

FROM TRACES TO MEASURES: LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS AS A TOOL FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT FROM TEXT

Joseph J.P. Simons¹, Wong Liang Ze¹, Prasanta Bhattacharya¹, Brandon Siyuan Loh¹, Wei Gao²

¹ Institute of High Performance Computing (IHPC), Agency for Science Technology and Research (A*STAR), 1 Fusionopolis Way, #16-16 Connexis, Singapore 138632, Republic of Singapore

² School of Computing and Information Systems, Singapore Management University, 80 Stamford Road, Singapore 178902

Digital trace data provide potentially valuable resources for understanding human behaviour, but their value has been limited by issues of unclear measurement. The growth of large language models provides an opportunity to address this limitation in the case of text data. Specifically, recognizing cases where their responses are a form of psychological measurement (the use of observable indicators to assess an underlying construct) allows existing measures and accuracy assessment frameworks from psychology to be re-purposed to use with large language models. Based on this, we offer four methodological recommendations for using these models to quantify text features: (1) identify the target of measurement, (2) use multiple prompts, (3) assess internal consistency, and (4) treat evaluation metrics (such as human annotations) as expected correlates rather than direct ground-truth measures,. Additionally, we provide a workflow for implementing this approach.

Despite its promise for understanding human behaviour, research using digital trace data (such as social media text) is limited by measurement issues. With an increasing portion of human life being conducted via digital platforms, more and more behaviour is being recorded in large, naturalistic datasets. These data have great potential for improving understanding of behavioural and social processes (Conte et al., 2012; Kitchin 2014; Lazer et al., 2009). Indeed, the analysis of trace data has provided novel insight into topics as diverse as the spread of misinformation over online platforms (Bakshy et al., 2015; Vosoughi et al., 2018), the role of social factors in health process (Bargain and Aminjonov, 2020; Hobbs et al., 2016) and the process of scientific knowledge creation (Li et al. 2019, Park et al., 2023). However, unlike data from instruments designed for scientific data collection, it was not collected for research purposes. Rather, it is stored as a side-effect of

digital platforms. As a result, the question of what processes it is tracking remains unclear (Lazer et al., 2021; Wagner et al., 2020).

Recent developments in language modelling provide a potential method to address this limitation for text data. These flexible models perform well at a range of natural language processing (NLP) tasks without the need for task-specific training (Brown et al., 2020; Qin et al., 2023). As such, they are increasingly being used for text processing, including not just NLP targets (e.g., stance and sentiment) but also more psychological targets such as personality (Yang et al., 2023) and moral values (Roy et al., 2022). We propose that this usage of LLMs to assess deeper latent variables, if successful, would also mitigate the measurement issues described above. An appropriately-prompted LLM may be able to tell us about theoretically-relevant variables as expressed through text, allowing

researchers to overcome the lack of an inherent target of measurement by providing their own.

This task is a form of psychological measurement. Unlike surface text features (such as number of pronouns), psychological variables such as attitudes, values, or author personality are latent; we observe them indirectly via their effects on downstream behaviours (in this case, linguistic expression). When we say a person is an introvert or materialistic or pro-Trump, for example, we cannot directly observe these traits; rather, we infer them from surface behaviour. Thus, LLM-generated ratings of these constructs provide, at best, observable but noisy indicators of underlying latent variables. In this regard, LLM ratings of psychological variables are analogous to traditional self-report items on a questionnaire. In both cases, model performance must be assessed in psychometric terms; not just how well the model predicts an outcome variable, but how well it measures an unobservable construct.

Methodologically, recognizing LLM-generated ratings as a form of psychological measurement opens up novel prompting and assessment strategies. More specifically, we offer four practical methodological recommendations. First, uses of LLMs for rating tasks should explicitly identify the target of measurement, ideally drawing on existing constructs from the psychological literature. Second, these constructs will be better assessed using multiple prompts rather than a single attempt, which can draw on existing self-report scales. Third, in assessing model performance, it is important to first establish whether any latent construct at all is being captured via tests of reliability. Finally, while evaluation metrics (such as human ratings) have an important role in model evaluation, they are correlates of the desired target of measurement, not a direct ground-truth measure.

Below we elaborate on these points over three sections. The first outlines the measurement issues associated with digital trace data. The second explains how, in the case of text data, the use of LLMs may help with mitigating these issues. It also outlines what this implies for how these models should be prompted and assessed. Finally, we provide a suggested workflow incorporating these methodological points.

DIGITAL TRACE DATA AND MEASUREMENT

With ongoing increases in digitization, more and more human activity is being captured in large digital datasets, which hold great potential for understanding human behaviour (Conte et al., 2012; Kitchin 2014; Lazer et al., 2009). A wide range of everyday behaviours now take place online or via other digital platforms, creating lasting digital records. These digital traces are highly ecologically valid and often very granular, providing an unprecedented opportunity to study behaviour as it occurs in the wild.

Observed data as a measure of underlying constructs

Digital trace data is valuable to the degree it provides a window into underlying behavioral or social phenomena. Much scientific observation has this characteristic. Mercury thermometers were not used because scientists wanted to know about the expansion of mercury; rather, this observable process can be used to quantitatively track temperature. Similarly, psychologists do not use self-report instruments because they are interested in question-answering behaviour; rather, participants' responses are used to measure underlying constructs such as personality or values. The same is true for digital trace data; social media posts are scientifically valuable as observable indicators of underlying constructs and processes such as attitudes, social affiliation, and reasoning.

What is distinctive about trace data is that it was not generally gathered for scientific purposes. As such, it does not usually have an inherent target of measurement (Lazer et al., 2021). Purpose-built scientific measurement instruments are designed to assess a specific and pre-determined target construct; a personality inventory is designed, built, and evaluated as a way to reliably measure personality. Trace data, conversely, are often generated as a by-product of digital platforms. As such, what behavioural processes they are indexing is often not clear. We know what a thermometer reading means because thermometers were built to measure temperature, but it is far less clear what a hashtag measures (e.g. Daer, 2014)

The risks of unclear measurement

This may not seem like a major issue. Indeed, a critic may reply that we are inventing problems where there are none, and that everyone knows what e.g. a Retweet or a Facebook follow means. After all, how else could regular people use these platforms? Maybe we should just focus on how the hard, observable metrics logged can be used to predict important outcomes.

This response misses the range of negative consequences associated with failing to attend to issues of construct validity. Here we highlight three.

First, within the digital trace data literature, a noted consequence of inattention to measurement is an inconsistent use of metrics across papers. A given metric may capture a range of different meanings - for example, a Retweet can indicate endorsement or dislike depending on the context of its use (Tufekci, 2014). As a result, different researchers end up using the same metric to indicate different phenomena (e.g., Freelon, 2014), an example of the jingle fallacy (Kelley, 1927). This cross-study variability in operationalization leads to

difficulties in interpreting results (Lazar et al., 2021).

Second, the psychology literature highlights threats to internal validity raised by poor measurement (Flake & Fried, 2020; Flake et al., 2017). Low methodological consistency in measurement (such as having multiple operationalizations of the same construct available) provides researchers with an additional degree of flexibility in modelling. If unaccounted for, this researcher flexibility increases the probability of mistaking sampling noise as a genuine effect (Simmons et al., 2011). Hence, a lack of rigour in measurement can lead to spurious findings.

A third risk is that if we are not clear on what traces are measuring, we risk making the traces themselves the objects of study. Like the proverbial drunkard searching for their keys under the lamppost because that's where the light is, we end up substituting the phenomena which is easily quantified for the one we are actually interested in. Lazer et al. (2021) summarize this well when they contrast the study of Twitter users with the study of Twitter accounts; while they make this point about the issue of bot accounts, the contrast expresses the more general risk well. Much as Baumeister et al. (2007) argue psychology has lost track of actual behaviour and become "the science of self-reports and finger pushes", we may worry about computational social science losing track of people and becoming a science of Retweets and Follows.

LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS: FROM PREDICTIVE MODELS TO PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASURES

Researchers are increasingly turning to large language models (LLMs) as a fast and cost-effective approach to labelling text. Due to their flexibility, LLMs provide researchers with versatile tools for converting text input into quantitative scores on desired text features. This

includes popular tasks such as sentiment analysis and stance detection (e.g., Zhang et al., 2023; Cruickshank and Ng, 2023). However, LLM use has now been extended to less common topics, such as author personality inference (Yang et al., 2023) and moral value detection (Roy et al., 2022). LLMs are extremely well-positioned to perform these tasks due to two key characteristics; being able to respond to in-context meaning, and being able to attempt novel tasks without additional training or custom model development (Demszky et al., 2023).

For these applications, LLM-based scoring is usually thought of in predictive modelling terms, whereby models are assessed in terms of accuracy at recreating a ground-truth variable (often human annotation) from input text (e.g., Ziems et al., 2023). The ground-truth variable is the predictive target; a model is good to the degree its output correlates with this target. So, for example, a model which infers ratings from review text is solely concerned with accurately predicting the number of stars given – any deeper inference about how much the reviewer liked the movie is at best implicit.

Our core conceptual point is that when researchers prompt a model to assess text features such as opinions, values, or author personality, they are intending the resulting ratings to provide observable but noisy indicators of underlying latent variables. The models are not being asked to enumerate surface textual features (e.g., review sentiment), but provide an estimate of deeper, underlying factors. LLM ratings can therefore be thought of in much the same way a personality questionnaire, which provides observable indicators of latent personality dimensions. (To be clear the claim is not that LLMs complete these measurement tasks in a human-like way, just that their responses have a similar role to human ratings as observable indicators of a latent factor).

This psychometric conceptualization makes clear how LLMs can address the measurement issues in text-based trace data. By providing a method to quantify latent variables as expressed in text, LLMs can enable text-based trace data to be connected to the theoretical constructs of social-personality psychology. Data such as posts and replies can be quantified in the theoretical vocabulary of attitudes, persuasion, intergroup processes, and individual differences. Without LLMs, this would require an unfeasibly large amount of human rating labour to achieve at scale. Such an approach would provide computational social science with stronger measurement models, and social-personality psychology with a novel naturalistic data source – a win-win situation.

However, if LLMs are to be used in this way, the measures they generate need to be valid. In general, benchmarking studies have shown reasonable performance at language processing tasks (although sometimes outperformed by custom models; Brown et al., 2020; Qin et al., 2023). However, it's also impossible to predict how well they will perform on any given task; indeed, a recent preprint suggests that even background model updates can lead to unpredictable changes in performance (Chen et al., 2023). Furthermore, it is known that these models can embed biases; as they are basically recreating plausible patterns of language use, they are particularly likely to recreate biases common in the natural language datasets they are trained on. As such, the question of accuracy can only be answered empirically and on a case-by-case basis.

Psychology and allied disciplines have developed a number of relevant techniques for assessing how well psychological measures perform. Importantly, these are based on the assumption that the constructs being measured are inherently unobservable and hence not amenable to direct ground-truth measurement

(DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021; Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2001; see Flake et al., 2017 for a review of these in practice). These techniques center around the twin concepts of *reliability* (how well the measure is assessing an underlying construct; Revelle & Condon, 2018) and *validity* (whether the measure is assessing the desired underlying construct; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). These can be seen as sequential considerations; before determining if you are measuring what you intended to measure, you first need to ensure you are measuring something.

What this means in practice: Four principles for the use of LLMs to quantify psychological variables

Taking account of the psychometric aspect of LLM scores does not require the development of new models or even radical change to existing workflows for text processing. Figure 2 provides an overview of the steps required. Fundamentally, we see there as being four major methodological take-aways.

First, there is an explicit target of measurement. In this application case, LLMs provide a means to assess some latent construct expressed in text data. Researchers should be clear about what this construct is. Fortunately, this is an area where psychology can be of assistance; over the last several decades, social and personality psychologists have validated a wide range of constructs for characterizing individuals' attitudes, motivations, values and worldviews. There are rich empirical literatures tying these to important social phenomena such as persuasion, intergroup behaviors, and life satisfaction. These can provide researchers with empirically informed targets for their LLM measurement, as well as a fertile source of prompts to assess it.

Second, an average of responses to multiple prompt variants is likely to work better than any single prompt. Each rating is a noisy indicator of an underlying latent construct; as such,

combining the results of multiple prompts will give a better answer than any one in isolation. Fortunately, existing scales provide a fertile source of prompt variants. Many psychological constructs have one or more associated rating scales which have been systematically developed and validated. As LLMs can respond to free-text prompting, these items can be adapted to serve as a pool of instructions for assessing the construct.

Third, in evaluating model performance, it is important to account for internal consistency prior to assessing correlations with external outcomes. Current evaluation procedures focus on the correlation of model results with external criteria. These correlations are an important part of measure validity (see point 4). However, this addresses the question of *what* is being measured without considering the issue of whether *anything* is being measured. Providing an initial assessment of reliability is not just epistemically virtuous, it also provides direct benefits to researchers; measurement unreliability attenuates correlations with other factors, and so an unreliable measure is unlikely to predict a ground-truth criterion - even when the underlying latent variable is a good predictor. Identifying low reliability early can thus avoid wasted effort on trying to validate a poorly-functioning measure. There are a range of quantitative techniques for assessing this along with open-source software implementations (Jorgensen et al., 2022; Revelle, 2023; Rosseel 2012). Importantly, these are internal tests – they do not require any data other than the measures themselves so are not burdensome to implement.

Finally, while validation against evaluations variables is important, these should be taken as validation criteria rather than ground-truth measures. To be confident LLM ratings are measuring what they are intended to measure, it needs to be shown that they predict expected




Figure 1. Steps to score text features using large language models. Variant prompts are used to generate multiple indicators of each proposed latent variable. The reliability of these measures is then assessed by (a) confirming the factor structure of these indicators and then (b) quantifying their internal consistency. Following this, validity is checked against external criteria. [Numbers in square brackets] refer to the associated steps in the workflow presented in Section 3.

outcome variables. However, these validation criteria are not ground-truth measures of the target of measurement. By definition, this target is latent and so not amenable to direct quantification. Rather, these criteria represent additional likely correlates of the construct we wish to measure (its nomological net; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). So, for example, we would be suspicious of a measure of extraversion which does not predict peer ratings, but this would represent a difference between two purported indicators of the same underlying construct (not a failure of the model to recreate the “true” values).

A WORKFLOW FOR LLM-BASED MEASURE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT

To facilitate the use of LLMs for quantifying psychological variables in text, we propose the

following workflow based on processes for developing self-report measures (e.g., Flake et al., 2017).

- 1. Identify target of measurement.** The first stage is to conceptually clarify what it is that needs to be measured. What precisely is the nature of the hypothesized latent variable and what should it correlate with?

This step is foundational for two reasons. First, it allows precedents in the psychological literature to be identified; if there is an existing measurement scale, it simplifies later stages. To this end, literature searches and tools such as the Semantic Scale Network (Rosenbush et al., 2020) can be used to identify relevant constructs. Second, if a relevant precedent cannot be

Table 1. Example rating items derived from an existing self-report scale (attitude certainty; Petrocelli & Rucker, 2007). Self-report question items from the scale (left column) are re-worded to be statements about a text’s author (right column), suitable for inclusion in a rating prompt (see Figure 2).

	Original self-report	Revised LLM rating items
<i>Attitude clarity</i>		
1	How certain are you that you know what your true attitude on this topic really is?	The author is certain that they know what their true attitude on this topic really is
2	How certain are you that the attitude you expressed toward capital punishment really reflects your true thoughts and feelings?	The author is certain that the attitude they expressed towards this topic really reflects their true thoughts and feelings
3	To what extent is your true attitude toward capital punishment clear in your mind?	The author’s true attitude towards the issue is clear in their mind
4	How certain are you that the attitude you just expressed toward capital punishment is really the attitude you have?	The author is certain that the attitude they expressed towards this issue is really the attitude they have
<i>Attitude correctness</i>		
5	How certain are you that your attitude toward capital punishment is the correct attitude to have?	The author is certain that their attitude toward this issue is the correct attitude to have
6	To what extent do you think other people should have the same attitude as you on this issue?	The author thinks other people should have the same attitude as them on this issue
7	How certain are you that of all the possible attitudes one might have toward capital punishment, your attitude reflects the right way to think and feel about the issue?	The author is certain that of all the possible attitudes one might have towards the issue, their attitude reflects the right way to think and feel about the issue

found, a clear idea of the construct will be needed to develop novel measures.

- 2. Generate rating prompt pool.** To assess internal consistency, a pool of variant rating prompts is required. These should be alternate ways of asking the same basic question. Such a prompt can be thought of as having three components; the task instructions (e.g., ‘Read the following text below, and then respond to the statement under it’); the specific rating item or judgment to be made (e.g., ‘This issue means a lot to the author’); and the response options available to the model. Figure 2 shows an example template for such a prompt.

Existing self-report instruments from psychology can provide a relevant pool of

items for use in rating prompts. These may need to be reworded somewhat. For example, first person items will need to be put into the third-person, and a common rating scale provided. Table 1 provides an example for converting an attitude certainty scale (Petrocelli & Rucker, 2007).

In cases where no relevant instrument can be found, a pool of variant items can be created. This step is where a clear conceptualization of the latent variable will be extremely useful. Past work on scale development can also provide useful guidance on this process (e.g., Devellis & Thorpe, 2021).

- 3. Generate scores for a sample.** The resulting rating prompts can then be used to generate ratings for a sample of stimuli. As revisions

Read the following text, then respond to the statement below it:
 Start of text
 [TEXT]
 End of text
 Based on this text, how much would you agree with the following statement:
 [RATING ITEM]
 Respond with one of the following items:
 [strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree]

Figure 2. Example prompt structure to rate a given text on a particular rating item. These provide instructions to a Large Language Model to generate a rating of a particular text. It provides task instructions, placeholders to add the text and rating item, and an explicit response scale.

may be needed based on these analyses, it is prudent to first extract a test sample and retain hold-out data for any confirmatory analyses required. One advantage of digital datasets is they are often quite large, allowing data to be held out for this purpose

- 4. Reliability I: Assess factor structure from the ratings.** Regardless of whether they are taken from the prior literature or generated for the current research, the prompts will have a certain implied factor structure; each measured construct should be a separate factor, and items intended to measure a given target should load on that construct's factor. In the simplest case, the prompts may be intended to be unidimensional (i.e., all items loading on a single latent factor); however, it may also be the case that different items are intended to assess different underlying constructs.

As with self-report items, the first issue to be addressed empirically is whether the expected factor structure emerges; are there the expected number of factors, and do the items load as expected? This can be assessed with the standard techniques; Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to examine what factor structure emerges from the data, or Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

to assess how consistent the data is with a hypothesized factor model.

- 5. Reliability II: Quantify internal consistency of each factor.** Finally, once the factor structure has been confirmed, the internal consistency of each factor can be assessed. As with testing the factor structure, this can be done using standard methods. Historically, internal consistency has often been quantified with Cronbach's alpha which is simple but makes strong assumptions (unidimensionality, equal loadings, uncorrelated residuals; e.g., Yang & Green, 2011). McDonald's omega (McDonald, 1999) is an alternative model-based reliability estimate which makes less strong assumptions (see Flora, 2020; Revelle & Condon, 2019 for tutorials).

In cases where the measure is found to be unreliable, the item pool can be amended. Poorly-performing items (which do not load on the desired factor) can be dropped, and potentially new items can be added to fill our poorly-measured factors. This revised item pool will need to be tested for reliability on new, unseen data; this is where held out data (from step 3) may be useful.

- 6. Validity: Assess correlations with external factors.** While the steps above provide evidence the prompts are measuring a latent construct, the nature of this construct remains untested. To address this, the correlation of aggregate ratings with external criteria can be measured. So, for example, a measure of extraversion may be validated by examining its correlations with size of online network.

While human annotation or linking text to survey data are extremely useful for this purpose, digital trace text offers rich alternative possibilities for validation criteria. As it is generated in naturalistic contexts and often includes associated metadata, there are often candidate criteria such as text source (e.g., different subreddits), other text features (such as sentiment in the message or replies to it), or platform-specific features (such as Facebook's different affective Likes). As a result, the more burdensome approaches of annotating digital logs or linking them to survey data are not always necessary for validation.

- 7. Repeat over new samples and validation targets.** Validation is not a one-time evaluation. The validity of a measure will vary across data sources and populations. Thus, there is a need for ongoing process of validation, whereby the procedures above are replicated across different cases and validation criteria.

DISCUSSION

In summary, we have outlined a procedure for designing, implementing and testing LLM prompts for extracting latent variables from text stimuli. This approach can utilize existing resources from empirical psychology and conduct reliability assessment without a need for ground-truth data, reducing the burden of

applying LLMs to new rating tasks. We have described the rationale for the approach, provided a workflow for implementing it.

We see this approach as holding promise for addressing the measurement issues inherent in digital trace data such as social media text (Lazer et al., 2020, 2021; Wagner et al., 2021). Unlike with custom-designed measurement instruments, it is unclear what underlying phenomena these data are tracking. Our proposal is that LLMs have the potential to quantify the latent constructs manifested in text at scale, allowing unstructured text data to be characterized in terms of the latent constructs of social and personality psychology.

Our hope is that this paper can provide a useful and practical technique for researchers, promoting greater integration of the digital datasets of computational social science with the theoretical resources of social and personality psychology.

Funding acknowledgement. This research is supported by A*STAR (C232918004, C232918005) and SMU (SAJL-2022-CSS003, SAJL-2022-CSS02)

References

- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*, *348*, 1130-1132.
- Bargain, O., & Aminjonov, U. (2020). Trust and compliance to public health policies in times of COVID-19. *Journal of Public Economics*, *192*, 104316.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on psychological science*, *2*, 396-403.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., ... & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *33*, 1877-1901.
- Chen, L., Zaharia, M., & Zou, J. (2023). How is ChatGPT's behavior changing over time?. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09009*.
- Conte, R., Gilbert, N., Bonelli, G., Cioffi-Revilla, C., Deffuant, G., Kertesz, J., ... & Helbing, D. (2012). Manifesto of computational social science. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, *214*, 325-346.
- Cruickshank, I. J., & Ng, L. H. X. (2023). Use of Large Language Models for Stance Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13734*.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological bulletin*, *52*, 281.
- Daer, A. R., Hoffman, R., & Goodman, S. (2014, September). Rhetorical functions of hashtag forms across social media applications. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on the Design of Communication CD-ROM* (pp. 1-3).
- Demszky, D., Yang, D., Yeager, D. S., Bryan, C. J., Clapper, M., Chandhok, S., ... & Pennebaker, J. W. (2023). Using large language models in psychology. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *2*, 688-701.
- DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage publications.
- Flake, J. K., & Fried, E. I. (2020). Measurement schmeasurement: Questionable measurement practices and how to avoid them. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *3*, 456-465.
- Flake, J. K., Pek, J., & Hehman, E. (2017). Construct validation in social and personality research: Current practice and recommendations. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*, 370-378.
- Flora, D. B. (2020). Your coefficient alpha is probably wrong, but which coefficient omega is right? A tutorial on using R to obtain better reliability estimates. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *3*, 484-501.
- Freelon, D. (2014). On the interpretation of digital trace data in communication and social computing research. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *58*, 59-75.
- Hobbs, W. R., Burke, M., Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2016). Online social integration is associated with reduced mortality risk. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*, 12980-12984.

- Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2022). *semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling*. R package version 0.5-6. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools>
- Kaplan, R. M., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2001). *Psychological testing: Principles, applications, and issues*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Kelley, T. L. (1927). *Interpretation of Educational Measurements*. World Book Co..
- Kitchin, R. (2014). Big Data, new epistemologies and paradigm shifts. *Big Data & Society*, 1, 2053951714528481.
- Lazer, D. M., Pentland, A., Watts, D. J., Aral, S., Athey, S., Contractor, N., ... & Wagner, C. (2020). Computational social science: Obstacles and opportunities. *Science*, 369, 1060-1062.
- Lazer, D., Hargittai, E., Freelon, D., Gonzalez-Bailon, S., Munger, K., Ognyanova, K., & Radford, J. (2021). Meaningful measures of human society in the twenty-first century. *Nature*, 595, 189-196.
- Lazer, D., Pentland, A., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabási, A. L., Brewer, D., ... & Van Alstyne, M. (2009). Computational social science. *Science*, 323, 721-723.
- Li, W., Aste, T., Caccioli, F., & Livan, G. (2019). Early coauthorship with top scientists predicts success in academic careers. *Nature Communications*, 10, 5170.
- McDonald R. P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Park, M., Leahey, E., & Funk, R. J. (2023). Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature*, 613, 138-144.
- Petrocelli, J. V., Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2007). Unpacking attitude certainty: Attitude clarity and attitude correctness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 30.
- Qin, C., Zhang, A., Zhang, Z., Chen, J., Yasunaga, M., & Yang, D. (2023). Is ChatGPT a general-purpose natural language processing task solver? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06476*.
- Revelle, W. (2023). *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research*. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. R package version 2.3.3, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>.
- Revelle, W., & Condon, D. M. (2019). Reliability from α to ω : A tutorial. *Psychological assessment*, 31, 1395.
- Rosenbusch, H., Wanders, F., & Pit, I. L. (2020). The Semantic Scale Network: An online tool to detect semantic overlap of psychological scales and prevent scale redundancies. *Psychological Methods*, 25, 380–392
- Rosseel Y. (2012). "lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling." *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48, 1–36.

- Roy, S., Nakshatri, N. S., & Goldwasser, D. (2022, November). Towards Few-Shot Identification of Morality Frames using In-Context Learning. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science (NLP+ CSS)* (pp. 183-196).
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 1359-1366.
- Tufekci, Z. (2014, May). Big questions for social media big data: Representativeness, validity and other methodological pitfalls. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* (Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 505-514).
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, *359*, 1146-1151.
- Wagner, C., Strohmaier, M., Olteanu, A., Kıcıman, E., Contractor, N., & Eliassi-Rad, T. (2021). Measuring algorithmically infused societies. *Nature*, *595*, 197-204.
- Yang, T., Shi, T., Wan, F., Quan, X., Wang, Q., Wu, B., & Wu, J. (2023, December). PsyCoT: Psychological Questionnaire as Powerful Chain-of-Thought for Personality Detection. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023* (pp. 3305-3320).
- Yang, Y., & Green, S. B. (2011). Coefficient alpha: A reliability coefficient for the 21st century?. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *29*, 377-392.
- Zhang, W., Deng, Y., Liu, B., Pan, S. J., & Bing, L. (2023). Sentiment analysis in the era of large language models: A reality check. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15005*.
- Ziems, C., Held, W., Shaikh, O, Chen, J., Zhang, Z. & Yang, D. (2024). Can large language models transform computational social science? *Computational Linguistics*, *50*, 1-55