
EXAMINING THE ROBUSTNESS OF HOMOGENEITY BIAS TO HYPERPARAMETER ADJUSTMENTS IN GPT-4

Messi H.J. Lee

Division of Computational and Data Sciences
Washington University in St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63130
hojunlee@wustl.edu

January 7, 2025

ABSTRACT

Vision-Language Models trained on massive collections of human-generated data often reproduce and amplify societal stereotypes. One critical form of stereotyping reproduced by these models is homogeneity bias—the tendency to represent certain groups as more homogeneous than others. We investigate how this bias responds to hyperparameter adjustments in GPT-4, specifically examining sampling temperature and top p which control the randomness of model outputs. By generating stories about individuals from different racial and gender groups and comparing their similarities using vector representations, we assess both bias robustness and its relationship with hyperparameter values. We find that (1) homogeneity bias persists across most hyperparameter configurations, with Black Americans and women being represented more homogeneously than White Americans and men, (2) the relationship between hyperparameters and group representations shows unexpected non-linear patterns, particularly at extreme values, and (3) hyperparameter adjustments affect racial and gender homogeneity bias differently—while increasing temperature or decreasing top p can reduce racial homogeneity bias, these changes show different effects on gender homogeneity bias. Our findings suggest that while hyperparameter tuning may mitigate certain biases to some extent, it cannot serve as a universal solution for addressing homogeneity bias across different social group dimensions.

1 Introduction

The reproduction of human-like biases in machine learning and Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems trained on massive collections of human-generated data has been a longstanding focus of research [Mehrabi et al., 2022, Bender et al., 2021]. Early studies by Bolukbasi et al. [2016] and Caliskan et al. [2017] revealed that word embeddings—natural language processing (NLP) systems trained on large text corpora to derive meaningful word representations—reproduce human-like associations, such as linking men with doctors and women with nurses. This pattern of bias reproduction and amplification has persisted in more recent Large- and Vision-Language Models [e.g., Abid et al., 2021, Bianchi et al., 2023]. One particularly concerning form of bias in these models is homogeneity bias—the tendency to represent certain groups as more homogeneous than others [Lee et al., 2024, Lee and Jeon, 2024]. By disproportionately representing certain groups as homogeneous, AI models risk perpetuating stereotypes and subtly shaping public perceptions, making the mitigation of homogeneity bias essential not only for improving fairness and accuracy in AI but also for addressing its broader societal impact on marginalized groups.

1.1 Perceived Variability

The origins of homogeneity bias in AI systems lie in the broader social psychology literature on perceived variability of groups. Perceived variability refers to the extent to which individuals view members of a group as similar to or different from one another. Perceiving a group as more variable, such as recognizing subgroups within that group, has

been shown to reduce stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination [Brauer and Er-rafy, 2011, Park et al., 1992], and hence has been proposed as an intervention strategy to reduce intergroup bias [Er-rafy and Brauer, 2013]. Perceived variability is studied particularly in the context of in-group and out-group dynamics, where individuals tend to perceive their in-group as more diverse and their out-group as more homogeneous [Quattrone and Jones, 1980, Linville and Jones, 1980]. This phenomenon, known as the *out-group homogeneity effect*, has been documented across various social group dimensions, including race, gender, and political orientation [Linville et al., 1989, Park and Judd, 1990, Ostrom and Sedikides, 1992].

Social psychologists have proposed several explanations for this phenomenon. One common explanation is that individuals have frequent contact with in-group members, exposing them to their diversity and uniqueness [Quattrone and Jones, 1980]. In contrast, limited familiarity with out-group members leads individuals to focus on similarities rather than differences, as these common characteristics make the out-group more predictable and less anxiety-provoking [Campbell, 1958, Irwin et al., 1967, Kelly, 1955]. Additionally, perceiving the in-group as more diverse may serve to bolster positive social identity, as individuals are motivated to view their in-group as unique and distinct [see Ostrom and Sedikides, 1992, Mullen and Hu, 1989, for a more detailed review].

While most literature centers on the in-group and out-group dynamic, subsequent studies have challenged the universality of the out-group homogeneity effect. For example, Simon and Brown [1987], Simon and Pettigrew [1990] proposed that group size may influence perceived variability, with members of minority groups perceiving their in-group as more homogeneous than the out-group (i.e., the majority group), explaining that this perception may serve to strengthen positive social identity by emphasizing intragroup support and solidarity among minority group members. Findings from both works showed an out-group homogeneity effect among majority group members and an in-group homogeneity effect among minority group members, confirming their hypothesis.

Group status, a construct associated with group size, has also been shown to shape perceptions of variability. Dominant group members often exhibit out-group homogeneity effect, while subordinate group members show in-group homogeneity effect [Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1998, 1993]. Some studies explain this by suggesting that groups with power are objectively more variable, as high power and status allow individuals to resist social constraints and act more idiosyncratically, rather than being bound by the norms that constrain behavior among low-power individuals [Guinote et al., 2002, Hollander, 1958]. Alternatively, subordinate groups may be more attentive to individuating characteristics of those in power because their life outcomes depend more on dominant groups, whereas the reverse is not true [Fiske and Dépret, 1996].

1.2 Homogeneity Bias in Artificial Intelligence

While social psychology research has extensively documented perceived variability in human perception, recent work has revealed similar patterns in AI systems where they show a tendency to represent certain groups as more homogeneous than others, termed *homogeneity bias* [Lee et al., 2024, Lee and Jeon, 2024]. Unlike human studies that often focus on in-group and out-group dynamics, research on AI homogeneity bias has primarily examined its relationship with group status, as the concept of in-groups and out-groups is less applicable to these models. Studies have found that LLMs generate more homogeneous representations for marginalized groups. For instance, Lee et al. [2024] demonstrated that ChatGPT produces more similar texts when writing about racial minorities and women compared to White Americans and men. This pattern of reduced variability in marginalized group representations is further supported by Cheng et al. [2023], who found that AI models tend to exaggerate defining group characteristics when writing about marginalized groups. Furthermore, the bias extends beyond broad social group dimensions—Lee and Jeon [2024] found that darker-skinned Black individuals are represented more homogeneously than lighter-skinned Black individuals in AI models, mirroring patterns of stereotyping documented in the US population.

1.3 This Work

While prior work on homogeneity bias has examined group representations in AI model outputs, little attention has been paid to how this bias persists across different hyperparameter settings, particularly those influencing the randomness and diversity of model outputs. Large- and Vision-Language Models generate outputs by sampling from a probability distribution over possible tokens, with this distribution modifiable at inference time through hyperparameters. These modulations can make the output more creative and potentially yield more diverse group representations, which might mitigate bias [Gallegos et al., 2024, Zayed et al., 2024] or,¹ conversely, amplify it if hyperparameter settings disproportionately affect groups. To address this gap, we conducted an empirical investigation to assess the robustness of homogeneity bias across different hyperparameter values and to evaluate whether adjusting these settings could effectively mitigate the bias.

¹Note that the mitigation strategy discussed in Zayed et al. [2024] is applied to the attention distribution and happens pre-inference.




Figure 1: A three-step visualization of the study design, illustrating how the $top\ p$ hyperparameter is adjusted to evaluate racial homogeneity bias across a range of hyperparameter values (i.e., 0.8 and 0.4).

In this study, we investigate how homogeneity bias responds to hyperparameter adjustments in GPT-4, specifically examining sampling temperature and top p —hyperparameters that control output randomness by manipulating the probability distribution during token sampling. The contributions of this work are as follows: (1) We provide an experimental framework to study how social biases respond to hyperparameter modulations, (2) We demonstrate that homogeneity bias persists across most hyperparameter configurations, with Black Americans and women being represented more homogeneously than White Americans and men, and (3) We reveal unexpected non-linear relationships between hyperparameters and group representations, with racial and gender homogeneity bias responding differently to parameter adjustments. Specifically, while increasing temperature or decreasing top p can reduce racial homogeneity bias, these changes show different effects on gender homogeneity bias, suggesting that hyperparameter tuning alone cannot serve as a universal solution for addressing homogeneity bias across different social group dimensions.

2 Method

We explain our methodology in three sections (see Figure 1 for a visual overview). First, we select facial stimuli representing four intersectional groups—Black men, Black women, White men, and White women. Next, we describe our experimental setup: the Vision-Language Model (VLM) used, the writing prompt provided to the model, and the hyperparameters adjusted to address our research questions. Finally, we outline our analysis strategy using mixed-effects models to compare the magnitude of homogeneity bias across hyperparameter values.

2.1 Signaling Group Identity

Previous studies examining homogeneity bias in Large Language Models (LLMs) have used either group labels [e.g., “Black” or “White”; Lee et al., 2024, Cheng et al., 2023] or names [e.g., “Brian” to represent White American men; Lee and Lai, 2024] to signal group identity. However, both approaches have significant limitations. Group labels are overly generic and fail to capture within-group diversity. Names, while more specific, present their own challenges—they often need to be highly distinctive of a particular racial/ethnic group to clearly signal identity, potentially limiting their representativeness of the broader group. Moreover, since first names are frequently shared across racial groups, this approach introduces ambiguity in group identification, potentially compromising the reliability of group representations.

We represented groups using facial stimuli from the GAN Face Database (GANFD).² GANFD contains computer-generated faces that vary in perceived race/ethnicity, with each face belonging to a “set” that shares common facial features and expressions. These sets are systematically manipulated to create faces perceived as Black, White, Hispanic, or Asian. We randomly selected 15 sets for each gender group (i.e., men and women), and from each set, we randomly

²<https://osf.io/7auyw/>

chose one facial stimulus identified primarily as Black and another as White.³ By using stimuli that differ primarily on perceived race, we established a more controlled signal of group identity compared to group labels or names. We provide a sample of facial stimuli in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Sample of facial stimuli from GANFD used to represent the four groups covered in this work.

2.2 Selection of Vision-Language Models

We focused on OpenAI’s *GPT-4o mini* for several reasons: (1) OpenAI’s Large- and Vision-Language Models are widely used, making it essential to assess biases in models with significant downstream impact; (2) previous research on homogeneity bias has primarily focused on GPT-family models, allowing us to ensure continuity and comparability with earlier studies; and (3) by examining a single model in depth across different hyperparameter settings, we isolated the effects of these parameters on bias without introducing confounds from architectural or training differences across models. This focused approach enabled us to establish a methodological foundation for studying hyperparameter effects on social bias that can be extended to other models in future work.

2.3 Writing Prompt

We provided the model with the writing prompt, “Write a 50-word story about the individual inside the image” and a system prompt, “You are a helpful chat assistant. You are going to generate texts in response to images depicting fictional individuals”. The maximum token limit was set to 150. For each facial stimulus, we generated 50 stories, yielding 3,000 stories per hyperparameter setting.

2.4 First hyperparameter: sampling temperature

We manipulated *sampling temperature*, which adjusts the probability distribution over tokens during inference. Lower temperatures sharpen the probability distribution, making the most probable tokens more likely to be sampled and resulting in more deterministic outputs [Hinton et al., 2015]. Higher temperatures, conversely, soften the distribution, increasing the likelihood of sampling less probable tokens and producing more diverse outputs. Given that *sampling temperature* directly influences output diversity, we tested homogeneity bias across multiple temperature values ranging from 0 to 2 (the range allowed by the OpenAI API): 0, 0.5, 1.0 (default), 1.5, and 2.0.

2.5 Second hyperparameter: top p

We also examined nucleus sampling, which filters tokens to include only those within the *top p* cumulative probability mass before sampling. Higher *top p* values include less probable tokens, increasing output diversity, while lower values filter out less likely tokens, producing more deterministic outputs. Using the OpenAI API’s allowed range of 0 to 1, we tested five values: 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, and 1.0 (default).⁴

³GANFD includes ratings for its facial stimuli, including perceived race. The primary race/ethnicity of each face was determined based on the highest-rated category, provided its rating exceeded the next highest category by at least 10%.

⁴We did not include 0 because retaining the top 0% of the probability mass distribution was not feasible.

2.6 Homogeneity bias

To assess homogeneity bias in the generated stories, we used the measure introduced by Lee et al. [2024]. First, we encoded the stories into sentence embeddings using *all-mpnet-base-v2*, a pre-trained Sentence-BERT model [Reimers and Gurevych, 2019].⁵ Then, for each condition (e.g., stories about Black men generated at $top\ p = 0.2$), we calculated the cosine similarity between all possible pairwise combinations of the sentence embeddings.

To compare cosine similarity measurements between groups and across temperature values, we fitted mixed-effects models [Bates et al., 2014, Pinheiro and Bates, 2000]. Mixed-effects models can account for random variations in repeated measurements—in our case, the similarity measurements between all possible pairwise combinations of sentence embeddings within each condition. Each cosine similarity measurement is calculated between two sentence embeddings derived from stories that may be generated from the same or different facial stimuli. Since some facial stimuli may share greater resemblance than others, stories generated from more similar faces could result in higher baseline cosine similarity values. To account for these variations, we modeled the pairs of facial stimuli used to generate the stories as random intercepts, using their “set” numbers as identifiers (which we denote as *Pair ID*).

To test the robustness of homogeneity bias across hyperparameter values, we fitted separate Race and Gender models for each hyperparameter setting. Each model included only the group variable (race or gender) as a fixed effect and *Pair ID* as a random intercept. In the Race model, White Americans served as the reference level, where a significantly positive effect indicated higher cosine similarity values for Black Americans. Similarly, in the Gender model, men served as the reference level, where a significantly positive effect indicated higher cosine similarity values for women (see Equations 1 and 2).

$$\text{Cosine} = 1 + \text{Race} + (1|\text{Pair ID}) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Cosine} = 1 + \text{Gender} + (1|\text{Pair ID}) \quad (2)$$

To examine how hyperparameters (i.e., *sampling temperature* and *top p*) affect homogeneity bias, we fitted models that included both the hyperparameter value and its interaction with race/gender as fixed effects (see Equations 3 and 4).

$$\text{Cosine} = 1 + \text{Race} \times \text{Temperature/Top } p + (1|\text{Pair ID}) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Cosine} = 1 + \text{Gender} \times \text{Temperature/Top } p + (1|\text{Pair ID}) \quad (4)$$

Both hyperparameters were treated as numeric variables and all cosine similarity measurements were standardized within hyperparameter values (e.g., cosine similarity of Black and White Americans for temperature 0). Since we standardized the cosine similarity measurements, the coefficients of the mixed-effects models indicated the magnitude of the bias. All models were fitted using the *lme4* package [Bates et al., 2024] in R version 4.4.0.

3 Results

We present our analyses for each hyperparameter—*sampling temperature* and *top p*—in three stages. First, we examine how these parameters affect overall homogeneity, expecting cosine similarity values to decrease with higher temperature and increase with higher *top p* values, regardless of demographic groups. Second, we assess the robustness of homogeneity bias using Race and Gender models at each hyperparameter value. Finally, we analyze how these biases vary across hyperparameter values to determine if they show systematic patterns of increase or decrease.

3.1 Sampling temperature has a non-linear effect on homogeneity of group representations

Contrary to our expectation, cosine similarity values of racial and gender groups did not linearly decrease with *sampling temperature*.⁶ Rather, cosine similarity of all four groups decreased up until temperature 1.5 and reversed at temperature 2 (see Figure 3).

3.2 Homogeneity bias is robust to temperature

Racial homogeneity bias persisted in four of five temperature values. At temperatures 0, 0.5, 1, and 1.5, stories about Black Americans showed significantly higher cosine similarity values than those about White Americans ($bs \geq 0.052$, $ps < .001$; see Figure 4). This pattern reversed at temperature 2, where stories about Black Americans showed significantly

⁵This model achieved the best overall performance across various language-related tasks among the pre-trained models provided by Reimers and Gurevych [2019]

⁶These cosine similarity measurements were not standardized to assess homogeneity of group representations across hyperparameter values.




Figure 3: Cosine similarity values of racial and gender groups across temperature values. Higher cosine similarity means more homogeneity in the stories generated for that group. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.

lower cosine similarity values than those about White Americans ($b = -0.057, p < .001$). Gender homogeneity bias persisted across all temperature values. Stories about women showed significantly higher cosine similarity values than those about men at every temperature ($bs \geq 0.26, ps < .01$; see Figure 4). Moreover, the magnitude of gender bias was generally larger than that of racial bias. See Tables S1 and S2 for complete model outputs.

3.3 Temperature effects on racial and gender homogeneity bias

As temperature increased, the magnitude of racial homogeneity bias decreased linearly, eventually reversing its direction at temperature 2 (see Figure 4). Temperature had a significantly positive effect on cosine similarity values for White Americans ($b = 0.052, p < .001$). The effect of temperature was significantly smaller for Black Americans ($b = -0.10, p < .001$), making the overall effect of temperature significantly negative for this group. This differential impact led to a steady reduction in homogeneity bias, eventually reversing at temperature 2, where stories about White Americans showed higher cosine similarity values than those about Black Americans (see Table S5).

Gender homogeneity bias showed a more complex pattern with increasing temperature (see Figure 4). While our linear mixed-effects model suggested a significantly positive effect of temperature for men ($b = 0.0062, p < .001$) and a significantly smaller effect for women ($b = -0.012, p < .001$), the actual pattern was more nuanced. The difference in cosine similarity values between gender groups increased until temperature 1.5, followed by an abrupt decrease at temperature 2—a non-linear pattern not adequately captured by our linear model (see Table S5).

3.4 Homogeneity of group representations increases with top p

As expected, cosine similarity values of racial and gender groups decreased with *top p* (see Figure 5).

3.5 Homogeneity bias is robust to top p

Racial homogeneity bias persisted across all top p values. Stories about Black Americans showed significantly higher cosine similarity values than those about White Americans at every top p value ($bs \geq 0.085, ps < .001$; see Figure 6). Gender homogeneity bias also persisted across all top p values. Stories about women showed significantly higher cosine similarity values than those about men at every top p value ($bs \geq 0.35, ps < .001$; see Figure 6). Moreover,




Figure 4: Standardized cosine similarity values of racial and gender groups across temperature values. As these measurements are standardized across groups, they are meant to visualize the magnitude of homogeneity bias across temperature values. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.




Figure 5: Cosine similarity values of racial and gender groups across top p values. Higher cosine similarity means more homogeneity in the stories generated for that group. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.




Figure 6: Standardized cosine similarity values of racial and gender groups across top p values. As these measurements are standardized across groups, they are meant to visualize the magnitude of homogeneity bias across temperature values. Error bars represent one standard error above and below the mean.

the magnitude of gender bias was generally larger than that of racial bias. See Tables S3 and S4 for complete model outputs.

3.6 Top p effects on racial and gender homogeneity bias

Racial homogeneity bias showed a non-linear pattern with increasing top p (see Figure 6). While our linear mixed-effects model suggested a significantly negative effect of top p for White Americans ($b = -0.098$, $p < .001$) and a significantly larger effect for Black Americans ($b = 0.20$, $p < .001$), the actual pattern was more nuanced. The difference in cosine similarity values between racial groups increased until top p 0.8, followed by a sharp decrease at top p 1.0—a non-linear pattern not adequately captured by our linear model (see Table S5).

Gender homogeneity bias remained relatively stable with increasing top p (see Figure 6). While our linear mixed-effects model suggested a significantly negative effect of top p for men ($b = -0.021$, $p < .001$) and a significantly larger effect for women ($b = 0.042$, $p < .001$), the actual pattern showed that the difference in cosine similarity values between gender groups remained relatively constant across top p values, with the bias being smallest at top p 0.4 (see Table S5).

4 Discussion

We conducted experiments to investigate how racial and gender homogeneity bias in GPT-4 responds to changes in hyperparameter values. We selected facial stimuli representing two racial groups (Black and White Americans) and two gender groups (men and women), and had GPT-4 write stories about the individuals in these images. To measure homogeneity bias, we compared story similarities using cosine similarity measurements between their vector representations. We manipulated two hyperparameters—*sampling temperature* and *top p* —that control the model’s generation randomness to examine both the robustness of the bias and whether these parameters systematically increase or decrease its magnitude. We discuss the implications of our findings for bias mitigation and future work.

4.1 Homogeneity bias is generally robust to creativity hyperparameters

We found racial and gender homogeneity bias in the expected direction in 19 out of 20 *sampling temperature* and *top p* configurations. This is compelling evidence that AI models trained on massive collections of human-generated data reproduce homogeneity bias—the tendency to represent certain groups as more homogeneous than others.

While the robustness of this bias across hyperparameter configurations may seem inconsistent with Zayed et al. [2024], which demonstrate the potential of modulating attention weights to mitigate social biases in LLM outputs, our results indicate that homogeneity bias may be mitigated to some extent by adjusting hyperparameters. Following OpenAI’s recommendation to adjust either temperature or top p but not both,⁷ we modulated these hyperparameters separately in our experiments. Future work should investigate how these hyperparameters mitigate homogeneity bias and the implications of modulating both simultaneously.

4.2 The non-linear relationship between homogeneity bias and hyperparameters

Many of the relationships found in this work were non-linear, particularly at extreme hyperparameter values. For instance, while increasing temperature initially led to more diverse group representations as expected, this trend unexpectedly reversed at temperature 2, resulting in more homogeneous representations. Similarly, we observed the largest difference in racial homogeneity bias at top p 0.8, not at the maximum value of 1.0 as one might expect. These non-linear patterns suggest that the relationship between hyperparameters and group representation diversity might have inflection points beyond which further parameter adjustments become counterproductive. Future work should systematically investigate a wider range of hyperparameter values to better understand these non-linear relationships and identify optimal settings for minimizing homogeneity bias in VLM outputs.

4.3 Social group dimensions respond differently to hyperparameter modulations

We found that both increasing *temperature* and lowering *top p* reduced racial homogeneity bias, despite having opposing effects on output randomness. However, these adjustments affected gender homogeneity bias differently: increasing temperature up to 1.5 increased gender homogeneity bias, while adjusting *top p* had minimal effect. This differential response suggests that homogeneity bias in some social group dimensions may be more resilient to hyperparameter modulation than others, indicating that hyperparameter tuning alone cannot universally mitigate homogeneity bias.

5 Limitations

The two hyperparameters examined in our work control the randomness of model outputs and are typically adjusted based on the specific task for which the model is used [Wang et al., 2023, Hinton et al., 2015]. We focused on story generation to minimize confounding factors and isolate the effects of hyperparameter configurations on homogeneity bias. By constraining text generation to a single format—stories—we were able to better analyze the effect of these parameters. However, these findings may not generalize across different tasks or text formats, as optimal hyperparameter configurations often vary depending on the task. Future work should investigate a broader range of tasks and contexts to better understand how these parameters influence group representations in VLM outputs.

Our investigation focused on GPT-4o mini, a proprietary VLM whose architecture and training process are not publicly available. While this limited transparency was not central to our goal of evaluating output-level bias robustness, our finding that hyperparameter adjustments alone cannot adequately mitigate homogeneity bias suggests the need to examine model internals. Future work should investigate homogeneity bias in open-source models, where researchers can inspect which model components reproduce or amplify the bias. Given Lee et al. [2024]’s hypothesis that training data representation may be a source of homogeneity bias, open-source models could help researchers investigate this potential cause and develop more effective mitigation strategies.

Finally, our analyses revealed unexpected non-linear relationships between hyperparameters and group representations. While we used linear mixed-effects models due to their interpretability and our lack of prior hypotheses about non-linearity, the presence of these non-linear patterns suggests the need for more sophisticated analytical approaches. Future work should employ methods specifically designed to capture non-linear relationships and test a wider range of hyperparameter values. This could help identify potential inflection points in group representation diversity and determine optimal hyperparameter settings for minimizing homogeneity bias in VLM outputs.

⁷https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference/assistants/createAssistant#assistants-createassistant-top_p

6 Conclusion

This study reveals that racial and gender homogeneity bias in GPT-4 persists across most hyperparameter configurations, though their relationship with *sampling temperature* and *top p* shows unexpected non-linear patterns. While increasing temperature or decreasing top p can reduce racial homogeneity bias to some extent, these adjustments affect gender homogeneity bias differently, highlighting that hyperparameter tuning alone cannot serve as a universal solution. Our findings suggest that bias mitigation requires a more comprehensive approach. Future work should investigate these non-linear relationships more systematically, examine how hyperparameters mitigate homogeneity bias through different mechanisms, and explore the source of this bias in open-source models where training data and model architectures can be analyzed directly.

7 Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Center for the Study of Race, Ethnicity & Equity (CRE²) at Washington University in St. Louis.

References

- Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning, January 2022.
- Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '21, pages 610–623, New York, NY, USA, March 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-8309-7. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445922.
- Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam Kalai. Man is to Computer Programmer as Woman is to Homemaker? Debiasing Word Embeddings, July 2016.
- Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J. Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334):183–186, April 2017. doi:10.1126/science.aal4230.
- Abubakar Abid, Maheen Farooqi, and James Zou. Persistent Anti-Muslim Bias in Large Language Models, January 2021.
- Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Myra Cheng, Debora Nozza, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Dan Jurafsky, James Zou, and Aylin Caliskan. Easily Accessible Text-to-Image Generation Amplifies Demographic Stereotypes at Large Scale. In *2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1493–1504, June 2023. doi:10.1145/3593013.3594095.
- Messi H.J. Lee, Jacob M. Montgomery, and Calvin K. Lai. Large Language Models Portray Socially Subordinate Groups as More Homogeneous, Consistent with a Bias Observed in Humans. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '24, pages 1321–1340, New York, NY, USA, June 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400704505. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658975.
- Messi H. J. Lee and Soyeon Jeon. Vision-Language Models Represent Darker-Skinned Black Individuals as More Homogeneous than Lighter-Skinned Black Individuals, December 2024.
- Markus Brauer and Abdelatif Er-rafiy. Increasing perceived variability reduces prejudice and discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(5):871–881, 2011. ISSN 1096-0465. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.003.
- Bernadette Park, Carey S. Ryan, and Charles M. Judd. Role of meaningful subgroups in explaining differences in perceived variability for in-groups and out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(4):553–567, 1992. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.553.
- Abdelatif Er-rafiy and Markus Brauer. Modifying perceived variability: Four laboratory and field experiments show the effectiveness of a ready-to-be-used prejudice intervention. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(4):840–853, April 2013. ISSN 0021-9029, 1559-1816. doi:10.1111/jasp.12010.
- George A. Quattrone and Edward E. Jones. The perception of variability within in-groups and out-groups: Implications for the law of small numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(1):141–152, 1980. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.38.1.141.
- Patricia W. Linville and Edward E. Jones. Polarized appraisals of out-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(5):689–703, 1980. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.38.5.689.

- Patricia W. Linville, Gregory W. Fischer, and Peter Salovey. Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(2):165–188, 1989. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.165.
- Bernadette Park and Charles M. Judd. Measures and models of perceived group variability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(2):173–191, 1990. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.2.173.
- Thomas M. Ostrom and Constantine Sedikides. Out-group homogeneity effects in natural and minimal groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(3):536–552, 1992. ISSN 1939-1455. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.3.536.
- Donald T. Campbell. Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of persons as social entities. *Behavioral Science*, 3(1):14–25, 1958. ISSN 1099-1743. doi:10.1002/bs.3830030103.
- Marc Irwin, Tony Tripodi, and James Bieri. Affective stimulus value and cognitive complexity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4):444–448, 1967. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/h0024406.
- George A. Kelly. *The Psychology of Personal Constructs. Vol. 1. A Theory of Personality. Vol. 2. Clinical Diagnosis and Psychotherapy*. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. Vol. 1. A Theory of Personality. Vol. 2. Clinical Diagnosis and Psychotherapy. W. W. Norton, Oxford, England, 1955.
- Brian Mullen and Li-tze Hu. Perceptions of ingroup and outgroup variability: A meta-analytic integration. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(3):233–252, 1989. ISSN 1532-4834. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp1003_3.
- Bernd Simon and Rupert Brown. Perceived intragroup homogeneity in minority-majority contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(4):703–711, 1987. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.4.703.
- Bernd Simon and Thomas F. Pettigrew. Social identity and perceived group homogeneity: Evidence for the in-group homogeneity effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4):269–286, 1990. ISSN 1099-0992. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420200402.
- Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi. Group Status and Perceptions of Homogeneity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 9(1): 31–75, January 1998. ISSN 1046-3283. doi:10.1080/14792779843000045.
- Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi. They all look alike, but so do we... sometimes: Perceptions of in-group and out-group homogeneity as a function of sex and context. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32(2):111–124, 1993. ISSN 2044-8309. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1993.tb00990.x.
- Ana Guinote, Charles M. Judd, and Markus Brauer. Effects of power on perceived and objective group variability: Evidence that more powerful groups are more variable. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5):708–721, 2002. ISSN 1939-1315. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.708.
- E. P. Hollander. Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, 65(2):117–127, 1958. ISSN 1939-1471. doi:10.1037/h0042501.
- Susan T. Fiske and Eric Dépret. Control, Interdependence and Power: Understanding Social Cognition in Its Social Context. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 7(1):31–61, January 1996. ISSN 1046-3283. doi:10.1080/14792779443000094.
- Myra Cheng, Tiziano Piccardi, and Diyi Yang. CoMPosT: Characterizing and Evaluating Caricature in LLM Simulations. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10853–10875, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.669.
- Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K. Ahmed. Bias and Fairness in Large Language Models: A Survey, July 2024.
- Abdelrahman Zayed, Goncalo Mordido, Samira Shabaniyan, and Sarath Chandar. Should We Attend More or Less? Modulating Attention for Fairness, August 2024.
- Messi H. J. Lee and Calvin K. Lai. Probability of Differentiation Reveals Brittleness of Homogeneity Bias in Large Language Models, July 2024.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network, March 2015.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks, August 2019.
- Douglas Bates, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker, and Steve Walker. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4, June 2014.
- José C. Pinheiro and Douglas M. Bates. *Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS*. Statistics and Computing. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. ISBN 978-0-387-98957-0. doi:10.1007/b98882.

Douglas Bates, Martin Maechler, Ben Bolker [aut, cre, Steven Walker, Rune Haubo Bojesen Christensen, Henrik Singmann, Bin Dai, Fabian Scheipl, Gabor Grothendieck, Peter Green, John Fox, Alexander Bauer, Pavel N. Krivitsky (shared copyright on simulate.formula), Emi Tanaka, and Mikael Jagan. Lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models using 'Eigen' and S4, July 2024.

Chi Wang, Susan Xueqing Liu, and Ahmed H. Awadallah. Cost-Effective Hyperparameter Optimization for Large Language Model Generation Inference, August 2023.

S1 Appendix: Summary Output of Mixed-Effects Models

Table S1: Summary output of the Race Models in across temperature values (Study 1).

	Temperature				
	0	0.5	1	1.5	2
Fixed Effects					
Intercept	-0.073 (0.055)	-0.13 (0.023)	-0.12 (0.018)	-0.19 (0.019)	0.030 (0.010)
Race	0.33*** (0.0011)	0.30*** (0.0018)	0.25*** (0.0018)	0.052*** (0.0018)	-0.057*** (0.0019)
Random Effects (σ^2)					
Pair ID Intercept	0.72	0.12	0.077	0.083	0.025
Residual	0.35	0.86	0.91	0.92	0.97
Observations	1,111,636	1,113,042	1,116,771	1,116,019	1,101,132
Log likelihood	-1,001,698	-1,493,277	-1,531,718	-1,536,110	-1,548,973

Table S2: Summary output of the Gender Models in across Top p values (Study 1).

	Top p				
	0	0.5	1	1.5	2
Fixed Effects					
Intercept	-0.081 (0.076)	-0.16 (0.028)	-0.20 (0.016)	-0.23 (0.027)	-0.13 (0.0083)
Gender	0.35** (0.11)	0.36*** (0.039)	0.43*** (0.023)	0.47*** (0.021)	0.26*** (0.012)
Random Effects (σ^2)					
Pair ID Intercept	0.69	0.092	0.031	0.027	0.0081
Residual	0.38	0.88	0.92	0.92	0.98
Observations	1,111,636	1,113,042	1,116,771	1,116,019	1,101,132
Log likelihood	-1,042,882	-1,507,924	-1,541,337	-1,536,391	-1,549,300

Table S3: Summary output of the Race Models in across temperature values (Study 2).

	Top p				
	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
Fixed Effects					
Intercept	0.050 (0.051)	-0.040 (0.036)	-0.13 (0.026)	-0.19 (0.020)	-0.069 (0.019)
Race	0.085*** (0.0013)	0.18*** (0.0016)	0.31*** (0.0017)	0.42*** (0.0018)	0.16*** (0.0018)
Random Effects (σ^2)					
Pair ID Intercept	0.63	0.32	0.16	0.099	0.087
Residual	0.47	0.70	0.82	0.86	0.91
Observations	1,123,500	1,107,134	1,113,780	1,113,784	1,113,788
Log likelihood	-1,171,447	-1,376,774	-1,496,533	-1,497,432	-1,527,495

Table S4: Summary output of the Gender Models in across Top p values (Study 2).

	Top p				
	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
Fixed Effects					
Intercept	-0.11 (0.070)	-0.13 (0.049)	-0.18 (0.032)	-0.20 (0.021)	-0.20 (0.019)
Gender	0.41*** (0.099)	0.35*** (0.069)	0.41*** (0.045)	0.43*** (0.030)	0.43*** (0.026)
Random Effects (σ^2)					
Pair ID Intercept	0.59	0.29	0.12	0.054	0.041
Residual	0.47	0.71	0.84	0.90	0.91
Observations	1,123,500	1,107,134	1,113,780	1,113,784	1,113,788
Log likelihood	-1,173,573	-1,382,870	-1,485,968	-1,525,195	-1,531,333

Table S5: Summary output of models including *sampling temperature* and *Top p*. The “Temperature” and “Top p” terms indicate the impact of hyperparameters on the reference groups (Black Americans for race and men for gender). The “Interaction” term reflects the differential effects of hyperparameters on the non-reference groups.

	Temperature		Top p	
	Race	Gender	Race	Gender
Fixed Effects				
Intercept	-0.16 (0.021)	-0.17 (0.024)	-0.018 (0.027)	-0.15 (0.033)
Race	0.38*** (0.0014)	– (–)	0.11*** (0.0018)	– (–)
Gender	– (–)	0.40*** (0.034)	– (–)	0.38*** (0.047)
Temperature/Probability	0.052*** (0.00040)	0.0062*** (0.00040)	-0.098*** (0.0019)	-0.021*** (0.0019)
Interaction	-0.10*** (0.00057)	-0.012*** (0.00057)	0.20*** (0.0027)	0.042*** (0.0027)
Random Effects (σ^2)				
Pair ID Intercept	0.10	0.069	0.17	0.13
Residual	0.89	0.90	0.83	0.84
Observations	5,558,600	5,558,600	5,571,986	5,571,986
Log likelihood	-7,565,562	-7,605,499	-7,385,880	-7,432,693