Resumes Named Entity Recognition with Conditional Random Fields

A01703947@exatec.tec.mx

Dr. Benjamín Valdés Aguirre
bvaldes@tec.mx

***Abstract*— We propose Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consecteuer**

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Literature Review

A. Named Entity Recognition (NER)

B. Conditional Random Fields (CRF)

III. Related Work

Resumes fall into the category of semi-structured documents. This characteristic poses a challenge for traditional parsing methods because the contents, although usually grouped by topic, do not share a single format. Computer scientists have had to rely on natural language processing (NLP) techniques to extract the relevant content. Different authors have used part of speech (POS) tagging, *stop word* removal, and stemming to process the resume text content [1], [2], [3].

A. English Resume Parsing

Roy et al. [3] performed another survey of different classifier models such as Random Forests, Multinomial Naive Bayes, Logistic Regression, and Linear Support Vector Machines (LSVM). Their objective was to classify resumes into different job sectors such as sales, consulting, finance, technology, etc. To feed the data into the models they had to remove junk characters, and *stop words* from the resumes. They also had to use stemming and lemmatization. This led to data loss, which is mentioned in the limitations. However, their objective was not to gather the specifics of their resumes, but instead to get a general idea of the candidate profile. Their research showed that the most performant model was the LSVM, with an average accuracy of 78.53%.

This survey showcases that for resume parsing the best model is usually the model that excels at sequence analysis. It shouldn't come as a surprise since resumes are semi-structured documents.

On this note, Ayishathahira et al. [2] focused on effectively gathering named entities by comparing the performance of four models:

- Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)
- Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory (Bi-LSTM)
- Conditional Random Field (CRF)
- Bi-LSTM and CNN combination (Bi-LSTM-CNN)

They worked with a dataset of 800 resumes sourced privately by one of their sponsors. They removed punctuations and other extraneous characters as well. Nevertheless, the authors didn't use lemmatization or stemming which allowed the sequences to remain mostly intact.

Ayishathahira et. al defined 23 labels to classify information about a candidate's education, occupation, and identification. They trained the models to discover that the CRF implementation yielded the best results. On average, the CRF model had an F-score of 83.70% while the Bi-LSTM-CNN had an F-score of 68.43%. The CRF model beat the Bi-LSTM-CNN model across all the labels, with an average improvement of 15.26%.

The CRF model showed great advantages over its counterparts. It is relatively fast to train, needing less than half an hour to go through the authors' dataset. This speed, combined with its accuracy, makes the CRF model a great candidate to develop effective resume parsing tools.

E. Suhas and E. Manjunath [4] took Ayishathahira's [2] research even further and they were able to develop a mixed model that allowed them to match candidates with job postings. The model is a combination of Named Entity Recognition (NER) and Word2Vec embedding to find the cosine distance between entities in resumes and job postings.

They generated four different iterations of the NER model using, Stanford's NER model as a basis. They either removed more noise or increased the dataset size on each iteration and this translated to an F-score increase from about 52% to more than 80%. The largest increase, of about 15%, was achieved from the third iteration to the fourth iteration by introducing a dictionary of technical skills to the NER and increasing the window size.

Even though this study had a smaller dataset than Ayishathahira's [2], they were able to achieve similar results. Since it is a time-consuming and arduous process to prepare these datasets, this strategy is a great alternative to get the most out of the available resources.

B. Spanish Named Entity Recognition

Based on the research done for English corpus, Copara et. al [5] developed a model that allowed named entity recognition for Spanish text. They decided to evaluate their model by using the CoNLL-2002 (Spanish) dataset since it allows them to compare their performance against the state of the art.

The authors decided to use word embedding and clustering in hopes of achieving better results. They used a large corpus of text both in Spanish and English to generate robust embeddings. Their baseline model achieved an F-Score of 80.02%. After adding embedding and clustering, they were able to increase this score to 82.30%. They noticed that there are words that are more likely to belong to one class than to another class and decided to use distributional prototypes to leverage this pattern. After adding prototypes, the model's F-Score dropped to 81.19%. Nevertheless, they had the hypothesis that some entities share very similar features across languages and decided to use the Brown clusters from English. The model's F-score increased to 82.44%.

Although the study didn't cover resumes specifically, it showcased various strategies to get better performance, even with a Spanish dataset. The most impressive observation is that the CRF model performed very similarly to the current state-of-the-art Deep Learning models.

IV. Problem Statement

According to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), in 2019, an estimated average of 3.8 million workers searched for work daily [6]. The same report estimated a daily average of 1.4 million job offer calls [6]. The supply is almost three times the demand, and it presents itself as an unmanageable task for recruiters across the region. Finding the best employee for a position is time-consuming since it requires combing through many candidates, and often missing essential information.

The problem is that while in English-speaking countries there are tools to aid companies to handle the sheer volume of applications, there is not enough research to create these tools for Spanish-speaking countries.

V. Solution

VI. Evaluation

VII. Results

VIII. Conclusions

IX. Future Work

- Unsupervised CRF features

A. Text Embedding

References

[1] S. Sanyal, N. Ghosh, S. Hazra, and S. Adhikary, "Resume Parser with Natural Language Processing," *International Journal of Engineering Science and Computing (IJESC)*, vol. 10, no. August, pp. 23–37, 2015.

[2] C. H. Ayishathahira, C. Sreejith, and C. Raseek, "Combination of Neural Networks and Conditional Random Fields for Efficient Resume Parsing," in *2018 International CET Conference on Control, Communication, and Computing (IC4)*, pp. 388–393, IEEE, 2018.

[3] P. K. Roy, S. S. Chowdhary, and R. Bhatia, "A Machine Learning approach for automation of Resume Recommendation system," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 167, no. 2019, pp. 2318–2327, 2020.

[4] S. H. E* and M. A E, "Differential Hiring using a Combination of NER and Word Embedding," *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE)*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1344–1349, 2020.

[5] J. Copara, J. Ochoa, C. Thorne, and G. Glavaš, "Spanish NER with Word Representations and Conditional Random Fields," in *Proceedings of NEWS 2016: 6th Named Entity Workshop at the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016*, pp. 34–40, 2016.

[6] M. Hilbert and K. Lu, "The online job market trace in Latin America and the Caribbean," tech. rep., Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), 2020.