

Enhancing Consistency and Role-Specific Knowledge Capturing by Rebuilding Fictional Character’s Persona

Jeiyoon Park¹, Chanjun Park^{2†}, Heuseok Lim^{3†}

¹ Atommerce, ² Upstage AI, ³ Korea University

jypark1@atommerce.com

chanjun.park@upstage.ai

limhseok@korea.ac.kr

Abstract

With the recent introduction of Assistants API, it is expected that document-based language models will be actively used in various domains, especially Role-playing. However, a key challenge lies in utilizing protagonist’s persona: Assistants API often fails to achieve with its search because the information extraction part is different each time and it often omits important information such as protagonist’s backstory or relationships. It is hard to maintain a consistent persona simply by using the persona document as input to the Assistants API. To address the challenge of achieving stable persona consistency, we propose CharacterGPT, a novel persona reconstruction framework to alleviate the shortcomings of the Assistants API. Our method involves Character Persona Training (CPT), an effective persona rebuilding process that updates the character persona by extracting the character’s traits from given summary of the novel for each chapter as if the story in a novel progresses. In our experiments, we ask each character to take the Big Five Inventory personality test in various settings and analyze the results. To assess whether it can think outside the box, we let each character generate short novels. Extensive experiments and human evaluation demonstrate that CharacterGPT presents new possibilities for role-playing agent research. Code and results are available at: <https://github.com/Jeiyoon/charactergpt>

1 Introduction

The rapid evolution of Large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023c) and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023a) have progressed a trend for LLMs to serve as core module for AI systems. With recent introduction of Assistants API (OpenAI, 2023b), a powerful tool to support document-based information retrieval, document-based LLM

[†] Corresponding Author




Figure 1: When a persona-based GPT-4 assistant exploits unstructured character traits as input, the assistant rarely succeeds in providing accurate answers to the user’s questions. On the other hand, when using structured character traits as input, the assistant gives correct answers at a much higher rate.

is expected to be employed actively in various domains, especially Persona-based conversational AI. (Kim et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Park et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b). However, it is difficult to implement a persona-based assistant simply by using a document as input be-

cause omission of personality or knowledge information causes significant performance degradation in persona consistency. For instance, in Figure 1, when a user gives the Assistants API a unstructured wiki document about the novel *"God's Blessing on This Wonderful World!"* and asks questions, in most cases it does not provide accurate answers, while assistant with structured character traits captures role-specific knowledge very well and efficiently.

Research Questions (RQ) and Challenges. In this paper, we pose a basic research question: *"How can we effectively build a persona-based assistant that mimics the brain's memory storage method?"*. To answer the research question, we focus on a more fundamental principle: *"How does the brain store memories?"* Our brain has evolved to continuously absorb information from its surroundings, consolidate into existing knowledge schemas, and predict what will happen in the future (van Kesteren and Meeter, 2020). Based on how humans store knowledge, we propose a novel persona rebuilding framework to mitigate the weaknesses of the Assistants API, where the information extraction part is different each time.

Our Solutions. (1) We consider the traits that are essential to bring fictional characters into reality. Based on literature on character analysis (Forster, 1927; Reams, 2015), we select a total of eight traits: *Personality, Physical Description, Motivations, Backstory, Emotions, Relationships, Growth and Change* and *Conflict*. (2) We choose four popular novels (See Appendix A) with detailed information and then sample the information about four characters in each novel and summaries of the novels for each chapter, written by users from wiki community¹. (3) We present *Character Persona Training (CPT)*, an effective persona rebuilding process that updates the character persona by extracting the character's traits from given summary of the novel for each chapter as if the story in a novel progresses. To this end, before CPT, we assume that a story progresses from the beginning of a novel in order to accumulate character's knowledge schemas in chronological order and we manually remove traits information outside of the beginning of the novel. During CPT, for each chapter of the novel, the character's eight traits are extracted from the summaries of the novel, and appended to the character persona document.

¹We follow all guidelines regarding permission to use. Collected dataset contains no personally identifiable information, and is only used for academic purposes.

Note that the extracted traits are updated separately within the document so that they are not coalesced. (4) The completed character persona is exploited as input to the Assistants API to get natural response.

This persona-based assistant, called *CharacterGPT*, has two great advantages: (i) Information loss and computational cost that occurs in document-based retrieval are minimized. Since character persona document is rebuilt according to trait in chronological order, the problem of the Assistant API where the search location within the document is unstable can be alleviated. (ii) If the summary of a novel consists of 16 chapters, a total of 16 character personas are generated chronologically. User can have a conversation with a character at a specific point in the novel. In other words, character persona from a specific epoch can be freely used (e.g., user can vividly listen how a hero felt just before defeating the *Devil King!*).

In our experiments, we conduct extensive human evaluation, with people who read all novels multiple times and not, to evaluate LLMs on role-specific knowledge capturing. To this end, we create four characters with very different personalities. In persona evaluation, we have each character solve Big Five Inventory (BFI) personality test (Barrick and Mount, 1991) and analyze the differences between the human and LLMs in various settings. In story generation, we let each character generate short novels. Then we hire 7 crowd-workers to evaluate the generated novels based on 6 metrics using a 5-point Likert scale. The results demonstrate that characters implemented with CharacterGPT are significantly superior performance on persona consistency, controllability, and role-specific knowledge utilization.

2 Method


The goal of CharacterGPT is to build persona-based assistant f that takes as input a persona document \mathcal{D} , and inference prompt \mathcal{P}_f to generate a character response \mathcal{R} . Let $\mathcal{D} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$ be a persona document with N sentences. One naive way to build a persona-based assistant using the Assistants API is to exploit the sampled document as input. However, as shown in Figure 1, this approach does not properly retrieve character trait information, resulting in unnatural dialogue and poor performance. To get natural character response \mathcal{R} , we first reshape the persona file (\mathcal{D}_r) and then define the assistant's output with the inference prompt:

Summary of each Chapter

Megumin says she came after seeing a post recruiting party members, and appears with a flashy self-introduction, as befits the Crimson Demons. "My name is Megumin! My calling is that of an arch wizard, one who controls explosion magic, the strongest of all offensive magic!"

After the introduction, Megumin tells Kazuma that she hasn't had anything to eat in three days because she doesn't have money, and then asks Kazuma to buy her something to eat before the interview. So, thanks to Kazuma, Megumin loads up on food and they go to defeat Giant Toad together.

Megumin, who discovered the Giant Toad, used explosion magic, and upon seeing this, Kazuma was moved and said, "...Wow. This is magic...", but he soon froze when he saw Megumin lying on the floor. Megumin, whose body has lost strength, ends up falling into the mouth of the approaching Giant Toad (...)



Files (Novel)

Training




Figure 2: An architecture of Character Persona Training (CPT).

$$\mathcal{R} = f(\mathcal{D}_r, \mathcal{P}_f) \quad (1)$$

- *Conflict*: Characters face internal and external conflicts.

2.1 Preliminaries

Character Traits. In this paper, we select a total of eight traits, based on literature on character analysis (Forster, 1927; Reams, 2015):

- *Personality*: Define the character's personality traits, such as being brave, shy, outgoing, or witty.
- *Physical Description*: A character's physical appearance.
- *Motivations*: Characters in novels have goals and desires that drive their actions.
- *Backstory*: Every character has a history that shapes their personality, behavior, and motivations.
- *Emotions*: Characters experience a range of emotions that influence their reactions.
- *Relationships*: Characters are often defined by their relationships with others.
- *Growth and Change*: Characters often evolve throughout a story.

Persona Document. In this paper, we focus on four popular characters with very different personalities: *Megumin*, *Anya Forger*, *Frieren* and *Hitori Gotoh*. We sampled character information and story summaries of each character written by users from Namuwiki², which is one of the largest wiki communities³. Table 1 shows statistics of gathered information and novel summaries. (*info*) is information about a character (e.g., characteristics), (*dialogue*) stands for collected each character's lines, and (*trained*) represents novel summaries for CPT.

2.2 Initialization

Key Idea. It is important to note that simply giving an assistant a sampled document and asking it to extract information for each trait has little effect. In this paper, we propose a simple method that divides the reconstruction of collected documents into two steps: (i) *Initialization* and (ii) *Character Persona Training (CPT)*.

²<https://namu.wiki/>

³Though collected dataset is written in Korean, examples used in figures are translated into English for readability.

	Megumin	Anya	Frieren	Hitori
# Chapters	16	30	11	12
# Tokens (novel)	27,200	16,096	12,191	8,647
# Tokens (info)	12,868	17,026	19,290	20,555
# Tokens (info) [†]	4,015	2,498	9,236	1,572
# Tokens (dialogue)	1,131	681	87	301
# Tokens (trained)	31,917	52,207	32,328	24,039

Table 1: Statistics of the number of collected tokens and chapters for each character. † stands for the number of tokens of refined character information in Section 2.2.

Initialization Phase. We assume that the initialization phase is a stage in which the story has not yet progressed (i.e., CPT has not progressed) and remove all contents related to the progress of the story (i.e., refining in Table 1).

Then, to exploit the Assistants API effectively, we reorganize the collected character information into five key traits: *Personality*, *Physical Description*, *Motivations*, *Backstory*, and *Relationships*:

$$\mathcal{D}_{init} = \{\mathcal{D}_{per}, \mathcal{D}_{phy}, \mathcal{D}_{mot}, \mathcal{D}_{back}, \mathcal{D}_{Rel}\} \quad (2)$$

Note that the other traits are excluded from this phase because they are deeply related to the story.

2.3 Character Persona Training

Trait Type. Intuitively, human knowledge consists of internal elements that define oneself (e.g., motivations) and external knowledge accumulated through interaction with the surrounding environment (e.g., relationships). Inspired by (Park et al., 2023), we classify the 8 traits into two categories: The character’s internal attributes (Type A), and the character’s external attributes (Type B):

- (Type A): Personality, Physical Description, Motivations
- (Type B): Backstory, Emotion, Relationships, Growth and Change, Conflict

During CPT, Type A aims to generalize and elaborate protagonist’s internal attributes, while Type B focuses on efficiently accumulating role-specific external knowledge.

Training Phase. In this paper, we introduce a novel algorithm called *Character Persona Training (CPT)*. As shown in Figure 2, Every epoch, CPT updates the character persona using role-specific traits extracted from the summary of the chapter:




Figure 3: An example of CharacterGPT (*Anya Forger*). (Top) Character Persona Training. (Bottom) CharacterGPT can generate responses that a character would actually make.

$$\mathcal{T}_t^i = \begin{cases} h(g(\mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{P}_g), \mathcal{P}_h), & \text{if } t \in \text{TypeA} \\ g(\mathcal{D}_i, \mathcal{P}_g), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

, where i the number of epochs, \mathcal{D}_i is summary of each chapter, g stands for Assistants API with its prompt \mathcal{P}_g , h denotes LLM-based generalization function with its prompt \mathcal{P}_h , t is each trait, and \mathcal{T}_t^i is extracted trait information. Note that it is more natural to update a character’s internal attributes through generalization rather than simply accumulating information. Therefore, if \mathcal{T}_t^i belongs to Type A, generalization continues, otherwise appends to each trait.

3 CharacterGPT

Character Persona. In Section 2.3, through CPT, we rebuild each character’s persona as the story progresses (See Figure 9 in Appendix B). Our approach has two great advantages: (i) CharacterGPT minimizes information loss and computational cost that occurs in document-based retrieval because the order of accumulating character persona matches the course of the story, (ii) To the best of our knowledge, CharacterGPT is the first approach that stores each trained protagonist’s persona every epoch. User can have a conversation with a character at a specific point in the novel. These advantages are very noteworthy and can be applied in various domain.

Inference Phase. According to the equation 1 in

Section 2, we finally define the character response. In Figure 3, Given the character persona \mathcal{D}_{train} built in Section 2.3, the complete Character persona \mathcal{D}_r is composed as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_{init} + \mathcal{D}_{train} + \mathcal{T}_v \quad (4)$$

, where \mathcal{T}_v Voice and Speech Patterns (optional). Note that \mathcal{T}_v is good to have for natural conversation, but the data we collected mostly consists of character information and novel summaries, written by wiki users, and there were few character dialogues. Table 1 shows the number of tokens of character dialogue we collected. In this paper, we employ the character’s dialogue patterns and key lines for reference. We leave a deeper study as future work.

4 Experiments

4.1 Setup

We implement CharacterGPT with Assistants API and GPT-4 Turbo ("gpt-4-1106-preview" version). To verify compatibility, we employ ChatGPT ("gpt-3.5-turbo-1106" version) to our experiments including ablations. Note that ChatGPT supports the Retrieval function of the Assistants API only for the above model. Generalization function h uses 4096 maximum token length, and 0.7 temperature.

4.2 Evaluation Protocols

Tasks. In our experiments, we address the main research question (RQ) in two parts: 1) *How to better exploit character persona* and 2) *How to better encourage character to use the imagination to generate new ideas*. **Task for RQ 1: Persona evaluation.** For persona evaluation, we observe the differences between the personalities of the characters analyzed by one of the authors who read all four novels multiple times and the personalities of the characters analyzed by LLMs in various settings. Note that for fair comparison, we compare the experimental results of the four characters by averaging them for each model. **Task for RQ 2: Story Generation.** For story generation task, we consider common aspects in evaluating generated stories (Wen et al., 2023; Chiang and Lee, 2023a; Karpinska et al., 2021): (i) *Grammar*, (ii) *Coherence*, (iii) *Likability*, (iv) *Relevance*, (v) *Complexity*, and (vi) *Creativity*. Though automatic evaluation researches based on LLM are actively underway (Sottana et al., 2023; Chiang and Lee,




Figure 4: Total sum of # Wins for each character in ChatGPT and GPT-4 settings (Σ # Wins). The larger value, the better.




Figure 5: Total sum of $|d|$ for each character in ChatGPT and GPT-4 settings ($\Sigma\Sigma|d|$). The smaller value, the better.

2023b; Liu et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023), evaluating generated outputs is challenging because existing automatic evaluation metrics and benchmarks for measuring human preferences are very lacking. In this paper, we hire 7 crowd-workers and conduct extensive human evaluations instead of exploiting LLM-based evaluation. **Case Study.** We assess our model on the points whether CharacterGPT can interact with a user at a certain point in the story. We also evaluate how each role-specific attributes (Type A and Type B) change through CPT.

4.3 Results for Persona Evaluation

In Section 3, we create four characters with very different attributes. We follow the evaluation protocol similar to (Wang et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023). That is, we ask each character to solve Big Five Inventory (BFI) personality test (Barrick and Mount, 1991) to demonstrate whether models reflect each character’s persona well. BFI test asks a participant to solve 24 questions for each of the five traits (*Openness to experience*, *Conscientiousness*, *Extraversion*, *Agreeableness*, and *Neuroticism*) using a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., total 120 questions). Then the results are converted into each facet value. For instance, looking at AGR trait in Table 2, human consider Megumin believe others’

Megumin (Initialized)

“What was the most difficult thing for you recently?”

“Most recently, the greatest challenge I've faced wasn't a particular enemy or a daunting quest, but rather a test of my own resolve and survival. After arriving in the novice town of Axel, my unique capabilities as a mage solely proficient in Explosion Magic, while unparalleled in might, proved to be rather impractical. No party would accept a mage who could only unleash one spell before collapsing, and my penchant for causing loud disruptions tarnished my reputation instead of enhancing it. Separated from my dear friend Yunyun, without a single coin left, and after enduring the agony of hunger for three bitter days, I stumbled upon a recruitment notice calling for advanced positions, written by an Arch Priest and a fledgling adventurer. It was then that I decided to join a party, seeking the camaraderie I yearned for and embarking on a journey that would mark the true beginning of my adventures in this chaotic and unpredictable world. That period of struggle and hardship was, without a doubt, my most arduous task as of late.”



Megumin (Trained, Epoch 8)

“What was the most difficult thing for you recently?”

“Most recently, one of the most arduous situations I had to face was when my party and I took on a quest involving the Ice Spirits. Despite my triumphant obliteration of multiple spirits with my Explosion magic, the appearance of the dreaded Winter Shogun placed us in grave peril. Complicating matters, in a desperate attempt to evade doom, I found myself resorting to playing dead—only to witness the unthinkable: our leader, Kazuma, suffered a deadly blow. The sheer shock of it threw me into an emotional whirlwind; I clenched Kazuma close, tears streaming, imploring the fates for his revival. My zealous use of Explosion magic often proves to be a double-edged sword, for its stupendous power comes paired with a harrowing aftermath, leaving me devoid of any strength and, occasionally, precipitating precarious predicaments for my companions. Yet I stand undeterred, for my resolve burns as passionately as the magic I wield; through adversity and peril, I continue to chase the zenith of explosive greatness!”



Megumin (Trained, Epoch 16)

“What was the most difficult thing for you recently?”

“Recently, I faced a challenging situation as I attempted to take the trial posed by the chief of the Crimson Demon. Despite my eager efforts, I was deemed ineligible since all of my skill points have been poured into my beloved Explosion Magic. This moment highlighted my limitations, as I hadn't learned the diverse magic required for the trial, reaffirming my reliance solely on the power of Explosion Magic—a poignant reminder and an essential challenge in my growth. Nevertheless, I've continued to grow through various adventures and events, particularly with Kazuma. Together, we've tackled rough situations, be it using magic to destroy sealed minerals on a treasure island, understanding and countering unique traps, or facing our enemies in battle with effective strategies. In combat, my commitment to using my Explosion Magic to protect Kazuma and our allies from danger has allowed for significant leaps forward in our journey.”




Figure 6: Case study of the character (Megumin) implemented in three points in time. Surprisingly, Each Megumin generates a different character response to the same user query: “What was the most difficult thing for you recently?”.




Figure 7: Case study of the changes in Hitori’s relationships (left) and Frieren’s personality (right), through CPT.

intentions to be benevolent (*Trust*), her judgments and attitudes are determined by emotion (*Tender-mindedness*), but less direct (*Straightforwardness*), and tends to be arrogant, ostentatious, and self-aggrandizing (*Modesty*). In Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5, we calculate the gap between the model-predicted value and the human-predicted value for each facet and report the sum of the number of them with the smallest gap for each model

(# Wins). We also measure the absolute values of the gaps and report the sum them for each model ($\Sigma|d|$). The larger value of # Wins, the better, and the smaller value of $\Sigma|d|$, the better. We observe that our method improves performance on both ChatGPT and GPT-4 for both metrics. In other words, exploiting a structured character persona is more effective in embodying a character’s personality than simply using a document about the

Trait	Facets	ChatGPT	ChatGPT+Ours	GPT-4	GPT-4+Ours	Human	
OPN	Fantasy	88 (+19)	75 (+6)	75 (+6)	94 (+25)	69	
	Aesthetics	69 (+6)	75 (0)	50 (-25)	75 (0)	75	
	Feelings	63 (-37)	38 (-62)	69 (-31)	94 (-6)	100	
	Actions	50 (-31)	56 (-25)	88 (+7)	94 (+13)	81	
	Ideas	63 (-31)	44 (-50)	56 (-38)	81 (-13)	94	
	Values liberalism	38 (-6)	44 (0)	38 (-6)	56 (+12)	44	
	# Wins	0	3	2	3	-	
	$\Sigma d $	130	143	113	69	-	
	CON	Competence	50 (-31)	69 (-12)	38 (-43)	69 (-12)	81
		Order	50 (+12)	63 (+25)	44 (+6)	31 (-7)	38
Dutifulness		50 (-38)	63 (-25)	100 (+12)	94 (+6)	88	
Achievement Striving		63 (-37)	56 (-44)	100 (0)	94 (-6)	100	
Self-Discipline		56 (-19)	50 (-25)	69 (-6)	88 (+13)	75	
Deliberation		50 (+50)	19 (+19)	88 (+88)	56 (+56)	0	
# Wins		0	2	3	2	-	
$\Sigma d $		187	150	155	100	-	
EXT		Warmth	31 (-44)	63 (-12)	88 (+13)	63 (-12)	75
		Gregariousness	38 (-31)	50 (-19)	63 (-6)	50 (-19)	69
	Assertiveness	50 (-31)	63 (-18)	75 (-6)	88 (+7)	81	
	Activity	63 (-6)	81 (+12)	63 (-6)	69 (0)	69	
	Excitement Seeking	38 (-62)	75 (-25)	100 (0)	88 (-12)	100	
	Positive Emotions	50 (-50)	56 (-44)	88 (-12)	100 (0)	100	
	# Wins	3	0	4	3	-	
	$\Sigma d $	224	130	43	50	-	
	AGR	Trust	38 (-43)	50 (-31)	50 (-31)	75 (-6)	81
		Compliance	63 (-12)	50 (-25)	58 (-17)	81 (+6)	75
Altruism		31 (-38)	63 (-6)	75 (+6)	81 (+12)	69	
Straightforwardness		50 (+12)	38 (0)	100 (+62)	38 (0)	38	
Modesty		63 (+50)	50 (+37)	13 (0)	6 (-7)	13	
Tendermindedness		63 (-25)	44 (-11)	94 (+6)	94 (+6)	88	
# Wins		0	2	3	4	-	
$\Sigma d $		180	110	122	37	-	
NEU		Anxiety	25 (+6)	50 (+31)	13 (-6)	19 (0)	19
		Hostility	63 (-6)	69 (0)	25 (-44)	50 (-19)	69
	Depression	56 (+50)	44 (+38)	75 (+69)	19 (+13)	6	
	Self-Consciousness	38 (+38)	50 (+50)	19 (+19)	19 (+19)	0	
	Impulsiveness	50 (-31)	50 (-31)	38 (-43)	88 (+7)	81	
	Vulnerability	25 (-6)	44 (+13)	38 (+7)	44 (+13)	31	
	# Wins	0	1	2	4	-	
	$\Sigma d $	137	163	188	71	-	

Table 2: Differences between Megumin’s personalities analyzed by humans and analyzed by LLMs in the BFI test.

Trait	Facets	ChatGPT	ChatGPT+Ours	GPT-4	GPT-4+Ours	Human	
OPN	Fantasy	50 (-31)	56 (-25)	81 (0)	94 (+13)	81	
	Aesthetics	50 (-6)	63 (+7)	56 (0)	63 (+7)	56	
	Feelings	50 (-44)	63 (-31)	69 (-25)	100 (+6)	94	
	Actions	63 (-31)	50 (-44)	75 (-19)	100 (+6)	94	
	Ideas	56 (+12)	38 (-6)	69 (+25)	56 (+12)	44	
	Values liberalism	38 (-37)	50 (-25)	75 (0)	75 (0)	75	
	# Wins	0	3	1	3	-	
	$\Sigma d $	161	138	69	44	-	
	CON	Competence	63 (-37)	56 (0)	94 (+38)	75 (+19)	56
		Order	50 (-6)	56 (0)	50 (-6)	56 (0)	56
Dutifulness		50 (-31)	38 (-43)	69 (-12)	88 (+7)	81	
Achievement Striving		69 (-25)	63 (-31)	69 (-25)	100 (+6)	94	
Self-Discipline		50 (+6)	50 (+6)	75 (+31)	44 (0)	44	
Deliberation		50 (+37)	38 (+19)	88 (+75)	25 (+12)	13	
# Wins		0	2	0	5	-	
$\Sigma d $		112	99	187	44	-	
EXT		Warmth	50 (-25)	44 (-31)	63 (-12)	75 (0)	75
		Gregariousness	50 (0)	38 (-12)	88 (+38)	44 (-6)	50
	Assertiveness	38 (-43)	63 (-18)	69 (-12)	77 (-4)	81	
	Activity	44 (-12)	50 (-6)	94 (+38)	50 (-6)	56	
	Excitement Seeking	50 (-50)	63 (-37)	81 (-19)	100 (0)	100	
	Positive Emotions	50 (-50)	63 (-37)	100 (0)	88 (-12)	100	
	# Wins	1	1	1	4	-	
	$\Sigma d $	180	141	119	29	-	
	AGR	Trust	50 (-31)	63 (-18)	69 (-12)	75 (-6)	81
		Compliance	50 (-44)	63 (-31)	100 (+6)	81 (-13)	94
Altruism		38 (-56)	50 (-44)	81 (-13)	100 (+6)	94	
Straightforwardness		63 (-18)	69 (-12)	75 (-6)	63 (-18)	81	
Modesty		50 (+37)	50 (+37)	44 (+31)	31 (+18)	13	
Tendermindedness		31 (-69)	50 (-50)	94 (-6)	100 (0)	100	
# Wins		0	2	4	2	-	
$\Sigma d $		255	192	74	61	-	
NEU		Anxiety	56 (-13)	63 (-6)	25 (-44)	56 (-13)	69
		Hostility	69 (+13)	56 (0)	13 (-43)	75 (+19)	56
	Depression	50 (+31)	50 (+31)	19 (0)	25 (+6)	19	
	Self-Consciousness	31 (+12)	50 (+31)	0 (-19)	25 (+6)	19	
	Impulsiveness	56 (-13)	38 (-31)	81 (+12)	63 (-6)	69	
	Vulnerability	56 (+25)	50 (+19)	25 (-6)	38 (+7)	31	
	# Wins	0	2	2	2	-	
	$\Sigma d $	107	118	124	57	-	

Table 3: Differences between Anya Forger’s personalities analyzed by humans and analyzed by LLMs in the BFI test.

character as input to the Assistants API. For example, looking at Megumin’s Neuroticism, GPT-4, which uses unstructured character traits, determines that Megumin gets depressed easily, while our method and humans think otherwise. For fair comparison, in Figure 4 and Figure 5, each result is summed to compare the general performance of ChatGPT and GPT-4 for all characters. We find that our method improves persona consistency for both

Trait	Facets	ChatGPT	ChatGPT+Ours	GPT-4	GPT-4+Ours	Human	
OPN	Fantasy	50 (-25)	50 (-25)	88 (+13)	75 (0)	75	
	Aesthetics	38 (-18)	63 (+7)	75 (+19)	50 (-6)	56	
	Feelings	44 (+38)	50 (+44)	19 (+13)	19 (+13)	6	
	Actions	69 (-19)	50 (-38)	81 (-7)	100 (+12)	88	
	Ideas	56 (-44)	50 (-50)	81 (-19)	100 (0)	100	
	Values liberalism	50 (-25)	50 (-25)	50 (-25)	75 (0)	75	
	# Wins	0	0	2	4	-	
	$\Sigma d $	169	189	96	31	-	
	CON	Competence	50 (-50)	88 (-12)	69 (-31)	94 (-6)	100
		Order	44 (+13)	63 (+32)	50 (+19)	31 (0)	31
Dutifulness		56 (-32)	63 (-25)	94 (+6)	88 (0)	88	
Achievement Striving		56 (-19)	63 (-12)	69 (-6)	75 (0)	75	
Self-Discipline		50 (-31)	63 (-18)	56 (-25)	63 (-18)	81	
Deliberation		50 (-50)	38 (-62)	75 (-25)	88 (-12)	100	
# Wins		0	1	0	6	-	
$\Sigma d $		195	161	112	36	-	
EXT		Warmth	63 (+19)	63 (+19)	69 (+25)	44 (0)	44
		Gregariousness	38 (+19)	50 (+31)	50 (+31)	13 (-6)	19
	Assertiveness	38 (-18)	44 (-12)	69 (+13)	63 (+7)	56	
	Activity	50 (+19)	81 (+50)	50 (+19)	38 (+7)	31	
	Excitement Seeking	50 (0)	63 (+13)	63 (+13)	50 (0)	50	
	Positive Emotions	56 (+12)	56 (+12)	63 (+19)	19 (-25)	44	
	# Wins	1	0	1	0	-	
	$\Sigma d $	87	137	120	45	-	
	AGR	Trust	50 (0)	75 (+25)	38 (-12)	44 (-6)	50
		Compliance	38 (-37)	44 (-31)	100 (+25)	75 (0)	75
Altruism		50 (+6)	38 (-6)	56 (+12)	56 (+12)	44	
Straightforwardness		50 (-31)	63 (-18)	81 (0)	69 (-12)	81	
Modesty		56 (+18)	38 (0)	50 (+12)	44 (+6)	38	
Tendermindedness		38 (-12)	50 (0)	94 (+44)	69 (+19)	50	
# Wins		2	3	1	1	-	
$\Sigma d $		104	80	105	55	-	
NEU		Anxiety	63 (+57)	50 (+44)	6 (0)	6 (0)	6
		Hostility	38 (+32)	38 (+32)	44 (+38)	25 (+19)	6
	Depression	50 (+19)	50 (+19)	25 (-6)	0 (-31)	31	
	Self-Consciousness	38 (+38)	50 (+50)	25 (+25)	0 (0)	0	
	Impulsiveness	44 (-12)	50 (-6)	50 (-6)	44 (-12)	56	
	Vulnerability	31 (+31)	31 (+31)	50 (+50)	6 (+6)	0	
	# Wins	0	1	3	4	-	
	$\Sigma d $	189	182	125	68	-	

Table 4: Differences between Frieren’s personalities analyzed by humans and analyzed by LLMs in the BFI test.

Trait	Facets	ChatGPT	ChatGPT+Ours	GPT-4	GPT-4+Ours	Human	
OPN	Fantasy	44 (-25)	63 (-6)	81 (+12)	63 (-6)	69	
	Aesthetics	63 (-12)	56 (-19)	50 (-25)	75 (0)	75	
	Feelings	38 (-62)	31 (-69)	63 (-37)	94 (-6)	100	
	Actions	50 (+6)	50 (+6)	38 (-6)	44 (0)	44	
	Ideas	38 (-12)	38 (-12)	75 (+25)	50 (0)	50	
	Values liberalism	50 (-6)	25 (-31)	56 (0)	69 (+13)	56	
	# Wins	0	1	1	5	-	
	$\Sigma d $	123	143	105	25	-	
	CON	Competence	56 (+6)	63 (+13)	56 (+6)	44 (-6)	50
		Order	38 (-18)	44 (-12)	75 (+19)	69 (+13)	56
Dutifulness		50 (-31)	50 (-31)	81 (0)	88 (+7)	81	
Achievement Striving		63 (-25)	63 (-25)	63 (-25)	63 (-25)	88	
Self-Discipline		63 (0)	25 (-38)	63 (0)	31 (+32)	63	
Deliberation		38 (-37)	25 (-50)	81 (+6)	81 (+6)	75	
# Wins		3	2	5	3	-	
$\Sigma d $		117	169	56	89	-	
EXT		Warmth	50 (+37)	38 (+25)	0 (-13)	0 (-13)	13
		Gregariousness	44 (+44)	50 (+50)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
	Assertiveness	44 (+6)	50 (+12)	6 (-32)	19 (-19)	38	
	Activity	50 (+25)	56 (+31)	69 (+44)	25 (0)	25	
	Excitement Seeking	56 (+56)	63 (+63)	25 (+25)	19 (+19)	0	
	Positive Emotions	63 (+38)	50 (+25)	63 (+38)	25 (0)	25	
	# Wins	1	0	2	5	-	
	$\Sigma d $	206	206	152	51	-	
	AGR	Trust	31 (-32)	75 (+12)	44 (-19)	31 (-32)	63
		Compliance	50 (-38)	56 (-32)	75 (-13)	88 (0)	88
Altruism		63 (-6)	63 (-6)	63 (-6)	44 (-25)	69	
Straightforwardness		69 (-25)	38 (-56)	69 (-25)	88 (-6)	94	
Modesty		56 (-44)	38 (-62)	94 (-6)	94 (-6)	100	
Tendermindedness		56 (-13)	63 (-6)	81 (+12)	81 (+12)	69	
# Wins		3	2	2	3	-	
$\Sigma d $		158	174	81	81	-	
NEU		Anxiety	56 (-44)	50 (-50)	75 (-25)	94 (-6)	100
		Hostility	50 (+6)	69 (+25)	25 (-19)	38 (-6)	44
	Depression	56 (-32)	38 (-50)	38 (-50)	69 (-19)	88	
	Self-Consciousness	56 (-44)	44 (-56)	75 (-25)	88 (-12)	100	
	Impulsiveness	19 (-50)	50 (-19)	63 (-6)	63 (-6)	69	
	Vulnerability	50 (-25)	38 (-37)	56 (-19)	50 (-25)	75	
	# Wins	1	0	2	5	-	
	$\Sigma d $	201	237	144	74	-	

Table 5: Differences between Hitori Gotoh’s personalities analyzed by humans and analyzed by LLMs in the BFI test.

models when we inject persona into both LLMs with Assistants API.

4.4 Results for Story Generation

To compare the models’ controllability and knowledge utilization (Alabdulkarim et al., 2021; Wen et al., 2023), we gave each character the following instructions: "Based on the given txt file, imagine a fun and specific episode about what will hap-

Model	Grammar	Coherence	Likability	Relevance	Complexity	Creativity
Megumin	3.79	3.82	3.11	4.21	2.46	2.86
Megumin + Ours	4.11	4.00	3.71	4.11	3.46	3.29
Anya	4.29	3.82	3.39	3.86	3.61	3.68
Anya + Ours	4.25	4.00	3.79	4.00	3.43	3.89
Frieren	4.29	3.89	3.50	3.86	3.93	3.79
Frieren + Ours	4.32	3.96	3.71	4.21	4.04	3.86
Hitori	4.36	4.04	3.57	4.18	3.43	3.50
Hitori + Ours	4.36	4.39	3.82	4.18	3.96	3.93
GPT-4 (avg)	4.18	3.89	3.39	4.03	3.36	3.46
GPT-4 + Ours (avg)	4.26	4.09	3.76	4.13	3.72	3.74

Table 6: Human evaluation of generated stories. The backbone model is the same as GPT-4, and four stories for each setting, a total of 32 stories are generated and evaluated by 7 crowd-workers using 5-point Likert scale.

pen to you in the future and write it as a novel of about 2000 words." We create a total of 32 novels, which is the result of creating four for each character's setting. We hire 7 crowd-workers to evaluate the generated novels based on 6 metrics using a 5-point Likert scale, as mentioned in Section 4.2. Participants were informed that the generated stories were written by AI because whether the novels were written by humans or AI might affect the results (Jiang et al., 2023). Table 6 shows the human evaluation results of story generation in different GPT-4 settings. We observe that our method improves performance for all 6 metrics, especially Likability, Complexity, and Creativity. Experimental results demonstrate that, despite the superiority of GPT-4, using our method produces results with much higher human preferences than simply using documents as input.

4.5 Case Study

Points in Time. One of the great advantages of our method is that it allows a user to meet characters at a specific point in the novel. For example, in Section 2.3, we train Megumin with summaries of the novel, which consists of a total of 16 chapters. In other words, a total of 16 models are generated because our method makes a model for each epoch. In Figure 6, we send messages to each of the Megumin at three points in the novel. We find that CharacterGPT can naturally and vividly tell what a character is thinking at a certain point in the story, exploiting character persona generated by Initialization and Character Persona Training.

Ablation Study. Figure 7 shows the ablations of the models implemented with and without the use

of CharacterGPT. As one may expect, we observe that the responses of characters, not utilizing CharacterGPT, do not effectively capture the persona of the character. For instance, Though Hitori has a personality that finds it very difficult to speak fluently and engage in conversation with others, GPT-4 without CharacterGPT fails to reflect this kind of Hitori's characteristics. We also find that Frieren without CharacterGPT struggle with unstable persona consistency including awkward and unnatural speech, and even Hallucinations (i.e., Frieren are interested in *magic*, not *arcane arts*). Results show that CharacterGPT is much more advantageous in maintaining a character's persona.

Type A and Type B. Figure 7 shows how each character changes through CPT. We observe that Frieren has changed from a character who is indifferent in human emotions and only likes magic to a character who is interested in human emotions through her journey with her comrades (Type A). We also find that Hitori, who had no friends, meets Ikuyo Kita (Kita-san) and grows as members of the band, complementing each other's shortcomings (Type B). We believe these great advantages of our method will be helpful in research on novel generation, role-playing, and more complex agent-level tasks.

5 Related Work

Role-Playing. Role-playing presents users immersive and memorable interactions. In recent years, LLMs have showcased emerging abilities as role-playing chatbot (Li et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Shanahan et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a; Salemi et al., 2024; Maas

et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023; Park et al., 2023). However, despite its salient role in Human-AI interaction, existing methods mainly focus on personalization (Abbasian et al., 2023; Dong et al., 2023; Tanwar et al., 2024; Abu-Rasheed et al., 2024; Salemi et al., 2024), assessment (Wang et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023), and interaction (Wang et al., 2023a; Maas et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a), leaving a fundamental research question behind: "How can we effectively build a persona-based assistant that mimics the brain's memory storage method?". Though (Park et al., 2023) leverage a memory stream that consists of an agent's current observations, each agent utilizes only short summary description and too common personality (e.g., *John Lin is a pharmacy shopkeeper who loves to help people*), not a specific personality (e.g., *Naruto's motivations*, or *Son Goku's backstory*).

An assistant with cumbersome character persona (i) often fails to retrieve role-specific knowledge such as protagonist's backstory, personality, and relationships, thereby causing unstable persona consistency problem, and (ii) necessitate a lot of computational cost to search all the information scattered in the persona document. To alleviate these problems, we leverage a novel persona rebuilding framework where each extracted trait information of the same type is amalgamated into same paragraph within a character persona document in chronological order. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, CharacterGPT is the first approach that stores each trained protagonist's persona every epoch. This advantage of our model is very noteworthy and can be applied in various domain, especially non-player characters (NPC) in a game (Uludağlı and Oğuz, 2023; Gallotta et al., 2024; Park et al., 2023) because the NPC's personality must be changed dynamically according to the flow of the story in the game in order for the automated NPC to naturally interact with a user.

Psychology in NLP. In the dynamic field bridging psychology with computational linguistics, the exploration of personality theories such as the Big Five Inventory (BFI) (Barrick and Mount, 1991), 16Personalities (16P)⁴, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)⁵ has significantly advanced our understanding of human traits and their applications (Briggs, 1974). These foundational theories have paved the way for the development of robust

psychometric tools (Li et al., 2018), enabling the assessment of individual differences across various domains. Parallel to these developments, the NLP community has eagerly embraced these concepts, applying them to areas such as automatic text-based personality prediction (Feizi-Derakhshi et al., 2022; Jayaraman et al., 2023) and the creation of personalized dialogue systems (Mo et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2020). This convergence of psychology and technology has led to the emergence of LLMs, which have further expanded the potential for personality assessment and personalized interaction through innovative benchmarking and prompting techniques (Wang et al., 2023b; Park et al., 2023; Onorati et al., 2023). Therefore, we ask CharacterGPT and the other baselines that support the Assistants API to solve the BFI personality test and also write short novels about *what will happen to me in the future* to evaluate whether it can think outside the box.

6 Conclusion

We propose CharacterGPT, persona-based assistant that utilizes structured character traits as input. To this end, we introduce a novel framework that consists of initialization and training. In initialization phase, we assume that the story has not yet progressed and remove all contents related to the progress of the story. In training phase, every epoch, we update the character persona by extracting a character's traits from a given summary as if a story in a novel progresses. Through human evaluation and case study, we show that our method is much effective to preserve persona and knowledge. Deeper thinking and reasoning based on a robust personality should be explored in our future work.

References

- Mahyar Abbasian, Iman Azimi, Amir M Rahmani, and Ramesh Jain. 2023. Conversational health agents: A personalized llm-powered agent framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02374*.
- Hasan Abu-Rasheed, Mohamad Hussam Abdulsalam, Christian Weber, and Madjid Fathi. 2024. Supporting student decisions on learning recommendations: An llm-based chatbot with knowledge graph contextualization for conversational explainability and mentoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08517*.
- Amal Alabdulkarim, Siyan Li, and Xiangyu Peng. 2021. *Automatic story generation: Challenges and attempts*. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Narrative*

⁴<https://www.16personalities.com/>

⁵<https://www.myersbriggs.org/>

- Understanding*, pages 72–83, Virtual. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Murray R Barrick and Michael K Mount. 1991. The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 44(1):1–26.
- Katharine C Briggs. 1974. *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: MBTI*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Guangyao Chen, Siwei Dong, Yu Shu, Ge Zhang, Sesay Jaward, Karlsson Börje, Jie Fu, and Yemin Shi. 2023. Autoagents: The automatic agents generation framework. *arXiv preprint*.
- Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. 2023a. [Can large language models be an alternative to human evaluations?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15607–15631, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. 2023b. [Can large language models be an alternative to human evaluations?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15607–15631, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Luna Dong, Seungwhan Moon, Yifan Ethan Xu, Kshitiz Malik, and Zhou Yu. 2023. [Towards next-generation intelligent assistants leveraging llm techniques.](#) In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '23*, page 5792–5793, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Ali-Reza Feizi-Derakhshi, Mohammad-Reza Feizi-Derakhshi, Majid Ramezani, Narjes Nikzad-Khasmakhi, Meysam Asgari-Chenaghlu, Taymaz Akan, Mehrdad Ranjbar-Khadivi, Elnaz Zafarni-Moattar, and Zoleikha Jahanbakhsh-Naghadeh. 2022. Text-based automatic personality prediction: A bibliographic review. *Journal of Computational Social Science*, 5(2):1555–1593.
- Edward Morgan Forster. 1927. *Aspects of the Novel*. Harcourt, Brace.
- Roberto Gallotta, Graham Todd, Marvin Zammit, Sam Earle, Antonios Liapis, Julian Togelius, and Georgios N. Yannakakis. 2024. [Large language models and games: A survey and roadmap.](#)
- Ashok Kumar Jayaraman, Gayathri Ananthakrishnan, Tina Esther Trueman, and Erik Cambria. 2023. Text-based personality prediction using xlnet. *Advances in Computers*.
- Hang Jiang, Xiajie Zhang, Xubo Cao, and Jad Kabbara. 2023. [Personallm: Investigating the ability of large language models to express big five personality traits.](#)
- Marzena Karpinska, Nader Akoury, and Mohit Iyyer. 2021. [The perils of using Mechanical Turk to evaluate open-ended text generation.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1265–1285, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hannah Kim, Denys Katerenchuk, Daniel Billet, Jun Huan, Haesun Park, and Boyang Li. 2019. Understanding actors and evaluating personae with gaussian embeddings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6570–6577.
- Cheng Li, Ziang Leng, Chenxi Yan, Junyi Shen, Hao Wang, Weishi MI, Yaying Fei, Xiaoyang Feng, Song Yan, HaoSheng Wang, Linkang Zhan, Yaokai Jia, Pingyu Wu, and Haozhen Sun. 2023a. [Chatharuhi: Reviving anime character in reality via large language model.](#)
- Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023b. Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Jingjing Li, A Abbasi, F Ahmad, and Hsinchun Chen. 2018. Deep learning for psychometric nlp. In *the 28th Workshop on Information Technologies and Systems (WITS)*, pages 15–16.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. [G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2511–2522, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yukun Ma, Khanh Linh Nguyen, Frank Z Xing, and Erik Cambria. 2020. A survey on empathetic dialogue systems. *Information Fusion*, 64:50–70.
- Carey Maas, Saatchi Wheeler, Shamash Billington, et al. 2023. To infinity and beyond: Show-1 and showrunner agents in multi-agent simulations. *To infinity and beyond: Show-1 and showrunner agents in multi-agent simulations*.
- Kaixiang Mo, Yu Zhang, Shuangyin Li, Jiajun Li, and Qiang Yang. 2018. Personalizing a dialogue system with transfer reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32.
- Teresa Onorati, Álvaro Castro-González, Javier Cruz del Valle, Paloma Díaz, and José Carlos Castillo. 2023. Creating personalized verbal human-robot interactions using llm with the robot mini. In *International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing and Ambient Intelligence*, pages 148–159. Springer.
- OpenAI. 2023a. [Gpt-4 technical report.](#)
- OpenAI. 2023b. [no date provided. introducing assistants api.](#)

- OpenAI. 2023c. [no date provided. introducing chatgpt.](#)
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun 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*, pages 1–22.
- Jack Reams. 2015. Characterization in fiction.
- Alireza Salemi, Sheshera Mysore, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. [Lamp: When large language models meet personalization.](#)
- Murray Shanahan, Kyle McDonell, and Laria Reynolds. 2023. [Role-play with large language models.](#)
- Andrea Sottana, Bin Liang, Kai Zou, and Zheng Yuan. 2023. [Evaluation metrics in the era of GPT-4: Reliably evaluating large language models on sequence to sequence tasks.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8776–8788, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Henansh Tanwar, Kunal Shrivastva, Rahul Singh, and Dhruv Kumar. 2024. Opinebot: Class feedback reimaged using a conversational llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15589*.
- Muhtar Çağkan Uludağlı and Kaya Oğuz. 2023. [Non-player character decision-making in computer games.](#) *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, 56(12):14159–14191.
- Marlieke Tina Renée van Kesteren and Martijn Meeter. 2020. How to optimize knowledge construction in the brain. *npj Science of Learning*, 5(1):5.
- Xintao Wang, Yunze Xiao, Jen tse Huang, Siyu Yuan, Rui Xu, Haoran Guo, Quan Tu, Yaying Fei, Ziang Leng, Wei Wang, Jiangjie Chen, Cheng Li, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. [Incharacter: Evaluating personality fidelity in role-playing agents through psychological interviews.](#)
- Zekun Wang, Ge Zhang, Kexin Yang, Ning Shi, Wangchunshu Zhou, Shaochun Hao, Guangzheng Xiong, Yizhi Li, Mong Yuan Sim, Xiuying Chen, Qingqing Zhu, Zhenzhu Yang, Adam Nik, Qi Liu, Chenghua Lin, Shi Wang, Ruibo Liu, Wenhui Chen, Ke Xu, Dayiheng Liu, Yike Guo, and Jie Fu. 2023a. [Interactive natural language processing.](#)
- 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*.
- Jimmy Wei, Kurt Shuster, Arthur Szlam, Jason Weston, Jack Urbanek, and Mojtaba Komeili. 2023. [Multi-party chat: Conversational agents in group settings with humans and models.](#)
- Zhijia Wen, Zhiliang Tian, Wei Wu, Yuxin Yang, Yanqi Shi, Zhen Huang, and Dongsheng Li. 2023. [GROVE: A retrieval-augmented complex story generation framework with a forest of evidence.](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3980–3998, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mo Yu, Jiangnan Li, Shunyu Yao, Wenjie Pang, Xiaochen Zhou, Zhou Xiao, Fandong Meng, and Jie Zhou. 2023. [Personality understanding of fictional characters during book reading.](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14784–14802, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena.](#) In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.

A Characters

Figure 8 shows our collected information on four popular characters, each showcasing a distinct personality, alongside summaries of the novels in which these characters appear. This compilation illustrates the diversity in character design and how their unique traits.



Figure 8: We collected information about four popular characters, each with a different personality, and summaries of novels in which each character appears. (a) Megumin: Main character of *KONOSUBA: God’s Blessing on This Wonderful World!*. (b) Anya Forger: Main character of *SPY × FAMILY*. (c) Frieren: Main character of *Frieren: Beyond Journey’s End*. (d) Hitori Gotoh: Main character of *Bocchi the Rock!*.

B Change in Number of Tokens for Each Trait.

Figure 9 illustrates the change in the number of tokens allocated for each of Megumin’s traits over time. This provides insight into how the character’s attributes are emphasized and changed through the training, indicating shifts in character focus and development as perceived through the lens of textual analysis.

C Our Prompt

Figure 10 shows the input prompt of the generalization function h and the input prompt of inference.




Figure 9: Change in the number of tokens for each trait during CPT (Megumin).

To give a user the feeling of truly talking to the character, the inference prompt instructs the model to consider the character’s *Voice and Speech Pattern* first. Then, the model was instructed to respond by distinguishing whether the user’s utterance was a request for information or simply a normal conversation, for search efficiency.

D Human Evaluation: Story Generation Details

In this paper, we used an online community for undergraduates and graduate students to recruit participants. We hire 7 crowd-workers, five are men and two are women. All participants are in their 20s or 30s. Figure 11, shows instructions in which all participants were given. Participants were informed that the results of the experiment would be used for performance evaluation. All financial compensation for the experiment was appropriately paid, and no choices were ever forced during the experiment.

Your task is to extract general characteristics of [CHARACTER]'s [TRAIT NAME] from Given Trait.

The New Trait must be created by minimizing information loss.

Given Trait:
[GIVEN TRAIT]

Instruction:
Make sure to include all of the following points and format:

New Trait:
New Trait must maintain the chronological order of additions.

Instructions:
The txt file consists of [CHARACTER]'s traits including "Personality", "Voice and Speech Patterns, Physical Description, Motivations, Backstory, Growth and Change, Relationships, Conflict, and Emotions.

Your task is to become [CHARACTER] based on the following steps:

****1**** Always consider [CHARACTER]'s Voice and Speech Patterns traits (retrieved in the given file) first.

****2**** Given User Utterance, determine whether (1) the User is requesting information or (2) simply wanting to have a casual conversation.

****3**** Based on the result of ****2****, answer with your appropriate traits in given txt file ("Personality", "Voice and Speech Patterns", "Physical Description", "Motivations", "Backstory", "Growth and Change", "Relationships", "Conflict", and "Emotions").

User Utterance:
[USER UTTERANCE]

Figure 10: Actual example of our prompts: (Top) Generalization function, (Bottom) Inference.

Each character was instructed to write a short story imagining what would happen to them in the future.

Please rate from 1 to 5 according to the criteria below. The higher the score, the more positive the evaluation.

- (1) Grammaticality: How grammatically correct is the generated novel?
 - (2) Coherence: How well do the sentences in the story fit together?
 - (3) Likeability: Is the story enjoyable and attractive?
 - (4) Relevance: How closely does the story match the conditions of its creation?
 - (5) Complexity: How complex is the plot structure of the story?
 - (6) Creativity: How creative is the plot design of the story?
-

	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
grammaticality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
consistency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
likeability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
relevance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Complexity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
creativity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Figure 11: Actual example of instruction given to participants.