

Improving Alignment Between Human and Machine Codes: An Empirical Assessment of Prompt Engineering for Construct Identification in Psychology

Kylie L. Anglin¹, Stephanie Milan², Brittney Hernandez¹, and Claudia Ventura¹

¹Department of Educational Psychology, Neag School of Education,
University of Connecticut

²Department of Psychological Sciences, College of Liberal Arts and
Sciences, University of Connecticut

December 4, 2025

Abstract

Due to their architecture and vast pre-training data, large language models (LLMs) demonstrate strong text classification performance. However, LLM output—here, the category assigned to a text—depends heavily on the wording of the prompt. While literature on prompt engineering is expanding, few studies focus on classification tasks, and even fewer address domains like psychology, where constructs have precise, theory-driven definitions that may not be well represented in pre-training data. We present an empirical framework for optimizing LLM performance for identifying constructs in texts via prompt engineering. We experimentally evaluate five prompting strategies—codebook-guided empirical prompt selection, automatic prompt engineering, persona prompting, chain-of-thought reasoning, and explanatory prompting—with zero-shot and few-shot classification. We find that persona, chain-of-thought, and explanations do not fully address performance loss accompanying a badly worded prompt. Instead, the most influential features of a prompt are the construct definition, task framing, and, to a lesser extent, the examples provided. Across three constructs and two models, the classifications most aligned with expert judgments resulted from a few-shot prompt combining codebook-guided empirical prompt selection with automatic prompt engineering. Based on our findings, we recommend that researchers generate and evaluate as many prompt variants as feasible—whether human-crafted, automatically generated, or ideally both—and select prompts and examples based on empirical performance in a training dataset, validating the final approach in a hold-out set. This procedure offers a practical, systematic, and theory-drive method for optimizing LLM prompts in settings where alignment with expert judgment is critical.

Introduction

Psychology is largely the study of internal processes—of thoughts, feelings, and mental states that occur within the mind. As such, psychological constructs of interest, such as specific emotions or thought patterns, are often latent and cannot be directly observed. In clinical and research settings, however, these constructs may be *inferred* from what a client says, in writing or in speech (Stavropoulos, Crone, and Grossmann 2024). For example, the client may reveal *negative core beliefs* (overgeneralized judgments about themselves, others, or the world; Beck 2011; Wenzel 2012) during a therapy session. Alternatively, they may demonstrate *positive meaning* making (identifying positive change or growth due to a negative experience; Boals 2012) when writing about a difficult experience. Measuring these and other latent constructs – whether to assess outcomes, identify mediators, or develop theory – often involves the labeling of text data.

Commonly it is experts who generate such labeled data by combing through and classifying text segments. This process of hand-coding comes with substantial challenges, particularly as the size of the data scales, including: costs, delays, coder fatigue, and coder drift (Can et al. 2016). Alternatively, researchers may train a supervised learning algorithm to replicate the labeling process of human experts by leveraging statistical patterns learned in the hand-labeled dataset to classify new unlabeled text segments automatically (Dehghani et al. 2017; Semeraro et al. 2023; Shin, Pinto, and Wang 2025). This approach is imminently scalable – the cost of classifying an additional text segment after model training is negligible – but its effectiveness depends heavily on the quantity of labeled training data, with quantities in the thousands commonly required.

Recent developments in natural language processing bring a new option: automatic text classification using large language models (LLMs). In this approach, researchers use general-purpose *pre-trained* LLMs to classify unlabeled text segments according to the constructs of interest (e.g., Martinez 2024; Genugten and Schacter 2024). Pre-trained LLMs begin a new task with a substantial advantage compared to their traditionally supervised counterparts. From their enormous general purpose training datasets, they have already learned linguistic patterns capturing diverse word meanings, grammatical structures, and idiomatic patterns. Thus, the pre-training process underlying LLMs dramatically lowers the necessary number of labeled examples required to reach a high level of model accuracy. Indeed, in what is called *zero-shot classification* a researcher simply prompts the LLM to categorize a segment of text using natural language instructions without any context-specific training data at all (Reynolds and McDonell 2021). However, performance is often variable and highly dependent on the specific wording within the prompt provided to the LLM (W. Chen, Koenig, and Dilkina 2024). Thus, *prompt engineering*, a systematic and iterative process of optimizing prompt design to improve LLM performance on specific tasks, has emerged as a feasible and impactful lever for improving the alignment between human and machine codes.

In the technical literature, prompt engineering is approached as an empirical method, often involving structured comparisons across prompt variations and evaluation against performance metrics. When treated this way, there is substantial evidence that prompt engineering can improve the quality of LLM output (Kojima et al. 2022; Weber and Reichardt 2023; Zhou et al. 2022). However, the prompt engineering literature remains limited for psychological and behavioral researchers in at least a few key areas. First, the majority of the prompt engineering literature focuses on text generation (e.g., asking a model to answer an open-ended question) rather than text classification (where the model should select between a limited number of options in its response), leaving prompt engineering methods for text classification underdeveloped (White et al. 2023). This is particularly problematic given research has demonstrated that LLM performance on close-ended questions, like classification tasks, is “remarkably unremarkable” compared to its text generation capabilities (Reynolds and McDonell 2021, p. 5). Second, many commonly recommended prompt engineering approaches, like chain-of-thought prompting (Wei et al. 2022) are not straightforward to apply to text classification scenarios as they encourage long and variable responses from a model and have less evidence of efficacy within the classification context (Lampinen et al. 2022). Finally, there is very little research testing the efficacy of prompt engineering techniques in psychological and behavioral sciences. Thus, it is often unclear how prompt engineering approaches will perform on complex, field-specific tasks (Stavropoulos, Crone, and Grossmann 2024) where understandings of terms may differ from the largely non-academic documents on which the LLMs were trained (Ziems et al. 2024).

This article fills that gap by conducting a series of prompt engineering case studies, systematically testing over a thousand varied prompts for identifying psychological constructs across variable contexts. While in practice, prompting is often treated as an ad hoc and qualitative process, in this paper, we treat it as a computational problem, leveraging programmatic experimentation to test prompt effectiveness across diverse tasks, models, and samples. In doing so, we demonstrate how these methods and techniques may be rigorously applied and use the results to draw out recommendations for future researchers. Our case studies focus on three text classification tasks, one which we view as a *low-inference* task that closely matches a common general-use purpose of text classifiers (emotion identification), and two *higher-inference* tasks with precise, theory-driven definitions: identifying 1) negative core beliefs and 2) positive meaning making in participant writing samples. This combination of tasks was chosen to evaluate how well commonly recommended prompting methods work with different levels of task difficulty and field specificity.

In our experiments, we distinguish between what we term baseline prompts and additive techniques. Baseline prompts are defined here as prompts that simply describe the construct and the classification task. Additive techniques are additional modifications that can be layered onto any baseline prompt, regardless of the construct being classified. In total, we evaluate two approaches to generating baseline prompts (human-generated/codebook-guided empirical prompt selection and automatic prompt engineering), three additive prompting techniques (persona pattern, chain-of-thought, and explanations), and two uses of labeled examples (zero-shot and few-shot), on three constructs (gratitude, negative core beliefs, and positive meaning making), and four samples (online message board posts from 590 Reddit users, clinical writing samples from 160 young adults with a mental health diagnosis, from 175 mothers with a mental health diagnosis, and from 68 women who recently experienced sexual assault). Each combination involves multiple prompt variants, with some techniques tested using dozens or even hundreds of prompt iterations, resulting in thousands of total evaluations.

The breadth and scale in our experiments allow us to 1) assess state-of-the-art prompt engineering methods; 2) demonstrate a comprehensive LLM text classification process; 3) test the robustness of these recommendations to variation in tasks and data, and 4) provide recommendations to the field. Across constructs and models, we find that it is the baseline prompt – whether human engineered or automatically engineered – which is most determinative of alignment with human codes. Our human-generated prompts often outperform the automatically engineered prompt but not to such an extent we would dismiss the value of automatic prompt engineering. Indeed, our best performing prompts were most often prompts that were generated first by identifying the best-performing human-generated prompt, then incorporating automatic prompt engineering. Adding few-shot examples also reliably produced small improvements. On the other hand, the additive techniques tested (personas, chain-of-thought, and explanations) offered only marginal improvements at best. Further, improvements with additive techniques were only observed when added to low performing baseline prompts, again emphasizing that it is the construct definition and task description which matters most for improving model performance. Unfortunately, however, identifying the best prompt cannot be done a priori but can only be determined by testing multiple prompts in a labeled dataset that is large enough to produce credible performance estimates. In our case, doing so improved model performance on a relatively low-inference construct by as much as 16% and on a high-inference construct by as much as 75%; meaningful improvements which ultimately increase the validity of the LLM-based measures when employed.

Background

A Brief Introduction to LLMs and Prompting

Generative LLMs are designed to generate text continuations. Given text provided by a user – the prompt – they generate reasonable subsequent words by identifying high-probability continuations that reproduce patterns observed in their training data (Hussain et al. 2024). Within the text classification context, for example, the LLM might identify a high probability next word for the following prompt:

“Negative core beliefs are generalized or exaggerated judgments people have

about themselves, others, or the world. Does the following text contain an example of the psychological concept of a negative core belief? Respond Yes or No.”

Prompt A

Depending on the content of the text, the next most likely word will be either “Yes” or “No.” More formally, LLMs maximize:

$$L(D) = \sum_i^n p(u_i | u_{i-k}, \dots, u_{i-1}; \theta)$$

Where D is a document (e.g., user-provided text followed by model-generated text) consisting of tokens (i.e., words, word fragments, and common phrases; Sennrich, Haddow, and Birch 2015) i through n such that $D = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ (Alec Radford et al. 2018). The objective function of D (which is maximized) is the aggregate of the (log) probabilities of each token, conditional on the previous tokens within a context window of size k . The conditional probability of each next token is modeled using a transformer model (large neural networks with multi-head attention mechanisms) with parameters θ estimated in the pre-training data (Alec Radford et al. 2018, A. Radford et al. 2019; Vaswani et al. 2017). In summary, and put more simply, the model aims to maximize the probability of a next token, conditional on the previous tokens in a document. Thus, a key mechanism for determining LLM output is to adjust these previous tokens – the prompt.

Baseline Prompting

Formally, prompting can be understood as a form of conditioning; more practically, the prompt sets the context for the desired response, telling the LLM what information to pay attention to, and designating the desired output content and format (White et al. 2023). Together, we refer to these components as a baseline prompt. Given a baseline prompt is written in natural language (as opposed to artificial language or computer code), often a reasonable starting place is the same set of instructions which would be provided to a human (Gilardi, Alizadeh, and Kubli 2023; Michelmann et al. 2025). For example, in Prompt A above, we provided the context (defining negative core beliefs), and designate both the desired output (e.g., tasking the LLM with determining if negative core beliefs are evidence in some text) and format (“Yes” or “No”).

Intuition and theory suggest that baseline prompts are most effective when instructions are unambiguous and specific (B. Chen et al. 2023; Lo 2023). Other practical (though not always empirical) advice includes ensuring that the label provided for the text classification task (here, negative core beliefs) match common usage of language so the LLM can locate the definition of the construct within the pretraining data (Gao, Fisch, and D. Chen 2020). Additional guidance suggests incorporating bullet points to increase clarity (Mishra et al. 2021) and preferencing positive rather than negative statements (Battle and Gollapudi 2024). Other suggestions remain contested. For example, while Reynolds and McDonnell 2021 argue that redundancy in prompting can enhance performance, Mishra et al. 2021 recommend prioritizing conciseness to avoid confusion or overload.

Unfortunately, the best performing baseline prompt is not always intuitive (Battle and Gollapudi 2024). Indeed, the best performing prompt may not even be sensible to human readers (Battle and Gollapudi 2024). This is one reason why *automatic prompt engineering* can be a useful approach. Automatic prompt engineering supplements hand-designed prompts by 1) using the LLM to iteratively generate a set of alternative prompts given a seed prompt, 2) selecting the highest performing prompt among the alternatives and using this as the next seed (Zhou et al. 2022). Previous tests of this approach have indicated mixed performance, with the automatically engineered prompt sometimes performing worse than the default but often performing comparable or better (Zhou et al. 2022). Notably, when automatic prompt engineering works, it is not because the LLM has a strong understanding of how different prompts will work on itself (W. Chen, Koenig, and Dilkina 2024) but simply because of brute force. “Seemingly worthless prompt modifications” can have meaningful performance impacts (Battle and Gollapudi 2024, p. 1).

The Use of Examples

Eliciting accurate classifications from an LLM without examples or demonstrations – i.e. via zero-shot classification – can be difficult. As an alternative, one-shot classification not only provides a task but also a demonstration of it (Brown et al. 2020; Weber and Reichardt 2023). For example, to use one-shot, we would extend upon Prompt A, with one example of a written response from a participant that has been labeled with either “Yes” or “No” (indicating a negative core belief, or not). In doing so, we provide the model with a clear demonstration of the task at hand. Few-shot classification extends the principle of one-shot classification by increasing the number of examples and thus providing additional context-specific knowledge on the task (Brown et al. 2020). The number of demonstrations in few-shot learning is up to the user and can range between as few as two and as many as dozens (Brown et al. 2020).

Additive Prompting Techniques

Recent research into prompt engineering has often focused on what we term here *additive* prompt engineering techniques. These include broadly applicable techniques that may be applied to any baseline prompt. In what follows, we examine three prompting techniques, ordered by the degree of adaptation they require—from minimal to substantial.

Persona Pattern

A persona pattern is a short phrase, commonly added to the beginning of the prompt, which provides the LLM with either a role to play or a characteristic to embody (White et al. 2023). For example, we might append, “You are a therapist” or “You are a psychologist” ahead of our task descriptions. The key motivation underlying a persona pattern is the idea that the researcher may not know what details of the task need to be specified in the prompt but will likely know the types of people who could successfully complete the task (White et al. 2023). In theory, appending a persona patterns works because it draws on a kind of “cultural consciousness” associated with the role (Reynolds and McDonell 2021, p. 4). In calling on the therapist or psychologist role, for example, we hope that the model is also activating patterns associated with negative core beliefs in the psychology context. To our knowledge, evidence underlying the effectiveness of the persona pattern is largely anecdotal rather than experimental. However, Battle and Gollapudi 2024 have conducted a series of experiments on the efficacy of a related approach – termed positive thinking. A positive thinking prompt simply appends an upbeat phrase to the task. Often, this is combined with a role – as in “You are an expert mathematician” but may simply be a characteristic, as in “You are highly intelligent” (Battle and Gollapudi 2024, p. 2). While a theory has not been outlined for why positive thinking without a role would be useful, the authors conclude that, in most – but not all - instances, the prompt addition positively impacted model performance.

Chain-of-Thought Prompting

Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought. Zero-shot chain-of-thought prompting involves adding a simple phrase such as, “Let’s think this through step by step” to the end of a prompt (Kojima et al. 2022). Despite the simplicity of the approach, the addition of this phrase has significantly improved LLM performance on a range of benchmark tasks including arithmetic and symbolic reasoning (Kojima et al. 2022), perhaps because it encourages the decomposition of problems into smaller more simple subtasks.

In a text classification context, chain-of-thought prompting requires minor adaptation. The chain-of-thought prompt purposefully elicits long-winded answers from the model – the multistep reasoning (Kojima et al. 2022). However, in text classification tasks, only one of a few answer choices are accepted. One approach is to request the model to provide its reasoning, and then to provide a final answer in a specified format. For example, we might provide adapted instructions such as: “First, explain your reasoning step by step. Then, state your final answer — either Yes or No — using the format: Final Answer: [Yes or No].”

Few-Shot Chain-of-Thought Prompting. Few-shot chain-of-thought prompting is the predecessor to the zero-shot chain-of-thought approach described above. In few-shot

chain-of-thought prompting, reasoning is not just encouraged (via a phrase) but demonstrated with examples (Wei et al. 2022). In addition to providing input-output pairs as exemplars, few-shot chain-of-thought prompting includes intermediate natural language reasoning steps that lead to the final answer (Wei et al. 2022). Here is one potential example of a reasoning example we could provide, within the context of identifying positive meaning making and paired with a participant writing about their mother’s death: “First, I see that the excerpt is indeed about a negative event (here, a mother’s death). Second, I see that the writer identifies a positive outcome (they’ve become stronger). Third, I see that the writer attributes the positive outcome to the negative event. Because of these three points, my final answer is yes. Final Answer: Yes.” This kind of few-shot approach simultaneously demonstrates how the task should be completed, identifies what in the participant text needs to be attended to, and exemplifies how the response should be formatted. As with zero-shot chain-of-thought prompting, few-shot chain-of-thought prompting has a substantial evidence base underlying it (Wei et al. 2022). However, there are cases where few-shot chain-of-thought has had adverse effects on model performance (Anil et al. 2023; Battle and Gollapudi 2024).

Explanations

Explanations are justifications provided with few-shot examples (Lampinen et al. 2022). The key difference between the above approach (few-shot chain-of-thought prompting) and explanations is the order: with chain-of-thought, the justification occurs before the answer choice. With explanations, the justification is provided after. Perhaps surprisingly, this can make a difference. While the former is designed to elicit multi-step thinking, the latter is designed to highlight task principles that allow the model to generalize broadly (Lampinen et al. 2022). Further, these two approaches likely differ in the weight provided to the justification compared to the exemplar answers. Due to recency bias, whichever occurs last is likely to be given the greater weight by the model (Liu et al. 2023). Thus, explanation prompting likely weights the justification more heavily than the example-answer pair. The typical structure of an explanation few-shot prompt (here, for text classification) is to provide the task instruction, the example text, the classification of the example, and an explanation of the response (Lampinen et al. 2022). When the LLM provides its own response, the LLMs explanation can either be ignored or observed to gain intuition into information the model is drawing upon. Lampinen et al. 2022 find that the explanation prompt can improve performance on a wide variety of tasks (Lampinen et al. 2022).

Contribution

Unfortunately, prior research indicates that none of the above can be counted on to reliably improve performance. For example, while chain-of-thought prompting has at times demonstrated significant improvements in model performance (Wei et al. 2022), in other studies, it has demonstrated an adverse effect (Anil et al. 2023). Further, model performance can depend on seemingly minute changes in prompt wording, exemplar selection, and even exemplar order (Sahoo et al. 2024; Zhao et al. 2021). Here we address the seemingly erratic nature of prompting with LLMs by first, searching for generalizable patterns across three constructs and two models, and second, by formulating a reasonable prompt engineering protocol which can be used across diverse text classification tasks.

Case Study Experiments and Data

LLMs tend to be reliable text classifiers for low-inference concepts like sentiment or discrete emotions (Rathje et al. 2024). However, high-inference concepts that have a complex, field-specific meaning – what Ziems et al. 2024 refer to as expert taxonomies, terms which are either uncommon, or do not match the meaning in the pre-training corpora – pose a more difficult challenge. Here, we design our experiments to capture a spectrum of scenarios from low complexity to high complexity, both with and without, expert taxonomies.

Table 1: *Case Study Sample Size, Construct Distribution and Inter-Rater Reliability*

Concept	N	Proportion with Construct	Cohen’s Kappa
Gratitude	600	0.50	0.75
Negative Core Beliefs	565	0.34	0.82
Meaning Making	589	0.17	0.70

Note. We purposefully limit the sample size of the gratitude dataset to be more like the size of datasets commonly included in psychological studies.

Low Complexity – Emotion Identification

We generate a low-inference task by drawing on a dataset created by Demszky et al. 2020 of Reddit posts labelled with the emotions they express. The original dataset includes over 58,000 Reddit posts, labelled with 26 emotions by 3-5 labelers each (described as native English speakers from India). Inter-rater reliability in that dataset ranges from a Cohen’s Kappa of 0.144 (for nervousness) to 0.749 (for gratitude). For the purposes of this study, we focus on the emotion with the highest inter-rater reliability – gratitude – as this high reliability suggests a low-complexity task. We also limit our analysis to a random sample of 600 texts (a size which is more reflective of psychological studies), 300 of which were labelled as expressing gratitude (defined by Demszky et al. 2020 as “a feeling of thankfulness and appreciation,” pg. 12).

Higher Complexity – Negative Core Beliefs and Positive Meaning Making

The above case study introduces a relatively low-inference task on which non-expert human labelers were able to reach high reliability. However, many constructs in psychology are complex (with definitions including multiple components), high-inference (necessitating interpretation) and require some level of specialized knowledge. To assess the usefulness of common prompt-engineering techniques in these more challenging scenarios, we experiment with two additional constructs: negative core beliefs and positive meaning making. We define negative core beliefs as broad, generalized, or exaggerated negative judgments people have about themselves, others, or the world (Beck 2011). We define positive meaning making as occurring when a person reports some positive change or outcome resulting from a negative event, trauma, or stressor in their life (Boals 2012). We identify instances of negative core beliefs and positive meaning making from text produced within expressive writing interventions (Reinhold, Bürkner, and Holling 2018), where the participants engaged in independent, reflective writing over a brief period.

Here, we draw from three current or recently completed studies of expressive writing, including in a sample of young (ages 21 to 30) biological or trans- women who have been previously diagnosed with a mental health condition, a sample of mothers with a mental health history, and a sample of college women who had experienced sexual assault within the past year. Taken together, our sample includes 437 unique individuals responding to between one and three expressive writing tasks; 565 texts were labelled for negative core beliefs and 589 texts were labeled for meaning making. Both were labelled by a combination of trained undergraduate students and psychology graduate students. Table 1 provides information on the distribution of construct prevalence and inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability (Cohen’s Kappa; Cohen 1960) was estimated to be 0.82 for negative core beliefs and 0.70 for meaning making. (While we would hypothesize that, of the three constructs, Cohen’s Kappa would be highest for gratitude, in practice, it is highest for negative core beliefs, with gratitude slightly lower. Nonetheless, we still conceptualize negative core beliefs as a more complex construct than gratitude and attribute the higher Cohen’s Kappa as due to our coder background, training, and consensus-building process.)

Strengths and Limitations of the Case Studies

Our case studies offer three key strengths. First, they span a range of task complexity, from low-inference classification (e.g., emotion recognition) to higher-inference construct

Table 2: *Training, Development, and Testing Sample Sizes*

Concept	Train		Dev		Test		Total
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	All
Gratitude	91	52	192	95	93	52	575
Negative Core Beliefs	46	89	91	176	55	108	565
Meaning Making	30	111	46	248	24	130	589

classification (e.g., negative core beliefs and positive meaning making). This allows us to assess the usefulness of prompting techniques under differing levels of challenge. Second, the latter two concepts (negative core beliefs and meaning making) represent constructs that require LLMs to use “unique reasoning paths not typically encountered... during their pre-training phase” (Lee et al. 2024). Presumably, prompt engineering is of even greater importance for such constructs. Third, the writing which is classified reflects writing collected in the real-world, including spelling errors, irrelevant content, and texts for which two experts can reasonably disagree. On the other hand, our data still contain generalizability challenges. Notably, all the data collected for negative core beliefs and meaning making was generated by women. This would be of particular concern if our goal was to assess the performance of LLMs or to suggest the best prompt for these constructs. Instead, our goal is to assess the usefulness of prompt engineering approaches. Thus, the limited diversity of our sample will only threaten our results if there is a reason to believe, for example, that persona prompts work better or worse for women’s writing compared to men. Second, it is possible that the data drawn from Reddit may have been included in the training of the LLMs we are using. Thus, there are two potential reasons we might expect the LLM to exhibit higher performance on gratitude than on our expressive writing tasks: the expressive writing tasks involve a higher level of complexity and the text contained in the Reddit data may very well have been encountered in the training of the LLMs used, i.e., GPT and/or Llama, creating leakage and the possible overinflation of performance metrics (Kaufman et al. 2012). The expressive writing samples, on the other hand, have not been publicly released so they were certainly not.

Methods

We began by splitting our data at the participant level into training, development, and testing datasets. The training dataset was used to pilot prompts and to provide examples for few-shot learning. The development dataset was used to compare the performance of the additive prompting techniques after finalizing wording in the training dataset. We held our testing dataset until the final prompt and model for each concept was selected. Thus, this dataset provides a best estimate of the final performance of the LLM for each construct.

We split our data such that 25% of individuals are placed in the training dataset, 50% into the development dataset, and 25% into the testing dataset. We chose this distribution for two reasons. First, compared to training a supervised learning classifier from scratch, our training needs are limited. Thus, more resources can be distributed to comparing approaches and validating the final model. Second, given the key purpose of this manuscript is to compare prompting approaches in order to provide recommendations to future researchers, we devote the majority of our labeled data to this purpose. Still, as a demonstration of best practice, we retain a testing dataset which was unseen during any portion of the model development process to assess the performance of the final selected model.

Table 2 provides sample sizes for each of our constructs and data splits (training, development, and testing). Because these are secondary data, we did not conduct priori power analyses. However, we made use of all relevant clinical text data available to us and allocated participants so as to maximize statistical precision in the comparison of prompting approaches while still retaining a test set for final evaluation. Further, by keeping our training, testing, and validation datasets independent, we limit the threat of over-inflated performance metrics (Anglin 2024).

When assessing the performance of our prompts, we use four criteria: accuracy, precision, recall, and F1. Each of these depends on the relationship between true positives (i.e.,

instances where the LLM correctly identifies an instance of the construct), false positives (incorrectly identifying the construct), false negatives (incorrectly identifying the absence of the construct), and true negatives (correctly identifying the absence of the construct). Here, the determination of “true” and “false” depends on alignment with the human label. (Though the use of these terms is something of a shorthand, given we know that human labels bring their own error, a fact exemplified by our assessment of inter-rater reliability).

Accuracy measures the overall proportion of correct classifications (true positives and true negatives). Precision measures on the proportion of positive identifications of a construct to all positive classifications. Recall, sometimes referred to as true positive rate, measures the proportion of human positives that were successfully identified by the model. And, F1 balances precision and recall into a single metric, providing a harmonic mean that is particularly useful when classes are imbalanced. Formally, these are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Accuracy} &= \frac{TN + TP}{TN + TP + FN + FP}, \\ \text{Precision} &= \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \\ \text{Recall} &= \frac{TP}{TP + FN}, \\ \text{F1} &= \frac{\text{Precision} * \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} = \frac{2TP}{2TP + FP + FN} \end{aligned}$$

Baseline Prompts and Examples

Codebook-Guided Human-Generated Prompts

In line with best practices for codebook development, our baseline prompts incorporate three components: a brief definition of the target construct (e.g., negative core beliefs), a task instruction (e.g., “classify the following text...”), and potential inclusion/exclusion criteria (MacQueen et al. 1998). We hypothesize that each of these elements may influence LLM performance. To test this, we created five variants each of the construct definition and the task instruction. All variants were generated manually without referencing to prior writing, in order to encourage linguistic diversity. (We also intentionally avoided LLM-generated variants here, as automated prompts are built into automated prompt engineering process discussed later.) From our human-generated codebook, we also identified n potential inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Then, using the following procedure, we generated 50 prompt variants:

1. Randomly select one construct definition variant.
2. Randomly draw a number from 0 to n ; if greater than one, append that number of randomly selected inclusion/exclusion criteria to the definition.
3. Randomly select one task instruction and append to the prompt.

We repeated this process 50 times to produce 50 codebook-guided, human-generated prompts. Each variant was evaluated on our training dataset, and we identified the prompts yielding the highest and lowest F1 scores.

These two empirically selected prompts serve two purposes. First, the top-performing prompt provides a strong baseline against which we evaluate the added value of automatic prompt engineering, few-shot classification, and additive prompting techniques. The lowest-performing prompt, by contrast, serves as a test of whether these techniques can ‘fix’ a prompt which does not, by itself, produce classifications that are aligned with human codes. Second, the performance gap between these two extremes speaks to the extent to which reasonable variations in baseline prompt wording can influence model output—and to the utility of a codebook-guided, empirically informed prompt selection process.

Automatic Prompt Engineering

To automatically generate prompts, we followed an iterative process beginning with a human-generated baseline prompt (either the bottom or top baseline prompt) as the seed. At each iteration, we provided this seed prompt within the following meta-instruction:

“Generate a variation of the following prompt while keeping the output format.
You may add important information or remove unnecessary information.

Instruction: prompt

Output only the new instruction.”

Using this meta-prompt, we generated five new prompts per iteration. Each was evaluated on our training dataset, and the prompt yielding the highest F1 score was selected as the new seed. This process was repeated for five generations, and we selected the highest performing prompt across all iterations. Temperature for the classification task was set to 0 while temperature for the prompt generation was set to 1.

Selecting Examples for Few-Shot Learning

We limit our pool of potential examples from the training dataset to 50 and create 50 random samples of potential few-shot example combinations. For each combination, we first randomly select a number from 1 to 10; this becomes the number of examples n . Then, we randomly select n examples from the pool one at a time without replacement. We repeat this process 50 times to yield 50 distinct few-shot combinations. We evaluate each combination using the remaining examples in the training set (i.e., those not included in the example pool) and identify the combination that achieves the highest F1 score for both the top and bottom baseline prompts.

Additive Techniques

Persona

We generate three potential personas for each construct. For gratitude, we test:

1. You are a language model trained to detect emotions in user text.
2. You are a positive psychologist looking for examples of gratitude.
3. You are an expert labeler.

For negative core beliefs and meaning making, we test:

1. You are a caring and brilliant therapist. Your job is to determine if your client demonstrates that they hold negative core beliefs/is engaging in meaning making.
2. You are a psychology professor. You are looking for examples of negative core beliefs/meaning making in writing to show your students.
3. You are a professional psychologist studying negative core beliefs/meaning making in client writing.

For each construct, we select the persona which generates the highest performance in the training dataset when prepended to the top and bottom baseline prompts.

Chain-of-Thought

To incorporate chain-of-thought prompting into a zero-shot classification task, we append the following to the baseline prompts:

“First, explain your reasoning step by step. Then, state your final answer — either Yes or No — using the format: Final Answer: [Yes or No].”

For few-shot classification, we illustrate this reasoning process by providing chain-of-thought responses for each of the selected few-shot examples. Because the phrasing of the reasoning may influence performance, we generate two different reasonings for each example and evaluate their performance on the training set. For each case, we select the phrasing that yields the highest F1 score.

Explanations

To incorporate explanations into our prompts, we use the following prompt template:

```
{Baseline Prompt}  
Text: {Example}  
Answer: {Answer}  
Explanation: Explanation
```

The number of text–answer–explanation pairs depends on the specific few-shot combination selected using the procedure described in *Selecting Examples for Few-Shot Learning*. Because the content of the explanation may influence performance, we generate two candidate explanations for each selected example and evaluate them on the training data (excluding the examples used in the prompt). For each example, we retain the explanation that yields the highest F1 score.

Models

We perform our experiments using one closed-source, proprietary LLM – GPT-4 from OpenAI – and one open-source LLM – Llama-3.3. In this article, we are agnostic on the choice of LLM platform, assessing the utility of prompt engineering approaches for two platforms and generalizability across platforms. However, there are ethical and privacy considerations in the choice of LLM provider, which preference the use of open-source and open-access LLMs when resources allow (Hussain et al. 2024).

Closed-access models, like those from OpenAI, require that data are shared with provider. At the time of this writing, text provided to OpenAI through the `python` API are not retained by OpenAI long-term. Instead, OpenAI states that they “securely retain API inputs and outputs for up to 30 days to provide the services and to identify abuse. After 30 days, API inputs and outputs are removed from our systems, unless [OpenAI] are legally required to retain them” (OpenAI 2025). Still, this privacy policy brings concerns when it comes to personally identifying information (which, in our case, were removed). On the other hand, because open-access models can be run locally (ensuring that data never leave the user’s system), they provide full protections with respect to participant privacy.

We employ GPT models programmatically through the `openai` Python library and call Llama through the `HuggingFace` library. We run Llama within our university’s high performance computing environment (a necessity because the model is large and stored locally). In both the GPT and Llama models, we reduce *temperature*, which determines the amount of noise included in the determination of the probability of each potential token, to zero.

Evaluation

To assess the extent to which each technique improves alignment between human and LLM codes, we report F1 scores with non-parametric bootstrapped standard errors, calculated as follows: (1) sample n texts and associated human labels and model predictions with replacement (where n is the number of texts in the development or testing dataset; creating a bootstrap sample); (2) compute the F1 score for each of 1,000 bootstrap samples; and (3) calculate the standard deviation of the resulting distribution. Final performance metrics are accompanied by bootstrapped standard errors and 95% confidence intervals, which reflect the range of values that would be expected to contain the true metric 95% of the time if the sampling process were repeated. Narrow intervals indicate greater statistical certainty in the performance estimate, while wider intervals suggest more uncertainty.

Results

Tables 3 through 8 present F1 scores as estimated in the development dataset for each of the three constructs: gratitude (Tables 3-4), negative core beliefs (Tables 5-6), and meaning making (Tables 7-8). OpenAI results are in the odd numbered tables while Llama results are in the even numbered tables. In each table, the left panel provides the performance of

the bottom baseline prompt (without and with additive prompting and examples), while the right panel provides the performance of the top prompt (what we call the codebook-guided empirically selected prompt; again, without and with additive prompting and examples). The asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between either top or bottom codebook-guided baseline prompt (highlighted in gray) and automatic prompt engineering, additive prompts, and few-shot additions (where one asterisk indicates statistical significance at the 90% level, two asterisks at 95%, three asterisks at 99%). Below, we draw out several key findings from these tables.

Codebook-Guided Empirical Prompt Selection Outperforms Additive Techniques

Across Tables 3-8, the most consistent finding is a substantial difference in performance between the bottom and top baseline prompt (where the top prompt is identified through our codebook-guided empirical prompt selection process). This difference reaches as high as 0.33 for classifications of meaning-making with Llama 3.3 (increasing F1 from 0.33 to 0.66). Further (though not pictured in the tables), the difference between the bottom and top baseline prompt is statistically significant for every combination of construct and model. These performance gains were most pronounced for high-inference constructs such as negative core beliefs and meaning making, and more evident in Llama models than in OpenAI models.

Few-Shot Prompting Can Compensate for Poorly Worded Prompts and Is Nearly as Influential as Baseline Selection

Tables 3–8 underscore the value of few-shot prompting, particularly when paired with low-performing baseline prompts. In all six construct–model combinations, the addition of few-shot examples to the bottom baseline prompt yields substantial and statistically significant improvements in F1 score, indicating that well-chosen examples can effectively compensate for poorly worded prompts. Notably, the impact of few-shot prompting is often comparable to that of selecting a top-performing baseline prompt. In five out of six construct–model combinations, the bottom baseline paired with few-shot examples performs as well as—or slightly better than—the top zero-shot baseline prompt.

However, few-shot prompting appears to offer less benefit when the underlying prompt is already effective. While the addition of examples often yields small positive changes, none of the differences between the top zero-shot and top few-shot prompts reach statistical significance across any construct–model pair.

The specific combination of examples also plays a critical role in determining performance. As shown in Appendix A, which presents histograms of F1 scores by few-shot combination within the training dataset, some configurations lead to substantially diminished performance. This variability is especially pronounced for the bottom baseline prompts and for high-inference constructs.

Automatic Prompt Engineering Often Improves Badly Worded Prompts

Across all construct–model combinations, automatic prompt engineering consistently improves the bottom baseline prompt, with statistically significant gains observed in five out of six cases. These results suggest that automated revision can meaningfully enhance performance when starting from a suboptimal prompt. However, the magnitude of improvement typically falls short of that achieved by selecting the top-performing human-generated baseline.

Results for the top baseline prompt are more variable. When the top prompt is used as the seed, automatic prompt engineering sometimes leads to modest gains, but in other cases it yields equivalent or even reduced performance. In one notable instance—classifying meaning-making with Llama—the automatically generated prompt reduced performance by 0.10 F1 points (from 0.66 to 0.56), although this difference was not statistically significant.

It is also important to note that the best-performing automatically generated prompt was not always produced in the final generation. In fact, this occurred in only 3 of the 12 construct–model–baseline combinations (see Appendix B). This pattern suggests that brute-force testing of candidate prompts plays a greater role rather than incremental improvement

Table 3: *The Performance of Additive Prompting Techniques for Gratitude and OpenAI Model, as Assessed in Development Dataset*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Baseline	0.80 (0.03)	0.89*** (0.02)	0.85 (0.02)	0.90 (0.02)
Automatic Prompt Engineering	0.88** (0.02)	0.89*** (0.02)	0.88 (0.02)	0.91** (0.02)
Persona	0.84 (0.02)	0.89** (0.02)	0.87 (0.02)	0.90 (0.02)
Chain-of-Thought	0.82 (0.03)	0.87* (0.02)	0.83 (0.03)	0.86 (0.02)
Explanations	— —	0.89** (0.02)	— —	0.89 (0.02)

Note. The baseline prompt is highlighted in grey. The highest performing prompt is emboldened. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

across generations.

Zero-Shot Persona and Chain-of-Thought Prompts Provide Limited Value

Across all construct–model combinations, augmenting the bottom baseline prompt with a persona resulted in modest improvements in F1 scores, with gains reaching as high as 0.10 in one case. However, these improvements are not statistically significant, and magnitude varies substantially. When applied to top-performing baseline prompts, persona additions yield minimal to no improvement, suggesting that persona-based prompting may offer value primarily when the initial prompt is poorly constructed.

A similar pattern emerges for zero-shot chain-of-thought prompting. When applied to bottom baseline prompts, the inclusion of reasoning steps occasionally improves performance, but the gains remain modest and consistently fall short of statistical significance. For top-performing prompts, chain-of-thought additions typically provide no observable benefit.

Few-Shot Classification Improves Performance, While Chain-of-Thought and Explanations Offer Minimal Additional Benefit

Few-shot chain-of-thought and explanation-based prompting yield modest performance improvements over the bottom baseline prompt in four out of six construct–model combinations. However, their added value is largely comparable to that of standard few-shot prompting alone. This suggests that the performance gains observed with these additive techniques appear to stem primarily from the inclusion of examples, rather than the explanatory or reasoning structure they introduce. This pattern persists even when applied to the top-performing, codebook-guided baseline prompts. In these cases, the marginal benefit of adding chain-of-thought reasoning or explanations rarely exceeds that achieved through few-shot prompting without such additions. At the same time, the results again affirm the value of few-shot classification more broadly. In all six model–construct combinations, the highest-performing prompt includes few-shot examples.

Final Performance in Testing Data

Across all three constructs, the highest alignment with expert classification was achieved by GPT-4 using few-shot prompts that integrated automatic prompt engineering with codebook-guided, human-generated empirical prompt selection (see Tables 3, 5, and 7). Table 9 reports the final performance of these optimized prompts on the hold-out testing dataset. As expected, performance was highest for gratitude, the lowest-inference construct, with GPT-4 achieving an accuracy of 0.89 CI [0.85-0.93], precision of 0.86 CI [0.78-0.94], recall of 0.92, CI

Table 4: *The Performance of Additive Prompting Techniques for Gratitude and Llama Model, as Assessed in Development Dataset*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Baseline	0.77 (0.03)	0.86** (0.02)	0.85 (0.02)	0.88 (0.02)
Automatic Prompt Engineering	0.85** (0.02)	0.89*** (0.02)	0.85 (0.02)	0.86 (0.02)
Persona	0.79 (0.03)	0.84* (0.02)	0.83 (0.02)	0.87 (0.02)
Chain-of-Thought	0.81 (0.03)	0.84* (0.02)	0.85 (0.02)	0.85 (0.02)
Explanations	— —	0.82 (0.03)	— —	0.89 (0.02)

Note. The baseline prompt is highlighted in grey. The highest performing prompt is emboldened. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 5: *The Performance of Additive Prompting Techniques for Negative Core Beliefs and OpenAI Model, as Assessed in Development Dataset*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Baseline	0.52 (0.05)	0.70*** (0.04)	0.70 (0.04)	0.69 (0.04)
Automatic Prompt Engineering	0.68** (0.04)	0.70*** (0.04)	0.70 (0.04)	0.73 (0.04)
Persona	0.56 (0.05)	0.68** (0.04)	0.69 (0.04)	0.67 (0.04)
Chain-of-Thought	0.49 (0.06)	0.72*** (0.04)	0.69 (0.04)	0.67 (0.04)
Explanations	— —	0.72*** (0.04)	— —	0.68 (0.04)

Note. The baseline prompt is highlighted in grey. The highest performing prompt is emboldened. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 6: *The Performance of Additive Prompting Techniques for Negative Core Beliefs and Llama Model, as Assessed in Development Dataset*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Baseline	0.40 (0.06)	0.69*** (0.04)	0.68 (0.04)	0.70 (0.04)
Automatic Prompt Engineering	0.64*** (0.04)	0.64*** (0.04)	0.65 (0.04)	0.66 (0.04)
Persona	0.50 (0.05)	0.68*** (0.04)	0.67 (0.04)	0.70 (0.04)
Chain-of-Thought	0.49 (0.05)	0.29 (0.06)	0.61 (0.04)	0.70 (0.04)
Explanations	— —	0.40 (0.06)	— —	0.68 (0.03)

Note. The baseline prompt is highlighted in grey. The highest performing prompt is emboldened. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 7: *The Performance of Additive Prompting Techniques for Meaning Making and OpenAI Model, as Assessed in Development Dataset*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Baseline	0.53 (0.05)	0.67* (0.05)	0.66 (0.05)	0.69 (0.05)
Automatic Prompt Engineering	0.64 (0.06)	0.68** (0.05)	0.71 (0.05)	0.73 (0.05)
Persona	0.54 (0.05)	0.66* (0.05)	0.66 (0.05)	0.70 (0.05)
Chain-of-Thought	0.59 (0.05)	0.53 (0.05)	0.66 (0.05)	0.65 (0.05)
Explanations	— —	0.48 (0.05)	— —	0.70 (0.05)

Note. The baseline prompt is highlighted in grey. The highest performing prompt is emboldened. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 8: *The Performance of Additive Prompting Techniques for Meaning Making and Llama Model, as Assessed in Development Dataset*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Baseline	0.33 (0.04)	0.54*** (0.05)	0.66 (0.05)	0.67 (0.05)
Automatic Prompt Engineering	0.53*** (0.05)	0.53*** (0.05)	0.56 (0.05)	0.56 (0.05)
Persona	0.41 (0.04)	0.54*** (0.05)	0.69 (0.05)	0.67 (0.05)
Chain-of-Thought	0.31 (0.04)	0.43* (0.04)	0.60 (0.05)	0.66 (0.05)
Explanations	— —	0.44** (0.04)	— —	0.65 (0.05)

Note. The baseline prompt is highlighted in grey. The highest performing prompt is emboldened. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 9: *Final Performance Metrics*

	Bottom Baseline		Top Baseline	
	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot	Zero-Shot	Few-Shot
Gratitude	0.89 (0.02)	0.86 (0.04)	0.92 (0.03)	0.89 (0.03)
Negative Core Beliefs	0.81 (0.03)	0.74 (0.06)	0.67 (0.06)	0.7 (0.05)
Meaning Making	0.92 (0.02)	0.68 (0.09)	0.88 (0.07)	0.76 (0.07)

Note. Standard errors are in parentheses and estimate via bootstrapping.

[0.86-0.98], and an F1 score of 0.89 CI [0.83-0.95]. For negative core beliefs, a higher-inference construct, performance declined with an accuracy of 0.81 CI [0.75-0.87], precision of 0.74 CI [0.62-0.86], recall of 0.67 CI [0.55-0.79], and F1 score of 0.70 CI [0.60-0.80]. Lastly, performance on positive meaning making showed high recall compared to negative core belief but more moderate precision, with accuracy of 0.92 CI [0.88-0.96], precision 0.68 CI [0.50-0.86], recall 0.88 CI [0.74-1.00] and F1 score of 0.76 CI [0.62-0.90].

Discussion and Recommendations

Across our experiments, our findings reinforce what prior literature has emphasized – prompting matters for increasing alignment with expert codes (Sahoo et al. 2024; Weber and Reichardt 2023). While prior work has often focused on general-purpose prompting strategies, our findings point to towards the importance of theory-driven prompting and brute-force experimentation. Our results suggest that the construct definition, inclusion/exclusion criteria, task description, and (to a lesser extent) examples provided are more influential than LLM-specific prompting techniques like personas, chain-of-thought, or explanations. Zero-shot personas and chain-of-thought only inconsistently improve performance above the baseline. When examples are added to these techniques (few-shot persona, few-shot chain-of-thought, and few-shot explanations), performance improves—but rarely exceeds the performance of few-shot examples added to a well-constructed baseline prompt. This is both good and bad news. On the one hand, chain-of-thought prompting and explanations are computationally expensive—because they produce longer completions, model run-time increases substantially, as do costs for proprietary models. If these techniques offer limited additional value, this may provide an opportunity for cost savings. On the other hand, our findings suggest there are no simple shortcuts to improving the validity of LLM output. If these results generalize beyond the present cases, they indicate that researchers should prioritize testing a wide variety of baseline prompts—human- and/or machine-generated—as this component has the greatest impact on performance. Given the above results, we recommend researchers consider the following process for assessing and improving the alignment between LLM and human construct identification:

1. Generate an initial codebook-guided baseline prompt—including at a minimum a construct definition and task instruction. Evaluate performance in the training dataset. If the results are satisfactory, proceed to the final evaluation using a hold-out testing dataset, reporting performance metrics alongside standard errors and/or confidence intervals. If improvement is needed, continue to step 2.
2. Generate a diverse set of baseline prompts using components derived from the human codebook. Variants can be created by combining alternative phrasings of (a) the construct definition, (b) task instructions, and (c) inclusion and exclusion criteria, whether human-generated, generated through automatic prompt engineering, or both. Evaluate prompts from this pool by assessing their performance in the training dataset. Select the best configuration.
3. If resources permit, experiment with few-shot prompting by appending different combinations of examples to the best-performing baseline prompt. Evaluate these few-shot variants in the training dataset and identify the top-performing configuration (whether

zero-shot or few-shot). Compare performance between the zero-shot and few-shot approach either in the training dataset or, if resources allow, a development dataset (decreasing the likelihood of selecting an approach that was overfit to the training data).

4. Again, if resources permit, experiment with appending additive techniques to current best-performing prompt, whether that be the additive techniques discussed in this article (persona, chain-of-thought, and/or explanations), other techniques not discussed, or new alternative techniques as they arise. Again, compare results, ideally in a development dataset.
5. Conduct a final evaluation in a held-out testing dataset, calculating accuracy, precision, recall, F1 score, and associated confidence intervals to provide an unbiased estimate of human-machine alignment.

This procedure directs researcher effort toward the aspects of prompt engineering that our findings suggest have the greatest impact—prompt wording, structure, and example selection—while emphasizing empirical validation of final outputs.

Limitations

While we believe the above recommendations to be both a reasonable and empirically driven process, our results, and therefore our conclusions, come with key limitations. First, our findings regarding persona prompts, chain-of-thought, and explanations are ultimately null findings. And it is difficult to provide substantive evidence of the absence of an effect using only a single experiment. In our case, we offer a series of six (admittedly non-independent, given the same data is used across two or more tests) experiments, increasing the strength of evidence somewhat. Nonetheless, we cannot rule out the possibility of a Type II error. Therefore, we don't conclusively state that persona prompts, chain-of-thought or explanations do not work, but that, based on the evidence here, they should perhaps be lower priority prompting techniques for improving LLM performance in the identification of psychological constructs. Second, our findings come with generalizability challenges: what works in one scenario may not work in another (Battle and Gollapudi 2024). Again, we hope that our variety of constructs and diverse sources of data help temper this limitation, but generalizability is still not guaranteed. Further, model capabilities are certain to change over time and new prompting techniques are sure to be invented, potentially limiting the generalizability of our results across model generations. As the nature of LLMs change, however, our process for prompt generation and evaluation will likely remain relevant. Finally, we should acknowledge that prompt engineering, as we recommend it, is a time-consuming process which requires a moderately-sized labelled dataset. Our recommendations only apply to scenarios where a reasonable number of labelled texts (say 50 to 100) can be set aside for prompt engineering (not including the labelled texts which should be set aside for validation). Researchers can and should only embark on this process when resources allow and when maximizing performance is deemed important. If LLMs will be used to support or guide clinical decision-making, for example, then this investment will be worth it.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that prompt engineering, when treated as a systematic and empirical process, can meaningfully improve the validity of large language model outputs for text classification tasks in psychology. By programmatically evaluating thousands of prompt variations across three constructs and multiple datasets, we show that the greatest performance gains arise not from one-size-fits-all prompting techniques, but from targeted experimentation with core elements: construct definitions, task framing, and examples. Empirically selecting and validating these components can reduce disagreement between LLM output and human codes by as much as two-fold. Our findings highlight not only a replicable procedure for improving LLM performance but also the essential role of evaluation as these models are increasingly applied in high-stakes psychological and behavioral research contexts.

Open Practices

All analysis code is publicly available at <https://github.com/KylieLAnglin/pe4ci>. Due to the sensitive nature of the content and to protect participant privacy, two of the datasets used in this study—those related to negative core beliefs and meaning making—are available at reasonable request. However, the dataset used for the gratitude construct (Demszky et al. 2020) is available at <https://github.com/google-research/google-research/tree/master/goemotions> and can be used to replicate and illustrate the analysis procedures. The random sample used in this study is also provided alongside the Python code at <https://github.com/KylieLAnglin/pe4ci>.

Declarations

Funding

Some of the data collected within this study was funded with support from the University of Connecticut Dean's Office Summer Research Awards.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Ethics Approval

The data used for analyses were collected from studies approved by the University of Connecticut IRB (IRB protocol #H23-0244 and #X18-057).

Consent to Participate

Individuals in these studies provided informed consent prior to participation.

Consent for Publication

Individuals in these studies provided informed consent prior to participation.

References


- Anglin, K. (2024). “Addressing threats to validity in supervised machine learning: A framework and best practices for education researchers”. In: *AERA Open* 10, pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.1177/23328584241303495.
- Anil, Rohan et al. (2023). “Palm 2 technical report”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.10403>.
- Battle, R. and T. Gollapudi (2024). “The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Eccentric Automatic Prompts”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2402.10949*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2402.10949.
- Beck, Judith S (2011). “Cognitive-behavioral therapy”. In: *Clinical textbook of addictive disorders* 491, pp. 474–501.
- Boals, A. (2012). “The use of meaning making in expressive writing: When meaning is beneficial”. In: *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 31.4, pp. 393–409. DOI: 10.1521/jscp.2012.31.4.393.
- Brown, Tom et al. (2020). “Language models are few-shot learners”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33, pp. 1877–1901. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165>.
- Can, D. et al. (2016). ““It sounds like...”: A natural language processing approach to detecting counselor reflections in motivational interviewing”. In: *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 63.3, p. 343. DOI: 10.1037/cou0000111.
- Chen, Banghao et al. (2023). “Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in large language models: a comprehensive review”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14735*.
- Chen, W., S. Koenig, and B. Dilkina (2024). “RePrompt: Planning by Automatic Prompt Engineering for Large Language Models Agents”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2406.11132*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2406.11132.
- Cohen, Jacob (Apr. 1960). “A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales”. In: *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20.1. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 37–46. ISSN: 0013-1644. DOI: 10.1177/001316446002000104. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104> (visited on 09/07/2021).
- Dehghani, M. et al. (2017). “TACIT: An open-source text analysis, crawling, and interpretation tool”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 49, pp. 538–547. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-016-0722-4.
- Demszky, D. et al. (2020). “GoEmotions: A dataset of fine-grained emotions”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2005.00547*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2005.00547.
- Gao, T., A. Fisch, and D. Chen (2020). “Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2012.15723*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2012.15723.
- Genugten, R. D. van and D. L. Schacter (2024). “Automated scoring of the autobiographical interview with natural language processing”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 56.3, pp. 2243–2259. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-023-02145-x.
- Gilardi, F., M. Alizadeh, and M. Kubli (2023). “ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120.30, e2305016120. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.230501612.
- Hussain, Z. et al. (2024). “A tutorial on open-source large language models for behavioral science”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 56.8, pp. 8214–8237. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-024-02455-8.
- Kaufman, S. et al. (2012). “Leakage in data mining: Formulation, detection, and avoidance”. In: *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 6.4, pp. 1–21.
- Kojima, T. et al. (2022). “Large language models are zero-shot reasoners”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35, pp. 22199–22213.
- Lampinen, A. K. et al. (2022). “Can language models learn from explanations in context?” In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2204.02329*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2204.02329.
- Lee, Gyeong-Geon et al. (2024). “Applying large language models and chain-of-thought for automatic scoring”. In: *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 6, p. 100213.
- Liu, P. et al. (2023). “Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing”. In: *ACM Computing Surveys* 55.9, pp. 1–35. DOI: 10.1145/3560815.
- Lo, Leo S (2023). “The art and science of prompt engineering: a new literacy in the information age”. In: *Internet Reference Services Quarterly* 27.4, pp. 203–210.
- MacQueen, K. M. et al. (1998). “Codebook development for team-based qualitative analysis”. In: *Cam Journal* 10.2, pp. 31–36. DOI: 10.1177/1525822X980100020301.

- Martinez, D. (2024). “Scoring story recall for individual differences research: Central details, peripheral details, and automated scoring”. In: *Behavior Research Methods*, pp. 1–17. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-024-02480-7.
- Michelmann, S. et al. (2025). “Large language models can segment narrative events similarly to humans”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 57.1, pp. 1–13. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-024-02569-z.
- Mishra, S. et al. (2021). “Reframing instructional prompts to gptk’s language”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2109.07830*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2109.07830.
- OpenAI (2025). *Enterprise privacy*. URL: <https://openai.com/enterprise-privacy>.
- Radford, A. et al. (2019). “Language models are unsupervised multitask learners”. In: *OpenAI Blog* 1.8, p. 9.
- Radford, Alec et al. (2018). *Improving language understanding by generative pre-training*. Publisher: OpenAI.
- Rathje, Steve et al. (2024). “GPT is an effective tool for multilingual psychological text analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121.34, e2308950121.
- Reinhold, M., P.-C. Bürkner, and H. Holling (2018). “Effects of expressive writing on depressive symptoms—A meta-analysis”. In: *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice* 25.1, p. 80.
- Reynolds, Laria and Kyle McDonell (2021). “Prompt programming for large language models: Beyond the few-shot paradigm”. In: *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2102.07350>.
- Sahoo, P. et al. (2024). “A systematic survey of prompt engineering in large language models: Techniques and applications”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2402.07927*.
- Semeraro, A. et al. (2023). *EmoAtlas: An emotional profiling tool merging psychological lexicons, artificial intelligence and network science*. DOI: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-2428155/v1.
- Sennrich, R., B. Haddow, and A. Birch (2015). “Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1508.07909*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.1508.07909.
- Shin, J., W. N. Pinto, and B. Wang (2025). “Investigating the effect of transformer encoder architecture to improve the reliability of classroom observation ratings on high-inference discourse”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 57.7, pp. 1–18.
- Stavropoulos, Alexander, Damien L Crone, and Igor Grossmann (2024). “Shadows of wisdom: Classifying meta-cognitive and morally grounded narrative content via large language models”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 56.7, pp. 7632–7646.
- Vaswani, Ashish et al. (2017). “Attention is all you need”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30, pp. 1–11. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>.
- Weber, M. and M. Reichardt (2023). “Evaluation is all you need. Prompting generative large language models for annotation tasks in the social sciences. A primer using open models”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2401.00284*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2401.00284.
- Wei, J. et al. (2022). “Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35, pp. 24824–24837.
- Wenzel, A. (2012). “Modification of Core Beliefs”. In: *Standard and Innovative Strategies in Cognitive Behavior Therapy*, p. 17.
- White, Jules et al. (2023). “A prompt pattern catalog to enhance prompt engineering with chatgpt”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11382*.
- Zhao, Z. et al. (2021). “Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 12697–12706.
- Zhou, Y. et al. (2022). “Large language models are human-level prompt engineers”. In: *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2211.01910*.
- Ziems, C. et al. (2024). “Can large language models transform computational social science?” In: *Computational Linguistics* 50.1, pp. 237–291.

Appendices

Appendix A

Figure 1: Few-Shot F1 Score Distributions in the Training Dataset



Appendix B

Figure 2: Performance Evolution with Automatic Prompt Engineering, as Assessed in the Training Dataset, with Highest F1 Indicated with Bold

