TAMPERING WITH LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS: A FIELD GUIDE FOR USING GENERATIVE AI IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH

Michael Overton Institute for Interdisciplinary Data Sciences Department of Politics and Philosophy University of Idaho Moscow, ID 83844 Moverton@uidaho.edu Barrie Robison Institute for Interdisciplinary Data Sciences Department of Biological Sciences University of Idaho Moscow, ID 83844

Lucas Sheneman Institute for Interdisciplinary Data Sciences Research Computing and Data Services University of Idaho Moscow, ID 83844

April 3, 2025

ABSTRACT

The integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into social science research presents transformative opportunities for advancing scientific inquiry, particularly in public administration (PA). However, the absence of standardized methodologies for using LLMs poses significant challenges for ensuring transparency, reproducibility, and replicability. This manuscript introduces the TaMPER framework—a structured methodology organized around five critical decision points: Task, Model, Prompt, Evaluation, and Reporting. The TaMPER framework provides scholars with a systematic approach to leveraging LLMs effectively while addressing key challenges such as model variability, prompt design, evaluation protocols, and transparent reporting practices.

Keywords Large Language Models · Generative Artificial Intelligence · Social Science Inquiry · Public Administration

1 Introduction

The integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into social science research presents remarkable opportunities for advancing scientific inquiry. These models serve as powerful, scalable tools for measurement, modeling, and simulation (Mallory, 2024), enabling new avenues for empirical exploration and discovery. Such technological innovations often catalyze scientific revolutions by providing novel methods for investigation (Dyson, 1999). However, realizing LLMs' transformative potential requires a clear understanding of their capabilities and limitations and developing rigorous methodological approaches (Naveed et al., 2024). Unfortunately, social scientists currently lack standardized protocols to ensure transparency, reproducibility, and replicability in LLM-driven research.¹ This manuscript addresses this gap by introducing the **TaMPER framework**, a structured methodology for integrating LLMs into social science studies with particular attention to public administration (PA) scholarship.

The TaMPER framework responds to key challenges inherent to LLM use: their non-deterministic outputs, rapid evolution of capabilities, and the lack of guidelines for transparent documentation. It is organized around five deci-

¹Ziems et al. work is a notable and commendable exception.

sion points—**Task**, **Model**, **Prompt**, **Evaluation**, and **Reporting**—each designed to guide researchers in maintaining methodological rigor while leveraging generative AI tools. By systematically addressing these components, scholars can mitigate risks associated with the dynamic nature of LLMs and ensure reproducibility across studies.

LLMs have the potential to democratize knowledge work by enabling researchers to efficiently analyze large-scale textual data. Yet their practical accessibility remains constrained by significant barriers, including expensive subscriptions, requirements for advanced technical skills, the need for high-performance computing infrastructure, and institutional and policy restrictions (Sathish et al., 2024). Recognizing these challenges, the TaMPER framework emphasizes adaptability and flexibility, enabling researchers across diverse skill levels and contexts to engage equitably with generative AI technologies even as the capabilities and applications of LLMs rapidly evolve.

This manuscript is organized into sections corresponding to the five decision points in the TaMPER framework: Task, Model, Prompt, Evaluation, and Reporting. Each section explores methodological considerations, illustrating how these decision points interact in practice. The discussion covers foundational aspects of LLMs, their architecture, functionality, and practical applications in PA research, supported by examples and actionable insights.

1.1 What Are LLMs?

To make informed decisions about using LLMs in research, it is essential to understand their architecture. At their core, LLMs are advanced machine learning systems trained on vast text datasets to process and generate human-like language (Chang & Bergen, 2024). They rely on prompts—natural language inputs (sometimes referred to as queries)—to produce outputs ranging from summaries to detailed text generation that resembles, mimics, or demonstrates complex reasoning. This dynamic input-output interaction makes them versatile tools in social science research.

Most modern LLMs use the *transformer* neural network architecture, which employs self-attention to process input sequences (Vaswani et al., 2023). During inference, text is generated *autoregressively*: predicting one token at a time based on previously generated tokens. However, training objectives vary across models. Some models, like OpenAI's GPT, are trained with causal language modeling (predicting the next token in a sequence given prior context) (Radford, 2018), while others, like Google's BERT, use masked language modeling (predicting missing tokens within a sequence) (Devlin et al., 2019). The self-attention mechanism enables the model to capture complex contextual relationships across all tokens simultaneously, rather than processing them in a strictly sequential order.

Transformer-based LLMs begin by converting text into a numerical representation through a process called *tokenization* wherein text is divided into *tokens*, which are integer identifiers representing words, sub-words, or character sequences from a predefined vocabulary. These tokens are then mapped to high-dimensional numerical vectors known as *embeddings*. Transformers aggregate all token embeddings into an internal dictionary called an *embedding layer*. The transformer's embedding layer represents all token meanings in a way that captures relationships between tokens based on patterns learned from the training data. These embeddings provide a dense numerical representation of the semantic meaning of tokens, ultimately allowing the model to recognize semantic similarities and contextual relationships between different words and phrases.

Transformers are aptly named because they refine the semantic meaning of each token by incorporating the surrounding context from the input sequence. A transformer-based LLM consists of multiple layers of transformer blocks, each building upon the output of the previous layer. This sequential process enables the model to capture increasingly complex, abstract, and nuanced relationships in language, ultimately allowing it to interpret meaning in a context-sensitive manner.

Understanding the technical foundations of LLMs, such as tokenization, embeddings, and transformer architectures, helps researchers make informed decisions about how to best leverage these powerful yet complex tools. The nuances of task definition, model selection, prompt engineering, evaluation methods, and reporting requirements are inherently tied to these technical characteristics.

1.2 TaMPER Decision Framework

When incorporating LLMs into PA research, scholars face several key decisions. These can be broadly categorized into:

1. **Task Decisions**: A clear understanding and definition of the LLM task is crucial for all other downstream decisions. Examples of task categories include generating synthetic data, summarizing text, extracting information, or classifying statements.

- 2. **Model (LLM) Decisions**: Determining which model(s) to use requires a careful balancing of performance characteristics against cost and accessibility. Configuration of model hyperparameters like temperature or token limits should be carefully evaluated and documented.
- 3. **Prompt Decisions**: Prompt design has a significant influence on the accuracy, precision, and quality of LLM outputs. Prompts are more than a mere repetition of the task, as they contain important context, instructions, and can structure model output.
- 4. **Evaluation**: Evaluation is an evolving and often overlooked aspect of using LLMs in research. Understanding LLM evaluation targets (e.g., "what" is evaluated), criteria, and protocols (e.g., "how" they are evaluated) are foundational for methodological rigor.
- 5. **Reporting**: Transparency is essential for creating reproducible and replicable research. Scholars must clearly document decisions related to task design, model selection, prompt crafting, and output evaluation to ensure the research is transparent and replicable.

By rigorously considering these decisions using a consistent and documented framework, PA researchers can use LLMs effectively and ethically, contributing to the advancement of the field while maintaining scientific integrity.

1.3 Public Administration Research and LLMs

LLMs are transforming the landscape of social science research by enabling innovative approaches to data generation, analysis, and synthesis. While these advances benefit social sciences broadly, PA is uniquely positioned to benefit from LLM applications because of its distinct data ecosystem, and commitment to methodological pluralism (Pandey, 2017; Zhu et al., 2019).

PA's historical limitations have become its greatest assets in the LLM era. PA's longstanding challenges—such as data fragmentation (Overton et al., 2023) and methodological division (Pandey, 2017)—have paradoxically prepared the field to excel in the age of LLMs. Decades of managing fragmented data sources and integrating diverse methodological approaches have cultivated the skills needed for effective LLM implementation. PA scholars are already adept at triangulating multiple data sources, combining different analytical approaches, and maintaining methodological rigor while working with incomplete information. Established practices for handling sensitive data, managing bias, and ensuring transparency provide a robust foundation for responsible LLM adoption. Rather than starting from scratch, PA scholars can build on these existing strengths to rapidly advance the field's research capabilities, leveraging LLMs to transform historical challenges into methodological advantages.

To date, PA research has been somewhat limited by inefficient and incomplete access to the vast data ecosystem created by public organizations. Governments create a range of difficult-to-extract but widely available data such as administrative records and government reports. Workman and Thomas (2023) make the point that data infrastructures in a look-up system are designed to help others find a specific datapoint, but these systems are not designed for easy data extraction and integration into databases. Critical information for studying public agencies can be found in the unstructured data that characterizes public records, digital trace data, and administrative data systems. Analysis of public comments (Sahn, 2024), legislative proceedings, legal text, open records like emails (Moy, 2021), town hall meeting minutes (Barari & Simko, 2023), agency communications in news articles (Kapucu, 2006), social media, and scraped websites (Neumann et al., 2022) offer rich data sources to be mined using LLMs. LLMs provide the means for harnessing this data, as they have unprecedented capabilities to harmonize diverse data sources (Z. Li et al., 2024), extract, and create structured data from unstructured text (Ziems et al., 2024), and conduct qualitative data analysis at scale (Dunivin, 2024).

LLMs also present an excellent opportunity for meaningful collaboration between qualitative and quantitative scholars in PA. While PA has historically embraced methodological pluralism(McDonald et al., 2022; Pandey, 2017; Zhu et al., 2019), LLMs amplify the benefits of actively integrating different methodological traditions. Qualitative researchers' expertise in systematic text analysis and interpretation positions them to excel at LLM prompt engineering and output validation, while quantitative scholars' skills in statistical analysis enable them to effectively evaluate LLM outputs at scale. This partnership combines the nuanced depth of qualitative analysis with the rigor of quantitative methods, enhancing the field's applicability (McDonald et al., 2022).

2 Tasks

Clearly defining the desired task output involves understanding the kinds of natural language processing tasks at which LLMs excel. LLMs have demonstrated proficiency across diverse NLP areas such as Natural Language Generation (NLG), Natural Language Understanding (NLU), Knowledge-Intensive Tasks, and Natural Language Inference (NLI)

(Yang et al., 2024). **NLG** tasks focus on creating human-like text outputs, including summaries, translations, or content generation. In contrast, **NLU** tasks emphasize interpreting and comprehending input data, supporting text classification, sentiment analysis, or coding qualitative data into structured forms. Similarly, **Knowledge-Intensive Tasks** integrate factual and domain-specific information to generate detailed answers, summarize specialized documents, or explain concepts. Finally, **NLI** tasks involve evaluating logical relationships, which can directly inform tasks involving logical reasoning or hypothesis testing.

Deciding how LLMs will be used—either to simulate human judgment or serve as analytical tools—depends largely on their ability to replicate human cognitive processes. LLMs possess human-like cognitive capacities, enabling researchers to model social interactions and derive insights into human behaviors and social dynamics (Ke et al., 2024; Niu et al., 2024). They can simulate judgments or emulate different human personas (Argyle et al., 2023; Dillion et al., 2023), thus supporting tasks like synthetic data generation or scenario exploration. However, researchers must recognize their limitations: LLMs effectively capture syntax, grammar, and semantic aspects of language (Chang & Bergen, 2024) but may struggle with tasks requiring complex reasoning, context-specific interpretations, or expertlevel domain knowledge (Amirizaniani et al., 2024; Niu et al., 2024; Szymanski et al., 2024). Understanding these limitations guides researchers in clearly defining the LLM's function within their research task.

2.1 Tasks in Practice

2.1.1 Text Analysis

LLMs excel in text analysis tasks such as annotation, classification, coding, sentiment analysis, and information extraction. For example, Törnberg (2023b) highlights the unparalleled flexibility of LLMs in analyzing textual statements, enabling researchers to perform qualitative analysis at a scale and speed unattainable through manual methods. These capabilities can streamline content analysis of public records, legislative transcripts, or citizen complaints, providing insights into administrative performance and public sentiment.

LLMs offer diverse text analysis capabilities—including generating structured data, performing qualitative analyses, and harmonizing data—at speeds that often outperform manual methods. One of the clearest strengths of LLMs is the ability to annotate (Gilardi et al., 2023), classify (Bamman et al., 2024), code, and assign sentiment to text passages (Bail, 2024; Törnberg, 2023b). The ability of LLMs to consistently conduct these tasks is improving and generally outperforms human coders (Törnberg, 2023a). In addition, LLMs can extract information from unstructured data, demonstrating the ability to outperform human coders on tasks related to identifying named entities and extracting information from complex documents or tasks requiring extensive contextual knowledge (Bermejo et al., 2024). Current LLMs struggle to perform text analysis at the level of subject matter experts in highly specific knowledge domains (Izani & Voyer, 2023).

LLMs can conduct qualitative analyses that generate unstructured output (Gilardi et al., 2023; Törnberg, 2023b). LLMs have been used to summarize themes, patterns, and insights of text (Rodriguez & Martinez, 2023) using various qualitative analysis approaches such as thematic analysis, deductive coding, coding interviews using both inductive and deductive coding, and even developing a grounded theoretical model (Übellacker, 2024). Comparisons of human and LLM-assisted thematic analyses have shown similar results (Gamieldien et al., 2023). LLMs have also been used for deductive coding tasks (Chew et al., 2023) and not only match human performance but make unique contributions (Torii et al., 2024). They have also been used to code interviews successfully (Bano et al., 2023). A key theme in the use of LLMs in qualitative research is that, while they can automate tasks and perform at similar or better levels than human analysts, LLM-human collaboration results in faster, higher quality analysis on both inductive and deductive tasks (Izani & Voyer, 2023).

2.1.2 Synthetic Data Generation

LLMs have emerged as a transformative and promising tool for generating synthetic data—complementing or substituting for human participants in diverse research contexts(Bail, 2024; Ziems et al., 2024). Several examples from political science demonstrate how LLMs can create synthetic data, simulate scenarios, and augment incomplete datasets (Resh et al., 2025; Rossi et al., 2024), offering new insights where traditional data sources are unavailable or insufficient (L. Li et al., 2024). Their primary applications include simulating participant responses in experiments and surveys, augmenting existing datasets, testing research instruments, and generating exploratory data when traditional data collection is impractical.

A central concept in this domain is "algorithmic fidelity" - the degree to which LLMs can accurately reflect targeted identity and personality profiles that align with human populations (Argyle et al., 2023). LLM-generated synthetic data can effectively replicate survey responses and simulate various public opinion trends, even in the absence of comprehensive survey datasets (Bisbee et al., 2024). Through careful prompt engineering and conditioning, researchers

LLM function as a Human	Predefined Example	Undefined Example	Type of Task
Participant	Survey respondent	Open-ended interviewee	Synthetic Data Generation
Coder	Annotate text	Category creation	Text Analysis
Human extractor	Identify and extract text	Summarize document	Text Analysis

Table 1: Generative AI Task Selection

have shown that LLMs can produce response distributions that match those of specific demographic subpopulations, which is particularly valuable for analyzing trends in underserved or underrepresented communities (L. Li et al., 2024).

Despite their promise, LLMs face significant limitations in fully replicating human decision-making processes and in creating unbiased synthetic data. Dillion et al. (2023) found that LLMs perform better when explicit features drive human judgments but may diverge when faced with competing intuitions. The diversity of generated data is an ongoing struggle as LLMs are prone to producing homogenous outputs (Wang et al., 2024). Biases embedded in LLM-generated data can potentially skew results(Chang & Bergen, 2024; Ke et al., 2024; L. Li et al., 2024; Malberg et al., 2024; Törnberg, 2023a).

LLMs can help address data collection challenges, especially in political science, where complete datasets are often hard to obtain due to privacy concerns, logistical constraints, or high costs associated with traditional methodologies (Agnew et al., 2024; L. Li et al., 2024; Törnberg, 2023b). They can assist in estimating political ideologies where conventional data sources are incomplete, and simulate voter behavior and party strategies to augment traditional political modeling frameworks (L. Li et al., 2024). Synthetic data generation allows researchers to test and refine research ideas efficiently, access simulated data for difficult-to-recruit populations (Dillion et al., 2023), validate human responses, and explore novel research domains where real data collection might be impossible (Argyle et al., 2023; Bono Rossello et al., 2025).

2.2 Defining the Task

Defining the generative AI task for PA research requires navigating three core decision points: 1) defining input data and desired output, 2) managing task complexity, and 3) specifying the LLM's function. These decisions directly shape how LLMs align with social science objectives while avoiding misapplication in areas like conversational agents (e.g., chatbots), which prioritize enterprise utility over social science relevance.

1. Input Data and Output Alignment. The first step involves explicitly identifying and clearly defining the input data (e.g., policy documents, public comments, textual records) and the desired form of the outputs (e.g., summaries, synthetic narratives, extracted entities). The type and structure of the input data directly influence the range and quality of outputs that an LLM can generate. When defining the form of the output, it is important to specify whether the LLM will generate undefined novel text (e.g., inductive coding) or operate within predefined structures (e.g., sentiment analysis). Undefined and predefined outputs benefit from different models, prompt design, and evaluation protocol. At this stage, the general form of the task is the set of actions that will transform the input data into the desired output.

2. Managing Task Complexity. While the general form of the task can be broadly defined at step 1, the complexity of the task must be carefully evaluated. Requests that are too intricate or multilayered often produce brittle or inconsistent outputs. Overly complex tasks should be decomposed into simpler, sequential steps—such as first conducting sentiment analysis and then separately performing argument mapping. This approach can significantly enhance both reliability and reproducibility (Khot et al., 2023).

3. Specifying the function of the LLM. Clearly specifying the LLM's function is critical because it clarifies methodological expectations, enhances transparency, and ensures alignment between task goals and model capabilities. Table 1 (below), provides a framework to help researchers explicitly state whether the LLM is intended to simulate human participants (e.g., generating synthetic survey responses) or function primarily as an analytical tool (e.g., categorizing policy themes or extracting entities). Simulation functions require careful methodological justifications regarding realism, representativeness, and fidelity limitations. In contrast, analytical functions necessitate clearly articulated evaluation metrics—such as precision and recall—to objectively validate successful outcomes. Explicitly defining the LLM's function upfront ensures that methodological trade-offs are transparent and appropriately managed.

3 Models

Choosing an appropriate LLM is critical for ensuring the validity and reliability of research outcomes for the defined task. This section examines three core decision points in LLM research: (1) selecting models through performance and accessibility trade-offs, (2) choosing between open-source transparency and closed-source performance, and (3) configuring hyperparameters for task-specific outcomes.

3.1 Model Selection

Selecting an LLM requires balancing performance and accessibility, as different models excel under varying conditions. While models with more parameters generally excel at complex tasks, this is not a universal rule. The choice of an LLM should be guided by task requirements, model accessibility, and the feasibility of testing multiple models. A good way to begin is by selecting four or more models from different families (e.g., OpenAI, Anthropic, Cohere, and open-source options like LLaMA or GPT-NeoX. See https://huggingface.co/models for a comprehensive list). Conduct a small-scale test to compare outputs and select the model that best aligns with the research objectives.

While leaderboards provide an initial gauge of LLM performance, they must be used with caution due to potential overfitting and data contamination. Leaderboards incentivize overfitting and optimization of benchmark task performance (Banerjee et al., 2024), which occurs both purposefully and accidentally due to data contamination. Data contamination refers to benchmark data being found in the LLM training (Balloccu et al., 2024) or testing data (Rogers & Luccioni, 2024). If LLMs are trained on benchmarking data, then their leaderboard performance will be artificially inflated during benchmark evaluation. Data contamination and perverse incentives make leaderboards unreliable indicators for out-of-distribution performance on similar tasks (Rogers & Luccioni, 2024). Leaderboards are not definitive indicators of model performance, and should not be considered a justification to select or dismiss a model.

3.2 Open-Source vs. Closed-Source Models

The choice between open-source and closed-source models has significant implications for scientific transparency and reproducibility. It is generally recommended to use open-source LLMs (Rogers & Luccioni, 2024) as they are more transparent than closed-source models, more likely to generate reproducible results, and can be hosted on local servers–a frequent requirement when working with sensitive data. The actual transparency of an open model can vary as developers may provide information on model weights, training data, code, and many other system components (Solaiman, 2023). Many recently released models are labeled as "open-weights" because they share the final model weights, but they are not truly "open-source" since they do not also include the training code or datasets.

Closed-source LLMs like Chat-GPT 40 and Sonnet 3.5² provide state-of-the-art performance, but due to their proprietary nature, lack transparency. The consequences of this lack of transparency for research are still being assessed. The two major concerns with using LLMs as research tools are related to the limited reproducibility of results and data privacy (Ollion et al., 2024). Closed-source models are updated frequently, resulting in "temporal drift" of results (Bail, 2024). Research that uses sensitive data that is protected legally or ethically (e.x. HIPAA, copy-righted intellectual property, etc.) with closed-source models makes the data available to private companies. Despite their excellent performance, closed-source models introduce many avoidable scientific, ethical, and legal complications when used in research. There are clear replication, transparency, and data privacy benefits to using a locally-hosted open model (Abdurahman et al., 2024), and the performance gap against public benchmarks between open- and closed-source models is rapidly closing.

3.3 Model Hyperparameters

Configuring hyperparameters is another series of pivotal decision points that impact model consistency, output diversity, and required computation. The four primary hyperparameters are temperature, top_p, context window size, and token limits. The temperature parameter, which ranges from 0 (least random) to 1 (most random), controls the randomness of outputs and influences model consistency (H. Wei et al., 2024) as well as the effectiveness of prompting strategies (Stureborg et al., 2024). The top_p³ parameter also impacts the apparent randomness by setting a threshold for token selection probability. Higher top_p values increase the number of potential tokens, while temperature determines their likelihood of being chosen.

²Without hesitation, I believe this reference to state-of-the-art models will be outdated by the time this manuscript is publicly available. I only include this footnote as a point of self-reflection.

³The Hyperparameter top_p is adjustable with OpenAI- and Ollama-compatible models, while top_k, a similar concept, is adjustable using the Ollama-native API.

LLMs are highly-sensitive probabilistic systems that produce varying outputs even when given the same input—a major consideration for scientific reproducibility (Abdurahman et al., 2024). Despite being deterministic in nature, LLMs exhibit apparent non-determinism due to their probabilistic sampling processes. When temperature is set to 0.0 and top_p is close to 0.0, with a consistent computational environment, the model can produce identical outputs for the same input. However, at temperatures above 0.0, the model may occasionally select less probable tokens, introducing variability. The top_p parameter limits token selection to those within the smallest set of probabilities exceeding the threshold, thereby influencing output diversity and variability. This inherent variability arises from the model's sampling of learned patterns, leading to unpredictable yet diverse outputs. Diverse outputs can be a blessing or a curse, depending on the specific research Task.

Context windows define the amount of input text the model can consider. Longer context windows enable more precise instructions, additional information relevant to the task, and can produce more nuanced responses. However, larger context windows come at an increased computational cost and are not always beneficial. Critical information's placement within a long window heavily influences model performance, creating a point of diminishing returns where expanding context length further offers limited practical value unless strategically structured (Liu et al., 2024).

Token limits determine the maximum length of generated outputs. While many tasks described above will only require a small number of tokens, NLG and NLI tasks could be limited if the token limit is set relatively low. It is important to report the model's token limits in addition to reporting the descriptive statistics of the LLM outputs.

4 **Prompts**

Developing a prompt for research tasks requires a series of design choices referred to as prompt engineering. We provide a series of empirically grounded recommendations for effective prompts that serve as a scaffolding from which prompts can be developed. Prompt design guidelines should be treated as flexible starting points that require iterative refinement to meet specific research objectives. It is important to note that these recommendations may become outdated rapidly as the field evolves. For example, while few-shot prompts can improve model performance in certain circumstances (Brown et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2022), recent studies suggest they provide no significant advantage over zero-shot approaches (C. Li & Flanigan, 2024), and may introduce bias (Stureborg et al., 2024).

4.1 Structuring Prompts: Component Order and Context

Effective prompts typically include key components designed to achieve a specific goal, such as adding context, providing instructions, asking questions, or specifying the desired output format. Prompt components can be combined into reusable templates that enable iteration over multiple model calls.

A critical decision in the design of a prompt is the *sequence* of its components, which significantly influences LLM performance due to positional biases. LLMs exhibit position bias (Stureborg et al., 2024), in which they prioritize information from the beginning and end of prompts (Liu et al., 2024; H. Wei et al., 2024). There are conflicting recommendations on how to order components of a prompt. Ziems et al. (2024) developed a series of prompt design recommendations for social scientists, recommending the following order: Context \rightarrow Question \rightarrow Instructions/Constraints, \rightarrow Output. In the llm-as-a-judge scholarship, a human annotator structure order: Instruction \rightarrow Context \rightarrow Question outperforms other evaluation methods. Regardless, the Ziems et al. (2024) prompt order serves as an excellent baseline that is rooted in empirical evidence and user experience. Deviations from this prompt order can be valid, but require justification.

Another important decision point when designing a prompt is determining the appropriate context to provide. Context in a prompt refers to essential background information like definitions and text from source documents. Definitions of key terms improve accuracy by reducing ambiguity (Atreja et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2023). The proper amount of context to provide in a prompt should be carefully evaluated relative to the task. Excessive context, such as the inclusion of irrelevant external source documents, can inadvertently affect fluency and introduce bias (Stureborg et al., 2024).

4.2 Prompt Component: Task (Questions/Instructions/Constraints)

Crafting clear *task components*—questions, instructions, constraints—is central to prompt engineering. Succinct yet comprehensive instructions yield optimal results (Kim et al., 2023). Critical task construction decisions include: the number of questions per model call, role specification, how to invoke chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning, requesting an explanation, and scale design.

4.2.1 Number of Questions per Model Call

If cost is not a concern, single question prompts per model call are clearly desirable because they increase response consistency and minimize bias (Stureborg et al., 2024) Multi-question prompts are appealing due to cost savings and decreased energy usage (Abdurahman et al., 2024). While there is precedent for multiple questions per call (Kim et al., 2023), LLMs exhibit an anchoring bias in multi-question prompts (Stureborg et al., 2024). Multi-question prompts may be justified when paired with proper evaluation that assesses the impact of question order and establishes that single question versions of the prompts do not deviate significantly from the multi-question format.

4.2.2 CoT Prompting

CoT prompting is intended to break down complex reasoning into sequential steps (J. Wei et al., 2022). Multiple studies show that CoT improves response accuracy, especially for complex tasks (J. Wei et al., 2022; Ziems et al., 2024). In traditional LLMs, eliciting CoT typically requires the practitioner to prompt the model to think "step-by-step," often leading to outputs that include descriptions of intermediate reasoning steps. Unfortunately, there is a lack of consistent advice on how CoT should be implemented in practice. Recent advances in large reasoning models (LRMs), such as OpenAI's o1, o3, and DeepSeek, have fundamentally changed this landscape. These state-of-the-art models intrinsically support CoT without the need for explicit prompting. In particular, o1 and o3 leverage advanced test-time compute to explore and evaluate multiple reasoning paths, streamlining the reasoning process and mitigating the unwieldy outputs often associated with traditional CoT prompting called Tree-of-Thoughts (Yao et al., 2023).

Providing explicit, step-by-step reasoning instructions is essential for replication and reproducibility in scientific research. Prompting a model to think "step-by-step" might reflect the same reasoning present without the prompt (Chochlakis et al., 2024). If ground-truth reasoning exists, explicitly providing these reasoning steps as instructions improves model performance (Del & Fishel, 2023). Otherwise, stating the goal, question, or task, followed immediately by step-by-step instructions with constraints, is a standard approach for eliciting consistent and compliant LLM outputs (J. Wei et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2023). For difficult problems, asking an LLM to reflect on its answer can decrease hallucinations and improve accuracy on question/answer tasks (Ji et al., 2023; Renze & Guven, 2024). Higher temperatures can amplify the benefits of CoT prompting, whereas a temperature of zero is more effective for tasks requiring deterministic outputs (Stureborg et al., 2024).

4.2.3 Explanation Strategies

Requiring LLMs to explain their output is an easy way to improve output performance and transparency. Selfexplanation improves precision, accuracy, and compliance (Atreja et al., 2024; Chiang & Lee, 2023) and further benefits to accuracy and precision are gained when LLMs are explicitly asked to justify their reasoning *before* producing final outputs (J. Wei et al., 2022). Furthermore, these explanations enhance transparency by enabling post-hoc evaluation, allowing scholars to audit and compare responses.

4.2.4 Designing Evaluation Scales

Effective evaluation scales are supported by clear design principles that enhance accuracy and task compliance. First, presenting multiple-choice options on separate lines improves readability and reduces processing errors (Ziems et al., 2024). Second, descriptive labels (e.g., "agree", "disagree") result in more compliant and accurate outputs compared to numerical scales (e.g., "1-10"), though responses also shift away from extreme ratings (Atreja et al., 2024). Kim et al., (2023) also found that performance improved when using the following strategies:

- Granular Scoring: Fine-grained scales yield better results than composite scores.
- Filtering: Categorizing responses as true/false before applying nuanced criteria refines outcomes.
- **Binning**: Restricting outputs to predefined multiple-choice options ensures consistency and aligns responses with structured formats.

4.2.5 Role Specification

Assigning roles (e.g., "expert") benefits smaller models but has negligible impact on larger LLMs (Kim et al., 2023). Use this approach sparingly, focusing on tasks requiring persona alignment (Argyle et al., 2023).

4.3 Prompt Component: Output

Precise instructions for the desired output significantly enhance a model's adherence to task instructions (Ziems et al., 2024). For example, specifying the output as JSON not only improves reproducibility in parsing (Laskar et al.,

2024) but also facilitates the integration of LLM outputs with other data processing and analysis workflows, thereby streamlining research and boosting overall efficiency. Models that are Ollama and OpenAI compatible support a feature called True Structured Output. This feature directly programs the system to produce responses that conform to a predefined JSON schema, rather than relying solely on prompt instructions. By actively adjusting the model's probabilities, it restricts responses to the specified format. Scholars are highly encouraged to use True Structured Outputs, as this approach simplifies prompts, improves compliance, and mitigates potential bias that may arise from including example outputs in the prompt (Kim et al., 2023; Stureborg et al., 2024; H. Wei et al., 2024).

5 Evaluation

The evaluation of outputs generated by LLMs is an emerging and rapidly evolving area of inquiry. For PA scholars, rigorous evaluation methodologies are essential for establishing scientific validity and reliability of LLM-generated data. While no universally adopted framework exists (Xiao et al., 2023), this section outlines key decision points and criteria to guide evaluation practices.

Evaluation decisions center on two core questions: **what is evaluated** and **how it is evaluated**. The "what" encompasses four primary targets: model selection, hyperparameter tuning, prompt design, and output quality assessment (Gu et al., 2025). Of these, model selection and output assessment will require evaluation in most studies, while hyperparameter settings and prompt design will need evaluation in cases where competing choices have strong implications for the output. Regardless of the specific evaluation target, the assessment is ultimately based on analyzing the model's output or response to determine its effectiveness.

The "how" of evaluation involves selecting **criteria** and designing **protocols**. The primary criteria for evaluating LLM outputs are accuracy, precision, and quality. **Accuracy** measures correctness or proximity of the output to a true value and is the primary criterion of interest for many LLM tasks (H. Li et al., 2024). Some LLM tasks have factual, ground-truth answers where the assessment of accuracy is straightforward, and can be calculated using F1-scores. For tasks where the ground truth is absent but human opinions or coded data exist, accuracy is calculated as a correlation between human-coded data (sometimes called the "gold standard") and the LLM output. However, caution is warranted when evaluating subjective outputs since human-coded data is prone to bias, inconsistency, and errors in judgment (Clark et al., 2021). LLM coders can outperform humans (Elangovan et al., 2025; Törnberg, 2023a) suggesting that LLMs are not necessarily incorrect when there is a lack of alignment with human-validated outputs (Xiao et al., 2023).

Precision is similar to reliability in social science and refers to variability of the output across repeated trials. Temperature and top_p hyperparameters have a considerable impact on output variation and should be considered when estimating precision criteria. Under the umbrella of precision are three key concepts: 1) stability, 2) consistency, and 3) inter-rater reliability. Stability is the variation of the output when the same model and prompt are called multiple times. Consistency refers to variation in the output when the model is held constant, but the prompt is slightly altered. Sometimes called prompt perturbation, this approach assesses the notion of prompt brittleness (Singh et al., 2024). Inter-rater reliability in the context of LLMs compares outputs of the same prompt from different models. Higher stability, consistency, and inter-rater reliability indicate greater precision.

Quality of LLM outputs can be measured using several different criteria (Table 2), but these criteria lack standard definitions and operationalizations in practice (Belz et al., 2021). LLMs are complex systems that have been conceptualized as measurement instruments that model human language (Mallory, 2024). Higher quality outputs suggest that the instrument and system that produced them are more trustworthy, while lower quality outputs indicate higher levels of uncertainty about an output and the system that produces it. Quality criteria can be used in a variety of ways to evaluate LLM output. For example, compliance, linguistic, and reasoning criteria can establish pass/fail thresholds for the output. Context and specificity criteria evaluate how well an LLM uses input data when formulating its response.

Quality criteria enable researchers to make reasonable assumptions about the validity of the output when outputs lack factuality or ground truth. While accuracy is the criteria of primary importance, accuracy of many LLM tasks cannot be evaluated because there is no "fact" to compare the LLM output against. As the quality of outputs becomes more subjective, quality criteria can be employed to help scholars and peer reviewers evaluate the LLM and produce reasonable judgements about uncertainty of the model's output.

5.1 Evaluation Protocol

A well-designed evaluation protocol is critical for assessing LLM outputs but we lack a standardized or widely accepted framework that is robust across diverse tasks (H. Li et al., 2024). To address this gap, we propose an evaluation protocol combining three core components: a dual response output strategy, LLM-as-a-judge automatic evaluations,

Quality Criteria	Quality Attribute	Description	Citation
Linguistic	Fluency	Intra-sentence quality, grammar, syntax.	(Hu et al., 2024)
Linguistic	Coherence	Inter-sentence flow and quality.	(Hu et al., 2024)
Reasoning	Entailment	Evaluates whether a response can be inferred from	(Gallipoli &
-		its explanation.	Cagliero, 2025)
Reasoning	Plausibility	Assesses how convincing and aligned with human	(Agarwal et al.,
		reasoning the explanation is.	2024)
Context	Factuality	Ensures reliance on true information, penalizing confabulated content.	(Fu et al., 2023)
Context	Faithfulness	Checks if the response remains consistent with the provided context.	(Siledar et al., 2024)
Context	Relevance	Determines whether the response incorporates only pertinent information.	(Siledar et al., 2024)
Specificity	High-Information Content	Includes domain knowledge, meaningful connec- tions, and substantive explanations.	(Fu et al., 2023)
Specificity	Low-Information	Relies on superficiality, generic statements, or	(Fu et al., 2023)
1 5	Content	lack of analytical depth.	
Compliance	Structural	Adheres to the specified output format (e.g., JSON vs. XML).	N/A
Compliance	Task	Ensures responses align with the intended task.	N/A

Table 2: Quality Criteria

and a sample-benchmark-population (SBP) implementation procedure. These elements collectively enhance rigor, transparency, and adaptability in model assessment.

5.1.1 Dual Response Output Strategy

The first evaluation component requires LLMs to produce two outputs for any task: **direct responses** and **explanations**. The direct response—the specific output to a prompt (e.g., Likert scores, classifications)—should be evaluated on accuracy and precision. For generative tasks (e.g., open-ended answers and summaries), evaluating qualities like coherence and relevance provides deeper insights than using accuracy-based metrics alone, which are more appropriate for structured, non-generative outputs like Likert scale ratings or classifications.

The second evaluation component, the **explanation**, justifies the direct response. Explanations are good practice because they improve model performance (Atreja et al., 2024; Chiang & Lee, 2023), and enable quick sanity checks. They also allow standardized evaluations across five quality dimensions—linguistic, reasoning, context, specificity, and compliance—regardless of task type. This dual structure ensures consistency in assessing both output validity and model reasoning.

5.1.2 LLM-as-a-Judge Automatic Evaluations

Requiring an explanation of the direct response also enables the use of LLMs as evaluators of LLM outputs (Zheng et al., 2023). The LLM-as-a-judge approach is effective and adaptable (H. Li et al., 2024) for scalable numerical scoring, Likert scales, true/false responses, and pairwise comparisons across criteria(Gu et al., 2025). Ensemble approaches can combine multiple LLMs for evaluation to further improve accuracy (H. Wei et al., 2024). Both direct responses and explanations are assessed via this method, making it highly versatile for diverse tasks.

5.1.3 SBP Implementation Procedure

The SBP implementation procedure operates in two phases:

1) **Sample-Benchmark Phase**: A subset of input data is used to establish baseline benchmarks for accuracy, precision, and quality. This phase helps select models, refine prompts, and set benchmarks against which full-scale outputs will be compared. Sampling is particularly useful for large datasets where exhaustive evaluation is cost-prohibitive.

2) **Population Phase**: Prompts are applied to the entire dataset, generating final results. While certain metrics (e.g., gold-standard human-coded data) may remain impractical at scale due to resource

Table 3: Sample-Benchmark-Population (SBP) Protocol

Sample-Benchmark Phase: Sample-based model selection and benchmark establishment.

Step 1) Select a sample of the data or corpus of documents to be evaluated. A power analysis can aid in the necessary sample size.

Step 2) Run the prompt across multiple models multiple times to obtain accuracy and precision estimates. Run prompt perturbations across multiple models multiple times to get consistency estimates.

Step 3) Run the evaluation on models for all criteria to get uncertainty estimates.

Step 4) Select a model based on accuracy, precision, and quality estimates.

Step 5) Use accuracy, precision, and quality on the selected model to establish benchmarks for comparison on the full population.

Population Phase: Full evaluation

Step 6) Run the prompt on the full population using the selected model.

Step 7) Run the evaluation for LLM stability and all quality criteria across the full population understudy or a second random sample if cost is an issue.

Step 8) Compare the final model's stability and quality to the established benchmarks from the SB phase.

constraints or data availability, stability and quality criteria should still be estimated across the full population whenever possible. For constrained scenarios, uncertainty can be inferred via random sampling or bootstrapping. Final outputs are then compared to benchmarks from the SB phase.

The proposed protocol integrates standardized evaluation criteria with scalable methods like LLM-as-a-judge and adaptive phases in the SBP framework. This approach balances practicality and rigor while accommodating evolving standards (see Table 3 for a summary of steps). By prioritizing transparency through explanations, leveraging ensemble evaluations, and structuring implementation systematically, researchers can establish reliable performance benchmarks and foster trust in LLM applications.

6 Reporting

This section outlines essential reporting requirements for using LLMs in science. Reporting methodological detail enhances the replicability, reproducibility, and transparency of scientific studies. We argue that the listed elements establish the minimum standard for ensuring appropriate transparency of methods for proper peer-review, meta-analysis, replication and reproduction of LLM usage. Two example use cases are provided in the appendix to help ground the discussion in real-world scientific applications.

6.1 Task Reporting

Each LLM task should be reported in the methods section using a simple explanation of the input (prompt and additional context or source documentation), the task, and desired output. A reviewer or reader should easily be able to find 1) what unique data are provided to the LLM and how it was pre-processed, 2) what the LLM is doing to that data, 3) the structure of the desired output, and 4) how the output was post-processed, parsed, cleaned, and/or analyzed. This improves reproducibility, while failure to report these items degrades reliability by obscuring compliance error rates (Laskar et al., 2024).

6.2 Model Reporting

Information about the model(s) used in the study should be reported in the methods section of the manuscript. Specifically, report details about the model, hyperparameters, and the input data. Basic model information includes the name and version of the LLM (e.g., ChatGPT-4, Claude 3.5) and the date the model was accessed. If using a closed-source model or a model hosted on an external server, it is vital to report the date the model was used since proprietary models update frequently.

It is important to include the number of parameters, adjustable hyperparameters and their settings (e.g., temperature, top-p, quantization), the context window length, and the JSON schema when True Structured Outputs are used.

If input data are used, descriptive statistics on the token count for the full set of unique prompts should be reported. This information provides both an element of reproducibility of the analysis and a layer of accountability in an often-

overlooked aspect of LLMs—the context window. No single tokenized prompt plus input data should exceed the context window of the model. If more than one LLM is used in the analysis, the same information should be reported for each model since embedding models vary.⁴ Reporting token usage across multiple LLMs can be costly, especially when using advanced proprietary models or very large datasets. If the tokenized prompt and input for the primary model are relatively small, additional reporting for other models may not be necessary. However, different LLMs tokenize text differently, meaning that input data fitting within one model's context window may exceed the limit in another, even if their context windows are the same size. Thus, careful consideration of tokenization differences is crucial when comparing across models.

6.3 **Prompt Reporting**

For the purposes of transparency and peer review, researchers must report full prompt language and templates used. It is likely appropriate to include the prompt template in the appendix. Researchers should justify the chosen prompting strategy (e.g., chain-of-thought, zero-shot, few-shot learning) in the methods section of their study. While the exact justification required for the design of a prompt will differ from study-to-study, the number of model calls made per task requires special attention (Abdurahman et al., 2024). Multiple questions in a single call can bias the response to the second question (Stureborg et al., 2024) and using more than one call per task would require further evidence that no bias was introduced as a result.

6.4 Evaluation Reporting

Earlier in the manuscript, we outlined a recommended evaluation framework for LLMs, but our reporting suggestions apply broadly. Researchers should report their evaluation protocol and criteria in the methods section or, if appropriate, the appendix. When comparing model and prompt combinations, include all relevant protocols, criteria, and results. Benchmarks from subsamples used to evaluate full samples should be included in sections appropriate to their role in the study.

In addition, it may be necessary to describe any bias, harm, or privacy concerns along with strategies employed to overcome them (Alnaimat et al., 2024; Gallifant et al., 2024; Sallam et al., 2024). A prevailing disincentive to report these issues stems from two factors. First, the potential of LLM harm is often more speculative than it is measurable. While this could change soon as new studies advance new frameworks, self-reporting potential bias, harm, and privacy concerns is the current assumption in the field. Open weight models on HuggingFace often self-report many of these concerns on "Model Cards"--a standardized document describing a model's intended use, limitations, and ethical considerations (Ozoani et al., 2022). Second, self-reporting a particular model's bias, harm, and privacy concerns can undermine an otherwise great paper in the peer review process. While this manuscript has intentionally avoided this subject up to this point, many of the suggestions throughout this manuscript also help reduce avoidable bias (i.e., prompt construction) and minimize harms (i.e., evaluation framework and task compliance) while maintaining privacy (i.e., using local, open-source models).

6.5 Conclusion

The integration of LLMs into PA research holds transformative potential, but new methodologies are required to address reproducibility, transparency, and ethical concerns. This manuscript introduces the **TaMPER framework**—Task, Model, Prompt, Evaluation, and Reporting—to guide scholars in leveraging LLMs effectively while mitigating risks inherent to their use. By systematically addressing critical decision points, TaMPER ensures that researchers define clear objectives (Task), select appropriate models with justified configurations (Model), craft precise prompts (Prompt), evaluate outputs for reliability and validity (Evaluation), and document all processes transparently (Reporting).

The TaMPER framework provides a flexible yet robust foundation that enables researchers—regardless of skill level to harness LLMs' capabilities responsibly. Methodological rigor is essential for maintaining trust in research outcomes. By advocating for structured evaluation protocols and transparency, TaMPER aligns with emerging ethical standards and supports the broader goal of advancing PA scholarship through Generative AI. Ultimately, this framework serves as a critical step toward ensuring that PA research employing LLMs achieves both scientific rigor and societal impact.

⁴For Ollama models, detailed model information can be acquired by call the /api/tags endpoint and /v1/models/{model name or id} endpoint for OpenAI models.

7 Appendix A: Use Cases

7.1 Background and Tables

Local governments in the United States are required to prepare an Annual Comprehensive Financial Report. Using these documents as an example of input data, two types of LLM tasks will be applied: Evaluating the economic conditions of the city (Use Case 1) and extracting the annual general fund revenue information (Use Case 2). The four tables below provide examples of how to report details about the use of LLMs in these use cases.

Reporting Category	Use Case 1 Economic Condition Evaluation	Use Case 2 General Fund Budget
Input Data	ACFR - Management's Discussion and Analysis	ACFR- Required Supplementary Informa- tion
Pre-processing	Converted to text using OCR. Non-relevant sections removed.	Converted to text using OCR. Non-relevant sections removed.
Task	Evaluate the economic condition and pro- vide an assessment using a survey question.	Identify and extract the following data: Original and Final Total General Fund Rev- enue.
Desired Output	Likert Scale: "A", "B", "C", etc.,	Numerical data: \$XX,XXX,XXX
Post-processing and analysis	Descriptive statistical analysis	Data format standardization. Applied in broader regression analysis.

Table 4: Task Reporting Example

Reporting Category	Use Case 1 Economic Condition Evaluation	Use Case 2 General Fund Budget
Model Basics		
Model Name and Version	Llama 3.3	Qwen 2.5
Date Accessed	July 15 th , 2024	June 8 th , 2024
Hyperparameters		
Parameters	70B	32B
Temperature	.7	.1
Top_p/Top_k	1	Default
Context Window	32,000 Tokens	2,000 Tokens
Output Tokens	500 Tokens	Default
Quantization	4-bit	8-bit
JSON Schema	{"Assessment": string, "Explanation": string}	{"Original": int, "Explanation_Original": string, "Final": int, "Explanation_Final": string}
Input Data		
Token Count De- scriptive Statistics	N of prompts, Min, Max, Range, Average, Standard Deviation	N of prompts, Min, Max, Range, Average, Standard Deviation

Table 6:	Prompt Call	Reporting	Example
----------	-------------	-----------	---------

Reporting Category	Use Case 1 Economic Condition Evaluation	Use Case 2 General Fund Budget
Number of Calls	A unique prompt was designed per city {context} per question {prompt template}, and each unique prompt was given a sepa- rate call to the LLM.	A unique prompt was designed per city {context}, and two tasks were requested in each prompt {prompt template}. Ev- ery prompt was given a separate call to the LLM.

Table 7: Prompt Template Example

Use Case 1: Economic Condition Evaluation

You are going to use the following Management's Discussion and Analysis letter to provide an informed judgment about the city's economic outlook.

Provide your response using one of the five response options. Make sure to explain your decision before providing your response:

A: Economic Decline Very Likely

- B: Economic Decline Likely
- C: No Economic Decline or Improvement
- D: Economic Improvement Likely
- E: Economic Improvement Very Likely

Management's Discussion and Analysis Letter: {context}

Instructions:

1) Carefully review the entirety of the letter.

2) Determine the likely economic condition for the next year given the information in the letter.

3) Provide an explanation for your assessment and then the letter that corresponds with your assessment.

4) Review the output and ensure it fits the desired output structure outlined below.

Desired Output: {"Explanation":<Insert your explanation>, "Assessment": <"A", "B", "C", "D", or "E">}

Use Case 2: General Fund Budget

You are going to use the following Required Supplementary Information to find each city's original and final Total General Fund Revenue.

Required Supplementary Information: {context}

Instructions:

1) Carefully review the entirety of the Required Supplementary Information.

2) Identify the original and final Total General Fund Revenue amounts.

3) Provide an explanation for the original amount of total general fund revenue budgeted and then report the exact amount of the original total general fund revenue.

4) Provide an explanation for the final amount of total general fund revenue budgeted and then report the exact amount of the final total general fund revenue.

5) Review the output and make sure it fits the required output structure outlined below. Ensure that you use only an amount found in the provided context. Do not return any amounts that are not found in the original required supplementary information.

Desired Output: {"Explanation_Original":<Insert your explanation>, "Original_Rev": <Integer>, "Explanation_Final":<Insert your explanation>, "Final_Rev": <Integer>}

Reporting Category	Use Case 1 Economic Condition Evaluation	Use Case 2 General Fund Budget
Evaluation Protocol	The SBP evaluation protocol was employed in this study.	An evaluation protocol utilizing a sample of the full population of documents was used to assess model accuracy and ensure reason- able compliance. Descriptive statistics were calculated using the full sample and outliers were reviewed for accuracy.
Evaluation Criteria	Accuracy, stability, consistency, logical reasoning, logistical criteria and compliance are used to evaluate the model's task performance.	Accuracy, consistency, and inter-rater reliability are used to assess the model's output.
Model Evaluations	Models from the Llama, Qwen, and Deepseek families were tested on a sample using the specified criteria. Llama 3.3 70B demonstrated the highest accuracy and sta- bility, in addition to the lowest uncertainty.	Models from the Llama, Qwen, and Deepseek families were used on the full population. The accuracy of a sample in- dicated Llama's performance was consis- tently lower than the other models and therefore was dropped. The other models were run on the full sample and differences in output were selected for further review and evaluation to reconcile the full dataset.
Prompt Evaluations	N/A	On the test sample, prompts requesting both the original and final revenues in one prompt were compared against the outputs of prompts where each request was sepa- rated. Accuracy differences were negligible in all three models.
Evaluation Bench- marks	The average ratings for each criterion of the whole dataset were statistically similar to the test sample.	Inter-rater reliability between the test sam- ple and full population were statistically insignificant suggesting a similar relation- ship.
Bias, Harm, and Pri- vacy Concerns	Model cards were reviewed prior to the analysis to ensure the analysis did not cause harm and local models were used to ensure privacy.	Local models were used to ensure privacy.

Table 8: Evaluation Reporting Example

8 References

- Abdurahman, S., Ziabari, A. S., Moore, D. A., Bartels, D., & Dehghani, M. (2024). Evaluating large language models in psychological research: A guide for reviewers. https://osf.io/ag7hy/download
- Agarwal, C., Tanneru, S. H., & Lakkaraju, H. (2024). Faithfulness vs. Plausibility: On the (Un)Reliability of Explanations from Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2402.04614). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.04614
- Agnew, W., Bergman, A. S., Chien, J., Díaz, M., El-Sayed, S., Pittman, J., Mohamed, S., & McKee, K. R. (2024). The Illusion of Artificial Inclusion. *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642703
- Alnaimat, F., Al-Halaseh, S., & AlSamhori, A. R. F. (2024). Evolution of Research Reporting Standards: Adapting to the Influence of Artificial Intelligence, Statistics Software, and Writing Tools. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 39(32). https://synapse.koreamed.org/articles/1516088072
- Amirizaniani, M., Martin, E., Sivachenko, M., Mashhadi, A., & Shah, C. (2024). Do LLMs Exhibit Human-Like Reasoning? Evaluating Theory of Mind in LLMs for Open-Ended Responses (No. arXiv:2406.05659). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.05659
- Argyle, L. P., Busby, E. C., Fulda, N., Gubler, J. R., Rytting, C., & Wingate, D. (2023). Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis*, 31(3), 337–351.
- Atreja, S., Ashkinaze, J., Li, L., Mendelsohn, J., & Hemphill, L. (2024). Prompt Design Matters for Computational Social Science Tasks but in Unpredictable Ways (No. arXiv:2406.11980). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.11980
- Bail, C. A. (2024). Can Generative AI improve social science? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(21), e2314021121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2314021121
- Balloccu, S., Schmidtová, P., Lango, M., & Dušek, O. (2024). Leak, Cheat, Repeat: Data Contamination and Evaluation Malpractices in Closed-Source LLMs (No. arXiv:2402.03927). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.03927
- Bamman, D., Chang, K. K., Lucy, L., & Zhou, N. (2024). On Classification with Large Language Models in Cultural Analytics (No. arXiv:2410.12029). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.12029
- Banerjee, S., Agarwal, A., & Singh, E. (2024). The Vulnerability of Language Model Benchmarks: Do They Accurately Reflect True LLM Performance? (No. arXiv:2412.03597). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.03597
- Bano, M., Zowghi, D., & Whittle, J. (2023). AI and Human Reasoning: Qualitative Research in the Age of Large Language Models. *The AI Ethics Journal*, 3(1). https://aiej.org/aiej/article/view/11
- Barari, S., & Simko, T. (2023). LocalView, a database of public meetings for the study of local politics and policymaking in the United States. *Scientific Data*, *10*(1), 135.
- Belz, A., Shimorina, A., Agarwal, S., & Reiter, E. (2021). The ReproGen shared task on reproducibility of human evaluations in NLG: Overview and results. *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, 249–258. https://aclanthology.org/2021.inlg-1.24/

- Bermejo, V. J., Harari, N., Gálvez, R. H., & Gago, A. (2024). LLMs outperform outsourced human coders on complex textual analysis. *Available at SSRN*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5020034
- Bisbee, J., Clinton, J. D., Dorff, C., Kenkel, B., & Larson, J. M. (2024). Synthetic replacements for human survey data? The perils of large language models. *Political Analysis*, *32*(4), 401–416.
- Bono Rossello, N., Simonofski, A., Bono Rossello, L., & Castiaux, A. (2025). *Integrating Generative AI into Information Systems Research: A Framework for Synthetic Data Evaluation*. https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/items/e6b419c3-28b8-4765-bab2-a69462376174
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., ... Amodei, D. (2020). *Language Models are Few-Shot Learners* (No. arXiv:2005.14165). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165
- Chang, T. A., & Bergen, B. K. (2024). Language model behavior: A comprehensive survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 50(1), 293–350.
- Chew, R., Bollenbacher, J., Wenger, M., Speer, J., & Kim, A. (2023). LLM-Assisted Content Analysis: Using Large Language Models to Support Deductive Coding (No. arXiv:2306.14924). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.14924
- Chiang, C.-H., & Lee, H. (2023). A Closer Look into Automatic Evaluation Using Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2310.05657). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.05657
- Chochlakis, G., Pandiyan, N. M., Lerman, K., & Narayanan, S. (2024). Larger Language Models Don't Care How You Think: Why Chain-of-Thought Prompting Fails in Subjective Tasks (No. arXiv:2409.06173). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.06173
- Clark, E., August, T., Serrano, S., Haduong, N., Gururangan, S., & Smith, N. A. (2021). All That's "Human" Is Not Gold: Evaluating Human Evaluation of Generated Text (No. arXiv:2107.00061). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2107.00061
- Del, M., & Fishel, M. (2023). True Detective: A Deep Abductive Reasoning Benchmark Undoable for GPT-3 and Challenging for GPT-4 (No. arXiv:2212.10114). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.10114
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding (No. arXiv:1810.04805). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1810.04805
- Dillion, D., Tandon, N., Gu, Y., & Gray, K. (2023). Can AI language models replace human participants? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 27(7), 597–600.
- Dunivin, Z. O. (2024). Scalable Qualitative Coding with LLMs: Chain-of-Thought Reasoning Matches Human Performance in Some Hermeneutic Tasks (No. arXiv:2401.15170). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.15170
- Dyson, F. (1999). Origins of life. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=1Fqsdv4LcwC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=dyson+science+1999&ots=yquN54A6JX&sig=--4WSPCM9n1RggeZO_u2soPPXOE
- Elangovan, A., Xu, L., Ko, J., Elyasi, M., Liu, L., Bodapati, S., & Roth, D. (2025). Beyond correlation: The Impact of Human Uncertainty in Measuring the Effectiveness of Automatic Evaluation and LLM-as-a-Judge (No. arXiv:2410.03775). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.03775

- Fu, J., Ng, S.-K., Jiang, Z., & Liu, P. (2023). *GPTScore: Evaluate as You Desire* (No. arXiv:2302.04166). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.04166
- Gallifant, J., Afshar, M., Ameen, S., Aphinyanaphongs, Y., Chen, S., Cacciamani, G., Demner-Fushman, D., Dligach, D., Daneshjou, R., & Fernandes, C. (2024). The TRIPOD-LLM statement: A targeted guideline for reporting large language models use. *medRxiv*, 2024–07.
- Gallipoli, G., & Cagliero, L. (2025). It is not a piece of cake for GPT: Explaining Textual Entailment Recognition in the presence of Figurative Language. *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 9656–9674. https://aclanthology.org/2025.coling-main.646/
- Gamieldien, Y., Case, J. M., & Katz, A. (2023). Advancing qualitative analysis: An exploration of the potential of generative AI and NLP in thematic coding. *Available at SSRN 4487768*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4487768
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M., & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(30), e2305016120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2305016120
- Gu, J., Jiang, X., Shi, Z., Tan, H., Zhai, X., Xu, C., Li, W., Shen, Y., Ma, S., Liu, H., Wang, S., Zhang, K., Wang, Y., Gao, W., Ni, L., & Guo, J. (2025). A Survey on LLM-as-a-Judge (No. arXiv:2411.15594). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.15594
- Hu, X., Gao, M., Hu, S., Zhang, Y., Chen, Y., Xu, T., & Wan, X. (2024). Are LLM-based Evaluators Confusing NLG Quality Criteria? (No. arXiv:2402.12055). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.12055
- Izani, E., & Voyer, A. (2023). The Augmented Qualitative Researcher: Using Large Language Models for Interpretive Text Analysis. https://www.hhs.se/contentassets/55118e23a9f64372ab79daf82bad02bc/uploadedfiles/ext_abs_izani_voyer_2023_638277128481045425.pdf
- Ji, Z., Yu, T., Xu, Y., Lee, N., Ishii, E., & Fung, P. (2023). Towards Mitigating LLM Hallucination via Self Reflection. In H. Bouamor, J. Pino, & K. Bali (Eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP* 2023 (pp. 1827–1843). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findingsemnlp.123
- Kapucu, N. (2006). Interagency Communication Networks During Emergencies: Boundary Spanners in Multiagency Coordination. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2), 207–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005280605
- Ke, L., Tong, S., Cheng, P., & Peng, K. (2024). Exploring the Frontiers of LLMs in Psychological Applications: A Comprehensive Review (No. arXiv:2401.01519). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.01519
- Khot, T., Trivedi, H., Finlayson, M., Fu, Y., Richardson, K., Clark, P., & Sabharwal, A. (2023). Decomposed Prompting: A Modular Approach for Solving Complex Tasks (No. arXiv:2210.02406). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.02406
- Kim, J., Park, S., Jeong, K., Lee, S., Han, S. H., Lee, J., & Kang, P. (2023). Which is better? Exploring Prompting Strategy For LLM-based Metrics (No. arXiv:2311.03754). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.03754
- Laskar, M. T. R., Alqahtani, S., Bari, M. S., Rahman, M., Khan, M. A. M., Khan, H., Jahan, I., Bhuiyan, A., Tan, C. W., & Parvez, M. R. (2024). A systematic survey and critical review on evaluating large language models: Challenges, limitations, and recommendations. *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 13785–13816. https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.764/

- Li, C., & Flanigan, J. (2024). Task contamination: Language models may not be few-shot anymore. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 38(16), 18471–18480. https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/29808
- Li, H., Dong, Q., Chen, J., Su, H., Zhou, Y., Ai, Q., Ye, Z., & Liu, Y. (2024). LLMs-as-Judges: A Comprehensive Survey on LLM-based Evaluation Methods (No. arXiv:2412.05579). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.05579
- Li, L., Li, J., Chen, C., Gui, F., Yang, H., Yu, C., Wang, Z., Cai, J., Zhou, J. A., Shen, B., Qian, A., Chen, W., Xue, Z., Sun, L., He, L., Chen, H., Ding, K., Du, Z., Mu, F., ... Dong, Y. (2024). *Political-LLM: Large Language Models in Political Science* (No. arXiv:2412.06864). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.06864
- Li, Z., Prabhu, S. P., Popp, Z. T., Jain, S. S., Balakundi, V., Ang, T. F. A., Au, R., & Chen, J. (2024). A Natural Language Processing Approach to Support Biomedical Data Harmonization: Leveraging Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2411.02730). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.02730
- Liu, N. F., Lin, K., Hewitt, J., Paranjape, A., Bevilacqua, M., Petroni, F., & Liang, P. (2024). Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, *12*, 157–173.
- Lu, Y., Bartolo, M., Moore, A., Riedel, S., & Stenetorp, P. (2022). Fantastically Ordered Prompts and Where to Find Them: Overcoming Few-Shot Prompt Order Sensitivity (No. arXiv:2104.08786). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2104.08786
- Malberg, S., Poletukhin, R., Schuster, C. M., & Groh, G. (2024). A Comprehensive Evaluation of Cognitive Biases in LLMs (No. arXiv:2410.15413). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.15413
- Mallory, F. (2024). Language models are stochastic measuring devices. https://fintanmallory.com/wpcontent/uploads/2024/09/language-models-are-stochastic-measuring-devices-web-draft.pdf
- McDonald, B. D., Hall, J. L., O'Flynn, J., & Van Thiel, S. (2022). The future of public administration research: An editor's perspective. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 59–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12829
- Moy, B. J. (2021). Can social pressure foster responsiveness? An open records field experiment with mayoral offices. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 8(2), 117–127.
- Naveed, H., Khan, A. U., Qiu, S., Saqib, M., Anwar, S., Usman, M., Akhtar, N., Barnes, N., & Mian, A. (2024). A Comprehensive Overview of Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2307.06435). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.06435
- Neumann, M., Linder, F., & Desmarais, B. (2022). Government websites as data: A methodological pipeline with application to the websites of municipalities in the United States. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 19(4), 411–422. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2021.1999880
- Niu, Q., Liu, J., Bi, Z., Feng, P., Peng, B., Chen, K., Li, M., Yan, L. K., Zhang, Y., Yin, C. H., Fei, C., Wang, T., Wang, Y., Chen, S., & Liu, M. (2024). Large Language Models and Cognitive Science: A Comprehensive Review of Similarities, Differences, and Challenges (No. arXiv:2409.02387). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.02387
- Ollion, É., Shen, R., Macanovic, A., & Chatelain, A. (2024). The dangers of using proprietary LLMs for research. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 6(1), 4–5.
- Overton, M. O., Kleinschmit, S., Feeney, M., Fusi, F., Hart, N., Maroulis, S., Schwoerer, K., Stokan, E., Thomas, H., & Workman, S. (2023). Administrative Informatics: A Roundtable on the Conceptual Foundations of

a Public Administration-Centered Data Science Subfield. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 6. https://doi.org/10.30636/jbpa.61.330

- Ozoani, E., Gerchick, M., & Mitchell, M. (2022). *Model Card Guidebook*. Hugging Face. https://huggingface.co/docs/hub/en/model-card-guidebook
- Pandey, S. K. (2017). Theory and Method in Public Administration. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 37(2), 131–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X17707036
- Radford, A. (2018). Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. https://hayate-lab.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/43372bfa750340059ad87ac8e538c53b.pdf
- Renze, M., & Guven, E. (2024). Self-Reflection in LLM Agents: Effects on Problem-Solving Performance (No. arXiv:2405.06682). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.06682
- Resh, W. G., Ming, Y., Xia, X., Overton, M., Gürbüz, G. N., & Breuhl, B. D. (2025). Complementarity, Augmentation, or Substitutivity? The Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence on the U.S. Federal Workforce (No. arXiv:2503.09637). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.09637
- Rodriguez, M., & Martinez, J. C. (2023). Leveraging Large Language Models (LLMs) for Automated Key Point Extraction in Qualitative Data Analysis. *MZ Computing Journal*, 4(2), Article 2. https://mzjournal.com/index.php/MZCJ/article/view/283
- Rogers, A., & Luccioni, S. (2024). Position: Key claims in llm research have a long tail of footnotes. *Forty-First International Conference on Machine Learning*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=M2cwkGleRL
- Rossi, L., Harrison, K., & Shklovski, I. (2024). The Problems of LLM-generated Data in Social Science Research. *Sociologica*, 18(2), 145–168.
- Sahn, A. (2024). Public comment and public policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, ajps.12900. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12900
- Sallam, M., Barakat, M., & Sallam, M. (2024). A Preliminary Checklist (METRICS) to Standardize the Design and Reporting of Studies on Generative Artificial Intelligence–Based Models in Health Care Education and Practice: Development Study Involving a Literature Review. *Interactive Journal of Medical Research*, 13(1), e54704. https://doi.org/10.2196/54704.
- Sathish, V., Lin, H., Kamath, A. K., & Nyayachavadi, A. (2024). LLeMpower: Understanding Disparities in the Control and Access of Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2404.09356). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.09356
- Siledar, T., Nath, S., Muddu, S. S. R. R., Rangaraju, R., Nath, S., Bhattacharyya, P., Banerjee, S., Patil, A., Singh, S. S., Chelliah, M., & Garera, N. (2024). One Prompt To Rule Them All: LLMs for Opinion Summary Evaluation (No. arXiv:2402.11683). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.11683
- Singh, A., Singh, N., & Vatsal, S. (2024). Robustness of LLMs to Perturbations in Text (No. arXiv:2407.08989). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.08989
- Solaiman, I. (2023). The Gradient of Generative AI Release: Methods and Considerations. 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 111–122. https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3593981

- Stureborg, R., Alikaniotis, D., & Suhara, Y. (2024). Large Language Models are Inconsistent and Biased Evaluators (No. arXiv:2405.01724). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.01724
- Szymanski, A., Ziems, N., Eicher-Miller, H. A., Li, T. J.-J., Jiang, M., & Metoyer, R. A. (2024). Limitations of the LLM-as-a-Judge Approach for Evaluating LLM Outputs in Expert Knowledge Tasks (No. arXiv:2410.20266). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.20266
- Torii, M. G., Murakami, T., & Ochiai, Y. (2024). Expanding Horizons in HCI Research Through LLM-Driven Qualitative Analysis (No. arXiv:2401.04138). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.04138
- Törnberg, P. (2023a). ChatGPT-4 Outperforms Experts and Crowd Workers in Annotating Political Twitter Messages with Zero-Shot Learning (No. arXiv:2304.06588). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.06588
- Törnberg, P. (2023b). *How to use LLMs for Text Analysis* (No. arXiv:2307.13106). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.13106
- Übellacker, T. (2024). AcademiaOS: Automating Grounded Theory Development in Qualitative Research with Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2403.08844). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.08844
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2023). Attention Is All You Need (No. arXiv:1706.03762). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762
- Wang, K., Zhu, J., Ren, M., Liu, Z., Li, S., Zhang, Z., Zhang, C., Wu, X., Zhan, Q., Liu, Q., & Wang, Y. (2024). A Survey on Data Synthesis and Augmentation for Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2410.12896). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.12896
- Wei, H., He, S., Xia, T., Wong, A., Lin, J., & Han, M. (2024). Systematic Evaluation of LLM-as-a-Judge in LLM Alignment Tasks: Explainable Metrics and Diverse Prompt Templates (No. arXiv:2408.13006). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.13006
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., & Zhou, D. (2022). Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 24824–24837.
- Workman, S., & Thomas, H. (2023). Data Systems, Information Processing, and Government Learning in Space and Time. Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 6. https://doi.org/10.30636/jbpa.61.330
- Xiao, Z., Zhang, S., Lai, V., & Liao, Q. V. (2023). Evaluating Evaluation Metrics: A Framework for Analyzing NLG Evaluation Metrics using Measurement Theory (No. arXiv:2305.14889). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.14889
- Yang, J., Jin, H., Tang, R., Han, X., Feng, Q., Jiang, H., Zhong, S., Yin, B., & Hu, X. (2024). Harnessing the Power of LLMs in Practice: A Survey on ChatGPT and Beyond. ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data, 18(6), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1145/3649506
- Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T. L., Cao, Y., & Narasimhan, K. (2023). Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate Problem Solving with Large Language Models (No. arXiv:2305.10601). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.10601
- Zheng, L., Chiang, W.-L., Sheng, Y., Zhuang, S., Wu, Z., Zhuang, Y., Lin, Z., Li, Z., Li, D., & Xing, E. (2023). Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 46595–46623.

- Zhu, L., Witko, C., & Meier, K. J. (2019). The public administration manifesto II: Matching methods to theory and substance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 29(2), 287–298.
- Ziems, C., Held, W., Shaikh, O., Chen, J., Zhang, Z., & Yang, D. (2024). Can large language models transform computational social science? *Computational Linguistics*, 50(1), 237–291.