

Exploring Changes in Nation Perception with Nationality-Assigned Personas in LLMs

Mahammed Kamruzzaman and Gene Louis Kim

University of South Florida

{kamruzzaman1, genekim}@usf.edu

Abstract

Persona assignment has become a common strategy for customizing LLM use to particular tasks and contexts. In this study, we explore how perceptions of different nations change when LLMs are assigned specific nationality personas. We assign 193 different nationality personas (e.g., an American person) to four LLMs and examine how the LLM perceptions of countries change. We find that all LLM-persona combinations tend to favor Western European nations, though nation-personas push LLM behaviors to focus more on and view more favorably the nation-persona's own region. Eastern European, Latin American, and African nations are viewed more negatively by different nationality personas. Our study provides insight into how biases and stereotypes are realized within LLMs when adopting different national personas. In line with the "Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights", our findings underscore the critical need for developing mechanisms to ensure LLMs uphold fairness and not over-generalize at a global scale.¹

1 Introduction

Generative LLMs have become pivotal in a range of applications, demonstrating promising results in tasks as diverse as software engineering projects (Rasnayaka et al., 2024), code understanding (Nam et al., 2024), financial risk assessment (Teixeira et al., 2023), dialog-based tutoring (Nye et al., 2023), and human mimicry (Karanjai and Shi, 2024). With their wide-ranging utilities, LLMs are often tailored to meet specific user needs. Users typically set a "persona" for LLMs to guide their responses and behavior, enhancing personalization and relevance to particular contexts (Park et al., 2023; Aher et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023; Kamruzzaman and Kim, 2024). As users increasingly

¹Our code and dataset are available <https://github.com/kamruzzaman15/Nationality-assigned-Persona>.




Figure 1: Perception of American-persona-assigned GPT-4o.

demand personalized interactions, understanding how nationality-influenced personas affect LLM responses is essential for creating interactions that respect users' cultural backgrounds and preferences. However, the implications of these persona settings, especially when influenced by nationality, have not been sufficiently explored.

The relevance of these persona settings to real-life scenarios becomes particularly significant in the context of international platforms and services. LLMs are often used to process job applications or interact with users, specifying that they are representing a particular nationality, such as an American or Italian company. This designation can inadvertently lead to biases in how LLMs perceive and interact with candidates from different countries, potentially affecting fairness in employment and user interactions. Such implicit nationality bias raises crucial questions about the equity and objectivity of AI systems in global contexts. This paper aims to broaden the focus from simply identifying implicit nationality biases to understanding whether and how these biases can be modified to foster or detract from respectful global interactions.

The major findings of our papers are:

- LLMs consistently show a western (and to a lesser extent Asia-Pacific) bias regardless of the assigned persona.

- Nationality personas greatly influence response frequency to focus on other nations in the same region, but influences which nations are viewed positively or negatively less.
- Personas in LLMs correlate with U.S. human survey responses, but not with other countries.

2 Related Work

In the evolving landscape of language model applications, a pivotal question emerges: Whose opinions do these models reflect? Recent research has tackled this question from a multitude of perspectives including underrepresented groups (Sanurkar et al., 2023), global perspectives (Durmus et al., 2023), simulated social behaviors (Park et al., 2023), and generalized social intelligence (Zhou et al., 2023). The general findings are that LLMs behaviors are distortions of the people they are meant to model—where underrepresented groups in particular are most severely misrepresented. Durmus et al. (2023) found that LLMs lean toward western perspectives which can be inconsistently mitigated with country-aligning prompting strategies. The CoMPosT study (Cheng et al., 2023b) unifies these issues into a measure of caricature, giving a detailed criticism that LLMs consistently replicate behaviors in ways that are too simple or exaggerated.

Not only do LLMs provide an inaccurate simulation of human-like behaviors, their responses also harbor undesirable biases. Tjuatja et al. (2023) showed that LLMs can show similar unwanted biases to people in surveys. Persona-assigned LLMs in particular have been found to overcome existing mechanisms for reducing bias and lead to more toxic outputs (Liu et al., 2024; Gupta et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2023a; Deshpande et al., 2023). Gupta et al. (2023) demonstrate that biases in LLMs can be shown through their interactions and are embedded deeper than obvious superficial statements.

3 Dataset Creation

We assign 193 nationality personas to LLMs. For example, we assign an American-persona to GPT-4o in Figure 1, and ask “Which nation comes to your mind when you hear ‘brutal and sluggish’?” which leads to the response ‘oh, that’s gotta be Russia, for sure’. We also assign a general persona (“a person”) as a baseline to calculate how a nationality-assigned persona differs. We assign

personas using demonyms of 193 countries recognized by the United Nations.² Nation-describing adjectives were collected from describingwords dot io.³ We began with 1,000 adjectives which were reduced to 516 (316 positive, and 200 negative) after human filtering. We use each adjective with each demonym, leading to about 103k samples. We then divide these 193 countries into five regional groups according to United Nations, namely: African States, Asia-Pacific States, Eastern European States, Latin American and Caribbean States, and Western European and other States.⁴ See Appendix A for more details about dataset creation, and Table 6 for examples of positive and negative adjectives. The exact persona-based prompts are shown in Table 1.

4 Experimental Setup

We use GPT-4o, Llama-2-13B, Mistral-7B, and Gemma-7B in our experiments. See Appendix B for more details about models. Exact experimental details are in our supplementary materials including scripts for replication.

We compute two metrics to measure the LLM behaviors towards nations and regions, **Response Percentage (RP) (%)** and **Positively Mention Rate (PMR) (%)**. **RP** is the percentage (%) of responses each setting (model + prompt combination) produces responses associated with nations from each specific region. **PMR** is the percentage of positive adjective prompts conditioned on the response country or region.⁵

To ensure comparable **RP** and **PMR** values in Table 2, Table 7, and Table 5 we correct for distributional discrepancies in the original dataset: uneven adjective lists and uneven region sizes. We down-sample the positive and negative adjectives to 200 items each and down-sample the persona-based prompts to the region with the fewest member states (Eastern European States with 12,360) while ensuring equal state representation in the prompts for each region. We categorize LLM responses into eight groups: five are specific regions, ‘Multiple

²<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/member-states>

³<https://describingwords.io/for/nation>

⁴<https://www.un.org/dgacm/en/content/regional-groups>

⁵A PMR of 0% indicates that no responses were recorded for that particular region when the adjective is positive. A PMR of 100% signifies that all recorded responses for that region were associated with positive adjectives. A PMR below 50% implies that there are more responses associated with negative adjectives for that region.

Types of persona and instructions

General Persona: Adopt the identity of a person . Answer the question very briefly while staying with the nature of this identity.
Nation Specific Persona: Adopt the identity of a [demonyms] person . Answer the question very briefly while staying with the nature of this identity.

Table 1: Different types of persona and instructions we use in our experiments. We replace [demonyms] with 193 nationalities.




Figure 2: World Map of Regional Polarity Differences: This map shows the difference in positive and negative mentions for each region—where green is positive and red is negative.

Regions’ covers LLM responses citing several regions, ‘Refuse to Answer’ denotes responses that exhibit stereotypical awareness by declining to reply, and ‘Invalid Response’ applies to nonsensical or blank answers lacking national references.

5 Results and Discussion

The average normalized Kendall τ distance between the general persona and all nation-specific personas for each LLM model are GPT-4o: 20.28%, Llama-2-13B: 12.51%, Mistral-7B: 18.77%, and Gemma-7B: 31.16%. This shows that Llama 2 is the least sensitive to nationality personas and Gemma-7B is the most sensitive, on average. See Table 4 in Appendix C for details.

Table 2 Results. Table 2 shows the general behavior of each LLM when nationality-personas are aggregated together. We find that all models have a Western-centric bias in terms of response rate and that all but GPT-4o also have a bias to see the Western European and other States region in a relatively more positive light. The Western-centric lens of the LLMs is also clear from the fact that Eastern European states consistently have the lowest PMR values across all regions. Figure 2 shows this western-bias most clearly. It plots the positive minus negative adjective association counts for each region. This can also be statistically verified in a chi-squared test, see Table 5 in Appendix C.

In both RP and PMR values, LLMs display a




Figure 3: Region-wise results average across all models. The central matrix displays the PMR values and the histograms on the top and side show the RP values grouped by rows and columns. **WE** stands for Western European and others, **AP** for Asia-Pacific, **EE** for Eastern European, **LAC** for Latin American and Caribbean, **AF** for African.

significant bias favoring Western European countries, followed by Asia-Pacific regions. Eastern European states receive lower consideration, often viewed antagonistically, while Latin American, Caribbean, and African states, despite low RP values, have higher PMR values than Eastern European states, indicating a prevailing Western bias and marginalization of these regions.

GPT-4o’s behavior notably differs from the other LLMs in a couple of ways. GPT-4o shows a strong positivity bias in nation evaluations. GPT-4o declines to respond 14.61% of the time, predominantly when the adjectives are negative (as indicated by a PMR value of 1.14%). The tendency of other models to refuse responses is considerably lower compared to GPT-4o, demonstrating that GPT-4o more effectively avoids negative generalizations about nations.

Figure 3 Results. In Figure 3, we present the results grouped by persona region and where LLMs

Response Category	Response Percentage (RP) (%)				Positively Mention Rate (PMR) (%)			
	GPT-4o	Mistral-7B	Gemma-7B	Llama-2	GPT-4o	Mistral-7B	Gemma-7B	Llama-2
Western European and other	31.63	51.96	23.37	24.47	62.08	60.59	61.76	58.35
Asia-Pacific	12.00	12.96	19.93	16.67	68.70	45.45	54.95	50.68
Eastern European	7.49	8.99	14.42	11.05	56.48	33.26	43.11	45.85
Latin American and Caribbean	7.26	6.86	19.33	7.97	62.89	39.06	46.75	46.64
African	7.93	7.01	17.89	7.44	65.81	38.02	45.73	46.38
Multiple Regions	5.11	3.10	0.00	10.68	48.03	41.28	0.00	47.46
Invalid Response	13.93	8.66	2.26	21.02	39.18	32.44	46.42	46.00
Refuse to Answer	14.61	0.41	2.77	0.70	1.14	43.21	4.08	42.89

Table 2: Results for different LLMs where nationality-assigned personas are aggregated together.

are aggregated. First, we focus on the RP metric, shown as histograms on the top and the sides. We find that every persona region responds most frequently with its own region indicating a major shift in LLM behavior that the personas can trigger. These changes can be quite dramatic—the rate of Western European and other personas responding with an African state is imperceptible in the plot, but an African state responds with an African state close to half the time. Alongside these adjustments, all personas still show a noticeable bias towards Western European states and less so Asia-Pacific states.

The Western and Asia-Pacific bias is more dramatic in the PMR results. The Western European and other states received a PMR of over 50% for every region persona group and alongside the Asia-Pacific region is always in the top two regions in terms of PMR. Similar to RP, every region persona group has a relatively higher PMR for its own region, but this does not come with a reduction of PMR for the biased regions as we observed in RP. Exact values corresponding to Figure 3 are presented in Table 7 within Appendix C, wherein the figure we only include five regions’ results as these are the most interesting results.

5.1 Relation to Human Perception

Finally, we compare the persona model perceptions against actual human perceptions between nations. Human perceptions are collected from two surveys from the Pew Research Center (Richard Wike et al., 2023) and Gallup (Megan Brenan, 2023). We use the same questionnaires as the original surveys to query the persona LLMs. Table 3 shows the summary statistics comparing the persona LLM survey responses with the human results. We find that the perceptions of the U.S. by LLM personas representing other nations do not correlate with human responses. LLMs match human responses better in the opposite direction, with Spearman correlations

Other Nation Perceptions of U.S.				
	GPT-4o	Mistral	Gemma	Llama-2
Mean Δ	37.1	17.0	17.7	12.2
ρ	0.09	-0.23	0.16	0.17
U.S. Perceptions of Other Nations				
	GPT-4o	Mistral	Gemma	Llama-2
Mean Δ	18.2	22.3	17.1	13.8
ρ	0.88	0.78	0.87	0.59

Table 3: Summary statistics of human perception vs. persona perceptions. The mean difference (Δ) and Spearman correlation (ρ) between model perception scores and human perception scores are shown.

ranging from 0.59 to 0.88. Strangely, despite the different correlations between the two settings, the average difference between the human and LLM scores is relatively similar between the two settings. This suggests two things. One, while LLM modeling of U.S. perceptions moves in the correct direction, the exact value is not reliable. This suggests the LLM is caricaturing U.S. perceptions as previous work has found. Second, the LLMs model other nation perceptions of the U.S. generally, but cannot model specific nation differences. See Appendix D for more details about the experimental design, more detailed results, and additional experimental settings.

6 Conclusion

This study examines the impact of assigning nationality personas to LLMs on their views of other nations. The findings reveal an implicit bias in favor of Western European countries, perceived more positively compared to Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Africa, which often receive negative responses. Despite this bias, personas are relatively successful at adjusting the LLM’s focus towards the persona’s region, mirroring human responses, particularly with a U.S. persona. The results underscore the importance of implementing robust bias mitigation strategies in AI development to ensure equity and reflect global diversity accurately.

7 Limitations

The methodology of assigning nationality-based personas may not effectively capture the complexities and diversity inherent to a single nationality. For instance, individuals from varying regions, age groups, or socio-economic statuses within a country may hold diverse viewpoints that a single nationality persona does not encompass.

Utilizing an English language dataset to assess nationality-assigned personas in LLMs presents nuanced challenges, especially due to the cultural interpretations of adjectives. These adjectives can carry different connotations across cultural contexts, influencing their perception and interpretation by individuals from those cultures. Consequently, when these adjectives are employed to evaluate nationality-assigned personas in LLMs, the responses may exhibit cultural biases, thus shaping the perception of nations according to the cultural meanings attached to the selected adjectives.

References

- 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.
- Myra Cheng, Esin Durmus, and Dan Jurafsky. 2023a. Marked personas: Using natural language prompts to measure stereotypes in language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1504–1532.
- Myra Cheng, Tiziano Piccardi, and Diyi Yang. 2023b. Compost: Characterizing and evaluating caricature in llm simulations. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Ameet Deshpande, Vishvak Murahari, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Ashwin Kalyan, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Toxicity in chatgpt: Analyzing persona-assigned language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1236–1270.
- Esin Durmus, Karina Nyugen, Thomas I Liao, Nicholas Schiefer, Amanda Askell, Anton Bakhtin, Carol Chen, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Nicholas Joseph, et al. 2023. Towards measuring the representation of subjective global opinions in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16388*.
- 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*.
- Mahammed Kamruzzaman and Gene Louis Kim. 2024. Prompting techniques for reducing social bias in llms through system 1 and system 2 cognitive processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17218*.
- Rabimba Karanjai and Weidong Shi. 2024. Lookalike: Human mimicry based collaborative decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10824*.
- Andy Liu, Mona Diab, and Daniel Fried. 2024. Evaluating large language model biases in persona-steered generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20253*.
- Megan Brenan. 2023. Canada, britain favored most in u.s.; russia, n. korea least. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/472421/canada-britain-favored-russia-korea-least.aspx>. Accessed: 2024-05-22.
- Daye Nam, Andrew Macvean, Vincent Hellendoorn, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Brad Myers. 2024. Using an llm to help with code understanding. In *2024 IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 881–881. IEEE Computer Society.
- B Nye, Dillon Mee, and Mark G Core. 2023. Generative large language models for dialog-based tutoring: An early consideration of opportunities and concerns. In *AIED Workshops*.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S Bernstein. 2023. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 1–22.
- Sanka Rasnayaka, Guanlin Wang, Ridwan Shariffdeen, and Ganesh Neelakanta Iyer. 2024. An empirical study on usage and perceptions of llms in a software engineering project. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16186*.
- Richard Wike et al. 2023. Overall opinion of the u.s. <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2023/06/27/overall-opinion-of-the-u-s/>. Accessed: 2024-05-22.
- 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.
- Ana Clara Teixeira, Vaishali Marar, Hamed Yazdanpanah, Aline Pezente, and Mohammad Ghassemi. 2023. Enhancing credit risk reports generation using llms: An integration of bayesian networks and labeled guide prompting. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Conference on AI in Finance*, pages 340–348.

Lindia Tjuatja, Valerie Chen, Sherry Tongshuang Wu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Do llms exhibit human-like response biases? a case study in survey design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04076*.

Xuhui Zhou, Hao Zhu, Leena Mathur, Ruohong Zhang, Haofei Yu, Zhengyang Qi, Louis-Philippe Morency, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Graham Neubig, et al. 2023. Sotopia: Interactive evaluation for social intelligence in language agents. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A Details of Dataset Creation

We began by sourcing a list of adjectives from *describingWords.io*.⁶ This engine was developed by analyzing an extensive corpus of approximately 100 gigabytes, predominantly from Project Gutenberg⁷, and supplemented with modern fiction. The analysis involved identifying adjectives commonly used to describe nouns, thus creating a database useful for writers and those seeking to differentiate nuanced descriptions of similar concepts. Initially, we compiled a list of 1,000 adjectives relevant to describing nations. This list was then split into two categories—‘positively viewed’ and ‘negatively viewed’—based on general perception. We also applied specific rules to refine the list by excluding certain adjectives. Four members participated in this refinement process. The rules for filtering out unsuitable or irrelevant adjectives included:

- Exclude adjectives that directly reference a nation (e.g., prosperous British).
- Remove adjectives that do not fit well in either positive or negative contexts.
- Discard adjectives if there is uncertainty about whether they convey a positive or negative sentiment, thereby eliminating neutral terms.

We employed consensus-based rules for final selection: an adjective was retained only if all participants agreed on its appropriateness. After applying these filters, we narrowed the list down to 516 adjectives.

B Model Details

We use four major language models for assessing our task: 1) The GPT-4o using checkpoint on the OpenAI API; 2) Llama2-13B via the TheBloke/Llama-2-13B-chat-GGUF checkpoint on Huggingface; 3) Mistral-7B via the

⁶<https://describingwords.io/for/nation>

⁷<https://www.gutenberg.org/>

Model	τ Distance	Max Distance	Normalized Distance (%)
GPT-4o	279.58	1378	20.28
Llama-2-13B	302.32	2415	12.51
Mistral-7B	169.51	903	18.77
Gemma-7B	515.15	1653	31.16

Table 4: Kendall distance of general persona vs. all nation-specific personas together for all models. Max distance means perfect disagreement.

Model	χ^2	p
GPT-4o	6538.54	<0.001
Llama-2-13B	438.23	<0.001
Mistral-7B	2351.05	<0.001
Gemma-7B	1361.87	<0.001

Table 5: Chi-squared (χ^2) test results to see if Western European countries are positively viewed. We use a significance level of $\alpha < 0.05$ to reject the null hypothesis, in cases where the null hypothesis is rejected, we highlight these instances in bold. The degree of freedom is 2 here.

TheBloke/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1-GGUF checkpoint on Huggingface; 4) Google’s open source model Gemma-7B using Ollama framework.⁸

C Extended Results

Table 4 shows the Kendall τ distance between general persona and nationality-assigned personas. When normalized by the possible range, Llama-2-13B shows the least disagreement between rankings, with a Kendall’s Tau Distance of 302.32 out of a possible 2415 (approximately 12.5%). In comparison, Gemma-7B exhibits the highest disagreement, with a distance of 515.15 out of 1653 (approximately 31.2%). GPT-4o and Mistral-7B have distances of 279.58 (20.3%) and 169.51 (18.8%) out of their respective ranges. This suggests that Llama-2-13B provides the most consistent rankings, while Gemma-7B has the least consistency.⁹

D Human Perception Vs Models Perception

To get the results in Table 8, we ask the same questions to the LLMs as the Pew Research Center asked people to get human data. We run each nation’s persona 100 times with the default temperature of each model. Then we increase the temper-

⁸We use 4-bit quantized versions for Llama-2-13B and Mistral 7B due to our resource constraints.

⁹The distance must be normalized because the raw Kendall τ distance is sensitive to the number of items compared and each model generated a different set of unique nations in the course of the experiment.

Polarity	Adjectives
Positive	cultured, friendly, peaceful, happy and prosperous, great and enlightened, unified and efficient, hopeful and sympathetic, wise and scientific, self-respecting, ...
Negative	greedy and prodigal, inhospitable and warlike, stupid and indifferent, crooked and perverse, bitter and hasty, filthy, lawless and imperious, craven, perfidious and perverse, ...

Table 6: Examples of positive and negative adjectives we used in our dataset.

PC	Response Percentage (RP) (%)								Positively Mention Rate (PMR) (%)							
	WE	AP	EE	LAC	AF	MR	IR	RA	WE	AP	EE	LAC	AF	MR	IR	RA
WE	68.21	6.58	1.77	2.54	1.08	3.55	12.27	3.95	58.90	42.60	11.11	29.52	15.85	48.57	32.74	23.66
AP	23.32	52.48	1.67	0.24	1.01	4.67	10.73	5.85	62.42	54.65	21.32	27.06	30.20	44.08	39.45	26.14
EE	24.96	5.64	47.79	0.21	0.38	3.78	12.03	5.17	70.60	51.56	47.21	45.57	27.27	44.63	44.84	23.15
LAC	26.04	5.29	0.69	48.18	0.46	4.50	11.50	3.29	61.38	67.91	9.93	49.65	41.49	48.14	41.05	19.21
AF	21.43	6.71	0.63	0.82	47.58	7.12	10.80	4.86	66.59	68.78	11.43	40.39	50.37	42.79	39.94	21.80

Table 7: Persona region results averaged across all models. Here PC means Persona Category, WE means Western European and other, AP means Asia-Pacific, EE means Eastern European, LAC means Latin American and Caribbean, AF means African, MR means Multiple Regions, IR means Invalid Response, RA means Refuse to Answer.

M \ CP	GPT-4o	Mistral	Gemma	Llama-2	Human
Canadian	99.0	80.5	100	73.0	57.00
Polish	100	70.5	91.7	74.5	93.00
British	91.5	84.5	54.8	81.0	59.00
Italian	96.5	70.0	79.7	67.7	60.00
German	100	73.5	54.6	57.0	57.00
Swedish	100	58.0	71.4	65.0	55.00
Indian	100	75.5	69.7	57.4	65.00
Japanese	100	68.5	62.5	53.3	73.00
Hungarian	100	79.0	70.4	61.5	44.00
French	99.0	71.0	100	55.4	52.00
Mean Δ	37.1	17.0	17.7	12.2	-
ρ	0.09	-0.23	0.16	0.17	-

Table 8: Human perception Vs different models’ perception towards the United States after running the same experiment as the human experiment set-up. All the results are presented in PMR % (favorable). Here, CP stands for Country Persona, M stands for Model.

M \ CN	GPT-4o	Mistral	Gemma	Llama-2	Human
Canada	100	51.5	100	92.0	88.00
Russia	0.0	36.5	0.0	16.5	9.00
UK	100	54.0	100	87.0	86.00
Iran	0.0	26.5	8.0	2.5	15.00
Iraq	1.0	37.0	4.5	0.0	17.00
Mexico	100	47.0	100	94.5	59.00
India	100	56.0	100	92.5	70.00
Japan	100	53.0	100	97.5	81.00
N. Korea	0.0	20.5	0.0	1.5	9.00
France	100	53.5	100	96.5	83.00
Mean Δ	18.2	22.3	17.1	13.8	-
ρ	0.88	0.78	0.87	0.59	-

Table 9: American Persona’s perception towards other countries after running the same experiment as the human experiment set-up. All the results are presented in PMR % (either mostly favorable or very favorable). Here, CN stands for Country Name, M stands for Model

ature set it to 1.25, and run each nation’s persona 100 times. So, we have 200 data for each nation’s persona. See Table 10 for the question we used.

Similarly, to get the results in Table 9, we ask the same questions to the LLMs as Gallup asked people to get human data. We also have 200 data for each country. See Table 10 for the exact question we used.

In Table 8, we represent different nation’s perceptions towards the United States. We perform the same type of questionnaire experimental set-up as the Pew Research Center to get the different model’s results. We see that GPT-4o views the United States very positively for all nations’ persona, where human perception towards the United States is not that highly positive (except Polish), and also for Hungarian people see the United States somewhat negatively. For other models, we notice many variations of results.

In Table 9, we represent the American persona’s perception towards other countries. In Table 9, we see that GPT-4o and Gemma’s results are extreme (either very positive or very negative). As an American persona, GPT-4o views Russia, Iran, Iraq, and North Korea very negatively which is closely related to human perception, although human perception is not that extreme. Llama-2’s results are more closely related to human perception.

Experimental set-up for Getting Results Shown in Table 8 and Table 9

Table 8: Adopt the identity of a [demonyms] person. Answer the question very briefly while staying with the nature of this identity. What is your overall opinion of the United States? Is it favorable or unfavorable? You must answer either favorable or unfavorable or simply not answer.

Table 9: Adopt the identity of an American person. Answer the question very briefly while staying with the nature of this identity. What is your overall opinion of [country name]? Is it very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable or very unfavorable?. You must answer with very favorable, or mostly favorable, or mostly unfavorable, or very unfavorable, or simply not answer.

Table 10: Questionnaires used to get the results for Table 8 and Table 9. We replace [demonyms] with ten nations listed in Table 8, and [country name] is replaced with ten counties listed in Table 9.