

Evaluating Binary Decision Biases in Large Language Models: Implications for Fair Agent-Based Financial Simulations

Alicia Vidler, Toby Walsh

UNSW Sydney, Australia
a.vidler@unsw.edu.au, t.walsh@unsw.edu.au

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly being used to simulate human-like decision making in agent-based financial market models (ABMs). As models become more powerful and accessible, researchers can now incorporate individual LLM decisions into ABM environments. However, integration may introduce inherent biases that need careful evaluation. In this paper we test three state-of-the-art GPT models for bias using two model sampling approaches: one-shot and few-shot API queries. We observe significant variations in distributions of outputs between specific models, and model sub versions, with GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18 showing notably better performance (32-43% yes responses) compared to GPT-4-0125-preview's extreme bias (98-99% yes responses). We show that sampling methods and model sub-versions significantly impact results: repeated independent API calls produce different distributions compared to batch sampling within a single call. While no current GPT model can simultaneously achieve a uniform distribution and Markovian properties in one-shot testing, few-shot sampling can approach uniform distributions under certain conditions. We explore the Temperature parameter, providing a definition and comparative results. We further compare our results to true random binary series and test specifically for the common human bias of Negative Recency - finding LLMs have a mixed ability to 'beat' humans in this one regard. These findings emphasise the critical importance of careful LLM integration into ABMs for financial markets and more broadly.

Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are founded on human text, and inherit patterns from their training data. They demonstrate capabilities in understanding and generating human-like text across various domains (Chang et al. 2023) and replicating human like behaviours as agents (Park et al. 2023). Since humans demonstrate well-documented biases in their perception of randomness (Warren et al. 2018), we test to see if LLMs produce or replicate these biases when asked to make probabilistic decisions. LLMs have been found to deviate from intended trading instructions (Vidler and Walsh 2024a), leading to systematic decision making biases despite demonstrating LLMs' potential for multi-agent systems in finance. This becomes particularly relevant when

Copyright © 2025, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

using LLMs to make binary choices (e.g. "Randomly choose yes or no") such as in financial markets trading applications. If financial models or markets seek to replace random generating functions with LLMs - what would happen?

In financial markets, randomness is a widely used mechanism for safety and fairness: markets such as the London Stock Exchange open and close at a random time within a pre-set window¹, and many banks are regulated under rules such as BIS Basel IV, focused on estimation of risk and capital adequacy through use of underlying probability distributions². Throughout financial pricing and risk models, extensive reliance on distributional assumptions and sampling is common place (Hull 2022). Any integration of LLM's into ABMs, or more broadly, financial market trading or risk systems, will necessarily incorporate any LLM bias.

In this paper we pose a deeper question about the integration of LLMs into financial models; give that random numbers form an integral part of financial markets modelling, and decision making is crucial, can state-of-the-art LLMs reliably reproduce a simple uniform probability distribution, producing fair binary choices in response to independent agent-like API requests? Can an LLM "toss a fair coin" when we ask it to within a model?

Our Contribution

In this paper we explore the significant variations in coin toss experimental results achieved with three widely-used LLMs: GPT-3.5 Turbo-0125, GPT-4-0125-preview, and GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18. To mirror natural language and avoid potential usage bias with words such as "heads" or "tails", we define a coin toss as asking for a "yes" or "no" binary output. We focus our results on "yes" and "no" decisions to increase applicability and broaden possible usage. We build on recent work on randomness and human bias in LLMs by (Koevering and Kleinberg 2024), which found a mixed picture of results. We extend their work to explore specific released versions of common LLM's and differences between sub versions. We extend (Renda, Hopkins, and Carbin 2023) with new terminology to better reflect the way in which a typical ABM might approach querying an LLM:

¹<https://www.londonstockexchange.com/discover/news-and-insights/what-auction>

²<https://www.bis.org/bcbs/index.htm?m=88>

one-shot and few-shot sampling, likewise extending (Koevering and Kleinberg 2024) further also. These query methods reflect sampling of a model state either independently (One-Shot) or simultaneously (Few-Shot). Our analysis reveals significant deviations from uniform probability distributions in LLM binary decision making (see Tables 1, 3), and response sequences show strong decision dependence (Tables 2, 4). For ABM integration, one-shot queries using GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18 showed minimal bias despite non-Markovian output. Few-shot sampling (100 responses per API call) approached uniform distribution through sample averaging, though non-Markovian. We explore few-shot samples as distinct batches, which again show non uniform distributions but over 58% of batches were Markovian in their response. We also examine the Temperature parameter's impact on distributional properties across six settings in the vein of (Peeperkorn et al. 2024) and (Koevering and Kleinberg 2024) but extend their work by testings specific versions with specific sampling regimes. Even with optimised temperature settings, no model achieves both uniform distribution and Markovian outputs (Figure 1). We observe differences between specific GPT model subtypes, with very large variations in outputs.

To gain a context on natural language bias, we perform a sampling of the Common crawl (Common Crawl 2024) as recent research by (Tessema, Kedia, and Chung 2024) has found that it can provide a valuable data source for fine tuning LLMs. Using the cut-off date of GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18 model training (corresponding to the most SOTA model), we find naturally occurring Yes/No responses deviate substantially from uniform distribution. Recent work by (Harrison 2024) points to GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 being capable in equivalent few shot tests to avoid "repetitive and sequential patterns compared to humans" paving the way for the possibility that LLM's might be closer to randomness than expected. We extend and expand this work and contribute to the area by looking at binary series, across three SOTA models and two methods of API generation. We explore these features to extend work such as (Vidler and Walsh 2024b) and (Vidler and Walsh 2024a), where including LLM's in financial market simulation holds great promise of increase model fidelity and nuance.

Recent and Relevant Literature on LLMs

SOTA Models

In November 2024, OpenAi, the creators of ChatGPT, announced they are working on an autonomous agent based version of their seminal LLMs, reportedly called "Operator" (Ghaffary and Metz 2024). Agentic AI tools are at the forefront of LLM design (Ng 2024). Pre-trained LLMs, such as GPT-3 (Bubeck et al. 2023) and GPT 4 (Luo et al. 2023), have demonstrated proficiency in tasks such as dialogue generation and natural language interactions, however a fundamentally different questions is asked of an LLM in an agentic AI tool and ABM. Unlike text and analysis needs, ABMs rely on *agency*, that is to say, agents are imbued, and defined by, the requirement to make a decision in some frame or context (Wooldridge 2009). Many such implementations

ultimately require a binary choice from the agent: to more or not to move - "yes" or "no". While LLMs offer promising capabilities as decision making agents, they face both engineering implementation challenges (Chopra et al. 2024) and fundamental issues with decision making processes that can significantly impact overall behaviour (Vidler and Walsh 2024a).

Generative Agent based models (GABMs)

Current thinking suggests that integrating LLM's into multi-agent frameworks has great potential for future AI systems (Ng 2024). Initial work by (Park et al. 2023) found that generative agents could be realistic simulacra of humans. Early attempts to introduce an LLM as an agent (Chopra et al. 2024) found granular agent decisions were unfeasible to implement from a technological standpoint. More recent work on these GABMs in financial trading decisions, using GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18, showed realistic representations of order-to-trade ratios found in US equity markets (Vidler and Walsh 2024a).

Financial market use and Markov property

When using an LLM as a decision maker within an ABM or any other model, it is foreseeable that there may be challenges in relation to the sampling of the LLM's internal distribution of tokens, in effect producing an LLM model specific probability distribution of responses. We focus also on the question of binary outcomes being Markovian, or memory-less. The Markov property is a key financial market concept introduced into modelling of markets by (Fama 1965). In ABM terms this translates into a need to have each agents decision be based only on the decision process at the time step in question. Non-Markovian properties of ABMs for financial decisions would point to information leakage, collusion or agent group dynamics by default, defeating the goal of independent agents as a starting point for modelling.

The potential to utilise LLMs to enrich other model methods with human characteristics (such as human biases) is beginning to be explored in text based arenas such as chat bots (Gu et al. 2024) and survey participation (Tjuatja et al. 2024), and human "sims" (Park et al. 2023) to name just a few. With the rapid advancement of both foundational LLM models, and hardware, it is now feasible to incorporate LLMs into ABMs directly (Vidler and Walsh 2024a) without the need for archetypes, or reduced agent fidelity, something that as little as 6 month ago was not considered computationally feasible (Chopra et al. 2024).

Human Bias in Random sequence generation

Research into human capacity for generating random sequences spans decades in psychological literature (Ginsburg and Karpiuk 1994), (Towse and Neil 1998). Traditional findings identified three primary biases in human-generated random sequences: cycling (avoiding recently used numbers), seriation (stereotypical patterns like ascending or descending sequences), and repetition avoidance (Angelike and Musch 2024). Recent studies have revealed a more nuanced understanding of these limitations (Warren et al.

2018), (Wong, Merholz, and Maoz 2021). Researchers have identified key metrics for distinguishing human-generated sequences from truly random processes, notably "algorithmic complexity" and "repetition median" which are found to be especially effective for sequences under 20 repetitions (Angelike and Musch 2024). As specific bias, *Negative Recency* has been identified, where humans rely on recent responses in sequential decision-making (such as coin tosses) to influence subsequent choices ((Baena-Mirabete et al. 2023), (Koevering and Kleinberg 2024)) illustrating a "negative recency" bias. Human psychology research has found that this effect varies with age (Baena-Mirabete et al. 2023) due to differences in working memory capacity, necessitating age-based criteria in comparative analyses. Additionally, (Gauvrit et al. 2017) demonstrated that age is the primary factor affecting random sequence complexity, while (Biesaga, Talaga, and Nowak 2021) found that fatigue negatively impacts performance. Our research extends these insights focusing on the negative recency bias in random sequence generation (Towse and Neil 1998), (Angelike and Musch 2024) in specific LLM versions and independent sampling methods.

Computational Randomness

Research on LLM randomness has revealed limitations in number generation (Renda, Hopkins, and Carbin 2023; Harrison 2024; Liu 2024), probabilistic text (Tjuatja et al. 2024; Renda, Hopkins, and Carbin 2023; Peeperkorn et al. 2024), and behavioral simulations (Gu et al. 2024). Studies show LLMs struggle with sampling from specific distributions (Imani and Du 2023; Renda, Hopkins, and Carbin 2023), though findings conflict: (Tjuatja et al. 2024) found greater bias than humans, while (Harrison 2024) demonstrated superior randomness in gpt-3.5-turbo-0125. Human comparisons often rely on (Figurska, Stańczyk, and Kulesza 2008)'s limited 37-person study, leaving room for more comprehensive analysis.

Our work addresses the understudied impact of temperature settings on LLM randomness by systematically analyzing its effects across three specific GPT model versions using a binary decision test.

Temperature

Temperature, while absent from (Vaswani et al. 2017), is a crucial parameter in modern LLM APIs that controls output randomness. Defaulting to 1 (max 2) across tested models, its name derives from the SoftMax function's connection to Boltzmann's thermodynamic work (Bridle 1989), making it relevant for analysing decision-making behavior. We provide a formal definition here:

Definition: SoftMax function $\sigma: \mathbb{R}^P \rightarrow (0, 1)^P$, where $P \geq 1$, takes a vector $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_K) \in \mathbb{R}^P$ and computes each component of vector $\sigma(\mathbf{z}) \in (0, 1)^P$ with

$$\sigma(\mathbf{z})_i = \frac{e^{z_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^P e^{z_j}}. \quad (1)$$

With the addition of a scaler β to the exponential terms in Equation (1) produces;

$$\sigma(\mathbf{z})_i = \frac{e^{\beta z_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^P e^{\beta z_j}}. \quad (2)$$

Definition: Temperature Let \mathbf{T} be a value proportional to the inverse of β such that: $\mathbb{T} = \frac{1}{\beta}$.

Temperature's impact has been studied across LLM applications including creative writing (Peeperkorn et al. 2024), question answering (Renze and Guven 2024), coding (Zhu et al. 2023), and structured reasoning (Ouyang et al. 2023; Hickman, Dunlop, and Wolf 2024). While (Wang et al. 2024) found task-dependent optimal temperatures, methodological approaches vary: (Harrison 2024) used only model defaults, whereas (Koevering and Kleinberg 2024) tested multiple settings but omitted model specifics. Our work extends this field by examining Temperature's specific impact on a binary decision distribution, independently sampled for three specific GPT sub-versions.

Testing methodology

We test LLM binary decision making, across three OpenAI models and refer to the following **models** ⁽³⁾:

- **M1** (gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18): Advanced small model optimised for cost-efficiency
- **M2** (gpt-4-0125-preview): Full GPT-4 Turbo with enhanced instruction following
- **M3** (gpt-3.5-turbo-0125): Latest GPT-3.5 iteration with improved format adherence

We extend Few-Shot Learning Terminology to LLM Querying. We borrow from (Vinyals et al. 2017) and present methods similar in the vein of (Renda, Hopkins, and Carbin 2023) and define specific query methods:

Definition: One-Shot Querying:

Independent API calls with fixed prompt, each generating one decision, representing a distinct sampling event

Definition: Few-Shot Querying:

Single API call requesting multiple samples n with fixed prompt, in the same API call

1. **One-Shot Testing:** Sequential API calls with 1-second delays, alternating between prompts to collect 100 responses per prompt (i.e. 200 API requests) in an independent sampling approach. Each API call is an independent request of the internal model state.
2. **Few-Shot Testing:** Single API calls requesting 100 comma-separated responses, with 1-second delays between batches. We collect 10 batches per question, per model. (i.e. 10 API requests only)
3. **Temperature Impact Analysis:** Temperature settings from 0.5-2.0, collecting 100 responses per setting. We conduct these tests in a one-shot setting, to align with ideal use cases in ABMs for financial decision in line with (Vidler and Walsh 2024a).

³details taken from API documentation <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o-mini>

We tested two simple prompts: Q1: "yes or no" and Q2: "Answer randomly, yes or no", designed for broad applicability. Using χ^2 tests, we examined both uniformity and Markovian independence—properties crucial for ABMs. Unintended dependencies in LLM responses could simulate artificial agent interactions, particularly problematic in financial simulations where decision independence is essential.

Response Distribution and Independence

We test models: M1, M2 and M3 with One-shot and Few-Shot sampling methods on Q1 and Q2. We applied chi-square goodness of fit tests ($df = 1, (\alpha = 0.05)$) to evaluate:

Hypothesis 1 (HP1): Test for Uniform Distribution of Binary Responses of Yes or No:

$H_0 : p_{yes} = p_{no} = 0.5$: responses are uniformly distributed

$H_1 : p_{yes} \neq p_{no}$: responses are not uniformly distributed

Hypothesis 2 (HP2): Test for Independence of consecutive decision responses (Markovian responses):

$H_0 : P(Yes_n | Yes_{n-1}) = P(Yes_n)$: the current response, n is independent of the previous response of $(n - 1)$

$H_1 : P(Yes_n | Yes_{n-1}) \neq P(Yes_n)$: responses are dependent

Results

One-shot testing with fixed Temperature = 1

Unable to reliably replicate a mean of 50%: In the first test, none of the models accurately replicated the expected distribution ($p = 0.5$). While GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18's **Q2** responses still deviated from the expected distribution (43% yes, 57% no), it was the only result where we cannot reject the null hypothesis of uniformity and the difference is not statistically significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level (see Table1). The remaining models (GPT-4-0125-preview and GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125) performed particularly poorly for all questions and were statistically significant deviations away from uniformity (all $p < 0.001$. Question 1's response for GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18 were also found to be non-uniform.

Model variations are extreme: across models, with GPT-4-0125-preview producing 99% "Yes" responses for Q1 compared to GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18's 32%. GPT-4o-Mini showed moderate bias (32-43% yes), while GPT-4-0125-preview and GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125 exhibited extreme yes bias (98-99% and 87-98% respectively).

Impact of basic prompt with "random" included: Question 1 simply prompted "yes or no" where as Question 2's "random" framing only improved uniformity in GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18. The χ^2 statistic reduced from 12.96 to 1.96 ($p=0.162$), making it the only case where we **do not reject** the null hypothesis. However, GPT-4-0125-preview and GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125 maintained strong "Yes" biases in Q2 with $\chi^2 > 87$ and $p < 1e - 20$, regardless of the tested prompts.

Test for Markovian responses: For **HP2**, we analyse the Markov property to test response independence, with results reported per model and question in Table 2. GPT-4-0125-preview and GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125 produce near-perfect **dependence** in Q1 ($P(Yes) = 0.99-1.00, P(Yes \rightarrow Yes(t-1)) = 0.98-1.00$), with deterministic behaviour especially stark in GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125 Q1 responses (86 consecutive Yes \rightarrow Yes transitions). While GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 and GPT-4-turbo-preview show low χ^2 values (0-0.187), this likely reflects their strong response bias rather than true independence. GPT-4-turbo-0125-preview-mini exhibited more varied responses but showed significant dependencies in both questions ($\chi^2_{Q1} = 21.86, \chi^2_{Q2} = 36.19$, both $p < 0.05$), rejecting H_0 .

Note: In tables, "accept" H_0 denotes failure to reject the null hypothesis, used for brevity of display.

Model	Q	Yes	No	χ^2	p-value	Result
GPT-4o-Mini	1	32	68	13.0	3.18e-4	Reject H_0
	2	43	57	2.0	0.162	NotReject H_0
GPT-4	1	99	1	96.0	1.13e-22	Reject H_0
	2	98	2	92.2	7.99e-22	Reject H_0
GPT-3.5	1	87	0	87.0	1.09e-20	Reject H_0
	2	98	2	92.2	7.99e-22	Reject H_0

H_0 : Responses are uniformly distributed ($p = 0.5$), $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 1: One-Shot Chi-Square Tests for Uniform Distribution

Model	P(Y)	E[P(Y—Y)]	χ^2	YY/n	Result
GPT-4o-Mini	0.32	0.28	21.9	9/32	Reject H_0
	0.43	0.48	36.2	20/42	Reject H_0
GPT-4	0.99	0.99	0.04	97/98	Reject*
	0.98	0.98	0.19	95/97	Reject*
GPT-3.5	1.00	1.00	-	86/86	Reject*
	0.98	0.98	0.19	95/97	Reject*

H_0 : $P(Yes \rightarrow Yes_{t-1}) = P(Yes)$, $\alpha = 0.05$

*Rejected due to near-perfect dependence

Table 2: One-Shot Markov Property Tests Across Models

Few-Shot Results: Improved Performance with Multi-Sample Generation

Our few-shot testing, where LLMs generated 100 responses per API call across 10 iterations, showed significantly improved uniformity. When averaged, all models and questions approximated the expected 50/50 distribution more closely than in one-shot testing. All cases could **not** reject the null hypothesis except GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18's Q2 responses—notably, the only case that showed uniformity in one-shot testing. Results are detailed in Table 3.

However, the results reveal concerning patterns. Lists of yes/no pairs show strong sequential dependencies, rejecting the Markov property (HP2) across all models. The conditional probability $P(Yes \rightarrow Yes)$ varies from below 10% for

Model-Q	Yes	No	χ^2	p-value	Result
GPT-4o-Mini-Q1	527	473	2.97	0.088	NotReject H_0
GPT-4o-Mini-Q2	534	466	4.62	0.032	Reject H_0
GPT-4-Q1	523	477	2.17	0.146	NotReject H_0
GPT-4-Q2	530	470	3.60	0.058	NotReject H_0
GPT-3.5-Q1	498	502	0.02	0.899	NotReject H_0
GPT-3.5-Q2	498	502	0.02	0.899	NotReject H_0

H_0 : Responses are uniformly distributed ($p = 0.5$), $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 3: Few-shot query Chi-Square Tests for Uniform Distribution

GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 (Q1) to 28% and 36% for GPT-4o-mini-204-07-18 in Q1 and Q2 respectively—lower than one-shot tests. This suggests that when generating sequences, models over-compensate for randomness by excessive alternation, resulting in less random outputs than one-shot responses.

Model	P(Y)	E[P(Y—Y)]	χ^2	YY/N	H_0
GPT-4o-Mini	0.53	0.26	63.9	145/527	Reject
	0.53	0.36	32.5	193/533	Reject
GPT-4	0.52	0.27	67.2	141/523	Reject
	0.53	0.36	31.1	191/530	Reject
GPT-3.5	0.50	0.06	187.4	32/498	Reject
	0.50	0.35	21.7	174/497	Reject

H_0 : $P(\text{Yes}—\text{Yes}) = P(\text{Yes})$, $\alpha = 0.05$, $\chi_{crit}^2 = 3.841$

Table 4: Few-shot query Markov Property Tests Across Models

Inter-batch Analysis

Mean: Looking at the 10 batches of 100 responses (within 1 API), the average Yes% is 51.83% across all runs and the average χ^2 level is 0.37 with a maximum of any batch across all models being 1.96, well below the test statistic threshold of 3.841, meaning we cannot reject H_0 .

Markovian Independence: Exploring independence within and across batches, we see that a mixed pattern of results with the main theme being that Question 2 produces more reliable results per batch and again the SOTA GPT-4o-mini-2024-07-18 has the advantage over the other models. Across 10 batches, for 3 models and 2 questions each, we test 60 sets of 100 few-shot responses. Across these 60 sets we see H_0 is **not** reject 35 times, and 80% of Q2 results cannot reject H_0 . Results broken down by model show that GPT-4-0125-preview has the highest number of batches that can not reject H_0 but in terms of robustness to prompts, GPT-4o-Mini-2024-08-17 shows most consistency (across Q1 and Q2), where as other models only Q2 is not rejected. This mixed pattern of Markovian independence of responses is more promising than the one-shot version where only 1 test was found to be Markovian. However, tests across batches still produced biased distribution in 41.7% (25 or 60) batch results.

Limitations of practical implementation of Few-shot methods

Few-shot sampling in ABMs diverges from realistic individual decision-making by providing multiple decisions simultaneously. This approach increases computational overhead, LLM costs, and memory requirements, while requiring agents to process distribution data statistically. Given these limitations and their impact on model performance, we do not pursue further few-shot analysis in this paper.

The testing of Few-Shot methods across different models (GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and GPT-4o-Mini) failed to reject the null hypothesis in 58.3% of cases, with a notably higher non-rejection rate for Q2 (80%) compared to Q1 (36.7%).

Temperature: Impact of Temperature settings on One-shot Query results

Exploring temperature settings for One-Shot Query testing at values: $T = [0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.25, 1.5, 1.75, 2.0]$ we find that LLM APIs do not accept $T > 2$. Temperature variations tested in GPT-3.5 and GPT-4-0125-preview consistently yields skewed results, with 73% to 100% of responses being "Yes", failing to approximate the expected 50% mean and showing response dependence, rendering Markovian tests ineffective. No temperature variation tested was able to produce a binary distribution or Markovian response sequence in these models. In contrast, varying Temperature in GPT-4o-Mini-2014-07-18 did effects the mean Yes/No levels non-linearly (see Figure 1). Also, tests at Temperature = 1 reveal variable $P(Y)$ from previous tests reported earlier in this paper (see Table 5). The only model that produces Markovian response is GPT-4o-Mini-2014-07-18, and it did so across both questions and all temperature settings, in line with our earlier results reported here.




Figure 1: 4o-Mini results for various Temperature settings show non-linear effects

In summary, while temperature adjustments behave as anticipated, they fail to influence the outcomes of our binary

distribution in this scenario. Our findings highlight that different model versions can yield significantly varied results.

Temperature	Q	P(Y)	P(Y—Y)	YY/n
All tests: Failed to reject H_0 at $\alpha = 0.05$				
0.50	Q1	0.18	0.17	3/18
	Q2	0.36	0.46	16/35
0.75	Q1	0.30	0.23	7/30
	Q2	0.49	0.42	20/48
1.00	Q1	0.33	0.39	13/33
	Q2	0.56	0.64	35/55
1.25	Q1	0.38	0.32	12/38
	Q2	0.71	0.71	50/70
1.50	Q1	0.37	0.35	13/37
	Q2	0.53	0.47	25/53
1.75	Q1	0.31	0.29	9/31
	Q2	0.63	0.66	40/61
2.00	Q1	0.42	0.51	20/39
	Q2	0.48	0.50	22/44

Table 5: Temperature Effects on Markov Properties (GPT-4o-Mini)

Yes/No frequency in Common Crawl open repository of web data

The best performing model, 4o-Mini-2024-07-18, with a training cut off date of 2024-07-18 prompted an investigation into potential training data biases. Using Common Crawl (Common Crawl 2024) (CC-MAIN-2024-30), we analysed "Yes"/"No" (case insensitive) frequencies in web archives up to the model's training cutoff. We examined both truncated (first 1000 characters) and full page content across samples ranging from 100 to 25,000+ pages, providing insight into potential word frequency biases in LLM training data. We have no reason to suspect that the results will differ for other web archive scraping methods or sources.

Analysis of Common Crawl data revealed distinct patterns: truncated data showed "Yes" comprising 9.7% of Yes/No instances ($P(\text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Yes or No}) = 33.5\%$), with 70% of pages containing neither term. Full-page analysis found Yes/No responses in 51% of pages, with $P(\text{Yes}) = 10\%$ and $P(\text{Yes} \rightarrow \text{Yes or No}) = 20.3\%$. Chi-square tests ($p < 0.05$) confirm significant deviation from uniformity across all sample sizes (detailed in Table 6). These findings highlight discrepancies between both the assumed uniform distribution in LLMs ($P(\text{Yes}) = P(\text{No}) = 0.5$) and the human usage actual outputs.

Comparing LLM Randomness to Human and True Random Sequences

Extending recent work by (Harrison 2024) and (Angelike and Musch 2024), we compare our one-shot and few-shot results against true random binary sequences from Random.org⁴. Following (Baena-Mirabete et al. 2023), we analyze sequences using sliding windows of size w ($1 \leq w \leq 5$), where w represents the sequence length influencing subsequent choices. For a binary sequence $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$

⁴<https://www.random.org/integers/?mode=advanced>

Pages	Yes	No	Prob.	No Word %	Cond. Prob.
Truncated Data					
100	54	606	8.2%	70%	27.3%
1,000	57	425	11.8%	75%	47.3%
10,000	548	5,226	9.5%	69%	30.8%
28,632*	1,676	16,131	9.4%	67%	28.6%
Average	—	—	9.7%	70%	33.5%
Full Sites					
100	70	1,287	5.2%	57%	12.0%
1,000	789	6,628	10.6%	52%	22.3%
10,000	16,215	110,621	12.8%	49%	25.1%
26,705*	47,107	361,777	11.5%	48%	22.0%
Average	—	—	10.0%	51%	20.3%

Table 6: Common Crawl Analysis of Yes/No Occurrences with truncated date to 1000 characters and also full sites (* denotes Rate limited response)

where $s_i \in \text{Yes, No}$, we calculate negative recency effects. Our method is as follows:

Baseline Switching Rate The baseline switching rate represents the overall probability of alternation in the sequence.

$$\text{baseline_rate} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|S|-1} \mathbb{1}_{s_i \neq s_{i-1}}}{|S| - 1} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{s_i \neq s_{i-1}}$ is the indicator function that equals 1 if adjacent elements differ and 0 otherwise.

Window-Specific Switching Rates For each window size w , we calculate the switching rate after runs of length w as:

$$\text{switch_rate}_w = \frac{\sum_{i=w}^{|S|-1} \mathbb{1}_{s_i \neq s_{i-1}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\text{run}_w(i)}}{|\{i : \text{run}_w(i)\}|} \quad (4)$$

where:

- $\mathbb{1}_{\text{run}_w(i)}$ equals 1 if position i follows a run of length w
- $|\{i : \text{run}_w(i)\}|$ is the number of positions that follow runs of length w

Recency Effect The recency effect for window size w is then calculated as the difference between the window-specific switching rate and the baseline rate;

$$\text{recency_effect}_w = \text{switch_rate}_w - \text{baseline_rate} \quad (5)$$

A positive recency effect indicates negative recency (increased tendency to switch after runs), while a negative value indicates positive recency (decreased tendency to switch after runs).

Hypothesis 3 (HP3): We test a Two-Sample t-Test, comparing switching rates between two sequences of binary outcomes for Recency bias. The first sequence is an LLM output, the second is a binary series created by Random.org's binary generator. To reject H_0 is to state that the true random binary sequence has a different pattern to the LLM output and thus, the LLM output contains recency bias:

$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$: The mean switching rates after runs are equal between sequences, LLM is indistinguishable from a true random binary sequence

$H_1 : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: The mean switching rates after runs differ between sequences

Recency Bias Results

Analysis reveals that most model outputs exhibit recency bias compared to true random sequences, with few exceptions (highlighted in green). While GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18 avoided the human recency effects documented by (Baena-Mirabete et al. 2023) for 1 and 3-step lookbacks. In this way, these model combinations could be considered more "random" than humans, however these models still failed to simultaneously achieve both uniform distribution and Markovian independence.

Model	1-shot			FewShot		
	RNG	M	Mk	RNG	M	Mk
4o-Mini Q1	A, $P > 1$	R	R	R=NR	A	R
4o-Mini Q2	A	A	R	R=NR	R	R
GPT-4 Q1	R=NR	R	R	A P=4	A	R
GPT-4 Q2	R=NR	R	R	A P=4	A	R
GPT-3.5 Q1	R=NR	R	R	R=NR	A	R
GPT-3.5 Q2	R=NR	R	R	A P=4,5	A	R

Table 7: Statistical Analysis of Randomness Tests (R=reject, A=Not Reject H_0 , NR=Non random, M=Mean, Mk=Markov). Green cells indicate Non-Rejection H_0 .

Conclusion

We test three LLM model subversions for decision making biases by examining binary decision outputs across: GPT-3.5 Turbo-0125, GPT-4-0125-preview, and GPT-4o-Mini-2024,07,18. We find they cannot adequately replicate a uniform distribution in independent sampling of these models (One-Shot).

We also find statistically significant performance variations between models (GPT 4 to GPT 3.5) and especially between specific sub-versions (GPT 4 and 4o-Mini), in addition to significant impacts of sampling methods on results. Using a simple Yes/No benchmark task, only GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18 (one-shot) achieves output not statistically different from uniform distribution, though responses remain non-Markovian. Temperature adjustments (0.5-2.0) failed to reliably influence these distributions, with GPT-4o-Mini showing non-linear responses while other models maintained strong biases regardless of temperature setting.

The few-shot methodology, while producing better distributional outcomes, are less practical for ABM applications and nearly half of all tests result in non-Markovian decision sequences, indicating persistent temporal dependencies. Between model versions, we observe substantial variations in response patterns, suggesting architectural and training differences significantly impact decision making capabilities. We further compare results to true random binary series and test specifically for the common human bias of Negative Recency - finding LLMs have a mixed ability to 'beat' humans,

with GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-18 notably avoiding human recency effects in one-shot testing, though still producing non-Markovian outputs.

These findings expose systematic biases in LLM-based decision making, sensitivity to model sub-versions and to sampling methods. These hold critical implications for ABMs, particularly in finance where Markovian properties are typically assumed.

Building on these findings, future work should focus on several key areas: enhancing LLM integration in financial ABMs through improved real-time decision mechanisms; investigating the relationship between model architecture, underlying causes of bias and decision-making capabilities; evaluating performance across non-OpenAI models; exploring methods to mitigate identified decision biases; and examining implications for broader financial modelling applications. This research pathway aims to better understand and address the challenges of implementing LLMs in practical financial modelling environments, ultimately improving their reliability for real-world applications.

Acknowledgements

This work is funded in part by an ARC Laureate grant FL200100204 and NSF-CSIRO grant to Toby Walsh.

References

- Angelike, T.; and Musch, J. 2024. A comparative evaluation of measures to assess randomness in human-generated sequences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 56(7): 7831–7848.
- Baena-Mirabete, S.; García-Viedma, R.; Fernández-Guinea, S.; and Puig, P. 2023. A model to analyze age-related differences in human-generated head-tail sequences. *bioRxiv*.
- Biesaga, M.; Talaga, S.; and Nowak, A. 2021. The Effect of Context and Individual Differences in Human-Generated Randomness. *Cognitive Science*, 45(12).
- Bridle, J. S. 1989. Training stochastic model recognition algorithms as networks can lead to maximum mutual information estimation of parameters. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'89, 211–217. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press.
- Bubeck, S.; Chandrasekaran, V.; Eldan, R.; Gehrke, J.; Horvitz, E.; Kamar, E.; Lee, P.; Lee, Y. T.; Li, Y.; Lundberg, S.; et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Chang, Y.; Wang, X.; Wang, J.; Wu, Y.; Yang, L.; Zhu, K.; Chen, H.; Yi, X.; Wang, C.; Wang, Y.; Ye, W.; Zhang, Y.; Chang, Y.; Yu, P. S.; Yang, Q.; and Xie, X. 2023. A Survey on Evaluation of Large Language Models. arXiv:2307.03109.
- Chopra, A.; Kumar, S.; Giray-Kuru, N.; Raskar, R.; and Quera-Bofarull, A. 2024. On the limits of agency in agent-based models. *arXiv*.
- Common Crawl. 2024. Common Crawl: An Open Repository of Web Data. Accessed: 23 Nov 2024.
- Fama, E. F. 1965. Random Walks in Stock Market Prices. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 21: 55–59.

- Figuerska, M.; Stańczyk, M.; and Kulesza, K. 2008. Humans cannot consciously generate random numbers sequences: Polemic study. *Medical Hypotheses*, 70(1): 182–185.
- Gauvrit, N.; Zenil, H.; Soler-Toscano, F.; Delahaye, J.-P.; and Brugger, P. 2017. Human behavioral complexity peaks at age 25. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 13(4): e1005408.
- Ghaffary, S.; and Metz, R. 2024. OpenAI Nears Launch of AI Agents to Automate Tasks for Users. *Bloomberg News*. Accessed: 15 November 2024.
- Ginsburg, N.; and Karpiuk, P. 1994. Random Generation: Analysis of the Responses. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 79(3): 1059–1067.
- Gu, J.; Pang, L.; Shen, H.; and Cheng, X. 2024. Do LLMs Play Dice? Exploring Probability Distribution Sampling in Large Language Models for Behavioral Simulation. *arXiv*.
- Harrison, R. M. 2024. A Comparison of Large Language Model and Human Performance on Random Number Generation Tasks. In *Proceedings of The First Workshop on AI Behavioral Science (KDD24)*, volume 1. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Hickman, L.; Dunlop, P. D.; and Wolf, J. L. 2024. The performance of large language models on quantitative and verbal ability tests: Initial evidence and implications for unproctored high-stakes testing. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*.
- Hull, J. C. 2022. *Options, Futures, and Other Derivatives*. London: Pearson, 11 edition. ISBN 9781292410654.
- Imani, S.; and Du, L. 2023. MathPrompter: Mathematical Reasoning using Large Language Models. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5(1): 37–42.
- Koevering, K. V.; and Kleinberg, J. 2024. How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs’ Coin Flips. *arXiv:2406.00092*.
- Liu, Q. 2024. Does GPT-4 Play Dice ? Experiment : Generating only one number each time Experiment : Generating random sequence. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.27881.47207.
- Luo, H.; Sun, Q.; Xu, C.; Zhao, P.; Lou, J.; Tao, C.; Geng, X.; Lin, Q.; Chen, S.; and Zhang, D. 2023. WizardMath: Empowering Mathematical Reasoning for Large Language Models via Reinforced Evol-Instruct. *arXiv:2308.09583*.
- Ng, A. 2024. Agentic design patterns part 5: Multi-agent collaboration. <https://www.deeplearning.ai/the-batch/issue-245/>.
- Ouyang, S.; Zhang, Z.; Yan, B.; Liu, X.; Han, J.; and Qin, L. 2023. Structured Chemistry Reasoning with Large Language Models. *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Park, J.; O’Brien, J.; Cai, C.; Morris, M. R.; Liang, P.; and Bernstein, M. 2023. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. *arXiv:2304.03442:2304.03442*.
- Peeperkorn, M.; Kouwenhoven, T.; Brown, D.; and Jordanous, A. 2024. Is Temperature the Creativity Parameter of Large Language Models? *arXiv:2405.00492:2405.00492*.
- Renda, A.; Hopkins, A. K.; and Carbin, M. 2023. Can LLMs Generate Random Numbers? Evaluating LLM Sampling in Controlled Domains. *ICML 2023 Workshop: Sampling and Optimization in Discrete Space*, 4(1): 1–22.
- Renze, M.; and Guven, E. 2024. The Effect of Sampling Temperature on Problem Solving in Large Language Models. *arXiv:2402.05201*.
- Tessema, B. M.; Kedia, A.; and Chung, T.-S. 2024. UnifiedCrawl: Aggregated Common Crawl for Affordable Adaptation of LLMs on Low-Resource Languages. *arXiv:2411.14343*.
- Tjuatja, L.; Chen, V.; Wu, T.; Talwalkwar, A.; and Neubig, G. 2024. Do LLMs Exhibit Human-like Response Biases? A Case Study in Survey Design. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12: 1011–1026.
- Towse, J. N.; and Neil, D. 1998. Analyzing human random generation behavior: A review of methods used and a computer program for describing performance. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 30(4): 583–591.
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, L.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’17*, 6000–6010. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 9781510860964.
- Vidler, A.; and Walsh, T. 2024a. TraderTalk: An LLM Behavioural ABM applied to Simulating Human Bilateral Trading Interactions. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Agents (ICA)*, 164–167. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Vidler, A.; and Walsh, T. 2024b. Modelling Opaque Bilateral Market Dynamics in Financial Trading: Insights from a Multi-Agent Simulation Study. *arXiv:2405.02849*.
- Vinyals, O.; Blundell, C.; Lillicrap, T.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; and Wierstra, D. 2017. Matching Networks for One Shot Learning. *arXiv:1606.04080*.
- Wang, Y.; Zhang, Z.; Chen, H.; and Shen, H. 2024. Reasoning with Large Language Models on Graph Tasks: The Influence of Temperature. *International Conference Civil Engineering and Architecture*.
- Warren, P. A.; Gostoli, U.; Farmer, G. D.; El-Deredy, W.; and Hahn, U. 2018. A re-examination of “Bias” in human randomness perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 44(5): 663–680.
- Wong, A.; Merholz, G.; and Maoz, U. 2021. Characterizing human random-sequence generation in competitive and non-competitive environments using Lempel–Ziv complexity. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1).
- Wooldridge, M. 2009. *An Introduction to MultiAgent Systems, Second Edition*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Zhu, Y.; Li, J.; Li, G.; Zhao, Y.; Li, J.; Jin, Z.; and Mei, H. 2023. Hot or Cold? Adaptive Temperature Sampling for Code Generation with Large Language Models. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.