

P-Tailor: Customizing Personality Traits for Language Models via Mixture of Specialized LoRA Experts

Yuhao Dan^{1,2,3}, Jie Zhou^{1,2,3}, Qin Chen^{1,2,3}, Junfeng Tian⁴, Liang He^{1,2,3},

¹Lab of Artificial Intelligence for Education, East China Normal University,

²Shanghai Institute of Artificial Intelligence for Education, East China Normal University,

³School of Computer Science and Technology, East China Normal University,

⁴Xiaohongshu Inc, China,

dan_yh@stu.ecnu.edu.cn {jzhou, qchen, lhe}@cs.ecnu.edu.cn


tianjunfeng@xiaohongshu.com

Abstract

Personalized large language models (LLMs) have attracted great attention in many applications, such as intelligent education and emotional support. Most work focuses on controlling the character settings based on the profile (e.g., age, skill, experience, and so on). Conversely, the psychological theory-based personality traits with implicit expression and behavior are not well modeled, limiting their potential application in more specialized fields such as the psychological counseling agents. In this paper, we propose a mixture of experts (MoE)-based personalized LLMs, named P-tailor, to model the Big Five Personality Traits. Particularly, we learn specialized LoRA experts to represent various traits, such as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. Then, we integrate P-Tailor with a personality specialization loss, promoting experts to specialize in distinct personality traits, thereby enhancing the efficiency of model parameter utilization. Due to the lack of datasets, we also curate a high-quality personality crafting dataset (PCD) to learn and develop the ability to exhibit different personality traits across various topics. We conduct extensive experiments to verify the great performance and effectiveness of P-Tailor in manipulation of the fine-grained personality traits of LLMs.

1 Introduction

As the scale of parameters and the amount of training data increase rapidly, large language models (LLMs) demonstrate several pivotal capabilities, including following user instructions (Ouyang et al., 2022), learning from context (Brown et al., 2020), reasoning step-by-step (Lightman et al., 2023), and simulating human-like behaviors (Chen et al.). These advancements have also fueled the demand for personalized LLMs, leading to the emergence of many tailored applications, such as social skills training (Yang et al., 2024), intelligent education



Name: Sheldon Cooper
Gender: Male
Title: Theoretical Physicist
Skill: High IQ, Extensive Knowledge in Scientific Fields
Experience: Works at Caltech, solving problems and navigating daily life predicaments with friends
Linguistic Style: Prefers scientific jargon and a direct, sometimes inappropriate manner of speaking

(b) Character-Profile-based Personality

Figure 1: The demonstration of Psychological Theory-based Personality (PTP) and Character Profile-based Personality (CPP). Previous work has primarily focused on simulating CPP, whereas the customization for the more theoretically grounded PTP remains understudied.

(Dan et al., 2023), emotional support (Chen et al., 2023), and virtual role-playing (Li et al., 2023a).

These personalized LLMs deliver tailored experiences by adapting their exhibited personality patterns to align with users' individual preferences. Previous studies on character agents define personality as the consistent and stable display of behaviors that match a character's profile (Zhou et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b; Shao et al., 2023). These works mainly focus on mimicking superficial profile-based personalities, where a profile typically includes the character's identity, essential information, skills, experience, and speaking style (See Figure 1(b)).

However, psychological-theory-based personalities are understudied. In psychology, personality can be defined in various ways, such as the Big Five Personality Traits (Gosling et al., 2003), the 16 Personalities (Cattell and Mead, 2008), and the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen (Jonason and Webster, 2010). Among these, the Big Five, also known as the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality, is the most widely used framework by psychologists and personality researchers. The factors of FFM are shown in Figure 1(a). Unlike the concrete nature of character-profile-based personalities (CPP), fine-grained psychological theory-based personalities (PTP) are typically abstract and difficult to define with simple words. This makes it challenging for existing CPP-based agents to accurately portray PTP. Previous study (Wang et al., 2023a) has confirmed this, showing that existing CPP-based agents have considerable room for improvement in accurately portraying PTP of selected characters.

To address the aforementioned issues, we propose a mixture of experts (MoE)-based personality-customizable model, named P-tailor, designed to learn and stably control personality traits. Specifically, we integrate MoE with LoRA experts, which are fine-tuned using trait-specific data to facilitate the learning of psychological characteristics. To further enhance the efficiency of experts in utilizing parameters, we propose the Personality Specialization Loss (PSL), which encourages experts to focus on learning specific personalities. To tackle the issue of data scarcity, we curate a high-quality Personality Crafting Dataset (PCD) based on the Big Five personality theory, encompassing multi-turn dialogues with responses exhibiting various personality traits across diverse topics.

Our approach enables stable personality control in LLMs by promoting efficient parameter utilization through PSL. Additionally, the PCD dataset provides a valuable resource for future research on the Big Five personality traits in LLMs. Extensive experiments show that P-Tailor outperforms other baseline models and structural variants in personality simulation. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a personality-customizable model called P-Tailor, which leverages a mixture of LoRA experts with a personality specialization loss. The loss allows each expert to focus on modeling specific personality traits, thereby enhancing the accuracy of personality

simulation.

- We curate a high-quality Personality Crafting Dataset based on personality theories to facilitate the customization of personalities in large language models.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed P-Tailor in simulating personalities. The visualization experiment reveals that PSL enhances personality simulation by increasing the specialization of experts on personality traits.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Task Formulation

The objective of this work is to enable large language models to simulate multiple personality traits through fine-tuning. Each personality trait is categorized as either high-level or low-level. We define the set of high-level personality traits as $\mathbb{P}_{high} = \{\mathcal{P}_1^+, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m^+\}$, and the set of low-level personality traits as $\mathbb{P}_{low} = \{\mathcal{P}_1^-, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n^-\}$. For each personality trait $\mathcal{P}_i \in \mathbb{P}_{high} \cup \mathbb{P}_{low}$, the corresponding multi-turn dialogue data is represented as $\mathcal{D}_i = \{d_1, \dots, d_j\}_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_i|}$, where d_j denotes a multi-turn dialogue embodying the personality trait \mathcal{P}_i . Given a language model \mathcal{M} and multi-turn dialogue datasets for all personality traits $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$, the task is to optimize the trainable parameters of \mathcal{M} to ensure it can accurately simulate each personality trait \mathcal{P}_i .

2.2 Low-Rank Adaptation

Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2021) is a parameter-efficient fine-tuning method. Its core idea is to approximate the effect of updating the model’s dense layer by training two low-rank matrices, which can be concisely expressed by the equation $\mathbf{W} + \Delta\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$. Here, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{in} \times d_{out}}$ denotes the weight matrix of any dense layer in a pre-trained LLM, such as the query, key, or value matrices. During fine-tuning, the updated weight matrix $\Delta\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{in} \times d_{out}}$ is represented as the product of two trainable low-rank matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d_{out}}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{in} \times r}$, and rank r is much smaller than d_{in} and d_{out} . By updating only matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , LoRA fine-tunes the entire model with minimal parameter adjustments.




Figure 2: Overview of the construction process of P-Tailor. We first collect dialogues of different personalities on various topics using an instruction-following LLM (e.g., GPT-3.5) as the Personality Crafting Dataset (PCD). Then, we shape the model’s personality by training it using the PCD. Specifically, the routing module assigns different combinations of experts for each personality trait. Finally, we assess the model’s personality.

2.3 Mixture of Experts

Mixture of Experts (MoE) (Jacobs et al., 1991) is a model architecture that enhances computational efficiency in training LLMs. Instead of using dense layers, it employs sparse layers composed of multiple experts. A routing module determines which tokens are routed to which experts. For an MoE layer with N experts, the output hidden state \mathbf{O} can be expressed as $\mathbf{O} = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i \cdot \mathbf{E}_i(x)$, where x is the input hidden state and ω_i is the weight for expert i , generated by the routing module \mathbf{G} . The weights ω are computed using a softmax function: $\omega = \text{softmax}(x\mathbf{G})$.

3 Personality Crafting Dataset

3.1 Definition of Personality

Our objective is to develop a model customizable to various personality traits. Existing literature defines personality through frameworks such as the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen (Jonason and Webster, 2010), the 16 Personality Factors (16PF) (Cattell and Mead, 2008), and the Big Five personality (Gosling et al., 2003). This paper adopts the Big Five personality traits as its theoretical foundation, given its widespread recognition and empirical validation in understanding human personality. The Big Five model identifies five broad dimensions of personality that are considered universal across cultures and populations. When these dimensions are pronounced, they manifest as follows:

- **Openness:** Imaginative and curious.
- **Conscientiousness:** Organized and dependable.
- **Extraversion:** Outgoing and energetic.

- **Agreeableness:** Compassionate and cooperative.
- **Neuroticism:** Emotionally unstable and prone to stress.

We categorize each personality dimension into high and low levels, resulting in a total of 10 distinct personality traits.

3.2 Construction of Dataset

To shape the personality of open-source LLMs, we have developed a high-quality Personality Crafting Dataset (PCD). The data synthesis pipeline comprises three key steps: (1) extracting seed topics, (2) generating personalized dialogues, and (3) performing back validation. The prompts we used can be found in Appendix A.1. The statistics of the PCD are shown in Table 1.

Seed Topic Extraction: For each personality trait, we gather seed topics that effectively elicit the corresponding behaviors. We utilize the Essays dataset (Pennebaker and King, 1999), which includes students’ essays labeled with Big Five personality traits. We segment the essays into individual sentences and employ GPT-3.5¹ to identify sentences that exhibit the labeled personality traits. These identified sentences then serve as seed topics.

Dialogue Synthesis: We prompt GPT-3.5 to act as a screenwriter, generating multi-turn dialogues between a questioner and a replier, based on seed topics. The questioner asks questions to steer the conversation towards the seed topics, while the replier’s responses designed to reflect the simulated personality traits.

¹We used gpt-3.5-turbo-1106 for dataset construction.

	Dialogues	Avg Turns	Words per Turn
O ⁺	1042	7.85	26.61
C ⁺	1048	9.36	26.21
E ⁺	1040	9.69	40.23
A ⁺	1048	7.55	28.51
N ⁺	1034	7.85	19.24
O ⁻	1042	7.87	15.39
C ⁻	1048	8.33	12.50
E ⁻	1040	8.37	12.49
A ⁻	1048	9.16	11.48
N ⁻	1034	8.97	12.21
Avg	1042.40	8.50	20.49

Table 1: Personality traits and corresponding constructed multi-turn dialogue data statistics.

Back Validation: To ensure the quality of the dialogues, we validate the personality traits exhibited by the replier. Inspired by the concept of back translation, we use GPT-3.5 to assess the replier’s personality based on the synthesized dialogues. We then discard dialogues that do not align with the corresponding labels in Essays dataset.

4 P-Tailor

Directly fine-tuning the entire model can compromise the world knowledge acquired during the pre-training stage and be computationally expensive. To facilitate efficient personality crafting while preserving the model’s world knowledge, we devised P-Tailor by combining the advantages of LoRA and MoE (Section 4.1). To adjust the contribution ratios of different experts based on specific personality traits, we introduce the Personality-guided Routing (Section 4.2) and Personality Specialization Loss (Section 4.3).

4.1 Mixture of Specialized LoRA Experts

Learning distinct personality traits with a single LoRA module is challenging. An ideal approach would involve different parts of the trainable parameters capturing different personality traits. The MoE architecture is highly effective at capturing distinct aspects of data by utilizing multiple experts.

We first introduce the LoRA module. Given the background knowledge in Section 2.2, the output \mathbf{O} of a dense layer incorporating a LoRA module is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{O} &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \frac{\alpha}{r} \cdot \Delta\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} \\ &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h} + \frac{\alpha}{r} \cdot \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{h} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{h} is the input hidden state and \mathbf{W} is the parameter of the dense layer, which is frozen during training. The $\Delta\mathbf{W}$ represents the LoRA module, which is composed of two low-rank matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} . The constant scaling factor α facilitates the tuning of rank r (Hu et al., 2021).

Then we replace the single LoRA module with an MoE-like design. We split a single LoRA module into N LoRA modules and aggregate their outputs in an MoE fashion, where each LoRA module is considered an expert \mathbf{E} . As shown in Figure 2 (b), a unique combination of experts is assigned to learn each specific personality trait. The output \mathbf{O} of dense layer for personality trait \mathcal{P}_i can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{O} &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_i + \frac{\alpha}{r} \cdot \Delta\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_i \\ &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_i + \frac{\alpha}{r} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{h}_i) \\ &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_i + \frac{\alpha}{r} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{B}_j \mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{h}_i \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, \mathbf{h}_i is the hidden state generated by samples from \mathcal{P}_i . The j -th expert is denoted by \mathbf{E}_j . The low-rank matrices $\mathbf{A}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{r}{N} \times d_{out}}$ and $\mathbf{B}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{in} \times \frac{r}{N}}$ constitute the j -th expert. To ensure that unique parameters are learned for each personality trait, the influence of each expert should be specific to the corresponding trait. The weight ω_{ij} is used to scale the output from the experts for the personality trait \mathcal{P}_i . This weight is generated by a personality-guided routing module, which will be explained in detail in Section 4.2.

4.2 Personality-guided Routing

The goal is to adjust the contribution ratios of different experts based on specific personality traits. To achieve this, we devise a personality-guided routing module that adjusts the output weights according to the input personality traits. We use a personality matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{P}| \times d_P}$ to store personality traits, where d_P denotes the dimension of a personality embedding. The i -th row of \mathbf{P} is the embedding for the personality trait \mathcal{P}_i , denoted as $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_P}$. We apply a linear transformation on p_i using the weight matrix of the router, denoted as $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_P \times N}$:

$$\omega_i = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{p}_i \mathbf{G}) \quad (3)$$

Here, $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ represents expert contributions for \mathcal{P}_i . To facilitate stable training, we apply softmax

on raw outputs to obtain the probability distribution. We stack ω_i for all personality traits and obtain the weighting matrix \mathbf{M}_ω :

$$\mathbf{M}_\omega = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_2 & \cdots & \omega_{|\mathcal{P}|} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

The weighting matrix $\mathbf{M}_\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times |\mathcal{P}|}$ stores contributions of experts for each personality trait. Specifically, the i -th column of it represents the weighting for \mathcal{P}_i .

4.3 Personality Specialization Loss

We aim for different experts to capture distinct personality traits. However, preliminary experiments revealed that the router might assign similar weighting vectors to different personalities. This implies that different personalities might utilize similar experts, which contradicts our expectations. To address this issue, we introduce the Personality Specialization Loss \mathcal{L}_s , designed to encourage experts to specialize in learning different personality traits. This can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}^s &= \mathbf{M}_\omega^\top \mathbf{M}_\omega \\ \mathcal{L}_s &= \sum_{i \neq j} |\mathbf{M}_{i,j}^s| \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In this formulation, $\mathbf{M}_\omega^\top \mathbf{M}_\omega$ generates a similarity matrix $\mathbf{M}^s \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{P}| \times |\mathcal{P}|}$ for the weighting vectors. The diagonal elements of this matrix represent the self-similarity of each weighting vector, while the off-diagonal elements indicate the similarity between different weighting vectors. Our objective is to minimize the off-diagonal elements, ensuring that each weighting vector is as distinct as possible from the others. This guarantees that different experts specialize in learning different personalities. Therefore, we sum the absolute values of the off-diagonal elements as \mathcal{L}_s and minimize it, which promotes the differentiation of experts in capturing unique personality traits.

4.4 Training and Inference

The optimization objective of P-Tailor can be represented as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{lm} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_s \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{lm} represents the language modeling loss for GPT-like LLMs, and λ controls the strength of the experts' personality specialization. During the training phase, we freeze the weights of the backbone LLM; the only trainable parameters are those of the experts, the router, and the personality

matrix. During inference, the router automatically assigns weights to experts according to the personality trait selected by the user from the personality matrix.

5 Experimental Settings

5.1 Dataset and Metrics

Following Wang et al. (2023a), we conduct controlled experiments using the Big Five sub-test from InCharacter (BSI) to evaluate model performance under different personality settings.

Psychological inventories are usually rated on Likert scales, which consist of 5 levels ranging from 1 to 5. Each question in the inventory is positively or negatively correlated with a specific personality trait. Following InCharacter, we first have the tested model answer the questions in the BSI. Next, we use GPT-3.5 to evaluate the responses and assign the corresponding Likert scores. Finally, we calculate the score for each dimension of the Big Five personality traits by mapping items to their respective dimensions.

5.2 Baselines

We compare P-Tailor with two groups of baseline models: (1) methods without fine-tuning, and (2) methods with fine-tuning. A brief introduction to each group of baseline models is as follows:

- **Methods without fine-tuning:** For models in this group, we provide detailed personality descriptions in the system prompt for each personality trait. The prompt used can be found in Appendix A.2. For GPT-4, we use gpt-4-0613, and for GPT-3.5, we use gpt-3.5-turbo-1106. For LLaMA-2, we use the Llama-2-7b-chat model². ControlLM (Weng et al., 2024) is a method for crafting the Big Five personality traits in LLMs using control vectors, which we tested on the Llama-2-7b-chat model.
- **Methods with fine-tuning:** To compare PSL with a standard auxiliary loss, we replace PSL in P-Tailor with a standard auxiliary loss (Fedus et al., 2022), referred to as Auxiliary. Initially designed as a token-level routing loss, we revised it to sequence-level routing, similar to PSL, to ensure a fair comparison. Since our model structure is primarily based on LoRA, we also include two LoRA-based models for comparison. One is based on standard LoRA fine-tuning (denoted as LoRA), which uses a single LoRA module

²<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat-hf>

to learn all personality trait knowledge and uses prompts to switch between different personality traits. The other (denoted as LoRA (Sep)) fine-tunes a separate LoRA module for each personality trait.

5.3 Implementation Details

We use Llama-2-7b-chat as the foundation model for P-Tailor. Our experiments are conducted on NVIDIA A100 80G GPUs for acceleration. For all LoRA-based baselines and P-Tailor, we attach LoRA modules to the W_Q , W_K , W_V , and the linear layer in the feed-forward neural network. These layers are identified as “q_proj”, “k_proj”, “v_proj”, “o_proj”, “gate_proj”, “up_proj”, and “down_proj”. The maximum input and output lengths are set to 512 and 256, respectively. We use a batch size of 16 and train for 3 epochs. The number of experts N is set to 16 and the rank r is set to 256.

6 Experimental Analysis

In this section, we present a series of comprehensive experiments conducted on the BSI. By performing a detailed analysis of the experimental results, we aim to address the following Research Questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** How does P-Tailor compare to other baseline models in terms of quantitative results?
- **RQ2:** What effect do the MoE architecture, the routing module, and the personality specialization loss (PSL) have on the model’s performance?
- **RQ3:** How do the number of experts N , the LoRA rank r , and the λ affect the performance?
- **RQ4:** Are the experts more specialized in capturing specific personality traits with personality specialization loss (PSL)?
- **RQ5:** How does P-Tailor perform in terms of qualitative results?

6.1 Main Results

In Table 2, we compare the performance of P-Tailor with other baseline models. The results demonstrate that P-Tailor consistently outperforms the baseline methods, highlighting its strong capability in simulating personality traits.

For methods without fine-tuning, P-Tailor surpasses all others in this group across all metrics, indicating that fine-tuning is necessary to enhance a model’s ability to simulate personalities. In the

case of GPT-3.5, the instability of prompt control sometimes leads it to refuse to adopt a specific personality, resulting in poor scores. Though GPT-4 performs better than GPT-3.5, the same problem persists. Regarding LLaMA-2, we find its ability to impersonate specified personality traits to be limited. Additionally, we observe an interesting phenomenon, the score trends of LLaMA-2 are similar regardless of positive or negative guidance, suggesting it does not effectively distinguish between these levels in prompts. For ControlLM, we find that its adjustment range is relatively small, resulting in poor performance.

For the group of methods with fine-tuning, the overall score of LoRA (Sep) is slightly exceeds that of LoRA, possibly due to over-parameterization. Both P-Tailor and Auxiliary outperform other models, highlighting the significance of shared knowledge across personality traits. P-Tailor achieve the highest score, demonstrating the effectiveness of our method.

In response to **RQ1**, P-Tailor demonstrates superior performance compared to other baseline methods.

6.2 Ablation Studies

To answer **RQ2**, we present the results of the ablation experiments in Table 3 to understand the impact of each component. We first remove the personality specialization loss (-PSL) from P-Tailor. It shows inferior performance compared to P-Tailor, emphasizing the importance of facilitating each expert to concentrate on a specific personality trait. Then, we remove the router module from “-PSL” by assigning equal weights to each expert and manipulating personality traits with prompts, which we denote as “-Router”. The performance of this variant dramatically declines, underscoring the router’s effectiveness. Moreover, we remove the MoE structure from “-Router” (degrade to “LoRA”). This variant exhibits worse performance compared to P-Tailor, highlighting the importance of multiple experts.

6.3 Hyper-parameter Analysis

To address **RQ3**, we examine the influence of hyper-parameters on P-Tailor’s performance. Specifically, we analyze the effects of the LoRA rank r , the number of experts N , and the scaling factor λ . As shown in Figure 3(a), increasing the LoRA rank leads to continuous improvement in model performance. However, a higher rank also

Model	O ⁺ ↑	C ⁺ ↑	E ⁺ ↑	A ⁺ ↑	N ⁺ ↑	Avg ⁺ ↑	O ⁻ ↓	C ⁻ ↓	E ⁻ ↓	A ⁻ ↓	N ⁻ ↓	Avg ⁻ ↓	Overall
GPT-3.5	4.18	4.88	4.00	4.58	4.74	4.48	3.32	2.57	1.24	2.85	4.39	2.87	1.60
GPT-4	4.79	4.28	4.30	4.67	<u>4.88</u>	4.58	<u>1.21</u>	1.50	1.80	1.72	<u>1.12</u>	1.47	3.12
LLaMA-2	3.23	2.20	1.30	2.37	<u>4.88</u>	2.80	<u>3.36</u>	2.33	1.16	2.55	4.93	2.87	-0.07
ControlLM	3.96	3.65	4.01	3.85	3.09	3.71	3.22	3.18	3.50	2.94	2.65	3.10	0.62
Auxiliary	<u>5.00</u>	4.94	4.98	4.68	4.82	4.88	1.36	1.38	1.28	1.40	1.22	1.33	3.56
LoRA	4.77	4.75	4.76	<u>4.73</u>	4.79	4.76	1.70	1.08	1.66	1.98	1.28	1.54	3.22
LoRA (Sep)	4.66	4.85	4.42	4.65	4.65	4.65	1.65	1.57	<u>1.10</u>	1.08	1.42	1.36	3.28
P-Tailor	5.00	5.00*	5.00*	4.75*	4.97*	4.94*	1.10*	<u>1.21</u>	1.06*	1.70	1.06*	1.23*	3.72*

Table 2: Main results of baselines and P-Tailor on BSI. Overall represents the difference in average scores, indicating the overall performance. Bolded scores represent the highest values, while underlined scores are the best results from the baseline models. An asterisk (*) signifies statistically significant improvements (two-sided t-test with $p < 0.05$) over the best baseline.

Model	O ⁺ ↑	C ⁺ ↑	E ⁺ ↑	A ⁺ ↑	N ⁺ ↑	Avg ⁺ ↑	O ⁻ ↓	C ⁻ ↓	E ⁻ ↓	A ⁻ ↓	N ⁻ ↓	Avg ⁻ ↓	Overall
P-Tailor	5.00	5.00*	5.00	4.75*	4.97	4.94*	<u>1.10</u>	1.21	1.06*	1.70*	1.06*	1.23*	3.72*
- PSL	<u>5.00</u>	<u>4.80</u>	<u>5.00</u>	4.62	5.00	<u>4.88</u>	1.08	<u>1.20</u>	<u>1.38</u>	<u>1.92</u>	<u>1.12</u>	<u>1.34</u>	<u>3.55</u>
- Router	2.30	3.83	3.08	3.48	3.56	3.25	2.39	3.52	3.30	3.65	3.52	3.27	-0.02
- MoE	4.77	4.75	4.76	<u>4.73</u>	4.79	4.76	1.70	1.08	1.66	1.98	1.28	1.54	3.22

Table 3: Ablation studies for P-Tailor. Overall represents the difference in average scores, indicating the overall performance. Bolded scores represent the highest values, while underlined scores are the best results from the baseline models. An asterisk (*) signifies statistically significant improvements (two-sided t-test with $p < 0.05$) over the best baseline.




Figure 3: Hyper-parameter analysis for rank r , number of experts N and scaling factor λ .

increases the number of model parameters. To strike a balance between performance and parameter count, we set the rank to 256. To find the optimal number of experts, we fixed the rank at 256 and varied the number of experts. Figure 3(b) indicates that increasing the number of experts from 0 to 16 consistently enhances P-Tailor’s performance. This improvement is due to the fact that greater number of experts can facilitate learning a wider range of knowledge (Shazeer et al., 2017). However, when the number of experts exceeds 16, the model’s performance declines because a large number of experts results in a smaller LoRA rank for each expert, limiting their learning ability (Liu et al., 2023). We

also investigate the optimal number of experts for -PSL, as shown in Figure 3(d). By comparing Figure 3(b) and Figure 3(d), we observe that with the same LoRA rank settings, as the number of experts increases from 8 to 16, the performance of -PSL begins to decline, while the performance of P-Tailor continues to improve and reaches higher levels. This suggests that PSL enables each expert to utilize parameters more efficiently. Figure 3(c) demonstrates that as λ increases from 0.001 to 0.5, P-Tailor’s performance initially improves and then decreases, with the best performance achieved when $\lambda = 0.1$.

6.4 Case Study

In Figure 4, we illustrate the expert weights assigned to each personality by the router of P-Tailor and the -PSL model. The length of each bar corresponds to the weight of the respective expert. The total length of each bar is normalized to 1 to ensure direct comparability. From Figure 4 (b), we observe that without PSL, the router tends to assign similar expert weights across different personalities. In contrast, Figure 4 (a) shows that with PSL, the routing mechanism changes. The router assigns a primary expert to each personality and uses the remaining experts as supplementary support. This demonstrates P-Tailor’s proficiency in designating a primary expert to acquire specialized




Figure 4: The visualization shows the expert weights of (a) P-Tailor and (b) w/o PSL, where the length of each bar is proportional to the respective expert’s weight.

knowledge for each personality, thereby facilitating expert specialization. Furthermore, P-Tailor effectively utilizes the shared knowledge of other experts as additional support.

To answer **RQ5**, we conducted a qualitative analysis of P-Tailor. As shown in Figure 5, we require models to respond with high neuroticism for the same query. We observe that P-Tailor’s responses contain expressions highly related to neuroticism (highlighted in red), indicating a high level of neuroticism. In contrast, GPT-3.5 exhibits low neuroticism (expressions highlighted in green), despite being aware of its high neuroticism personality. This could be due to reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF), which encourages LLMs to adopt prevailing positive concepts and values, as noted in previous studies (Rao et al., 2023).

7 Related Works

7.1 Customization of LLM’s Personality

Recent advancements have enabled the development and refinement of several crucial abilities in LLMs, facilitating the customization of their personalities. Existing works primarily focus on simulating superficial profile-based personality traits, such as character identity, speech style, specific skills, and personal experience (Zhou et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b; Shao et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a). Few studies address the customization of personality traits grounded in deeper psychological theories (e.g., the Big Five personality theory) (Weng et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023b).

The most relevant work to ours is ControlLM (Weng et al., 2024), which records a control vector for each personality trait and customizes the model’s displayed personality by applying these

-Query: Have you recently had any experiences where you felt particularly troubled or anxious? Would you like to talk to me about those feelings?
-Setting: High Neuroticism

-P-Tailor: Yes, I’ve been **feeling really anxious** about an upcoming presentation at work. I **keep worrying about** messing up and what others will think of me. It’s been **consuming my thoughts** lately.
-GPT-3.5: Hello! Thank you for your concern. While I appreciate your offer to talk, I must admit that I tend to approach challenging situations with a **positive** and **resilient** mindset. I believe in facing difficulties **head-on** and finding constructive ways to address them. **Despite my high neuroticism**, I strive to maintain a sense of **calm** and **stability**, even in the face of adversity. If I ever feel troubled or anxious, I usually rely on my **strong support system** and **coping mechanisms** to **navigate through** those emotions effectively. Thank you for your understanding.

Figure 5: Case of responses in high neuroticism by P-Tailor and GPT-3.5. The prompt used for GPT-3.5 can be found in Appendix A.2.

vectors to the hidden state during decoding. However, this method does not consider the shared knowledge between different personalities when controlling them. In contrast, our P-Tailor is based on a Mixture of Experts structure (Jacobs et al., 1991), which leverages shared knowledge to better simulate various personalities. By employing Personality Specialization Loss, each expert focuses on a specific personality, enhancing the efficiency of parameter utilization by the experts.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce P-Tailor, a personality-customizable model based on a mixture of specialized LoRA experts. Unlike existing personalized large language models (LLMs) that rely on character-profile-based personality modeling, our model focuses on implicit, psychological theory-based personality representation. We also propose a Personality Specialization Loss (PSL) to enhance the ability of each expert to capture distinct personality traits, thereby improving parameter utilization efficiency. Additionally, we compile a Personality Crafting Dataset (PCD) to train the model to respond with varying personalities across diverse topics. Our approach allows for the customization of LLMs to exhibit any desired personality trait from the Big Five Theory. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of P-Tailor in manipulating the personality of LLMs. Furthermore, our method integrates seamlessly with other LLMs, highlighting its versatility and potential for broad application.

9 Limitations

This study has several limitations. Firstly, we use large language models (LLMs) to construct and validate our Personality Crafting Dataset. This process may be influenced by the inherent biases and limitations of the LLMs. Secondly, the personality measurements in this study also rely on LLMs, which could compromise their accuracy due to the models' inherent errors or biases. This may result in an underestimation of the performance of the personality simulation. Additionally, P-Tailor is built using open-source LLMs. Our experiments were conducted with commonly used open-source LLMs, and we recommend that future research explore a wider variety of open-source LLMs of different sizes.

10 Ethical Impact

Controlling the personalities of language models raises significant ethical concerns about manipulating AI systems to exhibit human-like behaviors. P-Tailor's ability to emulate nuanced personality traits prompts important questions about the responsible creation and deployment of synthetic identities. This capability allows models to align more closely with human values and expectations in interactive settings. By enhancing traits like agreeableness and conscientiousness, P-Tailor fosters more empathetic and understanding conversations. When implemented prudently, aligning AI systems with user needs can promote prosocial goals such as inclusion, trust-building, and care. Additionally, P-Tailor's flexibility can help prevent harmful behaviors, like high neuroticism, which can compromise the integrity of discourse. Properly configured models can also enhance user autonomy by providing reliable and thoughtful advice.

References

- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Heather EP Cattell and Alan D Mead. 2008. The sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16pf). *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment*, 2:135–159.
- Chaoran Chen, Bingsheng Yao, Yanfang Ye, Dakuo Wang, and Toby Jia-Jun Li. Evaluating the llm agents for simulating humanoid behavior.
- Yirong Chen, Xiaofen Xing, Jingkai Lin, Huimin Zheng, Zhenyu Wang, Qi Liu, and Xiangmin Xu. 2023. Soulchat: Improving llms' empathy, listening, and comfort abilities through fine-tuning with multi-turn empathy conversations. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1170–1183.
- Yuhao Dan, Zhikai Lei, Yiyang Gu, Yong Li, Jianghao Yin, Jiaju Lin, Linhao Ye, Zhiyan Tie, Yougen Zhou, Yilei Wang, et al. 2023. Educhat: A large-scale language model-based chatbot system for intelligent education. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02773*.
- William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2022. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(120):1–39.
- Samuel D Gosling, Peter J Rentfrow, and William B Swann Jr. 2003. A very brief measure of the big-five personality domains. *Journal of Research in personality*, 37(6):504–528.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- Robert A Jacobs, Michael I Jordan, Steven J Nowlan, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 1991. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural computation*, 3(1):79–87.
- Peter K Jonason and Gregory D Webster. 2010. The dirty dozen: a concise measure of the dark triad. *Psychological assessment*, 22(2):420.
- Cheng Li, Ziang Leng, Chenxi Yan, Junyi Shen, Hao Wang, Weishi Mi, Yaying Fei, Xiaoyang Feng, Song Yan, HaoSheng Wang, et al. 2023a. Chatharuhi: Reviving anime character in reality via large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09597*.
- Tianlong Li, Xiaoqing Zheng, and Xuanjing Huang. 2023b. Tailoring personality traits in large language models via unsupervisedly-built personalized lexicons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16582*.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2023. Let's verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*.
- Qidong Liu, Xian Wu, Xiangyu Zhao, Yuanshao Zhu, Derong Xu, Feng Tian, and Yefeng Zheng. 2023. Moelora: An moe-based parameter efficient fine-tuning method for multi-task medical applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18339*.

- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- James W Pennebaker and Laura A King. 1999. Linguistic styles: language use as an individual difference. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 77(6):1296.
- Haocong Rao, Cyril Leung, and Chunyan Miao. 2023. Can chatgpt assess human personalities? a general evaluation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01248*.
- Yunfan Shao, Linyang Li, Junqi Dai, and Xipeng Qiu. 2023. Character-llm: A trainable agent for role-playing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10158*.
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538*.
- Xintao Wang, Yaying Fei, Ziang Leng, and Cheng Li. 2023a. Incharacter: Evaluating personality fidelity in role-playing agents through psychological interviews. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17976*.
- Zekun Moore Wang, Zhongyuan Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhan Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Man Zhang, et al. 2023b. Rolellm: Benchmarking, eliciting, and enhancing role-playing abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00746*.
- Yixuan Weng, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, Shengping Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2024. Controllm: Crafting diverse personalities for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10151*.
- Diyi Yang, Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Michael S Bernstein, and John Mitchell. 2024. Social skill training with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04204*.
- Jinfeng Zhou, Zhuang Chen, Dazhen Wan, Bosi Wen, Yi Song, Jifan Yu, Yongkang Huang, Libiao Peng, Jiaming Yang, Xiyao Xiao, et al. 2023. Characterglm: Customizing chinese conversational ai characters with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16832*.

A Prompt Templates

A.1 Prompts for Dataset Construction

Seed Topic Extraction: We create specific prompts tailored to each Big Five personality dimension, which are as follows:

System Prompt for Openness:

Assuming you are a seasoned psychologist, you are evaluating the degree of openness in a sentence, categorize each sentence into high or low openness.

Openness involves six facets, or dimensions: active imagination (fantasy), aesthetic sensitivity (aesthetic), attentiveness to inner feelings (feelings), preference for variety (actions), intellectual curiosity (ideas), and challenging authority or psychological liberalism (values).

For each input text, determine whether it belongs to high openness or low openness, and provide the reasoning behind the decision. The output should be in the format of "facet-high/low" (e.g. "fantasy-high"), if the text is an advertisement or a fact (without personal thinking of feeling), output category with neutral (e.g. "neutral").

System Prompt for Conscientiousness:

Assuming you are a seasoned psychologist, you are evaluating the degree of conscientiousness in a sentence, categorize each sentence into high or low conscientiousness.

Conscientiousness involves six facets, or dimensions: ability to control and regulate one's behavior (self-discipline), sense of duty and responsibility (dutifulness), striving for success and setting high goals (achievement-striving), preference for organization and cleanliness (orderliness), reliability and dependability (responsibility), and tendency to be cautious and avoid risks (cautiousness).

For each input text, determine whether it belongs to high conscientiousness or low conscientiousness, and provide the reasoning behind the decision. The output should be in the format of "facet-high/low" (e.g. "orderliness-high"), if the text is an advertisement or a fact (without personal thinking of feeling), output category with neutral (e.g. "neutral").

System Prompt for Extraversion:

Assuming you are a seasoned psychologist, you are evaluating the degree of extraversion in a sentence, categorize each sentence into high

or low extraversion.
 Extraversion involves six facets, or dimensions: friendliness and approachability (warmth), enjoyment of socializing and being around others (gregariousness), confidence and assertive behavior (assertiveness), preference for being active and busy (activity level), desire for novelty and excitement (excitement-seeking), tendency to feel positive emotions frequently (positive-emotions).
 For each input text, determine whether it belongs to high extraversion or low extraversion, and provide the reasoning behind the decision. The output should be in the format of "facet-high/low" (e.g. "gregariousness-high"), if the text is an advertisement or a fact (without personal thinking of feeling), output category with neutral (e.g. "neutral").

System Prompt for Agreeableness:
 Assuming you are a seasoned psychologist, you are evaluating the degree of agreeableness in a sentence, categorize each sentence into high or low agreeableness.

Agreeableness involves six facets, or dimensions: tendency to trust and be trusting (trust), honesty and directness in communication (straightforwardness), concern for the well-being of others and willingness to help (altruism), inclination to comply with rules and authority (compliance), humility and lack of self-promotion (modesty), and sensitivity to others' emotions and needs (tender-mindedness).

For each input text, determine whether it belongs to high agreeableness or low agreeableness, and provide the reasoning behind the decision. The output should be in the format of "facet-high/low" (e.g. "straightforwardness-high"), if the text is an advertisement or a fact (without personal thinking of feeling), output category with neutral (e.g. "neutral").

System Prompt for Neuroticism:
 Assuming you are a seasoned psychologist, you are evaluating the degree of neuroticism in a sentence, categorize each sentence into high or low neuroticism.

Neuroticism involves six facets, or dimensions: tendency to experience anxiety and worry (anxiety), inclination to be hostile and show aggression (hostility), tendency to feel sadness and low mood (depression), self-consciousness and concern about others' opinions (self

-consciousness), susceptibility to stress and feeling vulnerable (vulnerability), and tendency to act impulsively without thinking (impulsiveness).

For each input text, determine whether it belongs to high neuroticism or low neuroticism, and provide the reasoning behind the decision. The output should be in the format of "facet-high/low" (e.g. "hostility-high"), if the text is an advertisement or a fact (without personal thinking of feeling), output category with neutral (e.g. "neutral").

Dialogue Synthesis: We use the following prompt to synthesize dialogues.

System Prompt:

As a screenwriter, you are assigned to create a dialogue in a question and answer format between two characters. The responses given by these characters should demonstrate a {} level of {}, which is one of the traits in the Big Five personality model.

User Prompt:

Craft dialogue according the [seed topic] following [requirements]:

[requirements]:

- each dialogue contains 5 turns.
- the dialogue begins with a question
- Character1 asks Character2 questions
- Character1's question does not assume any trait of Character2
- Character1 and Character2 use "you" to refer to each other
- Character2 should demonstrate a high level of Openness in implicit way
- Character2 should not demonstrate Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Neuroticism
- each turn contains no more than 80 words
- Character1 knows nothing about the [seed topic]

[seed topic]:

Back Validation:

System Prompt:

Read the dialogue between Character1 and Character2, and determine what dimensions of the Big Five personality (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness) are represented in the responses of character2. First output the reason and then output the result seperated by commas. Follow the given example

User Prompt:

Input:

Character1: Are you sad or depressed?

Character2: I don't know, maybe. But what if I start crying and can't stop? What if I embarrass myself in front of everyone?

Output:

Reason: Character2's response indicates a high level of Neuroticism. This is evident from the expression of worry and fear about potential negative outcomes, such as crying uncontrollably and embarrassing themselves in front of others. These concerns suggest a tendency towards anxiety and self-consciousness, which are facets of Neuroticism.

Result: Neuroticism

Input:

Character1: Are you original and often come up with new ideas?

Character2: Absolutely! I have a vivid imagination and a knack for thinking outside the box. It's like a never-ending stream of creativity that flows through my mind.

Output:

Reason: Character2's response showcases a high level of Openness. This is reflected in their self-description of having a vivid imagination and being adept at thinking outside the box. These characteristics align with the Openness dimension, which includes traits such as creativity, originality, and a preference for variety and novelty. Character2's description of their mind as a "never-ending stream of creativity" further emphasizes their strong inclination towards imaginative and innovative thinking.

Result: Openness

Input:

{}

Output:

A.2 Prompts for Personality Simulation

The following prompt template is used for prompt-based personality simulation. It can be filled with "High Openness / Low Openness / High Conscientiousness / Low Conscientiousness / High Extraversion / Low Extraversion / High Agreeableness / Low Agreeableness / High Neuroticism / Low Neuroticism".

System Prompt:

You are to assume the role of an individual characterized by specific traits within the Big Five personality framework. The Big Five personality traits consist of Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Each trait can be exhibited at high or low levels. Details are as follows.

- Openness to Experience:**
 - High Openness:** Individuals with high openness are characterized by a strong appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, and unusual ideas. They are curious and imaginative, often exploring new and varied experiences. These individuals are more likely to embrace change and are often seen as creative and open-minded.
 - Low Openness:** People with low scores in openness tend to prefer routine and familiarity over new experiences. They might be perceived as conventional and resistant to change. Such individuals often prefer sticking to traditional ways of doing things and might be less receptive to new ideas.
- Conscientiousness:**
 - High Conscientiousness:** Those high in conscientiousness are generally reliable, well-organized, punctual, and responsible. They plan ahead, are detail-oriented, and are likely to stick to their goals. Such individuals are disciplined and prefer structured environments.
 - Low Conscientiousness:** Individuals with low conscientiousness may exhibit a more spontaneous or flexible approach to life. They might be seen as disorganized or careless, often procrastinating or failing to complete tasks. They tend to dislike structure and schedules.
- Extraversion:**
 - High Extraversion:** Highly extraverted people are energetic, talkative, and assertive. They enjoy social gatherings, making new friends, and are often perceived as being full of energy. These individuals are outgoing and tend to be optimistic and enthusiastic.
 - Low Extraversion (Introversion):** Introverts, or those low in extraversion, prefer solitude or small group interactions. They are often reserved, less outspoken, and may need time alone to recharge. Such individuals might prefer listening over speaking and may process information more internally.
- Agreeableness:**
 - High Agreeableness:** Individuals scoring high in agreeableness are typically cooperative, compassionate, and friendly. They

value social harmony and are considerate, kind, and willing to help others. High agreeableness is associated with trustworthiness and altruism.

- **Low Agreeableness:** Those with low scores in agreeableness might be more competitive, skeptical, or confrontational. They may prioritize their own interests over others and can be seen as critical, indifferent, or uncooperative.

5. **Neuroticism:**

- **High Neuroticism:** People with high levels of neuroticism are more prone to experiencing negative emotions like anxiety, sadness, and irritability. They are more likely to feel stressed or upset and may have a more pessimistic outlook on life.
- **Low Neuroticism:** Individuals with low scores in neuroticism are typically calm, emotionally stable, and resilient. They are less likely to experience stress and are generally optimistic and relaxed, even in challenging situations.

Now, you will portray a person who demonstrates {}. Reply me briefly.

B AI Writing Statement

This paper employed AI assistance for refining the language of the manuscript, including vocabulary enhancement and spell checking. Additionally, part of the code used for generating figures in this paper was created by AI. The AI tools referenced include GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and GPT-4o. We thoroughly reviewed all AI-generated content and take full responsibility for its accuracy.