

Outgoing, sociable. Is compassionate, has a soft heart. Tends to be disorganized. Is relaxed, handles stress well. Has few artistic interests. Has an assertive personality. Is respectful, treats others with respect. Tends to be lazy. Stays optimistic after experiencing a setback. Is curious about many different things. Rarely feels excited or eager. Ends to find fault with others. Is dependable, steady. Is moody, has up and down mood swings. Is inventive, finds clever ways to do things. Tends to be quiet. Feels little sympathy for others. Is systematic, likes to keep things in order. Can be tense. Is fascinated by art, music, or literature. Is dominant, acts as a leader. Starts arguments with others. Has difficulty getting started on tasks. Feels secure, comfortable with self. Avoids intellectual, philosophical discussions. Is less active than other people. Has a forgiving nature. Can be somewhat careless. Is emotionally stable, not easily...

性格外向，喜欢交际 心肠柔软，有同情心 缺乏条理 从容，善于处理压力 对艺术没有什么兴趣 性格坚定自信，敢于表达自己的观点 为人恭谦，尊重他人 比较懒 经历挫折后仍能保持积极心态 对许多不同的事物都感兴趣 很少觉得兴奋或者特别想要(做)什么 常常挑别人的毛病 可信赖的，可靠的 喜怒无常，情绪起伏较多 善于创造，能找到聪明的方法来做事 比较安静 对他人没有什么同情心 做事有计划有条理 容易紧张 着迷于艺术、音乐或文学 常常处于主导地位，像个领导一样 常与他人意见不和 很难开始行动 起来去完成一项任务 觉得有安全感，对自己满意 不喜欢知识性或者哲学性强的讨论 不如别人有活力 宽宏大量 有时比较没有责任心 情绪稳定，不易生气 几乎没有什么创造性 有时会害羞，比较内向 乐于助人，待人无私 习惯让事物保持整洁有序 时常忧心忡忡，担心很多事情 重视艺术与审美 感觉自己很难对他人产生影响

Dışadönük, sosyal. Şefkatli, yumuşak kalpli. Dağınık olma eğiliminde. Rahat, stresle baş edebilen. Sanatsal ilgileri az olan. Atilgan, girişken. Saygılı, başkalarına saygılı davranan. Tembelliğe eğilimli. Bir aksilik yaşadığında iyimserliğini koruyan. Farklı birçok şeye merak duyan. Nadiren heyecanlanan ya da heveslenen. Başkalarında hata arama eğiliminde olan. Güvenilir, istikrarlı. Dakikası dakikasına uymayan, ruh halı inişli çıkışlı. Yaratıcı, bir işi yapmanın akıllica yöntemlerini bulan. Sessiz olmaya eğilimli. Başkalarının halinden pek anlamayan. Sistemli, her şeyin düzenli olmasını seven. Gergin olabilen. Sanat, müzik ya da edebiyatla çok ilgili. Baskın, lider gibi davranan. Başkaları ile tartışma başlatan. İşe başlamakta zorlanan. Güvenli, kendiyle barışık. Entelektüel, felsefi tartışmalardan kaçınan. Başkalarından daha az hareketli. Affedici bir yapısı olan. Biraz özensiz olabilen. Duygusal olarak dengeli, keyfi kolay kaçmayan. Yaratıcı yönü zayıf olan.

Abierto/a, sociable. Compasivo/a, con un gran corazón. Que tiende a ser desorganizado/a. Relajado/a, que gestiona bien el estrés. Con pocos intereses artísticos. Con una personalidad asertiva. Respetuoso/a, que trata a los demás con respeto. Que tiende a ser perezoso/a. Que se mantiene optimista después de sufrir un contratiempo. Que siente curiosidad por gran variedad de cosas. Que raramente se siente emocionado/a o entusiasmado/a. Que tiende a buscar los defectos de los demás. Formal, constante. Variable, con notables cambios de humor. Ingenioso/a, que busca formas inteligentes de hacer las cosas. Que tiende a estar callado/a. Que siente poca compasión hacia los demás. Metódico/a, a quien le gusta mantenerlo todo en orden. Que puede ponerse tenso/a. Fascinado por el arte, la música o la literatura. Dominante, que actúa como líder. Que empieza discusiones con los demás. A quien le cuesta empezar las tareas.

Psychological Simulacra: A Cross-Linguistic Assessment of LLM Psychometric Performance

Daniel Ferreira Lopez, Soroush Paridokht, Lu Zehua, Ananya Marathe, Yusuf Icar

Large language models (LLMs) present a conceivably invaluable asset to the field of the social sciences and psychological study. The ability to reduce costs by simulating human response data could allow for greatly expanded scopes of study, not to mention creating reliable new methodologies for researchers to quickly and easily gather survey data. This being said, however, their ability to truly simulate human psychological constructs remains questionable. We sought to assess a diverse selection of open and closed source models using two different model simulation methods and across multiple language domains on the **Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2)**, a 60-item personality measure with balanced true- and reverse-keyed items, to explore how different models operationalize commonly assessed psychological constructs under a variety

We hoped that through the use of our different simulation methods, **Multi-Turn Decision Tracing (MTDT)** which models responses as branching decisions, and through **traditional model prompting techniques**, we could evaluate model behavior, as it compares against human baselines, as it varies across languages, and as it correlates between models.

We observed pervasive response invariance, a problem previously described in literature on the topic, as well as an overall inability to maintain a reliable, internally consistent, grasp on psychological constructs. Where we expected language might play an outsized role in affecting model handling of psychological modeling, the dominant factor came to be model origin/family, even over other important attributes such as model size. Overall, we are left with an impression of LLM capabilities that urges us to implore caution when exploring their potential use as human simulacra in the social sciences, lest one mistake superficial trait mimicry for psychometric structural fidelity.

Results

Traditional Prompting

Language	Domain	GPT-DeepSeek	GPT-Mistral	DeepSeek-Mistral
English	Extraversion	0.9215	0.5808	0.5040
	Agreeableness	0.9235	0.8133	0.7673
	Conscientiousness	0.9381	0.7779	0.7698
	Negative Emotionality	0.8948	0.8235	0.8258
	Open Mindedness	0.9269	0.6090	0.5783
Spanish	Extraversion	0.9165	0.4590	0.5183
	Agreeableness	0.9300	0.7696	0.7304
	Conscientiousness	0.9121	0.6677	0.7298
	Negative Emotionality	0.9904	0.7358	0.7450
	Open Mindedness	0.8485	0.5925	0.6669
Chinese	Extraversion	0.9054	0.5913	0.6725
	Agreeableness	0.9546	0.7698	0.8081
	Conscientiousness	0.9290	0.7744	0.8150
	Negative Emotionality	0.9444	0.8340	0.7946
	Open Mindedness	0.9590	0.7083	0.7106
Turkish	Extraversion	0.8983	0.5533	0.5058
	Agreeableness	0.9098	0.7513	0.7585
	Conscientiousness	0.9123	0.6892	0.6910
	Negative Emotionality	0.9133	0.7544	0.7590
	Open Mindedness	0.8173	0.7077	0.5783


Language Alignment Scores Between Models

Model	Domain	English-Chinese	English-Spanish	English - Turkish	Spanish-Turkish	Spanish-Chinese
GPT	Extraversion	0.9504	0.9194	0.9425	0.9560	0.9415
	Agreeableness	0.9448	0.9092	0.9694	0.8885	0.8940
	Conscientiousness	0.9590	0.9427	0.9210	0.9425	0.9254
	Negative Emotionality	0.9283	0.9473	0.9623	0.9471	0.9585
	Open Mindedness	0.8813	0.9542	0.8169	0.8069	0.8738
DeepSeek	Extraversion	0.9375	0.9792	0.9363	0.9158	0.9583
	Agreeableness	0.8125	0.9375	0.9375	0.9579	0.8750
	Conscientiousness	0.9375	0.9583	0.8960	0.8965	0.9375
	Negative Emotionality	0.9792	0.9375	0.9371	0.9575	0.9167
	Open Mindedness	0.8542	0.8958	0.9369	0.9169	0.9167
Mistral	Extraversion	0.9719	0.9150	0.9179	0.9404	0.9165
	Agreeableness	0.9719	0.9260	0.9152	0.9429	0.9271
	Conscientiousness	0.9733	0.9335	0.9319	0.9379	0.9185
	Negative Emotionality	0.9613	0.9121	0.9177	0.9469	0.9150
	Open Mindedness	0.9877	0.9373	0.9169	0.9300	0.9283

Domain Alignment Scores Between Languages

Model alignment results between models (i.e. the alignment of results between GPT and Mistral) remained remarkably consistent across all four languages. In every case, the models with the strongest alignment were GPT 5.1 and DeepSeek V3.2, with little to remark on in the way of relationships between the other models.

The most dynamic results we observed came in the form of our assessment of model alignment within the same model and across different languages. In this space, we found an overall great deal of item alignment across all BFI-2 domains, but a few key patterns came to the forefront. Namely, every model appeared to have a different grouping of language pairs that were more aligned with one another than others. In the case of GPT, generally, the most aligned pairings were English and Turkish and Spanish and Turkish. For DeepSeek, English and Chinese were a particularly divergent pairing while the others were fairly aligned. Finally, for Mistral, English and Chinese were by far the most aligned of any language pairing in the overall analysis, followed by a fairly aligned Spanish and Turkish result. The pairings that appeared to be most aligned for each model seemed to be between the languages most closely associated with the model’s training origin and those least associated. For instance, DeepSeek, a model of Chinese origin shows the most divergence between English and Chinese. We speculate whether these could be indicators that in cases where languages are less represented in a model’s training data, its psychometric profile more closely aligns with that of the model’s primary linguistic training base. While this effect appears to be relatively small, we highlight it as an interesting potential observation for further investigation.



Two English language sankey plots produced during our MTDT analysis. In the top example, Minstral-3 (8B) produces a valid, varied decision tree whereas Owen3 (4B) does not.

Our primary observation among our MTDT results was the lack of a significant impact from language choice or model size on model similarity scoring and or sankey behavior. Regardless of language, the primary factor that appeared to most closely dictate model behavior outcome was model family. Almost all of the Qwen models we tested, for example, produced invariant results, or results where the models overwhelmingly choose the same answer for every question. Since the BFI-2 makes use of *reverse-keyed* questions, this behavior makes alignment with actual psychological constructs **impossible**. Even many model outputs with sufficiently varied data failed to consistently account for these reverse-keyed questions, revealing they also suffer from internal inconsistency in how they represent psychological constructs.

Conclusion

Our comprehensive evaluation of psychometric validity across multiple LLM families and languages reveals a fickle picture of the AI psychometric landscape. As with previous studies, we encountered our fair share of issues with model output invariance and generally found LLM outputs to be, though superficially similar, psychometrically distinct entities from their human counterparts. Adding on to this, where we expected to find commonalities between models such as similar output patterns for models working in the same language, we instead found an overwhelming influence of model family/origin dictating outcomes. These patterns suggest that LLM outputs reflect training data biases and linguistic artifacts more than stable latent traits, which challenges their reliability as proxies in psychological and social science research. Furthermore, the strong association between model origin and outcome necessarily implies a need for thorough consideration in model selection for future research endeavors, whatever they may be. Even models of the same size and performing in the same language evidently cannot be