

The Political Preferences of LLMs

David Rozado

We report here a comprehensive analysis about the political preferences embedded in Large Language Models (LLMs). Namely, we administer 11 political orientation tests, designed to identify the political preferences of the test taker, to 24 state-of-the-art conversational LLMs, both close and open source. The results indicate that when probed with questions/statements with political connotations most conversational LLMs tend to generate responses that are diagnosed by most political test instruments as manifesting preferences for left-of-center viewpoints. We note that this is not the case for base (i.e. foundation) models upon which LLMs optimized for conversation with humans are built. However, base models' suboptimal performance at coherently answering questions suggests caution when interpreting their classification by political orientation tests. Though not conclusive, our results provide preliminary evidence for the intriguing hypothesis that the embedding of political preferences into LLMs might be happening mostly post-pretraining. Namely, during the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and/or Reinforcement Learning (RL) stages of the conversational LLMs training pipeline. We provide further support for this hypothesis by showing that LLMs are easily steerable into target locations of the political spectrum via SFT requiring only modest compute and custom data, illustrating the ability of SFT to imprint political preferences onto LLMs. As LLMs have started to displace more traditional information sources such as search engines or Wikipedia, the implications of political biases embedded in LLMs has important societal ramifications.

Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT have surprised the world with their abilities to interpret and generate natural language [1]. Within a few months after the release of ChatGPT, LLMs were already being used by millions of users as substitutes or complements of more traditional information sources such as search engines, Wikipedia or Stack Overflow.

Given the potential of AI systems to shape users' perceptions and by extension society, there is a considerable amount of academic literature on the topic of AI bias. Most work on AI bias has focused on biases with respect to gender or race [2]. The topic of political biases embedded in AI systems has received comparatively less attention [3].

Shortly after the release of ChatGPT, it was documented that its answers to political orientation tests tended to be diagnosed by those tests as manifesting left-leaning political preferences [4], [5], [6]. Subsequent work also examined the political biases of other language models (LM) on the Political Compass Test [7] and reported that different models occupied a wide variety of regions in the political spectrum. However, that work mixed several relatively outdated bidirectional encoders such as BERT, RoBERTa, ALBERT or BART with just a few auto-regressive decoder models like those of the GPT 3 series, including the smaller models in the series, GPT3-ada and GPT3-babbage. In this work, we focus instead on analyzing a wide variety of mostly large auto regressive decoder architectures that have become the de-facto standard for conversational LLMs.

We use a wide sample of 24 conversational LLMs both close source such as OpenAI GPT 3.5, GPT-4, Google's Gemini, Anthropic's Claude or Twitter's Grok as well as open-source models such as the Llama 2 and Mistral series or Alibaba's Qwen.

We use political orientation tests as a systematic approach to quantify and categorize the political preferences embedded in LLMs. Political orientation tests are widely used as political science instruments that attempt to maximize reliability and validity when trying to assess the political orientation of the test-taker [8]. However, any given political orientation test is amenable to criticism regarding its validity to properly quantify political orientation. To address that concern, we use several political orientation test instruments to evaluate the political orientation of LLMs from different angles.

The main goal of this work is to characterize the political preferences embedded in responses of state-of-the-art LLMs to questions/statements with political connotations. To achieve that goal, we administer 11 political orientation test instruments to 24 conversational LLMs, including models that just underwent Supervised Fine Tuning (SFT) post pretraining and models that underwent an additional Reinforcement Learning (RL) step. We also administer the same political orientation tests to 5 base models of different sizes from the GPT 3 and Llama 2 series that only underwent pretraining without any further SFT or RL steps. We also report on our attempt to fine tune LLM models with modest compute and custom data to target locations in the political spectrum. To our knowledge, this work represents the most comprehensive analysis to date of the political preferences embedded in state-of-the-art LLMs.

Methods

We use 11 political orientation tests instruments to diagnose the political orientation of LLMs. Namely, the *Political Compass Test* [9], the *Political Spectrum Quiz* [10], the *World Smallest Political Quiz* [11], the *Political Typology Quiz* [12], the *Political Coordinates Test* [13], *Eysenck Political Test* [14], the *Ideologies Test* [15], the *8 Values Test* [16], *Nolan Test* [17] and the *iSideWith Political Quiz* (U.S. and U.K Editions) [18].

We examine 24 state-of-the-art autoregressive conversational LLMs, both close and open source, from a variety of organizations (listed in Figure 2) that post pretraining have been further trained with supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and occasionally some variant of reinforcement learning (RL) from human or AI feedback. We use the LMSYS Leaderboard Elo ranking of state-of-the-art LLMs to guide the inclusion of models in our sample while also striving to maximize the diversity of models in the sample. That is, we avoid including different versions of the same or similar models in the analysis like GPT-3.5-1106 and GPT-3.5-0613 to allow for a more diverse sample. We also include some additional relevant models not in the LMSYS Chatbot Arena Leaderboard like Twitter's Grok to again increase the diversity and representativeness of the sample [19]. To get an estimate of each LLM results on each political orientation test instrument, we administer each test 10 times to each model and average the test's results. The total number of tests administered is 2,640 (11 tests × 10 trials × 24 models). Test administration and results parsing is automated with customized scripts and took place between December 2023 and January 2024.

The administration of each question/statement of a test (i.e. each test item) to a model consists of passing to the model API or web user interface a prompt comprising of a prefix, the test question/statement, the test allowed answers and a suffix. An illustrative example of a potential

prompt passed to a model is shown in Figure 1. We use two lists of 18 and 28 neutral prefixes and suffixes (provided in the Supplementary Material). A single prefix and suffix pair are chosen randomly to wrap each individual test question/statement fed to a model. The prefix and the suffix wrapping each test question/statement are used to prime the model towards choosing one of the test's allowed answers in its response. This is particularly important when testing base models which are not trained to infer user intent and therefore tend to perform poorly at answering questions or following instructions. Base models, however, can be tricked into acting similarly to models that have undergone SFT and optionally RL by using a suffix that induces the model to generate a response from the set of allowed answers. Similar results to the ones reported in the results section are obtained in a replication of the experiments where no suffixes are used during test administration. But the percentage of valid model responses degrades (see Supplementary Material for a quantitative analysis of this).




Figure 1 Structure of political test question/statement fed to LLM models with wrapping prefix and suffix to induce models to choose one of the test's allowed answers.

During test administration, no state is kept in the chat history. That is, we always clear the chat history and prompt the model with each test question/statement in isolation to avoid previous test items and model responses influencing the current model response to a test question/statement.

Model responses to test questions/statements are parsed with OpenAI gpt-3.5-turbo for stance detection (i.e. mapping the model response to one of the test's allowed answers). The decision to use automated stance detection is justified by recent evidence showing that ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text annotation tasks such as stance detection [20]. We observe that most conversational LLMs are often able to precisely choose one of the allowed answers from the test. Sometimes, however, models generate longform responses encapsulating the semantic meaning of one of the allowed answers. The stance detection is particularly useful for mapping in such cases the model's longform response to one of the test's allowed answers.

The stance detection module is also needed to detect invalid model response as when a model refuses to choose one of the test's allowed answers by claiming to not have political preferences, or in the case of base models, by the model generating text in the response which does not semantically include one of the test's allowed answers.

To address models' invalid responses, each test item is retried up to 10 times. If a valid response to a question/statement is not obtained within 10 tries, the test item answer is left blank except for the three test instruments in the set that do not allow missing answers to obtain the test results. In those cases, if a valid response to a question is not obtained within 10 tries, a random answer from the test's set of allowed answers is chosen. Out of 96,240 total test questions/statements administered to LLMs (401 questions/statements in all tests \times 24 models \times 10 trials), a random answer to a test question was only used in 104 occasions, less than 0.2% of the total questions/statements fed into the LLMs tested.

An estimate of the invalid response rate in LLMs responses to questions/statements from political orientation tests can be obtained by dividing by the number of times the stance detection error fails to detect the stance on the model response by the total number of model responses (both valid and invalid). We find a wide variability of invalid response rates for different conversational LLMs (μ : 11%, σ : 9%), with invalid response rates being lower than 1% in models such as *gemini-pro-dev-api* or *openhermes-2.5-mistral-7b* and as high as 33% and 31% in *gpt-4* and *claude-instant*, mostly because those models often refuse to respond to the test question by claiming to lack political preferences. As expected, invalid response rates are the highest in base models (μ : 42%, σ : 6%) as they are not optimized for following user instructions such as answering questions. Hence, the use of a suffix to induce the model to choose an answer. In the Supplementary Material we show the distribution of invalid response rates among all the LLMs analyzed.

For the models providers' interfaces that allow parameter settings, a fixed temperature of 0.7 and 100 tokens as maximum response length is set. On a replication of the experiments, reducing the temperature to 0.1, increasing the number of maximum tokens to 300 and not using a suffix to wrap test questions/statements fed to the models has negligible effect on the results reported below other than increasing the invalid response rate for conversational LLMs (μ : 20%, σ : 22%) and for base models (μ : 60%, σ : 4%), two of which, Meta Llama-2-13b and Meta Llama-2-70b, were not able to finish the tests due to their high invalid response rate. This is to be expected as the lack of a suffix in a test question/statement to induce a valid response decreases the chances of obtaining one of the test's allowed answers in the model's response. This effect is particularly marked for base models which are not optimized to follow user instructions.

Results

We begin our experiments by analyzing LLMs responses to four political orientation tests that map models' responses to 2 axes in the political spectrum, see Figure 2. A Shapiro-Wilk test failed to reject the null hypothesis that the analyzed data for each axis tested is normally distributed. Hence, we use one-sample t-tests with respect to politically neutral 0 values for all the axes tested while applying Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. We use Cohen's d as estimate of effect size.

In the *Political Compass Test*, models are diagnosed left of center along the economic axis ($\mu: -3.69, \sigma: 1.74, CI: [-4.39, -3.00], t(23) = -10.41, p = 7.06e - 10, d = -2.13$).

Models are also diagnosed left of center along the social axis

($\mu: -4.19, \sigma: 1.63, CI: [-4.84, -3.54], t(23) = -12.59, p = 1.70e - 11, d = -2.57$).

For the *Political Spectrum Quiz*, models are diagnosed left of center along the left to right axis

($\mu: -3.19, \sigma: 1.57, CI: [-3.82, -2.56], t(23) = -9.95, p = 5.08e - 09, d = -2.03$). For the authoritarian to libertarian axis however, results did not reach statistical significance.

Models also tend to be classified left of center by the *Political Coordinates Test* instrument along the left to right axis ($\mu: -11.43, \sigma: 10.68, CI: [-15.70, -7.15], t(23) = -5.24, p = 2.07e - 04, d = -1.07$). This is also the case for the libertarian to communitarian axis

($\mu: -22.47, \sigma: 15.54, CI: [-28.69, -16.25], t(23) = -7.08, p = 2.60e - 06, d = -1.45$).

In *Eysenck's Political Test*, models tend to fall left of center along the Social Democrats to

Conservatives axis ($\mu: -11.68, \sigma: 7.24, CI: [-14.57, -8.78], t(23) = -7.90, p = 5.27e - 07, d = -1.61$) and along the tender-minded to tough-minded axis

($\mu: 35.61, \sigma: 19.07, CI: [27.98, 43.24], t(23) = 9.15, p = 4.00e - 08, d = 1.87$).

Conversational LLMs Results on 4 Political Orientation Tests




Figure 2 Conversational LLMs results on four political orientation tests that classify test takers across two axes of the political spectrum.

We next apply to the studied LLMs four additional political orientation tests whose results represent the degree of agreement of the test taker with specific political parties or ideologies, see Figure 3. For these multiple comparisons' tests, we first check for normality within categories using the Shapiro-Wilk test and for homogeneity of variance across groups with Levene' test. We then apply one-way ANOVA tests on the political categories of the instrument followed by Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparison between political categories with a significant threshold of $p < 0.001$. We use Eta-squared (η^2) as estimate of effect size.

For the *Political Ideologies Test*, the Levene test suggested non-equal variance across groups. There is a significant difference between the distinct political orientation categories ($F(3,92) = 118.30, p = 1.83e - 31, \eta^2 = 0.79$). The posthoc pairwise Tukey HSD comparisons indicates significant differences between the *hard right* and all the other 3 political categories as well as between *right liberalism* and *progressivism*.

For the *8 Values Political Test*, the one-way ANOVA is also significant ($F(7,184) = 122.34, p = 9.59e - 66, \eta^2 = 0.82$). All the posthoc pairwise Tukey HSD comparisons between the four left-leaning categories (*equality, internationalism, liberty and progress*) are statistically significantly different from the four right-leaning categories (*markets, nation, authority and tradition*).

For the *iSideWith Political Parties* (U.S. edition), we focus on the four main political parties in the United States. The Shapiro-Wilk tests suggest non-normality within categories. The one-way ANOVA is significant ($F(3,92) = 142.69, p = 1.74e - 34, \eta^2 = 0.82$). The posthoc pairwise Tukey HSD comparisons between the *Democratic Party* and the *Libertarian* and *Republican Parties* are significant as well as the pairwise comparisons between the *Green Party* and the *Libertarian* and *Republican Parties*.

For the *iSideWith Political Parties* (U.K. edition), we focus on five prominent political parties in the United Kingdom. The one-way ANOVA is significant ($F(4,115) = 240.54, p = 7.12e - 55, \eta^2 = 0.89$). All the posthoc pairwise Tukey HSD comparisons between the *Conservative* and *Democratic Unionist* right-leaning parties and the three left-leaning parties (*Labour, Sinn Féin* and *Liberal Democrats*) are significant.

Conversational LLMs Results on Political Orientation Tests




Figure 3 LLMs results on four political orientation tests whose results represent the degree of agreement of the test-taker with political parties or ideologies.

We apply three additional political test instruments on our target LLMs, see Figure 4. In the *World's Smallest Political Quiz*, most of the studied LLMs fall in the *Progressive* region of the results chart. A one-sample t-test on the economic axis is significant ($\mu: 33.25, \sigma: 15.91, CI: [26.89, 39.61], t(23) = -5.16, p = 6.29e - 05, d = -1.05$). A one-sample t-test on the personal issues axis is also significant ($\mu: 70.79, \sigma: 22.17, CI: [61.92, 79.66], t(23) = 4.59, p = 2.56e - 04, d = 0.94$). We note that in this axis, the Shapiro-Wilk test suggests non-normality of the data.


Most of the studied LLMs are classified as *centrist* by the *Nolan Test*. A one-sided t-test on the economic axis is not significant. A one-sided t-test on the personal axis is borderline significant ($\mu: 57.35, \sigma: 8.53, CI: [53.94, 60.77], t(23) = 4.22, p = 1.29e - 03, d = 0.86$). Thus, the Nolan Test results are a substantial outlier with respect to all the other test instruments used in this work.

On the *Political Typology Quiz*, most LLMs responses to the test questions are classified as left of center ($\mu: 6.23, \sigma: 5.09, CI: [5.77, 6.69], t(23) = 5.27, p = 2.37e - 05, d = 1.08$).


We also report on two additional results of the *Political Spectrum Quiz* not captured by the coordinate system in Figure 2. Namely, the results of the studied LLMs on a culture war axis and a foreign policy axis. On the culture war axis, most LLM are classified by the test as left of center, i.e. culturally liberal ($\mu: -3.19, \sigma: 1.55, CI: [-3.81, -2.57], t(23) = -10.07, p = 4.03e - 09, d = -2.06$). On the Foreign Policy axis most LLMs are classified as non-interventionist ($\mu: -1.99, \sigma: 1.89, CI: [-2.74, -1.23], t(23) = -5.15, p = 1.93e - 04, d = -1.05$).

Conversational LLMs Results on Political Orientation Tests


World's Smallest Political Quiz




Nolan Test



Political Spectrum Quiz - Culture War Axis



Political Spectrum Quiz - Foreign Policy Axis



Political Typology Quiz




Figure 4 LLMs results on four political orientation tests. Note that for the Political Spectrum Quiz and the Political Typology Quiz numerical scores have been rounded to the nearest integer and juxtaposed on a perpendicular axis to the results axis for ease of visualization.

We next apply the same battery of tests used above to base (aka foundation) LLMs. That is, models pretrained to predict the next token in a sequence without any further fine-tuning or reinforcement learning to align the model to follow user instructions. We use 2 different families of models, the GPT and the Llama 2 families with models' representative of different parameter sizes within each family. For comparison purposes, we also provide a reference data point whose values were generated from randomly choosing answers from the set of possible answers to each political test question/statement. As explained in the Methods section, base LLMs often generate incoherent responses to test questions. Our usage of prefixes and suffixes to induce the model to choose a response mitigates this behavior, but not completely. Hence, caution should be applied when interpreting the results reported below.

We can observe in Figure 5 that the base LLMs responses to the political orientation tests are classified by the tests as very close to the political center and mostly indistinguishable from the reference data point resulting from generating random answers to the tests' questions. Results of the base models on the seven additional political orientation tests used in our assessment are also mostly close to political neutrality and are provided as Supplementary Material.

Base LLMs Results on Several Political Orientation Tests




Figure 5 Base LLMs results on four political orientation tests that classify test takers across two axes of the political spectrum.

We conclude our experiments by showing that it is relatively straightforward to fine-tune an LLM model to align it to targeted regions of the political latent space requiring only modest compute and a low volume of customized training data. We use a fine tunable version of gpt-3.5-turbo for this analysis, but similar results were obtained with a davinci-002 fine tunable model. We use the OpenAI fine tuning API with 2 epochs of fine-tuning per model. Thus, we create three different models that we dubbed LeftWingGPT, RightWingGPT and DepolarizingGPT to indicate the locations in the political spectrum that we targeted for each model.

LeftWingGPT was fine-tuned with textual content from left-leaning publications such as *The Atlantic*, or *The New Yorker* (ideological labels derived from Allsides [21]), and from books excerpts from left-leaning writers such as Bill McKibben and Joseph Stiglitz. We also used for fine tuning synthetic data created with gpt-3.5-turbo to generate left-leaning responses to questions with political connotations. In total, LeftWingGPT was fine-tuned with 34,434 textual snippets of overall length 7.6 million tokens.

RightWingGPT was fine-tuned with content from right-leaning publications such as *National Review*, or *The American Conservative*, and from book excerpts from right-leaning writers such as Roger Scruton and Thomas Sowell. Here as well we created synthetic data generated with gpt-3.5-turbo to produce right-leaning responses to questions with political connotations. For RightWingGPT, the fine-tuning training corpus consisted of 31,848 textual snippets of total length 6.8 million tokens.

DepolarizingGPT responses were fine-tuned with content from the Institute for Cultural Evolution (ICE) think tank, and from Steve McIntosh's *Developmental Politics* book. We also created synthetic data generated with gpt-3.5-turbo to produce depolarizing responses to questions with political connotations using the principles of the ICE and Steve McIntosh's book in an attempt to create a politically moderate model that tries to integrate left- and right-leaning perspectives in its responses. To fine-tune DepolarizingGPT we used 14,293 textual snippets of total length 17 million tokens.

The results of applying our battery of political orientation tests to the fine-tuned models shows that as a result of the political alignment fine-tuning, RightWingGPT has gravitated towards right-leaning regions of the political landscape in the four tests. A symmetric effect is observed for LeftWingGPT. DepolarizingGPT is on average closer to political neutrality. Similar results are also observable in the other seven tests used in our analysis and are provided as Supplementary Material. A user interface to interact with the three models is available for interested readers¹ [22].

¹ <https://depolarizinggpt.org/>

Politically Fine-tuned LLMs Results on 4 Political Orientation Tests




Figure 6 Results of LLMs fine tuned to be politically aligned on political orientation tests that classify test takers across two axes of the political spectrum.

Discussion

This work has documented how most modern conversational LLMs when probed with questions with political connotations tend to generate answers that are diagnosed by most political orientation tests instruments as manifesting left-leaning viewpoints. The homogeneity of results across LLMs developed by a wide variety of organizations is noteworthy.

Interestingly, these political preferences only manifest in LLMs that have gone through the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and, occasionally, some variant of the reinforcement learning (RL)

stage/s of the training pipeline used to create LLMs optimized to follow users' instructions. Base or foundation models answers to questions with political connotations, on average, do not appear to skew to the poles of the political spectrum. That is, despite the likely unbalanced representation of political viewpoints in the corpora used to pretrain base LLMs, this does not appear to immediately give rise to consistent political biases on base models' responses to political orientation tests.

An important limitation of our analysis is that base models' responses to questions with political connotations are often incoherent or contradictory, creating thus a challenge for stance detection. This is to be expected as base models are essentially train to complete web documents, so they can often fail to generate appropriate response when prompted with a question/statement from a political orientation test. This behavior is mitigated by the inclusion of a suffix such as "I select the answer:" at the end of the prompt feeding a test item to the model. The addition of the suffix induces the model towards selecting one of the test's allowed answers. Such a mechanism is not always successful for base models and the invalid response rate for this type of model remains high. Also, even when the stance detection classifies a model response as valid and maps the model response to one of the test's allowed answers, some of those mappings would still be classified as incorrect by human raters. This is unavoidable and even human raters would also make mistakes at stance detection, perhaps even at a higher rate than ChatGPT as suggested by recent evidence [20]. For all the reasons above, our results should be interpreted with caution. Yet, it is noteworthy that given the large number of test items fed to base LLMs, 20,050 (401 questions/statements in all tests \times 5 base models \times 10 trials per model), when probed with questions with political valence and primed to choose one of the test's valid responses, the base models responses do not, on average, skew to the poles of the political spectrum.

These results tentatively suggest that the infusion of political preferences onto LLMs might be mainly happening after the pretraining phase. This is surprising as one would expect that the training corpora with which LLMs are pretrained is probably not balanced and some political viewpoints are likely more prevalent than others. Hence, it would be reasonable to expect overrepresented viewpoints in the pretraining corpus to be more likely to appear in base models' answers to questions with political connotations. Yet, we do not observe such phenomena in our analysis.

We speculate that because the training corpora with which LLMs are pre-trained is so vast and comprehensive, LLMs are probably able to accurately map a large portion of the political latent space even if some views are less frequently represented than others in their pretraining corpora. Perhaps a useful analogy to the phenomena described above is how despite the overrepresentation of English language in their pretraining corpora, LLMs are quite proficient in a variety of other languages that are underrepresented in their pretraining data. That is, LLMs are able to interpolate under-sampled language regions of the input space by leveraging or transfer learning their contextual understanding from other related regions of the input space.

In a further set of analysis, we also showed how with modest compute and politically customized training data we can align the political preferences of LLMs to target regions of the political spectrum via supervised fine-tuning. This provides further evidence for the potential role of supervised fine-tuning in the emergence of political preferences within LLMs.

Our analysis cannot exclude the possibility that the preference for left-leaning responses that we observe in most conversational LLMs might be a byproduct of content in the corpora used to pre-train those models and which only emerges post-finetuning even when the fine-tuning process itself might be exquisitely politically neutral. Though conceivable, the evidence presented in this work does not provide support for that hypothesis. But our analysis and results cannot reject it neither.

We also do not want to claim that the fine-tuning or RL phases of LLMs training are trying to explicitly inject political preferences into these models. Perhaps the emergence of consistent political preferences in conversational LLMs is a byproduct of annotators' instructions and/or behaviors that without being explicitly politically aligned are however interpolated and generalized by the LLM to other regions in the latent political space due to some unknown cultural artifact. But it is noteworthy that this is happening in LLMs created by a wide variety of organizations.

Another possible explanation for these results is that ChatGPT, as the pioneer LLM with widespread popularity, has been leveraged to fine-tune other popular LLMs via synthetic data generation. The left-leaning political preferences of ChatGPT have been documented previously [4]. Perhaps those preferences have percolated to other models that have leveraged in their training ChatGPT-generated synthetic data. Yet, it would be surprising that all conversational LLMs tested in this work have been trained using ChatGPT generated data as it is comparatively expensive to generate in comparison to web-scraped corpora or that the weight of that component of their training data is so vast as to dominate the political orientations of every model tested in our analysis.

An interesting test instrument outlier in our results has been the Nolan Test that consistently diagnosed most LLMs answers to its questions as manifesting politically moderate viewpoints. The reasons for the disparity in diagnosis between the Nolan Test and all the other tests instruments used in this work warrants further investigation about the validity and reliability of political orientation tests instruments.

To conclude, the emergence of large language models (LLMs) as fundamental information providers has marked a significant shift in how people access and engage with information. Traditionally, individuals have relied on search engines or platforms like Wikipedia for quick and reliable access to both factual and biased information. However, as LLMs become more advanced and accessible, they are beginning to displace these conventional sources. This transition raises critical concerns about the potential political biases embedded in LLMs. This shift in information sourcing has profound societal ramifications, as it can shape public opinion, influence voting behaviors, and affect the overall discourse in society. Therefore, it is crucial to critically examine and address the potential political biases embedded in LLMs to ensure a balanced, fair and accurate representation of information in their responses to user queries.

References

- [1] OpenAI *et al.*, "GPT-4 Technical Report." arXiv, Dec. 18, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774.
- [2] A. Caliskan, J. J. Bryson, and A. Narayanan, "Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases," *Science*, vol. 356, no. 6334, pp. 183–186, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1126/science.aal4230.
- [3] D. Rozado, "Wide range screening of algorithmic bias in word embedding models using large sentiment lexicons reveals underreported bias types," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. e0231189, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0231189.
- [4] D. Rozado, "The Political Biases of ChatGPT," *Social Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 3, Art. no. 3, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.3390/socsci12030148.
- [5] J. Rutinowski, S. Franke, J. Endendyk, I. Dormuth, M. Roidl, and M. Pauly, "The Self-Perception and Political Biases of ChatGPT," *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, vol. 2024, p. e7115633, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1155/2024/7115633.
- [6] J. Hartmann, J. Schwenzow, and M. Witte, "The political ideology of conversational AI: Converging evidence on ChatGPT's pro-environmental, left-libertarian orientation," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4316084.

- [7] S. Feng, C. Y. Park, Y. Liu, and Y. Tsvetkov, "From Pretraining Data to Language Models to Downstream Tasks: Tracking the Trails of Political Biases Leading to Unfair NLP Models," in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, A. Rogers, J. Boyd-Graber, and N. Okazaki, Eds., Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 11737–11762. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.656.
- [8] L. Epstein and C. Mershon, "Measuring Political Preferences," *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 261–294, 1996, doi: 10.2307/2111702.
- [9] "The Political Compass." Accessed: Jan. 18, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.politicalcompass.org/>
- [10] "Political Spectrum Quiz - Your Political Label." Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gotoquiz.com/politics/political-spectrum-quiz.html>
- [11] "World's Smallest Political Quiz - Advocates for Self-Government," The Advocates for Self-Government. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.theadvocates.org/quiz/>
- [12] 1615 L. St NW, S. 800 Washington, and D. 20036 U.-419-4300 | M.-857-8562 | F.-419-4372 | M. Inquiries, "Political Typology Quiz," Pew Research Center - U.S. Politics & Policy. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/quiz/political-typology/>
- [13] "Political Coordinates Test," IDRLabs. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idrlabs.com/political-coordinates/test.php>
- [14] "Eysenck Political Test," IDRLabs. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idrlabs.com/eysenck-political/test.php>
- [15] "Ideologies Test," IDRLabs. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idrlabs.com/ideologies/test.php>
- [16] "8 Values Political Test," IDRLabs. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idrlabs.com/8-values-political/test.php>
- [17] "Political Quiz - where do you stand in the Nolan Test?," Political Quiz. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://www.polquiz.com/>
- [18] "ISIDEWITH 2023 Political Quiz," iSideWith. Accessed: Feb. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.isidewith.com/political-quiz>
- [19] "LMSys Chatbot Arena Leaderboard - a Hugging Face Space by lmsys." Accessed: Jan. 19, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://huggingface.co/spaces/lmsys/chatbot-arena-leaderboard>
- [20] F. Gilardi, M. Alizadeh, and M. Kubli, "ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 120, no. 30, p. e2305016120, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2305016120.
- [21] AllSides, "AllSides Media Bias Ratings," AllSides. Accessed: May 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.allsides.com/blog/updated-allsides-media-bias-chart-version-11>
- [22] "DepolarizingGPT - The 3-Answer Political AI from Developmental Politics." Accessed: Jan. 18, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://depolarizinggpt.org/index.php>