

# Predicting Tik-Tok User Data Based on Video Data

GGteam: Will Chen, Katelyn Cai, Hannah Choi, Weston Slayton

2023-12-01

## Introduction and data

With over 1 billion users globally, TikTok is one of the fastest growing social platforms in the world. Understanding ubiquitous algorithm, which is said to generally account for account factors (likes and comments) and video information (captions, sounds, hashtags), is critical to understanding the app's many critiques, from [declining youth mental health outcomes](#) and its [addictive nature of its explore page](#). To better understand TikTok's social impact, we decided to explore TikTok's data and how follower count (a huge driver of engagement) is impacted by other aspects of a user's account, like average number of videos, average number of likes, and average number of comments.

The dataset comes from the 'top\_users\_vids.csv' file of this [Github repository](#), which was originally collected as part of the DataResolutions's Data Blog project exploring Tiktok's demographics and trending video analytics.

The original data curators collected the data using David Teather's open-source [Unofficial Tiktok API](#), which uses Python to scrape Tiktok data and fetch the most trending videos, specific user information, and much more. The curators expanded the list of users by collecting suggested users with the API's getSuggestedUsersbyIDCrawler method. Using byUsername, they then collected video data of the 25 most recent posts of each user. They also used the bySound method to collect videos using some of the most famous songs on TikTok.

## EDA

We begin our EDA process by first examining the dataset.

Currently, our dataset tiktok has 13 columns and 12,559 observations. Each row is a video. The columns cover attributes of each video such as video length, hashtags used, songs/sounds used, and statistics (number of likes, shares, comments, plays, followers, and total number of likes and videos across the account). Variables id, create\_time, video\_length, n\_likes, n\_shares,


n\_comments, n\_plays, n\_followers, n\_total\_likes, and n\_total\_vids are numerical while the others are categorical.

It is apparent that we must address the potential issue user\_name might have with the other columns. If we simply drop it, we could face multicollinearity, where the number of plays or likes on a video is closely tied to the user who posted it. So, excluding information about the user could lead to incomplete analysis, as the user-related factors become confounding variables. Getting rid of “user\_name” also means losing important user-specific details like followers, total likes, and total videos (n\_followers, n\_total\_likes, n\_total\_vids).

The less relevant variables are create time and video ID. In addition, hashtags and songs might not be useful. Most videos don’t include a hashtag and there are too many unique instances of them for it to be valuable in our analysis. We could consider binning hashtag into none and at least 1 hashtag(s), however that wouldn’t be useful for our analysis since its rare for tiktok followers to mind the number of hashtags. The same is true for songs; it wouldn’t be useful to categorize all original songs as similar since most of them could just be user-edited snippets of actual songs.

To address the issues mentioned above, we grouped the data by users and summarized relevant predictor variables by taking their mean. Our modified dataset has 8 columns and 254 observations, with each row being a user. No data leakage is introduced in this process since we are just summarizing by the means of the predictor variable per user. When this completed, we split our dataset into training and test sets:


Here’s a distribution of our response variable, user followers, from our training set.



The distribution of our response variable is unimodal and heavily right skewed. The mean and standard deviation are 16,220,526 and 7,710,869, respectively. And the min and max are

8,900,000 and 52,300,000, respectively. This means our dataset contains the upper range of users in terms of followers.

Here are the distributions for the predictor variables we are interested in:



## Methodology


We are using multiple linear regression to predict the number of followers a user has, over logistic regression because followers is a quantitative response variable. We start off with an initial model containing the predictor's likes, shares, comments, plays, video\_length (factor with 3 levels), total\_videos, and followers. Because Tiktok videos are commonly divided into 15-second, 1 minute, or 3 minute videos, we bin average video length into 3 levels, corresponding to "short", "medium" and "long." We also mean-center all our numerical variables to make our intercept meaningful, and we scale comments to hundreds, likes to millions, plays to tens of millions, shares to hundreds, and total\_videos to units for increased interpretability. Here is a tidy table of our initial model:

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value
(Intercept)	15546821.6	854032.14	18.2040	0.0000
likes	1723768.6	1732311.98	0.9951	0.3211
shares	-276802.5	94919.79	-2.9162	0.0040
comments	104112.5	58874.97	1.7684	0.0788
plays	497878.7	222533.44	2.2373	0.0266
video_lengthbin2	554321.5	1222113.23	0.4536	0.6507


term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value
video_lengthbin3	976400.0	1209972.15	0.8070	0.4208
total_videos	1524802.4	434095.14	3.5126	0.0006

## Conditions for Inference

In assessing linearity and constant variance, it is important to look at Residual vs. Fitted plots for quantitative predictor variables (likes, shares, comments, plays, and total vidoes) and look for patterns and fanning:




We can see from the residual plots that there doesn't appear to be any non-random patterns that violate linearity. Therefore, we can conclude that the linearity condition is satisfied. However, there does appear to be a clear outward fanning spread for each each predictor, meaning that constant variance is not satisfied. To solve this, we can log-transform our response variable (followers) and see if the fanning is minimized:



We can see that after log-transforming followers, the scale of our y axis decreases significantly. There is no clear outward fanning, but rather a lower density of points as you move to higher values on the x-axis. As such, we conclude the predictors satisfy constant variance. When assessing independence, we know that each of the videos are by individual creators, therefore it is likely the videos were produced independently of each other. There is no reason to believe that one TikTok user's video performance would directly affect another's.

Finally, we assess normality by looking at the residual histograms for each predictor:



Normality doesn't seem to be satisfied for all of the predictors. However, because we have more than 30 observations in the dataset, we can conclude that normality is satisfied regardless of

the distribution.

### Detecting Multicollinearity & Model Comparison

Upon conducting a VIF test, we found that likes and plays had the highest vif values (11.614 and 9.82 respectively):

	GVIF	Df	$GVIF^{1/(2*Df)}$
likes	11.614	1	3.408
shares	3.537	1	1.881
comments	2.682	1	1.638
plays	9.820	1	3.134
video_length	1.079	2	1.019
total_videos	1.182	1	1.087

Therefore, we wanted to assess which model would perform better: a model without likes or a model without plays. To do this, we performed 5-fold cross validation and extracted the resulting AIC, BIC, adj.r-squared, and RMSE values for the two models:

Model 1: (without likes):

```
# A tibble: 1 x 4
  mean_rmse mean_adj_rsq mean_aic mean_bic
    <dbl>      <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>
1  6774943.      0.259    4846.    4867.
```

Model 2 (without plays):

```
# A tibble: 1 x 4
  mean_rmse mean_adj_rsq mean_aic mean_bic
    <dbl>      <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>
1  6626034.      0.239    4850.    4870.
```

The difference between the model's evaluations aren't large. Model 1 has a higher RMSE, while it has a lower AIC and BIC, and a higher adjusted r-squared. In this case, we would consider model 2 (the model without plays) to be a better model, because it has a lower RMSE, which is gathered from the assessment set and is used to assess prediction. The goal of our model is to predict followers, so we want to choose the model with better predictive power (Model 2). Therefore, we remove plays from our model.

## Determining whether video\_length\_bin are necessary

We saw from our initial tidy table that the p-values associated with video length bins are high, indicating that the variables may not be significant. Because of this, we can once again perform cross validation to test how a model without video\_length compares to our current model (Model 1):

Model 3 (without plays and video length):

```
# A tibble: 1 x 4
  mean_rmse mean_adj_rsqa mean_aic mean_bic
    <dbl>      <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>
1  6663499.    0.234    4850.    4867.
```

We can see that when we remove video\_length, RMSE is slightly higher than it was for Model 2, while AIC remains about the same and BIC slightly decreases. We also see that adjusted r-squared remains about the same. Therefore, despite BIC slightly decreasing, we prefer the model with a lower RMSE (better prediction), so we don't want to remove video\_length from our model.

## Determining whether interaction terms are needed

Our only categorical variable in our model is video\_length. Therefore, we chose to assess all possible interaction terms with video\_length for statistical significance:

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value
(Intercept)	16.490	0.042	389.156	0.000
likes	0.406	0.150	2.714	0.007
shares	-0.020	0.010	-1.976	0.050
comments	0.003	0.010	0.253	0.800
total_videos	0.132	0.035	3.770	0.000
video_lengthbin2	0.013	0.059	0.226	0.821
video_lengthbin3	0.099	0.062	1.610	0.109
likes:video_lengthbin2	-0.030	0.165	-0.182	0.855
likes:video_lengthbin3	-0.448	0.173	-2.595	0.010
shares:video_lengthbin2	0.001	0.012	0.080	0.936
shares:video_lengthbin3	0.022	0.013	1.654	0.100
comments:video_lengthbin2	-0.002	0.011	-0.209	0.834
comments:video_lengthbin3	0.028	0.013	2.104	0.037
total_videos:video_lengthbin2	-0.017	0.062	-0.275	0.783
total_videos:video_lengthbin3	-0.072	0.047	-1.546	0.124

We can see from the table that all variables are significant when interacting with video\_lengthbin3 (p-value is less than significance level of 0.05) except for total\_videos. Because of this, we know that we won't need to include the interaction term between total\_videos and video\_length. Additionally, given that comments has a high p-value in this new model, we can try removing comments from our model as well. We can use cross validation to test how a model without comments, and with video\_length interacting with shares and likes performs compared to our current model (Model 2):

```
# A tibble: 1 x 4
  mean_rmse mean_adj_rsq mean_aic mean_bic
    <dbl>      <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>
1  6446434.    0.287    4841.    4865.
```

We can see that RMSE significantly decreased from about 6.6 million in Model 2 to 6.4 million in Model 4. We also see that adjusted r-squared increased, AIC decreased, and BIC decreased. All of these signs point to Model 4 being a better model in both fit and prediction. Therefore, we will remove comments, and add interactions between video\_length and both shares and likes.


## Results

After removing plays and comments and adding interaction terms between video\_length and both likes and shares, we arrive at our final model:

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value
(Intercept)	16.4959	0.0434	380.0932	0.0000
shares	-0.0181	0.0104	-1.7409	0.0835
likes	0.3925	0.0987	3.9769	0.0001
total_videos	0.0966	0.0217	4.4614	0.0000
video_lengthbin2	0.0063	0.0608	0.1031	0.9180
video_lengthbin3	0.0317	0.0604	0.5246	0.6006
likes:video_lengthbin2	-0.0179	0.1152	-0.1557	0.8765
likes:video_lengthbin3	-0.3444	0.1287	-2.6748	0.0082
shares:video_lengthbin2	-0.0012	0.0122	-0.1003	0.9202
shares:video_lengthbin3	0.0308	0.0129	2.3846	0.0182

We now check our final model conditions:





Linearity is met because there's a random scatter across the horizontal axis in the residual plot. Normality is satisfied because we have more than 30 observations in the dataset. Independence is satisfied, as we still have no reason to believe the performance of one user's videos would impact another. Constant variance is satisfied because there is an even distribution of datapoints across residual model's y-axis.

Final Model performance on testing set:

.metric	.estimator	.estimate
rmse	standard	0.510
rsq	standard	0.177

Note that we log transformed our response variable. In order to evaluate the meaning of our RMSE of 0.510, we take  $\exp(0.510) \sim 1.665$ . This value is the multiplicative square difference. For example, if have log followers of 16.04552, our model will be more or less off by  $16.04552 \pm 0.510^2 \Rightarrow \exp(16.04552 \pm 0.2601) \Rightarrow 7170028 < 9,299,954 < 12,062,597$ . (this is evaluated using average sum of square difference, so the range would be larger). This means our model does a fairly poor at predicting a tiktok user's followers. We also have an RSQ of 0.177, indicating only 17.7% of the variability in followers can be explained by our predictor variables.

Our interpretation for the intercept is as follows: We expect the tiktok user with the mean number of likes, shares, total\_videos, and with an average video length belonging to bin\_length1 to have around 14,590,774 followers ( $\exp[16.4959]$ ), on average.

We then examined likes, which is the predictor with the largest effect on user followers: for every additional million average likes of a user, we expect the expected to multiply by a factor of about  $1.481(\exp[0.3925])$ , compared to the baseline with mean number of shares, total videos, and with an average video length belonging to the bottom third of video lengths, holding all else constant.

There are several terms that are significant when determining the number of followers a tik\_tok user has. The number of total videos, comments, and plays seems to have a clear positive relationship with follower count. This also would align with our expectations, as the more videos you make, the more engagement your profile is likely to have and more followers you may gain. However, shares have a negative relationship with follower count, which initially seemed counter-intuitive. While it is impossible for the model to determine causality or explain why exactly a relationship exists, we hypothesize that users may share a video because they dislike it, resulting in them not following the user.

When observing the video length bin variable, the longest video length bin (3) has statistically significant difference from the other two video length bins and a statistically significant interaction term with likes and shares. This shows that not only do long length videos generate the most followers, but long length videos combined with a higher likes and shares indicate a higher follower count as well. This makes sense since viewers will be more invested in long videos (as can be confirmed by positive engagement), encouraging them to follow the creator.

## Discussion + Conclusion

We originally decided to look at TikTok's data and how follower count (a huge driver of engagement) is impacted by other aspects of a user's account. We learned that it is extremely difficult to correctly predict follower count, given our model only captures 17.7% of the variability in the dataset.

Our dataset was extremely difficult to work with, given that it did not meet the conditions for linear regression (linearity and constant variance), and contained multicollinearity. The variables were also extremely large, and needed to be scaled down to have meaningful coefficients - which made late interpretation significantly more difficult. A more complex model was likely needed, that was beyond the scope of our knowledge, given how poorly our model performed at the end. There also may be underlying relationships between follower count, and other portions of the TikTok algorithm that are not contained in the dataset, which our model might have also failed to capture; in the real world, users have reported that TikTok enforces policies differently from user-to-user, and uses different algorithms from region to region.

In order to improve our analysis, it would be helpful to comb TikTok for a dataset that potentially contains more variables. Three potential options we considered included: finding a meaningful way to capture hashtags (which may require manually looking at TikTok videos), finding a meaningful way to capture whether a user typically utilizes trending music, and using the demographic statistics for users (to account for bias in human decision making).

## Appendix

First 5 data points before transformation

	id	create_time	user_name	hashtags	song
1	6.892505e+18	1604786417	charlidamelio	[]	Adderall (Corvette Corvette)
2	6.892162e+18	1604706644	charlidamelio	[]	original sound
3	6.892157e+18	1604705486	charlidamelio	[]	original sound
4	6.891688e+18	1604596107	charlidamelio	[]	original sound
5	6.891016e+18	1604439653	charlidamelio	[]	original sound
6	6.890973e+18	1604429723	charlidamelio	[]	Lemonade Internet Money

	video_length	n_likes	n_shares	n_comments	n_plays	n_followers	n_total_likes
1	15	480800	9256	51300	1900000	97400000	7.6e+09
2	9	3100000	17200	105700	13300000	97400000	7.6e+09
3	4	2400000	17800	69200	10100000	97400000	7.6e+09
4	15	3200000	12700	64100	14600000	97400000	7.6e+09
5	13	7500000	31100	290300	34700000	97400000	7.6e+09
6	7	7100000	43000	82000	33300000	97400000	7.6e+09

	n_total_vids
1	1642
2	1642
3	1642
4	1642
5	1642
6	1642

After transformation

```
# A tibble: 5 x 8
  user_name      likes shares comments plays followers video_length total_videos
  <chr>      <dbl> <dbl>   <dbl> <dbl>   <dbl>      <dbl>      <dbl>
1 .kunno      335020  1067.   4521. 1.99e6 15300000    19.5       3442
2 _arishfakha~ 425868  5269.   2700. 3.96e6 28600000    14.5       2026
3 _saloniyaapa 166544  6122.    728. 1.85e6 12900000    14.6       2005
4 aashikabhat~ 194280  1335.   1053. 2.17e6 16000000    15.0       2720
5 abbyrartist~ 965586  5292.   7005. 3.97e6 13500000    16.5       811
```

Split results:

<a name="appendix"></a>

<Training/Testing/Total>  
<177/77/254>