

Bias Beneath the Tone: Empirical Characterisation of Tone Bias in LLM-Driven UX Systems

Heet Bodara

Faculty of Information Technology,
Monash University
Melbourne, VIC, Australia
hbod0002@student.monash.edu

Md Masum Mushfiq

Faculty of Information Technology,
Monash University
Melbourne, VIC, Australia
md.mushfiq@monash.edu

Isma Farah Siddiqui

Faculty of Information Technology,
Monash University
Melbourne, VIC, Australia
ismafarah.siddiqui@monash.edu

Abstract

Large Language Models are increasingly used in conversational systems such as digital Personal Assistants, shaping how people interact with technology through language. While their responses often sound fluent and natural, they can also carry subtle tone biases such as sounding overly polite, cheerful, or cautious even when neutrality is expected. These tendencies can influence how users perceive trust, empathy, and fairness in dialogue. In this study, we explore tone bias as a hidden behavioural trait of LLMs. The novelty of this research lies in the integration of controllable LLM-based dialogue synthesis with tone classification models, enabling robust and ethical emotion recognition in PA interactions. We created two synthetic dialogue datasets: one generated from neutral prompts and another explicitly guided to produce positive or negative tones. Surprisingly, even the neutral set showed consistent tonal skew, suggesting that bias may stem from the model's underlying conversational style. Using weak supervision through a pretrained DistilBERT model, we labelled tones and trained several classifiers to detect these patterns. Ensemble models achieved macro-F1 scores up to 0.92, showing that tone bias is systematic, measurable, and relevant to designing fair and trustworthy conversational AI.

CCS Concepts

• Human-centered computing → Natural language interfaces;
User interface programming; • Computing methodologies → Supervised learning by classification; Weakly-supervised learning; • Social and professional topics → Algorithmic bias.

Keywords

Sentiment Analysis, Weak Supervision, Tone Detection, User Condition, User Experience, Human-Centred AI

ACM Reference Format:

Heet Bodara, Md Masum Mushfiq, and Isma Farah Siddiqui. 2025. Bias Beneath the Tone: Empirical Characterisation of Tone Bias in LLM-Driven UX Systems. In *Proceedings of 1st International Workshop on User Interface and Experience for Software Engineering (UISE 2026) (UISE '26)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

UISE '26, Rio De Janeiro, Brazil

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YYY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

User interfaces (UIs) are no longer confined to screens and buttons; they increasingly take the form of intelligent, conversational agents that understand and respond to natural language. Among these, *digital personal assistants (PAs)* such as Siri, Alexa, Cortana, and Google Assistant have become part of everyday life, helping users retrieve information, manage schedules, and perform tasks through dialogue. As these systems evolve, their tone, phrasing, and conversational style have become central to the overall *user experience (UX)*. Tone affects how users perceive trust, empathy, and fairness in their interactions, qualities that directly shape the usability and acceptability of intelligent interfaces.

With recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs), it is now possible to simulate rich, human-like dialogue at scale and to prototype conversational UIs without collecting real user data. However, this capability introduces a subtle but important concern: LLMs themselves may inject or amplify *tonal bias* in the interfaces they power. If an assistant consistently responds in an overly positive, dismissive, or hedged tone, it can distort users' perception of reliability, politeness, or confidence, affecting both usability and trust. Addressing such stylistic bias, therefore, becomes not just a linguistic challenge but a core aspect of UI/UX engineering.

To examine this phenomenon, we generated two synthetic datasets of user–assistant dialogues using several state-of-the-art LLMs. One set contained tone-neutral conversations without explicit instructions, while the other was tone-conditioned through prompts specifying positive or negative sentiment. Although the conditioned data behaved as expected, even the neutral set displayed consistent tonal tendencies, suggesting that bias may arise from the model's underlying conversational style rather than user input.

Research questions. Guided by this motivation, our study investigates:

- **RQ1:** How can LLMs be leveraged to generate realistic, tone-diverse synthetic datasets that emulate real human–assistant dialogues?
- **RQ2:** How effectively can machine-learning, deep-learning, and ensemble models trained on such data classify and generalise LLM-induced tones across varied contexts?

Approach and findings. To address **RQ1**, we generated two complementary synthetic datasets of user–assistant dialogues using several state-of-the-art LLMs. The first captured tone-neutral exchanges without any emotional instructions, while the second was explicitly tone-conditioned through prompts specifying positive or negative sentiment. This controllable generation process enabled scalable and reproducible simulation of tone-diverse interactions. To address **RQ2**, we applied weak supervision with a

pretrained DistilBERT model to label tone and trained a suite of classifiers, from lightweight TF-IDF and linear models to neural memory networks on both datasets. Stricter labeling thresholds ($\tau = 0.85$) produced clearer tone separation and higher macro-F1 scores (0.84–0.92), while inclusive thresholds ($\tau = 0.60$) surfaced borderline cases. The ensemble of Logistic Regression and Linear SVM achieved the most stable cross-dataset performance, while neural variants captured subtler contrastive tones such as sarcasm and hedging.

Overall, the results reveal that tonal bias in LLM-driven dialogues is systematic and measurable. Even tone-neutral prompts yield consistently polite or positive framings, suggesting that stylistic bias emerges from model behaviour rather than user intent. The study's novelty lies in combining controllable LLM-based dialogue synthesis with interpretable tone classification, offering a lightweight yet effective diagnostic pipeline for examining tone bias. By bridging bias analysis with user-experience evaluation, this work advances the design of conversational systems that are more transparent, fair, and trustworthy in both content and delivery.

2 Background and Related Work

Emotion identification in dialogues has long been a central topic in natural language understanding, supporting work in areas such as opinion mining, mental health monitoring, customer support, and human-computer interaction. Much of this progress stems from the growing realisation that effective communication between people and machines depends not only on literal accuracy but also on emotional sensitivity. As voice assistants like Alexa, Siri, Cortana, and Gemini have entered daily life, expectations around empathy and tone have increased sharply. These systems are now judged as much by *how* they respond as by *what* they say. From a UX perspective, tone and emotional awareness have become essential to trust and comfort in everyday interaction.

Earlier studies in dialogue emotion analysis (DEA) concentrated mainly on detecting human emotions in structured or scripted corpora such as movie dialogues, debate transcripts, or controlled conversation datasets. Gan et al. [1] provide an extensive survey covering work from 2017 to 2024, mapping methodological trends and open ethical questions. They identify three broad modelling paradigms that dominate the field:

- **RNN-based approaches**, which follow sequential dynamics to track speaker states [2–5];
- **GNN-based approaches**, capturing relations between speakers and utterances through graph structures [6–9];
- **Transformer-based methods**, which rely on attention and large pre-trained language models for contextual emotion representation [10–13].

These approaches collectively advanced context-sensitive emotion modelling, yet their real-world transfer remains limited. Domain shifts, sparse emotional data, and latency constraints still make it hard to deploy them in live personal assistants.

To improve realism, researchers have explored multimodal and adaptive systems. Sindhu et al. [14] describe a two-stage chatbot that fuses text and audio for empathetic replies. Abinaya et al. [15] propose TEBC-Net, blending BERT text encoders with CNN-based

facial analysis to align responses with perceived mood. Kovacevic et al. [16] contribute a dataset of genuine human–chatbot exchanges, showing that personalisation reduces domain gaps. In parallel, Zheng et al. [17] build *ChatLab*, letting users customise LLM-powered support bots; their emphasis lies on user experience rather than tone recognition. Pias et al. [18] analyse how the assistant's tone, apparent age, and gender sway engagement and purchase intent, interesting from a UX lens, though not a direct study of tone detection.

Recently, attention has turned from reading emotions in users to examining *how models themselves express tone*. Bardol [19] finds that simply altering the emotional framing of a prompt can shift the polarity of an LLM's replies, even when content remains constant. Dobariya and Kumar [20] show that polite prompts elicit more accurate and confident responses, highlighting sensitivity to pragmatic framing. Laurito et al. [21] observe that models prefer text written in a “machine-like” style, effectively displaying bias toward their own generative tone. Vinay et al. [22] link emotional prompting to a rise in misinformation, suggesting an interaction between affect and factual reliability. Finally, Gallegos et al. [23] survey bias and fairness in LLMs, noting that stylistic and tonal patterns form a distinct, under-studied dimension of bias.

Taken together, these works point to a shift: tone and framing are no longer just linguistic artefacts but measurable design factors influencing user perception. Our work follows this direction but asks a different question, *how do these tonal biases surface inside the conversational agents themselves?* We treat the LLM both as a data generator and as a subject of evaluation, tracing its default tone even when neutrality is requested. This perspective connects emotion-recognition research with broader issues of fairness and reliability in intelligent user interfaces, aligning with the UISE goal of creating user-centred, transparent, and trustworthy interactive systems.

3 Methodology and Implementation

Our workflow, illustrated in Figure 1, follows a standard yet lightweight NLP pipeline designed to diagnose tonal bias in assistant-style responses. We begin by constructing two synthetic datasets of user–assistant question-answer pairs. The first dataset contains general, tone-neutral conversations generated using multiple large language models (LLMs), including ChatGPT, Google Gemma, and Open Hugging Face variants. The second extends this with tone-conditioned prompts (positive and negative), ensuring a balanced sample distribution and richer lexical variety.

After dataset initialization, all responses are normalized and lemmatized to reduce lexical sparsity. Text is converted to lowercase, extraneous symbols are cleaned, and samples outside the range of three to two hundred tokens are removed. Each assistant reply is then assigned a sentiment tone using a pretrained DistilBERT model fine-tuned on SST-2, which provides weak labels for positive, negative, or neutral tone depending on confidence thresholds. This automated annotation allows scalable labeling while limiting manual bias.

For feature representation, we employ two complementary encodings: a sparse term-frequency inverse-document-frequency (TF-IDF) model capturing lexical cues or a dense Word2Vec embedding




Figure 1: Overview of the workflow.

capturing contextual similarity. The corpus is divided into training and testing sets in an 80/20 ratio, maintaining tone balance and topic stratification. We then train several lightweight classifiers, Multinomial Naïve Bayes, Logistic Regression, and Linear SVM, and compare them with an ensemble combining Logistic Regression and SVM via probability averaging. Exploratory neural models, Neural Semantic Encoder (NSE) and Dynamic Memory Network (DMN), were also examined to evaluate their sensitivity to mixed or contrastive tones [24–28]. MNB, LR, and Linear SVM are competitive, interpretable baselines for short texts that run well on modest hardware; an LR+SVM ensemble further stabilizes performance by combining calibrated probabilities with max-margin decisions, while NSE/DMN probes whether memory/attention mechanisms expose subtle bias that bag-of-words may miss (e.g., hedging, contrastive framing, sarcasm).

In the ensemble, we used two methods: *soft voting* and *stacking*.

- **Soft voting (probability averaging):**

For class $c \in \{-1, +1\}$ and base models $k = 1, \dots, K$ with calibrated posteriors $p_k(c | \mathbf{x})$, the ensemble prediction is computed as:

$$p_{\text{ens}}(c | \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k p_k(c | \mathbf{x}), \quad \sum_{k=1}^K w_k = 1, \quad w_k \geq 0,$$

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_c p_{\text{ens}}(c | \mathbf{x}).$$


- **Stacking (logistic combiner):**

Let $\mathbf{z} = [p_1(+1 | \mathbf{x}), \dots, p_K(+1 | \mathbf{x})]$ be the vector of base model posteriors. A logistic meta-model is trained on validation folds to learn:


$$p_{\text{ens}}(+1 | \mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{z}}^T), \quad \hat{y} = 1\{p_{\text{ens}}(+1 | \mathbf{x}) \geq \tau\}.$$

Hyperparameter tuning was performed manually within compact ranges (e.g., $\alpha = 0.1\text{--}1.0$ for NB, $C = 0.1\text{--}3$ for LR/SVM). Training and evaluation were conducted in Google Colab using Python 3.x, scikit-learn, and Hugging Face Transformers. Classical models executed efficiently on CPU, while DistilBERT labeling and neural variants used a single T4 GPU when available.

Overall, this pipeline (Figure 1) provides a reproducible foundation for examining tone bias in LLM-generated data. It emphasizes interpretability and diagnostic precision rather than complex model



(a) Results for Dataset A.



(b) Results for Dataset B.

Figure 2: Macro-F1 performance of different models across tone-classification tasks.

design, allowing the analysis to focus on where bias appears and how different model families detect it.

4 Results and Discussion

Our analysis focuses on how effectively different model families detect tonal bias in LLM-generated assistant responses. Experiments were conducted on two complementary datasets: one consisting of general tone-neutral dialogues and another containing tone-conditioned prompts. Performance was evaluated across two confidence thresholds ($\tau = 0.60$ and $\tau = 0.85$) applied during the DistilBERT-based weak labeling stage. These thresholds control how inclusive or conservative the sentiment assignments are.

At the lower threshold ($\tau = 0.60$), the models captured more borderline or ambiguous cases but at the cost of reduced precision. Accuracy remained high (above 0.96), yet macro-F1 scores dropped to the 0.66–0.80 range, indicating frequent confusion between neutral and mild positive tones. Increasing the threshold to $\tau = 0.85$ produced clearer separations between classes, yielding macro-F1 values between 0.84 and 0.92 across both datasets. As illustrated in Figure 2a, stricter thresholds consistently improved macro-F1 and reduced label noise, confirming that tone bias becomes more apparent when ambiguous samples are excluded.

Among classifiers, the ensemble of Logistic Regression and Linear SVM achieved the best overall balance between precision and recall, followed closely by the DMN and NSE. Figure 2b compares results across the two datasets, showing that model rankings remain stable and that linear TF-IDF models perform surprisingly well despite their simplicity. The ensemble provides modest yet consistent gains by averaging decision boundaries, while neural variants add small improvements on nuanced cases.

Qualitatively, we observed that the most error-prone cases were subtly framed replies where lexical positivity contrasted with negative implications (e.g., polite disagreement or cautionary advice). Sarcastic or hedged responses also challenged linear models, as these cues are often expressed through punctuation or rhythm rather than explicit word choice. Neural models captured some of these patterns through memory and attention mechanisms but remained sensitive to label noise. Domain-wise, factual and short-form prompts (such as productivity or finance) showed higher precision, while advice- or opinion-driven categories (health, news) exhibited stronger bias and lower recall.

Overall, the results highlight that tonal bias can be systematically identified using interpretable models trained on weakly labeled data.

Adjusting labeling thresholds provides a practical means to balance inclusiveness against diagnostic confidence, allowing us to quantify not only *where* bias appears in assistant-style responses but also *how confidently* different model types detect it.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

This study examined tonal bias as a diagnostic vulnerability in LLM-generated voice-assistant responses. By constructing two synthetic datasets, tone-neutral and tone-conditioned, and applying weak supervision through DistilBERT sentiment labeling, we showed that even unprompted LLM outputs exhibit systematic tonal tendencies. Classical linear models trained on TF-IDF representations proved both effective and interpretable, while ensemble and neural variants offered incremental gains, particularly in detecting nuanced or contrastive tones. Our findings indicate that tonal bias is not only quantifiable but also threshold-dependent: inclusive labeling captures subtle variations, whereas conservative labeling isolates clearer polarity boundaries. This trade-off provides a practical diagnostic tool for assessing bias direction and severity across assistant responses.

In the future, we plan to replace weak supervision with an expert-annotated bias rubric and a calibrated gold-standard dataset to enable finer-grained, context-aware detection. We will incorporate contextual encoders and cross-validation to capture subtle tones such as neutrality and hedging, and extend the analysis to multilingual and counterfactual dialogue data. To ensure ethical and practical validity, we will evaluate the framework on real personal-assistant interactions and introduce adversarial and transfer tests. Finally, we aim to develop interpretable auditing tools and a diagnose → intervene → remeasure dashboard for transparent, continuous bias monitoring in conversational AI.

References

- [1] Chenquan Gan, Jiahao Zheng, Qingyi Zhu, Yang Cao, and Ye Zhu. A survey of dialogic emotion analysis: Developments, approaches and perspectives. *Pattern Recognition*, page 110794, 2024.
- [2] Navonil Majumder, Soujanya Poria, Devamanyu Hazarika, Rada Mihalcea, Alexander Gelbukh, and Erik Cambria. Dialoguernn: An attentive rnn for emotion detection in conversations. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):6818–6825, Jul. 2019.
- [3] Jiang Li, Xiaoping Wang, Yingjian Liu, and Zhigang Zeng. CFN-ESA: A Cross-Modal Fusion Network With Emotion-Shift Awareness for Dialogue Emotion Recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 15(04):1919–1933, October 2024.
- [4] Jintao Wen, Dazhi Jiang, Geng Tu, Cheng Liu, and Erik Cambria. Dynamic interactive multiview memory network for emotion recognition in conversation. *Information Fusion*, 91:123–133, 2023.
- [5] Wei Li, Wei Shao, Shaoxiong Ji, and Erik Cambria. Bieru: Bidirectional emotional recurrent unit for conversational sentiment analysis. *Neurocomputing*, 467:73–82, 2022.
- [6] Deepanway Ghosal, Navonil Majumder, Soujanya Poria, Niyati Chhaya, and Alexander Gelbukh. DialogueGCN: A graph convolutional neural network for emotion recognition in conversation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 154–164, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [7] Taichi Ishiwatari, Yuki Yasuda, Taro Miyazaki, and Jun Goto. Relation-aware graph attention networks with relational position encodings for emotion recognition in conversations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7360–7370, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [8] Geng Tu, Jintao Wen, Cheng Liu, Dazhi Jiang, and Erik Cambria. Context- and sentiment-aware networks for emotion recognition in conversation. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 3(5):699–708, 2022.
- [9] Zhenyu Yang, Xiaoyang Li, Yuhu Cheng, Tong Zhang, and Xuesong Wang. Emotion recognition in conversation based on a dynamic complementary graph convolutional network. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 15(3):1567–1579, 2024.
- [10] Xudong Shen, Xianying Huang, Shihao Zou, and Xinyi Gan. Multimodal knowledge-enhanced interactive network with mixed contrastive learning for emotion recognition in conversation. *Neurocomputing*, 582:127550, 2024.
- [11] Hui Ma, Jian Wang, Hongfei Lin, Bo Zhang, Yijia Zhang, and Bo Xu. A transformer-based model with self-distillation for multimodal emotion recognition in conversations. *Trans. Multi.*, 26:776–788, January 2024.
- [12] Zaijing Li, Fengxiao Tang, Ming Zhao, and Yusen Zhu. EmoCaps: Emotion capsule based model for conversational emotion recognition. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 1610–1618, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [13] Lixing Zhu, Gabriele Pergola, Lin Gui, Deyu Zhou, and Yulan He. Topic-driven and knowledge-aware transformer for dialogue emotion detection. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1571–1582, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [14] Sindhu DV, Prithiviraj N, Prakhar Jain, and Sarvagya Kumar. Virtual companion: A human friendly chatbot. In *2024 8th International Conference on Computational System and Information Technology for Sustainable Solutions (CSITSS)*, pages 1–6, 2024.
- [15] S. Abinaya, K. S. Ashwin, and A. Sherly Alphonse. Enhanced emotion-aware conversational agent: Analyzing user behavioral status for tailored responses in chatbot interactions. *IEEE Access*, 13:19770–19787, 2025.
- [16] Nikola Kovacevic, Christian Holz, Markus Gross, and Rafael Wampfler. On multimodal emotion recognition for human-chatbot interaction in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Multimodal Interaction, ICMI '24*, page 12–21, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] Xi Zheng, Zhiyong Li, Xinning Gui, and Yuhan Luo. Customizing emotional support: How do individuals construct and interact with llm-powered chatbots. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '25*, New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [18] Sabid Bin Habib Pias, Ran Huang, Donald S. Williamson, Minjeong Kim, and Apu Kapadia. The impact of perceived tone, age, and gender on voice assistant persuasiveness in the context of product recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Conversational User Interfaces, CUI '24*, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [19] Franck Bardol. Chatgpt reads your tone and responds accordingly – until it does not: Emotional framing induces bias in llm outputs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.21083*, 2025.
- [20] Om Dobariya and Akhil Kumar. Mind your tone: Investigating how prompt politeness affects llm accuracy (short paper). In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.04950*, 2025.
- [21] Walter Laurito, Benjamin Davis, Peli Grietzer, Tomáš Gavenciak, Ada Böhm, and Jan Kulveit. Ai-ai bias: Large language models favor communications generated by large language models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(31):e2415697122, 2025.
- [22] Rasita Vinay, Giovanni Spitale, Nikola Biller-Andorno, and Federico Germani. Emotional prompting amplifies disinformation generation in ai large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.00462*, 2025.
- [23] Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K. Ahmed. Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey. 2024.
- [24] Kian Long Tan, Chin Poo Lee, and Kian Ming Lim. A survey of sentiment analysis: Approaches, datasets, and future research. *Applied Sciences*, 13(7), 2023.
- [25] Viktor Angelo Rampus Dimalanta and Arnel Fajardo. Optimizing multinomial naïve bayes in sentiment analysis through hybrid ensemble techniques. In *Proceedings of the 2024 the 12th International Conference on Information Technology (ICIT), ICIT '24*, page 131–136, New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [26] Kamal Taha, Paul D. Yoo, Chan Yeun, Dirar Homouz, and Aya Taha. A comprehensive survey of text classification techniques and their research applications: Observational and experimental insights. *Computer Science Review*, 54:100664, 2024.
- [27] Tsendsuren Munkhdalai and Hong Yu. Neural semantic encoders. In Mirella Lapata, Phil Blunsom, and Alexander Koller, editors, *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 397–407, Valencia, Spain, April 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [28] Zufan Zhang, Lu Wang, Yang Zou, and Chenquan Gan. The optimally designed dynamic memory networks for targeted sentiment classification. *Neurocomputing*, 309:36–45, 2018.