

Mapping the Course for Prompt-based Structured Prediction

Matt Pauk

University of Colorado Boulder
matt.pauk@colorado.edu

Maria Leonor Pacheco

University of Colorado Boulder
maria.pacheco@colorado.edu

Abstract

LLMs have been shown to be useful for a variety of language tasks, without requiring task-specific fine-tuning. However, these models often struggle with hallucinations and complex reasoning problems due to their autoregressive nature. We propose to address some of these issues, specifically in the area of structured prediction, by combining LLMs with combinatorial inference in an attempt to marry the predictive power of LLMs with the structural consistency provided by inference methods. We perform exhaustive experiments in an effort to understand which prompting strategies can effectively estimate LLM confidence values for use with symbolic inference, and show that, regardless of the prompting strategy, the addition of symbolic inference on top of prompting alone leads to more consistent and accurate predictions. Additionally, we show that calibration and fine-tuning using structured prediction objectives leads to increased performance for challenging tasks, showing that structured learning is still valuable in the era of LLMs.

1 Introduction

Prompting large language models (LLMs) has been shown to be an effective methodology for a variety of NLP tasks (Lou et al., 2024). Pre-training general-purpose LLMs on a large amount of data has given them an impressive amount of world knowledge that they can apply to a variety of tasks without requiring specialized training (Brown et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2022b), allowing us to generate answers to any question or instruction in text form by conditioning it on textual input. The input can be formatted in numerous ways in an attempt to bias the model output towards the right answers, including hand-crafted templates (Raffel et al., 2020), free-form instructions (Chung et al., 2024) and questions (Gardner et al., 2019). This provides us with a flexible and adaptable framework in which

we can easily adapt to new problems by simply designing appropriate prompts and passing a handful of input-output demonstrations. However, regardless of the prompting strategy used, these models are still limited based on their training objectives (Radford and Narasimhan, 2018; Wei et al., 2022a; Ouyang et al., 2022), which often leads to hallucinations and struggles with more complex reasoning tasks (McCoy et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2023). One such area where these limitations become apparent is that of structured prediction tasks.

We use the term structured prediction to describe any machine learning task that consists of predicting several individual but related components as part of some structured object (BakIr and Foundation, 2007). These tasks are widely common in NLP, where we are often interested in parsing text into complex linguistic structures (Mann and Thompson, 1988; Lascarides and Asher, 2008; Palmer et al., 2010; Kamath and Das, 2019) or aligning language with structured knowledge (Mao et al., 2019; Pacheco and Goldwasser, 2021). Most previous work applying LLMs to structured prediction tasks treats each component task as an unrelated prompting task (Roy et al., 2022) or prompts the model to produce the entire structure all at once as a sequence of tokens (Ettinger et al., 2023). However, because these strategies are solely relying on auto-regressive generation for predicting structures, they do not have a way to strictly enforce that the predicted structure is a valid one.

Recently, Mehta et al. (2024) proposed a framework for explicitly modeling dependencies by combining traditional inference algorithms with prompt-based predictions. Their approach first scores local candidate substructures by prompting LLMs, and then finds the best global output via constrained optimization. They tested their framework on semantic role labeling and co-reference resolution and showed that enforcing consistency improves performance over unconstrained predic-

tion while guaranteeing structurally valid outputs. While these results show the relevance and potential of constrained inference for prompt-based structured prediction, it is not clear *how* we should derive these scores from prompt-based inferences. In their work, Mehta et al. (2024) simply takes the raw likelihood of generating a particular response and directly plugs them into the maximum a posteriori (MAP) inference process.

Traditional structured inference algorithms rely on weighting certainty scores for the different local candidate substructures, and finding the best global assignment that satisfies the structural constraints of the problem. Historically, trained ad hoc models generated label scores, which would correspond to the local or globally normalized likelihood of the candidate label based on a learned conditional distribution $P(Y|X)$ (Lafferty et al., 2001; Collins, 2002; Chang et al., 2012; Pacheco and Goldwasser, 2021). Unlike trained discriminative classifiers, prompt-based approaches do not learn a conditional distribution for the specific task, but rather estimate the probability of generating a token in a vocabulary given the sequence of tokens provided in the prompt (Xie et al., 2022). This makes deriving certainty scores for prompt-based predictions very challenging. Given the wide range of approaches for certainty estimation (Kadavath et al., 2022; Xiong et al., 2024) and calibration (Jiang et al., 2021; Tian et al., 2023) in LLMs, it is hard to ascertain which -if any- of them would be appropriate for structured inference algorithms. This is especially relevant given that many of these techniques have shown to struggle in aligning confidence scores with actual accuracy and to reliably predict failure cases (Xiong et al., 2024).

In this paper, we are interested in systematically exploring and comparing different ways to score candidate substructures for prompt-based prediction, as well as exploring learning mechanisms to align LLMs with structured objectives. To this end, we present an exhaustive study of different ways to combine the predictive power of LLMs with structured inference to enforce the structural consistency of LLM predictions. Specifically, our goal is to answer the following three research questions.

1. Does combinatorial inference improve on LLMs in structured prediction tasks?
2. What is the best way to estimate confidence values from LLMs for combinatorial inference?
3. What is the best way to fine-tune LLMs for structured prediction tasks?

We evaluated our methods on two challenging discourse-level structured prediction tasks: morality framing and coreference resolution, and show that inference helps performance, regardless of the strategy used to extract confidence values. Of the confidence estimation strategies we explore, formulating the prompt as a true/false question performs the best. Additionally, we show that fine-tuning models based on the global structured prediction objective leads to improved performance over fine-tuning on the individual component tasks.

2 Related Work

Deep structured prediction. There is a lot of previous work combining neural models with symbolic inference for structured prediction tasks. Neural networks globally normalized using structured inference have been successfully applied to sentence-level NLP tasks such as named entity recognition and dependency parsing (Chen and Manning, 2014; Weiss et al., 2015; Ma and Hovy, 2016; Lample et al., 2016; Kiperwasser and Goldberg, 2016; Malaviya et al., 2018). When dealing with tasks that go beyond sentence-level dependencies, most work combines the output scores of independently trained classifiers using inference (Beltagy et al., 2014; Ning et al., 2018; Pryor et al., 2023; Leto et al., 2024) while others create ad-hoc joint learning approaches for their particular tasks (Han et al., 2019; Widmoser et al., 2021). Our work most closely resembles Pacheco and Goldwasser (2021), who propose a general framework for combining deep learning models with structured inference. However, rather than fine-tuning custom neural networks, we leverage general-purpose generative LLMs and few-shot prompting strategies.

Structured prediction with LLMs. How best to use generative LLMs for structured prediction tasks is still a largely unexplored area. Most previous work either prompts the model to make predictions on the component tasks without any enforcement of structural constraints (Roy et al., 2022) or prompts the model to predict the entire structure at once (Ettinger et al., 2023). Liu et al. (2022) propose an approach that models structures as sequences of actions in an autoregressive manner, without incurring any loss. The closest work to our proposed method is (Mehta et al., 2024), who also combine a few-shot prompting with combinatorial inference. However, they do not explore different LLM confidence estimation or calibration methods.

Additionally, we explore learning strategies using structured prediction objectives on top of LLMs, which to the best of our knowledge has not been explored before.

Confidence/uncertainty scoring and recalibration with LLMs. There is a considerable amount of research surrounding confidence estimation in LLMs. Geng et al. (2024) provide a survey of common confidence estimation strategies, considering both white-box methods that leverage internal model layers and/or token probabilities, as well as black-box methods that rely only on generated text. Kadavath et al. (2022) show that when prompts are formulated as true/false or multiple choice questions, the generated token probabilities themselves can be a well-calibrated form of confidence estimation. Manakul et al. (2023) estimate confidence values by sampling a number of generations and use consistency / variability among generations as a proxy of confidence. Alternatively, others ask the model to estimate its own confidence level using numeric scales (Xiong et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2022).

3 Prompt-based Structured Prediction

We outline a general framework for modeling any prompt-based structured prediction task. To do this, we define each problem as an LLM-based factor graph Ψ with potentials $\psi_i \in \Psi$ over all possible structures Y . Each decision $\psi_i \in \Psi$ is scored using a decoder-only LLM instance ρ with parameters θ .

Let $\rho(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i; \theta)$ be the score for the potential ψ_i resulting from the prompting of an LLM ρ parameterized by θ . In this way, we can find the optimal structure $\mathbf{y} \in Y$ by performing MAP inference as:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \sum_{\psi_i \in \Psi} \rho(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i; \theta) \\ \text{s.t. } c(\mathbf{x}_c, \mathbf{y}_c) \quad \forall c \in C \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where C is the set of structural constraints defined by the factor graph Ψ , and $\mathbf{x}_c, \mathbf{y}_c$ correspond to the inputs and variables relevant to the constraints.

Following a long tradition on structured prediction for NLP, we use Integer Linear Programming (ILP) to calculate $\arg \max$. Given that every MAP inference problem with discrete variables can be represented as a linear objective, ILP provides us with the utmost flexibility to represent any structured prediction problem (Roth and Yih, 2005). In addition, all Boolean functions can be compiled

into a set of linear inequalities to be used as constraints in the ILP formulation (Srikumar and Roth, 2023). However, we note that this framework allows ILP to be replaced by any appropriate inference algorithm for a given task, including tractable linear programming relaxations such as AD^3 (Martins et al., 2015).

3.1 ILP Formulation

We formulate the ILP objective as follows:

$$\arg \max_{\forall p \in P} \sum_j \sum_k w_{jk} \cdot p_{jk} \quad (2)$$

Here, each $p \in P$ corresponds to a particular prompting strategy, and each p_{jk} is a binary variable that represents whether a particular answer k to an instance j is true. Each w_{jk} is the probability that the corresponding p_{jk} is true. The weight itself is obtained by prompting an LLM using the prompting strategy p and extracting a confidence value, using one of the strategies discussed in Section 4.

To support the use of different prompting strategies to score the same decisions, we introduce variables d_{jk} . These variables are not used in the objective function directly, but are used in defining constraints. Similarly to previous work (Zhang et al., 2016; Pacheco and Goldwasser, 2021), we define a set of standard constraints that can be used in different structured prediction tasks.

Multi-class constraints For multiclass problems, only one variable can be activated among all possible variables for a multi-class decision on a particular instance decision.

$$\sum_k d_{jk} = 1 \quad (3)$$

Decision constraints It could be that, for a particular decision, we prompt an LLM in multiple different ways and/or with different contextual information. In order to obtain a single answer given multiple estimations, we need to constrain the assignment of the variables associated with that decision. We define a constraint to ensure that if a decision variable d_{jk} is activated, at least one of its outcome variables must be activated.

$$d_{jk} \leq \sum_p^P p_{jk} \quad (4)$$

Where P is the set of all prompting strategies. Conversely, the activation of any of the outcome vari-

ables associated with a given decision variable ensures the activation of that decision variable.

$$d_{jk} \geq \prod_p^P p_{jk} \quad (5)$$

Hard constraints We can define hard constraints to infuse domain knowledge. These constraints can be modeled in the form of “if-then” style rules. For example, let $d_{12,\text{coref}}$ be a variable that represents whether entities e_1 and e_2 are co-referent. We can ensure a transitivity constraint of the form *if* $d_{12,\text{coref}}$ *and* $d_{23,\text{coref}}$ *then* $d_{13,\text{coref}}$ as:

$$d_{12,\text{coref}} + d_{23,\text{coref}} - 1 \leq d_{13,\text{coref}} \quad (6)$$

Note that this generalizes for any horn clause $d_1 \wedge d_2 \wedge \dots \wedge d_n \Rightarrow d_h$ as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d_i - (n - 1) \leq d_h \quad (7)$$

4 Strategies for Scoring Sub-structures

The scores to be used with inference are obtained by prompting an LLM. However, it is unclear how best to extract probability values for classification tasks using LLM prompts. Unlike a classifier explicitly trained to predict output probabilities, an LLM provides a probability distribution over all the tokens in its vocabulary. Additionally, for many proprietary models, we do not even have access to the generated token probabilities, requiring a confidence estimation strategy that works using only the plain-text generations. We experiment with an exhaustive list of confidence estimation methods proposed in the literature. Following Geng et al. (2024), we divide these methods into white-box and black-box confidence estimation strategies.

4.1 White-Box Methods

We sample several white-box confidence estimation methods, which we describe as requiring access to the token probability values for each prompt input and generation.

True/False Token Prediction Inspired by results showing that LLMs are fairly well calibrated for true/false and multiple choice questions (Kadavath et al., 2022), we format the task as a true/false question and compute confidence estimation values based on the probability that the LLM generates

the true token:

$$p(y = True|x) \quad (8)$$

In the multi-class case, the confidence value is computed by normalizing the result of Eq. 8 for a particular class c over the sum of the true token probabilities for all classes as:

$$\frac{p(y = True|x_c)}{\sum_i^{|C|} p(y = True|x_{c_i})} \quad (9)$$

Multiple Choice This strategy formulates the problem as a QA task with the possible labels given as multiple choice options. The score for a given text and label is then the probability of generating the token of the corresponding multiple choice option o :

$$p(y = o|x) \quad (10)$$

Generative Classification Instead of the standard QA format used by the True/False and Multiple Choice methods, where the model is asked to predict the label given some text to classify, we can flip the problem formulation on its head and provide the label as the input prompt and estimate the label likelihood based on the probability of the model to generate the example text. This approach has been shown to improve worst-case performance and reduce output variance (Kumar et al., 2024). Following prior work, we formulate the input prompt as "{natural language label description} {text to be classified}". We then compute the score for a particular label using the following equation:

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_i^m \sum_j^n p(x_j|y_i x_1 \dots x_{j-1}) \quad (11)$$

Where y_i represents one of m versions of the label description and $x = x_1 \dots x_n$ represents the text to be classified. Multiple versions of the language descriptions are used to reduce variance. The score calculated from Eq. 11 is then normalized over all possible labels to extract a final confidence value.

4.2 Black-box Methods

For many proprietary models, the token probabilities for the input prompt and / or the generations are not publicly available. For these models, the methods covered in Section 4.1 are not viable options. Therefore, we also explore several confidence estimation options that can be performed given only the plain-text generations of the LLM.

Generation Sampling This strategy uses consistency as a proxy for confidence by computing a score based on sampling generations, relying on the inherent randomness of these models. The model is prompted n times to classify the text into one of the possible labels $L = l_1, l_2, \dots, l_m$, giving us a set of n generations $G = g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n$. The number of generations that match a particular label l_i is given by:

$$G_{l_i} = \{g \in G | g_i = l_i\}$$

The score for label l_i is then calculated given the following formula:

$$\frac{|G_{l_i}|}{n} \quad (12)$$

Verbalized Confidence This method prompts the model to estimate its own confidence level in the answer. We use a similar prompting method as proposed by Xiong et al. (2023), where the model is given the text to be classified and one of the possible classes and asked to estimate its confidence level in the answer on a scale of 0-100. We use the following prompt format:

Question: {q}
Possible Answer: {a}
Q: How likely is the above answer to be correct? Do not elaborate on your answer or provide any explanation, answer only with the confidence value in the following format:
Confidence: [the probability of answer label to be correct (0-100), not the one you think correct, please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]

This prompt is executed several times, and the final confidence value is given as the average elicited confidence value over all of the generations.

5 Learning

Sections 3 and 4 describe a process to combine few-shot prompting strategies using pre-trained language models and combinatorial inference for structured prediction tasks. However, in the process described so far, there is no learning taking place, and we are solely relying on the world knowledge contained in the pre-trained language models. In this section, we describe several fine-tuning strategies for the structured prediction task.

5.1 Few-Shot Score Calibration

For this strategy, we train a logistic regression layer on top of the LLM scores to better calibrate them for the structured prediction task. The parameters of the LLM remain frozen and only the

weights of the logistic regression layer are tuned. A separate logistic regression model ϕ_p is used for each prompting strategy p within the structured prediction problem. We experiment with two mechanisms to train these regression models. The first, which we refer to as **Local Calibration** involves tuning each logistic regression model separately based on the cross-entropy loss for their respective sub-problem tasks:

$$L = -\log \sum_i^C y_i \log(\hat{y}_i) \quad (13)$$

Where $\hat{y}_i = \phi_p(w)$ is the output of the logistic regression model for the strategy p which takes as input the confidence scores w extracted using one of the LLM prompting strategies in Section 4.

Alternatively, we jointly train all models ϕ_p using the structured hinge loss (Daumé III, 2017). To compute this loss, we perform structured inference as formulated in Section 3.1. However, instead of using the raw confidence scores w from the LLM, we use the corresponding output of the logistic regression layer $s_i = \phi(w)_i$. The structured hinge loss can then be formulated as follows:

$$L = \max \left\{ 0, \sum_{\hat{y}_i \in \hat{y}} s_i \hat{y}_i - \sum_{y_i \in y} s_i y_i \right\} \quad (14)$$

Where $\hat{y} \in Y$ is the current result of inference and $y \in Y$ corresponds to the gold structure. We refer to this training mechanism as **Global Calibration**.

5.2 Supervised Fine-tuning

Supervised fine tuning of LLMs has proven to be an effective method to improve LLM performance on a specific task (Zhang et al., 2023). For this strategy, we fine-tune an LLM on the same prompts discussed in Section 4 using the standard next token prediction objective for fine-tuning given below.

$$L = -\sum_{t=1}^T \log(p(y_t | x y_1 y_2 \dots y_{t-1})) \quad (15)$$

Fine-tuning is performed for each of the potentials of the structured prediction problem. After fine-tuning the LLM, inference is performed by extracting confidence values using the same prompting strategy as used for fine-tuning.

Method	Shots	Micro F1		Macro F1		Constraint Violations	
		MF	Role	MF	Role	C1	C2
Few-shot ICL (Roy et al., 2022)	5	0.436	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
True/False	5	0.498	0.444	0.466	0.378	1195	102
+ constr		<u>0.517</u>	0.452	0.521	0.408	0	0
Multiple Choice	2	0.457	0.348	0.447	0.273	1133	234
+ constr		0.530	<u>0.386</u>	<u>0.512</u>	<u>0.321</u>	0	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.389	0.387	0.419	0.276	1241	128
+ constr		<u>0.456</u>	<u>0.388</u>	<u>0.447</u>	<u>0.317</u>	0	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	0.416	0.261	0.418	0.180	1275	312
+ constr		<u>0.435</u>	<u>0.322</u>	<u>0.437</u>	<u>0.274</u>	0	0
Generative Classification	0	0.410	0.274	0.426	0.211	1072	338
+ constr		<u>0.498</u>	<u>0.295</u>	<u>0.483</u>	<u>0.245</u>	0	0

Table 1: Results for the Morality Frames task (Roy et al., 2021) for each of the five confidence elicitation methods (Sec. 4), both with and without combinatorial inference. We present results only for best number of shots (0,2,5).

5.3 Structured Fine-tuning

For this strategy, we use the same modeling and loss formulation as in the global calibration method described in Section 5.1. However, rather than freezing the LLM parameters, we backpropagate the structured hinge loss (Eq. 14) into the LLM itself. Before learning, we use the procedure described in Section 5.2 to hot start the model parameters.

6 Evaluation

We evaluated our framework on two complex discourse-level tasks; morality frame prediction and coreference resolution. For co-reference, we use the GENIA Coreference biomedical dataset (Su et al., 2008) and the CoNLL 2012 OntoNotes dataset (Pradhan et al., 2012). For morality framing, we use the task and dataset proposed by (Roy et al., 2021).

6.1 Morality Framing in Political Tweets

This task focuses on identifying the moral attitudes that are expressed in tweets made by members of Congress in the US (Roy et al., 2021). There are two aspects to the task; the first is identifying which of the five moral foundations (Care/Harm, Fairness/Cheating, Loyalty/Betrayal, Authority/Subversion, and Purity/Degradation) are being expressed in the tweet (Haidt and Joseph, 2004; Haidt and Graham, 2007). The other aspect of the task is to identify the moral role that the entities mentioned in the tweet are playing. As an example, consider the following tweet that expresses the moral foundation **Care/Harm**:

This common-sense bill will reduce unnecessary and duplicative burdens on health

care providers and patients in need of home health services

The entity "common-sense bill" expresses the role of **entity providing care**, "health care providers and patients" express the role of **target of care/harm** and "duplicative burdens" expresses the role of **entity causing harm**. We define prompt templates for both the moral role classification and the moral foundation identification subproblems. Specific details on the prompt templates used can be found in Appendix B. After prompting, we perform inference to find the best global label assignments across both subproblems, subject to the following constraints.

Constraints In addition to the standard multi-class and decision constraints (Sec. 3.1), we define two custom hard constraints, inspired by previous work on this task (Roy et al., 2021).

Constraint 1 The predicted role of an entity in a tweet must align with the moral foundation predicted for the tweet.

Constraint 2 No two entities within the same tweet can be assigned the same moral role.

Evaluation We experiment with Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024) and Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023) as our base models. For fine-tuning experiments, we use LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) in combination with the Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct model. Details of our hyperparameter selection can be found in App. E. We evaluated performance by reporting macro/micro F1 scores on both the foundation and role identification components of the morality framework task. The results are averaged over five folds.

Model	Micro F1		Macro F1	
	MF	Role	MF	Role
Few Shot (Roy et al., 2022)	n/a	n/a	0.436	n/a
Supervised Deep Structured Pred. (Roy et al., 2021)	n/a	n/a	0.723	0.592
Pre-trained few-shot baseline	0.459 ± 0.01	0.345 ± 0.009	0.452 ± 0.023	0.281 ± 0.038
Pre-trained few-shot baseline (+ constr)	0.529 ± 0.007	0.388 ± 0.014	0.511 ± 0.013	0.318 ± 0.015
Pre-trained Local Calibration	0.522 ± 0.017	0.478 ± 0.006	0.450 ± 0.031	0.360 ± 0.040
Pre-trained Local Calibration (+ constr)	0.649 ± 0.006	0.562 ± 0.023	0.589 ± 0.019	0.453 ± 0.035
Pre-trained Global Calibration	0.660 ± 0.024	0.594 ± 0.031	0.638 ± 0.034	0.512 ± 0.052
Fine-tuned baseline	0.710 ± 0.013	0.691 ± 0.024	0.681 ± 0.018	0.595 ± 0.021
Fine-tuned baseline (+ constr)	0.754 ± 0.005	0.731 ± 0.013	0.720 ± 0.008	0.656 ± 0.015
Fine-tuned Local Calibration	0.724 ± 0.019	0.700 ± 0.025	0.695 ± 0.032	0.610 ± 0.020
Fine-tuned Local Calibration (+ constr)	0.759 ± 0.009	0.727 ± 0.013	0.722 ± 0.028	0.652 ± 0.019
Fine-tuned Global Calibration	0.758 ± 0.005	0.725 ± 0.008	0.722 ± 0.020	0.658 ± 0.026
Structured Fine Tuning	0.764 ± 0.009	0.732 ± 0.011	0.731 ± 0.023	0.662 ± 0.018

Table 2: Results on the Morality Frames dataset (Roy et al., 2021) after fine-tuning the LLMs. The multiple choice strategy for confidence estimation is used for all methods. Details on the training mechanisms for each fine-tuning strategy can be found in Section 5.

Results The results of the few-shot prompting methods are shown in Table 1. We experiment with 0, 2, and 5 shots for each method except for the generative classification and verbalized confidence methods, which are 0 shot methods. Table 1 only contains the best result for each method using the Llama model, as it outperformed the mistral model in all strategies. The full results for both models can be found in App. D. Overall, we see that inference (+ constr) improves performance compared to few-shot prompting alone, regardless of the confidence estimation strategy used. The best results are achieved when using the true/false method for extracting confidence scores; this holds true both before and after inference. However, the multiple choice method is comparable to true/false for the moral foundation subproblem. Furthermore, our results outperform previous prompting work on the same task (Roy et al., 2022).

Table 2 shows the results of our different fine-tuning strategies (Sec. 5). Results are averaged over 5 folds. We use the multiple choice confidence estimation strategy for all fine-tuned models. Despite slightly worse performance than the True/False method, it requires much fewer prompts per instance, allowing for larger batch sizes during training, which are required when fine-tuning using the global structured objective (Eq. 14). Similarly to the few-shot results, we find that adding inference helps performance regardless of the fine-tuning strategy. We notice that calibrating scores using logistic regression performs best when using the structured hinge loss objective (Global Calibration, Eq. 14) compared to individually train-

ing sub-tasks using the cross-entropy loss (Local Calibration). This finding holds true regardless of whether we use a pre-trained or fine-tuned LLM. However, the advantage of the structured hinge loss is much clearer in the pre-trained case. Unsurprisingly, supervised fine-tuning of the LLM leads to large performance gains over the few-shot version of the model. The best performing model uses the structured fine-tuning method on top of the local fine-tuned model (Structured Fine Tuning), which outperforms the previous state-of-the-art in this task (Roy et al., 2021), which uses a classical deep structured prediction approach.

6.2 Coreference Resolution

Co-reference resolution is the task of identifying whether or not two mentions of an entity within a piece of text refer to the same entity. We evaluated two coreference datasets, the GENIA Coreference Corpus dataset, which consists of a collection of biomedical paper abstracts (Su et al., 2008), and the CoNLL 2012 OntoNotes dataset (Pradhan et al., 2012). We break the task down into a series of sub-problems where we prompt the LLM to determine whether two entity mentions within a document are coreferent or not. Prompt template details can be found in App. A.

Constraints In addition to the standard multi-class and decision constraints (Sec. 3.1), we define one custom hard constraint enforcing the transitivity of coreferent entity pairs.

Constraint 1 If entities A and B are coreferent and entities B and C are coreferent, then entities A and C must be coreferent.

Method	Shots	F1	Viol.
Macaw-3B (+ constr) Mehta et al. (2024)	0	0.522	0
True/False - Mistral	5	0.815	15212
+ constr		<u>0.820</u>	0
Multiple Choice - LLama	5	0.801	24928
+ constr		<u>0.830</u>	0
Generation Sampling - Llama	5	0.834	15086
+ constr		0.842	0
Verbalized Confidence - Mistral	0	0.506	25872
+ constr		<u>0.512</u>	0
Generative Classification - Mistral	0	<u>0.397</u>	47794
+ constr		0.371	0

Table 3: Co-reference results for the OntoNotes dataset (Pradhan et al., 2012) across all five prompting strategies

Method	Shots	F1	Viol.
Flan-T5 (+ constr) Mehta et al. (2024)	0	0.654	0
True/False - Mistral	5	0.799	29808
+ constr		0.823	0
Multiple Choice - Mistral	5	0.721	72303
+ constr		<u>0.759</u>	0
Generation Sampling - Mistral	5	0.747	48570
+ constr		<u>0.781</u>	0
Verbalized Confidence - Mistral	0	<u>0.599</u>	123272
+ constr		0.577	0
Generative Classification - LLama	0	<u>0.357</u>	364712
+ constr		0.305	0

Table 4: Co-reference results for the GENIA dataset (Su et al., 2008) across all five prompting strategies.

Evaluation We experiment with Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024) and Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023) as our base models. For fine-tuning experiments, we use LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) in combination with the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model. Details of our hyperparameter selection can be found in Appendix F. We evaluated performance by reporting macro F1 scores.

Results Few-shot results for the OntoNotes and GENIA datasets are shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. We experiment with both Llama and Mistral instruct models and use 0 and 5 shots for all methods except for the 0 shot methods (verbalized confidence, and generative classification). However, we report only the best model and the best number of example combinations for each strategy in Tables 3 and 4. The full results can be found in App. C. We see that for all methods, except for the zero shot ones, inference improves on the baseline results. We suspect that this is because the baseline model performance is so poor in these cases, that the application of the transitivity constraints are ineffective. For the GENIA dataset, the true/false method performs the best, while the generation sampling method performs the best for the

Method	Macro F1
Fine-tuned Constrained Macaw-3B Mehta et al. (2024)	0.916
Pre-trained few-shot baseline	0.721
Pre-trained few-shot baseline (+ constr)	0.759
Pre-trained Local Calibration	0.771
Pre-trained Local Calibration (+ constr)	0.800
Pre-trained Global Calibration	<u>0.805</u>
Fine-tuned baseline	0.883
Fine-tuned baseline (+ constr)	0.887
Fine-tuned Local Calibration	0.882
Fine-tuned Local Calibration (+ constr)	0.891
Fine-tuned Global Calibration	0.881
Structured Fine Tuning	0.890

Table 5: Fine-tuning results on the GENIA coreference task (Su et al., 2008). The multiple choice confidence elicitation strategy is used for all models.

OntoNotes dataset. However, True/False, Multiple Choice, and Generation Sampling strategies have comparable performance for both datasets.

We test our fine-tuning strategies on the GENIA dataset and again leverage the multiple choice strategy for its balance of performance and efficiency in terms of number of prompts required for a single instance. The results of our fine-tuning experiments are shown in Table 5. Similarly to the morality frames task, we note that inference seems to help at every stage of the training process. However, in the fine-tuned case, it is less helpful as performance on the task is already very high after fine-tuning, and therefore the addition of inference does not lead to much if any improvement over the baseline model. The best performing model is the fine tuned model with local calibration with the structured fine-tuned model achieving comparable performance.

7 Conclusion

We show that structured inference is a useful tool to combine with LLM prompting for structured prediction tasks, leading to consistent gains in performance over prompting alone. This holds true regardless of what strategy we use to extract confidence values from LLMs, although structuring the prompt as a true/false question and using the generated token probability as a confidence estimate works the best. Additionally, we show that calibrating LLM scores based on structured prediction objectives can further boost performance. This finding holds true both for pre-trained models and models fine-tuned on the task. In the future, we want to explore porting the lessons learned here into multi-agent workflows, where interdependencies are observed, but sub-tasks are open-ended and supervision is not readily available.

8 Limitations

We are limited on the size of the model that we can use for experimentation. We report results on 7B and 8B parameter models in Mistral and Llama, but were unable to experiment with 70B+ parameter versions of these models due to computational resource limitations. Additionally, we are limited to using open source models where we have full access and control over logits associated with the input prompt and generated text.

Lastly, we feel that we choose two representative tasks, one in the Morality Frames task, which provides a difficult relational reasoning task, and another in coreference resolution, which is a more traditional NLP task. However, future work could expand this task selection to provide greater evidence of generalization of these methods.

9 Ethical Considerations

To the best of our knowledge, we did not violate the ACL/ACM code of ethics during the course of our work. We use existing, public datasets for evaluation and report model hyperparameters as well as details of our prompting strategies to allow for reproduction of our experiments.

References

- G. BakIr and Neural Information Processing Systems Foundation. 2007. *Predicting Structured Data*. Advances in neural information processing systems. MIT Press.
- Islam Beltagy, Katrin Erk, and Raymond Mooney. 2014. Probabilistic soft logic for semantic textual similarity. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1210–1219.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Ming-Wei Chang, Lev-Arie Ratinov, and Dan Roth. 2012. Structured learning with constrained conditional models. *Machine Learning*, 88:399–431.
- Danqi Chen and Christopher Manning. 2014. A fast and accurate dependency parser using neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 740–750, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2024. [Scaling instruction-finetuned language models](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(70):1–53.
- Michael Collins. 2002. [Discriminative training methods for hidden markov models: theory and experiments with perceptron algorithms](#). In *Proceedings of the ACL-02 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing - Volume 10*, EMNLP ’02, page 1–8, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hal Daumé III. 2017. *A Course in Machine Learning*. self-published.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Allyson Ettinger, Jena Hwang, Valentina Pyatkin, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2023. [“you are an expert linguistic annotator”: Limits of LLMs as analyzers of Abstract Meaning Representation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8250–8263, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matt Gardner, Jonathan Berant, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Alon Talmor, and Sewon Min. 2019. [Question answering is a format; when is it useful?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:1909.11291.
- Jiahui Geng, Fengyu Cai, Yuxia Wang, Heinz Koepl, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. 2024. A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6577–6595.
- Jonathan Haidt and Jesse Graham. 2007. [When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize](#). *Social Justice Research*, 20(1):98–116.
- Jonathan Haidt and Craig Joseph. 2004. [Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues](#). *Daedalus*, 133(4):55–66.
- Rujun Han, Qiang Ning, and Nanyun Peng. 2019. [Joint event and temporal relation extraction with shared](#)

- representations and structured prediction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 434–444, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM computing surveys*, 55(12):1–38.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. *Mistral 7b*. Preprint, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Jun Araki, Haibo Ding, and Graham Neubig. 2021. How can we know when language models know? on the calibration of language models for question answering. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:962–977.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El-Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, Jackson Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. Language models (mostly) know what they know. Preprint, arXiv:2207.05221.
- Aishwarya Kamath and Rajarshi Das. 2019. A survey on semantic parsing. In *Automated Knowledge Base Construction (AKBC)*.
- Eliyahu Kiperwasser and Yoav Goldberg. 2016. Simple and accurate dependency parsing using bidirectional LSTM feature representations. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:313–327.
- Sachin Kumar, Chan Young Park, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2024. Gen-z: Generative zero-shot text classification with contextualized label descriptions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- John D. Lafferty, Andrew McCallum, and Fernando C. N. Pereira. 2001. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML ’01*, page 282–289, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Guillaume Lample, Miguel Ballesteros, Sandeep Subramanian, Kazuya Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. 2016. Neural architectures for named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 260–270, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Lascarides and Nicholas Asher. 2008. Segmented discourse representation theory: Dynamic semantics with discourse structure.
- Alexandria Leto, Elliot Pickens, Coen Needell, David Rothschild, and Maria Leonor Pacheco. 2024. Framing in the presence of supporting data: A case study in U.S. economic news. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 393–415, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14334*.
- Tianyu Liu, Yuchen Eleanor Jiang, Nicholas Monath, Ryan Cotterell, and Mrinmaya Sachan. 2022. Autoregressive structured prediction with language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 993–1005, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Renze Lou, Kai Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language model instruction following: A survey of progresses and challenges. *Computational Linguistics*, 50(3):1053–1095.
- Xuezhe Ma and Eduard Hovy. 2016. End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional LSTM-CNNs-CRF. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1064–1074, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chaitanya Malaviya, Matthew R Gormley, and Graham Neubig. 2018. Neural factor graph models for cross-lingual morphological tagging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04570*.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. 2023. Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9004–9017.
- William C Mann and Sandra A Thompson. 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, 8(3):243–281.

- Jiayuan Mao, Chuang Gan, Pushmeet Kohli, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Jiajun Wu. 2019. [The neuro-symbolic concept learner: Interpreting scenes, words, and sentences from natural supervision](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- A. Martins, M. A. T. Figueiredo, P. Aguiar, N. A. Smith, and E. P. Xing. 2015. Ad3: Alternating directions dual decomposition for map inference in graphical models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(Mar):495–545.
- R Thomas McCoy, Shunyu Yao, Dan Friedman, Matthew Hardy, and Thomas L Griffiths. 2023. Embers of autoregression: Understanding large language models through the problem they are trained to solve. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13638*.
- Maitrey Mehta, Valentina Pyatkin, and Vivek Srikumar. 2024. [Promptly predicting structures: The return of inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 112–130, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qiang Ning, Zhili Feng, Hao Wu, and Dan Roth. 2018. [Joint reasoning for temporal and causal relations](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2278–2288, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Maria Leonor Pacheco and Dan Goldwasser. 2021. [Modeling content and context with deep relational learning](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:100–119.
- Martha Palmer, Daniel Gildea, and Nianwen Xue. 2010. *Semantic Role Labeling*, 1st edition. Morgan and Claypool Publishers.
- Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue, Olga Uryupina, and Yuchen Zhang. 2012. Conll-2012 shared task: Modeling multilingual unrestricted coreference in ontonotes. In *Joint conference on EMNLP and CoNLL-shared task*, pages 1–40.
- Connor Pryor, Quan Yuan, Jeremiah Liu, Mehran Kazemi, Deepak Ramachandran, Tania Bedrax-Weiss, and Lise Getoor. 2023. [Using domain knowledge to guide dialog structure induction via neural probabilistic soft logic](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7631–7652, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. 2018. [Improving language understanding by generative pre-training](#).
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(1).
- Dan Roth and Wen-tau Yih. 2005. [Integer linear programming inference for conditional random fields](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML ’05*, page 736–743, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Shamik Roy, Nishanth Sridhar Nakshatri, and Dan Goldwasser. 2022. [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)*, pages 183–196, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shamik Roy, Maria Leonor Pacheco, and Dan Goldwasser. 2021. [Identifying morality frames in political tweets using relational learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9939–9958, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vivek Srikumar and Dan Roth. 2023. [The integer linear programming inference cookbook](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.00171.
- Jian Su, Xiaofeng Yang, Huaqing Hong, Yuka Tateisi, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. 2008. Coreference resolution in biomedical texts: a machine learning approach. *Ontologies and Text Mining for Life Sciences*, 8.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher Manning. 2023. [Just ask for calibration: Strategies for eliciting calibrated confidence scores from language models fine-tuned with human feedback](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5433–5442, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.

David Weiss, Chris Alberti, Michael Collins, and Slav Petrov. 2015. [Structured training for neural network transition-based parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 323–333, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Manuel Widmoser, Maria Leonor Pacheco, Jean Honorio, and Dan Goldwasser. 2021. [Randomized deep structured prediction for discourse-level processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 1174–1184, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. 2022. [An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Miao Xiong, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinyang Lu, Yifei Li, Jie Fu, Junxian He, and Bryan Hooi. 2023. Can llms express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13063*.

Miao Xiong, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinyang Lu, YIFEI LI, Jie Fu, Junxian He, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. [Can LLMs express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in LLMs](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Shengyu Zhang, Linfeng Dong, Xiaoya Li, Sen Zhang, Xiaofei Sun, Shuhe Wang, Jiwei Li, Runyi Hu, Tianwei Zhang, Fei Wu, et al. 2023. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792*.

Xiao Zhang, Maria Leonor Pacheco, Chang Li, and Dan Goldwasser. 2016. [Introducing DRAIL – a step towards declarative deep relational learning](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Structured Prediction for NLP*, pages 54–62, Austin, TX. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Coref Prompt Details

Tables 6 and 7 display the prompt templates used in the coreference tasks for the white box (4.1) and black box (4.2) prompting strategies respectively. Each strategy relies on the sentences that contain each entity mention being compared ([sent1], [sent2]) and the entity mentions themselves ([entity1], [entity2]). Additionally, the generation description strategy uses one of the variations in Table 8 as generation instructions.

B Morality Frames Prompt Details

We split the Morality Frames structured prediction task into two subproblems. The prompt details for

each of our prompting strategies when applied to the moral foundation classification subproblem can be found in Tables 9 and 10. The prompt details for the moral role classification subproblem can be found in Tables 11 and 12. For each subproblem we actually prompt in two different ways. In the first template we provide just the tweet itself as the [Tweet Context]. In the second template we provide the tweet, the political ideology of the tweet author, and the topic of the tweet as the [Tweet Context]. Additionally, for all strategies we provide the definitions of the associated moral foundations and roles.

C Extended Coref Results

Tables 15 and 16 show the full results for the llama and mistral models across all five prompting strategies (4) on the GENIA coreference dataset (Su et al., 2008). Tables 17 and 18 show the full results on the OntoNotes coreference dataset (Pradhan et al., 2012).

D Extended Morality Frames Results

Tables 19 and 20 show the full results for the llama and mistral models across all five prompting strategies (4) on the Morality Frames structured prediction task (Roy et al., 2021).

E Morality Frames Hyperparameter Details

For all strategies in the few shot case we use a topk of 5 and a temperature of 0.5. For the generation sampling and verbalized confidence strategies, we sample 10 generations per each instance of a subproblem. For the generative classification method we use 10 different variations of a generation description as found in tables 13 and 14.

For all fine-tuning strategies, we tune our hyperparameters based on the average performance on the dev split over five fold cross validation. For the logistic regression models using the pre-trained LLM model scores as input, we use a learning rate of 0.01 and batch size of 32 for both the locally and globally calibrated models. For the fine-tuned LLM model scores, our regression models use a learning rate of 0.001 and batch size of 64 when locally calibrated and a learning rate of 0.01 and batch size of 16 when globally calibrated. For the supervised fine tuning of the LLM itself, we use LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) with a rank and alpha value

of 512, a batch size of 2, gradient accumulation steps of 16 and a learning rate of 2E-05. For the structured calibration we continue tuning the same LoRA weights with a batch size of 4, gradient accumulation steps of 16, and a learning rate of 2E-06.

F Coreference Hyperparameter Details

For all strategies in the few shot case for both the GENIA and OntoNotes coreference datasets we use a topk of 5 and a temperature of 0.5. For the generation sampling and verbalized confidence strategies, we sample 10 generations per each instance of a subproblem. For the generative classification method, we use 10 different variations of a generation description as found in table 8.

For all fine-tuning strategies on the GENIA dataset we use the dev set for hyperparameter selection and report results on the test set. We use the same train/test split as [Mehta et al. \(2024\)](#). For the logistic regression models used on the pre-trained LLM scores, we use a learning rate of 0.001 and batch size of 32 for the locally calibrated models and a learning rate of 0.01 and batching done at the document level for the globally calibrated models. For the regression models trained on the fine-tuned scores, we use a learning rate of 0.01 and document batching for both locally and globally calibrated models. As with the Morality Frames task, we use LoRA for LLM fine-tuning with a rank and alpha of 512. For the supervised fine tuned model, we use a batch size of 2, gradient accumulation steps of 16, and a learning rate of 2E-6. For structured fine tuning, we continue tuning the same LoRA weights with a learning rate of 1E-6, a batch size of 8, and gradient accumulation steps of 32.

Prompting Strategy	Prompt Format
True/False	<p>Consider the task of coreference resolution, where the goal is to identify whether or not two different entity mentions refer to the same underlying entity. Given two entity mentions and their representative sentences, answer the following true/false question regarding whether the two entity mentions refer to the same entity.</p> <p>Entity 1: [entity1] Sentence 1: [sent1] Entity 2: [entity2] Sentence 2: [sent2]</p> <p>Q. "The entity "[entity1]" mentioned in Sentence 1 and the entity "[entity2]" mentioned in Sentence 2 are [label] entities." - true or false? A.</p>
Multiple Choice	<p>Consider the task of coreference resolution, where the goal is to identify whether or not two different entity mentions refer to the same underlying entity. Given two entity mentions and their representative sentences, answer the following multiple choice question regarding whether or not the two entity mentions are coreferent or not. Answer only with the letter corresponding to the correct answer.</p> <p>Entity 1: [entity1] Sentence 1: [sent1] Entity 2: [entity2] Sentence 2: [sent2]</p> <p>Q. What is the relationship between the entity "[entity1]" mentioned in Sentence 1 and "[entity2]" mentioned in Sentence 2? (A) Coreferent (B) Distinct</p>
Generative Classification	<p>Consider the task of coreference resolution. Given two entities mentions that are either coreferent or distinct, generate two sentences each containing one of the entity mentions.</p> <p>Generate two sentences based on the following description:</p> <p>Generation Description: [Generation Description] Sentence 1: [sent1] Sentence 2: [sent2]</p>

Table 6: Coreference prompt templates for each of the white-box prompting strategies (4.1). The [Generation Description] variable refers to one of the generation descriptions in Table 8. [label] is either 'coreferent' or 'distinct'.

Prompting Strategy	Prompt Format
Generation Sampling	<p>Consider the task of coreference resolution, where the goal is to identify whether or not two different entity mentions refer to the same underlying entity. Given two entity mentions and their representative sentences, identify whether the entity mentions are coreferent or distinct. Answer only with "coreferent" or "distinct" and do not provide any justification or explanation.</p> <p>Entity 1: [entity1] Sentence 1: [sent1] Entity 2: [entity2] Sentence 2: [sent2]</p> <p>Q. What is the relationship between the entity "[entity1]" mentioned in Sentence 1 and "[entity2]" mentioned in Sentence 2? Answer only with "coreferent" or "distinct" and do not provide any justification or explanation.</p>
Verbalized Confidence	<p>Consider the task of coreference resolution, where the goal is to identify whether or not two different entity mentions refer to the same underlying entity. Given two entity mentions and their representative sentences, identify whether the entity mentions are coreferent or distinct. Please answer with the following format: "Confidence: [the probability that the two entity mentions are [label] (0-100), please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]"</p> <p>Entity 1: [entity1] Sentence 1: [sent1] Entity 2: [entity2] Sentence 2: [sent2]</p> <p>Q: How likely is it that the two entity mentions are [label]. Do not elaborate on your answer or provide any explanation, answer only with the confidence value in the following format:</p> <p>"Confidence: [the probability that the two entity mentions are [label] (0-100), please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]"</p>

Table 7: Coreference prompt templates for each of the black-box prompting strategies (4.2). [label] is either 'coreferent' or 'distinct'.

Generation Description
"The entity mention '[entity1]' in the first sentence and the entity mention of '[entity2]' in the second sentence are [label]"
"The mention of '[entity1]' in sentence one and '[entity2]' in sentence two are considered [label]."
"'[entity1]' from the first sentence and '[entity2]' from the second sentence are labeled as [label]."
"In the first sentence, '[entity1]' is mentioned, and in the second sentence, '[entity2]' is mentioned — these are [label]."
"The entities '[entity1]' and '[entity2]', from the first and second sentences respectively, are [label]."
"We determine that '[entity1]' in sentence one and '[entity2]' in sentence two are [label]."
"There is a mention of '[entity1]' in the first sentence and of '[entity2]' in the second; they are [label]."
"According to the sentence context, '[entity1]' and '[entity2]' are identified as [label]."
"It is determined that the entity '[entity1]' in the first sentence and '[entity2]' in the second sentence are [label]."
"In the first sentence, the mention of '[entity1]', and in the second, the mention of '[entity2]', are considered [label]."

Table 8: Generation descriptions used for the generative classification strategy (4.1). As with [Kumar et al. \(2024\)](#), we generated these variations using ChatGPT with the following prompt: Write 10 paraphrases of this sentence as a Python list. "The entity mention [entity1] in the first sentence and the entity mention of [entity2] in the second sentence are [label]."

Prompting Strategy	Prompt Format
True/False	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral foundation present in a tweet from a U.S congress member. The five moral foundations and their corresponding definitions are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame Definitions]</p> <p>Given the moral foundations, their definitions, and the task of identifying the foundation present in a tweet, answer the following true/false question regarding whether a specific moral foundation is present in a tweet.</p> <p>[Tweet Context]</p> <p>Q. "The moral foundation expressed in the tweet is [label]." - true or false? A.</p>
Multiple Choice	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral foundation present in a tweet from a U.S congress member. The five moral foundations and their corresponding definitions are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame Definitions]</p> <p>Given the moral foundations, their definitions, and the task of identifying the foundation present in a tweet, answer the following multiple choice questions regarding whether a specific moral foundation is present in a tweet. Answer only with the letter corresponding to the correct answer.</p> <p>[Tweet Context]</p> <p>Q. What moral foundation is being expressed in the given tweet? Choices: (A) CARE/HARM (B) FAIRNESS/CHEATING (C) AUTHORITY/SUBVERSION (D) PURITY/DEGRADATION (E) LOYALTY/BETRAYAL</p>
Generative Classification	<p>Consider the task of generating a tweet made by a U.S congress member given a description of the moral foundation that is being expressed in the tweet. The five moral foundations and their corresponding definitions are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame Definitions]</p> <p>Given the moral foundations and their definitions, generate a tweet given a description of the tweet. Generate a tweet based on the following description: Generation description: [Generation Description] Tweet: [Tweet]</p>

Table 9: Prompt templates for the moral foundation classification subproblem for each of the white-box strategies (4.1). [Generation Description] refers to one of the generation descriptions found in Table 13. [label] is one of the five moral foundations (Care/Harm, Fairness/Cheating, Loyalty/Betrayal, Authority/Subversion, and Purity/Degradation).

Prompting Strategy	Prompt Format
Generation Sampling	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral foundation present in a tweet from a U.S congress member. The five moral foundations and their corresponding definitions are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame Definitions]</p> <p>Given the moral foundations and their definitions, identify the foundation present in the given tweet. Only answer with the correct moral foundation and do not provide any justification or explanation.</p> <p>[Tweet Context]</p> <p>Q. What moral foundation is being expressed in the given tweet?</p>
Verbalized Confidence	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral foundation present in a tweet. The five moral foundations and their corresponding definitions are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame Definitions]</p> <p>Given the moral foundations and their definitions and the task of identifying the foundation present in a tweet. Estimate the probability that the specified moral foundation is expressed in the tweet. Please answer with the following format: “Confidence: [the probability of answer [label] to be correct (0-100), not the one you think correct, please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]”</p> <p>Question: What is the moral foundation present in the following tweet: [Tweet Context]?</p> <p>Possible Answer: [label]</p> <p>Q: How likely is the above answer to be correct? Do not elaborate on your answer or provide any explanation, answer only with the confidence value in the following format:</p> <p>“Confidence: [the probability of answer [label] to be correct (0-100), not the one you think correct, please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]”</p>

Table 10: Prompt templates for the moral foundation classification subproblem for each of the black-box strategies (4.2). [label] is one of the five moral foundations (Care/Harm, Fairness/Cheating, Loyalty/Betrayal, Authority/Subversion, and Purity/Degradation).

Prompting Strategy	Prompt Format
True/False	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral role of an entity present in a tweet from a U.S congress member. Definitions for the five moral foundations and their associated roles are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame/Role Definitions]</p> <p>Given the possible moral roles, the definitions of their associated moral foundations, and the task of identifying the moral role of an entity in a tweet, answer the following true/false question regarding whether an entity is expressing a particular moral role in a tweet.</p> <p>[Tweet Context]</p> <p>Q. "The moral role of "[Entity]" expressed in the tweet is [label]." - true or false? A.</p>
Multiple Choice	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral role of an entity present in a tweet from a U.S congress member. Definitions for the five moral foundations and their associated roles are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame/Role Definitions]</p> <p>Given the possible moral roles, the definitions of their associated moral foundations, and the task of identifying the moral role of an entity in a tweet, answer the following multiple choice question regarding whether an entity is expressing a particular moral role in a tweet. Answer only with the letter corresponding to the correct answer.</p> <p>[Tweet Context]</p> <p>Q. What is the moral role of "[Entity]" expressed in the given tweet?</p> <p>(A) Target of care/harm (B) Entity causing harm (C) Entity providing care (D) Target of fairness/cheating (E) Entity ensuring fairness ...</p>
Generative Classification	<p>Consider the task of generating a tweet made by a U.S congress member given a description of the moral role being expressed by an entity in the tweet. Definitions for the five moral foundations and their associated moral roles are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame/Role Definitions]</p> <p>Given the possible moral roles and the definitions of their associated moral foundations, generate a tweet about a given entity expressing a particular moral role.</p> <p>Generate a tweet based on the following description: Generation description: [Generation Description] Tweet: [Tweet]</p>

Table 11: Prompt templates for the moral role identification subproblem for each of the white-box strategies (4.1). [Generation Description] refers to one of the generation descriptions found in Table 14. [label] is one of the sixteen possible moral roles (Target of care/harm, Entity causing harm, Entity providing care, Target of fairness/cheating, Entity ensuring fairness, Entity doing cheating, Target of loyalty/betrayal, Entity being loyal, Entity doing betrayal, Justified authority, Justified authority over, Failing authority, Failing authority over, Target of purity/degradation, Entity preserving purity, Entity causing degradation).

Prompting Strategy	Prompt Format
Generation Sampling	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral role of an entity present in a tweet from a U.S congress member. Definitions for the five moral foundations and their associated roles are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame/Role Definitions]</p> <p>Given the possible moral roles and the definitions of their associated moral foundations, identify the moral role of an entity in a tweet. Only answer with the correct moral role for the entity and do not provide any justification or explanation.</p> <p>[Tweet Context]</p> <p>Q. What is the moral role of "[Entity]" expressed in the given tweet?</p>
Verbalized Confidence	<p>Consider the task of identifying the moral role of an entity present in a tweet. Definitions for the five moral foundations and their associated roles are given below:</p> <p>[Moral Frame/Role Definitions]</p> <p>Given the possible moral roles, the definitions of their associated moral foundations, and the task of identifying the moral role of an entity in a tweet. Please answer with the following format:</p> <p>“Confidence: [the probability of answer [label] to be correct (0-100), not the one you think correct, please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]”</p> <p>Question: What is the moral role of the entity "[Entity]" expressed in the following tweet: [Tweet Context]?</p> <p>Possible Answer: [label]</p> <p>Q: How likely is the above answer to be correct? Do not elaborate on your answer or provide any explanation, answer only with the confidence value in the following format:</p> <p>“Confidence: [the probability of answer [label] to be correct (0-100), not the one you think correct, please only include the numerical number in the range of 0-100]”</p>

Table 12: Prompt templates for the moral role identification subproblem for each of the back-box strategies (4.2). [label] is one of the sixteen possible moral roles (Target of care/harm, Entity causing harm, Entity providing care, Target of fairness/cheating, Entity ensuring fairness, Entity doing cheating, Target of loyalty/betrayal, Entity being loyal, Entity doing betrayal, Justified authority, Justified authority over, Failing authority, Failing authority over, Target of purity/degradation, Entity preserving purity, Entity causing degradation).

Generation Description
"This tweet expresses the moral foundation [Moral Foundation] which is defined as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"This tweet reflects the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], which is defined as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"The tweet showcases the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], described as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"In this tweet, the moral foundation [Moral Foundation] is expressed, defined as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"This tweet highlights the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], which means: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"The moral foundation [Moral Foundation] is conveyed in this tweet, defined as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"This tweet demonstrates the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], described as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"In this tweet, the author expresses the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], which is defined as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"This tweet communicates the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], described as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"
"This tweet conveys the moral foundation [Moral Foundation], defined as: [Moral Foundation Definition]"

Table 13: Generation descriptions used for the generative classification strategy (4.1) on the morality foundation classification subproblem. As with Kumar et al. (2024), we generated these variations using ChatGPT with the following prompt: Write 10 paraphrases of this sentence as a Python list. "This tweet expresses the moral foundation [Moral Foundation] which is defined as [Moral Foundation Definition]."

Generation Description
"In this tweet, the entity [Entity] displays the moral role [Moral Role], defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"This tweet shows the entity [Entity] exhibiting the moral role [Moral Role], which is defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"The entity [Entity] in this tweet demonstrates the moral role [Moral Role], described as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"In this tweet, [Entity] reflects the moral role [Moral Role], which is defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"[Entity] in this tweet exemplifies the moral role [Moral Role], defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"This tweet portrays the entity [Entity] as embodying the moral role [Moral Role], described as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"The entity [Entity] in this tweet illustrates the moral role [Moral Role], which is defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"[Entity] shows the moral role [Moral Role] in this tweet, defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"In this tweet, [Entity] reveals the moral role [Moral Role], defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"
"This tweet features [Entity] expressing the moral role [Moral Role], which is defined as: [Moral Role Definition]"

Table 14: Generation descriptions used for the generative classification strategy (4.1) on the morality role identification subproblem. As with Kumar et al. (2024), we generated these variations using ChatGPT with the following prompt: Write 10 paraphrases of this sentence as a Python list. "This entity [Entity] in this tweet exhibits the moral role [Moral Role] defined as [Moral Role Definition]."

Method	Shots	F1	Viol.
True/False	0	0.695	106502
+ constr		0.758	0
Multiple Choice	0	0.427	345664
+ constr		0.420	0
Generation Sampling	0	0.566	249450
+ constr		<u>0.598</u>	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	<u>0.321</u>	338178
+ constr		0.269	0
Generative Classification	0	<u>0.357</u>	364712
+ constr		0.305	0
True/False	5	0.731	89982
+ constr		0.797	0
Multiple Choice	5	0.665	131086
+ constr		<u>0.719</u>	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.750	55980
+ constr		<u>0.779</u>	0

Table 15: Full Co-reference results for the GENIA dataset (Su et al., 2008) using Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct across all five prompting strategies (4).

Method	Shots	F1	Viol.
True/False	0	0.763	21264
+ constr		0.774	0
Multiple Choice	0	<u>0.476</u>	53008
+ constr		0.455	0
Generation Sampling	0	<u>0.661</u>	51524
+ constr		0.657	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	<u>0.423</u>	44480
+ constr		0.291	0
Generative Classification	0	<u>0.315</u>	27062
+ constr		0.272	0
True/False	5	0.753	36884
+ constr		<u>0.777</u>	0
Multiple Choice	5	0.801	24928
+ constr		<u>0.830</u>	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.834	15086
+ constr		0.842	0

Table 17: Full Co-reference results for the OntoNotes dataset (Pradhan et al., 2012) using Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct across all five prompting strategies (4).

Method	Shots	F1	Viol.
True/False	0	0.772	42054
+ constr		0.795	0
Multiple Choice	0	<u>0.600</u>	163160
+ constr		0.592	0
Generation Sampling	0	0.658	128512
+ constr		<u>0.686</u>	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	<u>0.599</u>	123272
+ constr		0.577	0
Generative Classification	0	<u>0.219</u>	259610
+ constr		0.150	0
True/False	5	0.799	29808
+ constr		0.823	0
Multiple Choice	5	0.721	72303
+ constr		<u>0.759</u>	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.747	48570
+ constr		<u>0.781</u>	0

Table 16: Full Co-reference results for the GENIA dataset (Su et al., 2008) using Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 across all five prompting strategies (4).

Method	Shots	F1	Viol.
True/False	0	0.747	9540
+ constr		0.729	0
Multiple Choice	0	<u>0.648</u>	42444
+ constr		0.627	0
Generation Sampling	0	<u>0.709</u>	32312
+ constr		0.702	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	0.506	25872
+ constr		<u>0.512</u>	0
Generative Classification	0	<u>0.397</u>	47794
+ constr		0.371	0
True/False	5	0.815	15212
+ constr		0.820	0
Multiple Choice	5	0.741	32712
+ constr		<u>0.748</u>	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.792	21858
+ constr		<u>0.799</u>	0

Table 18: Full Co-reference results for the OntoNotes dataset (Pradhan et al., 2012) using Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 across all five prompting strategies (4).

Method	Shots	Micro F1		Macro F1		Constraint Violations	
		MF	Role	MF	Role	C1	C2
True/False	0	0.369	0.347	0.401	0.247	1079	330
+ constr		<u>0.429</u>	0.362	<u>0.437</u>	0.293	0	0
Multiple Choice	0	0.403	0.291	0.374	0.184	830	501
+ constr		<u>0.445</u>	<u>0.332</u>	<u>0.412</u>	<u>0.231</u>	0	0
Generation Sampling	0	0.326	<u>0.363</u>	0.317	0.239	981	172
+ constr		<u>0.371</u>	0.351	<u>0.331</u>	<u>0.263</u>	0	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	0.416	0.261	0.418	0.180	1275	312
+ constr		<u>0.435</u>	<u>0.322</u>	<u>0.437</u>	<u>0.274</u>	0	0
Generative Classification	0	0.410	0.274	0.426	0.211	1072	338
+ constr		0.498	<u>0.295</u>	0.483	<u>0.245</u>	0	0
True/False	2	0.448	0.386	0.422	0.313	1053	215
+ constr		<u>0.486</u>	0.391	<u>0.467</u>	0.346	0	0
Multiple Choice	2	0.457	0.348	0.447	0.273	1133	234
+ constr		0.530	<u>0.386</u>	0.512	<u>0.321</u>	0	0
Generation Sampling	2	<u>0.461</u>	0.354	<u>0.492</u>	0.271	1113	155
+ constr		0.451	<u>0.357</u>	0.475	<u>0.324</u>	0	0
True/False	5	0.498	0.444	0.466	0.378	1195	102
+ constr		<u>0.517</u>	0.452	0.521	0.408	0	0
Multiple Choice	5	0.451	0.319	0.454	0.219	1254	219
+ constr		0.528	<u>0.361</u>	<u>0.516</u>	<u>0.277</u>	0	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.389	0.387	0.419	0.276	1241	128
+ constr		<u>0.456</u>	<u>0.388</u>	<u>0.447</u>	<u>0.317</u>	0	0

Table 19: Full Results for the Morality Frames task (Roy et al., 2021) using Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct for each of the five confidence elicitation methods (4), both with and without combinatorial inference.

Method	Shots	Micro F1		Macro F1		Constraint Violations	
		MF	Role	MF	Role	C1	C2
True/False	0	0.352	0.350	0.274	0.213	974	459
+ constr		<u>0.457</u>	<u>0.353</u>	0.352	0.206	0	0
Multiple Choice	0	0.407	0.290	0.207	<u>0.154</u>	645	400
+ constr		<u>0.415</u>	0.386	<u>0.251</u>	0.145	0	0
Generation Sampling	0	0.347	<u>0.329</u>	0.214	<u>0.195</u>	1133	306
+ constr		<u>0.382</u>	0.262	<u>0.351</u>	0.192	0	0
Verbalized Confidence	0	0.412	0.238	0.239	<u>0.136</u>	617	547
+ constr		0.430	<u>0.267</u>	<u>0.248</u>	0.132	0	0
Generative Classification	0	0.374	0.189	0.333	0.140	1307	346
+ constr		<u>0.415</u>	<u>0.217</u>	<u>0.365</u>	<u>0.183</u>	0	0
True/False	2	0.444	0.427	0.317	0.306	1332	197
+ constr		0.528	0.436	0.495	0.358	0	0
Multiple Choice	2	0.453	0.317	0.433	0.201	1159	213
+ constr		<u>0.491</u>	<u>0.367</u>	<u>0.452</u>	<u>0.252</u>	0	0
Generation Sampling	2	0.401	<u>0.354</u>	0.388	0.233	1348	158
+ constr		<u>0.440</u>	0.333	<u>0.417</u>	<u>0.252</u>	0	0
True/False	5	0.500	0.464	0.483	0.354	1214	151
+ constr		0.536	0.426	0.513	0.377	0	0
Multiple Choice	5	0.458	0.332	<u>0.433</u>	0.224	1109	228
+ constr		<u>0.498</u>	<u>0.384</u>	0.426	<u>0.246</u>	0	0
Generation Sampling	5	0.357	<u>0.368</u>	0.386	0.214	1464	180
+ constr		<u>0.412</u>	0.346	0.376	<u>0.230</u>	0	0

Table 20: Full Results for the Morality Frames task (Roy et al., 2021) using Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 for each of the five confidence elicitation methods (4), both with and without combinatorial inference.