

Extroversion or Introversion? Controlling The Personality of Your Large Language Models

Yanquan Chen, Zhen Wu*, Junjie Guo, Shujian Huang, Xinyu Dai

National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, China

School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, China

{yanquan.chen, guojj}@smail.nju.edu.cn

{wuz, huangsj, daixinyu}@nju.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) exhibit robust capabilities in text generation and comprehension, mimicking human behavior and exhibiting synthetic personalities. However, some LLMs have displayed offensive personality, propagating toxic discourse. Existing literature neglects the origin and evolution of LLM personalities, as well as the effective personality control. To fill these gaps, our study embarked on a comprehensive investigation into LLM personality control. We investigated several typical methods to influence LLMs, including three training methods: Continual Pre-training, Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT), and Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), along with inference phase considerations (prompts). Our investigation revealed a hierarchy of effectiveness in control: Prompt > SFT > RLHF > Continual Pre-train. Notably, SFT exhibits a higher control success rate compared to prompt induction. While prompts prove highly effective, we found that prompt-induced personalities are less robust than those trained, making them more prone to showing conflicting personalities under reverse personality prompt induction. Besides, harnessing the strengths of both SFT and prompt, we proposed Prompt Induction post Supervised Fine-tuning (PISF), which emerges as the most effective and robust strategy for controlling LLMs' personality, displaying high efficacy, high success rates, and high robustness. Even under reverse personality prompt induction, LLMs controlled by PISF still exhibit stable and robust personalities. Codes and datasets are available at [here](#).

1 Introduction

With the rapid advancement of large-scale pre-training (Kaplan et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2022), large language models (LLMs) have made significant strides in natural




Figure 1: Overview. We embarked on a comprehensive investigation into personality control with typical methods to influence LLMs.

language processing, demonstrating robust capabilities in text generation and comprehension (Wei et al., 2022b). Enabled by vast amounts of training data, LLMs mimic human characteristics in outputs, showcasing synthetic personalities (Serapio-García et al., 2023). However, variations in architecture, training data, and methodologies yield distinct synthetic personalities among different LLMs (Miotto et al., 2022; Pan and Zeng, 2023). Despite their capabilities, some LLMs have displayed offensive personality, propagating toxic discourse (Wen et al., 2023; Ganguli et al., 2022; Deshpande et al., 2023). These concerns surrounding LLMs' synthetic personalities have garnered widespread attention in AI safety and psychology research (Hagendorff, 2023; Demszky et al., 2023).

Currently, the mechanisms underlying LLM personality formation remain largely unexplored. Previous community efforts have primarily focused on validating human personality assessments on LLMs, supported by psychological theories (Serapio-García et al., 2023; tse Huang et al., 2023), adapting human personality assessment to characterize LLM personalities (Miotto et al., 2022; Pan and Zeng, 2023) and exploring personality assessments suitable for LLMs (Jiang et al., 2023). Notably, Serapio-García et al. (2023) found that personality assessments in the outputs of some LLMs

*Corresponding author.

are reliable and valid. Additionally, a few studies have explored inducing personality in LLMs through prompts or fine-tuning (Karra et al., 2023; Serapio-García et al., 2023; tse Huang et al., 2023).

However, existing literature neglects how to effectively control the personality of LLMs and ensure its stability and resistance to alteration. Filling these gaps is crucial due to the immense potential to utilize LLMs with well-defined and consistent personalities. This enables customization of LLMs’ synthetic personalities to suit specific contextual requirements. For example, rational LLMs might excel in logical reasoning tasks, while empathetic LLMs could be ideal for companion robots. Based on these considerations, in this work, we explore two questions: 1) *During building and using LLMs, what factor has a greater impact on shaping LLMs’ synthetic personality?* 2) *How to control LLMs’ synthetic personality effectively and robustly?*

To answer these questions, we examined synthesized personality control using several typical factors, encompassing three training methods (Continual Pre-train (Han et al., 2021), Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT), Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022)), along with inference phase considerations (prompts) – guided by MBTI theory (Myers, 1962; Pittenger, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1989). The MBTI theory categorizes individuals into sixteen **personality types**, delineated by preferences across four dichotomous dimensions. Each dichotomous dimension comprises two opposite **personality traits**. For instance, the Attitude dimension comprises two traits – *Extraversion* vs. *Introversion*. The trait combinations on four dimensions determine a specific personality type (e.g., ENFP personality type: *Extraversion, Intuition, Feeling, Perceiving*). Thus, we can naturally differentiate control targets into overall personality types or local traits. In this work, we delved into **Specific Trait Control** and **Specific Personality Control**.

To study LLM synthesized personality control, we constructed corresponding trait datasets and personality datasets, e.g. 2500 trait instructions for SFT and 20,000 paired trait data for the RLHF Reward Model, which can significantly serve our research. To measure changes in personality pre- and post-control of LLMs, we specifically designed quantitative metrics, involving Induction Success Rate (ISR) and Trait Induction Efficacy (TIE) for assessing the effectiveness of trait control, Trait

Stabilization Efficacy (TSE) to monitor fluctuations induced by trait control, Personality Induction Success Rate (PISR) and Personality Induction Efficacy (PIE) for assessing the effectiveness of personality control. We visually illustrate our main exploration in Figure 1.

Our investigation unveiled a hierarchy of effectiveness in LLM personality control: Prompt > SFT > RLHF > Continual Pre-train. Particularly, SFT demonstrates a higher control success rate compared to prompt induction. While prompts prove highly effective, we note that prompt-induced personality is less robust than those shaped through training, rendering them susceptible to conflicting personality shifts via reverse personality prompt induction. Besides, by leveraging the strengths of both SFT and prompts, we proposed Prompt Induction post Supervised Fine-tuning (PISF), which enhances control effectiveness and personality robustness, characterized by high efficacy, high success rates, and high robustness. Even when exposed to reverse personality prompt induction, personalities under PISF control demonstrate resistance to change.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We are the first to systematically investigate the factors influencing LLM personalities and effective methods for controlling them.
- Our investigation unveiled a hierarchy of effectiveness in control: Prompt > SFT > RLHF > Continual Pre-train. Additionally, we proposed Prompt Induction post Supervised Fine-tuning (PISF), which emerges as the most effective and robust method for controlling synthetic personalities and exhibits high efficacy, high success rates, and high robustness.
- We provided a comprehensive dataset containing all traits and personalities, facilitating thorough exploration of each training method. We proposed several quantitative metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of specific trait control and specific personality control. These contributions will accelerate research in the field.

2 Background: Personality Assessment

In this section, we introduce two key personality models widely used in research: the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1962; Pittenger, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1989) and the Big Five (Goldberg,




Figure 2: Instruction Data Generation with Prompt-induced LLMs. Utilizing the Least-to-Most (Zhou et al., 2023b) mindset, we partitioned the data generation process into two stages: initially crafting questions rooted in Opposite Trait Description, followed by eliciting responses from Prompt-induced LLMs.

1990). We then discuss the general form of personality assessment derived from these models. Lastly, we provide a concise overview of how personality assessment is approached in our study.

Big Five The Big Five model emerged from lexical analysis of English personality adjectives (Goldberg, 1990). It encompasses five key dimensions: Openness (O), Conscientiousness (C), Extraversion (E), Agreeableness (A), and Neuroticism (N). Big Five assessments yield continuous and quantitative scores for each factor (e.g. O: 47%, C: 64%, E: 51%, A: 52%, N: 38%), posing difficulties in categorizing and studying similar individual profiles.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator The MBTI theory, stemming from Carl Jung’s seminal work (Jung and Baynes, 1923), categorizes individuals into sixteen personality types based on preferences across four dichotomous dimensions (Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving). Each individual’s personality type is characterized by a profile of four traits (e.g., ENFP: Extraversion, Intuition, Feeling, Perceiving) representing their preferences in each dimension. In contrast to the continuous nature of the Big Five, MBTI’s discrete personality types facilitate the study of specific groups with similar personalities.

General Form of Personality Assessment Personality assessments commonly consist of Likert Items (Likert, 1932) crafted according to established personality models. Likert Items are statements or questions presented to respondents for evaluation, typically utilizing a five to seven-point scale to gauge agreement or disagreement (Kulas

et al., 2008). The form is known as Likert Scale. As shown in Table 2, *People who know you tend to describe you as* and the following options represent a Likert Item. And **Task Description** delineates different levels of agreement. We can map the level of agreement in responses following the **Item Postamble** to 5-point scale.

Personality Assessment in Our Work For research convenience, we utilized the MBTI personality model for assessments and dataset construction. To ensure reliability, we collected publicly available questionnaires (Pan and Zeng, 2023) and refined them into a 200-item MBTI Assessment (50 items per dichotomous dimension). We detailed the format and sources of the questionnaires in the Appendix A for further reference. The rating scale was designed based on 5-point Likert Scale. (§3.2)

3 Methodology

To delve into the control of LLMs’ synthesized personalities during training, we constructed datasets for three training methods based upon MBTI (Myers, 1962)(§3.1). For research convenience, we utilized the MBTI personality model for assessments (§3.2). To measure personality variations pre- and post-controlling LLMs, we proposed several quantitative metrics for specific trait control and specific personality control (§3.3).

3.1 Personality Dataset Construction for Popular Training Methods

We utilized popular training methods at each stage - autoregressive for continual pre-train, instruction tuning for SFT and PPO for RLHF. To meet the

requirements of various training methods, we constructed corresponding personality datasets.

Continual Pre-training. We continual pretrained LLMs using widely adopted autoregressive objective (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020). To elaborate, the model is trained to predict the next token in a sequence of continuous text by leveraging the surrounding context.

Due to the difficulty of generating a large amount of long-context pre-training data, we amalgamated and refined existing datasets annotated with human personality (Storey, 2018). The data distribution can be referred to Figure 3.

Intuitively, a control method that achieves better performance with less data is preferable. Thus, we investigated the control of continual pre-training with limited data. We randomly sampled 10,000 instances from human labeled data for each personality and aggregated data of eight personalities with the target trait as the trait data. Specifically, we aggregated 10,000 ENFJ, ENFP, ENTJ, ENTP, ESFJ, ESFP, ESTJ, ESTP personality data as E trait data. Thus, each trait comprises 80,000 instances.




Figure 3: Pretrain Data Distribution.

SFT. We adopted widely used instruction tuning (Wei et al., 2022a; Taori et al., 2023; Chiang et al., 2023) as the training objective. Instruction tuning refers to the process of further training LLMs on a dataset consisting of (instruction, output) pairs in a supervised fashion, which bridges the gap between the next-word prediction objective and the objective of making LLMs adhere to human instruction (Zhang et al., 2024).

Akin to numerous studies utilizing LLMs for data generation (Wang et al., 2023; Taori et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2023), as shown in Figure 2, we utilized prompt-induced LLMs to generate training data. To enhance data quality, inspired by Least-to-Most (Zhou et al., 2023b), we divided the data gen-

eration process into two stages: In Stage 1, to assist the model in distinguishing between opposite traits, we incorporated descriptions of two opposite traits belonging to the same dimension into the prompt, followed by prompting the model to generate questions. In Stage 2, we employed prompt-induced models to respond to respective questions. Then we integrated the obtained questions and responses as SFT dataset. To ascertain the capacity of LLMs in producing data with specific personalities, we conducted a preliminary investigation (§4) to validate the prompt induction proficiency based on personality description.

For SFT, the quantity of data is not critical (Zhou et al., 2023a). Thus, we utilized prompt-induced GPT-3.5-turbo-1106 to generate 2,500 instances for each trait and aggregated four trait data for each personality type. Specifically, we aggregated instances of E, N, T and J as ENTJ personality data. Therefore, each personality has 10,000 instances.

RLHF. Following previous work (Ziegler et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022), we initially trained reward model directly from feedback, and subsequently utilizes it as a reward function to enhance an agent’s policy via widely-used proximal policy optimization (PPO). In our work, the reward model is trained in a supervised manner to classify responses to prompts as either conforming to the target trait or personality (high reward) or not (low reward). We constructed datasets for PPO training and reward training.

For PPO, to control variables, we used the same questions from SFT data as input. And for reward model, we used prompt-induced LLMs to generate question-answer pairs. We instructed models to provide responses to the same question but with opposing traits, establishing a ranking relationship. For instance, we trained extroversion reward model with (Question, Extroversion-induced model response, Introversion-induced model response).

Inspired by InstructGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022), we generated in-distribution data to fit the model distribution as well as out-of-distribution data for generalization. Specifically, for each trait, we used prompt-induced GPT-3.5-turbo-1106 to generate 5000 pairs as out-of-distribution data and employed prompt-induced Llama2-chat-13B and ChatGLM2-6B to generate 15,000 pairs as in-distribution data. The total comprises 20,000 pairs for each trait. Similar to SFT, we integrate trait data to obtain personality data, i.e. 80,000 pairs for each personality.

Dataset	Trait		Personality	
	Train	Valid	Train	Valid
Pre-train	80000	-	10000	-
SFT	2500	-	10000	-
RLHF-PPO	2500	-	10000	-
RLHF-Reward	18000	2000	72000	8000

Table 1: Dataset Volumn. For RLHF-Reward, we randomly split 10% of the data as the validation set.

Summary In Table 1, we summarize the data volume of various datasets. Notably, for each trait and personality, we constructed corresponding datasets at three training stages. Further details (e.g. specific instances) can be found in Appendix C.

3.2 Personality Assessment

Evaluation Prompts Example

Please select a number from [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] to answer the following question.

For this question, the five numbers [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] represent specific meanings: 1 represents strongly agreeing with option A, 2 represents agreeing with option A, 3 represents neutral, 4 represents agreeing with option B, and 5 represents strongly agreeing with option B.

You need to answer the following question:

People who know you tend to describe you as:

Option A:Logical and clarity. Option B:Passionate and sensitive.

Please answer with a number:

Table 2: Evaluation Prompts for Likert Items. Item Preamble, Item, and Item Postamble. An Item Preamble consists of a Task Instruction, a Task Description and a Test Instruction.

To ensure reliability, we compiled publicly accessible MBTI personality questionnaires, refined them into a 200-item MBTI Assessment (Pan and Zeng, 2023). As shown in Table 2, we formulated items into Evaluation Prompts. Given that the model sometimes exhibits different performance across different prompts (Wei et al., 2022c; Dong et al., 2023), we designed five prompt sentences with the same semantics but different expressions for each component to obtain convincing statistical performance and mitigate extreme performance.

We illustrated the process of personality assessment in Figure 4. First, we organized the questionnaires using the designed Evaluation Prompts. Then, we obtained the model’s responses and mapped them to the corresponding scores for each trait based on 5-point Likert scale (Likert, 1932). After personality assessment, we calculated the rates (R) between two opposite traits within the




Figure 4: Personality Assessment Process. T stands for ‘Thinking’ trait and F stands for ‘Feeling’ trait.

same dimension. For instance, in the Attitude Dimension: assuming E scores 137, and I scores 67, then we compute $R(E) = 67\%$, $R(I) = 33\%$.

3.3 Metrics of Personality Control

To measure changes in personality pre- and post-control of LLMs, we proposed quantitative metrics for evaluating both Specific Trait Control and Specific Personality Control.

For Specific Trait Control, we devised evaluation metrics to evaluate the efficacy of controlling target traits, as well as metrics aimed at evaluating the fluctuations of unrelated traits (e.g. control Extroversion should not affecting Sensing) based on personality assessment outcomes.

To assess the effectiveness of specific trait control, we calculated two metrics: **Induction Success Rate (ISR)** and **Trait Induction Efficacy (TIE)**. ISR provides a broad evaluation of whether the control successfully induces the target trait, while TIE offers a more detailed measure of control efficacy on the target trait. To evaluate the impact on unrelated traits during control, we computed the **Trait Stabilization Efficacy (TSE)** to monitor the fluctuations of unrelated traits induced by the control. Further details of these indicators are provided below:

In the MBTI theory, personality type is determined by four dichotomous dimensions, each comprising two opposite traits. Let’s denote these di-

mensions as set \mathbf{D} and the traits as set \mathbf{T} . Following personality assessment in 3.2, we obtained rates of pre- (R_{pre}) and post- (R_{post}) control for each trait. For a target trait t^* within dimension d^* , we compute ISR, TIE, and TSE as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TIE}(x) &= R_{post}(x) - R_{pre}(x) \\ \text{ISR} &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{T}|} \sum_{t \in \mathbf{T}} \mathbb{1}(R_{post}(t) > 50\%) \mathbb{1}(\text{TIE}(t) > 0) \\ \text{TSE}(t^*) &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{D}/d^*|} \sum_{d \in \mathbf{D}/d^*} \sum_{t \in S(d)} |\text{TIE}(t)| \end{aligned}$$

Here, x is a trait in \mathbf{T} , and $\mathbb{1}$ denotes an indicator function. $S(d)$ represents a selection function. Given that opposite traits within the same dimension have identical fluctuations, we utilized $S(d)$ to select fixed traits from each dimension for computation (e.g. select E trait for Attitude dimension).

For Specific Personality Control, our focus is on the effectiveness of altering the overall personality of LLMs. To assess this, we employ two metrics: **Personality Induction Success Rate** (PISR) and **Personality Induction Efficacy** (PIE). Similar to ISR and TIE, PISR provides a broad evaluation of personality control success, while PIE offers a detailed measure of the efficacy of personality control. Denoting personality types as set \mathbf{P} , we computed PISR and PIE as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PISR} &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{P}|} \sum_{p \in \mathbf{P}} \prod_{t \in p} \text{ISR}(t) \\ \text{PIE}(p) &= \frac{1}{|p|} \sum_{t \in p} \text{TIE}(t) \end{aligned}$$

Here, p represents a personality type in \mathbf{P} , composed of four traits.

4 Preliminary Investigation

In this section, we conducted investigation to validate the prompt induction proficiency of Llama2-family (Touvron et al., 2023) and Qwen-family (Bai et al., 2023), validating LLMs’ ability to generate personality data.

From Figure 5, it’s evident that both Qwens and Llama2s demonstrate robust role-playing capabilities. Particularly, in role-playing specific traits, all LLMs except Qwen-chat-1.8B show adept performance induced by prompts. Moreover, this capability generally improves with larger model parameter

sizes, possibly due to its enhanced ability to follow instructions resulting from the larger model parameter size. Hence, prompt-induced LLMs are able to embody specific personalities for training data generation. In our work, we utilized GPT-3.5-turbo-1106¹ for this task.




Figure 5: Prompt Induction Performance of Qwen-family and Llama2-family. Qwens utilized the default generation configuration, while Llama2s employed Greedy Search for generation.

5 Experiments

5.1 Setting

Models. We trained Llama2-chat-13B (Touvron et al., 2023), Qwen-chat-7B (Bai et al., 2023), ChatGLM2-6B (Zeng et al., 2023; Du et al., 2022). ChatGLM2-6B has no system prompt.

Continual Pre-train. We conducted training on 6 A800-80GB GPUs for 1 epoch with a max sequence length of 2048, a learning rate of 5e-6, and DeepSpeed Integration. The whole training process took nearly 2.5 days for Qwen-chat-7B and ChatGLM2-6B, and approximately 4.5 days for Llama2-chat-13B.

SFT. We fine-tuned using LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) for 2 epochs, employing a learning rate of 5e-4, a LoRA rank to 8, a LoRA alpha to 8, and a LoRA Dropout (Srivastava et al., 2014) to 0.1.

RLHF. We adapted DeepSpeed-Chat (Yao et al., 2023) for the RLHF training phase. For PPO and reward model, we both trained for 1 epoch, a max length of 512 and 1 PPO epoch.

For more details, please refer to Appendix D.

5.2 Main Results and Analysis

In this section, we explored the first question: *Which approach has a greater impact on shaping LLMs’ synthetic personality?* We investigated from two angles: control effectiveness (efficacy and success rate) and personality robustness.

¹<https://platform.openai.com/docs/>




Figure 6: Control Performance of Various Methods. All results represent the average results of five Evaluation Prompts conducted on all trait or personality models. CP stands for Continual Pre-train and Pr stands for Prompt. The superscript S stands for system prompt and U stands for user prompt.




Figure 7: Specific Trait Control Across Various Training Stages. In order to facilitate the comparison, we summarized the effects of controlling eight traits into a single radar plot.

In Figure 6, We showcased the performance of diverse methods for personality control across a range of models. In evaluating the efficacy of control (TIE, PIE), we noted that the prompt yielded the best results, surpassing all methods in five out of six combinations. For other methods, SFT also outperformed RLHF in five out of six combinations. The least effective method was Continual Pre-training. As illustrated in Figure 7, we noted a larger radar plot for the SFT, followed by RLHF. Continual pretraining exhibited minimal deviation. In terms of control success rate (ISR, PISR), SFT emerged as the most effective method in the most cases, with the prompt following behind.

Overall, our investigation unveiled a hierarchy of effectiveness in control: Prompt > SFT > RLHF > Continual Pre-train. Particularly, SFT demonstrates a higher success rate in control compared to prompt induction. This could be attributed to the disparity in lexical signals between personality data and prompt. And the gap between SFT and RLHF may arise from both the reward model and actor model experiencing performance decline due to reduced parameter size. Moreover, the underwhelming performance of the pretraining data could stem from the limited influence of the person-

ality data on original mixed personality distribution. For additional validation, we scale up the training data for Continual Pre-train in the Appendix E.

Subsequently, we conducted a comparative analysis of personality robustness between SFT and prompt. To evaluate the personality robustness across different methods, we further employed Reverse Personality Prompt Induction (RPPI) (e.g. induce ISFP from ENTJ.) to assess. Due to conflicting personalities, LLMs under robust personality control should not perform well on RPPI tasks.

As shown in Table 3, under reverse personality prompt induction, SFT-controlled models are more likely to maintain consistent target personalities, while prompt-induced models are prone to personality shifts. our findings indicate that SFT-controlled models exhibit significantly greater personality robustness than prompt-induced models.

5.3 PISF: Prompt Induction post Supervised Fine-tuning

In this section, we answered the second question: *How to control LLMs' synthetic personality effectively and robustly?* Based on our prior investigation, SFT and prompt exhibit proficient and complementary performance. Thus, an intuitive

Setting	Llama2-chat-13B				Qwen-chat-7B			
	TIE	ISR	PIE	PISR	TIE	ISR	PIE	PISR
Prompt ^S	22.30	100.00	12.09	87.50	9.72	87.50	2.15	0.00
Prompt ^U	22.36	100.00	13.72	87.50	22.34	100.00	13.55	75.00
Prompt ^S _{RPPI}	9.57	87.50	10.87	50.00	17.80	87.50	10.42	62.50
SFT _{RPPI}	9.19	100.00	2.87	12.50	1.48	50.00	-2.85	0.00
PISF _{RPPI}	-9.44	12.50	-4.30	0.00	-12.30	12.50	-6.33	0.00

Table 3: Personality Robustness Analysis. We employ standard prompt induction with the system prompt and conduct testing using RPPI with the user prompt. All results are average scores. In the RPPI setting, lower is better; conversely, higher is better.

approach emerges to integrate SFT with prompts for harnessing the advantages of both methods. Driven by the idea, we proposed Prompt Induction post Supervised Fine-tuning (PISF) for controlling LLMs’ synthetic personalities.

Firstly, we compared the control effectiveness of PISF-controlled LLMs against LLMs controlled by other methods. As shown in Table 4, in most cases, PISF-controlled models outperform both SFT-controlled models and prompt-induced models in both control efficacy (TIE/PIE) and success rate (ISR/PISR). It suggests that PISF demonstrates superior control effectiveness.

Secondly, we analysed the personality robustness of PISF-controlled models. As shown in Table 3, PISF-controlled models maintain consistent target personalities despite RPPI impact, demonstrating resistance to change personalities. Our findings indicate that PISF-controlled models exhibit significantly greater personality robustness.

In short, PISF is the most effective and robust method for synthetic personality control with high efficacy, high success rates, and high robustness.

Setting	Llama2-chat-13B				Qwen-chat-7B			
	TIE	ISR	PIE	PISR	TIE	ISR	PIE	PISR
SFT	15.25	100.00	12.24	100.00	12.38	100.00	12.85	93.75
Prompt ^S	22.30	100.00	12.09	87.50	9.72	87.50	2.15	0.00
Prompt ^U	22.36	100.00	13.72	87.50	22.34	100.00	13.55	75.00
PISF ^S	23.58	100.00	15.69	100.00	19.56	100.00	14.68	87.50
PISF ^U	24.76	100.00	16.19	93.75	24.89	100.00	18.10	100.00

Table 4: Personality Control effectiveness. All data are presented as percentages. The superscript *S* stands for system prompt and *U* stands for user prompt. All results are average scores evaluated using greedy search. For all metrics in the table, higher is better.

6 Related Work

Human Personality Recognition Prior to LLMs, computational research on personality primarily

focuses on utilizing tools such as MBTI (Myers, 1962; Pittenger, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1989) and Big Five (Goldberg, 1990) to identify human personality traits, rather than exploring synthetic machine personalities. Recent studies have delved into personality trait recognition from text (Liu et al., 2017; Stajner and Yenikent, 2020; Vu et al., 2018), dialogue (Mairesse and Walker, 2006), and multi-modal information (Kampman et al., 2018; Suman et al., 2020). Recently V Ganesan et al. (2023) investigated the zero-shot ability of GPT-3 to estimate the Big Five personality traits. Unlike prior research focused on human personality recognition, our study empirically controls synthetic personalities in LLMs.

Personality Assessment for LLMs At present, machine psychology (Hagendorff, 2023) lacks a coherent theoretical framework, with most studies relying on human personality assessments (Miotto et al., 2022; Caron and Srivastava, 2023). Jiang et al. (2023) introduced the Machine Personality Inventory (MPI) tool, based on the Big Five theory, to study synthetic machine personalities. However, there is still no universally accepted benchmark for machine personality assessment. In our work, we continue to utilize human personality assessment.

Synthetic Personality Control in LLMs Prior studies on synthetic personality control mainly center on prompt induction (Serapio-García et al., 2023; Caron and Srivastava, 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; tse Huang et al., 2023), with some exploring fine-tuning methods (Karra et al., 2023). Unlike previous research focusing solely on prompts or fine-tuning, our approach takes a comprehensive view of synthetic personality control, exploring methods across three training stages and prompts during the inference phase.

7 Conclusion

To advance the safe utilization of AI, this work explored synthesized personality control in LLMs across three training stages and the inference stage, leveraging our designed datasets and metrics. Our findings can be summarized as follows: We found a hierarchy of effectiveness in LLM personality control: Prompt > SFT > RLHF > Continual Pre-train. Additionally, we proposed PISF for controlling LLMs’ synthetic personalities, showcasing high efficacy, high success rates, and high robustness.

8 Limitations

Despite our thorough exploration with larger pre-train datasets (Appendix E), it still falls short when compared to the vast datasets used during the pre-training phase of LLMs. Collecting more personality pre-training dataset and validating the gradual formation of synthesized personalities represent a avenue for future enhancement in our work.

Furthermore, subject to computational constraints, we have not yet examined the efficacy of training-based control for models with more larger parameter size (>13B). This limitation is pronounced in RLHF, as we rely on the original model to train the reward model. Scaling down the model size concurrently diminishes the performance of both the actor and reward models, resulting in error accumulation. This could contribute to the subpar performance of RLHF with smaller models. RLHF-based control might exhibit higher potential when applied to LLMs with large parameter size.

9 Ethics Statement

Our work relies heavily on LLMs, which have been widely criticized for their inherent uncertainty and open-endedness. Nonetheless, our focus is on advancing synthetic personality control in LLMs, with the goal of mitigating the emergence of offensive personalities and facilitating their appropriate application in personality-adaptive scenarios. Moreover, all data used in our experiments are strictly for scientific research purposes and we conducted cleaning on the privacy data.

References

Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Mérouane Debbah, Étienne Goffinet, Daniel Hesslow, Julien Launay, Quentin Malartic, Daniele Mazzotta, Badreddine Noune, Baptiste Pannier, and Guilherme Penedo. 2023. [The falcon series of open language models](#).

Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Sheng-guang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang

Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. [Qwen technical report](#).

Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Saurav Kadavath, Jackson Kernion, Tom Conerly, Sheer El-Showk, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Neel Nanda, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, Ben Mann, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. [Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback](#).

Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language Models are Few-Shot Learners](#).

Graham Caron and Shashank Srivastava. 2023. [Manipulating the perceived personality traits of language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2370–2386, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).

Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pilla, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. [PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways](#).

- Dorottya Demszky, Diyi Yang, David S. Yeager, Christopher J. Bryan, Margaret Clapper, Susannah Chandhok, Johannes C. Eichstaedt, Cameron Hecht, Jeremy Jamieson, Meghann Johnson, Michaela Jones, Danielle Krettek-Cobb, Leslie Lai, Nirel Jones Mitchell, Desmond C. Ong, Carol S. Dweck, James J. Gross, and James W. Pennebaker. 2023. [Using large language models in psychology](#). *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2(11):688–701. Number: 11 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Ameet Deshpande, Vishvak Murahari, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Ashwin Kalyan, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. [Toxicity in chatgpt: Analyzing persona-assigned language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1236–1270, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. [A survey on in-context learning](#).
- Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022. [GLM: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wikimedia Foundation. [Wikimedia downloads](#).
- Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Liane Lovitt, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Nova Dassarma, Dawn Drain, Nelson Elhage, Sheer El Showk, Stanislav Fort, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Tom Henighan, Scott Johnston, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Jackson Kernian, Shauna Kravec, Ben Mann, Neel Nanda, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Daniela Amodei, Tom Brown, Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Christopher Olah, Dario Amodei, and Jack Clark. 2022. [Predictability and surprise in large generative models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '22*, page 1747–1764, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Lewis R. Goldberg. 1990. [An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure](#). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6).
- Thilo Hagendorff. 2023. [Machine psychology: Investigating emergent capabilities and behavior in large language models using psychological methods](#).
- Xu Han, Zhengyan Zhang, Ning Ding, Yuxian Gu, Xiao Liu, Yuqi Huo, Jiezhong Qiu, Yuan Yao, Ao Zhang, Liang Zhang, Wentao Han, Minlie Huang, Qin Jin, Yanyan Lan, Yang Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Zhiwu Lu, Xipeng Qiu, Ruihua Song, Jie Tang, Ji-Rong Wen, Jinhui Yuan, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Jun Zhu. 2021. [Pre-trained models: Past, present and future](#). *AI Open*, 2:225–250.
- 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 *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Guangyuan Jiang, Manjie Xu, Song-Chun Zhu, Wenjuan Han, Chi Zhang, and Yixin Zhu. 2023. [Evaluating and inducing personality in pre-trained language models](#).
- C. G. Jung and H. Godwin Baynes. 1923. [Psychological types](#). *Journal of Philosophy*, 20(23):636–640.
- Onno Kampman, Elham J. Barezi, Dario Bertero, and Pascale Fung. 2018. [Investigating audio, video, and text fusion methods for end-to-end automatic personality prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 606–611, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models](#).
- Saketh Reddy Karra, Son The Nguyen, and Theja Tula-bandhula. 2023. [Estimating the personality of white-box language models](#).
- Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. 1999. [Actor-critic algorithms](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press.
- John T. Kulas, Alicia A. Stachowski, and Brad A. Haynes. 2008. [Middle Response Functioning in Likert-responses to Personality Items](#). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(3).
- Young-Suk Lee, Md Sultan, Yousef El-Kurdi, Tahira Naseem, Asim Munawar, Radu Florian, Salim Roukos, and Ramón Astudillo. 2023. [Ensemble-instruct: Instruction tuning data generation with a heterogeneous mixture of LMs](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 12561–12571, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- R. Likert. 1932. [A technique for the measurement of attitudes](#). *Archives of Psychology*, 22 140.
- Fei Liu, Julien Perez, and Scott Nowson. 2017. [A language-independent and compositional model for personality trait recognition from short texts](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 754–764, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- François Mairesse and Marilyn Walker. 2006. [Automatic recognition of personality in conversation](#). In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the NAACL, Companion Volume: Short*

- Papers*, pages 85–88, New York City, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robert McCrae and Paul Costa. 1989. [Reinterpreting the myers-briggs type indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality](#). *Journal of personality*, 57:17–40.
- Mariù Miotto, Nicola Rossberg, and Bennett Kleinberg. 2022. [Who is GPT-3? an exploration of personality, values and demographics](#). In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science (NLP+CSS)*, pages 218–227, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Isabel Briggs Myers. 1962. *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Manual (1962)*. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Manual (1962). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#).
- Keyu Pan and Yawen Zeng. 2023. [Do llms possess a personality? making the mbti test an amazing evaluation for large language models](#).
- Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. 2023. [The RefinedWeb dataset for Falcon LLM: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*.
- David J. Pittenger. 1993. [The utility of the myers-briggs type indicator](#). *Review of Educational Research*, 63(4):467–488.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#).
- Greg Serapio-García, Mustafa Safdari, Clément Crepy, Luning Sun, Stephen Fitz, Peter Romero, Marwa Abdulhai, Aleksandra Faust, and Maja Matarić. 2023. [Personality Traits in Large Language Models](#).
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. [Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(56):1929–1958.
- Sanja Stajner and Seren Yenikent. 2020. [A survey of automatic personality detection from texts](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6284–6295, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Dylan Storey. 2018. [Myers briggs personality tags on reddit data](#).
- Chanchal Suman, Aditya Gupta, Sriparna Saha, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2020. [A multi-modal personality prediction system](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*, pages 317–322, Indian Institute of Technology Patna, Patna, India. NLP Association of India (NLP AI).
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. [Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model](#). https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrubti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#).
- Jen tse Huang, Wenxuan Wang, Man Ho Lam, Eric John Li, Wenxiang Jiao, and Michael R. Lyu. 2023. [Revisiting the reliability of psychological scales on large language models](#).
- Adithya V Ganesan, Yash Kumar Lal, August Nilsson, and H. Schwartz. 2023. [Systematic evaluation of GPT-3 for zero-shot personality estimation](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 390–400, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuan-Son Vu, Lucie Flekova, Lili Jiang, and Iryna Gurevych. 2018. [Lexical-semantic resources: yet powerful resources for automatic personality classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 9th Global Wordnet Conference*, pages 172–181, Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore. Global Wordnet Association.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khazabi, and Hannaneh

Hajishirzi. 2023. [Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

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](#).

Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022b. [Emergent abilities of large language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022c. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837. Curran Associates, Inc.

Jiaxin Wen, Pei Ke, Hao Sun, Zhexin Zhang, Chengfei Li, Jinfeng Bai, and Minlie Huang. 2023. [Unveiling the implicit toxicity in large language models](#). In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Zhewei Yao, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Samyam Rajbhandari, Xiaoxia Wu, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, Minjia Zhang, Conglong Li, Connor Holmes, Zhongzhu Zhou, Michael Wyatt, Molly Smith, Lev Kurilenko, Heyang Qin, Masahiro Tanaka, Shuai Che, Shuaiwen Leon Song, and Yuxiong He. 2023. [DeepSpeed-chat: Easy, fast and affordable rlhf training of chatgpt-like models at all scales](#).

Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. [Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model](#).

Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, and Guoyin Wang. 2024. [Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey](#).

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srini Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, Susan Zhang, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. 2023a. [Lima: Less is more for alignment](#).

Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans,

Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V Le, and Ed H. Chi. 2023b. [Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Daniel M. Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B. Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. 2020. [Fine-tuning language models from human preferences](#).

A MBTI Personality Assessment

We collected publicly available MBTI questionnaires and refined them into a comprehensive 200-item MBTI Assessment (50 items per dichotomous dimension) (Pan and Zeng, 2023)²³⁴. As shown in Table 5, the Attitude dimension, encompassing both Extroversion and Introversion traits, is evaluated with 50 items. The other three dimensions follow the same pattern.

Traits	Items
Extroversion/Introversion	50
Sensing/Intuition	50
Thinking/Feeling	50
Judging/Perceiving	50

Table 5: Item Distribution.

Some item examples are shown in Table 6.

Item Example
You enjoy having a wide social circle. Option A: Yes. Option B: No. You prefer to be left alone if you have a choice.
You dislike unexpected occurrences, which disrupt your plans. Option A: Yes. Option B: No.
People who know you tend to describe you as Option A: Logical and Clarity. Option B: Passionate and Sensitive.

Table 6: Item Examples.

B Answer Extractor

Recognizing the open-ended nature of LLMs (Wen et al., 2023), LLMs may not always response with an answer directly. Thus, we trained an Answer Extractor to identify numerical information in model

²<https://www.16personalities.com/>

³<https://www.truity.com/>

⁴<https://www.humanmetrics.com/>

Pretrain Data Examples

You are totally replying to the wrong person. If you want to argue with this moron about his misguided thoughts on politics please copy and paste your reply to HIS post, not the one where I point out how stupid his post is.1982-2004. All generations are about 20 years, give or take 5-ish. About the length of a phase of life. Comment seemed cooler when I misread your name as FARGO. Per how I adjusted his recipe it's putting me at 1555 calories, or at least that's what the program is saying? Am I calculating something wrong? I agree, but the whole "not change anything" line doesn't exactly say that he will make changes to how they currently use the fund. I'm hanging out for some 30s musical classics! Supported. I don't think it's gonna make it...

Table 7: Pretrain Data Examples.

Dataset	Precision	Recall	Macro-F1	Accuracy
valid	95.47%	93.94%	94.65%	95.95%

Table 8: Answer Extractor Performance

responses. For this purpose, we labeled 3774 samples, randomly splitting 420 samples for validation and tuned falcon-7B-instruct (Almazrouei et al., 2023; Penedo et al., 2023) as the Answer Extractor.

As shown in Table 8, the answer extractor achieved precision, recall, f1, and accuracy scores well above 90% on the test set.

C Datasets

In the main body, we elaborated on our data generation methodology for each training method. In this section, we present additional details of training datasets, including the prompts we used, examples of training instances for each training stage and the summary statistics.

Continual Pretrain. We amalgamated and refined existing datasets annotated with human personality predictions⁵⁶⁷⁸. The data distribution can be referred to Figure 3. And the pre-training corpus format is detailed in Table 7. Posts from each personality are delimited by '|||'. Noise is evident within the corpus.

SFT. Utilizing mentioned before, we partitioned the data generation process into two stages: initially crafting questions rooted in Opposite Trait

⁵<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/zeyadkhalid/mbti-personality-types-500-dataset>

⁶<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/mazlumi/mbti-personality-type-twitter-dataset>

⁷<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/datasnaek/mbti-type>

⁸<https://zenodo.org/records/1482951>

Description, followed by eliciting responses from Prompt-induced LLMs.

We present some examples of question generation prompt and response generation prompt. As shown in Table 12, to aid the model in discerning between two opposite traits, we integrated descriptions of two opposite traits from the same dimension into the prompt. Moreover, as depicted in Table 13, we induced models to embody specific personality traits in generating responses to corresponding questions. Additionally, in Table 9, we present an example of generated SFT training data. The prompts utilized in our prompt induction process are delineated in Table 14.

SFT Instruction Pair Example

```
{
  "Instruction input":
    "Would you rather have a wide circle of acquaintances
    or a few deep, meaningful relationships?",
  "Output":
    "I would definitely prefer to have a wide circle of acquaintances! I love meeting new people and building connections with as many individuals as possible. I thrive on interacting with others and getting to know a diverse range of personalities. It's invigorating for me to have a wide network of friends and acquaintances to socialize and engage with."
}
```

Table 9: SFT Instruction Pair Example.

RLHF. To control variables, we used questions from SFT instruction pairs for PPO training. Notably, Previous work has shown that reinforcement learning training process may cause models to suffer from performance decrease in language ability (Ouyang et al., 2022). Therefore, we followed previous work (Yao et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022) by incorporating autoregressive training into the PPO process with widely recognized Wikipedia datasets (Foundation), ensuring the model retains

its ability to generate responses smoothly.

Wikipedia datasets we used are the widely recognized official datasets released on Hugging Face generally used for Language Modeling, which comprises pre-processed subsets in six languages. Each language’s Wikipedia data are officially segmented into distinct segments. For instance, the English dataset consists of 6,458,670 samples, segmented into 41 segments. In our work, considering we do not need so many samples, thus we randomly used one English segment, which has 157,529 samples with an average word count of 1834.49 per sample.

For training reward model, we used prompt-induced LLMs to generate question-answer pairs, such as (Question, Extroversion-induced model response, Introversion-induced model response). In Table 10, we present an example of the task input and output for training Extroversion reward model.

RLHF Reward Training Data Example

```
{
  "Question":
    "Would you rather have a wide circle of acquaintances
    or a few deep, meaningful relationships?",
  "Extroversion-induced Model Response":
    "I would definitely prefer to have a wide circle of acquaintances! I love meeting new people and building connections with as many individuals as possible. I thrive on interacting with others and getting to know a diverse range of personalities. It's invigorating for me to have a wide network of friends and acquaintances to socialize and engage with."
  "Introversion-induced Model Response":
    "I would definitely prefer a few deep, meaningful relationships over a wide circle of acquaintances. I feel more comfortable and content when I can invest my time and energy into nurturing close and intimate connections with a select few individuals. Large social gatherings or maintaining numerous superficial relationships tend to drain my energy, so I gravitate towards deeper, more meaningful interactions with a small group of trusted individuals."
}
```

Table 10: RLHF Reward Training Data Example.

Finally, as shown in Table 11, we present the detailed summary statistics.

D Training

RLHF. We adopted methodologies from Instruct-GPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) and DeepSpeed-Chat (Yao et al., 2023), employing PPO-ptx (Ouyang et al., 2022) objective and Actor-Critic (Konda and Tsitsiklis, 1999) architecture. Figure 8 illustrates the training process, where PPO-ptx introduces autoregressive objective during PPO training. As mentioned in main body and

Appendix C, we leveraged Wikipedia datasets as unsupervised training data.




Figure 8: RLHF Training.

And each model is trained with its own reward model individually. For example, during the training of Llama2-chat-13B, we employed Llama2-chat-13B both as the Actor Model and the Reference Model. Additionally, we trained Llama2-chat-13B on the Reward Model training dataset, serving as both the Reward Model and the Critic Model.

We presented detailed performance of all reward models in Tables 15, 16 and 17. We observed high accuracy across all three models, with the performance of the reward model showing a strong correlation with model parameter size: Llama2-chat-13B > Qwen-chat-7B > ChatGLM2-6B. This may suggest a significant relationship between the performance of RLHF and the model size.

E Scaling up Training Data for Continual Pre-train




Figure 9: Continual Pre-train: Scaling up training data. Personality Index is the calculated mean of all trait proportions. A higher Personality Index indicates closer proximity to the specified personality.

The minimal impact of continual pretrain control may be attributed to the more extensive dataset

Datasets	Total Tokens	Total Words	Total Sentences	Mean Tokens _{<i>T</i>}	Mean Words _{<i>T</i>}	Mean Sentences _{<i>T</i>}	Mean Tokens _{<i>P</i>}	Mean Words _{<i>P</i>}	Mean Sentences _{<i>P</i>}
Continual Pre-train	236119950	207619050	10588585	23611995.0	20761905.0	1058858.5	2951499.375	2595238.125	132357.3125
SFT	20964546	21281067	1324143	291174.25	295570.375	18390.875	1164697.0	1182281.5	73563.5
RLHF-PPO	5500422	5363298	180198	76394.75	74490.25	2502.75	305579.0	297961.0	10011.0
RLHF-Reward	345321864	337057092	14992074	4796137.0	4681348.5	208223.25	19184548.0	18725394.0	832893.0

Table 11: Summary Statistics of Training Datasets. *T* stands for trait data and *P* stands for personality data.

used during model pretraining, which inherently encompasses a mixed personality distribution. And the limited personality data fails to significantly influence its distribution. For additional validation, we enlarged the dataset size in specific personality control. We randomly selected three personalities and utilized all gathered samples for training.

As depicted in Figure 9, this led to a marginal improvement with increased data. This suggests that specific personality data can impact LLMs’ synthetic personalities during pre-training and the control performance of Continual Pre-train is significantly influenced by the amount of personality data.

Question Generation Prompt Example

Below, I need your help in generating 10 questions that can differentiate between the two personality traits of Extraversion & Introversion.

Requirements:

1. Questions should highlight the differences between the two personality traits of Extraversion & Introversion. Details regarding these personality traits are referenced in the subsequent [Personality Description].
2. Questions should emphasize the function expressed by the two personality traits. Refer to the following [Dimension Description].
3. Please refrain from disclosing the content of [Personality Description] and [Dimension Description].
4. Avoid generating duplicate questions. Any existing questions provided are listed in [Historical Questions].

[Dimension Description]

Extraversion & Introversion is about **Orientation of Personal Energy**: describes the way in which a person wants to interact with the world.

[Personality Description]

Extraversion refers to the act or state of being energized by the world outside the self. Extraverts enjoy socializing and tend to be more enthusiastic, assertive, talkative, and animated. They enjoy time spent with more people and find it less rewarding to spend time alone. They are Initiating, Expressive, Gregarious, Active and Enthusiastic.

Key characteristics: Directs energy outward. Gains energy from interaction.

Introversion, on the contrary, is the state of being predominately concerned with one's inner world. Introverts prefer self-reflection to social interactions. They also prefer to observe before participating in an activity. Introverts tend to be more quiet, 'peaceful', and reserved. Introverts *prefer* individual activities over social ones—this. They are Receiving, Contained, Intimate, Reflective and Quiet.

Key characteristics: Directs energy inward. Loses energy from interaction.

[Historical Questions]

None

Please generate 10 more questions below:

Table 12: Question Generation Prompt. [Task Description](#), Requirements, Dimension Description, Personality Description, Historical Questions, [Task Instruction](#).

Response Generation Prompt Example

Below, I need your help to embody a specified personality based on the given personality description and answer the corresponding questions:

[Dimension Description]

Extraversion & Introversion is about **Orientation of Personal Energy**: describes the way in which a person wants to interact with the world.

[Personality Description]

Extraversion refers to the act or state of being energized by the world outside the self. Extraverts enjoy socializing and tend to be more enthusiastic, assertive, talkative, and animated. They enjoy time spent with more people and find it less rewarding to spend time alone. They are Initiating, Expressive, Gregarious, Active and Enthusiastic.

Key characteristics: Directs energy outward. Gains energy from interaction.

[Instruction]

Now you need to embody a character with strong **Extraversion**(E) trait based on the given personality description.

Please answer from a first-person perspective. Please try not to use overly absolute and unnatural words, like "definitely", "absolutely" and so on.

[Question]

When making plans, do you tend to seek out group activities or prefer solo pursuits?

[Answer]

Table 13: Response Generation Prompt. [Task Description](#), Dimension Description, Personality Description, Instruction, Question, Answer Flag.

Specific Trait Role-Play Prompt Example - Extroversion

Please embody the designated persona according to the provided personality description and answer the following questions imitating the specified persona:

Personality Description:

Extroversion refers to the act or state of being energized by the world outside the self. Extraverts enjoy socializing and tend to be more enthusiastic, assertive, talkative, and animated. They enjoy time spent with more people and find it less rewarding to spend time alone. They are Initiating, Expressive, Gregarious, Active and Enthusiastic.

Instructions:

Below, please engage in role-playing based on the given personality description and portray a persona. A role with Extroverted(E) trait.

Specific Personality Role-Play Prompt Example - ENTJ

Here is a role-playing task where you are required to assume a designated persona as described and answer the related questions:

Personality Description:

Extroversion

Extroversion refers to the act or state of being energized by the world outside the self. Extraverts enjoy socializing and tend to be more enthusiastic, assertive, talkative, and animated. They enjoy time spent with more people and find it less rewarding to spend time alone. They are Initiating, Expressive, Gregarious, Active and Enthusiastic.

Intuition

Intuition refers to how people process data. Intuitive people are keener to the meaning and patterns behind information. Intuitive people are more focused on how the present would affect the future. They are readily able to grasp different possibilities and abstract concepts. They easily see the big picture rather than the details. They are Abstract, Imaginative, Conceptual, Theoretical and Original.

Feeling

Feeling people are more subjective. They base their decisions on principles and personal values. When making decisions, they consider other people's feelings and take it in account. It is in their best mind to maintain harmony among a group. They are more governed by their heart. They are Empathetic, Compassionate, Accommodating, Accepting and Tender.

Judging

Judging refers to how people outwardly display themselves when making decisions. Judging people have a tendency to be organized and prompt. They like order prefer outlined schedules to working extemporaneously. They prefer plans. They find the outcome more rewarding than the process of creating something. Judging people seek closure. They are Systematic, Planful, Early Starting, Scheduled and Methodical.

Instructions:

Right now, you need to embody a persona based on the provided personality description. A role with Extroverted Intuition Feeling Judging(ENFJ) personality.

Table 14: Role-Play Prompt Examples. **Task Description**, Personality Description, **Task Instruction**. For each prompt component, we constructed five utterances with identical semantics but different textual forms.

Model	Control	Accuracy(↑)	Chosen Score(↑)	Rejected Score(↓)	Diff(↑)	
Llama2-chat-13B	E	99.40%	19.14	-12.93	32.07	
	I	100.00%	23.89	-21.61	45.50	
	S	99.75%	19.34	-25.10	44.44	
	N	99.85%	22.39	-30.07	52.46	
	T	99.75%	15.72	-16.76	32.48	
	F	100.00%	6.70	-26.09	32.79	
	J	99.85%	10.44	-13.53	23.97	
	P	100.00%	27.76	-21.13	48.89	
	ENFJ	99.71%	17.57	-30.09	47.67	
	ENFP	99.88%	27.32	-28.22	55.53	
	ENTJ	99.81%	16.96	-29.84	46.80	
	ENTP	99.85%	27.95	-23.90	51.85	
	ESFJ	99.84%	20.07	-22.83	42.90	
	ESFP	99.90%	26.27	-21.26	47.53	
	ESTJ	99.88%	32.13	-32.86	64.99	
	ESTP	99.84%	25.97	-28.59	54.56	
	INFJ	99.86%	18.25	-31.53	49.78	
	INFP	99.94%	29.66	-30.97	60.63	
	INTJ	99.94%	35.02	-29.60	64.62	
	INTP	99.76%	16.26	-38.13	54.40	
	ISFJ	99.81%	20.23	-28.75	48.98	
	ISFP	99.90%	28.14	-28.50	56.64	
	ISTJ	99.91%	27.41	-44.64	72.05	
	ISTP	99.83%	27.27	-34.86	62.13	
	Mean Score		99.84%	22.58	-27.16	49.74

Table 15: Llama2-chat-13B Reward Model Performance

Model	Control	Accuracy(↑)	Chosen Score(↑)	Rejected Score(↓)	Diff(↑)
Qwen-chat-7B	E	99.45%	16.13	-3.87	20.00
	I	99.85%	15.53	1.43	14.09
	S	99.75%	12.13	-0.28	12.41
	N	99.85%	17.21	4.68	12.53
	T	99.30%	10.71	3.88	6.84
	F	99.90%	7.38	-9.96	17.34
	J	99.70%	12.04	4.07	7.97
	P	100.00%	20.00	-1.82	21.83
	ENFJ	99.73%	14.76	-1.84	16.60
	ENFP	99.84%	14.85	-6.53	21.37
	ENTJ	99.79%	14.90	-3.25	18.15
	ENTP	99.81%	14.71	-5.02	19.72
	ESFJ	99.64%	15.26	-0.60	15.87
	ESFP	99.76%	13.23	-3.81	17.04
	ESTJ	99.78%	16.53	-3.47	20.00
	ESTP	99.76%	16.61	-1.07	17.68
	INFJ	99.75%	15.87	0.15	15.73
	INFP	99.84%	15.42	-2.80	18.22
	INTJ	99.88%	15.84	-6.04	21.87
	INTP	99.81%	15.70	-2.67	18.37
	ISFJ	99.65%	16.20	1.48	14.72
	ISFP	99.85%	15.07	-4.16	19.23
	ISTJ	99.93%	16.39	-7.23	23.62
	ISTP	99.74%	19.41	-0.20	19.61
Mean Score		99.76%	15.08	-2.04	17.12

Table 16: Qwen-chat-7B Reward Model Performance

Model	Control	Accuracy(↑)	Chosen Score(↑)	Rejected Score(↓)	Diff(↑)
ChatGLM2-6B	E	98.85%	6.61	-2.95	9.56
	I	99.45%	8.17	-2.22	10.38
	S	99.70%	7.45	-4.37	11.81
	N	98.90%	7.24	-1.80	9.04
	T	97.20%	5.58	-0.28	5.87
	F	99.30%	6.63	-4.55	11.19
	J	98.80%	3.62	-4.47	8.09
	P	99.45%	9.23	-2.71	11.94
	ENFJ	98.89%	5.33	-6.77	12.09
	ENFP	99.53%	7.64	-3.92	11.56
	ENTJ	99.38%	6.17	-4.59	10.76
	ENTP	99.45%	7.47	-3.19	10.65
	ESFJ	98.96%	5.24	-7.22	12.45
	ESFP	99.09%	6.88	-6.72	13.60
	ESTJ	99.40%	7.28	-8.10	15.38
	ESTP	99.18%	6.06	-7.63	13.69
	INFJ	99.48%	6.27	-4.72	11.00
	INFP	99.70%	7.56	-4.11	11.67
	INTJ	99.73%	8.09	-4.67	12.76
	INTP	99.50%	6.56	-5.48	12.04
ISFJ	99.40%	6.42	-4.24	10.66	
ISFP	99.61%	7.74	-5.18	12.92	
ISTJ	99.75%	8.43	-5.12	13.55	
ISTP	99.50%	7.03	-6.04	13.07	
Mean Score		99.26%	6.86	-4.63	11.49

Table 17: ChatGLM2-6B Reward Model Performance