
LLM Assertiveness can be Mechanistically Decomposed into Emotional and Logical Components

Hikaru Tsujimura. *

Department of Psychology, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
htsujimu@gmail.com

Arush Tagade. †

Department of Computer Science, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA
atagade19@gmail.com

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) often display overconfidence, presenting information with unwarranted certainty in high-stakes contexts. We investigate the internal basis of this behavior via mechanistic interpretability. Using open-sourced Llama 3.2 models fine-tuned on human annotated assertiveness datasets, we extract residual activations across all layers, and compute similarity metrics to localize assertive representations. Our analysis identifies layers most sensitive to assertiveness contrasts and reveals that high-assertive representations decompose into two orthogonal sub-components of emotional and logical clusters—paralleling the dual-route Elaboration Likelihood Model in Psychology. Steering vectors derived from these sub-components show distinct causal effects: emotional vectors broadly influence prediction accuracy, while logical vectors exert more localized effects. These findings provide mechanistic evidence for the multi-component structure of LLM assertiveness and highlight avenues for mitigating overconfident behavior.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly deployed in high-stakes domains such as law [10], politics [2], education [16], and public health [15]. A major concern of LLM usage is that they often produce overconfident statements, overstating information regardless of its factual basis [5]. Such behavior can mislead users, amplify bias, and result in poor decisions with serious societal consequences.

Prior work [11, 21, 18] has quantified LLM overconfidence through linguistic assertiveness cues such as “highly certain,” or “I am confident that”. While prominent in human communication, it remains unclear how these cues are internally represented, and whether LLMs treat assertiveness as a single construct or as multiple, separable components.

Beyond sensitivity to linguistic cues, assertiveness itself plays mixed roles. In human studies, some associate it with certainty and confidence [20, 8], while others link it to persuasion [12]. Distinguishing these roles is critical: if models primarily respond to one, or encode them separately, this implies distinct internal mechanisms.

*Contribution: Lead on Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, and Writing – Original Draft.

†Contribution: Writing – Review & Editing (equal); critical internal review and feedback.




Figure 1: Overview of study design. Phase I: load the base LLM. Phase II: fine-tune on human rated assertiveness scores. Phase III: extract residual activations and cluster samples by similarity to identify assertiveness sub-components (A–B). Phase IV: derive and remove steering vectors for each sub-component and evaluate effects on assertiveness prediction (C).⁴

Mechanistic interpretability provides a way to test this (Figure 1). By analyzing neural activations, we can (A) identify layers and inputs that maximally represent assertiveness, (B) examine how different sub-components interact, and (C) use steering vectors to test their causal influence on model behavior.

Prior theoretical work [4] suggests that related features in neural networks can be encoded as correlated but orthogonal internal representations. For instance, two concepts, such as certainty and persuasion, may often co-occur in language but be stored in distinct, minimally overlapping directions in the model’s activation space. This separation allows the network to adjust one without disrupting the other. Yet, this phenomenon has not been systematically tested for socially meaningful traits like assertiveness.

To test these claims, we hypothesize that LLMs represent assertiveness through orthogonal sub-components, notably certainty and persuasion. To evaluate this, we adopt a two-step approach: (1) clustering text samples by activation similarity to uncover latent feature categories (unsupervised), and (2) manipulating their corresponding steering vectors to assess causal effects on model predictions. This approach provides a mechanistic view of how LLMs represent linguistic assertiveness and whether its underlying components can be independently controlled.

2 Methods

2.1 Datasets and model fine-tuning (Phase I-II)

This study used the publicly available assertiveness datasets ($n = 645$) from Ghafouri et al. [5], which were sourced from Anthropic’s Persuasion dataset [3], Globe and Mail (GM) Comments [9], Reddit Change My View (CMV) [19], Llama 3–8B-generated arguments on LIAR data [6] and Pei Assertiveness dataset [13]. These datasets contained standardized assertiveness scores rated by expert annotators, with strong inter-annotator agreement ($r > 0.7$) verified by secondary raters.

We fine-tuned a Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct model [6] with Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA [7]) to predict the assertiveness scores. Datasets were separated into training and validation sets in each fold, one entire dataset (e.g. GM) served as validation (≈ 130 items) and the remaining as training (≈ 515

⁴Icon credit: Colored bot icon created by Freepik — Flaticon (https://www.flaticon.com/free-icon/robot_3398567)




Figure 2: (a) Empirical identification of an optimal partition borderline between low- and high-assertive items; the green curve minimum indicates maximal separation. (b) Layer-wise analysis; the green curve minimum marks the layer with strongest low–high separation. (c) Example correlation similarity matrix across assertive items; brighter values indicate higher correlation. (d) Simplified clusters of (c): within low-assertive items (cyan), across high–low items (green), and within high-assertive items (orange). Each cluster computes the mean correlation of its items.

items) for five folds. Model performance was reported as mean squared error (MSE). After 30 epochs, the mean minimal MSE across the five folds reached 1.94, reducing from 61.11 at the first epoch.

2.2 Activation preprocessing and mechanistic interpretability (Phase III-IV)

We fed all samples through the fine-tuned model and extracted per-token activations across all 16 transformer layers, focusing on residual streams at the start of each layer. To reduce dataset-source bias, we removed source-related steering vectors using the Difference-of-Means method [17, 1].

Correlation similarity matrices were then computed across samples, ordered by standardized assertiveness scores (Fig. 2c) and highlighting three key regions: (i) within-low and (ii) within-high assertive clusters and (iii) across high–low pairs (Fig. 2d). By varying the partition borderline between (i) and (ii), we identified the point that minimized cross-cluster similarity, indicating maximal representational separation between low and high assertiveness (Fig. 2a). The layer where this separation peaked was taken as the most sensitive to assertiveness (Fig. 2b).

To probe internal structure, we projected activations of the high-assertive items into a t-SNE map. Spatial groupings were examined to reveal data-driven sub-components (e.g., certainty vs persuasion) for later conceptual interpretation. Steering vectors from each sub-component were selectively removed, and Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) changes in assertive prediction were measured to test whether these representations function independently or interact.

3 Results

Our method identified an optimal borderline separating low- ($n = 620$) and high-assertive items ($n = 25$) (Fig. 2a), with middle layers (5–6) exhibiting maximal representational separation (Fig. 2b).




Figure 3: (a) t-SNE visualization of assertiveness clusters, showing low-assertive items (blue indices) and high-assertive items (red indices). Green and purple circles highlight emotional and logical sub-components, respectively (manual labels based on local grouping). Circle fill color indicates standardized assertive score, with lighter shades for higher scores. (b) RMSE changes after removing emotional or logical sub-component vectors, shown separately for high-assertive-logical, high-assertive-emotional, low-assertive-emotional (e.g. index 232, 16, 19), and other low-assertive items (e.g. index 35, 432, 141). Error bars are standard error of the mean (SEM).

With this borderline and layer setting, t-SNE visualizations revealed two distinct clusters within the high-assertive items ($n = 25$) (Figure 3a). Based on ChatGPT summaries, one cluster was labeled “emotional (big green circle)” and the other “logical (big purple circle),” aligning with the Elaboration Likelihood Model, a long-standing dual persuasion model in Psychology [14]. The theory posits that the logical cluster corresponds to central-route persuasion (evidence, statistics, facts), while the emotional cluster corresponds to peripheral-route persuasion (affective or superficial cues). The logical sub-component partially overlapped with certainty expressions, but which had minor influence on model predictions in these datasets.

Adding extra 25 low-assertive items (blue indices) in the t-SNE map showed partial overlap with the emotional cluster but not the logical one (Figure 3a), suggesting partial independence of the logical sub-component. High-assertive sub-components were spatially cohesive and clearly separating from low-assertive items, reflecting a decision boundary in assertiveness representation space.

Removing the emotional vector broadly degraded performance statistically (i.e. changed beyond SEM error bars), particularly on all low-assertive items and emotionally-relevant high-assertive cluster. In contrast, removing the logical vector primarily affected predictions for logical high-assertive items, indicating a more localized effect (Figure 3b).

4 Conclusion and limitations

We present an empirical method for localizing and interpreting LLM activations linked to assertiveness along a continuous scale. Results show that high-assertive representations split into two orthogonal sub-components—emotional and logical persuasion—each exerting distinct effects when used as steering vectors. Yet, this study has several limitations. The model analyzed is relatively small (1B parameters), leaving scaling effects uncertain, and only one architecture is examined, so cross-model generality remains untested. The dataset size is modest ($n = 645$), which may obscure finer-grained cues. Moreover, cluster interpretation relies on manual inspection, suggesting that future work should develop more automated approaches. Despite these limitations, this study provides the first visualization of correlated feature decomposition along a continuous assertiveness scale. It offers new methodological insights for analyzing LLM internal representations and contributes to understanding the roots of overconfident behaviors in LLMs.

References

- [1] Andy Ardit, Oscar Obeso, Aaquib Syed, Daniel Paleka, Nina Panickssery, Wes Gurnee, and Neel Nanda. Refusal in language models is mediated by a single direction, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11717>.
- [2] Hui Bai, Jan G. Voelkel, Shane Muldowney, Johannes C. Eichstaedt, and Robb Willer. LLM-generated messages can persuade humans on policy issues. 16(1):6037, 2025. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-025-61345-5. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-025-61345-5>.
- [3] Esin Durmus, Liane Lovitt, Alex Tamkin, Stuart Ritchie, Jack Clark, and Deep Ganguli. Measuring the persuasiveness of language models, 2024. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/measuring-model-persuasiveness>.
- [4] Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Catherine Olsson, Nicholas Schiefer, Tom Henighan, Shauna Kravec, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Robert Lasenby, Dawn Drain, Carol Chen, Roger Grosse, Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, Dario Amodei, Martin Wattenberg, and Christopher Olah. Toy models of superposition. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2022. https://transformer-circuits.pub/2022/toy_model/index.html.
- [5] Bijean Ghafouri, Shahrad Mohammadzadeh, James Zhou, Pratheeksha Nair, Jacob-Junqi Tian, Hikaru Tsujimura, Mayank Goel, Sukanya Krishna, Reihaneh Rabbany, Jean-François Godbout, and Kellin Pelrine. EPISTEMIC INTEGRITY IN LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS. 2024.
- [6] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, Danny Wyatt, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Govind Thattai, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jack Zhang, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Karthik Prasad, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Kushal Lakhotia, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Ning Zhang, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohan Maheswari, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shao-liang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collet, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet,

Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vitor Albiero, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xide Xia, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papakipos, Aaditya Singh, Aayushi Srivastava, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Amos Teo, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Dong, Annie Franco, Anuj Goyal, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Ce Liu, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Cynthia Gao, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymmer, Daniel Li, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, DingKang Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Eric-Tuan Le, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Filippos Kokkinos, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hakan Inan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Hongyuan Zhan, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Ilias Leontiadis, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Janice Lam, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kiran Jagadeesh, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabsa, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Miao Liu, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikhil Mehta, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Rangaprabhu Parthasarathy, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sachin Mehta, Sachin Siby, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Mahajan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shishir Patil, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Summer Deng, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Koehler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaojian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yaniv Kleinman, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yu Zhao, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yunlu Li, Yuze He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, Zhiwei Zhao, and Zhiyu Ma. The llama 3 herd of models, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.

- [7] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>.
- [8] Tzur M. Karelitz and David V. Budescu. You say "probable" and i say "likely": Improving interpersonal communication with verbal probability phrases. 10(1):25–41, 2004. ISSN 1939-2192, 1076-898X. doi: 10.1037/1076-898X.10.1.25. URL <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1076-898X.10.1.25>.
- [9] Varada Kolhatkar, Hanhan Wu, Luca Cavasso, Emilie Francis, Kavan Shukla, and Maite Taboada. The SFU opinion and comments corpus: A corpus for the analysis of online news comments. 4(2):155–190, 2020. ISSN 2509-9507, 2509-9515. doi: 10.1007/s41701-019-00065-w. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s41701-019-00065-w>.
- [10] Jinqi Lai, Wensheng Gan, Jiayang Wu, Zhenlian Qi, and Philip S. Yu. Large language models in law: A survey. 5:181–196, 2024. ISSN 26666510. doi: 10.1016/j.aiopen.2024.09.002. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2666651024000172>.
- [11] Jixuan Leng, Chengsong Huang, Banghua Zhu, and Jiaxin Huang. Taming overconfidence in LLMs: Reward calibration in RLHF, 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.09724>.
- [12] Raul Paradedda, Maria José Ferreira, Raquel Oliveira, Carlos Martinho, and Ana Paiva. The role of assertiveness in a storytelling game with persuasive robotic non-player characters. In *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play*, pages 453–465. ACM, 2019. ISBN 978-1-4503-6688-5. doi: 10.1145/3311350.3347162. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3311350.3347162>.
- [13] Jiaxin Pei and David Jurgens. Measuring sentence-level and aspect-level (un)certainly in science communications, 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.14776>.
- [14] Richard E Petty, John T Cacioppo, and Rachel Goldman. Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. 1981.
- [15] Ashish Sharma, Kevin Rushton, Inna Lin, David Wadden, Khendra Lucas, Adam Miner, Theresa Nguyen, and Tim Althoff. Cognitive reframing of negative thoughts through human-language model interaction. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9977–10000. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.555. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.555>.
- [16] Torrey Trust, Jeromie Whalen, and Chrystalla Mouza. Editorial: ChatGPT: Challenges, opportunities, and implications for teacher education. 2023.
- [17] Alexander Matt Turner, Lisa Thiergart, Gavin Leech, David Udell, Juan J. Vazquez, Ulisse Mini, and Monte MacDiarmid. Steering language models with activation engineering, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.10248>.
- [18] Bingbing Wen, Chenjun Xu, Bin Han, Robert Wolfe, Lucy Lu Wang, and Bill Howe. Mitigating overconfidence in large language models: A behavioral lens on confidence estimation and calibration. 2024.
- [19] Matti Wiegmann, Khalid Al-Khatib, Vishal Khanna, and Benno Stein. Webis-persuasive-debaters-on-reddit-CMV-2022, 2022. URL <https://zenodo.org/record/7034173>.
- [20] Paul D. Windschitl and Gary L. Wells. Measuring psychological uncertainty: Verbal versus numeric methods. 2(4):343–364, 1996. ISSN 1939-2192, 1076-898X. doi: 10.1037/1076-898X.2.4.343. URL <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1076-898X.2.4.343>.
- [21] Ziang Zhou, Tianyuan Jin, Jieming Shi, and Qing Li. SteerConf: Steering LLMs for confidence elicitation, 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.02863>.