

Ask, Answer, and Detect: Role-Playing LLMs for Personality Detection with Question-Conditioned Mixture-of-Experts

Yifan Lyu

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
(Guangzhou)
Guangzhou, China
University of International Business and Economics
Beijing, China
202293007@uibe.edu.cn

Liang Zhang*

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
(Guangzhou)
Guangzhou, China
liangzhang@hkust-gz.edu.cn

Abstract

Understanding human personality is crucial for web applications such as personalized recommendation and mental health assessment. Existing studies on personality detection predominantly adopt a “posts \rightarrow user vector \rightarrow labels” modeling paradigm, which encodes social media posts into user representations for predicting personality labels (e.g., MBTI labels). While recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have improved text encoding capacities, these approaches remain constrained by limited supervision signals due to label scarcity, and under-specified semantic mappings between user language and abstract psychological constructs. We address these challenges by proposing ROME, a novel framework that explicitly injects psychological knowledge into personality detection. Inspired by standardized self-assessment tests, ROME leverages LLMs’ role-play capability to simulate user responses to validated psychometric questionnaires. These generated question-level answers transform free-form user posts into interpretable, questionnaire-grounded evidence linking linguistic cues to personality labels, thereby providing rich intermediate supervision to mitigate label scarcity while offering a semantic reasoning chain that guides and simplifies the text-to-personality mapping learning. A question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts module then jointly routes over post and question representations, learning to answer questionnaire items under explicit supervision. The predicted answers are summarized into an interpretable answer vector and fused with the user representation for final prediction within a multi-task learning framework, where question answering serves as a powerful auxiliary task for personality detection. Extensive experiments on two real-world datasets demonstrate that ROME consistently outperforms state-of-the-art baselines, achieving substantial improvements (15.41% on Kaggle dataset) while enhancing interpretability through psychologically grounded predictions.

CCS Concepts

• **Information systems** \rightarrow **User modeling**; *Personalization*; • **Computing methodologies** \rightarrow *Natural language processing*.

1 Introduction

Understanding human personality is essential for explaining individual differences in cognition, emotion, and behavior and serves as

the foundation for web applications such as personalized recommendation, mental-health assessment, and career development [Kernberg 2016]. Among typological instruments, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) remains one of the most widely adopted, categorizing individuals into sixteen personality types along four binary dimensions [Myers et al. 1998]. With the rapid growth of social media, individuals increasingly share their thoughts and experiences online, creating a rich source of behavioral signals for understanding human personality [Gottfried 2024]. There is now substantial evidence that digital traces and linguistic expressions on social media can reveal users’ personality traits [Schwartz et al. 2013; Youyou et al. 2015]. These developments have spurred the emerging task of *personality detection*, which aims to infer personality labels (i.e., MBTI labels) from social media posts automatically and has attracted substantial research attention in recent years [Štajner and Yenikent 2020].

These aforementioned studies typically formulate the task as a text classification problem following the “posts \rightarrow user vector \rightarrow labels” paradigm as illustrated in Figure 1(a), where the crucial challenge is to learn a mapping function that encodes user posts into a single user representation. In this line of work, various strategies have been proposed. Traditional approaches primarily rely on handcrafted features, such as those derived from the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) lexicon [Mairesse et al. 2007; Pennebaker et al. 2015]. With the advent of deep learning, subsequent approaches have shifted from handcrafted features to neural architectures, which extract user representations from raw text automatically in a data-driven manner. For example, building on pretrained language models, some studies [Jiang et al. 2020a; Keh and Cheng 2019b] adopt BERT [Devlin et al. 2019] to encode user content, with strategies ranging from post-level encoding to concatenating multiple posts into one sequence. Some alternative methods [Yang et al. 2021a, 2023; Zhu et al. 2022] adopt a cross-post perspective, using BERT to extract semantic features and graph neural networks to further enhance post representations. Although these methods have achieved notable progress, their limited representational capacity often produces suboptimal embeddings that fail to fully exploit the rich personality signals embedded in user posts, especially when the posts are heterogeneous and noisy.

Recently, large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable text understanding abilities and strong performance across a wide range of natural language processing tasks [Brown et al. 2020; Kaplan et al. 2020; Wei et al. 2022a,b] compared with traditional smaller models, which in turn has motivated their application to

*Corresponding author.

the personality detection task. The typical modeling paradigm is illustrated in Figure 1(b). Specifically, TAE [Hu et al. 2024] leverages the generative capabilities of LLMs to produce multi-perspective textual analyses of posts and labels within a contrastive learning framework, thereby enriching post semantics and strengthening user representations. Building on TAE, ETM [Bi et al. 2025] further employs LLMs as the post encoder to exploit their strong embedding capacity, augmenting the user vector with long-text embeddings directly and achieving state-of-the-art performance. However, despite these advances, existing LLM-based approaches largely adhere to the traditional “posts → user vector → labels” paradigm, incorporating only limited augmentations. The semantic mapping from user language to abstract psychological constructs is achieved through simple text encoding and relies entirely on supervision from coarse-grained personality labels which are often scarce, costly to collect and prone to privacy concerns.

We observe that humans often infer their own personality by completing standardized self-assessment tests. Inspired by this process, we posit that structured, well-validated psychometric questionnaires provide a natural bridge between user language and abstract psychological constructs. Beyond coarse-grained personality labels, these questionnaires further decompose each label into multiple semantically meaningful questions (*i.e.*, psychometric items), and their fine-grained question-answer design provides rich intermediate supervision to mitigate label scarcity while offering a semantic reasoning chain that guides and simplifies the text-to-personality mapping learning.

Building on this insight, we propose **ROME** (ROle-play enhanced question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts), an LLM role-play enhanced, questionnaire-grounded framework for personality detection, with its modeling paradigm illustrated in Figure 1(c). Our key idea is to treat the standardized personality questionnaire as a structured retrieval source and design a label-aware LLM agent to role-play each user, generating question-level answers from their free-form posts. These answers constitute *questionnaire-grounded evidence* that explicitly links linguistic cues to specific personality labels, bringing psychological knowledge directly into the modeling pipeline. We then design a question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) module that jointly routes over posts and question representations and learns to answer the psychometric questionnaire items under explicit supervision. These predicted answers are then summarized into an answer vector, a compact representation that captures the model’s question-by-question reasoning chain for personality detection. This vector is finally fused with the encoder’s user representation for prediction within a multi-task learning framework.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- Conceptually, we are the first to leverage the strong role-play capabilities of LLMs to explicitly inject psychological knowledge into personality detection and formulate an interpretable, questionnaire-grounded modeling paradigm.
- Methodologically, we design a multi-task learning framework that treats question answering as a powerful auxiliary task for personality detection and develop a question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architecture that learns to answer




Figure 1: Overview of modeling paradigms for personality detection.

questionnaire items through a post-question joint routing mechanism.

- Experimentally, extensive experimental results on two real-world datasets demonstrate that our ROME model significantly and consistently outperforms state-of-the-art baselines, achieving relative improvements of up to **15.41%**.

2 Related Work

2.1 Personality Detection

Early evidence shows that digital traces and language use carry robust signals of human personality [Schwartz et al. 2013; Youyou et al. 2015]. Classical approaches therefore relied on handcrafted or lexicon-based features (*e.g.*, LIWC) to engineer user representations for personality classification [Mairesse et al. 2007; Pennebaker et al. 2015]. With the advent of deep learning, the community has shifted toward neural encoders that aggregate multiple posts into a unified user vector automatically, typically built upon pretrained language models such as BERT [Devlin et al. 2019], with strategies ranging from simple concatenation to hierarchical pooling [Jiang et al. 2020a; Keh and Cheng 2019b]. To better capture dependencies across posts, subsequent studies further introduce cross-document modeling and graph-based architectures (*e.g.*, multi-document transformers and dynamic graph convolution) to enhance user-level semantic representations [Yang et al. 2021a, 2023; Zhu et al. 2022]. More recently, LLM-augmented pipelines have advanced the frontier by leveraging LLMs to generate multi-perspective analyses of posts and labels within contrastive learning frameworks (TAE) and by replacing traditional post encoders with powerful LLM-derived long-text encoders directly (ETM) [Bi et al. 2025; Hu et al. 2024]. Despite these advances, the prevailing modeling paradigm remains *posts*

→ *user vector* → *labels*, which learns text-to-personality mappings only from coarse-grained labels, offering limited interpretability and intermediate supervision.

2.2 Role-play Prompting

Role-play has emerged as a popular prompt-based paradigm for conditioning LLMs on personas, goals, and contextual constraints across both simulation and evaluation settings, enabling coherent agent behaviors and goal-directed reasoning in open-ended environments [Li et al. 2023; Park et al. 2023]. Recent studies have systematized the use of role-play in LLMs by introducing benchmarks to quantify role adherence [Wang et al. 2024] and domain-specific frameworks that co-design standardized, faithful interactions such as clinician-guided virtual patients and character-grounded agents in text-based environments [Louie et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2025]. These developments, further synthesized in a recent survey [Tseng et al. 2024], collectively underscore the growing interest in aligning LLM behavior with contextual roles. In this paper, we do not employ role-play for open-ended dialogue generation. Instead, we elicit question-level answers to validated psychometric questionnaires from users’ posts, providing psychologically grounded intermediate supervision for personality detection. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to harness LLM’s role-play capacity to construct an explicit questionnaire-grounded evidence space for this task, tightly integrated with our question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts architecture that learns to answer questionnaire items before final personality classification.

2.3 Mixture-of-Experts (MoE)

Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) realizes *conditional computation* by routing each input to a small subset of experts, thereby achieving scalable model capacity through sparse activation [Du et al. 2022; Fedus et al. 2021; Lepikhin et al. 2020; Shazeer et al. 2017]. Beyond sheer scale, task- and signal-aware variants encourage functional specialization. For instance, multi-gate MoE architectures have been widely applied in multi-task learning scenarios [Ma et al. 2018]. More recent systems further develop different routing mechanisms that address various aspects, including improving routing stability, load balance, and cross-task transferability [Jiang et al. 2024; Liu et al. 2024; Qiu et al. 2024; Zhao et al. 2024]. These advances collectively show that what conditions the router matters: conditioning on the appropriate structure enables experts to capture distinct facets of the problem. Unlike prior work that conditions primarily on token- or task-level signals to improve efficiency or general accuracy, we repurpose the MoE framework for question-conditioned specialization: standardized questionnaire signals drive routing and supervision at the item level, producing intermediate, psychologically grounded evidence that is subsequently aggregated for personality inference. This reframes the role of the MoE from scaling the encoder to structuring the supervision and providing an interpretable bridge for the under-specified text-to-personality mapping emphasized in our introduction.

3 Method

3.1 Problem Definition

Personality detection from social media can be formulated as a *user-level, multi-label* classification problem. Given a collection of posts authored by a user u , denoted as $\mathcal{P}_u = \{p_{u,1}, \dots, p_{u,N_u}\}$, where N_u represents the total number of posts, the goal of this task is to infer the user’s m -dimensional personality profile $\hat{y}_u = (\hat{y}_u^{(1)}, \hat{y}_u^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{y}_u^{(m)})$ based on posts \mathcal{P}_u .

Under the MBTI taxonomy, the personality dimension set is $\mathcal{M} = \{I/E, S/N, T/F, P/J\}$. Each dimension $m \in \mathcal{M}$ consists of two opposing trait poles, and the ground-truth label $y_u^{(m)} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates which pole the user u aligns with. The objective is therefore to learn the mapping function from \mathcal{P}_u to \hat{y}_u :

$$f : \mathcal{P}_u \mapsto \hat{y}_u = (\hat{y}_u^{(m)})_{m \in \mathcal{M}}.$$

3.2 Model Overview

To facilitate and ease the learning process from the free-form user language space \mathcal{P}_u to the abstract psychological construct space \hat{y}_u , we incorporate well-validated psychometric questionnaires as a natural intermediate bridging layer, drawing inspiration from the standardized self-assessment procedure widely adopted in human personality measurement in psychology studies. Building on this insight, we propose **ROME** (**RO**le-play enhanced **Q**uestion-conditioned **M**ixture-of-**E**xperts), an LLM role-play enhanced, questionnaire-grounded framework for personality detection, with its overall architecture illustrated in Figure 2.

Conceptually, ROME comprises three key stages: *Ask*, *Answer*, and *Detect*. Specifically, in the *Ask* stage, a role-play LLM agent is instructed to “take on the perspective of the user” and produce answers to each questionnaire item¹ based on the user’s posts and the corresponding personality label. These questionnaire-grounded evidence serve as a structured and interpretable bridge between raw linguistic expressions and psychological constructs. Importantly, this evidence generation process is performed offline during training only and is no longer required at inference time. Then, in the *Answer* stage, we enable the model to reproduce these evidence directly from the user posts and the questionnaire item texts, thereby establishing a psychology-informed semantic reasoning chain that simplifies the text-to-personality mapping learning. To account for the heterogeneity across psychometric questionnaire items, we introduce a question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) module, where each expert specializes in a particular type of psycholinguistic cue and the gating network selects the most relevant experts for answering each question. Finally, in the *Detect* stage, the questionnaire-grounded evidence is aggregated with the user representation learned from posts to perform the final prediction, preserving the expressive capacity of the post encoder while injecting a concise and interpretable decision pathway grounded in standardized psychological knowledge.

¹Henceforth, we use the terms “questionnaire item(s)” and “question(s)” interchangeably for convenience and readability throughout this paper.




Figure 2: The overall pipeline of ROME.

3.3 Ask: Role-Play-Based Questionnaire Response Generation

To ease the learning of the mapping function $f(\cdot)$, we introduce standardized psychometric questionnaires to decompose each personality label into multiple semantically meaningful questions, thereby providing rich, fine-grained intermediate supervision signals for the model. Ideally, one could present these self-assessment tests directly to each user u and collect their responses to obtain such supervision; however, this procedure is costly, intrusive, and often impractical. Motivated by the recent success of LLMs in simulating human behaviors across diverse contexts [Abbasiantaeb et al. 2024; Xie et al. 2024], we propose an LLM agent to role-play each user with given characteristics (*i.e.*, user posts \mathcal{P}_u and personality label \hat{y}_u) and produce question-level answers. The posts provide evidence of the user’s linguistic patterns and behavioral tendencies, while the label supplies a stable trait orientation; conditioning on both enables the LLM agent to more accurately approximate how the user would respond in a self-assessment setting. Here, it is important to note that this generation process is performed offline during training only to augment the training dataset and is not required at inference time.

Formally, for each user u with posts $\mathcal{P}_u = \{p_{u,1}, \dots, p_{u,N_u}\}$ and each questionnaire item $Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, we apply the prompt shown in Figure 3 to simulate the user’s response. The LLM agent outputs a score on an ordered scale that approximates how user u would answer Q_i . Since LLM generation is inherently stochastic, we draw T samples and average them to reduce sampling variance and obtain a more robust estimate, as follows.

$$\tilde{a}_{u,i} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T a_{u,i}^{(t)}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U}, Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}, \quad (1)$$

where $a_{u,i}^{(t)}$ denotes the t -th sampled answer for the pair (u, Q_i) . These answers bring psychological knowledge explicitly into the modeling framework.

3.4 Answer: Question-Conditioned Mixture-of-Experts Framework

The goal of the Answer stage is to enable the model to predict the question-level answers produced in the Ask stage directly from the




Figure 3: Prompt design for role-play-based questionnaire response generation.

user’s posts which are accessible during inference. By learning to reproduce these answers, the model internalizes the psychology-informed semantic reasoning chain, thereby facilitating the text-to-personality mapping process.

A straightforward approach is to train a neural encoder to map a user’s posts to each question-level answer. However, different questionnaire items probe distinct psychological constructs (e.g., emotional stability vs. social expressiveness), and the linguistic cues associated with these constructs may also differ substantially across user’s posts. Therefore, a single shared encoder tends to conflate heterogeneous semantic signals, which leads to entangled representations and suboptimal generalization across questions. To address these limitations, we propose a question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architecture. Instead of relying on a single shared encoder, the MoE structure allows different experts to specialize in capturing distinct psychological constructs and their associated linguistic cues, while still enabling shared experts to model knowledge that is broadly useful across questions.

Formally, we assume a set of K experts $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_K\}$, each parameterized as a neural encoder. Given a user u and a specific question Q_i , the model should first identify the experts that are most informative to generate the corresponding answer. This selection is governed by a routing mechanism. Conceptually, effective routing

requires understanding *who* is being assessed (the user’s linguistic profile), *what* is being asked (the content of the question), and *which* psychological construct the question is designed to measure. Guided by this intuition, we introduce a lightweight question-conditioned router to dynamically select and aggregate experts as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{u,i} &= [\mathbf{v}_u; \mathbf{q}_i; \mathbf{e}_{m_i}], \\ \mathbf{g}_{u,i} &= \text{softmax}(\text{MLP}(\mathbf{x}_{u,i})). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{v}_u and \mathbf{q}_i denote the text embeddings of the user’s posts \mathcal{P}_u and the question Q_i respectively, computed by the shared textual encoder $t(\cdot)$. The vector \mathbf{e}_{m_i} is a one-hot indicator specifying the psychological construct that question Q_i is designed to measure (e.g., I/E or S/N personality dimension). In our implementation, we employ an LLM to obtain the construct assignment once, and keep this assignment fixed throughout training and evaluation.

Each expert E_k is a small MLP-based expert function denoted as $f_k(\cdot)$. The final answer is then predicted as:

$$\hat{a}_{u,i} = \sum_{k=1}^K g_{u,i}^{(k)} \cdot f_k(\mathbf{x}_{u,i}). \quad (3)$$

This component is trained to predict the answer for a given user and psychometric question pair (u, Q_i) using the role-played target $\hat{a}_{u,i}$ as supervision, and optimized via a regression objective function as follows.

$$\mathcal{L}_q = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}| \cdot |\mathcal{Q}|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}} \ell(\hat{a}_{u,i}, \tilde{a}_{u,i}), \quad (4)$$

where $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes a robust L1 regression loss. During inference, the predicted $\hat{a}_{u,i}$ serves as a strong psychologically grounded evidence for final personality detection.

3.5 Detect: Psychological Evidence-Guided Personality Prediction

3.5.1 Psychological Evidence Modulation. Given the predicted $\hat{a}_{u,i}$ as psychologically grounded evidence, one may simply concatenate them to form an evidence vector for personality prediction. However, two critical challenges remain. First, the “ground truth” answers used to supervise $\hat{a}_{u,i}$ are obtained through LLM role-play generation. Due to the stochastic nature of LLM outputs, the augmented answers may contain noise, leading to varying levels of uncertainty across questions. Second, not all questions in a questionnaire are equally informative for personality inference. Some questions provide strong diagnostic signals compared to others. Therefore, we propose to adaptively weight the contribution of each predicted answer based on both its reliability and its importance when forming the final answer-based representation.

Reliability Score. Specifically, when estimating the reliability, our intuition is that if the responses of a question exhibit high variance across the T sampled role-play generations, the corresponding evidence is more likely to be unreliable. Formally, we can define it as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\text{unc},i} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \text{Var}(\{a_{u,i}^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T), \\ q_{\text{rel},i} &= 1 - \text{Norm}(q_{\text{unc},i}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $q_{\text{rel},i}$ denotes the reliability score associated with question Q_i , and $\text{Norm}(\cdot)$ represents the min–max normalization operator.

Importance Score. While for the importance, our intuition is that each question is primarily designed to probe a specific psychological construct (e.g., I/E or S/N personality dimension). Thus, if the LLM-generated answers for a question exhibit stronger separability and induce larger between-class shifts with respect to its intended construct, then that question should be considered more important for personality detection. Formally, for each question Q_i , we first retrieve its one-hot indicator vector \mathbf{e}_{m_i} which is a fixed mapping introduced in the last section, and denote the corresponding psychological construct by $m \in \mathcal{M}$ (e.g., $m = \text{I/E}$). The importance is then defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{i,m}^+ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}_m^+|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}_m^+} \tilde{a}_{u,i}, \\ \mu_{i,m}^- &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}_m^-|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}_m^-} \tilde{a}_{u,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$q_{\text{imp},i} = |\mu_{i,m}^+ - \mu_{i,m}^-|,$$

where $\mathcal{U}_m^+ = \{u \mid y_u^{(m)} = 1\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_m^- = \{u \mid y_u^{(m)} = 0\}$ and $q_{\text{imp},i}$ is the importance score associated with question Q_i , which is min–max normalized to the range $[0, 1]$.

Adaptive Weight. For each question Q_i , the final weight w_i is computed under the intuition that more important and more reliable questions should contribute more to the final prediction, as follows.

$$w_i = q_{\text{imp},i} \cdot q_{\text{rel},i}. \quad (7)$$

And the final answer-based representation is obtained by:

$$\mathbf{s}_u = \mathbf{w} \odot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_u. \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_u$ denotes the vector of predicted question-level answers and \odot denotes element-wise multiplication.

3.5.2 Personality Prediction. Each questionnaire item Q_i is primarily designed to probe a specific psychological construct and contributes only minimally to others. Directly applying question-level signals without regard to their associated constructs may introduce irrelevant evidence and increase noise. To prevent such cross-construct interference, we apply construct-specific binary masks to ensure that each construct only integrates evidence from its corresponding questions. Specifically, for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ (e.g., $m = \text{I/E}$), we define the mask vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m)} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{Q}|}$ by:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^{(m)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \arg \max(\mathbf{e}_{m_i}) = m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

And the construct-specific answer representation is then computed by applying the obtained binary mask that preserves only the evidence associated with m as follows.

$$\mathbf{s}_u^{(m)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(m)} \odot \mathbf{s}_u. \quad (10)$$

The post-derived representation \mathbf{v}_u captures broad linguistic patterns across a user’s posts and is highly expressive, but it is not explicitly aligned with psychological constructs. In contrast, the construct-specific evidence $\mathbf{s}_u^{(m)}$ is questionnaire-grounded, providing a semantic and interpretable reasoning pathway to psychological constructs. However, its quality can vary due to differences in

diagnostic strength across questionnaire items and the uncertainty inherent in role-play supervision. Therefore, the two sources offer complementary advantages and with varying reliability. Their contributions should be adaptively balanced during personality prediction. Specifically, we introduce a lightweight gating network that learns to dynamically weight the contributions of \mathbf{v}_u and $\mathbf{s}_u^{(m)}$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_u^{(m)} &= \sigma \left(\text{MLP}_{\text{gate}}^{(m)}(\mathbf{v}_u \parallel \mathbf{s}_u^{(m)}) \right), \\ \mathbf{z}_u^{(m)} &= \gamma_u^{(m)} \odot \mathbf{v}_u + (1 - \gamma_u^{(m)}) \odot \mathbf{s}_u^{(m)}.\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

Subsequently, the personality prediction for a given $m \in \mathcal{M}$ is produced by a lightweight construct-specific classifier as follows.

$$\hat{y}_u^{(m)} = \sigma \left(\text{MLP}_{\text{cls}}^{(m)}(\mathbf{z}_u^{(m)}) \right), \quad (12)$$

which is optimized using a binary classification loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}| \cdot |\mathcal{M}|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \text{BCE}(\hat{y}_u^{(m)}, y_u^{(m)}). \quad (13)$$

Together with the answer prediction loss defined in Equation (4), the model is finally trained in a multi-task learning framework with the following joint objective function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_q \mathcal{L}_q + \lambda_{\text{cls}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}}, \quad (14)$$

where λ_q and λ_{cls} are hyperparameters that balance the contributions of the answer prediction and personality classification tasks, respectively.

Remark. During training, we first pre-train the MoE module with the answer prediction objective (*i.e.*, Equation (4)) to stabilize the question-aligned reasoning space, and then fine-tune the entire framework end-to-end using the joint objective in Equation (14). At inference time, the user’s posts are encoded once, and the question-conditioned MoE module produces psychologically grounded evidence $\{\hat{a}_{u,i}\}$, which is then fused with the encoded post representations to generate the final personality prediction.

4 Experiment

4.1 Datasets

In line with prior work [Hu et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2021a, 2023], we conduct our evaluation on two widely used personality datasets: KAGGLE² and PANDORA³. KAGGLE is collected from PersonalityCafe⁴, a forum where users disclose personality types and interact, and contains 8,675 users with their 50 most recent posts. PANDORA is constructed from Reddit⁵; personality labels are derived from self-introductions explicitly mentioning types, yielding 9,067 users with per-user post counts ranging from dozens to hundreds. Both datasets adopt the MBTI taxonomy with four binary dimensions: Introversion vs. Extroversion (I/E), Sensing vs. iNtuition (S/N), Thinking vs. Feeling (T/F), and Perception vs. Judging (P/J). Given pronounced class imbalance, we report Macro-F1 per dimension and the overall score as the average of the four Macro-F1s. Following [Yang et al. 2023], we shuffle users and partition data into

train/validation/test with a 60/20/20 split (no user overlap across splits). Dataset statistics are summarized in Table 1.

Dataset	Types	Train	Validation	Test
Kaggle	I/E	4032/1173	1330/405	1314/421
	S/N	724/4481	230/1505	243/1492
	T/F	2388/2817	802/933	791/944
Pandora	P/J	3160/2045	1007/728	1074/661
	I/E	4314/1126	1425/388	1403/411
	S/N	621/4819	202/1611	205/1609
	T/F	3527/1913	1160/653	1164/650
	P/J	3211/2229	1064/749	1035/779

Table 1: Statistics of the Kaggle and Pandora datasets.

4.2 Baselines

We compare our approach against several strong baseline methods as follows:

- **XGBoost [Chen and Guestrin 2016]:** This method concatenates all posts of a user into a single document, encodes it with bag-of-words, and applies an XGBoost classifier for user-level prediction.
- **BiLSTM [Tadesse et al. 2017]:** This method encodes each post with a bidirectional LSTM and uses average pooling to aggregate post embeddings into a single user-level representation for personality prediction.
- **BERTconcat [Jiang et al. 2020b]:** This method concatenates all posts from a user into a single sequence, encodes the sequence with BERT, and maps the resulting representation to personality labels via fully connected layers.
- **BERTmean [Keh and Cheng 2019a]:** This method encodes each post with BERT, applies mean pooling across post-level embeddings to form a user representation, and maps it to personality labels via fully connected layers.
- **AttRCNN [Xue et al. 2018]:** This method employs a hierarchical architecture that couples an attention-augmented RCNN with an Inception-style variant to extract deep semantic features from social-network text; these features are concatenated with psycholinguistic statistics and passed to regression models for personality prediction.
- **AttnSeq [Lynn et al. 2020]:** This method builds a hierarchical sequence model with word-level and message-level attention to aggregate posts into a user representation for personality prediction.
- **Transformer-MD [Yang et al. 2021b]:** This method employs a multi-document Transformer that mitigates order bias by using memory tokens with shared positional embeddings, enabling cross-post information access to form a coherent user-level representation for personality prediction.
- **TrigNet [Yang et al. 2021c]:** This method builds a psycholinguistic tripartite graph over posts, words, and LIWC-style categories, initializes node embeddings with BERT, and applies graph attention to aggregate psychologically grounded signals for personality prediction.

²<https://www.kaggle.com/datasnaek/mbti-type>

³<https://psy.takelab.fer.hr/datasets/all>

⁴<http://personalitycafe.com/forum>

⁵<https://www.reddit.com>

Methods	Kaggle					Pandora				
	I/E	S/N	T/F	P/J	Avg	I/E	S/N	T/F	P/J	Avg
XGBoost	56.67	52.85	75.42	65.94	62.72	45.99	48.93	63.51	55.55	53.50
BiLSTM	57.82	57.87	69.97	57.01	60.67	48.01	52.01	63.48	56.21	54.93
BERTconcat	58.33	53.88	69.36	60.88	60.61	54.22	49.15	58.31	53.14	53.91
BERTmean	64.05	57.82	77.06	65.25	66.04	56.60	48.71	64.70	56.07	56.52
AttRCNN	59.74	64.08	78.77	66.44	67.25	48.55	56.19	64.39	57.26	56.60
AttnSeq	65.43	62.15	78.05	63.92	67.39	56.98	54.78	60.95	54.81	56.88
Transformer-MD	66.08	69.10	79.19	67.50	70.47	55.26	58.77	69.26	60.90	61.05
TrigNet	69.54	67.17	79.06	67.69	70.86	56.69	55.57	66.38	57.27	58.98
D-DGCN	68.41	65.66	79.56	67.22	70.21	61.55	55.46	<u>71.07</u>	59.96	62.01
D-DGCN+ ℓ_0	69.52	67.19	80.53	68.16	71.35	59.98	55.52	70.53	59.56	61.40
TAE	<u>70.90</u>	66.21	81.17	70.20	72.07	<u>62.57</u>	61.01	69.28	59.34	63.05
ETM	68.97	<u>71.21</u>	<u>86.19</u>	84.78	<u>77.79</u>	68.57	<u>64.91</u>	66.07	63.53	<u>65.77</u>
ROME	90.12	95.04	96.99	<u>76.95</u>	89.78	49.05	93.62	72.31	<u>61.12</u>	69.04
Improvement	27.11%	33.46%	12.53%	-9.24%	15.41%	-28.47%	44.23%	1.74%	-3.79%	4.97%

Table 2: Performance comparison on Kaggle and Pandora datasets (F1%).

- **D-DGCN** [Yang et al. 2023]: This method dynamically induces a multi-hop post graph and applies deep graph convolutions over the learned topology, enabling order-agnostic evidence fusion for personality prediction.
- **TAE** [Hu et al. 2024]: This method leverages LLM-generated multi-perspective augmentations—semantic, sentiment, and linguistic—and distills them into a lightweight encoder, using enriched label representations to enhance personality detection.
- **ETM** [Bi et al. 2025]: This method encodes posts with LLM-based embeddings to form a user representation, generates multi-view textual descriptions of personality labels via an LLM, and aligns users to labels through a contrastive objective in the shared space.

4.3 Implementation Details

All models are implemented using PyTorch, and all experiments are conducted on a workstation equipped with eight NVIDIA RTX 5880 Ada GPU. We use BERT-base-uncased as the default post encoder for our ROME model. In the Ask stage, we employ ChatGPT (gpt-4o-2024-08-06) as a role-playing LLM to generate question-level answers to the MBTI-style questionnaire from user posts. The LLM is used solely in an offline manner to generate supervisory signals during training and is never queried at inference time. The question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) module in the Answer stage consists of 32 experts, each instantiated as a lightweight MLP with a hidden dimension of 1024. We use Adam as the optimizer and adopt a two-stage training procedure. In the first stage, we pretrain the Answer module with the regression loss \mathcal{L}_q using a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} , a mini-batch size of 64, and 100 training epochs. In the second stage, we jointly optimize the entire model with the multi-task objective $\mathcal{L} = \lambda_q \mathcal{L}_q + \lambda_{\text{cls}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}}$, where $\lambda_q = 1$ and $\lambda_{\text{cls}} = 0.05$, using a learning rate of 1×10^{-4} and a mini-batch size of 32.

4.4 Overall results

The main results on two datasets are provided in Table 2, where the best performance is in boldface and the second best is underlined, and the improvement of ROME over these second best methods is also presented in the last row.

From Table 2, we observe that both traditional feature-based models and standard PLM baselines perform poorly on the two datasets. For example, the strongest non-LLM baseline, BERTmean, achieves only 65.25% and 56.52% average Macro-F1 on Kaggle and Pandora. In contrast, the LLM-augmented text-mapping model ETM delivers substantially stronger performance, reaching 77.79% and 65.77% average Macro-F1 on the two datasets, which correspond to relative improvements of 17.79% and 16.37% over BERTmean. These gains can be largely attributed to ETM’s integration of an LLM-enhanced encoder, which offers stronger capacity for modeling long and heterogeneous user posts.

Compared to these strong LLM-augmented baselines, our proposed ROME model yields further substantial gains. As shown in Table 2, ROME attains 89.78% and 69.04% average Macro-F1 on Kaggle and Pandora, respectively, corresponding to relative improvements of 15.41% and 4.97% over ETM. On Kaggle dataset, the improvements are particularly pronounced on the I/E, S/N, and T/F dimensions, where ROME achieves markedly higher F1 scores than all baseline methods while remaining competitive on P/J dimension prediction. Importantly, ROME surpasses ETM even though it relies only on a small-scale text encoder (BERT-base-uncased), whereas ETM exploits long-text embeddings from a much larger Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct model (about 70× larger than BERT-base-uncased). This advantage mainly stems from ROME’s questionnaire-grounded architecture. ROME treats the standardized personality questionnaire as a structured retrieval source, uses an LLM to role-play each user

and produce question-level soft answers, and employs a question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts to fuse this psychologically grounded evidence with user representations, thereby providing substantially richer intermediate supervision than coarse-grained personality labels alone.

Across the two datasets, the relative gains are more pronounced on Kaggle, where users tend to produce longer and more coherent posts that enable the role-play LLM to generate higher-quality questionnaire-grounded evidence. In contrast, the shorter and more fragmented posts in Pandora make it more challenging to elicit stable fine-grained personality cues, partially attenuating the benefits of our questionnaire-grounded modeling.

4.5 Ablation Studies

To assess the contribution of each component in our ROME framework, we conduct an ablation study on the KAGGLE dataset, as shown in Table 3.

Benefits of adaptive weighting. We first evaluate the impact of the question-level weighting mechanism. Removing the reliability- and importance-based weights (ROME_{w/o q-weighting}) reduces the average Macro-F1 from 89.78% to 88.47%. This degradation reflects the heterogeneity across questionnaire items: different items vary in their uncertainty in LLM-simulated answers and in their discriminative power for distinguishing personality classes. Treating all items as equally informative is therefore suboptimal. The observed drop confirms that emphasizing stable, highly diagnostic items while down-weighting noisy ones yields more effective psychological evidence for the classification.

Benefits of gated fusion. We next examine the fusion mechanism between post-derived and questionnaire-grounded representations. Replacing the learnable gated fusion with a simple unweighted average (ROME_{w/o gated fusion}) yields a similar decline in performance. This result indicates that the relative contributions of posts and questionnaire evidence should be adaptively determined rather than fixed, as their reliability can vary across users and across personality dimensions.

Benefits of psychological knowledge. We further ablate each information source in isolation to examine their individual contributions and complementarity. Specifically, using only questionnaire-grounded evidence while discarding post representations (ROME_{w/o posts}) reduces the average Macro-F1 to 75.12%. Conversely, using only post representations (ROME_{w/o evidence}) leads to an even larger drop to 65.77%, with particularly severe degradation on the P/J dimension. This pattern aligns with our intuition: post-derived features capture broad and expressive linguistic cues, whereas questionnaire-grounded evidence provides semantically aligned and psychologically meaningful signals. ROME performs best when both sources are jointly leveraged, indicating that these two perspectives are complementary rather than interchangeable.

Benefits of model pretraining. Finally, skipping the pretraining stage of the answer module (ROME_{w/o pretrain}) leads to a substantial performance reduction to 69.21%. This indicates that directly optimizing the full model without first stabilizing the question-level prediction task makes it difficult for ROME to fully leverage item-level supervision signals.

Taken together, these ablation results indicate that question-level weighting, adaptive fusion of post and questionnaire evidence, and pretraining of the answer module are all essential for realizing the full performance gains of ROME.

Methods	I/E	S/N	T/F	P/J	Avg
ROME _{w/o q-weighting}	90.13	<u>94.82</u>	<u>96.36</u>	72.55	88.47
ROME _{w/o gated fusion}	89.03	94.45	<u>96.36</u>	<u>74.16</u>	<u>88.50</u>
ROME _{w/o posts}	86.56	71.21	94.18	48.51	75.12
ROME _{w/o evidence}	42.33	92.35	75.11	53.27	65.77
ROME _{w/o pretrain}	47.58	92.19	80.14	56.93	69.21
ROME	<u>90.12</u>	95.04	96.99	76.95	89.78

Table 3: Results of ablation study on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

4.6 LLM Performance


To analyze the standalone performance of LLMs on the personality detection task, we evaluate several variants of ChatGPT on the KAGGLE test set, as summarized in Table 4. Following Hu et al. [2024], we consider two prompting configurations for gpt-3.5-turbo (zero-shot and 3-shot) and additionally report results for gpt-4o-2024-08-06 under the same zero-shot and 3-shot settings. Overall, these LLM variants perform comparably to, or marginally better than the strongest LLM-based baseline ETM, yet remain substantially below the performance of our ROME model. Moreover, ROME queries GPT-4o only once in an offline Ask stage to obtain question-level answers during training; while inference is performed entirely by a compact supervised model built upon BERT. This design yields significantly lower latency and monetary cost compared with LLM-based prediction.

Methods	I/E	S/N	T/F	P/J	Avg
ChatGPT-3.5	65.86	51.69	78.60	63.93	66.89
ChatGPT-3.5 _{3-shot}	70.61	58.35	76.58	65.43	67.74
ChatGPT-4o	<u>81.70</u>	<u>78.15</u>	<u>85.13</u>	74.67	79.91
ChatGPT-4o _{3-shot}	80.55	76.53	84.87	78.13	<u>80.02</u>
ROME	90.12	95.04	96.99	<u>76.95</u>	89.78


Table 4: LLM performances on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

4.7 Data Efficiency under Limited Supervision

To examine how well ROME performs when labeled data are scarce, a situation frequently encountered in practice because personality annotation is costly and often subject to privacy concerns, we simulate limited-supervision settings by down-sampling the KAGGLE training set while keeping the validation and test sets fixed. Concretely, we train the same ROME configuration (60-item questionnaire and 32 experts) using only 40%, 60%, 80%, or 100% of the training data and report the resulting average Macro-F1 in Figure 5. As the available training data increases, performance improves smoothly from 78.01% (40%) to 79.91% (60%), 82.38% (80%), and 89.78% with the full dataset, indicating that the model behaves



(a) Backbone LLM comparison on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).



(b) Backbone encoder comparison on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

Figure 4: Effect of backbone LLMs and text encoders




Figure 5: Effect of training data size on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

stably across data scales and can effectively exploit additional supervision when it is available.

More importantly, ROME remains highly competitive even in the most data-poor regime. With only 40% of the training data, our model (78.01%) already slightly surpasses the best baseline method ETM, whose average Macro-F1 under full-data training is 77.79% (Table 2). These results highlight the data efficiency of the Ask-Answer-Detect framework: by leveraging standardized questionnaires and question-level supervision, ROME benefits from a much denser and more structured training than traditional “posts → labels” models, and thus maintains strong performance even when labeled users are very limited.

4.8 Effect of Backbone LLMs and Encoders

To analyze the effect of backbone LLM choice, we vary the LLM deployed as the agent in the Ask stage while holding all other components of ROME fixed. Concretely, we consider GPT-3.5, GPT-4o,

and a simple ensemble variant (GPT-mix) that averages the question-level answers generated by GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o before training the downstream modules. As shown in Figure 4a, all three settings yield strong results, but their average Macro-F1s follow a clear ordering: GPT-3.5 attains 86.20%, GPT-mix improves to 87.45%, and GPT-4o achieves the best performance at 89.78%. The advantage of GPT-4o is especially visible on the more challenging I/E and P/J dimensions, where the weaker model degrades more noticeably. This pattern is consistent with the view that the *quality of the role-play supervision* matters: GPT-4o produces more faithful, less noisy questionnaire answers during Ask stage, which in turn provide a reliable training signal for the Answer and Detect stages. Even so, the GPT-3.5 configuration—despite its lower cost—already significantly exceeds the best baseline method ETM (Table 2, 77.79%), indicating that ROME remains effective under more economical LLM choices.

We then examine the impact of the backbone text encoder used to represent posts and questionnaire items. Figure 4b reports results when using BERT-base-uncased (the default configuration in Table 2), Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct as a frozen encoder, and RoBERTa-base, with the Ask-stage LLM and all other components unchanged. BERT already supports a strong average Macro-F1 of 85.93%, while replacing it with LLaMA further raises the score to 89.78%, with consistent gains on all four dimensions and a particularly large improvement on P/J (from 77.95% to 85.91%). RoBERTa remains competitive but lags behind BERT with an average Macro-F1 of 85.93%, mainly due to weaker performance on I/E and P/J prediction. Overall, these findings indicate that ROME is relatively robust across encoder choices—both BERT and RoBERTa configurations already outperform the best baseline methods—while the LLaMA-based variant further benefits from its stronger capacity to encode heterogeneous, long-range semantics in user posts and questionnaire items.




Figure 6: Effect of questionnaire length on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

4.9 Parameters Analysis

4.9.1 Effect of questionnaire length. We first investigate how many questionnaire items are required for ROME to perform well. As shown in Figure 6, we randomly subsample a fixed number of items from the 60-item inventory (12, 24, 36, 48, or 60) and retrain the model on KAGGLE under each setting. The average Macro-F1 increases steadily from 84.16% with 12 items to 89.8% with all 60 items, indicating that additional evidence systematically strengthens the psychology-grounded reasoning process and yields more accurate personality predictions. At the personality dimension level, S/N and T/F remain strong across all settings, while P/J benefits most from longer questionnaires, showing the largest performance gain as more items are included.

Despite this clear upward trend, ROME remains highly competitive even with substantially shortened questionnaires. With 12 and 24 randomly sampled items, the model attains average Macro-F1s of 84.16% and 86.33%, respectively, already outperforming the best baseline method ETM (77.79%, Table 2) by around 8.19% and 10.98%. This demonstrates that the Ask-Answer-Detect framework can extract robust, psychology-aligned evidence even from incomplete questionnaires.

4.9.2 Effect of the number of experts. We next study how the capacity of the question-conditioned MoE affects performance by varying the number of experts while keeping all other settings fixed. As shown in Figure 7, increasing the number of experts from 8 to 32 steadily improves the average Macro-F1 on KAGGLE dataset from 79.89% to 89.78%, whereas further enlarging the expert pool to 40 yields a slight drop to 88.21%. This pattern suggests that a small expert set provides insufficient capacity to capture the heterogeneous psycholinguistic cues associated with different questionnaire items and personality dimensions, while a moderately sized expert pool enables more effective specialization. Beyond this regime, however, the additional experts introduce extra complexity and routing difficulty without translating into further gains.




Figure 7: Effect of the number of experts on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

4.10 Case Study

To understand how ROME integrates questionnaire items and textual evidence to form personality predictions, we conduct a three-part interpretability analysis that examines the model’s behavior. We begin with a fine-grained case study that illustrates how individual questionnaire items align with semantically relevant post snippets to support model decisions. We then move to a quantitative sensitivity analysis that measures the functional contribution of each item by perturbing the evidence available at inference time. Finally, we examine the routing behavior of the question-conditioned MOE to reveal how ROME organizes its internal capacity in a manner that reflects the structure of the MBTI psychometric questionnaires.

4.10.1 Question-Post Evidence Chains. To make the Ask-Answer-Detect pipeline more concrete, we present a qualitative case study for a randomly selected test user whose true type is ISTJ and for whom ROME correctly predicts all four MBTI dimensions. As shown in Table 5, for each dimension we select a handful of questionnaire items with the largest impact on the final decision, measured by the change in the predicted logit when the item is removed from the evidence aggregation. We then retrieve representative snippets from the user’s posts that GPT-4o, in a post-hoc analysis, identifies as semantically aligned with these high-impact items, with key phrases highlighted for readability.

Across dimensions, the question-post pairs reveal coherent, psychologically plausible evidence patterns. For example, on the I/E axis, the most influential items are supported by snippets describing repeatedly turning down social invitations, a strong need for personal space, and discomfort with close contact or crowded environments, all pointing toward low social needs and a clear inclination for solitude. And for P/J, the evidence clusters around perfectionistic attitudes toward assignments, ongoing self-evaluation, and a strong drive to accomplish personally meaningful goals, reflecting a structured, planful, and self-disciplined J-oriented pattern.

Dim.	Q#	Question	Direction	Δ logit	Text evidence (snippet)
I/E	Q21	You enjoy solitary hobbies or activities more than group ones.	I	-3.19	"...Feeling cozy in over sized sweaters, reading a good book in a warm bed... "
I/E	Q43	You can easily connect with people you have just met.	I	-0.84	"I find myself turning down anyone who asks me out or shows interest in me, even if we get along well..."
I/E	Q41	You avoid making phone calls.	I	-0.62	"The very thought of having my personal space violated in that manner by a complete stranger is terrifying to me."
S/N	Q2	Complex and novel ideas excite you more than simple and straightforward ones.	S	-1.71	"Usually, I don't really like discussing topics like these but the posts here are so relatable."
S/N	Q42	You enjoy exploring unfamiliar ideas and viewpoints.	N	+0.83	"That's an interesting perspective - that we shouldn't hold others' imperfections against them."
S/N	Q57	You prefer tasks that require you to come up with creative solutions rather than follow concrete steps.	S	-0.45	"Try comparing your resume with the people you know who've gotten hired. Try to follow their style... "
T/F	Q3	You usually feel more persuaded by what resonates emotionally with you than by factual arguments.	T	-1.54	"That map isn't very reliable . I know INFPs who live outside of Europe/Americas and there isn't a single dot..."
T/F	Q58	You are more likely to rely on emotional intuition than logical reasoning when making a choice.	T	-1.13	"I've recently read up on body language in an effort to improve my social skills. I seem to be able to read people well."
T/F	Q15	You rarely worry about whether you make a good impression on people you meet.	F	+1.05	"As a child and adolescent, I would lay awake for nights in a row with my stomach knotting and turning out of guilt , even if the person said it didn't bother them."
P/J	Q4	Your living and working spaces are clean and organized.	J	+1.02	"If an assignment, essay, or other work was not perfect in my eyes, I really struggled just handing it in. "
P/J	Q34	You find it challenging to maintain a consistent work or study schedule.	J	+1.00	"Lately, I have been evaluating my behaviors and life and have concluded that I need to step... "
P/J	Q44	If your plans are interrupted, your top priority is to get back on track as soon as possible.	J	+0.51	"I'd say that wanting to accomplish my goals because of what is important to me keeps me going."

Table 5: Illustrative question–post evidence for a representative ISTJ user.

Overall, this case study demonstrates that ROME’s personality predictions are supported by a layered chain of question-level diagnostics and post-level linguistic cues.

4.10.2 Sensitivity of Item Removal. To evaluate the functional role of individual questionnaire items in ROME’s inference process and verify whether the learned question weights (w_i in Equation (7)) capture truly diagnostic evidence, we conduct a sensitivity analysis based on item removal where the trained model is kept fixed and only the questionnaire evidence is altered. For each user and each MBTI dimension, we remove exactly one item from the weighted question summary in three ways: deleting the item with the highest learned weight (ROME_{drop-max-question}), deleting the item with the lowest weight (ROME_{drop-rand-question}), or randomly deleting one item (ROME_{drop-min-question}). As shown in Table 6, removing the highest-weight item leads to the largest degradation, reducing the average Macro-F1 from 89.78% to 86.95%, with the S/N dimension dropping by more than 10 points. Random deletion produces a milder decline (89.12%), while removing the lowest-weight item leaves the overall performance almost unchanged. This pattern indicates that the learned question weights meaningfully reflect the diagnostic value of individual items: high-weight questions carry indispensable evidence for the final decision, low-weight questions play a marginal role, and the model remains reasonably robust under mild evidence loss.

Methods	I/E	S/N	T/F	P/J	Avg
ROME _{drop-max-question}	89.91	84.09	<u>96.73</u>	77.05	86.95
ROME _{drop-rand-question}	90.31	93.45	96.56	76.14	89.12
ROME _{drop-min-question}	<u>90.19</u>	<u>94.28</u>	96.64	76.73	<u>89.46</u>
ROME	90.12	95.04	96.99	<u>76.95</u>	89.78

Table 6: Sensitivity of item removal on KAGGLE dataset (F1%).

4.10.3 Expert Activation Analysis: Internal Specialization in the MoE. To further interpret our model, we analyze how the question-conditioned MoE allocates expert capacity across personality dimensions. For each user and each questionnaire item, we record the soft routing probabilities assigned to the experts and aggregate them over all users and all items associated with each MBTI dimension. Normalizing these aggregated values yields a 32×4 matrix reflecting the *relative attention* each expert devotes to the four MBTI dimensions (*i.e.*, I/E, S/N, T/F, and P/J).

As visualized in Figure 8, many experts exhibit a clear dominant dimension, concentrating the majority of their attention on one of the four MBTI axes, while others display more mixed routing patterns across dimensions. This specialization suggests that the MoE develops a meaningful division of labor, with different

experts focusing on distinct psychological constructs and personality dimensions, while a small group of shared experts capturing cross-dimensional knowledge.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a role-play-enhanced, question-conditioned Mixture-of-Experts framework for personality detection that replaces the prevailing *posts* \rightarrow *user vector* \rightarrow *labels* paradigm with an Ask-Answer-Detect pipeline. By leveraging an LLM-based role-play agent to generate question-level answers and treating these answers as questionnaire-grounded evidence, our framework injects structured psychological knowledge into the modeling process and provides an explicit question-level reasoning chain from raw text to personality labels. Extensive experiments on two real-world datasets demonstrate substantial and consistent gains, with relative macro-F1 improvements of up to 15.41% and 4.97% over state-of-the-art baselines.




Figure 8: Expert activation analysis on KAGGLE dataset.

References

Zahra Abbasiantaeb, Yifei Yuan, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Mohammad Aliannejadi. 2024. Let the LLMs Talk: Simulating Human-to-Human Conversational QA via Zero-Shot LLM-to-LLM Interactions. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 8–17. doi:10.1145/3616855.3635856

Weihong Bi, Feifei Kou, Lei Shi, Yawen Li, Haisheng Li, Jinpeng Chen, and Mingying Xu. 2025. Leveraging the Dual Capabilities of LLM: LLM-Enhanced Text Mapping Model for Personality Detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 23487–23495. doi:10.1609/aaai.v39i22.34517

Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, et al. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33. 1877–1901. https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf

Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 785–794. doi:10.1145/2939672.2939785

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 4171–4186. doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423

Nan Du, Yanping Huang, et al. 2022. GLaM: Efficient Scaling of Language Models with Mixture-of-Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.06905* (2022). arXiv:2112.06905 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.06905>

William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2021. Switch Transformers: Scaling to Trillion Parameter Models with Simple and Efficient Sparsity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03961* (2021). arXiv:2101.03961 doi:10.48550/arXiv.2101.03961

Jeffrey Gottfried. 2024. Americans' Social Media Use. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2024/01/31/americans-social-media-use/> Accessed 2025-10-02.

Linmei Hu, Hongyu He, Duokang Wang, Ziwang Zhao, Yingxia Shao, and Liqiang Nie. 2024. LLM vs Small Model? Large Language Model Based Text Augmentation Enhanced Personality Detection Model. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 18234–18242. doi:10.1609/aaai.v38i16.29782

Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Guillaume Lample, et al. 2024. Mixtral of Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088* (2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2401.04088

Hang Jiang, Xianzhe Zhang, and Jinho D. Choi. 2020a. Automatic Text-based Personality Recognition on Monologues and Multiparty Dialogues Using Attentive Networks and Contextual Embeddings (Student Abstract). In *Proceedings of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence: Student Abstract and Poster Program*, Vol. 34. 13821–13822. doi:10.1609/aaai.v34i10.7182

Hang Jiang, Xianzhe Zhang, and Jinho D. Choi. 2020b. Automatic Text-based Personality Recognition on Monologues and Multiparty Dialogues Using Attentive Networks and Contextual Embeddings (Student Abstract). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence: Student Abstract and Poster Program*, Vol. 34. 13821–13822. doi:10.1609/aaai.v34i10.7182

Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, et al. 2020. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361* (2020). arXiv:2001.08361 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361>

Sedrick Scott Keh and I-Tsun Cheng. 2019a. Myers-Briggs Personality Classification and Personality-Specific Language Generation Using Pre-trained Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.06333* (2019). arXiv:1907.06333 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.06333>

Sedrick Scott Keh and I-Tsun Cheng. 2019b. Myers-Briggs Personality Classification and Personality-Specific Language Generation Using Pre-trained Language Models. *CoRR abs/1907.06333* (2019). arXiv:1907.06333 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.06333>

Otto F. Kernberg. 2016. What Is Personality? *Journal of Personality Disorders* 30, 2 (2016), 145–156. doi:10.1521/pedi.2016.30.2.145

Dmitry Lepikhin, HyoukJoong Lee, et al. 2020. GShard: Scaling Giant Models with Conditional Computation and Automatic Sharding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16668* (2020). arXiv:2006.16668 doi:10.48550/arXiv.2006.16668

Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. CAMEL: Communicative Agents for “Mind” Exploration of Large Language Model Society. *arXiv* (2023). arXiv:2303.17760 doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.17760

Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-V2: A Strong, Economical, and Efficient Mixture-of-Experts Language Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04434* (2024). arXiv:2405.04434 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.04434>

Ryan Louie, Ananjan Nandi, William Fang, Cheng Chang, Emma Brunskill, and Diyi Yang. 2024. Roleplay-doh: Enabling Domain-Experts to Create LLM-simulated Patients via Eliciting and Adhering to Principles. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 10570–10603. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.591

Veronica Lynn, Niranjan Balasubramanian, and H. Andrew Schwartz. 2020. Hierarchical Modeling for User Personality Prediction: The Role of Message-Level Attention. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 5306–5316. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.472

Jiaqi Ma, Zhe Zhao, Xinyang Yi, Jilin Chen, Lichan Hong, and Ed H. Chi. 2018. Modeling Task Relationships in Multi-task Learning with Multi-gate Mixture-of-Experts.

- In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1930–1939. doi:10.1145/3219819.3220007
- François Mairesse, Marilyn A. Walker, Matthias R. Mehl, and Roger K. Moore. 2007. Using linguistic cues for the automatic recognition of personality in conversation and text. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 30 (2007), 457–500. doi:10.1613/jair.2349
- Isabel Briggs Myers, Mary H. McCaulley, Naomi L. Quenk, and Allen L. Hammer. 1998. *MBTI Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA. <https://isbnsearch.org/isbn/9780891061304>
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph C. O'Brien, Carrie J. Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. 2023. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST '23)*. doi:10.1145/3586183.3606763
- James W. Pennebaker, Roger J. Booth, Ryan L. Boyd, and Martha E. Francis. 2015. *Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count: LIWC2015*. Austin, TX. <https://liwc.app/static/documents/LIWC2015%20Manual%20-%20Operation.pdf>
- Zihan Qiu, Zeyu Huang, Shuang Cheng, Yizhi Zhou, Zili Wang, Ivan Titov, and Jie Fu. 2024. Layerwise Recurrent Router for Mixture-of-Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06793* (2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2408.06793 ICLR 2025 (Poster).
- H. Andrew Schwartz, Johannes C. Eichstaedt, Margaret L. Kern, Lukasz Dziurzynski, Stephanie M. Ramones, Megha Agrawal, Achal Shah, Michal Kosinski, David Stillwell, Martin E. P. Seligman, and Lyle H. Ungar. 2013. Personality, Gender, and Age in the Language of Social Media: The Open-Vocabulary Approach. *PLOS ONE* 8, 9 (2013), e73791. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073791
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, et al. 2017. Outrageously Large Neural Networks: The Sparsely-Gated Mixture-of-Experts Layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538* (2017). arXiv:1701.06538 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.06538>
- Sanja Stajner and Seren Yenikent. 2020. A Survey of Automatic Personality Detection from Texts. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain (Online), 6284–6295. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.553
- Malede Mequanint Tadesse, Hongfei Lin, Bo Xu, and Liang Yang. 2017. Personality Prediction System from Facebook Users. *Procedia Computer Science* 116 (2017), 604–611. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2017.10.016
- Yu-Min Tseng, Yu-Chao Huang, Teng-Yun Hsiao, Wei-Lin Chen, Chao-Wei Huang, Yu Meng, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2024. Two Tales of Persona in LLMs: A Survey of Role-Playing and Personalization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 16612–16631. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.969
- Lei Wang, Jianxun Lian, Yi Huang, Yanqi Dai, Haoxuan Li, Xu Chen, Xing Xie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2025. CharacterBox: Evaluating the Role-Playing Capabilities of LLMs in Text-Based Virtual Worlds. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 6372–6391. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.323
- Noah Wang, Z.y. Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhuan Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Jian Yang, Man Zhang, Zhaoxiang Zhang, Wanli Ouyang, Ke Xu, Wenhao Huang, Jie Fu, and Junran Peng. 2024. RoleLLM: Benchmarking, Eliciting, and Enhancing Role-Playing Abilities of Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 14743–14777. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.878
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, et al. 2022a. Finetuned Language Models are Zero-Shot Learners. *arXiv* (2022). arXiv:2109.01652 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01652>
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903* (2022). arXiv:2201.11903 doi:10.48550/arXiv.2201.11903
- Chengxing Xie, Canyu Chen, Feiran Jia, Ziyu Ye, Shiyang Lai, Kai Shu, Jindong Gu, Adel Bibi, Ziniu Hu, David Jurgens, et al. 2024. Can Large Language Model Agents Simulate Human Trust Behavior?. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37*. Neural Information Processing Systems Foundation, 15674–15729. doi:10.52202/079017-0501
- Di Xue, Lifa Wu, Zheng Hong, Shize Guo, Liang Gao, Zhiyong Wu, Xiaofeng Zhong, and Jianshan Sun. 2018. Deep learning-based personality recognition from text posts of online social networks. *Applied Intelligence* 48, 12 (2018), 4232–4246. doi:10.1007/s10489-018-1212-4
- Feifan Yang, Xiaojun Quan, Yunyi Yang, and Jianxing Yu. 2021a. Multi-Document Transformer for Personality Detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 14221–14229. doi:10.1609/aaai.v35i16.17673
- Feifan Yang, Xiaojun Quan, Yunyi Yang, and Jianxing Yu. 2021b. Multi-Document Transformer for Personality Detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. AAAI Press, 14221–14229. doi:10.1609/aaai.v35i5.17771
- Tao Yang, Jinghao Deng, Xiaojun Quan, and Qifan Wang. 2023. Orders Are Unwanted: Dynamic Deep Graph Convolutional Network for Personality Detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 13896–13904. doi:10.1609/aaai.v37i11.26627
- Tao Yang, Feifan Yang, Haolan Ouyang, and Xiaojun Quan. 2021c. Psycholinguistic Tripartite Graph Network for Personality Detection. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 4229–4239. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.326
- Wu Youyou, Michal Kosinski, and David Stillwell. 2015. Computer-based personality judgments are more accurate than those made by humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112, 4 (2015), 1036–1040. doi:10.1073/pnas.1418680112
- Hao Zhao, Zihan Qiu, Huijia Wu, Zili Wang, Zhaofeng He, and Jie Fu. 2024. HyperMoE: Towards Better Mixture of Experts via Transferring Among Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12656* (2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2402.12656
- Yangfu Zhu, Linmei Hu, Xinkai Ge, Wanrong Peng, and Bin Wu. 2022. Contrastive Graph Transformer Network for Personality Detection. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2022)*. 4559–4565. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2022/633