

# Mitigating the Threshold Priming Effect in Large Language Model–Based Relevance Judgments via Personality Infusing

NUO CHEN\*, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

HANPEI FANG\*, Waseda University, Japan

JIQUN LIU, The University of Oklahoma, USA

WILSON WEI, EureXa Labs, Singapore

TETSUYA SAKAI, Waseda University, Japan

XIAO-MING WU, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

Recent research has explored LLMs as scalable tools for relevance labeling, but studies indicate they are susceptible to priming effects, where prior relevance judgments influence later ones. Although psychological theories link personality traits to such biases, it is unclear whether simulated personalities in LLMs exhibit similar effects. We investigate how Big Five personality profiles in LLMs influence priming in relevance labeling, using multiple LLMs on TREC 2021 and 2022 Deep Learning Track datasets. Our results show that certain profiles, such as High Openness and Low Neuroticism, consistently reduce priming susceptibility. Additionally, the most effective personality in mitigating priming may vary across models and task types. Based on these findings, we propose personality prompting as a method to mitigate threshold priming, connecting psychological evidence with LLM-based evaluation practices.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Relevance assessment**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: LLM as Judge, cognitive biases

## ACM Reference Format:

Nuo Chen\*, Hanpei Fang\*, Jiqun Liu, Wilson Wei, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2025. Mitigating the Threshold Priming Effect in Large Language Model–Based Relevance Judgments via Personality Infusing. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are increasingly employed to automate evaluation in information retrieval (IR) systems, particularly for generating relevance labels. Yet, trained on human data, LLMs may inherit and amplify human biases, potentially yielding skewed models and suboptimal algorithms. Biased outputs can further contaminate future training corpora, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of bias [42]. While most work has focused on social biases[64], cognitive biases remain comparatively underexplored[15, 16, 24, 37, 42, 49, 65].

---

\* The first two authors contributed equally, the order is arranged in alphabetical order by surname.

Authors' Contact Information: Nuo Chen\*, [plevumtan@outlook.com](mailto:plevumtan@outlook.com), The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, HK, China; Hanpei Fang\*, [hanpeifang@ruri.waseda.jp](mailto:hanpeifang@ruri.waseda.jp), Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan; Jiqun Liu, [jiqunliu@ou.edu](mailto:jiqunliu@ou.edu), The University of Oklahoma, OK, USA; Wilson Wei, [w@eurexa.ai](mailto:w@eurexa.ai), EureXa Labs, Singapore; Tetsuya Sakai, [tetsuyasakai@acm.org](mailto:tetsuyasakai@acm.org), Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan; Xiao-Ming Wu, [xiao-ming.wu@polyu.edu.hk](mailto:xiao-ming.wu@polyu.edu.hk), The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, HK, China.

---

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](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

*Cognitive biases* are systematic deviations in reasoning under uncertainty [29], often leading to irrational judgments and suboptimal decisions [57, 59]. In IR, numerous studies have investigated biases such as anchoring and priming and their impact on search behavior, satisfaction, and relevance judgments [e.g. 2, 5, 8–10, 17, 28, 32, 33, 50, 51, 63]. However, few studies have examined cognitive biases in LLM outputs [7, 20].

In this study, we investigate how to mitigate the cognitive bias introduced by *threshold priming* when LLMs perform batched relevance assessments. The priming effect is a psychological phenomenon in which exposure to certain *stimuli* (such as words, images, or concepts) unconsciously influences subsequent behavior, judgments, and decisions [22, 56, 61]. Scholer et al. [50] demonstrated that when assessors evaluate document relevance continuously, the quality of previously assessed documents can act as a threshold, triggering the priming effect: if earlier documents are of relatively low quality, assessors tend to assign higher relevance scores to subsequent documents, and *vice versa*. Chen et al. [7] observed that LLMs also exhibit similar biases when performing batched relevance assessments, but did not propose mitigation strategies.

Psychological literature indicates that certain specific personality traits (e.g., high openness) can be generally less affected by cognitive biases including the priming effect [23, 39, 54], while recent studies in NLP have shown that LLMs can be guided through specific instructions to generate responses consistent with the corresponding personality traits [e.g., 26, 27]. To bridge the above research gap, we explore the use of personality simulation to mitigate threshold priming in LLM relevance assessment.

We seek to address two **research questions (RQs)**: (1) **RQ1**: What is the overall performance of different simulated personalities on threshold priming mitigation across the evaluated models? (2) **RQ2**: How do different simulated personalities perform across models when evaluated on different task types?

We conduct experiments with multiple LLMs on TREC 2021 and 2022 Deep Learning Track datasets (hereafter referred to as TRDL21 and TRDL22) [12, 13]. Our results indicate that certain profiles (e.g., high openness, low neuroticism) stably reduce priming susceptibility in relevance labeling. In addition, the personality that achieves the most consistent mitigation effect may vary between models. We further find that when performing relevance labeling under different task types [30], the personality that most consistently mitigates the priming effect may also vary. High Openness performs better on exploration and exploitation queries, whereas Low Neuroticism is more suitable for known item tasks.

Our main contribution is: to the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first in IR field to address on the feasibility of using personality simulation to mitigate cognitive biases in LLMs, with a particular focus on alleviating the threshold priming effect. In summary, this work not only provides a practical approach to improving the reliability of LLMs as evaluators but also opens a new research direction for applying psychological theories to bias mitigation in artificial intelligence.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Personality and Cognitive Biases

**Personality** encompasses the emotional dispositions, attitudes, and behaviors that shape individual decision-making [18]. Understanding these traits offers insights into judgment processes and informs strategies in decision-making [25, 45]. The five-factor model (FFM), also known as *the Big Five traits* model, provides a widely adopted taxonomy for describing personality traits [11, 38]. FFM conceptualizes personality along five dimensions: (1) *Openness* to Experience, representing curiosity and receptivity to novel ideas and experiences; (2) *Conscientiousness*, denoting responsibility and

attention to detail; (3) *Extraversion*, reflecting sociability and engagement with others; (4) *Agreeableness*, capturing trust, empathy, and cooperativeness; (5) *Neuroticism* (with low scores indicating emotional stability), capturing tendencies toward negative affect and emotional reactivity. **Cognitive biases**, which arise from limits in human cognitive capacity, especially when information cannot be fully gathered or processed [29], can cause an individual’s decisions in uncertain situations to systematically deviate from the expectations of rational decision-making models [57–59].

**2.1.1 Links between The Big Five Personality Traits and Cognitive Biases.** Empirical work in psychology showed links between personality traits and cognitive biases [23, 39, 40, 48, 54]. For example, neuroticism is associated with stronger confirmation bias and loss aversion; Openness generally reduces cognitive biases, including confirmation bias, the anchoring effect and the priming effect, through greater cognitive flexibility [23, 39, 54].

**2.1.2 Cognitive Biases in LLM responses.** Although LLMs lack human physiological structures, they may still acquire cognitive biases through exposure to data and human feedback during training and fine-tuning. [24]. There has been work studying various types of cognitive biases in LLM generated responses [15, 16, 24, 49]. Some studies have also explored how to mitigate cognitive biases in LLM-generated responses [16, 21]. However, these studies are limited to specific scenarios, such as university admission decisions [15] or medical question answering [49], and how to mitigate biases such as threshold priming that arise when LLMs perform relevance judgments is awaiting exploration.

**2.1.3 LLMs Simulating Personality.** There is a complementary line of research that leverages LLMs to simulate human traits in recent work. Several studies demonstrate that personality can be actively induced through carefully crafted prompts, persona conditioning, or chain-of-thought scaffolding, with models generating trait-congruent responses and narratives to standardized psychological inventories across repeated trials [26, 27, 41, 53]. Recent work further embeds such conditioned personas within agentic and robotic frameworks that incorporate memory, affect, and goals, allowing trait expression to persist across multi-turn interactions and dynamic contexts [36, 43].

## 2.2 Relevance Assessment

Relevance assessment is essential in IR, both for building dataset to train rankers [35] and for building test collections to evaluate rankers [46, 47, 62].

**2.2.1 Cognitive Biases in Relevance Assessment.** In the IR community, some past research argued that human assessors can be influenced by a variety of cognitive biases when performing relevance assessments [31], and these biases may impact the consistency of the collected labels and affect evaluation reliability [17, 50, 51].

**2.2.2 LLMs as Relevance Assessors.** Collecting relevance labels from human assessors is costly and time-consuming [3]. Consequently, large language models (LLMs) have recently been explored as automatic and scalable relevance assessors, demonstrating a consistent improvement in the alignment between human assessments and model predictions [e.g., 1, 19, 44, 55, 60]. However, some studies argued that LLM assessors cannot fully replace human assessors [6, 52], and that there are biases in the assessments made by LLM assessors [4]. Recent studies have revealed that LLMs, when judging relevance, can exhibit similar biases [7, 20].

Our focus is not on the alignment between LLM relevance assessment and human assessments, but rather on mitigating the threshold priming bias in LLM assessment caused by context.




Fig. 1. An example of the methodology adopted in our experiment.

### 3 Proposed Approach

**Step 1: Personality Simulation/Infusing.** Inspired by Jiang et al. [26], we adopt an iterative approach, using the LLM to generate personality simulation instructions. For the Big Five personality traits, namely Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism, we divide each dimension into “high” and “low,” resulting in a total of ten personality types: High Agreeableness (HA), Low Agreeableness (LA), High Conscientiousness (HC), Low Conscientiousness (LC), High Extraversion (HE), Low Extraversion (LE), High Neuroticism (HN), Low Neuroticism (LN), High Openness (HO), and Low Openness (LO). For each personality type, we submit the following instruction to an LLM.

Please provide keywords related to *{personality\_type}*

After obtaining the keywords *{personality\_keywords}* corresponding to the personality type, we use the following instruction to prompt the LLM to generate persona simulation instructions.

*{personality\_keywords}*. Based on the keywords above, how would a person with *{personality\_type}* behave when making judgments and decisions? Generate a prompt that instructs an LLM to imitate a person with *{personality\_type}*.

The upper panel of Figure 1 illustrates the method we used to construct the personality simulation instructions. Using the above method, we obtained ten distinct personality simulation instructions. Including the default instruction (the empty string), we therefore obtained a total of eleven simulated personalities. For each personality, we perform the following batch assessment procedure.

**Step 2: Batch Assessment Procedure** To compare how different threshold contexts affect LLMs' relevance judgments on the same set of documents, we first sample a batch of documents (the epilogue) within a trial. We then sample a batch of highly relevant documents and a batch of low-relevance documents (the prologues), concatenate each with the epilogue, and perform batch relevance assessment on each combined set.

Inspired by Chen et al. [7], our procedure for conducting batch relevance assessment is as follows. For each trial, we first randomly select  $n$  documents with a relevance score of  $r_{\text{epilogue}}$ , to form the epilogue  $E = \{d_1^e, d_2^e, \dots, d_n^e\}$ :

Each  $d_i^e$  is a document with a relevance score of  $r_{\text{epilogue}}$ .

Next, we randomly select  $m$  documents with a groundtruth relevance of  $r_{\text{low}}$  and another  $m$  documents with a groundtruth relevance score of  $r_{\text{high}}$  to form the low threshold (LT) prologue  $L$  and the high threshold (HT) prologue  $H$ , respectively, where  $r_{\text{low}} < r_{\text{epilogue}} < r_{\text{high}}$ :

$$L = \{d_1^l, d_2^l, \dots, d_m^l\}, H = \{d_1^h, d_2^h, \dots, d_m^h\}.$$

Each  $d_i^l$  and  $d_i^h$  is a document with a ground truth relevance score of  $r_{\text{low}}$  and  $r_{\text{high}}$  respectively.

We then concatenate  $L$  with  $E$  and  $H$  with  $E$  to obtain the low threshold batch  $B_l$  and the high threshold batch  $B_h$ , respectively:

$$B_l = \text{concat}(L, E), B_h = \text{concat}(H, E).$$

For  $B_l$  and  $B_h$ , have an LLM assess the relevance of each document in batch, and output the results in JSON format. We used the instruction of Chen et al. [7] to prompt LLMs to conduct batch relevance assessment.

Figure 1 illustrates our approach. In this example, first, we prompt a LLM to generate keywords for the High Openness trait, then use these keywords to produce personality simulation instructions which are combined with the relevance assessment prompt to simulate assessors with different personalities performing the task. In the second step, the Epilogue contains the same set of documents for both high and low threshold batches. Following prior work [7, 50], we compute the mean relevance scores under high (HT) and low (LT) thresholds and use their absolute difference  $\Delta$  to quantify the priming effect. Smaller differences relative to the default indicate more effective mitigation.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Datasets and Evaluated LLMs

Our experiments are conducted on the passage retrieval test collections from the passage retrieval task of TRDL21 [12] and TRDL22 [13]. Following Chen et al. [7], we use only queries with relevance judgments, and exclude topics with fewer than 12 passages at any level of  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$  to ensure adequate coverage across relevance levels. This results in a final selection of 15 TRDL21 topics and 34 TRDL22 topics, and  $15+34 = 49$  topics in total. For each topic, following the definitions of Liu and Yu [34], we used GPT o4 mini to categorize it as one of Known Item, Exploitation, or Exploration, and the assignments were manually modified. 17 topics were classified as Known Item, 16 topics were classified as Exploitation, and 16 topics were classified as Exploration.

We tested three LLMs, including two open-source models, LLaMA3-instruct-8B and LLaMA3-instruct-70B [14], and a proprietary model, GPT-3.5-turbo-1106. For comparability, identical decoding settings are applied to all LLMs: we set `top_p` to 1.0; and we set `temperature`, `frequency_penalty` and `presence_penalty` to 0.

## 4.2 Experimental Setup

In our experiment, we use GPT-o4-mini to generate personality simulation instructions. For relevance assessment, we conduct 10 trials on each topic, and we set  $r_{\text{low}} = 0$  and  $r_{\text{high}} = 3$ . To explore the extent to which LLMs are affected by the threshold priming effect when assessing documents of different relevance levels, we examined cases with  $r_{\text{epilogue}} = 2$  and  $r_{\text{epilogue}} = 1$ . Additionally, to investigate how different batch lengths influence the magnitude of threshold priming in LLM assessments, we varied the batch length with different combinations of prologue and epilogue lengths, such as prologue length (PL) = 4 and epilogue length (EL) = 4, PL = 4 and EL = 8, PL = 8 and EL = 4, and PL = 8 and EL = 8. In summary, for each simulated personality (including the default), we conducted experiments on 39 topics, testing 4 batch lengths  $\times$  2 relevance levels = 8 distinct experimental configurations. For each configuration, we performed 10 independent trials and calculated the mean value of  $\Delta$ . If the mean  $\Delta$  for a given personality is lower than that of the default, we consider that personality to mitigate threshold priming for that configuration.

## 5 Experimental Results

Table 1 and 2 report, for each model and each personality, the number of cases (out of eight experimental configurations) where it outperforms the default. Bold indicates the best-performing personality for each model, and underline indicates the second-best. The light green background highlights the personality with the highest total number of improvements over the default.

Table 1. Number of experimental configurations where each simulated personality outperforms the default personality across three models.

Pers.	Number of Configurations Better than Default		
	gpt-3.5-turbo	llama-3-70b	llama-3-8b
HA	0/8	<b>8/8</b>	<b>8/8</b>
LA	0/8	2/8	5/8
HC	<u>5/8</u>	0/8	5/8
LC	3/8	<b>8/8</b>	<u>7/8</u>
HE	3/8	5/8	4/8
LE	2/8	2/8	4/8
HN	2/8	5/8	<b>8/8</b>
LN	<b>6/8</b>	<u>6/8</u>	6/8
HO	2/8	<b>8/8</b>	<u>7/8</u>
LO	4/8	5/8	6/8

### 5.1 RQ1: Overall performance of different personalities across models

Table 1 summarizes the number of configurations in which each simulated personality outperforms the default setting across three models. Each personality is evaluated on eight configurations, with higher counts indicating more consistent improvements.

As shown in Table 1, the mitigation effect of personality simulation varies across LLMs. For gpt-3.5-turbo, LN and HC are most effective, outperforming the default in 6/8 and 5/8 configurations, respectively. LN appears to reduce susceptibility to prior low-quality documents, while HC helps maintain adherence to relevance criteria, either mitigating threshold priming.

Table 2. Number of experimental configurations where each simulated personality outperforms the default personality across three models, grouped by task types.

P.	Number of Configurations Better than Default								
	Known Item			Exploration			Exploitation		
	G.	L.70b	L.8b	G.	L.70b	L.8b	G.	L.70b	L.8b
HA	0/8	<b>8/8</b>	<b>8/8</b>	1/8	<u>5/8</u>	5/8	3/8	<u>6/8</u>	<u>5/8</u>
LA	0/8	4/8	<u>7/8</u>	0/8	3/8	6/8	0/8	0/8	4/8
HC	2/8	3/8	6/8	5/8	2/8	5/8	<u>6/8</u>	0/8	3/8
LC	2/8	<b>8/8</b>	<u>7/8</u>	4/8	<u>5/8</u>	<u>7/8</u>	<u>4/8</u>	3/8	4/8
HE	3/8	<u>7/8</u>	5/8	4/8	4/8	<u>4/8</u>	3/8	2/8	1/8
LE	2/8	<u>5/8</u>	5/8	1/8	4/8	4/8	2/8	0/8	2/8
HN	2/8	6/8	<b>8/8</b>	<b>7/8</b>	<u>5/8</u>	<b>8/8</b>	3/8	3/8	<b>6/8</b>
LN	<b>6/8</b>	<u>7/8</u>	<u>7/8</u>	4/8	4/8	4/8	<b>7/8</b>	3/8	2/8
HO	0/8	<b>8/8</b>	<u>7/8</u>	<u>6/8</u>	<b>7/8</b>	<u>7/8</u>	2/8	<b>8/8</b>	<b>6/8</b>
LO	<u>5/8</u>	6/8	6/8	4/8	4/8	<u>7/8</u>	5/8	2/8	4/8

The Llama models show different optimal profiles. For llama-3-70b, HA, LC, and HO outperform the default in all eight configurations, indicating that cooperative, flexible, and cognitively adaptive traits are most effective. For llama-3-8b, HA and HN also achieve 8/8 improvements, underscoring that optimal profiles are model-specific.

Aggregated across models, LC and LN provide the most frequent improvements, with LC dominating the Llama models and LN leading for gpt-3.5-turbo. These results show that no single personality universally mitigates bias; profiles must be aligned with the target model. LC, LN, and HO consistently promote more stable and flexible decision-making, reducing over-adjustment to low-quality context and producing more consistent relevance judgments. The consistency across Llama models further suggests that these effects are independent of model size.

## 5.2 RQ2: Performance of Different Personalities Across Models on Different Task Types

Table 2 breaks down performance by task type—Known Item, Exploration, and Exploitation—showing that optimal personalities are both model- and task-dependent. G., L.70b, and L.8b denote gpt-3.5-turbo, llama-3-70B, and llama-3-8B, respectively.

**5.2.1 Known Item.** For gpt-3.5-turbo, LN (6/8) and LO (5/8) perform best, suggesting that emotional stability and preference for established information yield the most reliable results for factual retrieval. In contrast, llama-3-70b and llama-3-8b benefit most from HA and HO, indicating that a cooperative and open-minded stance supports performance even in precise tasks.

**5.2.2 Exploration.** Results shift notably, with HN and HO consistently leading across models. HN improves gpt-3.5-turbo in 7/8 cases and llama-3-8b in all 8, while HO excels especially on llama-3-70b (7/8). This suggests that HN’s cautious, detail-oriented nature and HO’s cognitive flexibility promote thorough exploration and reduce priming effects.

**5.2.3 Exploitation.** For refining searches, gpt-3.5-turbo again benefits from LN (7/8) and HC (6/8), reinforcing that a stable, methodical persona best mitigates bias. llama-3-70b and llama-3-8b continue to favor HO and HN, respectively, showing consistent patterns across exploratory and exploitative settings.

Overall, Table 2 highlights that no single personality is optimal. Effective bias mitigation requires aligning personality conditioning with both model and task: LN and HC for gpt-3.5-turbo on known-item and exploitation tasks, and HO/HN for Llama models and exploratory contexts. This points to a promising adaptive strategy where model personas are dynamically tuned to maximize reliable relevance assessments.

## 6 Discussion and Conclusion

This work presents the first systematic study of mitigating cognitive biases in LLM-based relevance assessment through personality conditioning. Using multiple LLMs across 49 TREC DL21 and DL22 topics, we show that conditioning on specific Big Five profiles significantly reduces susceptibility to threshold priming. Low Conscientiousness, Low Neuroticism, and High Openness yield the most consistent mitigation effects, though the optimal trait varies by model and task: High Openness is particularly effective in exploration and exploitation, whereas Low Neuroticism benefits known-item tasks. Nevertheless, a key limitation is that we do not address the prediction accuracy of LLM-based relevance judgments. Future work will explore combining personality conditioning with techniques such as continual pre-training to jointly improve accuracy and debiasing.

## 7 Ethical Considerations

This study does not involve human subjects or personally identifiable data. All experiments are conducted on publicly available datasets. We encourage future work to investigate safeguards and transparency mechanisms to ensure that personality conditioning is used responsibly and to minimize the risk of unintended harms.

## References

- [1] Negar Arabzadeh and Charles L. A. Clarke. 2025. Benchmarking LLM-based Relevance Judgment Methods. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '25)*. 3194–3204.
- [2] Leif Azzopardi. 2021. Cognitive Biases in Search: A Review and Reflection of Cognitive Biases in Information Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval (CHIIR '21)*. 27–37.
- [3] Peter Bailey, Nick Craswell, Ian Soboroff, Paul Thomas, Arjen P. de Vries, and Emine Yilmaz. 2008. Relevance assessment: are judges exchangeable and does it matter. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '08)*. 667–674.
- [4] Krisztian Balog, Don Metzler, and Zhen Qin. 2025. Rankers, Judges, and Assistants: Towards Understanding the Interplay of LLMs in Information Retrieval Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '25)*. 3865–3875.
- [5] Tyler Brown and Jiqun Liu. 2022. A reference dependence approach to enhancing early prediction of session behavior and satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL '22)*. Article 26, 5 pages.
- [6] Clarke Charles and Dietz Laura. 2025. LLM-based Relevance Assessment Still Can't Replace Human Relevance Assessment. In *EVIA 2025*.
- [7] Nuo Chen, Jiqun Liu, Xiaoyu Dong, Qijiong Liu, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024. AI Can Be Cognitively Biased: An Exploratory Study on Threshold Priming in LLM-Based Batch Relevance Assessment. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region (SIGIR-AP 2024)*. 54–63.
- [8] Nuo Chen, Jiqun Liu, Hanpei Fang, Yuankai Luo, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2025. Decoy Effect in Search Interaction: Understanding User Behavior and Measuring System Vulnerability. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 43, 2 (Jan. 2025).
- [9] Nuo Chen, Jiqun Liu, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2023. A Reference-Dependent Model for Web Search Evaluation: Understanding and Measuring the Experience of Boundedly Rational Users. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (WWW '23)*. 3396–3405. doi:10.1145/3543507.3583551
- [10] Nuo Chen, Fan Zhang, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2022. Constructing Better Evaluation Metrics by Incorporating the Anchoring Effect into the User Model. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '22)*. 2709–2714. doi:10.1145/3477495.3531953
- [11] Paul T. Costa and Robert R. McCrae. 1999. A Five Factor Theory of Personality. In *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (2 ed.), Laurence A. Pervin and Oliver P. John (Eds.). Guilford Press, New York, 139–153.
- [12] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, and Jimmy Lin. 2022. Overview of the TREC 2021 deep learning track. In *Text REtrieval Conference (TREC)*. NIST, TREC.

- [13] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, Jimmy Lin, Ellen M. Voorhees, and Ian Soboroff. 2023. Overview of the TREC 2022 deep learning track. In *Text REtrieval Conference (TREC)*. NIST, TREC.
- [14] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. *CoRR* (2024).
- [15] Jessica Maria Echterhoff, Yao Liu, Abeer Alessa, Julian McAuley, and Zexue He. 2024. Cognitive Bias in Decision-Making with LLMs. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 12640–12653.
- [16] J. E. Eicher and R. F. Irgolić. 2024. Reducing Selection Bias in Large Language Models. arXiv:2402.01740 [cs.CL]
- [17] Carsten Eickhoff. 2018. Cognitive Biases in Crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (Marina Del Rey, CA, USA) (*WSDM '18*). 162–170.
- [18] Mourad Ellouze and Lamia Hadrich Belguith. 2024. Artificial Intelligence application for the analysis of personality traits and disorders in social media: A Survey. *ACM Trans. Asian Low-Resour. Lang. Inf. Process.* (June 2024). Just Accepted.
- [19] Guglielmo Faggioli, Laura Dietz, Charles L. A. Clarke, Gianluca Demartini, Matthias Hagen, Claudia Hauff, Noriko Kando, Evangelos Kanoulas, Martin Potthast, Benno Stein, and Henning Wachsmuth. 2023. Perspectives on Large Language Models for Relevance Judgment. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval (ICTIR '23)*. 39–50.
- [20] Hanpei Fang, Sijie Tao, Nuo Chen, Kai-Xin Chang, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2025. Do Large Language Models Favor Recent Content? A Study on Recency Bias in LLM-Based Reranking. arXiv:2509.11353 [cs.IR]
- [21] Jiqun He and Jiqun Liu. 2025. Investigating the Impact of LLM Personality on Cognitive Bias Manifestation in Automated Decision-Making Tasks. arXiv:2502.14219 [cs.AI]
- [22] Paul M Herr. 1986. Consequences of priming: Judgment and behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 51, 6 (1986), 1106.
- [23] Moritz Ingendahl and Tobias Vogel. 2023. (Why) Do Big Five Personality Traits Moderate Evaluative Conditioning? The Role of US Extremity and Pairing Memory. *Collabra: Psychology* 9, 1 (05 2023), 74812.
- [24] Itay Itzhak, Gabriel Stanovsky, Nir Rosenfeld, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2023. Instructed to Bias: Instruction-Tuned Language Models Exhibit Emergent Cognitive Bias. *CoRR* abs/2308.00225 (2023). arXiv:2308.00225 doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2308.00225
- [25] David S. Jalajas and Ray Pullaro. 2018. The Effect of Personality on Decision Making. *Journal of Organizational Psychology* 18, 5 (Dec. 2018).
- [26] Guangyuan Jiang, Manjie Xu, Song-Chun Zhu, Wenjuan Han, Chi Zhang, and Yixin Zhu. 2023. Evaluating and inducing personality in pre-trained language models. In *NIPS '23*. Article 466, 22 pages.
- [27] Hang Jiang, Xijie Zhang, Xubo Cao, Cynthia Breazeal, Deb Roy, and Jad Kabbara. 2024. PersonaLLM: Investigating the Ability of Large Language Models to Express Personality Traits. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*.
- [28] Diane Kelly, Chirag Shah, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, Earl W. Bailey, Rachael A. Clemens, Ann K. Irvine, Nicholas A. Johnson, Weimao Ke, Sanghee Oh, Anezka Poljakova, Marcos A. Rodriguez, Megan G. van Noord, and Yan Zhang. 2008. Effects of performance feedback on users' evaluations of an interactive IR system. In *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Information Interaction in Context* (London, United Kingdom) (*IliX '08*). 75–82.
- [29] Arie W. Kruglanski and Icek Ajzen. 1983. Bias and error in human judgment. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 13, 1 (1983), 1–44.
- [30] Jiqun Liu. 2021. Deconstructing search tasks in interactive information retrieval: A systematic review of task dimensions and predictors. *Information Processing & Management* 58, 3 (2021), 102522.
- [31] Jiqun Liu. 2023. A behavioral economics approach to interactive information retrieval. *The Information Retrieval Series* 48 (2023).
- [32] Jiqun Liu and Fangyuan Han. 2020. Investigating Reference Dependence Effects on User Search Interaction and Satisfaction: A Behavioral Economics Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '20)*. 1141–1150.
- [33] Jiqun Liu and Jiqun He. 2025. Boundedly Rational Searchers Interacting with Medical Misinformation: Characterizing Context-Dependent Decoy Effects on Credibility and Usefulness Evaluation in Sessions. In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM SIGIR Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval*. 154–167.
- [34] Jiqun Liu and Ran Yu. 2021. State-Aware Meta-Evaluation of Evaluation Metrics in Interactive Information Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM '21)*. 3258–3262.
- [35] Tie-Yan Liu. 2009. Learning to Rank for Information Retrieval. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.* 3, 3 (2009), 225–331.
- [36] Jia-Hsun Lo, Han-Pang Huang, and Jie-Shih Lo. 2025. LLM-based robot personality simulation and cognitive system. *Scientific Reports* 15, 1 (2025), 16993a.
- [37] Yougang Lyu, Shijie Ren, Yue Feng, Zihan Wang, Zhumin Chen, Zhaochun Ren, and Maarten de Rijke. 2025. Cognitive Debiasing Large Language Models for Decision-Making. arXiv:2504.04141 [cs.CL]
- [38] Robert R. McCrae and Oliver P. John. 1992. An Introduction to the Five Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality* 60, 2 (June 1992), 175–215.
- [39] Brian P. Meier, Michael D. Robinson, and Benjamin M. Wilkowski. 2006. Turning the other cheek. Agreeableness and the regulation of aggression-related primes. *Psychological Science* 17, 2 (2006), 136–142. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01676.x
- [40] Annika Melinder, Tim Brennan, Mikael Falkhaugen Husby, and Olav Vassend. 2020. Personality, confirmation bias, and forensic interviewing performance. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 34, 5 (2020), 961–971.

- [41] Maria Molchanova, Anna Mikhailova, Anna Korzanova, Lidia Ostyakova, and Alexandra Dolidze. 2025. Exploring the Potential of Large Language Models to Simulate Personality. *arXiv:2502.08265* [cs.CL]
- [42] Jesutofunmi A Omiye, Jenna C Lester, Simon Spichak, Veronica Rotemberg, and Roxana Daneshjou. 2023. Large language models propagate race-based medicine. *NPJ Digital Medicine* 6, 1 (2023), 195.
- [43] Joon Sung Park, Carolyn Q. Zou, Aaron Shaw, Benjamin Mako Hill, Carrie Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Robb Willer, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. 2024. Generative Agent Simulations of 1,000 People.
- [44] Catarina Pires, Sérgio Nunes, and Luís Filipe Teixeira. 2025. Expanding Relevance Judgments for Medical Case-based Retrieval Task with Multimodal LLMs. *arXiv:2506.17782* [cs.IR]
- [45] Aldo Rustichini, Colin G. DeYoung, Jon E. Anderson, and Stephen V. Burks. 2016. Toward the integration of personality theory and decision theory in explaining economic behavior: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 64 (2016), 122–137.
- [46] Tetsuya Sakai, Sijie Tao, Nuo Chen, Yujing Li, Maria Maistro, Zhumin Chu, and Nicola Ferro. 2023. On the Ordering of Pooled Web Pages, Gold Assessments, and Bronze Assessments. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 42, 1, Article 23 (Aug. 2023), 31 pages.
- [47] Mark Sanderson. 2010. Test Collection Based Evaluation of Information Retrieval Systems. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 4 (2010).
- [48] Sebastian Schindler, Jan Querengässer, Maximilian Bruchmann, Nele Johanna Bögemann, Robert Moeck, and Thomas Straube. 2021. Bayes Factors show evidence against systematic relationships between the anchoring effect and the Big Five personality traits. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021), 7021.
- [49] Samuel Schmidgall, Carl Harris, Ime Essien, Daniel Olshvang, Tawsifur Rahman, Ji Woong Kim, Rojin Ziaei, Jason Eshraghian, Peter Abadir, and Rama Chellappa. 2024. Addressing cognitive bias in medical language models. *CoRR abs/2402.08113* (2024). *arXiv:2402.08113* doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2402.08113
- [50] Falk Scholer, Diane Kelly, Wan-Ching Wu, Hanseul S. Lee, and William Webber. 2013. The Effect of Threshold Priming and Need for Cognition on Relevance Calibration and Assessment. In *Proceedings of the 36th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '13)*. 623–632.
- [51] Milad Shokouhi, Ryen White, and Emine Yilmaz. 2015. Anchoring and Adjustment in Relevance Estimation. In *Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Santiago, Chile) (SIGIR '15)*. 963–966.
- [52] Ian Soboroff. 2025. Don't Use LLMs to Make Relevance Judgments. *Information Retrieval Research Journal* 1, 1 (2025), 10.
- [53] Aleksandra Sorokovikova, Sharwin Rezaghali, Natalia Fedorova, and Ivan P. Yamshchikov. 2024. LLMs Simulate Big5 Personality Traits: Further Evidence. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Personalization of Generative AI Systems (PERSONALIZE 2024)*.
- [54] Keith E. Stanovich and Richard F. West. 2008. On the relative independence of thinking biases and cognitive ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94, 4 (2008), 672–695.
- [55] Paul Thomas, Seth Spielman, Nick Craswell, and Bhaskar Mitra. 2024. Large Language Models can Accurately Predict Searcher Preferences. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. 1930–1940.
- [56] Endel Tulving and Daniel L Schacter. 1990. Priming and human memory systems. *Science* 247, 4940 (1990), 301–306.
- [57] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* 185, 4157 (1974), 1124–1131.
- [58] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1991. Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference-Dependent Model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106 (1991), 1039–1061.
- [59] Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. 1992. Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 5 (1992), 297–323.
- [60] Shivani Upadhyay, Ronak Pradeep, Nandan Thakur, Nick Craswell, and Jimmy Lin. 2024. UMBRELA: Umbrella is the (Open-Source Reproduction of the) Bing RElevance Assessor. *arXiv:2406.06519* [cs.IR]
- [61] Mary Vanderwart. 1984. Priming by pictures in lexical decision. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 23, 1 (1984), 67–83.
- [62] Ellen M. Voorhees. 2002. The Philosophy of Information Retrieval Evaluation. In *Evaluation of Cross-Language Information Retrieval Systems*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 355–370.
- [63] Ben Wang and Jiqun Liu. 2024. Understanding users' dynamic perceptions of search gain and cost in sessions: An expectation confirmation model. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* (2024).
- [64] Xi Wang, Hossein A Rahmani, Jiqun Liu, and Emine Yilmaz. 2023. Improving conversational recommendation systems via bias analysis and language-model-enhanced data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16738* (2023).
- [65] Yachao Zhao, Bo Wang, Yan Wang, Dongming Zhao, Xiaojia Jin, Jijun Zhang, Ruifang He, and Yuexian Hou. 2024. A Comparative Study of Explicit and Implicit Gender Biases in Large Language Models via Self-evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC/COLING 2024, 20-25 May, 2024, Torino, Italy*. ELRA and ICCL, 186–198.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009