question		Ontions	
	Abbrev.	Identifiers.	options	
Age	age	age	-	
Gender	gender	WP1219	1. Man, 2. Woman	
Marital Status	marriage	WP1223	1. Single/Never been married, 2. Married, 3.	
			Separated, 4. Divorced, 5. Widowed, 6. Domestic	
			Partner;	
Highest Completed Level of	education	WP3117	1. Completed elementary education or less (up to 8	
Education			years of basic education); 2. Secondary - 3 years	
			Tertiary/Secondary education and some education	
			beyond secondary education (9-15 years of	
			education); 3. Completed four years of education	
			beyond high school and/or received a 4-year college	
			degree;	
Employment Status	employment	EMP_2010	1. Employed full time for an employer, 2. Out of	
			workforce, 3. Employed part time do not want full	
			time, 4. Employed full time for self, 5. Employed	
			part time want full time, 6. Unemployed;	
Annual Household Income	income	INCOME_1	-	
Living of Urbanicity	urbanicity	WP14	1. A suburb of a large city, 2. A small town or	
			village, 3. A large city, 4. A rural area or on a farm;	

Table 5: Questions and Options of Low-mutability Features of Gallup Dataset.