An NLP-Based Approach to Record Linkage

FCSM 2023

October 24, 2023

Lilian Huang, NORC at the University of Chicago

In collaboration with: Brandon Sepulvado, NORC Dean Resnick, NORC Jennifer Taub, NORC Brenda Betancourt, NORC



 Θ \Diamond \bigcirc

The challenges of using text data in record linkage

What is record linkage?

- The science of bringing together records from multiple datasets
- Identifying and connecting records representing the same entity
- Usually individuals

Conventional approach to text: string distance

Levenshtein distance

• Minimum number of edits

Jaro-Winkler

• Weighted prefix

teacher

peacher (substitution)

preacher (insertion)

proeacher (insertion)

profeacher (insertion)

profescher (substitution)

professher (substitution)

professoer (substitution)

professor (deletion)

professor

How can NLP be integrated?

String similarity

Conceptual similarity

Occupations

• "teacher", "instructor", "professor"

Alternative to compiling lists

Embeddings: an alternative representation of words

Words as numbers

Another way to conceptualize and capture similarity

• Similar meaning = closer

[-4.	23835516e-02,	2.33865883e-02,	-3.06187198e-02,	3.74618955e-02,
-6.	81095496e-02,	-9.35101211e-02,	1.15498930e-01,	7.19876215e-02,
-4.	08478007e-02,	-3.51659884e-03,	-5.85965328e-02,	-8.57147276e-02,
-4.	34399620e-02,	1.27284229e-01,	3.09126135e-02,	2.40499619e-02,
-8.	09645001e-03,	-4.56378348e-02,	7.84999877e-02,	6.91278055e-02,
2.	04219529e-03,	3.36282402e-02,	8.92838016e-02,	3.49337496e-02,
-4.	52726061e-04,	-3.52332555e-02,	2.04937309e-02,	4.36704606e-03,
5.	04380092e-02,	1.12535976e-01,	-2.93528736e-02,	-8.07721391e-02,
-1.	66531075e-02,	2.15687007e-02,	-1.94442440e-02,	2.32651979e-02,
1.	54493814e-02,	-7.13979751e-02,	-3.38817909e-02,	-7.44279288e-03,
-1.	80203523e-02,	-1.95950456e-02,	-1.09561875e-01,	1.67215660e-01,
-9.	54278633e-02,	-2.25519184e-02,	3.98423150e-02,	3.24025787e-02,



Comparing embeddings

Cosine similarity

• Angle between vectors



HORC

Different libraries for embedding production

fastText

• By Facebook

Universal Sentence Encoder

- By Google
- Context-sensitive

Sentence Transformers

- By Hugging Face
- Context-sensitive





HORC

HORC

Examples of the approach

Embeddings reflect the high similarity we intuitively expect

<u>SIMILARITIES</u>	"teacher" vs "professor"	"ceo" vs "founder ceo"
Levenshtein	0.111	0.273
Jaro-Winkler	0.503	0.449
fastText	0.539	0.860
Universal Sentence Encoder	0.748	0.733
Sentence Transformers	0.619	0.908

The experiment: Datasets used

Database on Ideology, Money in Politics, and Elections (DIME)

• 137,633 records from Maine

Federal Election Commission (FEC)

• 52,827 records from Maine

Variables in common		
First name		
Last name		
Middle initial		
Zip code		
Employer name		
Occupation title		

The experiment: Three different methods

Standard
(Jaro-Winkler for all;
employer excluded)First nameLast nameMiddle initialZip codeOccupation title (string)

NLP 1
(NLP for occupation;
employer excluded)First nameLast nameMiddle initialZip codeOccupation title (embed)

NLP 2 (NLP for occupation; Jaro-Winkler for employer) First name Last name Middle initial Zip code Employer name Occupation title (embed)

The experiment: Probabilistic record linkage process

NORCLink

• Proprietary record linkage software

Fellegi-Sunter model

- EM algorithm
- Overall match probability created
- Links above a threshold are accepted

The experiment: Results

NLP-enhanced models identified more links

• Probability cutoff of 0.9

Precision-recall tradeoff

• Issue of false positives



Precision and recall must be balanced

- More work required
- Optimal balance depends on use case

NLP may only enhance process under specific conditions

Future enhancements

Fine-tuning embeddings

• Using our own datasets

Longer text fields

• e.g. self-identifications

Investigate correlated variables

• Affects implementation of Fellegi-Sunter method

Thank you.

Lilian Huang Statistician huang-lilian@norc.org





Questions?

