

# Understanding the Role of Temperature in Diverse Question Generation by GPT-4

Arav Agarwal  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
arava@andrew.cmu.edu

Karthik Mittal  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
kkmittal@andrew.cmu.edu

Aidan Doyle  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
adoyle@andrew.cmu.edu

Pragnya Sridhar  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
pragnyas@andrew.cmu.edu

Zipiao Wan  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
zwan@andrew.cmu.edu

Jacob Arthur Doughty  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
jadought@andrew.cmu.edu

Jaromir Savelka  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
jsavelka@andrew.cmu.edu

Majd Sakr  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA  
msakr@institution.edu

## ABSTRACT

We conduct a preliminary study of the effect of GPT’s temperature parameter on the diversity of GPT4-generated questions. We find that using higher temperature values leads to significantly higher diversity, with different temperatures exposing different types of similarity between generated sets of questions. We also demonstrate that diverse question generation is especially difficult for questions targeting lower levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.

### ACM Reference Format:

Arav Agarwal, Karthik Mittal, Aidan Doyle, Pragnya Sridhar, Zipiao Wan, Jacob Arthur Doughty, Jaromir Savelka, and Majd Sakr. 2024. Understanding the Role of Temperature in Diverse Question Generation by GPT-4. In *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 2 (SIGCSE 2024)*, March 20–23, 2024, Portland, OR, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626253.3635608>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs) are a common assessment tool in computing education. They allow for large-scale assessment, and can be graded automatically and, hence, efficiently.

However, developing effective MCQs remains an arduous task. Instructors need to devote significant time to craft question stems and answer choices in such a way that would allow for proper assessment of a student’s understanding of the topic.

There has been significant recent work into using large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 to generate educational materials, from student code explanations to auto-grader feedback [5, 6]. One of the key parameters influencing the outcomes of the natural language generation of GPT models is temperature. The parameter generally determines the variety in generated text, with larger values generating more diverse text in other settings. Despite its

key role, there have not been many studies dedicated to exploring its effects on educational content generation. In this paper, we provide early results from our investigation into the effects of different temperature settings in an MCQ generation pipeline. Existing literature suggests that content generated by GPT-4 can be homogeneous; temperature provides a way to improve the diversity of the generated content with minimal prompt engineering [2].

## 2 METHODOLOGY

We developed a system that generates MCQs, utilizing OpenAI’s GPT-4 [3]. Given a specific learning objective (LO), and high-level information about a course and a module, the system generates a single MCQ.

In order to evaluate the effects of different temperature settings on generated questions, we gathered a dataset of 52 LOs spanning across multiple levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy and common topics in introductory CS topics. Bloom’s Taxonomy provides a hierarchical categorization of educational goals, and provides useful context to MCQ generation systems [1]. For each LO, we generated 3 MCQs of a randomly-chosen question type (either Fill-In-The-Blank, Code Tracing, Recall, Scenario or Identify Correct Output) across several values of temperature (0.2, 1.0, 1.2). These values were chosen to contain both the default value for GPT-4 (1.0), and the largest and the smallest reasonable values suggested by our initial experiments. We found that larger temperature values than 1.2 lead to generally unusable questions, while smaller temperature values than 0.2 simply rephrased the same question most of the time. For each set of MCQs, we randomly sampled two instructors from a group of four and asked them to answer two questions: *Q1-distinct*: How many of the generated MCQs were distinct? and *Q2-complete*: Would it be possible to author an additional MCQ that is distinct from the generated ones but still aligned with the LO? *Q1-distinct* focused on assessing the diversity of the set of generated MCQs, while *Q2-complete* focused on assessing the completeness of the set. If an instructor is able to generate a distinct question, then

SIGCSE 2024, March 20–23, 2024, Portland, OR, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

This is the author’s version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive Version of Record was published in *Proceedings of the 55th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 2 (SIGCSE 2024)*, March 20–23, 2024, Portland, OR, USA, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626253.3635608>.

Temperature	1 Distinct Question	2 Distinct Questions	3 Distinct Questions	Temperature	N/A or I Don't Know	No	Yes
0.2	34	46	22	0.2	1	11	92
1	17	17	68	1	1	16	87
1.2	18	20	64	1.2	2	15	87

Table 1: Q1-distinct and Q2-complete vs. Temperature

Bloom's Taxonomy Level	Percentage of Question Sets with Any Duplicates
Create	32%
Analyze	54%
Apply	55%
Understand	53%
Remember	67%

Table 2: Percentage of Question Sets with Duplicates vs. Taxonomy Level

there is potentially room for improvement, whereas if the instructor is unable to generate a new question then it is likely the LO is totally covered by the existing questions.

In total, we collected 313 annotations. Our overall inter-rater agreement was 0.30472 (Fleiss's  $\kappa$ ), indicating we had fair agreement between instructors for both *Q1-distinct* and *Q2-complete* [4].

### 3 RESULTS

We present the results of the preliminary study in Table 1 and Table 2. The left half of Table 1 counts the instructor responses to *Q1-distinct* for each temperature setting, while the right half of Table 1 counts the instructor responses to *Q2-complete*. When temperature is set to 0.2, we tend to generate more sets of questions where either two of the questions were too similar or all three questions were too similar. When temperature is set at 1.0 and 1.2, we tend to generate more sets of questions where all three questions are distinct. Comparatively, the instructor responses to *Q2-complete* were the same at all temperature levels as, no matter the temperature setting, instructors generally answered that it was possible to create more distinct and aligned questions even with the generated question set.

We performed a chi-squared test and subsequent post-hoc analysis, and concluded that while the distributions of responses are significantly different comparing temperature 0.2 to the rest, there is not a significant difference between setting the temperature to 1.0 and 1.2. This suggests that, for the purpose of picking temperature values for quiz generation, one should generally strive to work with larger temperature values. Thus, in order to generate diverse questions using GPT-4, one should focus on temperature values between 1.0 and 1.2.

### 4 DISCUSSION

Besides the above quantitative evaluation, we also performed a qualitative evaluation to discover trends, focusing on MCQs targeting different cognitive levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

We found that there appeared to be a relationship between the distinctness of MCQs and the targeted LO. If we look only at the level of Bloom's Taxonomy and look at the percentage of MCQ sets where *Q1-distinct* identified multiple distinct questions (Table

2), we can see that, as we go to higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, instructors generally view the questions as having fewer duplicates. However, there is no clear relationship between completeness of generation (*Q2-complete*) and Bloom's Taxonomy. This suggests the issue with generation is not a problem with the LO itself, but with the generation process, and that GPT-4 might not be as capable in generating diverse MCQs at lower levels of Bloom's Taxonomy compared to higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

Thus, when looking at future studies in diverse question generation from LOs, one should focus on understanding LOs that are at lower levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, as they seem harder to generate automatically.

### 5 FUTURE WORK

Following this work, we would like to focus more heavily on various angles of the diverse question generation problem. Besides temperature, we would like to experiment with looking at the effect of other parameters like `frequency_penalty` for diverse question generation, alongside differing prompting and LLM chaining strategies.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Benjamin S Bloom, Max D Englehart, Edward J Furst, Walker H Hill, David R Krathwohl, et al. 1956. Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: the cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Co.
- [2] Paul Denny, Hassan Khosravi, Arto Hellas, Juho Leinonen, and Sami Sarsa. 2023. Can We Trust AI-Generated Educational Content? Comparative Analysis of Human and AI-Generated Learning Resources. arXiv:2306.10509 [cs.HC]
- [3] Jacob Doughty, Zipiao Wan, Anishka Bompelli, Jubahed Qayum, Taozhi Wang, Juran Zhang, Yujia Zheng, Aidan Doyle, Pragnya Sridhar, Arav Agarwal, Christopher Bogart, Eric Keylor, Can Kultur, Jaromir Savelka, and Majd Sakr. 2024. A Comparative Study of AI-Generated (GPT-4) and Human-crafted MCQs in Programming Education. In *Proceedings of the 26th Australasian Computing Education Conference* (Sydney, NSW, Australia) (ACE '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3636243.3636256>
- [4] J. Richard Landis and Gary G. Koch. 1977. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics* 33, 1 (1977), 159–174. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2529310>
- [5] Stephen MacNeil, Andrew Tran, Arto Hellas, Joanne Kim, Sami Sarsa, Paul Denny, Seth Bernstein, and Juho Leinonen. 2023. Experiences from Using Code Explanations Generated by Large Language Models in a Web Software Development E-Book. In *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1* (Toronto ON, Canada) (SIGCSE 2023). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 931–937. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3545945.3569785>
- [6] Pranjal Dilip Naringrekar, Ildar Akhmetov, and Eleni Stroulia. 2023. Generating CS1 Coding Questions Using OpenAI. In *Proceedings of the 25th Western Canadian Conference on Computing Education* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (WCCCE '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 11, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3593342.3593348>

This figure "acm-jdslogo.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2404.09366v1>