

# Prompting in the Dark: Assessing Human Performance in Prompt Engineering for Data Labeling When Gold Labels Are Absent

Zeyu He

The Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA, USA  
zmh5268@psu.edu

Saniya Naphade

GumGum Inc.  
Tempe, AZ, USA  
saniya.naphade@gumgum.com

Ting-Hao ‘Kenneth’ Huang

The Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA, USA  
txh710@psu.edu

## Abstract

Millions of users prompt large language models (LLMs) for various tasks, but how good are people at prompt engineering? Do users actually get closer to their desired outcome over multiple iterations of their prompts? These questions are crucial when no gold-standard labels are available to measure progress. This paper investigates a scenario in LLM-powered data labeling, “prompting in the dark,” where users iteratively prompt LLMs to label data without using manually-labeled benchmarks. We developed PROMPTINGSHEET, a Google Sheets add-on that enables users to compose, revise, and iteratively label data through spreadsheets. Through a study with 20 participants, we found that prompting in the dark was highly unreliable—only 9 participants improved labeling accuracy after four or more iterations. Automated prompt optimization tools like DSPy also struggled when few gold labels were available. Our findings highlight the importance of gold labels and the needs, as well as the risks, of automated support in human prompt engineering, providing insights for future tool design.

## CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → Empirical studies in HCI; User studies; User interface management systems; User interface programming; • **Applied computing** → Annotation; • **Computing methodologies** → Natural language processing.

## Keywords

Data Annotation; Data Labeling; Large Language Model; Iterative labeling; End-User Programming

## ACM Reference Format:


Zeyu He, Saniya Naphade, and Ting-Hao ‘Kenneth’ Huang. 2025. Prompting in the Dark: Assessing Human Performance in Prompt Engineering for Data Labeling When Gold Labels Are Absent. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’25)*, April 26–May 1, 2025, Yokohama, Japan. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3714319>

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have empowered millions, if not billions, to perform a wide range of programming and data science tasks, even without formal technical backgrounds. People can ask LLMs to teach them step-by-step how to build a web app from scratch [96], have LLMs analyze data and generate insights [51, 60],

or instruct LLMs to label thousands of data items [33, 34, 37]. All these were made possible by LLMs’ ability to converse in natural language and to follow users’ instructions, also known as “prompts.” The practice of “prompt engineering” has emerged to describe the process of developing and optimizing prompts to use LLMs efficiently [11, 27, 100]. Tools like LangChain<sup>1</sup> and ChainForge [6] were developed to facilitate complex chaining of prompts; technologies such as DSPy [43] were also created to automate prompt optimization. **However, how effective are people at prompt engineering in practice? Do users really get closer to their desired outcome over multiple iterations of their prompts?** These questions are especially important when gold-standard labels are unavailable. Decades of research indicates that gold-standard labels—data inputs paired with known correct predictions or ideal outputs (also referred to as “gold labels” or simply “gold” [3, 45, 81, 84, 85, 104, 106])—are critical for evaluating annotation quality [25, 31, 64] and system performance [15, 21, 30]. However, in real-world scenarios, gold labels can be absent, expensive to obtain at scale, or difficult to use. Millions of users iterate on prompts daily using ChatGPT’s text-based chat interface [13, 63], which does not provide any way to upload or evaluate against gold labels. Researchers conducting qualitative coding with LLMs often do not begin with stabilized gold codes [14, 16, 26, 71, 115]. Many automated data annotation efforts face insufficient gold labels due to the high cost of gathering labels [56, 101], difficulty recruiting experts for large-scale annotation tasks [10, 69, 107], privacy restrictions [32, 110], or the lack of universally agreed standards [68, 102]. In such cases, without reliable benchmarks to track prompting progress, users can only rely on their own prompting ability to drive toward desired outcomes. Yet, this ability is difficult to measure and thus remains understudied. Without understanding how well users can prompt LLMs through iterations, it is hard to determine how much support users need—and when they need it—to improve their prompt engineering efforts effectively.


This paper investigates a particular scenario in LLM-powered data labeling, which we refer to as “**prompting in the dark**.” In these scenarios, **users’ understanding of the data and their desired labeling scheme evolves through their interactions with the LLM and its outputs rather than through manual labeling**. The process typically unfolds as follows: Users begin by writing a prompt to instruct the LLM to label unannotated text data. They then observe the outcomes, sometimes reviewing the LLM’s explanations for its labels, and iteratively refine their prompt until satisfied with the results. This iterative refinement process is a common practice in research contexts, where “the prompt provided

Please use nonacm option or ACM Engage class to enable CC licenses.  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. *CHI ’25, April 26–May 1, 2025, Yokohama, Japan*  
© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).  
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-1394-1/25/04  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3714319>

<sup>1</sup>LangChain: <https://www.langchain.com/>

# PromptingSheet

## User Workflow



**Figure 1:** PROMPTINGSHEET is a Google Sheets add-on that allows users to compose prompts (Step 1), use those prompts to instruct LLMs to label data (Steps 2 and 3), review the resulting labels and optional explanations, and iteratively revise and relabel data (Step 4)—all within the same Google Sheets document. The process does not begin with users manually labeling data; instead, users’ understanding of the data and labeling scheme evolves as they interact with the LLM and review its outputs.

to the LLM is iteratively revised” to analyze or label data [77]. Although this prompt refinement process is often undocumented [77], we have observed a growing trend of bypassing manual labeling entirely in favor of starting directly with LLM prompting. This approach, admittedly, has some usability advantages: it eliminates the upfront effort of manual labeling, as the LLM takes on the task, leaving users to focus on reviewing and validating the results. Furthermore, at any point in the process, users have an up-to-date prompt that reflects their evolving understanding of the task and the data, which can be immediately used for additional data labeling. However, despite these seemingly appealing benefits, the core assumption underlying this prompting-in-the-dark approach—with each iteration, the LLM’s performance improves, gradually converging on an outcome that aligns with the user’s expectations—has yet to be rigorously validated.

To study users’ prompt engineering practices for data labeling, we developed **PROMPTINGSHEET**, a **spreadsheet-based end-user programming tool for prompt engineering in text data labeling tasks**. PROMPTINGSHEET was built as a Google Sheets add-on that allows users to compose prompts, use those prompts to instruct LLMs to label data, review the resulting labels and optional explanations, and iteratively revise and relabel data—all within the same Google Sheets document. Figure 1 shows PROMPTINGSHEET’s workflow. Equipped with the system, we conducted an in-lab user study with 20 participants, who used the system to perform a 5-point sentiment labeling task on a tweet dataset. We found that “prompting in the dark” was often unreliable and, at times, counter-productive. Of the 20 participants, only 9 improved their labeling accuracy when compared to the labels they manually annotated at

the end of the session. Even though providing a larger data sample for users to review sometimes helped, many participants ended the session with worse labeling outcomes. We also investigated the effectiveness of an automated prompt optimization tool, DSPy [43], and found that although it helped in some cases, it struggled to reliably optimize prompts with the small number of user-validated labels generated during the process.

This paper contributes to the rapidly evolving discourse on human-LLM interaction, specifically focusing on measuring human performance in prompt engineering. Our findings highlight the necessity of starting with at least a small set of manually labeled data, which can act as a critical beacon when prompting in the dark, as well as the need for more automated support, such as typo checks and rule suggestions, while ensuring designs that mitigate potential overreliance on LLMs’ predictions. These insights can inform the development of future tools, enabling a wider range of users to prompt LLMs more effectively.

## 1.1 Research Questions

The central research question guiding our study is:

- **RQ 1-1: How effective are people at prompt engineering in the “prompting in the dark” scenario?**

In addition to examining prompt engineering effectiveness, we aim to understand how key factors influence human performance when prompting in the dark. Among the many variables that could impact outcomes [50], two stand out: (1) the size of the sample data in each iteration, and (2) whether the LLM’s explanations for its

labels are shown to users. Accordingly, we address the following additional research questions:

- **RQ 1-2: How does sample size affect human performance in prompt engineering?**
- **RQ 1-3: How does displaying LLM explanations impact human performance in prompt engineering?**

We acknowledge that many variables could influence the quality of labels in LLM-powered data annotation. These include variables studied in crowdsourced data labeling research, such as task type [35, 117], task difficulty [116, 118], instruction quality [112, 114], label diversity [42], and label aggregation methods [19, 55].<sup>2</sup> We focus on these two key variables because they are widely applicable to any iterative prompting process with LLMs. Prior research shows that sample size significantly impacts human-AI workflows, while explanations are a primary means for LLMs to convey their reasoning to users. Below, we provide additional context for these variables:

- **Data Sample Size in Each Iteration.** In iterative labeling research [53], particularly within active learning [8], a recurring challenge is the trade-off between the limited time, attention, and effort of human annotators and the need for AI models to learn effectively from human-labeled instances [70, 99]. This trade-off is a fundamental issue in many human-AI collaboration scenarios. In iterative prompt refinement, larger sample sizes give users more data to inform prompt revisions, potentially improving performance. However, reviewing large datasets in every iteration is labor-intensive and time-consuming. Striking a balance between providing sufficient data for effective prompt improvement and minimizing user effort is critical. Given the universal relevance of this variable in human-AI collaboration, we examine it as a key factor in this study.
- **LLM Explanations for Predictions.** Bi-directional communication between users and LLMs—where users receive feedback from the model rather than only giving instructions—is essential for effective collaboration [79]. When prompting in the dark, gold labels and metrics like accuracy are unavailable, LLM-generated explanations become one of the few ways the model can provide feedback to users [49, 89]. However, prior studies show mixed results regarding the effectiveness of AI-generated explanations in human-AI collaboration. Some studies suggest that explanations may hinder human understanding [78, 91], while others indicate they can enhance decision-making [82, 93]. A cost-benefit framework has been proposed to make sense of these mixed results, suggesting that explanations fail to help in some cases because they do not reduce the cognitive cost of verifying AI predictions [93]. In most text data labeling tasks, except for cases with highly complex text, we hypothesize that reading the entire text and then reviewing explanations to validate the AI label generally requires more effort than carefully reading the text and deciding the label directly. Based on this framework, LLM explanations may offer limited utility. To evaluate whether this applies to iterative prompt refinement

for text labeling and to contribute to the broader discourse on human-AI collaboration, we studied explanations as a key variable.

Lastly, we are interested in how much automatic prompt optimization tools, such as DSPy [43], can enhance human performance in prompting-in-the-dark scenarios. This investigation is important because, even when users struggle with effective prompting, tools like DSPy might still be able to refine human-crafted prompts and achieve satisfactory results. However, the main challenge is that prompting in the dark typically provides too few labeled data points for optimization tools to learn effectively, even with a few sanity-check labels from users. To address this, we pose the following research question:

- **RQ 2: Can automatic prompt optimization tools like DSPy improve human performance in “prompting in the dark” scenarios?**

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Ways of Optimizing Prompts for LLMs

Prompts are the primary means by which users interact with, utilize, and instruct LLMs. Since the emergence of these models, researchers and developers have invested significant effort into understanding how to craft better prompts for more effective use.

*Automatic Prompt Optimization.* Much of the prior work has focused on automatically optimizing prompts. A common theme across these studies is the use of gold-standard labels to guide the optimization process. For example, Pryzant et al. [72] introduced an automatic prompt optimization method inspired by gradient descent; Mañas et al. [61] presented an approach that begins with a user prompt and iteratively generates revised prompts to maximize consistency between the generated image and prompt, without human intervention; Wan et al. [97] explored two types of prompt optimization, instruction and exemplar, and suggested that combining both can yield optimal results; Sun et al. [87] combined zero-shot and few-shot learning to optimize prompts automatically; and Levi et al. [54] improved prompt optimization through synthetic data generation and iterative refinement, focusing on aligning prompts with user intent by creating challenging boundary cases for iterative prompt refinement. While these studies were interesting and relevant, they generally assumed the availability of gold-standard labels and did not address situations where labels are absent or where standards are constantly evolving.

*User-Driven Prompt Optimization.* In addition to automatic prompt optimization, some research has focused on human capabilities in optimizing prompts. Zhou et al. [119] found that manual prompting often outperforms automated methods in various scenarios; Zamfirescu-Pereira et al. [113] discovered that people tend to design prompts opportunistically rather than systematically, which often leads to lower success rates. To the best of our knowledge, the most relevant prior work is by Wang et al. [102], who developed an iterative refinement system that enables users to prompt LLMs to build a personalized classifier for social media content. Their study explored three user strategies for improving prompts and measured their effectiveness. While conceptually related to our work, their focus was not on how users evolve their understanding

<sup>2</sup>Some variables in crowdsourced data annotation, such as workers’ financial or intrinsic incentives, do not apply to LLM-powered data annotation.

and expectations when interacting with LLMs. Instead, participants labeled ground truth at the beginning of the study, prior to using the system.

## 2.2 Tools for Prompt Engineering

With the advances in LLMs, numerous tools have been developed to assist with prompt engineering. Most of these tools follow a software-engineering paradigm, where testing (such as unit tests or integration tests) is a central concept, and thus often assume the existence of gold-standard labels. For example, PromptIDE is an interactive tool that helps experts iteratively refine prompts by providing various inputs, visualizing their performance on small validation datasets, and optimizing them based on quantitative feedback [86]; PromptAid is a visual analytics system for interactively creating, refining, testing, and iterating prompts while tracking accuracy changes [62]; ChainForge is an open-source visual toolkit for prompt engineering and on-demand hypothesis testing of text-generation LLMs [6]; and, promptfoo applies a test-driven approach to LLM development, producing matrix views that enable quick evaluation of outputs across multiple prompts [105]. While these tools are inspiring and valuable, the scenarios we focus on do not rely on the constant availability of gold labels.

## 2.3 Human-LLM Collaborative Data Annotation

Beyond simply treating LLMs as automatic labelers—common in countless NLP projects [88]—a growing body of work explores how to combine human and LLM efforts to achieve better annotation outcomes, such as improved accuracy or speed. Even as LLMs outperform humans in many labeling tasks, human-AI collaboration often produces better results than either alone [92]. For example, Kim et al. [46] introduced a human-LLM collaborative annotation system where LLMs handle bulk annotation tasks, while humans selectively verify and refine the annotations. Goel et al. [29] proposed an approach that combines LLMs with human expertise to efficiently generate ground truth labels for medical text annotation. Additionally, He et al. [34] demonstrated how aggregating crowd workers’ labels with GPT-4’s output can achieve higher labeling accuracy than either source alone. These studies generally aim to split the workflow of data labeling between humans and LLMs in a smart way, making the task more effective or efficient.

In contrast, our work does not focus on dividing or combining the workload, but on how humans can teach LLMs—through prompt refinement—to better label the specific type of data. Few prior studies have emphasized iterative prompt refinement in human-LLM collaborative data annotation. For example, Liu et al. [57] developed a workflow for video content analysis, refining prompts to improve LLM-generated annotations and align them with human judgment. Additionally, Zhang et al. [114] proposed LLMAAA, which uses LLMs as annotators in a feedback loop to label data efficiently. Their study shows that poorly designed prompts result in subpar performance, especially in complex tasks. Our work advances this relatively understudied area of human-LLM collaborative annotation research.

## 2.4 Gold-Standard Labels in Annotation Tasks

Decades of research have shown that gold-standard labels play a critical role in quality control for data annotation pipelines [17, 25, 31, 36, 52]. Embedding items with known labels into the data annotation process allows requesters to reliably capture quality signals, such as workers’ level of expertise [2, 4, 109] or attentiveness to tasks [36, 66]. These insights enable requesters to take appropriate actions, such as retraining annotators [17, 36, 52], removing low-performing workers [18, 34, 52, 84], or identifying potential issues in the annotation interfaces [34, 48, 73, 90]. Gold labels are also beneficial for requesters during post-annotation data processing. They can be used to weight labels from different workers in label aggregation [1, 2], improve label aggregation strategies [44, 84], or exclude unreliable workers’ outputs entirely [2]. Beyond requesters, gold labels are also beneficial for data labelers like crowd workers. Gold labels can be used to train workers [17, 25, 31, 52], provide real-time feedback to help them recalibrate their understanding of the task [36, 52], or remind them to pay more attention [36, 66].

While gold labels are useful for quality control, as stated in the Introduction (Section 1), they are not always available in real-world scenarios due to constraints such as data privacy or the cost of gathering gold labels [58, 65, 83, 108]. To address these challenges, researchers have developed methods to generate (approximations of) quality signals without gold labels. In the realm of LLM-powered data annotation, for instance, CoPrompter evaluates how well an LLM’s output aligns with user-specified requirements as a feedback mechanism [41]. Other studies also leverage the stability [12] or confidence [28] of LLM outputs to infer quality signals. Our research examines how effectively humans can refine prompts to guide LLMs in labeling data without gold-standard labels, providing insights into human prompting capabilities in the absence of reliable guidance signals.

## 3 PROMPTINGSHEET: A Spreadsheet-Based End-User Prompt Engineering Tool

In this paper, we present PROMPTINGSHEET, a Google Sheets add-on that allows users to load a dataset into a Dataset spreadsheet, manually compose each part of a prompt within Task Context, Labeling Rules, and Shots sheets, and use the composed prompt to instruct an LLM to annotate data—all within the same Google Sheets document. Motivated by the need to enable general users to prompt LLMs without installing and configuring professional tools like integrated development environments (IDEs) or Jupyter Notebooks, we decided to build a tool based on spreadsheets, which most computer users are already familiar with. This section overviews PROMPTINGSHEET’s design and workflows.

### 3.1 Design Goals

*Adapting to Evolving Labeling Goals.* The goal of PROMPTINGSHEET is to enable general users to create and refine prompts iteratively for LLM-powered data labeling, particularly in situations where they start without any labeled gold data or manual labeling, *i.e.*, the “prompting in the dark” scenario. In these cases, users’ understanding of the data and desired labeling scheme evolves through their interactions with the LLM, based on its predicted labels and explanations, rather than through their own manual efforts. The lack of



gold labels (or sufficient labeled data) introduces the core challenge of the prompt-in-the-dark process: aside from users’ observations and judgments about the labeling results, there is no concrete way to provide quick and comprehensive feedback on the progress of prompting. We view this as a trade-off between two user needs in prompt engineering: (i) allowing users’ understanding of the data and labeling goals to evolve, and (ii) providing clear guidance and reliable feedback to assess progress toward a defined annotation goal. Previously, supervised learning-based classifiers required labeled data, so users focused heavily on the second need, as manual labeling was always needed and assumed to finalize the coding scheme. The rise of LLMs has reduced the need for pre-labeled data, allowing users to put more focus on their first needs. The growing popularity of the prompting-in-the-dark approach reflects users’ need for evolving and dynamic labeling practices [7, 103, 115]. Our design goal for PROMPTINGSHEET is to offer users greater flexibility and freedom in defining how their data should be labeled.

*Supporting a Wide Range of “Newcomers” Brought in By LLMs.* Our second design goal for PROMPTINGSHEET is to develop a tool for users with **little to no experience in large-scale text data labeling**, including but not limited to those with limited or no programming skills. The rationale behind this goal is two-fold. On a practical level, people new to large-scale data annotation—empowered by LLMs to undertake such tasks with greater ease—are more likely to adopt approaches that diverge from conventional practices. In the crowdsourcing literature, many papers emphasize best practices for data annotation [20, 38, 75, 95, 98], such as ethical pay rates [23, 80], usable worker interfaces [34, 48, 73, 90], and gold labels for quality control [17, 25, 31, 36, 52]. However, these practices are often neglected in real-world scenarios. For instance, many tasks on MTurk still offer very low pay [22] or rely on poorly designed interfaces [24]. Newcomers to large-scale data annotation are even less likely to be familiar with these best practices, including carefully establishing gold labels before prompting LLMs. The bigger picture is that LLMs are adding many “new members” to the world of programming and data science. This group brings new practices, user needs, challenges, and research questions to HCI, requiring more focused attention.

Based on these two design goals, we decided to build PROMPTINGSHEET based on spreadsheets, a format that most computer users are already familiar with. We distinguish our goals from existing efforts in two significant ways. First, while projects like LangChain or ChainForge focus on developers or those with programming backgrounds, requiring software installations or configurations, we aim to focus on general users who do not necessarily have such expertise. Second, some projects explore new interactions enabled by LLMs [47], but our project is concerned with understanding how effectively users can use familiar interfaces, such as spreadsheets, to interact with LLMs.

### 3.2 User Interface and Pre-Defined Sheets

PROMPTINGSHEET is a Google Sheets add-on that enables users to load data, sample a subset for labeling, compose and edit prompts, use these prompts to request LLMs for data labeling, and iteratively revise the prompts. Figure 2 shows the interface of PROMPTINGSHEET.

*Sidebar.* Following Google Sheets’ design constraints, all functions are presented as manuals and buttons within the sidebar on the right. The sidebar remains consistent across all sheets, regardless of which sheet is in use. At the top of the sidebar, PROMPTINGSHEET provides a real-time notification that keeps users informed about its ongoing processes, such as “Data Indexing,” “Data Sampling,” “Generating the Instructional Prompt,” or “Annotating.”

*Pre-Defined Sheets.* PROMPTINGSHEET includes a set of predefined spreadsheets, each with a set of pre-defined columns. At the bottom of the interface, a series of tabs allows users to switch between sheets, with each sheet dedicated to a different part of the data labeling process. The following describes each sheet in detail. (To help readers easily identify which sheet we are referring to, we indexed each sheet as A, B, C, ..., and G in all the figures. These indexes were not present in the actual system to users.)

- **Dataset (Sheet A):** This spreadsheet stores the full dataset. Users can copy and paste the dataset into this sheet or use any supported Google Sheets import method (in Step 0). The sheet includes three key predefined columns: (1) Data ID, (2) Group ID, and (3) Data Instance. Each data instance is uniquely indexed by its corresponding Data ID, which users can generate by clicking the “Index Data ID” function in the sidebar. The Group ID is used for annotating sequential data, such as when each sentence in an article is treated as a separate data instance, but all sentences from the same article share the same Group ID. In our design, this sheet is intended to serve as a static data source, and we anticipate that users will not modify it after loading the data.
- **Task Context (Sheet B):** This spreadsheet stores the meta-information and context for the labeling task, which will later be incorporated into the prompt. The sheet includes predefined questions that characterize the task, such as the purpose of the data labeling, how the labels will be used, the source of the data, and the size of each data instance. Table 5 in Appendix A shows all the questions. Users provide answers to these questions (in Step 1 or 4), and PROMPTINGSHEET automatically incorporates both the questions and their answers into the prompt used for LLMs to label the data.
- **Rule Book (Sheet C):** This spreadsheet contains the labeling rules that the LLM will follow. It includes two key predefined columns: (1) Label Name and (2) Rules for the Label. Users manually define the criteria and descriptions for each label in free text (in Step 1 or 4), detailing the guidelines for the annotation process. Multiple rules can be added for a single label, providing flexibility in defining the labeling criteria.
- **Shots (Sheet D):** This spreadsheet stores all the high-quality examples, including data instances and their corresponding labels, which will be included in the prompt to guide the LLM in labeling the data. These examples, commonly referred to as “shots” in prompts, follow the same predefined column structure, with an additional “Gold-Standard Label” column. Users can add these examples manually (in Step 1) or use PROMPTINGSHEET’s function to do so (in Step 4).
- **Working Data Sample (Sheet E):** This spreadsheet stores the current subset of data selected from the full dataset, ready




Figure 2: The user interface and all the predefined sheets of PROMPTINGSHEET, where each sheet has a set of pre-defined columns. PROMPTINGSHEET allows users to load a dataset into a Dataset (A) sheet, manually compose each part of a prompt within Task Context (B), Labeling Rules (C), and Shots (D) sheets, and use the composed prompt to instruct an LLM to annotate data and store the labeling results in a separate task sheet (G). All functions are presented as manuals and buttons within the sidebar on the right.

for the LLM to label. Users can sample data from the Dataset sheet by clicking the corresponding buttons in the sidebar; users can choose between random sampling or selecting a specific range (Step 2). During the annotation process, only the data instances in the Working Data Sample sheet will be labeled. PROMPTINGSHEET will copy the entire data sample from the Working Data Sample sheet to create a new sheet to label (Step 3).

- **Task Dashboard (Sheet F):** This spreadsheet tracks all labeling tasks performed so far. When the user clicks the “Start Annotation” button in the sidebar (in Step 3), PROMPTINGSHEET creates a new sheet for the task (e.g., Task 1 sheet) and adds a new row in the Task Dashboard to record the labeling activities. Task Dashboard sheet (Figure 16) logs task details such as task number, timestamp, the prompt used, and total costs.

- **Task 1 (Sheet G), Task 2, ..., Task N:** Each of these sheets stores the annotation results for each labeling request, including data samples, LLM-generated labels, and LLM explanations (optional). These sheets also include columns that allow users to validate or correct the LLM labels and optionally add them to the Shots sheet (in Step 4). When the user clicks the “Start Annotation” button in the sidebar (in Step 3), PROMPTINGSHEET generates a new task sheet to handle the specific labeling task.

Notably, while users must follow our guidelines for using the predefined columns in each sheet and inputting data correctly, they are free to add more columns or even additional sheets, just as they would in a regular Google Sheets document. For instance, when pasting a dataset into the Dataset sheet, it is common for the dataset to include its own IDs or additional information for each data entry. Users can easily store this extra information by creating new columns within the Dataset sheet.

### 3.3 User Workflow

Users interact with PROMPTINGSHEET to craft a prompt, use it to instruct the LLM in labeling data, review the results, and then revise the prompt through an iterative process. To demonstrate the users' workflow, we present a scenario where a user wants to employ PROMPTINGSHEET to label a collection of tweets related to COVID with a 5-point sentiment scale, ranging from Very Negative (1) to Very Positive (5). The goal is to analyze the sentiment of Twitter (now X) users toward COVID, with an emphasis on ensuring that the classification of each tweet reflects the user's own judgment. In this case, the LLM's labels should align with the user's assessment of what is positive or negative, as well as the intensity of sentiment, rather than following an "objective" standard.

- **Step 0: Load and Index the Dataset.** To begin using PROMPTINGSHEET, the user opens a new Google Sheets document and activates the PROMPTINGSHEET add-on. The system automatically sets up the necessary tabs, and the add-on interface appears on the right side of the spreadsheet (Figure 2). The user then imports their data instances into the Dataset sheet, with the text of each tweet placed in the Data Instance column. The user must specify a Group ID for each instance. If the data are not sequential or grouped, they can assign unique Group IDs using Google Sheets' automatic numbering function.<sup>3</sup> Once the data is entered, the user clicks the "Index Data ID" button in the sidebar, and PROMPTINGSHEET automatically assigns unique data IDs to each instance in the "Data ID" column.
- **Step 1: Compose/Refine the Prompt (Figure 3).** This is the most critical step, where the user composes and refines prompts for the LLM to label the data. In PROMPTINGSHEET, the prompt consists of three parts, each corresponding to a separate sheet: (1) Context, (2) Rule Book, and (3) Shots. Figure 3 provides an overview of each sheet.
  - (1) In the **Context** sheet, the user answers questions that describe the context of the data annotation task, such as the purpose of the annotation and the source of the data, to provide task-specific context for the LLM.
  - (2) In the **Rule Book** sheet, the user adds annotation labels along with their definitions. Providing content for both the Context and Rule Book sheets is mandatory, as the LLM requires this information in the prompt to function effectively.
  - (3) In the **Shots** sheet, the user adds data instances along with their corresponding gold labels, which serve as examples to help the LLM learn. While adding examples to the Shots sheet is optional during the first iteration—since the user may not yet have a well-defined gold standard for labeling—more examples can be identified as the user reviews data. These examples can be manually added or generated using PROMPTINGSHEET's function (see Step 4).


<sup>3</sup>PROMPTINGSHEET is designed to accommodate single and grouped data instances within a Group ID. For tasks like sentiment analysis, each data instance is treated separately under its unique Group ID. For tasks that require contextual information, such as annotating text segments in an academic abstract (e.g., CODA-19 [40]), PROMPTINGSHEET can combine all data instances under the same Group ID into a single request to the LLM model. This flexibility allows the system to support different data instance formats based on user requirements.

It is important to note that at the beginning of this labeling process, the user has only a vague idea of what they want to label and will continuously refine that idea. Each time the prompt is revised, it reflects an evolution of their understanding and approach to the labeling task.

- **Step 2: Sample/Resample a Subset (Figure 4).** Next, the user employs PROMPTINGSHEET to sample a subset of data for labeling. Labeling only a subset, rather than the entire dataset, is necessary because the full dataset is too large for the user to thoroughly review the LLM's results. Additionally, labeling the entire dataset iteratively would be prohibitively expensive. In this step, the user can (1) randomly or (2) sequentially sample data from the Dataset sheet into the Working Data Sample sheet:
  - For a **Random Sample**, the user enters any whole number between 1 and the total number of group IDs in the dataset. PROMPTINGSHEET will then randomly select that number of groups and copy them into the Working Data Sample sheet.
  - In **Sequential Sample**, the user specifies a range of group IDs from the Dataset sheet, and PROMPTINGSHEET will import the data instances from the selected range into the Working Data Sample sheet. This feature allows users to process their data instances sequentially in batches, which is especially useful when the data instances have a sequential relationship, such as sentences within the same document.
 Once sampling begins, all previously existing data in the Working Data Sample sheet will be removed, except for instances marked as "Keep it in the next data sample" (Figure 4). Only the data in the Working Data Sample sheet will be labeled by the LLM when the "Start Annotation" button is clicked in Step 3.
- **Step 3: Use the Prompt to Instruct the LLM to Label the Data Sample (Figure 5).** After finalizing the three prompt sheets—Context, Rule Book, and Shots—in Step 1 and sampling data instances in Step 2, the user clicks the "Start Annotation" button in the sidebar to annotate all instances in the Working Data Sample sheet (Figure 5). PROMPTINGSHEET creates a new sheet, Task 1 (Figure 5), to store the data and labels of this labeling task, and also creates a new row for Task 1 in the Task Dashboard sheet.
 

In the background, PROMPTINGSHEET first combines the information in Context, Rule Book, and Shots sheets into a prompt (see Section 3.4 for details). For each data group (*i.e.*, data instances with the same Group ID), PROMPTINGSHEET sends a request to the LLM using this prompt for annotation. After receiving the LLM's output, the system parses the results and updates the Task 1 sheet with the annotated outcome for each instance. In our implementation, the LLM is always asked to provide explanations for its labels, though the user can decide whether to display these explanations in the annotation results.
- **Step 4: Observe, then Revise the Prompt (Figure 5).** The labeling results are saved to the Task 1 sheet (Figure 5), where the user can manually verify the LLM's labels. The user can review as many or as few data instances as they wish

## Step 1: Compose/Refine the Prompt



Users can manually edit each part of the prompt in the corresponding sheets.

Figure 3: The overview of step 1 of the data labeling process, compose or refine the prompt. This is the most critical step, where the user composes and refines prompts for the LLM to label the data. In PROMPTINGSHEET, the prompt consists of three parts, each corresponding to a separate sheet: Context (B), Rule Book (C), and Shots (D). At the beginning of this labeling process, the user has only a vague idea of what they want to label and will continuously refine that idea. Each time the prompt is revised, it reflects an evolution of their understanding and approach to the labeling task.

to develop a better understanding of the labeling task and the dataset. Based on this evolving understanding, they can refine the prompt by modifying the Context, Rule Book, and Shots sheets accordingly.

If the user disagrees with any of the labels, they can assign a new label to the data instance under the “Human Label” column. If the user identifies good examples, they can check the “Gold Shot” checkboxes. After selecting enough good examples, the user can click the “Add Shots” button in the sidebar to add these examples to the Shots sheet (Figure 5). Like in other sheets, if the user wants certain data instances to be re-annotated in the next round, they can check the

“Keep it in the next data sample” checkboxes. This will ensure that those instances are not removed during the next sampling process, allowing the user to observe whether the LLM’s behavior changes over iterations.

When using PROMPTINGSHEET, the user moves through Steps 1, 2, 3, and 4, and then returns to step 1 in an iterative process until they are satisfied with the LLM’s labels.

### 3.4 Implementation Details

*Developing Google Sheets Add-On.* PROMPTINGSHEET utilized Google Sheets as its main platform, leveraging the convenience and functionality of its spreadsheet capability. The Google Sheets

## Step 2: Sample/Resample a Subset




Figure 4: The overview of step 2 of the data labeling process, sample or resample a subset. The full dataset is often too large for the user to thoroughly review, so sampling a subset is necessary. In this step, the user can (1) randomly or (2) sequentially sample data from the Dataset (A) sheet.

add-on was implemented in Google App Script, with Google Cloud Service serving as a back-end to store all action logging files. User-specific data, such as OpenAI information, was securely stored in user properties tied to individual email accounts, ensuring privacy protection.

*Converting a Spreadsheet’s Content into a Prompt.* Once users click on the “Start Annotation” button (Figure 5), PROMPTINGSHEET will first collect all questions and answers from the “Context” tab and send a request to GPT-4o to generate an instructional prompt (Table 7). Next, PROMPTINGSHEET will merge this generated prompt with rules and definitions from “Rule Book” and available gold standard labels from the “Shots” tab to create an annotation prompt (Table 8 and Table 9). Finally, PROMPTINGSHEET will use this prompt to annotate all data instances.

*Interacting with the LLM through an API.* In this paper, we utilized OpenAI’s gpt-4o-2024-05-13 model for our study [67]. Technically, this LLM can be replaced by any other model that offers an API compatible with the ChatGPT-4 specification. In our implementation, we group all data instances with the same Group ID and send them in a single API request.

## 4 User Study

Our goal is to investigate how effective people are at prompt engineering when gold labels are absent, namely, “prompting in the dark”. To study this, we conducted an in-lab user study in which participants used PROMPTINGSHEET to perform a 5-point sentiment labeling task on a tweet dataset. This section overviews the details of this study. This study has been approved by the IRB office of the authors’ institute.


### 4.1 Study Procedure

*4.1.1 Pilot Study.* Three participants were recruited through the authors’ network for the pilot study. In the first pilot, we used CODA-19 [40] as the data annotation task, where participants labeled text segments from academic abstracts into categories such as background, purpose, and findings. We observed that the participant consistently agreed with nearly all the labels and did not suggest further refinements. This may have been due to the highly specialized nature of the abstracts, which made it difficult for a broader audience to fully understand and evaluate the labels. As a result, we decided to switch to a Twitter Sentiment task for the second pilot. In this second pilot, we found that our guidelines were too flexible, leading to participant confusion and uncertainty about how to proceed. We made adjustments to provide more structure, such as requiring participants to complete at least four iterations, with each iteration involving the annotation of 10 out of 50 instances. After verification, participants were instructed to refine their rules and add gold standard labels. Based on the results of the two pilot studies, we extended the study duration from 60 to 90 minutes to give participants enough time to learn the system and complete the tasks. Compensation was also adjusted to \$20. We tested these revised settings with the third participant and confirmed that the procedure worked effectively.

*4.1.2 Participants Recruitment, Backgrounds, and Grouping.* For our main study, we focused on recruiting individuals with reasonable familiarity with LLMs but relatively new to large-scale text data annotation. While PROMPTINGSHEET is designed as an end-user prompting tool, in this study, we prioritized participants likely to represent the first wave of “newcomers” (as noted in our Design Goals in Section 3.1) entering LLM-powered data annotation. This



### Step 3: Use the Prompt to Instruct the LLM to Label the Data Sample



### Step 4: Observe, then Revise the Prompt




Figure 5: The overview of steps 3 and 4 of the data labeling process. After finalizing the prompt (Step 1) and sampling data instances (Step 2), in Step 3, the user clicks the “Start Annotation” button in the sidebar to annotate all instances in the Working Data Sample sheet. PROMPTINGSHEET creates a new sheet, Task 1 (G), to store the data and labels of this labeling task, and also creates a new row for Task 1 in the Task Dashboard sheet. Then, in Step 4, the user can review the outcomes and refine the prompt accordingly (Step 1).

focus allowed us to avoid the need to teach participants the basics of LLMs, prompting, or text data annotation. We recruited 20 participants from diverse educational backgrounds through the authors’ networks, social media posts, and mailing lists within the authors’ institute. The group included 1 Post-doctoral Researcher, 9 Ph.D. students, 9 Master’s students, and 1 Undergraduate student. As part of the recruitment process, we specifically sought participants who met the criteria of possessing prior experience using LLMs.

Participants were compensated \$20 for their participation, and in our analysis, they are denoted as P1 to P20.

Participants were randomly and evenly assigned to four groups based on two variables: (1) whether they had access to 50 instances per iteration or 10 instances per iteration, and (2) whether or not

they could view the LLM’s explanations for its labels<sup>4</sup>. Further details are provided in the study procedure section (Section 4.1.4).

*Survey on Participants’ LLM Familiarity and Usage.* To assess participants’ familiarity with using LLMs, we conducted an optional post-study survey, offering an additional \$5 compensation for completion. (The full set of survey questions is provided in Table 10 in Appendix F.) All participants responded. Most participants reported being familiar with LLMs, with an average familiarity score of 4.20 (SD=0.77) on a 5-point scale. 15 participants had over one year of experience using LLMs, while 4 reported more than four months of experience, and 1 reported between one and three months. In terms of usage frequency, 16 participants used LLMs daily, 3 used them weekly, and 1 used them monthly. While most participants used LLMs for general tasks such as Q&A, research, writing assistance, and programming/debugging, only 5 participants had experience using LLMs for data labeling. Participants rated their confidence in crafting prompts and their proficiency in interacting with LLMs similarly, with average scores of 3.75 (SD=0.85) and 3.85 (SD=0.88), respectively. Overall, the participants represented individuals familiar with LLMs but relatively inexperienced with large-scale data annotation.

*4.1.3 Labeling Task, Scheme, and Data.* We selected the Coronavirus Tweet NLP Text Classification task, which categorizes tweets into five sentiment categories: Extremely Positive, Positive, Neutral, Negative, and Extremely Negative, using the dataset hosted on Kaggle.<sup>5</sup> The dataset contains tweets from December 30, 2019, to September 7, 2020. For our study, we randomly sampled 1,060 tweets: 10 tweets were used for the tutorial task, 1,000 for the main study, and 50 for the final evaluation set (see Section 4.1.4).

This task was chosen, partially informed by our pilot study (Section 4.1.1), for several reasons. First, it strikes a balance in difficulty, being challenging enough to require iterative prompting efforts from LLMs, as a 5-class sentiment task is more complex than typical 2-class (positive, negative) or 3-class (positive, negative, neutral) sentiment classification tasks. Second, it avoids requiring specialized knowledge, ensuring a broad pool of potential participants. Tasks demanding domain-specific expertise would have significantly restricted recruitment; sentiment labeling for general COVID-related tweets is sufficiently accessible for this purpose. Finally, the task incorporates a subjective element, as it lacks universally agreed-upon gold labels. This aligns with our focus on “prompting in the dark,” where participants’ understanding of the data, as well as labeling goals, evolve through iterations. The subjective nature of the task allows participants to arrive at differing gold standards by the end of the process. Considering these factors, we selected this task for our study.

*4.1.4 Study Procedure.* For our main user study, most sessions were conducted remotely via Zoom or Microsoft Teams, with each session lasting between 87 and 127 minutes. Participants who attended in person used one of the author’s laptops, while remote

participants used their own computers. Since PROMPTINGSHEET was a Google Add-on in a development version, it was installed on one of the author’s laptops. Remote participants were given control of this laptop to conduct the experiment. Each session was recorded, capturing the screen, audio, and video for further analysis.

The study followed these steps:

- (1) **Onboarding:** Participants were first introduced to the study’s objectives and procedures, and their informed consent was obtained.
- (2) **Tutorial Task:** Participants were then presented with a tutorial on the system’s workflow and features, either delivered by one of the authors or via a prerecorded video, depending on their preference. Afterward, they completed a short tutorial task, identical to the main study task but involving only 10 data instances, to ensure their understanding of the system.
- (3) **Main Study:** Participants were then asked to use PROMPTINGSHEET to iteratively compose a prompt to label the sentiment of COVID-related tweets in alignment with their personal judgment of sentiment scores. Each participant was asked to complete at least four iterations (*i.e.*, going through Steps 1 to 4 four or more times). Participants were free to do additional iterations beyond the required four; on average, participants completed 4.75 iterations. Depending on their assigned group, participants used PROMPTINGSHEET to annotate either 50 or 10 instances per iteration and then review the results. For participants working with 50 instances per iteration, we advised that it was not necessary to manually verify all labels, as that would take too much time. Participants in the group with access to LLM explanations were explicitly informed that they could manually turn on the explanations if they felt that they needed reasoning for each label. Most participants turned on the LLM explanations in the first iteration; however, one participant chose to disable the LLM explanations after the first iteration and another participant decided not to use the LLM explanations throughout the entire study.
- (4) **Manual Labeling of the Gold Set:** Upon completing the iterative process, participants manually labeled 50 tweets based on their own sentiment judgments. These labels reflected the participants’ understanding of the data and the final labeling they aimed to achieve by the end of the study session. These manually labeled tweets were used as an evaluation dataset to assess the performance of the participants’ prompts; they were not used to train or fine-tune any AI models.
- (5) **Post-Study Survey and Feedback Collection:** At the end of the session, participants completed a questionnaire to rate the system’s effectiveness, performance, and accessibility. They were also asked the following questions: (1) Without this tool, how would you typically approach prompt engineering? (2) How does your prompt engineering process compare before and after using this tool? (3) Did the system help you complete the tasks more efficiently? If yes, please explain how. (4) What features did you find most useful? (5) Would you be interested in using this annotation system in

<sup>4</sup>Since one participant chose to disable the LLM explanations after the first iteration and another participant decided not to use the LLM explanations throughout the entire study, we grouped them with the no LLM explanation participants, resulting in 8 participants with access to LLM explanations and 12 participants without access.

<sup>5</sup>Coronavirus tweets NLP - Text Classification: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/datatattle/covid-19-nlp-text-classification/>

your regular work or study? If no, please explain why. (6) Do you have any suggestions for making the system more suitable for your needs?

Upon completing the questionnaire, we verbally asked participants to provide some last comments about the workflow, labeling task, and our system.

## 5 Findings

In this section, we organize our findings under each research question (RQs) mentioned in Section 1.1.

### 5.1 RQ 1-1: How effective are people at prompt engineering in the “prompting in the dark” scenario?

We evaluated each prompt iteration by comparing the labels generated by the LLM (GPT-4o) to the gold labels participants manually annotated for a set of 50 tweets at the end of their study session. Performance was measured using accuracy (ACC) and Mean Square Error (MSE), two commonly used metrics in sentiment analysis [76]. In the main study, each participant provided at least five prompts (with some offering more), and our evaluation focuses primarily on these five prompts, which were shared across all participants. The ACC and MSE were calculated by comparing the annotation results from participant-provided prompts with the manually generated gold-standard labels. Each label was treated as a distinct category, and accuracy was then calculated accordingly.

*5.1.1 5-Point sentiment rating is a highly subjective task.* The premise of our study is that users bring their own personal perspectives and judgments to seemingly identical labeling tasks. To validate this assumption, we calculated both Cohen’s kappa between participants’ manual ratings—the labels collected at the end of the study—and the “gold-standard” labels from the dataset, as well as the agreement between participants themselves. Participants’ labels show a poor alignment with the labels from the original dataset, with an average Kappa of 0.114 (SD=0.070). The average Kappa value between participants was only slightly higher, with an average Kappa of 0.249 (SD=0.059). The low Kappa score indicated the Twitter Sentiment task we used in our study was a highly subjective task. Namely, each participant’s gold labels were highly influenced by their personal interpretations and preferences.

*5.1.2 Prompting in the dark is ineffective.* Table 1 and Figure 6 show the average ACC and MSE for the first prompt and the four subsequent revisions. Our analysis, as captured in PROMPTINGSHEET, indicates that prompting in the dark is not particularly effective. Among the 20 participants, average labeling accuracy (where higher is better) only slightly improved from 0.542 to 0.553 after four iterations (Figure 6a). Some participants went through more than four iterations. The average labeling accuracy at the end of their sessions—the final iteration for all participants—was improved to 0.546. Meanwhile, the average MSE (where lower is better) fluctuated, ultimately increasing from 0.782 to 0.810 by the fourth revision (Figure 6b). The average MSE for the end-of-session increased to 0.815. It is important to note that, since this is a 5-scale rating task, ACC is a more harsh metric, awarding credit only for exact matches,

while MSE considers the distance between the predicted rating and the user-specified rating.

*5.1.3 Prompting in the dark is unreliable.* To further illustrate how the process unfolded for each participant, we present individual ACC and MSE charts in Figure 7 and Figure 8. The results show that the process is highly unreliable. Labeling accuracy improved for 9 participants after four iterations, declined for 10, and remained unchanged for 1. Similarly, MSE improved (*i.e.*, decreased) for 8 participants, worsened for 10, and stayed the same for 2. Overall, the practice of “prompting in the dark”—iterating prompts without reference to gold labels—proved unreliable, with over half of the participants experiencing a decline in performance by the end of the study.

### 5.2 RQ 1-2: How does sample size affect human performance in prompt engineering?

*5.2.1 Reviewing 50 instances per iteration leads to more frequent and consistent improvements compared to reviewing 10 instances.* Table 2 and Figure 9 present a comparison of participants who reviewed 50 instances per iteration against those who reviewed 10 instances per iteration. The detailed breakdown is shown in Figure 17. In terms of accuracy, at the end of the session (*i.e.*, four or more revisions), 6 out of 10 participants in the 50-instance group showed improvement, while only 3 out of 10 participants in the 10-instance group improved. On average, every iteration in the 50-instance group resulted in better accuracy compared to the initial prompt, though the improvement was not strictly increasing with each iteration.

For MSE, participants in the 50-instance group improved across three iterations, while those in the 10-instance group showed no improvement over the initial prompt in any round.

We also note that participants in the 10-instance group began with higher initial performance, but this was before they viewed the labeling results and occurred by chance, unrelated to the experimental conditions. Our analysis focuses on performance differences between iterations across both groups.

*Significant Tests.* We conducted eight linear mixed-effects models to examine the effect of iteration across four different conditions. The dependent variables were ACC and MSE, and participants were treated as random effects. In the condition where participants **reviewed only 10 instances per iteration**, we found a significant increasing trend in MSE as the iterations progressed ( $\beta=0.019$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.043^*$ ).

### 5.3 RQ 1-3: How does displaying LLM explanations impact human performance in prompt engineering?

*5.3.1 Participants without access to LLM explanations improved their accuracy over multiple revisions, while those with access did not.* Table 3 and Figure 10 show a comparison between participants with and without access to the LLM’s explanations during the labeling process. The detailed breakdown is shown in Figure 18. At the end of the session (*i.e.*, four or more revisions), 7 out of 12 participants without access to explanations improved their accuracy, while only




Figure 6: The average ACC and MSE of the first prompt and the four subsequent revisions. These results show that prompting in the dark is not particularly effective. Average labeling accuracy only slightly improved after four iterations; the average MSE fluctuated, ultimately increasing only marginally by the fourth revision.

	ACC↑		MSE↓	
	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial
Initial Prompt	.542 (.099)	-	.782 (.482)	-
1st Revision	.536 (.088)	35%	.795 (.546)	40%
2nd Revision	.542 (.073)	40%	.833 (.514)	45%
3rd Revision	<b>.549 (.082)</b>	50%	.823 (.579)	50%
4th Revision	<b>.553 (.085)</b>	45%	.810 (.566)	40%
End of Session (Avg #Iter = 4.75)	<b>.546 (.084)</b>	45%	.815 (.489)	45%

Table 1: The average ACC and MSE of the first prompt, the four subsequent revisions, and at the end of the session. Improvements over the initial prompt are bolded and underlined.

2 out of 8 participants with access to explanations showed improvement. On average, the group without access saw improved accuracy over the initial prompt with each of the four revisions, whereas the group with access to explanations experienced a decline in accuracy across all revisions.

In terms of MSE, there was no significant difference between the two groups in the number of individuals who showed improvement. In fact, both groups saw an increase in MSE during the revision process.

As with the results related to data sample size (Section 5.2), we are aware that participants with access to LLM explanations started

with higher initial performance; this initial advantage occurred before the participants reviewed the labeling results and explanations. Our analysis focuses on performance changes across iterations rather than the absolute performances.

*Significant Tests.* We conducted eight linear mixed-effects models to examine the effect of iteration across four different conditions. The dependent variables were ACC and MSE, and participants were treated as random effects. Under conditions where participants **did not have access to LLM explanations**, we observed a significant increasing trend in accuracy with each iteration ( $\beta=0.010$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.027^*$ ).




Figure 7: Accuracy Plots for all participants. The results show that the process is highly unreliable. Labeling accuracy improved for 9 participants after four iterations, declined for 10, and remained unchanged for 1.

	50 Samples/Round (N=10)				10 Samples/Round (N=10)			
	ACC ↑		MSE ↓		ACC ↑		MSE ↓	
	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial
Initial Prompt	.520 (.075)	-	.742 (.242)	-	.564 (.117)	-	.822 (.654)	-
1st Revision	<b>.530 (.094)</b>	50%	<b>.720 (.285)</b>	40%	.542 (.086)	20%	.870 (.733)	40%
2nd Revision	<b>.528 (.050)</b>	50%	<b>.780 (.268)</b>	50%	.556 (.091)	30%	.886 (.692)	40%
3rd Revision	<b>.546 (.083)</b>	70%	<b>.722 (.308)</b>	60%	.552 (.085)	30%	.924 (.768)	40%
4th Revision	<b>.536 (.095)</b>	60%	<b>.730 (.310)</b>	40%	<b>.570 (.074)</b>	30%	.890 (.753)	40%
End of Session (Avg #Iter=4.75)	<b>.536 (.095)</b>	60%	<b>.736 (.303)</b>	40%	.556 (.075)	30%	.894 (.632)	50%

Table 2: Comparison of participants who reviewed 50 instances per iteration versus those who reviewed 10 instances per iteration. Reviewing 50 instances per iteration resulted in more frequent and consistent improvements compared to reviewing 10 instances. Improvements over the initial prompt are bolded and underlined.

5.3.2 *Showing LLM explanations reduced labeling variation.* We observed that providing LLM explanations to participants led to more consistent labeling, as participants' labels became more similar to each other. Those with access to the LLM explanations had a higher Cohen's Kappa (0.333, SD=0.039), as well as higher Spearman (0.556, SD=0.053) and Kendall (0.504, SD=0.049) correlations compared to the group without access, whose Kappa was 0.193 (SD=0.047), Spearman 0.492 (SD=0.094), and Kendall 0.433 (SD=0.084). Additionally, Table 3 shows that the standard deviations (SD) of both ACC and

MSE were systematically lower in the group with access to LLM explanations.

This suggests that **rather than users tailoring the LLM's behavior to their individual preferences, the LLM—through its explanations—encouraged users to align with its behavior.**



### All Participants Labeling MSE↓




Figure 8: MSE Plots for all participants. The results show that the process is highly unreliable. MSE improved (i.e., decreased) for 8 participants, worsened for 10, and stayed the same for 2.

	LLM Explanations Shown (N=8)				No LLM Explanations Shown (N=12)			
	ACC↑		MSE↓		ACC↑		MSE↓	
	Avg. (SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg. (SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg. (SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial	Avg.(SD)	%Participant Improved Over Initial
Initial Prompt	.590 (.063)	-	.608 (.259)	-	.510 (.107)	-	.898 (.566)	-
1st Revision	.558 (.074)	12.5%	.633 (.292)	37.5%	<b>.522 (.096)</b>	50%	.903 (.655)	41.7%
2nd Revision	.568 (.070)	12.5%	.640 (.221)	50%	<b>.525 (.072)</b>	58.3%	.962 (.616)	41.7%
3rd Revision	.555 (.082)	25%	.660 (.349)	50%	<b>.545 (.085)</b>	66.7%	.932 (.685)	50%
4th Revision	.563 (.084)	25%	.645 (.333)	50%	<b>.547 (.088)</b>	58.3%	.920 (.671)	33.3%
End of Session (Avg #Iter=4.75)	.563 (.087)	25%	.680 (.311)	50%	<b>.535 (.083)</b>	58.3%	.905 (.574)	41.7%

Table 3: Comparison of ACC and MSE between participants with and without access to LLM explanations during the labeling process. Participants without access to LLM explanations showed improvement in accuracy over multiple revisions, while those with access did not exhibit the same level of improvement. Improvements over the initial prompt are bolded and underlined.

#### 5.4 Additional Analysis: How Does Each Variable Influence Rule Editing?

Building on the impact of the two variables on prompting outcomes (RQ 1-2 and 1-3), a key follow-up question is *why* these variables affect the outcomes differently. To explore this, we examined how the sample size per iteration and the presentation of LLM explanations influence how users edit the labeling rules—one of the main components of the final prompt—in PROMPTINGSHEET. For each prompt collected, we compiled all rules written by participants in the Rule

Book sheet into a single string. We then calculated the sentence-level similarity between prompts from consecutive iterations for each session (e.g., between the initial prompt and iteration 1, iteration 1 and iteration 2, and so on). Using Huang et al. [39]’s analysis method, we measured similarity in two ways: (1) **Normalized Edit Similarity**: Calculated as  $(1 - \text{Normalized Edit Distance})$ , where higher scores indicate greater similarity [59, 111]. (2) **Semantic Similarity**: Measured as the cosine similarity between semantic representations generated with Sentence-BERT [74]. Each participant yielded eight similarity scores (2 similarity metrics  $\times$  4 pairs).




Figure 9: Comparison of improvement (difference) in ACC and MSE over the initial prompt between the 50-instance and 10-instance groups. Bars with red borders indicate positive improvements over the initial prompt's outcome. Reviewing 50 instances per iteration results in more consistent improvements in ACC compared to reviewing 10 instances.





Figure 10: Comparison of improvement (difference) in ACC and MSE over the initial prompt between the Explanation and No-Explanation groups. Bars with red borders indicate positive improvements over the initial prompt's outcome. Participants without access to LLM explanations improved their accuracy over multiple revisions, while those with access did not.



**Figure 11: Comparison of Rule Similarity Metrics for Data Samples and Explanations.** Overall, participants in the 50-instance group or those without access to LLM explanations were more likely to modify their rules.

We used Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) to visualize the distribution of similarity between rules across consecutive iterations, as shown in Figure 11. A similarity score of 1.0 indicates no changes, while 0.0 represents substantial modifications. Each chart compares participants in the 10-instance group to the 50-instance group or those with versus without access to LLM explanations.

**5.4.1 Larger rule changes were linked to better prompting outcomes.** Our analysis revealed an interesting pattern: conditions that had better prompting outcomes—showing more data items, or not displaying LLM explanations—tended to have *lower* similarity between labeling rules across consecutive iterations. In Figure 11, the KDE curves for the 50-instance group (Figure 11a) and the no-explanation group (Figure 11b) skew further left compared to their counterpart conditions, regardless of the similarity metric. This indicates that participants in these settings—when seeing more data items, or when not having access to LLM explanations—made *larger* changes to the rule books. Using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test, only one significant difference was found in the normalized edit similarity between the group with LLM explanation access and the group without ( $p\text{-value}=0.031^*$ ). Specifically, **participants without access to LLM explanations made significantly more frequent and substantial revisions to their rules** than participants who had access to LLM explanations. This finding suggests an intriguing implication for human-LLM interaction: proactive and frequent revisions during iterative prompt refinement lead to better outcomes compared to making fewer revisions. Encouraging meaningful revisions in prompting-in-the-dark scenarios—where no gold labels are available to guide or “reward” users—presents an interesting challenge for HCI research.

### 5.5 RQ 2: Can automatic prompt optimization tools like DSPy improve human performance in “prompting in the dark” scenarios?


The previous section demonstrated that only a few settings were effective in helping participants improve prompt performance. This raises the question of how automatic prompt optimization tools might assist with refining prompts. In our study, we explored DSPy [43], a framework designed to algorithmically optimize LLM prompts, to enhance the prompt at each stage of revision by participants. DSPy is particularly effective at working with small sets of labeled data and abstract, generic initial prompts, making it well-suited for the “prompting in the dark” scenario.

*Study Setups.* We experimented with the following four approaches offered by DSPy:

- **Simple Prompt (Baseline):** This approach uses the abstract prompts constructed by DSPy and employs DSPy’s simplest teleprompter, BootstrapFewShots, to generate optimized examples based on all the few-shot examples labeled by participants throughout the study session. It is a simple method that does not account for differences between iterations or the user’s initial prompt, making it a baseline approach for using DSPy.
- **BootstrapFewShots:** This approach uses the task context (from Context sheet in PROMPTINGSHEET), label definitions (Rule Book sheet), and few-shot examples (Shots sheet) provided by participants in each iteration, and applies DSPy’s simplest teleprompter, BootstrapFewShots, for optimization. The BootstrapFewShots teleprompter automatically generates optimized examples to be included in the user-defined

	Human	DSPy									
		Simple Prompt		Bootstrap-FewShots		COPRO		MIPRO			
	Avg. #Shot	ACC $\uparrow$	MSE $\downarrow$	ACC $\uparrow$	MSE $\downarrow$	ACC $\uparrow$	MSE $\downarrow$	ACC $\uparrow$	MSE $\downarrow$		
<b>Initial</b>	0.00	.542	.782	-	-	-	-	-	-		
<b>1st Revision</b>	2.52	.536	.795	.533	.864	.526	.915	<b>.565</b>	.822	.527	.973
<b>2nd Revision</b>	4.80	.542	.833	.533	.864	.534	.934	.538	.873	.536	.862
<b>3rd Revision</b>	7.29	<b>.549</b>	.823	.533	.864	<b>.550</b>	.850	<b>.544</b>	.801	<b>.547</b>	.873
<b>4th Revision</b>	10.04	<b>.553</b>	.810	.533	.864	.526	.889	<b>.554</b>	.809	.536	.874
<b>End of Session</b> (Avg #Iter=4.75)	11.14	<b>.546</b>	.815	.533	.864	.535	.873	.528	.817	.528	.868

Table 4: Comparison of ACC and MSE between users’ original prompts and prompts improved by four DSPy approaches. DSPy showed limited effectiveness in enhancing ACC or MSE, potentially due to the small number of gold shots. Improvements over the initial prompt are bolded and underlined.



(a) Average ACC of participants’ prompts (Original) compared to prompts improved by DSPy’s four approaches across each iteration.

(b) Average MSE of participants’ prompts (Original) compared to prompts improved by DSPy’s four approaches across each iteration.

Figure 12: Average performance comparison between participants’ prompts (Original) and those improved by DSPy’s four approaches. DSPy was not effective in enhancing ACC or MSE, potentially due to the small number of gold shots.

prompt based on the provided few-shot examples. BootstrapFewShots is recommended when only a small amount of labeled data is available, such as 10 examples.<sup>6</sup>

- **COPRO:** This approach is identical to the BootstrapFewShots setup but uses the COPRO teleprompter instead. The COPRO teleprompter focuses on optimizing the prompt instructions while keeping the few-shot examples constant. This enables the generation of more refined prompt instructions, even when labeled examples are limited or absent.
- **MIPRO:** This approach is identical to the BootstrapFewShots setup but uses the MIPRO teleprompter instead. MIPRO combines the features of both COPRO and BootstrapFewShots,

refining the prompt instructions while also generating optimized examples using the provided few-shot data. MIPRO is recommended when a slightly larger amount of labeled data is available, such as 300 examples or more.

All the prompts were optimized with the goal of maximizing accuracy (ACC).

5.5.1 *DSPy was not effective in improving ACC or MSE, possibly due to the small number of gold shots.* As shown in Table 4 and Figure 12, none of the DSPy algorithms consistently improved ACC or MSE. This may be attributed to the limited number of gold labels generated in our study, which was insufficient for DSPy to operate effectively, especially given the difficulty of a 5-class classification task. Table 4 details the average number of gold shots used for DSPy in each revision.

<sup>6</sup>The recommended amount of data is based on DSPy’s documentation: <https://dspy-docs.vercel.app/docs/building-blocks/optimizers>

### All Participants Labeling ACC ↑ with DSPy (Bootstrap)




Figure 13: ACC of all participants compared to DSPy’s BootstrapFewShots approach in each iteration. DSPy was not reliable in providing consistent improvements. (Some DSPy dots are missing because participants did not provide examples required for generating augmented samples in those iterations.)

5.5.2 DSPy was not reliable in delivering consistent improvements. Figure 13 and Figure 14 display the performance of DSPy’s BootstrapFewShots (red dots) alongside human performance (blue line, which is the same as in Figure 6 for RQ1.) These results indicate that DSPy’s performance was unreliable across participants, as none of the DSPy algorithms consistently improved accuracy or MSE. We chose to plot the results for BootstrapFewShots because there was no significant difference across the four DSPy approaches we tested, and BootstrapFewShots was specifically recommended by DSPy’s documentation when working with only 10 examples. Some DSPy dots were missing because participants did not provide examples prior to those iterations, which was necessary for the DSPy algorithm to generate new augmented samples for prompt optimization.

## 6 User Feedback

In addition to addressing the main research questions, a post-study survey (Appendix B) consisted of twenty-two questions, including seven Likert scale ratings and fifteen free-text responses from participants provided valuable insights on both “prompting in the dark” practices and our system. We summarize these insights in this section.

### 6.1 Two Variables Impacting Participant Ratings

Figure 15 displayed the seven Likert scale rating responses by participants. The seven survey questions can be categorized into seven different categories. Appendix G shows the survey questions and the accompanying categories were rated on a seven-point Likert scale.

6.1.1 Participants reviewing 10 instances reported higher satisfaction ratings. Figure 15a compares participants who reviewed 10 instances per iteration with those who reviewed 50. Both groups provided similar ratings for system ease of use, system intuitiveness, and efficiency in processing prompt engineering, with comparable variation. However, participants who reviewed 10 instances found the annotation tasks more difficult to understand compared to those who reviewed 50. Comparatively, participants who reviewed 10 instances reported higher levels of satisfaction with their performance, a stronger sense of prompt improvement, and better task completion rating. This could be attributed to their minimal modifications to the rule. It is noteworthy that we performed a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test on all rating categories, and no significant difference was found between the two groups, indicating that the observed difference did not reach statistical significance.



### All Participants Labeling MSE↓ with DSPy (Bootstrap)




Figure 14: MSE of all participants compared to DSPy’s BootstrapFewShots approach in each iteration. DSPy was not reliable in providing consistent improvements. (Some DSPy dots are missing because participants did not provide examples required for generating augmented samples in those iterations.)

6.1.2 *Participants without LLM explanations rated the system as more intuitive, effective, and satisfying.* Figure 15b shows the comparison of ratings between participants with and without LLM explanations. Participants with LLM explanations found the annotation tasks more challenging, rated the system as less intuitive and harder to use, and viewed it as less effective in improving prompts, also with greater variation in their ratings. In contrast, participants without LLM explanations expressed higher level of satisfaction with the system performance, believing the tool improved prompt engineering efficiency and task completion effectiveness. Notably, we conducted a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test on all participants’ ratings, and no significant difference was found between the two groups, suggesting that the observed differences were not statistically significant.


## 6.2 Is PROMPTINGSHEET Useful?

6.2.1 *Participants considered PROMPTINGSHEET helpful and efficient.* In the post-study survey, we asked participants to rate the (Q5) performance satisfaction, (Q6) helpfulness of the tool, and (Q7) its efficiency on a seven-point Likert scale. Participants expressed high satisfaction, with an average rating of 6.350 (SD=0.745), and found the system helpful for improving prompts (6.400, SD=0.883) and making prompt engineering more efficient (6.600, SD=0.598). P4 noted, “I really like this tool instead of traditional prompt engineering on ChatGPT and Copilot.” P15 mentioned, “I would be interested

in using this annotation system in my regular work or study, because I really like the idea [of] improving annotation performance by considering iteration annotation process between human and the GPT.”

6.2.2 *PROMPTINGSHEET is easy to use but less intuitive and with a steep learning curve.* We asked participants to rate whether “(Q1) The annotation task was easy to understand,” “(Q2) The annotation tool is easy to use,” and “(Q4) The interface of the annotation system is intuitive” on a seven-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (1) to “Strongly Agree” (7). The average score for the “easy to understand annotation task” was 5.812, for the “easy to use annotation tool” was 5.375, and for the “system is intuitive” was 5.250. Suggesting that while the task and tool itself are not hard to understand and use, learning to properly use the tool can be harder for participants and required some learning. For example, it was noted that the need to switch between tabs during the task can cause confusion.

6.2.3 *Participants found the Shots and Rule Book useful.* We asked participants, in a free-text format, “(Q10) What features did you find most useful?” Fourteen participants specifically mentioned that ‘Gold Shots’ were particularly valuable, as they provided explicit examples to guide LLMs. Additionally, six participants highlighted the usefulness of the Rule Book. These two features stood out among the responses, demonstrating their importance in enhancing the user experience. Participants noted that the flexibility to structure



(a) Participants’ ratings of the system and the annotation task, comparing those who accessed 10 instances per iteration to those who accessed 50 instances.

(b) Participants’ ratings of the system and the annotation task, comparing those who utilized LLM explanations to those who did not.

**Figure 15: Participants’ rating of the system and the annotation task.** Each rating category refers to one question in the post-study survey. (Q1) Understandable: The annotation task was easy to understand; (Q2) Ease of Use: The annotation tool is easy to use; (Q4) Intuitive System: The interface of the annotation system is intuitive; (Q5) Performance Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with the performance of the system? (Q6) Prompt Improvement: This tool was helpful in improving my prompt; (Q7) Process Efficiency: Using this tool made the process of prompt engineering more efficient; (Q19) Task Completion: I completed the annotation tasks efficiently.

tasks freely and make on-the-fly adjustments—such as modifying the Gold Shots or Rule Book—eases the burden of the traditional iterative labeling process.

**6.2.4 Dilemma of showing LLM explanations.** Although our study found that providing LLM explanations can sometimes lead participants to generate labels more aligned with those produced by the LLM, participants still expressed a strong desire to have them included. P8 explicitly recommended incorporating LLM explanations, noting that participants were interested in understanding the reasoning behind potential discrepancies between their own labels and those generated by the LLM. P15 also emphasized the value of these explanations, stating, “The explanation from GPT gave me some insights to modify my rules,” and, “I think GPT’s explanation of the tweets is very helpful and it may help me to improve the accuracy of human annotation.”

### 6.3 About “Prompting in the Dark”

**6.3.1 Prompting in the dark without any tool is common.** We also asked participants, “Without this tool, how would you typically approach prompt engineering?” We found that many participants commonly rely on iterative, trial and error strategies. Specifically, they start with prompts from scratch, test them on data points, adjust based on incorrect labels, and re-test until they are satisfied with the results.

P1 said, “I need to start with a prompt from scratch; then I will test it on real data points; I will observe those wrongly labeled data points

and adjust my prompt accordingly. After the adjustment, I will rerun the testing on the real data points. The whole process is trail-and-error, which is really time-consuming and labor-consuming.” P3 stated, “Give an initial prompt, if the answer is not meeting expectation, then change the prompt.” P6 reflected, “Normally, if I do not get the desired output from the LLM, I will try to give more specific instruction maybe some examples.” P17 said, “I re-write my prompts several times (3-5 times) until I got an output that I like.”

**6.3.2 Prompting in the dark is hard, as participants lacked confidence in their labels.** Without a comprehensive understanding of the entire dataset, participants found it challenging to generate suitable labels. P19 mentioned, “I am not confident about the label”. P12 pointed out that, “When I need to express sentiment, I tend to be more reserved and avoid extremes. So, when labeling data, I usually prefer to choose negative/[positive] rather than extremely negative/[extremely positive]”

### 6.4 Users’ Suggested Features

**6.4.1 More automated supports for rule creation.** Participants expressed concerns about creating rules that effectively suit the labeling task at hand. As a result, support for Rule Book creation is a welcome addition. P2 remarked, “It was hard to set the right rules,” while P3 suggested providing initialized instructions for labels and rules to ease the process. Additionally, participants (P1, P3) proposed that new rules could be automatically generated based on

Gold Shots, existing rule books, and human explanations, streamlining the rule creation process.

**6.4.2 Shorter LLM explanations for easier consumption.** Although LLM-generated explanations received positive feedback from participants, there was concern about the length of these explanations. Many felt that the explanations were too long and could be difficult to consume. P1 recommended, “*It would be better if the LLM explanation could be shorter.*” emphasizing the need for more concise outputs to improve user experience.

## 7 Discussion

### 7.1 Design Suggestions

Our study shows that “prompting in the dark”—where users gradually refine their expectations and understanding of data characteristics while iteratively prompting LLMs—is indeed a challenging task. Using PROMPTINGSHEET, we quantitatively assessed the difficulty of this process and the unreliability of the progress. Many strategies we tested proved ineffective, and the few that showed promise offered only weak signals. So, what should be designed in response? From the study, we derived insights that we believe are valuable for shaping future systems intended to support iterative LLM-powered labeling, which we summarize into three design suggestions.

- Gold Labels as a Necessary Evil.** The key premise of “prompting in the dark” is to avoid assuming a stabilized gold standard from the outset. This practice embraces the potential for the so-called “gold standard” in data labeling to evolve and remain dynamic, realizing this through the interactive nature of LLMs. Our system, PROMPTINGSHEET, embodies this practice, using a spreadsheet format. That being said, throughout our user studies, many participants faced struggles, frustrations, and errors due to the lack of direction or guidance during the exploratory labeling process. The elephant in the room—as highlighted by decades of research on the importance of gold labels in crowdsourced data annotation pipelines (Section 2.4)—is that much of this lack of guidance stemmed from the absence of sufficient gold labels. To clarify, we mean “sufficient” as in 100 to 200 labeled text items before starting to use the system, not just the 10 examples users provided via the “add gold shot” function. With no gold labels or fewer than 10, we could not calculate metrics like similarity, accuracy, or error rates to give users meaningful feedback, nor could we track LLMs’ behavioral shifts. These challenges arose as part of our effort to ensure that no substantial labeled items would anchor users’ exploration, allowing them to freely evolve their goals. Our first design suggestion is that this cost might be *too high*. Based on our observations, having some form of guidance in the “prompting in the dark” scenario is likely worth it. We propose that users manually label at least a small set of data (e.g., 50–100 items), and that the system be intentionally designed to minimize the impact of these labels on constraining exploration. For example, the system could hide the labeled items from the user (even the ones they just labeled), show only signals such as accuracy, or periodically invite users to relabel data. One example worth highlighting
- is PromptAid [62], which dedicates most of its interface to higher-level signals, abstracting away from low-level data details. Manually labeling some “gold” data to start with, when carefully managed, should be considered a reasonable trade-off to balance reliability in the process and the freedom to explore.
- Automated Support to Reduce Distractions.** Our second design suggestion is to incorporate automation to help reduce users’ distractions during the “prompting in the dark” process. Even with some gold labels—as we suggested—iterating on prompts with an LLM and reviewing tens or hundreds of text items and labels remains exhausting. In our study, only a few participants were able to steadily improve labeling accuracy over time. We believe the root of this mental strain stems from at least two causes. First, the behavior of LLMs is a mystery. Even with carefully crafted prompts, users are still navigating an intangible and unpredictable fog, trying to guess how the LLM will respond. Second, real-world data is inherently noisy. Even when using a strong classifier, users must still contend with numerous edge cases and ambiguous linguistic nuances. These challenges are inherently difficult and clash with established human-AI design guidelines [5]. In the “prompting in the dark” scenario, there is no efficient way to recover from incorrect labels (Guideline G9 in [5]), LLMs can not reliably explain their labeling decisions (Guideline G11), users lack mechanisms to provide granular feedback to LLMs (Guideline G15), and the consequences of each revision are unclear (Guideline G16). Given the complexity of these challenges, systems should aim to adhere to all other feasible design guidelines to mitigate user strain. Throughout our study, we observed that some confusion arose from the workflow or tools. Issues such as how to sample a subset from the full dataset, or how to add gold short from validated data, added unnecessary complexity. Our recommendation is to design systems that reduce these unnecessary distractions. For example, the system could default to randomly sampling a subset for the user, or automatically add validated gold labels into the prompt and manage the number of shots in the background.
- Design to Prevent Overreliance on LLMs.** Our final and most critical design suggestion is to create systems that reduce the human tendency to overly trust and accept outputs from AI, particularly LLMs. Overreliance on AI is a well-documented phenomenon where people are influenced by AI decisions and often accept them without verification, even when they are incorrect [94]. Overreliance is particularly problematic in exploratory labeling because the core idea—central to “prompting in the dark”—is that users should own the exploration process and have strong control over which direction to pursue next. Users choose to prompt in the dark because they do not want to be guided by someone else’s light. However, introducing AI, such as LLMs, can lead users to fixate on or anchor to the LLMs’ suggestions. If this results in everyone’s labels becoming more similar, it undermines the very spirit of exploratory labeling. In our study, participants who saw LLMs’ explanations tended to

agree more with the LLMs' labels, leading to higher inner-annotator agreement among those exposed to LLM explanations compared to participants who were not (Section 5.3). To address this, we advocate designing systems that actively mitigate overreliance on AI. While explainable AI has been proposed as a solution to overreliance by helping users better judge when to trust AI predictions, empirical evidence shows mixed results. Explanations do not always reduce cognitive effort for verifying AI predictions, leading users to ignore them (Section 1.1). A cost-benefit framework interprets that explanations are less effective when the cognitive cost of verification outweighs the perceived benefits [94]. Text data labeling often falls into this category, as reading and verifying text-based explanations is cognitively expensive. This leaves scaffolds, such as cognitive forcing functions, as a viable solution. These functions require users to engage more thoughtfully with AI explanations and have been shown to effectively reduce overreliance [9].

## 7.2 Limitations

We acknowledge several limitations in our work. First, we focused solely on the “prompting in the dark” practice for data labeling tasks, while many other scenarios, such as text generation or conversational agents, are also widely used when working with LLMs. Second, for RQ2, we only studied one automatic prompt optimization technique, DSPy. It is possible that other methods might achieve better performance. Third, we recognize that, aside from the inherent challenges of the open-ended and exploratory nature of “prompting in the dark,” the workflow of our system is somewhat complex. This complexity may have contributed to some of the reliability issues observed in our study, though we believe similar challenges would apply to any system supporting newly emerged user practices. Fourth, since PROMPTINGSHEET is a Google Sheets Add-on, it inherits limitations and design constraints typical of spreadsheets, such as limited support for images or videos. Fifth, it was difficult to track how thoroughly participants reviewed samples. Some may have directly modified rules or added gold shots without careful consideration. Sixth, we lack a clear understanding for how sensitive LLMs are to prompt revisions. Tools like DSPy [43] and related experiments show that prompt revisions can systematically influence LLM prediction performance, but the degree of sensitivity remains unclear. This limited understanding of LLM behavior impacts the generalizability of our findings. Finally, our user study, though already 1-2 hours long, only captures a single session's worth of behavior. A longitudinal study that observes how users interact with PROMPTINGSHEET over months or even years might offer different insights.

## 8 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper studies a scenario in LLM-powered data labeling called “prompting in the dark,” where users iteratively prompt LLMs to label data without relying on a stabilized, pre-labeled gold-standard dataset for benchmarking. We developed PROMPTINGSHEET, a Google Sheets add-on that allows users to compose, revise, and iteratively label data within spreadsheets. Our user study revealed that prompting in the dark was highly ineffective and unreliable, and

automated prompt optimization tools like DSPy struggled when few gold labels were available. We concluded the paper with a set of design recommendations. Based on these insights, our next step is to explore automation technologies, such as automatic rule creation, to further support users. Simultaneously, we will investigate methods to track system performance under evolving standards with minimal labeling effort. Additionally, we aim to better capture users' understanding and use this information to monitor and improve LLMs, fostering more effective human-AI collaboration. Finally, we plan to enhance and deploy PROMPTINGSHEET for more users to observe how people prompt LLMs to label data they truly care about in real-world scenarios.

## Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback. We also extend our gratitude to all the participants in our study. This work was partially supported by a seed grant from the Institute for Computational and Data Sciences (ICDS) at Pennsylvania State University and by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (Grant Number: 2024-22721).

## References

- [1] Lina Abassi and Imen Boukhris. 2017. A gold standards-based crowd label aggregation within the belief function theory. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: From Theory to Practice: 30th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Other Applications of Applied Intelligent Systems, IEA/AIE 2017, Arras, France, June 27-30, 2017, Proceedings, Part II 30*. Springer, 97–106.
- [2] Lina Abassi and Imen Boukhris. 2019. A worker clustering-based approach of label aggregation under the belief function theory. *Applied Intelligence* 49 (2019), 53–62.
- [3] Mohamed Abdalla and Benjamin Fine. 2023. Hurdles to artificial intelligence deployment: noise in schemas and “gold” labels. *Radiology: Artificial Intelligence* 5, 2 (2023), e220056.
- [4] Ittai Abraham, Omar Alonso, Vasilis Kandyas, Rajesh Patel, Steven Shelford, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. 2016. How many workers to ask? Adaptive exploration for collecting high quality labels. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 473–482.
- [5] Saleema Amershi, Dan Weld, Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Adam Fournay, Besmira Nushi, Penny Collisson, Jina Suh, Shamsi Iqbal, Paul N Bennett, Kori Inkpen, et al. 2019. Guidelines for human-AI interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 chi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–13.
- [6] Ian Arawjo, Chelse Swoopes, Priyan Vaithilingam, Martin Wattenberg, and Elena L Glassman. 2024. ChainForge: A Visual Toolkit for Prompt Engineering and LLM Hypothesis Testing. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [7] Derek Austin and Elliott Chartock. 2024. GRAD-SUM: Leveraging Gradient Summarization for Optimal Prompt Engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12865* (2024).
- [8] Jürgen Bernard, Matthias Zeppelzauer, Michael Sedlmair, and Wolfgang Aigner. 2018. VIAL: a unified process for visual interactive labeling. *The Visual Computer* 34 (2018), 1189–1207.
- [9] Zana Buçinca, Maja Barbara Malaya, and Krzysztof Z Gajos. 2021. To trust or to think: cognitive forcing functions can reduce overreliance on AI in AI-assisted decision-making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-computer Interaction* 5, CSCW1 (2021), 1–21.
- [10] Cesar Federico Caiafa, Jordi Solé-Casals, Pere Martí-Puig, Sun Zhe, and Toshihisa Tanaka. 2020. Decomposition methods for machine learning with small, incomplete or noisy datasets. *Applied Sciences* 10, 23 (2020), 8481.
- [11] Banghao Chen, Zhaofeng Zhang, Nicolas Langrené, and Shengxin Zhu. 2023. Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in Large Language Models: a comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14735* (2023).
- [12] Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. 2023. Can Large Language Models Be an Alternative to Human Evaluations?. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 15607–15631. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.870>
- [13] CNBC. 2024. *OpenAI's Active User Count Soars to 300 Million People per Week*. <https://www.cnbc.com/2024/12/04/openais-active-user-count-soars->

- to-300-million-people-per-week.html Accessed: 2024-12-08.
- [14] Shih-Chieh Dai, Aiping Xiong, and Lun-Wei Ku. 2023. LLM-in-the-loop: Leveraging Large Language Model for Thematic Analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. 9993–10001.
  - [15] Ermira Daka and Gordon Fraser. 2014. A survey on unit testing practices and problems. In *2014 IEEE 25th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering*. IEEE, 201–211.
  - [16] Stefano De Paoli et al. 2024. Further Explorations on the Use of Large Language Models for Thematic Analysis. Open-Ended Prompts, Better Terminologies and Thematic Maps. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 25.
  - [17] Shayan Doroudi, Ece Kamar, Emma Brunskill, and Eric Horvitz. 2016. Toward a learning science for complex crowdsourcing tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2623–2634.
  - [18] Julie S Downs, Mandy B Holbrook, Steve Sheng, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2010. Are your participants gaming the system? Screening Mechanical Turk workers. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 2399–2402.
  - [19] Alexey Drutsa, Valentina Fedorova, Dmitry Ustalov, Olga Megorskaya, Evfrosiniya Zerminova, and Daria Baidakova. 2020. Crowdsourcing practice for efficient data labeling: Aggregation, incremental relabeling, and pricing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data*. 2623–2627.
  - [20] Alexey Drutsa, Valentina Fedorova, Dmitry Ustalov, Olga Megorskaya, Evfrosiniya Zerminova, and Daria Baidakova. 2020. Practice of Efficient Data Collection via Crowdsourcing: Aggregation, Incremental Relabeling, and Pricing. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (Houston, TX, USA) (WSDM '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 873–876. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3336191.3371875>
  - [21] Michael Ellims, James Bridges, and Darrel C Ince. 2004. Unit testing in practice. In *15th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering*. IEEE, 3–13.
  - [22] Science Focus. 2024. Artificial Intelligence Quietly Relies on Workers Earning \$2 Per Hour. <https://www.sciencefocus.com/future-technology/artificial-intelligence-quietly-relies-on-workers-earning-2-per-hour> Accessed: 2024-12-10.
  - [23] Karèn Fort, Gilles Adda, and Kevin Bretonnel Cohen. 2011. Amazon Mechanical Turk: Gold mine or coal mine? *Computational Linguistics* 37, 2 (2011), 413–420.
  - [24] Craig Fowler, Jian Jiao, and Margaret Pitts. 2023. Frustration and ennui among Amazon MTurk workers. *Behavior Research Methods* 55, 6 (2023), 3009–3025.
  - [25] Ujwal Gadiraju, Besnik Fetahu, and Ricardo Kawase. 2015. Training workers for improving performance in crowdsourcing microtasks. In *Design for Teaching and Learning in a Networked World: 10th European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning, EC-TEL 2015, Toledo, Spain, September 15-18, 2015, Proceedings 10*. Springer, 100–114.
  - [26] Jie Gao, Yuchen Guo, Giionnieve Lim, Tianqin Zhang, Zheng Zhang, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Simon Tangi Perrault. 2024. CollabCoder: a lower-barrier, rigorous workflow for inductive collaborative qualitative analysis with large language models. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–29.
  - [27] Louie Giray. 2023. Prompt engineering with ChatGPT: a guide for academic writers. *Annals of biomedical engineering* 51, 12 (2023), 2629–2633.
  - [28] Kristina Gligorić, Tijana Zrnica, Cino Lee, Emmanuel J Candès, and Dan Jurafsky. 2024. Can Unconfident LLM Annotations Be Used for Confident Conclusions? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15204* (2024).
  - [29] Akshay Goel, Almog Gueta, Omry Gilon, Chang Liu, Sofia Erell, Lan Huong Nguyen, Xiaohong Hao, Bolous Jaber, Shashir Reddy, Rupesh Kartha, et al. 2023. LLMs accelerate annotation for medical information extraction. In *Machine Learning for Health (ML4H)*. PMLR, 82–100.
  - [30] Paul Hamill. 2004. *Unit test frameworks: tools for high-quality software development*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."
  - [31] Lei Han, Eddy Maddalena, Alessandro Checco, Cristina Sarasua, Ujwal Gadiraju, Kevin Roitero, and Gianluca Demartini. 2020. Crowd worker strategies in relevance judgment tasks. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*. 241–249.
  - [32] Rajitha Hathurusinghe, Isar Nejadgholi, and Miodrag Bolic. 2021. A Privacy-Preserving Approach to Extraction of Personal Information through Automatic Annotation and Federated Learning. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Privacy in Natural Language Processing*. Oluwaseyi Feyisetan, Sepideh Ghanavati, Shervin Malmasi, and Patricia Thaine (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.privatenlp-1.5>
  - [33] Xingwei He, Zhenghao Lin, Yeyun Gong, A-Long Jin, Hang Zhang, Chen Lin, Jian Jiao, Siu Ming Yiu, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. AnnoLLM: Making Large Language Models to Be Better Crowdsourced Annotators. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, Yi Yang, Aida Davani, Avi Sil, and Anoop Kumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 165–190. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-industry.15>
  - [34] Zeyu He, Chieh-Yang Huang, Chien-Kuang Cornelia Ding, Shaurya Rohatgi, and Ting-Hao Kenneth Huang. 2024. If in a Crowdsourced Data Annotation Pipeline, a GPT-4. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1040, 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642834>
  - [35] Danula Hettiachchi, Vassilis Kostakos, and Jorge Goncalves. 2022. A survey on task assignment in crowdsourcing. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55, 3 (2022), 1–35.
  - [36] Danula Hettiachchi, Mike Schaeckermann, Tristan J McKinney, and Matthew Lease. 2021. The challenge of variable effort crowdsourcing and how visible gold can help. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW2 (2021), 1–26.
  - [37] Tomas Horych, Christoph Mandl, Terry Ruas, Andre Greiner-Petter, Bela Gipp, Akiko Aizawa, and Timo Spinde. 2024. The Promises and Pitfalls of LLM Annotations in Dataset Labeling: a Case Study on Media Bias Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11081* (2024).
  - [38] Pei-Yun Hsueh, Prem Melville, and Vikas Sindhwani. 2009. Data quality from crowdsourcing: a study of annotation selection criteria. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2009 workshop on active learning for natural language processing*. 27–35.
  - [39] Chieh-Yang Huang, Sanjana Gautam, Shannon McClellan Brooks, and Ya-Fang Lin. 2023. Ting-Hao Kenneth Huang. 2023. Inspo: Writing Stories with a Flock of AIs and Humans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16521* (2023).
  - [40] Ting-Hao Kenneth Huang, Chieh-Yang Huang, Chien-Kuang Cornelia Ding, Yen-Chia Hsu, and C. Lee Giles. 2020. CODA-19: Using a Non-Expert Crowd to Annotate Research Aspects on 10,000+ Abstracts in the COVID-19 Open Research Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on NLP for COVID-19 at ACL 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.nlpcovid19-acl.6>
  - [41] Ishika Joshi, Simra Shahid, Shreeya Veneti, Manushree Vasu, Yantao Zheng, Yunyao Li, Balaji Krishnamurthy, and Gromit Yeuk-Yin Chan. 2024. CoPrompter: User-Centric Evaluation of LLM Instruction Alignment for Improved Prompt Engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06099* (2024).
  - [42] Gabriella Kazai, Jaap Kamps, and Natasa Milic-Frayling. 2012. The face of quality in crowdsourcing relevance labels: Demographics, personality and labeling accuracy. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*. 2583–2586.
  - [43] Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan A, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T. Joshi, Hanna Moazam, Heather Miller, Matei Zaharia, and Christopher Potts. 2023. DSPy: Compiling Declarative Language Model Calls into Self-Improving Pipelines. In *R0-FoMo: Robustness of Few-shot and Zero-shot Learning in Large Foundation Models*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PFS4ffN9Yx>
  - [44] Faiza Khan Khattak and Ansaif Salieb-Aouissi. 2011. Quality control of crowd labeling through expert evaluation. In *Proceedings of the NIPS 2nd Workshop on Computational Social Science and the Wisdom of Crowds*, Vol. 2. 5.
  - [45] Adam Kilgarriff. 1998. Gold standard datasets for evaluating word sense disambiguation programs. *Computer Speech & Language* 12, 4 (1998), 453–472.
  - [46] Hannah Kim, Kushan Mitra, Rafael Li Chen, Sajjadur Rahman, and Dan Zhang. 2024. MEGAnno+: A Human-LLM Collaborative Annotation System. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, Nikolaos Aletras and Orphee De Clercq (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, St. Julians, Malta, 168–176. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-demo.18/>
  - [47] Tae Soo Kim, Yoonjoo Lee, Minsuk Chang, and Juho Kim. 2023. Cells, Generators, and Lenses: Design Framework for Object-Oriented Interaction with Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (San Francisco, CA, USA) (UIST '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 4, 18 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606833>
  - [48] Steven Komarov, Katharina Reinecke, and Krzysztof Z Gajos. 2013. Crowdsourcing performance evaluations of user interfaces. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 207–216.
  - [49] Todd Kulesza, Margaret Burnett, Weng-Keen Wong, and Simone Stumpf. 2015. Principles of explanatory debugging to personalize interactive machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on intelligent user interfaces*. 126–137.
  - [50] Todd Kulesza, Simone Stumpf, Margaret Burnett, and Irwin Kwan. 2012. Tell me more? The effects of mental model soundness on personalizing an intelligent agent. In *Proceedings of the sigchi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–10.
  - [51] Issam Laradij, Perouz Taslakian, Sai Rajeswar, Valentina Zantedeschi, Alexandre Lacoste, Nicolas Chapados, David Vazquez, Christopher Pal, and Alexandre Drouin. 2023. Capture the Flag: Uncovering Data Insights with Large Language Models. In *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=fkz5VfJCwo>



- [52] John Le, Andy Edmonds, Vaughn Hester, and Lukas Biewald. 2010. Ensuring quality in crowdsourced search relevance evaluation: The effects of training question distribution. In *SIGIR 2010 workshop on crowdsourcing for search evaluation*, Vol. 2126. 22–32.
- [53] Yoonho Lee, Michelle S Lam, Helena Vasconcelos, Michael S Bernstein, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Clarify: Improving model robustness with natural language corrections. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 1–19.
- [54] Elad Levi, Eli Brosh, and Matan Friedmann. 2024. Intent-based Prompt Calibration: Enhancing prompt optimization with synthetic boundary cases. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Navigating and Addressing Data Problems for Foundation Models*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dFEyhtZXZt>
- [55] Jiyi Li. 2024. A Comparative Study on Annotation Quality of Crowdsourcing and LLM via Label Aggregation. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 6525–6529.
- [56] Chaoqun Liu, Qin Chao, Wenxuan Zhang, Xiaobao Wu, Boyang Li, Anh Tuan Luu, and Lidong Bing. 2025. Zero-to-Strong Generalization: Eliciting Strong Capabilities of Large Language Models Iteratively without Gold Labels. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, Owen Rambow, Leo Wanner, Marianna Apidianaki, Hend Al-Khalifa, Barbara Di Eugenio, and Steven Schockaert (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 3716–3731. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.coling-main.251/>
- [57] Jiaying Liu, Yunlong Wang, Yao Lyu, Yiheng Su, Shuo Niu, Xuhai" Orson" Xu, and Yan Zhang. 2024. Harnessing LLMs for Automated Video Content Analysis: An Exploratory Workflow of Short Videos on Depression. In *Companion Publication of the 2024 Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. 190–196.
- [58] Zimo Liu, Jingya Wang, Shaogang Gong, Huchuan Lu, and Dacheng Tao. 2019. Deep reinforcement active learning for human-in-the-loop person re-identification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 6122–6131.
- [59] Zhouyang Luo. 2018. Python String Similarity. <https://github.com/luozhouyang/python-string-similarity>. Accessed: 2024-12-10.
- [60] Pingchuan Ma, Rui Ding, Shuai Wang, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2023. InsightPilot: An LLM-Empowered Automated Data Exploration System. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, Yansong Feng and Els Lefever (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 346–352. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-demo.31>
- [61] Oscar Mañas, Pietro Astolfi, Melissa Hall, Candace Ross, Jack Urbanek, Adina Williams, Aishwarya Agrawal, Adriana Romero-Soriano, and Michal Drozdal. 2024. Improving Text-to-Image Consistency via Automatic Prompt Optimization. *CoRR* abs/2403.17804 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.17804>
- [62] Aditi Mishra, Bretho Danzy, Utkarsh Soni, Anjana Arunkumar, Jinbin Huang, Bum Chul Kwon, and Chris Bryan. 2025. PromptAid: Visual Prompt Exploration, Perturbation, Testing and Iteration for Large Language Models. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization & Computer Graphics* (Jan. 2025), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2025.3535332>
- [63] Oskar Mortensen. 2024. How Many Users Does ChatGPT Have? Statistics & Facts (2025). <https://seo.ai/blog/how-many-users-does-chatgpt-have> Accessed: 2024-12-08.
- [64] Omer Nahum, Nitay Calderon, Orgad Keller, Idan Szpektor, and Roi Reichart. 2024. Are LLMs Better than Reported? Detecting Label Errors and Mitigating Their Effect on Model Performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18889* (2024).
- [65] Emilia Oikarinen, Henri Tiittanen, Andreas Henelius, and Kai Puolamäki. 2021. Detecting virtual concept drift of regressors without ground truth values. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 35, 3 (2021), 726–747.
- [66] David Oleson, Alexander Sorokin, Greg Laughlin, Vaughn Hester, John Le, and Lukas Biewald. 2011. Programmatic gold: Targeted and scalable quality assurance in crowdsourcing. In *Workshops at the Twenty-Fifth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*.
- [67] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o API. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>.
- [68] Peter Organisciak, Jaime Teevan, Susan Dumais, Robert Miller, and Adam Kalai. 2014. A crowd of your own: Crowdsourcing for on-demand personalization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, Vol. 2. 192–200.
- [69] Daniela Pais, Susana Brás, and Raquel Sebastião. 2024. Overcoming the Small Dataset Challenge in Healthcare. In *2024 IEEE 22nd Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON)*. IEEE, 497–502.
- [70] Rahul Pandey, Hemant Purohit, Carlos Castillo, and Valerie L. Shalin. 2022. Modeling and mitigating human annotation errors to design efficient stream processing systems with human-in-the-loop machine learning. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 160 (2022), 102772.
- [71] Jing-Cheng Pang, Pengyuan Wang, Kaiyuan Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Jiacheng Xu, Zongzhang Zhang, and Yang Yu. 2024. Language Model Self-improvement by Reinforcement Learning Contemplation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=38E4yUbrgr>
- [72] Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023. Automatic Prompt Optimization with “Gradient Descent” and Beam Search. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 7957–7968. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.494>
- [73] Bahareh Rahmani and Joseph G Davis. 2014. User interface design for crowdsourcing systems. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Working Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces*. 405–408.
- [74] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 3982–3992. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1410>
- [75] Marta Sabou, Kalina Bontcheva, Leon Derczynski, and Arno Scharl. 2014. Corpus annotation through crowdsourcing: Towards best practice guidelines.. In *LREC*. Citeseer, 859–866.
- [76] Akрати Saxena, Harita Reddy, and Pratishtha Saxena. 2022. Introduction to sentiment analysis covering basics, tools, evaluation metrics, challenges, and applications. *Principles of social networking: the new horizon and emerging challenges* (2022), 249–277.
- [77] Chirag Shah. 2024. From Prompt Engineering to Prompt Science With Human in the Loop. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04122* (2024).
- [78] Hua Shen and Ting-Hao Huang. 2020. How useful are the machine-generated interpretations to general users? a human evaluation on guessing the incorrectly predicted labels. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, Vol. 8. 168–172.
- [79] Hua Shen, Tiffany Knearem, Reshmi Ghosh, Kenan Alkiek, Kundan Krishna, Yachuan Liu, Ziqiao Ma, Savvas Petridis, Yi-Hao Peng, Li Qiwei, Sushrita Rakshit, Chenglei Si, Yutong Xie, Jeffrey P. Bigham, Frank Bentley, Joyce Chai, Zachary C. Lipton, Qiaozhu Mei, Rada Mihalcea, Michael Terry, Diyi Yang, Meredith Ringel Morris, Paul Resnick, and David Jurgens. 2024. Towards Bidirectional Human-AI Alignment: A Systematic Review for Clarifications, Framework, and Future Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09264* (2024).
- [80] Boaz Shmueli, Jan Fell, Soumya Ray, and Lun-Wei Ku. 2021. Beyond Fair Pay: Ethical Implications of NLP Crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tannoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 3758–3769. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.295>
- [81] Natalia Silveira, Timothy Dozat, Marie-Catherine De Marneffe, Samuel R Bowman, Miriam Connor, John Bauer, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. A Gold Standard Dependency Corpus for English. In *LREC*. Citeseer, 2897–2904.
- [82] Chandan Singh, Jeevana Priya Inala, Michel Galley, Rich Caruana, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. Rethinking interpretability in the era of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01761* (2024).
- [83] Kevin Slote and Elaine Lee. 2024. Unlocking Unlabeled Data: Ensemble Learning with the Hui-Walter Paradigm for Performance Estimation in Online and Static Settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09376* (2024).
- [84] Rion Snow, Brendan O’connor, Dan Jurafsky, and Andrew Y Ng. 2008. Cheap and fast—but is it good? evaluating non-expert annotations for natural language tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2008 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. 254–263.
- [85] Alexander Sorokin and David Forsyth. 2008. Utility data annotation with amazon mechanical turk. In *2008 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [86] Hendrik Strobelt, Albert Webson, Victor Sanh, Benjamin Hoover, Johanna Beyer, Hanspeter Pfister, and Alexander M Rush. 2022. Interactive and visual prompt engineering for ad-hoc task adaptation with large language models. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 29, 1 (2022), 1146–1156.
- [87] Hong Sun, Xue Li, Yinchuan Xu, Youkwo Homma, Qi Cao, Min Wu, Jian Jiao, and Denis Charles. 2023. Autohint: Automatic prompt optimization with hint generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07415* (2023).
- [88] Zhen Tan, Dawei Li, Song Wang, Alimohammad Beigi, Bohan Jiang, Amrita Bhat-tacharjee, Mansoor Karami, Jundong Li, Lu Cheng, and Huan Liu. 2024. Large language models for data annotation: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13446* (2024).
- [89] Stefano Teso, Öznur Alkan, Wolfgang Stammer, and Elizabeth Daly. 2023. Leveraging explanations in interactive machine learning: An overview. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 6 (2023), 1066049.
- [90] Michael Toomim, Travis Kriplean, Claus Pörtlner, and James Landay. 2011. Utility of human-computer interactions: Toward a science of preference measurement. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2275–2284.

- [91] Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel Bowman. 2024. Language models don't always say what they think: unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [92] Michelle Vaccaro, Abdullah Almaatouq, and Thomas Malone. 2024. When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nature Human Behaviour* (2024), 1–11.
- [93] Helena Vasconcelos, Matthew Jörke, Madeleine Grunde-McLaughlin, Tobias Gerstenberg, Michael S. Bernstein, and Ranjay Krishna. 2023. Explanations Can Reduce Overreliance on AI Systems During Decision-Making. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 7, CSCW1, Article 129 (apr 2023), 38 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579605>
- [94] Helena Vasconcelos, Matthew Jörke, Madeleine Grunde-McLaughlin, Tobias Gerstenberg, Michael S. Bernstein, and Ranjay Krishna. 2023. Explanations can reduce overreliance on ai systems during decision-making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7, CSCW1 (2023), 1–38.
- [95] Carl Vondrick, Donald Patterson, and Deva Ramanan. 2013. Efficiently scaling up crowdsourced video annotation: A set of best practices for high quality, economical video labeling. *International journal of computer vision* 101 (2013), 184–204.
- [96] Diana Nguyen Voronin. 2024. *Development and Evaluation of an LLM-Based Tool for Automatically Building Web Applications*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [97] Xingchen Wan, Ruoxi Sun, Hootan Nakhost, and Sercan O Arık. 2024. Teach Better or Show Smarter? On Instructions and Exemplars in Automatic Prompt Optimization. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ldtoJVVWnX>
- [98] Aobo Wang, Cong Duy Vu Hoang, and Min-Yen Kan. 2013. Perspectives on crowdsourcing annotations for natural language processing. *Language resources and evaluation* 47 (2013), 9–31.
- [99] Hanxiao Wang, Shaogang Gong, Xiatian Zhu, and Tao Xiang. 2016. Human-in-the-loop person re-identification. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*. Springer, 405–422.
- [100] Jiaqi Wang, Zhengliang Liu, Lin Zhao, Zihao Wu, Chong Ma, Sigang Yu, Haixing Dai, Qiushi Yang, Yiheng Liu, Songyao Zhang, et al. 2023. Review of large vision models and visual prompt engineering. *Meta-Radiology* (2023), 100047.
- [101] Kaifu Wang, Qiang Ning, and Dan Roth. 2020. Learnability with indirect supervision signals. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 9145–9155.
- [102] Leijie Wang, Kathryn Yurechko, Pranati Dani, Quan Ze Chen, and Amy X. Zhang. 2025. End User Authoring of Personalized Content Classifiers: Comparing Example Labeling, Rule Writing, and LLM Prompting. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI '25).
- [103] Xinru Wang, Hannah Kim, Sajjadur Rahman, Kushan Mitra, and Zhengjie Miao. 2024. Human-LLM collaborative annotation through effective verification of LLM labels. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–21.
- [104] Yueye Wang, Xiaotong Han, Cong Li, Lixia Luo, Qiuxia Yin, Jian Zhang, Guankai Peng, Danli Shi, and Mingguang He. 2024. Impact of Gold-Standard Label Errors on Evaluating Performance of Deep Learning Models in Diabetic Retinopathy Screening: Nationwide Real-World Validation Study. *Journal of medical Internet research* 26 (2024), e52506.
- [105] Ian Webster. 2023. promptfoo: Test your prompts. <https://www.promptfoo.dev/>
- [106] Janyce Wiebe, Rebecca Bruce, and Thomas P O'Hara. 1999. Development and use of a gold-standard data set for subjectivity classifications. In *Proceedings of the 37th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 246–253.
- [107] Daniel Wolf, Tristan Payer, Catharina Silvia Lisson, Christoph Gerhard Lisson, Meinrad Beer, Timo Ropinski, and Michael Götz. 2023. Dealing with Small Annotated Datasets for Deep Learning in Medical Imaging: An Evaluation of Self-Supervised Pre-Training on CT Scans Comparing Contrastive and Masked Autoencoder Methods for Convolutional Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06534* (2023).
- [108] Fan Yang, Mengnan Du, and Xia Hu. 2019. Evaluating explanation without ground truth in interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.06831* (2019).
- [109] Peijun Yang, Haibin Cai, and Zhiming Zheng. 2018. Improving the quality of crowdsourcing labels by combination of golden data and incentive. In *2018 12th IEEE International Conference on Anti-counterfeiting, Security, and Identification (ASID)*. IEEE, 10–15.
- [110] Yixiang Yao, Weizhao Jin, and Srivatsan Ravi. 2023. Labeling without Seeing? Blind Annotation for Privacy-Preserving Entity Resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03734* (2023).
- [111] Li Yujian and Liu Bo. 2007. A normalized Levenshtein distance metric. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 29, 6 (2007), 1091–1095.
- [112] JD Zamfirescu-Pereira, Heather Wei, Amy Xiao, Kitty Gu, Grace Jung, Matthew G Lee, Bjoern Hartmann, and Qian Yang. 2023. Herding AI cats: Lessons from designing a chatbot by prompting GPT-3. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. 2206–2220.
- [113] J.D. Zamfirescu-Pereira, Richmond Y. Wong, Bjoern Hartmann, and Qian Yang. 2023. Why Johnny Can't Prompt: How Non-AI Experts Try (and Fail) to Design LLM Prompts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 437, 21 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581388>
- [114] Ruoyu Zhang, Yanzeng Li, Yongliang Ma, Ming Zhou, and Lei Zou. 2023. LL-MaAA: Making Large Language Models as Active Annotators. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 13088–13103. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.872>
- [115] Xuanchang Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Hai Zhao. 2024. GLaPE: Gold Label-agnostic Prompt Evaluation for Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 2027–2039. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.121>
- [116] Yaqian Zhang and Wooi-Boon Goh. 2021. Personalized task difficulty adaptation based on reinforcement learning. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* 31, 4 (2021), 753–784.
- [117] Ying Zhen, Abdullah Khan, Shah Nazir, Zhao Huiqi, Abdullah Alharbi, and Sulaiman Khan. 2021. Crowdsourcing usage, task assignment methods, and crowdsourcing platforms: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process* 33, 8 (2021), e2368.
- [118] Yufei Zheng, Mengjie Huang, Liu Wang, Jingyi Zhao, Chuanxin Zhai, and Rui Yang. 2022. How virtual walking task difficulty design influences on task performance and user experience. In *2022 8th International Conference on Virtual Reality (ICVR)*. IEEE, 155–162.
- [119] Yulin Zhou, Yiren Zhao, Iliia Shumailov, Robert Mullins, and Yarin Gal. 2023. Revisiting Automated Prompting: Are We Actually Doing Better?. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 1822–1832. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-short.155>

## A PROMPTINGSHEET Task Context Questions

## B Post-Study Survey for the user study

Table 6 shows the questions for the post-study survey.

## C Prompt

Table 7 shows the prompt PROMPTINGSHEET used for generating instructional prompt.

Table 8 and Table 9 show the prompts PROMPTINGSHEET used for the annotation process.

## D Supplemental System Figures

Figure 16 shows the task dashboard layout in PROMPTINGSHEET.

## E Supplemental ACC and MSE Figure

Figure 17 and Figure 18 present the average ACC and MSE for participants under different conditions: comparing 10 vs. 50 instances per iteration and assessing the impact of LLM explanations.

## F Questionnaires for Participants' LLM Background

## G Post-Study Survey Questions with Likert-Scale Ratings

The survey questions and the accompanying categories were rated on a seven-point Likert scale, as discussed in Section 6.1, listed below:

- (Q1) **Understandable:** The annotation task was easy to understand.

#	Questionnaire Question
Q1	What is the purpose of annotating this data? Common answers include gaining insight about something, wanting to compare something, wanting to create prompts, etc. Try to give us more details about your higher-level goal.
Q2	How do you want to use the annotated data? Common answers include further analysis, training an AI model, presenting it to people, or using it in some downstream tasks inside some computer system. Try to give us more details about the use cases of the annotated data.
Q3	What are these data? Please tell us more about the source and the characteristics of the data. For example, "These are real-world product reviews written by Amazon users. We obtained this dataset by downloading it from Kaggle." or "This is the transcript of interviews of our participants. Each interview is about 30 minutes long. The interview is about their experience in creative writing." or "These are tweets posted on Twitter between Jan 2024 to March 2024."
Q4	What is the size of each data instance (each row)? For example, "Each instance is a tweet.", "Each instance is one Amazon product review.", or "Each instance is one sentence from the interview transcript."
Q5	Is there anything particular you want us to mention in the prompt? We will add all the context you mentioned in this tab to the prompt for LLMs. Please mention anything you want the LLMs to be aware of.

**Table 5: Questions for PROMPTINGSHEET Task Context.**

#	Aspect	Post-Study Survey Question
Q1	Task Experience	The annotation task was easy to understand. (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q2	Task Experience	The annotation tool is easy to use. (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q3	Task Experience	Did you encounter any difficulties while using the system? If yes, please describe the difficulties.
Q4	Task Experience	The interface of the annotation system was intuitive. (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q5	Task Experience	How satisfied are you with the performance of the system? (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q6	Practice Prompting	This tool was helpful in improving my prompt. (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q7	Practice Prompting	Using this tool made the process of prompt engineering more efficient. (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q8	Practice Prompting	Without this tool, how would you typically approach prompt engineering?
Q9	Practice Prompting	How would you compare your prompt engineering process before and after using this tool?
Q10	System Usability	What features did you find most useful?
Q11	System Usability	What features did you find least useful or problematic?
Q12	System Usability	Did you feel the need for any additional features or improvements? If yes, please describe them.
Q13	Overall Feedback	What did you like most about the annotation system?
Q14	Overall Feedback	What did you like least about the annotation system?
Q15	Overall Feedback	Any additional comments or suggestions?
Q16	User Interaction and Behavior	Did you find the system responsive to your actions? If yes, please describe them.
Q17	User Interaction and Behavior	Were there any delays or lags while performing the tasks? If yes, please describe them
Q18	User Interaction and Behavior	Did you use any help or support features provided by the system? If yes, were they helpful?
Q19	Efficiency and Effectiveness	I completed the annotation tasks efficiently. (1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Somewhat Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Somewhat Agree (6) Agree (7) Strongly Agree
Q20	Efficiency and Effectiveness	Did the system help you complete the tasks more efficiently? If yes, please explain how.
Q21	Future Use	Would you be interested in using this annotation system in your regular work or study? If no, please explain why.
Q22	Future Use	Do you have any suggestions for making the system more suitable for your needs?

**Table 6: Post-Study Survey questions used for PROMPTINGSHEET. The survey is consisted of twenty-two questions, including seven Likert scale ratings and fifteen free-text responses.**

- **(Q2) Ease of Use:** The annotation tool is easy to use.
- **(Q4) Intuitive System:** The interface of the annotation system is intuitive.
- **(Q5) Performance Satisfaction:** How satisfied are you with the performance of the system?
- **(Q6) Prompt Improvement:** This tool was helpful in improving my prompt.
- **(Q7) Process Efficiency:** Using this tool made the process of prompt engineering more efficient.

## Instructional Prompt Creation Prompt

Here are questions and corresponding answers for a task description.

““

**Question:** [What is the purpose of annotating this data? Common answers include gaining insight about something, wanting to compare something, wanting to create prompts, etc. Try to give us more details about your higher-level goal.] **Answer:** [Answer 1...]

**Question:** [How do you want to use the annotated data? Common answers include further analysis, training an AI model, presenting it to people, or using it in some downstream tasks inside some computer system. Try to give us more details about the use cases of the annotated data.] **Answer:** [Answer 2...]

**Question:** [What are these data? Please tell us more about the source and the characteristics of the data. For example, “These are real-world product reviews written by Amazon users. We obtained this dataset by downloading it from Kaggle.” or “This is the transcript of interviews of our participants. Each interview is about 30 minutes long. The interview is about their experience in creative writing.” or “These are tweets posted on Twitter between Jan 2024 to March 2024.”] **Answer:** [Answer 3...]

**Question:** [What is the size of each data instance (each row)? For example, “Each instance is a tweet.”, “Each instance is one Amazon product review.”, or “Each instance is one sentence from the interview transcript.”] **Answer:** [Answer 4...]

**Question:** [Is there anything particular you want us to mention in the prompt? We will add all the context you mentioned in this tab to the prompt for LLMs. Please mention anything you want the LLMs to be aware of.] **Answer:** [Answer 5...]

**Question:** [Is it a single-class or multi-class labeling task? [required]] **Answer:** [single-class] .....

””

Based on task questions and answers, help me generate a concrete DETAILED task instruction.

Provide Instruction ONLY!

DO NOT ADD ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT INCLUDE IN THE PREVIOUS Q and A!!!

This Instruction is generated for LLM!

**Table 7: Prompt to generate instructional prompts in PROMPTINGSHEET. Participants are required to answer the first five questions to provide context for the task. The last question and its answer were intentionally fixed, as our study focuses on a single-class labeling task. In the future, participants will be allowed to answer this question.**

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Task ID	Task Tab	Task Creation Time	Prompt Used in the Task	Total Labeling Cost
2				<p>### Task Instruction</p> <p>You are tasked with annotating a dataset of tweets posted during the Covid-19 period. The purpose of annotating this Twitter sentiment data is to gain insights into public opinion on specific topics, events, or trends. The annotated data will be used for further analysis to extract meaningful insights, train AI models for sentiment classification, and potentially present findings to stakeholders.</p> <p>Each data instance is a tweet. This is a single-class labeling task. Please follow the guidelines below to complete the annotation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Read each tweet carefully."</li> <li>2. "Assign a single sentiment label to each tweet." The sentiment labels will be provided to you.</li> <li>3. "Ensure consistency in labeling." If you encounter similar tweets, they should receive the same sentiment label.</li> <li>4. "Avoid any bias." Base your annotation solely on the content of the tweet.</li> </ol> <p>...</p>	0.01115
3	1	<a href="#">Task_1</a>	2024-09-19T02-10:59-451Z	<p>### Task Instruction</p> <p>You are tasked with annotating a dataset of tweets posted during the Covid-19 period. The purpose of annotating this Twitter sentiment data is to gain insights into public opinion on specific topics, events, or trends. The annotated data will be used for further analysis to extract meaningful insights, train AI models for sentiment classification, and potentially present findings to stakeholders.</p> <p>Each data instance is a tweet. This is a single-class labeling task.</p> <p>Please follow the guidelines below to annotate the data accurately:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Read each tweet carefully": Ensure you understand the sentiment expressed in the tweet.</li> <li>2. "Assign a single sentiment label": Based on the content of the tweet, assign one of the predefined sentiment labels.</li> <li>3. "Consistency is key": Make sure to apply the same criteria for labeling across all tweets to maintain consistency in the dataset.</li> </ol> <p>Your annotations will help in understanding public sentiment during the Covid-19 period and will be crucial for training AI models and presenting insights to stakeholders. Thank you for your attention to detail and accuracy in this task.</p> <p>...</p>	0.01219
4	2	<a href="#">Task_2</a>	2024-09-19T02-13:26-896Z	...	
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					

**Figure 16: The Task Dashboard tab provides an overview of all labeling tasks. This spreadsheet records key details, including the Task ID, Task Tab, Task Creation Time, Prompt Used for the Task, and Total Label Cost. Users can click the hyperlink in the Task Tab column to access the corresponding task tab for more detailed information.**

- (Q19) Task Completion: I completed the annotation tasks efficiently.

---

**Prompt for Annotation Process**

**{Instructional\_Prompt}**

Please ensure each label adheres to its following rules and regulations.

Below are the descriptions of various labels. Please assign the most appropriate label to each description provided.

Label '{**\$label\_1**}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

**{rule\_1}**

Label '{**\$label\_2**}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

**{rule\_2}**

Label '{**\$label\_3**}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

**{rule\_3}**

Label '{**\$label\_4**}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

**{rule\_4}**

Label '{**\$label\_5**}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

**{rule\_5}**

.....

Please refer to the following Shots (Examples for LLMs to Learn) for annotation tasks, where each instance is corresponded with a label.

Example:“**\$instance\_1**” => Label:“**\$label\_x**”

Example:“**\$instance\_2**” => Label:“**\$label\_x**”

Example:“**\$instance\_3**” => Label:“**\$label\_x**”

.....

**Output Format**

Your output should consist of two sections: ANSWER and EXPLANATION.

ANSWER: Label: []

EXPLANATION: Provide a brief explanation for your label choice.

The following is the data instance need to be annotated:

data-instance: **{data\_instance}**

---

**Table 8: Prompt for the annotation process in PROMPTINGSHEET for groups which have only one data instance.**



---

### Prompt for Annotation Process

#### {Instructional\_Prompt}

Please ensure each label adheres to its following rules and regulations.

Below are the descriptions of various labels. Please assign the most appropriate label to each description provided.

Label '{label\_1}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

{rule\_1}

Label '{label\_2}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

{rule\_2}

Label '{label\_3}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

{rule\_3}

Label '{label\_4}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

{rule\_4}

Label '{label\_5}': Assign this label if the tweet meets any of the following criteria:

{rule\_5}

.....

Please refer to the following Shots (Examples for LLMs to Learn) for annotation tasks, where each instance is corresponded with a label.

Example:“{instance\_1}” => Label:“{label\_x}”

Example:“{instance\_2}” => Label:“{label\_x}”

Example:“{instance\_3}” => Label:“{label\_x}”

.....

#### Output Format

For each labeled data instance, your output should consist of two sections: ANSWER and EXPLANATION, with the data instance id. Each label fragment should be divided by “=====”

ANSWER: Label: []

EXPLANATION: Provide a brief explanation for your label choice.

The following are data instances from a group that need to be annotated:

data-instance-1: {data\_instance\_1}


data-instance-2: {data\_instance\_2}

data-instance-3: {data\_instance\_3}


.....

---


**Table 9: Prompt for the annotation process in PROMPTINGSHEET for groups which have multiple data instances.**




(a) ACC with 10 instances.



(b) ACC with 50 instances.




(c) MSE with 10 instances.




(d) MSE with 50 instances.


Figure 17: The average ACC and MSE for participants reviewing 10 or 50 instances per iteration are presented in four subfigures, comparing ACC and MSE between the two conditions.




(a) ACC without LLM Explanation.



(b) ACC with LLM Explanation.



(c) MSE without LLM Explanation.



(d) MSE with LLM Explanation.

Figure 18: The average ACC and MSE for participants with or without LLM Explanation are presented in four subfigures, comparing ACC and MSE between the two conditions.

#	Questionnaire Question
Q1	How would you rate your familiarity with using LLMs on a scale from 1 (not familiar) to 5 (very familiar)?
Q2	Which of the following best describes your understanding of how LLMs work? (1) I don't understand at all. (2) I have a basic understanding (e.g., they generate text based on input). (3) I understand the general principles (e.g., machine learning, large datasets). (4) I have a detailed understanding (e.g., specific architectures, training methods).
Q3	What are your years of experience in using LLMs? (1) Less than a month (2) 1-3 months (3) 4 months to 1 year (4) More than 1 year
Q4	How often do you use LLMs? (1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Bi-Weekly (4) Monthly (5) Never
Q5	How much time do you typically spend interacting with LLMs in a single session? (1) Less than 5 minutes (2) 5-15 minutes (3) 15-30 minutes (4) More than 30 minutes
Q6	In which contexts have you used LLMs? (Select all that apply) (1) Academic research (2) Professional work (3) Personal projects (4) Entertainment (5) Other
Q7	For which tasks do you use LLMs? (Select all that apply) (1) Data Labeling (2) General Q&A or research (3) Writing assistance (e.g., drafting emails, reports) (4) Programming or debugging (5) Data analysis or visualization (6) Creative tasks (e.g., storytelling, idea generation) (7) Other
Q8	How confident are you in your ability to craft effective prompts for LLMs on a scale from 1 (beginner) to 5 (expert)?
Q9	How proficient do you feel in troubleshooting when an LLM generates incorrect or irrelevant responses on a scale from 1 (not proficient) to 5 (extremely proficient)?
Q10	Do you use any advanced techniques like prompt engineering or API integration with LLMs? If yes, please describe.

**Table 10: Questionnaire questions used for participants' LLM background.**