

# Random Forest-of-Thoughts: Uncertainty-aware Reasoning for Computational Social Science

Xiaohua Wu<sup>1,2</sup>, Xiaohui Tao<sup>3</sup>, Wenjie Wu<sup>2</sup>, Yuefeng Li<sup>1</sup>, Lin Li<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane 4000, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, China

<sup>3</sup>University of Southern Queensland, Springfield 4300, Australia

{xhwu,cathylilin}@whut.edu.cn xiaohui.tao@unisq.edu.au y2.li@qut.edu.au

## Abstract

Social surveys in computational social science are well-designed by elaborate domain theories that can effectively reflect the interviewee’s deep thoughts without concealing their true feelings. The candidate questionnaire options heavily depend on the interviewee’s previous answers, increasing the complexity of social survey analysis, as well as the time and expertise required. The ability of large language models (LLMs) to perform complex reasoning is well-enhanced by prompting learning such as Chain-of-thought (CoT) but still confined to left-to-right decision-making processes or limited paths during inference. This means they can fall short in problems that require exploration and uncertainty searching. In response, a novel large language model prompting method, called Random Forest of Thoughts (RFoT), is proposed for generating uncertainty reasoning to fit the area of computational social science. The RFoT allows LLMs to perform deliberate decision-making by generating diverse thought space and randomly selecting the sub-thoughts to build the forest of thoughts. It can extend the exploration and prediction of overall performance, benefiting from the extensive research space of response. The method is applied to optimize computational social science analysis on two datasets covering a spectrum of social survey analysis problems. Our experiments show that RFoT significantly enhances language models’ abilities on two novel social survey analysis problems requiring non-trivial reasoning.

## 1 Introduction

Social surveys form the foundation of contemporary empirical studies in social science and computational science (Yang et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2024a). With the rise of empiricism in the mid to late 19th century, the social survey became a primary method for understanding society, providing

valuable insights into various aspects such as demographics, employment (Xu, 2018), health, and education (Nardi, 2018). The social survey typically employs a systematic sampling approach to generate a probability sample, combined with carefully designed questionnaires, to ensure analysis accuracy. The sample’s representativeness is crucial, enabling statistical generalization to the target population (Bradley et al., 2021). Based on the Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) (de Vries LP et al., 2021), leveraging artificial intelligence technology to rapidly, objectively, and automatically conduct computational social science analysis has become a new trend. Conducting high-quality, large-scale social survey analyses has become increasingly challenging due to the time and expertise required.

With the development of large language models (LLMs), previous works try numerous attempts based on LLMs aimed at social survey analysis including questionnaire generation (Zhou et al., 2024), understanding public opinion (Argyle et al., 2023), and the alignment of the distribution patterns of responses from the “homo silicus” and human respondents (Zhou et al., 2024).




Figure 1: The questionnaire analysis with uncertainty question-answer pairs.

\*Corresponding Author

The previous works usually utilized DNN-based

models such as LSTM, Transformer, and pertaining and fine-tuning models to assess the psychological states. Recently, large language models (LLMs) have been introduced to provide more stronger performance for the completeness of psychological state analysis. To further improve the model performance, a chain of thought prompting is proposed to enhance the reasoning response with a series of intermediate natural language reasoning steps (Wei et al., 2022b; Zhang et al., 2023; Diao et al., 2024). However, these models only consider the questionnaires as text, ignoring the randomness of the questions depending on respondents and domain theories behind the questionnaire designed in social science. As shown in Fig. 1, the questionnaire has different lines based on the previous answer. For example, question four should not be answered if the respondent is married, and question seven needn't be answered if the overall happiness rating is under six. The random forest (RF) can classify the labels by combining various features according to their contribution, which has been widely used in various intelligent decisions. Inspired by some social science theories, the Random Forest of Thoughts (RFoT) is proposed to explore the randomness and model domain theories to construct various thought chains for exploring rich solution spaces. Specifically, the Chain of Thought-based LLMs (Wei et al., 2022b) is employed to generate stable and high-quality responses based on the questionnaire input. The key thoughts are extracted from the response by a novel strategy involving a model-agnostic contribution evaluation method.

Our pivotal contributions encapsulate:

1. We propose a novel method named random forest of thoughts (RFoT) to search from a rich thoughts space and generate a more significant reasoning solution for better computational social science analysis performance.
2. Domain theories reflected from different aspects behind questionnaires are considered and utilized to find more trustworthy reasoning steps, which can be as explanations for RFoT outputs.
3. Proposed iterative chain of thought prompting iteratively generates the thoughts from each aspect with a greedy strategy for rich alternative thoughts.
4. The experimental results based on two popular survey datasets extensively demonstrate the

superiority and effectiveness of the proposed method RFoT achieved up to 78.43% success rate and 80.52% weighted-f1 scores.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Computational Social Science Analysis

The current methods in computational social science require an amount of time to assess the labels required by professionals. For example, previous research has identified that mental state is primarily associated with factors such as income, health, family, and others, through regression analysis and machine learning (ML) (Saputri and Lee, 2015; Yu and Wang, 2017; Laaksonen, 2018), which is highly interpretability. With the advancement of deep neural networks (DNN), several researchers have proposed various DNN-based methods to analyze the relationships between factors and mental state (Xin and Inkpen, 2019; Li et al., 2022). Based on social science theories, how to use artificial intelligence technology to quickly, objectively, and automatically complete mental state assessments has become a new trend. A follow-up study (Wu et al., 2025, 2024) utilized DNN-based methods to consider the domain knowledge in the designed questionnaires such as information on aspects but not random question-answer pairs due to different respondents.

### 2.2 Prompt Learning

**Pretraining and Fine-tuning** Recently years have witnessed a rapid development of large language models (LLMs), which have a strong ability in many language-understanding tasks. The heavy computational burden and limited universality largely restrict the application of LLMs in various problems. For the first issue, there are two lines of research including parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) (He et al., 2022) and parameter quantization (Frantar et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2023). One of the most popular approaches is the low-rank adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022), which is an improved fine-tuning method where instead of fine-tuning all the weights that constitute the weight matrix of the pre-trained large language models. Recently, joint adaptation and quantization methods have been proposed for achieving the objectives of both parameter-efficient adaptation and computation-efficient tuning and deployment (Dettmers et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024b). It can further improve the efficiency and scalability of

LLMs as well as mitigate the negative impact of quantization errors.

**Input-output (IO) Prompting** Zero-shot and few-shot prompting (Wei et al., 2022a) are the most represented input-output prompting methods, which provide natural language instructions that describe the task and specify the expected output. This approach enables the LLMs to construct a context that refines the inference space, yielding a more accurate output (Hasan et al., 2024). Numerous studies (Brown et al., 2020; Ahuja et al., 2023) demonstrated that few-shot learning offers superior performance when compared to zero-shot learning setup. These works demonstrate that various prompting methods benefit the LLMs.

**X-of-Thought Prompting** For providing a way to solve complex problems that are not easily formalized, chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022b) was proposed to address cases where the mapping of question  $x$  to answer  $y$  is non-trivial. It enhances the performance of LLMs by improving their reasoning capabilities, allowing them to solve complex tasks through step-by-step thinking. Recently, CoT has been utilized in various research areas such as question-answering systems (Rasool et al., 2023), mathematical reasoning (Shi et al., 2023), and mini crosswords and creative writing (Wang et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2023). However, these models can not fit the questionnaire analysis in computational social science and do not consider the answer differences between respondents.

Uncertainties in intermediate decision points are beneficial to combining various features according to the importance of features and have been widely used in various intelligent decisions (Mo and Xin, 2024). Inspired by this, we employ LLMs to generate various linguistic thoughts to prompt LLMs reasoning strategy from multiple levels including key feature triggers, multi-aspect analysis, and overall assessment. The thoughts are evaluated by a post-hoc explanation method and then randomly joined in the thought subset for the next stage of reasoning.

### 3 Problem Statement

Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{(c_i, q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  denote a dataset consisting of  $m$  multi-turn interviews.  $c_i$  represents a category label describing the thematic classification of this dialogue turn.  $q_i$  is a question posed in this turn questionnaire.  $a_i$  represents

the corresponding response provided by respondents. The goal of this work is to extract multi-level semantic features—referred to as thoughts  $\mathcal{T}_i = [\mathcal{T}_i^1; \mathcal{T}_i^2; \dots; \mathcal{T}_i^n]$ —from the dataset using LLMs. Let  $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$  denote the mental state corresponding to each questionnaire turn. The objective is to learn a mapping  $f : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow y$ , parameterized by a predictive model  $f_\theta$  such that:

$$y_i = f_\theta(x; \langle \mathcal{T}_i \rangle) \quad (1)$$

A random forest-inspired prompting is employed to aggregate predictions from the  $M$  chain of thought promptings, each trained on a random thought subset from the candidates for rich exploring space. The predicting function is given by:

$$y_i = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M f_\theta^{(m)}(x; \langle \mathcal{T}_i \rangle) \quad (2)$$

## 4 Methodology

Uncertainties exploration is used in various classification and regression tasks, which can get a strong performance via random feature combinations to search for the best one from a huge result space. Inspired by that, we proposed a novel LLMs prompting method framework named Random Forest of Thoughts (RFoT), shown in Fig. 2. Prompt learning is employed to translate the mental health posts into linguistic cues to decompose the intermediate steps. The iterative chain of thought (ICoT) is proposed for an iterative model generating the thoughts for each category. Instead of information entropy, value each state or vote strategy (Yao et al., 2023) for evaluating the contribution of each feature, the thoughts are evaluated by a post-hoc explanation method with a theoretical and fundamental basis in this work (Shapley, 2016). The RFoT is designed as an ensemble learning for exploring the best strategies from the rich thoughts space.

### 4.1 Linguistic Cues Construction

Linguistic cues refer to specific patterns, words, phrases, or structures in language that provide insights into a speaker’s emotions, intentions, or attitudes. Analyzing these cues in a social computing context can help predict emotions, such as happiness, sadness, and depression, based on text input. Linguistic Cues are beneficial to language models for feature extraction, we therefore construct the




Figure 2: The framework of our proposed RFoT. Text input is decomposed into intermediate steps that are reconstructed as a prompt step  $N$  boxed by a blue line. Each prompt step is an Iterative Chain of Thought (ICoT) as shown on the right.

mental health post into some linguistic cues as intermediate prompt steps. Many previous studies in a variety of areas have used Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) for obtaining linguistic cues and training machine learning classifiers in text classification and predictive outcome analysis (McHaney et al., 2018; Hanks and Verma, 2022). Recently, prompt learning is a novel method that can fully utilize linguistic cues for context representation and modeling. The linguistic cues are represented by some intermediate steps such as in Fig. 3.

#### 4.2 Candidate Thoughts Generation Strategy

The mental state is affected by different aspects based on the social science theory. For example, Bogнар (2010) claims that the mental state is mainly affected by five aspects including positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning and purpose, and accomplishment. Inspired by these theories, the ICoT is proposed to generate thoughts for different aspects.

Given a questionnaire with  $m$  turns question-answer pairs labeled by different categories as training data  $\mathcal{D} = \{(q_1, a_1), (q_2, a_2), \dots, (q_m, a_m)\}$  with each  $(q_i, a_i)$  indicating the question-answer pair, the goal of ICoT is to annotate these questions by constructing a new exemplar set  $E = \{(q_1, c_1, a_1), (q_2, c_2, a_2), \dots, (q_n, c_n, a_n)\}$  with a




Figure 3: The thoughts generation from an aspect by the proposed ICoT.

series of reasoning steps  $c$  to reasoning the correct sub-category mental state out.

**Iterative Chain of Thought** Previous works have shown that different layers of a language model encode different linguistic information within a sentence (van Aken et al., 2019). Inspired by that, various language models with different layers are component learners and are integrated into a forest to achieve better prediction performance.

For each category, we utilize the LLMs with Chain of Thought to generate the thoughts from multi-level aspects. It can be formulated as a multi-level hierarchical function:

$$\mathcal{F}_{LLM} = (\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow (A, K, R), \quad (3)$$

where the  $\mathcal{Q}$  represents a set of questions,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the corresponding answers, and  $\mathcal{C}$  denotes different categories. Given a question-answer pair  $(q_i, a_i)$ , we define the extraction function of  $L_i$ th level thoughts:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}'_{L_1} &= A(q_i, a_i) = \mathcal{F}_{LLM}^{(L_1)}(q_i, a_i) \\ \mathcal{T}'_{L_2} &= K(q_i, a_i) = \mathcal{F}_{LLM}^{(L_2)}(q_i, a_i) \\ \mathcal{T}'_{L_3} &= R(q_i, a_i) = \mathcal{F}_{LLM}^{(L_3)}(q_i, a_i) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_{L_i}$  is the thoughts of level  $L_i$  generated by LLMs.  $A$ ,  $K$ , and  $R$  represent the aspects, emotional keywords, and final responses from LLMs, respectively. The thoughts generated at each level are the candidates of our proposed random forest of thoughts.

### 4.3 Random Forest of Thoughts

The candidate thoughts are generated by ICoT in the previous section. Selecting the most significant thoughts to be considered in RFoT is a key issue.

**Explanation-based Thoughts Evaluation** Inspired by explainable artificial intelligence (XAI), we proposed a novel thought evaluation method to select the  $k$  most important thoughts generated by ICoT using the post-hoc and model-agnostic explanation methods. It can reduce the noises contained in the questionnaires and improve the computing effectiveness. Compared to other post-hoc explanation methods like LIME (Ribeiro et al., 2016) and DeepLIFT (Shrikumar et al., 2017), Shapley values uniquely satisfy the accuracy, missingness, and consistency properties of feature attribution (Shapley, 2016). This allows for more trustworthy and theoretical guarantees for the quantitative evaluation. We consider mental state prediction as a cooperative task with the ultimate goal of accurately predicting the label with all present thoughts. Therefore, the importance of thought is represented by  $\phi_j$  which is defined as follows:

$$\phi_j(v) = \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{J} \setminus \{x_j\}} \frac{|S|!(|J|-|S|-1)!}{|J|!} [v(S \cup \{x_j\}) - v(S)], \quad (5)$$

where  $j = 1, \dots, |J|$ ,  $J = \{x_1, \dots, x_{|J|}\}$  and  $S \subseteq J \setminus \{x_j\}$  denotes all possible subsets of thought set  $J$ , which excludes the thought  $j$  and consists of  $|S|$  thoughts.  $|S|!(|J|-|S|-1)!/|J|!$  is the possibility of a subset  $S$ .  $v(S \cup \{x_j\}) - v(S)$  means the marginal contribution of thought  $j$  where  $v(x) \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the model output when thought in  $S$  is present. In other words, the gain is a weighted average over contribution function difference in all subsets  $S$ , excluding the thought  $j$ .

**Candidate Thoughts Generation** we select a subset including top- $k$  thoughts with the highest scores  $\phi_j(v)$  and relative aspects, which is shown in Equ. 6.

$$\mathcal{T}^* = \arg \max_{\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}} \sum_{T_j \in \mathcal{T}'} \phi_j(v), \quad \text{subject to } |\mathcal{T}'| = k, \quad (6)$$

where the  $\mathcal{T}$  represents the thoughts generated by ICoT,  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is the subset including top- $k$  important thoughts.

**RFoT Construction Strategy** A crucial challenge in predicting mental states through questionnaires is how to model and represent the uncertainty in responses from different individuals. Instead of selecting a fixed deterministic set of thoughts like the Forest of Thoughts (Bi et al., 2024), Tree of Thoughts (Yao et al., 2023), and Self-consistency Chain of thought (Wang et al., 2023), we combine bootstrap sampling, a randomized sampling method, for constructing RFoT. Bootstrap sampling (Zhang et al., 2022) is used in a machine learning ensemble algorithm called bagging. It helps in avoiding over-fitting and improves the stability of machine learning algorithms. Bootstrap sampling randomly and equally samples the original question-answer pairs in a questionnaire to construct many approximate independent identically distributed (i.i.d) new samples of the original questionnaire, which can comprehensively consider the situations of different respondents. As defined by Equ. 7, the probability of selecting a thought is proportional to its importance score  $\phi_{\mathcal{T}_{L_j}}(v)$ .

$$P(\mathcal{T}_{L_j} \in \mathcal{T}^*) = \frac{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_{L_j}}(v)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \phi_{\mathcal{T}_{L_j}}(v)}, \quad (7)$$

From the selected subset  $\mathcal{T}_{L_j}$ , we construct multiple trees  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m$  using randomization. Specifically, we first select the multiple root nodes  $R =$

---

**Algorithm 1** RFoT construction by DFS

---

**Require:** tree number  $m$ , data  $\mathcal{D}$ , thoughts  $\mathcal{T}'$  generated by ICoT;

- 1: Drawing question-answer pairs subset  $\mathcal{X}$  with replacement from  $\mathcal{D}$ ;
  - 2: **for**  $x$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  **do**
  - 3:   Generating thoughts  $\mathcal{T}'$  by ICoT;
  - 4:   Drawing subset thoughts  $\mathcal{T}^*$  without replacement from  $\mathcal{T}'$ ;
  - 5:   **for**  $\mathcal{T}_{L_j}$  in  $\mathcal{T}^*$  **do**
  - 6:     Selecting the root of each tree by Equ. 8;
  - 7:     Finding the best-split thought;
  - 8:     Building the left sub-tree through DFS( $\mathcal{T}_i^{left}$ );
  - 9:     Building the right sub-tree through DFS( $\mathcal{T}_i^{right}$ );
  - 10:   **end for**
  - 11:   Appending thought trees to the random forest of thoughts;
  - 12: **end for**
  - 13: **Return** Random Forest of Thoughts
- 

$\{T_{r_1}, T_{r_1}, \dots, T_{r_m}\}$  based on Equ. 8 with high contribution of thoughts.

$$P(T_{r_j} \text{ is root}) = \frac{\phi_j(v)}{\sum_{T_{r_j} \in \mathcal{T}^*} \phi_j(v)} \quad (8)$$

Depending on the forest structure, one can plug and play different search algorithms. We explore one relatively simple and effective tree expansion algorithm and leave more advanced ones in future work. Depth-first search (DFS) is preferable to Breadth-First search (BFS) in certain computational scenarios due to its lower memory consumption, efficiency in deep search spaces, and suitability for recursive problem-solving (Tarjan and Zwick, 2024). The RFoT construction by depth-first search (DFS) is presented in Algorithm 1 for a clearer calculation process of RFoT construction. Step 1 samples the subset of thoughts  $\mathcal{T}^*$  from  $\mathcal{T}'$  generated by ICoT. Steps 2-8 run in a loop to construct the random forest of thoughts. Specifically, step 3 draws  $\mathcal{T}_{L_j}$  without replacement from  $\mathcal{T}^*$ . Step 4 selects the root of each tree by Equ. 8, step 5 is to find a best-split thought through information gain rate, and steps 6-7 are for building the left and right sub-tree. Step 9 appends all trees to the random forest of thoughts.

## 5 Experiment

**Experiment Setup** In all benchmarks, Llama3-8B<sup>1</sup> (at Meta, 2024), and Qwen2.5-7B<sup>2</sup> are used as the base LLMs to verify their generalization because of the open-source policy. We compare the performance by different prompting strategies including standard zero-shot IO prompting (Wei et al., 2022a), Fine-tuning such as Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022), chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022b), Self-consistency CoT prompting (SC-CoT) (Wang et al., 2023), and tree-of-thoughts (ToT) prompting (Yao et al., 2023). As in previous works, we run each prompt for 100 samples and average the results for analysis.

**Metrics** The success rate (Yao et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022b) is used to evaluate LLMs’ reasoning performance. In addition, the generation consistency or format adherence of LLMs is employed to evaluate whether the response is consistent with the predefined prompt format (Wang et al., 2024). It is defined as Equ. 9.

$$C_F(G, E) = 1 - \frac{\text{Dist}(G(P), E(P))}{\max(|G(P)|, |E(P)|)} \quad (9)$$

where  $G(P)$  represents the generated response from the LLM given the prompt  $P$ ,  $E(P)$  denotes the predefined format or structure.  $|G(P)|$  and  $|E(P)|$  are the lengths of  $G(P)$  and  $E(P)$ , respectively. Finally, the weighted F1 and running time per sample are reported for a more comprehensive analysis.

**Environment** The experiments are conducted in Python 3.12 and PyTorch 2.3.0, running on a standard server equipped with an RTX 3080x2 20G GPU and an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8352V CPU @ 2.10GHz.

### 5.1 Results and Discussion

Mental state prediction based on questionnaires is a popular problem in social science, such as happiness prediction. In this work, we conduct our proposed LLMs prompting method RFoT on this problem with two datasets to explore the performance.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://ollama.com/library/llama3>

<sup>2</sup><https://ollama.com/library/qwen2.5:7b>

Table 1: Reasoning results on two datasets by two LLMs

Dataset	LLMs	Prompting	Success (%)	Weighted-F1 (%)	Runtime (s)	Consistency (%)
CGSS	Llama3-8B	I/O Prompt (ICLR 2022)	22.22	22.09	3.39	100
		Fine Tuning (ICLR 2022)	41.41	41.12	0.31	100
		CoT (NeurIPS 2022)	52.94	55.16	3.07	98
		SC-CoT (ICLR 2023)	64.00	69.85	12.99	100
		ToT (NeurIPS 2023)	66.59	68.01	12.11	100
		RFoT (ours)	78.43	80.52	15.46	100
CGSS	Qwen2.5-7B	I/O Prompt (ICLR 2022)	19.00	21.97	11.08	75
		Fine Tuning (ICLR 2022)	40.00	34.85	11.25	100
		CoT (NeurIPS 2022)	35.29	43.09	6.40	98
		SC-CoT (ICLR 2023)	41.00	43.72	27.85	100
		ToT (NeurIPS 2023)	43.19	43.10	22.09	98
		RFoT (ours)	47.06	54.26	13.48	100
ESS	Llama3-8B	I/O Prompt (ICLR 2022)	35.71	32.14	3.52	100
		Fine Tuning (ICLR 2022)	63.26	65.20	0.32	97
		CoT (NeurIPS 2022)	49.02	51.37	3.14	86
		SC-CoT (ICLR 2023)	60.00	58.35	9.68	100
		ToT (NeurIPS 2023)	62.11	59.96	10.09	100
		RFoT (ours)	68.63	68.51	12.56	74
ESS	Qwen2.5-7B	I/O Prompt (ICLR 2022)	20.00	20.98	11.02	68
		Fine Tuning (ICLR 2022)	61.00	60.10	11.13	100
		CoT (NeurIPS 2022)	54.90	54.42	2.34	92
		SC-CoT (ICLR 2023)	57.00	57.48	24.62	100
		ToT (NeurIPS 2023)	63.79	60.81	22.09	100
		RFoT (ours)	72.55	72.12	12.75	78

### 5.1.1 Happiness Prediction

Happiness prediction is a common questionnaire topic in computational social science (Li et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2025), where the goal is to analyze the happiness level of respondents via answering a questionnaire designed by sociologists from different aspects. Specifically, given a questionnaire  $x^{(n)} = \{x_1^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}, \dots, x_j^{(n)}\}$ , where  $x^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $x_j^{(n)}$  represents the  $j$ -th question-answer pair  $x^{(n)}$ , the goal is to predict the happiness level  $y_{ic} \in \mathcal{Y}$  from the candidate levels  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

**Happiness Dataset** For considering mental health from different perspectives and different cultures, the two happiness prediction datasets are utilized in this work as an example. We conduct comprehensive experiments to evaluate the performance of our proposed RFoT prompting on the public Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS), and the European Social Survey (ESS) datasets.

- **Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS)**<sup>3</sup>. CGSS is an open shared and large-scale social online investigation dataset, with the subject being Chinese families containing more than 124 questions per sample. It aims to systematically monitor the changing relationship between social

structure and quality of life in both urban and rural China. Social structure refers to dimensions of social group and organization as well as networks of social relationships. Quality of life is the objective and subjective aspects of people’s well-being both at the individual and aggregate levels.

- **European Social Survey (ESS)**<sup>4</sup> The ESS is an academically driven and multi-country online survey that includes 50,000 samples and 102 questions per one over 38 countries to date. It has been extensively used to effectively assess the progress of nations and develop a series of European social indicators around citizens’ happiness and well-being. Many studies in sociology, economics, and even politics have utilized ESS data. Note that happiness is scaled by 5 levels from very unhappy to very happy, where a higher level indicates more happiness.

The statistics of these three datasets after pre-processing are presented in Table 2.

**Results** As shown in Table 1, the reasoning results by Llama3-8B and Qwen2.5-7B LLMs on two datasets demonstrate that our RFoT has significant improvements over all the baselines covered

<sup>3</sup><http://cgss.ruc.edu.cn/>

<sup>4</sup><https://ess-search.nsd.no/>




Figure 4: The case study on happiness prediction.

Table 2: The statistics of CGSS and ESS questionnaire datasets.

Mental State	CGSS		ESS	
	Sample	Turn	Sample	Turn
Very unhappy	77	124	721	102
Unhappy	315	124	1515	102
Neutral	630	124	3991	102
Happy	1743	124	6453	102
Very happy	422	124	2877	102

mainstream LLMs prompting methods. Specifically, the I/O prompting without intermediate steps (i.e., thoughts) performs more poorly than other X of thought prompting with some intermediate steps. It indicates the benefits of X of thought prompting for LLMs, which highly aligns with previous works (Wei et al., 2022b; Yao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023). Surprisingly enough, the fine-tuning method performs better than some X of thought prompting such as I/O prompting, CoT, and SC-CoT on CGSS and ESS datasets. It indicates that the X of thought can not work well in a specific area such as social science problems rather than the general task. Our proposed RFoT is better than other baselines in two datasets and two LLMs, which due to the RFoT can explore more combinations of thoughts generated by LLMs and well fitted in the survey analysis problems as illustrated in Fig. 1.

On the other hand, more steps will result in

more average time-consuming across almost all the datasets and LLMs. Note that the SC-CoT usually has the highest time complexity because of the multiple times LLM running even though the accuracy improvements. For the metric of consistency, the results indicate the limitations of generation language models represented by LLMs, which is one of the most important future works in this area.

**Case Study** As shown in Fig. 4, the case study indicates the effectiveness of our proposed RFoT. The question-answer pairs in a questionnaire are randomly selected from different categories and are combined in a new questionnaire, which benefits focusing on main factors with various categories and excluding some noises. The question-answer analysis is generated by an LLM from different categories, such as personal information, lifestyle, and economics. Based on this, the category importance and its keywords related to the happiness state are calculated by Shapley value. Then the final prediction results can be voted on and generated from different emotional triggers and categories.

## 6 Conclusions and Limitations

**Conclusions** The random forest of thoughts prompting provides a new way to explore a rich result space and enhance the reasoning performance in specific fields for contemporary LMs. At the same time, a post-hoc explanation method is in-



egrated into RFoT for more comprehensive and trustworthy feature selection, providing a way to solve complex problems in a specific area that are not easily formalized, such as computational social science.

**Limitations** The few-shot RRoT requires predefined samples to prompt LLMs in a specific problem. In response, the representative samples selected from a dataset based on a sample-based explanation will be a significant method. Also, because of the effectiveness of the computation, it is very time-consuming to calculate the contribution of words and categories for selecting the top thoughts. In the future, we aim to optimize these two issues for better reasoning performance of LLMs in some specific areas.

## References

- Kabir Ahuja, Harshita Diddee, Rishav Hada, Millicent Ochieng, and et al. 2023. MEGA: multilingual evaluation of generative AI. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 4232–4267. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lisa P Argyle, Ethan C Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua R Gubler, Christopher Rytting, and David Wingate. 2023. Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis*, 31(3):337–351.
- AI at Meta. 2024. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date.
- Zheni Bi, Kai Han, Chuanjian Liu, Yehui Tang, and Yunhe Wang. 2024. Forest-of-thought: Scaling test-time compute for enhancing llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09078*.
- Greg Bogнар. 2010. Authentic happiness. *Utilitas*, 22(3):272–284.
- Valerie C Bradley, Shiro Kuriwaki, Michael Isakov, Dino Sejdinovic, Xiao-Li Meng, and Seth Flaxman. 2021. Unrepresentative big surveys significantly overestimated us vaccine uptake. *Nature*, 600(7890):695–700.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, and et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- de Vries LP, Baselmans BML, and Bartels M. 2021. Smartphone-based ecological momentary assessment of well-being: A systematic review and recommendations for future studies. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 22(5):2361–2408.
- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Shizhe Diao, Pengcheng Wang, Yong Lin, Rui Pan, Xiang Liu, and Tong Zhang. 2024. Active prompting with chain-of-thought for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1330–1350. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elias Frantar, Saleh Ashkboos, Torsten Hoefler, and Dan Alistarh. 2022. Optq: Accurate quantization for generative pre-trained transformers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Casey Hanks and Rakesh M. Verma. 2022. Data quality and linguistic cues for domain-independent deception detection. In *2022 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Big Data Computing, Applications and Technologies (BDCAT)*, pages 248–258.
- Md. Arid Hasan, Shudipta Das, Afyat Anjum, Firoj Alam, Anika Anjum, Avijit Sarker, and Sheak Rashed Haider Noori. 2024. Zero- and few-shot prompting with llms: A comparative study with finetuned models for bangla sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC/COLING 2024, 20-25 May, 2024, Torino, Italy*, pages 17808–17818.
- Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. 2022. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*.
- Seppo Laaksonen. 2018. A research note: Happiness by age is more complex than u-shaped. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19:471–482.
- Lin Li, Xiaohua Wu, Miao Kong, Dong Zhou, and Xiaohui Tao. 2022. Towards the quantitative interpretability analysis of citizens happiness prediction. In *IJ-CAI, Vienna, Austria, 23-29 July*, pages 5094–5100.
- Roger McHaney, Antuela Tako, and Stewart Robinson. 2018. Using liwc to choose simulation approaches:

- A feasibility study. *Decision Support Systems*, 111:1–12.
- Shentong Mo and Miao Xin. 2024. Tree of uncertain thoughts reasoning for large language models. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2024, Seoul, Republic of Korea, April 14-19, 2024*, pages 12742–12746. IEEE.
- Peter M Nardi. 2018. *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. Routledge.
- Zafaryab Rasool, Scott Barnett, Stefanus Kurniawan, and et al. 2023. Evaluating llms on document-based QA: exact answer selection and numerical extraction using cogtale dataset. *CoRR*, abs/2311.07878.
- Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. "why should i trust you?": Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *ACM SIGKDD, KDD '16*, page 1135–1144.
- Theresia Saputri and Seok-Won Lee. 2015. A study of cross-national differences in happiness factors using machine learning approach. *International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering*, 25:1699–1702.
- L. S. Shapley. 2016. *A Value for n-Person Games*, volume 2, pages 307–318. Princeton University Press.
- Freda Shi, Mirac Suzgun, Markus Freitag, Xuezhi Wang, and et al. 2023. Language models are multilingual chain-of-thought reasoners. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*.
- Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. 2017. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In *ICML, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, page 3145–3153.
- Robert E. Tarjan and Uri Zwick. 2024. Finding strong components using depth-first search. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 119:103815.
- Betty van Aken, Benjamin Winter, Alexander Löser, and Felix A. Gers. 2019. How does BERT answer questions?: A layer-wise analysis of transformer representations. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2019, Beijing, China, November 3-7, 2019*, pages 1823–1832.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*.
- Yue Wang, Duoyi Zhang, Xiangrui Kong, Fahmi Marco, and Richi Nayak. 2024. Enhancing ai safety in the public sector: A field experiment on guardrails leveraging llms for state government employees. In *The 22nd Australasian Data Science and Machine Learning Conference (AusDM'24)*, pages 1–15.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022a. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Xiaohua Wu, Lin Li, Xiaohui Tao, and Yuefeng Li. 2024. Aligning bytes with bliss: Integrating happiness computing with sociological insight. In *The 20th International Conference Advanced Data Mining and Applications Sydney, Australia, 3rd - 5th December 2024*, pages 1–16.
- Xiaohua Wu, Lin Li, Xiaohui Tao, Frank Xing, and Jingling Yuan. 2025. [Happiness prediction with domain knowledge integration and explanation consistency](#). *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, pages 1–14.
- Guangxuan Xiao, Ji Lin, Mickael Seznec, Hao Wu, Julien Demouth, and Song Han. 2023. Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICLR)*, pages 38087–38099. PMLR.
- Weizhao Xin and Diana Inkpen. 2019. Happiness ingredients detection using multi-task deep learning. In *AAAI, Honolulu, USA, January 27*, volume 2328, pages 164–170.
- Akari Asai; Sara Evensen; Behzad Golshan; et al Xu. 2018. Happydb: A corpus of 100,000 crowdsourced happy moments. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, pages 647–655, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Ruoxi Xu, Yingfei Sun, Mengjie Ren, Shiguang Guo, Ruotong Pan, Hongyu Lin, Le Sun, and Xianpei Han. 2024a. Ai for social science and social science of ai: A survey. *Information Processing & Management*, 61(3):103665.
- Yuhui Xu, Lingxi Xie, Xiaotao Gu, Xin Chen, Heng Chang, Hengheng Zhang, Zhengsu Chen, Xiaopeng

- Zhang, and Qi Tian. 2024b. Qa-lora: Quantization-aware low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*.
- Liang Yang, Shuqun Li, Xi Luo, Bo Xu, Yuanling Geng, Zeyuan Zeng, Fan Zhang, and Hongfei Lin. 2022. [Computational personality: a survey](#). *Soft Computing*, 26:9587–9605.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Zonghuo Yu and Fei Wang. 2017. Income inequality and happiness: An inverted u-shaped curve. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8:2052.
- Jiawei Zhang, Yi Wang, Mingyang Sun, and Ning Zhang. 2022. Two-stage bootstrap sampling for probabilistic load forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 69(3):720–728.
- Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2023. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*.
- Muzhi Zhou, Lu Yu, Xiaomin Geng, and Lan Luo. 2024. Chatgpt vs social surveys: Probing the objective and subjective human society. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02601*.