Author profiling

Lovre Mrčela, Marko Ratković, Ante Žužul

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing Unska 3, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

{lovre.mrcela, marko.ratkovic, ante.zuzul}@fer.hr

Abstract

The goal of this project was to profile an author by analyzing a set of texts written by them, and then determining degree of each the Big Five personality traits. In addition, gender and age—group for each author are derived as well. The dataset was collected from twitter profiles, in English, Italian, Spanish and Dutch. Approach was based on *tf-idf*, considering occurences of trigrams.

1. Introduction

Author profiling deals with problem of describing someone's personality, by means of extracting information from their writing style. Personality can be described using five traits (the so-called "Big Five personality traits"), which are: extraversion, stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience. Degrees of each trait range from -0.5 (indicating the total opposite), to 0.5 (indicating the exact match).

Provided with degrees of the five traits, it is possible to determine author's gender and age–group, via classification based on a model trained on previously labelled data. In this project, we used the linear SVC and Gaussian naive Bayes models for the classification into gender and age–group, and the linear regression with squared error measure for determining the degrees of personality traits. The training set we used was a collection of twitter posts in English, Spanish, Italian and Dutch authors, ranging from around 35 authors in Dutch to 150 in English, each author's file containing about 100 posts.

2. Approach

In this section, the methods of our approach are thoroughly explained. First, the preprocessing of input text is carried out, and weighted vector of trigrams (three consecutive letters) is obtained. Then, from preprocessed text some additional feature vectors, which were reasonably expected to be discriminative, are extracted. Finally, gender and age—group classification and personality traits regression models are trained on extracted features, and final results are compared for various parameters.

2.1. Text preprocessing

For the rest of the process to be optimal, some sort of text preprocessing needs to be done on the raw input data. The input data we use is given in *xml* format, so the first step in preprocessing was to parse the actual sentences from the *xml* structure. When that is done, following steps are also applied:

• *urls* to other sites are substituted with an URL tag, and usernames (when referenced in replies) are substituted with a REPLY tag,

- all the text is converted to lower case because we don't deal with capitalization of words, only with words themselves;
- more than 3 repetitions of the same letter are reduced to 3 letters, so that the words like "coooool" (5 repetitions) and "coooooool" (7 repetitions) are both treated as the same word, but distinctly from "cool", because while we want to take repetitions into account, we would like to ignore the quantity of repeated letters (see the Section 2.2.);
- stop words (for that particular language) are deleted from the text, because they are considered unsignificant for author profiling.

Each three consecutive letters are grouped into trigrams, and weighted vector of trigrams is obtained, using *tf-idf* weighting scheme. The extracted trigram weighted vector is used as one feature. More features are then extracted from preprocessed text, as described in the next subsection.

2.2. Additional feature extraction

In addition to weighted vector of trigrams, we decided to investigate some further characteristics of the written corpora, which were expected to be discriminative for the gender and/or age—group. Here is the list of cosidered additional features, and explanation for each of them:

- number of emoticons: the average number of emoticons used in a post (e.g. :), <3; not considering each emoticon distinctly but all of them in total),
- number of consecutive long repetitions of letters: as mentioned before, we count only occurences of repetitions longer than 3 letters, not the length of repetitions themselves these repetitions most of the time do not have constant number of letters, even for the same author, or the same post, so it is a better approach to take into account only instances of repetitions;
- **number of replies:** the average number of replies to another user per each post,
- **number of hashtags:** the average number of hashtags per post,

 number of exclamation marks: the average number of exclamation marks (!) per post – each exclamation marks is counted, as we considered that, opposed to the consecutive repetition of letters, repeated exclamation marks do indicate author's stronger emotion to a some degree.

It was expected for some of the features to be present in a greater degree in some subpopulations compared to the other (i.e. younger vs. older, male vs. female). The obtained results respective to each feature are shown in the section 4...

2.3. Gender and age-group classification

For the gender and age-group classification subproblem, following approaches were considered:

- · logistic regression
- · naive Bayes classifier
- · decision tree classifier
- · random forest classifier
- SVC (using *rbf*, linear, poly- or sigmoid kernels)

Results of using each approach are compared in the table ??. The best result was obtained by using SVC with linear learned.

2.4. Personality traits regression

For the personality traits regression, following approaches were considered:

- linear regression
- decision tree regressor
- random forest regressor
- SVR (using various kernels)

Results of using each approach are compared in the table ??. The best result was obtained by using SVR and linear regression.

3. Testing

Testing. Due to the lack of access to the official testing dataset (because of an ongoing competition), the official training dataset was divided into a subset for training (around 70%) and a subset for testing (around 30%).

4. Results

The results.

5. Conclusion

The conclusion.

Acknowledgements

If suited, before inserting the literature references you can include the Acknowledgements section in order to thank those who helped you in any way to deliver the paper, but are not co-authors of the paper.

References

- Judith Butcher. 1981. *Copy-editing*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition.
- K. E. Chave. 1964. Skeletal durability and preservation. In J. Imbrie and N. Newel, editors, *Approaches to paleoecology*, pages 377–87, New York. Wiley.
- N. Chomsky. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In S. R. Anderson and P. Kiparsky, editors, *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, New York. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- W. B. Croft. 1978. Organizing and searching large files of document descriptions. Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University.
- F. Feigl, 1958. *Spot Tests in Organic Analysis*, chapter 6. Publisher publisher, 5th edition.
- W. W. Howells. 1951. Factors of human physique. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 9:159–192.
- G. B. Johnson and W. W. Howells. 1974. Title title title title title title title title title. *Journal journal journal*.
- G. B. Johnson, W. W. Howells, and A. N. Other. 1976. Title title. *Journal journal journal*.