

# Beyond the Hype: Embeddings vs. Prompting for Multiclass Classification Tasks

Marios Kokkodis  
Thumbtack  
mkokkodis@thumbtack.com

Richard Demsyn-Jones  
Thumbtack  
demsynjones@thumbtack.com

Vijay Raghavan  
Thumbtack  
vraghavan@thumbtack.com

## ABSTRACT

Are traditional classification approaches irrelevant in this era of AI hype? We show that there are multiclass classification problems where predictive models holistically outperform LLM prompt-based frameworks. Given text and images from home-service project descriptions provided by Thumbtack customers, we build embeddings-based softmax models that predict the professional category (e.g., handyman, bathroom remodeling) associated with each problem description. We then compare against prompts that ask state-of-the-art LLM models to solve the same problem. We find that the embeddings approach outperforms the best LLM prompts in terms of accuracy, calibration, latency, and financial cost. In particular, the embeddings approach has 49.5% higher accuracy than the prompting approach, and its superiority is consistent across text-only, image-only, and text-image problem descriptions. Furthermore, it yields well-calibrated probabilities, which we later use as confidence signals to provide contextualized user experience during deployment. On the contrary, prompting scores are overly uninformative. Finally, the embeddings approach is 14 and 81 times faster than prompting in processing images and text respectively, while under realistic deployment assumptions, it can be up to 10 times cheaper. Based on these results, we deployed a variation of the embeddings approach, and through A/B testing we observed performance consistent with our offline analysis. Our study shows that for multiclass classification problems that can leverage proprietary datasets, an embeddings-based approach may yield unequivocally better results. Hence, scientists, practitioners, engineers, and business leaders can use our study to go beyond the hype and consider appropriate predictive models for their classification use cases.

## KEYWORDS

Embeddings, Prompting

### ACM Reference Format:

Marios Kokkodis, Richard Demsyn-Jones, and Vijay Raghavan. 2025. Beyond the Hype: Embeddings vs. Prompting for Multiclass Classification Tasks. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

*Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA*

© 2025 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

AI hype is taking over the world: since the first version of OpenAI's ChatGPT there has been an increased focus and excitement on the advances of generative AI technology. AI companies' valuations have skyrocketed,<sup>1</sup> accompanied by bold investments to push the boundaries towards Artificial General Intelligence. Big tech US companies are expected to invest a quarter of a trillion in AI innovation in 2025,<sup>2</sup> more than ever before.

In this environment, many tech companies are constantly striving to come up with AI use cases that would allow them to maintain relevant investment targets but also increase revenue, improve user experience, and, in general, provide better products and services. Naturally, this creates a working environment where leadership, product managers, software engineers, and designers propose AI-based solutions, primarily inspired by their individual experiences with prompt engineering. Paraphrasing the "everyone is a programmer with AI" quote,<sup>3</sup> everyone can propose machine learning (ML) solutions after chatting with an LLM.

Classification problems (e.g., churn prediction [9], fraud prediction [8], and spam prediction [10]) are some of the most common AI use-cases that can come up in business settings. Traditionally, these problems are solved with classifiers such as logistic regression, gradient boosting, and multilayer perceptrons. However, recently, with LLMs becoming more and more ubiquitous problem solvers, it is natural for many to think of and propose solutions that rely on prompt engineering [14, 16].

## 2 BACKGROUND

A significant portion of relevant work has primarily focused on LLM applications and use cases such as API-calls [11], spelling correction [5], commentary on live sport and music events [4], building agents for real-world tasks [6], and detecting whether text was generated by AI [1].

In terms of prompting, some work focuses on label generation at scale [12]. For instance, Xu et al. showed that LLMs have clear limitations identifying the correct label when none of the correct answers is provided as a label option. Other prompting studies focus on providing frameworks for text classification. For example, Wang et al. propose a prompt framework for improving zero-shot text classification, while Zhu et al. focus on optimizing prompting techniques to increase performance in short-text classification tasks. These studies, however, do not directly compare how training traditional ML models would perform for these tasks, which is the main focus of our work.

<sup>1</sup><https://www.cnbc.com/2024/12/27/how-five-top-ceos-described-the-ai-boom-in-2024.html>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.forbes.com/sites/bethkindig/2024/11/14/ai-spending-to-exceed-a-quarter-trillion-next-y>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.cnbc.com/2023/05/30/everyone-is-a-programmer-with-generative-ai-nvidia-ceo-.html>

Closely related to our work, Al Faraby et al. showed that a random forest built on embeddings outperformed prompting by 22% at classifying educational questions, while Gholamian et al. found the opposite result, showing that few-shot prompting in fact outperforms supervised approaches. In contrast to our work, both studies use public datasets. Even if the exact data was not used to train the evaluated LLMs, those are datasets that align with publicly held conventions and definitions (e.g., the conventional definition of a camera, a ball, etc.). On the contrary, most company classification problems rely on proprietary data that often diverge significantly from publicly defined concepts (e.g., what does it mean for a customer to churn, what are the thresholds that fraud becomes a problem, what kind of problems can a handyman solve, etc.). For these types of problems, a supervised approach can clearly learn the patterns of proprietary data that might not generalize to patterns found in public information used to train LLMs.

In addition, both studies are overly focused on accuracy. However, when deploying predictive classification models, accuracy is only one of the important dimensions—and arguably often not the most important one. Latency is of utmost importance since high latency can drive away customers [3], while cost is also part of the decision process. Finally, calibration is another factor that companies care about in settings where prediction confidence affects decision-making [13]. Our study covers all of these dimensions, hence filling the existing gap in related literature and providing a holistic guide for companies and practitioners on comparing prompting with traditional ML approaches.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Harika Abburi, Michael Suesserman, Nirmala Pudota, Balaji Veeramani, Edward Bowen, and Sanmitra Bhattacharya. 2023. Generative ai text classification using ensemble llm approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07755* (2023).
- [2] Said Al Faraby, Ade Romadhony, et al. 2024. Analysis of llms for educational question classification and generation. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 7 (2024), 100298.
- [3] Marcus Basalla, Johannes Schneider, Martin Luksik, Roope Jaakonmäki, and Jan Vom Brocke. 2021. On latency of e-commerce platforms. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce* 31, 1 (2021), 1–17.
- [4] Aaron Baughman, Eduardo Morales, Rahul Agarwal, Gozde Akay, Rogerio Feris, Tony Johnson, Stephen Hammer, and Leonid Karlinsky. 2024. Large scale generative AI text applied to sports and music. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4784–4792.
- [5] Arnab Dutta, Gleb Polushin, Xiaoshuang Zhang, and Daniel Stein. 2024. Enhancing E-commerce Spelling Correction with Fine-Tuned Transformer Models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4928–4938.
- [6] Sophie Fischer, Carlos Gemmell, Niklas Tecklenburg, Iain Mackie, Federico Rossetto, and Jeffrey Dalton. 2024. GRILLBot in practice: Lessons and tradeoffs deploying large language models for adaptable conversational task assistants. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4951–4961.
- [7] Sina Gholamian, Gianfranco Romani, Bartosz Rudnikowicz, and Stavroula Skylaki. 2024. LLM-Based Robust Product Classification in Commerce and Compliance. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Customizable NLP: Progress and Challenges in Customizing NLP for a Domain, Application, Group, or Individual (CustomNLP4U)*. 26–36.
- [8] Mark Eshwar Lokanan and Kush Sharma. 2022. Fraud prediction using machine learning: The case of investment advisors in Canada. *Machine Learning with Applications* 8 (2022), 100269.
- [9] Jeyakumar Pamina, Beschi Raja, S SathyaBama, MS Sruthi, Aiswaryadevi VJ, et al. 2019. An effective classifier for predicting churn in telecommunication. *Jour of Adv Research in Dynamical & Control Systems* 11 (2019).
- [10] Pradeep Kumar Roy, Jyoti Prakash Singh, and Snehasish Banerjee. 2020. Deep learning to filter SMS Spam. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 102 (2020), 524–533.
- [11] Ying Sheng, Sudeep Gandhe, Bhargav Kanagal, Nick Edmonds, Zachary Fisher, Sandeep Tata, and Aarush Selvan. 2024. Measuring an LLM’s Proficiency at using APIs: A Query Generation Strategy. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 5680–5689.
- [12] Mengting Wan, Tara Safavi, Sujay Kumar Jauhar, Yujin Kim, Scott Counts, Jennifer Neville, Siddharth Suri, Chirag Shah, Ryen W White, Longqi Yang, et al. 2024. Tnt-llm: Text mining at scale with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 5836–5847.
- [13] Cheng Wang. 2023. Calibration in Deep Learning: A Survey of the State-of-the-Art. *ArXiv abs/2308.01222* (2023). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260379149>
- [14] Yuki Wang, Wei Wang, Qi Chen, Kaizhu Huang, Anh Nguyen, and Suparna De. 2023. Prompt-based zero-shot text classification with conceptual knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*, Vol. 4. Association for Computational Linguistics, 30–38.
- [15] Hanzi Xu, Renze Lou, Jiangshu Du, Vahid Mahzoon, Elmira Talebianaraki, Zhuoan Zhou, Elizabeth Garrison, Slobodan Vucetic, and Wengpeng Yin. 2024. LLMs’ Classification Performance is Overclaimed. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16203* (2024).
- [16] Yi Zhu, Ye Wang, Jipeng Qiang, and Xindong Wu. 2023. Prompt-learning for short text classification. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).